

which was truly independent and truly socialist. Now our Party is entering into its third stage: and this is the stage of actually building and defending that kind of country. It is a stage of building with determination, and defending with determination, a free and socialist nation.

We shall celebrate on 9 December, 1971. And our nation has, and will have, something worth celebrating. But just as the celebration on 9 December 1961 was only a beginning, so will be the celebration this year. It is the beginning of our third phase. We have achieved our *Uhuru*; we have defined and accepted the kind of Tanzania we want to build and live in; now we must seriously build and protect such a Tanzania. And there is no true freedom and socialism without Freedom and Work—UHURU NA KAZI.

Tanzania: The Progress of a Decade

A critical review of President Julius Nyerere's report: Tanzania Ten Years After Independence

CLAUDE AKE*

What degree of progress has Tanzania achieved over its decade of independence? To answer this question one must first deal with a preliminary question. Progress to what? or better still, progress in regard to what? As the introduction to the report makes quite clear, progress in Tanzania is conceived largely in conventional developmental terms, particularly the elimination of "poverty, ignorance and disease". In a speech delivered in Bagamoyo in 1961, President Nyerere had claimed that the people of independent Tanzania would achieve more development in ten years than the colonial regime did in forty. This claim may have seemed like a typical politician's boast. As a matter of fact it was modest and realistic. It was realistic because Tanzania's colonizers did very little for Tanzania's development; they came to Africa to do well, not to do good. Like all capitalists they were interested merely in maximising their profit, not in social welfare or industrialization. They could concentrate on draining the colony of its resources rather than taking interest in social welfare because the colonized were too weak militarily and politically to apply the necessary pressure that would have led to a more enlightened policy; they could avoid making substantial investments because their economic interest consisted mainly in procuring primary products.

The colonizers' bent for exploitation was reinforced by their racism with its associated attitudes of contempt and hatred and discrimination, leaving them no humanist inhibition about appropriating all they could and reducing their victims to utter wretchedness. And interestingly enough, this wretchedness of its victims was not just a by-product of capitalist greed but a major aim of colonial policy. The point is that colonialism can only justify its inhumanity to its victims by denying them humanity, by oppressing them so thoroughly that they begin to live like animals, to lose all dignity, all sense of personal worth and to accept without question the superiority of their masters. Thus degraded, the victims of colonialism become more like what they would be to deserve the total assault on their dignity which is colonization. The degradation and wretchedness of the colonized is the source of the legitimacy of colonial rule and colonial economic policy is a major instrument for producing this degradation and wretchedness. That is why colonial economic policy could never be enlightened. One could not expect the colonial state to be interested in social welfare, in laying the foundations for industrialization, in eradicating ignorance, poverty and disease. If it did so, it would contradict itself fundamentally.

*Claude Ake is Visiting Senior Lecturer in Government at the University of Nairobi.

We can now see very clearly why President Nyerere's Bagamoyo claim could not be described as unrealistic or immodest. On its eve of independence, Tanzania like other victims of colonialism was quite wretched. The population toiled for a subsistence that barely kept them alive to toil some more; there was no social welfare system; there were just a few miles of tarred roads; a few schools and little else. The relevant data about the colonial regime's performances in the development of Tanzania are in the report and there is no need to dwell on them here.

Given Tanzania's starting point, Tanzania could hardly go anywhere but up. And she has indeed gone up—very much so. As the statistics in the report show, the government of Tanzania has made a tremendous effort to industrialize the country, and to improve the standard of living of its people. But because the starting point was virtually zero, it is of course very easy to report progress. The statistics of the performance of Tanzania in the fields of economic development and social welfare during its decade of independence can in fact plausibly defend two different conclusions, first, that Tanzania has made remarkable progress and second, that Tanzania's starting point being what it was, its progress has not exceeded what could be reasonably expected in the circumstances.

