

sen in die Wege zu leiten, wobei der Außenhandel (z. B. Rohstoffexporte und Produktionsmittelimporte) eben nur komplementäre und dienende Funktionen erfüllte.

Insgesamt also eine hochinteressante, eingedenk der schwierigen Datenbasis sorgfältig und überlegt recherchierte Studie über ein Land, über das bisher mehr spekuliert als kompetent diskutiert werden konnte – ein weiterer Anstoß, sich intensiver als bisher mit den Voraussetzungen, Chancen und Grenzen des Senghaaschen Konzepts autozentrierter Entwicklung zu befassen.

Rainer Tetzlaff

W. H. MORRIS-JONES & GEORGES FISCHER (eds.)  
**Decolonisation and After: The British and French Experience,**  
1980, Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., London, xvii, 369 S., £ 17,50.

Frank Cass are amongst the few specialist book makers who have committed themselves to publication of research work focused on leading contemporary issues affecting countries whose domestic policies and international relations can, in some sort, be traced back in history to colonial empire and, in some cases, also to a new supra-national organ which constitutes a “family” of free nations – the Commonwealth. “Decolonisation and After”, seen in this context, is a special volume both in its specific content and in the general type of contribution it makes to scholarship. For one thing it attempts to bring into the picture a new “family” – la Francophonie; for another it endeavours to further the understanding of both “families” through the medium of a common analytical bond – the comparative method of inquiry. “It should be instructive”, as Professors Morris-Jones and Austin observe in a prefatory note, “to place side by side the different experiences of European colonial powers in respect of (the) process of ending imperial links while still fashioning other ties to sustain ongoing connections” (p. iii).

The work under review is the fruit of a colloquim held in 1976, as a collaborative venture between selected British and French scholars. The broad purpose of the volume is the same one which had set in motion the said colloquium, viz., to analyse and expose clearly “the relations since the transfer of power between Britain and France on the one hand and their former imperial/colonial territories on the other” (p. xiii). Within this general objective the main theme is “dependence and independence”: What does independence in practice mean, in the context of latter-day international relations; and in what respects may a relationship of dependence still characterise new States vis-à-vis their former colonial overlords?

The various contributions are dovetailed into a framework which opens with a study of developments in the late colonial period through the transition to independence, in the former British and French colonies (Part I); this is followed by a treatment of the “bilateral” relations which have evolved since independence between ex-colony and ex-suzerain (Part II); the third dimension is furnished by a study of translocation of institutions and cultural influences from former tutelary authority to former colony (Part III); the remaining facet of the framework comprises of an inquiry into the impact at world level of the postindependence relations between ex-colony and ex-suzerain (Part IV).

To the first Part are devoted four essays. In the first of these, Austin examines the question whether the particular modality of decolonisation adopted was an affair purely freakish, or whether decolonisation, as a fundamental State task (likely to entail certain foreseeable courses of official action), would inevitably have entailed certain specific approaches, so that a common denominator would be discernible between the British and the French experience. On the one hand he considers that the particular mode of decolonisation adopted, in the case

of the British Empire, did in large measure conform with the official view of colonial rule (the colonies were in general governed “autonomously” by appointed governors); which contrasted with the French position, under which colonies were in general grouped in federal units, centrally integrated into the framework of metropolitan administration (this would have raised the chances of the colonies coming to share, willy-nilly, a more or less common feature – possibly a joint destiny – in their mode of take-off into independent statehood). On the other hand, as Austin observes, this general theory was often well qualified by practice: for instance, Britain’s long-term goal of decolonisation – as the culmination of a step-by-step process of constitutional advance – did not apply to all its colonies (notable exceptions included Cyprus, Malta and Jamaica – these being in the official view unsuitable as candidates for independence.) In practice, Austin notes, the grand plan of decolonisation was subject to many imponderables; to this extent there were common elements between the British experience (often treated as having been all rational) and the French (certainly having been marked by a rather precipitate formal departure of the colonial presence).

Austin’s argument is advanced further in the second essay, in which Miège emphasises that: “The very notion of a “colonial past” may be most misleading. It leads one to imagine a clear distinction between the “before” of colonialism and the “after” of independence, seen as two sharply contrasted periods separated by the moment of decolonisation” (p. 35). He underlines that decolonisation is a political and juridical event but which, with regard to the former empires of both Britain and France, has involved no sharp break between ex-colony and ex-suzerain: nay, decolonisation has in many cases refashioned remarkably (and sometimes even intensified) the interplay between the new States and the former colonial Powers. The colonial era helped to set in place certain economic and social alignments with an abiding interest in co-operation between the more active social groups in the colonies and their counterparts in the “mother-countries”: now “(o)nce . . . independence was obtained (and [the class in question] was its main beneficiary), the close links between its interests, both economic and cultural, and those of the ex-colonial Power remained” (p. 44). Such theses are well illustrated in Part II of the work, which focuses on the economic and military relations between the emergent States and the former colonial Powers.

