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INTRODUCTION:

This report has been prepared at the request of SAREC following a meeting of the panel convened March 11-16, 1985, to assess the work of the "Strategies for the Future of Africa" Project in Dakar, Senegal. The report proceeds point by point, according to the terms of reference as set forth by Dr. Gerhard Hultcrantz of SAREC.

1. THE ROLE OF INDEPENDENT SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN GENERAL IN AFRICA AND ITS IMPACT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SITUATION AND INTELLECTUAL REFLECTION IN THE REGION;

With few exceptions until the advent of Samir Amin's UNITAR-UNU-TWF Project (henceforth called The Project), Social Science research made little contribution to policy formulation in independent Africa for several reasons. First, particularly in the inherited British tradition, academics did not consider
policy their concern. In the 1960s, for example, the University of Ghana had two professors of classics, and one of philosophy, but no engineering faculty. The curriculum made little pretence of training students for serious policy-oriented research. Indeed, the faculty members centred their attention on giving lectures which they expected the students, for the most part, to regurgitate uncritically on final examinations.

Second, on completing their graduate studies, many potential researchers, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, had been immediately engulfed in the burgeoning administrative tasks of their new governments or swamped by heavy teaching loads in new universities seeking to fill the educational gap for sorely-needed university graduates.

Third, the few African staff members of newly-created research institutions had come away from their graduate training, usually in British, French or US universities, with the intellectual preoccupations, models, methods and even data primarily drawn from those developed countries' experiences. In Economics, they struggled to use sophisticated statistical tools, despite inadequate statistical data, to analyse assumed market behaviour. In Sociology, they tended to focus on the attitudes of the actors, which fostered the myth that the peasants' perverse behavior explained their failure to develop. They conducted little research on the nature and role of the state in
development, or the inherited institutions that shaped distorted markets and thwarted individual initiatives which might contribute to integrated productive structures and higher living standards.

Fourth, independent social science research tended to be isolated in the many countries and institutions across Africa. One could almost speak of a 'balkanization' of research that reflected the colonial divisions resulting from the 19th Century 'scramble for Africa'. While individual researchers sometimes conducted innovative and insightful research, their work -- with a few exceptions -- of which Amin's own work was one of the most notable -- was typically circumscribed by the experiences of separate peoples confined within national boundaries. As a result of all these interrelated factors, African social scientists seldom identified the common social, economic and political characteristics imposed by the century of colonial penetration that had linked their disarticulated national economies into the world system. They failed to formulate and test generalized scientific conclusions that together could be said to constitute knowledge as to the causes of underdevelopment and poverty throughout the continent. Yet this kind of knowledge is essential to improve policy-making.

Fifth, the busy policy-makers tended to rely on foreign advisers rather than seek the assistance of young African
researchers. This prevented even those researchers who desired to do so from contributing their social science skills to the formulation of more successful development strategies. At the same time, it hindered them from participating in the on-going intimate monitoring of policy-implementation necessary to enable them to improve their understanding of the development process.

The crisis of the late 1970s and '80s that engulfed all African states, regardless of their declared ideological and political perspectives, exposed the inadequacy of the new governments' development strategies. At the same time, it posed a challenge to the emerging African intellectual community: How could its members mobilize to conduct research to provide evidence to test alternative theories purporting to explain why interacting internal and external forces left their entire continent so vulnerable.

The geographically and intellectually isolated African researchers needed time and space to explore and share their reflections as to the causes of the prevalent poverty and underdevelopment that permeated all aspects of their national lives. They needed an opportunity to compare and contrast the results of their research, to synthesize their analyses into general principles that would provide more useful guides for the formulation of step-by-step measures that could contribute to national and continental reconstruction.
in the light of the African experience;

c. Some aspects of Euro-Arab-African relations: Arab finance; Afro-Arab cooperation; the Mediterranean in the world;

d. The challenge of new technologies for Africa.

Regardless of the various sources of finance for these programmes, the Project researchers, working together in a continent-wide network, have sought to define and develop them to ensure that they contribute to the understandings essential to formulate complementary elements of a strategy for the future development of Africa.