To say something more conclusive about the performance of independent Tanzania, we must look more closely at some of the other problems it has been trying to grapple with. One of these problems is that of maximizing her independence. Everyone recognizes that the new states of Africa are only nominally independent. What is not so fully recognized is the extent of the administrative, political and economic problems in the way of increasing the independence of the new state. Let us enumerate some of these difficulties:

1. The new state is burdened with an imported political formula and imported political institutions and with leaders thoroughly indoctrinated with the soundness of the political legacy of the mother country.
2. The colonial regime manipulated the process of the transfer of power in such a way as to ensure that power was transferred to the indigenous elites who were most favourably disposed towards their political culture and ideology.
3. The colonial regime embarked on a policy of "bourgeoisification" of indigenous leaders giving them money to buy land, giving them directorships. So what has happened in most Black African states is that independence meant simply the replacement of government by a racially homogeneous oligarchy by a government of a racially heterogeneous ruling class.
4. The bulk of the wealth and means of production in the post-colonial state is owned or controlled by foreign capitalist interests and there is little indigenous private wealth to mobilize, to "free" the economy because the colonial regime could not afford to allow the concentration of wealth in indigenous hands.
5. The economy of the colonial territory depends on primary products and could be manipulated at will partly because the supply of primary

products is generally very inelastic and partly because the international market for these products is controlled by the metropolitan country and her allies.

6. Partly because of the colonial regime's lack of investment in "human development" the new state finds itself heavily dependent on foreign experts who inevitably become decision-makers.
7. The military, technological and economic weakness of the new state and the aggressiveness of the metropolitan countries have the effect of making the new state very cautious and sometimes frightened of moving to maximize its independence.

If we look at the above factors carefully, we see that the situation in which the newly independent African state finds itself is not, as is usually believed, one of having a political independence which supposedly becomes the means for gradually winning independence in other fields. It is rather a matter of starting with nominal political independence which is rendered more nominal by economic and military weakness. Political weakness and dependence, and economic and military weakness reinforce one another in a vicious circle.

Very few newly independent black African countries have shown much capacity or determination to break out of this vicious spiral. Tanzania is one of the rare exceptions. Tanzania moved to independence with political leaders who were sufficiently committed to independence—and one might add, decency—to refuse to be lured by material rewards into joining international capitalism to exploit their own people. Of course the commitment to independence alone was not enough; it had to be translated into effective policies. Tanzanian leaders gave concrete expression to their commitment by launching their policy of self-reliance. The policy was carried out with great intelligence and it has paid off. Tanzania has come a very long way from those days of the Three-Year Plan when Shs. 380 million (about 80 per cent of a total planned expenditure of Shs. 480 million) was expected to be obtained from foreign sources. Since 1967, only about 26 per cent of development expenditure has not come from domestic sources.

By far the most dramatic achievement of the policy of maximizing her independence was the crop of nationalizations which put banking, housing, the bulk of exports and imports, development investment, land etc. in the hands of the State and away from the control of external interests. To all appearances, Tanzania's economy is probably the least foreign-controlled of all the economies of Black Africa. Thus there is no need to catalogue all of Tanzania's efforts and achievements in regard to maximizing her economic and political independence. One can sum up the matter by noting that in transforming itself into a socialist society, Tanzania furnishes an exceptional example of the newly independent country which is independent-minded enough to reject the basic assumptions on which it was nurtured.

The newly independent state which is concerned about increasing its political and economic independence does not, *ipso facto*, deserve to be praised or imitated. Political leaders may want to increase the political and economic independence of their countries merely as a means of facilitating political repres-

sion and economic exploitation, because being truly independent might insulate them more thoroughly against liberal ideas and influences which will curb their tyranny and greed. Attention to the issue of increasing political and economic independence may be a means of diverting attention from internal issues of justice and freedom, and of buttressing a regime's dubious legitimacy. One is hardly surprised that there is no single one of the cynical oligarchies of Black Africa who is not engaged in heroic verbal battles against the "external threats to our unity and independence". So it is timely to remind ourselves that economic and political independence and indeed industrial and technological advancement are not ends about which no further questions need be asked, but that African nationalism was among other things an assertion of the autonomy of man, of the dignity of being free; a cry for humanity and justice.

