

EXTENDED REPRODUCTION OF WAGE-LABOUR IN THE SUDAN*

By

*Elfatih SHAAELDIN***

I. — INTRODUCTION

Capitalist production, as asserted by MARX «produces not only commodities, not only surplus value, but it also produces and reproduces the capitalist relation» (1). Capital accumulation is a process of creating, on the one hand, the proletariat, the owners of labor power, and on the other hand, the capitalists, the owners of capital. This accumulation process, as suggested by BETTELHEIM, reveals two tendencies: The first tendency is towards «the dissolution of other modes of production and subsumption of their agents to capitalist production relations. However, the predominant tendency is combined with another secondary tendency, that of conversion-dissolution. This means that within a capitalist social formation the non-capitalist forms of production, before they disappear, are restructured, partly dissolved, and thus subordinated to a predominant capitalist relations» (2).

In this paper I attempt to discern these tendencies in the Sudanese social formation. In particular I focus on describing the mechanism of proletarianisation emphasizing non-market factors which have been responsible for the ongoing process of the destruction of the peasants' form of production. In so doing I depart from the bourgeois economic theories on which it has been argued that since productivity is higher in the capitalist sector than in the subsistence sector the former offers higher wages than the latter. Hence, labor is attracted to the capitalist sector. For, as G. ARRI-GHI correctly put it, in the bourgeois economic approach, «the development of capitalism is conceived not only as an ultimately beneficial but also as a spontaneous process in the sense that it is induced exclusively by market forces with no or little role assigned to open or conceded forms of compulsion» (3).

II. — THE STRUGGLE OF CAPITAL AGAINST THE NATURAL ECONOMY

The ultimate objective of an emerging capitalist mode of production is to extend its base of hegemony over the natural economy (4). Faced with rigid barriers in the precapitalist formations, capital attacks aggressively with the purpose of annihilating these formations by controlling land, freeing labor and introducing commodity production. The destruction of

* *An early version of this paper was presented in a seminar at the Development Studies and Research Centre, University of Khartoum.*

** *Lecturer, Department of Economics — University of Khartoum.*

these precapitalist formations is not left to their respective internal dynamics, nor to the market mechanism. Often, force is the only solution open to capital, as emphasized by LUXUMBERG. But various strategies are followed in order to realize these targets depending on the internal dynamics of capital, the level of development and structural characteristics of precapitalist modes of production.

Where production for use value is not dominant, the first phase of capital penetration in several cases takes the forms of promoting «petty» commodity production. Thus production for exchange value replaces production for use value. The introduction of commodity production is carried out through several mechanisms. The most common means is the imposition of taxes which is often preceded or accompanied by a process of monetization. The improvement in transportation narrows the distances and integrates the isolated villages. The flooding of the market with manufactured popular goods creates new tastes, and, hence encourages production for the market.

In this stage, the peasants are not alienated from the means of production. However, while this form of production was conserved for a large segment of the economy the very process of commodity production it creates causes the beginning of the disintegration of this simple reproduction process. Differentiation among the peasants emerges, creating the prerequisites for the realization of surplus and capital accumulation. However, the commoditization of labor is met by much more resistance and is carried out with more brutality than that of introducing petty commodity production.

Dispossession of the peasants from land is the single most important factor responsible for proletarianising them. This factor has received more attention in the literature than other factors. MARX, for instance, argued that:

«The capitalist system presupposes the complete separation of the labourers from all property and the means by which they can realize their labour. The so-called primitive accumulation, therefore, is nothing else than the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production. The expropriation of the agricultural producers of the peasant from the soil is the basis of the whole process» (5).

The process of capital accumulation in several countries of Africa began with the dispossession of the indigenous population of their lands and/or the use of forced labor. In Kenya, e.g., the colonialists seized more than 7.6 million acres of the best land of the Kikuyu. In what was then called Southern Rhodesia, European settlers seized more than half of the land, leaving the less fertile land to the Africans. Similarly, in Northern Rhodesia the colonialists expropriated 10.4 million acres.

In Russia the process of the disintegration of the peasantry was well illustrated by LENIN (6). Differentiation among the peasants as a result of differences in the ownership of the means of production or as a result of debt led to depeasantisation in rural Russia.

It should be noted that the indebtedness of the peasants can be a major factor in creating a proletarian class even where land is abundant. On the other hand, as pointed out by DOBB, economic inequality by itself is not sufficient to create a proletariat unless the means of production are monopolized by a few members of the population (7).

A major factor in the process of proletarianization is compulsion and force. Forcible eviction from land and forced labor were widely used. In Africa, Southern Rhodesia was the stage for the use of coercion which is thoroughly described by Van ONSELEN in his book entitled *Chibaro* (8). At the beginning of this century there was an extensive mining of gold and other minerals in Southern Rhodesia. To the disappointment of the British companies, gold was not profitable. Africans at the time were mostly peasants with enough independent sources of incomes to discourage them from any hired-labor type of employment. The colonial state imposed taxes on the peasants with the intention of forcing them into wage labor. Despite these taxes the industry failed to obtain sufficient supply of labor and as a result had to import cheap labor from abroad. These efforts were frustrated by the high turnovers, desertion and the rebellious attitude of the immigrants. Faced with competition from South African's mines the industry resorted to legislation, forced labor and other means except raising wages. The industry also established a repressive compound system which facilitated controlling the workers.

