



# University of Bremen

SUDAN ECONOMY RESEARCH GROUP

DISCUSSION PAPERS

---

**Sudan's Small Industry Development.  
Structures, Failures and Perspectives**

**By: Dirk Hansohm and Karl Wohlmuth  
University of Bremen**

Universität Bremen  
Sudanforschungsgruppe Bremen  
Diskussionsbeiträge

D-2800 Bremen 33, Federal Republic of Germany  
P.O. Box 330440 (Postfach 330440)  
Telex: UNI 245811  
Telephone: (0421) 218-3074

Sudan Economy Research Group

Discussion Paper No. 11

Editor: Karl Wohlmuth,

Professor of Economics,

University of Bremen

**Sudan's Small Industry Development.  
Structures, Failures and Perspectives**

**By: Dirk Hansohm and Karl Wohlmuth  
University of Bremen**

Bremen, December 1987

This is a revised version of a paper presented to EADI's 5th General Conference, Amsterdam, 1-5 September 1987, Working Group B 8: Industrialisation Strategies and Development. This paper will be published in a shorter and updated version by EADI in a volume edited by Meine Pieter von Dijk and Henrik Secher Marcussen.

## I. Introduction

Sudan's industrial sector is in a deep crisis. Very recent informations suggest that this sector needs monthly at least 20 million dollars to get the minimum input needs for sustaining a capacity utilisation of not more than 25 per cent (New African, June 1987, p. 39). Because of the unsolved issues between the Government of Sudan and the IMF the foreign exchange situation of the country is extremely unsatisfactory. This situation is complicated by the fact that the Sudanese Workers Abroad (SWA) in oil-rich Arab countries are more and more reluctant to remit their hard currency via official channels. But the roots of the problems of Sudan's industry are much deeper: there are causes of crisis which are internal and which are external to this sector.

Factors internal to the sector are manifold: the sector is extremely import-dependent because of the technologies chosen in the sixties and especially the seventies; the structural change of industry since Independence (1956) has favoured more and more those branches with a higher import-content (especially the production of luxury consumer goods); the consumer goods industries are heavily biased towards the provision of luxury goods (relative to the income levels); there is only a rudimentary input industry in the country; the insignificant export industries (producing edible oil and yarn) are under pressure; the system of industrial policy developed since Independence has favoured large-scale and capital-intensive industrial ventures at the expense of small- and medium-scale firms; the role of industrialists relative to the position of actors in the commercial sector (traders and merchants) has always been weak in the Sudan. In addition to this, the public sector of industry has failed to realise even modest targets (provision of goods as projected and realisation of development objectives, e.g. equity, regional balance, local resources use); inconsistent government policies towards industry have affected both segments of industry-private and public (Wohlmuth 1986).

Important factors and constraints which have an impact are to be found outside of the industrial sector. Out of the labour force of

6.2 million people 1/10 is employed in the formal sector, 1/10 in the informal sector, 1/10 on irrigated tenancies and 70 per cent are employed in rainfed agriculture as smallholders, pastoralists and landless labourers (see ILO 1986); this employment profile highlights the questions of markets and market growth for industry development. The disastrous agricultural policies in the Sudan have affected first of all the traditional sector where 70 per cent of the labour force have their employment (although 2 m people are migrating seasonally). The crisis of the Gezira Scheme and of other irrigated projects has affected the income potential of another 10 per cent of income earners; the real income decline of the government employees (by more than 50 per cent since the 1970s) has further reduced the market for industrial products (out of 600,000 people working in the formal sector approximately 500,000 belong to the public sector and the parastatals). This leaves only the informal sector as a dynamic and prospering sector - but at the expense of the formal industrial sector. As recent studies on the structure of the informal sector in Sudan show, comparatively high incomes, relatively high educational and training standards as well as access to unofficially transferred foreign exchange from SWA give this sector a good chance to compete with the formal industrial sector which is starved of funds (see ILO 1986). In this context the (formal and informal) small industry sector needs investigation in order to understand the perspectives of this sector and to answer the question of how far this sector can contribute to a revitalization of the whole industrial sector. Because of the assumed developmental advantages of the small industries (low import-dependency, high employment generation, use of more appropriate technologies, generation of local skills, supply of needed goods and services for local and rural markets, stronger linkages to the agricultural sector) it is of interest how far this subsector can contribute to the solution of Sudan's far-reaching structural adjustment problems (Hansohm/Wohlmuth 1985<sup>1</sup>).

In Part II we will give a historical and institutional policy review as related to small industry development in Sudan so as to understand the policy constraints which have affected this sector. In Part III we will discuss the performance and the characteristics of rural and urban small industries in Sudan. In Part IV we

will consider the policies for small industry development and review the appropriateness of some institutional approaches towards small industry development in Sudan. In the last Part we will present some conclusions.

## II. Small Industry Development In The Context of Sudan's Industrialisation Process

Six distinct periods of Sudan's industrial development may be distinguished:

first, the pre-Independence period until 1956 (with cottage industries and colonial-type processing of exported primary products);

second, the period 1956-1960 (with indirect public intervention and the start of modern manufacturing);

third, the period 1960-1969 (with direct public intervention in industrialisation parallel to private industrial investments);

fourth, the period 1969-1973 (with socialist orientation of government, nationalisation and confiscation of private industries in 1970, but a policy reversal in 1971);

fifth, the period 1973-1977/78 (with huge agro-industrial investments mainly by the public sector);

sixth, the period from 1977/78 up to now (of economic crisis affecting industry more and more).

Sudan's small industry development had been affected adversely by these policies in all these periods, so that it is useful to review the implications of industrial policies in detail. Common to these various periods is the outstanding commitment of all Sudanese governments towards industrialisation. However, objectives, strategies and instruments used have changed considerably over time.