The first program, "Transnationalisation or National Construction," focused on the basic challenge: The contradiction between the global pressures towards transnationalisation which render growth in African nations dependent on their ties to the world economy; and efforts to delink from that dependent relationship in order to build self-reliant integrated nations capable of fulfilling the basic needs of their peoples.

In implementing the first stage of this first programme, the researchers sought to discover the underlying explanations as to why State policies relating to agriculture and industry throughout the continent, rendered national economies vulnerable to the present crisis. They have now completed this first stage
and synthesized their findings.

The Project's researchers have formulated several interrelated propositions relating to the state and industrialisation: 1) Given the absence of a national industrializing class, the post-colonial State has tended to consist of elements which have become aligned with foreign capital to enrich themselves, instead of carrying out plans to achieve overall development; 2) Import-substitution industrialisation, typically used as a starting point, reached a premature end, usually because of foreign exchange constraints and the distorted pattern of the inherited import market; 3) Domestic processing of minerals, largely relatively capital-intensive, failed to lead to overall industrialisation; 4) Because of the nature of the State, and the lack of importance attributed to development, national planning generally failed to contribute to a coherent, integrated strategy of industrialisation; 5) Lack of internal cohesion caused what industrialisation did occur to undermine agriculture, particularly cultivation and processing of food crops for domestic consumption; 6) All the cases studied appeared externally-oriented, and ultimately culminated in various forms of dependency on foreign food aid, finance, technologies, culture, etc.

In relation to agricultural development, the Project researchers concluded: 1) The inherited dual pattern of farming,
while varying from one region to another, typically comprises capitalistic modern farms with relatively advanced techniques and wage labour; and, especially in subSaharan Africa, widespread small-sized family farms (not employing wage labour). 2) Typically, the government organizes production, marketing and distribution systems designed to capture the surpluses produced by peasant family farms for its own benefit. Government pricing systems pay peasant producers only a fraction of the world prices for crops the governments encourage them to grow. 3) Post-independence government bureaucracies employ other political mechanisms which impact negatively on small farmers, including various sytems of taxes and authoritarian controls. These include: associations imposed on peasants; promotion of export crops while neglecting food crops or taking over food farm produce for the benefit of other social classes; lack of coordination between farming and industry, resulting in the partial or total destruction of rural handicrafts industries.

As to relations between farming and industry, import-substitution industries typically import materials, rather than rely on local farm output. Operating at less than capacity, they cannot provide consumer goods to farmers at prices the latter can afford. With few exceptions, these industries are not designed to provide farm inputs for small farmers; and peasants cannot afford to buy the imported inputs necessary to improve their productivity.
The role of foreign capital in agriculture varies in different countries, but most frequently serves as an intermediary between industrial and financial capital and institutions meant to supervise farmers. This generally enables it to syphon off a share of the investable surpluses generated in the agricultural sector. Less frequently, foreign capital has a physical presence in agriculture, for example, in plantations in Eastern and Southern Africa, where it benefits directly from high profits resulting from prevailing low farm wages.

All these factors contribute to the further impoverishment of the rural population, and a continuous downward trend in farm production. In the 1970s, cereal imports trebled in North Africa, while multiplying fourfold in the Sahel. Food aid granted to the region increased 25% per year between 1974-5 and 1977-8, although it represented only 15% of cereal imports. This constituted a serious threat to food security and economic independence.

The Project researchers suggested that these findings underscore the need to form an alliance between small and medium farmers and other rural-world strata, together with wage earners and other classes marginalized in the urban world who generally retain links with the rural world. This would provide the necessary framework for reorganizing production and trade among
the various sectors of the economy to achieve self-sufficiency, especially in relation to food production. The most important measures would: 1) Raise farm production and productivity, giving priority to food production; 2) promote selective industrialisation in line with and supporting farm development; 3) give labourers in these industries income levels ensuring total reproduction of their manpower and maintenance of their families; and 4) stimulate output mainly for the domestic markets, both rural and urban, to raise the productivity and living standards of the population.

