

**THE ARUSHA DECLARATION
TEN YEARS AFTER**

Julius K. Nyerere
United Republic of Tanzania

THE ARUSHA DECLARATION

TEN YEARS AFTER

JULIUS K. NYERERE

The Arusha Declaration was passed by TANU in January, 1967. It explained the meaning of Socialism and Self-Reliance, and their relevance to Tanzania. At the same time TANU adopted the Arusha Resolution, and instructed the Government and other public institutions of mainland Tanzania to implement policies which would make Tanzania into a Socialist and Self-Reliant nation.

Action began within twenty-four hours of the publication of the Declaration and Resolution. On 6th February, 1967, all private Commercial Banks were nationalised; on each of the succeeding four days further steps were taken to bring the economy of the country into the ownership and control of the people.

Since that exciting week, never a month has passed without further endeavours by TANU, Government, public institutions, or individual groups of the people themselves, to translate into a reality the principles and policies outlined in these basic Party documents.

But I am a very poor prophet. In 1956 I was asked how long it would take Tanganyika to become Independent. I thought 10 to 12 years. We became independent 6 years later! In 1967 a group of the Youth who were marching in support of the Arusha Declaration asked me how long it would take Tanzania to become socialist. I thought 30 years. I was wrong again: I am now sure that it will take us much longer!

Ten years after the Arusha Declaration Tanzania is certainly neither socialist, nor self-reliant. The nature of exploitation has changed, but it has not been altogether eliminated. There are still great inequalities between citizens. Our democracy is imperfect. A life of poverty is still the

experience of the majority of our citizens. Too many of our people still suffer from the indignities of preventable disease and ignorance, and the aged and disabled do not all live in decency or even security, despite the clear statement in the Declaration that they have a right to support. Further, our nation is still economically dependent upon the vagaries of the weather, and upon economic and political decisions taken by other peoples without our participation or consent. And this latter is not a reciprocal situation; Tanzania is still a dependent nation, not an interdependent one.

We have not reached our goal; it is not even in sight. But that is neither surprising, nor alarming. No country in the world is yet fully socialist, although many committed themselves to this philosophy decades before Tanzania even became independent. Few other developing countries, and those only the biggest, are fully self-reliant. What matters is that in the last ten years we in Tanzania have taken some very important steps towards our goal, despite adverse climatic and international conditions.

First and foremost, we in Tanzania have stopped, and reversed, a national drift towards the growth of a class society, based on ever-increasing inequality and the exploitation of the majority for the benefit of a few. We have changed the direction of our national development, so that our national resources are now being deliberately directed towards the needs of this nation and its people.

Secondly, we have established some of the attitudes which are necessary to the development of socialism. There is now a general recognition that it is wrong for some people to live in luxury while others are destitute. The argument now is not on the principle, but on how, and how fast, we can move from our inheritance of great inequalities to a position where differences of income are slight and depend entirely upon service to society. Co-operation for common benefit rather than the relentless pursuit of individual advancement, is now the more generally approved social behaviour, even in the modern sector of our society. A

person is therefore beginning—only beginning—to be judged for what he contributes rather than by what he acquires. And we are learning to take pride in the extension of basic public facilities to the mass of our people, rather than in grandiose public buildings or the evidence of personal prosperity for a few. Our National Ethic, in other words, is beginning to be a socialist ethic—that is, a concern for the well-being of all rather than a pride in material goods for their own sake.

Thirdly, we have established many of the institutions, and worked out many of the strategies, for socialist advance. These are by no means complete, or perfect; a very great deal remains to be done. But in 1977 we are not starting from the beginning as we were in 1967; the public financial, productive, and social organisations which are necessary to serve the people's needs do mostly exist. We have even gained some experience, although it has been too often the experience which comes from making mistakes.

Fourthly, we have made reasonably good progress towards providing basic health, education, and transportation facilities for all the people of this country. Staff training has been multiplied, and by a combined effort from the people organised in TANU, and the Government, many new dispensaries, schools, community centres, and water supplies, have been created. Connected with these things has been the movement of virtually our entire people into villages, so that they can work together to provide, and get together to use, the public facilities which are essential to an improved standard of living for all.

And fifthly; we have, as a nation, continued to make some contribution to the freedom struggle in Africa, and therefore to strengthening our own freedom. Individuals and groups all over the country have made voluntary financial contributions to the struggles being waged by our brothers and sisters to the south of Tanzania. As a nation we have been active politically, and diplomatically, in support of freedom in Southern Africa. And we have provided training

places and rear bases when it has become necessary for the political freedom struggle to be converted into a war of liberation.

The measure of our success is that these fundamental achievements are generally taken for granted. We are now much more conscious of the difficulties in our daily lives than of fundamental exploitation. And that is as it should be.

Daily difficulties certainly exist. The absence of luxury goods in our shops affects only a small number of people. But the intermittent shortage of simple goods, and even of necessities, is a continuing problem for some people—especially in the more remote villages. Further, crops are not always collected, or paid for, as soon as they are harvested, with consequent loss or hardship to hardworking peasants. Work is delayed and people are frustrated by poor bus services or the absence of sufficient transportation for their goods. There are numerous regulations covering what appear to the individual to be simple transactions; these are always unpopular, sometimes unnecessary, and very often badly administered. And on top of all this, a few people have found their standard of living actually reduced over the past ten years.

To-day such difficulties and frustrations make us forget where we came from, and even make a reminder seem like an irrelevant impertinence. It is quite true that when our shops were full of a large variety of goods, the vast majority of people had no money to buy them. It is quite true that ten years ago most people walked to work because they could not afford the bus fare, and that they did not complain about their children not going to secondary school because they had not even gone to primary school! But people have now developed a little; they have higher expectations of life. No longer does a man or woman think of life as an endless round of hard physical labour, enlivened only by marriage and birth and the fellowship of community. For here also we have achieved fundamental success. Our people are now more conscious of their potential as human beings, and of the possibilities of human

life. So they reject the argument that because they did not resent the limited boundaries of their lives when they were mentally asleep, therefore they should not complain when the expectations of awareness are frustrated. They see that this argument is too often used as an excuse.

But a reminder is still necessary. Our current difficulties, and our failures, must not be allowed to hide our greatest achievement. It is one which usually goes unrecognised inside Tanzania, although many people outside—from their own bitter experience, or from observation—are aware of it. For we are like a man who does not get smallpox because he has got himself vaccinated. His arm is sore and he feels sick for a while; if he has never seen what smallpox does to people he may feel very unhappy during that period, and wish that he had never agreed to the vaccination.

There are some evils which Tanzania was too undeveloped to suffer from up to the time of independence. Among these were: the destitution which comes from landlessness when there is no other form of livelihood available; private usury; and literal starvation in the midst of plenty. In countries like India millions of people experienced these evils—and indeed still experience them because it is very difficult for a poor country to eradicate them once they are established. But all these things are liable to come from economic development, if it is not pursued along socialist lines.

We in Tanzania do not now have, and we shall not have in the future unless we abandon socialist policies, many problems for individuals and the society which afflict even the wealthiest of capitalist nations. Our people do not suffer from the tyranny of landlords who control their land and therefore their means of livelihood. They do not find it impossible to obtain or build a house because individuals own all the houses, and all the land, and charge what they like. Our workers are not grossly exploited by employers, and forced to work hard for a paltry wage or see their children die from lack of food or shelter. With a few exceptions which come from lack of understanding and

which we have not yet managed to control, our land and natural resources are not destroyed to make private profit for a few.

Further, because of our socialist policies, there are not growing inequalities between our citizens, with the already rich growing richer and the poor getting poorer. On the contrary, we have been—and still are—gradually reducing economic and therefore social inequalities among our people.

And although our nation is not by any means economically independent, we are not becoming more dependent on others as time goes on and development increases. As a result of our socialist policies, it is the people of this country—not foreigners—who determine what kind of factories and farms shall be established in Tanzania. This means that we can gradually increase our control over the Tanzanian economy; we are not being bound tighter and tighter into an international capitalist structure which we can never hope to control, or even influence.

All these evils, and many others which we are now spared, would have happened in Tanzania had we not adopted the Arusha Declaration. Indeed, the first signs of them could be seen before 1967, despite certain socialist measures which had been taken before that time. Thus, for example, immediately after independence, some citizens of African descent who had previously been denied bank loans or credit, suddenly found them easy to get. They were the political leaders, and the newly promoted civil servants. They were able, and indeed were encouraged by the private banks and financial institutions to borrow money to buy or build large houses, which they could then rent at a profit. Sometimes they were even getting public money for such purposes. On the strength of that, they could get more credit in order to build more houses, and get more profit. Again; in the rural areas, a few individuals who had better education or were believed to be "leaders of opinion" were getting a private claim over large areas of land, and employing others to work for them. Individuals, and again mostly political or NUTA or co-op leaders, were acquiring buses, or taxis,

from which they reaped a profit by employing others to run them on their behalf. Capitalism was beginning. And it was beginning with the leadership. Certainly it was a mean and unproductive kind of capitalism which was beginning in Tanzania, but it was capitalism all the same.

Fortunately, these things, this "creation of an African middle class", had not gone very far. Our leaders had begun to think that individual riches were part of the prerequisites of leadership; but they had not begun actually to become rich. So the Arusha Resolution came in time; it was passed after a long argument about its effect on individuals, but it was passed. For our leaders had been elected by the people from among themselves; they were not a separate group. And they realised that the only way they could really serve their country and their fellow citizens was as set out in the Arusha Declaration.

