
**FREEDOM
AND
DEVELOPMENT**

FREEDOM AND DEVELOPMENT

Freedom and development are as completely linked together as are chickens and eggs! Without chickens you get no eggs; and without eggs you soon have no chickens. Similarly, without freedom you get no development, and without development you very soon lose your freedom.

Freedom depends on Development

For what do we mean when we talk of freedom? First, there is national freedom; that is, the ability of the citizens of Tanzania to determine their own future, and to govern themselves without interference from non-Tanzanians. Second, there is freedom from hunger, disease, and poverty. And third, there is personal freedom for the individual; that is, his right to live in dignity and equality with all others, his right to freedom of speech, freedom to participate in the making of all decisions which affect his life, and freedom from arbitrary arrest because he happens to annoy someone in authority—and so on. All these things are aspects of freedom, and the citizens of Tanzania cannot be said to be truly free until all of them are assured.

Yet it is obvious that these things depend on economic and social development. To the extent that our country remains poor, and its people illiterate and without understanding or strength, then our national freedom can be endangered by any foreign power which is better equipped. This is not simply a question of military armaments—although if these are necessary they have to be paid for out of the wealth of the community. It is a question of consciousness among all the people of the nation that they are free men who have something to defend, whether the appropriate means of defence be by force of arms or by more subtle methods.

Equally obvious is the fact that freedom from hunger, sickness and poverty depends upon an increase in the wealth and the knowledge available in the community: for a group of people can only consume and use the wealth they have already produced. And even personal freedom becomes more real if it is buttressed by development. A man can defend his rights effectively only when he understands what they are, and knows how to use the constitutional machinery which exists for the defence of those rights—and knowledge of this kind is part of development.

For the truth is that development means the development of *people*. Roads, buildings, the increases of crop output, and other things of this nature, are not development: they are only tools of development. A new road extends a man's freedom only if he travels upon it. An increase in the number of school buildings is development only if those buildings can be, and are being, used to develop the minds and the understanding of people. An increase in the output of wheat, maize, or beans, is only

development if it leads to the better nutrition of people. An expansion of the cotton, coffee, or sisal crop is only development if these things can be sold, and the money used for other things which improve the health, comfort, and understanding of the people. Development which is not development of people may be of interest to historians in the year 3,000; it is irrelevant to the kind of future which is created. Thus, for example, the pyramids of Egypt, and the Roman roads of Europe, were material developments which still excite our amazement. But because they were only buildings, and the people of those times were not developed, the empires, and the cultures, of which they were a part have long ago collapsed. The Egyptian culture of those days—with all the knowledge and wisdom which it possessed—was quickly overthrown by foreign invasion, because it was a culture of a few; the masses were slaves who simply suffered because of the demands of this material development, and did not benefit from it. Equally, when the Roman Empire was attacked, and its legionnaires retreated to their homeland, the fine roads and buildings were left to rot because they were irrelevant to the people of the occupied areas. Further, it is doubtful whether either the Egyptian pyramids, or the Roman roads have made the slightest difference to the histories of the countries concerned, or the lives of their peoples.

Development brings freedom, provided it is development of people. But people cannot be developed; they can only develop themselves. For while it is possible for an outsider to build a man's house, an outsider cannot give the man pride and self-confidence in himself as a human being. Those things a man has to create in himself by his own actions. He develops himself by what he does; he develops himself by making his own decisions, by increasing his understanding of what he is doing, and why; by increasing his own knowledge and ability, and by his own full participation—as an equal—in the life of the community he lives in. Thus, for example, a man is developing himself when he grows, or earns, enough to provide decent conditions for himself and his family; he is not being developed if someone gives him these things. A man is developing himself when he improves his education—whatever he learns about; he is not being developed if he simply carries out orders from someone better educated than himself without understanding why those orders have been given. A man develops himself by joining in free discussion of a new venture, and participating in the subsequent decision; he is not being developed if he is herded like an animal into the new venture. Development to a man can, in fact, only be effected by that man; development of the people can only be effected by the people.

Finally, if development is to increase people's freedom, it must be development for the people. It must serve them, and their interests. Every proposal must be judged by the criterion of whether it serves the purpose of development—and the purpose of development is the people. Yet if a proposal contributes to the development of people, and if it is being carried out by the people of their own free will, it will automatically be for the people's interests, provided three conditions are fulfilled. First, if the people understand their own needs; second, if they understand how these needs can be met; and third, if they have the freedom to make their own decisions, and to carry them into effect.

