FROM PITY TO PRODUCTIVITY

The case of social cash transfers in Mozambique

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the requirements for

MASTERS OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES BY COURSEWORK AND RESEARCH REPORT

In the Graduate School of Social Sciences, Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand

By: Teresa N. Le
Student Number: 441288
Supervisor: Dr. Ben Scully
September 2016

Table of Contents

Declaration

I, Teresa Nguyen Le, declare that this research report is my own original work, and that where I have made use of others' ideas I have referenced accordingly. It is submitted as part of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts, Development Studies, by coursework and research report, to the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. It has not been submitted for any other degree or examination at any other university.

Signed: Date: 3 March 2016

Acknowledgement

This research would not be possible without the generous support of numerous individuals throughout the course of the last year. I would like to extend my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Ben Scully, for his constant feedback, guidance and efforts in helping me shape and execute this research project. In addition, I would like to thank Shireen Ally and the Development Studies Department for their support as well. In Mozambique, I am so grateful for the team at Kaleidoscopio, who not only invited me into their workspace, helped with translations, but also provided thoughtful, honest, and advantageous feedback to my research findings. Thank you to all of the interviewees who decided to participate in my research, and thank you to the Karimo family in Mozambique for their generosity during my field work.

List of Abbreviations

BWI	Bretton Woods Institutions
CCSSBB	Coordinating Council of the Basic Social Security Subsystem
DFID	Department for International Development
ENSSB	National Basic Strategy for Social Security
Frelimo	*Frente de Libertação de Moçambique*
GAPVU	*Gabinete de Apoio à População Vulnerável*
GBS	General Budget Support
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation Agency
HIPCs	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
IFI	International Financial Institution
ILO	International Labour Organization
INAS	National Institute for Social Action
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MISA	Minimum Income for School Attendance
MIS	Management Information System
MMAS	Ministry of Women and Social Action
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Nongovernmental Organizations
NSA	*Novo Sistema de Abastecimento*
PARPA	*Plano de Acçao para a Reduçao do Pobreza Absoluta*
PASD	Direct Social Support Programme
PASP	Productive Social Welfare Programme

PERPU	Strategic Urban Poverty Reduction Programme
PPI	*Plano Prospectivo Indicativo*
PRE	Economic Recovery Plan
PRES	Economic and Social Recovery Plan
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
PSA	Food Subsidy Programme
PSSB	Basic Social Subsidy Programme
Renamo	*Resistência Nacional Moçambicana*
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SASS	Social Welfare Social Services
SDA	Social Dimensions of Adjustment
SEAS	Secretariat of State for Social Action
WB	World Bank
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Programme

Abstract

Social cash transfer programmes on the African continent have more than doubled in the last decade, and this signifies a transformation in the perception of social cash transfers as ‘pity handouts’ to how they are seen today, as ‘productive investments’ in human capabilities. Southern Africa has been a pioneer in social protection growth in the last twenty years, but often accounts of these histories focus on pension schemes in places such as South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, and Lesotho. There is little incorporation of Mozambique’s social protection history, and most histories do not detail that Mozambique ranks fourth chronologically, in introduction of cash transfer programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa. This research puts forth that the Mozambican case of an early adoption of cash transfers in 1990 is a positive and unique example of a state’s active role in social protection despite neoliberal constraints. The state-led adoption of cash transfers in response to rising inequality and economic instability is unexpected at a time when these programmes were unpopular development interventions and when the state was supposedly rolled-back and confined because neoliberalism and the civil war. Tracing the history of Mozambican social cash transfers in the last 25 years illustrates two consistencies of the Mozambican government: 1. A supportive political position towards state involvement in welfare programmes, despite the government’s own political and development sector transformation from Marxist-Leninist orientation to welcoming of privatization; and 2. State financial and political support of social protection throughout a period when cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa went from unpopular hand-out interventions during crises, to lobbying for permanent social protection as a mechanism to address chronic poverty.

1. Chapter One: Introduction

1.i. Background

With regards to the environment of Mozambique in the midst his presidency, Joachim Chissano once exasperated, “I can’t do anything, because we are inside this machine of the World Bank” (Hanlon 1996). Known as a ‘development darling’ and privatization ‘success story’ in Africa because of its adoption of neoliberal practices, post-civil war Mozambique presents an interesting landscape to explore common conceptions of the role of the state under the confines of neoliberalism (Hanlon 2004; Hanlon and Smart 2008; Pitcher 2002). Neoliberalism is associated with a critique of state involvement in economic activity as inefficient or promoting corruption (Ferguson 2015; Mkandawire 2001; Mkandawire 2010; Oya 2009; Weiss 2010). On policies related to growth and poverty reduction in the 1980s and 1990s, neoliberal ideology tended to advocate for a limited role of state institutions and roles in social services, namely the provision of welfare, health and education. In part, this explains the vast number of non-governmental organizations carrying out social services and development work across the continent over this period (Ferguson 2006; Mkandawire 2010). While states such as Mozambique were perceived to be ‘rolled back’ when they accepted the conditions put in place to receive World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) support, there is evidence of the Mozambican state simultaneously implementing their own welfare and social services, such as social cash transfers, despite neoliberal disinclination towards these state practices. The social protection programmes that were initiated in this period of neoliberalism’s greatest influence have come to be seen as part of a wave of new welfare provisions across the global South, which some scholars see as signs of a post-neoliberal era (Harris and Scully 2015). Therefore, what does it mean to observe the Mozambican state in the 1990’s neoliberal era adopting and growing social cash transfer programmes, at a time unlikely for government-funded social cash transfer programmes? What does this additionally say about conceptions of state autonomy under the confines of neoliberalism?

State autonomy is the concept of the state having jurisdiction and authority over its economic, political and social affairs, independent from external actors (Evans 1995). State autonomy is often implied to be at odds with ‘anti-statist’ neoliberalism, and this creates a vacuum of discussion on what state autonomy has looked like under neoliberal influence, especially in the sphere of social services (Ferguson 2009; Mkandawire 2001). Scholars of recent, however, have pointed out that the role of the state has remained and been highly instrumental in creating the institutional atmosphere for economic liberalization during the neoliberal era of the 1970s to 1990s, despite ideas that the state was rolled-back in favour of free-market reforms (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Ferguson 2009; Jinadu 2010; Mkandawire 2001; Pitcher 2002; Weiss 2010). Evans (1995) supports this further when stating that the ‘zenith’ of attacking the role of the state during neoliberalism has passed, because involvement of the state under neoliberalism is a given. The question today, therefore, should not be about 'how much' states have been involved, but 'what kind' of involvement and autonomy. In addition, while literature on the state's role under neoliberalism does exist, scholars tend to focus on the extent of the state's role in economic activity, not social action or social services, which also took a hit because of neoliberal ideology. One particular social service, social protection, weakly emphasizes the role of the state in initiating these programmes in low-income countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Research Question:

What does the history of social cash transfer programmes in Mozambique tell us about the role of state within the confines of neoliberalism and civil war? How does this history of social cash transfer programmes relate to the common association of such programmes in Africa with the post 2000s focus on social protection from international financial institutions?

The utilization of social cash transfers as a measurement of the role of the state under neoliberal constraints is a response to neoliberalism's attempt to remove the state's role in social services. In practice, this privatization of development work has led to donors tending to overly influence and fund development agendas (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Hanlon 2008; Ferguson 2006; Ferguson 2015; Marshall 1990). Despite being a 'development darling', Mozambique started the first cash transfer programme of a low-income country on the continent, and it was initiated completely by the state without funding from external donors until after 2006 (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015; Massingharela and Nhate 2006).

1.ii.Literature Review

This literature review traces academic debates on the rise of social protection and social cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa, in order to present common rationales for the origins, growth, and challenges of social cash transfers over the last few decades. In addition, this section also presents scholarly discussions on the role of the state under neoliberal confines. If the dynamics of Mozambique's first social cash transfer are unique from the more common Southern African pension schemes, what can Mozambique's case say about how the state works and state autonomy despite restrictive external influence? In order to contribute to debates on social cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa, it is imperative to go back to their origins and understand the conditions under which social cash transfer programmes normally come about and the rationales behind them. Thus, this literature review also covers discussions on the roles of conflict, neoliberalism and structural adjustment in social protection development, as these conditions were present when Mozambique's first cash transfer programme started. These debates are brought forth here to support the argument that the Mozambican case of cash transfers offers evidence of state autonomy to act over social protection despite neoliberal attempts to remove this role, and an exceptionally early case of state-sponsored cash transfer development in Sub-Saharan Africa.

1.ii.a. Social protection and the rise of cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa

Social protection and cash transfer programmes have been on the rise on development agendas in Sub-Saharan Africa in the last two decades. The reasons for this growth range from their recognition as low-cost mechanisms to assist against environmental and economic catastrophe shocks, vulnerability due to sustained chronic poverty, and due to urbanisation and industrialization (Devereux 2013; Ellis, Devereux and White 2009, p.3; Garcia and Moore 2012; Lavers and Hickey 2015; Midgley 2013). Social protection programmes are implemented to improve social inclusion and political stability through, in addition to cash, provision of housing and adequate nutrition, and ensuring access to education and healthcare (Omilola and Kaniki 2014, p. 2). Debates on the purpose of social protection range from poverty reduction to emphasis on social solidarity, equality and promotion of social rights (Midgley 2013, p. 7-8). What most of these 'classifications' of social protection purpose fail to cover is that social protection programmes evolve over time, and do not need to be perpetually stuck within one type of focus or purpose.

A turn towards social protection mainstreaming has been cited as a move towards 'predictable funding for predictable needs', which is different from typical emergency and food insecurity interventions such as food aid and food subsidies (De Rooij 2015). These programmes emphasize seasonal deprivation and short-term relief during vulnerable times, and had been the main form of poverty relief in Sub-Saharan Africa for decades after independence of most countries (Devereux 2013; Ellis, Devereux and White 2009, p. 3-4; Ellis 2012; Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 2, 36). There are several positions regarding the rise of social protection in Sub-Saharan Africa, such as influence from European welfare programmes or Latin American economic crisis responses; social protection as a tool for economic growth; and lastly the political motivation to increase social stability and gain political support for an elite group or the state (Lavers and Hickey 2015). These rationales will be discussed in the successive sections.

Influence of Europe and Latin America

For decades, social policy has been the foundation of European welfare states to establish political settlements by democratic classes (Midgley 2013). Redistributive social protection was demanded by trade unions, the working classes and at times rural populations. These demands resulted in a political settlement between labor and the state, using social protection policy to bring stability and capitalist development to post-World War II Europe (Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 8). Some scholars such as Devereux (2002; 2013, p. 13) and Midgley (2013) argue that mid-20th century welfare policy in Africa, for small wage-earning urban populations, was largely modeled after European programmes. Therefore, early African social protection programmes were not indigenous. European models did not map well on the African context, however, and adoptions from the North failed to consider the economic and social structures of African countries. The setback of European models led to longer term inefficiencies and failure to meet local needs through social protection. Whereby in Europe, the number of people living in poverty without access to regular paid work is a minority, the reverse is the case in Africa (Devereux 2013). While the South African cash transfer has roots stemming from European pension schemes and could have influenced the growth of other similar programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa, it is titled 'exceptional' for the region because South Africa has historically been a wealthier country that has evidence of relevance to European models of development (Devereux 2002; Devereux 2013, p. 18; Seekings 2009 cited in Lavers and Hickey 2015).

Despite the links between Europe and its colonial states, there were limited examples of social protection for wider African populations during colonization. It is worth acknowledging, however, that there were scattered examples of social services for exclusive groups of colonial civil servants in places such as Mozambique (Kaleidoscopio 2015). As mentioned above, not all Sub-Saharan Africa programmes were linked to or modeled from European programmes, and the contextual failures of the European modeled programmes in Africa created a detachment from European models, seen in the more contemporary, indigenous African programmes. While the next section will portray how some Sub-Saharan African programmes similarly were employed for political settlement purposes, as with the trend in European programmes, there is one direct link between European and contemporary African programmes. This is stated clearly by Mkandawire (2010), when arguing that the spread of social policy and welfare in Sub-Saharan Africa was a result of the backlash against extractive and discriminatory practices of colonial authorities. This linkage has metaphorical value in the rise of cash transfers in response to neoliberal economic policies of the 1980ss.

The rise in contemporary social protection was ushered in by the implementation of conditional cash transfers in Brazil and other Latin American countries; the expansion and redesign of social assistance in South Africa; and the creation of pension schemes in other Southern African countries such as Botswana, Lesotho and Namibia (Ferguson 2015; Midgley 2013). From the successes seen in Latin America with conditional cash transfer programmes, some argue that these programmes influenced the growth in social cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa (Barrientos 2011; Ellis 2012; Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010; Lavinas 2013). In contrast to Europe, the socio-economic (non-wage earning) demographics, in addition to political atmospheres, of Latin American countries resonate with African countries more closely. In both cases in Sub-Saharan Africa and in Latin America, social protection and social cash transfers came in as a response to economic crises of the 1980s, in which poverty and inequality grew as a result of economic instability and the detriment of structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) (Garcia and Moore 2012; Lavinas 2013; Mkandawire 2010). Specifically, in Sub-Saharan

Africa, since the 1980s and even before, there has been intense strain on poor and vulnerable populations despite levels of aid and development assistance interventions. In addition, the threat of the 2008 global financial crisis and food shortages has exacerbated levels of chronic poverty, resulting in greater donor interest in mitigating the effects of rising food and fuel prices for vulnerable groups (Garcia and Moore 2012; Standing 2008). The same unstable economic trends were seen in Latin America in the 1980s, resulting in calls for increase in social protection against the shocks of the global financial crises, and cash transfers grew there at this time (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 32; Lavinas 2013).

These are the debates on the import, influence, or merely recognizable aspects of Latin American or European social protection on Sub-Saharan African social protection programmes. What is important in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa is that social cash transfers have risen in the last decade as a form of targeted poverty alleviation programming, in response to the vast number of people living in states of chronic poverty from various causes (Barrientos 2011; Ellis, Devereux and White 2009; Ellis 2012; Ferguson 2015; Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010; Lavinas 2013; Schubert and Slater 2006; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009). Historically, this a context different from Europe but relatable to parts of Latin America. In Latin America and parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, there are clear histories of social protection rising in response of widespread levels of chronic poverty, and one where Mozambique's history with cash transfers dates further back than most other countries on the continent.

Evolutions in development strategy and a move away from food aid

Other motivations for cash transfers are in their affordability and low implementation costs, abilities to reduce levels of poverty, and research showing that beneficiaries do not waste money but often use funds to enable wage labour (Ellis, Devereux and White 2009; Hanlon 2004; Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010). Some scholars argue that social cash transfers are imperative to any progressive development strategy, as they have the ability to lift people out of poverty traps due to a lack of money. Social cash transfer programmes are argued to be better than typical aid because putting cash directly into beneficiaries' hands overlooks the hurdles of conditions tied to donor-driven agendas. This is referred to as the 'Southern Alternative to Development', where cash transfers directly assist people and allow them to make decisions on their own development instead of Western actors dictating means and measures for development (Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010, p. 143, 161). Furthermore, Lavinas (2013, p. 39) adds that unconditional cash transfers have drawn praise from many quarters: "the Economist noted that they 'work better than almost anyone would have expected', and deny the stereotype of poor people as inherently feckless and ignorant". Within the same debate, cash transfers are rationalized in some development agendas by their ability to challenge market liberal, Washington Consensus programmes of the World Bank and IMF (Midgley 2013, p. 6).

Social cash transfers have also risen in order to replace or decrease use of 'inefficient' food aid programmes that were the main poverty alleviation and emergency programmes of donors to Sub-Saharan Africa (Devereux 2013; Ellis 2012; Garcia and Moore 2012). Food aid has been deemed as expensive, difficult to access in some areas, and costly to administer and transport. There is the additional setback of the lack of choice they leave recipients with. Logistics and price became two considerations that donors and governments tried to improve upon in new social cash transfer programmes (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 34; Standing 2008). Thus, with food aid inefficiencies, the international community started to create ad-hoc humanitarian responses to food security shocks, and in some places these developed into 'quasi-institutionalized' social assistance and social insurance mechanisms (Devereux 2013). Critics of aid and food aid assert that they can alleviate symptoms of poverty and livelihood destruction but not the underlying causes. Some governments have started to design programmes that targeted individuals based on a longer-range view of employment status, whereas aid programmes still tend to look at temporary assistance to buffer situations of drought and livelihood loss. The debate of cash vs. food in Africa, until recently, has been a lobbyist debate between backward-looking, self-serving food aid and the 'modern', progressive, positive intervention of cash transfers (Devereux 2013, p. 16-17).

Neoliberalism and economic growth

A second set of motivations for social cash transfers stems from a concern with macroeconomic growth, stipulating that growth is constrained by lack of demand or purchasing power. This argument suggests that people need to be equipped with income or assets to boost the economy and mitigate future poverty through their own development (Hanlon and Smart 2008, p. 156; Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010).The rise in social protection has been related to Polanyi's (2001, cited in Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 6) "assertion that the political impulse for social protection has its roots in the urge to re-embed processes of capitalist development with a more social logic, something that comparative research has identified as related to the adoption and extension of social protection in the Global South". Debates on social protection today assert that they give individuals tools to directly impact their own growth; it is an investment in people in a privatized fashion, removed from the state (Ferguson 2009; 2015). Ferguson (2009) argues that social protection and cash transfers are neoliberal tools that critique state-provided welfare. Otherwise, most scholars recognize that social protection, and as will be addressed in later sections most neoliberal practices, require state assistance and structures to implement locally. Today, these views on the necessity of social protection as 'investments' in vulnerable populations to create economic stability are being employed widely as rationales for nationally-supported social protection floors (ILO 2015).

Garcia and Moore (2012) take this argument further by stipulating that social cash transfer programmes can reduce the shocks of market imperfections at a less costly rate than intervening in markets. From a utility-maximization perspective, social cash transfers enable greater utility than any other type of in-kind transfer such as food aid or even subsidies, because beneficiaries have a choice for how their cash can be useful to them and how they want to spend it (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 20). Furthermore, there are arguments that the distribution of cash directly into the hands of the poor is more effective than some public sector investments in areas such as infrastructure, governance reform, or other social protection programmes such as social insurance, because these investments tend to not trickle down to populations living in poverty, who require the most support (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 19). While there have been various views by politicians, development agencies and policy makers over time on the utility of social cash transfers to address poverty and unemployment, that view is broadly changing today (Ferguson 2015; Standing 2008). Ferguson (2015) points out that cash transfer programmes today are carried out in the Global South with support from institutions such as the World Bank, who, not long ago would not be in favor of the idea of giving money directly to poor people. This change in view comes at a time when large populations are without access to wage labour, which historically is a form of livelihood important to economic development and an "anchor to progressive politics". Ferguson (2015, p.xii) calls this the "New Politics of Distribution".

Political motivations and the necessity of the state

While many social cash transfer programmes have common characteristics depending on the economic and stability statuses of countries, the variance in social protection programmes could result from political motivations (Garcia and Moore 2012; Lavers and Hickey 2015). Social protection programmes can be crucial in times of political change, and there are examples where these programmes are used to silence groups in society who might become political opponents or undermine political agendas. Lavers and Hickey (2015, p. 6) support this when stating that drivers of growth in social protection in the Global South stem from the ability of expanding levels of inequality to require a political response to maintain social stability. In line with Barrientos et al. (2013), Lavers and Hickey (2015, p. 7-8) portray that research on the politics of social protection emphasise its growing utility towards political stability, legitimacy, and creation of a political settlement. Therefore, it can be a means of elites responding to or preempting bottom-up demands from society, or using it in an attempt to undermine political opposition. Thus, the outcomes of social protection and development programmes can closely relate to elite commitments to domestic political economy, in addition to transnational views on these programmes (Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 3).

Two examples, given by Barrientos et al. (2013) were of Brazil and South Africa undergoing political transformations and at the same time renewing and expanding their social protection programmes. In the case of South Africa, social assistance was used in a top-down fashion to compensate for the capital-intensive growth strategy that resulted in high levels of inequality and unemployment (Barrientos et al. 2013; Seekings and Nattrass 2005, cited in Lavers and Hickey 2015). Economic growth for a minority, often elite group, existed alongside chronic poverty and unemployment for the majority, who would sometimes receive a social grant as a form of compensation, redistribution and furthermore a tool to legitimize the inequitable, neoliberal economic growth strategy (Leibbrandt & Woolard 2010, cited in Devereux 2013, p. 18).

In parts of the Global South, some democratization processes included expanded social assistance to address poverty and inequality. This perspective portrays political motivation by the state to use social cash transfers to redress inequalities faced by marginalized groups, for example being born into poverty and governments wanting to emphasize or address equity through redistributive activities (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 20). Cash transfers are motivated in this case because their cash-based nature means that the state does not decide what will benefit groups or not, as in-kind transfers might. Similar to how Ellis, Devereux, and White (2009) use Sen's capabilities approach to argue in favor of social protection, this emphasises a growing rights-based perspective in favor of social cash transfer programmes (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 20).

Social cash transfer programmes can originate outside of government institutions, too, but still have political motivations. Some argue that, historically, social protection in Sub-Saharan Africa had been implemented in a 'piece meal' manner with a lack of strategy supported by governments (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 32-33). By the 1980s, social protection arose in the form of limited 'safety nets', which turned emphasis away from previous institutionalized state-household support (Ellis, Devereux and White 2009, p.5). Therefore, the World Bank's late 1990 risk management framework pushed for individualistic focuses for social funds and social safety nets, a clear shift away from collective responsibility of the state towards households. Today, however, the focus has returned to promoting household level risk management in social protection (Townsend 1994; Dercon 2005 cited in Midgley 2013, p. 8). This example clearly highlights neoliberal, political motivations to liberalise social safety nets. Many low-income countries' cash transfer programmes are classified as 'donor driven', however, many scholars support that cash transfer programmes must be domestically driven, have clear political credibility, and be designed to strengthen government institutions (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 55; Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010, p. 162; Lavers and Hickey 2015).

Scholars such as Ulriksen (2013) and Garcia and Moore (2012) suggest that the social protection policies of aid dependent countries in Southern Africa are determined by donors. It is also debated that "in comparison, in potential developmental coalitions, where elites have a longer time horizon, there is likely to be more space to pursue an ideological programme, and ruling elites are more likely to try to protect their decision making autonomy from donor influence" (Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 17). Therefore, it could be argued that social protection policy deeply reflects the political ideology of a ruling coalition, when used as a tool to increase political stability or support the distributive ideals of the ruling coalition. When usage is unimportant for regime survival, however, there is more room for donor influence as the funding source (Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 18).

What has been an observable trend in relation to donor roles in social protection growth has been the adoption of their policy framings (especially the International Labour Organization's-ILO) by governments as a way to secure funding to grow their own (government-based) social protection programmes. Acquisition of donor alliances in social protection programmes can also be an expression of receiving non-financial donor vote-of-confidence, therefore emphasizing external influence on these programmes and ruling coalition images or patronage (Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 17). While social protection agendas coming from the outside-in can be a form of top-down development, especially where social protection programmes do not exist, many parties acknowledge that transnational actors cannot implement social protection programmes without them being institutionalized through government support. This could be viewed as an expression of state autonomy and political uses of social protection (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Devereux 2013; Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 10; Pitcher 2002; Weiss 2010).

Social protection literature

Development scholars working in social protection have historically relied on information coming from Eurocentric 'welfare state' approaches, which of course have their limitations in the developing world contexts. Midgley (2013, p. 5) states that the few studies on Africa, Asia and Latin America social protection tend to "conform to social policy's macro and Eurocentric 'welfare state' approach". This literature review presents a different angle that social protection and cash transfer literature from Africa does exist, and African literature widely focuses on implementation, and not theory. While new programmes have created a body of literature on social protection, Midgley (2013) argues that there is insufficient analysis of meta-theoretical issues or even theorizing social protection, which will help not only scholars but practitioners hoping to improve the design and implementation of their own programmes.

The lack of theory-based analyses on social protection and cash transfer programmes means that broadly speaking, these programmes become classified by the economic characteristics of the country from which they originate when discussed within academic and development literature. A World Bank study comparing cash transfer programmes throughout Sub-Saharan Africa makes distinctions between cash transfer programmes in low-income/fragile states, versus ones in middle income countries. Three distinguishing characteristics between programmes in these places are: 1. Inception before or after the year 2000; 2. Institutional base of programmes and funding source from government or outside of government; and 3. Duration of programmes as long-term or short-term (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 50). The second point is also emphasised by Midgley (2013, p. 7) in that many short-term programmes starting after 2000 in low-income countries have funding sources from non-profit organizations and international donors, but this does not mean that governments are not involved as many social protection innovations have been started by or managed by governments. These classifications become useful because they point to how different socio-economic circumstances might influence a country's implementation of social protection. The middle income vs. low income/fragile division, however, polarizes most programmes into two groups, and removes room for programmes to draw characteristics from both typologies.