Concerning the first period (pre-Independence), in the early period of colonization, cottage industries were prevailing (Oesterdiekhoff 1984) and some products could even be sold on foreign markets (based on cotton and wood). The steep increase in the de-

mand for raw materials from the side of the British textile industry led to intensified cotton production in Sudan, enforced by the colonial government. The Sennar dam built in 1925 made large-scale cotton cultivation in the Gezira possible; a large-scale export enclave was created (Awad 1973). This led to the first stage of manufacturing as represented by cotton-ginning factories. The expansion of this industry encouraged the development of edible oil industries based on cotton seeds. However, the step towards producing yarns and textiles was not possible before Independence. Colonial interventions and liberal import policies were responsible for this failure of reaching higher stages of raw materials processing. At the same time the colonial import policy had negative consequences on the growth of the cottage industries.

The colonial interventions affected negatively investments in the private industrial sector, especially in the small industry sector. Only oil-seed pressing industries could develop to some extent in the colonial period, obviously because of the widespread oil extraction activity taking place at the household level, so that colonial interventions could not block this development; some export of crude edible oil was even considered as beneficial by the colonial government (see Mahmoud 1984, p. 54-55). This is - besides the "traditional" industries - the only sector of small industries in Sudan which has survived colonial interventions. Important enough, the edible oil industry has remained the only industry in Sudan up to now which could export more or less on a regular basis parts of its production (Affan 1985, 68). Colonial-type policies towards small industries have continued also after Independence.

Some import substitution took place during World War II. These industries were induced by supply bottlenecks, but the industry could not survive after the war because of the then reopening import trade. Some smaller-scale industries by non-indigenous Sudanese private investors (in the sphere of confectionaries, vegetable oils, macaroni, soft drinks, soap, perfume and building materials) could however compete successfully with import products. Industry in the pre-independence period was oriented towards final consumption (mainly ISIC 31), with oil pressing, mineral water factories and flour mills covering 61 per cent of the total net

output of manufacturing industry in 1955/56 (Oesterdiekhoff 1979, p. 2-3). Only oilcake went back as an input to agriculture, so that the linkages from industry to agriculture were negligible. Neither inter-sectoral nor intra-sectoral linkages were of any importance. However, already in the 1940s to some degree a displacement of traditional industries/cottage industries/crafts took place because of more or less identical markets for the products of the modern and the traditional industrial sectors.

The colonial production in Sudan, e.g. of cotton in the Gezira, has determined to a large extent the prevailing regional concentration of industry towards the Three Towns (Khartoum, Khartoum-North and Omdurman) and the Central Region. Sixty-two per cent of total industrial value added, 62 per cent of the industrial labour force and 44 per cent of the manufacturing industrial establishments are concentrated now in Khartoum Province (Fadlalla 1986, p. 17); if we include the establishments in the Central Region, this means that the overwhelming share of industries is concentrated in the Khartoum/Gezira areas. This situation has not changed up to now, despite various approaches to develop industries in other regions and to accelerate growth in other provinces. The promotion of import substituting-industries in these areas was not accompanied by steps to promote rural industries and crafts. The Industrial Sector Survey 1981/82 reveals the fact of basically unchanged structures.

The second period (1956-1960) may be characterised as a period of indirect public intervention. Private investment was considered as the main vehicle of industrialisation. The idea was to move quickly from import substitution of consumer goods to import substitution of intermediate and capital goods. Even exports to neighbouring countries were contemplated at that time (Affan 1985, p. 13). Not only foreign exchange savings were expected from this industrialisation policy, but also a diversification out of the dependence on a few primary export products which have shown a high degree of price and volume fluctuations. The "Approved Enterprises (Concessions) Act, 1956" was an important step to promote private investments in Sudan, but it did by its implicit policy prescriptions discriminate against small industries. In this period, a clear-cut division of economic spheres was existent: the state in-



vested into large-scale agricultural and infrastructural projects, whereas the private sector concentrated on industry and housing, mainly in the Khartoum/Gezira regions. However, some structural change of industry towards textiles, shoes, paper products and chemical products took place in this period. The second period may therefore be considered as the starting point of modern manufacturing in Sudan. A partial transformation of the colonial industrial structure based on a low level of processing was therefore taking place. However, the limited market size was already a constraint on further steps in industrialisation, leading to relatively small production units, excess capacities and concentration within industrial sectors. The neglect of rural development precluded any small industry development via internal growth of established units; in urban areas no support was given to small-industries and crafts.

The third period (1960-69) is crucial to Sudan's industrialisation. Direct public intervention emerged. Influential was the "Ten Years Plan of Economic and Social Development of the Sudan 1961/62-1970/71". At the end of the plan period, Sudan was expected to have transformed its industrial structure towards the production of intermediate and capital goods, as well as exporting manufactures. A considerable share of planned industrial investment was allocated to the public sector, although private (including foreign) capital was expected to remain the leading sector. The creation of the Industrial Bank of Sudan in 1961 was an attempt to give additional assistance to private industries. Up to now the Industrial Bank of Sudan is discriminating in its lending policy against small industries and crafts.

The nine public factories built up in the spheres of agro-industries did not affect the position of the private sector as the leading one, but led to some deconcentration of the industrial structure because the factories were built near the agricultural resources base. Eventually, this type of deconcentration turned out to be a complete failure because of the lack of any coordination between industrial planning and agricultural development, thus leading even to raw material shortages. The basic aim of public sector investments into agro-industries - saving foreign exchange, e.g. on sugar - was not realised. Since these times, the

role of the public industries in Sudan - incurring heavy losses, working with substantial excess capacities and high units costs - is questioned again and again; it is an important point on the agenda of discussions with donors and IMF/World Bank missions to Sudan. However, the basic constraints to a broader industrial development (small market size, neglect of agricultural development and of rural industries) have not been removed in this period by general and industrial policy measures. The low performance of industrial policies led to "The Organisation and Promotion of Industrial Investment Act, 1967", stressing the role of the private entrepreneur (Affan 1985, p. 20), but not improving the position of small and rural industries at all. The whole system of concessions in industry has further worked against the smaller ventures.