Development depends upon Freedom

If the purpose of development is the greater freedom and wellbeing of the people, it cannot result from force. For the proverb tells the truth in this matter: you can drive a donkey to water, but you cannot make it drink. By orders, or even by slavery, you can build pyramids and magnificent roads, you can achieve expanded acreages of cultivation, and increases in the quantity of goods produced in your factories. All these things, and many more, can be achieved through the use of force; but none of them result in the development of people. Force, and deceitful promises, can in fact, only achieve short-term material goals. They cannot bring strength to a nation or a community, and they cannot provide a basis for the freedom of the people, or security for any individual or group of persons.

There is only one way in which you can cause people to undertake their own development. That is by education and leadership. Through these means—and no other—people can be helped to understand both their own needs, and the things which they can do to satisfy these needs. This is the kind of leadership which TANU and Government officials should be giving the people; this is the way in which we can bring development to Tanzania. But, although we must give this leadership, the decisions must come from the people themselves, and they themselves must carry out the programmes they have decided upon.

There are thus two factors which are essential in the development of people. The first is leadership through education, and the second is democracy in decision-making. For leadership does not mean shouting at people; it does not mean abusing individuals or groups of people you disagree with; even less does it mean ordering people to do this or that. Leadership means talking and discussing with the people, explaining and persuading. It means making constructive suggestions, and working with the people to show by actions what it is that you are urging them to do. It means being one of the people, and recognizing your equality with them.

In particular, at this stage in our history we should not be trying to blame particular groups or individuals for things which are not to our liking, or not to the liking of the people. The exploiters, who are now apparently so beloved by our leaders that they spend all their time talking about them, are a negligible factor in our development now. Those few who remain can most effectively be dealt with by constructive development work on the part of the people and their leaders; it is certainly absurd that we leaders should spend all our time abusing exploiters—especially as some of us do not understand the work which is being done by some of the individuals we abuse. Instead we should be providing creative and positive leadership. We should have taken the trouble to understand the development policies our Party is trying to pursue, and we should be explaining these policies to the people. When we have convinced the people that TANU's policies are good and sound, then we should be working with them to create a society in which exploiters will find no opportunities for their evil doing.

But giving leadership does not mean usurping the role of the people. The people must make the decisions about their own future through democratic procedures. Leadership cannot replace democracy; it

must be part of democracy. If the decision relates to national affairs, then the people make it through the National Executive Committee, and Parliament, and through the National Conference of TANU. If it is a decision about district affairs, the people make it through the District Committee and District Council. If it is a question of purely local interest—for example whether to undertake a particular self-help scheme—then the people directly concerned must make the decision following a free debate. There is no other way in which real development can take place. For just as real freedom for the people requires development, so real development of the people requires freedom.

Two Essentials of Democracy

There are, however, two essential elements of democracy without which it cannot work. First, is that everyone must be allowed to speak freely, and everyone must be listened to. It does not matter how unpopular a man's ideas, or how mistaken the majority think him. It does not make any difference whether he is liked or disliked for his personal qualities. Every Tanzanian, every member of a community, every member of a District Council, every Member of Parliament, and so on, must have the freedom to speak without fear of intimidation—either inside or outside the meeting place. The minority in any debate must have the right to speak without fear of persecution; it must be defeated in argument, not by threat of force. The debates leading to a decision must be free debates. And even after a decision has been made, free discussion about it should be allowed to continue. For the minority must know that if it has a good case, and if it argues properly and correctly, it will be able to convert the majority. Similarly, the majority must be willing to maintain the argument until the minority has been convinced of the correctness of the decision which has been made. Free debate must continue. It is an essential element of personal freedom.

But the necessity for continued freedom in discussion must not be allowed to prevent decisions from being made. There comes a point where action must follow discussion, or else we shall do nothing but talk. When there has been adequate discussion of a question, and every point of view has been expressed, then the decision must be reached, and the majority must be allowed to prevail. For just as the minority on any question have a right to be heard, so the majority have the right to be obeyed. Once a decision is reached, it must be accepted as the decision of all. And everyone—including those who were in opposition—have to co-operate in carrying out that decision. Thus, for example, once a law has been passed it must be obeyed by everyone, including those who spoke against it and have not been convinced by the arguments put forward in its support. More than that, once a law has been passed, it must be actively supported by everyone. It should not be merely a matter of acquiescence. It is not enough that a citizen should himself refrain from stealing; he must co-operate with the police in upholding the law, and must give over to the police those who transgress it.

