The Teaching of the Social Sciences in East Africa

Peter Anyang' Nyong'o *

INTRODUCTION

1. The purpose of this report is to evaluate the teaching of the social sciences in East Africa. The report is divided into Four major sections.

2. *Section one* deals with a brief analysis of the Social Sciences themselves. We ask ourselves the following questions :

— What is social science ?
— How has it evolved ?
— With what aspects of life is it concerned ?

3. *Section two* deals with the genesis and evolution of the social sciences in East Africa. Emphasis will be given to the emergence and institutionalization of the teaching and research into the social sciences in the now defunct University of East Africa and how, once it broke, the evolution of the three Universities has affected the social sciences.

4. The structure of *funding* social science research will be looked at ; the *teaching* of the social sciences will be closely ventilated from the author's personal experience as a student, a student leader and a faculty member in two of the campuses : the recruitment of *teachers* (lecturers) and student will be explained ; publication facilities will be analysed ; the diffusion of published material will also be looked at as a way of understanding how these are related to and affected by inter and intra-university communication.

5. *Section three* deals with *current* and *future problems* of social science teaching and research. A close look at the *University of Nairobi* is taken so as to make some statements which may be generalised, or may be applicable to the other two Universities - Makerere and Dar-es-Salaam. While Makerere may, at this time, be undergoing

---

* Lecturer, Department of Government, University of Nairobi, Kenya.
Revaluation report prepared for CODESRIA/UNESCO.
Views expressed in this work are those of the author's. They should not be taken to represent the views of CODESRIA or the Department of Government of the University of Nairobi.

some unusual experiences, it still maintains the basic infrastructure for teaching and researching into the social sciences established in the pre - 1970 period.

6. It will be emphasized that the expansion of social science programs at the University level should not be undertaken simply for manpower training purposes. Our point of departure is that the question of manpower is quite often *wrongly posed.* We emphasize the importance of the *content* of social science teaching and research, its day-to-day relevance to planning and policy in spite of the manpower question, the need to expand and extend University facilities to society in general, and the importance of expanding graduate programmes to realize these goals.

7. Problems of funding and maintaining qualified staff, attracting and sustaining graduate students, research and teaching facilities, academic freedom and issues of nationalism and academic mediocrity are discussed.

8. *Section Four* is concerned with what we have chosen to call « *Integration and co-ordination of research and scholarship in Africa and the third world* ». Here we contrast the *need* to have academic cross-fertilization among African and Third World scholars with the *reality* of the continued integration of African Universities into the occidental systems in terms of intellectual approaches, recruitment of teachers, graduate work, publications, reading materials, etc.

9. We emphasize the relevance of such bodies as CODESRIA and CLACSO in the re-organization of this « received » set-up and its re-structuring in favour of a « New International Academic Order ».

SECTION ONE

WHAT IS SOCIAL SCIENCE ?

10. What is social science and whit what is it concerned ? How did social science studies evolve ?

11. Nowadays, when we talk of the social sciences, we think of sociology, economics, geography, political science and anthropology. History, literature, philosophy, religious studies and art all belong to the *humanities,* or the *arts.* Law, apparently, though it should concern itself very much with issues that interest sociologists and political scientists alike, is quite often relegated to a category of its own. Concerned with the study of how conflicts are *finally resolved* in capitalist society, the teaching of law seem not to be concerned with analysing how these conflicts originally *arise.* Thus law faculties end up training *legal technicians* (something which pupillage should do) and not *juridical scholars* (those who understand systems and processes of law).

12. But dividing up social science into various disciplines does not tell us what social science is all about. It does, however, indicate

to us what its subject matter would be : i.e., politics, society, economic relations, culture, etc. We may, therefore, define social science as *that branch of knowledge which is concerned with the study of social processes which affect, and are shaped by, the relations among men in society.*

13. « Men », in this regard, is a *social concept.* We are not talking about biological men, we are talking about man the « social being ». For man (the biologically living being) becomes man (the bearer of social relations such as language, culture, religion, racial prejudice, etc.) only by living in society. But what does « living in society » involve ?

14. Living in society involves *production ;* the production of the material goods that man needs to survive as a biologically living being on the one hand, and the production of the social relations within which the process of material production is organized. If man is to survive, he has to feed himself, shelter himself and cure himself from diseases. That is, a minimum of his material wants and needs must be satisfied ; he has to « provide for himself » as natural wisdom would have it.

15. But man does not « provide for himself » as an individual, he does so as a member of a group. Ordinarily, we tend to think of this group as a family, or a village, or a clan or workers in an assembly plant. This is, to some extent, true. In actual fact, that is why classical political philosophy, in its attempt to understand the origins of the state (particularly Aristotle), frequently posed the question « what is the minimum unit of life without which man cannot survive ? » Aristotle, for example, thought « the family » was the primary unit of life. Anthropologists, palaeantologists and archaeologists have, however, now provided us with better data than Aristotle. Nowadays we are well aware that there have been diverse family forms in the history of man. These family forms correspond to various manners in which production has been organized in that history. Thus, although man provides for himself in groups, these groups are constituted not as they *immediately appear to us* in real life, but according to the relations that arise among men in the process of production. These relations, and only these relations, give specific characters to these groups in which « we see man » living. Society is therefore *structured* along these relations.