Also in the third period a distinct division of economic spheres has existed: the public sector concentrated on local raw materials-based modern production, whereas the private sector moved more and more into sectors producing non-essential goods; the limits of the import-substituting industrialisation were quite obvious already in the 1960s, as a result of the diversification of the private industry in the direction of small and exclusive markets; this tendency led to increasing demands for incentives and protection from competing imports, thereby distorting more and more the structure of incentives and of factor prices. Increasing state assistance kept private investors in these industries; on the other hand the share of public assistance for agriculture and related industries was insignificant.

In the fourth period (1969-1973), following Numeiri's May 1969 Revolution, nationalisation and confiscation of private industries took place (including foreign capital), but as soon as 1971 a policy reversal occurred (see on this period Hansohm/Wohlmuth 1985<sup>2</sup>). The long-term consequences of these policies for Sudan's industrial development were important. In order to regain some credibility in the circles of foreign investors and banks even more favourable investment concessions had to be granted. A further distortion of the structure of protection and incentives then took place. An expression of this policy reversal was "The Development and Encouragement of Industrial Investment Act, 1972".

The fifth period (1973-1977/78) marks the intensified direct public intervention in industry under the label of the so-called Breadbasket Strategy. The intention was to supply the Arab World with food, and to expand modern agriculture and agro-industries rapidly for this purpose. Various forms of capital participation in industry from the side of the state were used and institutional innovations (like the establishment of the Sudan Development Corporation as a catalyst for foreign, Arab and national private and public capital) took place (see Wohlmuth 1979, 1983). The government moved even further towards the support of capital-intensive and import-intensive projects (mainly in sugar and textile industries). The sharp increase of the capital-labour ratio in this period reflects not only the bias towards capital-intensive technologies, but also the increasing extent of excess capacities (Afan 1985, p. 164). This attitude of the Government got its expression in the 1 billion dollar Kenana sugar project (the story of Kenana is itself a lesson in industrialisation failures in Africa, see Wohlmuth 1983). It is obvious that the large-scale bias of Sudan's industrialisation in this period has drained off all available resources from alternative uses; more than that, the distortion of structures and prices as well as the creation of macroeconomic imbalances have resulted in Sudan's most severe economic crisis since Independence.

The sixth period (since 1977/78) is also a period of industrial decline. The great number of public sector investment projects (most of them delayed by years) led to overspending, pressure on infrastructure and human skills. Public investments rose by nearly 50 per cent in real terms between 1972/73 and 1973/74, and doubled in real terms by the end of the next year. Large foreign capital inflows that financed this programme inflated aggregate demand; demand pressures, increasing inflation and a worsening balance of payments with first signs already in 1976 were the result (World Bank 1985, 2). On the surface, this explanation of the crisis is convincing, but more important for an understanding of the real causes of the crisis is the observation that there was no consistent agricultural development strategy beyond the irrigated agricultural subsector and no industrial development planning to the effect of maximising linkages with other sectors (Wohlmuth/Hansohm 1984; Oesterdiekhoff 1980, 1983). Beyond this, there was not any

serious attempt to design a governmental redistribution policy (Mirghani 1980) in order to create the preconditions for a "wage goods" supply strategy, (see De Janvry 1983), aiming at expanding domestic markets. The lack of any changes in Sudan's production system and in the income distribution system both resulted in a stagnating industrial sector.

The fact that since 1977/78 all the major branches of manufacturing industry are on the decline (UNIDO 1985, p. 15) may therefore not only be attributed to austerity policies (depressing the demand for goods and the supply of imported inputs), but is basically the result of the inappropriateness of industrial policies to remove the basic constraint: market size. Neither external markets (supplying world markets and African regional markets), nor internal markets (based on final demand, inter-sectoral and intra-sectoral intermediate demand) were created to a sufficient extent. Sudan's rudimentary intermediate goods industry had been affected since 1977/78 more severely than food and other manufacturing branches, so that a further erosion of industrial linkages took place. Despite the heavy agro-industrial investments in the 1970s, there is virtually no agricultural machinery industry in the country to support productivity increases in agriculture (see Bedri 1979). In this context small industries, service centers and workshops could contribute in rural and urban areas to productivity increases.

These six periods show the increasing role of the public sector, the increasing limits to import substitution and the increasing level of "state assistance" which has been necessary to motivate industrial capitalists to stay in the sector. Therefore, a new approach to industrialization is urgently required. Up to now the whole framework of industrial policy in Sudan is not favourable for the internal growth of small enterprises; their role in production is limited relative to their role in repair services and distribution.

### III. Performance and characteristics of small industries in Sudan

The most common definition of small industries in Sudan (Department of Statistics) includes enterprises with less than 25 employees. The statistical records concerning small industries are very deficient. The statistics include only a fraction of these enterprises, especially of those in rural areas - let alone part-time non-farm activities. This is partly due to the fact that informal enterprises, who constitute a large part of small industries, are not registered by definition. Since the formal small industries are concentrated in the Three Towns, the statistics are biased towards that region.

The limited coverage of industries outside of the urban area of the Three Towns by the statistics can be recognized by a look at the regional distribution of the enterprises in the Ministry of Industry's industrial survey (1981/82):

Table 1: Regional Distribution of Small Industries\*

Region	No. of Units	% Share
Khartoum	878	45.7
Central	529	27.5
Kordofan	152	7.9
Darfur	63	3.3
Eastern	185	9.6
Northern	110	5.7
Southern	5	0.2
Total	1,922	100

\*Enterprises with less than 25 employees, excluding those engaged in bakery and grain milling.