For democratic decision-making must be followed by discipline in carrying out the decisions. The minority must be allowed to campaign for a change in the law or the decision. But until they have succeeded in

getting majority support for a change, they must obey the law or the rule which has been laid down. Without this kind of discipline no development of any kind is possible.

Discipline must follow Decision

Discipline must exist in every aspect of our lives. And it must be willingly accepted discipline. For it is an essential part of both freedom and development. The greater freedom which comes from working together, and achieving things by co-operation which none of us could achieve alone, is only possible if there is disciplined acceptance of joint decisions. And this involves the acceptance of lawfully constituted authority. It means that if we work in a factory, we have to accept the discipline of that factory. Whether the factory is privately or publicly owned makes no difference; its rules must be adhered to, and the people who are in charge of particular operations must be obeyed. Similarly, in hospitals, schools, offices, and so on. If the doctor orders certain treatment for the patient, it must be carried out by the nurse without argument, and without carelessness. If the matron lays down rules designed to ensure the smooth operation of the hospital, every nurse must obey these rules. If there are difficulties, representations can be made, but in the meantime the hospital discipline must be maintained or the person must accept dismissal. The same thing is true in our villages and rural communities. Once a community has democratically decided upon a particular self-help scheme, everyone must co-operate in carrying out that decision, or pay the penalty which the village agrees upon.

Yet provided decisions are made after free and friendly discussion, and by majority will, the essential discipline should be freely accepted, and should in fact, be largely self-discipline. For if our people want freedom for themselves, and if they want development, then they will accept the need for disciplined action. Indeed, the acceptance of community discipline is only a problem in Tanzania when our people do not understand the implications of the changes which we have already effected in our lives. In traditional society we had discipline—often very severe. It was accepted by everyone, and everyone co-operated in imposing it. Our problem now comes not from the discipline itself, but from a lack of understanding about the machinery which is necessary for discipline in a modern state, and from a failure to realize that different kinds of discipline are needed in the organizations of a modern society. Thus, for example, theft was dealt with directly by the community when each village looked after its own peace and security. Now it is essential that suspected thieves should be handed over to the police, and not mishandled by the people themselves. Or again, the simple rules of an isolated village are not enough for the running of a modern factory. In the village it rarely mattered whether a man carried out his task at daybreak or at noon; in a factory hundreds of other people can be made idle just because one man does not do his job at the right time.

These new kinds of discipline must be accepted by our people, and by all our leaders. And if anyone is unwilling to accept his responsibilities in this matter, then he must accept the penalties of his failure. If he disobeys the law, then the courts must punish him. If he fails to observe discipline

in his work, then he must be dismissed. For we have to accept that the people in authority in Tanzania now are the agents of the people of Tanzania. If they do their job badly, or if they fail to respect the humanity of every human being, then the Government will replace them, or at an election the people will replace them. But in the meantime they must be upheld while they are carrying out the law, or issuing orders which are in conformity with the law. We must ourselves stop abusing people who are trying to ensure discipline; we must stop calling a man a "Mkoloni" when he demands strict observance of the rules in an office, a factory, a hospital, a school, or any other institution.

If we are to live our lives in peace and harmony, and if we are to achieve our ambitions of improving the conditions under which we live, we must have both freedom and discipline. For freedom without discipline is anarchy; discipline without freedom is tyranny.

Discipline, however, must be a means of implementing decisions. Only in the very limited sense of orderly debate is discipline involved in the making of decisions. And discipline is not another world for force. A meeting must be disciplined if every member is to have an opportunity to be heard, but a disciplined meeting is not one where everyone automatically says "yes" to whatever is suggested. A disciplined meeting is one where the rules which have been accepted as fair are observed by everyone—for example, where every member speaks through the Chairman, and where each person is allowed to make his point without being shouted down or abused. For discipline allows the orderly conduct of affairs; it is the means by which decisions are implemented—not the way they are made.

