Zambia Social Science Journal

Volume 1
Number 2 *Volume 1, number 2 (November 2010)*

Article 7

11-1-2010

Achieving Middle-Income Status by 2030: Is this the Most Appropriate Objective for Zambia?

Venkatesh Seshamani
University of Zambia

Achieving middle-income status by 2030: Is this the most appropriate objective for Zambia?

Venkatesh Seshamani

University of Zambia

On the backdrop of three important quotes and based on a wealth of underlying research, this article presents a systematic review of growth and development measurement in general and specifically in relation to Zambia's prospects of achieving middle income status by 2030. It highlights what it takes to achieve middle income status and what the limitations of such ambitions are. In commenting about Zambia's prospects, the article presents detailed cross-country comparisons with selected African economies. Attention is paid to aspects of economic (income) growth, human development and true human progress, using a range of international indicators in the analysis. Ultimately the article puts forward a number of key propositions about achieving middle income status by 2030 as well as achieving broader human development.

1. Introduction

"*Where some have great possessions, and others have nothing at all, the result is either an extreme democracy or an unmixed oligarchy, or it may even be – indirectly, and as a reaction to both these extremes – a tyranny…..Where….the poor are greatly superior in number, trouble ensues, and they (democracies)are speedily ruined.*" Aristotle, Greek philosopher, 384 BC – 322 BC, quoted in Friedman (2005).

"*What a man really wants is happiness and happiness is not synonymous with wealth. Real happiness consists in the esteem in which one is held by others, and in health, freedom from debt and in a clear conscience*." Adam Smith, 1723 – 1790, father of modern economics and capitalism.

"*The economic growth experienced during the last decade has not translated into significant reductions in poverty and improved general living conditions of the majority of the Zambians.*'" (Government of Zambia: Sixth National Development Plan 2011 – 2015:6).

These three quotes give us the backdrop on which we raise the question whether or not achieving middle income status by 2030 is the most appropriate objective for Zambia . We discuss this issue by looking at the context in section 2. We discuss the main issue in section 3. We then look at the emerging evidence in section 4 and conclude in section 5.

2. Context Setting

Zambia today is a dynamic country that is on the move. Nearly two decades ago, the country began an extensive economic reform process. This included price liberalization, privatization, private sector development, market orientation, the promotion of competition and the opening up of the economy to the rest of the world. Since then, there has been a sea of change in the country's economy. Gone are the days of controls and shortages. From a stagnant economy registering near-zero real growth, Zambia has turned into a vibrant economy with sustained positive real growth rates. This has been especially so since the new millennium.

The sustained and upward–looking growth is perhaps the single most important change in the macroeconomics of the country. This is not to underplay the achievements in other areas such as the reduction in the inflation rate and an improved Balance of Payments position. But if Zambia is to reach higher levels of development, sustained high real growth is the single most important macroeconomic prerequisite.

The sustained positive growth achieved so far has raised the country's per capita income from US$ 365 at the start of the new millennium to US$ 680 in 2006 and to US$ 970 in 2009. This change, as the Government's 2011 Budget Address states, brings the country within hair's breath of the middle income status. Indeed, by 2009 the country fell short of the cutoff point for middle-income status level of US$ 996 per capita by only US$ 26. That this is no mean achievement can be appreciated from the data in Table 1 on per capita income for countries in the East and Southern African region.

Table 1: Per capita income in selected countries in East and Southern Africa , 2009

Country	Per capita income (US$)
Kenya	770
Tanzania	500
Democratic Republic of the Congo	160
Malawi	280
Mozambique	440
Uganda	460
Zambia	970
Angola	3,490
Botswana	6,240
Namibia	4,290
South Africa	5,770

Source: World Bank: List of countries by GNI (nominal) per capita, Atlas Method

It can be seen from the figures in Table 1 that most other countries in the region in the low-income category are way below the threshold level of the middle income status. Angola, Botswana, Namibia and South Africa have been in the middle-income category for quite some time. In other words, they have a starting point advantage.

