

A SAFER AND MORE PROSPEROUS WORLD:

2020

WHY AID REALLY MATTERS IN AN AGE OF AUSTERITY

BY ANDREW MITCHELL MP

THE LEGATUM INSTITUTE

Based in London, the Legatum Institute (LI) is an independent non-partisan public policy organisation whose research, publications, and programmes advance ideas and policies in support of free and prosperous societies around the world. LI's signature annual publication is the *Legatum Prosperity Index*[™], a unique global assessment of national prosperity based on both wealth and wellbeing.

THE LI-2020 POLICY DIALOGUES

The Legatum Institute (LI) and the 2020 Conservatives are joining forces on a series of policy dialogues with the aim of addressing fundamental questions regarding the responsibility and accountability of individuals and government, the role of markets, the scope of public policy, and democratic legitimacy. LI and 2020 will jointly curate a series of publications and debates in 2013 and 2014, each exploring individual policy areas. For further information about the series, please visit **www.li.com**

BUILDING A MORE PROSPEROUS WORLD THROUGH LIBERTY AND RESPONSIBILITY



FOREWORD

At a time when the UK economic recovery is slow and budget cuts are common right across Whitehall, the UK government's commitment to increase its international development budget has never been more controversial. Can spending so much in developing countries be justified when so many Britons are suffering at home? Further, what lessons have been learned in recent years—from both experience and empirical research—of the utility of foreign aid? Can we be sure what works and what doesn't?

Former secretary of state for international development, Andrew Mitchell, argues that the government's commitment to international development is not only morally right, but that it is a vital instrument of statecraft that helps protect the UK's prosperity and fosters peaceful diplomacy.

Andrew Mitchell is uniquely qualified to make the case for UK international development policy. Not only has he considerable experience in both government and opposition, he is also widely respected within the development community.

The Legatum Institute is the natural home for those wishing to secure the success of societies that are free, secure, and enterprising. In our **Policy Dialogues** series, the Legatum Institute is pleased to join serving politicians—in this case members of the 2020 Conservatives group—in creating a forum to air views, test ideas, and put forth arguments. The Legatum Institute is not allied to any political party or organization; rather we aim to be an incubator of sound ideas and creative minds.

Our perspective is an international one. Our annual Prosperity Index (**www.prosperity.com**) is a unique global assessment of wealth and wellbeing that highlights the drivers of national success and prosperity.

For many developing countries that rank at the lower end of such indices, the existence of national development programmes from countries like the UK provides essential, often life-saving, assistance. These programmes if administered correctly, help the world's poorest people to step up and secure a foothold on the ladder of development.

This topic is not without controversy, and we aim to promote a lively and intelligent discussion. To that end, we will be publishing a series of short responses to this pamphlet on our website to further the debate and enrich our understanding about international development. These can be accessed at **www.li.com**.

Jeffrey Gedmin President and CEO Hywel Williams Senior Adviser

WELCOME

A strong and clear commitment to keeping our pledge on development has been a hallmark of the Coalition and a touchstone of David Cameron's modern, progressive conservatism. This decision was especially bold considering the financial challenges we face.

Standing by our development spending goals in such a financial climate is a genuine tribute to the political courage of the Prime Minister. Such steadfast commitment is not only the right thing to do morally, it also strengthens Britain's long term national security and underpins our future economic prosperity. In the global race, in which we must compete, the development targets of today can be the high growth markets of tomorrow.

But it is vital that those of us who share these values and this vision, continue to speak up in support and consistently make the case for development. This pamphlet, in common with all 2020 publications, reflects the views of the author and not necessarily the individual views of all 2020 Group members.

However, 2020 Conservatives are pleased to provide a platform for this powerful and forensic argument by Andrew Mitchell, the Conservative politician who, more than any other, first in opposition and then in government, was responsible for developing and implementing a new, ambitious and authentic centre-right approach to development, which is now being rolled out around the world.

The wellbeing and life chances of millions of children, are certainly better because of it.

