

making, a common problem for those who focus upon organisational structures and behaviour. Had Finucane considered these factors he might not have been so critical of Tanzania's failure to achieve popular participation; moreover, had he broadened the scope of his study to include other regions in Tanzania, he might have obtained different results. As for Chambers, had he turned his attention more in the same direction, he might have recognised potential difficulties (over and above the lack of official will) which are likely to be encountered should the P.I.M. system be attempted beyond the experimental stages. Hydén and his collaborators have no apparent underlying ideological proclivities, but provide a useful, descriptive take-off point for the serious student of development. As a set, these three books make a timely contribution to the literature on public policy analysis and development administration in Africa.

EDMOND J. KELLER

Department of Political Science, Indiana University, Bloomington

Interdependent Development by HAROLD BROOKFIELD

London, Methuen, 1975. Pp. xiii + 234. £2.25 paperback.

L'Utopie ou la mort! by RENÉ DUMONT

Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1973. Pp. 185.

The advocacy of capitalism as a process of development has always involved intellectual *apartheid*. The coexistence of material luxury for the few and appalling misery for the many is not due, the apologists of capitalism assert, to any organic relation between the two sets of phenomena, but rather to the existence among poor peoples of some cultural and social obstacles which have been successfully swept aside elsewhere by the march of progress. It follows that the task of those working on development has been myopic and piecemeal by analysing and prescribing on a case-by-case basis, *given* the system as a whole, and never the essential one of calling into question the totality of the relations of production on which capitalism is founded.

So it is that social science itself has been fragmented into numerous 'disciplines', themselves the product of that same *apartheid*, and that within each 'field of study' conceptual 'models' have been endlessly constructed and reconstructed, here giving importance to one factor, there to another, without ever examining the core of capitalism itself. The results in practice have been disastrous since the well-meaning attempts of reformers have merely expanded the opportunities for exploitation, and at the intellectual level have provoked dismay tempered by earnest calls for sober reflection.

Harold Brookfield and René Dumont are two deeply concerned individuals who are aware of the dimensions of the material and conceptual crises, and who are struggling to find solutions. The former is a geographer who attacks the anti-historical attitude adopted by many writers on development, and seeks to unify the space and time dimensions of change into a single analytical framework. The latter has not the leisure to devote to such esoteric issues – he makes an urgent call, not from the mountain peak but from the paddy-field, for a socialistic organisation in the rich countries

which will, he believes, release resources to be used in the Third World. According to the French agronomist a speedy adoption of his own mixture of utopian socialism, the New International Economic Order, and the Cocoyoc Declaration is not only essential for the alleviation of poverty in the underdeveloped world, but also vital for the survival of the rich countries. Whilst Brookfield is posing questions, Dumont is offering solutions, though the interrogatives of the former are addressed to problems of approach and method, whereas the remedies of the latter are for the contemporary ills of raw material shortages, population pressures, and untrammelled industrialisation and urbanisation.

Neither writer, despite common concerns with present deficiencies of capitalist theory and practice, examines in depth the essential contradictions incarnate in that mode of production. Under capitalism there must necessarily be many who are exploited, and whose function is to provide the bases on which the wealth controlled by the remainder can continue to accumulate – as a rough empirical guide, I would argue that no more than about one-fifth of the population under capitalism can ever reach a material level that goes much beyond basic needs. The transformation of the lot of the majority can only be achieved through the removal of the system which defines their condition in this way.

State control of the means of production, distribution, and exchange is a first critical step along the path, and can – if well managed – lead to satisfaction of the minimum material needs of the people. To go further requires extending revolutionary practice beyond the abolition of private property, and creating social and political conditions where the build-up of newly dominant management and bureaucratic classes can be avoided, and where local as well as national autonomy and self-reliance have an opportunity to develop. To achieve these changes cannot be a matter of calls for justice or equity within the present system, for the necessary and unavoidable consequences of that mode of production are the creation and exacerbation of the conditions which lead to those calls in the first place.

As Brookfield to his credit recognises, he is one of those whom Mao Tse-tung complains ‘have their Marxism, but they have their liberalism as well – they talk Marxism but practice liberalism; they apply Marxism to others but liberalism to themselves. They keep both kinds of goods in stock and find a use for each’ (p. 195). The description is applicable to the work of Dumont as well, yet he is too absorbed with the pressing problems of the day to notice this.

PETER O'BRIEN
U.N.C.T.A.D., Geneva