It seems to me that, in evaluating Tanzania's performance, we must relate its achievements in promoting economic growth and economic and political independence to these other goals which are more fundamental. In particular, we must ask two questions: How far has Tanzania's economic growth been associated with economic exploitation? How far has Tanzania been interested in justice and freedom? Let me take the first question first. Tanzania and Guinea are probably the black African nations that have made the most strenuous effort to prevent the economic exploitation of some citizens by others. These two countries have largely eliminated economic exploitation because they have made a serious attempt to become socialist states. To be sure, there is hardly any black African country which does not claim to be socialist, or at least to operate on the principles of African socialism. But they proclaim African socialism only to exploit the associations of the term and to sound fashionable and enlightened. The word socialism suggests public ownership of the means of production and the fair distribution of resources and the adjective "African" appended to it gives the impression that this particular economic organization and economic justice grows out of the very core of the African's being. It is not surprising that the concept has such wide appeal. Unfortunately, the fact has to be faced; the traditional norms and practices which are the basis of the new socialism legitimize private property and capitalist exploitation. What one finds when one looks at traditional African societies is not collective ownership of the means of production, but what may be described as the public-spirited use of private property. If African socialism differs from capitalism, it is only on the point that African socialism gives the exploited a false sense of equal participation in the economic system, a misguided feeling of belonging to a brotherhood—a false consciousness which serves the forces of reaction. It is perhaps fair to say that Tanzania has largely succeeded in building a socialist society not because of her adoption of the ideology of African socialism but in spite of it. At any rate what interests us here for the moment is not so much how Tanzania came to be socialist, as the fact that she is now largely a socialist country. Just how far Tanzania has become socialist is clear enough. Banking has been nationalized. So was insurance, when the National Insurance Corporation was set up in February 1967. Land was

nationalized as early as 1962 when freehold ownership of land was abolished and leasehold ownership rights were greatly limited. Even before the *Arusha Declaration* which was the basic policy statement of Tanzanian socialism, forests, minerals, electricity, telecommunications, and railways were already under government control. The National Development Corporation which was founded in January 1965 took over responsibility for public investment, initiation and management in the manufacturing, processing and running of industries.

In 1970, the State Trading Corporation was dealing with something like 42 per cent of the total imports . . . Government, the smaller parastatals and the East African Community, together, were importing more than 50 per cent of the total, the National Development Corporation was responsible for another 5 per cent; and only 3 per cent or 4 per cent was still being handled by private firms.¹

It is much the same with exports. 60 per cent of exports is now in public hands and the remaining 40 per cent is bought by foreign agents from the Marketing Boards or other public institutions. Finally, the most interesting phenomenon of Tanzania socialism is the ujamaa villages. There are now 2,660 of these socialist villages with a total population of 830,000 which is approximately 7 per cent of Tanzania's population.

The Tanzanian economy is not yet fully socialist but it is getting there. And the advance to socialism has reduced the possibilities of economic exploitation of some citizens by others drastically. The leaders of Tanzania are serious enough about economic justice to realize that public ownership of the major means of production is not a sufficient condition for eradicating exploitation. Public officials may use their positions to appropriate resources unfairly. While Tanzania may not have succeeded in curbing the greed of its public officials she has taken steps to render their indulgence difficult and hazardous. For instance, the *Arusha Declaration* prohibited every TANU or government leader from holding shares in any company, or directorships in any privately-owned enterprises, and from owning houses which are rented to others. It also forbade them to receive two or more salaries. The spirit of the *Arusha Declaration* is reflected in the life-style of Tanzania's leaders which is modest, almost puritanical. And this life-style has helped to check the cult of affluence and consumerism in Tanzania. Tanzania is one of the few black African countries where the acquisition of wealth is not the prevailing ideology.

We must now turn to the second question. To what extent has Tanzania's economic development and socialism been associated with concern for the freedom and human dignity of Tanzanians? It may be said that the question contains its own answer in so far as economic equality is the fundamental condition for political democracy and for giving everyone a role in deciding how society should be run. Thus to become a socialist country is to go a long way towards creating a society whose citizens enjoy freedom and some sense of their own dignity. Certainly economic equality is necessary for political democracy. Despite the claims of the Western "democracies", capitalism is incompatible with democracy. What exists in the West is merely the illusion of democracy: competing political parties; universal adult franchise; general

elections; the right of every citizen to run for office. It is not necessary to waste time here trying to show that universal suffrage and general elections are compatible with dictatorship and totalitarianism, and that the right to seek office is real only for the handful of people who have the material resources to do so, or that the competing party system thinly masks the fact that the competing parties are dynasties of the same ruling class. Simply, since economic inequality inevitably leads to political inequality, those who want to have political democracy must become socialist.

