And these changes must be positive, they must be initiated and shaped by Africa and not simply be a reaction to events which affect Africa.

For a revolution has begun in Africa. It is a revolution which we hope to control and channel so that our lives are transformed. It is a revolution with a purpose, and that purpose is the extension to all African citizens of the requirements of human dignity. The task before us is a big and complicated one. In the process we shall have many decisions to make which involve clashes of principle—where we have to choose, let us say, between rapid development and individual freedom, or between efficiency and equality. There is and will be no simple or universal answer to such problems; the choice will have to be made in the light of historical circumstances and the conflicting needs of present and future. The only certain thing is that if we forget any of our principles, even when we are ignoring or breaking them, then we shall have betrayed the purpose of our revolution and Africa will fail to make its proper contribution to the development of mankind.

But the opportunity is before us provided we have the courage to seize it. For the choice is not between change or no change; the choice for Africa is between changing or being changed—changing our lives under our own direction, or being changed by the impact of forces outside our control. In Africa there is no stability in stagnation in this twentieth century; stability can only be achieved through maintaining balance during rapid change.

Tanzania has chosen to ride and try to harness the whirlwind which is sweeping through this continent. We know that some human dislocation is inevitable in this process, but we believe that much more would ultimately be involved in doing nothing. For we recognize that to try to maintain the status quo is to try to ignore the world. We prefer to participate in the shaping of our own destiny, and we believe that we have the resolution and the ability to overcome difficulties and build the kind of society we want.

For those with the courage to aspire, to believe, and to work, Tanzania is a challenging and exciting land. It is my privilege and my happiness to dedicate myself to its future.

January 1966
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Introduction

The Introduction to a collection of speeches and writings could usefully be a description of the events and changing circumstances of the period during which they were produced. But it is not my intention to provide such a background. To a large extent the items in this book explain their own context, and the events or developments which provoked them; for the rest I think the preliminary paragraphs give sufficient information to make their inclusion intelligible. Instead I propose to enlarge upon the socialist goal which Tanzania has accepted as its objective, and upon the manner in which Tanzania can progress towards this goal.

The Tanganyika African National Union has been formally committed to socialism since it revised its constitution almost immediately after Tanganyika's independence in December 1961. Much of the legislation and many of the policies adopted by the different Governments—both before and after the Union with Zanzibar—reflected that commitment. Yet it gradually became clear that the absence of a generally accepted and easily understood statement of philosophy and policy was causing problems, and some Government and Party actions were having the effect of encouraging the growth of non-socialist institutions, values, and attitudes. This was happening because the implications of our broad commitment to socialism were not understood. The adoption of the Arusha Declaration early in 1967 therefore marks an important step forward for Tanzania. For this Declaration, together with subsequent policy statements, provides some definition of what socialism demands of our country, and especially of its leaders.

But the Arusha Declaration is only a beginning. Tanzania is not now a socialist country; it is only a country whose people have firmly committed themselves to building socialism. The actual
work has barely begun. For socialism is not built by Government decisions, nor by Acts of Parliament; a country does not become socialist by nationalizations or grand designs on paper. It is more difficult than that to build socialism, and it takes much longer.

**UJAMAA: IS TANZANIAN SOCIALISM**

What does socialism mean for us? How can we move towards it? The answer to these questions is in some ways implicit in the word we have chosen to describe our goal. For there was nothing accidental in our selection of the word ‘ujamaa’ to define our socialist policies; nor did this word result solely from the desire to find a Swahili equivalent for the word ‘socialism’. Swahili is a growing language and continues to incorporate foreign words into its vocabulary when necessary; indeed we talk of the policies of some other countries as being ‘kisoshalisti’. The word ‘ujamaa’ was chosen for special reasons. First, it is an African word and thus emphasizes the African-ness of the policies we intend to follow. Second, its literal meaning is ‘family-hood’, so that it brings to the mind of our people the idea of mutual involvement in the family as we know it.

By the use of the word ‘ujamaa’, therefore, we state that for us socialism involves building on the foundation of our past, and building also to our own design. We are not importing a foreign ideology into Tanzania and trying to smother our distinct social patterns with it. We have deliberately decided to grow, as a society, out of our own roots, but in a particular direction and towards a particular kind of objective. We are doing this by emphasizing certain characteristics of our traditional organization, and extending them so that they can embrace the possibilities of modern technology and enable us to meet the challenge of life in the twentieth century world.

This emphasis on growth from traditional patterns of social living means that we shall be trying to create something which is uniquely ours, and by methods which may be unique to Tanzania. This does not invalidate our claim to be building socialism.

Socialism is international; its ideas and beliefs relate to man in society, not just to Tanzanian man in Tanzania, or African man in Africa. But just because it is a universal concept so it must also relate to Tanzanian man in Tanzania. And if it is to do this, it must be able to encompass us as we are—as our geography and our history have made us. It must not demand the remoulding of man to a single pattern, regardless of whether man has been born in Uzanaki or Hunan, Colchester or Uppsala. The universality of socialism only exists if it can take account of men’s differences, and be equally valid for all of them. And it can. For the universality of socialism does not imply a single, world-wide uniformity of social institutions, social habits, or social language. There is no reason why a dozen fully socialist societies should not have a dozen different methods of organizing themselves, a dozen different sets of customs relating to social intercourse, and a dozen different styles of political address and description. It is by no means necessary to call people ‘comrade’ in order to be socialist; it is not necessary to insist upon a civil marriage ceremony in a socialist society; it is by no means certain that a centralized economy is an inherent part of socialist organization. It is my contention that socialist societies in different parts of the world will differ in many respects even when they are fully developed instead of being, as now, at different stages on the road to socialism. The differences between these societies will reflect both the manner of their development, and their historical traditions.

It would be absurd to suggest that because differences will exist between different socialist societies in different parts of the world, that therefore ‘socialism’ has no meaning, or that it is too vague a concept to be sensibly adopted as the social goal of a young country. For there are certain universal values and essential characteristics which would be found in every socialist society, and which would not be found in non-socialist societies. It is the existence of these values and characteristics which define a socialist society. They will not necessarily be found in a society which is still creating socialism; a society in transition is, by definition, short of the goal. But the more of these values and characteristics which can be observed in the workings of any community the nearer it is to becoming socialist. The gap between the reality and the goal will show the distance which has still to be travelled and the work which still has to be done. A brief examination of these essential elements of socialism will demonstrate to those who know Tanzania the amount of hard work which our country still has to perform.
WHAT IS A SOCIALIST SOCIETY?

What should we look for when trying to determine whether a particular society is socialist? What are the universal characteristics and values which would underlie differences of institution and organization in a socialist society?

First, and most central of all, is that under socialism Man is the purpose of all social activity. The service of man, the furtherance of his human development, is in fact the purpose of society itself. There is no other purpose above this; no glorification of 'nation', no increase in production—nothing is more central to a socialist society than an acceptance that Man is its justification for existence.

