and solid book takes the first tentative steps towards what should have been done long ago by everyone concerned; go listen to the people and hope to learn. There is no paucity of followers of this slogan nowadays but the doers are precious few.

One does not have to go completely outside the currently dominant logical dogma to arrive at the necessity of conserving many societal institutions that would appear to stand in the way of "development". One does not even have to go outside classical economic doctrines. Adam Smith clearly thought of a nation's progress in terms of increase in terms of its well being. He even attempted to measure that by the ability to do things less painfully. And who can measure pain better, the experts or those who experience it?

Indeed Professor Hyden tries valiantly to escape the gravitational pull of the economic development lore. He tries but can't. Not quite at any rate.

He places the mean spirited, or incredibly naive, dogma of the Chicago brand of economics in its rightful place. Certainly at its extremely rightful place; outside serious discussions. Interdependence is not just a slight case of externalities that may be safely assumed away. Self interest is obscene if you think only as part of the group. The book brings out the fact that such dogmas are not mere points made or lost in a debate tournament. Policy recommendations are the outcome and actual blood is spilt. Worse yet, social fabric is tampered with and is irrevocably rent.

Also cast aside are the know-it-all pretentions of the Marxist dogma whose nonsensical substitution of words for ideas appear to be the currency of discourse in many a third world gathering. My friend Misbah Oreibi, formerly of Libyan University presently God knows where, used to say that the Marxist age will be known as the word age as in stone age. To be nursed by a goose.

But not quite. For instance, Professor Hyden believes that he can attribute a certain part of output to certain factors of production. He even cites the statistics to show it. How? At issue here is not only the distributional justice but also the choice of technique. What is capital saving if we don't know what is the output of capital?

The book takes the form of a hunting epic with small as the intended and modern big as the ardent suiter. Marx and the nice people of the World Bank are implicated weapons. The band includes a sundry of worthies: native and imported peddlers of irrelevant solutions to imagined problems. An experience. Does small escape? Can small escape? If small escapes, does small win? I won't tell.

I believe that Professor Hyden did listen to the people in Tanzania with a keen open mind and a sympathetic ear. But did they tell him? Is any of us worthy of being told? Why is it that this chapati tastes as if it is wrapped in leftse.

MOHAMED EL HODIRI

University of Kansas
Lawrence, U.S.A.


These two books, by virtue of their topics, might have told us something of the potentially revolutionary pressures building up in Africa since the days of formal em-
pire when the exploitation of African labour finally achieved a solid footing, and which was consolidated further since Independence. While Wogu Ananaba has some comments on what he calls "Promise and Performance" of the African trade union movements, the contributors to *Industrial Relations in Africa* (IRA) seem to go out of their way to avoid all the critical issues; at least Ananaba does speak from direct trade union experience, while the contributions to IRA are all politically aseptic and seem to suffer from various degrees of historical amnesia. Generally, they cast African workers, wage or self-employed, as politically naive and lacking any determined degree of consciousness. While Ananaba tries to avoid this approach, the authors of IRA see African workers in pursuit of economistic demands in a political vacuum. "At the beginning", the Editors suggest, "Africans did not consider their action as political" yet a little further they observe that "The early history of African trade unions thus became as much a reaction to imperial rule as a reaction to working conditions", and still further on they proclaim "On the whole, one cannot say that the conscious struggle against colonialism was a powerful force of African labour". This uncertainty, nay confusion, of what the political and economic paradigm is, characterises not only the Introduction to IRA but most of the contributions. Neither Ananaba nor the others seem to have been touched by recent social history writing on the labour process in Africa such as the work by van Onselen, Jeffries, Peace, Cohen and Sandbrook. Only Mihyo and Gertzel lean in a somewhat different direction, and Kraus, who devotes some comments attacking the stereotypical views held of African labour. Class analysis, while mentioned in the Introduction to IRA, and occasionally by some contributions, does not inform either publication. Yet what else but class struggle is the labour process? As this should be the central focus, much of the strength of the comparative data, Anglo and Francophone policy differences, is lost. Under British imperialism the African trade union movement had a little more elbow room, while the iron fist was a dominant feature of French rule. What the French left behind, African leaders intensified, while the British legacy produced an equal number of courageous union leaders as well as exploiters of peasants and the urban proletariat often in league with repacious politicians.

Both in IRA and *The Trade Union Movement in Africa* all the conventional analytical categories are used, i.e. ethnic factors, prices, wages and incomes policy, employment statistics, GNP, private and public spending, saving, collective bargaining, labour legislation and ideological guidelines. Indeed, an attempt is made to use a political-economy approach. But in the hands of the authors this lacks a clear and critical edge suitable to the explication of the evolving structure of the labour process and class. Hence virtually all the authors are satisfied with the sort of statement made by Martens that the African "labour movements are placed in the difficult position of being forced to achieve some balance between [an] everchanging evolution of political priorities and the pressures from their membership for improvement in their standard of living, or at least not a decline in real wages". Economic analysis as such, i.e. unequal exchange, or the multi-nationals, is virtually ignored. On the whole the argument is made that wages and, I assume, working conditions, stand in some relation to production. There is little historical depth. Few recognise that the roots which have shaped the current situation reach into the pre-colonial period, indeed, as far as West Africa is concerned, to the 15th century when the Portuguese launched their trading activities and, in the process, created both merchants and labourers. My own research has revealed that the strike weapon and considerable militancy, as well as labour legislation, can be found as early as the 16th century. Even if these historical roots were of no concern to the