1.ii.b. Debates against social protection and cash transfers

The previous section addressed rationales in support of social protection and cash transfer growth in Sub-Saharan Africa. The journey over the last two decades, however, has not always been met with complete support. On the right, the debate against social cash transfers resonates with European social welfare debates of handouts to able-bodied adults, also known as incentivizing 'dependency syndrome'. These arguments are often backed up by classical economic theory and behavioral economics suggesting that the 'poor' are ill-equipped to make decisions for themselves, and that they will misspend money (Devereux 2013; Hanlon and Smart 2008; Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010; Lewis 1963; Schubert and Slater 2006). Devereux (2010 cited in Devereux 2013, p. 17) cites that there is little empirical evidence supporting the existence of dependency syndrome in the case of cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa. From the left, critiques of these programmes surround political motivations for social cash transfers, whereby countries engulfed in neoliberal economic policies are said to use social cash transfers as 'palliative' measures to quell social unrest regarding radical political reforms or alternative economic models. Examples of this are seen in Botswana, South Africa, and Namibia: countries with high levels of inequality (Devereux 2013, p. 18).

Efficacy towards poverty alleviation

Another important scholar of social cash transfers, Ellis (2012), has used empirical research on targeting mechanisms to argue that social cash transfers do not actually lift people out of poverty as suggested by Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme (2010). They can, however, impact levels of poverty. Thus, unlike the widespread gains of social cash transfers in Latin America, social cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa can be deemed as inefficient development tools because of logistical issues, social tension, and because of meager distinctions between the poor and extremely poor in targeted programmes (Ellis 2012; Hanlon and Smart 2008; Schubert and Slater 2006). Other critics of social cash transfers state that the targeting mechanisms can create social divides and unrest between those in different (by mere margins) poverty levels. Cash transfers can also become a breeding ground for corruption through governments and administrators, therefore funders need to maintain tight monitoring of social cash transfers (Ellis

2012; Hanlon and Smart 2008). Other debates regarding the efficacy of social protection and cash transfers has to do with the possibly negative consequences that these programmes can have on economic development. Supporters of this viewpoint suggest that it is up to individuals and families to fund their own incomes and catalyze their own development (Midgley 2013, p. 10). Social policy research that provides evidence against these claims is widely ignored.

Welfare as a luxury

In addition, there are debates on the appropriate timing for a state to provide social protection and cash transfers, and these resonate with welfare debates. Midgley (2013, p. 6) presents that, "Income transfers were widely regarded as an expensive luxury that developing countries could not afford, and they were believed to detract from development priorities, which required investment rather than consumption expenditure." Typical Northern welfare theory suggests that welfare comes as a 'luxury', post-industrialisation (Evans 2010; Hanlon and Smart 2008; Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010, p. 161). These debates present that the affordability and ability for a country to provide welfare is only when the country has industrialised and therefore has funds in the national budget to give money to citizens. Market liberals and those opposed to government intervention argue that these programmes are unsustainable without imposing heavy taxes that will damage the economy (Midgley 2013, p. 8). Devereux (2002, p. 658) adds that "social safety nets are regarded by neo-liberal critics as fiscally unaffordable compensatory mechanisms that make no effective contribution to sustainable poverty reduction, and by left-wing critics as token handouts to make harsh neo-liberal reforms politically palatable, or to avoid taking real actions to redress the structural cause of poverty and vulnerability". Thus, neoliberal viewpoints can be used against and in support of cash transfers, and the views of neoliberalism with regards to state activity will be addressed in the next section.

1.ii.c. Neoliberalism and the role of the state

Neoliberalism is often regarded as a 'political project' of the Bretton Woods Institutions (BWI) aimed at transforming "political and economic [post-war] settlements… including labour market accords, industrial relations systems, redistributive tax structures and social welfare programs" in the Global North (Weiss 2010, p. 6). Neoliberalism spread to have the popular meaning as the political ideology in line with economic globalization and the spread of financial capitalism (Harvey 2005, Dumenil and Levy 2011, Overbeek and Van Apeldoorn (2012) cited in Flew 2014, p. 56). Many scholars relate neoliberal policy as "aimed to restore capitalist class power in the aftermath of the economic and social crises of the 1970s….. and one where, in Harvey's terms, 'the role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such [neoliberal] practices'" (Harvey 2005:2 cited in Flew 2014, p. 56).

Neoliberalism in Africa

In the context of the Global South, neoliberalism took the form of policy measures forced on Latin American and African states through Structural Adjustment Programmes targeted at liberalizing perceived 'corrupt' state institutions. These included policy changes necessary for receiving financial support from Bretton Woods Institutions for economic restructuring (Flew 2014). The 'state-phobic' lens of neoliberalism in Africa, as noted by Mkandawire (2001, p. 294) stems from 'Afropessimism' due to the 'dismal performances' of many 'oppressive and overbearing' post-independence African states (Ferguson 2006, p. 38). Jinadu (2010, p. 6757) points out the neoliberal argument that African socialism and other practices of one-party states post-independence created market imperfections, therefore stunting state capacity through denying individual thought and choice.

Corruption and 'weak state capacity' thus became rationales for neo-liberalism's intervention and push to roll-back the state, with the view that states were ill-equipped and overextended to take on the task of development. Despite these Afro-pessimistic views, Mkandawire (2010, p. 20) points out that for most the 1970s, the income of most African countries increased in absolute and relative terms, and the welfare of societies improved at slow paces. Regardless of these realities, anti-statist views of external financial institutions grew in African countries in the 1980s. Neoliberal policies then attacked 'big government' through creating terms for what the state should not do, and pushed for a reduction of state autonomy to act within economic, and at times social, affairs (Ferguson 2009; Mkandawire 2001; Weiss 2010, p. 4). Mkandawire (2001) further emphasized that neoliberalism creates a list of tasks for the state to respond to or uphold, in order to promote privatization and a free-market with the goal of reducing of the role of the state. Thus, the paradox of neoliberalism in Africa in that it attributes poor economic performances to 'overly interventionist states' and therefore tried to retract the state as a way to curb accumulation of state wealth and power. On the other hand, the welcoming of neoliberal international financial institutions (IFIs) and adoption of their SAPs reinforced the idea that African states are weak, and authority easily falls to the hands of outsiders (Pitcher 2002).

Through invoking the work of Weber and Marx, Evans (1995) argues towards the centrality of the role of the state, specifically with regards to the people within its territory. Jinadu (2010, p. 6753, 6755) explores African state capacity in light of neoliberalism and globalization, recognizing the character of states to renew, regenerate and re-invent themselves, which in turn impacts state capacity. Tracing the history of state capacity throughout the colonial era in Africa, Jinadu (2010) asserts that authoritarian colonial leadership led to the underdevelopment of state capacity. Colonization, through its "interdependence of the domestic and external political economies", led to fragile economic and political institutions, and weak human resource endowments resulting in an underdeveloped state capacity and autonomy against institutions of globalization (Jinadu 2010). The same is debated regarding neoliberal ideology and the Bretton Woods Institutions (Jinadu 2010).

Views of neoliberal successes in state roll-back

While institutions such as the World Bank claim that their neoliberal practices of structural adjustment programmes in Africa had many success stories, such as Mozambique, different scholars refute the level of success that can be measured during this period (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Ferguson 2006; Hanlon and Smart 2008; Pitcher 2002). The World Bank defines 'success stories' through high growth rates, restoration of normal economic activity following growth-interrupting civil wars, and how well states adopted neoliberal macroeconomic policy and free market practices (Ferguson 2006, p. 212). Other scholars, such as Marshall (1990), point out the irresponsible decisions of the BWIs in motivating for drastic economic policy changes in countries that were in the midst of civil wars. The consequences of these economic constraints were economic stagnation instead of economic recovery, and a rise in inequality (Ferguson 2007, p. 11). Evans (1995, p.4) asserts that, "fervent calls for the dismantling of the state by the late-twentieth-century capitalist free-marketers served to derail the state's ability to act as an instrument of distributive justice, but not to reduce its overall importance".

As argued by Weiss (2010, p. 20) there was evidence of liberalising reforms during the neoliberal era, such as privatisation of state entities, financial liberalisation, etc. Policy liberalisation, however, did not result in a 'rolled-back' state. This is because neoliberalism widely depended on the state to create conditions, such as labour market regulation, corporate governance, and infrastructure resources, for neoliberal activity to carry out (Weiss 2010, p.2). This view, as additionally supported by Ferguson (2009), Herbst (1990), and Jinadu (2010), shows that the state and neoliberalism must in fact coexist, at different capacities within market and economic activity towards liberalization. Jinadu (2010, p. 6757) adds to this critique of neoliberalism when stating that its weakness was that it over-emphasized non-intervention in market forces, "especially when so-called market policies conflict with social goals that must remain the responsibility of the African state, given the reality of underdevelopment and the problem of state capacity it underscores." Therefore, the binary view of existence and non-existence of state autonomy is unnecessary in today's debates of neoliberalism.

Other scholars have pointed out that despite attempts through SAPs to weaken the role of the state in economic policy, because of levels of poverty in Africa, the state will always have a dominant economic role. Herbst (1990, p. 955) illustrated that "African states will be caught in the particularly frustrating position of being the dominant economic organizations within the country, but being limited in the extent to which they can actually intervene in the economy." In reality, Mkandawire (2001, p. 308) points out that reduction in public expenditure was justified as response to fiscal crises, but did not lead to a 'roll back of the state', however, a drastic erosion of state capacity. As emphasized by Miller (2010, p. 56, cited in Flew 2014, p. 60), the "grand contradiction of neo-liberalism was its passion for intervention in the name of non-intervention". Critical approaches such as these are problematic, however, because they fail to highlight the importance of state institutions, their autonomy, and ability to influence political and economic outcomes (Skocpol 2008, cited in Flew 2014, p. 58). Ferguson (2009, p. 183) adds to this by arguing that it is unproductive to view neoliberalism as 'evil', as this blocks discourse from viewing the influence that neoliberalism has had on state capacity and power. These discussions on the actual roles of states while under neoliberal influence will become important when considering state autonomy in social action, too.

Herbst (1990, p. 953) debates SAPs and the World Bank's views of 'successful' state roll-back when showing that their own publications, such as Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa (1981), critiques of state intervention in the economy are present, but the publication never defines what the role of the state should be, or a vision for the state, thus how is success measured? Flew (2014, p. 51) even argues that the usage of the term 'neoliberalism' is "intellectually unsustainable, particularly where it functions as an all-purpose denunciatory category.. or where it is simply invoked as 'the way things are'". Mkandawire (2001) adds that in stating that neoliberalism, specifically SAPs and their measures to weaken state capacity, created such high levels of inequality that became rationale for state intervention and further interest in playing a central role in economic growth. While is it pointed out that the 'disillusionment with the state' as an aspect of neoliberalism that waned by the 1990s, Evans (1995, p. 22-23) adds to Mkandawire (2001), Jinadu (2010) and Ferguson (2009) when claiming that the real set-back of neoliberalism was that it did not separate what the state was able to do versus unlikely to do, while focusing on improving state performance; neoliberalism simply 'demonized the state' and did not do much further.

Legacies of neoliberalism

Long term, the push to 'roll back the state' has resulted in what Ferguson (2006) refers as a lack of confidence, or provocation of a far-reaching political crisis, from Africans on their national governments regarding their macroeconomic processes or assisting the day-to-day living conditions of their people. Because of this, many people return to kin-based social systems, ethnic separation, and religious movements for support, or reliance on external technical assistance and donor support. Therefore, neoliberal views on the state role resulted in a shift in how states would begin to legitimize their policies, and this provided more strength to external organizations to influence decisions. The 'moral language' of African socialism of the 1970s was replaced through the state adoption of the idea of structural adjustment, often in times of duress, to address their own state 'inefficiencies' and as a 'necessity' for economic growth (Ferguson 2006, p. 77). The austerity practices that intended on rolling back the state in favor of markets increased corruption and rent-seeking, and what Hibou (2004, cited in Ferguson 2006, p. 11) calls "the privatization of the state". This included social services and development work becoming privatized too, in the sense that these services moved away from the state sector and into the hands of international development agencies and NGOs. These parties also moved their strategies away from implementation through government and instead working with grassroots channels and civil society (Ferguson 2006). Different from western neoliberal reform, whereby the result has been 'less state interference and inefficiency', Ferguson (2006 p. 39) argues that in Africa, the replacement of the state role in social services by non-governmental organisations (NGOs), means less order, peace and security.

1.ii.d. Argument rationale based on literature

Although scholars are starting to critically examine gaps where neoliberal ideology itself fails to address its reliance on the state, there are still gaps portraying where state autonomy did exist under neoliberalism constraints beyond economic affairs, for example in social services. Herbst (1990, p. 954) makes the important point that, "True adoption of structural adjustment policies will prevent the state from offering subsidies or some other political good if a group becomes disaffected or if a leader suddenly needs to garner public support," and this point will add to evidence on the effectiveness of neoliberalism to roll-back states. In addition, how have the perceived 'constraints' of neoliberalism created dynamics motivating the state to push back and autonomously pursue action in response to neoliberalism-induced issues such as inequality and poverty? Mkandawire (2010, p. 49) asserts that neoliberalism's motivation to dismantle states as "effective policy reform and adjustment" included dismantling the social agenda of provision of basic healthcare, education and pro-poor targeted programmes. Therefore, while neoliberalism's efforts to reign in states clearly included social activity too, there is less literature defining the capabilities of state-sponsored social action under neoliberalism. Ferguson (2015) also claims that narratives of neoliberalism are blind to the needs for social protection, and this adds to the motivation of this research to understand the social protection efforts of states during neoliberalism. The case of cash transfers in Mozambique will be imperative in order to demonstrating the role and extent of state autonomy in social policy in response to the detrimental impact on welfare and social development caused by neoliberal policy.

Mozambique has created at least four social cash transfer programmes in the last 20 years and a comprehensive social protection sector, yet the state's rationale for direct involvement and funding is unclear (Handa et al. 2012). What is missing from academic literature is an analysis of why the Mozambican state has been adopting social cash transfer programmes during neoliberal era state restricted capabilities, and how these arguments fit into wider debates on the state's autonomy during neoliberalism in countries of the Global South where structural adjustment programmes had adverse impact on society. If, as suggested by Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme (2010), social cash transfers are a 'Southern Alternative' to development and have not been a result of hands-outs from the North, why did they emerge in Mozambique: a low-income, fragile state, and what does this portray about state autonomy?

Lastly, review of literature on social protection in Sub-Saharan Africa revealed the sizable gap in literature on Mozambique's cash transfer and social protection programmes in comparison to other places. While it has been noted that Mozambique has had cash transfer programmes longer than most countries on the continent, places such as Botswana, Namibia and Lesotho are often focused on with regards to Southern Africa social protection (Devereux 2013; Ferguson 2015). Even with regards to the link between natural resources and funding sources for social protection, a study done by Ulriksen (2013) compared nine other countries in the Southern Africa region, while leaving out Mozambique, a country that has a high amount of natural resources and a diversity of cash transfer programmes. Therefore, this research will aim to insert Mozambique's case of cash transfers within Sub-Saharan African cases as a means to see how this case either supports social protection and cash transfer trajectories or how it proves to be an exceptional case that can exemplify unique state capacity characteristics.

1.iii. Methodology

A research question probing at how the Mozambican state was able to act during neoliberalism restrictions required historical tracing of the processes and debates of the case being used in this research: social cash transfers. History tracing focused on the origins and rationales of these programmes to understand the state's motivation to start these programmes. Additionally, emphasis was placed on the constraints and debates around them given the environment of the country and involvement of external actors. This process was performed through the predominant use of documentary analysis of policy, national development strategy papers, organizational reports, budgets, and political party records. Documentary analysis was complemented by in-depth interviews with past and current actors involved with Mozambican social cash transfer programmes. Policy documents and government strategy papers enabled tracing the roots of and pinpointing the evolution of the role of the state from the 1970s to today, in social action and eventually cash transfer programmes. Interviews with specific government entities, NGOs and development institutions directly involved in cash transfer lobbying, research and implementation provided original data on the inception and use of social cash transfers over time, and filled gaps where documentary analysis inadequately portrayed why cash transfers had been adopted.

1.iii.a. Process or History Tracing

In their own work on the political economies of social protection programmes, Lavers and Hickey (2015, p.22) describe 'process tracing' as a theoretically-based historical explanation of a sequence of events used within case analysis, that has the purpose of understanding causal relationships through examining the mechanisms by which they are produced. This process critically engages competing hypotheses that might explain a particular phenomenon, to enhance the validity of a causal explanation (George and Bennett 2004, cited in Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 22). Process tracing, for the purpose of Lavers and Hickey's (2015) study involved a historical analysis of social policy and social protection within specific national contexts, in order to compare recent policy developments to the contexts of past programmes and their legacies. Process tracing can include analyses around the ideas that have framed national social policy debates; the utilities of social protection (economics, social action, politics) and the expectations of social protection within development strategy. For process tracing, literature also suggests that documentary and archival evidence provide useful evidence, as well as key informant interviews because of their witnessing in events and their ability to refute and confirm information from documents or reconstruct undocumented events. These insights on process tracing informed the questionnaire for the interviews carried out with social protection stakeholders in Mozambique (George and Bennett 2004, Tansey 2007, cited in Lavers and Hickey 2015 p. 23).[1]

1.iii.b. Documentary Analysis

Documents are 'social facts' that are produced, organised, and used in social ways, and a documentary analysis describes the systematic procedure for analysing these documents in order to create meaning and develop empirical knowledge (Bowen 2009, p. 27). Documentary analysis provided evidence for the shifting or continuous position of the state with social policy and cash transfers, dating back from the post-independence period of Mozambique. Information from specific documents helped illustrate the role of the state and its type of autonomy in decision-making during the neoliberal era as seen through policy and programmes implemented at a specific time. The utility of documentary analysis in case research lies in its ability to produce rich descriptions of a single phenomenon, organization, event, or programme (Bowen 2009, p. 29). Furthermore, documentary analysis has five main uses: 1. Setting context; 2. Suggesting questions that need to be asked, that can be enquired in interviews; 3. Serving as supplementary research data or a knowledge base; 4. Providing means of tracking change and development; and 5. Using documents to verify findings (Bowen 2009, p. 30).

Although the Mozambican state is technically 'present' throughout the period of this study, documentary analysis showed what it was able to do in terms of social protection activity, and how, neoliberal ideology, through policy, attempted to constrain it. Furthermore, policy showing the shifting position and role of the state in poverty reduction strategy and cash transfer implementation also provided evidence on the extent and how the state has pushed back on neoliberal restriction mechanisms. Documentary analysis also helped language barriers (with most people speaking Portuguese) and also the process of history tracing, as most

[1] Sample questionnaire can be found in the appendices section

interviewees had shorter tenures in Mozambique than the period of this study. Thus, documents helped locate a specific period 20 years ago, that most people could not shed much light on.

1.iii.c. In-depth Interviews

Although documentary analysis can give a historical and policy-based perspective on the constraints and abilities of the Mozambican state during neoliberalism, in-depth interviews provided rich detail in support of or contesting what was portrayed in documents. As literature gaps have shown a deficit in detail on the state's role in welfare and cash transfer programmes under neoliberalism and in Mozambique, in-depth interviews with actors involved with cash transfers were necessary. Interviews in Maputo and over Skype were semi-structured and aimed to include a Portuguese interpreter when necessary.

It was crucial to interview state and non-state actors related to these programmes and to welfare development in Mozambique as a way to observe embedded relationships, and whether or not as well as the extent that they influence each other. Evans (1995, p.9) portrays that, "interviews with dozens of current and former government officials were the primary source of understanding of what was going on inside these states and the starting point for the description of state roles." Therefore, my sampling site for interviews, as well as documents to analyse, was international and state-based institutions and development organisations in Mozambique, with a deliberate decision of purposive sampling to focus on authoritative and administrative actors of the past and present. In his own work on analyzing state autonomy, Evans (1995) invoked the use of comparative institutional approach as a strategy of gathering information because he describes that states are products of their societies, but also pawns of games with other actors. Therefore, a comparative institutional approach works because it portrays patterns of relationships rather than one historical, generic explanation. This process helped collect information across institutions and time that located a specific set of contexts under which state policies were produced.

As my research question focused on investigating state autonomy in the case of cash transfers, the sampling site rested in decision makers and authorities related to the state, thus there was not a necessity to understand views of cash transfer recipients. The rationale to include development organisations and non-state institutions drew from Ferguson's (2009, p. 168) argument that NGOs have played a 'de-facto government' role reminiscent of a 20th century social welfare states, in 'social' activities in Mozambique. There was significant evidence of this involvement seen in policy suggestions and development reports regarding the Mozambican social protection floor and cash transfer programmes from these non-state actors. It was therefore critical to my argument to challenge and unpack this claim in comparison to state activity. My sample size was 10 interviews, and this number reflected the potential scope of available participants who interact with the sector on a non-recipient basis.[2] In order to ensure anonymity and ethical considerations for in-depth interviews, voluntary participants were able to self-identify (name and position in organization) or have the choice to leave their identity anonymous. As the specific site of research was in the capital city of Maputo, Portuguese language consideration had been incorporated into this study. An interpreter was covered under ethics clearance, however, for all but one interview, participants were able to conduct interviews in English. A substantial amount of documents sought out for the documentary analysis were available in English, and only one document from INAS as well as the interview questionnaire were translated into Portuguese.

A blend of both interviews and documentary analysis as my data collection methods for this research hoped to address the constraints of both methods. The use of interviews in general was important to get to the core of information that is not available in English written documents, which is typical for a place such as Mozambique whose written recent history is less-available through English scholarly work. The utility as well as the setbacks embedded in the interpretation process were apparent, and interview information considered these complexities in the analysis. In addition, documents available were not just read for information extraction, but were read critically and based on positionality of authors. For the context of Mozambique, it became evident that information presented in spoken word or through text was often subjective to the personal history of the presenter (Reis 2012). Therefore, in an attempt to fill gaps in information regarding the history and perceptions on social cash transfers in Mozambique, data collection for this research strongly considered personal background and position of scholars and interviewees, and critically used information gathered from documents and interviews to support, refute, and challenge each other.

In the month of August, I performed ten in-depth interviews with key informants involved in cash transfer programmes and the Ministry of Finance and Planning in Mozambique. The constraints of this data collection process were: time limits in Maputo due to visa constraints allowing for one month field work; limited access to government officials for interviews and certain government documents (archives); turnover of development workers, therefore lack of sufficient historical knowledge or institutional knowledge in Mozambique; certain important government stakeholders were no longer in Mozambique out of personal choice or relating to the political ideology transition from socialism to capitalism-backed development. Similar to the experience of Evans (1995, p. 19) when performing interviews with former and current government officials for his work on embedded autonomy, the interview process was performed with the understanding that participants offer accounts of history and relationships based on their own biases and self-interests, which is highly influenced from their positions within their

[2] List of contacted and scheduled interviews is available in the appendices section

own government or non-government institutions. In agreement with Evans (1995), these biases are crucial pieces of evidence themselves, and positionality is considered within the body of this research. While more interviews with government officials would have added favorably to research, as mentioned in the above constraints, time and language barrier presented the greatest access challenges to the government sector. Despite these constraints, the field work and documentary analysis provided ample information that will be presented in the remainder of this research report.

1.iv. Outline of Research

The next two chapters focus on two periods of cash transfer programmes in Mozambique. While documents from the United Nations (UN) and other external organizations state that the periods of cash transfer programmes should be distinguished between pre-2005 and 2005-today, these dates are influenced by the policy adoption of a 2007 Social Protection Law with little consideration of Mozambique's first programme- GAPVU (Gabinete de Apoio à População Vulnerável)[3] and its history (Chivambo 2015; UN 2015). The second chapter focuses on the period while GAPVU existed as its own organization that implemented the PSA (1990-1997) and the third chapter presents the period of the PSA falling under the National Institute for Social Action (INAS) and the Ministry of Women and Social Action (MMAS) (1997 –today). The fourth chapter is a thematic discussion of how the case of Mozambique fits into wider debates regarding the growth of social protection and cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa, as well as ways that this case is different from the typical conceptions of these programmes. Chapter four also engages with debates on the role of the state while confined by neoliberalism and how Mozambique's social cash transfer example refutes or contributes to discussions on neoliberalism. The fifth chapter concludes by touching on the implications of this research on Mozambique's development trajectory.