In one sense, all the other characteristics of socialism follow from this. But in view of the historical development of mankind, one more thing has to be stated categorically. The word 'man' to a socialist, means all men—all human beings. Male and female; black, white, brown, yellow; long-nosed and short-nosed; educated and uneducated; wise and stupid; strong and weak; all these, and all other distinctions between human beings, are irrelevant to the fact that all members of the society—all the human beings who are its purpose—are equal.

The equality of man may or may not be susceptible to scientific proof. But its acceptance as a basic assumption of life in society is the core and essence of socialism. No one who qualifies his belief in the equality of man is really a socialist. A society is not socialist if, in its organization, or its practices, it discriminates, or allows discrimination, between its members because of their race, their place of birth, their appearance, their religious beliefs, or any thing other than their behaviour in relation to their fellows. The existence of racialism, of tribalism, or of religious intolerance, means that a society is not socialist—regardless of whatever other attributes it may have. A society in which all men are of equal account will probably be socialist, because socialist organization is really the means by which the diversity of mankind is harnessed to the common benefit of all men. Socialism, as a system, is in fact the organization of men's inequalities to serve their equality. Their equality is socialist belief.

The upholding of human dignity could be expected to follow automatically from these two basic characteristics of a socialist society. For a society cannot acquiesce in the abasement or humili-
For work is not only a duty to society; it is also a right of every human being, and anyone who is deprived of the opportunity to do something useful for himself, his fellow citizens, and his society, needs and merits some compensation. The child needs food, love, and care; that is obvious and unquestioned. The sick and crippled need an opportunity to do whatever is within their power, and also the willing gift of such food, clothing and shelter as they are unable to provide for themselves. And the society has a responsibility also towards any person whom it deprives of an opportunity to earn his own living. Under socialism there could not be a group of 'permanently unemployed'; but technological changes, and the economic flexibility which must exist in a developing community, may mean that some individuals need support while they are receiving new training, or—especially in a country like Tanzania—until the first harvest when they return to the land.

Apart from these groups, however, everyone in a socialist society will be a worker. Whether this is so socialism cannot exist; it would collapse through its own poverty. But the word 'worker' in this context means anyone who works; he may be a peasant working on his own shamba, a member of a co-operative farming group, or a woman looking after her small children and the family home. None of these people receive wages for their activity, but they do contribute to the total output of goods and welfare. Nor is it necessary to make a distinction between a wage-earner whose work involves much physical labour, and one who works in an office or carries managerial or professional responsibilities. All who contribute to the society by their work are workers.

It follows from this that in a socialist society there will be no exploitation of one man by another. There will be no 'masters' who sit in idleness while others labour on 'their' farms or in 'their' factories. Nor will there be too great a degree of inequality between the incomes of different members of the society. It is arguable that an especially clever man, or an especially hard-working man, contributes more to the society than one who does not have these qualities, and that he is therefore entitled to receive greater remuneration. But can any one man do work which is 100 times more valuable than that of another? It is true that for some jobs to be done effectively certain extra facilities are needed by the worker; a teacher or an administrator, for example, will need a place where he can study quietly, will need to be able to obtain books of a certain type, and so on. But does anyone need a palace while another receives only a 'bedspace'?

There is, however, another form of exploitation which a socialist society would avoid, and to which it may be especially prone. A man who cheats his fellows by dishonesty, who fails to do a full day's work, or who fails to co-operate with his fellows because he wants to bolster his own personal interests, is exploiting other men. Society has as much a right, and a duty, to prevent these kinds of exploitation as it has to prevent the exploitation which arises from individual ownership of the means of production and exchange.

For this is another characteristic of a socialist community. It would be so organized that the tools of production and the mechanisms of exchange are firmly under the control of the people. Control in this context does not only mean regulation in the negative sense of stopping people from doing certain things. It also means the power to do positive things—to expand a factory, to build a new one in a particular place, to invest in a risky enterprise, etc. It seems almost certain that this will normally involve public ownership at least of the key points of the economy, and one would therefore expect a socialist society to be distinguished from a non-socialist society in this matter of ownership of the economy. It may be, however, that particular societies can devise other means of securing effective and positive control over their economy in such a manner as to preclude exploitation. This would be unusual, but if they can, that society could still be recognized as socialist, provided that the other essential characteristics of socialism exist.

It may be necessary to add that public ownership can be of many types, and it has a purpose. The purpose is to ensure that there is no exploitation in the economy, and no built-in tendency towards inequalities. It could therefore be ownership by the people through the instrument of their elected central government, or their local government; or it could be expressed through co-operatives, or other group organizations. The appropriate form would vary both according to the technology concerned, and according to the other practices and desires of the society. The essential point is that no individual or group of individuals would be able to hold to ransom either the society as a whole, or other individuals, by means of their
exclusive control of an instrument which is necessary to the increasing well-being of the community.

Obviously this does not preclude private ownership of the things which pertain to the individual worker, or to the family. Such a suggestion is simply put forward to frighten the timid man and to mislead those trying to find an alternative to the social evils of capitalism. A farmer can own his hoe, a carpenter can own his hand-saw; any worker can own the tools which he uses by himself as a supplement to his own hands. Similarly, a family can own the house in which it lives, the furniture and equipment which increase the comfort of its members, and so on. The question of public ownership arises when men have to co-operate together in the pursuit of a particular objective. When the task has to be used by two men it must be owned equally; when the product is necessary for the decent life of others they must be involved in the control over it. Any suggestion that socialism involves the nationalization or community ownership of every artifact of life is the suggestion of a fool or a mischief-maker.

There is another bogeyman which is used to frighten people, and that is the suggestion that individual freedom does not exist under socialism. The purpose of socialism is to enlarge the real freedom of man, to expand his opportunity of living in dignity and well-being. An obviously essential part of this is that the laws of the society shall be known, be applied equally, and that people shall not be subject to arbitrary arrest, or prosecution by the servants of the society. The Rule of Law is a part of socialism; until it prevails socialism does not prevail. By itself the Rule of Law does not bring socialism; but you cannot have socialism without it, because it is the expression of man's equality in one facet of social living.

The final characteristic of a socialist society which must be listed here is the social values it emphasizes. In a feudal or aristocratic system, birth is a matter of the highest importance; if you are born of certain parents you have social respect as well as economic advantages accorded to you as of right. In a capitalist system, individual wealth is the most important single criterion for respect, and the competitive spirit is acclaimed as a paramount social virtue—in practice if not in theory. The social values of a socialist society will be very different from either of these. First, both the organization and the teaching will emphasize man's co-operative spirit—his desire to work in harmony with his friends and neighbours—not his personal aggressiveness. Second, it will reserve its highest respect and highest prizes for those whose life and work demonstrate the greatest service, not the greatest personal acquisitiveness. Comparative wealth will not be the criteria on which a man is judged by his fellows. Success in a socialist society will imply that a man has earned the respect, admiration, and love of his fellow citizens, by his desire to serve, and by the contribution he has made to the well-being of the community.