Although economic equality is the necessary basis for political democracy, it does not follow that once economic equality is achieved democracy necessarily follows and that by economic equality alone dignity is given to everybody's life. After all, the tyranny of supposedly socialist countries such as the Soviet Union is well-known. Granted, Tanzania has a socialist government; one might go further and say that they have a good government—the question is, do Tanzanians also have self-government?

The Tanzanian government claims to be deeply committed to giving all power to the people and to have made great progress towards a people's democracy. One is tempted to dismiss this claim as one that every government is expected to make. Yet there is something about the Tanzanian case which compels serious attention to this claim. To begin with there is the movement to socialism which we have already discussed. Then there is the campaign which the Tanzanian Government initiated recently. I am thinking of the launching of the *TANU Guidelines*. This little green book has been so energetically publicized and distributed that it is now a familiar sight in Dar es Salaam. To all appearances one of the things that this booklet is doing is to inculcate the attitude that people must look for more than efficiency and economic productivity from their leaders and that the people must insist on participation.

Of course, in the final analysis, one must look beyond manifestos to action. The evidence suggests that Tanzanians are still far from achieving self-government and the Government is not doing enough to make the country truly a people's democracy. Tanzanian leaders appear to be too impressed by the need for a "strong and unified government" and this is leading to too much bureaucratization and centralization. There is still no industrial democracy to speak of. The organization of TANU, the working of the government and of industry show a heavy leaning towards Leninist elitism. For all their declarations of intent to build a people's democracy, Tanzanian leaders are still very suspicious of the ability of the Tanzanian masses to rule themselves. For instance, why are there presidential appointees in the City Council of Dar es Salaam? Why is it that workers, such as taxi-drivers or street sweepers (as opposed to élites) are not appointed? Why is there so much emphasis on the leadership role of the party? This emphasis is evident even in the *TANU Guidelines* which points to the need for popular participation.

As a victim of colonialism, the logic of the necessity for leadership makes me very nervous. To say that it is necessary for someone to be led does not give a flattering picture of the capabilities of that person. The logic of leadership was the logic of colonialism. Our colonial masters insisted that we were

colonized not for their profit but because we needed to be led so as to be brought up to the level of civilized existence. This was part of the reason why colonialism could never be enlightened, for if the colonizer admitted that the colonized was as human and as capable as himself, the legitimacy of colonial rule disappeared. I hope it is now clear why the emphasis on leadership is so disturbing. Presumably we Africans want to be free and not to change one set of masters for another.

The emphasis on the leadership role of TANU is doubly disturbing because TANU has now become by far the dominant institution of Tanzania. TANU is the effective government of Tanzania. To have a democracy, the decision-making institutions must be controlled by the people and remain accountable to them. Whatever else Tanzania may be, it cannot be a democracy unless TANU is a party of the people, controlled by the people and accountable to them. Far from wanting to become a popular party, in some elements TANU seems intent on becoming more élitist. Even the *Arusha Declaration* stated that:

Since the founding of the Party greater emphasis has been put on having as large a membership as possible. This was justified during the struggle for independence. Now, however, the National Executive Committee feels that the time has come for emphasis to shift away from mere size of membership on to the quality of the membership. Greater consideration must be given to a member's commitment to the beliefs and objectives of the Party, and its policy of socialism.

The Membership Clause in the TANU Constitution must be closely observed. Where it is thought unlikely that an applicant really accepts the beliefs, aims and objectives of the Party, he should be denied membership. Above all, it should always be remembered that TANU is a Party of Peasants and Workers.²

No! No Tanzanian, whatever his views and commitments can afford to be denied full membership and participation in TANU as long as his country is ruled by TANU. In *Education for Self-Reliance*, President Nyerere writes that "we want to create a socialist society which is based on three principles: equality and respect for human dignity, sharing of the resources which are produced by our efforts, work by everyone and exploitation by none". The first, and most fundamental of these three principles is incompatible with rule by a party which is not in every sense a party of the people.