In this context, focusing on the resources of the rural world which have till now been wasted or plundered, measures could be implemented to: 1) Ensure equitable access to the land for all; 2) diversify production and enhance all possible sources of food supply; 3) conduct research to develop appropriate methods to preserve and process farm products for use during the dry season; 4) improve techniques and inputs in the context of an appropriate industrialisation strategy designed to serve farm development; and 5) link the rural development strategy to an appropriate urban development strategy.

Upon completing this first stage of the first programme, "Transnationalisation or National Construction", the Project researchers have begun to work on the second stage by organising into seven working groups. Each will deal with one of the
following themes:

1. "The Relations Between Agricultural Development and Industrial Strategy", focusing on the crisis which has arisen due to contradictions between and within past industrialisation and agricultural strategies adopted by African states in the context of the global system;

2. "Adjustment versus Delinking", an examination of the lessons of experience with efforts to delink, including those of Nasser's Egypt; Ghana under Nkrumah and today; and Tanzania;

3. "The Nature of the State", to discover what factors determine whether the State functions as a transmission belt of transnationalisation or as a prime mover in nation-building;

4. "Social Reproduction", analysing, in cooperation with the African Association of Women for Research and Development, how past development processes on the continent have affected the role of women in relation to the labour force and the production and distribution of income;

5. "Regional Cooperation", focusing on SADCC to illustrate the nature and impact of the internal as well as external forces shaping the pattern of regional cooperation in Africa;

6. "Euro-African Relations", to explore the inherited links as they have affected and been affected by the current crisis and the competition between Europe, the US, and Japan;

7. "Peace and Regional Security" (closely related to the work of group No. 3) to analyse the causes and consequences of the contradictory facets of the national question which have given rise to military conflicts exacerbated by external interventions.
As the seven groups complete their research over the next two years, an eighth working group, mainly composed of representatives from each of the seven, will synthesize the results of their work. This eighth group will draw connecting conclusions as a basis for an African response to the current global crisis. The February 1985 Rome meeting of the UNU Faculty of the Regional and Global Studies Division agreed that, in 1986-7, an effort should also be made to integrate research being conducted along these lines in Asia and Latin America, as well as Africa, as the basis of an analysis of Third World Development looked at from the South.

The second programme, "Alternative Development Strategies for the Mediterranean Region", focused on the question of whether countries of that region could achieve more autonomy from the major powers to create space for national construction. It completed the first stage of its work with a seminar in Naples in 1983.

In sum, the Project has achieved the goals stated in Bulletin No. 1, contributing to African intellectual endeavours in three respects:

1. It has greatly stimulated African intellectual endeavours at a high level across the continent to analyse the causes of the crisis confronting Africa today;

2. It has pioneered in encouraging African
researchers to explore alternative development strategies to those which have culminated in the crisis;

3. In the process, it has contributed to the formation of a core of African researchers capable of using an appropriate and potent methodology for helping to build self-reliant nations rooted in their own cultural heritage.

As the assessment panel meeting in Dakar pointed out, more needs to be done to ensure that the products of the Project have a real impact on policies. Greater interaction with policy-makers would have a two fold benefit: First, the policy-makers could learn from a constructively critical evaluation of the impact of the measures they introduce; and the researchers could learn more about the theoretical implications of practical obstacles hindering implementation of proposed new policies. Such an interaction, in other words, might lead to a deepening of theory as well as improved practice. Bulletin No. 1 pointed out that the means at the disposal of the Project for this purpose remain limited. Nevertheless, it would seem appropriate to focus more attention on ways of ensuring greater dialogue between the Project’s researchers and policy makers.

3. ASSESS THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE PROJECT IN RECRUITING JUNIOR AND SENIOR RESEARCHERS ACROSS THE REGION TO HELP BUILD AUTONOMOUS AFRICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH CAPACITY AND IN ENHANCING RESEARCH COOPERATION:
As described above, the Project has created networks which have involved over 200 African researchers in some 35 out of the 50 African countries. Each working group, under the guidance of its coordinator and the Project staff, meets at least twice in the course of two years. The first time, its members, working together, design the research they plan to undertake. For the next several months, working in accord with this common plan, each researcher critically evaluates the alternative relevant theories in light of the available evidence in his or her own country, seeking to assess which offers the best guide to explaining and perhaps solving the problems with which the working group is concerned. At the end of this process, the group meets again to compare and analyse the evidence and the conclusions they have reached. On this basis, the coordinator seeks to synthesize the results to arrive at a deeper theoretical explanation of the common causes of the relevant problems. Having identified the constraints as well as the resources in the concrete circumstances of African political economies, the group can then propose more effective strategies to overcome the problems.