Source: Industry Survey, from: Sen 1985, 31

By category of activity the small industry enterprises (exclusive of bakeries and grain mills) are distributed as follows:

Table 2: Distribution of Small Industry Enterprises on Categories of Activity (1981/82)

Classification	Number	%	Gross Output LS 000	%	Employment	%
Food, Tobacco & Beverages	686	35.0	190,133	66.4	6,105	31.9
Textile, Weaving Apparel & Leather	77	3.9	11,864	4.1	984	5.1
Wood & Wood Products, Furniture	173	8.9	8,369	2.9	1,467	7.7
Paper, Paper Products, Printing	77	3.9	3,244	1.1	769	4.2
Chemicals & Chemical Products	69	3.4	30,376	10.6	1,232	6.4
Other Non-Metallic Products	68	3.4	7,909	2.8	2,059	10.7
Basic Metal Industries	4	0.02	159	0.05	64	0.3
Fabricated Metal Products & Machinery	820	41.5	34,223	12.0	6,451	33.7
Total	1,974*	100	286,277	100	19,185	100

\* Difference to the number of enterprises in Table 1 due to "errors and omissions".

Source: Industrial Survey 1981/82, from: Sen 1985, 30

Concerning the gross output, the category of Food, Tobacco & Beverages is the most important; it is second in number of enterprises and employment. Its activities are concentrated on oil milling, fruit juice, local sweets, noodles and macaroni. The category "Fabricated Metal Products & Machinery", second in gross output, concentrates on auto-servicing and repair workshops and sheet metal workshops (furniture, doors, windows etc.). In the third category (Chemicals & Chemical Products) indigenous soap and perfumes are prominent.

Small industries as a whole play a major and positive role in the secondary sector. They account for 95 per cent of all enterprises, 27.4 per cent of the employees and 34.3 per cent of the gross out-

put. The UNIDO Industrial Survey (1985) estimates that 30 per cent of small-scale industries are located in Khartoum province (in contrast to 60 per cent of large industries). Compared to large industries, small industries produce 10 times more per unit of investment, need half of the investment to create a job and their value added per worker is about 3 times higher (Sen 1985, 28). Large industries appear to be heavily capital-intensive and grossly unproductive.

In spite of being outdated and confined to the Northern regions, the Handicraft Industries Survey of the Department of Statistics is a valuable source of data on a part of the small industries. The survey defined a handicraft unit as a unit engaged in the production of goods and services without using modern equipments. It identified 19022 handicraft units and covered a sample of 3966 out of these. The total number is distributed regionally as follows:

Table 3: Regional Distribution of Handicraft Units (1970/71)

Region	No. of Units	% of Total	No. of Workers	% of Total	Value of Production LS 000	% of Total
Khartoum	2,736	14.33	9,084	24.93	8,998	41.45
Blue Nile	4,928	25.90	8,948	24.55	5,290	24.37
Kassala	2,347	12.34	4,126	11.32	2,204	10.15
Kordofan	5,980	31.44	8,388	23.02	2,524	11.63
Northern	1,206	6.35	2,945	8.11	1,703	7.84
Darfur	1,825	9.64	2,941	8.07	990	4.56
All Northern Regions	19,022	100	36,441	100	21,709	100

Source: Handicraft Industries Survey 1970/71 (Dept. of Statistics 1974)

Comparing the number of enterprises with the figures of the Industrial Survey, one can see that the Handicraft Survey gives more consideration to the rural industries: 85.7 per cent of the enterprises are located outside of Khartoum province. The share of Khartoum increases, however, when we look at the number of workers and the value of production. Then the share of the rural areas decreases to 75.07 per cent and 58.55 per cent respectively. Assessing

these figures, it has to be considered that the Survey seems to be confined to full-time activities. Part-time craft and industry activities are more common in rural areas. Therefore we have to assume that also the Handicraft Survey is biased towards the urban areas. Besides that, it can be assumed that the Survey was confined to major centres in the rural areas. For that reason, the activities which are more common in small villages are not represented adequately.

The Handicraft Survey divides the crafts into 10 categories (see Table 4):

Table 4: Distribution of Handicraft Units by Branches (1970/71)

Branch	No.	% of Total	of these: Khartoum	% of Total	No. of Workers	% of Total	Value of Production LS 000	% of Total
Food Products	1,189	6.25	184	6.72	6,243	17.13	8,965	41.30
Drinks	2,792	14.68	164	5.99	3,737	10.26	897	4.13
Clothes	9,308	48.93	1,532	55.99	13,096	35.94	4,053	18.67
Furniture	941	4.95	88	3.22	11,946	5.34	1,337	6.16
Leather, Plastic & Tannery Products	1,232	6.48	56	2.05	2,220	6.09	915	4.21
Ornaments & Blacksmith Products	1,733	9.11	168	6.14	3,466	8.51	2,457	11.32
Palm Leaves Products	670	3.52	8	0.29	716	1.96	53	0.25
Pottery	465	2.44	180	6.58	3,669	10.07	626	2.88
Tobacco	540	2.73	320	11.70	716	1.96	431	1.99
Unclassified	172	0.91	36	1.32	632	1.74	1,975	9.10
Total	19,022	100	2,736	100	36,441	100	21,709	100

Source: Handicraft Industries Survey 1970/71 (Dept. of Statistics 1974)



Concerning the numbers of enterprises and workers, "clothes" is the most important category, both for Khartoum and the rural areas. Second are the food production categories ("food production" and "drinks"). Concerning the value of production, they rank first. Other important branches are "ornaments and blacksmith products", "furniture" and "leather, plastic and tannery products".

As yet few studies have been done on small scale industrial activities, either of a formal or informal character. Available evidence will be summarized in this part in order to throw some light on characteristics which are of special importance in view of the presumed developmental advantages of the sector (see above). The basis for this are two studies on the Three Towns - Omdurman (own study 1986) and Khartoum North (Curtis 1980) -, an own small field study in Western Sudan (Hansohm 1986) and reports on Darfur (Bakhit/Ibrahim/Rheingans 1986), on two areas in Eastern Sudan (Babiker 1982), on Wad Medani (Anand/Nur 1984, 1985, Bilal 1985) and on Juba (Jenkins 1981).