[3] GAPVU-literal translation: Office to Assist At-Risk Populations (Devereux 2002; Datt et al. 1997; Low et al. 1999; Schubert 1992)

2. Chapter Two: GAVPU- Mozambique's First Cash Transfer Programme

2.i. Introduction

Schubert (1992), Low et. al (1999) and Taimo and Waterhouse (2007, p. 1) are some of the few scholars to highlight that Mozambique's Gabinete de Apoio a Populacao Vulneravel or 'Office for the Assistance of Vulnerable Populations' (GAPVU) cash transfer has been a 'rare example' of state-led social security or social protection programming that has received continuous funding over a long period of time. Starting in 1989-1990 under the conditions of structural adjustment, civil war and economic hardship, GAPVU is a case that presents an atypical example of low-income state capacity towards welfare provision. While the start date of this programme is not widely published, when comparing its 1990 start date against a World Bank study on cash transfer programmes across Sub-Saharan Africa, Mozambique's GAVPU and its more recent identity as the PSA (Programa Subidio de Alimentos- Food Subsidy Programme) and today as the PSSB (Basic Social Security Programme) would be the fourth oldest, continuously running programme on the African continent (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 47). It comes after Mauritius' Old Age Pension, Namibia's Pension and South Africa's Old Age Grant, and therefore Mozambique has one of the oldest histories of non-contributory cash transfers on the continent. Of poorer countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, Mozambique was the first to implement a cash transfer programme (G20 France 2011; Schubert 2015). This chapter presents a case study of GAPVU in order to portray the limited conditions under which the Mozambican government deployed its first social cash transfer programme, as a political and social mechanism of continuing its welfare agenda while under the constraints of structural adjustment policies. Analyzing the history of GAPVU allows for the argument that the Mozambican state did attempt to maintain its socialist political ideology towards equality and pro-poor, inclusive development despite the influences of external actors and neoliberalism's emphasis on state roll-back and a minimized state role. While a small case, GAPVU's ability to start and run without challenging WB structural adjustment policies and at the same time enable the state to provide a type of solidarity to the urban masses, are aspects that have led to the continuous survival and longevity of this programme.

2.ii.The Setting of Mozambique Before GAPVU's Start

Pinpointing a start date of Mozambique's first cash transfer programme was a more difficult task than would be expected, and mixed information about the start date of this programme has implications for its analysis. Depending if one's history comes from the public sector, development sector, or civil society sector, the start date can be stated as 1990, 1993, or even 2007 when Mozambique's National Social Protection Law was created (Alane 2015; Chivambo 2015; Datt et al. 1997; Low et al. 1999; Fernandes 2015; Garcia and Moore 2012; Reba and Taimo 2007; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009). Even with some sources attributing 2007 as the start date of Mozambique's social protection, there is general acknowledgement that the government has been giving out cash transfers since the mid-1990s (Chivambo 2015; Greany 2015; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009). GAPVU's history is not well-known in recent literature on social protection in Mozambique or Sub-Saharan Africa. This is evident in the division between referring to the first cash transfer programme GAPVU versus the PSA: food subsidy programme (Garcia and Moore 2012; INAS 2013; Low et al. 1999). The food subsidy programme was the specific name of the cash transfer that GAPVU implemented, however in most studies performed before 2000, GAPVU is what the whole cash transfer programme was known as. More recent studies state that the first cash transfer was called the PSA without referring to GAVPU. Notably, the PSA was replaced by the Basic Social Subsidy Programme (PSSB) in 2011, and this the largest programme that continues to run today under the National Institute for Social Action- *Instituto Nacional de Acção Social* (INAS) (G20 France 2011; Selvester 2012). This shift in calling the first cash transfer GAPVU versus the PSA can most likely be attributed to the closing of GAPVU's office in 1997 and the PSA continuing on through INAS, later to evolve to the PSSB (Low et. al 1999; Massingarela and Nhate 2006).

Discussions on the creation of GAPVU and the PSA date back to 1987, with a government resolution for implementation dating to 1990 (Datt et al. 1997; INAS 2013; Low et al. 1999; Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Schubert 1992; Schubert 2015; Standing 2008; Taimo and Waterhouse 2007). This start date is critical to highlight given the landscape of Mozambique in the previous years and most notably the late 1980s: just over a decade into the civil war between the Frelimo (*Frente de Libertação de Moçambique*)[4] and Renamo (*Resistência Nacional Moçambicana*)[5] political parties, high levels of inflation and exchange rate volatility, economic difficulties creating hardships on social life as consequence to structural adjustment programme (SAP) adoption in the mid-80s, heavy dependence on foreign aid and emergency relief, and mass internal and external migration resulting from violence and instability in rural areas (Hanlon 1996; Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009). Marshall (1990, p. 28) describes the acceptance of SAP conditions and their implementation through the Mozambican government's 1986 Economic Recovery Plan (PRE) as "the loss to the IMF and World Bank over economic policy". While Mozambique showed signs of economic growth in 1987 and 1988 in terms of gross domestic product, which could be a result of structural adjustment via the PRE or delayed impact of state economic planning from the early 1980s, human suffering as a consequence of SAPs led to a situation of "survival at all costs for many" (Hanlon 1996; Marshall 1990, p. 29).

The intensification of pressure on the government from the IMF and the World Bank through SAPs at a time of armed conflict created a situation of rising unemployment due to the privatization process, increasing food prices due to a removal of food subsidies and by 1988, "half of the urban and two-thirds of the rural population were absolutely poor…where basic food providing two-thirds of caloric requirements costs more than half the income." (Hanlon 1996, p.

[4] Translates to 'Mozambican Liberation Front'
[5] Translates to' Mozambican National Resistance'

70; Marshall 1990, p. 31; Massingarela and Nhate 2006). These negative consequences of SAPs on the lives of Mozambicans became a recurrent theme within the Frelimo party up until their Fifth Congress in July 1989 (Marshall 1990, p. 28). Studies were carried out by the Ministry of Health and by consultants regarding the impact of the PRE/adjustment programme on cost of living, health and nutritional statuses of urban dwellers, many who had relocated because of the armed conflicts in rural areas. These studies concluded that there was clear "underestimation of the social costs of the economic recovery programme and a failure to question the inappropriateness of adopting the IMF formula of depressing urban incomes and channeling resources to the rural areas in a country at war" (Marshall 1990, p. 30).

Government thus felt compelled to cover a minimum set of basic needs to the very poor in urban areas (Antunes 2015; Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 16; Salomao 2015). On November 13, 1988, Prime Minister Machungo announced the Government was preparing measures to "protect vulnerable groups in society from the effects of the PRE and indicated that donors had expressed their willingness to support such programmes at a recent World Bank Consultative Group meeting in Paris" (Marshall 1990, p. 40). These measures included a social fund to subsidize the price of medicine for the chronically ill and for low-income workers. While donors supported the social fund and subsidy efforts, in the coming year the Government would instate its own intervention in the form of GAPVU. Although the end of urban food price subsidies was officially marked by the IMF in 1988**,** the Government of Mozambique was already underway in devising its solution to replace the poorly rated urban food subsidies with a programme that would be more accessible and had more direct impact (Garcia and Moore 2012; Marshall 1990; Schubert 2015). Massingarela and Nhate (2006, p. 7) note that, "In 1990, Mozambique was the lowest income country, according to World Bank Data. Despite the formal opening up of the economic regime, the war remained intense and the economic collapse was deepening."

From the Government's perspective, Dr. Tomaz Salomao (2015) explained in an interview how the economic team, led by Prime Minister (former Minister of Planning) Mario Machungo, and the Minister of Finance, Magid Osman, needed to devise a way to support the urban poor who were forcefully displaced by the civil war and affected by rapid inflation. It was a situation whereby most public expenditure was either cut by SAPs or channeled to the army in order to protect and defend the country. Coincidently, in December of 1987, there was a meeting held by the World Bank, IMF and the Minister of Finance, and it resulted in a split between the Bank and the IMF regarding a decision to end urban food subsidies (Hanlon 1996, p. 3). The compromise between the Bank and the IMF was to cut 'unproductive' food subsidies and focus on creating safety nets for the poor. The split between the World Bank and IMF could be read as a signal to the Ministry of Finance of the necessity for it to own its role in the creation of Mozambique's first cash transfer programme, outside of the World Bank and IMF. The creation of the GAPVU cash transfer is attributed by most to a team made up of the Minister of Finance, the Deputy Minister of Health, and a social advisor who was a World Bank consultant, Professor Reginald

Green, who was also involved in Government's evaluations of the PRE/SAP social costs (Green 1991; Hanlon 1996; p. 93; Schubert 1992, p. 111; Schubert 2015).

Thus, the state-led idea of a Mozambican cash transfer can date back to late 1987 and early 1988, with its official politically-backed start date of June 1990. This year and a half period gave the Ministry of Finance ample time to devise a programme that would fit into the financial and authoritative constraints caused by civil war conditions and the backlash of structural adjustment on government spending capabilities. The consultant team needed to create a programme that would be able to reach out to a large number of people at a very low cost, and that could be implemented by the limited institutional human resources and infrastructure available, constraints attributed to the departure of the Portuguese colonial authority in 1975 and lack of government budget to expand because of SAPs (Hanlon 1996). A new programme also needed to not repeat the shortfalls of the food security and food subsidy programmes that were under critical debate in the late 1980s (Schubert 1992, p. 111). Lastly, this time in between the debates on the inefficiencies on food subsidies and discussions on a new programme for vulnerable populations also allowed the Minister of Finance time to get the Minister of Councilors to officially pass a bill to create GAPVU, showing a sign of strong political will and state support financially and politically behind this programme from its start (Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Schubert 1992, p. 112). In an interview with the first technical expert to GAPVU, Bernd Schubert (2015), it was described that the spirit of GAPVU's inception was one where suddenly the Government came up with the idea, "Why don't we just give people money?"

GAPVU was officially launched as a unit within the Ministry of Finance and Planning through the Internal Resolution No. 2/90 of the Council of Ministers of the Government of the Republic of Mozambique on the 26th of June, 1990 (INAS 2013, p. 1; Low et al 1999, p. 5; Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 11, 30). The mission of GAVPU was "to channel social assistance in the form of cash transfers (unearned income) to destitute urban households in order to ensure their survival" (Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Schubert 1992, p. 110; Schubert 2015; Standing 2008). Later that year in September, the implementing office (GAPVU) put out its first set of cash transfers, known as the food subsidy programme (PSA), with an initial outreach of 23 households. This number went up to 572 households by the end of the first cycle of the programme and 2,000 households by the end of 1991 (Low et al, 1999; Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Schubert 1992). The initially low coverage of GAPVU, which sometimes is estimated at only 19 beneficiary persons at the end of 1990, was cause for concern laid out by the Minister of Finance. In a meeting on May 27, 1991, a decision was made to reorganize the programme and bring in an external consultant (Bernd Schubert) to improve coverage rapidly or cancel the programme (Low et al 1999; Schubert 2015).

This pressure resulted in GAPVU growing by the end of 1991 to 2000 households, in 1993 reaching 54,000 beneficiary households and at its height in 1995-1996 it reached between 85,000-92,300 beneficiary households (Datt et al, 1997, p. 1; Hanlon 1996, p. 70; Low et al 1999, p. 22; Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 11; Schubert 1993 cited in Low et. al 1999). Funding for

GAPVU cash transfers came entirely from the Mozambican state's budget as allocated by the Minister of Finance. This funding source, with additional programme oversight from the Ministry of Finance, played a crucial role in GAPVU's growth and longevity (Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Schubert 2015; Taimo and Waterhouse 2007). It has been mentioned that the funding came from money accrued and saved by the Government from food auctions that were part of food ration or subsidy schemes in previous food aid packages. External involvement came later in the form of technical assistance funding from the WB Social Dimensions of Adjustment (SDA) programme and UNICEF (United Nations Children's Emergency Fund) (Low et al, 1999; Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Schubert 2015).

2.iii. GAPVU Programme Details and Timeline

Logistically, GAPVU was a cash transfer implemented and funded by the Ministry of Finance and Planning. It was managed by Ms. Lopes, who was assisted by a local consultant, Prefuta Jayantira, who became the Director of GAPVU when Dr. Tomas Salomao (2015) was the Minister of Planning and Finance from 1994-1999 (World Bank 2013; Schubert 2015). The cash transfer was targeted at specific groups of people who were living in states of absolute poverty in urban areas. These people could apply for the cash transfer at a local Ministry of Finance outreach office. Local community leaders also helped identify households that could benefit from GAPVU, and assisted with providing applications and documentation proving identity. After an application had been made, a home visit would sometimes occur and clinic nurses would screen malnourished children and pregnant women (Low et al. 1999). Once applicants had passed a means test, the beneficiaries would receive a monthly payment that at the time was roughly "7,500 MT[6] per month for individuals not belonging to a family unit. For family units, the amount of the subsidy increase[d] to 12,500 MT or to 15,000 MT, depending on the number of family members", and there was intention to readjust this to stay proportionate to minimum wage increases (Low et al 1999, p. 24; Massingharela and Nhate 2006; Taimo and Waterhouse 2007). The amount was readjusted in 1993 and for the last time in 1996, to 32,000 MT for individuals and 51,000-64,000 MT for two and three person households, with an addition of 8,000 MT per household member beyond three (Low et al. 1999).

In terms of implementation, roughly 90% of beneficiaries would walk to their local GAPVU representation office to receive their monthly cash transfer. There were reports of interruptions in monthly payments for an average of 2.5 months at a time. This is significant as most GAPVU beneficiaries stayed with the programme for only 11 months (Datt et al. 1997). Towards 1996, more information became available about ghost beneficiaries and non-poor beneficiaries receiving the cash transfer, and some attribute this to GAPVU's closing and move to INAS after 1997 (Alane 2015; Datt et al. 1997; Low et al. 1999).

GAPVU's organization within government also transformed over time. During the time of its creation in 1990, the food subsidy programme fell under the Ministry of Finance but was

[6] MT is the Mozambican currency, the *Meticais*

organized under the Ministry of State Administration, the Ministry of Health and the Secretariat of State for Social Action (SEAS). When GAPVU was reorganized after its first roll-out, its coordination role was moved from the Ministry of Finance and put directly under the SEAS. This body, an autonomous state institution, kept internal links with the Ministry of Health, made decisions on defining the selection criteria for beneficiaries, outlined the terms of reference and contractual conditions for GAPVU's managerial team, and defined the objectives and functions for the advisory councils. Therefore, over time the role of the Ministry of Finance became confined to decisions on the budgetary allocation of state funding for GAPVU, and no longer an administrative role (Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 11).

2.iii.a. GAPVU Targeting

GAPVU's main beneficiary group was the urban poor, and this is different to today's PSA after the 1998 expansion to rural areas (De Rooij 2015; Low et al. 1999). Targeting of GAPVU and the PSA portrays the Government's original intention in creating this cash transfer to address the hardships faced by the urban poor who were capable of working but received salaries below 50% of minimum wage (Green 1991 cited in Low et al. 1999). Some scholars have attributed the urban bias of Frelimo as motivated by their desire to maintain links with non-Renamo urban populations (Sumich 2007). In addition, there was better capacity of the Government to reach out to urban areas versus rural areas dominated by Renamo (Antunes 2015; O'Laughlin 1996). The reason for GAPVUs urban roots could have also been influenced by the hardships felt by urban populations because of inflation and the strain on resources felt in urban areas due to mass internal migration to these areas (Salomao 2015). The overall outreach population included the following targeting of people with a salary below 50% of the minimum wage, which at the time was 58,800 MT ($20) who also were: 1. Elderly people, aged 60 years or more, and 2 years unemployed; 2. Chronically disabled people over 18 years old and 3. Families with undernourished pregnant women. The categories of single mothers with more than five children as well as chronically ill people were added in 1991 (Low et al. 1999, p. 15; Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 12; Schubert 1992, p. 111).

These target populations were natural results of the civil war and internal displacement of people coming from the northern and central regions of Mozambique to urban areas such as Maputo, but were also justified through household surveys done on Maputo to identify characteristics of extreme poverty (Greany 2015; Low et al 1999). Because of the decade of war, 77% of Maputo's population were children, women and the elderly with only 23% being men of employable age (Schubert 1992, p. 11). Many of the 40,000-60,000 poor households in the urban centers and periphery were female-headed, as most men were either soldiers in the war or migrants to South Africa for work. The female-headed households with family members in South Africa, however, were not typically part of the 10,000 households that received a cash transfer, because work in South Africa provided an income over GAPVU limits (Schubert 1992, p. 109).

2.iii.b. Key dates in GAPVU's Timeline

1988: Consultant team formed between the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Health and an external consultant (Schubert 1992)

June 1990: Resolution passed by the Council of Ministers to officially create GAPVU (INAS 2013)

September 1990: First cash transfers are rolled-out under the Programa Subsidio de Alimentos (PSA) to roughly 23 beneficiary households (Massingarela and Nhate 2006)

May 27, 1991: Meeting with the Minister of Finance criticizing the low enrollment rate of GAPVU, thus giving the programme six months to reorganize with the help of Bernd Schubert, who received invitation to consult in Mozambique from the World Bank's Social Dimensions of Adjustment programme (Low et al, 1999, p. 21; Schubert 2015)

September 1991: GAPVU coverage reached 54,000 (Schubert 1993b, cited in Low et al, 1999, p. 21)

1992-1996: Period of reorganization and expansion phase of GAPVU (Low et al 1999, p. 5)

1995-1996: Height of programme, 85,000-92,000 beneficiaries (Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 11; Hanlon 1996; (Tovela 1997, cited in Low et al. 1999, p. 6)

1996-1998: Restructuring phase and major reorganization including move to INAS (Low et al. 1999, p. 6)

1997: GAPVU criticized for corruption and 'ghost' beneficiaries (Garcia and Moore 2012; Low et al. 1999). GAPVU closed and the PSA is moved to INAS, a newly created semi-autonomous institute under the Ministry of Women and Social Action (MMAS). It still receives its budget directly from the Ministry of Finance, as all Government departments do (Alane 2015; Ellis 2007 cited in Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 283; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009; UNICEF 2014)

2.iv. Rationales for GAPVU

This section explores in detail three rationales given for Mozambique's early adoption of cash transfer programmes and the creation of GAPVU against economic odds and restricted state capacity. These rationales were gathered through interviews, documentary analysis and review of literature. While neither one rationale can be attributed as the main source behind the creation of GAPVU, and at times they overlap, they have been split up into three themes.

2.iv.a. A World Bank influenced concept related to the Social Dimensions of Adjustment programme:

In the mid-1980s, Mozambique's economy took several hard hits resulting from skills shortage post-independence and the civil war that flared up shortly thereafter. This war was catalyzed by the South African Apartheid Government's and the Rhodesian Government's strengthening of Renamo as a way to challenge the Frelimo socialist agenda (De Brito et al. 2014; Hanlon 1996; Salomao 2015). There are sources implying that the government, under Samora

Machel, went to Washington DC and approached the World Bank and IMF on their own to receive financial support. What resulted was that government agreed to the conditions of SAPs in order to get funding, and instituted these conditions through their own economic strategy (the PRE) that they had devised before approaching these institutions. The goal was to “regain economic health and [it] urge[d] sacrifices and belt-tightening at all levels” (Marshall 1990, p. 41). Thus, the PRE was a Mozambican-crafted strategy that was endorsed and later influenced by the IMF and World Bank. It enabled membership into the Bretton Woods Institutions, a necessity at the time because other foreign donors made this membership a condition to receive financial support from them.

Sources state that the negative impact of SAPs through the PRE were frankly discussed and outlined by the World Bank and the Government of Mozambique, foreshadowing that urban areas would take a hit from unemployment, from job cuts in the public sector, and the cutting of social service budgets (O’Laughlin 1996, p. 215). The main issue, that became a reality, was whether or not the Government had foreshadowed the social consequences of PRE. The intended economic ‘benefits’ of this programme were not realized to the desired extent of economic turnaround, and the social consequences were exacerbated to beyond the level that was predicted. The fact that Mozambique was still in a civil war during SAPs meant that a cut on government expenditure was felt more harshly because funds were being channeled into defense (Salomao 2015). These conditions led to an increase in poverty levels during the PRE, and around the world the burden of SAPs was starting to be felt on populations these programmes affected (O’Laughlin 1996).

A couple years after the first set of structural adjustment programmes were implemented worldwide, the social implications on these economic recovery programmes were starting to come to light. Taube (1993, p. 166) noted that SAPs in Sub-Saharan Africa were criticized for increasing poverty levels and reducing access to social services, while having little focus on poor populations. Furthermore, SAPs had the consequences of “budget switching” or the reallocation of fiscal resources such as social expenditures and decreasing supply of social services (health and education) to boost up productive sectors and economic infrastructure; removal of subsidies on food and other consumer goods in addition to wage restraint, and weakening of purchasing power for low-income groups. This led to a rise in unemployment in the public sector and a strain on women and children because of increased agricultural workload and more work required to secure public services such as healthcare for households. At this time, the World Bank and the Government of Mozambique recognized that on average, the ‘urban poor and females’ were hit harder by adjustment policies in Sub-Saharan Africa (Stewart 1991, p. 1854 cited in Taube 1993, p. 167). While budget switching did not occur everywhere, and the policies in some countries maintained social expenditures, in Mozambique SAPs directly impacted bills and practices that cut healthcare and education capacity, even against the will of the State.

In the late 1980s, the World Bank and IMF also began to realign their work to show more focus on poverty. In many countries, these institutions had begun to incorporate poverty and social policy into their negotiations for new adjustment programmes at country level. This came in the form of initiating 'Social Action Funds' with multi-sectoral anti-poverty programmes, including in some cases, public works schemes, nutrition support for children and pregnant women, and targeted food subsidies (Taube 1993). This was a period of time where Schubert (2015) noted that 'welfare' was not a popular term in development work. In addition, the traditional, often state implemented, social security systems and safety nets at community levels were breaking down due to social and economic change. Thus, while neoliberalism ushered in market and policy liberalization practices, it had yet given attention to social policy (Ferguson 2009). Mkandawire (2010) notes that before neoliberalism, many African countries already had interest in strengthening social policy, and Mozambique was one of those newly independent countries to do so.

As a consequence of information on the negative implications of SAPs and the World Bank's growing focus on poverty, the World Bank created the 'Social Dimensions of Adjustment' programme in 1987, and acted as the supervising body of this assistance programme. It received funds from governments of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany and others such as the African Development Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 11; Salomao 2015; Taube 1993, p. 168) It was created to address the criticisms that the World Bank faced because of SAP's negative consequences on the social standards of poor populations in developing countries (Taube 1993, p. 165). It is unclear if the conception of GAPVU predated SDA arrival in Mozambique, as the earliest report of SDA activity there dates back to the same time period, with several scholars attributing the cash transfer programme to having resulted from SDA (O'Laughlin 1996; Hanlon 1996; Selvester 2012). It is worth noting, however, that GAPVU's growth and reorganization in 1991 was one of the activities supported under the umbrella of SDA programmes (Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 3, 11). O'Laughlin (1996, p. 218) argues towards the origins of GAPVU from SDA and SAP influence because of its targeted nature, versus the inclination of the previously-socialist Frelimo tendency to nationalize all programmes. At this time, however, the adoption of SAPs already meant that the government could not promote nationalized or egalitarian-like programmes, and were confined to taking care of the most vulnerable. O'Laughlin (1996) attributes the adoption of a cash transfer programme to the World Bank's take on Sen's entitlements and increased purchasing power concerns, by providing direct nutritional support via food aid, but this claim is not widely found.

Schubert (2015) notes that in late 1990, the SDA programme put out calls to its bilateral partners for funding of programmes that could fall under the parameters of the SDA mandate, one area specifically being the World Bank's desire to help those who had lost jobs because of SAPs. The German development agency (GTZ) put out a call for interest for programmes in places affected by SAPs such as Mozambique. While social welfare programmes and cash transfers were not popular nor favorable as development programmes at that time, Schubert (2015) had appealed to GTZ that Mozambique had a cash transfer programme already. He proposed an evaluation of this programme towards its capacity build-up and growth under GTZ's call for programmes in line with SDA. Schubert's position as GAPVU's first external technical consultant was therefore funded on the down-low by GTZ and his entrance into Mozambique to GAPVU was made possible through SDA's advocacy for this programme (Low et al. 1999, p. 5).

