

THE DYNAMICS OF THE URBANIZATION FORCES IN TANZANIA AND RELATED POLICY AND RESEARCH ISSUES

By

Fidelis P. Mtatifikolo*

Introduction and Concepts

1.1. Overview and Summary

This paper is about the dynamics of the urbanization forces in Tanzania. In five sections the paper (i) provides an operationalization of some basic concepts in the relevant literature, (ii) traces the history and main features of urbanization in Tanzania, and (iii) discusses the dynamics of the urbanization processes (iv) covers government policies on urbanization and (v) provides a framework for policy and research issues on the topic as relevant for Tanzania.

Some of the major findings show that the history and location of major urban areas was a creation of colonisers, Germany and Britain. However, under colonialism processes of urbanization (and migration) were strictly controlled and urban growth did not evolve into 'a crisis' since it was organically linked to the whole colonial Political Economy. The second observation is that urban growth especially after independence and the relaxation of controls on migrations and settlements resulted mainly from rural-urban migration. Dar es Salaam is judged as a 'crisis' area in terms of its high rate of growth and serious imbalances between its economy and the population (not only in relation to other towns in Tanzania but also in relation to other countries in similar stages of development). Other features in many urban centres raise 'sensitive concerns', like the displacement of indigenous 'tribes' by other settlers from within and outside the country, the squatter and object poverty in many pockets of urban settlements, and the high unemployment and crime rates especially in unplanned neighbourhoods.

Government policies, tried in various combinations of 'carrots and sticks' (both explicit and implicit, are evaluated and seen to have largely failed. Such policies centred around 'growth pole' strategies, specific function urban designation strategies, the Incomes Policy strategies (carrots), and regulatory (coercive) measures.

The Policy questions and research issues raised centre on the need to (1) work out a policy framework and action plan for an optimal minimal sizes for urban 'take-off' to reduce parasitic vision associated with current urban centres (2) provide for a policy on resource balances through public revenue and expenditure programmes on urban development (3) conduct research on optimal balances between persuasive and coercive measures in urbanization processes and (4) address seemingly sensitive issues (e.g., internal dynamics with respect to tribal and ethnic mixes, gender issues, poverty and squatting, and crime waves) in urbanization processes, aspects gradually being shelved off or even being ignored by census designers in recent times.

*University of Dar es Salaam

The bottom line in addressing problems of urbanization hinges on a credible Urbanization Policy that is within a broader 'umbrella' of a Population Policy and Socio-Economic Development Programme.

1.2. Concepts on Urbanization Process and Forces

There is substantial literature on urbanization but such literature is not rich in concepts and definitions like, for instance, the literature on migration, a related concept for purpose of this study. Even a standard for characterizing an urban area is lacking, and especially the distinction between urban and rural areas. Some degree of arbitrariness is in order. Population density and the size of the 'centre' are generally the major yardsticks for characterizing towns; so that a town qualifies as one when, within a fairly small area, housing and services are compacted to serve a large population, all of which lives within a short radius of this centre. In certain instances arbitrary sizes of population and size, such as population of 20,000 and above, and occupying no larger than, say, 16 square miles, can qualify as a town.

In Tanzania there are official characterizations (unexplained though) of urban centres. Under this format all the Regional Administrative Headquarters qualify as urban areas ('larger' ones are called Municipalities, and one- Dar es Salaam- is a City, whereas smaller ones are simply called towns). Most District Administrative Headquarters are called 'small towns'. For instance, in the 1988 Population census Iringa Region had one Municipality (Iringa urban) with a population of 84860. The District Headquarters of Mufindi and Njombe had populations of 24902 and 25213 for Mafinga and Njombe mjini, respectively. These two would be called 'small towns'. The City of Dar es Salaam had slightly more than one million people (The region, which has a few mixed and rural areas, had a total population of 1,360,850 in a total land area of 1393 square kilometres, or a population density of 977 inhabitants per square km, relative to the Mainland density of only 26.

Migration is also defined and briefly discussed here because, as we show later below, it has a great bearing on this study. This concept is generally characterized with reference to a specific measurement procedure. Thus according to the Bureau of Statistics in Tanzania migration involves 'movement' and 'settlement' aspects. An immigrant is defined as one who moves in and stays for a period of time (usually six months or above). However, in the literature on migration definitions of area, settlement, activity and residence have been debated with substantial controversy (see Mtatifikolo, 1991, for a survey of such debates).

Migrants are classified between temporary or short term and long term. In the former case typical cases involve seasonal migrants who would combine activities in several places in the course of one accounting period (typically a year) according to seasonal labour requirements and work opportunities. If such opportunities form cycles every year then the migrants themselves are called circular migrants to emphasize the fact that they are involved in short term repetitive movement for purpose of work without any intention for lasting change of residence. Long term migrants, on the other hand, refer to those who change both their usual residence and place of activity for a prolonged period.