Political participation is only one aspect of the process of promoting equality and respect for human dignity. There is something else related to this process which deserves attention especially in a situation of decolonization: that is mental decolonization. At the beginning of the report President Nyerere notes that:

the most immediate task after independence, however, was the assertion of the dignity of all Tanganyikan citizens. It was for this reason that within weeks of independence there was a shock deportation of five Europeans who publicly insulted Africans after 9 December. Those deportations were intended to have, and did have, a psychological effect on the whole society. They showed that, whatever else we had not achieved when the Tanganyikan flag was raised on the flagstaff, we achieved the right to be treated as human beings.

It is to President Nyerere's credit that he recognizes the problem posed for

decolonization by the success of the colonial regime in degrading the African and depriving him of his sense of personal worth. Freedom is partly a matter of consciousness. You can make people slaves, but it is virtually impossible to force them to be free. Men cannot be free unless they have a sense of their own dignity. The eradication of the sense of dignity of the victim of colonialism is important not only because it impairs the emergence of the free man but also because it renders the colonized incapable of mobilizing his energy and imagination to eliminate those factors which made it possible for him to be emasculated and humiliated. So in a very serious sense, the emancipation of the African is primarily a matter of restoring his self-respect.

If President Nyerere is shrewd enough to recognize the problem he is entirely too complacent about the extent to which his government has met it. From what one knows of President Nyerere one is inclined to doubt that he thinks, (as the report suggests), that the integration of several high-class clubs in Dar es Salaam, Africanization of the bureaucracy and the deportation of five cheeky Europeans constitutes anything more than an acknowledgement of the problem. Beyond acknowledging the problem, what President Nyerere's government has achieved is fairly accurately stated in the report: "Today the humanity and equality of Africans is no longer challenged inside Tanzania by non-Africans." It would be more accurate to say "blatantly challenged". But no matter. This achievement, modest as it is, is still much better than that of the bulk of newly independent African countries. Yet if we look carefully at the achievement which we are conceding to Tanzania, we see that it is really an irrelevancy in relation to the original problem. For what is at issue is not what non-Africans think about Africans but what Africans think about themselves.

Tanzania has not achieved much on that score. Tanzanians like other Africans still lack confidence in themselves. They are still suffering from colonial mentality. I want to turn to a discussion of one manifestation of this colonial mentality which helps us to summarize Tanzania's progress over this decade of independence and to appreciate the present state of the African revolution.

The particular manifestation of colonial mentality which I want to discuss is our tendency to think of our evolution in terms of Western ideas of development. We have largely accepted that it is proper to call ourselves developing countries and that we are developing to the extent that we achieve economic growth, technological advancement, industrialization and subsequently the eradication of ignorance, poverty and disease. What is not generally realized is that the habit of thinking of our evolution in terms of Western standards of development deepens our sense of inferiority and prevents us from dealing imaginatively with our problems. To elaborate; development connotes progress, desirable change, change to a better status. When we put nations on a continuum of development as the terms "developed" and "developing countries" imply, we are asserting that the overall status of some nations is better, superior, and more desirable than those of others. When we look at our evolution in terms of this Western notion of development then the question in our

minds becomes, in effect, how can we be more like them? This is the question of the person who not only considers himself inadequate but inferior.

Clearly, by being induced to accept the overall goal of development, we have been made more dependent and open to manipulation. There is hardly anyone in the so-called developing countries who does not take it for granted that we need capital, super-markets and super-highways, railways, national airlines, tarred roads, electricity, modern universities and hospitals, beauty parlours and discotheques. What we have been induced to want and the quantities in which we want them are such that we cannot supply ourselves. To get them we must barter our independence. Thus our need for foreign exchange and development capital ties us to the apron strings of the World Bank, and of racist European governments. Our need for technological advancement obliges us to abandon ourselves to the mercy of foreign experts. The single point is that need, not coercion as such, is the basis of all slavery. It is not possible to dominate somebody or make them feel inferior unless you control something they need. Thus if I am totally indifferent to death and to pain, you cannot control my behaviour by threatening me with death or with torture. The so-called developing world is manipulated and dominated by the controlling industrialized countries. To the extent that we do not want these goods we will be freer. Suppose we think of our needs in the more modest terms of giving our people good health, better food, drinkable water, and clean, cheap houses, we will find that with some hard work we can be completely self-reliant. Why does it never occur to us that what we need in the area of health is not so much the modern hospitals with sophisticated equipment for prolonging life unnecessarily, but a network of dispensaries which can be manned by medical orderlies rather than expensively trained doctors. Why must higher learning be done in such expensive settings as the University of Dar es Salaam? Why not a cluster of brick-coated mud houses?