It is worth noting that while an urban cash transfer had been one of the programmes advocated by the World Bank's Food Security Strategy for Mozambique in 1989, this specific recommendation was of "improved coverage of the existing ration system and indirect transfers through subsidies on inferior goods, such as yellow maize" (Low et al, 1999 p. 5). As portrayed through Schubert's (2015) description of the funding source for GAPVU and through Low et al. (1999, p. 5), by the following year, however, consultants were suggesting that a targeted, not indirect, cash transfer would be more effective than the poorly functioning ration schemes. In addition, there were many reasons for the failure of the food rationing schemes, including the privatization and state-roll back pressure of SAPs that cut salaries of civil servants administering social services, thus weakening capacity to implement certain social programmes (O'Laughlin 1996, p. 219). Therefore, the World Bank's indirect cash transfer suggestion was not GAPVU and its ration scheme plan was not adopted.

Although the Government of Mozambique should take main credit for the inception, funding and implementation of this programme, international financial institutions did play their part in the early days of this programme. For example, Bernd Schubert (2015) has pointed out that the continuation of this programme was made possible after the pilot phase through funding from the World Bank's Social Dimensions of Adjustment programme and the Bank's desire to mitigate the effects of adjustment on social life. In addition, Low et al. (1999, pg. 4, 41) state that because of the negative social consequences of SAPs, "once [GAPVU] begun, there was pressure to show success, especially given the lackluster performance of most other SDA-funded initiatives." Thus, the BWIs played a role in catalyzing GAPVU and cash transfer programmes because of the socially harmful effects of structural adjustment, through the riff between the World Bank and the IMF on outlooks of the failing food rationing programmes, and later through financial support to technical expertise to grow the programmes successfully.

Interestingly, two sources from the World Bank (Fernandes 2015; Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 277) have consensus that cash transfers in Mozambique started in 1993 after food subsidies for commodities were removed, and GAPVU was used as an emergency programme, not a permanent one. While they do not attribute the World Bank to starting them, 1993 was a period when GAPVU already had scaled its beneficiary numbers and kept growing, and this section has pointed out how this could be because of technical assistance funding given by the World Bank's own SDA programme. In conclusion, data suggesting inception of GAPVU from the World Bank and its SDA programme are limited, however, they did have a role in ensuring that

GAPVU continued and grew over the next few years. The World Bank's relationship with Mozambican cash transfers will be addressed in the next chapter.

2.iv.b. From food aid to cash transfers-food ration replacement strategy:

Food aid in the form of auctions, rations and subsidy programmes, had been the predominant form of aid and hunger assistance programming in Sub-Saharan Africa in the 20th century (Ellis 2012; Garcia and Moore 2012; Schubert 2015). Food aid in Mozambique was a significant programme utilized by foreign donors to address difficulties created by the war and the failure of state farms and agricultural cooperatives enacted under Frelimo's socialist agenda (O'Laughlin 1996, p. 210). Marshall (1990, p. 31) stated that by 1987, food aid dominated food markets alongside private production, and was up to $200 million. By the Frelimo Fifth Congress in mid-1989, 7.7 million people out of the country's 15 million were partially or fully dependent on food aid (ration and subsidy programmes), a significant number when considering that food rations officially stopped in 1988 (Marshall 1990; O'Laughlin 1996). O'Laughlin (1996, p. 200) comments that during the 1980s, the NSA (*Novo Sistema de Abastecimento)*[7] was integral to poor and non-poor households in Maputo as a food rationing scheme of everyday subsistence. It was thought that this system would be continued as a safety net for urban households when SAPs started in 1987 and while the World Bank was becoming concerned about SAPs effects on urban poverty in Africa. The food subsidy systems, however, were terminated in March 1988, most likely resulting from the clash between the World Bank and IMF as previously discussed. The NSA was terminated in 1993, when GAPVU was already in place and growing. Schubert (2015) noted that in Mozambique and many other places, food subsidy programmes rarely reached the poor, who did not have any money to buy the maize or other commodities that were being subsidized.

Subsidies on foods such as maize meal, rice, pasta, beans, sugar, and oil, had been a "pillar of social policy for urban dwellers" over the years and the main form of social protection (Marshall 1990, p. 31). Schubert (2015) described how starting in the mid 20th century, American food aid used to be auctioned in Mozambique and the money went to a government account. The termination of these programmes resulted in a harsh removal of an urban survival system and left urban workers and dwellers unable to purchase food that was available at higher prices. As stated in the previous section, there were suggestions that the new cash transfers programme (GAPVU) were part of the package advocated within the World Bank and IMF for food distribution programmes in urbans areas consisting of internally displaced refugees from the war. These programmes are noted to have been met by widespread protests in different spheres of Mozambican society, and the cash transfer suggested was an 'indirect income transfer programme', and was not implemented. The reasons given were that food aid, versus an alternative such as cash, did not have the ability to enable people to make small investments or

[7] Translates to: New Provisioning System

engage with formal insurance schemes. In addition, medical care and transportation could not be covered by food schemes (Schubert 1992, cited in Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 10).

An interesting point about GAPVU's PSA in discussion of food aid programmes transitioning to cash transfer programmes comes from the PSA's naming convention. Low et al. (1999, p. 8) highlight that the official title of the 'food subsidy programme' (*programa subsidio de alimentos*) is unclear, because there were never direct implications, yet only assumptions, that the cash transfer would go only to purchasing additional food. These assumptions were based on the fact that the PSA came at the time when the food subsidy programmes were terminated and therefore is perceived as a politically-motivated substitute (Low et al. 1999, p. 8). Additionally, another assumption is because of an increased awareness of the rising costs of food due to inflation and the cut-off of subsidies. These all resulted in rising urban food insecurity, thus it is assumed that GAPVU and the PSA were created to address these conditions. There is no evidence, however, stating that beneficiaries were encouraged to spend the cash on food, and only some external studies imply that means testing and other data for this programme surrounded caloric intake (Datt et al 1997; Low et al. 1999). As mentioned, a justification for replacing food subsidy programmes is that they did not address other needs of urban dwellers in ways that a cash transfer programme could and did, such as purchasing power (even to buy subsidised food) and capabilities of unemployed urban groups living in states of destitution. While one study mentions that the PSA was supposed to target populations in such states of poverty that they did not have enough purchasing power to access urban food ration programmes, the urban food ration programmes were terminated by the time the PSA was implemented but at any rate were both Government implemented programmes (Schubert 1990, cited in Low et al, 1999, p. 8).

In an interview, Schubert (2015) clarified that from his understanding, the programme was called the PSA because the funds that were given out as cash transfers were actually saved up by the Government from the previous food auctions. Therefore, the PSA got its name from funds diverted away from food subsidies, and this could explain why today its name does not necessarily imply food subsidy cash transfers. Further evidence for this statement has yet to be gathered, however, it does resonate with known information that the Government provided, and still today provides a majority of the cash to beneficiaries of this programme. This explanation also resonates with the Government's stance on finding an innovative social assistance solution for the urban poor during the war, using available resources and out-of-the-box financial streams at a time when a majority of the government resources were channeled to the army or significantly constrained by SAPs (Salomao 2015).

2.iv.c. The Government's socialism-influenced response to mitigating the effects of Structural Adjustment- an economic and social hardship strategy:

Poverty in Mozambique was not only a direct result of the civil war and structural adjustment, but a condition that had predated and persisted before and after Mozambique's independence from the Portuguese colonial government. Thus, poverty, equality, and the end of exploitation were major pillars of Frelimo's political agenda, especially as a firstly egalitarian and then Marxist-Leninist influenced socialist regime (Nwafor 1983; Schubert 1992). The decision for Mozambique to adopt socialism post-independence was influenced by the establishment of socialist-supported governments around Africa in the 1960's-1970s (Mkandawire 2010). Herbst (1990, p. 951) states that this was because of the "hierarchically organized and centralized, and economically intrusive government systems" that weak and insecure African governments inherited from colonialists. In addition, centralized power enabled these new governments to have a stronger hold on the economy during infancy periods of the new governments. Socialism enabled many governments to provide resources to their citizens, such as jobs, access to government work, subsidies on goods, and social services. In Mozambique, socialism was officially confirmed by Frelimo's Third Congress in 1977 and the creation of a ten-year plan to promote central planning, the *Plano Prospectivo Indicativo* (PPI) adopted in 1980 (Hanlon 1996, p. 96). Despite difficult circumstances post-independence such as skills shortage and a loss of $600 million due to UN sanctions against Rhodesia, this period welcomed economic recovery, doubled export numbers, industrial production rising by 16%, a steady Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and social services being expanded rapidly within Mozambique (Hanlon 1996, p. 89). The trend of the 1960s and 1970s of development through state intervention in the economy, interestingly, was endorsed by the World Bank (Herbst 1990; Mkandawire 2010).

Frelimo's social policy and poverty strategy

Social policy was a main facet of Frelimo's socialist 'planned economy' standpoint, as indicated in their initial moves to nationalize education and healthcare, and provide general food subsidies (Hanlon 1996; Nwafor 1983; O'Laughlin 1996, p. 204). This nationalization of social services was a stark contrast from the Portuguese colonial rule, where little resources were devoted to social services (World Bank 1995). The nationalization of social services, however, was under attack during the civil war and migration as well as devastation of infrastructure weakened the social services project. Hanlon (1996, p. 5) stated how the civil war:

> "was no mindless violence. Renamo and its South African and US strategists had clear goals: the aim was to destroy the gains of independence and, almost Pol Pot-like, to target the better-off, thus building a base among the poorest and the most backward. Because health and education were the main causes of Frelimo's popularity, schools and health facilities were particular targets; students, teachers and nurses were kidnapped or killed, and in some cases hospital patients were massacred, so that people would be afraid to provide or use social services."

To add to this description, one-third of all the rural health units were closed or destroyed, leaving roughly 60% of the population without health facilities and about 70% of the primary school network was shut down during the civil war (World Bank 1995, p. 2).

Frelimo's ten-year prospective plan intended to defeat underdevelopment throughout the decade of the 1980s. The civil war period interrupted this and discredited the socialist system, alienating a majority of the rural population from Frelimo (O'Laughlin 1996, p. 210).

There were even efforts to create consumer cooperatives in communal villages to ensure that basic necessities were offered even in remote rural areas, as part of Frelimo's view on how distribution should be organized (Nwafor 1983, p. 61; O'Laughlin 1996, p. 208). These decisions made by Frelimo point to its emphasis on welfare, provision of basic needs, and equality as central to the party's beliefs. Economic growth and development could not be achieved without a reduction of exploitation: a clear shift from the viewpoint of the Portuguese colonial authority of an extractive state with social services only made available to Black Mozambicans who were being groomed as 'elites' by the Portuguese (Kaleidoscopio 2015; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009; p. 2). Frelimo's efforts to tackle inequality and promote growth was through redistribution, price controls, subsidies on staples, free education and free healthcare for many. These efforts, however, did not get rid of the poverty levels growing in Maputo at that time. Government programmes had leakages and notable exclusions for internally displaced persons who settled on the urban peripheries. O'Laughlin (1996, p. 209) notes that poverty hit those "without access to income from a regular wage-employment or cultivable land; those without money to pay the entry quota for a consumer cooperative… many of these were women- divorced, widowed, unmarried mothers- without education or experience to move into formal wage employment." These are the same groups that would later be targeted as GAPVU beneficiaries.

Flederman (1993, p. 125-126) adds to this when stating:

> "Since Independence, the Mozambican Government has demonstrated a high level of political will to generate social services policy, backed by resource allocation, for the poorest groups- a record unique in Southern Africa. (Green, 1993) The water supply programme and vaccination campaign are direct Government services, the outcome of policy and resource allocation for the very poor, especially for women and children…Commitment to a social safety net resulted in the coordinated efforts of a number of ministries to nurture the conception of the GAPVU cash transfers programme and to remove the red tape once it expanded."

The poverty reduction strategy of the Government by the late 1980s was four-fold, and was carried over into the post-War Reconstruction Plan (Salomao 2015; Schubert 1992): employment, food aid, cash for work programmes, and GAPVU. GAPVU became the biggest programme and most effective programme with the longest enduring lifespan (Schubert 1992, pg. 111). It is noted that the Government initially viewed the cash transfer programme as a poverty alleviation tool and not a tool that would result in widespread poverty reduction, and this is seen in its packaging with other poverty alleviation programmes that were carried over to the Reconstruction Plan (Boletim 1993, cited in Low et al, p. 7). While different sources suggest that the creation of GAPVU was in line with Frelimo's socialist tendencies to create equality and safety nets, other scholars such as O'Laughlin (1996, p. 219) imply that the government did not have the capacity to provide safety nets for even a majority of urban destitute households. Therefore, GAPVU can also be read as a 'political smokescreen' in response to doubts of the effectiveness of adopting SAPs and of the damaging social consequences of SAPs and civil war for people who were able to work and who had previously felt social justice through the language of socialism.

It was also said that by the time of reconstruction, the Ministry of Planning and Finance's Poverty Alleviation Unit began to review the safety net system in order to reorient its goals from disaster preparedness to permanent systems for vulnerable rural groups (World Bank 1995, p. 2). The incorporation of rural areas under GAPVU came in the successive years, and was a focal point of GAPVU's reorganization in 1997. To aid the Government-initiated plan on expanding permanent poverty programmes, the budget for social services increased by 43% in real terms, yet this was still lower than the per capita expenditure for social services of the early 1980s (World Bank 1995, p. 2). This aspect, combined with other examples of social policy within the party, is important to highlight as explanation for Mozambique's early adoption of a cash transfer programme through Frelimo government leadership. As mentioned, these programmes were not socially favorable around the world at that time and were difficult lobby for, fund, and administer under the confines of neoliberal ideology and policy (Devereux 2013; Midgley 2013; Schubert 2015).

Political shift and state autonomy

As a member of Frelimo since the 1980s, Dr. Salomao (2015) described in an interview that from Independence, the socialist ideology had been present in Frelimo but the change in political stance to open up to capitalist development came about during the war due to constraints, and sentiments that perhaps the socialist economic model was not appropriate for growth at that time. Salomao (2015) stated that the adoption of capitalism, which was ushered in by the decision to become a member of the Bretton Woods Institutions, happened while Samora Machel, Mozambique's first president and an architect of Frelimo's socialist position, was still president. Machel had also felt that socialism was not working, and he had taken a trip to Washington DC. to meet with President Ronald Regan and tell him that Mozambique would approach the IMF and World Bank for support. This was a decision motivated by the war, and the need to survive. This event also goes against many political sentiments that Samora Machel died clinging onto the socialist mentality.

Therefore, it is evident that Frelimo did have a political shift from the time of independence to the time of GAPVU, which can be seen in the move from basic needs provision and state-centric development to the acceptance of capitalist development through SAPs, "under which the state was charged to protect only the most vulnerable" (O'Laughlin 1996, 201). The overarching view of the role of the state during the time of neoliberalism was to weaken the state in favor of privatization and liberalization of the market (Evans 1995; Herbst 1990; Jinadu 2010; Mkandawire 2010; Weiss 2010). While one of the motivations for structural adjustment was the perception of weak, corrupt state structures especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, neoliberal institutions had been reluctant to clearly outline the role of the state under long-term structural adjustment, or give an idea of what the state should look like after structural adjustment (Herbst

1990, p. 952-953). This lack of strategy to specifically determine the role of the state or even weakly describe it during SAPs enabled the Government of Mozambique to dictate and maintain their own strategy within the confines of neoliberal policy, and define their 'no go' zones in terms of neoliberal adoption, with some failures to defend their autonomy such as in the case of the liberalization of the cashew market (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Salomao 2015).

Even during structural adjustment through the PRE, Hanlon (1996, p. 92) stated that still in 1987, "there was no major privatization and subsidies to state industry continued; the urban food ration system was maintained; key prices remained controlled and the social sector remained state-controlled." The BWI's were not pleased with this level of state-control under the PRE and PRES, but they accepted these plans that the Government had created. They acknowledged that the Government still adopted many of the policies outlined by BWI's while protecting areas crucial to their existence, as described by the Finance Minister (Hanlon 1996). For example, Dr. Salomao (2015) insisted how the Government did not privatize all areas, because some areas such as "railway companies, energy, mobile companies, TDM, water, LAM (national airlines)" had no need for the private sector, and no others wanted to be involved; thus certain sectors were left to the Government or protected by it. Because of the Government's ability to choose "which ones to follow and which ones to ignore", in terms of BWI policies, Hanlon (1996, p. 93) states that this 'selectivity' accounted for the only period of growth in 15 years.

While it is noted that the "IMF finally asserted its dominance with the agreement in 1990 of the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, which marked the adoption of the full neoliberal package- privatizations, free international trade, the end of price controls and the cheap urban food ration, sharp cuts in government spending and credit restrictions," this is the same time that GAPVU started (Hanlon 1996, p. 93-94). In an interview with Eleasara Antunes (2015), who had lived in Maputo during the civil war and who is the Director of the Gender and Social Protection Unit of the Embassy of the Netherlands in Mozambique, she described that the start of cash transfers in Mozambique were initiated after Structural Adjustment Programmes started in the late 1980s. From her view, this was a means for Government to buffer increasing inflation (Antunes 2015). Furthermore, she detailed how the time during GAPVU's creation was:

> "a complicated moment in the 1980s, where the first president (Machel) had just died, and there was political interest to provide a minimum for the increasing urban poverty. Many were living in flats with 20 people, and there were no jobs. Thus, the motivation of the Government was to use social protection at an opportune time to respond to civil riots or to mitigate civil unrest; this trend of governments using cash transfers to respond to inflation and poverty increases because of SAPs can be found in literature in other places too" (Antunes 2015).

As previously addressed, the trend governments using cash transfers to respond to inflation-induced poverty was also seen in Latin America. While the impact of SAPs on the economy had been weak, as team leader for the reconstruction plan Dr. Salomao (2015) described that government had created their own strategies, yet needed World Bank support to organize a consultative conference to present the reconstruction plan from 1992-1994 and scale efforts. This process occurred because Mozambique, as a member of the World Bank since the mid-1980s, had been paying contributions to the World Bank. Therefore, Salomao (2015) portrayed that there was a package available (of Mozambique's contributions) from the World Bank, and allocation would be made by the World Bank for infrastructure, roads, etc. This process clearly shows that while the heavy hand of the World Bank existed during the height of neoliberalism, the Government still maintained authority over decision-making processes in addition to where and how (financially or non-financially) it wanted involvement of the World Bank in certain sectors. This will later be seen in the Fernandes (2015) description of World Bank involvement via Government request in social protection in Mozambique today. This is also seen in Salomao's (2015) description of the World Bank providing funds for public works programmes within the Government strategized, and technically funded via Government contributions to World Bank, reconstruction plan, and more so the Government implementing these programmes directly. These examples of government leadership and activity simultaneous to neoliberal efforts to 'roll-back' and confine the state portray why the state had such an interest in creating its own cash transfer programme. The Government deliberately used cash transfers as both a poverty and solidarity addressing mechanism, and continued exercising of its own welfare to its citizens as a buffer against external interventions exacerbating poverty. Despite political shifts and adoption of capitalism and neoliberal policies, Frelimo remained and has remained supportive of these programmes because cash transfers have uniquely fit into the State's own political ideologies and vulnerability-targeted plans. Despite claims that the Government was confined because of SAPs and this lead to Mozambique being a neoliberalism 'success story', more attention needs to be attributed to the fact that the Government selected areas for neoliberal intervention and areas where external actors would not play a role. This Government selectivity is often ignored as a 'success' factor for post-war, post SAP economic growth in Mozambique as the success is often attributed to liberalisation practices.

2.v. Conclusion

Development experts such as Waterhouse and Lauriciano (2009, p.2) state that:

> "Post war, the Government's top priorities were to re-establish security and rebuild infrastructure. However, political and economic liberalization in the 1990s saw tight caps on state spending. Poverty was so widespread and deep that there seemed to be little scope for special consideration of the 'poorest of the poor'...except for ad-hoc initiatives, such as the food subsidy programme for the poor and unable to work".

To what extent were social cash transfers ad-hoc towards war reconstruction, or were they in fact part of the Government's continued desire to provide social services for all, including the poorest of the poor? Additionally, other claims state that neoliberal policy and attempts to weaken (socialist) state autonomy meant that the Government was restricted from providing support on national levels, and had to resort to only focusing on the most vulnerable groups

(O'Laughlin 1996). In many ways, the story of GAPVU and more so its continuation as the PSA and PSSB today challenges the views of Waterhouse and Lauriciano (2009). It is evident that structural adjustment implemented under civil war conditions clearly influenced and perhaps catalyzed GAPVU because of the negative consequences on society leading to Government devising survival strategies within budget constraints (De Rooij 2015; Low et al. 1999, p.4). Neoliberalism's impact in other places and even Mozambique was one of privatization of social services, cuts on public sector salaries resulting in weak capacity to implement public services, and fiscal restraints de-capacitating state structures (Mkandawire 2010). Yet still in this time, the Mozambican state created Sub-Saharan Africa's fourth cash transfer programme and one of the oldest non-contributory schemes. This chapter has provided ample evidence that it was out of the Government's will, political ideology, and desperation because of economic, political and social crises to create a programme of giving money directly to people as a form of welfare and solidarity during tough times. GAPVU is said to have been the only 'fully functioning' social programme in Mozambique and the only programme providing a safety net and poverty alleviation to urban populations, from the period starting just before the end of the civil war and to today (Datt et al. 1997, p.2; Low et al 1999).

What made Mozambique different from other countries in Sub-Saharan Africa who went through periods of 1. independence from colonialism; 2. war or economic instability; or 3. structural adjustment and neoliberalism? Schubert (2015) detailed that from his eight visits and consultancies to Mozambique for GAPVU between 1991-1993, he could see that GAPVU "got off under all restrictions of SAPs despite skepticism of Government and development experts existing, because it was not a mainstream programme." What clearly made a difference for the case of GAPVU was the socialist aspirations, welfare and solidarity approach from the State in addition to the clear role of and continued engagement of the Ministry of Finance from the early days (Greany 2015; Schubert 2015). In addition, an important take away of this programme is the clear commitment from the government to its most vulnerable citizens. Over time, this has endured through its ability to boost the livelihoods of the urban poor and today rural populations too. GAPVU as a programme had its organizational flaws and in later years was marred with corruption charges and weak coverage. Its challenges could have also been the odds it faced through its 'imbedding in a strategy of liberalization' (PRE and PRES period) that did not adequately address the structural issues of pervasive poverty, a challenge that Mozambique still confronts today (O'Laughlin 1996, p. 200). Greany (2015), a development professional in Maputo, stated in an interview that Mozambique's programme is unique because it grew from a 'pity hand out' during the war to an impactful social protection programme that is focused on the idea of investment in people. This will be fully elaborated through tracing the history of GAPVU to the PSA and PSSB from 1997-present. While the roots of this urban cash transfer have several implied sources, what matters is the legacy that was created out of times of civil war and neoliberal constraints to the implementing source, the state. The successive programmes born out of the legacy of the Government-initiated programme will be covered in the next chapter.

3. Chapter Three: the Second Wave of Cash Transfers

3.i. Introduction: Continued social cash transfer programmes

After the start of GAPVU, Mozambique lavished in a period of rapid increase in beneficiary outreach for GAPVU and increased external development aid to support war reconstruction and anti-poverty programmes. What will be addressed next is how in spite of GAPVU's closure as an office in 1997 and increased space and authority realised by external development actors between 1997 and now, deeming Mozambique a 'development darling', the Government has maintained and grown its own social cash transfer spread of programmes since then. What this signifies is a continuation of its social welfare ideology in addition to a continuation of emphasis on government funding of cash transfers. Over the same period of time, the policy space of social cash transfers at the Sub-Saharan Africa level changed. While these programmes used to be stigmatized as 'hand out' interventions, they are now increasingly touted as transformative poverty reduction programmes and investments in people's productive capabilities. The new view of social cash transfers was ushered in with increased donor and international community attention and monetary support, inside and outside of Mozambique.

Chapter two argued that GAPVU began and persisted under the adverse conditions of weak economic capacity and structural adjustment efforts to 'roll-back' the state. These conditions did not disable or restrict the role of the state to the extent that is implied when Mozambique is called a neoliberalism 'success story'. Neoliberalism did, however, influence the political will seen by the state to provide for the poorest of the poor, a moral issue that is witnessed in Frelimo's ideology from its earliest days too. This chapter will present the history and logistics of Mozambique's expanded social cash transfer agenda from 1997 until today, while arguing that the Government backing of GAPVU from 1990 until today has remained constant and overall consistent. This positioning of the Government at the center of its cash transfers programmes has been integral to the survival and emphasis of social cash transfers in one of the poorest countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. What was once perhaps motivated through civil war-time efforts to build solidarity, political support and assistance against the shocks of SAPs, has grown into a long-term, state-centric social protection floor within Mozambique's social action sector. Moreover, the State has maintained a continuous position supportive of cash transfers, throughout a time when the rest of the social protection trajectory dramatically shifted from wide skepticism of anti-neoliberal handouts, to a mainstream programming within development sectors. The government's solid position on cash transfers, pioneering before most countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, is seen in fiscal control and direct oversight over programme growth. Despite other actors getting involved in Mozambique's social protection sector only when social protection was no longer marred by the development sector's distaste towards welfare transfers pre-2000, the Government has maintained its central, supportive role in these programmes.