The literature on migration flows distinguishes between three forms: individual versus household migration, step migration, and chain migration. Individual migration, especially of males, is typical under the circular short term category (migrant labourers) whereas in refugee streams it is common for families to move together. Chain migration describes situations in which first individual migrants settle and when they think they have 'stabilized' enough they call upon their immediate families, then probably the extended family in a gradual manner. This constitutes a lagged family migration. Step migration, on the other hand, refers to cases where people move first from rural areas to small towns, then to larger towns, and finally, to cities. The lags in each category will be specific to the nature of occupation the migrant is involved in and the relevant costs of adjusting to each 'step' in the process which can take as short as (typically) two years and as long as generation or so.

This paper is mainly about the dynamics of the urbanization processes in Tanzania, and the concepts introduced thus far will find use in the discussion. In the section below the history of urbanization in Tanzania is traced from the colonial times. This provides the initial conditions that set the whole urbanization question in motion. It is followed by a critical discussion of the dynamics and forces behind the trends that were to ensue after independence (section three). Section four is about some government policies that tried to address the related questions directly and indirectly. Following an analysis of such (failed) policies section 5 discusses the research and policy issues that can address both urbanization and the rural-urban migration.

2. History and Main Features of Urbanization in Tanzania.

2.1. History

The location, size and distribution of major urban centres in Tanzania is almost entirely the product of German and British decisions in the late 19th Century to the first few decades of the 20th. They were mainly the results of settings of administrative headquarters, the routing of transport lines and the identification of areas of strategic and economic importance to colonial interests. The initial key foci of urban development were the major ports and administrative headquarters. Seaports emerged as the basing points for colonial penetration and as centres for the export-import trade (Tanga on the line through Usambara Mountains to the fertile Kilimanjaro and Arusha regions; Dar es Salaam at the head of the central railway line to Lake Tanganyika and the Congo basin beyond, and northward from Tabora to minerals, cotton and cattle rich Mwanza and Shinyanga to cover the Lake zone, Rwanda and Burundi).

Earlier bustling centres that thrived under Arab influence and rule like Bagamoyo, Kilwa and others were soon overtaken and went into stagnation. Dar es Salaam, for instance, began to grow fast after 1891 when the Germans shifted their administrative centre there from Bagamoyo, and the completion of the central railway line in 1914 linking it with the whole stretch of central mainland Tanzania virtually completed the creation of the "shadow of Bagamoyo" which sent it to a permanent decline. Dar es Salaam proved a more attractive harbour thereafter, and remains so today.

The most powerful influence on urban growth in the hinterland was the development of a network of administrative centres, especially when integrated as trading centres too. They were linked to four layers of the colonial political economy, identified as (a) primary production almost exclusively located in agriculture; (b) processing and handling primary products; (c) export-import trading processes based in the metropolis; and (d) colonial administrative and political machinery to manage the whole system. Each layer was hierarchically structured and geographically focused around the primate city, Dar es Salaam. Apart from the primate city there were specialized towns, and in Tanzania the role of Tanga as the special port serving the rich north eastern Tanzania hinterland was very pronounced. The rest of the towns grew largely as administrative centres or as 'collection centres' (geographical middlemen) linking primary producers and export-import traders represented in the primate city.

The colonial urban system thus contained a single 'core city' (Dar es Salaam), a specialized secondary centre (Tanga) and an array of small administrative and commercial centres. The transport network that grew represented this network in the grid.

Under colonialism African urbanization was strictly controlled, especially that resulting from rural-urban migration. After independence many restrictions were removed and it is noted that the predominant proportion of urban growth after 1960 in Tanzania was attributed to the rapid expansion of a class of African urban poor which was restricted from urban settlement during colonial period.

2.2. The Rural-Urban Migration and Urbanization Processes

Three important forces link urbanization and migration. First, administrative or political action to designate some urban areas as specific-function centres. For instance, the growth of Dodoma for the period after it had been designated the capital city of Tanzania was far greater than any projections made earlier about its normal growth. With civic works and other public works being promoted, and city limits expanding, rural people in neighbouring districts moved in to look for jobs and residence opportunities, resulting in faster than normal influx in the form of rural-urban migrants. For the smaller towns, apart from the core and the specialized, fast growth was facilitated by the recategorization as regional administrative centres. Iringa, Arusha and Musoma benefited from this in the intercensal period 1957 and 1967.

The second force was the 'growth pole' designation of some regional administrative centres, especially under the second five year plan of Tanzania in 1969-1974. Taken partly as a measure to help curb the fast growth of Dar es Salaam ten regional centres had been identified for 'purposeful and directed/enhanced economic growth' under the Plan. This partly worked to help localize migration to within such towns, and to the extent that more resources were directed to these areas under the Plan this worked to 'encourage' net in-migration to them.

