

As an advocate of democratic socialism Harris does not see the NIC model to be of benefit to the workers of underdeveloped countries. While he does argue that the NICs have changed the structure of their economies so that they can no longer be considered to be 'Third World', these changes have, in his view, merely brought new problems, not prosperity, to workers in the NICs. For Harris the only salvation for the majority of citizens in underdeveloped nations lies in the development of some type of international working class solidarity. The NICs blossomed in a period where technology, particularly in transport and telecommunications, gave multinational corporations the option of producing where labour costs were lowest. Frequently this meant relocation of factories from North America and Western Europe to cheap labour areas in underdeveloped nations. Foremost among these cheap labour areas were the NICs. It was this sort of foreign investment which was a precursor to the rise of locally owned multinationals.

But Harris does not think the future economic expansion of undeveloped countries should rest merely on the super-exploitation of the workforce. He contends that the type of labour exploitation which occurred in these NICs can only be stopped when labour becomes as international in perspective as the multinational corporation employers. No form of local nationalism is enough to deter the rising force of international Capital. Without any powerful international labour organisations, Harris believes multinational corporations will continue to gravitate toward nations where labour is cheapest. The result will be super-exploitation in these nations, and millions of unemployed in other countries whose chief hope for finding a job will rest in underbidding their fellow workers across the globe.

Clearly Harris would be no advocate of trade liberalisation programmes such as Zimbabwe's new Investment Code. Those who are now championing the liberalisation cause locally would do well to consider Harris's points. The author clearly knows his economics. Furthermore, unlike economists in general, and Marxists in particular, he writes in an accessible style that is devoid of rhetoric. His biggest shortcoming is that in offering international labour solidarity as an alternative vision to rapid capital accumulation, his suggestions are not very concrete. Some hints about what type of international labour organisation could effectively serve workers' interests, and how they could develop into a global force, would go a long way towards making his arguments more worthy of serious contemplation as an alternative to the present world dominance of the free market idea.

Reviewed by John Pape, Harare.

Africa and Empire: W M MacMillan, Historian and Social Critic, Hugh MacMillan and Shula Marks, Gower, Aldershot, 1989 (353pp, £29.50).

This fine collection of stimulating essays on Southern African historiography is a trifle over-generous towards its subject, W M MacMillan. His gentle Fabian approach to politics was wholly ineffective in the face of the rapaciousness of those who gave Southern Africa segregation and apartheid while removing the gold. His writings, in retrospect, have not the power of Eddie Roux's *Time Longer Than Rope*, nor the understanding later to be found in Simons's *Class and Colour in South Africa*. One who could write in 1930, when the

Communist Party already had a strong 'black' membership, that (p70) "the semi-barbaric masses are nowhere near ready to acquire a swamping vote" can hardly be called a liberal, let alone a liberator. The book bathes MacMillan in a warm, yet scholarly, light: the warts are visible, but their size varies in the beholder's eye. Some chapter authors are kinder than others, and the work is characterised by healthy contradictions.

Introducing the book, Hugh MacMillan writes "the greatest virtue of MacMillan's analysis was that 'black' and 'white' workers were the product of similar and related pressures of proletarianisation...by 1930 he had an enlarged and clarified vision of South Africa as a single political economy". Jeremy Krikler's penetrating chapter on MacMillan and the working class claims the opposite, that for MacMillan (p70) "economics and political struggle were radically divorced from one another".

It must be remarkably difficult to assemble a fair academic analysis of one's own father. Hugh MacMillan has proved himself a highly competent historian in doing so, with Shula Marks' help. Chapter authors include scholars such as Christopher Saunders, William Beinart, Robert Ross and Jeffrey Butler, treating topics as widely varied as the Seretse Khama marriage and Dr John Philip's work towards Ordinance 50 of 1928. Yet the book is best summarised by examining Jeremy Krikler's excellent chapter.

Krikler traces how MacMillan, son of a minister-school teacher from Scotland, defined himself against the growing Afrikaner nationalism of his childhood town, Stellenbosch, as being more in sympathy with the (p38) "coloured people" than with his "white compatriots". Yet sympathy is not the same as being able to achieve changes in the plight of the oppressed, and MacMillan's social achievements were small.