3.ii. Social protection and cash transfer history from 1997-present

The mid-1990s saw a period of reconstruction, state funds being channeled towards emergency relief, and growth of external dependency on foreign aid. SAPs continued during this time, with an emphasis on privatization of state enterprises, restrictions on government spending and the overall role of the state in economic affairs, justified as strategies to curb inflation and promote growth. Economically, adherence to SAPs did result in positive economic growth at an average rate of 7% in the late 1990s, and gradually government resources were shifted from military activities to education, health, agriculture and social action (Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 7). This is different from the situation of the rest of Africa, which saw the lowest period of economic growth because of SAPs, While these neoliberal policies were supposed to remove state 'distortions' of markets and yield economic growth via new private capital investment, the reality was of increasing inflation and inequality (Ferguson 2009, p. 11). Politically, in 1994 Mozambique held its first ever multi-party elections, with Frelimo remaining as the front-runner in all elections even until today (Hanlon and Smart 2008; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009, p. 5). Much of the country remained in situations of absolute poverty and it was "accepted that there ha[d] not been any significant improvement in the nutritional conditions in the rural areas despite peace" (Hanlon 1996, p. 3).

3.ii.a. The role of the Mozambican state in the mid-1990s

There are polarized views on what type of role the Mozambican state had in economic affairs at this time. Many argue that because of the strong hand of the BWIs in Mozambique, and the need for financial assistance from external sources, the role of the state a weak one because of the prolonged conditions of structural adjustment's 'anti-statist' agenda (Ferguson 2009; Hanlon 1996; Hanlon and Smart 2008). The rise in foreign aid over this period resulted in a situation whereby in 1996, 65% of the GDP was made up of foreign aid (Greany 2015; Hanlon and Smart 2008). Because of the historically weak financial performance of Mozambique, the decade of civil war and on top of it all, the financial demands of the reconstruction plan, it was quoted by the Head of Agronomy at Universidad Eduardo Mondlane, Firmino Mucavele, that "when you lack capacity, you tend to accept what outsiders say and you come to believe it. We sing the IMF songs, even though we don't understand what the words mean" (Hanlon 1996, p. 113). Another description of the situation showed that "in contrast to what we would like to think, the rulers of Africa are not the various African states...The bosses of Africa and of Mozambique are the World Bank and the IMF…Their programme is to integrate Africa into a system of economic neocolonialism which takes no account of people. What counts is the free market; its god is money" (Hanlon 1996, p.1).

The opposite and lesser-expressed view is of a not only present but actively involved state, against the odds of neoliberal attempts to confine the state in order to implement free market practices. This type of role was seen in Frelimo remaining focused on assisting

Mozambican citizens through social services. This view supports that the conditions outlined by the BWIs did not remove nor weaken the role of the state, outside of and despite budgetary constraints and increased influence of donor agencies. As mentioned, some scholars highlight that the state was an essential and necessary actor in creating the economic and regulatory conditions by which neoliberal state roll-back and privatization activities could occur (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Jinadu 2010; Pitcher 2002; Weiss 2010). The view in support of a strong and autonomous state capacity is illustrated by a statement made by the Frelimo Central Committee on May 10, 1996, that:

> "Reducing inflation must be balanced with economic growth in a way that does not result in major suffering by Mozambicans. The international financial institutions must take into consideration the concrete need of Mozambique to reconstruct. Macroeconomic policies lose all legitimacy when they inevitably degrade the lives of citizens, reducing them to absolute misery… The state cannot give up its capacity as regulator of the economy" (Hanlon 1996, p. 134).

The neoliberal idea of a small role of the state was therefore not supported by Frelimo and most Mozambicans at all levels, despite accepting SAPs and its conditions. As mentioned, during the time of initial SAPs negotiations, the Frelimo government was insistent on selecting where adjustment policies were applicable and what areas the Government intended to protect from SAPs (Salomao 2015). By the late 1990s, it was not a situation of 'privatisation vs. state enterprises' and the privatization agenda for certain areas was actually supported by Frelimo and by entities in society, too. There was also clear recognition that a stronger state would create the environment for the growth of the private sector (Hanlon 1996, p. 101). Lastly, there was agreement from UNICEF and UNDP that "for most of these public services there is no alternative basic supplier to the state either now or in the foreseeable future" (Adedji et al., 1995 cited in Hanlon 10996, p. 101).

While Waterhouse and Lauriciano (2009) state that at this time the poverty agenda received increased attention, this depends on how one views Frelimo's emphasis on equality as synonymous to or outside of a poverty agenda. It is apparent, however, that the increase in foreign donors and development agencies within Mozambique and their poverty agendas had shaped the Government's political view of poverty as a growth strategy. The first National Poverty Assessment was carried out in 1997, and showed that roughly 69% of the population was living in poverty, while the second National Poverty Assessment in 2002 indicated that the level had dropped to 54% of the population (Massingarela and Nhate 2006, p. 7-8).

3.ii.b. The End of GAPVU

The period of 1996-1998 is described as the third stage of GAPVU's evolution, whereby the program received an initial restructuring and subsequent reorganization to a new area of government. This was a result of the numerous evaluations done on the first few cycles of the cash transfer programme. In 1995, despite budget and human capacity constraints, the Ministry of Finance ordered a large-scale beneficiary survey. The goal of this survey was to find ways to reduce the cost of the programme and justify its impact, amidst negative claims against the programme. The result of this evaluation and a few others was a push to reform Government's policy on the selection of targeted groups (UAP/UUP/MPF 1997 cited in Low et al. 1999, p. 17). A distinction was then made between those who could and could not help themselves by means of obtaining work, with a focus on the latter when the programme was restarted under INAS. INAS was created on the 10th of September 1997 through a decree from the Council of Ministers (Decreto no. 28/97) and was responsible for social service delivery (INAS 2013, p. 1). Through INAS, the PSA continued and other cash transfer programmes were initiated. One of them was a pilot cash-for-work programme to provide income for women who had previously received the GAPVU transfer but did not fall under the new eligibility criteria because they were capable of obtaining work. In addition, the revived programme provided 5.8 times more money than the previous PSA cash transfer administered by GAPVU (Low et al. 1999; Massingarela and Nhate 2006 p. 18).

After the evaluations of GAPVU, between 1996-1997 the GAPVU office that was started under the Ministry of Finance and Planning was officially shut down and therefore "GAPVU was abolished" by Government (Low et al. 1999, p.6). There are numerous reasons for why the Office was shut down, including corruption allegations and the discovery of numerous 'ghost beneficiaries' (Devereux and Pelham 2005 cited and Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 280; Low et al. 1999, p.6; Massingharela and Nhate 2006; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009). A second reason suggests it was closed in response to internal and external pressures reacting to the programme evaluations. Lastly, there were claims in an interview with the architect of the post-war reconstruction plan, Dr. Salomao (2015), that the reconstruction programme had come to a close by 1997 and that the targeted beneficiaries of the cash transfer (urban migrants displaced by war) were encouraged to return home to rural areas by then. Dr. Salomao (2015) elaborated that, "At some point, if you are in peace, you are undertaking rehabilitation of roads and people are encouraged to go back [home]. This program could encourage people to live on this subsidy, so the programme ended." This statement has hints of the 'dependency view' or 'handouts view' that was an on-and-off view of different Ministers of Finance throughout time, and will be touched on later in this chapter. This statement, however, does not elaborate on why GAPVU and the PSA were continued under INAS, but it could be that the new targeting metrics prevented capable workers from staying unemployed and living off of transfers.

Massingarela and Nhate (2006, p. 17) recall that,

> "Before the change of mandate and name of the institution, consultations were made to gather the views of the many stakeholders in Mozambique's development process. It should first be recalled that the Government Five-Year Plan was discussed in Parliament involving all parties represented, and that INAS was created as a direct implementation of the Government Plan."

Therefore, in light of corruption and inefficiency charges against the GAPVU, this is evidence that the Government desired to continue roll-out and even increase cash transfer programmes for Mozambique. This portrays a positive Government view of cash transfer programmes, and furthermore motivation to reorganize the programme to increase efficiency and impact.

The mission of the programme to 'minimize the difficulties of the poor' and not necessarily promote widespread poverty eradication remained the same under INAS. The 'new' programme' had two major transformations being in the inclusion of the rural poor as targeted beneficiaries and the focus specifically on the poor who were unable to work (Low et al. 1999, p. 7). The inclusion of rural areas arose because the former reconstruction plan schemes that provided food subsidies for free or through cash-for-work programmes in rural areas were discontinued by 1997. Yet, there were still thousands of people in rural areas who had benefited from this social safety net programme and still needed assistance. INAS initially expanded the programme to six rural centres, with administration based on local political pressure (Low et al. 1999). It could also be that this programme expanded to rural areas as a way for Frelimo to garner support in Renamo-dominated rural areas.

At this time, the monitoring of the programme tightened in response to the corruption-due-to-weak-administration claims of previous evaluations. By December 1997 there were only 30,000 social cash transfer beneficiaries, less than a third of GAPVU's numbers at its height in 1996. This reduced number of beneficiaries, despite a large increase in geographical coverage, however, was either a result of the removal of 'ghost beneficiaries' or moreover a result of the newly formed targeting and therefore removal of those who had the physical ability to do work (Low et al. 1999; Massingarela and Nhate 2006). This period of corruption charges, closure of GAPVU's office and decline in beneficiaries has signified to some scholars weak political support for the cash transfer. What does the immediate creation of INAS within the Government's Plan and expansion of the cash transfer to rural areas, however, signify (Low et al. 1999; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009)?

3.ii.c. The PSA Under INAS

The PSA food subsidy programme, also known today as the Basic Social Subsidy Programme (PSSB) continued under the INAS post-1997, and today it is the most widespread cash transfer in Mozambique. The PSSB has continued to receive increasing amounts of funding directly from the State budget over time (G20 France 2011; UNICEF 2014). With over 140,000 beneficiary households in 2008, it has the second highest number for cash transfer beneficiaries after Ethiopia (and excluding South Africa) as per a study performed in 2013 (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 59). While the number of beneficiaries of the PSA is high compared to other countries, the coverage is still weak in relation to the potentially qualifying beneficiaries in Mozambique, a place with poverty levels nearing 50% of the total population (Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009). While enjoying high levels of Government prioritization in the last 18 years, expansion into rural areas post-GAPVU has succeeded in reaching all districts of Mozambique, but has faced difficulty with rising administrative costs and weak individual outreach (Soares, Hirata and Ribas 2010). While the value of each cash transfer continues to change, since 2008 the cash transfer has contributed on average 21.8% of a beneficiary household's consumption yet only 10% of the minimum wage (Garcia and Moore 2012; Handa et al. 2012; Soares, Hirata and Ribas 2010). This can be viewed as a high amount of monthly expenditure, yet hardly enough to cover household needs.

3.ii.d. Expansion of various social cash transfers

Reviews of GAPVU and the creation of INAS opened up the second wave of cash transfers for Mozambique, with the cash transfer programme's targeting definition of absolute poverty narrowed in on those unable to work. This widely impacted the beneficiary numbers as well as the strains on administrative capacity to deliver to new beneficiaries. Coincidently, another important change that came with these reviews and need for improved administration was the recommendation for INAS to work in partnership with non-governmental organizations to achieve its outreach goals (Low et al. 1999, p. 36). Around the mid-2000s, INAS gradually created a Social Fund or scheme that donors could contribute to for a number of social assistance programmes. This Social Fund still exists within INAS, and the two most consistent donors to this Social Fund have been the Embassy of Netherlands and the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015; Greany 2015; UN Mozambique 2015).

Because of the removal of able-workers as beneficiaries for the cash transfer programmes, in 1999 INAS created two new income-generation schemes for small business owners and food-for-work within its growing social assistance platform (Massingharela and Nhate 2006, p. 3; 16). These programmes were all created to complement the PSA, and provide expanded social services. From the mid-1990s to today, there have also been several types of cash transfers in Mozambique, from short-term ad-hoc programmes such as the UNDP funded, government implemented Soldier Demobilization Grant of the early 1990s and the USAID funded Flood Victim Grant of 2000, to the education conditional cash transfer (MISA) that was imported from Brazil but did not last longer than a year (Hanlon 2004; Massingarela and Nhate 2006; Standing 2008). Those programmes were short-term, with a consistent facet of short-term grants being partially-to-fully funded and implemented by donors.

3.iii. Promotion and Growth of Social Protection in Mozambique

Since the closure of GAVPU and the creation of INAS in the late 1990s, Mozambique's urban poverty-focused cash transfer programme has expanded through internal political and external actor support. Today, INAS is part of the social protection and welfare sector that includes other government and non-governmental supported initiatives towards social action. Information gathered from ten interviews with government and NGO actors working directly with cash transfer programmes highlighted several explanations for the growth of cash transfer programmes in Mozambique after GAPVU. These rationales touch on the positive views by Government of cash transfer programmes after the success of GAPVU, the pressures for growth from development and international finance institutions, and views on the increase of cash transfers after the 2008 and 2010 urban food riots in Maputo.

3.iii.a. Focus within Mozambique's new, externally inclusive poverty agenda

As portrayed in Chapter Two, poverty alleviation had always been on Frelimo's agenda due to its position that poverty reduction was a means to promote equality. Thus, poverty reduction and the reinvigoration of social services remained on the Frelimo agenda throughout the civil war and reconstruction, through GAPVU and other cash-for-work programmes. With the adoption of SAPs and under President Joachim Chissano, the Government of Mozambique's political orientation became more welcoming to free-market orientation and capitalism. Neoliberal positioning included increased donor responsibilities as well as NGO involvement in social services as a proxy for civil society (Ferguson 2006; Reis 2012). Therefore, the state's role in development and social services evolved in the last twenty years to become what it is today, whereby Mozambique is seen as 'donor dependent'. This is because liberalisation of the development sector has meant that external actors have played an increasing role in poverty reduction and development work, instead of this responsibility remaining in the hands of the state (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Hanlon and Smart 2008; Pitcher 2002). The inclusion of external actors in assisting the most vulnerable populations is a contrast from the early 1990s, when neoliberalism restricted the Government's influence to focusing on the most vulnerable, and no longer influence over all populations; now the sphere of the poor had to be shared. During the same period, from the end of the 1990s and onward, poverty entered center stage on international agendas, first with social funds, Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and then poverty strategy papers (Mkandawire 2010). These agendas were welcomed into Mozambique too given the Government's new donor-friendly political orientation.

Foreign donors

As mentioned, one of the 1997 evaluations of GAPVU recommended to the Ministry of Finance that the programme needed to begin to receive support from NGOs (Massingharela and Nhate 2006). Foreign donors had been present in Mozambique's political and economic spheres starting after independence from a couple Nordic countries and then when international financial institutions gained authority there during the SAP time period (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007). It is worthwhile to consider that SAPs created such 'politically risky' economic growth requirements for African leaders to carry out, that "long-term flows of concessional aid" became a necessity. This was clearly the case for Mozambique, after having not received much aid post-independence to a period after SAPs where a majority of GDP came from aid (Herbst 19990, p. 957). In 2004, it was noted that foreign aid made up 23% of Mozambique's national income, making it the 8th most aid dependent country in the world (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007, p. 3). The period of 1995-2005 has been titled the 'period of accommodation' of donors according to De Renzio and Hanlon (2007). This is a time period where the World Bank and the IMF loosened their hold on Mozambique as structural adjustment wore down. This paved way for Western European donors to move in. It is described that the donor community and the State reached a "modus vivendi in which the government's policy agenda was mostly dominated by the IFIs and donors, without a clear national development vision" (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007, p. 6). Until 2006, however, these organizations only played technical assistance roles in Mozambique's cash transfer programmes, and as noted the finances and budgeting of social protection programmes came directly from and were managed by the Government.

PRSPs: PARPA I and PARPA II

The 'loosened hold' of the World Bank and IMF is debatable, as this was also the time when these institutions implemented their poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs). These papers or policies were a requirement for Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPCs) to receive debt relief. In Mozambique, they are known as the Government's Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty- *Plano de Acçao para a Reduçao do Pobreza Absoluta* (PARPA) (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009). Tying the new development orientation together with the impact of the PSRPs, De Renzio and Hanlon (2007, p. 4) point out that "Despite the emphasis that the government ha[d] put on increasing domestic revenues in its poverty reduction strategy (known as PARPA), between 1997 and 2004 revenues fluctuated around 12% of the GDP, without any substantial increases." The first poverty reduction paper of Mozambique ran from 2001-2005, known as PARPA I. As a carry-over from structural adjustment, PARPA I promoted economic growth through market liberalization, fiscal restraint and strengthening the environment for private sector growth (Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009, p. 6). In addition, PARPA I was claimed to be written with strong donor support yet none from civil society, and "was submitted to donors for comment but never submitted to Parliament, and was mostly seen as a document directed at donors for complying with the requirements of HIPCs" (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007, p. 10)

The results of PARPA I were measured through the second National Poverty Assessment from 2002-03, and showed that absolute poverty levels had dropped from 69% to 54% of the population. Calculations of these figures by the Ministry of Finance are debatable to some scholars and income inequality actually increased during this period (Hanlon and Smart 2008; Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009, p. 6). Of note, PARPA I did not explicitly promote cash transfer programmes or social safety nets. During the time of PARPA I in the early 2000s, Devereux (2002, p. 658) explained that:

> "According to the World Bank itself (1994: 163): 'It is likely that narrowly targeted interventions to reach specific groups of the poor will play only a small role in the poverty reduction strategies of most African countries.' This view is evident in the limited or non-existent role ascribed to safety nets or social protection in most national Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)."

Massingarela and Nhate (2006, p. 15) also support this when stating that social protection was not included in the priority areas of PARPA I, however there is a discrepancy on whether the food subsidy program was included in the strategy elsewhere. By 2006, however, cash transfer programmes and social safety nets took up greater importance in poverty reduction strategies around the world. This is seen in Mozambique in the inclusion of the PSA and social protection through 'social action' as a priority area in PARPA II, which ran from 2006-2009 (Massingarela and Nhate 2006). The rationale for the inclusion of social safety nets stems from the realization of the importance of protecting those without work capabilities, which had already been a running theme in the 1997 adjusted PSA. Thus, the PSA was already fulfilling objectives of these poverty agendas, but only became a 'priority area' of PARPA II, which formerly comprised of health, education and sanitation. UNICEF (2007, p. 2) notes that the Performance Assessment Framework of PARPA II was "reviewed annually by government and partners-instrumental in creating a space for dialogue with the Minister of Planning and Development, Minister of Finance and bilateral partners on the expansion of unconditional cash transfer programmes." PARPA II covered the period of approval of Mozambique's Social Protection Law and of other joint legislative support to the social protection sector (UN Mozambique 2015). Therefore, it makes sense to see commitment to expand social protection at this time, through PARPA II's allocation of additional resources to this sector and through international lobbying for social protection (Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009, p. 9).

From 2008-2014 (a period covered by PARPA II's 2006-2009 range), the social welfare sector (INAS and MMAS) grew from .84% of the total government budget, to 1.64% by 2014 (UNICEF 2014, p. 4). By 2014 the priority areas grew to take up 64% of the government expenditure, with social welfare comprising 3.1% of that figure (UNICEF 2014, p. 4). The increase in budget allocations to social action are not only justified by the growth in the national expenditure, but also the transition in the role of government from PARPA I to PARPA II. Waterhouse and Lauriciano (2009, p. 7) note that even though PARPA II implies poverty reduction through economic growth and continued liberal market economics, it "includes important emphasis on the state's role in basic social service provision." This is different from the so-called policy-level retracted-state view of structural adjustment of the 1980s and 1990s, and resonates more closely to the Frelimo government's view of what the state's role should be regardless of attempts to confine its central role in social services (World Bank 1995).

3.iii.b. Social protection policy and the Social Welfare Sector

Externally, bodies such as the UN and the ILO state that while 73% of the world does not have access to comprehensive social protection, it is a key strategy in reaching the Sustainable Development Goals focused on eradication of poverty (ILO 2015; Ellis, Devereux and White 2009). 'Social Protection Floors' are "Nationally defined sets of at least four basic social security guarantees that ensure basic income security for all and access to universal essential health care" (ILO 2015). Social cash transfers are included in social protection floor activities as they provide cushions against socio-economic shocks and foster inclusive growth. The growth of the PSA paved the way for the Mozambique's dynamic social protection floor, especially as a low-income country.

While it is evident that Mozambique had already been carrying out social protection programmes as part of the wider push for social services post-independence, there lacked official social protection policy even within the early poverty reduction agendas (Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009, p. 9). With social protection and cash transfer programmes running consistently for almost 15 years, why was there no guiding policy document or overall social protection framework until 2007? While GAPVU and INAS were created under official government resolutions, they did not fit into wider Government strategies or policies on social protection until much later. Waterhouse and Lauriciano (2009, p. 9) attribute this to the "history of colonial rule and the Government's failed attempt after national Independence to provide free basic services to all Mozambicans." This view implies that the Government's provision of free education and healthcare, which faced challenges during the civil war and under SAPs, was a failure for administrative reasons and not results of war destruction and external privatization policy. It also implies that a lack of social protection policy was due to the Government's ego bruise from previously failed programmes. A lack of policy, however, does not mean that the Government did not support social protection and cash transfer programmes and should not overshadow the official resolutions passed by the Council of Ministers to form GAPVU and INAS. With evidence from GAPVU, MISA, the Soldier Demobilization Grant, and the creation of INAS, it is hard to argue that the Government had no interest in social protection.

When the Social Protection Law was approved by Government in 2007 (Resolution 4/2007), it defined social protection as "a right for all citizens and established the legal basis for the social protection system" (UN Mozambique 2015, p. 7). This law structured the three-pillar social security system: Basic Social Protection (under the direction of the Ministry of Women and Social Action); Social Insurance (Ministry of Labour); and complementary social protection from private and voluntary sectors (Waterhouse and Lauriciano 2009, p. 9). The overall consolidation of the social protection system took two periods: Stage one, 2005-2010: establishment of a legal and strategic framework for social protection, and Stage two, 2011-Present: implementation of the National Strategy for Basic Social Security in order to expand coverage to beneficiaries (Chivambo 2015; UN Mozambique 2015). By 2014, all four cash transfer programmes of INAS still only included 15% of the poor population (UNICEF 2014, p. 8). Under the new Social Protection Law, the PSA, the successor to GAPVU, officially changed its name to the PSSB. Today, the four basic social protection programmes under INAS are:

1. Basic Social Subsidy Programme (PSSB)
2. Direct Social Support Programme (PASD)
3. Productive Social Welfare Programme (PASP)
4. Social Welfare Social Services (SASS)

External actor roles in social protection policy

What was the delay in creating a national social protection policy? One can comment that for the case of Mozambique there was a 'delay', because existing social protection work had already been implemented for almost two decades. Therefore, there lacked a rush to create policy around an existing system already being carried out. The insertion of a social protection policy in Mozambique in 2007 made sense, however, in terms of the chronology of international social protection development. This was the time when the continent had started to focus on the promotion of basic social protection in Africa. The African Union hosted a conference on 'Examining the Case for Basic Social Protection in Africa' in March of 2006, and it was there that Mozambique, along with 12 other African countries signed the Livingstone Call to Action. This called upon national governments to "put together national social transfer plans within 2-3 years that are integrated within National Development Plans and within National Budgets, and that development partners can supplement" (AU 2006). These clauses most likely motivated the Government of Mozambique to officiate a social protection law.

Antunes (2015), Director of Gender and Social Protection at the Embassy of Netherlands in Mozambique, is one of few sources to describe that the growth in the social protection sector and policy initially came to be via ILO lobbying even as early back as discussions in 1996-97. In 1998, the 'first' policy was approved, and the second 'main' policy, or consolidation of policy, was enacted in 2007 and in 2009 (Antunes 2015). Evidence of this 'first' policy from 1998 has not been sourced, unless the 'first' policy is synonymous to the resolution creating INAS. From the donor perspective, the consolidation of policy in the late 2000s was catalyzed by interested donors approaching government in 2006, and in reaction to lack of social action measurement indicators in PARPA, as will be addressed below (De Rooij 2015). It was also the foundation for designing the National Strategy for Basic Social Security (ENSSB) from 2009-2010 (UN

Mozambique 2015). Karin de Rooij (2015), who at the time of interview was the Social Protection Specialist at UNICEF Mozambique and previously was the Social Protection Specialist at the Embassy of the Netherlands (replaced by Eleasara Antunes), provided further details on DFID and the Embassy of the Netherlands being the first two donors to start looking at the PSA in 2005. In 2006 the two organizations approached the Ministry of Women and Social Action (MMAS) to get involved with the PSA financially. Therefore, "this opened a 'jar' and the Embassy of Netherlands and [then] UNICEF jumped onto it [not just for financial support' but to get a measurement indicator for government on social action and social protection, and this was a huge step" (De Rooij 2015).