In many major towns there were satellite or periphery sub-urban areas that provided for a 'labour reserve' to serve in the main towns, or as transit labour for other distant (cyclical) jobs. These areas were strictly controlled under colonialism in respect of population movement and with the main towns. Tegeta and Mikocheni/Kawe outside of Dar es Salaam, and

Makorora/Kwanjeka in Tanga are some typical cases. Many of the Tegeta, Kunduchi and Mikocheni/Kawe people were migrants from Kigoma, Tabora and Shinyanga; and Lindi and Mtwara, respectively, and they worked in Dar es Salaam; but many were sent to sisal estates in north eastern Tanzania in cyclical movements. The Makorora/Kwanjeka suburb of Tanga was composed mainly of people from Iringa and Ruvuma regions. They too worked in the sisal estates in Tanga region. With independence and the removal of restrictions on urban immigration, with the decline in the sisal industry, and with the expansion of urban boundaries these former satellite areas are now part of the relevant urban areas (Dar es Salaam and Tanga, respectively). This has been the third force linking migration and urbanization in Tanzania. Moreover, the migrants themselves increased in numbers through their natural growth (net fertility).

The post-independence features are discussed next.

2.3. Some Salient Features

Urban population in Tanzania was estimated at 4.8% of total population in 1960, 6.9% in 1970 and 9.2% in 1975. Estimates for 1980 showed 11.8% while those for 1985 and 1990 were, respectively, 14.8% and 18.1%. Projections put urban population share at 21.6% in 1995 and 25.0% in 2000 (see UN, 1985: World Population Prospects). The World Development Report, 1988, shows urban population of Tanzania growing at an average annual rate of 8.7 for 1965-80 (compared with 3.6 weighted growth rate for all low income economies) and 8.3 for 1980-85 (4.0 for low income economies). Whereas in 1960 the largest city had only 34% of total urban population, in 1980 this city (Dar es Salaam) had 50% of total urban population, and it was the only city with over 500,000 people. The main urbanized regions by the 1978 census were Dar es Salaam, Tanga, Mwanza and Mbeya, and government projections of urbanization showed that these same regions would feature prominently too. The main towns and ranking by the various censuses from 1948 to 1978 reveal the pattern described in the historical background above, as follows:

Urban Population: Major Towns: Census Years

Population in Thousands of People: Tanzania Mainland:

	1948		1957		1967		1978	
	Pop	Rank	Pop	Rank	Pop	Rank	Pop	Rank
Dar Es Salaam	69.2	1	128.7	1	272.8	1	769.4	1
Tanga	22.3	2	38.1	2	61.1	2	103.4	3
Mwanza	11.3	4	19.9	3	34.9	3	110.6	2
Tabora	12.8	3	15.4	4	21.0	9	67.4	5
Arusha	5.3	10	10.0	9	32.5	4	55.2	8
Mbeya	3.2	12	6.9	11	12.5	11	76.6	4
Dodoma	9.4	5	13.4	7	23.6	7	45.8	10
Morogoro	8.2	6	14.4	5	25.3	6	60.8	6
Iringa	5.7	9	9.6	10	21.7	8	57.2	7
Moshi	8.0	7	13.7	6	26.9	5	52.0	9

Notes:

1. In 1948 Lindi had a larger population than Iringa, and would be ranked 8th. Bukoba was larger than Mbeya.
2. In all cases Mtwara/Mikindani and Kigoma/Ujiji are not counted as single towns.
3. In 1957 Lindi was larger than Arusha (and would be ranked 8th.)
4. In 1967 Musoma was larger than Mbeya (and was 10th overall).

Source: **Statistical Abstract: 1973 and 1987.**

One observation worthy noting from the table is that the significant gainers in shares especially after the early 1960s were the south western towns of Iringa and Mbeya which 'opened up' after independence, with substantial improvement in transport network (Tazara-mainly for Mbeya, and the Tanzam 'Highway', for both towns). These towns are also situated in rich agricultural regions whose improvement in transport significantly increased the incentive for fast town growth (simple agroprocessing or simply as 'collection centres'). Moreover, the product mix in agriculture in the two regions is quite diverse (food and typically cash crops), making it easy for the regions to survive shocks that afflicted single crops at a time. Moshi and Arusha were 'losers' in shares in the period, mainly a reflection of the 'exodus' of natives of those towns to other urban areas, particularly Dar es salaam. Arusha was, however, to rebound after the late 70s as a result of its redesignation as an 'international town'.

Provisional data for 1988 census are provided in the table below:

1988 Census: Urban Population: Major Towns:

Urban Centre	Population (000s)	Rank in Top Ten
Dar Es Salaam	1360.9	1
Tanga	187.2	4
Mwanza	223.0	2
Mbeya	152.8	5
Morogoro	117.8	7
Dodoma	203.8	3
Iringa	84.9	10
Arusha	134.7	6
Tabora	93.5	9
Moshi	96.8	8

Source: 1988 Census: Preliminary Report

*Caution: As listed in the Preliminary report these include some peripheral or satellite townships within. In the Preliminary Report, for instance, there are other urban areas which had larger population than Iringa and Tabora (see Pp. 99 which shows that Songea Urban had 86880 and Shinyanga with 100724). Figures are thus not to be compared directly with the earlier census data.