Rt. Hon. Gregory Barker MP 2020 Conservatives

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

WELCOME

- CHAPTER 1: THE CONTEXT OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
- CHAPTER 2: RESULTS, RESULTS & RESULTS
- CHAPTER 3: MAKING THE WORLD SAFER
- CHAPTER 4: WEALTH CREATION, TRADE & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
- CHAPTER 5: BRITISH LEADERSHIP
- **RESPONSE:** PROFESSOR PAUL COLLIER

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

THE 2020 CONSERVATIVES

Children back in school in Sindh province following Pakistani flooding

4

*

www.li.com

H



Britain's international development policies are not about soft-hearted altruism. They are a clear and hard-headed approach to our own security and prosperity. But they are also morally right. By standing by our commitment to international development, Britain has earned both respect and admiration around the world. Even at a time of economic hardship for many families in Britain, we have refused to balance the books on the back of the world's poor. This is in our best traditions. Britain has a proud history of going to the assistance of those who are suffering, whether it is campaigning to abolish slavery in the nineteenth century, the fight against fascism in the twentieth century, or "making poverty history" in the twenty-first century.

This year, 2013, under a Conservative-led government, Britain is delivering its historic promise to the world's poorest people to allocate 0.7 percent of our gross national income (under one penny in every pound) to their support. This is in addition to the immense generosity shown by British individuals who support the work of the extraordinary British charities and NGOs that make such a difference in the poorest parts of the world.

But at a time of economic difficulty, the justification for development spending when other areas of public expenditure are being reduced is not an easy one. Anyone can spend other people's money, but the real test is whether it delivers value to British taxpayers as well as clear results for those we are trying to help. Is it effective? Are funds used for the best possible advantage? Is it aid and development for the benefit of Britain as well as from Britain?

THE CONTEXT OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT



This short pamphlet will argue that Britain's development policy is not just morally right, but is also a valuable and worthwhile investment in Britain's future; an investment in Britain's security as well as providing assistance to the world's most dysfunctional and ungoverned nations; a real investment in Britain's future prosperity and potential for wealth generation as countries we support start to lift themselves out of poverty through economic growth and investment.

There is clear evidence that aid and development works. Over recent years agreements to cancel debt and increase aid, together with strong economic growth across Asia, have seen more than 500 million people lift themselves out of poverty, millions more children receive an education, and child mortality rates plummet. Incredible improvements such as these are sometimes overlooked.

For the first time ever it is our generations that have the power to do something definitive to address the colossal inequalities of opportunity that disfigure our world. As the High Level Panel of the United Nations meets, under the co-chairmanship of David Cameron, with the aim of identifying the key ingredients for tackling poverty beyond the expiry of the United Nation's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in 2015, we can see how the sometimes called "golden thread of development" can deliver extraordinary progress: building a rule of law that treats all citizens equally and assures foreign investors that they will be dealt with fairly and according to transparent rules, not at the whim of a powerful politician or warlord; supporting openness and transparency; zero tolerance of corruption; building the sinews of the state; and support for democratic institutions. These are as essential as more traditional aid interventions such as clean water and sanitation, or feeder roads along which agricultural goods can get to market.

I wish more people across Britain could see the huge difference British development policies are making. Last year I stayed in a tukul with a poor family in a village 150 miles from Addis Ababa in rural Ethiopia. The parents worked hard but lived on less than 50p per day. Each night their home filled with smoke from the open fire cooking their daily meal. On the night that I was there, there were eight children, the mother, the father, the grandmother, four sheep, two goats, a cow and the editor of Conservative Home. The children had

only the clothes on their backs, however, over the last two years their lives and their whole community had been transformed by British aid. Clean water that used to be a two-hour walk away is now only two minutes away. The family has access to a small health clinic and, for the first time, has two pit latrines adjacent to their home. Going to school involves a walk of just one mile thanks to the British charity Action Aid, with six of the eight children now in school and with every expectation that the youngest two will follow.

And many British international development charities are leading the way across the world. Water Aid, backed by British taxpayers, is achieving remarkable results. CamFed is currently educating more than 1 million girls in the developing world—including through the British taxpayer-funded Girls Education Challenge Fund. And Save the Children is now internationally acknowledged as a world leader in elevating the condition of children.