In the process of involving African researchers in this kind of collective, critical analytical endeavour, the Project provides the most effective kind of training: It helps them to learn to carry out research by actually examining the concrete evidence drawn from their own circumstances to test and deepen
theory as a guide to improved policy. As they continue to participate in evaluating the consequences of new policies adopted in light of objective reality, they must, inevitably, improve their own skills, both individual and collective, for conducting the essential critical research enterprise.

The primary researchers, whether they work in universities, research institutions, or government ministries, inevitably pass along to their colleagues the findings and critical insights they have acquired in the process. To the extent that university researchers in the working groups involve their graduate students in the research, they impart to them, too, the necessity of conducting this kind of critical and analytical activity. University lecturers, furthermore, incorporate the findings in their courses, helping undergraduates as well as graduates to obtain deeper insights into the causes of African problems than those available in most textbooks.

The Project organisers might, however, make a more conscious effort to encourage the researchers to work directly with and draw on the lessons of experience of policy makers. They might suggest that the researchers engage graduate students, and even undergraduates, to work in the field to identify problems confronting policy-makers at grassroots levels, and gather evidence as to their causes, in order to suggest more effective strategies for overcoming them. This would help to build a core
of researchers trained in relating theory to practice that might be helpful in future policy making.

4. EXAMINE THE PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION OF RESEARCHERS AND THE CRITERIA FOR THE FORMULATION OF RESEARCH PRIORITIES AND TOPICS:

The Project staff, typically in consultation with senior researchers throughout the continent, initially selects the coordinators for the working groups engaged in the research network. Working with the staff, these coordinators identify participating researchers from universities, research institutions, and government ministries throughout the continent. In each working group, they seek to include both senior and junior researchers, as well as participants from a regionally-balanced group of countries. As the Project Director has emphasized, the coordinators seek, in this way, to contribute to an 'investment' in training young researchers from every country, as well as to enhance the work of more experienced personnel, by creating an environment in which they may share and critically analyse each others' work.

The Project staff, in cooperation with the network members, decides on those research priorities which are likely to provide significant insights into the complex of interrelated problems that compose basic features of the crisis which today confronts
Africa. Concerned with the overall logic of the programme, the staff works with the researchers to ensure that each new piece added contributes to building up a cohesive analytical picture of the historically-shaped causes of the current crisis, and the consequences of past efforts to overcome them. On this foundation, the Project seeks to contribute knowledge that will help in the formulation of more effective strategies in the future.

In this context, it is unfortunate that the Project has not devoted more attention to two additional research priorities. First, given Dr. Amin's own past fruitful analyses of finance, it seems surprising that the Project has not focused in greater depth on the way financial institutions have contributed to distorting the pattern of accumulation and reinvestment of capital in Africa. Especially given that domestic and foreign debt constitute crucial features of the current crisis, one would have expected the Project to probe deeply into the way existing financial institutions have misdirected locally generated investable surpluses or even facilitated their flight.

Second, while analysing the role of the State from a political economic perspective, the Project has neglected to examine the failure of Africa's new governors to restructure the machinery of State, itself. Typically, they have focused on Africanisation, leaving in tact the bulk of old laws and regulations that shape
the behavior of the State. As a result -- despite radical rhetoric -- throughout the continent, increasingly swollen bureaucracies have continued to grind out much the same kinds of decisions which, in the past, have impoverished their peoples and rendered their political economies vulnerable to external forces over which they have no control.

Particularly if the Project aims to influence policy implementation, it should foster research as to the kinds of changes in laws and regulations governing the State's actions required to implement the proposals stemming from its social science research. This would require involving selected African lawyers and legislative drafters in the Project to help them to understand the implications of the social science research, so they could translate the resulting proposals into laws designed to restructure the State's role in the process of national and regional development.

