

that corruption among the chiefs and headmen was just as much an administrative problem as the 'crimes' they were expected to punish. In 1932, McMahon recorded in the District Book that "half the trouble is that Native Courts are not functioning with justice, but once we abolish corruption I think the present troubles will automatically cease." In 1940, S.R. Tubbs, another colonial official, recorded that "the courts are not greatly respected and are not, in my opinion, worthy of much respect" (because they are corrupt). And finally, in 1944, J.C. Clarke wrote that "as Kuria natives are not above offering bags of money to their administrative officers, it must be assumed that the practice of bribery is so ingrained amongst them as to become a second nature". All above citations taken from N.M. Lugoe, "Customary Law in North Mara", (Report on Law Documentation Project), *Journal of the Denning Law Society*, Vol.1, nr.3, pp.47-60.

21. Cery, 1945, op.cit. See also Lugoe, op.cit. His research in the district also confirms that the rules were not observed by the majority of the Kuria people.
22. Chacha, op.cit., p.36 (transl. BAR).
23. Moore, op.cit., p.56.
24. Id., p.57.
25. A circumcision set consists of usually not less than 350 males drawn from neighbouring villages and who were circumcized as a group. In pre-colonial times, a young man qualified for circumcision at the age between 20 and 30 years and this event took place after every four years. The average age has now fallen to about 17 years and the interval between two circumcision sets has gone to two years. Each circumcision set has its own name and enjoys seniority status over all other sets coming after it. Members of a particular set are united by a bond analogous to a system of blood-brotherhood. As a semi-autonomous social field, the sets generate and enforce internal rules of good conduct and assist each of their members in times of economic need. For example, some mutual work teams are organized on the criterion of sets and they perform various economic activities as a group. There is a parallel organization for females, whose membership is usually terminated on the marriage of its various members. According to Kuria law, on marriage a wife changes her 'initiation set' to that of her husband with which she has to identify herself for the future. See B.A. Rwezaura, *Social and Legal Change in Kuria Family Relations*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Warwick School of Law, 1982, pp.16-19.
26. B.A. Rwezaura, *Traditional Family Law and Change in Tanzania*, Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, Band 17, Baden - Baden 1905 p. 11 ff.
27. Ruel, op.cit. p.58.
28. Moore, op.cit. p.74
29. Ruel, op.cit., p.53
30. Id., pp.141-2.
31. Id., p.117.
32. C. Murray, High Bridewealth, "Migrant Labour and the Position of Women in Lesotho", *Journal of African Law*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1977, p.80
33. Fitzpatrick, op.cit.

The Teaching and Research of Political Economy in Africa with Specific Reference to East Africa*

H. Campbell**

Introduction

Despite its relative poverty Tanzanian society for more than fifteen years was the central point of intense intellectual debate on the political economy of Africa. More progressive scholars have visited, studied and arisen in Tanzania then in most other African states. Judging from the published bibliographical works on political economy, the conditions within the society and at the University seem to have encouraged research on the polity, problems of transformation, class struggle and development policies. The Dar es Salaam School of history emerged as one variant of 'nationalist' ideas in the era of decolonization, but with the added impetus of a society which aspired towards a different path than the route aptly described by Kwame Nkrumah as *Neo-colonialism*. In this aspiration the Dar es Salaam school sought to contribute to the store of human knowledge.

The present debates and intellectual activities within the university and the wider society afford an opportunity to reflect on the teaching and learning processes with respect to the scientific method of political economy. These days, the material poverty of the society is increasingly reflected in the production of knowledge. Thus, the teaching and research of any subject has to be examined against the background of the economic depression of capitalism. Questions must arise on how the teaching of political economy can be grounded in the concrete analyses or concrete processes in African society. Classical political economy which arose in the rosy era of competitive capitalism was retailored in the ideas of 'modernisation' and 'progress', and these ideas have foundered on the rocks of hunger, famine, repression and militarism. In this situation teachers and researchers are either forced to fall back on idealism to seek the help of 'Allah' or 'Jesus', depending on religious inclination, or to sharpen the tools of research in the interest of those classes in Africa who are disregarded and exploited.

In a situation of tottering state institutions where knowledge and creative inquiry is increasingly viewed with suspicion, it would not be too hasty to say that the whole process of political retrogression has affected the production of knowledge. And yet it is in the depth of this crisis that a clear methodology must emerge of how to develop the tools necessary for the process of transformation out of underdevelopment.

This paper seeks to analyse the teaching and research of Political Economy in East Africa within the context of the present world capitalist crisis. It will not analyze

*Revised version of a paper presented at the OSSREA Workshop on the Discipline of Political Science and Public Administration 15th - 17th April, 1985, Nairobi.

**Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Dar es Salaam.

the development of independent research institutes such as the Council for the Development of Economic and Social Research in Africa CODESRIA based in Dakar. Although this institute operates as a Pan African and regional organization which collaborates with varying organizations to carry out research on the political economy of Africa, it is outside the scope of this paper to delve into their work. There is also not enough information in East Africa on the teaching and research of Marxist political economy in West Africa and North Africa. Recent bibliographical work on Nigeria suggests a healthy debate on the question of the *political economy of Africa* evidenced by Claude Ake's work on this question.

This paper raised questions on the methodological tools required to sharpen the teaching of Marxist political economy in Africa. What are the essential components of the political economy of Africa? Can political economy be taught as political science or economics or history? Can political economy as a science be enriched when the popular masses have not asserted themselves politically? How can political economy be developed when present-day University departments are geared towards high level manpower? Should the teaching of political economy be oriented to producing public administrators and district development officers?

It is the view of this paper that these questions are conjunctural and relate to the intellectual concerns of the period of decolonization and the recent reversals engendered by the economic crisis. The question of political economy requires that the concepts which Marx expressed in the *Preface to the Critique of Political Economy* be enriched by the production of knowledge in Africa. Concepts such as modes of production, history, the labour process, transformation and self emancipation remain at the core of the scientific method of political economy. However, these concepts remain problematic in so far as there are scholars who seek to find everywhere in Africa the same historical categories as those analyzed by Marx in Western Europe in the 19th century. Marxists in Africa such as A. T. Nzula, Franz Fanon, Amilcar Cabral and Walter Rodney (despite the differences in their work) have made important contributions to the study of political economy. Elsewhere, there are young scholars who, through slow and patient research, are seeking to develop the teaching and research of Marxist political economy in Africa.