Development aid well spent creates small miracles that transform lives, and yet today 67 million children—particularly girls and children with disabilities—do not go to school. A girl born tonight in South Sudan is statistically more likely to die in childbirth than to complete her primary school education. This year, despite significant efforts by international aid to improve maternal health, more than a million children will lose their mother when they are born. Today, the greatest cause of death among children in Africa is not AIDS, TB, or malaria, but dirty water. All of this we know, as previous generations have not. As William Wilberforce said of the slave trade, "You may choose to look the other way but you can never again say you did not know." Today none of us can say we do not know the depths of poverty in which a billion of our global neighbours live. That is why the British government has injected new energy into international development, asserting global leadership, placing girls and women at the centre of everything we do, championing economic growth, free trade and markets, and open investment alongside conflict resolution, tackling corruption, and stability building. It is an approach that is now being replicated all around the world.

Reconstruction and repair of houses damaged by earthquake in Malawi

......





RESULTS, RESULTS,

RESULTS

it was "walking the last mile" with India, fundamentally changing what had previously been Britain's most substantial overseas aid programme since 1945. In future, up to half the programme was to engage in investment that seeks to generate a return for the benefit of Britain too. The remainder focused only on the poorest areas of India where private sector investment has yet to take hold and where childhood malnutrition rates are some of the highest in the world. Britain also agreed with both India and South Africa to wind down our traditional bilateral development programme by 2015. Through the Bilateral Aid Review, Britain has reduced its bilateral development programmes from 43 countries to 27, focusing British aid where it is most needed, making some hard decisions along the way.

On the election of the Coalition in 2010, Britain immediately ended British aid to China and Russia and announced that

Much of Britain's development funding goes through the multilateral system, organizations like the World Bank and United Nations. Britain introduced its Multilateral Aid Review to hold the many international organizations funded by British taxpayers to account. Some were found to perform outstandingly well, and in the case of UNICEF, which under the inspiring leadership in New York of Tony Lake scored so highly on their work for the poorest children, their core funding was doubled. Other agencies that did less well but whose services were still needed (e.g. the Commonwealth Secretariat) were set challenging new targets for reform or placed in "special measures". There were, however, 10 percent who were not providing adequate value for money and



their funding was withdrawn. Many of these international agencies had never been subjected to external review (our findings were published online, inviting comment from the agencies themselves). Many had not been audited in this way since they were created, some as long ago as 1947. But as a result of this British initiative many other countries that fund international institutions have carried out their own review. Even the European Union—far too often synonymous with inefficient and unaccountable aid spending—has welcomed change under Commissioners Piebalgs and Georgieva as they follow the British reforms.

Accountability and transparency have increased, and across the international system the emphasis on aid effectiveness (demonstrable results) has been boosted significantly by the decision to work more closely with BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa), agreed at the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Busan in 2012.

Britain's effort to respond to humanitarian emergencies within the critical first 72-hour period, which can determine the difference between a disaster and a catastrophe, was reviewed under Paddy Ashdown's leadership. We also implemented a new and vital role for the private sector in this work.

And throughout the world where Britain is engaged in development, the Government has ensured that it is branded with the Union flag so that the contribution of Britain and the British taxpayer is there for all to see (*opposite*).

Once the architecture of Britain's development programme had been reformed a new watchdog was introduced: the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI). ICAI provides the independent evaluation of British aid so that taxpayers can access an objective and independent review that reports not to ministers (the executive), but to Parliament (the legislature), and the respected International Development Select Committee. This innovation, as I have seen at first hand, can be a nightmare for civil servants; however it is fundamental in enabling taxpayers and Parliament to hold the government and ministers to account. These changes were further enhanced by the Aid Transparency Guarantee, led by Britain and Sweden, the first countries to publish any expenditure above £500 online for all to see.

This has also led to another key lesson for international development: the importance of development as part of a wider government approach. Government departments are now working more closely than ever before (DFID was sometimes seen as a rather well upholstered NGO moored off the coast of Whitehall, rather than the government Department for International Development). Key partnerships for development have been built across business, defence, the Department of Energy and Climate Change (DECC), the Home Office, and the Foreign Office. No longer should DFID feel the need to be squeamish about a UK trade mission to Africa, for example, or about the British Armed Forces involvement in one of its key countries. While aid must be spent with the primary purpose of reducing poverty (there is an Act of Parliament governing this), DFID remains a

government department that must coordinate effectively with Britain's economic security or diplomatic machinery.