All these things together are the hallmark of a socialist society. When you find them you have found a society which is socialist.

Socialism and the Production of Wealth

Both before and since the Arusha Declaration, the Government and Party in Tanzania have been emphasizing the need to increase output—to increase the production of wealth. We shall continue to do this, because in our circumstances an increase in the amount of goods produced and available for social services, for distribution, and for investment, is a socialist purpose. Our country is bedevilled by its present poverty; people are sick, ignorant, and live in very poor conditions, because we do not produce enough wealth to be able to eradicate these evils. We have to increase our production of goods if we are to enable everyone to live in conditions of human dignity. At present not even complete equality in the distribution of the available wealth would do this; our national income per head is something between Shs. 400/- and Shs. 460/- per year. An increase in production must have a very high priority in our social plans; it is the cornerstone for all our other ambitions.

It is necessary to stress this because the production of wealth for its own sake is not a socialist purpose. The purpose of production must always be the greater well-being of man; goods must be produced because they are useful and make life better. To Tanzanians that looks very obvious; indeed, most Tanzanian citizens may
wonder what I am talking about, because it is so obvious that extra food, bricks, roofing, ovens, chairs, tables, beds, clothing, and so on and so on, will make life better. Yet we are still in danger of being attracted by the idea of ‘wealth’ as represented by all the consumer goods we see advertised in foreign magazines (and even Tanzanian ones), or in the films, etc. We are still in danger of accepting the idea that the greatest production of consumer goods is the criterion by which a nation, or an economic system, should be judged.

A socialist does not look at things that way. He asks, what sort of production? What is it that is being produced? Under what conditions? And what effect does it have, on balance, on the society as a whole? To a socialist, therefore, there is no virtue in ‘creating a market’ for something which people have never thought of wanting and really have no need for, but which someone hopes to make a profit by producing. This happens all the time in capitalist societies; it is an inherent part of them. There are very many examples which could be given; I will mention only two. In some societies it is a matter of pride, I am told, to buy an electric toothbrush—presumably the energy required to clean one’s mouth properly is beyond the strength of well-fed men and women! An even more useless object which manufacturers were trying to persuade the people of another capitalist country to buy was something called a ‘non-spill’ tray, which was said to enable you to swing a tray holding glasses of liquid without spilling a drop! Advertisements to promote the sale of such things are a normal part of capitalist society; their newspapers, television, etc. make every attempt to suggest to people that they will be ‘old-fashioned’ if they do not acquire the object in question. In other words, an attempt is made to make people discontented without the thing which is being ‘promoted’, so that they will buy it—if they have enough money. This is called ‘creating a market’, and ‘creating a market’ is said to be an inherent part of ‘progress’, of increasing the national income, and of ‘free consumer choice’.

A socialist will not be impressed by such values, nor even by the talk of people ‘exercising their freedom as consumers’, if, at the same time as these things are being produced and sold, other human values are being ignored or sacrificed. For the incredible thing is that in the same countries which encourage this kind of ‘market creation’, other people are living in conditions of great poverty, educational facilities are starved of funds, and completely free hospital care for everyone is said to be too expensive for the community to bear! The production of wealth for the benefit of man—that is production for socialist purposes—would have rather different results. Electric toothbrushes and non-spill trays—if they were produced at all—would not be produced until after these more basic needs had been met.

To a socialist, the first priority of production must be the manufacture and distribution of such goods as will allow every member of the society to have sufficient food, clothing and shelter, to sustain a decent life. Other goods would be produced only if they in some way hastened the day when this goal was reached. Apart from these basic needs of man, a socialist society would put much emphasis on the production of socially advantageous goods. It would concentrate on better educational facilities, medical care, places of community activity like libraries, community centres, parks, etc. It would devote resources also to social values which have nothing to do with production—things like improving the hours and conditions of work, or maintaining and improving the natural beauties of the world in which we live. Of course, some care; money, and energy has to be spent on these non-consumer products even before the basic job is complete, because they affect the way people will be able to live. Thus, for example, when building new houses in a town it is necessary to plan for public spaces and leave room for community buildings even if you cannot build them immediately; it is necessary to provide minimum educational and health services as far as you can; and it is essential to spend that minimum amount of money which is necessary to prevent the destruction of that natural beauty or wild life which could never be replaced if it was once allowed to disappear.

In a socialist society, therefore, man as a consumer is not ‘king’. Instead man is recognized as a human being who desires human dignity, who is a consumer both privately and socially, and who is also a producer. For socialism involves an acceptance of the fact that man’s life in society cannot be divided up into bits. A man is concerned with his life as a whole; if he is starving it is no use expecting him to be happy because he has the freedom to vote every few years, or if he is well-fed it is no use expecting him to be happy as a slave. Under a socialist society men come together to try and
organize the community in which they live so that all their different needs and all their co-operative social values are considered, with priority being given to those which are most urgent—but without any being destroyed.

In Tanzania the increased output of wealth so that all our people may live decently is the most urgent thing. But we cannot allow this need to destroy our belief in human equality and human dignity. On the contrary, we have to organize our expansion of wealth in such a way as to give the maximum possible emphasis to these other values.

**SOCIALISM IS SECULAR**

The fact that socialism is concerned with all aspects of man's life in society does not mean that man as an individual ceases to exist. Every person is unique; there are some things which are, and which must be, private to himself. Society has the right where necessary to regulate, encourage, or discourage, those actions of individuals which affect other members of the society. It has no business in relation to things which are by nature or by method entirely personal. Once a man has fulfilled his responsibilities to the society, it is nothing to do with socialism whether he spends his spare time painting, dancing, writing poetry, playing football, or just sitting. Nor is it any business of socialism if an individual is, or is not, inspired in his daily life by a belief in God, nor if he does, or does not, attend a place of religious worship—or pray elsewhere.

Socialism is concerned with man's life in this society. A man's relationship with his God is a personal matter for him and him alone; his beliefs about the hereafter are his own affair. These things have nothing to do with anyone else as long as he does not indulge in practices which adversely affect the similar private rights of other members of the society. Thus, for example, a man's belief that he should pray at specified hours of the day and night wherever he happens to be is a matter for him, and no one else has the right to interfere. But a religion which involved human sacrifice, or demanded the exploitation of human beings, could not be allowed to carry out these practices.

Socialism's concern about the organization of life on earth does not involve any supposition about life elsewhere, or about man's soul, or the procedures for fulfilling the will of God or Gods.

Socialism is secular. It has nothing to say about whether there is a God. Certainly it rests on the assumption of the equality of man, but people can reach this conclusion by many routes. People can accept the equality of man because they believe that all men were created by God, they can believe it because they feel that the scientific evidence supports such a conclusion, or they can accept it simply because they believe it is the only basis on which life in society can be organized without injustice. It does not matter why people accept the equality of man as the basis of social organization; all that matters is that they do accept it.

