



NO. 20

JANUARY 1975

IN THIS ISSUE

GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
PARADOX OF DEMOCRACY
WHY SOCIALISM
ENVIRONMENT AND PRODUCTIVE FORCES IN TANZANIA
RELIGIOUS MYSTIFICATION
POEMS.....

TANU YOUTH LEAGUE
THE UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM

"H A J I H A J I"

January 1975

Issue No. 20

Published by :
THE TANU YOUTH LEAGUE,
University District,
P.O. Box 35054,
DAR ES SALAAM
Tanzania.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Kulikoyela Kahigi
Gibe Nyalobi
Majola Mbele
Laurean Tibasana
Paul Bateyunga
Salha George
Thereza Komba
Ndimila Kapiga

C O N T E N T S

	Page
1. IN LIEU OF EDITORIAL NOTES	ii
2. EDITORIAL	iii
3. CAN A GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY BRING ABOUT DEVELOPMENT ?	1
4. OPERATION MARA: PARADOX OF DEMOCRACY	17
5. POEMS	30
6. WHY SOCIALISM	31
7. THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF TANZANIA	41
8. THE BIG LIE	46

* * * * *

OPPRESSED OF THE WORLD UNITE !
YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR CHAINS !
YOU HAVE A WORLD TO WIN !

* * * * *

DISCLAIMER

THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN ARTICLES
PUBLISHED IN THIS JOURNAL ARE THOSE
OF THE CONTRIBUTORS. THEY DO NOT
NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF
EITHER THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE OR
THE TANU YOUTH LEAGUE, UNIVERSITY
DISTRICT.

Instead of the occasional editorial notes, we hereby publish a shorter part of K. Libwelelo's long poem Raging Song Today. This poem is an attempt to portray the contemporary social reality in the country. It does not take account of the latest developments, but that is of no consequence for the main trends depicted are as dominant today as when the poem was written a year ago.

=====

we now come to this our land
which is part of the troubled world:
there was the song of the poverty
of our villages
which told a grim epic in million pages
and there was the city -
symbol of sophistication
housing low workers, unemployed rabble
the surfeited rich rolling in benzis
luxurious bungalows and conspicuous
consumption
contradictions
life devoid of harmony full of strife
violence-bound hatred-bound
we sing of the wind that blew over
the land
bringing hope where there was none
we sing of the thunderous awakening
caused by the wind
and the fever that gripped the people
the poets of the people applauded
the wind
and the awakening (Azimio).....

and so we awoke and thought:
"We are now awake, we are not asleep:
waves are beating a new note now."
but who knew that revolution is a
special bride who needs new house
so that she can thrive and strive?
who knew that revolution while
striving and thriving
ought to rumble like thunder
and flash like lightning
to frighten off the cunning vitches
of night and to destroy impregnable
bastions of inhumanity?
so it became a timely herald
of yet a fierce struggle to behold:
the neo-colonial python still alive
the nascent petty bourgeoisie still
at large.....
yet Ujamaa villages for peasants
were fine
for weren't new horizons at hand as
old villages gave way to new ones?
weren't new horizons at hand
with new songs
songs of peasants and workers
being sung in the land
in dances resounding with new
drumbeats?

...we have been oppressed a great
deal,
we have been exploited a great deal..
now we want a revolution...

.....

the crashing collision of class
interests and outlooks
antagonistic emotions rising
comrades, rise rise in invincible
numbers, against this disease
injected into the body of the
living by the bacillus of
underdevelopment!

now sees:
peasants disillusioned by falling
prices on the world market
peasants still disillusioned by
inefficient and corrupt
co-operatives (money still escape
into clever hands and poverty into
benused hands!)

peasants and workers oppressed by
rising prices of consumer goods
still oppressed by oppressive
machinery
workers and peasants tired of
politicians' false empty
uncommitted loud talk about Ujamaa
lip-service commitment....

truly here is
clarity lacking, commitment lacking
here is full-blooming enlighten-
ment lacking!
the prescriptions are lamentably
ineffective - they do not touch
the roots - while mystification
and muddling prevails!
the results of the traumatizing
blow of imperialism
the reign of confused ideas and
ideals, the gag of revolutionary
theory and practice

Ujama's cause is gagged
boggled are we in mystification,
sabotage, bureaucratic lassitude
apathy, hypocrisy!

and so surely we need another drum
to thunder and awaken the people-
workers and peasants - to gird
up their loins....

we should identify the enemy
the saboteurs, mystifiers, confusers
the petty bourgeoisie....