These scholars have matured out of the debates relating to underdevelopment and dependence. However, in the midst of the second major capitalist crisis in this century there is a new thrust by teachers of neo-classical political economy. The new interest in the teaching of neo-classical doctrines is presented in one form as monetarism and package in another form as a purely counter-revolutionary ideology of the IMF stabilization programmes. Thus, the crisis generates a sharpening of ideological lines between those who seek to link themselves to the emancipation of the oppressed Africans and those who want to reconstitute and recompose capitalism over the backs of the African poor. University teaching and research, then, bears particular relevance in this ideological demarcation. In some societies, because the universities offer the only possibility for independent expression and analysis, there are frequent closures of universities and arrests of teachers and students. Force, coercion and the administration of the people increasingly oppresses those who want to carry out intellectual work which is not part of the reproduction of state ideology.

Political Economy in Africa

The teaching and research of political economy in Africa continues to be an area of keen interest, debate and development. A random survey of the listing of books in the social sciences will show the expansion of research and publications on the subject of political economy. But from the many books, articles and journals which carry the name of political economy wide differences of opinion can be found between the authors on the essence of political economy. In Africa, the teaching and studying of political economy must at present be examined within the context of teaching and research within institutions of higher learning. Within the principal East African universities there are departments of Political Science and of Economics where courses on political economy are offered. However, because the attempt to develop Marxist political economy transcends the traditional boundaries between interconnecting social processes, courses on political economy are being taught in the Faculty of Law, in the Department of History and within the Institute of Development Studies. In the main, the courses on political economy follow the lines of the classical and neo-classical political economy of Smith, Ricardo, Keynes, Galbraith and Milton Friedman,¹ though there is an increasing interest in the Marxist method and the application of this method to the specific conditions of African societies.

The starting point of a discussion of the teaching of political economy must be an awareness of the role of knowledge in the reproduction of society. The pre-capitalist societies of Africa had developed their own forms of the reproduction of social knowledge, but the most systematic expansion of the production of knowledge occurred in the period of the dawn of industrial capitalism in Europe. Political economy developed in England at the time of the industrial revolution when the ideas of rapid economic expansion and of classical free trade generated its own ideological vision of society. Adam Smith and David Ricardo were two of the principal theoreticians of English political economy and Smith's labour theory of value along with Ricardo's conception of comparative advantage are still being taught in the Economics departments of the universities of Africa.

Adam Smith presented his contribution to the study of labour and the amount of labour embodied in a product in his study *the Wealth of Nations*. Numerous critical accounts of Smith's work by both Marxists and non-Marxists exist and there are many areas of acute controversy with respect to his work. For African teachers and students two of the crucial themes which recur in his labour theory of value and which are still being taught in Africa are:

- (a) the role of productive and unproductive labour and
- (b) the supposed backwardness and savagery of Africans. Smith as a chronicler of the rising bourgeoisie in England was concerned with the productivity of skilled labour in industry. He made a distinction between skilled (productive) labour in industry and what he termed unproductive labour in society: the work of soldiers, priests, lawyers etc. Smith also distinguished between what he called material and non-material activities, that is: profit making and non-profit making activities.

Critical studies of this body of knowledge have shown that in dividing the sum total of communities, the total annual social product, into revenue and wages Smith missed the interconnections between labour, capital, technology, coercion, the state

and the totality of the labour process in the overall process of capital accumulation. Simultaneously, by labeling priests and soldiers as unproductive labourers he missed the fundamental rule of ideology, politics and force in the sustenance of the social system. Smith in his assumption that the value of labour of a commodity could be measured with the value of labour brought and commanded by it, could not grasp the transformation of labour into capital and the creation of surplus value; in effect: the whole process of realization.

Karl Marx recognized the importance of Smith to the study of political economy but Smith did not grasp the contradictions inherent in the exploitative relations of capitalist production. Marx used the dialectical method of German philosophy to underscore the contradictions between the social production and private appropriation under the capitalist mode of production. Drawing from the lessons of the French Revolution and critically analysing the writings of the Utopian socialist (especially Saint Simon and Fourier) Marx centralized the struggles of the rising proletariat in his study of capitalism.

Marx's contribution was to fuse the three principal intellectual currents of rising capitalism, English political economy, French socialism and German philosophy and to develop a *Critique of Political Economy*. Marxism or the scientific method of political economy differs from classical political economy in that it is a philosophy which seeks to understand the processes of production and reproduction not only in the sphere of the production of commodities (commodity fetishism) but in the totality of the labour process, the production of life, of consciousness, the ideas, the religion, politics, the state and the questions of law, morality, the family and the material conditions of society. Marx summarized his study of society of the following manner:

My investigation led to the result that legal relations as well as forms of state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so called development of the human mind, but rather have their roots in the material conditions of life, the sum total of which Hegel, following the example of the Englishmen of the eighteenth century, combines under the name of 'civil society', that, however, the anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy.

Marx further elaborated his conception of political economy as follows:

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations constitute the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness.²

This now famous and immensely rich formulation summarized the principal theoretical constructs which formed the basis of the scientific method of historical materialism, a scientific methodology that addresses itself to man's relationship in the process of production and considers production and the labour process not merely as the basis of man's existence, but as the basis for defining man as a special kind of being with a special kind of consciousness. Historical materialism and the methodology developed by Marx then became a science which is richer than politics

or economics, and the centrality of the labour process in the work of Marx was enriched by the deepened study of classes, modes of production and the superstructural forms of societies which develop at a particular moment of history. A second and fundamental point of the Marxist political economy was specifically, a class ideology. Marxist political economy could be distinguished from classical theorists in that while their ideas reflected the intellectual concerns of the rising industrial bourgeoisie of Western Europe, Marxism, or historical materialism, arose within capitalist society to speak in the interest of the producers in that society, to speak in the interest of those who were exploited and expropriated, in essence as an ideology speaking on behalf of the most oppressed section of society. It is in this sense that the two main conceptions of political economy are characterized as Bourgeois Political Economy and Marxist Political Economy.