This means that socialism cannot require that its adherents be atheists. There is not the slightest necessity for people to study metaphysics and decide whether there is one God, many Gods, or no God, before they can be socialist. It is not necessary to try and decide whether there is an after-life, or what kind, before you can be a socialist. These questions are important to man, but irrelevant to socialism; trying to bring them into the discussion about socialism simply causes quarrels between socialists, and thus weakens the struggle for the things they all support. What matters in socialism and to socialists is that you should care about a particular kind of social relationship on this earth. Why you care is your own affair.

There is nothing incompatible between socialism and Christianity, Islam, or any other religion which accepts the equality of man on earth.

The fact that socialism and religion are two different things does not mean that socialism is anti-religious. In a socialist society the members of the community would be free to be religious, and to follow whatever religion they wish; the society would try very hard not to make a decision which outrages the religious feelings of any of its members, however small in numbers the group may be. There are times, however, when this cannot be done—for example if questions of public health arise in an urban society out of certain religious burial practices. But even then, every effort would be made to reach agreement with the people concerned; the religious feelings would always be taken into account.

This necessity for religious toleration arises out of the nature of socialism. For a man's religious beliefs are important to him, and the purpose of socialism is Man. Socialism does not just seek to serve some abstract thing called 'the people'; it seeks to maximize the
benefit of society to all the individuals who are members of it. It is thus the essentially personal nature of religious beliefs which makes it necessary for socialism to leave religious questions alone as far as possible—which makes it necessary that socialism should be secular. And being secular involves trying to avoid upsetting deeply held religious beliefs however stupid they may appear to non-believers. The wearing of long hair, the erection of statues to the religious heroes or saints, the pouring of libations, the ban on music and dancing—all these things appear at best irrelevant to those who do not follow the religion concerned, but they are important to those who do. And because they are important to these believers, a socialist society will not interfere. It will not force people to cut their hair, nor allow others to be forced to wear their hair long. It will not prohibit libations, although it may ask that they be poured where they will not damage public property. It will not force people to dance, even if the society has agreed that its people should do a period of National Service which normally includes dance activity. It will protect the statues from wilful damage. It will allow genuine conscientious objection to the bearing of arms, and so on. Always socialism will try to enlarge freedom, and religious freedom is an essential part of man's liberty.

THERE IS NO THEOLOGY OF SOCIALISM

There is, however, an apparent tendency among certain socialists to try and establish a new religion—a religion of socialism itself. This is usually called 'scientific socialism' and the works of Marx and Lenin are regarded as the holy writ in the light of which all other thoughts and actions of socialists have to be judged.

Of course, this doctrine is not presented as a religion; its proponents are often most anxious to decry religion as the 'opium of the people', and they present their beliefs as 'science'. Yet they talk and act in the same manner as the most rigid of theologians. We find them condemning one another's actions because they do not accord with what the priests of 'scientific socialism' have decided is the true meaning, in modern terms, of books written more than 100 years ago. Indeed we are fast getting to the stage where quarrels between different Christian sects about the precise meaning of the Bible fade into insignificance when compared with the quarrels of those who claim to be the true interpreters of Marxism-Leninism!

This attempt to create a new religion out of socialism is absurd. It is not scientific, and it is almost certainly not Marxist—for however combatant and quarrelsome a socialist Marx was, he never claimed to be an infallible divinity! Marx was a great thinker. He gave a brilliant analysis of the industrial capitalist society in which he lived; he diagnosed its ills and advocated certain remedies which he believed would lead to the development of a healthy society. But he was not God. The years have proved him wrong in certain respects just as they have proved him right in others. Marx did not write revealed truth; his books are the result of hard thinking and hard work, not a revelation from God. It is therefore unscientific to appeal to his writings as Christians appeal to the Bible, or Muslims to the Koran.

The works of Marx and Lenin are useful to a socialist because these men thought about the objective conditions of their time and tried to work out the actions necessary to achieve certain ends. We can learn from their methods of analysis, and from their ideas. But the same is true of many other thinkers of the past. It is no part of the job of a socialist in 1968 to worry about whether or not his actions or proposals are in accordance with what Marx or Lenin wrote, and it is a waste of time and energy to spend hours—if not months and years—trying to prove that what you have decided is objectively necessary is really in accordance with their teachings. The task of a socialist is to think out for himself the best way of achieving desired ends under the conditions which exist now. It is his job to think how to organize society, how to solve a particular problem, or how to effect certain changes, in a manner which will emphasize the importance of man and the equality of man.

It is especially important that we in Africa should understand this. We are groping our way forward towards socialism, and we are in danger of being bemused by this new theology, and therefore of trying to solve our problems according to what the priests of Marxism say is what Marx said or meant. If we do this we shall fail. Africa's conditions are very different from those of the Europe in which Marx and Lenin wrote and worked. To talk as if these thinkers provided all the answers to our problems, or as if Marx invented socialism, is to reject both the humanity of Africa and the universality of socialism. Marx did contribute a great deal to socialist thought. But socialism did not begin with him, nor can it end in constant reinterpretations of his writings.
Speaking generally, and despite the existence of a few feudalistic communities, traditional Tanzanian society had many socialist characteristics. The people did not call themselves socialists, and they were not socialists by deliberate design. But all people were workers, there was no living off the sweat of others. There was no very great difference in the amount of goods available to the different members of the society. All these are socialist characteristics. Despite the low level of material progress, traditional African society was in practice organized on a basis which was in accordance with socialist principles.

These conditions still prevail over large areas of Tanzania—and indeed in many other parts of Africa. Even in our urban areas, the social expectation of sharing what you have with your kinsfolk is still very strong—and causes great problems for individuals! These things have nothing to do with Marx; the people have never heard of him. Yet they provide a basis on which modern socialism can be built. To reject this base is to accept the idea that Africa has nothing to contribute to the march of mankind; it is to argue that the only way progress can be achieved in Africa is if we reject our own past and impose on ourselves the doctrines of some other society.

Nor would it be very scientific to reject Africa’s past when trying to build socialism in Africa. For scientific thinking means finding out all the facts in a particular situation, regardless of whether you like them or not, or whether they fit in with preconceived ideas. It means analysing these facts, and then working out solutions to the problems you are concerned with in the light of these facts, and of the objectives you are trying to achieve. This is what Marx did in Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century; if he had lived in Sukumaland, Masailand, or Ruvuma, he would have written a different book than Das Kapital, but he could have been just as scientific and just as socialist. For if ‘scientific socialism’ means anything, it can only mean that the objectives are socialist and you apply scientific methods of study in working out the appropriate policies. If the phrase does not mean that, then it is simply a trap to ensnare the unwary into a denunciation of their own nature and therefore into a new form of oppression. For a scientist works to discover truth. He does not claim to know it, nor is he seeking to discover truth as revealed—which is the job of the theologian. A scientist works on the basis of the knowledge which has been acumulated empirically, and which is held to be true until new experience demonstrates otherwise, or demonstrates a superior truth which takes precedence in particular situations.