16. The task of social science is to study the structure of society and the social dynamics and processes given by this structure. This structure need not coincide with « things as they appear to us ». After all, as the famous saying goes, if appearances coincided with reality, science would be superfluous ! One of the ways in which society reproduces itself, i.e. ensures its own survival, is to transmit pictures of itself to its members which help them support and participate in that process of reproduction. Members of a society frequently come to « know » that society not by what it *actually* is, but by what they

have been » socialized » to believe it is. That is, members of a society quite often do not have a theoretical knowledge of that society (a knowledge of the structure), but an ideological knowledge of it (as socialized agents) (1). But this ideological knowledge must be ensured if a particular manner of living, a particular mode of production is to reproduce itself. As Hindess and Hirst (2) say, and as Apollo Njonjo (3) rightly points out, the reproduction of a mode of production requires not simply the reproduction of its material subsistence, but also its *ideological conditions for existence,* through their transmission to its future agents of production — the children.

17. Men, therefore, come into this world unclothed of the relations which they bear as social beings. It is the bearing of these relations which develops them into particular characters with certain idiosyncracies but of specific social types. Bourgeois ideology, i.e. the ideology in capitalist society which individualizes social beings in their conscious interaction with others, at one level accepts the validity of this « structuring but at another level does not. It accepts it in so far as it would not challenge « the common destiny of men » and their need to support the « foundations of society » — whether put in terms of the principles of the « founding fathers » or the rule of law ; but it denies it in so far as it holds that individuals must fend for themselves « freely » in the political and economic market place. Whether the latter happens in reality is the task of social science to determine, i.e. to understand the structure and its social dynamics (ideology being one of the dynamics) and not to seek to find in ideology simply the picture it portrays of this reality.

18. Whether in capitalist society or not, this problem of unmasking ideological relations so as to understand the real structure of society, the basic pattern of social relations, always poses itself. It is usually the case that those who hold political power in society who, therefore, by that very act of exercising that power, are interested in stabilizing the social order in which they operate, will regard as subversive any ideas that tend to question the assumptions behind their activities. This necessarily leads to an explanation of this reality clouded by ideological considerations and assertions. Social science, interested in unmasking appearances so as to understand the inner reality of social life, will, equally if necessity, have the potential of being *subversive* as far as power-wielders are concerned. This is a structural quality that can emerge more nakedly in the social dynamics of society at particular times in history (4).

19. But social science scholarship need not always concern itself with theoretical issues as a way of sharpening its analytical tools (5). This is explained by several factors, the principal *ones* having to do with *the class position of intellectuals and the history of their intellectual formation.*

20. In the world of the social sciences in Africa to-day, we can speak of two types of scholars or intellectuals : *traditional scholars and vocational scholars* (6).

21. Traditional scholarship is the scholarship in the professions where intellectual work is done as a way of earning a living. Vocational scholarship, however, requires the commitment of the individual scholar to intellectual work *as a vocation.*

22. There is a fundamental difference between two types of scholarship. While intellectual Labour is done by both types of scholars, the traditional scholar does his job merely to earn a living. He is, as it were, a cog in the wheel of a society in which division of labour is required and his job involves, among other things, *the reproduction of the structure of that society as it is.*

23. Vocational scholarship, however, goes beyond the requirements to reproduce a particular institution or society on the basis of intellectual labour ordinarily rendered : it involves engaging intellectual work with *the goal of invention,* or *of altering the conditions under which social life is organized or labour performed.* Vocational scholarship therefore cannot rest comfortable with the assumptions that are made about why things happen in society the way they do until it has thoroughly questioned the basis of these assupmtions and found out that they do, indeed, spring from the bedrock of social reality itself. To be a vocational scholar or academic is to opt for the uncomfortable. It is to opt for the uncomfortable in the sense that the reproduction of ideological relations quite often militates against a structural analysis of social life, especially with regard to the interests of ruling classes.

24. The division of the social sciences into its various disciplines, the bureaucratization of these disciplines and the mystification of their autonomies from each other have all led to the debasing of the knowledge that social science teaching and research can have in the capitalist world. Where these disciplines have then been inserted into societies with *no* modern-day intellectual tradition, and where they then have become the « regions » or « avenues » for the upward mobility of traditional scholars, their « eclecticness » and inability to grow as arenas for the production of knowledge has been amazing. Mediocrity is then defended in the name of nationalism ; eclecticness is complimentarily defended in the name of professionalism.

25. But more than that, we are talking of a social science compartmentalized not only in terms of disciplines at the bureaucratic level, but also in terms of accessibility of these disciplines to students. Sociology is concerned with analysis of social relations. Sociology is, therefore, the mother of the social sciences. But a sociology devoid of philosophy or some basic mathematical logic may easily be inaccessible to students. Political science is concerned with the analysis of political processes and political institutions ; it may address itself specifically to the issue of public policy making and implementation. But if it is ignorant of the fact that before any policy is pronounced by the state as binding on society, certain forms of struggles must have gone before, the knowledge it is capable of producing will equally be inaccessible to students. In this instance, this is political science taught without the basic subject matter of the discipline, i.e. *politics.*

26. We can, in actual fact, go on *ad infinitum.* But the point we are driving home is the following : that, in spite of bureaucratic compartmentalization, social science teaching and research should and must concern itself with its subject matter : *the structure of society and its social dynamics.* The thing that must be avoided is the inability of the social sciences to fail to produce this knowledge (a) as a result of compartmentalization and/or (b), as a result of the inaccessibility to knowledge producable within these disciplines due to compartmentalization and/or quality and depth of intellectual work.

We can now discuss the East African case.