CHAPTER II

OUR ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER THE ARUSHA DECLARATION

Public Ownership of the means of Production and Exchange:

The nationalisation of existing industries and services, which took place immediately after the Arusha Declaration, was more important for what it enabled us to do later than for its own sake. For you can only nationalise what exists, and there was very little industrial development in Tanzania. Even so, the nationalisation exercise was fundamental to what followed. And it has meant a reduction in the outflow of Tanzania's wealth in the form of interest and profits.

It is impossible to assess the total amount of money which would have been sent out of Tanzania over the past 10 years if we had not taken over the major means of production and exchange in 1967. Looking at the National Bank of Commerce alone, its total net profits retained in Tanzania from 1967-1976 amounted to Shs. 557.3 million.

This is after paying full compensation to the private Banks out of which the N.B.C. was formed, and therefore gives some indication of money which would probably have gone out of Tanzania during the period from this source alone.

It can therefore be said, without hesitation, that one result of the Arusha Declaration, from which we are now benefiting, is that such wealth as we do produce in Tanzania is available for use in Tanzania. A "mrija", through which our little wealth was being sucked, has been cut.

Even more important, however, is that by taking the productive and distributive sectors of our economy into public hands, we have been able to decide for ourselves what we want to build, and determine our own priorities. We have therefore been able to use our limited resources (either of our own, or from overseas borrowing) to create industries which will serve the needs of our people. Obviously we made some mistakes; there were one or two occasions when we fell into the trap of being "modern" at all costs, and invested in large capital-intensive factories when a number of small labour-intensive plants could have given the same service at lower financial cost and with less use of external technical expertise.

A few mistakes apart, however, we have made advances in industrialisation. In the last ten years we have started a large number of small and cottage industries, either in urban industrial estates, or in the villages of Tanzania. We have also started factories manufacturing such varied goods as farm implements, tyres, fertilisers, radios, batteries and bicycles, as well as a cement works, printing plants, etc. All these and many other industrial enterprises produce goods needed by the people of Tanzania. We have also expanded some of the factories we took over in 1967—as for example the shoe and tobacco factories. More industrial plants are currently under construction.

Apart from those mentioned, we have given particular emphasis to the expansion of enterprises which use our own raw materials. For example, in 1967 hardly any of our cotton was made into cloth in Tanzania; by 1975 we

had 8 textile mills, capable of producing over 84 million square metres of cloth. Sisal rope production has greatly expanded. Still further expansion of these industries is planned or in process; a new textile mill is to be built in Musoma, and the Mwanza Mill is now being expanded. The expansion of "Urafiki" Textile Mill has been completed. A sisal carpet factory is being constructed in Kilosa; new cement works are planned for Tanga and Mbeya; several different factories are being planned for Morogoro; and so on. In all these cases our dual aim is to be able to meet the mass needs of our own people by production within Tanzania and also to convert our raw materials into manufactured goods before exporting them. By that means we shall increase our foreign exchange earnings, because the value added by the manufacturing processes will accrue to Tanzania, and be paid in the form of wages and investible surplus to Tanzanians.

The industrial expansion over the last ten years is certainly small in comparison with our needs, but it is nothing to be ashamed of. Once again it is good to remember where we come from. The value of our industrial production has trebled over the decade, and industry now accounts for about 10 per cent of our national income instead of 8.0 per cent in 1966. This is in a much more expanded economy. The number of people who earn their living in industry is now about 2½ times as great as it was in 1967.

Few, if any, of these new factories would have been started in Tanzania had we relied upon private investment for industrial expansion. Even had there been an increase in foreign private investment and a consequent growth in the monetary value of Tanzanian industrial production, it is quite certain that the new factories would not have been directed at making goods needed by Tanzanians or at maximising the value of Tanzania's primary products. For such activities in a poor country are not very profitable in money terms.

It is true that had we tried indiscriminately to attract foreign capital, factories might have been started to produce other things. For example, in some new states Trans-national Corporations have established factories which produce some of the components for complicated manufactured goods. These components are then exported and assembled in Europe, together with different parts made in other poor countries. The major effect of this so-called industrial development is to make certain important sectors of the national economy become dependent upon a capitalist Trans-national Corporation. As such institutions have the sole objective of maximising their total international profit, regardless of the interests of any of the individual states in which they operate, that kind of "development" is not really national development at all. It can make the industrial growth statistics look very good, but in the end the country can be worse off as far as its independence and people's welfare are concerned. Some countries have such urgent unemployment problems, and so little land, that it is difficult for them not to adopt this strategy. But Tanzania has no such need to increase its economic dependence on foreign capitalists. And we have avoided any danger of doing so by insisting that, in all large or important activities, foreign capital shall operate in this country as a minority partner, and therefore under public control.

Equality:

Human equality and dignity is fundamental to socialism, as the Arusha Declaration makes very clear. And although we still have a long way to go, we have made very commendable progress towards equality since 1967.

There are three aspects to the development of greater equality within a nation. One is differentials in personal incomes. The second is different degrees of access to public services, and the extent to which taxation-supported activities serve the interests of the people as a whole rather than those of a small minority. And the third is participation in decision-making.

In some ways the second aspect of equality—that is the communal aspect—is more important than the first in a poor country when market forces are prevented from operating freely by decisions of the democratically elected Government. For provided that everyone is assured of minimum food, clothing, and shelter, a great advance towards equality has been made if such things as education, health services, clean water, agricultural advice, and transport are equally available to everyone—or even if their availability is made less unequal.

And the third aspect of equality, that is the power to participate in decision-making, is absolutely fundamental. Unless every person plays an effective part in his own government, rather than always being the recipient of decisions made by others, there can be no equality in human dignity and status. Nor is there likely to be very much progress in economic equality.

In all these aspects of equality we have made some advance.

Education:

In order to train Tanzanians for the middle and senior posts in the administration and the economy of the country, it was necessary immediately after independence to emphasise the creation of secondary and post-secondary educational facilities. In the last ten years, we have been able to turn our attention more to basic education for everyone, although secondary, and higher education (especially teacher-training) has continued to be expanded. In 1974 TANU even took the bold step of opting for universal primary education for all our children by the end of 1977, despite the current intense economic difficulties.

A tremendous jump in the number of children attending primary school has been the result. In 1967 there were about 825,000 pupils in Tanzanian primary schools. In 1975, the comparable figure was 1,532,000 pupils, and the numbers will continue to rise rapidly for some years to come. Thus, in 1976 there was a still further increase in

the school population as 665,621 children entered school for the first time, compared with a total of 187,537 who entered standard I in 1967.

Great advances have been made in adult education—especially the extension of literacy. Thus, during the five years of the illiteracy eradication campaign, over 5 million people registered themselves in literacy classes, and of these some 3.8 million sat for the literacy test conducted in August 1975. All the people who persisted with their classes deserve our congratulations, because it is not easy for adults to learn these skills for the first time at the end of a day's work. Further, 1.9 million people passed the literacy test at the 3rd or 4th level, which means that they can read, write, and do simple sums with ease. We should salute their achievement—and must make certain that they can obtain reading materials of the kind which interests them and from which they can learn more.

For equally important with the fact of learning is what people learn. Since the publication of Education for Self-Reliance in 1967, our teaching at all levels has become increasingly appropriate to the needs of our people and of Tanzanian society taken as a whole. In the primary schools, and in special post-primary groups, there has been new emphasis given to technical and agricultural training, and the pupils no longer spend most of their time preparing for secondary school education which the majority of them will never receive. The literacy campaign also was designed to pass on other knowledge while people were learning to read and write; thus books were about better husbandry methods for crops important in the locality, or about good health and child-care requirements etc. The secondary schools are also giving increased emphasis to technical and scientific subjects, with most schools now specialising in either agriculture, science, or technology. Such changes in curriculum and syllabus can only be a gain, both to the individuals who find their knowledge more useful in their lives, and to the country whose stock of practical skills is increased.

Such rapid educational expansion does, however, put a great strain on the teachers and educational administrators. They have accepted the challenge, and are overcoming it; they have done very well, and have worked hard for many extra hours without any extra pay. They have earned the respect, and deserve the thanks, of the whole community.

But the expansion also costs a lot of money! Our people cannot finance U.P.E. nor larger numbers of secondary schools through taxation or any other way if we continue to support the schools and school-children in the manner of the past. The "Self-Reliance" of institutions has thus become vital to the Tanzania educational system. We have made a beginning on this, although we need to go much further. It is estimated that in the school year 1974/75 economic activities in our schools produced goods to the value of over Shs. 7.7 million. These activities include the growing of different crops—mostly food which was consumed by the schools—and the raising of chicken and livestock, all of which were used to provide food in one way or another. In addition, many schools made bricks, furniture, or clothes, either for their own use or for sale. These self-reliance activities are still small and often ill organized; but they are being accepted as part of the normal educational system.

One other important education development which is relevant to the growth of socialist attitudes was the changed method of entry to University. Now all students finish their education at the end of secondary school. Only those who have been working in our villages or factories are eligible to go to University, and their admission depends upon character references given by their work-mates as well as upon academic qualifications.