A really scientific socialist would therefore start his analysis of the problems of a particular society from the standpoint of that society. In Tanzania he would take the existence of some socialist values as part of his material for analysis; he would study the effect of the colonial era on these attitudes and on the systems of social organization; he would take account of the world situation as it affects Tanzania. After doing all that he would try to work out policies appropriate for the growth of a modern socialist state. And he could well finish up with the Arusha Declaration and the policies of ujamaa!

A scientific socialist could do all this with or without a knowledge and understanding of Marx and Lenin—or for that matter Saint-Simon, Owen or Laski. Knowledge of the work and thinking of these and other people may help a socialist to know what to look for and how to evaluate the things he sees; but it could also mislead him if he is not careful. Equally, a knowledge of history may help him to learn from the experience of others; a knowledge of economics will help him to understand some of the forces at work in the society. But if he tries to use any of these disciplines or philosophies as a gospel according to which he must work out solutions he will go wrong. There is no substitute for his own hard work and hard thinking.

For example, a study of the work of past socialist thinkers and of history and economics appears to have led some people to argue that Tanzania can only become socialist if it first goes through the stage of capitalism. Yet it is difficult to believe that they thought about the objective conditions of this country when coming to this conclusion. (It is also difficult to believe that they understand the principles of socialism—the attitude of mind it requires!) Certainly Tanzania was part of the Western capitalist world while it was under colonial domination, but it was very much on the fringe. Certainly our independent nation inherited a few capitalist institutions, and some of our people adopted capitalist and individualistic ideas as a result of their education or their envy of the colonial representatives whom they encountered. But the masses of the people did not become capitalist, and are not filled with capitalist ideas. By far the largest
part of our economy is not organized on capitalist lines. Indeed, whenever we try to help Africans to become capitalist shopkeepers, capitalist farmers, industrialists, etc., we find that most of them fail because they cannot adopt the capitalist practices which are essential to commercial success! Yet rather than give up their theories, these dogmatists often attribute these African failures to the machinations of a racial minority—thus revealing their racism and non-socialist beliefs—instead of recognizing that capitalism demands certain attributes among its practitioners which the majority of our people have never been forced to acquire.

Under these circumstances what would be the sense in working to create capitalism, with all the individualism, social aggressiveness, and human indignities which it involves? These attributes would have to be fought against, and the organizations of capitalism destroyed or reformed, when you finally decided that the task of building socialism could be begun. And when should opposition to capitalism be started? If capitalism must precede socialism, how far does it have to go before it can be replaced?

Capitalism would only have to precede socialism if there was some reason to believe that the people will fail to solve the problems of production except by capitalist methods. It is certainly true that capitalism can lead to the high output of goods and services—no socialist would dispute that. But there is very little evidence to support the contention that only through capitalism can a satisfactory level of production be attained; indeed there is an increasing amount of evidence with which to refute such a statement. Countries like the USSR, East Germany, China, and North Korea may differ in their approach to socialism, but they are certainly not capitalist, and they do produce the goods their people need. North Korea, for example, may not be able to compare with the state of New York in the provision of television sets, cars, and fashion clothes; but it has electrified something like 98 per cent of its villages, and 86 per cent of its farm houses, and it has built new and improved houses for about two thirds of its rural families in the space of eight years. In other words, the priorities of production may be different, and the emphasis given to economic output as against other values may vary, but North Korea has shown that production can be organized in a non-capitalist manner. If it can be done once, what reason is there to believe that it cannot be done again?

The real truth is that the principles of socialism are relevant to all human society at all stages of technology and social organization. But their application has constantly to be worked out afresh according to the objective conditions prevailing in the time or place. There is no book which provides all the answers to these problems of application; there is no 'socialist road map' which depicts all obstacles and provides a path through or around them. In fact we have no alternative but to hold fast to the principles of socialism—to understand its characteristics—and then apply the accumulated knowledge of man to the continuing and changing problems of man. And we have to do this as best we can, without the infinite knowledge which belongs to God and which would provide the answers to all our problems. There is no magic formula, and no short cut to socialism. We can only grope our way forward, doing our best to think clearly—and scientifically—about our own conditions in relation to our objectives.

THERE IS NO MODEL FOR US TO COPY

In 1965 Tanzania adopted its own form of democracy—we rejected the Western model and said it was not appropriate for our circumstances despite the fact that all our constitutional development had until then been based on it. We looked at different democratic systems round the world, and studied the work of different thinkers, and we asked ourselves two questions. First, what is the purpose of democratic systems? And second, what are the conditions of Tanzania, and what special problems face the country? Then we worked out a system of one-party Government which seemed to us to include the essential elements of democracy at the same time as it provided for unity and strength in Government, and took account of our poverty, our size, our traditions, and our aspirations. The resultant constitution is not perfect; but it suits us better than any system operating elsewhere, and we believe that it safeguards the people's sovereignty at the same time as it enables the effective and strong Government so essential at this stage of our development.

When we introduced this new system, we were criticized for 'abandoning democracy', and even now these charges are still heard. The criticisms came mostly from the traditional democracies of the West; even some of our sympathizers felt that we had taken a step backwards in our development. In response to this criticism
we tried to explain what we were trying to do and why we thought our new system was both democratic and suitable for our conditions. But having done that we did not worry about what the Western countries said or what democratic theorists said. For in rejecting the idea that we had to follow the ‘Westminster model’ if we wanted to be democratic, we had also overcome the psychological need to have a certificate of approval from the West in relation to our political system. We did not reject this idea of an accolade from the West because we were critical of the political systems operating in Western countries. On the contrary, there was much that we admired in them, and we learned a great deal from them. But we acted as intelligent and thoughtful citizens of Tanzania who wanted democracy to be a continuing reality in our own country.

What we have done in relation to democracy we have also to do in relation to socialism. It is not intelligent to reject an accolade from the West on democracy in order to seek one from the East on socialism. Socialism is about people, and people are the products of their history, education, and environment. It is absurd to assume that while democracy has to be adapted to the circumstances of the country in order that the people’s will shall be effective, socialism can just be copied from somewhere else. Admiration of some facets of democracy in Britain, Sweden, and elsewhere did not lead us to imitation. Equally we should be able to admire certain things which have been done in China, Russia, Korea, Yugoslavia, and so on, without assuming that any of these countries provide a model for us to copy.

Unfortunately some of our people—often the ones who were most insistent that we should not copy the democracy of the West—are now judging our socialist policies and progress by what Moscow or Peking have done, and are demanding that we do something because it has proved useful in one of these places. They get upset if the communist parties of these countries express disapproval (either explicitly or implicitly), because they believe that the model for socialism already exists there, and that we can only be really socialist if we have earned a ‘certificate of approval’ from the guardians of this model. Such people are refusing to think for themselves. They are saying that the perfect answer to the problems of man in society is already known, and all we have to do is to copy others. Once again, they are saying that Africa has nothing to contribute to the world and all good things come from elsewhere. And then, in their insecurity, they look for a ‘certificate of socialist approval’ from the country or party which they believe has these answers.

