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Abstract

The effective functioning of institutions is the hallmark of a developmental state globally. This is because institutions have a key role to play in the implementation of policies and the delivery of public goods. One of the fundamental roles played by institutions is the coordination of government interventions. In the absence of such, policy implementation and service delivery will not be rational. For coordination to take place, governments all over the world need to enter into partnership with other societal players such as business, labour and civil society. In essence, the idea developmental states requires that states enter into social contracts on the basis of long-term national developmental goals in partnership with other developmental partners. However, the state should be able to play a guiding role in pursuit of national developmental goals. In order for the state to effectively play this role, it needs to insulate itself from external influence and pressure. It should also be able to appoint its personnel based on merit, so as to enable its bureaucracy to interpret and implement policy accordingly. The government should also establish powerful oversight structures capable of conducting checks and balances on the affairs of the state and its partners.
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1. Introduction

The paper is about whether South African state has the characteristic features of a developmental state. It will focus on how South African government intervenes in service delivery using the state-citizens contract to deliver services. It also want to understand whether the South African government does meet all the
requirements of a successful developmental state, more especially the capacity to intervene in any developmental agenda that is facing the citizenry. The focus of the study of course is on whether the South African government has appropriate institutions for driving the developmental state agenda in the country. For instance, the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MITI) of Japan had power to intervene, guide and direct developmental interventions in the evolution of Japan’s developmental state. It also had the power to give carrot and stick incentives to governmental or state institutions on the basis of how they follow the state agenda by administering an admixture of market incentives and subsidies as well as sticks in a form of punitive measures to influence private sector behavior. The key question is whether the South African government has the institutional and administrative capacity similar to those in Japan to intervene to guide and direct economic recovery. The other question is whether the bureaucratic system that the South African government has possesses the ability to drive economic recovery. The Japan MITI was comprised of well-trained bureaucracy capable to interpret, develop and implement state policies demonstrating the ability and capacity to intervene in developmental issues affecting the citizenry. Having said that, this paper will focus on the key characteristics of a developmental state and assess whether South African government does have and the implications our answers for service delivery.

2. Debates on Developmental State in South Africa

Developmental states worldwide (including in Africa, Asian and the Caribbean) are anchored in the establishment of appropriate and well-functioning public institutions with the administrative capacity to reinforce or strengthen state power. Developmental states success lies in the nature of public institutions set up to implement policies and programmes that support state ability to intervene in the realization of the societal interests. Essentially, developmental states the world over are comprised of a meritocratic bureaucracy that is assigned with the responsibility to guide and intervene in the developmental agenda of the state. The importance of meritocratic bureaucracy is also highlighted by Evans (1998), when defining the importance of developmental state linking it to ability to create a bureaucratic coherence through meritocracy and personal networking, which become critical in the realisation of the developmental state agenda. The
importance of a developmental state is also expounded by Karagiannis (2001:11-13), when he says ‘a Developmental State are [sic] naturally referred to as strong, engaging states whose power lies in the strength of the social forces such as classes, interest groups and trade unions’.

A developmental state has a responsibility to organise and create public-private partnerships with all sectors of the economy. Clearly, all aspiring developmental states either on the African continent or elsewhere in the world are expected to aspire to ensure that government institutions enter in some form of partnership with the private sector and civil society movements. In case of South Africa, the implementation of National Development Plan vision 2030 enjoins the state to partner with all societal partners as part of a social compact. Furthermore, government is required to play a critical role in the coordination of the societal partners, including the business community for them to support the government plans and interventions. The South African government is expected to understand that the pursuit of a developmental state can only be realised when the state and market are working together as a cohesive force (Karagiannis 2002:4;Mulaudzi 2015:40).

According to the Economic Commission for Africa (2011), the developmental state propels its national agenda by intervening in two ways: directly, through the nationalisation of key socio-economic sectors, ensuring that the state has control and ownership of public institutions and projects that are perceived to be essential for economic growth and empowerment. This is meant to ensure that the state is able to intervene in the key sectors of the economy, such as mines and manufacturing industries. However, it has to be understood that interventions would also include indirect interventions in the form of easy credits, low taxes, secure and cheap supply of raw materials, guaranteed government purchases, as well as the application of trade discrimination against foreign imports in particular areas of industry. So in a developmental state, you have a government that is highly involved in the stimulation of economic activities with an idea to grow small enterprise development into big economic opportunities. Clearly, governments in a developmental state have all the means at their disposal to ensure that economic development is embedded within the concept of selective intervention. South Africa’s governing African National Congress (ANC) in its 2016 National Conference took a decision to expropriate the land without compensation, which in itself would ensure that the state is able to intervene in
directing the agrarian economy. Without this decision it would become difficult to distribute the wealth to those who were previously marginalised. However, it should be cautioned that selective intervention in the delivery of goods and infrastructure creates other risks unless based on good data and science. Without accurate information on what collective goods or services the citizenry needs, states can invest vast resources but fail to have capability or reach to the expectations of the citizenry. Therefore, capability expansion or service delivery reach depends on the efficient provision of collective goods (Evans 2008:7).