This unremitting focus on results—increasingly a key part of development policy around the world—is something of a change for the international development community, which in the past was too willing to spend public funds without real accountability or public explanation. This results-driven approach is prone to criticism for encouraging "short-termism", whereas development is about long-term trends and generational change. This, however, does not absolve development organizations, funded with taxpayers' money, from explaining why and how results will be achieved and value for money delivered. Full and open accountability leads to better results on the ground, but is also indispensable if there is to be any chance of persuading hard-pressed taxpayers of the value and justice of the development cause.



...where Britain is engaged in development, the Government has ensured that it is branded with the Union flag.

After 20 years of war, normality is returning to the streets of Gulu in northern Uganda 2001

100

۵



SECURITY: MAKING

THE WORLD SAFER

Development is impossible without security and stability. And in this increasingly interconnected world, it is not in Britain's interest to allow states to be ungovernable or unstable, nor allow their path to development and growth to be blocked.

As Paul Collier, the Oxford Development Economist, and godfather of today's centre-right approach to international development, has said, "Conflict is development in reverse." Indeed there is credible research to show that conflict is four times more expensive than the international peacekeeping cost of preventing it, but this figure ignores the human cost. I will never forget hearing from a community leader in Ntoto, in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo, and her furious and devastating denunciation of the international community as well as her own regional and national government, as she spoke of the killing of women and children, at the hands of the 28 lawless groups which ravaged her locality. It also underlined how girls and women suffer grievously when conflict and instability are endemic. Women bear the brunt of conflict in ways with which we are sadly all too familiar. It is right to put them at the heart of everything we do in international development.

Combating conflict is central to development. Action must be taken to stop conflict before it starts via early warning and preventative action, such as working to secure an arms trade treaty, as Alan Duncan, the minister for international development, has done. Development work is needed in reconciling post-conflict communities that have terrorised



each other. The importance of this, and just how difficult it can be, has been demonstrated by the recent history of the Great Lakes region of Africa. And yet the recent history of Somalia offers hope that progress can be made in extraordinarily difficult circumstances. For 20 years this has been ungovernable space, as countless local and international initiatives have failed.

In 2011, with famine threatening the lives and livelihoods of millions in the Horn of Africa, international attention again returned to that part of the world. As a result of international intervention (led by Britain) a catastrophe was averted and hundreds of thousands of lives saved. Our attention then turned to whether something more fundamental could be done to address the underlying causes of Somalia's condition.

The international conference on Somalia held in London in 2012 made considerable if unexpected progress. Most of the key players within Somalia attended. There was agreement amongst the regional powers and the UN leadership on what needed to be done. Four key ingredients were present: a new constitution was brokered; a "bargain", whereby some form of credible local accountability would trigger international funding to support development; a new approach to public financial management in Somalia (hitherto most public funds have been brazenly stolen) was proposed; and finally, the brave, under-equipped, international force based in Mogadishu—mainly comprising of Ugandan and Burundian troops—was significantly strengthened and better coordinated with Kenyan and Ethiopian forces.

This is not only about the interest of Somalia and the surrounding countries. There were recently more British passport holders in Somalia training in terrorist camps than in any other country in the world. British efforts to help Somalia directly assist our own security as well as saving lives there. And it underlines that there is no development without security and no security without development.

Developments in Somalia also demonstrate the importance of the more connected approach that Britain now employs thanks to the innovation of the National Security Council. This new structure brings together the Secretaries of State for Foreign Affairs, Defence and Development as well as the Chief of the Defence Staff, heads of MI6, GCHQ,

MI5, and others as required. It is chaired by the Prime Minister and attended by the Deputy Prime Minister. I believe it clearly showed its value during the war in Libya when, for example, planning for the post-conflict period was considered from day one so that when fighting ceased the country could start getting back on its feet straight away.