Africa was not the first continent in which force was used to create wage-labourers. MARX also illustrated the use of force in England, the first country to witness capitalism. Thus, he wrote that:

«The spoliation of the church's property, the fraudulent alienation of the state domains, the robbery of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and class property, and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of reckless terrorism, were just so many idyllic methods of primitive accumulation. They conquered the field of capitalistic agriculture, made the soil part and parcel of capital, and created for the town industries the necessary supply of «a free» and outlawed proletariat» (9).

The pace of the process of the disintegration of the natural economy is not always equal to that of capital accumulation. In some instances the process of the disintegration of the natural economy occurred faster than that of capital accumulation. Not all the peasants dispossessed from land were absorbed in capitalists' enterprises. In Europe beggars, robbers and vagabonds had increased tremendously in the early years of the emergence of capitalism. Hence, regulations were introduced to control these groups (e.g. Edward VI in England and Louis XVI of France). Also emigration to colonies was an equilibrating mechanism in metropolitan countries during the excess supply of the dispossessed peasants.

In the present periphery the presence of vagabonds and squatters in the urban areas can only be explained by the divergence between the pace of capital accumulation and labor absorption and that of the disintegration of peasants.

Earlier, during the colonial days, the process of proletarianisation was much slower than the process of accumulation. Where force was not used immigrants from other social formations were encouraged. This took place when the natural economy of the other formations were in a relatively advanced state of destruction. Such was the case of Uganda where the Indians were encouraged to immigrate as workers for the railways. In Peru Chinese were imported to work in the sugar and cotton plantations.

III. — COMMODITISATION OF LABOR AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN THE SUDAN: THE COLONIAL ERA

The Anglo-Egyptian occupation of Sudan in 1898 signalled the beginning of the integration of the Sudanese economy into the world capitalist system. On the eve of this occupation, a natural economy where production was directed mainly for use value was dominant. Exchange and commodity production were limited. Differentiation among the peasantry had evolved very slowly since centuries ago. The landowning, slave-owning and merchant classes existed but had been weakened by external and internal events and were still in embryonic forms.

The articulation of the economy during the first phase (1898–1925) was mainly through the expansion of peasant production. The colonial administration encouraged and imposed petty commodity production, first facilitated by the improvement in the transportation system. The mechanism through which the subsistence economy was transformed into cash producing one was through the imposition of taxation and the increase in the need for cash to buy imported goods. As a result of these measures production for exchange value was substantially increased in the form of petty commodity production. Peasants production of corn, wheat, sesame, millet (Dukhun), sorghum (Dura), and gum arabic increased significantly.

Accompanying the increase in peasant commodity production there were unsuccessful attempts to establish mines and plantation enclaves. The failure in the plantations and mines slowed down the development of capitalist relations. This first phase was thus characterized by the exploitation of the peasants partly undertaken through primitive precapitalist forms such as tributes extracted by religious and tribal leaders from the peasants. Moreover, the new structure with the merchant and usury capital operating as intermediaries between the peasants and international capital formed avenues for exploitation at the distribution levels.

The increase in petty commodity production continued after 1925 accompanied by some capital accumulation in agriculture. Earlier, the main capital expenditure was in the railways and construction sectors. Later, agriculture became the major base of accumulation. The first avenue for capital accumulation in agriculture was in the irrigated schemes. The failure of a settler capitalism similar to those in East and Southern Africa led to a significant colonial government participation in the capital accumulation process. The establishment of the Gezira cotton scheme as a partnership between the colonial state and foreign private capital signalled the beginning of agrarian capitalist relations of production.

The late 1940's and the early 1950's witnessed an accelerated capital accumulation in cotton schemes by indigenous private capital consequent to the rise in the prices of cotton which accompanied the Korean war. The area under private cotton schemes increased from 20,000 in 1949 to 200,000 feddans in 1960/61.

Capital accumulation in agriculture resulted in the emergence of rural proletariat. The process of proletarianisation of the nomads was met with a much stronger resistance than that of the cultivators. This is so

because there were two phases in turning the nomads into agricultural labour. In the first phase, there was a process of denomadisation whereby a nomad had to be alienated from his old practice and be turned into an agriculturalist. The difficulty in this phase was described by EVANS-PRITCHARD for the case of the Nuer. The Nuer regarded horticulture as toil forced on them by poverty of stock. «For at heart they are herdsmen, and the only labour they are delighted with is the care of cattle (10). In the second phase, the nomads had to be turned from a self-employed person into a seller of his or her labor. According to OSMAN and SULIEMAN the agricultural schemes found difficulty in inducing nomads to settle (11). In the case of the cultivators their early resistance has been explained by some in viewing the tenants in Gezira as ex-slave owners who carried with them the master's attitude towards work (GAITSKELL and MCLOUGHLIN) (12). However, it is an incomplete argument to claim that the Zande or the Gezira tenants refused to work on cotton production without qualifying the conditions under which they refused to work. It is instructive to note that the Zande as well as the tenants in Gezira did accept producing cotton at the beginning but only to suffer from declining incomes. According to CARTFORD the Zande were first enthusiastic about producing cotton. As the prices of cotton declined they showed reluctance to work. In Gezira also many tenants gave up their tenancies after the great depression as they had other options. According to HAS-SOUN, since land wanting to be cultivated with millet by rain still remained they withdrew when the prices were low» (13).