Most of the production is destined for the final consumption demand. Few branches supply production inputs. Examples are tannery (producing for the leather industry) and blacksmiths/metal workshops as far as they produce agricultural implements and spare parts. Thus the inter-industrial linkages appear to be low. This is a contrast to the experiences of South Asian economies, especially India, where sub-contracting (of large firms to small firms) provided a stimulus to small industries growth.

However, it is assumed that the potential of productive linkages between agriculture and industry would be great if an appropriate policy were implemented. Local blacksmiths have provided a wide variety of agricultural tools, however on a primitive level. The main constraint to increasing the technological level (intermediate technologies) seems to be the limited purchasing power of farmers (cf. Silsoe College 1986). The Jebel Marra Rural Development Project experiments with the introduction of camel-drawn ploughs on small to medium farms, assisted by a credit programme. The ploughs are produced locally and the experience has been encouraging.

Most of the production is directed at the local market, if not for home consumption. Only few items seem to be traded inter-regionally (e.g. shoes from Darfur). Nothing seems to go to export.

Most, both in traditional and modern activities, is produced on order and marketed by the producers at the place of production.

Traditionally, small industries produce predominantly for lower-income groups of the population, compared to large enterprises. However, presently it is not any more possible to attach this label to the sector as a whole. In fact, many of the products or services seem to be consumed throughout all income groups and some are even directed at higher-income groups (e.g. modern carpentry, car repair). This appears to contradict the assumption that small industries are directed at the demand of low income groups and that their development is, therefore, constrained by the deteriorating income distribution. That is, however, not necessarily the case. Because the studies are limited to "successful" entrepreneurs, they do not give a representative view of the sector's development. At the same time, if there is a shift away from inferior goods, this might be interpreted as a sign for increasing development opportunities.

For a large part of the examined enterprises/activities, the demand perspectives are evaluated positively. One reason for this is that there is hardly any competition with large-scale domestic enterprises. This is partly due to the low capacity utilization of large industries and points to possible stimulating effects of the economic crisis on the development of small industries. Similarly, the limited infrastructure in the country acts as a barrier and gives comparative advantages to those industries which are based on local resources.

The incomes of small industrialists differ widely. The incomes of many activities appear to be high in comparison to agriculture and also formal sector incomes. Compared with the last category, incomes increased during the last years. This is partly due to the declining real wage levels. This corresponds with the fact that a

surprisingly high number of entrepreneurs (29% in the urban area of Omdurman) had worked formerly in the formal sector, partly even in highly qualified positions.

Altogether, there appears to be a high social mobility. The social origin of the entrepreneurs varies broadly.

Traditionally, artisanal industries were subject to strict social segmentation by sex and in some instance by ethnical group. This was assumed to be an obstacle for the development of small industries. Currently these segmentations seem to begin to break down. Two examples will illustrate this:

- 1) In Darfur, blacksmithing is traditionally a "despised" trade practised by West Africans. Presently, indigenous people begin to work in this trade.
- 2) Weaving of mats, baskets and food covers is traditionally done by women. However, it is reported that in some areas men are now engaged.

The characteristic of "reliance on local raw materials" has to be qualified. This is true to a high degree only for traditional rural industries. For all of the modern branches in Darfur (carpentry, metal work, tailoring, mechanical services, electrical workshops), for example, the supply of raw materials and/or equipment appears to be the main constraint. Even the raw material supply of some traditional industries is presently endangered as a result of environmental degradation (supply of wood, wool, leather, palm leaves). On the other hand, some trades are now using waste material (e.g. scrap). The market for raw materials is often dominated by few traders. Shortages are aggravated by them in order to increase profits.

Hardly any of the small industrialists has access to institutionalized credit. Most rely almost exclusively on self-finance. Some trades are dependent on merchants: They borrow money or raw materials at very high interest rates. Lack of capital appears to be a barrier to growth. However, this view is not undisputed (cf. Curtis 1980). In any case, programmes focussing on credit supply run the risk of increasing capital intensity to an inappropriate degree - the ability to work efficiently under the conditions of ca-

pital scarcity is one of the strong points of small industries. If increased market demand is not ensured, the result will be a displacement of many entrepreneurs by the few who get credit.

The technological level of many activities is low. Generally, they are labour-intensive and use little capital. To develop small industries, a modernization is necessary (except for artistic crafts). But the appropriate technologies will be intermediate, their introduction has to be carefully prepared and due regard must be given to the conditions under which small industries work.

Possession of licences and tax paying capacity are characteristics of formal enterprises. For industries in rural areas, especially those of a traditional character, they appear to be almost irrelevant. Proposals to "tap the broad tax base provided" by this sector (cf. Anand/Nur 1985, 159; Bilal 1985) have to be met with scepticism at this stage of development. The internal economics of the enterprises has to be fully understood first in order not to restrict or even prevent their evolutionary growth (cf. Hansohm/Wohlmuth 1985<sup>1</sup>).

#### IV. Small Industries Development: Policies, Programmes and Institutions

It is obvious that governmental policies on industry, agriculture, wage, trade and tariffs, foreign exchange, money and credit supply, public revenues and expenditures still have negative repercussions on the dynamics of the small industry sector, including the rural crafts sector. One of the 10 targets of the Six Year Plan 1977/78-1982/83 was the "Development of small industries based on local raw materials", and the importance of this subsector was stated again and again, but concrete actions to that effect did not follow. The promotion of large, capital-intensive and highly import-dependent industries at the expense of small ventures led to the structural deficiencies recorded above. Capital-intensive ventures were favoured for example by the overvaluation of the Sudanese Pound and by the orientation of the Industrial Bank of Sudan towards larger establishments. Low interest rates in

times of accelerating inflation led to negative real interest rates favouring investors in large ventures. Rural crafts and small industries however have to deal with traditional moneylenders and nowadays also with Islamic banks; both of them charge very high implicit interest rates.