The cutoff point mentioned above is for the lower middle income level status. The minimum cutoff point for upper middle income level status is US$ 3,946. The question is: will Zambia meet the goal of middle-income status by 2030? There can be little doubt that it will. If the country could treble its per capita income within a decade, it could most likely attain (lower) middle-income status even within a couple of years or so. The country won't have to wait for another twenty years for this to happen. And further, if, other things remaining equal, cumulative growth continues to accrue at the present average rate of growth or possibly higher rates in the future, by 2030, Zambia could well be an upper middle-income country that is relentlessly pushing towards the threshold of high income status (US$ 12,196).

Presumably, Zambia's long-term vision envisages an upper middle-income status rather than a lower one. For the vision is for Zambia to become a prosperous middle-income country by 2030. And no country can become *prosperous* in any sense by simply crossing the threshold from low-income to lower middle-income level.

3. The Main Question

Now, assuming that Zambia does become an upper middle-income country by 2030, should it be deemed to be a satisfactory state of affairs? Is this goal that the country has set itself to achieve in its long-term vision the most appropriate one?

The answer depends on one's idea of a "prosperous" country. For many people, the concept of prosperity is highly correlated with a concept related to hedonistic materialism. A country is prosperous if its people are not deprived of access to the basic necessities of survival such as food, clothing and shelter and are able to enjoy to a greater or lesser extent all the appurtenances that modern technology can afford – cell phones, cars, televisions, mansions with swimming pools and possibly helicopter pads!

Indisputably, the above goods and gadgets do have their place in human lives. But will people be satisfied if they possess them in adequate measure? Here is where many of the present-day gurus of wealth come in conflict with the gurus of development.

As is well-known, at the instance of thinkers such as the late Pakistani economist Mahbub-ul-Haq and Nobel laureate Amartya Sen working under the aegis of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) , a concept of human development was introduced in 1990 that went beyond the concept of per capita income. The Human Development Index (HDI) included non-money metric variables (average life expectancy at birth and education). This is in addition to money-metric income adjusted for purchasing power parity. The UNDP 1996 Human Development Report showed that there was no close correlation between countries' rankings based on the HDI and per capita income. This lack of correlation continues. This can be seen from Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2: Human Development Index (HDI) in Selected Countries in East and Southern Africa, 2010

Country	HDI
Kenya	0.470
Tanzania	0.398
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.239
Malawi	0.385
Mozambique	0.284
Uganda	0.422
Zambia	0.395
Angola	0.403
Botswana	0.633
Namibia	0.606
South Africa	0.577

Source: UNDP: Human Development Report 2010

Note: Less than 0.480 = low human development; 0.480 – 0.670 = medium human development; 0.670 – 0.785 = high human development; and Greater than 0.785 = very high human development.

In 1997, the Human Development Report introduced the concept of the Human Poverty Index (HPI). This is in addition to the money-metric indices of poverty showing incidence, severity and depth. The report further suggested that a country can be deemed to be developing only if it was making progress on both the HDI and per capita income and reducing deprivation based on both the HPI and the money-metric measures of poverty. This was described as the conglomerative cum deprivational approach to gauging development. It was then demonstrated that very few countries could be deemed to be developed on the basis of these criteria. Specifically in the Zambian context, as the last quote in the introduction to this article shows, the Government itself has expressed concern that there has not been any notable nexus between economic growth and poverty reduction in the past decade despite the impressive rise in incomes.

Table 3: Per Capita Income and HDI Rankings of Selected Countries in East and Southern Africa.

Country	Per capita income rank	HDI rank
Kenya	6	4
Tanzania	7	8
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11	11
Malawi	9	10
Mozambique	8	6
Uganda	8	5
Zambia	5	9
Angola	4	7
Botswana	1	1
Namibia	3	2
South Africa	2	3

Source: Tables 1 and 2

Note: Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is – 0.63. Thus, not only is there no high positive correlation between income and human development, the correlation is in fact negative!

Here, one may refer to another quote in the introduction. Adam Smith, the original guru of wealth, analysing rational human behavior based on the fundamental motivation of self interest, explained the ways in which an economy should be organised in order to maximize income and wealth. Needless to say, Smith was an advocate of the free market.