Surely, without competent and coherent public bureaucracies, capability expanding in public services will not be possible. Having outlined the above it is important to mention that any aspiring 21st century developmental state should focus on capability expansion. Therefore, the need for information and engagement from societal partners to be collected through joint planning should be elevated to the highest level. Leaders in developmental states strive to strengthen the relationship with societal partners through continuous engagement and information sharing. This should be despite the fact that such as relationship would always be frosty based on the fact that the character of the network is always complicated. Accordingly, the provision of accurate information on collective priorities driving the national development agenda is the sine qua non for a successful 21st century developmental state (Evans 2008:11).

Developmental state requires that multiple institutionalised arrangements be established ostensibly to effectively guide the national developmental agenda towards the delivery of services. However, service delivery requires that recipients of services become active participants rather than passive recipients, because the provision of services to passive recipients produces results that are sub-standard and services that are not targeted or do not respond to the needs and demands of the citizenry (Evans 2008:11). Surely, government is required to disseminate information to all societal partners so that citizens are able to make informed decisions on the nature of intervention they require.

3. The State role in planned development

Planned development is seen as an efficient way of combining planning and the market in a creative partnership (Karagiannis 2002:39). Planned development presupposes the state as a powerful engine of service delivery and, in particular,
long-term economic growth and production-oriented industrial development. Here, the line of argument is that, “at a minimum, the process of development requires the guiding hand of the state, and does not come about through the market system alone” (Kitthananan in Kennett 2008: 82). If the argument about the state occupying a central role in the development process where economic activities are guided and directed by the state is granted, the point to emphasise here is that planned development and creative partnerships rest on the desire and capacity of the state for a coordinated and strategic response to economic challenges of development. Because state capacities differ, the ability to exploit the opportunities of international economic change also differs amongst states. Essentially, it needs to be emphasised that due to historical, geopolitical, institutional and policy differences, the state capacity concept did not apply in a uniform manner to the countries of East Asia and Latin America.

In some instances, the developmental state idea faced criticisms blamed for failure to avert the debt crisis of Latin American states in the 1980s and subsequent economic stagnation in East Asian states. During this period government interventions were blamed for high inflation rates, impeding macro-economic balances, and creating inefficient and wasteful government policies (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco 1998:1). The developmental states were criticised mostly for their inability to deal with the debt crisis as instantiated during the economic downturn of Japan. There was thus little attention to plans for industrialization and other benefits that developmental states drove and help lay the groundwork for long-term economic recovery. In fact, countries were dragged into narrow economic trajectory (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco 1998:1).

The 1997 crisis raised concerns about the effectiveness of the East Asian miracle driven by developmental states and the role of the state in the industrialisation process throwing into sharp focus a key component of the developmental state model; the alliance between politics and the economy and more precisely the effectiveness of the partnership that existed between the state and the private sector. Moreover these economic crises were blamed on poor regulatory procedures and a lack of transparency, made possible by the institutional framework of the developmental state. It was also blamed on the absence of risk management plans (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco 1998:1).

The economic demise raised questions about developmental states’ ability to intervene through developmental programmes as well as the state’s ability
to coordinate the development process in partnership with the private sector in times of crises. The economic downturn was also blamed on poor regulatory policies and the lack of institutional structural arrangements of developmental states (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco 1998:1). Yet, to collapse the developmental state model into general failure is to ignore important variations between developmental states. Even at the most basic level, there are major differences between first and second generation East Asian Newly Industrialising Countries (NIC). In Thailand in the 1990s, for example, the availability of easy finance coupled with the virtual absence of investment guidelines contrasted sharply with the highly coordinated investment strategies put in place earlier by the Taiwan, Korea and Japan at a similar stage of development. Whereas the state guided strategies of the three countries generated high levels of investment in strong-growth industries Thailand’s uncoordinated approach encouraged intense speculative activity, leading to a frenzy of overinvestment in the property sector and ultimately contributing to the currency crisis in 1997.