Thus, while the Project has done an admirable job in general in selecting researchers and research priorities, its contribution to strategies for the future of Africa might be greater if it tackled these two additional areas of research.

5. DISCUSS THE ORIGINALITY AND QUALITY OF THE RESEARCH AND OF THE RESEARCH DOCUMENTS IN RELATION TO THE EXISTING BODY OF THEORY
AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

As suggested in the observations relating to point number 1 above, independent African states and the researchers in them confront a fundamental difficulty in that the theories and evidence relating to development strategy have been drawn largely from more developed countries. Frequently, the theories fail to take into consideration the objective conditions and the particular socio-economic characteristics of the African countries. This Project, in contrast, emphasises involving African researchers in a process of critical reexamination of the objective evidence relating to the consequences of development strategies based on conventional wisdom. This enables them to sift through alternative existing theories, critically evaluating them in terms of their ability to provide adequate explanations and effective solutions to current problems. In the process, they may reject those which appear incapable of illuminating the problems confronted, while deepening those which provide the most valuable insights.

The research conducted in the first stage of the first programme, "Transnationalisation or National Construction," discussed in response to point 2 above, illustrates the potential value of the Project in contributing in this way to original and critical analysis. Many of the resulting country papers -- about 70% of which have been deemed publishable by peer reviewers on the UN University faculty -- provide profound insights into the
development process as it has affected industry and agriculture in Africa. These suggest the need to reconsider the major thrust of the policy recommendations stemming from mainstream social science.

It is impossible here to review all the papers in depth. Instead, two cases serve to suggest the kinds of fruitful implications the Project's findings may have for mainstream theory and practice. In the case of agricultural policy, for example, the bulk of mainstream economic doctrine has long provided theoretical justification for encouraging export agriculture as a potential engine for growth for African economies. It underlies the proposals of both IMF and World Bank advisors who for years have urged African states to provide market and pricing policies designed to stimulate peasants to grow export crops. The findings of the several country researchers reveal, however, that these kinds of policies have had profoundly negative consequences in widely diverse parts of Africa.

On the one hand, cultivation of export crops has spread over the better lands, marginalizing food crops and those who produce them. Often, African women -- who grow 70-80% of the continent's domestically consumed foodstuffs -- must use outmoded tools to grow food crops in the least well-watered, least fertile soils --
the very areas hardest hit by drought. Meanwhile, the growing numbers of people fleeing rural poverty to crowd into urban slums have come to rely on imported foods.

On the other hand, expanded export crops have required the growing import of agricultural inputs, leaving most African nations dependent on them increasingly vulnerable to world price fluctuations. The worsened terms of trade accompanying the international recession of the late 1970s and early 80s has undercut their ability to import the food, agricultural inputs, transport machinery and petroleum on which they increasingly depend. As a result, prolonged drought and world recession in the late 1970s and early 80s found most African agricultural exporting states mired in debt, their rural populations suffering malnutrition and outright famine.

Examination of these issues on a country by country basis has provided extensive evidence of the need to reformulate agricultural policies to help African governments and their peoples achieve greater self-reliance. It also underscores the need to re-examine the theoretical premises of these policies to provide a more reliable guide to sound national construction.

In a second case, the country papers reveal the inadequacy, in the African circumstance, of the mainstream theoretical perspective -- typically incorporated into IMF conditionality --
which urges the African governments to expose their country's fragile industrial sectors to international market forces. A particularly illuminating case study is that concerning the capital goods industry in Zimbabwe by Dr. Dan Ndlela (who incidentally did his graduate degree at the Lund). He examines the rather extensive growth of import-substitution industry during the pre-independence regime under 15 years of UN sanctions. Transnational corporations, prohibited from sending any profits out of the country, invested significant amounts in industries to produce capital goods for the white-owned commercial farms and mines, as well as consumer goods for the narrow high income minority.