It has been necessary to make some temporary exceptions to this rule. Women students and students for the Engineering Faculty are all allowed to enter directly after completing their National Service. This is intended as a temporary compensation for the social and education disadvantages suffered by Tanzanian women in the past, and

in order to ensure that expensive technical and scientific equipment, and teaching capacity, at the University is fully used during the transition to the new system. But in time the same rules will apply to all. And it is interesting to see from reports of the first year under the new system that the more mature students in fact get better results on average, even in technical and scientific subjects, than did the students who were accepted straight from school. This is not surprising; a mature student has greater understanding of what he wants to do at University.

Health:

We were slower in changing the direction of our health service towards meeting the needs of the people in the rural areas. But the new emphasis began in 1972, and has gathered speed since then. Thus, for example, in 1967 there were only 42 rural health centres in operation; in 1976 there were 152, with many more under construction. And there were 610 more maternal and child-care clinics in 1976 than were operating ten years before. There was also a 200% increase in the number of Rural Medical Aids and a 270% increase in the number of Medical Assistants at work in the country. As these provide most of the medical service in the village dispensaries and health centres, it is obvious that we are directing our care to where the majority of the people live rather than spending all our resources on big urban hospitals.

Preventive medicine is part of the work of the Health Centres, clinics, and dispensaries. It has been receiving greater emphasis, for it is obviously better to prevent someone from getting ill than try to cure them afterwards. For this purpose, mass education campaigns—Mtu ni Afya and Chakula ni Uhai—have been conducted throughout the country so that people understand what they can do to help themselves. The digging of latrines, and general cleanliness are of even greater importance now that people are living in villages than they were before. But this kind of educational work has to go on continually, as has vaccination and inoculation against preventable disease

like Tuberculosis, measles and polio. The response of the people in all these matters has been generally good; many of the new village dispensaries, etc. are being built at least partly on a self-help basis.

So we have not made a bad beginning in the extension of basic health care to the people. And the results are just beginning to show in the statistics; it is now estimated that in Tanzania the expectation of life at birth is something like 47 years as against 35-40 years in 1961; the infant mortality rate has gone down from 161 per thousand in 1967 to about 152 per thousand now. Yet although these figures show an improvement, they also show how far we still have to go. The expectation of life in Europe is over 70 years and the European infant mortality rate is about 20 per thousand! So we must continue our efforts, and even increase them.

Clean water is one vital factor in improved health and living standards, and it is estimated that about 3 million people in the rural areas now have this available reasonably near at hand. That means that about 10 million people do not! They are still using dirty water, and often walking long distances to get it. Further, few of them will have the time or resources to boil their water and let it cool before drinking it. The consequences to health do not need elaboration.

A lot of work is being done on extending clean water supplies, which is now a high priority for the Party and the government—as well as for the people directly affected! Something like Shs. 100 million has been spent in each of the last 5 years on rural water supplies, and the self-help efforts of the people are now beginning to be marshalled in support of the work. However, we are yet doing enough to train village people to maintain their own pumps and pipes; too often these break down after a short while, sometimes leaving the people worse off than before, because for the sake of cleanliness their well has been sealed up when the pump was installed. The resistance by our water engineers to the use of windmills continues to be absolute but quite impossible to understand! It is a kind of mental block.

Personal Incomes:

Although it is true that equal access to basic public services is at the core of socialist equality, the relationship between different personal incomes is also important—especially in social terms. In this also we have made great progress.

It is now probably true to say that in Tanzania no able-bodied person lives on an unearned income; such incomes have been reduced almost to nothing by the combined effect of all government policies. In 1967 the top salary in the public sector of the economy was 29 times as much as the minimum wage. After direct tax is taken into account the proportion was 20:1. In other words, a person earning the minimum wage had to work for 20 years in order to receive the amount which the highest paid public employee received in one year. By the end of 1976 this degree of inequality had been greatly reduced. After direct tax was deducted, the highest paid employee in the public sector took home 9 times as much as the minimum wage earner did. To any objective observer this differential will still seem very great, but our achievement so far is even greater. At independence the top incomes were about 50 times as great as the lowest incomes, even after direct tax was deducted. Tanzanian senior officials in government and parastatal organisations should receive full credit for the spirit with which they have accepted this worsening of their economic position; for in recent years they have suffered from a real reduction in income as well as a reduction relative to other workers. This country is fortunate in their patriotism, and their commitment to our socialist policies. Those armchair revolutionaries who denounce these young men are talking like idiots. Not all young nations have been so well served by their educated leaders.

In the last ten years we have also corrected the tendency for urban average incomes to grow much faster than those in the rural areas. Although reliable statistics are non-existent in this area, it appears that since 1967 the hard working peasant (especially in areas with a good cash crop) has improved his lot faster than an equally hard working

wage-earner in the towns. The increasing cost of buying building materials for a house, and paying cash for all food, is one factor in this change; another is the deliberate bias in the tax structure in favour of the peasants in the rural areas.

Yet one problem which still makes life in the rural areas less attractive to the young is that the peasant's income does not come in the form of a regular cash payment. He never knows how much he will get until he has sold the harvest, and even then he may not get the money straight away. For many months in a year the peasant may therefore be without any cash, even to buy little necessities like soap or cloth. For those who grow crops like tobacco, or coffee, this is mostly a problem of organisation. They get good money if they use proper methods of husbandry, but it all comes together as one or two payments in a year. And many of them spend it all at once. Therefore a further extension of the Banking system into these areas, combined with education about the use of a Bank Account to make deposits and draw out at need, will help. But for farmers whose land cannot grow the best paying crops, this is not so much of an answer, for their cash income is very small even considered on an annual basis. They need further help to earn cash, either through the establishment of village industries or the introduction of new crops. Both these things are being attempted, although they will take time to bring results. But in the meantime, when people work on ujamaa farms they may consider distributing the income earned on a regular monthly basis rather than all at once when payment is made for the crop sold.

These various movements towards greater equality of incomes within the country have not happened by accident. They are the result of deliberate government policies to that end. Among these are the incomes policies, the pricing policies—both to the producers and consumers—and the taxation structure.

Democracy:

The administrative decentralisation which was introduced in 1972 had two objectives. One was to speed up decision-making, and the other was to give local people greater control over events in their own District and Region, as well as greater access to the implementors of development decisions. Decision-making has been speeded up; Districts and Regions can now act in many matters without waiting to refer everything to Dar es Salaam. It is, however, still difficult to say how far the decentralisation has increased the people's democratic control over the district and regional administration. It appears that this varies considerably from place to place, dependent in part upon the personalities of the leaders and officials concerned, and to a larger extent upon the political consciousness and democratic forcefulness of the people themselves.

Villagisation has already helped to give the people more effective power, and as the villages become more settled their power should grow still more. For the villagisation exercise is now virtually complete. There are some 7,684 villages in Tanzania, with a population of about 1,700 people to a village. Village Councils and elected Village Committees now exist almost everywhere in accordance with the Act of 1975. This means that the people in a village can determine the development of their own place, and within the framework of our national policies draw up their own rules for living and working together. They will also be able to participate more effectively in District and Regional decision-making by regular discussions with their representatives on these bodies.

Thus it is truer now than ever before that the people can determine their own rate of progress towards socialism and the human dignity which comes from economic sufficiency. But they have to use these democratic powers. If they do not use them—if they sit back and wait for someone to tell them what to do,—then others will take over effective power. For decisions have to be made, and work has to be done. Just as water fills up the low places

near a river, so within a theoretically democratic structure small tyrants will fill up a gap left by low political consciousness and apathy. During the next decade continued political education will remain necessary if we are to reach the objective of democratic practice.

Agriculture as the basis of development:

Since the Arusha Declaration was passed, we have talked a very great deal about rural development and the expansion of agriculture as the basis for Tanzania's future. And we have spent large sums of money on rural development—some of it from friends abroad. Thus, for example, whereas in 1967 something like Shs. 45 million was spent on agricultural development, the figure has been around Shs. 400 million in each of the past two years!

Also in support of agricultural expansion, the government has subsidised the sale of fertiliser (the consumption of which has more than doubled in the last five years); made credits available to cooperatives and ujamaa villages through the Rural Development Bank; helped with the planning of irrigation; and provided training in the use of animal-drawn implements, etc. Not enough has been done, and sometimes the efforts have been misapplied, or too late in arrival. But some attempt has been made.

However, the truth is that the agricultural results have been very disappointing. Modern methods have not spread very quickly or very widely; the majority of our traditional crops are still being grown by the same methods as our forefathers used. Irrigation, and even the building of small dams, is talked about more than done. People still think in terms of getting a tractor for their farms—even when they are small—rather than learning how to use oxen-ploughs; or they concentrate on saving for a lorry when their real need is a number of small carts to move seeds and crops from the shamba to the collecting point or village store. Towards agriculture, and agricultural methods, even our attitudes have not changed as much as they need to do.

Of course our total agricultural output has increased over the past ten years. In some crops the expansion has been very creditable when allowance is made for the recent years of bad weather. But in food production, for example, the increase in output has not kept pace with the increase in the population. It is true that when the weather is good we have been generally self-sufficient in food. The large imports of grain in 1974/75 were unusual. But the explanation for our normal self-sufficiency is not our agricultural efficiency. We are a peasant country. And if peasants have land they will at least produce the food they need. This they have been doing. Our urban population is very small. Therefore the surplus we need to feed this population is also very small. If the weather is good the peasant can produce this surplus. But our agricultural productivity is too low to produce a surplus that can feed a larger urban population or maintain strategic reserves.