These 1997 crisis in East Asia reminds us that no region or country is crisis-proof. But this does imply that the developmental state concept as a whole is inherently fragile. Rather that the resilience or non-resilience of states during economic crisis evolves around the quality and capacity of state institutions, to which this paper now turns. To be precise it depends on a process of institutionalising cooperation, or creative partnerships, towards selective interventions in order to effectively direct the economy. Here the interconnectedness between the state and the private sector guides the functioning of the private sector. The common denominator in both the ‘authoritarian’ and ‘democratic’ forms of the developmental state is ‘institutionalised public-private partnership’ in the process of economic policy formulation and implementation (Onis 1991:115). Amongst a gamut of findings by some scholars like Peter Evans; public service unity is listed as another fundamental determinant of institutionalised cooperation (Weiss 1998:36; Compton Jr 1964:126-127).

In economics, the benefits of state coordination have been noted for a range of areas including coordinating balanced investment decisions as well as the coordination of specialist functions such as the sharing of information, technological acquisitions, learning and diffusion (Weiss 1998: 6). A state that has strong coordination mechanisms has the potential to effectively assess investment opportunities. In essence such a state has the potential to undertake or execute
certain developmental aspects including the state’s potential to coordinate small institutions in order of priority. In respect of state-capital relations, Japan is a powerful case in point. To suggest that Japan’s political and economic elites were keen to revitalise the national economy in the wake of the war is hardly novel (Beeson 2003:4). It is possible to generalise public policy as the pursuit of economic growth. It is important to note however that what distinguished Japan, and what has attracted a great deal of academic interest to Japan developmental state is not simply the country’s dramatic success but the specific mechanisms that underpinned it (Beeson 2010:4).

The Japanese political class pursued economic growth in an extraordinary manner in the post-Second World War era. However, it is always important to bear in mind that the Japanese success story is not a result of the state’s ability to turn around things rather it is the methods and instruments that underpinned the success story that matter here. Part of the success story, to be sure is the distinctive pattern of institutionalised relationships, or partnerships, between business and government. The use of the word business in this context refers to the private sector including big conglomerates such as Mitsubishi and Mitsui and their affiliate companies that dominated the Japanese economic market. Similarly, government in this context refers primarily to a number of key ministries in the state bureaucracy, particularly the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of International Trade and Industry, and their roles in guiding the course of Japan’s post-war development project. This kind of institutionalised arrangement was seen by many as conferring specific advantages, influentially captured by Peter Evans, who has suggested that a number of East Asian states had followed Japan’s lead, having derived specific benefits from a pattern of relationships he has described as ‘embedded autonomy’ (Beeson 2010:4).

Japan is a genuine example of how a state has used institutionalised cooperation or partnerships to build and promote its economy and deliver services. Evans concludes that a number of conditions are essential if state policies are to be consistent with a transformative or developmental project and in line with growth-oriented goals. One of the conditions is that of insulation of the state’s key policy-making agencies from special interest groups and clientelistic pressures (Weiss 1998:36). Thus, the state’s policymaking institutions must be
independent from the influence of interest or concerned groups which, in turn, enables the state to define the developmental path without interference or resistance from such organisations (Weiss 1998:36). The other condition is that of a competent bureaucracy committed to organisational objectives. For a state to become developmental, the public service must be comprised of capable and experienced public servants committed to the government’s goals and agenda. We will proceed to discuss the two in turn.

4. The concept of embedded autonomy

According to Evans (1998:35) states which are more effective in coordinating their development goals tend to be insufficiently autonomous to formulate their own national development goals, but are also sufficiently embedded in particular industrial networks. With the notion of embedded autonomy, Evans contributes an important intellectual tool to these discourse, not only for differentiating Third World capabilities but also for making sense of differential capabilities within the advanced industrial world (Evans 1998:35). It is interesting to observe that the word ‘autonomy’ refers to effective and protected bureaucracies which provide security against uncontrolled influence by particularist societal groups on state decisions (Huque and Zafarullah 2006:207). Following this line of reasoning, bureaucratic independence is important in the sense that it determines whether the state would effectively be able to play a role in pursuing the national interest. This means that public servants need to be independent from politics so that they are able to collect, synthesise and disseminate information to all societal partners without been influenced by political positions of their superiors.