Many students of political economy in Africa attempt to start from a prerogative position with respect to idealism and materialism without regard to the methodology and the class orientation of political economy. This they attempt to do without a clear understanding of either the foundations of bourgeois political economy or the class basis of Marxism. Walter Rodney, one of the recent students of Marxism, attempted to develop the science of historical materialism in order to be able to bring his knowledge to the advantage of the voiceless millions of Africa sufferers.³ Rodney argued quite clearly that the method of Marx was independent of time and place, and he pointed to the contributions of both Lenin and Cabral. He showed that the development of scientific socialist thought can be applied, and must be applied, to different times and to different places. As a student who survived the highest institution of bourgeois knowledge, Rodney was most sensitive to the need of the grounding of political economy in the specific conditions of the society in which one is studying or teaching. He taught in Africa at a time when the attempt to develop a critical application of the Marxist method had become urgent in view of the confusion wrought by the neo-classical theories of 'take off' and 'political stabilisation'. It is now useful to turn to the concrete experience of the teaching of political economy in East African, starting at Makerere.

The Teaching and Research of Political Economy at Makerere University, Kampala

As the ideological centre of the East African Community, for two decades, Makerere University taught courses on political science, economics and political behaviour and encouraged research on the various components of political economy. A bevy of researchers, financed by Western capitalist states, undertook research in Uganda and other parts of East Africa and produced enough books, monographs, doctorates and papers so that this abundance of knowledge could be of use both in the teaching of and understanding the social processes in society. And yet, at the core of all this knowledge was an inability to transcend the ideological parameters of colonial scholarship and to conclude that Africans needed to be modernized out of tribalism.

The teaching of political science in the University followed the approach of the division between administration, political theory (mainly Western political theory), international relations, comparative politics and the politics of industrial states. The

clear division between politics and the economics of prices, money, banking, labour and economic growth was also reflected in the research projects undertaken within the University. Research priorities were closely linked to the Makerere Institute of Social Research (MISR), previously called the East African Institute of Social Research (EAISR). In their 20th anniversary brochure, 1950–1970, the Institute explicitly outlined how the starting point of research was the anthropological study of tribes:

The work of the Institute began in 1948, when Dr. W.H. Stanner, the first director, made a survey of East African research priorities in the Social Sciences. The early fame of EAISR rested on the sponsorship of research projects primarily on Social Anthropology, under the direction of people like Fallers and Audrey Richards.⁴

The methodology which guided the research on anthropology was the Parsonian structural functional approach to society. Anthropology was, and still is, a racist colonial discipline which purported to be the study of man, but it was essentially the study of 'primitive man'. A major limitation of the anthropological studies on the Nuer or the Ankole was that it presented a picture of a static, unchanging and hence historical Africa.⁵ There was no sense for the way in which social divisions came into being, of how there was a transformation of the consciousness over time and the ideological foundations of the societies. It followed from the conceptualizations of the anthropologists that the primitive Africans needed to be modernized and brought into the world of the 20th century.

Modernization theory presented African societies as backward and the teaching of modern ideas was to help guide the society to break 'traditional' barriers to modern life. This framework of teaching was strengthened by the theories of Rostow on the *Stages of Economic Growth*. Rostow's theory began from the premise of the anthropologists that each particular economy reaches a particular point which he terms 'takeoff', after which the economy develops. Rostow's influential theory dominated the teaching of economics and development politics at Makerere, even though there was no concept of history, or African History, in his theory. There was, and still is, no concept of historical materialism in this body of knowledge because there has been no prior study of the history of the society, and the one-sided description of the historical development of Western Europe suggests that other parts of the world must follow the same stages of economic development as Western Europe and North America.

These ideas took root and were, in part, a restatement of the ideas of Adam Smith developed in Book III of his *Wealth of Nations*, namely that Africans were barbaric and uncivilized. Hence, guided by these classical concepts of political economy, the teaching and research of political economy in the Economics Department and the MISR was geared towards identifying the factors of production in African which needed to be modernized to prepare African societies for the 'takeoff point'. This static analysis tended to analyze isolated factors and economic indices, such as the productivity of labour, the expansion of agricultural credit, the number of tractors imported, the breakdown of traditional pastoralism and the number of African entrepreneurs. The whole project of teaching and research was flawed by the concrete conditions of the colonial labour process. The clearest manifestation of this was

to be found in the teaching of bourgeois political theory of the rights of man, and the principles of 'bourgeois democracy'. For in colonial and neo-colonial Uganda democratic forms were never part of the political process.

Classical political economy, particularly Smith, Ricardo, Mills, Keynes, List, etc., did begin their study with some consciousness of the basic factors of capitalist production. Hence Smith, as a historian, found it necessary to trace the development of capitalism in England in order to develop his labour theory of value. In this sense, Smith made an important contribution to the body of knowledge on English political Economy. So that even though Marx's critique differed significantly, Marx acknowledged the importance of the work of Smith and the Physiocrats. However, in Eastern Africa the methodological weaknesses of the Rostow theories made it impossible to understand the colonial economy and how force, coercion and commandism were central to the alienation of the labour power of the African poor.

The weaknesses in the methodology of political economy of the modernizers meant that million of dollars were spent on projects conceptualized to generate takeoff but which were grounded because of a clear lack of knowledge of the societies. The failures and recriminations should have given way to questions on the methodology of political economy. The outstanding example of the failure of this concept of takeoff was the abortive Groundnut Scheme.⁶ Other examples, such as the Ankole–Masaka Ranching project, the Masai Range Project and numerous Tractor Hire Services were projects which were supposed to break down traditional barriers to accumulation. The failures of these schemes reinforced the notions that Africans were backward and force would be used to propel them to modern life.

It is this fact which helps students and teachers to understand the role of force in politics. Among the voluminous studies on Uganda during this period, there were those of scholars who were not shackled by the anthropological notions of primitive Africans and were able, in spite of the cost-benefit studies, to grasp the conditions of labour. One such example was the doctoral thesis of D.J. Vail on the *Public Sector as a Stimuli of Innovation Adoption*. This thesis documented the fact that the peasant had to work 367 hours to reap one acre of early cotton.⁷

Despite its own methodology, this work was showing that technical conditions of cotton production were regressive in the world of polyester fabrics. Given that the peasants depended on the iron-age technology to produce for the capitalist market, conceptions of increased production and economic growth, which did not break the colonial forms of production, mean that force, or the threat of force, lay behind the calls to grow more crops. It was, and is, physically impossible for poor peasants to export more without increasing the amount of labour time expended in cash crop production.