The abundance of land made the proletarianisation of the peasants a difficult task. The low density of the population at that time and the lack of large feudal estates helped in maintaining the peasants mode of production. Hence, the colonial administration used covert methods of coercion.

FORCED LABOR

Resort to force by the colonial power as a means of creating labor was not uncommon in Sudan. CARTFORD and REINING documented the use of compulsion in the production of cotton in the Southern region (14). In 1926 the colonial administration introduced cotton in the Maridi and Zande region. Commodity production had been introduced among the Azande as a result of taxation and change in taste. However, the introduction of pepper in the early years provided enough money for most households to pay their taxes in cash. The colonial administration decided to introduce cotton production. The Azande were enthusiastic at the beginning. But since the rewards of producing cotton were decreased the Azande showed reluctance to grow cotton. Hence, compulsion was used for cotton production. Each Zande family was forced to cultivate at least one half acre of cotton as a public service.

Conscripted labor was also used in the Gezira for cotton picking during the great depression but was not effective. Also, forced labor was used in several areas of the country for the construction of roads and buildings. Even after the colonial administration ratified the 1930 Forced

Labor Convention it continued to conscript labor to work on public roads, schools and dispensaries.

Forced Labor in Sudan was not as common as elsewhere in Africa. This may be explained by the fact that there were no European settlers in Sudan as in East Africa. Moreover, the British avoided arousing any revival of Mahdism. The consolidation of political power by the colonial state was not achieved even up to the 1920's. The concern with political stability especially at the early years of occupation had made the colonial administration cautious in dealing with the peasants as well as the slave owners and slave traders.

FREEING SLAVES

It is difficult to specify the exact extent of slavery relations at the eve of colonial penetration. There is quite a bit of evidence and general agreement that it existed during the Anglo-Egyptian occupation. However, there are controversies over its type, i.e., stage of development and extent. M'CLOUGHLIN (1963) and GAITSKELL (1959) portrayed a picture of widespread slavery relations. Both of them used this to claim that the proletarianised tenants in the new capitalists' schemes originated from the class of ex-slaves owners and carried on a hostile attitude towards manual and agricultural work. M'CLOUGHLIN estimated the number of slaves to be 20–30 % of the total population in Northern Sudan. In my judgement while it is an undisputable fact that there existed a significant slavery relation, M'CLOUGHLIN's estimates were highly exaggerated. For one thing he did not provide a strong evidence to support his claim. The methodology he used to estimate that figure was «influence from like societies elsewhere under equivalent socio-economic conditions». This can hardly be an acceptable argument since each social formation has its own experience and forces which operate to produce a certain level of development. It was more likely the case that slavery as well as feudal relations were more widespread in the riverian land and Gezira than elsewhere in the country.

The colonial administration avoided antagonizing the slave owners. Thus up to 1920 there was a mutual understanding between the colonial administration and the slave owners or traders. A Kitchner memorandum explicitly stated that slavery should be tolerated as long as there were no complains (15). In fact attempts were made to give ideological justification with racist tones. The first Governor of Kordofan stated in 1903 that he was personally «not a great admirer of the black man at his home». And that «you see him at best as a slave or a soldier». SLATIN, an Austrian who had been imprisoned by the Madhists and became advisor to the British stated that the slaves did not «deserve to be treated like free independent men. They should remain under the protection of their former masters who were forced to treat them well» (16).

According to WARBURG, in 1898, over seventy Sudanese 'notables' presented WINGATE with a petition in which they complained that they had been robbed of all they possessed. They claimed that owing to the compulsory recruitment of agricultural slaves into the army, cultivation was

at a standstill and hence famine was imminent. In fact, the fear from the slave owners was expressed explicitly by WINGATE when he said that an anti-slavery policy would produce several rebellions. As a result, the colonial administration tolerated the slave trade.

However, as the administration gained more power and consolidated its control, and perhaps as the slave owners became weaker and weaker, the administration changed its policy towards the latter. A conflict of interest started gaining momentum. Thus, in the period of extensive construction of government buildings and railways, labor was needed. One possible source of labor was the ex-slaves. The administration made an effort to recruit the ex-slaves as construction or agricultural workers and labor offices were opened. After 1920, with the establishment of large scale cotton schemes the need for free labor was even greater than before. The colonial administration started observing the anti-slavery laws which were legislated in the last period of the Turco-Egyptian rule.

Many of the ex-slaves moved to towns and a great number of them joined the army. Others became truck drivers, mechanics, etc.. But a significant number preferred to live in the countryside cultivating their own «bildat» or living at the margins of the villages sometimes treated as out-casts.