SECTION TWO

GENESIS AND EVOLUTION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN EAST AFRICA

27. The three East African countries, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania (the union fo Tanganyika and Zanzibar), were all British colonies until the early sixties. Though a former colony of Germany, Tanganyika became a British mandated territory and, for all practical purposes, assumed the general character of a British colony.

28. This common British background is important in understanding the educational systems which were evolved in these three territories. First, education was an important part of the *social infrastructure* ncessary for « la mise en pied » of the colonial economy. If cotton was to be exported from Uganda to Manchester, there were to be enough clerks to count the bales, enough train drivers to drive it to Mombasa and enough workers to produce it in the rural areas. The workers need not know how to read and write ; the others required some formal education. This « target » education characterized most of the pre-Second War period. It functioned more-or-less in a similar manner in the three colonies. Uganda, however, was a little different in the sense that it had the traditional aristocratic regimes, like Buganda, where education for « the king's man » became a modern status to accompany and fortify royalism, or closeness to it. Hence the great expansion of professionals — lawyers and doctors — in Buganda society in colonial Uganda.

29. That, however, is a very general picture. But when it was clear, after the second World War, that the political management of the British colonies would have to pass to the local people, the size of what Lennox Boyd, the then Colonial Secretary, called « a responsible middle class », (7) became an important issue. In Uganda, this middle class had developed not just in the professions but also in rural agriculture. In most cases, it was highly sophisticated in its bourgeois aspirations economically and politically. Kenya was more or-less the same. Tanzania, however, was a different story (8).

30 Although the British had taken over the administering of Tanzania after World War One, they never treated it as an important

colony. What the Ivory Coast was to Senegal is what Tanganyika was to Kenya, i.e. the backyards of the colonial economy. Tanganyika's economy was tagged into the economies of Kenya basically as a market for consumer commodities manufactured in British-owned « manufacturies » in Kenya. Uganda's ginneries and coffee plantations fed the East African Railways and Harbours with commodities which principally transported agricultural exports from Kenya. For all intents and purposes, it was Kenya and Uganda which were important to British colonialism. Developing proper educational systems as social infrastructures to these colonies — Kenya and Uganda — topped the agenda after 1945. Little concern was shown over Tanganyika (9).

31. Thus, when the first University College in East Africa was started as an oversea branch of London University, it was in Uganda where it got located, i.e. at Makerere College situated on one of Kampala's seven hills (10). The growth of Makerere as a University College, its student intake and the kind of subject studied reflected the patterns of higher education in East Africa and the demands for college graduates by the colonial economies then (11). It was, therefore, at Makerere, that the teaching of, and research into, the social sciences first took place in Est Africa.

32. Imported social science had its origins in the Makerere Institute of Social Research which was founded in 1948 and developed a strong tradition of study in social anthropology associated with the work of Andrey Richards, Lloyd Fallers and Aidan Southall. In 1958 the permanent staff of the Institute consisted of nine anthropologists, one sociologist and one economist, and most of the additional short term research associates were engaged in anthropological field studies of circumscribed communities. In the college itself at this time the disciplines of political science, economics and sociology shared a grand total of eight staff members and were little more than courses in the Department of Social studies which in turn was part of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Compared to the Departments of English, Geography, History and Religious Studies which had twenty seven staff positions between them, this was obviously a very skewed distribution of academic ressources (12).

33. That, of course, reflected the emphasis placed on the teaching of the arts in the British system for producing cultivated civil servants and « men of letters ». The dominance of anthropology in the social sciences, with its structural-functional orientation, also norrowed the concern of social science research into pre-capitalist social formations, thereby taking it away from « the concerns of its days », i.e. contemporary politics (being the concentration of economics) then. Even within the analysis of these pre-capitalist social formations, structural-functionalism limited the arena of knowledge.

34. The theoretical limits of structural-functional anthropology led it to classify pre-capitalist social formations into two broad categories: those which developed states (or centralized forms of authority) and those which did not develop states (so-called acephelous societies). Forms of state, though they had different class bases and could be

periodiced differently, were then lumped together and their qualitative differences relegated to quantitative narratives as to how, in this year, the king of so-and-so was able to capture so much land from x, y, z while the king of so-and- so could not. Social science became an art, the art of narration. Historians seized on the academic outputs of anthropologists and, having perfected the art of narration from their historical education in colonial East Africa, produced so-called pre-colonial histories of East African Societies, « histories » which are bastardized by an art which insists appearances always coincide with reality.

35. These anthropological writings and researches, and these « histories », nonetheless, have a wealth of data in them which became invaluable to further social science research in East Africa. As I have said elsewhere, these data can be very useful, but their usefulness is often limited by :

a) the categorie of analysis, i.e. the way concepts lead data to be grouped in particular ways,

b) the modes of interpretation of these data, i.e. the way problems are formulated within which these data are interpreted (13).

36. If social science was then to take over from where anthropology had arrived by the time the University of East Africa was beginning in 1963 (14), it needed to broaden its scope and sharpen its theoretical weapons. But the University of East Africa started with a mission that gave it little time to evaluate the type of social science teaching and research that could concern itself with *the production of knowledge.* This was the mission of *Education for Manpower Training,* high-level manpower.

37. High-level manpower was seen specificallly in terms of the requirements of the economy. And since the economy needed to grow fast, the Africans needed to get those social services denied to them during colonial times, and state bureaucracies needed to be Africanized, the rapid production of this manpower had to be the urgent task of the University (15).