The appalling conditions of the poor peasants and workers were not central questions of research and teaching for teachers and students of political economy. This fact is manifest in that, of all the intellectual production, there is only one doctoral thesis on the working class in Uganda and their struggles to break the penal sanctions of the colonial order. Gonzalves' study on the struggles of the workers⁸, even though it was conceived as a study of Industrial Relations, was a far advance on the preoccupation of the colonial state on a constant supply of the cheap and unorganized workers. Studies such as that of W. Elkan on *Migrants and Proletarians* did

not elaborate the social conditions of labour and treated African labourers as a factor of production and not as human beings with a cultural life, a family, and history and social needs. It is for these reasons that the modernizing theorists could not grasp how the colonial economy shaped regional differentiation and the consequent ideological images.

Regional Differentiation and Tribal Consciousness

Regional differentiation becomes a central category in the political economy of African societies if one is to understand forms of consciousness in Africa beyond the static assumptions of anthropology. Regional differentiation and class formation were interwoven in Uganda to the extent that the colonial infrastructure and colonial economic activities were more concentrated in the South. In the South were the major cash crops zones while the North was the recruiting ground for cheap labour, for soldiers and the rustication area for 'troublemakers'. Hence, the better-off southern zones were the areas in which some Africans were doing better than others in responding to the implantation of the colonial economy.

Buganda, in Uganda, was one such region where there was a minority of Africans who had developed the material means of setting themselves apart from the masses and they were fully conscious of their interests. Regional differentiation also meant that the hub of anti-colonial activities were located in Buganda, such as the 1945 and 1949 revolts. Inevitably, these anti-colonial struggles were interwoven with the politics of the ruling clique of Buganda. But the fact that the 1949 peasant struggles were anti-chief and anti-Indian reflected forms of the consciousness of the popular masses. Because there were no real links between the pastoralists of Ankole and the tea pickers in Toro there was no social force to link the problems of these people.

In this context one of the major negative consequences of the teaching and research of political economy of Makerere was the inordinate stress on the need to modernize 'tribal' structures. Eminent bourgeois scholars such as Pratt, Low, Twaddle, Fallers, Southall, Leys, Richards, Gertzel and Apter all produced books and papers on tribes and tribal structures.⁹ Apter's work in particular, on *The Political Kingdom in Uganda*, was influential in elaborating an intellectual framework on how to transform traditional structures through controlled participation into modern institutions. Apter's work on the political behaviour of the petty bourgeoisie in Buganda set the mechanical and systems analysis standards of a whole generation of scholars who descended on Africa from the American Political Science Association (APSA).¹⁰ These scholars from the APSA Committee on Comparative Politics had generated a huge output of studies on 'interest articulation', 'political structure', 'systems analysis' and 'patron-client relationships'. The systems theory of David Easton which was developed within the context of American politics, was implanted in Africa via the Development Approach to politics conceived of by G. Almond and G.B. Powell. One of the major priorities of this group of scholars was to try to predict and control political behaviour and political change in order to find an answer to the appeal of Marxism among nationalist leaders. There were of course disagreements between those behaviouralists who tried to apply the straightforward liberal assump-

tions of western democratic theory and those who were less concerned with democracy and more with stability and systems maintenance. It was not surprising to see that so many of the theorists of political science in the USA were willing to give intellectual justification to the US pacification programmes in Vietnam.¹¹

The ascendancy of American scholarship in the teaching and research of political economy in East Africa reflected the power of American transnationals in the post World War II period. The Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, both named after major exploiters of labour around the world, became the principal financial supporters of field research and staff development; and this strengthened the influence of the American Political Science Association. It was therefore not by chance that two of the foremost scholars from the schools of 'National Integration' and 'Nation Building',¹² Coleman and Rosberg, for a while headed the Departments of Political Science in both Makerere University and the University of Dar es Salaam. Coleman was simultaneously an academic and an administrator of the Rockefeller Foundation. From this position he wielded tremendous influence on the reproduction of teachers and students in East Africa.

One of the most extended and negative consequences of the influence of MISR and the philanthropic foundations was the inordinate intellectual energy expended on tribes. The foreign researchers usually employed African students who were encouraged to carry out research on their own tribal customs. This intellectual energy had a two-fold effect: on the one hand it introduced a stratum of Africans who imagined themselves to be the bearers of modernity to their fellow tribesmen and, thus, became reference point for their communities while, at the same time it marked the evolution of a class which had internalized the image of a classless Africa of tribes. Another major effect was the whole spirit of dependence which was bred through the paternalism of the agents of research institutes. The logical result was that the university was the principal field for the reproduction of the African petty bourgeoisie.¹³ It would be interesting to follow-up the places of the former students of Makerere in the present ruling class in East Africa.

The teaching and research of political economy at Makerere could not ignore the concrete reality, and the ideal conceptions of political order and pluralistic democracy came up against the fact that democratic traditions could not take root where force and extra-economic coercion remained the principal on modern political institutions, the reality of the regional differentiation, under-development, coupled with the politicization of region, ethnicity and religion caused sharp struggles around the state. More significantly, there were no attempt to integrate the popular masses through the franchise. The force of the state which was used to coerce workers and rob poor peasants in the cooperatives was ultimately used to settle political squabbles, and this resulted logically in the militarization of the state and society. Uganda, which had been a veritable laboratory of modernization, became the centre of wanton destruction, violence and oppression of the poor. The manifest contradictions of neo-classical political economy took its most caricatured form in the words of Amin, who said that he had wanted to create 'black millionaires' when he used force to expel the Asians in 1972. Ideas of the World Bank and the researchers on the need for modern entrepreneurs were exposed by the contradictions of militarism. Numerous scholars found that under military rule the teaching and research of political eco-

nomy could become a matter of life or death. Even in this period there were those who reproduced the ideas of the modernizers:

the armies created by the colonial administration and by newly emergent countries have been consistently among the most modernised institutions in their societies.¹⁴

The crisis of the Ugandan political economy sharpened the need for alternative understanding the problems of Uganda and Africa as a whole beyond the modernization approach.