Looking back it is possible to see many contributory factors to this lack of sufficient agricultural growth. Government has been too slow in changing the prices offered to the farmers, so that at times they were not recompensed for their effort on food crops or for the increased costs of production following inflation. This has now changed; the new prices should enable an active farmer to get a reasonable return for his effort if the rains do not fail. Also, difficulties with transportation, and inefficient service from the co-operative societies have been discouraging. But the real failure seems to have been a lack of political leadership and technical understanding at the village and district level. Despite the call in "Politics is Agriculture" for all political leaders to learn the basics of good husbandry in their areas, and to join with the peasants in production, we have continued to shout at the peasants, and exhort them to produce more, without doing much to help them or to work with them in a relationship of mutual respect. Many of our leaders know nothing about agriculture; what is more, they don't want to learn!

As regards forestry, our progress has also been smaller than it should have been; but it would be wrong to say that we have done badly. 16,500 hectares of new forest have been

planted with soft woods during the past nine years, and 3,200 hectares with hard wood. Also some villages have begun to plant their own trees, either in areas set apart for that purpose, or along village roads, between their shamba, or along ridges. This is a very good development and should be encouraged. Every village should plant trees for future building needs, and for furniture etc., as well as for firewood.

We must, however, pay more attention to guarding the river sources and banks, and to protecting the mountain sides. There has been a tendency for some villages to be quite ruthless in cutting down trees in such areas; by doing so they are—for their own immediate profit—destroying the land on which we all depend. For indiscriminate tree-felling leads to soil erosion and turns fertile valleys into areas without surface water. Regulations on these matters must be immediately enforced; at the same time educational work must be undertaken to help the people understand what they have been doing and how they can benefit economically from proper land conservation and use.

The one thing which cannot be said about the past ten years is that the peasants of Tanzania have failed to work. They have worked hard. But they have worked without sufficient knowledge and understanding of improved husbandry; they have also been badly hit by drought following successive years of poor rains. More effort on small-scale irrigation and the building of dams could at least reduce the loss imposed by rain shortage. And we must also stress the importance of planting, weeding and harvesting at the right times, as well as proper spacing; for these do not cost anything but can result in a greatly increased harvest.

Further, we must apply more widely the knowledge and the seeds which have been developed by scientists in our research institutions. For very good research work is being done. New seeds have recently been developed for the grain crops as well as for the cash crops—to which research used to be restricted. Seeds for some very good varieties of maize and millets are now in use in the country;

we must plant them in appropriate areas. At present there is too great a tendency to cultivate maize even where sorghum and the very nutritious millets would give more assured and better harvests. In agriculture there has been plenty of "Juhudi". The emphasis should now be on "Maarifa".

One other tradition to which we must return is the storage of grains in the villages. Traditional storage methods could often be made very effective if minor changes were made to keep out vermin. And village food stocks would provide additional security for the people against future disasters, including a breakdown of communications, and would save the peasants' cash income for other things. It will, however, still be necessary for us to build up national stores of food in different parts of the country—about which we have been remiss in the past.

Village workshops for the manufacture and repair of simple agricultural implements must be developed. The manufacture of furniture, clothes, and bricks for improved housing can also be done in the villages. This work is just beginning, with the support of SIDO and the Rural Development Bank. We must do more.

Political Education and Leadership:

When moving a country from embryonic capitalism and capitalist attitudes towards the growth of socialism, few things are of more long term importance than political education. In this respect Tanzania has been very active indeed. Political education has been introduced in schools, colleges, and other educational institutions; it has been given emphasis in the National Service, and the T.P.D.F. Very large numbers of Political Education Seminars have been run in Government and Parastatals, especially for senior personnel who can influence or affect decisions. The English language newspaper has been nationalised so that we could rely upon it to report news accurately, and to analyse events from a Tanzanian and socialist viewpoint—although in practice it has not been infallible on either

count! And the radio has been used as an educational medium, for it reaches further and more quickly into our villages than any other form of communication.

All these things are important, for all our people need to understand our goals, and the policies to which we are committed. Political education must be continued, and intensified; it is the only way we shall be able to see clearly through the current difficulties to the purpose of our activities and the needs of the future.

But although formal political education is important, people learn just as much if not more from observing the behaviour, the attitudes, and the expectations, of avowed socialists, and especially socialist leaders. The Leadership Code (and its later extension to all Party Members) was therefore one of the most crucial aspects of the Arusha Resolution. For it has ensured that those who aspire to lead, or to take an active part in, our movement towards socialism have been forced to share the problems of the mass of the people. And we have been quite successful in observing the Code. When the Central Committee of TANU investigated a series of allegations that it was being broken, most of them were found to be based on misunderstandings, and the Leadership Code Enforcement Commission which was established after that time has not found many major breaches of the Code. But observing—or rather, not breaking—the Leadership Code is not enough. We have to be believing socialists. Party leaders have been known to break the Code as soon as they cease to be leaders. This shows that they just wanted to hold office; they were not believers in Ujamaa.

And another tendency which has grown up, and which has to be fought, is for TANU leaders to expect payment for their services to the Party and the people. There have even been suggestions that all Ten Cell leaders should receive "subsistence",—although no-one has said who should pay this subsistence! It is of course necessary that people who devote their whole time to political work, and who are not on pension, should receive enough money to live on and

to work properly. But our Party grew on the basis of its members' commitment and willingness to contribute their time and energy to the things they believed in. It must not become an organisation of mercenaries. Our commitment can best be judged by the amount of voluntary and unpaid service we render both to the Party and to the general public.

But in general it can be asserted that through political education of all kinds—that is, through teaching, action and example,—great changes in attitudes have taken place in Tanzania. Government and leaders are beginning to be judged by how they live up to socialist ethics. People's complaints are now about the remaining inequalities, and about inefficiency in the execution of socialist policies; we have much less special pleading for high salaries or privileges for particular sections of the community.

Indeed, we have reached the stage where our greatest danger is a new one. The thing which could now do most to undermine our socialist development would be failure in the battles against corruption, against theft and loss of public money and goods, and other abuse of public office, or against slackness in fulfilling the duties for which people are being paid. All these evils breed cynicism among the mass of the people when they are committed by those entrusted with responsibility. The person who steals from the public, who allows public property to be destroyed, who gives or accepts bribes, or who fails to carry out his job as quickly and efficiently as possible, is now a very dangerous enemy of socialism in Tanzania. They are more dangerous than the honest man who keeps a private shop. We must wage unremitting war against such people.

The Freedom Struggle:

The struggle for political freedom in Africa has advanced since 1967. Mozambique, Angola, and Guinea-Bissau are now independent sovereign states, and members of the Organization of African Unity. The struggle for majority rule in Zimbabwe, and for the independence of Namibia, is also further forward now than ten years ago. All these

are achievements of the peoples of those countries themselves; no one else has fought their battles for them. But it has been Tanzania's duty, and privilege, to support these Freedom Movements in the past. We have fulfilled that duty; we are continuing to do so today; and we shall not change our policy. Nor shall we flinch from giving full political and diplomatic support to the anti-apartheid struggle. Rather, we shall continue with our efforts to isolate South Africa culturally, economically and politically; we shall continue to give what help we can to the South African victims of racist brutality. And in defence of the territorial integrity of our newly independent neighbouring state, we shall not hesitate, if requested, to render military support.

In the fight for economic independence, co-operation with other Third World countries has increased since February 1967, although difficulties have not been absent. The signing of the East African Treaty of Co-operation in December 1967 was a matter for rejoicing, in Tanzania and elsewhere in Africa; it seemed to take African economic unity a stage further forward. Unfortunately, political developments in Uganda, and a number of unilateral transgressions of the Treaty by Kenya, have put the Community in jeopardy. The Government is working to overcome the current difficulties and to get agreement on Treaty Revisions which will enable all partner states to work together. Co-operation in East Africa is needed by the whole continent; it has been, and can again be, a valuable weapon in the fight for greater economic development and freedom. But I must confess, with very great sadness, that the hope of reviving the East African Community is now a very slight one. We tried; but it appears that we shall be defeated. Our colleagues neither had, nor have, the desire for real co-operation. There is still a long way to travel before Africa is liberated.

Co-operation with other developing countries has increased. With Zambia, Tanzania's communications links have been multiplied since 1967. The road to the border has been realigned and macadamised; it is now one of the best and strongest roads in the country—which is helpful to

the people in Southern Tanzania as well as to our neighbour. The jointly-owned oil pipeline has helped Zambia to withstand the Smith Regime's counter-attack against free Africa through that front line state. And the Uhuru Railway, also jointly owned by Zambia and Tanzania, was opened in 1976 although construction only began in 1970. For this very important inter-African link we are greatly indebted to the Government and People of China, who made us an interest-free loan and provided all the technicians and engineers needed for this major undertaking. The Railway has already provided greater economic security to Zambia—and therefore greater security for the freedom of this country; it provides an opportunity for an almost limitless expansion of trade between our two countries; and it also opens up large areas of Tanzania for economic development.

New trading opportunities have been created also by the independence of Mozambique, and our links are being fostered by a Joint Tanzania/Mozambique Economic Commission. A similar Joint Commission exists between Tanzania and India, for we have realised that some of the manufactured goods we used to buy from the developed world can be obtained more cheaply from India. This kind of reorientation of trade is an advantage to the Third World as a whole as well as to ourselves, for it makes the poor countries less dependent on the rich states.