IMMIGRANTS

The reluctance of the indigenous population to work in the new capitalist schemes led the colonial administration to encourage immigrants from other countries. Efforts, first, were undertaken to bring Egyptian fellaheen. Some of the fellaheen actually came and participated in the early capitalists' schemes, e.g. Ziedab. However, they were not numerous. Leigh HUNT, the first American capitalist in the Sudan, proposed to encourage the immigration of Afro-Americans. Few came to Sudan but did not settle. Other attempts were made to encourage the immigration of Indian coolies. But the negotiations with the Indian government failed (17).

However, the colonial administration was successful in attracting large numbers of West Africans. Various methods were used to attract them, e.g., provision of transport facilities and tenancies with the intention of establishing settlements that will attract others. Mr. CRAWFORD (1929), the Gezira Commissioner, wrote that: «to attract labour, we shall be forced to give a certain number of tenancies to outside people – It has been done with White Nile Province Arabs and has on the whole been successful. Isolated fellatas hold tenancies with the idea of inducing them to found a «hilla» for local labour. I cannot say how long or much further one can go along such lines without alarming the indigenous population» (18).

As a result of such colonial policy settlement of West Africans (Nigerians and Central Africans) increased considerably in the Gezira. Their number jumped from 5,000 in 1929 to 60,000 in 1952. A significant number of them obtained tenancies – especially during 1930–35 when the indigenous tenants quit their holdings as a result of the cotton slump.

West African settlements were also common in Gash and Tokar. Kassala Cotton Syndicate allotted tenancies to West Africans since the Hadendowa showed reluctance to grow cotton. A conflict took place between the Syndicate and the Hadendowa tribe who owned the land for centuries. The colonial government resolved the issue by terminating the contract of the syndicate. The Hadendowa were fearful warriors and the memories of Osman DIGNA's guerilla war must have prompted the government's decision.

While a great majority of West Africans worked as agricultural workers some of them also moved to towns or to irrigation projects. West African women became much involved in commodity distribution, selling powdered chillies, roasted groundnuts and a variety of other things. This high participation of West African women can either be explained by the poverty of their families or their coming from relatively more advanced economies in regard to commodity production.

IV. — THE PRESSURE ON LAND: THE POST-COLONIAL ERA

Capital accumulation is continuing in the post-colonial era. The most important factor that is reinforcing the process of proletarianisation in this era is the pressure on land. Such a conclusion which will be substantiated below should come by surprise to many. As recent as 1966 in a FAO sponsored conference entitled «World Land Reform Conference» it was suggested that «there are no problems of land shortage in that vast country with comparatively small population. Problems of land-lordism encountered in other parts of the world do not exist in the Sudan» (19). In fact, an extensive survey on land tenure conducted in 1964/65 did not contradict such a conclusion (20).

It was the colonial government that granted a legal status of land-ownership in which three types of land tenure were recognized. First, there was government land subject to no rights. Second, there was government land subject to rights vested in a community, such as a tribe, district or village. Third, there was privately owned land.

According to the land survey (1965/66) the largest percentage of land was held under communal ownership. However, this lumping together of all tribal lands has led to a significant underestimation of the extent of rural differentiation and to the uneven distribution of land. Apart from its legal-status — tribal land is, in effect, distributed among the members of the tribe. Since the tribal leaders had the authority to distribute land among users, they favoured themselves, their families and their associates — noticeably merchants. The Shaykhs and other tribal leaders were delegated the authority of distributing land among the members of their respective communities. The land allotted to any cultivator was in principle as much as he/she can cultivate. When one left the land, it became communal property again. Similarly, this arrangement was extended to the gum gardens and grazing areas. With the increasing pressure on land, the tribal administrators abused their power and acquired vast areas for themselves, their relatives and for the «Jallaba» merchants.

Since the early days of colonial capital penetration a tendency towards the commoditization of land had appeared. The increase in commodity production and the «early» pressure of foreign capital on land had led to land hunger. The foreign community attempted to buy land – mostly for speculative reasons. Some companies showed intentions of establishing plantations. The rush for land by foreign capital led to more land consciousness among the inhabitants.

By independence private landownership became a well established institution in several regions of the country. Though some regions did not yet develop the same attitude as the riverian the change has been an on-going process. According to an ILO Report, land transactions have been increasing in Sudan (21). The early 1970's revealed even more polarization in the rural districts. This has been verified by Galal El DIN who conducted a survey for the Rahad region. In that region 3.3 % of the landholders own 24.2 % of all the land while 27 % of the landholders own only 6.8 %, and each of the latter group has a holding of less than 5 acres. Another survey conducted by Galal El DIN in Um Ruaba in Kordofan revealed that out of 230 families, 10 families own more than half of the land in the area. Galal El DIN attributed this new pattern of land registration to the alliances between the «Jallaba» merchants, the government employees and the Shaykhs (22).