38. From the social sciences high school teachers, government administrators, social workers and university lecturers were to be quickly produced. If sociology and political science were not high school subjects and high school teachers were urgently needed, then sociology and political science would not receive priority consideration in the development of Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences. Instead, the teaching of English Language, English Literature, History, Geography and Economics dominated such faculties. It was no wonder that Faculties of Education soon emerged at Makerere, Nairobi and Dar-es-Salam in which the *humanities* and *the natural sciences* were taught, but *not* the social sciences (16). We shall later see the consequences of this appreach to the growth of education in East Africa.

39. Although social science teaching was therefore to be perpetually absent from high school syllabuses by the very way in which the University accepted the « structuring » of manpower requirements within a system « handed down to it » from colonial times, social science faculties emerged as the traditional components of a « normal » University. With the creation of the University of East Africa in 1963, a Faculty of Social Science was created at Makerere consisting of separate departments of Economics, Sociology and Political Science and Public Administration, with the Est African Institute of Social research (former MISR) also a constituent department of the Faculty. The organization of corresponding departments at Nairobi and Dares-Salaam set the stage for a development which has resulted in the achievement of a full range of social science departments and research institutes at all *three* Universities (17).

40. But the methods by which a social science education could be dovetailed into high-level manpower needs was, by the early sixties, much more developed in the American higher education system than in its British counterpart. Coupled with the American « push » to enter former colonies after World War Two in tune with the development of her global hegemony economically, the University of East Africa found itself developing social science departments with two tendencies : the traditional British tendency of emphasizing anthropology and the philosophical traditions of western civilization, and the American behavioural approach to the study of the social sciences in which the Social Science Research Council Committee on the comparative study of New Nations was already providing leadership on how to set up social science studies in Africa. David Court succinctly notes :

« At the time of the foundation of the University of East Africa the dominent strain of social inquiry reflected the British academic tradition on which the University was based and emphasized the study of history, philosophy and anthropology. This tradition was steadily supplemented and to some extent over shadowed by the « new » social science — noted in the disciplines of economics, sociology and political science — *which emphasized theory building as the goal, individual behaviour as the unit of analysis and quantitative measurement as the form of assessment* » (18).

41. What type of theories were these and to what extent did they go beyond the limits of structural-functionalist theories within which British anthropology had tried to establish its hegemony ?

42. Taking the individual as the unit of analysis, *behaviouralism assumed the overt behaviour of human beings consciously reflected structural relations.* But I have elsewhere observed that in most human societies, *men are always socialised to carry in their heads pictures of society which are meant to guide their conduct. These pictures needs not necessarily coincide with what their real life situations actually are.* But it may be necessary, as a way of making them comply with the existing order, that they do indeed believe in the reality

of these pictures and behave according to them. This, in actual fact, is the role of *ideology* in society (19).

43. Behaviouralism was therefore *ideological* from the very beginning. Its concern for the maintenance of the existing social order was reflected in the kinds of books its champions published and the researches they generated: *Creating Political Order, Political Order in Changing Societies, Prismatic Theory of Public Administration, System Maintenance and System Stability in New Nations,* etc, etc. As I have also observed elsewhere, this type of social science assumes a goal that society ought to achieve, i.e. modernity, and then proceeds to tabulate pre-requisites needed in the system for such a goal to be arrived at. Any behaviour contrary to these pre-requisites are relegated to the museum of tradition, and « modernization programmes » are recommended for the achievement of these goals and also *as ends in themselves.* When no social classes could perfectly obey « the laws of modernization », behaviouralism floundered and the type of social science research it advocated almost disappeared from East African universities with as much haste as the one it had in its advent.

44. So as not to paint the picture too dark, the productivity of behaviouralism must be recognized in its hayday during the sixties. The East African Social Science Conference, held annually in one of the three campuses of the University of East Africa, can be used to gauge this productivity. As David Court has noted, « the list of papers presented to the annual East African social science conference over the period 1950 to 1973 provides a historical overview of the concerns and emphases of East African Social Science. All the trends which have been mentioned can be discerned. The expansion is immediately apparent from the relative space devoted to the annual entries. In 1950, for example, ten papers were presented at the annual conference ; in 1973 the number was 142. The steady increase in the number of East African contributors is equally evident. In 1963 out of the 55 papers which were presented only one was by an East African author whereas by 1969, 32 out of 121 were by local authors and by the 1973 the number had risen to almost 100. The shifting emphasis of the subject matter is also apparent. In 1958 all ten papers described micro studies of small ethnic communities. By 1963 conference papers had become divided into disciplinary sections and since then the most significant trends have been the increase in the numbers devoted to recognized practical problems, a similar expansion of these based on survey research methods and an expansion of the scope of concern from small communities to issues of national, regional and continental interest. *The application of political economy approaches has occurred since the demise of the conference in 1974 but can be gauged from the subjects and titles of individual departments and research institutions* » (20).

45. Once history forced social scientists — behaviouralists included — to look at social phenomena within the *totality in which they were* embedded, political economy compulsively called attention to the utility of its own analytical tools. With the failure of « Uhuru governments » left, right and center in Africa, the corrupt tendencies

that emerged among certain modernizing elites, the inability of certain buoyant Third World ecenomies to « take off », social science was increasingly challenged to abandon its old tools of analysis and pick up some new and more « window-opening » concepts and theories.