We must avoid this attitude. It is neither patriotic nor sensible to deny the need for Western approval and in the next breath to seek an accolade from the East. Tanzania does not need a certificate of approval about its internal policies from any outside group. The only approval our policies need is the approval of the Tanzanian people. We shall get that if we succeed in dealing with our own problems in a way which is suitable to our present circumstances and acceptable to the people’s beliefs and understanding at any one time. True Tanzanians will worry about what the Tanzanian people think, not what anyone else thinks. True Tanzanian socialists will worry about how the Tanzanian people can move in the quickest possible time towards a society where socialist principles find their fullest expression. They will not worry about the approval or disapproval of other socialists in matters which are of exclusive concern to us.

Of course it would be stupid to allow an insistence on working out our own policies to develop into a rejection of the lessons we can learn from the experiences of other countries and the ideas of other people. To say that Tanzania does not need certificates of approval from this country or that does not mean that we cannot learn from non-Tanzanians. This kind of automatic rejection of something because it is said by an American or Chinese, or done in Britain or Poland, is as much a reflection of an inferiority complex as the automatic acceptance of what they say or do.

Why should Tanzania not learn from the agricultural communes of China? Their experience could promote thought and ideas about our own rural organization, provided that we go to learn, and proceed to think—not to copy. Why can we not learn from the Korean success in rural transformation in comparison with continuing difficulties in other Communist countries? Do the Cuban experiments in adult education have nothing to teach us? Agricultural organization, rural transformation, adult education, are all problems we have to deal with in Tanzania; why should we not study the techniques used by other men to see if they could usefully be adapted to meet our needs, or if they provide a clue to the solution of a difficulty we are experiencing?
Nor do we have to confine our attention to development in communist countries. The co-operative settlements of Israel, the co-operative organizations of Denmark and Sweden, have all accumulated great experience which we could learn from. Even the most avowedly capitalist countries have something to teach us—for example, the techniques by which they encourage workers to increase their output. We do not have to adopt these blindly, but we could usefully consider whether, or to what extent, these techniques are acceptable to a socialist society. And what of the freedom for individuals to express their beliefs and ideas about government, about policies, about organization? Is there nothing valuable for us in this freedom? Even if individual freedom to vote and organize does not have the exclusive importance which advocates of capitalism appear to give it, surely it is a reflection of one facet of man’s equality and therefore important to a socialist? How far can we achieve this kind of freedom and equality in our circumstances without sacrificing other freedoms and equalities?

We in Tanzania are a part of mankind. We have to take our place in the world. We would be stupid to reject everything or everyone coming out of the West because that is the home of capitalism; we would be stupid to reject everything the communists do. We are trying to build ujamaa—socialism—which is neither of these things. We can learn from both—and from other political systems—without trying to copy or seeking for their approval. Our task is to look first at our own position and our own needs, and then to consider other experience and other suggestions in the light of our requirements. We should not put ourselves into blinkers as though we were a horse which could not be trusted to see what is going on elsewhere. We should be willing to learn from our fellow men, and we should contribute to the common pool of knowledge and experience. We can do this if we use our brains—that is, if we THINK.

The Universality and Diversity of Socialism
What does all this amount to? It is an expression of belief that man can only live in harmony with man, and can only develop to his full potential as a unique individual, in a society the purpose of which is Man, which is based on the principles of human equality, and which is so organized as to emphasize both man’s equality and his control over all the instruments of his life and development.

It is a statement that because men are different, and because different communities and societies have had different histories, live in different geographical conditions, and have developed different customs and systems of belief, therefore the road to socialism and the institutions through which socialism is ultimately expressed will be different. It is a statement insisting that the progress of one man or group of men does not make it unnecessary for other men and other groups to think for themselves. It is an assertion that there are no natural laws of human development which we have only to discover and apply in order to reach the Nirvana of a perfect socialist society; on the contrary, that it is by deliberate design that men will build socialist societies, and by deliberate design that they will maintain socialist principles in a form which seems to them to be good. It is an assertion of man’s unity and also his diversity; the validity of certain basic principles for social living, and the variety of their expression. It is a statement that one will not recognize or define a socialist society by its institutions or its statements, but by its fundamental characteristics of equality, cooperation, and freedom.

The Transition to Socialism
By definition, however, the characteristics which identify a socialist state will not exist in their entirety in a state which is trying to build socialism. If the institutions, and the attitudes, of socialism existed it would be socialist; until then it is inevitable that at least some of the essential elements of socialist society will be missing. This is true whether the commitment to socialism is linked with revolution, or whether it follows peaceful political development.

Socialism does not spring ready-made out of the womb of violence. Even the most successful and popular revolution inevitably leaves behind it a legacy of bitterness, suspicion and hostility between members of the society. These are not conducive to the institutions of equality, and make it difficult to build a spirit of co-operation between the whole people. In particular there is always a fear that those who suffered during the revolution may be looking for an opportunity of revenge; there is the memory of injury and bereavement deliberately inflicted, which poisons the relations between men within the society. A violent revolution may make the introduction of socialist institutions easier; it makes more difficult the
development of the socialist attitudes which give life to these institutions.

This is not to say that violent revolutions are always wrong or irrelevant to socialism. Sometimes they are a regrettable necessity because they are the only way to break the power of those who prevent progress towards socialism. But violence is a short cut only to the destruction of the institutions and power groups of the old society; they are not a short cut to the building of the new. For even if change is secured through the violent overthrow of a feudal or a fascist society, the new life has still to be built by and with people who lived in the old society and who were shaped by it even if they reacted against it. The necessity for a violent revolution brings its own problems to the building of socialism; they may be different problems from those experienced by the states which are fortunate enough to be able to move peacefully from one kind of social system to another, but they are nonetheless real.

In fact those who talk as if violence must always and everywhere precede socialism, and who judge a country to be developing towards socialism only if violence has occurred, are almost certainly not socialist in their own attitudes. For violence cannot be welcomed by those who care about people. It is a very serious matter because of the misery and suffering it involves for human beings; it should only be accepted as a necessity when every other road forward is completely blocked and cannot be cleared by persistence, by public determination, or by other expressions of the majority will. Violence itself is the opposite of a socialist characteristic. Brigands can govern by violence and fear; dictatorships can establish themselves and flourish. Socialism cannot be imposed in this way, for it is based on equality. It denies the right of any individual or any small minority, to say, 'I know and the others are fools who must be led like sheep.' Leadership can be given—and indeed must be given—in a socialist state. But it must be the people's leadership, which they accept because ultimately they control it. Socialist leadership is of the people; it cannot be imposed by force or tyranny.

This means that where a violent revolution was a necessary precondition for the establishment of an opportunity to begin the work of building socialism, the early period of transition towards this goal will have certain kinds of non-socialist characteristics. There may well be suspicions, fear, illegalities, and an absence of political freedom; there may be something of a vacuum in effective administration even as brave attempts are made to create the groundwork of socialist economic organizations.