In addition to the local administrators, the state has been instrumental in granting the right to use the land to indigenous as well as foreign capital. The government usually disposes its own land or uses communal land which is considered as government land subject to tribal rights. Once an opportunity of capitalist expansion materializes the government expropriates the land and puts it to use for that objective. This has been the case since colonial days. In 1903 the colonial government regulated a land ordinance giving itself the right to acquire land by expropriating rights. In 1930 a similar ordinance enabled the colonial government to acquire any land for public purposes. This ordinance permitted the government to transfer the right to use the land to another person. The colonial administration was thus able to expropriate several lands owned by peasants, nomads or landlords, e.g. Shendi, Karu, Bugr, Tokar and Gezira.

Land expropriation continued after independence. The expansion of capital in the Blue Nile, White Nile, and Gedarif was all carried on by displacing the nomads and peasants in these regions. Private Cotton Schemes were established in around 200,000 feddans in the Blue and White Nile regions in areas which were originally «Bildat» (tenancies).

The allotments of land for mechanized rainfed farms have been taken by the governmental Mechanized Farming Corporation in consultation with the local government land allotment boards. It was originally stated that 60 % of the land should be given to local inhabitants of the region in which the project is situated. The applicants should have at least Ls. 5,000 available to start the farms, which should be 100 – 1,500 feddans. The Agricultural Bank is to finance the purchases of tractors and some operating costs. To get a loan one has to provide a collateral. According to O'BRIAN the effect of these allotment and credit procedures is to concentrate the ownership of these farms among the wealthy merchants, «Jallaba»

and ex-government employees outside the areas in which the project is undertaken (23). For example in Renk district, of 254 schemes allotted, 164 went to merchants, 58 to Dinka, seven to others and the rest to the state. The 59 Dinka schemes and 53 were sublet to the merchants.

Land expropriation, the expansion of capitalist farms, in addition to the growth of population, and the increase in the number of animals owned by the nomads has led to shrinking areas available for grazing and peasant cultivation. There is evidence indicating that the peasants have been deprived of their own land which has then been allotted to rainfed mechanized farms and irrigated schemes. AFFAN reported that a government mechanized farm in Habila displaced cultivators by expropriating 25,000 feddans. Moreover, mechanized farms and cotton schemes were sometimes situated in seasonal movements. In several areas clashes with the owners of the mechanized farms or the police have taken place resulting in violent confrontations. The Hawazma nomads, for example, found themselves forced to move their animals through the Habila project. The authority called on the army to protect the farms.

In fact, such clashes are very common and highly publicized by the government which has tried to mobilize support against the nomads. Thus, the prevalent ideological premise among the urban dwellers is that the nomads are not contributing to the welfare of the country nor to the development of productive forces. The nomads are usually viewed with hostility – especially when they constitute a threat to such highly esteemed schemes as the Gezira or the mechanized farms. Often at the micro village or town level the local police establish good terms with the local merchants and leasers of mechanized farms from which they accrue several privileges, e.g. free supplies of grain and credits. Thus, it is to their best interest to protect the agrarian capitalists against the despised «Arab nomads». Since the central government's regulations and laws encourage such policies the local authorities do not find difficulty in applying them.

The pressure on land led to four major effects. First, there is a process of denomadization in which the nomads become sedentary peasants. Several examples of this process are referred to in the literature about the Baggara, Shukrayia, and Rufa Al Hoi, to mention some.

Abdel GHAFAR AHMED illustrated the pressure on the nomads which was created by capital expansion in the southern part of the Blue Nile Province. Historically, the Ingessana and other small tribes inhabited this region. The penetration of the nomadic Arabs of Rufa Al Hoi from an early time might have constituted a threat to the Ingessana who competed with these tribes for grazing lands. Recently the Fulani West African nomads also flooded the area. The natural multiplication of the nomads' stocks especially after the improvement in vaccination facilities, put pressure on land. Above all the rapid expansion of mechanized agriculture posed a real threat to the very existence of these societies – Mechanized farms were started in Dali and Mazmum and later in Grabien both by the private and state capital. Nomads' seasonal movements and access to traditional water resources were very much restricted. Because of this situation, Abdel GHAFAR concluded that:

«What is gradually happening in the last two years as a result of competition is that some of the Rufa Al Hoi who had only the minimum necessary wealth to maintain a nomadic life, find it not profitable to move for long distance. They are thinking of having part of their household settled. But since the possibility of getting good plots of land to cultivate is small, the only other alternative is to change into agricultural workers» (24).

Secondly, there is an increasing tension between the different nomadic tribes over their respective grazing territories. Nomads whose traditional grazing areas were taken over by the mechanized farms moved to other people's land leading to bitter conflicts. Several violent confrontations and legal battles have taken place between the nomads themselves or with the owners of mechanized farms.

Thirdly, as a result of the shrinking grazing areas, nomads were forced to accept marginal grazing zones. In many instances the number of stocks for the nomadic family can no longer support their reproduction. Hence, they also have to rely more and more on seasonal labor. Such partial proletarianisation is also required by the structure of the agricultural sector where seasonal labourers are needed in the cotton and sugar schemes. Thus, the peasant societies continue to partially assist in the reproduction of the agricultural laborer.