The presence of the Development Secretary on the National Security Council underlines the truth that we in Britain derive our security not only from the bravery and brilliance of our Armed Forces, but also from the work we put into training the police in Afghanistan, helping to build governance structures in the Middle East, and ensuring girls go to school in the Horn of Africa. All three are funded through Britain's development budget.

> For development to work, combating conflict is central: ... and once conflict is over, reconciling communities which may have terrorised each other.

Kidist Mulugeta, a site surveyor at a cement factory in Ethiopia

0

www.li.com

CD

三田山 ト 金田

复到山

0

16





WEALTH CREATION AND TRADE: MAKING US ALL MORE PROSPEROUS

It is in our interest to be part of a world marked by prosperity, not poverty. Beyond question, the fastest way to alleviate poverty is to be economically active and to have a job. Much else matters besides but who can deny that wealth creation, economic growth, and enterprise allow the poorest to lift themselves out of poverty. For Conservatives, believing this is part of our DNA. Even Labour increasingly recognizes that the market and private enterprise are the engines—and not the enemy—of economic growth and development.

That is why one of the first actions the Coalition government took in 2010 was to set up a private sector department within DFID, led by a senior official with secondment from the private sector and a vigorous recruiting programme to address what was a deficiency in the DNA of British development civil servants. This new structure linked closely with what was an already well developed (and all-Party) approach to trade: strong support for the WTO at Doha (alas now effectively dead) and a cross-Party campaign "Trade Out of Poverty" led by Peter Lilley, Clare Short and Menzies Campbell, accompanied by a strong intellectual attack on protectionism.

One of the most important changes was the radical reform of CDC. CDC (formerly the Commonwealth Development Corporation) is the British Government's 100-percentowned Development Finance Institution (DFI). CDC had lost its way in recent years and became too much like a conventional private equity provider. But its raison d'etre had been to provide "pioneer capital"—going where the commercial sector was too nervous to tread—and "patient



...wealth creation, economic growth, and enterprise are the ways for the poorest to lift themselves out of poverty. capital" which did not require an immediate commercial return, whilst still returning a profit for its shareholder, the British taxpayer. Failure to enact the Coalition's reforms of CDC would have left the case for its privatization unanswerable. As it is, we sold off Actis in a potentially excellent deal for the taxpayer. Now, with new and additional leadership and a clear mandate from ministers, CDC is recruiting and re-skilling and has every chance of becoming the world's leading DFI in due time.

In my view it is not an unreasonable proposition to suggest that in 50 years time CDC will be seen as the principal British development structure, rather than DFID. Nothing would more eloquently demonstrate the success of development policy as countries graduate from aid with their own equity and debt markets funding their future development. If this is the macro approach, micro finance is the other end of the scale—although the international community should do far more to harness the colossal flows of remittances to a country's economic development. The marriage between microfinance and remittancing needs more active attention not least since remittance flows dwarf both aid levels and foreign direct investment. Harnessing remittances, which is in the interests of a country's economic development as well as individual security, is an area of inadequate progress. In Bangladesh the work of Muhammad Yunus and his Grameen Bank prove that being economically active enables even the poorest of the poor to lift themselves out of poverty. Bringing the benefits of enterprise to those living on the streets of Dhaka is among Professor Yunus's greatest achievements.

Britain has championed this approach to development with enthusiasm over recent years, and my successor as development secretary Justine Greening has rightly continued the priority of promoting economic growth and investment from the UK. Strong support for mobile phone technology not least through M'pesa in Kenya, which enables financial services to reach the poor—along with more macro support for economic development through Trade Mark East (and Southern) Africa is having a significant effect as Britain champions trade facilitation, enterprise, micro enterprise, and free trade, while a far stronger cross-Whitehall approach secures greater effectiveness for these policies.

Measles vaccination programme in Ethiopia ¢.

20



BRITISH LEADERSHIP

A new agenda for international development has emerged. The old certainties of the left—that development is about spending taxpayers' money—or of the right—that all funds end up in the Swiss Bank accounts of corrupt leaders—has made way for common ground which, to a greater or lesser extent, commands support among the many people who take an interest and who are not wholly ideologically opposed.