And with China, Tanzania's economic links are constantly being strengthened. There has been something of a fall in the number of Chinese goods sold in this country now that the Commodity Credit connected with the railway has been exhausted; but this merely enables a re-arrangement of our trade and other links on a more permanent basis. The jointly owned Tanzania-Chinese Shipping Line is operational. We still have a number of Chinese Doctors and other technicians helping us—and setting a first-class example of socialist dedication as they do so. And co-operation between our two countries for the development of Tanzanian iron and coal is now being worked out.

Another cause for satisfaction is the co-operation between Tanzania and Cuba which has been established in many fields.

Tanzania has also been working on a multilateral basis with other Third World countries in dealings with the developed world. The "Group of 44" which negotiated the Agreement with the European Economic Community was able to obtain better terms for all of us than any poor country could have obtained on its own. And in the "Group of 77" (which really involves more undeveloped countries than that) Tanzania has been able to work in unity with other exploited nations to fight for a New International Economic Order. As a result, this demand is no longer a dream; it is now a matter of world politics. Co-operation among the poor has forced the Developed Nations to listen to what we say. In time it will lead to greater achievements.

CHAPTER III

OUR MISTAKES AND FAILURES

Self-Reliance:

In the Arusha Declaration there is whole section attacking the outlook that "money is the basis of development. Without it there can be no development". Yet this attitude is still prevalent in Tanzania today. The Minister for Finance, and his Officials, are still attacked as if they were deliberately frustrating legitimate demands of other Ministries and of Regions. Plans based on the use of money—sometimes large amounts—are still announced as if they were realities; with the Minister being blamed when he says there is no money.

Yet it is as true now as it was in 1967 that the calf can only suck the amount of milk which its mother cow produces! The total amount of goods—whether expressed in the form of money or not—which we can consume and invest is limited by the amount of wealth which we produce. External aid—of which we have received a great deal in recent years—is by its nature temporary and unreliable.

It must not become the basis of development; our plans should not rely upon it. Money is not the foundation of Tanzania's development; if we wait for money in order to develop our country then there will be hardly any development, for we have very little money.

Yet even the money we do have, and do allocate for development, is treated very casually. Plans are still being drawn up by Ministries on the basis of buying services or goods which we could create by voluntary effort—or do without. Ministries and Regions still issue cheques in excess of their budgetary allowance on the assumption that no government can refuse to honour its own cheques, and apparently without realising that the result must be either inflation (that is, a fall in the value of money) or that other projects will never be started at all. Further, our public institutions, our Districts, and our ujamaa villages, often seem to worry very little about repaying the debts they incur. For example, since 1972 debts to the value of over Shs. 70 million have not been repaid on the due date to the Rural Development Bank. As its loan portfolio is Shs. 350·7 million, that means that something in the region of 20 per cent of the loans made are not being repaid! On that basis the T.R.D.B. will soon be able to make no new loans at all, for all its capital will have been exhausted. In addition, it is noticeable that some villages are taking loans from the Banks without the Banks making sure that the projects are properly supervised, and that the villages will be able to repay those loans. Yet these Banks are lending public money; the money they make available comes from taxes, or from overseas loans which have to be repaid either by the Bank or from taxation. Such practices as failure to repay loans, or properly supervise plans which are financed by loans, are a further reflection of our failure to understand that money represents goods, and that if we waste money, or fail to repay the loans we have had, then other plans will have to be left undone.

At the root of this whole problem is our failure to understand, and to apply to our own activities, the concept of "Self-Reliance". We are still thinking that big schemes, and

“orthodox” methods will solve our problems. We do not approach a problem by asking how we can solve it by our efforts, with the resources which we have in front of us. This applies from the village level to the Ministries; but the latter are most responsible. For when villages have a problem they ask for advice. And they are rarely shown how they can solve it within the village without outside assistance, or even given the training which would enable them to do so afterwards. Indeed, local initiatives are often scorned, as not being “modern” enough. When the people build a dispensary with traditional materials they are told it is not hygienic; they are rarely if ever shown how a few alterations and special care from day to day could make it satisfactory.

The fact is that we are still thinking in terms of “international standards” instead of what we can afford and what we can do ourselves. And we think of getting external assistance for simple projects, instead of reserving this for the really major projects which we could not undertake without it,—like the Uhuru Railway, or the Kidatu Hydro-electric scheme. Villages buy tractors—or are sometimes given them through the Regional Development Fund—when they have not yet mastered the disciplines of working together with oxen-ploughs, and have no idea of mechanical maintenance. Doors, window-frames, beds and chairs, are not manufactured by village carpenters because the modern tools which would produce a sophisticated product are not available. And so on.

The same attitudes prevail about housing. Not very long ago it was estimated that to build an improved traditional house—that is one with a permanent roof, insect-proofed wood-work, and a thin cement floor—cost about Shs. 7,000/-; a smaller cement block house, costs at least Shs. 18,000/- to construct. Yet although we know that most of our people cannot afford the mortgage or rental costs of the cement house, we persist in promoting its construction. Obviously it is more comfortable, and lasts longer. It is a case of the best being the enemy of the good. For most people the only effective choice is between an

improved and an unimproved traditional house,—they cannot afford the cement house. So if we do not help them to build an improved house of traditional materials, or of burnt bricks and tiles if they have a little more money, then we shall not be doing anything to help them live in decent house.

We must become more practical in these matters—in Dodoma as well as elsewhere. It is no use expecting the National Housing Corporation to supply all the houses we need; it does not have the resources, and people's failure to pay the inevitably high rents of N.H.C.-type houses has reduced its capacity still further. In fact since 1967, the N.H.C. has constructed only 11,036 new houses for rent, and the rate of construction is going down. Instead we should concentrate on the development of Site-and-Service projects so that people can build for themselves houses which are appropriate to their income, and which can be gradually improved over time. A beginning has been made; the Housing Bank now makes loans of between one and five thousand shillings so that people can build improved traditional houses; and the Ministry Building Research Unit is investigating cheaper but still good modern housing methods. The Site-and-Service policy is also getting slowly off the ground; since 1972 about 9,000 new sites have been prepared, although most of these were in Dar es Salaam. Development in Dodoma must be based on this system. The new capital will never be built if we wait until the C.D.A. has the capital resources to build modern housing for all expected inhabitants. And when the C.D.A. does build, or when people can afford more modern type houses, they must use burnt brick and tiles, not cement and bati.

The present widespread addiction to cement and tin roofs is a kind of mental paralysis. A bati roof is nothing compared with one of tiles. But those afflicted with this mental attitude will not agree. Cement is basically earth; but it is called "European soil". Therefore people refuse to build a house of burnt bricks and tiles; they insist on

waiting for a tin roof and "European soil". If we want to progress more rapidly in the future we must overcome at least some of these mental blocks!

The developments mentioned as regards the financing of our new housing may be taken as a sign that we are now beginning to adapt our thinking to our capacity. And there are other examples of what can be—and is being—done by villagers working together in co-operatives or informal groups. Knives and other tools are being made by traditional blacksmiths in some villages while they wait for teaching about how to build a more modern furnace. Villages are making burnt bricks with which to replace their temporary school building; in other places people are working a communal shamba, in order to buy bati for the dispensary roof with the cotton or other cash crop they produce; and so on.

This kind of development should be encouraged. For a lot depends on leadership. Villagers have to be helped to understand what they can do for themselves to meet the needs they recognise. And they must be given training so as to upgrade their traditional skills in order that they can provide goods for their own use and for the market.

It is imperative that we should make more deliberate effort in these matters. Whenever any problem is being tackled, or any new development is being proposed, our first question must be: What can we, in this village, or district, or region, or nation, do to solve this problem by ourselves! And if the considered answer must be "not everything", then the second question should be: How much can we do without seeking for financial help from outside the village, district, region or nation? And always the further question must be asked: Are we doing this in the most economical, efficient, and appropriate manner, in the light of our circumstances?

A poor nation does not develop on the basis of money. It cannot be independent if it depends upon external help.

Production:

Over the last ten years we have done quite well in spreading basic social services to more and more people in the rural areas. More remains to be done; but we shall only be able to do it if we produce more wealth. And we have not been doing very well on that front.

Measured in constant prices, our National Income has increased at a lower speed since 1967 than the rate at which it was increasing before. Thus, from 1964 to 1967, Tanzania's National Income rose by an average of 6.4 per cent per year. Between 1967 and 1975, it rose by an average of only 4.2 per cent a year. Even excluding the drought years when a fall in production was beyond our control, the average rate of increase was only 4.6 per cent a year. As the population is increasing by about 2.8 per cent every year, this means only a negligible real improvement in the per capita standard of living. The improved living standards of the majority of Tanzanians comes from better distribution of what we do produce, more than from an increase in the amount of production.

It is true that the last ten years have been very difficult ones economically. For example, the terms of trade between our imports and exports have been moving against us almost throughout the period, which means that the goods we produce for sale abroad have less value in terms of the kind of things we need to import. But we must not use that—or the drought years—as an excuse to cover up our own failures. These we must analyse and examine in order to do better in the coming decade.