But although Smith's "invisible hand" is commonly interpreted to signify the unfettered operation of market forces, as a religious man, Smith envisaged the invisible hand as the mechanism by which a benevolent God administered a universe in which human happiness was maximized. In other words, according to Smith, man was created by God to maximize happiness and not wealth. Wealth has a role only if it can contribute to happiness. But Smith was clear that happiness did not depend so much on wealth as on four other factors that appear in the quote. These are esteem, health, freedom from debt and a clear conscience. It is interesting to note that that three of these factors do not appear even in the HDI. The fourth factor, health, only enters indirectly in terms of the life expectancy index.[1]

One will be quick to point out – and quite rightly – that variables such as esteem and clear conscience cannot be objectively quantified. But no developing country like Zambia, especially when it has been declared as a Christian state, can ignore these factors. The literature is replete with instances of countries, where, in the words of the eighteenth century poet Oliver Goldsmith : "wealth accumulates and men decay"[2] through debilitating deprivation; where the women are decked from head to foot with heavy ornaments of gold, silver, diamonds and other precious gems, but the majority of them are illiterate; where people enjoy all the comforts of life but have no power to raise their grievances against the powers that be; and where the prosperity enjoyed by the present generation is not future-proof. Would one want Zambia after achieving middle-income status to be a country falling in any of these categories?

Way back in 1934, in his first report to the US Congress, Nobel Laureate Simon Kuznets stated that “the welfare of a nation can scarcely be inferred from a measure of national income” (Kuznets,1934).

Today, with the growing realization even in developed countries that not income and wealth but happiness is the more fundamental goal to strive for, attempts are being made to develop methodologies to quantify happiness[3]. One recent attempt is contained in a book by Van Praag and Ferrer-i-Carbonnel (2008). Happiness is represented in terms of several satisfactions that include: income, health, job, finance, housing, leisure, environment, social life, marriage, politics and general satisfaction. Showing the limitations of traditional methods of econometric analysis to handle these variables, the authors have developed new methods such as the Probit-adjusted Ordinary Least Squares (POLS), Cardinality Probit (CP) and Cardinality Probit-adjusted Ordinary Least Squares (COLS).

Dissatisfaction with the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Gross National Income (GNI) as measures of human welfare has spawned many efforts to develop alternative indices. The National Economic Foundation based in Maryland believes that the use of the GDP is not appropriate as the usual ultimate aim of most people is not to be rich but happy. Prosperity in the sense of human well-being is operationalized as Happy Life Years. A Happy Planet Index has been developed based on life expectancy, subjective life satisfaction and ecological footprint. The third factor is considered important to gauge sustainability of welfare over time. Table 4 shows that it is not easy to score on this Index. Even the United States fares badly (with an aggregate score of 30.7%) presumably because of a very low score on the ecological footprint. As James Gustav Speth, Distinguished Senior Professor at Demos, New York stated: “We in the US are chewing up a lot of environment for not much happiness” (quoted in Schwartz, 2010). Costa Rica has the highest score of 76.1%.

Way back in 1995, a Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) was developed in the United States. The underlying rationale for this indicator is that from a strictly numerical perspective, the GDP may be a good indicator of a country’s economic health. But from the perspective of a citizen living with the day-to-day realities of life, GDP can be misleading. There are many ‘defensive expenditures’ such as medical insurance, car insurance, and health care bills that are viewed as negative by the GPI, but the GDP views them as positive.

Table 4: Happy Planet Index, 2009

Country	Happy Planet Index Score (%)
Kenya	27.8
Tanzania	17.8
Democratic Republic of the Congo	29.0
Malawi	34.5
Mozambique	24.6
Uganda	30.2
Zambia	27.2
Angola	26.8
Botswana	20.9
Namibia	21.1
South Africa	29.7

Source: National Economic Foundation, Happy Planet Index 2, 2009, Maryland

The GPI distinguishes between worthwhile growth and uneconomic growth. Worthwhile growth results in improvements in well-being. Uneconomic growth entails depletion of natural and social capital. There are huge costs in terms of resource depletion, crime, ozone depletion, family breakdown, air, water and noise pollution and loss of farmlands and wetlands.

