

butions to the technical efficiency of South Africa's fruit-exporting industry. The most famous of the government institutes is closely connected with Pretoria University; it is the Veterinary Research Institute at Onderstepoort and is the strongest centre of veterinary research in Africa. In spite of political stresses the Institute still supplies essential vaccines to many countries to the north. Other government organisations deal with horticulture, plant protection, soils research, tobacco research, and viticulture. The Forest Research Institute at Pretoria is well known for sound practical work in South Africa's extensive softwood and eucalyptus plantations.

The outstanding research organisation in South Africa is the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research. The C.S.I.R. is well endowed and is directed with imagination. It is housed in a most impressive complex of modern laboratories, known as 'Scientia', near Pretoria. Much of the research work in physics, chemistry, building, mechanical engineering, roads, nutrition, and water has a very direct bearing on agricultural progress.

In the universities, Cape Town does not have a faculty of agriculture, but the Zoology Department of the Faculty of Science studies problems of agricultural importance. The University of Natal has a very large Faculty of Agriculture, with a strong concentration on agricultural science. The University of Potchefstroom has no agricultural department, but the Crop Research Station run by its Faculty of Science is well known to agriculturalists throughout Southern Africa. The University of Pretoria is world-famous for its veterinary science. The University of Stellenbosch is best known for its Faculty of Forestry, which is closely associated with the internationally known Jonkershoek hydrological experiments. The University of the Witwatersrand does not include a faculty of agriculture, but both the Science Faculty and the hydrological side of the Engineering Faculty make strong contributions to agricultural progress.

Throughout all the countries included in this incomplete and rapid survey there is steadily increasing evidence of interest in and support for the natural resource sciences from European governments, especially those of West Germany and Scandinavia, and from the U.S.A., particularly among American university departments. The latter are sometimes handicapped by a mythology that Africa is still at the mud-hut stage and by a tendency to discount what has already been established, but the input of funds and of enthusiasm has been welcomed throughout Southern Africa.

H. C. PEREIRA

East Malling Research Station, Nr Maidstone, Kent

Democracy and Economic Growth: the role of the I.L.O.

An abbreviated version of an address given in Accra on 15 December 1969, by Dr C. Wilfred Jenks, who has since been elected Director-General of the International Labour Office, Geneva.

Throughout the developing world today the accent is upon economic growth. No reasonable man can question this emphasis while inequalities among nations, and inequalities within nations, remain so glaring. Inevitable and

healthy as this may be, it raises one fundamental question, Growth for what? Growth for growth's sake? Growth for those astute enough to profit from it? Or growth as an essential concomitant of political stability and social justice for the whole community? There are other searching questions. Is democracy compatible with economic growth? Are human rights and civil liberties, free enterprise and free trade unionism, compatible with growth? Where they conflict, which comes first? or what reasonable compromise can be made?

Africa, Dr Kofi Busia tells us, is in search of democracy. Africa has millennial traditions of human equality, and of the responsibility of the chief to his people, which will ultimately reassert themselves and find some appropriate, probably new, institutional form. There is a school of thought which holds that only strong government can provide the initiative and discipline necessary for economic growth, and that democracy is not strong enough for this, at least in new states. This is, I believe, a most dangerous misconception. Democracy affords no assurance of economic growth, but neither does any other form of government. Nor does a plan guarantee economic growth. Development plans have been described by a leading economist, Sir Arthur Lewis, as 'the most popular activity' and nearly the 'biggest failure' of the governments of developing countries. There are important things which you cannot have without planning. You cannot, for instance, have a Volta River Project without planning in a big way. But it is doubtful whether anyone has yet succeeded in planning successfully a whole economy, even in economies where the plan is a command and not merely an indicative target.

The difficulty about plans is that those who frame them too often believe that they are imposing mind upon matter and that matter must yield. But life is far more complex, moves far more quickly, and is far more unpredictable than can be foreseen by the most sophisticated plan. How are we to decide how much to plan? Economic growth requires more than strong purpose; it requires a combination of strong purpose with an infinite capacity for adaptation. Democracy can, if appropriately organised and led, provide this, but only if labour and management have been brought into the process of government so as to create, through a continuing partnership among all three, a greater strength of purpose and capacity for adaptation than any one of them could achieve alone. The I.L.O. aims to contribute to economic growth in a democratic framework by helping to forge such a partnership.

Human rights and civil liberties are the purpose of economic growth; it follows that, if there is any incompatibility, economic growth is not an unqualified priority—we must sacrifice some growth to the preservation of its purposes. But are human rights and civil liberties in fact a restraint upon growth? This question is raised most frequently and consistently in relation to the mobilisation of labour for economic development and the freedom of collective bargaining.