If these data are to be believed then the pattern does not change very much. Dar es Salaam, Mwanza and Tanga are still significant. The surge of Dodoma resulted more from the expansion of city limits after the town was designated as the capital of the country, as well as the major public and civic works that were promoted thereafter. If comparison were possible over the successive census periods then in the decade the major gainers among the major towns would be Dodoma and Arusha, while the losers would be Iringa and Tabora.

In the mid 1980s the major studies done on urbanization in Tanzania included the World Bank sponsored exercise of Wilson (1986). This study showed that Tanzania's urban population growth was more than twice the national population growth rate even though the government had deliberately biased its development programs toward rural development. It noted that urban population was growing at 8.6% annually during the 70s into the early 80s. With the natural increase of about 3.5% or less during the period more than 5% of this net growth was

attributed to migration; and at that rate urban population was likely to double in nine years or less (projection reported in the Statistical Abstract, 1987, showed urban population at 2.58 million in 1980, expected to rise to 5.09 million in 1990).

One notable feature in urbanization trends in Tanzania is that urban growth is occurring largely in one city, Dar es Salaam, which accounted for 34% of the country's urban population in 1960 and 50% in 1980. It had less than 70 thousand people in 1948, growing to 128.7 thousand in 1957, then to 272.8 thousand in 1967, before shooting to 769.4 thousand in 1978. By the 1988 census it was counted at slightly over 1.1 million (the balance between 1.361 million as counted for Dar es Salaam region and 0.261 million being the rural population in this region). In terms of intercensal growth the region witnessed 7.8% annual average growth rate between 1967 and 1978 which was the highest (the national average was 3.2). A distant second highest growth for the period was that of Rukwa (at 4.5%). In the period 1978-1988 the regional growth rate for Dar es Salaam region was 4.8% per annum (national average at 2.8%), with the second being that of Rukwa again (at 4.3%).

Moreover, relative to the second largest urban centre Dar es Salaam has also exploded disproportionately, as follows:

Ratio of Population: Dar: Second largest town:

Census Year	1948	1957	1967	1978	1988
Ratio	3.1	3.4	4.5	7.0	6.1

Dar: Tanga for 1948, 1957 and 1967

Dar: Mwanza for 1978 and 1988

Thus save for 1988 census whose data are (still) preliminary and not readily comparable with data for earlier censuses the general trend is clear: that of an overgrowth of Dar es Salaam relative to its closest second, from a factor or ratio of 3.1 to 7.0 in thirty years. Thus whereas in 1948 Dar es Salaam was only about three times the size of its closest second in 1978 this multiple factor had exploded to seven.

Urbanization trends in Tanzania, and particularly of Dar es Salaam, are disturbing even in comparison with such trends for East Africa, for Sub Saharan Africa (SSA) and the group of Less Developed Countries (LDCs) to which Tanzania belongs. The table below is indicative.

	LDCs	SSA	Tanzania	Kenya	Uganda
Urban Population					
% of Popn.					
1965	17	11	6	9	6
1984	23	21	14	18	7

Growth Rate

Ave. Annual

1966-1973	4.5	6.2	8.1	7.3	8.3
1973-1984	4.5	6.1	8.6	7.9	-0.1

%of Urban
Popn in
Largest City

1960	10	34	34	40	38
1980	16	42	50	57	52

Source: World Bank, 1986 (World Development Report, 1986)

It is clear from the table that the biggest urbanization momentum in Tanzania is a feature of the mid 60s to late 70s. The growth rates are higher than those obtainable as weighted averages for SSA and for all LDCs. The percentage of urban population in total population more than doubled in the period (no similar case in the table), and, excluding Kenya in the table, the percentage of urban population residing in the largest city grew the most (from 34 to 50).

The 'Human Development Report, 1990', summed up world urban explosion with examples that include Tanzania trends with respect to Dar es Salaam as follows: "The population for many Sub Saharan Africa's larger cities increased more than sevenfold between 1950 and 1980 - Nairobi, Dar es Salaam, ..., Lusaka, Lagos, Immigration has usually contributed more than natural increase to their growth. This high growth has been far beyond anything imagined only a few decades ago - and at a pace that is without historical precedent" (pp 85).

The dynamics of urbanization processes are discussed next.

3. The Dynamics of Urbanization Processes in Tanzania:

3.1. Components of Growth of Urban Areas

The main components of urban growth are typically three: net migration from rural and other areas, the natural increase of original natives, migrants and other previously reclassified people, and new reclassification (like expansion of city limits and thus incorporating suburbs and satellite towns). These can be augmented by administrative decisions which designate towns as specific-function centres (Dodoma as capital-designate) or growth poles (2nd FYP of Tanzania noted earlier). The mere administrative declaration has impact on speculative behaviour on the part of potential investors, job seekers and financiers. These would be expected to move in and settle/start business to take advantage of anticipated administrative favours and new business climate to come. When public works and other government programs are launched they bring with them substantial immigrants. Designation of a national character (e.g. a Capital City) brings in more diversified migrants from the neighbourhood, from other towns and even from

other countries, depending on the incentives provided to attract skills and capital. Growth poles on the other hand have impact mainly in attracting migrants from within the relevant regions.