Destanne de Bernis, in a highly lucid essay, gives a forthright account on some salient aspects of the economic relations between France and its former colonies. She sees a crucial common factor in all latter-day post-independence bilateral relations:

“(F)ormal independence starts a new ‘game’ with three sets of players: the ex-colonies, who will wish to convert their new status into more real terms; the ex-colonial Powers which try to retain their position by new methods including the cultivation of language ties; and thirdly, the non-colonial Powers, such as West Germany or the United States with great industrial capacity and desire for fresh markets (p. 109).”

In this web of interdependence the critical factor, as the author observes, is capitalism. Under this concept “French multi-nationals rely on the French State to help them in their hard-fought struggle against international competition” (p. 124) – with the consequence that the new States are exposed to both diplomatic and industrial-cum-commercial offensives emanating from the former colonising Powers. In a sense, Destanne de Bernis observes, “independence from the metropolitan Power in the end only leads to another kind of dependence on all industrialised countries, or rather on the multi-nationals” (p. 125). Thus – as it seems – the international economic order works, in contemporary times, in such a way that the economies of new States are firmly set in the orbits of the industrialised economies. Some of these arguments are further illustrated in the essays by Caire, Lipton, Poirier and Touscoz.

One of the contributions in Part II (by Clayton) is devoted to a study of the military relations between Great Britain and Commonwealth African countries. The author notes that the mere concept of political independence has not been seen to preclude military co-operation between former colony and former suzerain, although, of course, “(n)o British parallels exist to the complex co-operation, monetary and defence treaty arrangements entered into by France with some of her territories at independence” (p. 196).

In Part III (on the subject of the development of institutions and cultures), Schaeffer underlines that, in the very nature of things at the time of independence and in the years after, the new States hardly could be expected to bring up novel legal orders entirely independent of western models: So real and compelling were the economic and cultural factors of dependence that “(i)t can . . . be ruled out that, in the very short time between the birth of the new . . . States and the present day, their governments, following their acceptance of the need for development, could have worked out a system which was legally, economically and culturally quite independent” (p. 254). Further, the prevailing state of international economic relations was to commit these States to certain recognised principles of western law: “The need for foreign capital, business and technology requires the publication of investment codes and the existence of commercial and company law, labour law, even land law, directly based on modern law familiar to the west; only such a legal framework gives firms from capitalist countries a sense of confidence and allows credit transactions to take place normally” (p. 258). Some of Schaeffer’s more general theses are further illustrated by specific examples in the essays by Vatin (on the Maghreb), by Rita Cruise O’Brien (Senegal and Kenya), by Souriau (Maghreb), etc.

The last Part, in spite of its importance as the really global aspect of the work, is unfortunately comprised of but one essay. In this contribution Marie-Claude Smouts examines the international implication (at the level of the United Nations Organisation) of the relationships of dependence and independence considered in the earlier essays. Her general finding is that the mundane interests arising from the relationships of dependence are a highly material factor in the exercise of the vote at world forums, even though the spectacle is frequently interspersed with assertions of independence.

\* \* \*

The careful planning of the work under review obviously furnishes a most valuable framework for the understanding of the principal questions which preoccupy many States of the Third World, both at the domestic and the external level, as well as the interplay between these States and the industrialised world, within the frame of international relations and the international legal order. The work is all the more successful for the fact that it brings together the views of eminent scholars who express themselves with specific and acute focus, a quality not frequently found in full-length studies though it is a normal feature in learned journals. On the whole, the individual contributions are lucid, forthright and effective; certainly the sort of work which ought to be read by all those who seek a good grasp of the internal political arrangements in new States as well their interaction with the world outside. Yet it may be – unfortunately – that it is just this merit which, by the other side of its coin, defeats one of its very virtues – as a comparative inquiry. It would seem to the reviewer that it has not in all cases been possible to expose in sufficient detail the comparative element in the short compass of the individual essays, many of these confining themselves to but one set of State relations or the other, with the result that the parallel dimension of the treatment has stolen the show at the expense of the comparative one!

J. B. Ojwang