In 2009, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed between Government and select organizations. DFID and the Embassy of Netherlands became 'official' donors, although they had already been donating since 2006. This MOU allowed UNICEF to contribute technical assistance, and the ILO provided social protection floor support in addition to macro-level policy work and fiscal space advisory. These are the four stakeholders who have consistently played a role in shaping the growth of social protection in Mozambique in the last ten years (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015). Today, as emphasized in Antunes' and Greany's (2015) interviews, the social protection portfolio includes funding INAS and the PSSB through a common scheme or common fund, with the Embassy of the Netherlands and DFID being the only two direct donors to the cash transfers carried as the PSSB. In an interview with Ivete Alane (2015), who is currently the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Sport and Youth, and was formerly the Permanent Secretary for MMAS, she noted that symbolically the PSA became the four programmes (noted above) of the ENSSB, and that is a positive sign that Government understands the impact of social cash transfers.

Antunes (2015) remarked that in 2009, when donors first signed the MOU to officially enable external donations to social protection, the PSSB was 30-40% donor funded. Today, it is only 9-11% donor funded and there are efforts by Government to decrease this external funding even more (UNICEF 2014). For the whole social protection sector, direct donations to social action and welfare work is only 11% from external sources, and this is a trend that reflects the Government's original position (as seen in GAPVU) as being the only direct funder of social action and notably cash transfers (Alane 2015; UNICEF 2014). Greany (2015) also took this further in explaining that initial donor funding to this sector was important during its growth phase, because the new Basic Social Security provision was "quite ambitious, so there was an expectation to receive donor funding." She further stated that DFID has an interest in capacity building and funding systems, and not necessarily funding cash transfers directly, thus the decline in DFID funding over time while government funding increases works cohesively (Greany 2015).

What is important to note is that the main change that came with the creation of the Social Protection Law was the ability for donors to contribute directly into social protection programmes, and for the programme to begin working with external actors on a financial and non-financial basis, as recommended in the PSRPs. It can be analysed that donors had strong influence over helping Mozambique craft its Law, and in interviews it was confirmed that the ILO, AU, and inquiries into donation prospects played a strong role in the creation of the Law (Antunes 2015). It could also be that the government welcomed in external funding through the policy in order to receive support to expand programmes and better capacitate the implementing organization, INAS. Donors to social protection are viewed to have a cooperative, and not a competitive, relationship with INAS, and this point can be supported even in light of the Government's current push to decrease external donor funding.

3.iii.c. Food riots response

Chapter two and the literature review presented the common transition from food aid to social cash transfers as improved development programmes because of their greater ability to reach deserving populations. Chapter two did note that food aid through subsidies had been a staple safety net programme for millions of Mozambicans during the time of independence and during the civil war. Despite the coverage and because of their inefficiencies, however, there was little objection when these programmes stopped (O'Laughlin 1996). The relationship between food aid and social cash transfer growth after GAPVU, presented some differences in the late 2000's. The more recent link between social cash transfers and the urban food riots had to do with Government measures to address urban insecurity and perhaps using social protection to do so.

The 2008 and 2010 food riots in a few of the larger cities in Mozambique can be described as violent protests by ordinary citizens, addressing the rising costs of living in those cities (De Brito et al. 2014). In 2012, there was another set of riots that were quickly appeased by police action, too. De Brito et al. (2014), of the Mozambican think-tank, the Institute of Social and Economic Studies, argue that the Mozambican food riots can fit into a wider worldwide movement. This movement includes uprisings addressing the volatility of food prices that also uncover the social and political exclusion of the world's poorest populations. Particularly in Mozambique, the period of the late 2000s, similar to the late 1980s, was one of difficulty in accessing food in urban and rural areas because of weak domestic production and rise in food prices, and the same situation for fuel (De Brito et al. 2014; O'Laughin 1996). The result was a text-message circulated call for a 'strike' starting in Maputo on February 5th, 2008, which turned into a violent protest of looting, burning and stoning vehicles, and blocking roads for three days in Matola and Maputo.

Similar text-message initiated protests occurred on September 1 and 2 of 2010, and again on the 15th and 16th of November 2012. These protests always started in Maputo, where scholars have addressed there are higher levels of education and access to information, in addition to unemployment and the largest concentration of poverty and inequality as compared the rest of the country (De Brito 2014, p. 19-20). Rising inequality due to migration of vulnerable populations during the war and SAPs-induced inflation was the context when GAPVU was first implemented and a reason for starting the cash transfers in Maputo (Schubert 1992). The direct response of Government to the 2008 protests, however, became one of condemnation and repression of the right to protest through considering them illegal and unproductive towards 'the fight against poverty' (De Brito et al. 2014, p. 28). In 2010, however, the Government message transformed into one of delivering on economic measures to control prices and incentives that would support citizens against the pressures of increased costs of living (which had to do with fuel) (De Brito 2014, p. 28). The 2010 response of the Government is more closely related to the late 1980s response by the Government to curb inflation pressures through GAPVU.

From interviews, there are mixed positions regarding whether the food riots from 2008-2012 had an influence over increased social protection budgets from the Mozambican State. While De Rooij (2015) and Antunes (2015) noted that from 2009 onwards, the period after the first food riot, the social action budget increased. To them, this was most likely due to non-governmental organizations, such as their respective work places of UNICEF and the Embassy of Netherlands, using the platform of the food riots to demand increased social protection (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015). It was enquired in interviews whether civil society directly demanded cash transfers and social protection to address the food insecurity as part of their protest messages. The answers were negative on the part of civil society however there was a push from academia and NGOs that was picked up by Government (De Rooij 2015). The specific message that came from civil society, through the Civil Society Platform for Social Protection (*Plataforma Sociedade Civil- Proteção Social)* was to stop rising food and fuel prices in urban areas (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015). Antunes (2015) does clarify that she felt the that the food riots and the social unrest they created reinforced support for social protection, and this is why by 2011 a heightened budget increase is observable. To support her position, she pointed out that in 2012, after the second food riots, government created a 'basic basket' of subsidized goods (Antunes 2015). De Brito et al. (2014, p. 34) substantiate that in the Government response to the riots, via their 2010-2014 Strategic Urban Poverty Reduction Programme (PERPU), they noted the growth of social protection and creation of job opportunities as two prioritized areas.

From the side of the Government, Alane (2015) was working at MMAS, the ministry overlooking social cash transfers at that time. She stated that the increase in budget to social protection was actually a result of years of policy building and lobbying, that led to increases at coincidently the same time. It is important to recall that 2007 was the year that the Social Protection Law came to be, and that 2009 was when the National Basic Social Security Strategy was put in place (UN Mozambique 2015). Alane's response challenging the link between food riots and social protection budget growth should also take into context the political climate and sentiments towards the food riots. It has been observed that the origination of protests in the late 2000's in Maputo came by surprise to the Government, as Maputo also has a population with more sympathy for the ruling elite than other areas (De Brito et al. 2014). From another standpoint, the unsuspected food riots could be rationalized as the use of increased social protection by political elites to appeal to civil society, as seen in other places, or it could justify why Alane is hesitant to connect the two issues.

While there are various stances on the connection between the food riots and the creation and expansion of social protection in Mozambique, what is significant to note is the link between urban insecurity in both cases and the responses met from Government with or without civil society demands. While there were no urban protests noted when GAPVU was created, as in the case of the food riots of the late 2000's, GAPVU was started at a time of civil war and mass migration. That context left the Government feeling insecure to the possibility of urban revolts in an already overpopulated urban context because of rural war migrants. As pointed out by Lavers and Hickey (2015), social cash transfers can become a political tool to appease threats of uprising or opposition. Without particularly being a 'direct' response to the food riot demands of the 2000s, the Government was more than likely aware that increased social protection and cash transfers could be a way to address urban insecurity and urban uprisings due to vulnerability. Food prices did rise in the late 1980s due to SAPs induced inflation, and that was one of the reasons why GAPVU started. As has been noted, GAPVU's continuation after the 1980s was a sign that the Government found the cash transfer to be an effective mechanism to address increasing levels of urban insecurity and rising poverty related to inflation and economic hardships. Therefore, their prioritization of social protection in the 2000s to respond to similar economic contexts in addition to more active citizen demands and uprisings, is justifiable because of past action related to GAPVU. During the late 2000s, the Government received additional support and motivation from donor organisations to increase social protection coverage for similar rationales, and ones that had been clear to them throughout the 1990s. The lack of civil society demand directly for cash transfers in these cases almost portray how cash transfers have come to a be a 'preferred' mode of intervention by the Government of Mozambique, well before this tool has become mainstream by other governments worldwide.

3.iii.d. Timeline of Major Dates of Social Protection in Mozambique

The chart below presents key dates and activities in the consolidation of the Social Protection System in Mozambique from 2005-2015, as emphasized by the ILO, UNICEF and World Food Programme (UN Mozambique 2015, p. 6-14):

2005	Low coverage, fragmentation, limited technical capacity and lack of policy instruments
2006	The Livingstone Conference, increased donor interest and the incorporation of Social Action in the Government Poverty Assessment Framework
2007	Approval of the Law on Social Protection and consolidation to one UN support system for this sector
2008	Signing onto the Social Policy Framework for Africa and receiving institutional support to INAS
2009	Consolidation of the Legislative Policy Framework for the social protection system
2010	Approval of the National Strategy for Basic Social Security (2010-2014); period of fiscal space and capacity development
2011	Creation of the new programmes within ENSSB's implementation framework
2012	Development of a new operational system for the social protection programmes
2013	Increased budget allocations, expansion of the programmes and the creation of the technical secretariat for the CCSSSB
2014	Evaluation of the ENSSB; the development of an information management system and a single registry
2015	Revision of the National Strategy for Social Security; the rollout of the MIS an the re-registration of current beneficiaries

3.iv. Analysis

The opportunity to interview several key stakeholders within the social protection sector of Mozambique today provided detail and clarification on the history of social protection growth since the late 1990s and more specifically from 2005 onwards. From these interviews, there were two other emergent themes that helped gauge views on how state autonomy despite neoliberal influence played out, as seen through the case of social cash transfers. These two themes are discussed below.

3.iv.a. State views on social protection and state role in social protection growth

Every interview that occurred in addition to several publications make note that GAPVU and the PSA/PSSB were social cash transfer programmes that were initiated and predominantly funded by the Government of Mozambique. While a unique aspect for a low-income government's own programme, consideration should be given to the fact that the percentage of the national expenditure that goes to social action work is still below ILO and IMF targets of .8% of GDP on an international level. Is the Government actually a supporter of these programmes as they were when they started GAPVU, or has the provision of social cash transfers become a pressure from the external donor community? Have the Government had one consistent position? These conflicting realities motivate one to further question how 'state autonomy' is measured. Is the extent of state autonomy simply measured by the state's ability to autonomously decide and act on social protection, free from external influence such as the possibility of neoliberalism dissuading the Government towards owning a role over these programmes? Or is autonomy merely measured by a percentage of budget support that the Government is able to give to these programmes? The former places more emphasis on a measurement of state autonomy and action, within the confines of not only neoliberalism, but its own monetary constraints as a low-income country. The question is not whether or not the state exercised autonomy, but what type of autonomy and action took place while considering the constraints of neoliberalism.

In engaging the question of 'state views' of cash transfers during interviews with development specialists, several responses noted the inconsistent views of the Minister of Finance on cash transfer programmes. As noted, support from the previous Ministers of Finance when GAPVU was initiated and belonged under their portfolio were 'key success factors' for this early cash transfer programme, one that did not have many other Sub-Saharan Africa examples to learn from (Schubert 2015). While the PSA does not sit within the Ministry of Finance anymore, the Ministry of Finance is still the Department in charge of making budget decisions for all government bodies. As clarified by Alane (2015) and Garcia and Moore (2012, p. 283), all Government departments receive funding directly from the Ministry of Finance as a conduit for national budget funds. Thus, the Ministry of Finance still plays a role in determining the financial allocation of Government resources to INAS and the MMAS, which is important at a time when Government is significantly scaling back the amount of external funding to social action work (Antunes 2015; UNICEF 2014). In the future, growth in Government funding directly to social cash transfers can be justified because of the positive examples of Government funding impacting GAPVU's success.

Antunes (2015) commented that from her experience, some "Ministers of Finance can be defensive [towards social protection] because of the 'handouts' view" of social welfare and social cash transfer programmes. She further stated that "advocates try to portray social protection as an 'investment', and that advocates strategically involve the Minister of Finance" to work towards the benefit of the sector. Greany (2015) also noted that during her time in Mozambique, she has observed that the "lazy poor" mentality still exists in some conversations with Government. That is why there is an observable growth in public works programmes, most noticeably through the Government approaching the World Bank for public works support (Fernandes 2015; Greany 2015). Overall, De Rooij (2015) and a UNICEF (2014) publication emphasize that "social protection has been received positively, as seen in the budget growth sometimes at 40-50% over the course of a year; although it is 'easy' when the percentage of budget is still very small, the margin of growth can be great." Therefore, despite skepticism claims from Government, the programmes are still funded, rolled-out, and include measures to increase direct Government support. Lastly, while no longer the administrative body for social cash transfers, the Ministry of Finance is still viewed as playing a crucial role even from a lobbying perspective as they make decisions on funding amounts.

De Rooij (2015), whose institutional knowledge was more extensive than most interviewees due to her seven years of work in the sector in Mozambique, explained that from her view,

> "Two big events that really strengthened the government relationship and agenda for social protection were: 1. the provision of external support (through the ILO) in the legal framework (policy and strategy) building procedure in 2009/2010. This is where the multi-sectoral approach was built, and it pulled other actors together with an aligned development agenda through PARPA. Here, they invested in training and exchange visits for ministers (including the Minister of Finance) to other countries such as Kenya and Ethiopia to visit other ministers and programmes. This facilitated getting a common vision for social protection. 2. Arab Spring: This was a signal to government on inequality, in conjunction with Mozambique's food riots. Actors such as UNICEF and academia appealed to government that social protection could be a means to appease civil society."

The Arab Spring view is a unique take on a rationale for the growth of social protection, however, it does correlate to the food riots rationale of social protection increase as a response to uprisings related to rising inequality and vulnerability. De Rooij (2015) stated that she, through UNICEF and formerly the Embassy of Netherlands, felt lucky to be working with the Minister of Women and Social Action, the new implementing ministry for cash transfers that took over from the Ministry of Finance. The Institute that they work with, INAS, includes a few champions who have strongly supported social protection, instead seeing it as an 'investment' and not an 'unproductive handout' as other Ministry of Finance skeptics may have seen it in the present and past (Antunes 2015). De Rooij (2015) further elaborated that the current Minister of Finance has had a "strong vision of social protection, instead of 'unproductive handouts' which caused difficulty before." Several interviews did clarify that the perception of social cash transfers tend to change when a different Minister of Finance comes in and government seats (Greany 2015). For external stakeholders, they have to work to revise their visions and procedures with every political change (De Rooij 2015). This comment portrays that Government is the main actor responsible for social protection, and that donors must work around and to fit into their agendas, despite the international agendas that their organizations hold (Chivambo 2015). This also portrays that Government is the leading authority around cash transfers, and their role has remained regardless of the 'roll-back' and weak state emphasis that neoliberalism has tried to portray by including external actors and NGOs in social services and social protection. Therefore, Ministry of Women and Social Action support in addition to Ministry of Finance support, as was in the days of GAPVU, are still critical success factors for cash transfers.

In Alane's (2015) view as a civil servant, she strongly noted that Government has a key interest in supporting social protection, however on the list of priority items for the Government to provide such as healthcare, education, infrastructure, agriculture, rural development, governance and security, social protection unfortunately falls after these priorities and this explains the weak budget support when compared to international targets (UNICEF 2014). Therefore, one is lead to question whether the international measures for .8% of GDP are realizable for a low-income and economically unstable country such as Mozambique. What is more a success measure for the State's role in cash transfers: quantity in terms of programme funding amounts of quality in terms of consistently running and growing programmes? The latter would deem the Mozambican state as a successful example of a Government-run and funded cash transfer, uncommon for low-income, fragile states.

That being said, to Alane (2015), the mere fact that Government continues to provide for these programmes and increase the Government expenditure annually (because of increased tax collection by Government), is a strong sign of commitment to this work on the side of Government. She lastly stated that from her experience in Government, if the Government had more money, they would certainly fund more, thus why increased tax collection is important (Alane 2015). She commented that, "Society claims that Government thinks that social protection and cash transfers are unproductive; this is not necessarily a shared perspective across all of Government and the willingness to grow social protection from Government is evidence of this" (Alane 2015).

Alane (2015) noted that she felt that Government had good control over social protection, given the relationships it needs to maintain with external stakeholders too. A sentiment shared by Alane (2015) and the former Minister of Finance and Planning, Dr. Salomao (2015) was that the Government knows what it wants: the well-being of the population. It knows its priorities and how to get there, and it is Government's own strategy, which is not in conflict with outside organizations. A majority of the interview respondents, whether from Government or outside, clearly acknowledge that the Mozambican Government is responsible for social protection growth (Antunes 2015; Chivambo 2015; De Rooij 2015; Greany 2015; Fernandes 2015). The reasoning for this could be that sector partners understand the difficulty of implementing social protection without Government buy in, or it could be a result of the long history that the Government has had with these home-grown programmes. Additional reasoning could include a sort of reverence that was felt from interviewees towards the Government for creating its own cash transfer programmes against political and economic odds, and without previous examples to learn from. Further evidence on this was the point that DFID grew into social protection in

Mozambique and added social protection to its local portfolio of work because the Government already had social protection programmes, not necessarily because it existed in neighboring country operations of DFID (Greany 2015). These elements point to Weiss' (2010) and Jinadu's (2014) arguments that neoliberalism, and in this case the privatization of social protection and development work, cannot exist without a present and active, central role of the state in creating an enabling environment for neoliberal work to be carried out.

Therefore, the Government's previous work catalyzed further growth and support from other actors instead of actors coming in and creating their own programmes. While the case of external actors coming in and creating their own programmes has happened with Save the Children, the Embassy of Brazil and others, these programmes have not lasted (Ellis, Devereux and White 2009). Thus, as echoed in interviews, a critical success factor in social protection is cooperating with Government and also working within their programmes. But, there was stated concern regarding whether this cohesion will last as numerous new programmes outside of Government are popping up and causing fragmentation (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015). The significant growth in new programmes coming up, that did not happen during the first phase of Mozambican social cash transfers, is a result of the mainstreaming of social protection. All these cases strongly support the consistent centrality of the State and its autonomy to exercise its role within social protection, dating back to the GAPVUs start during the neoliberal, anti-statist era. These respectful views towards the Government's role in social protection also challenge the neoliberal 'Mozambican success' notion of weakening the state and privatizing social services and development.

3.iv.b. Government ownership of programmes or dependency?

Another view on the Government's position on social cash transfers is the observation from development partners on the lack of ownership from the government. This view comes from Fernandes (2015), the Social Protection Consultant at the World Bank Mozambique, who also alluded to the State's ever present autonomy in Mozambique especially in terms of receiving World Bank funding. Others noted the weak capacity of the Government to implement social protection, however, should capacity be a justification of autonomy given the public service-restrictive emphasis of neoliberal ideology (Alane 2015; Antunes 2015; Chivambo 2015; De Rooij 2015; Greany 2015)? As covered in the previous chapter, the World Bank's relationship with Mozambique through structural adjustment and through support for the growth of GAPVU via the SDA programme is a complex history. From several interviews, the World Bank seems to continue to have a strong presence in Mozambique dating back from Bretton Woods membership in the mid-1980s. Their role within social protection, however, is different from the government and other donors, and perhaps from the World Bank's role in other areas. Fernandes (2015) had only served 6 months in Mozambique at the time of our interview, but has a range of experience working on social protection since 2001 in Europe and in other parts of the world, including Timor l'Este. Fernandes (2015) commented that from the World Bank's perspective, while social protection came into Mozambique in 2007, the World Bank only began to be involved starting in 2013. At that time, the Government of Mozambique approached the World Bank to support 'building systems' through a social protection project from 2013-2018.

What is important to note here is that funding support from the World Bank came at the request of the Mozambican Government, as that is the official process of receiving World Bank funding (Fernandes 2015). As pointed out in interviews with De Rooij (2015) and Salomao (2015), what is often overlooked is that World Bank funding is either from Government contributions to the Bank or loan provisions; therefore, the process is almost like requesting funding from one's own account or requesting a loan that will be paid back by the recipient Government. In addition, the World Bank is the last main donor to the social protection sector in Mozambique, despite its early involvement and support to GAPVU through SDA. This point, regarding the gap in funding and involvement of the World Bank between SDA and 2013, could portray the hands-off, almost 'disinterested', role of the World Bank throughout a large portion of social cash transfer evolution in Mozambique. What the Mozambique-World Bank relationship signifies, however, is that the Government has the ability to choose whether they want to work with the World Bank on their own programmes, such as social protection. This is a view different from the notion that since its civil war, Mozambique has been caught in a debt cycle that has created dependency on donors and Bretton Woods Institutions.

In addition, the Government reached out to the WB with an interest in boosting up finances and technical assistance to expand cash transfers, a clear sign of Government support of social protection. The claims that the Government has a 'lack of ownership' over social protection can be regarded weakly because, as clarified through interviews, the Government is the starting point for requesting funding from the World Bank on these programmes. Therefore, a lack of ownership would have portrayed that Government did not have the impetus nor ability to request for funding. In addition, the claim that the Government has weak capacity to implement could stand correct, but it is important to note that the Government at least cooperates with donors and requests for funding to increase capacity for social protection. As has been addressed, capacity to implement is a difficult indicator for state role in Mozambique because of the legacy of constrained social service human resources due to Portuguese colonization and neoliberal policy. The World Bank Social Protection programme does signal that the Government aspires to invest in expanded social service human capacity.

Looking further at the World Bank support to social protection in Mozambique, 'building systems' is another term used for the 'General Budget Support' (GBS) that the World Bank, and other donors, provide as a form of development assistance. Massingarela and Nhate (2006, p. 12) comment that this modality of external aid, from actors such as the African Development

Bank to the PSA via budget support, enables the "capacity building and state ownership of INAS activities." Taking a critical view on the World Bank's support and even the support of the other donors through GBS, De Renzio and Hanlon (2007, p. 16, 17) unpack that GBS is also known as:

> "the latest testing ground of government-donor-relations in Mozambique relate[d] to the arrangements that have been put in place for making the support that donors provide directly to the government budget. Its rationale and justification follows a simple argument: the failure of structural adjustment policies to 'buy' reform in many countries stems from the lack of political will to reform. Therefore, reform will only succeed where recipient governments 'own' their development strategies and the associated reform agenda. Ownership, in turn, comes as a result of the definition of a development strategy which allows for increasing control over the resources necessary to implement it… GBS, therefore, should be the preferred aid delivery modalities in all countries where donors feel comfortable with aligning with national systems and strategies. The subtle contradiction of the argument lies in the definition of the boundaries of 'zone of comfort' that donors are willing to accept.. This [intertwining with government standards] includes using the PARPA merely as an 'operationalised' version of the Government's 5-year plan, rather than as a policy document in its own right."

The significance of the last sentence is that it points out the critical view by which the PARPA, and even going further back to the PRE and PRES, were indeed 'government conceptualized and owned' strategies. Whereby it is known that the PRE and PRES were synonymous to Mozambique's structural adjustment implementation strategies, the PARPAs are less-explicitly stated so (Hanlon 1996). De Renzio and Hanlon (2007, p. 9) argue that since adoption of a neoliberal, free-market approach, the Government has failed in its attempts at a "nationally-owned development strategy based on a strong vision of future needs and policy priorities which are not dictated by external forces." Furthermore, scholars note that PARPA II, which had been the key policy document through which donor support was agreed upon in a similar fashion to the PRES and IMF/WB support in the 1980s, used language of an "enabling state in in which the private sector is the main engine for growth and poverty reduction." (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007, p. 10). These views are similar to that of Mkandawire (2001), when portraying how the World Bank started to include the 'role of the state' after 1989, after criticisms of its lack of emphasis, and this was done through its tool of 'Good Governance'. Good governance has widely been attacked as a World Bank tool to give states a role, but having the World Bank directly define and measure what states should and should not be within that role (Mkandawire 2001).