The Dar es Salaam Alternative

The University of Dar es Salaam, when it was established, was conceptualized in the same manner as Makerere where the whole process of knowledge production was alien to the social processes in the society. In the staffing and teaching some of the modernizers from Makerere joined the University but because the society conceived of a different path of development, that of socialism, the University was the scene of sharp struggles between materialism and idealism.

Because of the move towards socialism, even at the level of rhetoric, since much of it wasn't put into practice, the move towards socialism itself had behind it the power of the producing masses in Tanzania,¹⁵ and this could not be kept out of the development of the University of Dar es Salaam.

The Dar es Salaam school of history evolved in the context of the declaration of Ujamaa and within this development, was a conscious effort to develop the methodology of scientific political economy. Cabral's formulation on history, class, and national liberation became an important reference point for those scholars at Dar es Salaam who wanted to understand political economy beyond the 'voting patterns' of 'one party elections' and the operations of 'development villages'. Cabral's contribution to the study of history in Africa was informed by his awareness of the need for a correct strategy to change the world. The starting point of Cabral's important essay, *The Weapon of Theory*, was not debates within academic institutions but how to grasp the concrete political economy of his society in the struggle for national liberation.

Inspired by the work of Cabral, by the experiment of Ujamaa, and by the fact that Dar es Salaam was the base for so many freedom fighters, there were many socialist scholars from across the world who were attracted to Dar es Salaam. These teachers and researchers of political economy started from the position of historical materialism to locate the place of Africa in the international division of labour. Questions relating to underdevelopment, blocked growth, dependence, historical arrest and political retrogression were mooted. It was significant that it was in this intellectual discussion that one of the most important books on Marxist political economy was written, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*.

Rodney had sought to use the science of historical materialism to penetrate the forms of human organization in Africa. Rodney's work sharpened the break with the priorities of the American Political Science Association to the point where in East African Social Science Conferences and the African Studies Association of the USA there were intense ideological battles. Rodney's conception of political economy

draw from the scholarship of Latin America, where the perception was that underdevelopment was a *historical* force and arose as a particular form of international capitalist production. This intellectual framework within Tanzania was reinforced by the work of scholars such as J. Rweyemamu, Clive Thomas, Issa Shivji, H. Mapolu, A. Mafeje, T. Szentes, John Saul, Lionel Cliffe and others who attempted to teach alternative conceptions to the modernizing themes. Whatever the weaknesses of these scholars, and there were many, they did establish a new conceptual framework for the teaching of political economy. It was clearly established that African political economy could not be discussed without an understanding of the technical conditions of the labour process within the international division of labour, or could one understand politics, economics or law without locating them within the trajectory of underdevelopment, dependence and class struggles. The theoretical framework was expressed in many books which went towards a very comprehensive body of knowledge and gave rise to one of the most respected journals on political economy, *The Review of African Political Economy*.

It must be stressed, however, that in historical terms this approach was in embryonic stage. The fact is that this scholarship could not develop fully as long as the workers and poor peasants had not fully asserted themselves as a political force in the society. Hence, the idealism within the society took many forms within the University. Not of the least importance here was the fact that the leader of the Tanzanian State had imprinted his own ideological stamp on social theory with his vision of socialism without class struggle.¹⁶ The idealism of the head of state provided a firm footing for the World Bank theoreticians and modernizers who were not willing to give up the ideological struggle. They deployed their considerable financial resources into staff development and research in order to counter the influence of Rodney, Thomas, Rweyemamu and others. The struggle was supported by the State in their quest to get intellectuals to do research on projects which gave intellectual cover for coercive acts such as the villagization exercise.¹⁷

Direct state intervention in the teaching of political economy took a concrete form in the efforts of the ruling party to develop a common course for all students at the University of Dar es Salaam. A programme of Development Studies which was compulsory for all first and second year students at the University was the end result. The curriculum, by and large, drew from the tracts of Progress Publishers. It is unclear whether this alternative to the theories of Almond and Powell was an advance, in so far as the books on political economy from Progress Publishers incorporated the intellectual limits of Soviet Marxism. The books on political economy and the 'non-capitalist path' could not deal with the concrete history and forms of class struggles which developed in Africa. This literature was also negative in the strident and partisan manner in which it dealt with the ideological differences between the Soviet Union and China.

Because of the difficulty in the development of the intellectual foundations of the political economy of socialism,¹⁸ the attempt by some scholars to identify the teaching of political economy with particular sections of the socialist camp marked the dawn of the new forms of idealism and alienation. Added to this alienation was the pressure by the State to use the common course as a platform for the ideology of

the party, CCM (Chama cha Mapinduzi). A former Director and Minister was clear on this when he declared:

My plea to you all is that as Tanzanians and members of CCM, you will help me to make sure that the University fulfils the responsibility assigned to it... that of producing cadres for implementing CCM policy. It is upon all of us to ensure that we do not harbour here stooges and slaves of foreign ideologies and opponents of our system.¹⁹

Foreign ideologies here meant the scientific principles of historical materialism. The neo-colonial state in Tanzania was expressing its hostility to science, for the idealism and metaphysics of structural functionalism and development aid were not foreign to the Tanzanian ruling class. At this time, American consultancy firms such as Arthur D. Little and McKinsey were wielding tremendous influence in the State and party.

Future research on the major research project at the University in the seventies, the *Decentralisation* project, might follow—up the interconnections between the McKinsey report and the decentralization of the administration: (i) the changes within the rural administration, (ii) the role of the RIDEPS (Regional Integrated Development Programmes), (iii) the changes in the course structure of the University to stress rural development and management, and (iv) the place of the graduates of the department of political science in this rural management structure.

Tanzanian idealism of peaceful transition to socialism incorporated a conception of social democracy even though the State did not have the material means to support its programmes of 'socialism and self-reliance'. Consequently, the anti-Marxist elements of western social democracy championed the cause of the Tanzanian ruling class and the research foundations of the Nordic states were in healthy competition with the Americans for the training of young teachers. The social democratic traditions of Sweden merged well with the patchwork programmes called 'redistribution with growth', 'basic needs' and 'access to services', and the research priorities generated by these programmes.