We have already showed that the primary force behind urban growth in Tanzania has been migration from rural areas. The case of Dar es Salaam is more complex since international immigrants are also significant. Arusha is also joining the Dar es Salaam bandwagon, and possibly Dodoma will, in the medium to long term. However, specific to Dar immigrants from within the nation there is evidence that most such migrants, especially in the business sector, moved to the 'greener pastures' in Dar from some 'green pastures' in other towns; i.e., moving in from some 'successful' ventures in other smaller towns seeking bigger fortunes in the big city. In terms of the concepts introduced earlier this represents some step migration. Such is yet to happen to the regional towns in any significant way.

There are no specific data or studies that characterize the relative importance of the main components of urban growth, especially as it is taking place today. This is one area of inquiry wanting in details and serious research.

3.2. Internal Organization of Urban Areas.

A very prominent feature of the social-spatial organization of towns under colonialism was a pronounced racial compartmentalization between European areas, Asian areas and African areas (Uzunguni, Uhindini and Uswahilini). The quality of infrastructural services, residential density of services were concentrated in the European areas. The dense pockets of African settlements were mainly the urban equivalent of the rural labour reserves, supplying unskilled and semi-skilled labour to the European enclaves. Asians dominated much of the business and trade districts, especially at wholesale and retail level and they resided mainly in the town centres (larger scale commerce and import-export trade remained largely European). In Dar es Salaam European residential areas occupied the 'choicest' land available; along the cool Indian Ocean coast. In all towns the pattern was the same; all premium locations were European and squatters and slums 'belonged' to the 'natives'.

Notable changes occurred after independence. Increasing numbers of elite Africans penetrated the high income areas as Europeans left after residential restrictions were removed. Thereafter, wealth and political status emerged as the main determinants of residential 'choices'. Similarly, for many towns the conspicuous presence of Asians in the inner commercial centres was gradually reduced as more and more Africans started taking up wholesale and retail business. Today there is a conspicuous (and uneasy?) coexistence of Asian and African businessmen in towns; and Asians still dominate the town centres. At the same time squatter settlements burgeoned fast in the inner towns and around expanding and planned industrial estates. Despite the modification in the racial mix the contrasts in density, income and public services between the three residential sectors have remained very conspicuous (it is claimed that such contrasts are increasing for many towns).

The expansion of city limits, especially to the extent that new undeveloped land was brought in, has enabled some planned development to take place in most suburbs either as industrial estates or as residential areas. In Dar es Salaam the case of Mbezi Beach and, now, Tcgeta; in Iringa the Kibwabwa and Mtewila opening up; in Mbeya the Forest and Mbalizi/Songwe stretch; in Morogoro the Kilakala and Kihonda developments, etc... and the list extends to all the major towns. Such residential-cum-industrial areas still remain homes of the elite and wealthy since land is at a premium, the plots are sizeable and the needed investments are high for purposes of developing any given plot of such land. Thus in such urban areas some suburbs are developing in some orderly fashion relative to what had happened in the inner cities in the past.

The other form of internal urban dynamics in Tanzania involves the gradual displacement of the ethnic groups that historically 'belonged' to the relevant regions. For Dar es Salaam it has been documented as the table below shows for two census periods:

Population Change: 1957-1967 In 000s and in %

	1957	Pop	%	1967	Pop	%
Total	1 2 8 . 7		1 0 0	2 7 2 . 8		1 0 0
African	9 3 . 4		7 2 . 5	2 2 8 . 9		8 3 . 9
Zaramo	(4 6 . 9)		(3 6 . 4)	(6 2 . 7)		(2 3 . 0)
Asian	2 7 . 4		2 1 . 3	2 8 . 2		1 0 . 7
European	4 . 5		3 . 5	3 . 4		1 . 3

Data for 1978 and 1988 censuses have not been desegregated to such ethnic details, but it is said the pattern of displacing natives by other African immigrants has gone on unabatedly, and for most towns. The Zaramo, the main tribe in Dar es Salaam rural and Coast regions, who made up 36.4% of the total population of Dar es Salaam city in 1957, were reduced to only 23% ten years later. Therefore with the reduction in shares of Asians (and in the absolute number of Europeans) the main beneficiaries in urbanization of the time were other Africans apart from the historical 'natives'. This feature is revealing itself in the other fast growing towns of Arusha, Mbeya, Dodoma, Iringa and Morogoro. Official data are scanty but casual empiricism confirms this trend.

Sensitivities about discussing 'tribes' in Tanzania when the official stand is for integration makes it difficult to address the question, and even the recent census (1988) did not address 'tribes' in its questionnaires. Indeed, even the government official policy of encouragement of people from Kilimanjaro which is densely populated (the Chaggas) to settle in Morogoro (In land of 'Waluguru') was to be understood partly as an attempt at integration of "Tanzanias". The long term impact of this largely 'silent integration' is unknown, especially as most tribes still consistently maintain their separate tribal and cultural identities.

