FOOTNOTES

1. Bhagavan, M.R. 1984 "The Woodfuel Crisis in the SADCC Countries" *Ambio* 13(1) pp 25—27.
2. International Labour Organisation 1982 *Basic Needs in Danger* JASPA: Addis Ababa.
3. Bhagavan 1984 *op cit*
4. See Nkonoki p 25 and compare with the *Holy Bible* Joshua 9:22 "Now therefore you are cursed and some of you shall always be slaves, hewers of wood and drawers of water".
5. Mascarenhas, O. and M. Mbilinyi 1983 *Women in Tanzania: An Analytical Bibliography* SIAS: Uppsala.
6. Fergus, M. 19 'Firewood or Hydro-power: A Case Study of Rural Energy
7. *Ibid*
8. Due, J. and Anandayasekeram P. 1982 "*Women and Productivity in Two Contrasting Farming Areas of Tanzania*" Illinois Agricultural Economics Paper
9. Mascarenhas O 1984 quoted i *Afrique Asia* April
10. Mutemba



# BOOK REVIEW

# BEYOND UJAMAA IN TANZANIA: UNDERDEVELOPMENT AND UNCAPTURED PEASANTRY*

*Kathleen Staudt***

Does it make any difference how one conceives the economic and political participation of peasants in their countries' development processes? This is generally described, abstractly, in terms of their 'integration' into economic markets and into the political system. Goran Hyden argues, provocatively, that it is better understood in terms of 'capture'. He suggests that other social classes have not yet captured African peasants, and in particular Tanzanian peasants, who are the focus of his book.

Peasants are producers who experience labour rather than land scarcity and remain independent due to reliance on subsistence production, having a limited integration into the cash crop economy. Most important, they exist in a pre-capitalist mode in what Hyden calls an 'economy of affection', where familial and communal ties affect their behaviour more than considerations of economic rationality.

Peasants resist incorporation into the state and into capitalist economies, valuing their independence and fearing the changes and subordination which 'capture' brings. Neither the state nor capitalist structures are good at penetrating the peasant sector, having very different conceptions of the reality which peasants live within. Yet they must bring peasants into new political and economic exchange relations, according to Hyden, if development is to proceed.

Motivational and administrative techniques common to capitalistic societies, such as price incentives, administrative reform and political education, are not powerful enough to influence the peasantry very much from outside. Hyden is vague as to whether the state should acquire sufficient power to influence the peasantry through the use of force and control over land, if this is the only way to spur peasants' incorporation.

This is an unpleasant subject for all but the most committed 'modernisers'. Should peasants' independent subsistence production be rendered obsolete, or should peasants be left to decide eventually to transform themselves in response to their new opportunities and their motivating social and economic desires? These are 'macro-participation' questions, transcending any particular project or programme. By posing them, even if not answering them to everyone's satisfaction, Hyden adds a valuable, and value-laden, angle to the participation debate.

Oe major limitation of Hyden's discussion is that, although claiming to

---

Hyden, G. 1980 *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania: Underdevelopment and an Uncaptured Peasantry* Heinemann: Nairobi,

Department of Political Science, University of Texas.

look at Africa an 'its own terms', using a phenomenological approach rather than Western or Marxist perspectives, he is viewing it through the familiar male lens, though which most Western and Marxist observers describe and understand African reality. If Hyden has submerged himself in the African peasant reality, how can he fail to notice the special and difficult situation of peasant women? Even a 'rural development tourist', to use Robert Chambers' phrase to describe one who only visits rural areas and then travels only on tarmac roads, can see that women's agricultural labour roles set them apart from men.

The Hyden lens sees an undifferentiated peasant reality, which is limited to the male reality. The continous reference to the peasant as 'he' obscures the fact that women are part of the peasantry and their reality differs from men's. The work women do, their rewards for that labour, the crops they specialise in, and the time they devote to work and leisure are all markedly different.

That women in Africa predominate in subsistence food production, spend more time in agricultural labour than men, and head households in areas of heavy male out-migration are all well documented findings, which do not show up in Hyden's account. His several vague references to 'family labour or to the 'household' cannot begin to reveal the complexity of peasant reality shaped by sexual division of labour. Hyden's failure to incorporate knowledge about women in the context of peasant reality raises several questionsm the answers to which can elaborate, undermine or fundamentally alter his argument.