Marxist political economy, as it was taught and researched within the universities in East Africa, reflected an intellectual culture which did not arise out of the history of Africa. The culture which it reproduced through the structure of the educational institutions, and for other reasons such as class, language and intellectual context, marked a sharp division between 'theory' and 'practice' and between mental labour and manual labour. The radicalization of some of the teachers within the universities has been an enclosed and autonomous process with very little if any *direct* correlation with the broad struggles of the producing classes within the societies. There was not a generation of intellectuals whose research was linked to the priorities of the working poor and which drew inspiration from their practical struggles. Thus, the state from time to time used its power of employment to keep 'discipline' and ensure that the debates on the class question were not linked to the concrete problems of poverty and exploitation in society. The isolation of those scholars who sought to develop practical contacts with the struggles of the poor was reinforced by the lack of organization of the masses. Up to the present, in East Africa the working people do not have the social weight or the organizational strength to intervene decisively in the political process. A consequence of this isolation can be gleaned from

the theoretical formulations and the vitriolic style of the debates on *Class, State and Imperialism*. The political limitations of a section of these political economists were clearly manifest in the politics of Uganda in the short period of the Uganda National Liberation Front.²⁰

Questions relating to the political experience of teachers of political economy in the past ten years can now be discussed, given the fact that so many members of the intelligentsia have joined the ranks of government within the region and elsewhere. This short but important period has demonstrated the need for the development of a method of political economy and for genuine teachers and researchers who are interested in teaching and not in using the classroom as a stepping stone to politics. Those who aspire to develop the methodology of Marxism need to be aware that the development of a scientific method can not be based on borrowings from the history of other societies. All societies have traveled along differing historical paths and there is need to develop a correct reconstruction of the African past in order to be able to understand the present.

Cabral grasped the essence of this problem by showing that the classic statement which Marx and Engels made that "the history of all existing societies is the history of class struggles" would have to be made more precise and given a wider field of application when dealing with colonized peoples, or peoples dominated by imperialism. Cabral maintained:

This leads us to pose the following question: does history only begin with the development of 'class' and consequently class struggles? To reply in the affirmative would be to place outside human history the whole period of life of human groups from the discovery of hunting and later of nomadic and sedentary agriculture, to the organisation of herds and the private appropriation of land. It would also be to consider — and this we refuse to accept — that various human groups in Africa, Asia and Latin America were living without history, or outside of history at the time when they were subjected to the yoke of imperialism.²¹

Cabral's contribution to the study of historical materialism in Africa is important, given the present tendencies in European Marxism to seek everywhere the same modes of production that Marx formulated in the *Preface to a Critique of Political Economy*. It was very clear that Marx' formulations were based on his investigations and at that time his investigations were limited to the history of Western Europe. The body of knowledge available to Marx at that time did not allow him to study the history of African societies. Hence, students of political economy would be making an important contribution to the body of knowledge of humanity by concretely studying and recording the history of Africa. Nationalist history, which struggled against the Eurocentric concept that there was no history in Africa before the white man has not been able to transcend the nationalist project to root the questions of the popular masses at the centre of the development of historical knowledge.

It is not insignificant that it is exactly in the Department of History of the University of Dar es Salaam that the foundations of the scientific method of political economy survive. At present, there are more courses in political economy offered in this History Department than in any other department in the University of Dar es Salaam. This teaching also generates research projects by students and, oftentimes,

the quality of the students' research of the political economy of Tanzania is higher than that of the aided projects of the research institutes of the University. Currently, a vigorous debate is being waged on the issues of philosophy and methodology of history in Africa. Students and teachers of the Department continue to raise pertinent questions on the social processes and transformations which have occurred in Africa.²² Conversely, the Department of Political Science has only one course where Marxist political economy is taught.

Such a discussion on methodology and history becomes pertinent with the recent debates on 'modes of production', 'capitalism development' and the state. In the absence of the body of knowledge which can shed further light on the historical process in Africa there has been an effort to see 'capitalist development' as a necessary aspect of 'progress' and as a 'historical necessity'. This debate, caught in the language and ideological mould of structuralism, reduces real human beings to structured relations of production and explicitly retreats from the class basis of Marxist political economy.

This development found expression in the essay of Bill Warren on "Imperialism and capitalist Industrialisation" and his subsequent book, *Imperialism, Pioneer of Capitalism*. In these works Warren restores the Rostow stages of growth theory in the language of Marxism in asserting that:

(1) capitalism, when it has been effectively introduced from the exterior by colonialism, must destroy all the archaic pre-capitalist forms and substitute in their place capital-labour relations, and that

(2) the accumulation of capital is synonymous with progress, and the constant improvement in the living conditions of the greatest number.

Many critics have exposed the myths of the Warren thesis by concretely demonstrating the growing inequality in the world and the polarization of wealth between the advanced capitalist countries and the poor underdeveloped nations. More significantly, studies on the labour process in South Africa show how capitalism has an interest in maintaining pre-capitalist forms or even in creating them as in the case of the Bantustans of South Africa.²³

In East Africa, this discussion took root in the teaching and research of political economy at the University of Nairobi where the expansion of transnational capital gave the semblance of 'development'. This 'boom' at the expense of poor and unorganized workers gave rise to studies on the 'peasantry' in Kenya and the rise of corporate capitalism in Kenya. Other scholars who were schooled in the modernization theories but who try to keep abreast of the spread of Marxist categories prefer the use of force to destroy the uncaptured peasant.²⁴

This body of knowledge suggests a significant retreat from the period of the sixties when there was an explicit concern to develop the teaching and research of political economy from a pro - people position. This present retreat corresponds to the ideological onslaught of capitalism in the era of crisis. This economic crisis spreads drought, famine, death, hunger and misery across the continent. In the midst of this crisis the neo-classical political economists seek to reassert some claim to the future of Africa through the IMF stabilization programmes. The stridency of the assertions of the monetarists reflects the intellectual crisis of bourgeois ideology, for the ideas of free market economic bear very little relevance to the present day realities of protectionism, trade barriers, debt crisis and state intervention.