The state should always guard against been insulated from society such that it starts to drift away from society and becomes completely isolated and detached, for this would make it difficult for the state to appreciate the needs of the people so as to be able to put into place service delivery measures (Fritz and Menocal 2007:535). Thus, the state must be ‘embedded’ in society so that it is “connected to a concrete set of social ties that bind the state to the society and provide institutionalised channels for the continual negotiation and recognition of goals and policies” (Fritz and Menocal 2007:535). In so doing, institutionalised channels for the continual negotiation and recognition of goals and policies become a permanent fixture of constantly mediated relationships (Fritz and

The concept ‘embeddedness’ refers to the fact that the state is based on networks that link it to particular social groups with which it shares a joint project of transformation (Huque and Zafarullah 2007:207). As a matter of fact, the concept of embedded autonomy was coined by Peter Evans in an endeavour to solve the puzzle of why some highly interventionist states are able to translate their developmental goals into practice whilst others have been less effective in economic management. Evans wanted to gain an understanding of the underlying conditions which determine whether a developmental state is strong or weak (Weiss 1998:35). In solving this puzzle, Evans explained that there are certain attributes internal to state structure that heighten insulation or autonomy from pluralistic interests. However, he cautioned that autonomy is not sufficient if goals are not implemented successfully. For that to occur, autonomy must be ‘embedded’ in society: ‘It is an autonomy embedded in a concrete set of social ties which bind the state to society and provide institutionalised channels for the continual negotiation of goals and policies’ (Weiss 1998:35).

The embedded autonomy refers to a point in which the bureaucracies of state are placed at the centre of coordination in a web comprised of strong social partners. In principle, what this means is that the state bureaucracy should work in partnership with other capable institutions for the state to become a strong developmental institution, albeit that the state remains at the heart of that coordination. Once again, this demonstrates the importance of partnerships and networks of relevant institutions that define the extent to which some interventionist states are able to translate their developmental goals into practice (Weiss 1998:35). This is a lesson that the South African leadership needs to embrace and understand if they want to build a strong developmental state with the capacity to intervene in the socio-economic development. Basically, if the South African need to avoid further economic downgrades, it has to be able to enter into partnerships and also create a network with relevant institutions such as business so that it is able to make necessary service delivery interventions.

As a point of caution, the apparatus of the state should neither be too distant or lacking in effective capacity as it will weaken government capacity to implement policy and guide the course of development in an ‘appropriate’ ways. Conversely, the state apparatus should not be too close as it risks been captured by self-serving interests of corrupt business people as witnessed in the Zondo
Commissions wherein a number of evidence is coming out on how the state capture in particular of government and State Entities in South Africa took place. This exposes state institutions to a risks in the sense that it results in certain individuals capturing the state institutions to a point that they are weakened to deliver effective and efficient service delivery. South African government may draw lessons from East Asian bureaucracies in that these states have on the whole have been effective coordinators because they have used their insulation from those with self-serving interest to developing a more encompassing networks. Furthermore, the model for coordination as applied by East Asian states focused more on reliance on the use of incentives or negotiated power, rather than coercion (Weiss 1998:81). In economic terms, East Asian States enable state officials or bureaucracies to strategically and selectively intervene in the economy, focusing on sectors which they perceive as crucial to the future of industrial growth and transformation (Edigheji 2010:4).

5. Meritocratic State and Service Delivery

According to Evans in Rauch and Evans(1990), the developmental state is independent in so far as it has a balanced bureaucracy characterised by meritocracy and long-term career forecasts, which are fundamental characteristics of good public servants (Rauch and Evans 1999:30); (Beeson 2003:5). In the East Asian States, merit-based recruitment and promotion of officials, rather than political appointments, have tended to minimise the political manipulation of the bureaucracy. Therefore, priorities in these states has been placed on attracting highly qualified individuals. There is a belief among the East Asian states that the ‘non-bureaucratic forms of recruitment bound such groups more tightly to the state and thus served to foster the kind of bureaucratic culture in which individuals took as their own objectives the goals of their organisations’ (Weiss 1998: 50). Non-bureaucratic or political deployments do is that, though necessary in some areas, it has the potential to create public servants who then behave as politicians and therefore impact negatively on the broader goal of government. In essence, the point that is that without competent, cohesive public bureaucracies, capability-expanding services will not be delivered.