Ujamaa Villages

It is particularly important that we should now understand the connection between freedom, development, and discipline, because our national policy of creating socialist villages throughout the rural areas depends upon it. For we have known for a very long time that development had to go on in the rural areas, and that this required co-operative activities by the people. Ever since 1959, therefore, TANU has encouraged people to go in groups to farm in the rural areas, and our TANU Government has initiated settlement schemes of many kinds. But we can now see that we have committed many mistakes, and it is important that we should learn the right lessons from them.

When we tried to promote rural development in the past, we sometimes spent huge sums of money on establishing a Settlement, and supplying it with modern equipment, and social services, as well as often providing it with a management hierarchy. In other cases, we just encouraged young men to leave the towns for a particular rural area and then left them to their own devices. We did these things because we recognized that the land is important to our economic future, but we acted on the assumption that there was a shortcut to development in these rural areas. All too often, therefore, we persuaded people to go to new settlements by promising them that they could quickly grow rich there, or that Government would give them services and equipment which they could not hope to receive

either in the towns or in their traditional farming places. In very few cases was any ideology involved; we thought and talked in terms of greatly increased output, and of things being provided for the settlers.

What we were doing, in fact, was thinking of development in terms of things, and not of people. Further, we thought in terms of monetary investment in order to achieve the increases in output we were aiming at. In effect, we said that capital equipment, or other forms of investment, would lead to increased output, and this would lead to a transformation in the lives of the people involved. The people were secondary; the first priority was the output. As a result, there have been very many cases where heavy capital investment has resulted in no increase in output—where the investment has been wasted. And in most of the officially sponsored or supported schemes, the majority of the people who went to settle lost their enthusiasm, and either left the scheme altogether, or failed to carry out the orders of the outsiders who were put in charge—and who were not themselves involved in the success or failure of the project.

It is important, therefore, to realize that the policy of Ujamaa Vijijini is not intended to be merely a revival of the old settlement schemes under another name. The Ujamaa village is a new conception, based on the post-Arusha Declaration understanding that what we need to develop is people, not things, and that people can only develop themselves. The policy is, in fact, the result of learning from the failures which we have had, and from the successes of those small groups which began and grew on a different basis.

Ujamaa villages are intended to be socialist organizations created by the people, and governed by those who live and work in them. They cannot be created from outside, nor governed from outside. No one can be forced into an Ujamaa village, and no official—at any level—can go and tell the members of an Ujamaa village what they should do together, and what they should continue to do as individual farmers. No official of the Government or Party can go to an Ujamaa village and tell the members what they must grow. No non-member of the village can go and tell the members to use a tractor, or not to use a tractor. For if these things happen—that is, if an outsider gives such instructions and enforces them—then it will no longer be an Ujamaa village!

An Ujamaa village is a voluntary association of people who decide of their own free will to live together and work together for their common good. They, and no-one else, will decide how much of their land they will cultivate together from the beginning, and how much they will cultivate individually. They, and no-one else, will decide how to use the money they earn jointly—whether to buy an ox-plough, install water, or do something else. They, and no-one else, will make all the decisions about their working and living arrangements.

It is important that these things should be thoroughly understood. It is also important that the people should not be persuaded to start an Ujamaa village by promises of the things which will be given to them if they do so. A group of people must decide to start an Ujamaa village because they have understood that only through this method can they live

and develop in dignity and freedom, receiving the full benefits of their co-operative endeavour. They must understand that there will be difficulties, and that the sheer coming together will not bring them prosperity. They must understand that coming together enables their work to be more productive in the long run, but is not a replacement for that work.

Unless the purpose and socialist ideology of an Ujamaa village is understood by the members from the beginning—at least to some extent—it will not survive the early difficulties. For no-one can guarantee that there will not be a crop failure in the first or second year—there might be a drought, or floods. And the greater self-discipline which is necessary when working in a community will only be forthcoming if the people understand what they are doing and why. Yet if the purposes, and the potential, are understood and accepted, then the members of an Ujamaa village will be able to surmount such difficulties, and use them to strengthen their organization and determination. The difficulties will help to speed up their development to socialism. But the people have to realize that Ujamaa living does not cause miracles; it only allows them to improve their own lives.