Recently, Nobel laureate Daniel Kahneman and Angus Deaton (2010) have analysed the relationship between high incomes and happiness in the United States. The authors distinguish between two aspects of subjective well-being: One, emotional well-being which refers to the emotional quality of an individual's everyday experience – the frequency and intensity of experiences of joy, stress, sadness, anger and affection that make one's life pleasant or unpleasant. Two, life evaluation that refers to thoughts that people have about their life when they think about it. Analysing more than 450,000 responses to the Gallop Healthways Well-being Index, the authors conclude that high income buys life satisfaction but not happiness, while low income is associated with both low life evaluation and low emotional wellbeing.

Although the UNDP had already developed a Human Poverty Index (HPI), in its latest Human Development Report for 2010, it has developed a new Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI). The MPI considers deprivation in three dimensions with several constituents: Living Standards (assets, floor, electricity, water, toilet, cooking fuel); Education (children enrolled, years of schooling) and Health (child mortality, nutrition).

The MPI measures acute poverty, incidence and average intensity of poverty. Acute poverty reflects several deprivations that people face at the same time. Incidence reflects the proportion of people who are deprived in at least 30 % of the indicators and average intensity of poverty is the average number of deprivations people experience at the same time. In table 5 we show the MPI values for Zambia and selected countries in the region.

Table 5: Values of MPI and MPI-related Measures for Selected Countries in East and Southern Africa, 2000 – 2008

Country	MPI	MPI headcount (%)	MPI intensity of deprivation (%)
Kenya	0.302	60.4	50.0
Tanzania	0.367	65.3	56.3
Malawi	0.384	72.3	33.2
Mozambique	0.481	79.8	60.2
Zambia	0.325	63.7	51.1
Angola	0.452	29.3	47.3
Namibia	0.187	39.6	47.2
South Africa	0.014	3.1	46.7

Source: UNDP: Human Development Report 2010

Note: MPI = Incidence of poverty x intensity of poverty.

The rankings for countries in the East and Southern African region for which data were available on all the four indices, namely per capita income, HDI, Happy Planet Index and MPI were used to see the extent of agreement between them. The relevant statistic Kendal's Coefficient of Concordance or Kendal's W4 was calculated. Its value turned to be a moderate 0.55. Table 6 provides the rankings.

Table 6: Kendal's W Rankings of Selected Countries in East and Southern Africa on Four Indices, 2009/10

Country	Per capita income	HDI	Happy Planet Index	MPI
Kenya	5	3	3	3
Tanzania	6	6	8	4
Malawi	8	8	1	6
Mozambique	7	4	6	8
Zambia	4	7	4	5
Angola	3	5	5	7
Namibia	2	1	7	2
South Africa	1	2	2	1

Source: Data in Table 1, 2, 4 and 5.

4. The Emerging Evidence

Discussions of the prominent gaps that exist between income measures such as GDP per capita on the one hand and human welfare measures such as the HDI, Happy Planet Index, MPI and the General Progress Indicator on the other are now ceasing to be purely academic and research issues and are becoming real policy questions.

These discussions do not in any way diminish the importance of economic growth especially in developing countries like Zambia. But they do strongly suggest that conscious efforts are required in terms of policy to ensure that growth is positively and closely linked to human development, human welfare and human happiness.

We would like to propose that this needed intimate link between growth in income on the one hand and human development on the other can be forged only if growth is characterized by the five Es. These are: employment, equality/equity, ethnicity, empowerment and environment/ecology. That is to say that the desired form of growth is one that will generate jobs, promote equity by bringing down high inequality, preserve ethnic cultures, ensure freedom of speech, expression and participation and protect the ecological balance so that future generations do not face natural resource shortage that could adversely tell on their level of well-being. These are not new concepts but only a positive formulation of the negative characteristics that the UNDP had suggested should be avoided. Thus the undesirable forms of growth that are antithetical to the five Es would be jobless, ruthless, rootless, voiceless and futureless growth respectively.