If, on the other hand, the transition out of the old society can be effected by non-violent means, different non-socialist characteristics will be evident as the work of building is in process. There will be many remnants of the preceding social organization; many old habits may continue simply because social upheaval has not forced people to think about them; and old attitudes and behaviour may still be dominant in people holding responsible positions. These things create difficulties for socialist progress just as the aftermath of a revolution creates difficulties. By whichever method the conditions for building socialism are established, a visitor could look at the society in transition and deny its socialism, or its progress, by pointing to characteristics which are non-socialist, or even anti-socialist.

This is as true in Tanzania as elsewhere, and indeed our Union provides examples of the difficulties of both kinds of transition. In Zanzibar the revolution cleared many obstacles from the path of socialism, but it created other difficulties and fears. On the mainland, where political circumstances obviated the necessity for violence, we are able to try to build socialism by evolution—by dealing with the problems one by one in accordance with the consensus of opinion and our capacity at any one time. But this, too, has its difficulties, and the danger that self-seeking men will be able to mislead the people into opposing the struggle forward. And in both parts of the Union we have still to ensure that new privileged groups do not grow out of the post-independence and post-revolutionary forces.

The solution to all these problems depends upon the growth of socialist understanding and socialist attitudes among the people. In particular it depends upon the speed and success with which the concepts of human equality and the people's sovereignty are accepted by the society and the leadership in the society. Institutions can help to spread these ideas and encourage their expression, but they do not in themselves provide an answer. Thus, for example, the Permanent Commission of Enquiry provides machinery through which members of the public can complain against petty tyranny of leaders and officials, but its effectiveness depends upon the willin-
ness of the people to make and to substantiate their complaints, as well as the willingness of Government and Party personnel to correct wrongs which reduce the people’s sovereignty. Or, again, the leadership qualifications are aimed at emphasizing the identity of the leadership and the people, but they can only restrict behaviour negatively—and their intentions can be evaded. There is, in fact, no substitute for the individual moral courage of men; everything ultimately depends upon the determination of the people to be judges over those to whom they have entrusted positions of responsibility and leadership. The only way in which leadership can be maintained as a people’s leadership is if the leaders have reason to fear the judgement of the people.

The people’s purposes in society, however, will only go forward smoothly when they exercise their power over leadership in a calm and deliberate manner—and when the institutions of the society enable them to do so. And the people have to understand their own power, and its importance to their future; they have to understand the basic principles of socialism. Only then will they be able to avoid being used by the jealousies and envious of individuals who seek to exploit, for their own ambition’s sake, the honest mistakes of individual leaders. Only then will the people be able to avoid the blandishments of those who, for their own benefit, pretend that there is a short cut to socialism and to prosperity which the existing leaders stand in the way of. The people’s will must be sovereign; but it will only lead them to the equalities and dignities of socialism if they exert that sovereignty with an understanding of socialism.

THE PROBLEMS OF BUILDING SOCIALISM IN AN EX-COLONIAL COUNTRY

There are particular problems about this in an ex-colonial country like Tanzania. For to build socialism you must have socialists—particularly in leading positions. It is not enough that our people’s traditional life should have been based upon socialist principles; that is good, but it is necessary that the leaders in modernization should also accept those principles and be able to apply them in the very different technological and international conditions of the twentieth century. Further, it is essential that the people should be aware of the new socialist objective and what it means to them.

Yet in Tanzania the great mass campaigns of the 1950s and early 1960s were for independence. We campaigned against colonialism, against foreign domination. We did not campaign against capitalism or for socialism. Creating still more difficulties was the fact that the colonialism we fought against was that of a people who happened to be of a different racial group than ourselves. It was fatally easy to identify the thing you were fighting against as people of this other race—the Europeans. It is true that we in Tanzania campaigned on the grounds of human equality; that has helped us. But the problem Africa knew was that of discrimination against the African majority. We therefore asked, “Why are there no African District Commissioners, administrators, supervisors, secretaries, etc.?”, and often this was transposed into, “Why are there European or Asian—this and that?”. Humanity took second place in this struggle very often; even when political leaders said on public platforms and elsewhere that they would never countenance reverse discrimination after independence, this was sometimes interpreted as a manoeuvre designed to avoid the heavy hand of the colonial authority! Almost throughout Africa, therefore, the first and most vocal demand of the people after independence was for Africanization. They did not demand localization—indeed, the most popular thing would have been for leaders to deny citizenship to non-black residents. Still less did the people demand socialization; they simply demanded the replacement of white and brown faces by black ones. The leaders could therefore receive applause if they replaced white, or brown, capitalists by black ones. Capitalism was the system which the masses knew in the modern sector, and what they had been fighting against was that this modern sector should be in alien hands.

It was not only the masses who looked upon things in this way; many leaders of the independence struggle themselves saw things in these terms. They were not against capitalism; they simply wanted its fruits, and saw independence as the means to that end. Indeed, many of the most active fighters in the independence movement were motivated—consciously or unconsciously—by the belief that only with independence could they attain that ideal of individual wealth which their education or their experience in the modern sector had established as a worthwhile goal. It is in this fact that lies the paradox of the changing classifications given to different African
leaders by the capitalists of the colonial territories. For the ‘extremist’ of the independence period was sometimes the man who was saying, ‘Kill the whites’ because he wanted what they had for himself. In such a case (if he survives) the ‘extremist’ may well become a great defender of capitalism after independence, and he will then probably be reclassified as a ‘moderate’! Similarly, the independence campaigner who opposed the murder of non-Africans could either have been deeply religious, or he could have been a socialist. If he was the latter, his classification by the capitalists after independence is liable to change from ‘moderate’ to ‘extremist’ or ‘communist’!

This lack of ideological content during the independence struggle often served to maintain unity among the anti-colonialist forces, or to prevent a diversion of energies into the difficult questions of socialist education. (It was not always selfishness which made leaders think only in terms of Africanizing the capitalist economy of the colonialists; often they had no knowledge of any alternative). But it can present a serious problem in the post-independence period. Once they have power, some of the leaders whom the people have learned to know and trust will think their nationalism demands expropriation of non-Africans in favour of African citizens; the more sophisticated may deny this but think of economic development in terms of expanding capitalism with the participation of Africans.

Such leaders as these may well identify the progress they have promised the people with the increasing wealth of the few; they will point to African-owned large cars and luxurious houses, and so on, as evidence of growing prosperity and of their own devotion to the cause of national independence. It was on this basis, for example, that some Tanzanian leaders criticized the Arusha Declaration. They said that the leadership qualifications prevented Africans from becoming landowners and businessmen, while Asians and Europeans could continue in these fields as they had done before independence. These critics thus demonstrated their conviction, firstly, that Asian citizens could not or should not desire to hold responsible positions in the society; and secondly, that exploitation was only wrong when carried out upon the masses by people of a different race. Incidentally, they were also showing that they wished to use positions of power for private gain, because almost the only way in which Africans could get the capital to become landlords or capitalists was by virtue of their office or their seniority in the public service. (There were exceptions to this general rule, because there had been isolated instances before independence of Africans establishing themselves in business or modern farming. But in general it was the post-independence accession to power which enabled Africans to enter the capitalist system as owners or employers instead of as workers).