BUT beware, beware!
those who think that we shall
remain apathetic are wrong:
FORCES continue to gather, AND
the anger of the people against
the mystifiers, saboteurs, confusers
posing as socialist leaders!

EDITORIAL

This issue of MAJI MAJI is chiefly concerned with the contemporary Tanzanian politico-economic situation. Apart from the article on WHY SOCIALISM, which is more general but all the same answering some fundamental issues - in regard to Socialism as a historical necessity and inevitability - which have been distorted by bourgeois ideologues, the rest of the articles deal precisely with the burning issues of strategy, ideology and implementation in relation to the building of Ujamaa in this country.

Of paramount importance among the issues discussed is the current mobilization of peasants by moving them into development villages - in accordance with Resolution 14 and 15 of the 16th TANU Biennial Conference (24/9 - 1/10/1973) which demanded rapid villagisation in the whole country. This mobilization, however, has raised once again the question of whether a bureaucratic bourgeoisie can lead a country to real socialism. Naturally, after the call for villagisation, the bureaucracy responded in its characteristic manner. In many cases (as in the case of Mara discussed in this issue), it completely disregarded all tenets of Ujamaa, it did not even educate the people, and so people were not involved in decisions which would affect their lives. It just implemented the resolution from above. More often than not, force has been used in the name of the Party; people have been harassed and dehumanized in the name of the Party. Justification for the use of force has not been difficult to find: peasants have been accused of being reluctant to respond to the Party's call. As usual, we are not told why such peasants have been reluctant. No wonder that the affected victims should ask themselves such questions as: Is this how Ujamaa operates? Is this the Ujamaa which is meant to liberate us? Of course they know the answer, knowing as they do who is using force against who, and who is actually benefitting from the system. This is the paradox of our Ujamaa.

Undoubtedly, the villagisation scheme will make peasants produce more. But will producing more solve the basic economic malady plaguing the country? To a very large extent, they will be producing for the world market - a capitalist market. The international division of labour which condemns underdeveloped countries to a peripheral status in the capitalist system as producers of raw materials and buyers of manufactured goods will continue. Meanwhile the petty bourgeoisie will continue entrenching themselves. Exploitation of peasants will continue.

This brings us to the basic problem which Mwalimu has already stated more than once: that we are trying to build socialism without socialists. We should yet ask ourselves another question which follows from that statement. Can a mass party (such as our own which managed to evict the colonial flag and white faces), controlled by the petty bourgeoisie and open to all people of differing interests and outlooks (workers and peasants, the petty bourgeoisie, mystics, Christian socialists and African socialists, the lot!) successfully face the challenge of building Ujamaa? OF COURSE NOT.

For building Socialism is a class issue. A socialist revolution entails the total socio-politico-economic transformation whereby the working masses capture, control and wield political power and institute a socialist democracy. The prerequisite of such a revolution is the existence of an exclusively working class party with a firm proletarian ideological stand. Which means that without the creation of a vanguard party with a dialectical materialist approach to the whole issue of revolution, a vanguard party whose scientific ideological stance and strategy are free from any mystification and idealism, building socialism will remain a daydream.