The tariff system created an additional advantage to modern and large-scale industry because of the low tariff rates for capital goods and raw materials and the high effective protection on its output. The foreign exchange allocation system also discriminates heavily against the smaller producer who has virtually no access to foreign exchange, and all types of administrative procedures (licences, regulations, formalities) are a heavy burden on smaller producers (a factor making informal sector production more remunerative because of the absence of such regulations). The license system for imports is promoting the concentration among producers, mainly by excluding new and small ventures.

All these factors give artificial advantages to industrial commodities competing with products of small industries. Tax concessions, concessionary rates for land and inputs, allotment of prime land, financial guarantees and various types of subsidies are other biases towards the large-scale sector. Exemptions from income taxes, import duties and restrictions, exemption from rules of independence and competition of tenders, reduced costs of government services and guaranteed purchase quantities and prices have to be mentioned also as affecting favourably the larger units of industry. All these artificial inducements of the large-scale industrial sector discriminate against small producers directly or indirectly. They are part of a development model which is biased against broad-based market integration and the creation of linkages between agriculture and industry. The market for products of small industry and rural crafts is thereby severely restricted.

A drastic change of the economic environment for small industrial activities by establishing neutrality as regards the incentives to industrial establishments of different size is necessary. There is also a case in point for making Investment Acts positively discriminating towards small industries. At least the impediments for

small industries development as they are still contained in the 1980 Investment Act have to be eliminated in the ongoing revision of the Act. The responsibility towards small industries development and promotion under the political control of the Ministry of Industry and assisted by the Industrial Bank of Sudan should be firmly established. Small industries promotion is an urgent point on the agenda for inducing structural adjustments in the industrial sector as a whole, because of the proven capacity of small industries and crafts to produce inputs, maintenance services and wage goods. For small and fragmented regional markets the development of small industries is the only alternative. Small investors, cooperatives, savings associations and returning migrants may take advantage from such a promotion policy even in remote areas.

An integrated concept for small industries and crafts promotion in Sudan has yet to be developed, which also makes clear the long-term commitment of the Central and Regional governments towards this sector. It is obviously necessary to establish an extension service for small industries as soon as possible, but based on experienced personnel working at the local level. Adequate supplies of inputs, equipment, industrial estates and access to technological know-how may also become part of such an extension programme for small industries. Institutional choices have to be reviewed; either a Small Industry Development Authority (directed by the Ministries of Finance and Economic Planning), or a strong and competent unit in the Ministry of Industry may be feasible solutions. It is obvious that a link to research institutions and universities can facilitate the transfer of appropriate technology, and that the vocational training institutions in Sudan have to be linked with small industries promotion. Small industries development also links up with issues of effective regionalisation and participation in decision-making, and with the issues of informal sector growth in manufacturing and repair services.

The small industrialists and craftsmen lack an adequate institutional representation. Neither in the Trade Unions nor in the Federation of Industrialists and Businessmen is a strong group supporting their interests. Their sole institution is the Sudanese Craftsmen and Small Enterprises Union (SCSEU). This is, however,

presently not an effective instrument for support. Only a fraction of the craftsmen and small entrepreneurs are members. The institution is very weak. Surveys show that these people use other channels to make their problems known to public authorities (cf. Curtis 1980). The main reason to join the SCSEU seems to be the option to get access to real estate at favourable conditions (far below the market prices). To use this option is, however, possible only for a fraction of those interested, and they are those in possession of finance capital, not necessarily craftsmen by qualification or small industrialists (cf. Hansohm/Wohlmuth 1985<sup>1</sup>).

The access of small industries to institutionalized credit is very limited. The commercial banks concentrate their activities on short-term lending (consistently more than 70 per cent) and the finance of import/export trade (almost half of this). Less than one third of the short-term loans go to industry (1985: 30.2 per cent; Bank of Sudan Annual Report 1985). The low and stagnant share of loans directed to industry is primarily determined by the unfavourable environment for industrial investments which contrasts with potential high profits in the tertiary sector. This is even more pronounced for small and rural industries.

Since 1980, however, the Faisal Islamic Bank Sudan began to take interest in medium-term financing of industries in the small business and artisans sectors. A special branch for this purpose was opened in Omdurman and is operating successfully. However, it does not cover rural areas and it did not alter the pattern of the Faisal Bank's activities significantly, which are still concentrated on trade.

In 1961 the government established the Industrial Bank of Sudan (IBS) in order to fill this institutional gap in industrial finance and to relieve the capital constraint for industrial development. The IBS started operations with a capital stock of LS 3 mill. The capital stock amounted to LS 7.5 mill. in 1984. During the period 1962-84 259 loans and 84 supplementary loans were approved. The total IBS contributions came to LS 22.6 mill. which amounted to 47.9 per cent of the projects' total investments (IBS Annual Reports). Ranked by total investment, the most important

categories are food processing and ice factory, oil mills, textile knitwear and readymade clothes, building materials and flour mills. It is remarkable that traditional industries and very small industries are not covered. Furthermore, the Bank's activities are highly concentrated on the urban area (67.26% to Khartoum province in 1981-84; IBS Annual Reports).

In order to serve the rural areas the government formed the Sudan Rural Development Corporation (SRDC) group in 1982. Its operational area is the whole country except for Khartoum province. The task is to promote and develop small to medium-sized agricultural and industrial projects. In 1984 the SRDC was involved in 10 industrial, 4 agricultural and 1 service sector projects with a sum of LS 8.38 mill. (approved loans and equity). 70% of the credit volume went to industrial sector projects (SRDC Annual Report 1984). These are, as in the case of the IBS, engagements in modern categories/activities; also they are comparatively large projects (the smallest loan approved is LS 31,000).