The perpetuation of capitalism, and its expansion to include Africans, will be accepted by the masses who took part in the independence struggle. They may take the new wealth of their leaders as natural and even good—for a time they may even take a reflected pride in it. This may go on for a long period if economic circumstances of the country allow a simultaneous lightening of the general poverty—or even if the conditions of the masses remain static. This public acceptance of African capitalism will be obtained because the people have learned to trust their nationalist leaders, and will wish to honour them. Also there will inevitably be new jobs and opportunities for a good number of the most active, vocal and intelligent of those who might otherwise have led criticism. And on top of that, there will be an end to stupidities like interference with traditional African customs by a foreign Government.

But, sooner or later, the people will lose their enthusiasm and will look upon the independence Government as simply another new ruler which they should avoid as much as possible. Provided it has been possible to avoid any fundamental upset in their traditional economic and social conditions, they will then sink back into apathy—until the next time someone is able to convince them that their own efforts can lead to an improvement in their lives!

It is comparatively easy to get independence from a colonial power—especially one which claims to base its national morality on the principles of freedom and democracy. Everyone wants to be free, and the task of a nationalist is simply to rouse the people to a confidence in their own power of protest. But to build the real freedom which socialism represents is a very different thing. It demands a positive understanding and positive actions, not simply a rejection of colonialism and a willingness to co-operate in non-co-operation. And the anti-colonial struggle will almost certainly have intensified the difficulties.

During the campaign for independence a number of developments
were probably inevitable, or were unavoidable except at great cost. First, is the fact that racialism has been allowed to grow—and may even have been indirectly encouraged during the process of simplifying the issues at stake. In Tanzania the masses remained remarkably free from this disease—and are still free. But many of the leaders suffered from discrimination themselves, and some have been unable to achieve that degree of objectivity which would enable them to direct their hatred towards discrimination itself instead of at the racial group which the discriminators represented. Yet racialism is absolutely and fundamentally contrary to the first principle of socialism—the equality of man.

Second, the most active, and therefore the most popular, of the nationalist leaders may have been people without a socialist conviction. They may either have never had an opportunity to study the problems and possibilities of social and economic organization, or they may even have been people who were motivated by a personal desire for the fruits of capitalism.

Third, all the national Party organization and education were geared to defeating colonialism and to opposing people of another race who happened to be in positions of power. This means that once independence is achieved, and the key positions of power have been Africanized, there is a grave danger that the Party will lose support and will atrophy. The people—and even many of the leaders—may feel that the Party has achieved its purpose; once independence has been attained there is no point in the effort required to sustain it.

All these things mean that after independence the work of building socialism has to be started from the beginning. The people have to be shown another goal—the goal of socialism—and they have to learn that only by extending their efforts for this second purpose will they really benefit from the effort they have already made.

To do this new task a strong Party organization is as essential as it was before independence, but it involves a serious and conscious effort on the part of the leaders. In particular they have to act deliberately so as to emphasize their identification with the people, and so as to remain one of them. During the independence struggle this was no problem: the leaders lived with the people, and were as poor as the masses whom they led. They had no choice in the matter and no particular temptation. In the struggle for socialism the position is different: often the leaders have to live in more comfortable surroundings if they are to do their new Government tasks efficiently, and they are also faced with all the temptations of power. Yet to be effective leaders in this second phase of the freedom struggle, it is essential that they should turn their backs on these temptations; they have to act like socialists and be prepared to account to the people for all the personal wealth which they deploy.

However, it is not only leaders who must be involved in the building of socialism. There must be an active adult education system which is directed at helping the people to understand the principles of socialism and their relevance to real development and freedom. There must be local institutions of socialism—co-operative societies which are under the effective control of the members, ujamaa villages, and so on. These are as essential to the building of ujamaa as the Government action which secures control of the key points of the economy for the people at the same time as it mobilizes all the resources of skill and experience which are available. In addition, new economic, social and political institutions must be created which will stress the equality of all men regardless of race or tribe, and which will enable the people to make their voices heard throughout the society. Yet all this must be done under conditions which safeguard these infant institutions, and the young state, from subversion. These things must be achieved while the people are protected against the manipulation of those who are so arrogant that they wish to enforce their own judgement of what is ‘the good life’.

This is formidable—though not exhaustive—list of work to be done even when stated in such broad and general terms. It becomes much more difficult when translated into practice—when you begin to work out the details which appear insignificant but which can make all the difference to success or failure. The difficulties are exacerbated in Africa where the responsibilities and temptations of new nationhood coincide with a great shortage of educated people, of finance, and of committed, modern, and thinking socialists. But these same difficulties also provide unique opportunities. Because a new nation has been created, the people are ready and anxious for change—they only need leadership based on human respect. And the absence of large financial resources—once it is understood and accepted—forces a concentration on the abilities and the importance of men rather than money, and thus orientates
the society towards the development of man instead of material wealth. The very magnitude of the problem creates a challenge, and the major difficulty is to relate the hard, detailed work, and the long-drawn-out struggle forward, to the ultimate goal.

In Tanzania we have begun the work of building socialism. So far all that we have really achieved is some success in showing people that there is another goal to work for now that our independence exists. For the rest we have tried to prevent the growth of new and stronger groups with a vested interest in capitalism; we have established some of the institutions through which the people can speak; and we have just begun to search out and help the local experiments in modern socialism. We have defined our policies in education, in rural development, and have listed our expectations of leadership. But we are NOT a socialist society. Our work has only just begun. Of particular priority are the outstanding tasks of socialist adult education, and of strengthening the people's self-confidence and pride. These are the essential preliminaries to real freedom from the abuse of power, and from the dangers of manipulation by ambitious, dishonest, and selfish men. They are also fundamental to the people's active participation in, and control of, the development of a new society.

The ultimate success in the work of building socialism in Tanzania—as elsewhere—depends upon the people of this nation. For any society is only what the people make it. The benefit to the people of a socialist society will depend upon their contribution to it—their work, their co-operation for the common good, and their acceptance of each other as equals and brothers.

To the extent that we in Tanzania succeed in the struggle to which we have committed ourselves, so we shall be taking our place in the march of humanity towards peace and human dignity. For too long we in Africa—and Tanzania as part of Africa—have slept, and allowed the rest of the world to walk round and over us. Now we are beginning to wake up and to join with our fellow human beings in deciding the destiny of the human race. By thinking out our own problems on the basis of those principles which have universal validity, Tanzania will make its contribution to the development of mankind. That is our opportunity and our responsibility.

August 1968

J.K.N.