The report under review still reflects that something remains of our colonial mentality, and our unwillingness to be bold enough to think the unthinkable. It assumes too easily that poverty, ignorance and disease are problems—period. It accepts too readily that progress is made if we have a higher gross national income, tarred roads, electricity, railways, more schools, etc. Yet it also illustrates the fact that Tanzanian leaders are less prone to colonial mentality than practically any other leaders of Black Africa. If one reads the report carefully one sees that Tanzanian leaders are not inclined to accept that economic growth is the ultimate achievement or to equate happiness with purchasing power; one sees a refreshing concern with the consequences of productive conditions and social and political conditions for the quality of life and with the idea that, in the final analysis, it is the development of the man that counts.

The intelligence and originality of Tanzanian leaders is commendable. But it does not go far enough. We need to reject *in toto* the Western view of development, of the world we want, not only because it is an uncivilized world but also because we want emancipation. The mental revolution we need to emancipate ourselves will, in my opinion, come only if we dare to survive solely by

our own resources. The danger of our isolation will then stimulate our imagination and release our latent energies for the desperate effort we must make.

The District Development Front in Tanzania

LIONEL CLIFFE and JOHN S. SAUL*

In describing and evaluating the Tanzanian Government's attempts to reach the rural populace and encourage it to participate in the development effort attention must be drawn to several important characteristics of the *general strategy* adopted by the leadership. Though subject to ambiguities in its detailed interpretation and difficulties in its realization, it is, in many of its particulars, a strategy distinctive in East Africa as brief comparisons with Kenya and Uganda will subsequently make apparent. We have used the term "the development front" to epitomize its most salient features for central to it is the intention to co-ordinate as closely and as fruitfully as possible the activities of *all* institutions with a presence in the Tanzanian countryside. Ideally this is designed to achieve the construction of an integrated phalanx of "development agencies" over a broad front (local councils, co-operatives, government ministries) capable, in turn, of presenting a uniform set of stimuli to Tanzanian peasants designed to encourage their adoption of novel patterns of behaviour desired by the central government. Equally important, primary responsibility for achieving such co-ordination and galvanizing the related agencies into action rests, at least theoretically, with the ruling political party.

Though these various agencies interact at the national level in ways that are relevant to policy-making for the rural sector we shall direct our attention primarily to the local level, particularly to the districts. A sub-district, even village, focus would also be an illuminating one for certain purposes, but the district does have the advantage of being large enough to bring into full play all the relevant agencies (indeed some districts in Tanzania are as large as Sierra Leone!); and, generally, it is uniform enough geographically and sociologically to make coherent planning a valid and valuable aspiration. The government's attempt to forge a front for effecting the realization of development is thus of particular importance at that level.

Moreover the pattern of politics specific to the development front becomes most graphically apparent at the district level. This point will become clearer

*Lionel Cliffe, formerly Director of Development Studies, University of Dar es Salaam. John Saul, Senior Lecturer, Department of Political Science, University of Dar es Salaam.

The empirical observations on which this paper is based have been accumulated by the two authors during some years' research and teaching in Tanzania. They would like to acknowledge the assistance they have received from the Research and Publications Committee of the University of Dar es Salaam; the hard work and insight of many students; and the support and encouragement of colleagues, especially that loose band of radical interdisciplinarians that have made up the Rural Development Research Committee. The long period which has elapsed in bringing this manuscript to publication may mean that certain passages are now of more historical than immediate interest, especially after the dramatic decentralization of the planning process in early 1972; in the authors' opinion, however, the emphasis here presented, and much of the substantive findings, are still of crucial relevance.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 J. K. Nyerere, "Tanzania Ten Years After" (Dar es Salaam, 1971), p. 50.
- 2 "The Arusha Declaration and TANU's Policy on Socialism and Self-Reliance" (Dar es Salaam, Government Printer, 1967), p. 19.