3.3. The Rural-Urban Links:

The fast growth of towns resulting from migration has been documented to result in two negative results: depriving rural areas of critical labour and crowding towns with unemployed looking for jobs and shelter. The problem of feeding the towns has become critical, become critical, and the main rural-urban link with respect to this phenomenon has been the designation of some regions by official encouragement as the national grain basket. The 'big four' regions of Mbeya, Iringa, Ruvuma and Rukwa are the main grain producing and 'exporting' regions in Tanzania, the primary destination being Dar es Salaam. However, there has been official encouragement at local level too within each region. The National Agricultural Policy of 1983 and the National Food Strategy declared in 1984 have elaborate plans for each region and a comprehensive plan at national level.

The growth pole designation of some urban centres, together with some spontaneous developments, have helped in localized integration of urban investments with rural undertakings. Many small scale industries abound in most urban centres, either in the official Small Industries Development Organization (SIDO) Estates owned by the Government, or outside spontaneously chosen areas, processing rural products from their neighbourhoods. Examples can be cited, such as the fruit cannery in Iringa using many agricultural inputs from Iringa district, timber processing in most urban centres whose immediate 'hinterland' have wood products, oil extraction from oilseeds, leather processing, etc. This is not to mention the new processes of the 'ruralization' of the urban areas through such spontaneous initiatives as animal husbandry, horticultural activities and commercial gardening in the urban areas in most major towns.

Thus with effective policies and support to such integration towns would not necessarily appear as 'ghosts' beyond government control and regulation, or simply as 'sick parasites'.

3.3. Dar es Salaam as a Special (Problem) Case

Dar es Salaam has been singled out as a special problem case because of its relative size and the pace and pattern at which it is growing. It still is the only city with over 500,000 inhabitants and now having more than 50% of all urban population in Tanzania. Population density per square kilometre grew from 256 in 1967 to 605 in 1978 and then to 977 in 1988. The corresponding density for its closest second (Mwanza) was 54, 74 and 96, respectively; whereas the national averages were, respectively, 14, 19 and 26. Thus in solving land problems the Dar es Salaam question takes on a national character.

In the discussion above we noted the mammoth size (and growth rate) of Dar es Salaam relative to the other towns (like being more than six times the size of the second town, whereas the differences between the second and the third, the third and the fourth, etc. ... are generally marginal. This makes it difficult to address general town planning and urbanization controls which would put Dar es Salaam together with the rest of the towns in the same setting. Moreover, projections still put Dar es Salaam's growth at significantly higher rates relative to other towns and the national average (from the already large population base) for some several decades to come. It is mainly for these reasons that most submissions on urbanization in Tanzania regard Dar es Salaam as a special crisis case.

Dar es Salaam's situation has also been amplified by the plight of settlements. The formal housing sector rarely produces more than 20% of the new housing stock in developing countries. The remainder is produced informally, normally with various forms of illegalities ranging from unlawful occupation of land to neglect of building codes and standards. Land speculation and dubious transactions involving premium land are said to have driven out most non-elite inhabitants. In Dar es Salaam alone urban population in informal settlements is about 80% of total urban population (relative to only 35% for Karachi, Pakistan; 20% for Abidjan, Ivory Coast; or even such large unorganized cities like Mexico City which has 45% in informal settlements) (see UNDP's **Human Development Report**; 1990). Largely as a result of this trend city services in utilities and social services are in a 'sad' state.

Government Policies on urbanization in Tanzania are discussed next.

4 Government Concern about Urbanization:

Urbanization, which in the developed countries was one of the driving forces in economic and social development has been seen as constraining development in developing countries. Uncontrolled and fast growth has put a severe squeeze on urban infrastructure and collective facilities. The decline in the quality and quantity of social and economic services, increased insecurity and high incidence of crime are used to characterize 'urban decay'.

In the period between the mid 1960s and late 1970s two broad efforts were (implicitly) conspicuous in addressing the urbanization question in Tanzania: the Arusha Declaration (and its evolved Incomes Policy), and the measures under the Second National Five Year Plan of 1969-1974. Under the latter it was decided to expand ten towns as growth centres. To these 'poles' new factories and other employment opportunities would be diverted. It was intended that the growth poles would stimulate development. These growth poles were to be dispersed over the country to maximize the positive impact on rural population. Thus, defending the growth pole strategy on urbanization Nyerere, the then President of Tanzania (then introducing the Plan to the TANU Conference in May 1969) said' ... by concentrating our attention on the towns selected, at least two or three should be able to stand on their own by the end of this Plan Period'. Any attempt to spread efforts over more than ten towns within the five years were ruled as unsustainable.

The second policy involved decentralization of certain government activities. As part of the program of administrative decentralization embarked upon in 1972 and 1973 the government decided to move the capital of the country to Dodoma. Target dates were set for the completion of the move (initially set for 1980, later revised to 1985 -- but uncompleted to date!).