De Renzio and Hanlon (2007, p. 10) ascribe that in PARPA I Government was more focused on the provision of health and education, and this is interesting to see because those were areas underpinning debt cancellation in the late 1990s. Debt-cancellation through structural adjustment attempted to take these social services out of the hands of the Government's former nationalization efforts, towards privatization of these services. De Renzio and Hanlon (2007, p. 19-20) explain that throughout the adjustment period, the IMF put heavy caps on government spending, specifically in cutting the wages of teachers and health workers to not exceed 7% of the GDP as outlined in the Government Wage Bill within an IMF agreement. They described that this made donors anxious to increase GBS because cutting capacity in health and education would make it harder for Mozambique to meet the Millennium Development Goals. Cutting these services from Government support could be seen as a mechanism to maintain dependence on the BWIs and the conditions they had put on Mozambique starting in the mid-1980s.

While these viewpoints on the current relationship between Government, the World Bank and over time a number of other donors are important in defining that the World Bank responds to the requests of Government, one must consider two points. First, on what level is the Government of Mozambique dependent on the World Bank to provide support? This is a view supported by Fernandes (2015) during her time in Mozambique. She argues that Government is already in a habit of requesting support from the World Bank due to the long relationship of World Bank support since the days of Structural Adjustment (Fernandes 2015). Second, is this demand by Government for donor support due to lack of resources (another structural adjustment privatization-gone-dependency issue) or is it because of what other interviewees called, a desire to include donors to signal a 'vote of confidence' from external stakeholders?

Lastly, in terms of 'government ownership' of externally funded and, to an unknown extent, externally 'written' economic and social development strategies such as the PARPAs, PRE and PRES: to what extent do these 'cooperative' strategies signify a level of 'autonomy' of the Government in relation to donors and external actors? Or are these neoliberal ways of masking dependency-created-through-funding mechanisms of crafted notions of 'ownership' (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007)? Thus, does the World Bank's 'request' procedure characterize 'dependency' or 'autonomy'? Looking at the overall case of social cash transfers from the 1990s and until today, the World Bank has generally had a 'hands off' approach to social protection and cash transfer policy in Mozambique, despite worldwide engagements in these programmes starting before 2013. Looking more broadly, is this a case of another development programme superficially 'in the hands' of Government? Or is the case of cash transfers a truly Government-owned programme with hints of scattered World Bank involvement on the sidelines, not strong enough to take away the Government's central role? What level of ownership is the Government content with and willing to hold on to? For the case of social cash transfers, emphasis across all actors has been on the Government's active, authoritative, and autonomous role, given the limitations of overstretched bureaucratic capacity and financial resources in addition to, and perhaps resulting from, neoliberal privatization efforts.

Mkandawire (2010, p. 49) argues that:

> "In all of the successful cases of fighting poverty under both democratic and authoritarian regimes, the state has assumed a 'developmental' role. One quite remarkable feature of the new social policy focused on MDGs or PRSPs is that the status and the requisite capacity of the state differ radically from the historical 'success stories'…. Consequently, they are to be implemented by 'regulatory states' that are stripped of many of the instruments available to developmental states and whose main task is to ensure a 'level playing field and the protection of property rights."

This, and perhaps a 'spectrum' of ownership mentality, needs to be considered when trying to address to what type of ownership states desire over programmes. For example, it is clear that Mozambique has ownership over their cash transfer programmes because they sit within Government and donors have to work within their programmes, with the exception of the World Bank Mozambique's 'Parallel Programme' point of view (Antunes 2015). Is it therefore accepted that the Government allows donors to contribute and shape their home-grown programmes through policy, because they know at the end of the day these programmes, and other neoliberal activity, actually rely on them to be carried out, as emphasized by Evans (1995), Weiss (2010), Jinadu (2014) as new approaches to neoliberal analyses?

3.v. Conclusion

The question of the Mozambican Government's autonomy under the conditions of neoliberalism and today under the condition of GBS is a 'contested issue' of national sovereignty challenged by external forces and internal political dynamics (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007, p. 22). What that means to De Renzio and Hanlon (2007, p. 22) is that for the past three decades, Mozambique has been conflicted with three issues. First, there is donor inflexibility on the policies they 'influence'; second, there is a lack of unity from political parties against the donor community; and third, civil servant and bureaucratic capacity is overstretched in light of rising donor demands and aid management. In addition, these scholars question whether the Mozambican state is able to produce 'locally defined development strategies' or if the state has lost the ability towards expression of its national sovereignty because of the entrenchment of donors and external actors in the country over time.

The cases presented in this chapter and the previous chapter attempt to challenge the notion that the Government faced reduced state autonomy and failed attempts at locally-defined national development plans because of the external forces imposing conditions of structural adjustment, state roll-back, and of dependency-inducing aid. While the interviews presented in this chapter portray that the development community played a huge role in creating the policy environment for social cash transfers to grow, it must be recognized that the environment for these programmes to commence was through government initiative. In addition, Devereux (2013), Hanlon (2007), Herbst (1990), Jinadu (2010), Pitcher (2002), and Weiss (2010), all recognize that the neoliberal 'state roll-back' and move towards privatization was only made possible through government acceptance of these conditions, and government creation of the policy and fiscal structures to enable these conditions. Therefore, how far could these ‘anti-statist’ efforts go against the Government, when ultimately relying on Government? This research argues that that in itself is an expression of withheld state autonomy actively engaged by state leadership, that should not be confused or labeled as a ‘weak state’.

While De Renzio and Hanlon (2007) question the ability of Mozambique to portray its state sovereignty and authority over the development community, this chapter presents evidence to refute whether that is the right approach to take. In another sense, what does it mean when scholars label states as acting under ‘neoliberal influence’ or ‘socialist influence’, and has Mozambique had one political trajectory since independence? History shows us that the state, a majority of the time represented by the Frelimo Party, has switched from a rigid Marxist-Leninist agenda after independence and throughout the civil war to the adoption of capitalism and a free-market approach towards the end the civil war until today (Hanlon and Smart 2008; Reis 2012). As this chapter has portrayed, however, the central question is not of what political orientation the State had and its influence on cash transfers. It is a question of the continuity of cash transfer programmes in Mozambique despite political ideology transformations leading to attempts to reduce the state, and changes to the social cash transfer trajectory externally. Mozambique, unlike many neighboring and developing countries, had faith in using cash transfers as a pro-poor solution way before they were mainstream development tools. Although the state might have created GAPVU out of necessity to build solidarity in a time of war, as this research argues, it could have also been an attempt to cling on to subtle forms to exercise state autonomy and its expression of socialist ideology. What is important is the legacy of GAPVU and the state’s ability to hold onto its control over social services and social protection, and remain respected in the development community as having a level of ownership over this sector.

4. Chapter Four: Analysis

4.i. Introduction

The history of social cash transfers in Mozambique from the closure of GAPVU until today brings to light the importance of GAPVU starting at the time of and under the conditions it did, and of it being a completely government implemented and funded programme from its beginning. While most studies and reports on Mozambique's cash transfer programmes of the last decade focus on their implementation and efficacy, most interviews solidly acknowledged the Government's role being central to the survival and growth of these programmes. Greany (2015) summarized the significance of these programmes in their shift from being 'pity hand outs' because of the war to turning into impactful social protection programmes that are now linked to the idea of productive investments in poverty alleviation. This chapter will analyze how Mozambique's social protection history benchmarks with others in Sub-Saharan Africa, and bring forth the ways that Mozambique's case of cash transfers is exceptional in comparison to specific debates from the literature review that have not been covered in chapters two and three. It will also serve to argue that while Mozambique's case of cash transfers can fit into typical debates on cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa, it is story as a government-initiated long-term programme. Exceptionally, Mozambique's case has seen continuity before and throughout the period of social protection going from unpopular to becoming mainstream in development agendas.

4.ii.Trajectories of Social Protection in Sub-Saharan Africa

To understand the growth of social protection in the last two decades, scholars have attempted to classify social protection programmes by the circumstances under which they are born out of in different countries. This is done by understanding the history of these programmes and the rationales for their inception and expansion under different social and political environments. Tracing the history of social cash transfer programmes in Mozambique of the last two decades uncovers how these programmes differ from the typical histories of social protection programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa, as well as the ways that Mozambique's often uncounted cash transfer history resonates within wider debates on Sub-Saharan Africa social protection.

4.ii.a. Typical debates strengthened by the case of Mozambique

This section presents ways that the Mozambican cash transfer history can fit into discussions on social protection growth in Sub-Saharan Africa, under the influence of cash transfers in Latin America and Europe. It also touches on the economic growth rationale for cash transfers and how it applies to Mozambique's history.

Latin American and European social cash transfer influence in Mozambique

The literature review touched on the debate that social protection programmes have weak links to European welfarist programmes, aside from influence of pension schemes in perhaps South Africa. It presents that a growth in interest in social protection most likely has roots in the successes seen in Latin American programmes (Midgley 2013). Lavinas (2013, p. 6) notes how there has been a recent trend of governments in industrialised countries to move towards conditional cash transfer programmes to replace the universal welfare provisions created in the early parts of the 20th century. Additionally, Latin American governments began to provide social cash transfers as part of a growing desire to provide social safety nets, in response to the inequality and instability caused by severe economic crises in the 1980s. These economic crises created conditions of high unemployment, high inflation, and decline in real wages in Latin America, and were met by and exacerbated by structural adjustment programmes implemented by the IMF (Lavinas 2013). SAPs in Latin America, similar to in Sub-Saharan Africa, resulted in cuts on social spending, cuts on subsidies and a rise in the informal economy and poverty (Lavinas 2013; Mkandawire 2010). There was then a motivation to create a 'cushion' against the negative consequences of liberalization, and the existing 'pay-as-you-go' social protection systems could not cope with the shocks created by structural adjustment (Lavinas 2013). Out of the crises in Latin America came a privatization of pension funds, and an 'enabling state' role in the smooth operation of markets. Thereafter, was the birth of conditional cash transfers in Latin America in the 1990s (Lavinas 2013).

This history of Latin American social cash transfers is important because it resonates with the history of Mozambique's cash transfers, more so than other histories of programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa. Lavinas (2013) summarises that conditional cash transfers and government-backed social protection were the response of an enabled-state working against the detriment of SAPs. The Latin American conditions of weak economic capabilities and growing poverty were the same conditions (in addition to civil war) that motivated the Mozambican State to create GAPVU around the same time. There is also direct evidence of Latin American links, from Brazil's implementation a social cash transfer programme in Mozambique in 2003: the education cash transfer: MISA (Massingharela and Nhate 2006). This cash transfer was adopted from Brazil's *Bolsa Escola* and was implemented by the Embassy of Brazil in Mozambique. As a conditional cash transfer which was externally implemented and funded outside of the Ministry of Finance, although requested and endorsed by the Mozambican Government, it faced challenges and only lasted year (Massingharela and Nhate 2006).

While an interesting exception of a Brazilian-imported conditional cash transfer coming over a decade after GAPVU, MISA and the information from Lavinas (2013) present only weak and indirect examples of influence from Latin American countries. In addition, because of the timing, it is doubtful that the Mozambican Government was influenced by Latin America when first creating GAPVU. The growth of the social protection sector, however, could have many links to Latin American cash transfers. The worldwide acclaim they have received most likely influenced the mainstreaming of social protection and cash transfer programmes within development agendas. What is notable about the histories of Latin American cash transfers and Mozambican ones is that they present similar conditions under which governments are motivated to use cash transfers as interventions. The conditions of SAPs, inflation, economic instability in addition to rising inequality clearly create such difficulties that innovation in poverty programmes is needed to reach out to and build solidarity with large numbers of chronically poor people, from governments with weak financial and bureaucratic capabilities. As mentioned in the literature review, cash transfers are seen as affordable (therefore feasible within restrictive budgets), and relatively simple development programmes, or 'Southern Alternatives to Development' (Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010).

Neoliberalism's legacies, economic growth and the use of cash transfers

There are debates relating the growth of social protection and cash transfers to their utility in economic growth strategies. Cash transfers, in these debates, are seen as 'investments' in vulnerable populations that will create economic stability, against the shocks of natural disasters or catastrophes such as droughts. Ferguson (2015) point out that there are debates on whether cash transfers are neoliberal tools for equipping individuals with assets or investments to enable their own growth, instead of relying on the state for welfare and means of development. This research suggests a different relationship to neoliberalism. Cash transfers in many places in the Global South have been state-led responses to the negative consequences of structural adjustment and other neoliberal activity. In support of a different relationship between neoliberalism influencing the start of cash transfers (and not cash transfers being a neoliberal tool), Devereux (2013, p. 18) links neoliberalism's production of economic growth for a minority group, alongside chronic poverty for the majority, to the creation of a cash transfer or social grant to the poor masses as compensation. It is also suggested that while cash transfers replaced food aid, they are criticized for underwriting neoliberal policy (Devereux 2013).

The case of Mozambican, and as mentioned above, Latin American cash transfers too, add to debates on cash transfers starting during and because of the backlash of neoliberalism. Directly related to Devereux's (2013) point on cash transfers being compensation for the widening inequality created by neoliberalism, Mozambique is a great example of this. Inequality has grown in the country since the end of the civil war in 1992. During this period, the transition from socialism to a capitalist, democratic system has also meant that there has been a growth in an elite faction within the upper class and Frelimo political party (Sumich 2007). While poverty levels are said to have reduced from the late 1990s to today, inequality has grown because of neoliberalism's privatization efforts allowing elite groups to grow richer and taking away the socialist promotion of equality and distribution. At this same time as an elite has grown in

Mozambique, to support Devereux's (2013) point, cash transfers have grown in coverage and spread to compensate for growing inequality levels.

The economic growth rationale for cash transfers, as investments in human capital, also can be supported by evidence in Mozambique. It was suggested in interviews with Antunes (2015), De Rooij (2015), and Greany (2015) that the development community motivation for cash transfers is of 'investments' in people rather than unproductive 'hand outs'. Evidence for this come from Hanlon (2004) when noting that two of Mozambique's short-term cash transfer programmes, targeted at soldier demobilisation from 1992-1996 and flood victims in 2000, had positive evaluations of most recipients using their cash transfers to invest in labour-producing assets such as farm tools. What is significant to note about the case of Mozambique is that while it supports the 'investment' mentality linked to cash transfers argument, this ideology started before the 2000s, and during the time when there was still skepticism around cash transfer utility (Schubert 2015).

As mentioned in chapter two, GAPVU was part of a parcel of offerings to vulnerable and displaced persons right before and through the end of the war, during the war-time reconstruction phase too. These programmes, such as cash-for-work programmes and cash transfer programmes, invested cash interventions in vulnerable groups to allow them to work again and return home (Schubert 1992). The evidence for these programmes being seen as 'investments' in economic growth and human capabilities was seen in the ending of these programmes five years after the war, so that the intention of human asset-building would be achieved and dependency would not ensue (Salomao 2015). As discussed, GAPVU was repackaged and continued as the PSA after the Office was closed, because of positive results of productive use of the cash transfers with a focus on beneficiaries not able to work. Therefore, investment in people unable to work became a focus, using the cash transfer as a replacement for work capabilities. Or, they could have been continued because of political motivations of elites to appease populations because of neoliberalism creating more dependency on aid and sustaining inequality through liberalisation.

4.ii.b. Typical cash transfer debates challenged by the case of Mozambique

In contrast to the above section, the case of Mozambique's cash transfers and social protection trajectory is exceptional to other histories of cash transfer development. While chapters two and three point out many ways in which this case differs from other cash transfer histories, this next section will elaborate on debates of cash transfer development in relation to stages of economic development and challenge the notion of welfare as a 'luxury' for citizens.

The luxury and timing of state-sponsored welfare

On a macro-level, there are debates supporting that welfare-first development is a means to spur economic development and that human development and social protection programmes are important prerequisites to enable growth (Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010). This argument in favour of the reconstruction of a welfare state as a 'safer bet' for development over capital accumulation and labour outputs has recently gained traction in the Global South (Arrighi, Aschoff and Scully, cited in Evans 2010, p. 41; Evans 2010, p. 38-40). The rise in social protection programmes and welfare-first development in the Global South has come as a surprise, however, since historically countries in the Western hemisphere only adopted social assistance via cash transfers post-industrialization. This is because they were seen as a social luxury and because states felt the need to be at a certain economic level before being able to fund welfare (Hanlon, Barrientos and Hulme 2010).

In this sense, Mozambique is an exceptional example of a low-income, pre-industrialised country that adopted social welfare and social protection practices before reaching this state of development. This early adoption can be attributed to Mozambique's Marxist-Leninist political ideology that promoted equality through a means of social assistance, even when state budgets barely had flexibility for these programmes. Even a poor, war-ridden country heavily constrained financially under structural adjustment programmes and weak economic development was able to promote welfare of their most vulnerable citizens at an unexpected time. It has been said that the Ministry of Finance came up with crafty ways of initially funding these programmes (through food auction profit savings) and focused on keeping their administrative costs low because of budget constraints (Schubert 2015). Lack of financial resources has never been motivation for the Mozambican state to stop supporting these programmes, and they have even taken measures to request World Bank funding to maintain and expand the programmes. Therefore, this financial inventiveness of the Ministry of Finance allowed Mozambique to start a cash transfer programme, despite having a weak national expenditure and not being at an advanced stage of economic development. Social protection programmes have been praised globally as relatedly low-cost development programmes, and this is perhaps why they have spread in the rest of Sub-Saharan Africa too, despite industrialisation lagging in these places.

These debates on timing of social cash transfers within a certain period of a country's economic status relate to the ability for states to sustainably fund these programmes. Mozambique has never been a middle-income country, even despite consistent 'high' rates of economic growth, but the state has always been the majority contributor to social protection. As noted by Garcia and Moore (2012), their 'typologies of cash transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa' imply that long-term, government funded programmes mostly only occur in middle-income countries. This is in contrast to low-income, fragile states implementing short-term, externally supported intervention programmes. Government funding in Mozambique has not only impacted the longevity of the social cash transfer programmes, but also the relationship that the programme has with external donors and external technical assistants. What came through in the interview process was a clear depiction of government ownership of social cash transfer programmes in Mozambique, however, this is unique to the sector as donors have completely saturated other social services such as healthcare and education (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015). From the side of the donor community and civil society, there was also a notion of respect for this government ownership in allowing these programmes to thrive (Chivambo 2015; De Rooij 2015).

Garcia and Moore (2012) note that one of the issues that helps programmes survive is clear government ownership and impetus towards social cash transfers by creating an enabling environment for policy, or through ministerial support. In the case of Mozambique, the clear government role in cash transfer programmes could have also attributed towards a partnership-style collaborative environment for donors to work together (Antunes 2015; De Rooij 2015). With clear government leadership, donors do not have to fight over who will manage or implement these programmes, and donors can work around what government has put in place, including working with the implementing institution, INAS. Thus, despite its low-income status, the case of Mozambique shows that welfare is no longer a luxury but a necessary investment in vulnerable people.

Mozambique's adoption of social cash transfers and overall promotion of social policy and welfare was unique for the stage of economic development that the country was in, but also was unique for the time period that they began on the African continent. As addressed above, Mozambique did follow the pattern of adopting cash transfers in a time of conflict and instability (Garcia and Moore 2012). In addition, after a period of economic decline caused by high inflation, the early 1990s time period in which Mozambique enacted its cash transfers is completely exceptional for Sub-Saharan Africa, although was similar to the case of Latin America (Lavinas 2013). In comparison to the other countries on the African continent, 31 out of a survey of 40 of Africa's total 123 social cash transfer programmes started after year 2000, with 50% of all cash transfer programmes starting within the last ten years (Garcia and Moore 2012, p. 49). Thus, while cash transfers for poverty alleviation were not completely novel programmes, in the context of a fragile state such as Mozambique, cash transfers were called an 'unconventional' social policy starting well over one to two decades before most African programmes.

The histories of Mozambique and Latin America presented in this section are unique, because as Devereux (2002, p. 661) pointed out, "the late 1990s saw a growing disillusionment with social safety nets, which were criticized as welfarist mechanisms that reduced the poor to passive recipients of handouts and made little contribution to broader development goals or to sustainable poverty reduction." Although GAPVU was officially closed in the late 1990s, previous chapters have addressed that this was more for administrative purposes. It was closed in order to reshape the programme by giving it its own autonomous implementing institution (INAS), make the transfers more effective by creating new targeting that recognized different socio-economic requirements, and expand their coverage to rural areas (Alane 2015; Massingharela and Nhate 2006, p. 18). These are clearly signs of government support and intention to expand these welfare mechanisms during a period of time when these programmes were not popular and saw a growing 'disillusionment'. Furthermore, Latin America and Mozambique actually are exceptional cash transfer histories with significant scale during the late 1990s, too: a time when these programmes were not favorable yet they grew because of local evidence of their importance and successes in the ten years prior.

Lavers and Hickey (2015, p. 16) suggest that timing is essential for social protection adoption, whereby in times of stability, external actors have little opportunity to influence states and decision makers regarding their political settlements. Instead, external actors must capitalize on moments of crisis or uncertainty when elites are re-negotiating the terms of the political settlement with citizens (Hickey 2009 cited in Lavers and Hickey 2015, p. 16). Fernandes (2015), of the World Bank in Mozambique, adds to this debate when pointing out how in the context of poverty and vulnerability, social protection is very similar everywhere, even when countries are at different stages of development. Fernandes (2015) asserts that social protection always takes a hit in times of crises, which turns into a 'vicious' cycle because that is when these programmes are needed the most. While Fernandes' (2015) point can resonate with discussions on social protection and their links to health, education and labour markets across countries, the case of Mozambique challenges part of her claims that these programmes take a hit in times of crises, as we saw that social protection in Mozambique were born and strengthened during times of crises—from the civil war, to the food riots.

4.iii. Conclusion: GAPVU exceptionalism as a pioneer

It has been addressed that Mozambique's cash transfers have had a unique inception on the African continent, and can relate closely to the cases of cash transfer development in Latin America. The case of Mozambique is exceptional on the African continent, too, because there were zero programmes of similar nature (non-pension) to learn from when it started (Schubert 2015). Massinghela and Nhate (2006, p. 17) take this further when pointing out that generally implementation of any sort of development programme in Africa is a result of successful implementation in other neighboring countries, and through donor support. It is evident that the Government did not have any other examples to learn from, and this caused management set-backs and suspected high levels of corruption in its first five years. The important aspect to take away is that the Mozambican state started these programmes without other pioneer examples, and as a result has kept these programmes close to home and within government control for longer periods of time than most other programmes.

Schubert (2015) mentioned that even though Mozambique did not have other examples of social cash transfer programmes to learn from, at the demand of low cost and war conditions, the motivation for GAPVU came from personalities within Government who were willing to think outside of the box, and not employ the mainstream modes of poverty reduction such as ineffective food aid. Thus, the ‘political’ ingenuity to utilise the programmes for political support is positively exemplified in the case of Mozambique, and this was not a strategy adopted from examples of any other countries, as there did not exist such examples at the time. Perhaps Frelimo’s employment of GAPVU could be one of the first usages and replications during the food riots of social cash transfers for political motivations and deepening social rapport with political settlements, especially during times of increased political and social vulnerability.

5. Chapter five: Conclusion

5.i. The significance of the case of Mozambique

What is the significance of Mozambique's long history of cash transfers, as mentioned, being the fourth oldest programme and first non-contributory cash transfer scheme from a low-income country? Mozambique's main programme, unlike many early programmes in Southern Africa, is not a contribution-based pension scheme, but an unconditional cash transfer targeted at different vulnerable groups. In addition, most social protection programmes on the African continent have either been recent developments of the last ten years, or have been implemented through the wide use of external support and funding (Garcia and Moore 2012). The historical significance of the case of Mozambique's social cash transfers is not only because it is often not discussed in social protection literature (Ferguson 2015; Garcia and Moore 2012). The significance is brought forth by Mkandawire (2010, p.41), when stating:

> "The history of poverty, especially its on-and-off appearances on national and international agendas, has been one of the central preoccupations of modern social science. However, the current discourse on poverty seems totally oblivious to the earlier appearances of poverty on the social agenda, and thus rarely bothers to ask why things have not worked."

The process of tracing Mozambique's social cash transfer history required digging into the political framings of poverty, social development, and redistribution from the viewpoint of Frelimo. This history, as outlined in chapter two, explained why the Government was motivated to create a social cash transfer programme when they had little means nor technical capability of doing so. In addition, tracing the history of SAPs and the civil war, the conditions under which GAPVU was created, draws strong links between social cash transfer interventions for political use, in addition to its use in addressing rising inequality, inflation and vulnerability. This concluding section will touch on how the case of Mozambique can contribute to larger discussions on state autonomy carried out during neoliberalism confines, development in Mozambique, and the significance of the case of cash transfers at this specific point in Mozambican history.