Today, especially in the wake of the global recession, job creation has become a critical target not only for developing countries like Zambia but even for the developed countries. Despite having been hit hard by the global recession, the United States is still the most powerful economy in the world with a per capita income in excess of US$ 46,000. But its President lost his recent mid-term elections on mainly one issue – jobs. The American economy is faced with a 9.5% unemployment rate and we often hear that President Obama's three topmost priorities are: jobs, jobs and jobs! It is somewhat incongruous that in Zambia, despite such emphasis being placed on income growth, there is a policy attention deficit when it comes to employment.

Employment is important not only because it is a means to ensure livelihood for the families of the employed. It has other roles. Economist Schumacher, author of Buddhist Economics, stated that the function of work is threefold: it gives man a chance to utilize and develop his faculties; it enables him to overcome his ego-centeredness by joining with other people in a common task; it brings forth the goods and services needed for a becoming existence. Thus work stands in the same relation to the higher faculties as food is in relation to the physical body. Referring back to Adam Smith's quote, employment is necessary to bring esteem and to ensure freedom from debt – two factors that are among the main contributors to happiness.

It is no exaggeration to say that Zambia's growth has been relatively more jobless than job-creating. Policies have to be formulated to accelerate the generation of employment. Although employment levels have gone up in the past five years, this has greatly been in the informal sector. Formal employment currently stands at 10% of the total employment (Government of Zambia, 2010).

This brings us to one more aspect of employment. Just as income generation without adequate job creation is not satisfactory, job creation without adequate income to go with it is also not satisfactory. People must be able to earn enough to live in dignity. In a recent submission, Caritas Europa suggested the integration of minimum income as a factor of "active inclusion" in policy (Caritas Europa, 2008).

In Zambia, although some minimum wage regulations are in place, there is need for a serious rethink on them. Every month, the Jesuit Centre for Theological

Reflection brings out an estimate of the cost of a basic needs basket for a family of six in Lusaka and contrasts it with the salaries of different income earners. In its release for October 2010, the cost of the Basic Needs Basket is estimated at K2.878 million. Some typical salaries earned are: teacher – K1.3 million to K2.2 million; nurse - K1.3 million to K3.4 million; security guard – K250,000 to K 850,000; secretary in civil service: K1.391 million to K1.9 million. If the individual happens to be the sole wage earner in the family, living in dignity would be a challenge.

This brings one to the next question: why should the above kind of phenomena exist when incomes seem to be rising fairly fast in Zambia? The obvious answer is inequality in income distribution. Few will dispute that the level of income inequality is high in Zambia. The most frequently used measure of inequality, the Gini Coefficient, remains as high as 52.6% (Republic of Zambia, 2010a).

Like employment, inequality is not a pure economic variable. In a recent book, two eminent British health scholars Richard Wilkinson and Kate Picket (2010) show that unequal incomes are highly correlated with negative outcomes on physical health, mental balance, levels of violence, social integration, teen births, school performance and just about everything else. Wilkinson and Picket, therefore, reject economic growth as a public health policy because growth may not necessarily reduce income differences. Of course, like all authors, Wilkinson and Picket too have their critics. Claude Fisher (2010) in a review of their book says that correlation does not imply causation. But Fisher does concede that "Wilkinson and Picket make a valuable contribution in enthusiasm and evidence, both of which will help fuel any effort to squeeze down the widening inequalities of our era" (Fischer, 2010).

The drastic impact of inequality on human development can be readily seen from what happens to the HDI when adjusted for inequality. The Human Development Report for 2010 has calculated an Inequality-Adjusted Human development Index (I-A HDI). The results for countries in East and Southern African region are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index for Selected Countries in East and Southern Africa, 2010

Country	HDI	I-A HDI	Loss in HDI (%)
Kenya	0.470	0.320	31.9
Tanzania	0.398	0.285	56.3
Malawi	0.385	0.261	53.2
Mozambique	0.284	0.155	45.3
Uganda	0.422	0.286	32.1
Zambia	0.395	0.270	31.7
Angola	0.403	0.242	39.9
Namibia	0.606	0.338	44.3
South Africa	0.597	0.411	31.2

Source: UNDP: Human Development Report 2010

There is a sizeable and growing literature showing how high inequality can hamper economic growth and also weaken the linkage between economic growth and poverty reduction (See, for example, Seshamani and Kabaso, 2010). We, however, do not go into those details in this article.