The Arusha Declaration of 1967 pronounced the twin goals of Socialism and Self Reliance, with some implicit bearing on urbanization processes. First, the emphasis on rural development and spreading of basic social services to the villages was aimed at encouraging people, especially the youth, to remain on the land. Secondly, the Directive on Education for Self Reliance which was accompanied with, among other things, a substantial emphasis on practical (mainly manual) forms of 'education' through self reliance activities in schools was meant to instill sense of self

reliance through non-sophisticated means and tools. It would be expected to result in general acceptance by youth of village life which was typically characterized by manual, unsophisticated labour.

The third form in which developments following Arusha were meant to contain urbanization was through the vocational training programs for primary school leavers in simple, rural based income generating activities like plumbing, masonry, modern farming, woodworking and the like. These could be taken up at village level with minimal investment requirements. Communal activities in the form of village workshops organized around cooperatives served this purpose too when primary cooperatives were strong.

Other measures were more forceful; especially with the conspicuous lack of success in the voluntary measures. These included the requirements for identification cards of the legal occupations and habitat of bearers, and some restrictions on travel to towns especially during peak agricultural seasons. In 1985 the Human Resources Redeployment Act was passed, which required all able bodied persons to be gainfully and legally employed. Thus using this Act many town authorities were known to take steps to round up suspected loiterers and jobless and expel them to their areas of origin.

At the broader policy level the evolved Incomes Policy after Arusha aimed at controlling urbanization, albeit indirectly. The Policy aimed at equity across regions and individuals and between rural and urban areas. Three sets of tools were used; Wages and Salaries, Prices and Taxation. With regard to the rural-urban question the official thinking was that workers in the wage sector had improved their standard of living since independence at the expense of peasants, and that wage restraints were necessary to prevent further exploitation of peasants and to reduce income differential between urban and rural areas. Thus after 1974 agricultural producer prices were allowed to rise every year and the agricultural sector enjoyed significant subsidies in inputs while the growth of salaries was restricted. By the early 1980s a large degree of income equality had been achieved and the trends in income was moving heavily in favour of the rural areas. This did not however, slow down urbanization very significantly, as the data in successive censuses were to confirm.

Policy issues are discussed next, together with the current research agenda.

5. Policy Questions and Research Issues on Urbanization in Tanzania

Many governments in developing countries have failed to contain fast urbanization resulting from migration despite many well meaning attempts. Among the various attempts well documented in the literature include (1) programs of integrated rural development intended to raise agricultural productivity and 'persuade' people to remain on the farm (2) colonization projects, especially opening new land for settlement as part of land reforms (3) setting minimum wages for rural areas to reduce urban-rural wage differentials, and (4) creation of growth poles to stimulate development away from major cities and spreading such poles in the country to maximize linkages among contiguous neighbourhoods. Many such programs have failed as major cities are turning into mega-cities, and government policies seem hopeless.

Some measures have been drastic and ruthless, like the destruction of new squatter settlements, periodic expulsion of 'loiterers' and jobless, and the massive deurbanization as happened in China between 1961 and 1976 and Cambodia in 1975. Most of these failed too, because they were highly unpopular and very demanding of administrative controls and policing. Moreover, they were not backed by any comprehensive programs for balanced development of the destination of forceful resettlement areas and that of areas (urban areas) from which people were being massively expelled.

For Tanzania four broad policies addressing urbanization explicitly and implicitly have been singled out in this discussion. First there was the growth pole designation of some towns, and their spatial distribution all over the country, meant to maximize the advantages of urban dynamism to the largest possible rural population. The obvious policy question from this strategy is whether generally growth pole strategies can be expected to succeed. Tanzania was not alone in contemplating such a strategy. Available evidence shows that such strategies succeeded in the short term in countries like Cuba, North Korea, Poland and Japan (see Simmons, 1979). Partial successes were recorded for India. However, for Tanzania, Malaysia and Columbia it was documented that the growth was too slow, absorbing huge amounts of public revenues while not notably being able to draw migrants away from the major cities. It is further claimed that there was considerable difficulty in getting such urban areas to a minimal size at which there would be sufficient economies of scale and scope for backward and forward industrial linkages to generate industrial investment and attract large scale enterprises. **Research on an optimal minimal sizes for urban 'closeup-off' in developing countries like Tanzania is urgently warranted here.**

The second policy involved decentralization of administration, accompanied by public works programs that would be expected to divert population away from the major cities. This was generally combined with the general growth pole philosophy. It has been noted that only ten out of thirty major new industries that were established in the country following the two years of implementation of decentralization were located outside of Dar es Salaam (see Mtatifikolo, 1991a). Any well meaning immigrant in search of job opportunities in relation to the growth pole strategy would most likely be attracted by the Dar es Salaam possibilities. The growth pole philosophy was quietly shelved after the Plan (1974). The third five Years Plan was not to take effect until 1976, with newer demands on the economy (and limited concern for urbanization). A critical research issue here relates to the role of political decisions, especially with regard to the locations of capital cities, on the dynamics of urbanization, and the required' minimum public spending' to enable such centres to take off. Cases exist from which Tanzania can learn: India, Brazil, Nigeria, Malawi, etc.