The ideas of monetarism also correspond to a counter-revolutionary period in the world. For the retreat of the monetarist from even the social democratic premises of Keynes shows a reversal of the consensus politics of the last forty years. Reaganomics as one component of this neo-classical 'rebirth' hopes to reinforce the power of American capitalist in a period of intense capitalist crisis. The continent of Africa remains one area of the world where, though the objective conditions of exploitation are most extreme, the subjective conditions in the organization of the producing classes are as yet underdeveloped. And it is in Africa that the fierce competition between Europe, the USA and Japan to reconstitute capitalism is taking place, over the backs or the bodies of the African peasants.

The teaching and research of political economy is caught in the midst of this problem. African states and the ruling classes have decided that the universities should pursue a course to further integrate African labour and resources with the West. This finds expression in the programme of 'links' between departments in East Africa and the capitalist world. The rationale for these 'links' is that this guarantees the flow of research funds. In this intellectual climate there is an effort to marginalize those teachers who do not join the queue for research trips and handouts. This situation leads to a qualitative degeneration in the production of knowledge and this degeneration affects the teaching and research in the societies. To compound this deterioration there are conscious attempts to reorganize the course structures so that the content of political economy becomes peripheral as the principal task of teaching becomes the training of administrators and development managers to coerce the masses. Inside Tanzania, the removal of the major M.A. course of Political Economy coincided with the Nguvu kazi (Forced Labour) exercise by the state. At the same time, the degeneration means that young students are cut off from new ideas on political economy such as the links between linguistics and politics,²⁵ politics and automation, and the debates on the political economy of socialism.

Conclusion

The present experience of depression, poverty, hunger, food shortages and political authoritarianism provide a sobering background for re-examination of the research and teaching of political economy in Africa. During the euphoria of decolonization and the rise of national liberation of influence of teachers such as Rweyemamu, Thomas, Rodney and Szentes brought questions of underdevelopment to the fore and raised the problems of the long term consequences of dependence and aid. Their contributions were attempts to creatively enrich the concepts of Marx and to concretely analyze these concepts within the context of the specific form of the labour process in Africa.

This quest was not easy as was manifest from the intense ideological debates which took place at the University of Dar es Salaam. A tradition of open discussion on the teaching and research of political economy still exists in Dar es Salaam and this is significant in a continent where, more and more, thinking and independent analysis can be construed as subversive activities. The debates which continue at Dar es Salaam are now informed by the old concepts of political economy which are hidden in the stabilization programmes based on export led growth. These notions are

most advanced in Kenya where the physical expansion of capitalist enterprises gave rise to the view that there was still room in human history for capitalist development in the era of the transition to socialism. But the Kenya discussion could not develop, for the University of Nairobi became the principal field of mass resistance to imperialism and foreign military bases. Thus, in the past five years, the University of Nairobi has been closed more than it has been open.²⁶

The polarization in the debate on the teaching of political economy is based on the differing conceptions of the future of Africa. This polarization is between those who want to speed up the extraction of surplus from Africa and those who seek to regain the dignity of labour and humanity in Africa. Such a contest is sharpest in the Republic of South Africa where the ideology of apartheid invokes pseudo science to justify the super exploitation of black labour. It is in this society where the insurrectionary violence and spontaneous struggles of the working poor place a clear choice for teachers and students of political economy.

In East Africa, because the bulk of research is still being financed from outside, the direction of research and training has been towards fulfilling the requirements of developing high level manpower. This conception of teaching increasingly removes critical and analytical work from the classroom. The logical consequence of this can be seen in the Political Science Department of the University of Dar es Salaam where the name of the department was changed to Department of Political Science and Public Administration without a democratic discussion on the subject by members of that department.²⁷

Force, coercion and the administration of people increasingly become the concern of states in crisis. Researchers and students of political economy are faced with the concrete reality of universities without books, papers and the minimum requirements for decent intellectual work. This reality poses a clear choice between those who seek to command and administer the people and those who search for new avenues of academic freedom as part of the wider struggle for democracy.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a summary of the main ideas of neo-classical political economy, See *Present Day Non-Marxist Political Economy*. A critical analysis, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975.
2. Karl Marx, *Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.
3. Walter Rodney, *Marx in the Liberation of Africa* W.P.A. pamphlet 1981. See also H. Campbell, "Walter Rodney and the Marxist Method in African History", History teachers Seminar 1983. University of Dar es Salaam.
4. *Makerere Institute of Social Research*, Institute Publications, 1950-1970.
5. In the past decade there has been a new thrust in the study of anthropology by those scholars who recognized that anthropology was the handmaiden of colonial rule. This is manifest in the rise of a journal titled *Critique of Anthropology*.
6. Alan Wood, *The Groundnut Affair*, London, 1950.
7. D.J. Vail, *The Public Sector as a Stimuli of Innovation Adoption: A Case Study of Teso District*, Ph.D. Thesis, Yale, 1971.
8. Ralph Gonzalves, *The Politics of Trade Unions and Industrial Relations in Uganda, 1950-1971*, University of Manchester Ph.D. 1974.