After independence, the government, pressed by the World Bank and IMF, adopted the conventional wisdom of permitting the transnational firms to remit 50% of their after-tax profits, beginning the process of opening the economy, and importing new machinery and equipment in hopes of improving efficiency to compete in the international market. Donor-countries' commodity import programmes accelerated the import of capital-intensive equipment, much of which actually duplicated goods formerly produced by local (settler) firms. The resulting process of de-industrialisation tended to decrease the economy's potential for internal integration and employment of local resources, including labour, rendering it increasingly dependent on imported parts and material. This constituted an important factor
contributing to the fact that, within a few years of attaining independence, Zimbabwe, too, had become mired in international debt.

These two cases serve only to illustrate the way African researchers, delving into the evidence of the objective conditions prevailing in Africa, have come up with results at variance with the explanations offered and solutions proposed by established theorists. Their findings suggest the validity of the Project's focus on the issue of "Transnationalization or National Construction", with a potential for offering significantly different kinds of development strategies than those which have culminated in today's crisis.

It is important to note, as the Project Director did at the Dakar UNITAR Evaluation Panel meetings, that the second stage of the Project will focus more on political, social and cultural issues involved in development. These also appear likely to generate equally significant conclusions. It is to be hoped, as suggested in the comments relating to point no. 4 above, that the Project will also undertake analyses of the role of financial institutions and the impact of the law-making process, itself, on African development.

6. MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE PUBLICATION AND APPROPRIATE DISSEMINATION OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS:
The research results should be disseminated as widely as possible among policy makers as well as research institutions and the academic community. This might take several forms. First, the Project should circulate its own Bulletin to all state planning agency and university libraries throughout the continent. The Bulletin should regularly include a list of papers which could be made available on request. It would be preferable, if funds could be provided, for the papers themselves to be available in every planning agency and university library.

Second, every working group member should be encouraged to hold meetings within his or her country to discuss with planners and researchers the implications of the working group's findings for national and regional development. This could provide a means of obtaining additional insights into the working group's findings and simultaneously stimulate debate within each country as to appropriate future development strategies.

Third, existing national and regional journals -- like the Economics Journals of Zimbabwe, Ghana, Nigeria, and East Africa -- should be approached to publish relevant papers from the project.

Fourth, the Project might publish its findings in volumes which could be sold to the general public. Specific efforts
should be made to sell them to government policy makers. Encouragement of their use as textbooks in university courses could also help ensure that future government decision-makers become familiar with the relevant debates and the Project's findings concerning them.

Fifth, if additional funds could be made available, regional and continent-wide workshops and seminars could be held with relevant middle-level policy makers to discuss the implications of the research findings for policies in specific areas. For example, the Dakar Evaluation Panel suggested such workshops might be organized to discuss the implications of the research findings for dealing with aspects of the current crisis like FAMINE and INTERNATIONAL DEBT.

Several of these possibilities were considered by the Dakar Evaluation Panel, where it was pointed out that additional funds and personnel would be required to implement them.

7. DISCUSS THE PROBABLE IMPACT OF THE RESEARCH RESULTS OF THE PROJECT ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SITUATION IN AFRICA, AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROJECT IS STIMULATING SYSTEMATIC REFLECTION ON ALTERNATIVE CHOICES OF DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES:

The Project may have two kinds of impact on the future
socio-economic situation in Africa:

First, to the extent that the Project’s growing network of researchers impart their findings to decision-makers actually concerned with the practical business of shaping development strategies, they should contribute to improved policy measures. Some of the researchers are themselves policy-makers or advisors to policy makers; others are associated as friends and family members with government personnel. Thus through formal and informal contacts on a national level, the Project’s findings may have some influence on the day-to-day formulation of more effective policies.

Second, the continent-wide involvement of African researchers in systematic comparative analysis of pressing issues should stimulate debates and facilitate identifying and deepening appropriate and relevant theory as a potential guide for improved development policies. The very involvement of African researchers along with their colleagues and students in this process, furthermore, constitutes a primary step in providing new personnel capable of formulating and implementing better policy measures.