There is a number of training institutes (Vocational Training Centres, Youth Training Centres, the National Cooperative Development and Training Centre) and projects at the micro-level, intended to promote traditional rural industries and crafts by cooperative organisation and production, training etc. They are financed by the government, multilateral organisations, bilateral donors and NGOs. No systematic evaluation has yet been done, but the available evidence allows the following conclusions (cf. Hansohm/Wohlmuth 1985<sup>1</sup>):

- 1) Often ideas from outside are imposed on local communities.
- 2) Often socio-economic factors are not considered adequately, especially concerning the role of women.
- 3) Most of the projects have only marginal, if any, success.
- 4) The programmes strongly reflect the view that the constraints to rural small industry development are centered within the sector itself, and ignore the external constraints, especially the impact of governmental policies in different fields.



It is obvious that policies of structural adjustment in Sudan which eliminate biases against small rural and urban ventures are crucial for small industry development (see Wohlmuth/Hansohm 1987 and World Bank 1987<sup>1</sup>, 1987<sup>2</sup>). However, if reforms as regards macroeconomic and industrial sector policy issues are feasible and implementable, a variety of institutional changes and adjustments to the benefit of small industrial ventures may have important economic effects.

## V. Conclusions

In the discussion of socio-economic developments of Sudan and other African countries the actual and potential roles of small-scale industries are increasingly recognized. Many African governments as well as supra-national organisations give now a higher priority to the promotion of small industries - at least at the stage of planning. The new Sudanese government, elected in 1986, declared the promotion of small industries as one of its priorities. This was a declared shift of policies pursued since Independence which had negatively affected small industry development.

The presumed characteristics of small industries allow the conclusion that they may play a positive role in the structural adjustment programmes which are necessary in many African countries, and that structural adjustments can improve the conditions for small industry development. In Sudan, however, the data base which is necessary to identify the branches which have a potential for evolutionary growth and to determine appropriate measures for their promotion is missing.

Among the determining factors for the development of small industries both the internal factors as determining the dynamics and the external factors, e.g. governmental policies in different fields, have to be taken more fully into account. It is obvious that more evidence about markets, types of production, incomes and earnings, investments and technical changes, qualifications and knowhow, access to credits and inputs, linkages with agriculture and services subsectors, and about the social origin of small en-

trepreneurs is very important. It is also important to know how public policies (tariffs, taxes, monetary and fiscal policies) affect the small urban and rural industries, and what type of structural adjustment measures may help to overcome the crisis and stagnation of this subsector. In terms of growth stimulation and employment creation, balance of payments improvement and basic needs provision such a policy change can be extremely rewarding. However, up to now the new government has failed to take concrete steps towards implementing such new policies on small industry development.

### References

- AFFAN, Bodour Osman Abu, 1985, Industrial Policies and Industrialization in the Sudan, Graduate College Publications No. 16, University of Khartoum
- ANAND, Vinod K./El Tahir Mohamed Nur, 1984, A Report On The Results Of A Census Survey Of The Small Scale Enterprises In Wad Medani. Population Studies Centre. University of Gezira, Wad Medani-Sudan
- ANAND, Vinod/Thair Mohammed NUR, 1985, The Role of Small Scale Enterprises in Developing Countries - A Case Study of Wad Medani in Sudan, in: Asian Economic Review, Vol. 27 No. 1/2, pp. 137-159
- AWAD, Hashim, 1973, A Note on Foreign Enclaves and Polarization: Example from Sudanese Agriculture, Seminar paper, United Nations African Institute For Economic Development And Planning, Dakar, Senegal, March, 13 pages
- BABIKER, Abdelbagi A., 1982, The Role of Rural Industries in the Arid and Semi-Arid Areas of the Sudan, in: GEO Journal. Wiesbaden, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 49-55
- BAKHIT, Abdel Hamid/Fouad IBRAHIM/Frauke RHEINGANS, 1986, Small-Scale Industries in Darfur, Sudan, Hannover/Khartoum, State of Lower Saxony, F.R. Germany
- BANK OF SUDAN Annual Report 1985
- BEDRI, M.A., 1979, Agricultural machinery industry and rural industrialization in the Sudan, pp. 141-148, in: UNIDO, Appropriate Industrial Technology for Agricultural Machinery and Implements, New York

- BILAL, Gassoum K., 1985, On the Role of the Informal Sector in Development: A Case Study of Medani Town, Khartoum, ESRC Bulletin No. 128
- CURTIS, Donald, 1980, Small Scale Industry Promotion. Report on a Field Project, Development Administration Group, University of Birmingham, DAG Occasional Paper 7
- De JANVRY, Alain, 1983, Growth and Equity: A Strategy for Reconciliation, pp. 19-33, in: Kenneth C. Nobe/Rajan K. Sampath, Issues in Third World Development, Boulder Publisher, Westview Special Studies.
- DEPARTMENT of Statistics, 1974, Handicraft Industries Survey 1970-71, Khartoum (in arabic)
- FADLALLA, Beshir Omer M., 1986, Unbalanced Development and Regional Disparity in the Sudan, National Economic Conference Paper, January, 36 pages
- HANSOHN, Dirk, 1986, Promotion of Rural Handicrafts, in: Republic of the Sudan (Ed.), Reassessment Rehabilitation Programme Kordofan and Darfur, Khartoum
- HANSOHN, Dirk/Karl WOHLMUTH, 1985<sup>1</sup>, Promotion of Rural Handicrafts as a means of Structural Adjustment in Sudan. With special Reference to Darfur Region, SERG Discussion Paper No. 7, University of Bremen, December, 34 pages
- HANSOHN, Dirk/Karl WOHLMUTH, 1985<sup>2</sup>, East-South and South-South Economic Cooperation of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, SERG Discussion Paper No. 3, January, 29 pages
- ILO (International Labour Office), 1987, Employment and economic reform: Towards a strategy for the Sudan, Report of the ILO/JASPA Mission to the Sudan, August-September 1986, Geneva: International Labour Organisation
- INDUSTRIAL Bank of Sudan Annual Reports 1962-1984
- JENKINS, S.J., 1981, Aspects of the Informal Economic Sector of Juba, Southern Sudan, University of Juba, Population and Manpower Unit, Research Paper No. 1
- MAHMOUD, Fatima Babiker, 1984, The Sudanese Bourgeoisie-Vanguard of Development?, Khartoum University Press, Khartoum
- MIRGHANI, Hussein Mohamed, 1980, Government Policies and Income Distribution in the Sudan, pp. 214-225, in: J.F. Rweyemamu (ed.), Industrialization and Income Distribution in Africa, Codesira, Dakar, Senegal
- NEW AFRICAN, June 1987
- OESTERDIEKHOF, Peter, 1979, Industrial Development and Industrial Structure in Sudan, (in German), Research Report No. 2, University of Bremen, April, 159 pages