Fourthly, a significant number of the peasants as well as the nomads have abandoned their old mode of living and become permanent laborers. An example of the disintegration of the peasants is given by ADAM and KHIDIR for the case of the Fur region. Unlike the rest of the country, the Fur unit of production is based on the individual and not the household. The wife provides her own labor and on her own land. Except for the beer group work, each individual has to do his/her own work. Working for wage is considered shameful. But in recent times such attitudes have started to change. ADAM and KHIDIR reported that:

«The increasing burden on taxation, coupled with the introduction of a new range of crops, namely orchard gardens and the pressing competition emanating from developments in mechanized rainfed agriculture, have led to the disintegration of the small scale agriculture in the Fur economy and the extension of commodity relations. As a result, the members of the Fur community have been compelled to undertake wage work outside the Millet beer sphere in order to satisfy the basic necessities of life» (25).

DUFFIELD also argued that the expansion of peripheral capitalism in Maiurno has tipped the balance in Maiurno against small scale agricultural production amongst the peasantry. Merchants from the town of Sennar, the ex-government employees and Sultan MAIURNO's family expropriated the land leaving small traces for the peasants. Since the fertility of the land of the latter deteriorated through time leaving them with a small product and heavy debts, the only option left for the poor peasants is to sell their labor (26).

OTHER REASONS

The land factor emphasized in this paper is of less importance in Western and Southern Sudan than in the Central-eastern region. Capital accumulation is heavily concentrated in the latter region. It should be noted that agricultural capitalism first penetrated the Gezira region and Blue Nile, the area in which the cotton or sugar schemes were directly brought under capitalists relations. At the beginning 25,000 tenants and their families became the first nucleus of rural proletariat. This number reached about 100,000 after the extension of the scheme in the Managil region. The latter region used to supply the Gezira with seasonal workers. Prior to the establishment of the Managil extension, 75,000 seasonal laborers used to come from that region. As the Managil extension was developed, the number of these workers dwindled since these workers were either allotted tenancies or preferred to work near home. In 1974/75 both Gezira and Managil employed 147,147 tenants or members of their families, 62,854 resident laborers and 268,181 imported laborers.

A large portion of imported labor comes from as far away as Western Sudan, the Fung area, Southern Sudan or West Africa. These laborers were driven by a variety of factors in addition to the land factor emphasized earlier. In one report it was argued that: «the wage labourers are confronted with worse problems in their own countryside. In their search for livelihood, they gratefully found the Gezira scheme and other irrigated and rainfed schemes welcoming in dire need of their labor» (27). This ambiguous reasoning seems to emphasize drought or the decline of productivity in rainfed regions. But other factors can not be ignored. Western Sudan had entered into commodity exchange with the capitalist mode of production. The appropriation of surplus by the export and import houses, taxes, inflation and the adverse terms of trade against agricultural products has influenced the level of development of productive forces in the peasants societies. Their failure to develop their productive forces is responsible for their lack of means to confront the drought. With the rise in the need for manufactured goods, sugar, tea, etc... there is a rise in the need for cash. Their specialization in the production of cash crops, e.g. oil seeds has even made them dependent on food importation. As a result Western Sudan is now dependent on the importation of dura from the capitalist mechanized farms of the Central-Eastern Sudan. Moreover, the development of rural differentiation, the uneven distribution of land and above all the indebtedness of the poor peasants has led to migration of the peasants eastward seeking to sell their labor.

Southern Sudan has been subjected to different influences. The civil war 1955–72 drove many southerners to the urban centres. Since they could not find means of living in the Southern Urban centres they migrated northward working as seasonal agricultural laborers, urban industrial workers, or construction workers.

V. — REPRODUCTION OF CAPITAL

It should be noted that the major pattern of this capitalist development and slow disintegration of the peasantry and nomads is that it is undertaken as a result of the appropriation of surplus from the peasants, nomads and agricultural workers by the state and the merchants. Thus, the disintegration of the small peasants for the most part was not a result of internal developments within the rural society.

To further examine this last remark let us look more closely at the process of reproduction at the village or camp level and see the way the peasant and nomad societies were articulated and subjected to the laws of motion of the dominant capitalist mode of production. It should be noted that the stages of social development and articulation differ from one region to another. However, the general trend is almost typical only differing in timing and speed of change.

During the colonial era capital penetration into the different regions was uneven. The central-eastern region of the country especially the Gezira, Butana and riverian lands of Northern Province were more integrated in world capitalism than Western and Southern Sudan. Capitalist production relations were more common in the Blue Nile, Kassala and Northern provinces. Western and Southern Sudan had less developed capitalist relations. Nomads and peasantry constituted the largest segment of the population in the latter region.

In the early days of the colonial rule, the cycle of production process in the peasant villages was simple with no surplus and expansion. Independent cultivators and herd owners cultivated the land or bred their animals with the division of labor based on sex and age. The cultivators produced their subsistence grains, sorghum and millet. Five sources were recognized as communally owned: water, cultivatable land, forest products, grazing land and salts. Wage labor is absent and usually substituted for by the joint group party called «Nafir».