5.i.a. State autonomy during neoliberalism

It has been addressed that scholars are no longer focused on neoliberalism's anti-statist agenda, but have focused on the ways that neoliberal activity relied on the state to create institutions and policy for economic liberalization and privatization to occur (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Jinadu 2010; Weiss 2010). The same has not been done for neoliberalism and social sector activity, however, which also took huge hits from budget switching activity and the roll-back of state involvement in social services. It is generally implied that a result of the neoliberal era and a facet of the post-independence period of Africa is that foreign institutions and NGOs played and still play an increasing role in development and social service provision

(O'Laughlin 1996). In fact, the link between the rise of donor-dependency and neoliberalism's attempt to 'privatise' the development and social sectors has not been addressed as much, although there is ample evidence. Take the example of 'development darlings' such as Mozambique, who not only welcomed in market liberalisation which resulted in economic growth, but who also became increasingly aid development over the same period of time (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007).

It is worth analyzing GAPVU as a case because as mentioned earlier, neoliberalism had the effect of 'being blind' to social policy and social protection in general (Ferguson 2009). The importance of highlighting where social protection and social policy occurred in relation to neoliberalism is that these examples highlight the relationship that neoliberalism, its programmes, such as SAPs had in catalyzing the growth of government interventions in social services. The case that is discussed here is of social cash transfers, which was a direct response of the Government to the inequality that increased because of the conditions of neoliberalism and because of the war, which as stated was ignored when SAPs was adopted. In addition, the same could be viewed of the 2008 and 2010 food riots, whereby rises in inequality and hikes in food prices were seen not only in Mozambique but in other places around the world. While neoliberalism might not be the direct catalyst of these food riots, globalisation and the impact of global volatility in food prices were also felt in Mozambique. Therefore, this case urges further analysis of neoliberalism and the role of the state in social services, because social services and development are areas that still widely feel the impacts of neoliberalism and privatization.

In terms of social policy history, Mkandawire (2010) notes that the 1960s-1970s anti-poverty initiatives in Africa widely failed due to a lack of social policy framework. This was because of the prioritization of the 'nation-state' project in many African states, that was not coupled with efforts towards welfare development. As noted in chapter two, however, Mozambique's history with their nationalist project did attempt to incorporate social welfare through the message of equity and distribution. These comments by Mkandawire (2010) are important because these 'failures' of the 1960s and 1970s, which Waterhouse and Lauriciano (2009) closely link to the 'failures' of the Mozambican socialist project of the 1970s and early 1980s, would have suggested that the Mozambican government would not have tried to engage with social policy in the early 1990s. Waterhouse and Lauriciano (2009) attribute these failures to why Mozambique did not have a social protection policy until 2009. This research argues against these claims, and provides evidence that despite failures on the front of the nationalist social project, failures of social policy in post-independence Africa, and despite the welcoming of neoliberalism and World Bank poverty agendas, the Mozambican state still played and still plays an instrumental role in state-sponsored social protection.

5.i.a. Mozambican development discourse

Development discourse is where examples, however small, such as Mozambique's social cash transfers, can have significant impact. The social protection sector in Mozambique is unique because, unlike health and education, interviewees noted that there are only four main actors in the social protection sector versus 40 in each health and education (De Rooij 2015; Greany 2015). Versus social protection, where donors 'get along' and work within the programmes and frameworks created by the Government's autonomous implementing institution, INAS, it was noted that health and education are so saturated with donors that programmes cannot move forward and decision-making is a difficult task (De Rooij 2015). Health and education, as presented earlier, have a unique history in Mozambique because they were the two sectors that fell under Frelimo's nationalization project. One particular result of these nationalization efforts was that Maputo in 1992 had a better vaccination rate than New York City and London, and the health sector under Marxist-Leninist Frelimo was quite strong (Flederman 1993; Salomao 2015). This is not the case today, and as presented in chapter two, health facilities and schools outside of the capital city became targeted by Renamo during civil war combat (Hanlon 1996). In addition, under SAPs, state budgets for education and hiring of medical professionals were severely cut. This is an issue that President Guebuza also faced up until 2005, when trying to hire 10,000 new teachers and being blocked by the BWIs in doing so (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007). Health and education contrast widely to the social protection in Mozambique, and those sectors can be analysed as successful in terms of privatization, yet, unsuccessful because of the weak role the Government has over those sectors because of neoliberal achievements.

While critiquing the World Bank's SDA Programme, Marshall (1990, p. 41) commented that "one of the most troubling dimensions of the economic recovery programme is Mozambique's dramatic dependency on foreign donors. Control has shifted out of Mozambican hands in an alarming fashion. Economic policy has come to rest very much with the IMF/World Bank, with bilateral donors lining up behind it." While this comment was made in 1990, the continual rise of foreign aid in Mozambique and views on Mozambique's aid 'dependence' spread throughout the 1990s, 2000s and this view is still regarded today (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007). The dichotomy of 'BWIs and donors' versus the 'Mozambican State' at odds with each other is one that has remained in the development discourse of Mozambique since the post-independence period.

This research has attempted to challenge this dichotomy, and whether it is necessary to try to seek out cases of non-state autonomy (and therefore donor-led, neoliberal influence) or state-autonomy present. Whereby donor influence has impacted the pressure of budget allocation increases and pressure to expand coverage of social cash transfers, donors only started playing a significant role in cash transfer programmes starting in the mid-2000s. In addition, this research has brought forth that within the development community, there is a level of respect from donors for the Mozambican Government, and its ownership over its internally incepted social cash transfer programme. What is significant to take away from the case of GAPVU and the social cash transfer programmes today is that perceptions on the Mozambican Government's 'donor-led development' can be challenged. GAPVU is a case that falls outside of the notion of high levels of aid, and very weak Government 'owned' or created development strategies at the hands of donors. This dominant notion regarding development in Mozambique usually results in a negative answer of whether 'Mozambique has had development' (De Renzio and Hanlon 2007; Hanlon and Smart 2008).

This is not necessarily the question that should be asked today. Similar to how the question of the state's existence during neoliberalism has evolved from 'how much state' to 'what kind of state' from Evans (1995), the question today should be, 'what kind of development' instead of 'how much'. Therefore, it is appropriate to acknowledge these small cases of state-led development, because long-term cases like GAPVU create dynamics where the Government is able to command where they want donor assistance. For example, will the Government choose to request World Bank funding for specific programmes? Or when they want to maintain control over their programmes, will the Government continue to decrease donor funding directly to cash transfers? This image of authoritative, well-respected Government institutions, such as INAS and the Ministry of Finance, taking leadership on a development programme for the last twenty years is not the image that is typically given off when people think of development in Mozambique. In addition, the 'kind' of development that Mozambique seems to desire is not one that is completely owned by donors, versus completely owned by the state; it is cooperative and complementary.

In his interview, Dr. Salomao (2015), who has been a civil servant and member of Frelimo for over 30 years, implied that the Government of Mozambique has understood that it needs the assistance from IFIs in order to achieve growth. In the same light, the Government knows how to be very strategic about how accepting donor conditions, and how to keep them within the parameters of the Government's own vision. While this 'position' on government-donor relations has played out differently in various sectors of Mozambique, whereby certain sectors have been dominated by donors or private companies, the case of cash transfers is a good example of the Government being able to draw boundaries and maintain its autonomy over this programme. The role of the Mozambican state is clearly recognized in social protection development circles, and this is different from the state's role in general discussions on Mozambican development, as addressed above. While the Government might have 'failed' against the liberalisation of health and education due to neoliberalism state-roll back and budget cuts, social protection and the work of cash transfers is one, even small, area that the government has maintained its central position and desire to stay autonomous despite attempts to confine its role. Perhaps out of desperation because of high rates of poverty and growing inequality from the civil war and structural adjustment, it can be observed that the Government strategically formed links with the BWIs in order to receive much needed donor assistance but in order to dictate how that assistance would play out. As remarked by Dr. Salomao (2015), this does not mean that the Government lost interest in its own provision of welfare and social protection for citizens, which today only grows in numbers.

5.ii.Concluding remarks

This research comes at an interesting time when some of the dynamics that were present when GAPVU was started are appearing again. Mozambique today is once again faced with conditions of rising inequality, high inflation rates, as well as brewing political and social instability between Renamo and Frelimo, just when the country is about to celebrate 25 years since the end of the previous civil war. Arguments presented here highlight that one of the rationales for the Government's adoption of social cash transfers was as a political solidarity move, through providing a cash transfer to aid vulnerable, and potentially oppositional populations. What will be interesting to see in the coming months and years is whether social cash transfers are once again called upon as a political tool to appeal to masses, and potentially appease conflict. While the Government is already on a mission to increase budget allocation and outreach of its social cash transfer programmes in line with its strategy of the last decade, will these programmes receive additional attention and funding because of the political and social climate of Mozambique?

In addition, the development community in Mozambique is still deeply aid entrenched and one can still ask if the Government is 'dependent' on aid. But within these realities, similar to the past, the Government still works to maintain hold of its autonomy an authority through implementing social cash transfers and giving their own money directly into the hands of their own people. And perhaps similar to the notion of a 'Southern Alternative to Development', the Government of Mozambique chooses unconditional cash transfers, and chooses to receive relatively low amounts of funding from donors for them, as a way to allow citizens a level of autonomy, too. This research has addressed how cash transfers have risen to replace food subsidies and other forms of in-kind development assistance, because they equip people with the capability to make their own decisions over how money will be spent. The results, especially in Mozambique, have been a productive use of cash transfers as investments in assets, education, or day-to-day commodities. On a symbolic level, perhaps the Mozambican Government is so supportive of unconditional cash transfers because from the State's perspective, Mozambique does not want donors to keep telling them how to spend their money, such as through tied aid, funding of their development programmes, and so forth. Cash transfers in Mozambique are not only an expression of state autonomy, but a state-sponsored opportunity for individual autonomy.

6. References:

Alane, I 2015, Interview with Former Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Women and Social Action, Maputo. Edited by Teresa Le.

Antunes, E 2015, Interview at the Embassy of Netherlands, Maputo. Edited by Teresa Le.

AU 2006, 'Livingstone Call to Action', *Intergovernmental Regional Conference: A Transformative Agenda for the 21st Century: Examining the case for basic social protection in Africa*, 20-23rd March, 2006. AU, Livingstone.

Barrientos, A 2011, 'Social Protection and Poverty', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, vol. 20, pp. 240-249.

Barrientos A, Moller V, Saboia J, Lloyd-Sherlock P, Mase J 2013, ''Growing' social protection in developing countries: Lessons from Brazil and South Africa', *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 54-68.

Bowen, G 2009, 'Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method', *Qualitative Research Journal*, vol. 9, no. 10, pp. 22-40.

Chivambo, G 2015. Interview with Plataforma Sociadade Civil- Protecao Social, Maputo.

Datt, G Simler, K Dava, G Jolliffe, D Low, J Matusse, C and Tostao, E 1997, 'The GAPVU Cash Transfer Program in Mozambique: An Assessment', *FCND Discussion Paper No. 36*, International Food Policy Research Institute.

De Brito L, Chaimite E, Pereira C, Posse C, and Shankland, A 2014, 'Hunger Revolts and Citizen Strikes: Popular Protests in Mozambique, 2008-2012', *Food Riots and Food Rights project report. Institute of Development Studies/Instituto de Etudos Sociais et Economicos*, Brighton/Maputo.

De Rooij, K 2015, Interview at UNICEF, Maputo. Edited by Teresa Le.

Devereux, S 2002, 'Can Social Safety Nets Reduce Chronic Poverty?', *Development Policy Review*, vol. 20, issue 5, pp. 657-675.

Devereux, S 2013, 'Trajectories of Social Protection in Africa', *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 13-23.

Ellis, F 2012, ''We are All Poor Here': Economic Difference, Social Divisiveness and Targeting Cash Transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa', *The Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 201-214.

Ellis, F, Devereux, S and White, P 2009, *Social Protection in Africa*, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, Cheltenham.

Evans, P 1995, *Embedded Autonomy: State and Industrial Transformation,* Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Evans, P 2010, 'Constructing the 21st Century Developmental State' in *Constructing a Democratic Development State in South Africa: Potentials and Challenges*, Ed. Omano Edigheji, HSRC Press, Cape Town, pp. 37-58.

Fernandes, R 2015, Interview at the World Bank, Maputo. Edited by Teresa Le.

Ferguson, J 2006, *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*, Duke, Durham.

Ferguson, J 2009, 'The Use of Neoliberalism', *Antipode*, vol. 41, no. 9, pp. 166-184.

Ferguson, J 2015, *Give a Man a Fish: The New Politics of Distribution*, Duke: Durham.

Flederman, P 1993, *Despite the Odds: A Collection of Case Studies on Development Projects in Mozambique,* UNICEF, Maputo.

Flew, T 2014, 'Six Theories of Neoliberalism', *Thesis Eleven,* vol. 122, no. 1, pp. 49-71.

G20 France, 2011, 'Social Protection Floor in Mozambique', *Conference summary: G20 08 September 2011*, France.

Garcia, M and Moore, T 2012, 'The Cash Dividend: The Rise of Cash Transfer Programs in Sub-Saharan Africa', the World Bank, Washington, D.C.

Greany, K 2015, Interview with DFID, Maputo. Edited by Teresa Le.

Green, R 1991, 'The Struggle Against Absolute Poverty in Mozambique', *SDA Project: National Directorate of Planning*, Republic of Mozambique.

Hanlon, J 1996, *Peace without Profit: How the IMF Blocks Rebuilding in Mozambique*, James Currey, Oxford.

Hanlon, J Barrientos, A and Hulme, D 2010, *Just Give Money to the Poor: the Development Revolution from the Global South*, Kumarian Press, Sterling.

Hanlon, J and Smart, T 2008, *Do Bicycles Equal Development in Mozambique?* James Curry, Suffolk.

Handa, S et al. 2012, 'Targeting Effectiveness of Social Cash Transfer Programs in Three African Countries', *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp.78-108.

Harris, K and Scully, B 2015, 'A Hidden Counter-Movement? Precarity, Politics, and Social Protection Before and Beyond the Neoliberal Era,' *Theory and Society*, vol. 44, no. 5, p. 415-444.

Herbst, J 1990, 'The Structural Adjustment of Politics in Africa', *World Development*, vol. 18, no. 7, pp. 949-958.

ILO 2015, 'Promoting Social Protection Floors for all: Time for Action', ILO.

INAS 2013, 'Instituto Nacional de Acção Social: Retrospectiva 1997-2012: INAS 15 anos Renovando as Estratégias de Atendimento aos Grupos mais Vulneráveis' INAS, Maputo.

Jinadu, L 2010, 'Globalization and State Capacity in Africa', *Procedia Social and Behavioral* Sciences, vol. 41, pp. 6751-6761.

Kaleidoscopio 2015, 'Presentation on Mozambican Cash Transfers with Focus Group: Euclides Goncalves, Benedito Machava', Maputo. Edited by Teresa Le.

Lavers, T and Hickey, S 2015 'Investigating the Political Economy of Social Protection Expansion in Africa: At the Intersection of Transnational Ideas and Domestic Politics', ESID Working Paper No. 47. University of Manchester, Manchester.

Lavinas, L 2013, '21st Century Welfare', *New Left Review*, no. 84, pp. 5-40.

Low, J Garrett, J and Ginja, V 1999, 'Can Cash Transfer Programs Work in Resource-Poor Countries? The Experience of Mozambique', *FCND Discussion Paper No. 75*, International Food Policy Research Institute.

Marshall, J 1990, 'Structural Adjustment and Social Policy in Mozambique', *Review of African Political Economy*, vol. 17, issue 47, pp. 28-43.

Massingarela, C and Nhate, V 2006, 'The Politics of What Works: A Case Study of Food Subsidies and the Bolsa-Escola in Mozambique', B*ackground Paper for the Chronic Poverty Report 2008-2009*, Chronic Poverty Research Center.

Mkandawire, T 2001, 'Thinking about Developmental States in Africa', *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol. 25, pp. 289-313.

Mkandawire, T 2010, 'How the New Poverty Agenda Neglected Social and Employment Policies in Africa', *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 37-55.

Midgley, J 2013. 'Social Development and Social Protection: New Opportunities and Challenges', *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 2-12.

Nwafor, A 1983, 'Frelimo and Socialism in Mozambique', *Contemporary Marxism*, no. 7, pp. 28-68.

O'Laughin, B 1996, From Basic Needs to Safety-Nets: the Rise and Fall of Food-Rationing in Mozambique', *European Journal of Development Research: Special Issue: Arguing Development Policy: Frames and Discourses*, vol. 8, issue 1, pp. 200-223.

Omilolo, B and Kaniki, S 2014, 'Social Protection in Africa: a Review of Potential Contribution and Impact on Poverty Reduction' study report, UNDP.

Oya, C 2009, 'Ambiguities and Biases in the Definition and Identification of the "Poor": Who is Missing? What is Missing?', *Afriche e Orienti*, Special Issue on Poverty II, pp. 34-51.

Pitcher, A 2002, *Transforming Mozambique: The Politics of Privatization*, 1975-2000, Cambridge University Press, London.

Portes, A 2015, 'The Sociology of Development: From Modernization to the Institutional Turn', *The Sociology of Development*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 20-42.

Reis, G 2012, 'The Political and Ideological Path of Frelimo in Mozambique, 1963-2012' *Conference Paper XXII World Congress of Political Science*.

Salomao, T 2015, Interview with the Former Minister of Finance and Planning and Former Deputy Minister of Planning, Maputo. Edited by Teresa Le.

Schubert, B 1992, 'Cash for Survival' in *Despite the Odds: A Collection of Case Studies on Development Projects in Mozambique* (1993) edited by Patricia Flederman. UNICEF: Maputo.

Schubert, B 2015, Interview with former GAPVU Technical Consultant via Skype. Edited by Teresa Le.

Schubert, B and Slater, R 2006, 'Social Cash Transfers in Low-Income African Countries: Conditional or Unconditional?', *Development Policy Review*, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 571-578.

Selvester et al. 2012, 'Transforming Cash Transfers: Beneficiaries and Community Perspectives on the Basic Social Subsidy Programme in Mozambique', *Overseas Development Agency*: London.

Soares FV, Hirata GI, and Ribas RP 2010, 'The Programa Subsidio de Alimentos in Mozambique: a Baseline Evaluation', *International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth, Research Brief,* No. 14, May 2010.

Standing, G 2008, 'How Cash Transfers Promote the Case for Basic Income', *Basic Income Studies*, vol. 3, issue 1, pp. 1-30.

Sumich, J 2007, 'Illegitimacy of Democracy? Democratisation and Alienation in Maputo, Mozambique', *Working Paper no. 16: Crisis State Research Centre*, LSE, London.

Taimo, NV and Waterhouse, R 2007, 'REBA Case Study of the Food Subsidy Programme of the National Institute for Social Action (INAS), Maputo and Inhambane June 2007', REBA: Regional Hunger and Vulnerability Programme, Parktown North.

Taube, G 1993, 'Social Dimensions of Adjustment (SDA): Conceptual Issues and Empirical Evidence from Tanzania and Other African Countries', *African Spectrum*, vol. 28, issue 2, pp. 165-183.

Tshishonga, N 2009, 'Do Bicycles Equal Development in Mozambique: Review', *Development in Practice*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 947-948.

Waterhouse, R 2007, 'The Political and Institutional Context for Social Protection in Mozambique – A Brief Overview'. UNDP Briefing Paper.

Waterhouse, R and Lauriciano, G 2009, 'Social Protection in Mozambique: a New Imperative?" *IESE Conference Paper for Poverty Dynamics and Patterns of Accumulation in Mozambique*, April 2009.

Weiss, L 2010, 'the State in the Economy: Neoliberal or Neoactivist?' *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Institutional Analysis*, eds. J Campbell, et al. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Ulriksen, M 2013, 'The politics of social protection expenditure and financing in Southern Africa', *Development Southern Africa*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 39-53.

UNICEF 2007, 'Mozambique: the Mozambican Unconditional Cash Transfer Programme, Programa Subisidio de Alimentos (Lessons Learned)', UNICEF, Maputo.

UNICEF 2014, 'Budget Brief: Social Welfare Sector in Mozambique', Policy Brief with ILO.

UN Mozambique 2015, 'The Development of a Social Protection Floor in Mozambique', UN, Maputo.

World Bank 2013, 'Southern Africa: SADC- Development Community'. Accessed online on 14 February 2016.

7. Appendices

7.i. Interview contacts

Organization	Contact	Position	Meeting set up
Wits School of Governance	A. van den Heever	Professor	7/14/2015
Embassy of Netherlands	Eleasara Antunes	Gender, Social Protection, HIV Director	7/30/2015
UNICEF	Karin de Rooij	Social Protection Specialist	8/4/2015
DFID	Kate Greany	Social Development Adviser; Lead Adviser on Social Protection	8/5/2015
World Bank Moz	Rita Fernandes	Social Protection Specialist (Consultant)	8/14/2015
PSC-PS	Genifer Chivambo	Communications Officer	8/20/2015
Kaleidoscopio	Group led by Euclides Goncalves and Benedito Machava	Director of Kaleidoscopio and History Lecturer at Universidad Eduardo Mondlane	8/21/2015
Frelimo	Tomaz Salomao	Former Minister of Planning and Finance, 1994-1999; Former Secretary of SADC	8/25/2015
MMAS	Ivete Alane	Permanent Secretary for Ministry of Sport and Youth; Former Permanent Secretary at MMAS	8/26/2015
GTZ/Consultant	Dr. Bernd Schubert	Consultant to GAPVU	8/27/2015
IMF	Rita Neves		contacted
INAS	Olivia Faite		contacted
MMAS	Miguel Mausse		contacted
MMAS/INAS	Elsa Alfai	Adviser and Former Director	contacted
OPM	Luca Pellerano		contacted
Wits School of Governance	Horatio Zandemela	Professor	contacted
World Food Programme	Marta Guivambo		contacted
FES	Manon Dietrich-Rossini		contacted
IESE	Antonio Francisco		contacted
Consultant/DFID	Rachel Waterhouse	Human Development Team Leader	contacted
INAS	Lúcia Bernadete Nairroce/Mairosse	Director of INAS	contacted
ILO	Nuno Cunha		contacted- end Aug
ILO	Ruben Vicente		out of town until 8/31

7.ii.Sample interview guidelines (English and Portuguese)

Personal Involvement in the Social Protection Sector

-What is your position at your organisation? How long have you worked there?
Qual é a sua posição na sua organização? Quanto tempo você trabalhou lá?

-How did you get involved in this work?
-Como foi que você se envolveu neste trabalho?

Process of Social Protection Development in Mozambique

-Who started the first cash transfer programme? When?
Quem iniciou o primeiro programa de transferência em dinheiro/programa da proteção social? Quando?

-Why was it created? Was it in response to anything?
-Por que ele foi criado? Foi em resposta a alguma coisa?

-What are motivations for growing the social protection sector?
Quais são as motivações para o crescente sector da proteção social?

-What were major milestones in its growth? By who/From who?
Quais foram as principais etapas de seu crescimento? Por quem/De quem?

Roles in Social Protection

-Who are the key actors involved in the social protection sector today?

Quem são os principais actores envolvidos no sector da proteção social hoje em dia?

-Who are the main supporters of cash transfers:
a. Politically
b. Financially
C. Socially

-Quem são os principais apoiantes da proteção social:
a. Politicamente
b. Financeiramente
c. Socialmente

Views on Social Protection and Cash Transfers

-How have views on social protection and cash transfers evolved politically and socially, and by different sectors?
Como é que opiniões sobre a proteção social e as transferências de dinheiro evoluíram politicamente e socialmente, e por diferentes setores?

-What is your view on the state's ability and/or responsibility to provide welfare to its citizens?
Qual é a sua opinião sobre a capacidade e ou da capacidade do estado de proporcionar o bem-estar aos seus cidadãos?

-Does the state have an interest in growing cash transfer programmes?
o estado tem interesse em aumentar programas de transferência de renda?

-What is the utility of cash transfer programmes to the government?
Qual é a utilidade dos programas de transferência de renda para o governo?

-What are challenges to government's implementation of cash transfer programmes, historically and today?
Quais são os desafios para o governo na implementação de programas de transferência de renda, historicamente e hoje?

-Do donors or external partners create challenges for government's ability to carry out cash transfer programmes?
Os doadores ou parceiros externos criam desafios na de execução capacidade do governo nos programas de transferência de renda?