The problem has not been a failure to make investments in new factories or farms. In the four years 1967—1970 Shs. 1,155 million was invested in new productive facilities by the Parastatals alone, and the amount of directly productive investment increased steadily, even if slowly, for the next five years. By the financial year 1975/76 it became possible to put more emphasis on this, rather than on infrastructural investments: in that year the Development Budget allocated almost Shs. 890 million for directly pro-

ductive national investments (investments made in the Regions would be additional) and in the current year the allocation has been further increased. Although these more recent investments will not yet be showing results, it is obvious that we should by now be receiving the benefit of the investments made in the first half of the post-Arusha Declaration decade.

But we are not using our investments as efficiently as we should. Almost all our industrial plants are running well below capacity; sometimes less than 50 per cent of what could be produced with existing machinery is actually being manufactured and put on to the market! Even the Tanzania Breweries was only using 68 per cent of its capacity in 1975; Tegry Plastics ran at 46 per cent capacity; and the Mara Milk Plant at less than 30 per cent capacity. Further, the Wazo Hill cement works is certainly not producing anything like the amount of cement it could do if it were working properly, and the textile mills could probably do better also. In 1975 at least, Bora Shoes were not only producing a much lower quantity than their machinery justified, but they were also producing shoes of low quality. However, in this case some improvement has been shown during the last year.

Certainly our parastatals are not producing sufficient surplus to finance new investment. In the eight years from 1967—74, only about 20 per cent of new productive investment was financed from the resources of the existing publicly owned corporations. They were not, in more common terms, making sufficient profit. For profit is necessary whether an enterprise is privately or publicly owned. Public ownership affects what happens to the profits, not the necessity for them. Taken as a whole, over eight years the profit of our parastatals as a percentage of sales was only an average of 6.5 per cent a year. In 1975 even the Breweries' pre-tax profit was only just over Shs. 4 million on gross sales valued at Shs. 535.5 million—and they certainly have no sales problems!

The fact is that we have been, and still are, grossly inefficient in our factories and workshops. Profits are not the only test which demonstrates this. For example, the value of output per worker in our industrial enterprises actually fell from an average of Shs. 18,870 in 1967 to an average of Shs. 16,540 in 1974—by which time money was of much less value. A fall in the productivity per man-hour in the construction industry is also noticeable, and the expansion of our agricultural production is not keeping pace with the population increase.

Not every failure is the direct fault of the individual firm. The basic problem at the Mara Milk Plant, for example is that not enough milk is produced by the peasants in the area; and one of the problems of other firms is sometimes interruptions in the supply of vital imported raw materials—although often this itself is an indication of failure to make orders in time. Again, the frequent electricity and water supply failures in Dar es Salaam and Mwanza during 1974—76 did adversely affect production. And these hold-ups arose because Government was too slow in undertaking the basic infrastructural works, which then fell behind schedule once construction had started.

But problems external to the firm are not sufficient to account for the extent of our inefficiencies. Rather, there are many contributory factors, each of which has to be examined in relation to each enterprise.

Management and Administration costs are often much too high in relation to output. In every parastatal we have a whole series of managers for different functions, and a General Manager on top. Each Manager has a Secretary, an office of his own, and often a car. These facilities are sometimes justifiable when the managers are efficient at their jobs and active, for they can multiply the efficiency and profitability of the manager many times over. But this is not always the case. We employ some "Sales Managers" who sit in their offices and wait for customers to search them out; without making any attempt to find out what needs the factory could be fulfilling and is not, or what change in

their product could make it more useful to their customers, etc. We employ some "Production Managers" who do not order spare parts or the necessary raw materials on time, or, having done so just sit and complain instead of going after them if the goods are not delivered. We have "Maintenance Managers" in our transport enterprises who apparently find it acceptable to have as many as 40 per cent of their vehicles off the road at any one time waiting for repairs or service!

Some of these failures are the result of inexperience or lack of confidence among the young people holding such posts. Where this is the case, more training may help, as would greater contact with older managers in other enterprises who can be consulted informally about serious problems. For it is true that our managerial cadre is very much younger, very much less experienced, and has less opportunity to learn by observing others, than people in comparable positions in older countries. Such people must be given the opportunity and the time to learn and to improve. But if they do not learn quickly, and if they do not improve, then they must be replaced, or even just relieved of their job; it is better to have a vacancy than a person who is taking pay for doing nothing.

But it is not only faults at management level which account for our low output; indeed, many of our managers are working extremely hard and for long hours every day. But some of the workers in our plants, offices, shops, and so on, have not yet realised that when the rights of the worker are more respected, so his duties increase. For we have virtually eliminated the discipline of fear; it is quite hard for a manager or employer to dismiss a worker, or even suspend or fine him for dereliction of duty. But in Tanzania it is not unusual for a Manager to be locked out by the Workers! For we have not everywhere succeeded in establishing the discipline which comes from understanding one's responsibilities, and having a commitment to a co-operative increase in production. Although attitudes have now greatly improved, in many places TANU and

NUFA Branches are still better at protecting the workers in the particular plant than they are at protecting the workers and peasants of Tanzania as a whole from bad workmanship or slackness.

It is essential that we should tighten up on industrial discipline. Slackness at work, and failure to give a hard day's effort in return for wages paid, is a form of exploitation; it is an exploitation of the other members of the society. And slackness has undoubtedly increased since the Arusha Declaration was passed. Both Managers and Workers are affected by this tendency, and each group is too ready to blame the other. The fact is that all of us must correct our own slackness, and expose the slackness of others to the light of day. Managers must involve their workers in this task; they must be willing to accept criticism and must give it. The same applies to more junior grades of workers; a messenger who does not deliver a letter quickly may cause the loss of an order or delay delivery of goods so that the work of a whole factory is held up; carelessness with a machine—whether it is a lathe or a bus—may cost thousands of shillings of the people's money. TANU Branches should be more active in the struggle against such attitudes and actions. Defending slackness and negligence is not socialism; on the contrary, it is very stupid.

Every Parastatal must examine its own record on efficiency and try to find ways in which costs can be cut, or output increased with existing resources. In some places this work has already started; the N.D.C. is involved in a complex cost-cutting and quality-improvement exercise covering all its subsidiaries. But this work is urgent and must be undertaken by all our parastatals. And we must work out for each enterprise the appropriate goals against which efficiency can be measured. These will vary from one kind of activity to another. They may be, for example, the ratio of buses on the road to the number being repaired, or the length of cloth, the number of ploughs, etc., produced and sold in relation to the capital investment and number of workers, and so on. This is a very serious matter. The

fulfilment of our social goals, as well as an improvement in our people's personal consumption standards, depends upon the speed and efficiency with which we increase our total output.

Costs of Government:

Since 1967, Government has been the fastest growing sector of the economy. In 1967 it accounted for 10.9 per cent of the National Income; in 1975 it was 16 per cent! Efficiency and economy of operation is therefore vital, for Government is not directly productive,—which is not the same thing as saying it is unproductive! But in any case, Government is financed out of the wealth which the people produce on the farms, factories, and roads of this country, and it should be extracting the minimum necessary for effective operation and service to the people. Extravagance in Government hinders the peoples' development.

After 1967, some increase in the proportion of the national wealth which is used by Government was inevitable. For the Government of Tanzania is now actively engaged in promoting and organising economic and social development; it is not just an administrative and public security organisation. When the people decide to adopt a policy of universal primary education, they are at the same time deciding to increase the proportion of our wealth which is used in Government activities. When Government is told to initiate and control economic development, it must take the resources with which to do that work. And the amount of Government activity related to development must not be under-estimated. In 1974, for example, the Government, parastatals, and the East African Community together were responsible for over 70 per cent of the total capital formation of the year, and almost every aspect of that work involved Government servants as well as the Parastatal and Community employees. It would therefore be absurd to talk as if the expansion of Government costs meant automatically an unjustified imposition on the directly-productive workers and peasants of this country.

Yet we must use the minimum amount of money on Government, and we must use it to best effect. Just now, for example, 80 per cent of the recurrent revenue allocated to the Regions is spent on wages and salaries of Government employees. This is absurd. It means that we pay people to work, and then cannot provide them with the facilities and equipment they need to do the jobs for which they are paid! Teachers do not get books and papers; there is a shortage of medicines in the dispensary; agricultural officers and Development Personnel do not tour their District or Region because there is no money for petrol.

This kind of thing must not continue. We are not able to increase the recurrent budget available to the Regions to any noticeable extent, so we have to tackle the problem from the other end. We have reduced some staff; we may have to leave other vacancies unfilled. And we must be more adaptive to our circumstances. There was a time, for example, when Agricultural Officers used to walk from village to village on duty, spending the nights in people's houses or in tents. Now we even scorn bicycles! And paper is wasted in our offices; the simplest letters are marked "Secret" and put in two envelopes, circulars are duplicated on one side of the paper only, and so on. Such economies seem petty, and the amounts saved appear so small as to be unimportant in a single office; but they do mount up when 20 Regions and 72 Districts—to say nothing of the Ministries—are added together! Serious attention must be given to every detail of expenditure, and the question asked "How can the job be done more cheaply".

In Government generally we must also resist the temptation to establish a new institution every time we tackle a problem. By the end of 1967 we had 64 parastatal organisations; by 1974 we had 139—and the number has been increased since. Some increase was necessary; we could not have carried out decisions without setting up the appropriate new institution. But still new parastatal corporations are proposed almost every month. And it is difficult to know the work that some of them do. There are

two institutions dealing with sisal; one is called the Authority, and the other is called the Corporation! Why? It would be wrong to assume that the increased number of parastatals is just a sign of careless multiplication; we have learned from experience (e.g. with S.T.C.) that it is often better and easier to run a smaller specialised organisation than a large, multi-purpose one. Yet we must always remember that every parastatal involves extra administrative costs, and we should carefully consider whether a new one is necessary, or necessary now rather than in the future.