Even by the time the University of East African Social Science Conference was already making a shift towards political economy as a result of the internal struggles and changes that were taking place in the Social Science faculties of the three sister University colleges. In Tanzania, the battle was raging over the nature and organization of social science courses and how they were to reflect *social problems* not disciplines « blindly received » from civilizations with their own intellectual traditions of viewing their problems (21). For example, departments would be disbanded and the Faculty of Social Science would offer courses leading to students graduating in B.A. (Economic Planning), B.A. (Child Welfare), B.A. (Water Engineering), B.A. Youth Organization) and so on. In Uganda, the General Development studies, organized under the voluntary directorship of Dr. Locksley Edmonson in the academic year 1969-70, aimed at the breaking down of the barriers set by these « received disciplines » in studying society (22). But GDS lasted for only that academic year when it was taught as a general course for *all* university students. The next year was to see its relegation to the museum of « interesting things » which, however, « don't quite fit into the way we academics do things » (23). In Nairobi, some students of the department of Government had started pressurizing Professor Colin Leys for courses on Marxism. It might partly be due to the pressures and concerns of these students that Colin Leys, from the 1970-71 Academic year, rapidly shifted to the Left and renounced the validity of the theoretical stands he had taken in studying problems of social change. Those old tools of analysis, he finally recognized, mystified reality instead of clarifying it.

46. The power of Marxism or political economy approaches to social science studies does not lie in its revolutionary ideology (frequently misunderstood and very often under-stated), but in its *explanatory potential* as a social science. If the ideological aspects of it are the only ones emphasized, it becomes a religion and not a social science. But if the usefulness of its methodology is recognized and correctly used, it becomes a dynamic tool of analyses that no social scientist can do without in this day and age.

47. Marx's most fundamental contribution to the study of social phenomena was his insistence that reality be *conceived of* in its *totality.* Reality is a totality composed of internally related parts. These parts are essentially reducible to the interaction of man and nature in his struggle for survival. Thus, the way man produces and reproduces his life, in whatever epoch, forms the *core,* the innermost secret, of social life, of reality. From that we are led to the notion that man becomes *aware of himself as he produces and reproduces* his life ; i.e., knowledge is a function of production, it emerges through the activity of producing and reproducing this life and « acts back on it ».

48. When, then, the concept *mode of production* is said to play a key role in the problematic of the Marxist science of social development or history (Historical Materialism), it is not because of some wonder-working potential of this phrase in the production of knowledge. Par contre, it is because of its « window-opening ability » to unmask social appearances and « see into » social reality. The *basic pattern* of social development is laid out only from the point of departure of the tools of knowledge which can dissect social phenomena effectively. Research which begins by highlighting such issues as integral parts of understanding reality (data) is then what qualifies as *social scientific research* (24).

49. Althrough, due to social changes in East Africa, Marxist methodology has progressively asserted its relevance, the social science community has not been « cultivated » enough to fully recognize and nurture it. First, there is problem of academic formation. Nurtured in the various schols of behaviouralism, most social scientists — even if they are sympathetic to Marxist approaches — are not aware of or literate in Marxist epistemology. Secondly, without even being submerged in behavioural epistemology, some social scientists have simply had inadequate preparation for social science research and teaching. Rapidly promoted (due to Africanization policies) up the ladder of seemingly academic achievement in their various disciplines, they attain titles whose academic demands neither their own intellectual formation nor their academic productivity can measure up to. The result is insecurity, a strong attachement to gerontocracy, and an unwillingness to confront other epistemologies for this would mean a process of learning already missing in their own intellectual formation. Thirdly, academic mediocrity is then reflected in the constant urge to fight ideological battles (natives versus expatriates, communists versus nationalists) and not theoretical battles. Fourthly, with the devaluation of intellectual labour, this mediocrity becomes structurally reproduced because, in order to reproduce middle class (or better) life-styles, scholars are compelled to engage in revenue-earning non-academic activities. This process of « straddling » deprofessionalizes them, leading to less time being devoted to scholarly labours, hence to a general deterioration of social science discourse and research.

50. Yet, of course, for social science to grow, there must be academic freedom seen not simply in terms of state-university relations, *but academic freedom within the academic market place.* For academic freedom does not just mean the freedom to persue knowledge wherever that pursuit may lead the academician ; more importantly, it means *making academic work competitive in the academic market place.* It means letting a thousand thoughts contend, and a million flowers bloom. It means subjecting all kinds of epistemologies which claim to be the roots of this or that place of knowledge to undergo the test of ruthlessly questioning the assumptions on which they are based. *It means making the academician not closet himself in any one particular epistemology, but to expose himself to several epistemologies which will, indeed, test the validity of his own world-view in the quest* of knowledge.

When we talk about academic freedom, we should talk about it with two concerns : First, we should ask how academic freedom can influence our quest for knowledge, i.e., help us in acquiring diverse types of intellectual tools for understanding society in our free market economies. Second, given that these free market economies are ruled by classes which do not always entertain intellectual weapons that reveal the nature of the reality on which they survive, to what extent is academic freedom a threat to those who have political power ? (25)

51. Perhaps the issue of state-university conflict or potential conflicts in the pursuit of academic freedom has been over-emphasized at the expense of the former. It might even be used as an excuse for social scientists not to do challenging research, or for foundations and « donor agencies » not to fund « politically-sensitive » research (26).