The fact that people cannot be forced into Ujamaa villages, nor told how to run them, does not mean that Government and TANU have just to sit back and hope that people will be inspired to create them on their own. To get Ujamaa villages established, and to help them to succeed, education and leadership are required. These are the things which TANU has to provide. It is our job to explain what an Ujamaa village is, and to keep explaining it until the people understand. But the decision to start must be made by the people themselves—and it must be made by each individual. For if a group of 20 people discuss the idea and only 7 decide to go ahead, then that Ujamaa village will consist of 7 people at the beginning. If 15 decide to start, then it will begin with 15 members—others will join as they are ready. There is no other way forward, because by joining a man has committed himself to a particular kind of life, and five who come in unwillingly can destroy the efforts of the 15 who want to work out a new pattern for themselves.

The decision to join with others in creating an Ujamaa village is an individual one. But once that decision is made, then normal democratic rules will apply to all members. Thus, for example, the 15 people will sit down together and discuss whether to cultivate all their crops together, or whether to begin by jointly cultivating only the cash crops, leaving food crops for individual activity. If they can, they will talk until they agree; but if they cannot come to a unanimous agreement before it is time for work to begin, then they will decide by majority rule. Once this decision has been taken for the forthcoming season, all the members have to accept the discipline of the work which has been made necessary by the majority decision—even if they voted against it. While working hard the minority can continue to try to persuade the other members to make a change next year, but their talk must not lead to a reduction in the effort they make in carrying out the majority decision.

In fact, once an Ujamaa Village is created, it is a democracy at work. For it provides an example of free discussion among equals, leading to their own decision-making; it shows that when discussion has to give

way to action, then the majority will prevail; and it demonstrates the need for discipline by all members in the implementation of the decisions which the group has made. And in this very process, the people will have begun to develop themselves as dignified and confident human beings, in a way which is impossible if they simply take orders from someone else. The fact that the orders of an "expert" may have led to greater output of a crop if they were fully carried out, does not affect this issue. By debating this matter and then deciding for themselves, the people will be doing real development of themselves. Achieving greater output will come later as they learn from their own experience, and as they are convinced that it would be a good idea to try a new method. Progress may appear to be slower in the sense that statistics of crop output will not increase very fast at the beginning. We should remember, however, that those people who marched hundreds of miles in support of the Arusha Declaration did not break speed records. They plodded steadily on until they reached their objective, suiting both their speed, and their hours of walking, to what they felt they could maintain.

Yet Government and TANU leaders can and should help these Ujamaa Villages and their members. Leaders should help people to understand the arguments for and against different methods of organization. We should help a group which decides to start by making sure that they can get adequate land in a convenient parcel. We should help to explain the advantages of working a communal farm, and how the problems can be overcome. We should make sure that the members have agricultural and other advice available to them when they are making their decisions.

Further, Government and Party leaders must make sure that Ujamaa Villages get priority in service to back up their own efforts and their own decisions. For example, if the members of an Ujamaa Village decide that they have a priority need for water, and that they can dig the ditches and buy the pipes but not the pump, then Government and Party should help them by providing a pump rather than laying on water to some other area. But there must be no question of Government assistance replacing the efforts of the members of an Ujamaa Village. Advice must be given, but the decisions must be those of the members themselves; help must be given when possible, but it must be help for something the people are already doing for themselves. These villages must start, and must grow, on the basis of self-reliance. For self-reliance is the means by which people develop.

Tanzania is all the People

By developing the people of Tanzania, we are developing Tanzania. For Tanzania is the people; and the people means everyone. (Tanzania ni ya Wa tanzania; na, Watanzania ni wote). No one person has the right to say, "I am the People". No Tanzanian has the right to say "I know what is good for Tanzania and the others must do it".

All Tanzanians have to make the decisions for Tanzania; all have to work together, and all of us have to accept the discipline we impose upon ourselves. It must be joint discipline—applying to us all equally. But in accepting this discipline we must remain free men, implementing our own decisions. The group involved in any particular decision, and any

particular discipline, will vary. Some decisions are national, and the discipline is that of law which we must all obey. Some decisions affect only those who live in a particular town or district, and the discipline is that of by-laws. Some decisions arise out of our own free decision to participate in a particular group—to work in a factory, to live in an Ujamaa Village, etc.; and the discipline then applies to us because of our membership of that group. But all of us are Tanzanians. Together we are the people. Our development is our affair; and it is the development of ourselves as people that we must dedicate ourselves to.