International attention is now turning to what comes after the Millennium Development Goals in 2015. These MDGs mainly dealt with health and education. While spectacular success has been achieved in some places, it is a sad fact that no country caught up in or just emerging from conflict has achieved any of the MDGs. There will be useful debate, but Britain's contribution, through David Cameron's co-chairmanship of the High Level Panel, draws the international communities' attention to the persuasive argument that promoting good governance and accountability while tackling corruption and supporting a rule of law deserves much greater attention. Promoting prosperity relies on attracting investors who themselves rely on a clear set of commercial laws and the payment of fair and accountable taxes. Tackling instability draws on policies that address corruption and promote accountability. Equally there are initiatives more narrow in nature which given strong support and a laser-like focus on delivery can be utterly transformational.

For example, in 2011 the British government decided to try to secure the maximum possible support for vaccinating

children against killer diseases in the poorest parts of the world. Working with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, we gathered more than 40 nations, international and private sector donors, to support a major boost to this initiative. The result should mean that Britain's contribution alone will ensure that a child is vaccinated every two seconds and that the life of a child is saved every two minutes (during the five years of this Parliament) from diseases which no longer kill children in Britain. Eighty-nine percent of people across Britain supported this initiative.

In 2012, a similar effort was directed towards achieving the same impact with family planning. This is an issue fraught with difficulty, and attempts to help have frequently been derailed either by concerns from the religious right about artificial birth control, or on the left with women's rights. But it really matters. I remember seeing a woman with five children appearing at a newly opened family planning clinic in Rwanda desperately worried that she was pregnant again. On being told that she was not, tears of joy streamed down her face as she danced and ululated with happiness and relief. This was the first time she was able to access family planning and she received contraceptive advice and support thereafter.

The effort targeting family planning led by Britain should mean that over the next eight years we reduce, by half, the number of poor women in the world today who want access to family planning but cannot get it. It is hard to think of a result that will have a greater effect on the position of women around the world. This year, 2013, in the margins of the G8 the prime minister and his development secretary seek to boost the work being done to tackle starvation and hunger, recognizing that a child's life chances can be destroyed if they are malnourished in the first thousand days following conception from poor brain development and stunting. And, at the G8 itself, William Hague's effort to place ending violence against girls and women more firmly on the international agenda deserves support and success.

Perhaps the most surprising breakthrough is the emerging agreement on tackling tax havens and the moral pressure on companies to pay tax where it is ethically due. It is an extraordinary irony that some of the poorest people on earth live on top of the most valuable real estate.

Mineral wealth in many countries has proved a curse for the poor. Openness and transparency in the future could make it a blessing. In the past mineral resource issues have often been about geography, whereas now they are much more about public policy. Tackling corruption, with its cancerous effect on development should be one of our highest priorities. It is often the case that government officials and politicians go straight not because they see the light but because they feel the heat. If Afghanistan was able to develop its mineral resources in a way that divided the profits fairly between its developers and the state which owns them, with tax receipts accounted for in an open and transparent way, and by spending the funds in the best interests of the Afghan people, then life for ordinary Afghans would be transformed. Developing an open, fair, and transparent approach to taxation and extractive industries is now much more than a distant dream.

Recent polling suggests that in Britain, support for international development is greater among women and much greater still amongst those under 35. The desire of young and old alike to play their part in tackling global poverty—not least through partnerships in health and education (something strongly supported through our new health partnership scheme developed and promoted by Stephen O'Brien in his time as international development minister) is rightly encouraged by the Coalition Government—whether through the new International Citizens Service (ICS) which has shown early signs of success or through the new Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) which seeks to multiply the extraordinary results being achieved by British NGOs and charities who are often working in dangerous and difficult parts of the developing world.

CONCLUSION

Those interested in international development frequently debate which single intervention is most effective in ensuring progress: educating girls, tackling conflict, building markets, promoting enterprise, stopping corruption, vaccinating children, extending family planning, building a rule of law, ending malnutrition, or helping countries to stand on their own two feet.

There are many more, and they are truly all interconnected. If we succeed, we can deliver a better life for millions of people, and a safer more prosperous world for Britain. Our generation, for the first time, has the power to transform our world.