9. The list of books on tribes in Uganda is quite comprehensive. See Robert Collison, *Uganda*, World Bibliographical Services Vol. II. For a critical analysis of this notion of tribes: See Archie Mafeje, "The Ideology of Tribalism", *Journal of Modern African Studies* Vol. 9 No. 2, 1971.
10. See E.A. Brett, "Towards a political theory of the periphery". Mimeo, Sussex 1978.
11. Scholars such as S.P. Huntington is still widely used in Africa. For a critique of the political scientists who served the US administration in Vietnam see, N. Chomsky. *American Power and the New Mandarins*, Penguin, 1969.
12. J.S. Coleman and C.G. Rosberg, *Political Parties and National Integration in tropical Africa*, Berkeley, Californial, 1966. For a critical analysis of this body of knowledge see J.R. Barongo, "Understanding African politics: The Political Economy Approach", *African Review* Vol. 8 No. 3 and 4, 1978.
13. The aid donors were quite conscious of this fact for from time to time there were efforts to trace the mobility of ex-students from Makerere. See J.E. Goldthrope, *An African Elite*, OUP, Nairobi 1965.
14. L. Pye, "Armies in the process of process modernisation", in Fintle and Gamble, *Political Development and Social Change*, Ali Mazrui initially hailed the military intervention as that of the true 'common man', but when the destruction became apparent this was reformulated in the language of tribalism, *Soldiers and Kinsman in Uganda*. For the political economy approach to the question of militaries in Uganda see Campbell, *The Communist State in Uganda* Ph.D. Sussex 1979.
15. W. Rodney, "Class Contradictions in Tanzania", in H. Othman: *The State in Tanzania*, O.U.P., 1984.
16. J. Nyerere, *Ujamaa - Essays on Socialism*. For a full list of articles on Ujamaa Villages see Dean E. McHenry Jr., *Ujamaa villages in Tanzania: A bibliography*, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppaala, Sweden 1981.
17. For an account of this exercise and the consequence on the peasantry see Henry Mapolu, "The State and the Peasantry in Tanzania", *Mawazo*, Vol. 5, No. 3, June 1984.
18. The problems of Transition are discussed by Walter Rodney in *Transition*, Special issue, Maji Maji, September 1980. Since 1954 there has been a quite lively debate in the *Current Soviet Digest* on the *Political economy of socialism*. *Progress Publishers has since come out with books by this title. However, there is no agreement among socialist states on the real content of the political economy of socialism.*
19. Quoted in M. Kagero, "University Radicalism", paper presented for the 20th anniversary of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, 23 October 1984. For another view of the common course see I. Kimambo and A.G. Ishumi, 'Twenty years of the Faculty of Arts and Social Science', mimeo, October 1984.
20. Yash Tandon, the editor of the collected papers on *Class, State and Imperialism* was one of the principal leaders of the UNLF along with Dan Nabudere, One of the principal participants in the debate.
21. A. Cabral, *Revolution in Guinea*, Monthly Review press, 1969, pp. 95.
22. The book by A.J. Temu and B. Swai, *Historians and Africanist History* came out of this department. For a more recent discussion on the question of the 'Scientificity of historical materialism see, E. Wamba-dia-Wamba, *History of Neo-colonialism or Neo-colonialist History: Self Determination and History in Africa*", Working Papers No. 5, *African Research and Publications Project* 1984. Trenton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
23. Samir Amin, "Expansion for Crisis of Capitalism"? *Third World Quarterly*, April 1983. For a critical analysis of this theory in the context at the Kenya debate see Horace Campbell". The so-called National Bourgeoisie in Kenya, *Ufahamu*, Winter 1979.

24. Goran Hyden, *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania: Underdevelopment and the uncaptured peasant, and No Shortcuts to Progress: African Development Management in Perspective*, Heineman 1980 and 1983. For a critique see Nelson Kasfir, "The notion of an autonomous African peasantry", *Mawazo*, Vol. 5, No. 3, June 1984.
25. See Noam Chomsky, *Language and responsibility*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1977. There is a very important chapter in this book on the relationship between language and politics.
26. In the period 1977–1982 there were lively debates within the University of differing aspects of political economy and courses were being taught in the Department of Government and the Nairobi Institute of Development Studies. However, since 1980 the University has been one of the principal areas of opposition to the imperialist domination leading to constant confrontations with the police and University staff and students. For a chronology of the clashes, see *Weekly Review*, Feb. 15th, 1985, pp. 12–13.
27. For the past three years the course structure and content of the Department of Political Science and Public Administration in Dar es Salaam has been under review. The new emphasis has been on the areas of Public Administration and International Relations. Courses on Political Economy are so unimportant that of the more than 10 members of staff presently on staff development programmes overseas there is not one candidate specializing in Political Economy. A brief history of the priorities of the department up to 1980 is given in "A note on the development of the Political Science Department 1964–1980", *TAAMULI*, Vol. 10, No. 1, August 1980.

W. Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, London, Bogle Onverture, 1972.

Book Reviews

Communist Working Group: *Unequal Exchange and the Prospects of Socialism*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Manifest Press, 1986. 225 pp., notes, bibliography.

This is a timely book in many ways. For over a decade now, imperialism has dealt fatal blows to some of the promising struggles for socialism in oppressed nations. Chile comes to mind; so do Grenada and, to some extent, Mozambique. In the imperialist countries themselves, the elections and re-elections of ultra-conservatives like Thatcher, Reagan, Nakasone, Kohl, Mulroney and Chirac indicate that the prospects for socialism, for now, are not too bright. To be sure, the post-Vietnam period has seen impressive national liberation struggles and social revolutions (Angola, Ethiopia and Nicaragua being among the most prominent), but this has also been a period of profound difficulties for socialism globally, as imperialism has re-doubled its efforts to recover lost ground.

This situation raises several important questions: Why has the revolution not occurred in the imperialist countries? What are the chances of it occurring? What are the prospects for socialism in the oppressed countries in the face of mounting imperialist aggression and counter-revolution? What social forces remain revolutionary and can be expected to struggle for socialism? These questions require serious attention, if only for revolutionaries to learn the proper lessons from past experiences and prepare for the continuing gathering waves of social emancipation globally.

This book is devoted to these issues. It is made up of six chapters prefaced by Arghiri Emmanuel, whose controversial theory of unequal exchange (first propounded in the 1970s) is used as the theoretical starting-point. The first chapter explains a number of basic Marxist concepts and categories: the dialectics of theory and practice, dialectical materialism, base and superstructure, etc. It also provides statistics (not new) to show what we already know: that the "population of the world is divided into rich and poor". The second chapter describes the historical background of unequal exchange, and the third chapter explains the essential aspects of the theory of unequal exchange by its reference to wage differentials between "rich and poor countries". The final chapters, the most original parts of the book, consider the prospects for socialism in both imperialist and oppressed countries, and what actions must be put on the political agenda of communists in imperialist countries.

The entire book is based on the argument that the imperialist countries exploit third world countries through unequal exchange, as illustrated in wage variation, consumption differentials and trade imbalances in the world market. On the basis of this premise, the authors argue the thesis that the proletariat in the imperialist countries is better off materially than the people of the poor nations. Not only that: this proletariat constitutes a labour aristocracy that actually shares in imperialist exploitation. It cannot, therefore, be revolutionary. Indeed, it has time and again betrayed the people of the poor nations in their anti-imperialist struggle. We are told that, in the imperialist countries,