I cannot believe that Africa will revert to methods of exacting labour which recall the worst memories of the past. These things have gone for ever. Slavery, forced labour, recruited labour, contract labour, have all, morals apart, proved to be economically unsatisfactory. Forced labour is reluctant and inefficient, and becomes increasingly unsatisfactory as skills become more

important. There is therefore sound economic justification for describing the purpose of the I.L.O. World Employment Programme as the promotion of 'full, productive, and freely chosen employment'.

Freedom of collective bargaining presents more difficult issues, and freedom of action, when collective bargaining fails, raises still greater difficulties. Nowhere are such freedoms absolute, nor can they be without placing the public interest at the mercy of irresponsibility; but it is neither accident nor illusion that freedom of collective bargaining is widely regarded as an essential freedom. How are any conflicts to be reconciled? The only solution lies in securing a workable compromise between the public interest and the conflicting special interests. The I.L.O. offers assistance in designing such compromises, which help to reconcile human rights and economic growth, neither of which can be more than partially achieved without the other.

Human rights and civil liberties are a purpose of economic growth. The same cannot be said of free enterprise and trade-unionism; they are even more clearly means to an end than economic growth itself. Are free enterprise and free trade unionism compatible with growth? This question is still being tested by experiment and experience; but there are two further, decisive questions on which the answer will depend. Can a free economy identify itself with the interests of the whole community? And can a free economy take a long view?

These are questions for employers and workers alike. Of course, free enterprise may be concerned chiefly with the freedom of each particular enterprise from the collective discipline which is necessary for all, rather than with the freedom to make bold investment decisions which give new life to the economy as a whole; and free trade unionism may be concerned chiefly to get more for its privileged, sometimes limited, membership rather than to raise the standards of the whole people, especially the least well-off and least readily organised. If this is so, governments may increasingly consider that their responsibility to the community as a whole requires them to assume an even greater control of the economy, insufficient as such control may almost always be. If immediate profits or wage increases are regarded as more important than growth, or the protection of existing job patterns as more important than higher productivity, governments will increasingly consider that the free economy cannot secure growth.

In these matters, neither the employer nor the worker alone can take a broad and long view, and it is particularly difficult for the worker to do so without the full co-operation of the employer. The I.L.O. is concerned to create and maintain a climate of government-labour-management co-operation in which a three-way dialogue can take place. If we achieve only that, we shall have made a substantial contribution to the vitality of democracy in stimulating economic growth.

It is in the context of these fundamentals that the I.L.O. is directly relevant to an Africa in search of both democracy and economic growth. Our World Employment Programme and its constituent elements, such as labour-intensive technology, manpower planning, placement, and training, and our varied work in rural development, small-scale industries, productivity,

management development, and workers' education, all have a practical bearing on economic growth. But here I have emphasised the role of the I.L.O. as an instrument of partnership between government, labour, and management, in securing the compatibility of economic growth with, on the one hand, human rights and civil liberties and, on the other, free enterprise and free trade unionism.

C. WILFRED JENKS
International Labour Office, Geneva

Dag Hammarskjöld Seminar on the Development and Promotion of Tourism in Africa

Uppsala, Sweden, 10–28 August; and Tunisia, 29 August–2 September 1969

Faced with declining earnings from the export of agricultural products, with rising population, and with an urgent need for accelerated economic growth and structural change, many African countries are today searching for new channels through which they can supplement their foreign-exchange earnings. One source of rapidly growing importance is tourism, which already plays a decisive role in the economic development of some countries.

In Eastern Africa the conditions for a successful tourism industry are particularly favourable. The aim of this seminar was to acquaint participants from this part of Africa with the most recent trends in the technology of holiday resort and hotel planning, transport, market conditions, and business techniques, and with the problems involved in the development of tourism.

The programme was directed by Christer Montén, a Projects and Investments Manager from Stockholm, and Dr Vojislav Popovic, an Economic Affairs Officer at the U.N. Economic Commission for Africa. The 16 participants came from Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and the Indian Ocean Tourist Alliance (the Comoros, Madagascar, Mauritius, and Réunion). They represented ministries of tourism or other relevant government authorities in their own countries.

The first few days were devoted to introductory information, including the characteristics of the main tourist-generating markets; and this was followed by an analysis of the interconnexion of tourism and economic planning in the tourist-receiving countries. The second week dealt with 'the product'—resorts, hotels, excursions, various services, air-transport facilities, and so on—and how this can be marketed. The third week was concerned with the financing of tourism projects, and the role of the government in development, marketing, and promotion.

The last part of the seminar took the form of a study visit to Tunisia, which illustrated some of the problems previously discussed from a more theoretical point of view in Sweden. This practical case study, arranged in co-operation with the Government, included visits to various types of hotels, studies of tourist-resort life and related activities, and ended with lectures on aspects of the local industry by MM Driss Guiga and Abdelaziz Mathari.

Since the field covered throughout the whole seminar was so wide, and the subjects often of a highly specialised nature, the Dag Hammarskjöld Founda-