The development of commodity production led to a significant social differentiation among the peasantry. The most distinguished new group among the peasants became the traders who originated from among the peasants. Others included «Omdas» and «Shaykhs» and their sons who collected surpluses through imposing internal taxes on their respective subjects. Another source of social differentiation was the ownership of a resource, e.g. gum gardens and land. In some areas the owners of the gum gardens sold the rights to tap gums for entrepreneurs or foreigners (non-residents of the village) who hired labor to collect the gum. Some gum garden owners received shares. Usually the owners of these vast gum gardens would be «Omdas» or merchants.

By the end of the 1960's internal wage labor relations within the villages were very restricted. The reproduction of capitalist relations from within the village community came from the class of small traders and the low level of tribal leaders. But this capital accumulation process within the village was very limited. The reason for this was that the base of production in each village is slim. The surplus was thus limited within the village community where usually a parasitic group of the Omda family,

some religious individuals and traders distribute this slim surplus among themselves. These expropriators of surplus could not make a drastic breakdown of the simple cycle of reproduction of the peasants. The traders of the villages were themselves indebted to the merchants. As to the tribal leaders, they did not accumulate much wealth because the members of their respective communities were few. «Nazirs», «Meks» or «Roth» accumulated huge fortunes when they were acting as heads of their large tribes. Usually they established for themselves bases in towns in which there were local administration councils. They virtually controlled these councils. They established enterprises, such as cotton schemes or mechanized farms.

Evidences of such developments are numerous. El Agab of Rufa Al Hoi, Zubiari El Mek of Dongola, Habania of the White Nile are examples of tribal leaders who established themselves at the superstructure and moved afterwards to the capitalist production of cotton.

OMER noted that in Northern Sudan wealthy peasants could not produce enough surplus to expand production. Instead traders and foreigners introduced pump schemes and employed hired labor (28). DUFFIELD also noted that the peasants of Maiurno could not generate enough surpluses which they can use for expansion. Instead merchants from the nearby town of Sennar such as Salih OBIED or HUMADA family established cotton schemes.

VI. — CONCLUDING REMARKS

It is thus obvious that the process of the destruction of peasants has not been a result of capital accumulation which is undertaken by the rich peasants. Rather the merchants, ex-government employees and the local administrators accumulated wealth through tributes extraction, corruption and trade. The structure of exchange relations is such that a large surplus from agricultural produce is concentrated in the urban areas among the merchants, tribal leaders and above all the state. Up to the present time significant sources of surplus extraction are the above-mentioned primitive means of accumulation. The process of extended reproduction of capital is not solely based upon surplus extraction in the capitalist mode of production as such.

The corresponding process of proletarianisation during the independence era has been the result of the pressure on land which is a consequence of capital accumulation in agriculture, the commoditization of land and the growing inequalities in the distribution of land ownership in the rural areas. In contrast, the colonial state relied on forced labor, immigrants and ex-slaves. Moreover, through the existence of occasional shortages in rural labor one can easily conclude that the pace of proletarianisation during the independence era is much more rapid than during the colonial era. The monetization and commercialization of peasants' production, the increase in taxation, and the resort of the state to such mechanisms of redistribution of income as inflation, have all contributed in the disintegration of the peasants and the formation of a large proletarian class.

The proletarian class consists of three distinct fractions. Of these, two fractions are based in the rural areas, namely, the tenants and the seasonal agricultural workers. The total irrigated schemes, mainly producing cotton, employ around 250,000 tenants. The number of the latter fraction exceeds 1,500,000 employed in the irrigated schemes and the mechanized rainfed schemes. The third fraction consists of around 400,000 of the urban proletariat concentrated in the manufacturing and the transportation sector.

During the post-colonial era there has been a shift in the strategy of capital regarding its relations with agricultural labor. This change is reflected in two aspects. First, there has been a trend towards more use of direct wage labor than the disguised agrarian capitalist relation which is labelled «partnership» between the tenants and capital. As a result of intense agrarian conflicts in the irrigated cotton and sugar schemes direct wage labor is used in the newly established sugar plantation. Second, production relations in the irrigated cotton schemes started to be changed from the old sharing system. At present, flat water and land charges are used in El-Rahad and Essuki schemes. Moreover, all mechanized farms use direct wage labor extensively.

It should be noted that seasonal rural workers have been so far non-unionized and less militant than other rural and urban workers. The shift towards employing seasonal laborers in sugar plantations and the significant increase in the employment of seasonal laborers in the dynamic capitalist mechanized farms implies that the structure of the proletarian class in Sudan is becoming even much more predominated by seasonal rural laborers than before. This will have important consequences for militancy within the working classes. It is of vital importance to the revolutionary movement in the Sudan to understand the strategy of capital. With the acceleration of capitalist relation in the Sudan and the penetration of foreign capital, a counterstrategy by the working classes becomes an urgent issue.

FOOTNOTES

1. Marx, K. 1967, *Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production*. New York: International Publisher, Vol. 2, p. 542.
2. See Emmanuel, A. 1972, *Unequal Exchange: A Study of Imperialism of Trade*. New York: Monthly Press, p. 297.
3. Arrighi, G. 1973, «Labour Supply in Historical Perspective: A Study of the Proletarianization of the African Peasantry in Rhodesia». In Arrighi, G. and Saul, J., *Essays on the Political Economy of Africa*. New York: Monthly Review Press, p. 183.
4. Natural Economy is defined as a one which is based on «The Production for Personal Needs and the Close Connection between Industry and Agriculture». See Luxemburg, R., 1951, *The Accumulation of Capital*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, p. 402.
5. Marx, *op. cit.*, p. 737.
6. Lenin, V. 1967, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. Moscow: Progress Publisher.