The third broad policy related to the evolved Incomes Policy of Post-Arusha which aimed at general reduction in the flow of migration (as opposed to the above two which aimed at redirecting migration away from, mainly, Dar es Salaam). Rural development programs, the education and resource redirection to rural schemes were all geared to making rural areas 'livable' and would be expected to help stem out rural -urban migration. This policy did not work despite its good intentions. One reason was government reversals after 1979 when the general economic malaise was demanding new redirection in development philosophy. Thereafter

more liberal approaches to the Incomes Question in Tanzania were to govern policy. One of the relevant research issues here relates to the desired link between government policies and the spontaneous events which have a bearing on the urbanization dynamics (in particular, where leadership should originate from).

The 'stick' (forth policy measure) used under the Human Resources Deployment Act of 1985 was not likely to work either. Informal sector growth together with that of self employed made it difficult to even characterize an unemployed or a loiterer in Tanzania urban areas. Thus even petty business at the lowest scales of business sizes still qualifies as self employment. The use, thus, of the 1985 Act to curb urbanization through expulsion has met with legal challenge and continues to be politically very embarrassing to government. The needed research here is on the 'optimal' mix between 'sticks' and 'carrots', not only in urbanization policies but in other related policies.

From the various policies attempted by government there is an implicit recognition that the fast urbanization process is mainly a result of rural-urban migration. Unfortunately there is no serious attempt to address the internal dynamics of such growth: the natural growth of natives, of earlier inhabitants, urban growth through the expansion of city limits, etc.. The conspicuous lack of policies, data or even baseline studies on these related forces attests to this lack of concern. The development of a culture of keeping baseline data on the dynamics of urbanization (however sensitive) is warranted as an urgent policy issue, not to mention the development of a credible Urbanization Policy itself.

The main consequences of rural-urban migration are largely not understood (on the migrants and their families, on the regions of origin and on the urban destinations). Uncontrolled urban flows, if they are associated with reduction of critical labour in rural areas way below optimum, and adding to the unemployed in urban areas, should be regarded as posing acute problems. Severe squeeze on resources for urban services, the need to feed the towns, and increased urban decay (crime and insecurity as the main manifestations) have been cited. In the literature on urbanization forces in the developing countries (said to be without precedence in history) topical concerns are in relation to urbanization of poverty, of malnutrition, of disease, and of crime. It is claimed that the poor (susceptible to diseases and malnutrition) in the rural areas are more likely to migrate to towns in search of 'green' pastures. When they don't get jobs they enter illegal activities or become destitute (beggars?), thus aggravating the problems of urban poverty, malnutrition, diseases and crime.

Managing the urbanization processes requires a comprehensive approach that links population dynamics and socio-economic development planning. The starting point is a comprehensive Population Policy and Action Program. Such a Policy should, among other things, specify the national and sub-national goals on overall population growth (and the dynamics inherent in it, viz. explicit and implicit measures to use to address fertility and mortality mainly) and on the distribution of population between regions and between rural and urban areas. Moreover, as UNFPA (1980) notes, 'Plans for redistribution of population, as part of comprehensive national population policy, will only succeed if they form part of a strategy for balanced development. Such a strategy should be aimed at encouraging a balanced pattern of

urban settlements; i.e., small, intermediate and large cities, and at the economic development of rural areas'. Some recent contributions by this author on the subject have emphasized this point of balanced growth too, citing the Draft Population Policy for Tanzania as some credible starting point (Mtatifikolo, 1991).

It is unfortunate that the Draft Policy is also quietly being shelved (like the Growth Pole Strategy in 1974).

REFERENCES

Berry, B.J.L. (ed) (1976), *Urbanization and Counter-Urbanization*, Sage Publications Inc.

Bureau of Statistics (1989), *Tanzania Sensa 1988; Preliminary Report*, Government Printer.

Mtatifikolo, F.P. (1991): "Tanzania: Population and Socio-Economic Development: An Analysis and Contribution to a National Population Programme", Report to the Planning Commission, President's Office.

Mtatifikolo, F.P. (1991a): "Migration and Urbanization in Tanzania: An Analysis of Trends and Policies" Report to UNFPA.

Mtatifikolo, F.P. (1992), "Population and Development: Tanzania", Sector Review Report to UNFPA.

Simmons, A.B. (1979): "Slowing Metropolitan City Growth in Asia: Policies, Programs and Results", in *Population and Development Review*, March.

Tanzania Government (various), *Statistical Abstract*, Annual Government Printer.

Tanzania Government (1983), *National Agricultural Policy*, Government Printer.

Tanzania Government (1984), *Tanzania National Food Strategy* Government Printer.

UNDP (1990), *Human Development Report; 1990*, Oxford University Press.

UNFPA (1979), *Tanzania: Report of Mission on Needs Assessment for Population Assistance*, Report number 11, UN, NY.

UNFPA (1980), *Rome Declaration on Population and the Urban Future*, Rome.

Wilson, P. (1986): "Review of Population, Health and Nutrition Sectors of Tanzania", World Bank, Washington, D.C. (Mimeo).