Further, some costs of government could be reduced if we helped the people in villages and towns to do more things for themselves. Training village members to do minor repairs and to service pumps, for example, would be better and cheaper than relying upon the District Engineer's staff for the work; other village members could be trained and then made responsible for the accounts, and the management. We must not rely solely on village managers, or village technicians provided by the State. Many of these people do a useful job, and this kind of technical and professional aid is now essential to the implementation of plans drawn up by Village Councils and Development Committees. But these people are not an integral part of the village, affected personally by its success or failure. Therefore, although it is necessary now to give the villages the help of trained government employees, eventually our aim should be to phase these out and gradually replace them by trained members of the village who are paid out of the village income. Then the Government should concentrate on providing "consultants" and "inspectors" whom the village technicians and members could call upon for advice, or who could be called in when a new project is being undertaken.

We have started training village people for work in their own villages. The National Service is doing a useful job training people in skills like carpentry, shoe-making, and basic mechanics. And the Ministry of Health takes people from the villages for a few months and trains them how to deal with the simplest illnesses and how to use the First

Aid Boxes. When they return home, such people are able to join in the agricultural activities of the village at times of pressure, or do the other work on a part-time basis. We must give more emphasis to this approach to village development. We cannot yet support full time village specialists in every important field; what is important is that the skills should be available in the village to be applied as needed.

Leadership:

Political and public service leadership has undoubtedly improved over the past ten years, in both commitment and in efficiency. But still leaders too often forget that the purpose of Government and Party and of ALL the laws and regulations in this country, is to serve people. And when we say "serve the people" we do not just mean "the masses" as an abstraction; we mean the people in large groups, and small groups, and as individuals.

It is inevitable that good and necessary social policies should sometimes bear hardly upon individuals. When that happens, it is the task of leadership to help people to adjust, and to arrange the implementation of the policy so that those who are willing to re-arrange their plans or their life have time to do it in dignity. And a good leader will always be able and willing to explain the purpose and the aims of the new policy, and why it has been adopted. That is part of the function of leadership; it is political education also.

Yet in practice leaders at all levels seem to delight in saying "no" in response to even the most reasonable requests. Ask them why they have said something can be done in six days, or six months, but not now, and they have no answer; the truth is that by giving that decision they have demonstrated their authority. And in some cases they are also indicating that if a little "chai" is passed over, the matter can be speeded up!

All too often leaders in the Government and the Civil Service—and even in the Party—fail to show by their actions that they care for people. They do not act positively to help individuals who are in trouble even although this can be done without damage to our policies or to our security. There have been instances of gross illtreatment of our people by Government and Party leaders who are supposed to serve the people. And when those instances of illtreatment begin to surface, immense efforts are made to silence either the victims or those who have the courage to speak for them. This is a disgrace. This is an area where our Party must be extremely vigilant.

However, it is not only in respect of individual problems that some of our leaders fail to show a socialist commitment to people. Many of them also fail to fulfil the responsibilities with which they have been entrusted. Why is it, for example, that the numbers of buses on the road increases after the President has visited a depot and maintenance centre? How does sugar or something else appear in shops immediately after the President has called at a go-down? The President neither repaired a bus, nor manufactured sugar! These things mean that someone was not providing leadership, was failing to make necessary decisions, or was not ensuring that decisions were implemented.

Unfortunately, failures such as these are much more obvious than the more usual case of people carrying out their responsibilities and rising to the challenges made to them by the people. Consider, for example, the question of villagisation.

In my Report to the 1973 TANU Conference I was able to say that 2,028,164 people were living in villages. Two years later, in June, 1975, I reported to the next TANU Conference that approximately 9,100,000 people were living in village communities. Now, there are about 13,065,000 people living together in 7,684 villages.

This is a tremendous achievement. It is an achievement of TANU and Government leaders in co-operation with the people of Tanzania. It means that something like 70 per

cent of our people moved their homes in the space of about three years! All these people now have a new opportunity to organise themselves for local democratic government, and to work with the Regional, District, and Central administrations to hasten the provision of basic educational, health, and other public services which are necessary for a life in dignity. Results are already becoming apparent. Universal Primary Education by the end of 1977, for example, would have been out of the question had the people not been living in village communities by now. As it is, we stand a good chance of achieving that objective.

We have become defensive about the villagisation exercise because there were widely publicised cases of maladministration, and even of mistreatment of people. Some few leaders did act without thinking, and without any consultation with the people who had to move. Therefore we did have cases of people being required to move from an area of permanent water to an area which is permanently dry. We had other cases where the new villages were made too large for the amount of land available. And there were cases where people were rounded up without notice, and dumped on the village site, without time to prepare shelter for themselves.

But it is absurd to pretend that these cases were typical of villagisation. They did occur; and they were bad examples of leadership failure. Of course they made people very angry—and rightly so. If one fish in a barrel goes bad, they all go bad. Yet it remains true that 11 million people could not have been moved by force in Tanzania; we do not have the physical capacity for such forced movement, any more than we have the desire for it. The vast bulk of our people moved on their own, with only persuasion and a little help from TANU and the administration. Many of them may have felt some initial reluctance to break the habits of a lifetime in isolated homesteads, but they recognised that we had talked villagisation since 1962 and that it was time to act. And already, village life is proving itself to be beneficial and popular. Although rural life cannot be revolutionised in so short a time, the people

now have a rational hope of improving their living conditions—at least of receiving clean water, simple medical care, and basic education for themselves and their children within a few years.

It is time that tribute was paid to all those leaders, in TANU and in the Government, who worked with the people and for the people's benefit, over villagisation. This tremendous job was a real test of leadership, and the majority of our leaders came out of it well—some of them very well indeed.

And the leadership failures which were revealed at this time provide a lesson for all of us. In particular they demonstrate how much care people should give to the election of their representatives on District and Regional Development Councils, and how important it is that Regional and District Secretaries should be carefully selected.

There is still a tendency for all levels of Government to act as if the peasants were of no account, because our peasants are very patient people. Thus, for example, when houses are demolished in urban areas, compensation is always paid—even for shelters which are not more than temporary shacks. Compensation is paid even for trees. Yet very few of that minority of peasants who were required to leave houses made of cement blocks, or with a bati roof which could not be removed, have yet received even a token or "first-payment" in compensation. Such payments should be a priority charge on the Regional Development Funds. The purpose of villagisation is to lay the foundation for a permanent improvement in people's lives. When an individual had in good faith tried to carry out the injunctions of the Party, and spent his money on a house rather than on pombe, he should not be penalised for it because the village had to be sited elsewhere. We have neglected this matter too long.

Listening to the People:

The truth is that despite our official policies, and despite all our democratic institutions, some leaders still do not LISTEN to people. They find it much easier to TELL

people what to do. Meetings are too often monologues, without much, if any, time being devoted to discussion; and even then the speech is usually an exhortation to work hard rather than an explanation of how to do things better.

Our leaders at all levels must make more effort to reach decisions by discussion. They must encourage the people to criticise mistakes which have been made, and they must be willing to work with the people in rectifying past mistakes and avoiding new ones. A willingness to discuss problems, to recognise mistakes made by themselves as well as those made by others, and to bring problems into the open, is a sign of real and confident leadership. The leaders of Tanzania must accept that democracy is at the heart of socialism.

Leadership by intimidation is not leadership. And it will work for a short time only. When people criticise stupid decisions they are exerting their rights as citizens. When they criticise decisions which are not stupid they can be brought to understand why the decision was taken, and what it implies. Leaders are acting for, and on behalf of the people; explaining things until the people understand is an important part of their work.

The real danger to ujamaa in this country does not come at all from the people's criticism of leaders. Our people support ujamaa; there are very very few individuals who oppose it, and these can be politically isolated and made ineffective when the masses of the people understand our policies. Detention of critics is not the answer; an Area or Regional Secretary who responds to a problem by detaining people—even within his legal powers—is almost always demonstrating his own incapacity for leadership. For it is very rare indeed that a peasant, a small trader or craftsman, or a junior official, is a danger to the security of the state or to our economic progress.

It is arrogance, incompetence, and slackness, among leaders which we have to guard against. And we must do so. Every leader should privately examine his own behaviour to see where he or she has fallen down. For everyone makes mistakes; if we hold important positions

these mistakes are likely to have serious effects. But if we acknowledge a mistake, first to ourselves and then to those affected by it, it is usually possible for the error to be rectified or for its consequences to be minimised by co-operation between the leaders and the people. Leaders are not Gods; they are able to be effective, and to serve the people, only on a basis of mutual respect between themselves and those who have entrusted them with responsibility. A person who can admit a fault, and strive to do better, is both more worthy of trust, and more likely to be trusted, than one who pretends to be infallible and tries to shift the blame on to others.

The Need to be Serious:

The basic aims of Tanzania are very clear. So is the need for dedication and discipline in working for them. We have undertaken a very difficult task, and it is necessary that we should be serious in pursuing it.

But we do not always demonstrate that seriousness by our actions. For example, there have been very many occasions when new policy initiatives have been announced by local or national leaders, and all other work is abandoned while these ideas are pursued in a great blaze of publicity or self-righteousness. After a week or two, the drive is called off, and the whole project dies a natural death.