Rt. Hon. Andrew Mitchell MP



RESPONSE BY PAUL COLLIER, OXFORD UNIVERSITY

An effective development programme need not pose tensions between compassion and self-interest. As Andrew Mitchell argues, Britain's finest traditions demand that we respond compassionately to the tragedy of persistent and acute poverty in the midst of global prosperity. Hard-heartedness is not in our nature. But precisely because of the importance and urgency of this challenge we should not be selfindulgent: our approach must be hard headed.

As described in this pamphlet, the focus of UK-development policy has shifted towards the private sector, most importantly revitalizing CDC with new leadership and new purpose. The poorest countries have an acute need for risk capital and effectively managed business organizations, and CDC could gradually become the main vehicle for Britain's assistance. There is huge global pool of finance, currently earning very low returns. Yet Africa, which has many opportunities for high-yielding infrastructure investments, is unable to tap into it. Public risk capital, exemplified by the new CDC, could be the bridge that links African needs to global finance. The potential for gearing from public capital to private makes CDC and its equivalents attractive successors to conventional aid programmes.

Development strategy is not just about money: governments can impact upon opportunities in the poorest countries through a variety of different policies, including security provision, taxation, and the rule of law.

Without security there can be no development, and many small, poor states are structurally insecure. We should not confine our approach to humanitarian responses to the consequences of insecurity, but do what we can to address its causes. On security, Britain has led the way in building a whole-of-government approach. As this pamphlet describes, the innovation of the National Security Council, on which the secretary of state for development sits, is precisely the type of policy coherence that is needed.

On taxation and the rule of law, the latest flowering of the new policy coherence is the British-hosted G8 at which tax and transparency are centre stage. With British leadership, the rich world is at last tackling

the scandals of corporate tax avoidance and money laundering, which, as Kofi Annan's Africa Progress Panel estimated, has been costing Africa more than double its aid receipts. Britain led Europe into making the reporting of payments by extractive companies mandatory, and has just signed up to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative. Britain has finally replaced the infuriating preaching of "do as we say", with the true leadership of "do as we do". Britain's G8 has got this tax and transparency agenda started, but it needs years of sustained effort. This should become our priority.

While secretary of state for development, Andrew Mitchell led the major strengthening of Britain's development programme. He refocused our assistance onto the poorest countries—the countries of the bottom billion—charting a path that the European Commission has now followed. It is right for Britain to concentrate our help on those countries that are still not able to provide credible hope to the mass of their citizens. The only viable aspiration for their young people should not be emigration.

Britain has also kept faith with the commitment to increase development financing. Done at a time of austerity, this has enormously strengthened our influence. Would a British prime minister otherwise have been chosen by the general secretary of the United Nations to co-chair the new report rethinking global-development priorities? Thanks in part to sustained British support, Africa is at last growing. China recognizes this opportunity and is all over the region. Britain's strategy of making Africa a priority for our development assistance will prove to be not only compassionate, but in our long-term interests as a trading nation.

Andrew was a fine secretary of state and I commend this statement of his ideas.

Paul Collier

Professor of Economics and Director of the Center for the Study of African Economies, Oxford University





RT. HON. ANDREW MITCHELL MP

Andrew Mitchell has been the Member of Parliament for Sutton Coldfield since 2001. He was previously the Member of Parliament for Gedling from 1987 to 1997 during which time he held office as a Government Whip and was Minister for Social Security. He served as a Vice Chairman of the Conservative Party from 1992-1993.

In November 2003 he became Shadow Minister for Economic Affairs and from September 2004 was the Shadow Minister for Police. Following the General Election in May 2005 he was appointed Shadow Secretary of State for International Development, setting up Project Umubano in Rwanda and Sierra Leone, the Conservative Party's respected Social Action Project. He then served as the Secretary of State for International Development from May 2010 to September 2012 and Government Chief Whip from September to October 2012.

Born in 1956, Andrew was educated at Rugby and studied History at Cambridge, where he was President of the Cambridge Union. He served in the Army (Royal Tank Regiment) and was a United Nations Peacekeeper in Cyprus before joining Lazard.