East Asian bureaucracies were successful in attracting the brightest and the most competitive public servants who share the same tradition and culture.
Promotions and recruitment to positions of authority have depended on one’s ability to showcase brilliance and expertise. This method of recruitment has minimised the abuse and exploitation of state resources by those connected to political leadership, even though such approaches have been aligned to the goals of political organisations and that of the government in power (Weiss 1998:50). Basically, any aspiring developmental state needs to know that emphasis should be placed on efficient, well-coordinated and well-skilled employees. Such states have administrative, technical and political capacity, and competency to set national goals. To this effect, it is believed that meritocratic recruitment would contribute to three objectives: the creation of unity; high standard of performance and professionalism (Fitz and Menocal 2007:534). Having said the above, I would like to indicate that a state is not developmental due to its being advanced and developed; rather, it is due to a state’s pursuance of a set of criteria that conform to growth and strong management (Bolesta 2007:110). These are necessary requirements for South Africa to pursue, given the downgrades and continuous reviews that threaten economic downgrade to the junk status. The fundamental pillars that the South African government needs to put into place are institutionalised coordination mechanisms with the societal partners including business. But it is also about strengthening institutional capacities at all levels including ensuring that government pursues meritocratic recruitment.

Developmental states are the embodiment of their transformative outcomes which include, amongst others, a combination of capacities, visions, norms and ideologies (Fritz and Menocal 2007:534), which is expected to translate in services that transform lives. The point is clearly articulated by Ghani et al. (2005:1). According to Ghani et al (2005:1), state capacity is an essential condition to build an effective state. Focusing firstly on its ability to control the areas under its jurisdiction Leftwich (2000:167-168) argues that states should have additional capacities that will enable them to formulate and deliver policies with a long-term perspective that is not limited to any political figure or leader. This kind of thinking was further elaborated by Leftwich when he defined the attributes of an ideal-type developmental state as one that demonstrates a ‘determination and ability to stimulate, direct, shape and cooperate with the business sector and arrange or supervise mutually acceptable deals with foreign interests’ (Leftwich 2000:167-168). This means that the government has to work with all societal partners including business sector in the delivery of services, and rendering of
socio-economic interventions which include amongst others attracting foreign direct investment for the benefit of the citizenry in the form of employment opportunities (Leftwich 2000: 167-168); (Fritz and Menocal 2007:4). Moreover, the state should work with other institutions that are operating within the society such as Research Organisations and other political institutions outside the ambit of government (Southall in Buhlungu et al. 2007:19).

6. Social Contract or an Institutionalised National Consensus

As indicated earlier on embedded autonomy, developmental state is anchored around institutional capacity: which is the state forming alliances or social contract with key social groups in society that helps it to achieve its goals referred to as social contract or national consensus managed by a competent bureaucracy responsible for ‘actual planning, intervening in, and guiding of the economy’ (Kitthananan 2008:82). However, this is not to suggest that bureaucratic elites or public servants are the only players in the process of developmental governance (Economic Commission for Africa 2011:10-11). Rather, they play a much bigger role in service delivery mostly because they are responsible for actual planning, intervening and guiding of the economy only after political elites have defined broad policy parameters. Bureaucratic elites, as technicians, have to be tasked with formulating detailed policies and plans to achieve the broad developmental goals set by political elites.

Furthermore, because these bureaucrats are recruited on merit and have long-term and predictable career paths as compared to the political leaders or their political principals, they are likely to resist pressures from political leaders and sectional interest groups that could undermine long-term national developmental goals (Economic Commission for Africa 2011:10-11). But once political leaders have defined the broad policy parameters, economic leaders within the private sector and public sector are required to formulate detailed policies and service delivery plans to achieve the broad developmental goals outlined by political leaders (Economic Commission for Africa 2011:10-11). In the case of local government elections that are to be held on the 03 August 2016, it is important for political organisations to field well-trained and well-skilled people to be local councillors, and this should be people capable of interpreting broad policy parameters that are articulated at national, provincial and within
their mayoral councils and be able to translate them into service delivery plans to reach to all the citizenry in their communities.

To make the afore-mentioned point clear in relation to governance, the work of the political executive and bureaucracies which serve the executive office at all governance levels is informed by three overriding capacities: (1) the ability to formulate policy goals and develop strategies for implementing them independent of societal pressures; (2) the ability to change the behaviour of important internal groups in order to further their policies; and (3) the ability to restructure the internal environment in pursuit of its goals (Weiss 1998:26). In short, it is about the ability of the bureaucracy to formulate and develop strategies for service delivery independent of pressure groups (Weiss 1998:26). The public service has to develop mechanisms and strategies to lobby or mobilise all societal groups to the outline a political vision.