The Dakar Evaluation Panel noted the importance of further disseminating the knowledge generated by the researchers to policy makers. Panel members agreed on the necessity of
involving policy-makers in discussing how to implement the proposals. As suggested above, this includes the necessity of focusing on the question of how to change the role of the State, itself, in the development process to lay the basis for drafting the laws and regulations required to shape appropriate new institutions governing future agricultural and industrial development.

8. ADVISE SAREC ON THE CONTINUATION, SCOPE AND MODALITIES OF SAREC SUPPORT TO THE PROJECT:

SAREC is to be congratulated on its stance in supporting this Project for all the reasons cited above. The Project's beneficial multiplier effect is already significant.

As the above comments suggest, and the Dakar Panel agreed, two aspects of the Project could be improved. First, the Project could extend the content of its programme to encompass at least two more priority issues. One would be to add a working group to focus on the kinds of legislation to be adopted by governments seeking to implement some of the nation-building strategies suggested by the Project's findings. The State and law constitute the only instruments available for implementing the kinds of policies proposed. Yet all too often, new African governments have perforce relied on legal draftsmen trained only to replicate the very kinds of laws that have perpetuated the
status quo. A working group in this area could bring qualified young lawyers together with social scientists to draft models of the kinds of laws required to make changes in priority areas. In the process working group members would acquire new skills that would enable them to contribute in their own countries, helping to create a cadre of qualified legal draftspersons capable of designing additional laws to help restructure the inherited state machinery.

The Panel members agreed that another working group should focus on the mobilization and direction of locally-generated investable surpluses to finance the proposed new kinds of agricultural and industrial programmes. This working group would need to explore the way banking and financial institutions, as well as government finance, have functioned in the past to channel available surpluses to foster the present disarticulated pattern of growth; and recommend changes necessary to achieve more balanced, integrated political economies.

Creation of two new working groups would obviously require additional staff with appropriate expertise at the Dakar headquarters; and additional resources to enable the groups to function collectively along the lines of the rest of the network. Any contribution SAREC could make in these areas would be helpful.
Second, the Dakar Evaluation Panel recommended that additional resources be found to extend dissemination of the Project's findings to local, national and international policy makers. The present multiplier effects, while significant, leave much to the local researchers at the national level, and to the initiatives of the already-too-busy four member staff in Dakar. Additional resources need to be found to speed the publication of the Project's findings, and to arrange seminars or workshops of policy-makers together with key researchers on such critical Africa-wide issues as FAMINE and INTERNATIONAL DEBT. SAREC might help either directly or by bringing other donors into the picture to help finance these kinds of dissemination methods.

9. ADVISE SAREC ON ANY FURTHER NEEDS OF EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT, NOW AND DURING THE NEXT FEW YEARS:

The United Nations University (UNU) conducts regular evaluations of all papers presented for possible publication by researchers in the Project. However, it might be useful to organize the researchers themselves into some form of bi-annual evaluation process which regularly assessed the overall progress of the Project and recommended next steps in terms of priorities and future organization. To some extent, this already appears to be in place. For example, following the completion of the first stage of Programme I, the researchers met together to critically evaluate the papers and the proposed synthesis. On this basis,
they participated in formulating the second stage. The process could be extended further so that researchers in each working group, together with their colleagues in their home-base institutions, evaluated the results of the Project bi-annually to make proposals for next steps. This might contribute to strengthening the Project's institutionalized relations with the local researchers' home institutions.

Such an evaluation process might be extended to include selected policy makers from several countries. This would be another way of acquainting the policy makers with the Project's findings, as well as making the Project's researchers aware of the reactions of sympathetic policy-makers to the possibilities and problems of implementing their proposals.

This kind of extension of the evaluation process should be incorporated as an explicit feature of the on-going network and the proposed additional activities suggested by the Panel.

10. MAKE OTHER COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE CONSULTANT'S OWN EXPERIENCE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN AFRICA:

At this time, the above, together with the report of the Dakar Evaluation Report, essentially covers the present comments and recommendations that come to mind. Once again, however, SAREC is to be complimented on its foresight in funding what really
provides the most valuable framework for stimulating essential
critical analysis of the causes of the crisis in Africa today.
This is surely the soundest possible way of contributing to
increasingly effective development strategies for the future.