His business career has included time as a Senior Strategy Adviser to Boots, Accenture and Montrose. Directorships at The Miller Insurance Group, The Commer Group and Financial Dynamics as well as Lazard London, Asia, and India. He was and is a Member of the Advisory Board of The Foundation and is a Trustee of International Inspiration—the Olympic legacy charity.

He is married to Dr Sharon Bennett, a GP. They have two daughters.

www.2020conservatives.com

27



2020 CONSERVATIVES

The 2020 Conservative Group was founded in Autumn 2011. We are a group of Conservatives who believe in: a modern, fair and inclusive politics; an open, aspirational and liberal economics; and a strong, just and pluralist society.

The views in this pamphlet are the views of the author and may not reflect the views of the whole group. Members of the 2020 Conservative group are:

AFRIYIE, Adam **BALDWIN**, Harriett BARKER, Greg BARWELL, Gavin **BENYON**, Richard **BLACKWOOD**, Nicola BLUNT, Crispin BRAY, Angie **BRINE**, Steve BUCKLAND, Robert **BURNS**, Simon **BURROWES**, David COLLINS, Damian CROUCH, Tracey ELPHICKE, Charlie EUSTICE, George FREEMAN, George FULLER, Richard GARNIER, Mark GLEN, John GOLDSMITH, Zac GOVE, Michael GRANT, Helen GREEN, Damian **GREENING**, Justine

GUMMER, Ben **GRIFFITHS**, Andrew GYIMAH, Sam HALFON, Robert HAMMOND, Stephen HARRINGTON, Richard HURD, Nick HINDS, Damian HOLLINGBERY, George HOPKINS, Kris JAMES, Margot JAVID, Sajid JOHNSON, Jo LEADSOM, Andrea LEE, Phillip LESLIE, Charlotte LETWIN, Oliver LEWIS, Brandon LUFF, Peter MACLEOD, Mary MARLAND, Lord MILTON, Anne MITCHELL, Andrew MORDAUNT, Penny MORGAN, Nicky

MORRIS, James NEWMARK, Brooks NORMAN, Jesse **OPPERMAN**, Guy PENROSE, John PERRY, Claire ROBERTSON, Hugh RUDD, Amber SANDYS, Laura SIMMONDS, Mark SMITH, Julian SOUBRY, Anna STEWART, Rory STRIDE, Mel SWIRE, Hugo TIMPSON, Edward VILLIERS, Theresa WALKER, Robin WHITE, Chris WIGGIN, Bill WILLETTS, David ZAHAWI, Nadhim WEI, Lord (of Shoreditch)



www.li.com www.prosperity.com

LEGATUM INSTITUTE

11 Charles Street Mayfair London W1J 5DW United Kingdom t: +44 (0) 20 7148 5400

f: +44 (0) 20 7148 5401 http://twitter.com/LegatumInst



www.2020conservatives.com

2020 CONSERVATIVES e: info@2020Conservatives.com

JUNE 2013

"In this pamphlet Andrew Mitchell explains how British aid is saving millions of lives and building the foundation for a safer, wealthier and more sustainable world for all of us." KOFI ANNAN, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS 1997–2006

"This is a thoughtful and very important collection of policy ideas outlining Britain's contribution to international development. These ideas are based on real experience and, if followed, will make positive improvements to the lives of millions of the poorest people in the developing world."

BARONESS LYNDA CHALKER OF WALLASEY, MINISTER OF STATE FOR OVERSEAS DEVELOPMENT 1989–1997

"Andrew Mitchell is the architect of today's Conservative aid policy. This pamphlet lays out that policy, not only its humanity and generosity (despite austerity at home), but also its tough mindedness in guarding the British taxpayer's pound."

LORD MALLOCH-BROWN, DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME 1999–2005

"Long after many of this coalition government's policies are forgotten, its achievements in bringing food, health and security to the world's poorest will still be remembered. In this fascinating pamphlet Andrew Mitchell explains the intellectual thinking behind a policy that combines both compassion and enlightened self-interest." TIM MONTGOMERIE, COMMENT EDITOR, THE TIMES