7. Dobb, M. 1967, *Studies in the Development of Capitalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
8. Van Onselen, C. 1970, *Chibaro: The African Mine Laborer in Southern Rhodesia, 1900–1933*, London: Pluto Press.
9. Marx, *op. cit.*, p. 685.
10. Evans-Pritchard, E.F., *The Nuer*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
11. Osman, O.M. and Suleiman, Ali 1969, «The Economy of Sudan», in the *Economies of Africa*, edited by Robinson and Lury, Northwestern University Press.
12. See Gaitskell, A. 1959, *Gezira: A Story of Development in the Sudan*. London: Faber and Faber. McLoughlin, P.F. 1968, «Economic Development and the Heritage of Slavery in Sudan Republic». *Africa*. Rome.
13. Hassoun, Isam 1952, «Western Migration and Settlement in the Gezira». Khartoum: *Sudan Notes and Records*.
14. See Cartford, J.R. 1953, «The Introduction of Cotton as a Cash Crop in the Mari-di Area of Equatoria», *Sudan Notes and Records*. Reining, C.C. 1966, *The Zande Scheme: An Anthropological Case Study of Economic Development in Africa*. Northwestern Press.
15. See *Governor General Report*. London: H.M. Stationary's Office, 1899.
16. Warburg, G. 1971, *Sudan Under Wingate: Administration in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan 1899–1916*. London: Frank Cass.
17. See Mohamed Omer Bashir, 1974, *Revolution and Nationalism in the Sudan*. London: Rex Collings.
18. See Hassoun, 1952.
19. FAO, 1966, *Land Tenure in the Sudan*. Rome.
20. Department of Statistics, *Land Survey 1964/65*. Khartoum.
21. ILO, 1976, *Growth, Employment and Equity: A Comprehensive Strategy for the Sudan*. Geneva.
22. Mohamed Galal El Din, 1978, *Some Issues in Population and Development in the Sudan and the Third World*. Khartoum: Development Studies and Research Centre (in Arabic).
23. O'Brien, J. 1980, *Agricultural Labour and Development in the Sudan*. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
24. Abdel Ghaffar M. Ahmed, 1973 «Nomadic Competition in the Funj Area» *Sudan Notes and Records*.
25. Farah H. Adam and Mohasin Khidir, 1977, «Development of Small Scale Agriculture». In Ali M. El-Hassan (ed.): *Growth, Employment and Equity*. Khartoum: Economic and Social Research Council.
26. Duffield, M. 1978, «Peripheral Capitalism and the Social Agricultural Production of the Village of Maïurno». Khartoum: Economic and Social Research Council.
27. Omer El-Agra, et. al., 1980, «A Preview of Human Settlement in Gezira» in Bhoushan, B.S. (ed.), *towards Alternative Settlement Strategies*.
28. El-Haj B. Omer, 1976, «Rural Traders and Socio-Economic Transformation in Dongola Area: Khartoum: Economic and Social Research Council. *Bulletin No. 47*.

RESUME

Cet article essaie de décrire le mécanisme de prolétarianisation au Soudan, en mettant l'accent sur les facteurs non-mercantiles responsables du processus actuel de destruction de la production paysanne. Après la pénétration anglo-égyptienne (1898), l'économie s'était articulée d'abord autour de l'expansion de la production paysanne. A la suite de l'accroissement de cette production, on tenta en vain de mettre sur pied des enclaves minières et des plantations. Par la suite, l'accumulation du capital agricole se fit sous forme d'entreprises à grande échelle (Gezira). Pendant la période postcoloniale, un prolétariat a été créé à la suite de pressions exercées sur la terre, elles-mêmes résultant de l'utilisation de la terre pour la culture de denrées commerciales et des disparités croissantes dans la distribution de la propriété foncière en milieu rural. Par contre, l'état colonial reposait sur le travail forcé, l'immigration et les anciens esclaves. Outre le facteur foncier souligné dans cet article, les rapports commerciaux inéquitables (du point de vue du paysan), les taxes et dans une moindre mesure les facteurs naturels tels que le climat ont contribué au renversement du processus de formation d'un paysannat en milieu rural.

ANNOUNCEMENTS / ANNONCES

CODESRIA BOOK SERIES / SÉRIES DES LIVRES DU CODESRIA JUST PUBLISHED / VIENNENT DE PARAÎTRE

1. L'Enclave Industrielle: La Société Surcrière de la Haute Volta, (édité par M. Taladidia THIOMBIANO).
2. Economic Cooperation and Integration in Africa (edited by Hedi JEMAI).
3. Population and Development in Africa (Edited by Hedi JEMAI).

For more information contact the Editoin-Chief – CODESRIA, B.P.3304, Dakar, Senegal.