As in the case of employment, the impact of equality/inequality also transcends the pure economic domain. And here one may refer to the first quote at the beginning of this article. The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle was clear that high inequality and poverty posed a risk to the very sustenance of a democracy.

In a similar vein, a later-day development economist, Albert Hirschman described what he termed the 'tunnel effect' or society's tolerance for inequality. And as Ray explains: "If growth and equity in income distribution are considered to be the two principal objectives of the process of economic development, the development strategy has to be devised by keeping in mind the social and political context. If, given the social structure, the tunnel effect is weak (i.e. tolerance for inequality is low), a strategy of 'grow first, distribute later' is unlikely to meet with success. Even with strong initial tunnel effects, the development process may be thwarted if ruling groups and policy makers are insensitive to the erosion of these effects over time" (Ray, 1998:201). This caution is of particular significance to Zambia where high sustained growth is a must and the prevailing inequality is also high.

It cannot be over-emphasized that empowering growth requires good governance. This is especially the case for countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. It may not be palatable for Zambia and for several other countries in this region to know that we are slipping on good governance. Kaufmann, Kraay and Mastruzzi have recently brought out a paper showing the performance of some 190 countries on governance. They look at six dimensions of governance: Voice and Accountability, Political Stability, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law and Control of Corruption. The units in which governance is measured follow a normal distribution with zero mean and unit standard deviation. Therefore, all scores lie between -2.5 and 2.5 with higher scores corresponding to better outcomes. The tables in the paper by Kaufmann et al provide an idea of the change in governance between 1998 and 2006. Table 8 provides excerpts from these tables showing the performance of countries in the East and Southern African region. The figures in this table show that with the exception of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa, all other countries are to the left of zero in the distribution on all dimensions[5] Despite being a middle-income country, Angola's performance is negative on all dimensions of governance. Even South Africa scores a negative value on political stability.

Table 8: Governance Indicators for Countries in East and Southern Africa

Country	V&A	Pol. Stab.	Gov. Eff.	Reg. Qual.	Rule of law	Control of corr.
Kenya	-0.18	-1.09	-0.69	-0.21	-0.98	-0.97
Tanzania	-0.25	-0.17	-0.31	-0.40	-0.47	-0.37
Malawi	-0.31	0.02	-0.85	-0.64	-0.46	-0.74
Mozambique	-0.06	0.52	-0.30	-0.49	-0.59	-0.74
Uganda	-0.54	-1.18	-0.50	-0.18	-0.50	-0.57
Zambia	-0.34	0.29	-0.74	-0.56	-0.61	-0.78
Angola	-1.25	-0.51	-1.20	-1.20	-1.29	-1.14
Botswana	0.57	1.23	0.74	0.48	0.63	0.81
Namibia	0.39	0.83	0.13	0.16	0.17	0.16
South Africa	0.60	-0.07	0.78	0.66	0.24	0.55

Source: Kaufmann, Kraay & Mastruzzi (2010)

Note: Governance Indicators: V&A= Voice and Accountability; Pol. Stab.= Political Stability; Gov. Eff.= Government Effectiveness; Reg. Qual.= Regulatory Quality; and Control of corr.= Control of Corruption

5. Conclusion

So what is the synthesis emerging from all this discussion? We put forward five propositions. First, achieving middle income status is not an irrelevant goal for Zambia. But one must not lose sight of the fact that it is not the fundamental goal. Income-augmenting economic growth has only an instrumental value. Second, the fundamental goal is the maximization of human welfare or happiness and income is only one important factor that can contribute to this goal. Hence there should be no fetishism about income and wealth creation. Third, the extent to which income can impact on happiness depends on the way in which the income is generated and distributed. Fourth, income growth will have a high impact on human development and happiness only if it is in consonance with the five Es. Fifth, policies are required that will simultaneously address the critical issues of employment, equality, governance and inter-temporal sustainability, alongside those for stepping up growth of incomes and wealth. Trickle down may take a long time to impact on inequality and poverty reduction. And there may be no trickle down at all on the other dimensions of human well-being.

The Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore who won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1913 prayed to the Almighty Father that his country should awake into a heaven of freedom where, among other things, “the mind is without fear and the head is held high and where knowledge is free”. (Tagore, 1912). I am sure everyone would want Zambia too, sooner than later, to awake into such a heaven of freedom. Zambians need to commit themselves to this goal and not just set their sights simply on achieving middle-income status.

Notes

This is a revised version of a paper presented at the Annual National Economic Development Conference organized by Zambia Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (ZIPAR) on the theme "Achieving Middle Income Status" on November 25, 2010 in Lusaka, Zambia.

1. Of course, human development advocates do acknowledge that the concept of human development is broader than the concept of the Human Development Index.
2. See Oliver Goldsmith. 1980. "The Deserted Village. " The New Golden Treasury of English Verse. " Pan Books.
3 In September 2009, French President Nicolai Sarkovsky commissioned a report by Professors Joseph Stiglitz and Amartya Sen to find alternatives to what he called "GDP fetishism".
4. Kendal's $W = (12S)/m^2(n^3 – n)$. $S = \boxed{x}(R_i - R)^2$. $R_i = \boxed{x}r_{i,j}$, = rank for country i on index j. $R = 1/2m(n + 1)$. m = number of indices = 4. n = number of countries = 8
5. Zambia has a positive value for political stability.

References

Caritas Europa. 2008. "Bringing Human Dignity to the Heart of the European Debate." Brussels.

Fisher, C. 2010. "Mind the Gap", review of book by Wilkinson and Picket. *Boston Review*. Boston.

Friedman, B. 2005. *The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth*. New Yok: Alfred Knopf.

Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection. 2010. *JCTR Basic Needs Basket*. Lusaka. October.

Kahneman, D. and A. Deaton. 2010. *High Income Improves Evaluation of Life but not Emotional Wellbeing*. Princeton: United States National Academy of Sciences.

Kaufmann, D.; A. Kraay and M. Mastruzzi. 2010. *The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and Analytical Issues*. Washington D.C. : Brookings Institution.

Kuznets, S. 1934. *Report to the United States Congress*. Washington D.C.

National Economic Foundation. 2009. *Happy Planet Index 2*. Maryland.

Ray, D. 1998. *Development Economics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Republic of Zambia, 2010a. Sixth National Development Plan 2011 – 2015 (zero draft). Lusaka: Ministry of Finance and National Planning.

Republic of Zambia. 2010b. Budget Address 2011. Lusaka: Ministry of Finance and National Planning.

Schumacher, E. F. 1968. "Buddhist Economics." *Resurgence Magazine*. Hartland.

Schwartz, J. 2010. " Is GDP an Obsolete Measure of Progress?" *Time Magazine*, January

Seshamani, V. and P. N. Kabaso. 2010. " Equity, Equality, Pro-poor and Poverty-Reducing Growth: The Case of Zambia." Project Report funded by the Netherlands Government, Lusaka.

Smith, A. 1776. *The Wealth of Nations*, ed. J.S. Nicholson. London: Nelson.

Tagore, R. 1912. *Gitanjali: Song Offerings*. London:The India Society.

United Nations Development Programme.1996. *Human Development Repor*t 1996. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Development Programme.1997. *Human Development Report* 1997. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

United Nations Development Programme. 2010. *Human Development Report* 2010. New York: United Nations Development Programme.

Van Praag, B. M. S. and A. Ferrer-i-Carbonnel. 2008. *Happiness Quantified*. Revised Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkinson, R. and K. Picket. 2010. *The Spirit Level: Why Greater Equality Makes Societies Stronger?* New York: Bloomsbury Press.

World Bank. 2010. *Doing Business* 2010. Washington D.C. : World Bank.