It is validly argued that the East African universities, because of their geographical location and structural closeness to political power, make their social scientists highly vulnerable to state power (27). No doubt there are numerous pieces of evidence to demonstrate instances during which at Makerere, Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam, lecturers and students alike have been coerced and terrorized by state power for their critical analysis of society. This problem is bound to continue. But the solution to it is not for academicians to become sleeping ideologues of ruling parties etc, but for them to struggle for their democratic rights, i.e. academic freedom (28).

For academic freedom is indeed a threat not just to non-democratic ruling classes but also to those traditional academicians who thrive on the stability of such regimes. Further, academic freedom is useful both for the advancement of bourgeois democracy and for the advancement of knowledge itself in society. Moreover, the advocacy of new ideas and policies in an open democratic fashion is the only way in which policy makers can arrive at *real alternatives* in their planning proccesses.

SECTION THREE

CURRENT AND FUTURE PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHING AND RESEARCH IN EAST AFRICA

52. We have dealt with the general problems, but always giving certain concrete examples whenever we were able to. We now want to breefly deal with some current specific problems of teaching and research in the social sciences in East Africa. The University of Nairobi will be our example.

53. The University's social science Faculty is almost fully Africanized, with the exception of the Department of Sociology. But it tends to lose good lecturers who get more lucrative offers elsewhere. It has been observed that this may be due to salaries at the university

being relatively lower than those in the private sector. That is true. But it must also be remembered that some people leave, not so much because of lower salaries, but as a result of *lack of professional working conditions and working relations within the university*. The standard of scholarship being uneven, younger teaching staff often feel emasculated when their older, but at times less competent colleagues arrogate for themselves the task of determining « what is to be done » and allow little or no room for innovation from below. Lack of professionalism has also to do with working conditions, i.e. provision of adequate resources with which a proper academic profession can be pursued. Such resources include bookshops, libraries, journals, staff associations, seminar rooms, telephones that work, and so on. Departments without libraries are not a rare phenomenon at the University of Nairobi, let alone courses without their text-books selling in the university bookshop ! ! !

54. Good lecturers shoud not, however, leave the university because of these problems; it is by trying to solve them within the university itself that an academic tradition can be built by those who have been in the game long enough.

55. Quite often the problem is not primarily that of good lecturers leaving, but of the university not being able to replace them by equally good local staff. This is as a result of the narrowness of the social science community, and the smallness of the graduate programmes. This, again, can be explained by the *way* graduate work in the social sciences evolved and the staff-recruitement bias they took.

56. Apart from those who have gone, by themselves, to do graduate work overseas, a good number of current lecturers in the social sciences have been associated with staff-development schemes. Thus, in the department of government at the University of Nairobi, out of 10 members of the teaching staff, six entered university teaching at one time or another as former Rockefeller Foundation Fellows in its staff-development programmes for the universities of East Africa. Since this programme has now been discontinued, one wonders what would happen should these lecturers decide to leave. The immediate action would, of course, be to advertise the posts. But the department would be much better off if it had had a graduate programme from which products can provide a market to recruit locally from in the event of a vacancy or of an expansion.

57. But the university has so far treated local graduate courses more as ways of training immediately needed lecturers (the pipe-line approach) and not as a way of creating a literate social science community. Graduate work should not be regarded as a « service programme » for the university's staff development scheme. This should just be one of the many functions that it serves as the need arises from time to time (29).

In order, however, to widen the base of the social science community, the graduate programme should concern itself with the deepening of the intellectual formation of those students who, during their

undergraduate career, have shown the potential of contribution to knowledge and the understanding of social phenomena in the various avenues of life. A graduate school would also provide adequate conditions for faculty members for effective teaching and research by benefitting from the intellectual challenge and research assistance that graduate students provide at a level more profound and advanced than the undergraduates. It is only by developing full graduate programmes geared to serve the home market first, and the international market second, that the university can advance beyond its heritage as a college. Colleges can content themselves with an ever growing body of undergraduates universities, on the other hand, must be the seat of real academia.

58. The same thing has to be said of the university's social science research institutes, like the Institute of Develoopment Studies. Training in research techniques is something that should not simply be put at the disposal of those wanting to do « dissertation research ». It is extremely important that instruction in various techniques of analysing social science data be provided as part of general social science training (30). Research could then be undertaken by competent social scientists in different occupations and branches of the economy apart from the university. This would make for easier dialogue between the university researchers and scholars, policy makers and policy consumers. Again, the aim is to build a wider community of social science researchers. This pre-supposes a close interaction between the social science departments and the Research Institute.

59. While, at the endergraduate level, more room should be given for students to take courses in the social sciences, these very courses should also be conscious of their mission to study reality for whar it is. A general course like « East African Society and Environment », or « Society and Environment in Africa », if well conceived and taught, would provide *all* students with a solid background of studying their society in whichever discipline they choose. At the moment, a first-year student takes 2 hours of lectures and one of tutotials in 3 subjects of his choice from among the following: geography, history, literature, french, swahili, religious studies and philosophy, political science and sociology. In the second year, anyone of two; that choice continues to the third year. Whether a student gets around enough education in those fields depends very much on the syllabi, the way they are taught and the seriousness of purpose of the lecturers. Little more can be added.

60. At graduate level, however, it would be useful if the Faculty of Arts and social sciences had a *single graduate* programme to which *all* departments would integrate their courses. At the moment, for example, each department develops its own graduate programme almost autonomously of other departments. This means that graduate students are rarely in a position to take courses in other departments complimentary to courses in the departments in which they are registered (except, of course, in situations where *Options or electives are stipulated*).