A poor man on a Rhodes scholarship, MacMillan was driven by the activities of the aristocratic bloods of Merton College, Oxford, towards a worker Christianity, and towards reform not revolution (p40-1). In vacations he bicycled across England and Scotland, writing about the lives of the workers and peasants he saw. About the Scottish crofter he wrote (p45):

"The evils of landlordism have put the people 'against the landlords' at any price and made the most truly conservative people imaginable into the most ardent radicals...so we may well say with the suffering Gael ...- '*bas gha na feidh*' - Death to the Deer".

Back from Britain, as lecturer in charge of Economics and History in Grahamstown, MacMillan at once attempted Fabian social reform, publishing on sanitary conditions and on economic conditions generally in the town, setting out how poverty was to be alleviated, or, rather, prevented, because charity would be inadequate.

No less a Fabian than Sidney Webb reviewed MacMillan's work in the *New Statesman*, referring to it as being (p49) "on Booth, Rowntree, Bowley lines". But Krikler notes the boundaries of Fabianism, which meant MacMillan did not challenge the racism around him (p49):

"The cheap unskilled black workers, argued Macmillan, through their competition in the labour market, tended 'to degrade whites down to and below their level'; this, he suggested, was 'the solid basis of the native menace'".

In this period of his life, MacMillan effectively proposed an alliance of 'white' workers with the 'white' middle class, against the 'black' working class. Krikler observes that, logically, to end white poverty, the undercutting effect which MacMillan observed could

only be destroyed by raising the condition of the black workers, rather than by combining against them.

The travels in writing the *Agrarian Problem* exposed MacMillan to what he called the 'poor-black' question, and led to his major work, *Complex South Africa* (1930) (p60), "a scholarly and passionate intervention against the segregationists". By now MacMillan had come to see that the solution to South Africa's problems lay in raising the condition of black workers. In *Complex South Africa* MacMillan wrote (p60):

"Colour may be a peculiar social complication, but is still only an accident, and in economics the blackness of the native makes no difference. The problem he represents is in essentials that of 'dilution', familiar enough to workers in Europe when the war brought about an invasion of the skilled engineering trades by women".

Krikler concludes this picture of MacMillan by analysing his writings about the 1919 and 1922 strikes on the Rand. MacMillan was strongly opposed to the 'Soviet' direction of the 1919 incidents, notwithstanding the follies of the City Council, which precipitated the strike. He consistently advocated moderation on both sides of the 1922 strike, and, unlike his friends, became neither a scab nor a special constable. "I knew that the best of the men had a case" (p63). Yet Krikler criticises MacMillan's writings on 1922 (p65):

"A gifted historian such as he should surely have perceived that an insurrectionary struggle cannot be explained by complaining of the implacability of the contending social forces that compose it....What made their clash so unremitting? An analysis of such questions was more likely to create the sympathy for the strikers which MacMillan, in his decency, sought to create. Such analysis, however, would have required an emphasis upon the essential class nature of the fateful combat of 1922. And it was precisely 'class struggle' from which MacMillan was taking flight".

In short, MacMillan's moderation prevented him from understanding the great social issues of his day. Just as one cannot be moderate about whether the earth is round or flat, a moderate, or classless, analysis of the 1922 revolt prevents historical understanding of that revolt. Similarly, no matter the degree of sympathy which MacMillan had for 'black' people, his racism in denying the (p70) "semi-barbaric masses a swamping vote" meant that he was politically the enemy of democracy.

Reviewed by Renfrew Christie, University of the Western Cape, South Africa.
(no references supplied. Ed)

Malds and Madams. Domestic Workers Under Apartheid, Jacklyn Cock, The Women's Press, London, 1989 (rev) (206pp, £6.95 pbk).

In the wake of increased international interest in South Africa, the Women's Press of London has issued an updated and revised version of Jacklyn Cock's *Malds and Madams*. This volume has virtually become a classic of South African social science. Based on Cock's PhD research in the Eastern Cape in 1978-9, *Malds and Madams* forcefully depicts the lives of black women domestic workers under apartheid.