To what extent does men's appropriation of the social and material fruits of female labour explain the resistance to agricultural change about which Hyden writes? He argues that peasants are not responsive to price incentives. Is this another version of the pre-1960s development argument that 'the farmer is irrational'? Or does this reflect the alienation of agricultural producers (women) from the rewards of labour (appropriated by men through exclusively male participation in co-operatives, or through household authority relations)?

As an old Zambian women farmer said to the historian Maud Shimwaayi Muntemba, "Now a woman is like a slave. She works hard... At the end of the year, the family sells one hundred bags of maize. The man gives here K20 (abour $25). Following year, the family sells three hundred bags. He still gives her K20. What is that but slavery?" Assumptions about resource sharing between husbands and wives are not always borne out in reality. In such situations, the term 'economy of affection' has a hollow ring.

The production and extraction of a surplus are limited in the world of 'he-peasants' Hyden describes, at least in part because the terms of trade with the peasantry are unfavorable for them. Would not such inequality in the terms of trade between sexes explain the limited production and extraction in a peasant economy at least as well as Hyden's sex-neutral explanation? Under prevailing conditions of inequality, some women may simply refuse to work harder and longer hours. There is no 'price incentive' for them.

Hyden writes very instructively about the autonomy of peasants vis-a-vis the state, using the argument that 'small is powerful". His argument can be taken further if one makes some simple sex differentiations, since women have even



greater autonomy than men. The expansion of wage employment and of conventional political participation in the modern state should mean, to use Hyden's term, that male peasants are 'captured' well before female peasants.

While one might say that women in turn are 'captured' by men who control the land and thus the means of subsistence, women are the quintessential peasants about whom Hyden is concerned. After all, who does the subsistence food production, and who does the cash crops? One cannot begin to discuss adoption or non-adoption of agricultural practices in Africa without first understanding the sex division of labour as well as the labour abundance or scarcity implied within that division.

Dependency theorists concerned about the effects of international and national capitalist penetration into African rural areas will be surprised at Hyden's generalisation that Tanzania's pre-capitalist peasantry has been able to block "efforts to cheapen production of the means of subsistence". Let us suppose for a moment that men played the predominant role in subsistence that Hyden conjures up. If men are increasingly integrated into the wage economy or migrate elsewhere for wage employment (thereby enlarging women's agricultural work and management) and are paid an individual wage (or do not share their incomes with wives), are the means of subsistence not cheapened? Outside a wage economy where work has a monetary value, women produce food for themselves and their children at no cost to capital or to men. As long as Hyden fails to differentiate the sex division of labour and of returns to labour as it changes overtime, he will be unable to support his generalisation. Only when women are also incorporated into the State and Capitalist structures will the kind of changer Synonymous with exploitation and manipulation that Hyden advocates take place. But this begs the question whether this is something to be desired or in what ways. Who defines the terms on which integration takes place? Will it be the holders of state authority and the owners of capital almost all male anyway? Will women be able to affect these terms? Inescapably, this brings us to profound questions concerning 'participation'.

If women become more engaged in cash crop production and thus 'participate' in the market economy, and if they become more regular voters in national elections, will this constitute 'participation' in any meaningful sense? When the question is asked, of course, we see that this is as important for he peasants as for she-peasants. The definition of 'participation' presumably should consider whether the terms on which market production and exchange occurs are equitable, and whether rural people can affect the choices open to them through the political system, rather than just vote year or nay. Otherwise 'participation' becomes synonymous with exploitation and manipulation.

That these kinds of questions should arise out of an analysis of the Tanzanian experience, which has sought explicitly and laudably at the normative level to avoid exploitation and manipulation, is sobering. This is not the only recent consideration of 'ujamaa' which addresses the reality of 'participation' in Tanzania. The difficulties of achieving greater authentic participation in a peasant society even where the normative environment is favorable are real. The questions of whether 'small is powerful', and if so, how and why, are very important to ponder, even or also interms of he-peasants.