61. A general principle could be established whereby the graduate programme of every department allows for *Option* and/or *Electives* from sister departments. This could be done without necessarily making all courses in all departments uniform in terms of duration or unit-weight. Such an elective/option would, no doubt, make it possible for various departments in the Faculty of Arts to contribute to the intellectual formation of the student. At the level of course work for the PhD, such options/electives would definitely increase and make it possible for graduate classes to be bigger, graduate students to have more intellectual interaction with each other, and graduate teachers to get academic cross-fertilization from sister departments.

SECTION FOUR

INTEGRATION AND CO-ORDINATION OF RESEARCH: SCHOLARSHIP IN AFRICA AND THE THIRD WORLD

62. It cannot be emphasized how important research output is to social science teaching and to public policy makers in society in general. But once research is done it must be disseminated or communicated to its consummers.

63. Apart from the problem of having a small social science research community in Africa, we also have very few resources for communications/disseminations research done. This has two dysfunctions : it keeps the community small because it cannot expand : two, it keeps the small, and at times shrinking, community disaggregated.

64. Yet the coordination of research and the effective dissemination of its products is what would make the community to be conscious of itself. In a place like Nairobi, *there is no university press;* products of scholarship have to compete for the attention of commercial publishers. This can hinder academic progress.

65. To take of some of these problems — without being a subtitute for university presses or anything like that — the Council for the Development of Economic and Social Research in Africa (CODESRIA) was created. Apart from coordinating social science research in Africa, CODESRIA documents and disseminates research done. Thus it publishes quarterly journal *Africa Development,* organizes seminars and conferences, gathers data for its documentation center, and keeps research institutes informed of the personel and works of each other At the moment the CODESRIA/CLACSO research project on « Industrialization and Agriculture in Africa and Latin America » is the first project that is now trying to situate African social problems in their Third World context.

66. Thus, of course, in trying to arrive at *A New International Academic Order* such bodies as CODESRIA and CLACSO must be given full support. For, it is only by trying to create a community of « home-grown » researchers and scholars, capable of innitiating, orga-

nizing and executing their own research into indigenous socio-economic issues, will we also have a local reservoir of *social literates* from which the state can recruit its planners and the university its researchers and teachers. The concern of the *New International Academic Order* is to begin a process of a self-centered academic growth in terms of intellectual formation (through local graduate schools), research conception, organization and execution (through native researchers and institutions) and research communication (through local journals, publishing firms etc). It is hoped that this paper will modestly contribute towards that goal.

NOTES AND FOOTNOTES

1. See, for example ANYANG'NYONG'O, « Academic Freedom and Political Review in Africa », University of Nairobi, Department of history, *Staff Seminar Paper No.* 8, 1978/79, *November* 28, 1978.
2. Barry HINDESS and Paul HIRST, *Pre-Capitalist Modes of Production.*
3. Apollo NJONJO, « Kenya : The Survival of the Peasantry or the Development of Capitalism ? »
   CODESRIA/CLACSO Seminar on Comparative Studies in the Relationship Between Agriculture and Industrial Development Amongst a Number of African and Latin American Countries. Dakar, Sénégal, December 11-14, 1978.
4. See ANYANG' NYONG'O, « Academic Freedom ».
5. The « mathematization » of Social Science research, encouraged in the hayday of behaviouralism, tended to drive out all theoretical debates from social science research.
6. See ANYANG'NYONG'O « Scholars at Crossroads in search of Direction » *Historical Association of Kenya,* Nairobi Branch, May 1978.
   This paper was also read, on my behalf, by Dr. Abdalla BUJRA at the Khartoum Meeting of the CODESRIA/DSRC Conference on Social Science, Research and National Development in Africa, 4-8 November, 1978.
7. See Mahmoud MANDANT, *The Politics of Class Formulation in Uganda*
8. See, for example, J. CAMERON and W.A. DODD, *Society, Schools and Progress in Tanzania* (New York : Pergamon Press, 1970).
9. *Ibid.*
10. Margaret MACPHERSON, *They Built For the Future,* (London :Cambrige University Press, 1964).
11. See, for example, CAMERON and DODD, pp. 142-48.
12. David COURT, « The idea of Social Science in East Africa », Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi, February 1978.
13. Anyang' NYONG'O, « SAREC'S FIRST YEAR »,
    Africa Development, Vol. III, No 1, 1978.