- OESTERDIEKHOFF, Peter, 1980, Agrarpolitische Orientierungen: Phasen, Tendenzen und Alternativen, pp. 143-256, in: Tetzlaff/Wohlmuth 1980
- OESTERDIEKHOFF, Peter, 1983, Industrial Development. Structural Deficiencies, Agroindustrial Prospects and Alternatives, pp. 164-193, in: Oesterdiekhoff/Wohlmuth 1983
- OESTERDIEKHOFF, Peter/Karl WOHLMUTH (eds.), 1983, The Development Perspectives of the Democratic Republic of Sudan. The Limits of the Breadbasket Strategy. Weltforum Verlag, München, München/Köln/London
- PAGE, John M./William F. STEEL, 1984, Small Enterprise Development. Economic Issues from African Experience, Washington, World Bank Technical Paper No. 26
- SEN, A.R., 1985, The Development of Small Industries in the Sudan: Policies, Strategies & Programmes, prepared for the Government of Sudan by UNIDO
- SILSOE COLLEGE, 1986, Animal Drawn Implements. A Study to Assess the Feasibility of Local Manufacture in Sudan, study for the EEC Delegation Khartoum
- SUDAN Rural Development Corporation Annual Report 1984
- TETZLAFF, Rainer/Karl Wohlmuth (Eds.), 1980, Der Sudan. Probleme und Perspektiven der Entwicklung, Alfred Metzner Verlag GmbH., Frankfurt am Main
- UNIDO, 1985, The Democratic Republic Of The Sudan, Industrial Development Review Series, 17 July, UNIDO/IS. 541
- WOHLMUTH, Karl, 1979, International Resources in Sudan: Indebtedness and Foreign Capital (in German), Research Report no. 3, University of Bremen, May, 138 pages
- WOHLMUTH, Karl, 1983, The Kenana Sugar Project: A Model of Successful Trilateral Cooperation?, pp. 195-235, in: Oesterdiekhoff/Wohlmuth, 1983
- WOHLMUTH, Karl, 1986, Sudan's Industrialisation After Independence. A Case of Africa's Crisis of Industrialisation. Eighth IEA World Congress, New Delhi, December 1986, 25 pages
- WOHLMUTH, Karl/Dirk HANSOHN, 1984, Economic Policy Changes in the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, Research Report, University of Bremen, 98 pages
- WOHLMUTH, Karl/Dirk HANSOHN, 1987, Sudan: A Case For Structural Adjustment Policies, pp. 206-225, in: Development And Peace, volume 8, No. 2/Autumn
- WORLD BANK, 1985, October 7, Sudan. Prospects for Rehabilitation of the Sudanese Economy, Vol. I: Main Report, 186 pages, Report No. 5496-SU
- Sudan.
- WORLD BANK, 1987<sup>1</sup>, The Manufacturing Sector: Setting the Stage for Restructuring (in Two Volumes), June 30, Report No. 6475-SU

WORLD BANK, 1987<sup>2</sup>, Sudan. Problems of Economic Adjustment (in  
Three volumes), June 19, Report No. 6491-SU

Sudan Economy Research Group Discussion Papers

- No. 1 Bestimmungsfaktoren des Arbeitsverhaltens in 'traditionellen' Gesellschaften: Ein Fallbeispiel aus dem Westsudan (die Fur und Baggara) (Determinants of Working Behaviour in 'traditional' societies: A case from the Western Sudan)  
By Dirk Hansohm, University of Bremen, November 1984
- No. 2 Handwerk Im Sudan - Technische und Sozioökonomische Aspekte (Non-Factory Small Industry In Sudan-Technical And Socioeconomic Aspects)  
By Peter Oesterdiekhoff, University of Bremen, December 1984
- No. 3 East-South and South-South Economic Cooperation of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan  
By Dirk Hansohm and Karl Wohlmuth, University of Bremen, January 1985
- No. 4 The Limited Success of IMF/World Bank Policies in Sudan  
By Dirk Hansohm, University of Bremen, February 1985
- No. 5 Agroindustrielle Großprojekte und Landbevölkerung im Sudan (Agroindustrial Large-scale projects and peasant population in Sudan)  
By Angela König, Bremen, March 1985
- No. 6 A New Approach to Agricultural Development in Southern Darfur - Elements of an Evaluation of the Jebel Marra Rural Development Project  
By Dirk Hansohm, University of Bremen, March 1985
- No. 7 Promotion of Rural Handicrafts as a Means of Structural Adjustment in Sudan.  
With Special Reference to Darfur Region  
By Dirk Hansohm and Karl Wohlmuth, University of Bremen, December 1985
- No. 8 Sudan: A Case for Structural Adjustment Policies  
By Karl Wohlmuth and Dirk Hansohm, University of Bremen, February 1986
- No. 9 Foreign Private Direct Investment And Economic Planning In The Sudan  
By Ahmed A. Ahmed, University of Khartoum  
December 1986
- No. 10 Sudan's National Policies on Agriculture  
By Karl Wohlmuth, University of Bremen, June 1987
- No. 11 Sudan's Small Industry Development, Structures, Failures and Perspectives  
By Dirk Hansohm and Karl Wohlmuth, University of Bremen, December 1987