Sometimes the reaction of any sensible person must be one of thankfulness that the announced policy has been abandoned. For new policies are too often made on the spur of the moment, either in the excitement of a public meeting or in anger at an emotional Committee Meeting, and have not been given any serious consideration at all. For example, it was once announced in a District that no peasant would be allowed to travel on a bus, or attend a market, unless he could prove that he, and each of his wives, was cultivating three hectares of land. Such a demand is itself obviously unconsidered; whether three hectares can be cultivated by a single person depends upon the tools

used, the strength of the individual, and the type of crop. And in addition, such a regulation is quite unenforceable without an army of inspectors and a great deal of expensive red tape in the issuing of permits and so on.

Again; District or Regional Authorities lay down regulations to deal with temporary but urgent problems, and then they are enforced as a permanency, quite regardless of changed circumstances. An example of this is the prohibition on the movement of food out of a District at a time of local famine; if it is justified at all—which is doubtful—the ban should be strictly limited in time. Yet we find that for months and years after the danger of local famine is over, road blocks are still being erected, and peasants taking food to their relatives in the town—or even from their own shambas to their homes—are being harrassed and abused. Indeed, in December 1976 this kind of thing was still happening, as if Tanzania were 72 different countries instead of one single nation with a single economy. No distinction is made between illegal movement of food from Tanzania to a neighbouring state and an ordinary and quite legitimate movement of food within Tanzania itself. The latter should be normal practice.

Actions such as these are a cause of much distress to law-abiding peasants and workers; they are an encouragement to petty corruption; and a drag on our development. They arise through lack of thought, and lack of vigilance by the people's representatives.

Yet on other occasions this lack of intelligent persistence in pursuing decisions means that good and necessary policies are made ineffective. It has been announced more times than it is easy to count that every able-bodied person in Tanzania must work, either on the land, in the factories and offices, or in some useful capacity in what is called the "informal sector", (that is, as a carpenter, blacksmith, full-time trader, etc. etc.) I myself have been leading advocate of the principle that every person must work. Then, on every occasion there is a great drive to "round up" the unemployed in towns and repatriate them. For a week or so the criminals and idle parasites hide in their houses while

respectable workers and peasants on legitimate business are harrassed, and the people in paid employment otherwise carry on working hard or not as they did previously. Then the whole campaign dies away until it is realised that the problem of criminals in towns, and of people not doing a hard day's work, is still with us—and the process is repeated! The fault in such cases is not the decision itself; the Arusha Declaration says that in a socialist state "everyone who is physically able to work does so; every worker obtains a just return for the labour he performs". The fault was in trying to carry out the policy by a temporary "drive" instead of a well-thought out and planned scheme which has the active support of the people. These hasty "campaigns" are becoming a disease.

For we come back to the same problem. If our laws and regulations are to serve the people and to be effective, they cannot be adopted casually or in the heat of the moment. "Platform Policy-making" is not the answer to our problems. The people must be fully involved in drawing up policies. They must always be made to understand the need and the purpose of a particular public decision; and they must be involved in its implementation. Thus, for example, the Ten Cell leaders should know all the people who are living in their areas, and how they make their livelihood. Unless they are themselves criminals they could therefore be the spearhead of any campaign to re-settle on the land those who have no honest way of earning their living in towns. Similarly, the TANU Branches in factories and offices should be acting to correct the faults of workers who slack or are negligent in the performance of their duties.

Further, Party and Government bodies, at all levels, must each fulfil their own functions. The Party lays down basic policy; through the machinery of Government, Parliament, the Civil Service, and Regional and District Development Committees, (all of which are made up of Party Members) these basic policies are turned into legislation and put into execution. Individual leaders do not make laws or policies.

When they announce them, they are either speaking on behalf of the relevant Party or Government Committee—in which case they should say so and not try to take credit for themselves—or they are stating what they would like to see as a policy or a law. And sub-Committees, whether of the Party or of Cabinet etc., can only make recommendations to the body which established them; their proceedings and announcements should be of interest as a contribution to public discussion, but they do not constitute law.

It is essential that we should approach this question of implementing Party policies with greater seriousness. We should give all legislation and rules more careful consideration through the machinery laid down. We may find that we are then making less laws and rules. But having made sure that they are practical and can win the support of the people, and having passed them, we must then enforce them properly—either permanently, or during the period for which they are to have effect before being renewed.

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEMS CAN BE SOLVED

This brief survey of the past ten years shows two things. We have many problems to overcome, and many mistakes to correct; but we are moving in the right direction. Our problems are therefore soluble by serious effort and intelligent hard work, even if external events continue to hinder our rate of advance.

We have made good progress in very many respects, and especially in the movement towards greater equality, greater political understanding, and greater commitment to the principles of socialist co-operation. We have advanced a long way towards providing basic educational and health services for all our people; democratic participation in decision-making and policy-implementation is greater than ever before. There has also been an increase in the personal consumption standards enjoyed by the mass of the people as evidenced by the per capita consumption of things like

meat and other proteins, sugar, and cotton cloth. In other respects we have laid very useful foundations, on the basis of which we can improve our performance as regards production and distribution.

We have also seized control of our own economy. It is the people as a whole who determine the kind of society we shall create, and not foreign capitalists, or even local capitalists. And we have been able to use that control for our own benefit. Thus, for example, we were able to marshal all our foreign exchange resources to fight against the serious famines of 1973—1975, so that no-one in this country died of hunger or was even seriously affected by it in the way which used to happen in the past. And we have been able to divert the impact of imported inflation, and the recession in the developed world, away from the poorest people, so that the heaviest part of the burden imposed on us was borne by those better able to carry it. Further, because we now control our own economic activities, we have been able to meet the economic difficulties of the last few years with a “do battle” strategy.

In addition, we have now worked out a new Industrial Strategy, on the basis of which we shall be able to become more self-reliant as plans are implemented. The planned development of our coal and iron resources with the help of our Chinese friends is one aspect of this; another is our determination to expand our production in the basic and intermediate goods industries such as fertiliser, cement, spare parts, and simple agricultural and transport implements. We are able to make these new production plans because of our past infrastructural investments. More of these will be needed, for we began independent life grossly deficient in the public utilities which are essential to economic development. Indeed, when you consider the size of the country one might almost say that permanent roads and other means of communication, electricity, and water supplies hardly existed in 1961. But we may now be able to shift emphasis slightly on to investments which are directly productive; indeed, this has been the tendency in the last few years of the decade.

The Near Future:

We used up all our foreign exchange reserves in fighting the drought and meeting the increased costs of essential fuel and development goods. Indeed, we have been forced to incur heavy overseas debts which will have to be repaid. Further, there is no sign that the world economy is likely to become more favourable for our development in the near future. On the contrary a further increase in oil prices has been announced, and inflation in the developed world continues to raise the prices of all our imports. And apart from coffee, which is enjoying a temporary boom, the prices of our exports are not keeping pace with the import prices.

We cannot give way to these difficulties. We must fight them. We have to increase our production of wealth, and our self-reliance, as a matter of great urgency. It is for this reason that Government is undertaking new investments in industry and in agriculture. We are concentrating on expanding the production of basic consumption goods, and on the processing of our own raw materials into manufactured commodities. But we must make a big export effort, so that we have more commodities to sell and can also break into the world market for simple manufactures. To do this we must produce more efficiently, and we must also learn and apply appropriate sales techniques for the different overseas markets.

But however hard we try, it will take some time for our investments to bring results. That is why we have sought for, and welcome, a great increase in foreign assistance in recent years. It is now a high percentage of our development budget—in the current financial year it is likely to constitute something like 59 per cent of the total! This rate of dependence upon external aid is much too high. It can be justified as an emergency operation in the existing circumstances, but only if it is used to increase our output and our ability to pay our way in the world. It must be used to increase production not to supplement our living standards. The intelligent farmer does not eat his seed-corn, and especially not borrowed seed!

And this amount of foreign aid cannot be expected to last. Tanzania has many friends—the Scandinavian countries, China, and Canada are notable among them—but they are willing to help us only because they respect our determination to help ourselves, and to try to build a society based on human equality and dignity. If our effort slackens, they will—and they should—lose interest in co-operating with us for our benefit. And in any case, we have no right to rely upon these countries. We can accept their willingness to help us become self-reliant; we must not think of them as sources of charity which excuse us from work and sacrifice.

There is no doubt at all but that for the next three or four years Tanzania's economic circumstances will be very difficult indeed. Our effort has to be proportionate to these difficulties. We cannot expect early rewards from our work in the way of increased consumption—either of public or personal goods. We must be prepared to find our rewards for effort in increased national self-reliance and the maintenance of our independence of action. There is a time for planting and a time for harvesting. I am afraid for us it is still a time for planting.

Conclusion:

We have cause for great satisfaction in our achievements of the past ten years. But we have no cause at all for complacency. We have done quite well; but with effort, and more intelligent effort, we could do better.

In the coming decade we must build on what we have achieved. We must increase our *discipline*, our *efficiency*, and our *self-reliance*. In particular we must put more effort into looking always to see what we can do for ourselves out of our own resources—and then doing it.

As we celebrate the tenth anniversary of the Arusha Declaration, let us determine that the twentieth anniversary will find us more productive, and therefore more free, as a nation and as individuals.

January, 1977