

and validity of the instruments used. The sample was quite representative and countrywide. It embraced all the major denominations including Moslems, and traditionalists. Data is very well tabulated using simple statistics easy to be understood by readers without a deep knowledge of statistics.

Since the study was undertaken it appears as if many of the respondents did not understand the role of the church in education. Few young men in particular who mentioned the work of the church in education did not think the church had much to do with education. Among the rural population it was felt the church should participate in education to increase the number of school opportunities. The church too should involve itself in a wide range of developmental activities.

Church and Education in Tanzania is a thoroughly executed study providing useful information on one of the most important agencies engaged in the development of the people.

D.N. SIFUNA

Comments on B.D. BOWLES', Review of the Politics of State Formation: The Nature and Effects of Colonialism in Uganda

This comment on Bowles' review in Utafiti Volume No. 1, January 1976 is not intended to defend the book. For a book which was in complete manuscript form by August 1971 and went to publishers in early 1972, it must be talking about things which are now fairly well known in 1976. Bowles, however, seems to think that since the book came out in 1974, May of that year to be exact, it must cover a research interest like his, judging from the article which appears in the same volume of Utafiti. One is not even apologising for spelling mistakes like "welfare" instead of "warfare" which are many and obvious. The context leaves the reader in no doubt as to what is intended.

The fact that a publication says things that are already known is not necessarily a weakness. What matters is whether the old wisdom is being used to say something new. The reference to Ankole, Busoga, Acholi etc., was not so much intended to introduce novel ideas but to show how colonialism created local identities. In this way it was possible to prove that "tribes" were colonial creations, a point Bowles finds 'valuable'! If I were studying Ankole certainly I would not achieve much by reapearing Karugire nor do I in fact do that.

'Tribalism' does not result from the fact of people belonging to the same culture and living together in one polity. That Kakwa and the Alur were divided by international boundaries is a historical fact. The concern with this division was in reference to culture and how people were inconvenienced by the boundaries especially in the case of the Kakwa in their religious affairs. One would not like to debate here what is meant by tribalism and again, the

context, the theme, the argument has to be understood in its context.

There is constant reference to ideas that are already known. One would like to ask the question who know these facts? Is it the policy-makers who know? Is it the academics like Bowles who number a handful in East Africa? If this knowledge was widespread as Bowles seems to imply, certainly certain mistakes which are committed everyday would not be made unless people know they are making mistakes and continue to do so. This would certainly cover the majority of Africa's leaders.

One reviewer of that same book felt disappointed I had not talked about Amin! For Bowles I have not talked about productive forces. I have apparently even tried to convince him that Kaggwa was a peasant! Certainly everything should have been included! Bowles should have tried to find out what I set out to do.

It seems to Bowles there are some states I like. I do not know what he thinks I like. I might value the information. Bowles claims to know me since I have "once pointed to me". I would certainly have great difficulties in identifying him if I met him on the street! nor do I remember the encounter when I stated the obvious that historical analysis is not casual analysis!

Whether we talk of "colonial benefits" or not, some groups were better off than others. Some places like Kilimanjaro, Buganda, Central Kenya and others developed a capitalistic infrastructure before the others did. This generated relative deprivation. It does not surprise me to hear that Amin is doing everything to put West Nile on the same footing as Buganda or that he has tried to force the Karamajong to wear clothes!

In the review, the author referred to my inconsistency of thought. For my benefit and those of his audience, he does not demonstrate this. If the space allowed for the review was limited, I would like him to spare his time and point this out to me privately. I will certainly acknowledge him when I revise the book for the second edition. However, it seems to me that the inconsistency comes about because "throughout I treated Uganda as a geopolitical unit". If the book had considered "changing modes of production, the process of underdevelopment, the state as a supportive institution", would have been consistent. If inconsistency is a result of what I left out because I had a different interest from his, I have nothing to do about it. If it is a fault in the logic of presentation of what I had to say, I wish he could enlighten me more. But if it comes about because I did not do a research like the one he is doing from which he has published "Export Crops and Underdevelopment in Tanganyika 1929-61", I am sorry to beg to differ. Studies of underdevelopment by the way are no longer novel either! The study of underdevelopment should perhaps be replaced by studies of society construction and revolution.

Finally, a word about causal and historical analysis, a topic apparently Bowles and I have discussed. As a sociologist I am aware of the difficulties that surround causal analysis in the study of social phenomena. Perhaps historians are more competent in this field. Nowhere in the book was a causal analysis attempted. Even a detailed "consideration of the 30 years before the event", a prescription he provides would not help me to present a causal explanation. The multiplicity of social phenomena and their interrelationships simply limit causal analysis, the way I understand it. Even his one factor approach, study Kulaks, is inadequate without studying institutions which precipitate the Kulaks. Even one would have to go beyond the Kulaks in Buganda and perhaps go to West Nile or even Southern Sudan and indeed to the colonial army at least to know how Amin emerged! What is it that continues? Is it values, social institutions, social relationships, modes of life, human frailty or what? Is it purely internal problem or an externally generated one as well in the ex-colonial countries? I am sure these questions are an albatross which hangs around Bowles' neck as well as mine.

Finally, I am not so sure that Bowles is right when he says Dar es Salaam has gotten rid of all the people who believe colonialism is a benevolent reforming institution. Why does the struggle still continue? What I have said in the book may fall flat simply because some people have convinced themselves too early that they know!

T. B. KABWEGYERE<sup>+</sup>

---

<sup>+</sup>Senior Lecturer, Sociology, University of Nairobi.