What makes this apparent legitimation of patriotic contribution unique to developmental states is that it is not only pragmatic, focused on the bureaucratic management of day-to-day service delivery tasks but also offers an economic and institutionalised structure for a process of facilitating the practical proximity of delivery in an ‘isolated’, individualised society characteristic of modernity. It directly reflects the notion of ‘mediated communities’ to which we referred earlier, rather a process of mediation concerned with the future socio-economic structure (Weiss 1998:35). Perhaps, this designation of role and identity is best characterised as forward planning, which is to say, the nature and workings of national development plans. These plans, ultimately, are indicative of the delivery of services to the citizenry as a long-term standard narrative of the passage from the present to the future, where the future is a determinate outcome of the ever shifting borders of national and transnational economic forces (Weiss 1998:35).

7. Building Strong and Powerful Oversight Structures

Finally, for a state to be able to address service delivery problems and challenges, it has to establish strong and capable oversight institutions. This should comprise a well-resourced and quality cohort of public servants with the capacity to monitor performance without political interference. In any developmental state, economic challenges require competent and impartial referees, which are to be found in strong institutions. Thus, a high-quality civil service that has the capacity
to monitor performance is essential. A high-quality civil service also augments government’s ability to design and implement policies (Ibadan 1993:11). Such an institution allows the state to formulate and implement proactive policies to improve access to services.

Whilst it is commendable that in South Africa the national government established the Department of Monitoring and Evaluation in 2009 to monitor and evaluate the impact of services, it is not clear on whether South African Local Government Association (SALGA) – formation that brings together all local municipalities around service delivery and local economic development- is playing a similar role with respect to local government. It is not clear if SALGA has the capacity to effectively render such a responsibility as required under the new monitoring and evaluation system, given the current mandate of SALGA. Perhaps South Africa needs to establish a Monitoring and Evaluation entity that runs across all spheres of government, in as far as monitoring and evaluation is concerned.

On another level, it is now axiomatic that in order to tackle coordination problems, leaders need institutions and mechanisms to reassure competing groups that each should benefit from growth. Therefore, an important role that South Africa could play towards the attainment of transformative outcomes is to recruit a competent and relatively honest bureaucratic cadre and insulate it from day-to-day political interference that is increasingly becoming a challenge such that it is now difficult to separate politics from administration (Ibadan 1993:14). Moreover, there should be centralised institutions that are entrusted with the responsibility to tackle coordination challenges in order to ensure that state intervention is comprehensive, cohesive and even. However, for effective coordination to take place, politicians need to develop institutions and formulate mechanisms that would enable members of the society to have confidence in the neutrality of such institutions. This would instill confidence in citizens that such institutions serve their interests and not the political interests. The success of coordination, then, lies in the competence of the public service to perform its task; it involves the coordination of policy and developmental interventions (Ibadan 1993:11). The process of mobilising the developmental agenda, in short, is far easier to sustain when it is legitimised by what the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci has called the ‘active consent’ of the citizenry.
8. Conclusion

We can now discern the institutional elements that are vital conditions of general capabilities in formulating, transmitting and legitimating notions of common interest in a developmental state. The role of the state in embedding developmental practices in society as a mobilising platform for the neutralisation, or accommodation, of particular interests is a complex and carefully calibrated sequence of coordinated interventions that depend on the capacity of the developmental state to advance an economic growth and development agenda. At a deeper level, however, the question is whether the economic movements that so significantly advanced the economies of East Asia in the past six decades are to be transubstantiated in a country like South Africa, which only two decades ago ended apartheid. In order to answer that question, this paper limits itself to a discussions of those conditions that explain the success of the developmental states in east Asia to lay the basis for the analysis that must follow, looking at how South Africa has in practice sought to implement these conditions since it declared its commitment to a developmental state ideal.

All that can be said here as matters of principle is that if South Africa has to deliver services and reach out to all its citizens, it has to strengthen institutional coordination mechanisms in the manner that they are embracive of all societal groups. Government also has to ensure that competent people are appointed in the positions of authority, so as to be able them to translate broader policy objectives and link such objectives to service delivery plans. Furthermore, in order to effectively monitor and evaluate service delivery impact, government has to create service delivery institutions that would monitor service delivery as it happens at national, provincial and local government level.
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