14. The constituent colleges of the University of East Africa were Makerere University College, Kampala, Uganda ; Nairobi University College in Kenya and the University of Dar-es-Salaam in Tanzania.
15. COURT, « The Idea of Social Science », p. 12
CAMERON and DODD, *Society, Schools..*, *p.* 198.
16. With the exception of geography which is taught as a high school subject and quite often regarded as a social science at the university level. At Makerere, geography was in the faculty of arts. In Nairobi, the faculty of Arts subsumes social science subjects.
17. COURT, *op. cit.*
18. Ibid
19. Ayang' NYONG'O, « Academic Freedom ».
20. COURT, *op. cit.*
21. Information received from discussions with Dr. GWASSA, the director of the IDS, Dar-es-Salaam; Dr. A. BUJRA, who was then Chairman of the Sociology Department at the Dar-es-Salaam University and Dr. NICOT Adholla, then a sociology undergraduate there.
22. The author was himself a member of the Steering Committee for the establishment of the GDS. Later, the President — as visitor to the College — asked for a visitation Committee to look into the reorganisation of the new Makerere university which was to be born out of the break-up of the University of East Africa. The author was then the President of the Makerere Students' Guild. The visitation Committee Report was sympathetic to the GDS proposals, and recommended further de-compartimentalization of social science departments. The March 1971 coup, however, set the clock back many years.
23. Comments from a renown professor at a university Council meeting vividly remembered by the author who was a member of the Council by virtue of being Guild President.
24. Anyang' NYONG'O, « SAREC'S FIRST YEAR ».
25. Anyang' NYONG'O, « Political Power »
26. « SAREC'S FIRST YEAR »
27. COURT, *op. cit.*
28. Whether they succeed or fail in this struggle is not the measure of its utility. As I have argued in the paper on « Political Power and Academic Freedom », « it is not a question of stopping the controllers of state power from being itchy when thorny questions are raised, nor for the academics to stop raising such thorny questions because the controllers of state power will itch ; *it is a question of recognizing the nature of struggle and for each party to continue its work precisely because it is by going through that very struggle that democratic traditions (which include academic professionalism) are built.* (For further discussion see my paper on « Political Power » and Akiiki MUJAJU, « Political Science and Political Science Research in Africa » *The African Review,* vol. 4 No 3, 1974.
29. Anyang' NYONG'O, Memorandum to the Board of the Faculty of Arts, University of Nairobi, entitled « Graduate Programme : Faculty of Arts », 18/8/78.
30. An idea that was strongly expressed by Professor Kenneth Prewitt, National Opinion Research Council in Chicago, after running a Summer Workshop on « Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences », Institute for Development Studies University of Nairobi, in July 1978.

RÉSUMÉ

L'objectif de ce rapport est de faire une évaluation de l'enseignement des sciences sociales en Afrique de l'Est. Le rapport est divisé en qautre parties principales.

Dans la partie I l'auteur fait une brève analyse des sciences sociales elles-mêmes en se posant les questions suivantes :

— Qu'est-ce que la science sociale ?

— Quel a été son cours d'évolution ?

— Quels sont les aspects de la vie qui la concernent ?

Dans la partie II l'auteur étudie la genèse et l'évolution des sciences sociales en Afrique de l'Est. Il met l'accent sur l'émergence et l'institutionalisation de la recherche dans ce domaine en choisissant comme cadre l'ancienne Université de l'Afrique de l'Est qui n'existe plus maintenant et explique comment, une fois cette Université disparue, l'évolution des trois universités a affecté les sciencès sociales.

Il étudie également les structures de financement *de la recherche en science sociale ; son analyse de* l'enseignement *des sciences sociales est basée sur son expérience personnelle en tant qu'étudiant, dirigeant d'organisations estudiantines et membre du personnel de faculté dans deux des Universités. Le système de recrutement des* enseignants *et des étudiants fait également l'objet d'une explication ; l'auteur analyse également les facilités de publication ; il aborde également la question de la diffusion du matériel publié pour nous permettre de comprendre comment ces publications sont liées et affectées par la communication inter-universitaire.*

La partie III porte sur les problèmes actuels et futurs de l'enseignement et de la recherche dans le domaine des sciences sociales. L'auteur fait une étude détaillée de l'Université de Nairobi de manière à pouvoir faire sur cette base certaines affirmations qui peuvent être généralisées, ou qui peuvent être appliquées aux deux autres universités — celle de Makerere et celle de Dar-es-Salaam. Même si actuellement l'Université de Makerere est le cadre d'expériences exceptionnelles, elle garde toujours l'infrastructure de base qui y avait été créée dans la période précédant les années 1970 *pour l'enseignement et la recherche dans le domaine des sciences sociales.*

L'auteur met l'accent sur le fait que le développement des programmes d'enseignement des sciences sociales au niveau universitaire ne devrait pas être entrepris uniquement pour satisfaire des objectifs de formation de main d'œuvre. Son argumentation prend comme point de départ le fait que la question de la main d'œuvre est très très souvent mal posée. *Il met l'accent sur l'importance du contenu de l'enseignement et de la recherche dans le domaine des sciences sociales, la pertinence permanente de cette branche à la planification et à la politique indépendamment du problème de la main d'œuvre, la nécessité de développer et de permettre l'accès des facilités universitaires à la population en général, et l'importance qu'il y a à élaborer des programmes de licence pour réaliser ces objectifs.*

L'auteur aborde également les problèmes de financement et de maintien du personnel qualifié, ceux ayant trait à l'attraction et à l'appui qu'il y a lieu de donner aux étudiants de licence, de même que la question des facilités de recherche et d'enseignement, celle de la liberté académique ainsi que les problèmes de nationalisme et de médiocrité académique.

Dans la partie IV l'auteur aborde le problème qu'il intitule : « L'intégration et la Coordination de la Recherche et de l'Octroi des Bourses en Afrique et dans le Tiers-Monde ». Dans ce chapitre, il établit un contraste entre la nécessité d'instaurer un système de fécondation-croisée sur le plan académique entre les intellectuels africains et ceux du Tiers-Monde et la réalité *marquée par l'intégration continue des Universités africaines dans les systèmes occidentaux en ce qui concerne les approches intellectuelles, le recrutement de professeurs, le travail post-universitaire, les publications, le matériel de lecture, etc.*

L'auteur met l'accent sur l'importance d'institutions telles que le CODESRIA et le CLACSO dans la réorganisation de ce cadre « hérité » et dans sa restructuration pour la création d'un « Nouvel Ordre Académique International ».