It is therefore hightime the progressive leadership of the party officially endorsed the concept of class struggle, thereby transforming our Ujamaa from an undialectical category to a dynamic, creative proletarian ideology. This, we know, is a class issue, too. But unless building Socialism is regarded as a class issue,

all the talk about disengagement from the world capitalist system and building a self-reliant economy will remain empty talk, since the petty bourgeoisie which is in power will at most only take half-measures which won't change the basic structure of society. The concept of "revolution through evolution" which we have been advocating should be discarded too. It is high time we realised that gradualism, which is part and parcel of the doctrine of bourgeois liberalism, will only ensure the entrenchment of petty bourgeois interests and the continual reproduction of the system of underdevelopment which is characterized by our peripheral status in the capitalist system and the low level of development of productive forces.

Ideological mystification should be fought relentlessly. Let's face the grim reality glaring at us, the reality of classes and class struggle.

"It is very crucial to try and understand why the bureaucracy is so slow in disengaging, why it continues to rely on advisers from the very capitalist firms (not just countries), and why it has not given absolute priority to consumer necessities and capital projects. There are undoubtedly a few elements who are ideologically hostile to Socialism and who are still the direct spokesmen of external interests. There are many more who are indifferent and intellectually lazy, and since they are not committed firmly to change, they too are unwitting allies of anti-Tanzanian forces. The class struggle involving exposing the difference between revolutionary and non-revolutionary ideas. It involves scrutinizing the overall implications of the policies pursued by the economic bureaucracy at every stage. Because these ideas and policies are associated with individuals, it means drawing the line between those who are prepared to come over to the side of the labouring masses and those who are interested in preserving personal privileges incompatible with socialism." (WALTER RODNEY, Some implications of the Questions of Disengagement from Imperialism. MAJI MAJI No. I.)

"No revolutionary doubts that the eventual outcome of the Class Struggle in Tanzania and Africa will be victory for the workers and peasants; and it follows that the battle of ideas will be won by progressive tendencies allied to workers and peasants. It is the timing of the victory which is at issue, and one of the most crucial factors affecting that is the extent to which sections of the petty-bourgeoisie attach themselves to and actually transform themselves into workers. Petty-bourgeois intellectuals must have the humility and integrity to admit that in a certain sense they are no less self-appointed spokesmen of the masses than the others who are selling Africa down the drain. The Revolution requires that the millions who have been gagged throughout history should speak and choose. It is the responsibility of the revolutionaries to find ways and means of indicating to peasants and workers the relevance of socialist ideology..." (W. Rodney, *ibid*).

"THE EVOLUTION OF RURAL POLICIES IN TANZANIA"

or

"CAN A GOVERNMENT BUREAUCRACY BRING ABOUT DEVELOPMENT?"

Summary

At independence Tanzania inherited a peasant economy. In order to get minimum cash incomes peasants cultivated cash crops, but in the world division of labour, these cash crops could not be the basis of a sustained rise in living standards.

Peasants realised this most of the time, and therefore resisted growing cash crops.

Government staff and politicians tried to persuade them to grow more crops, sometimes using force to persuade them, and sometimes using the promise of higher incomes. But mostly the staff were ignored, often their advice was technically unsound, and when peasants did decide to grow more crops it was not usually because of staff.

Since independence Tanzania has used these same staff to try and increase production, and in 1972 their potential power to use force was much increased by the decentralisation measures. Moreover the implementation of "ujamaa" has gradually come to use more and more force.

But, as pointed out by Mwalimu Nyerere himself, force is bound to fail, since it regards those on whom it is used as less than human being, alienates them and discourages them from growing more.

To liberate productive forces and increase production and enthusiasm people have to plan things for themselves, and to believe that a better life for themselves and their children will come if they work harder.

This cannot happen without a struggle which puts the workers and peasants in power in place of the bureaucratic class. All other policies - i.e., the use of even more force, and the use of less and an attempt to re-establish individualistic production - are in the present situation bound to fail.

A Peasant Economy

At independence in 1961 Tanzania inherited a peasant economy which was rather unimportant appendage of the world capitalist system.

That is to say that most of the 95% of its people who lived in the rural areas grew most of their own food, built their own houses, collected their own fuel, maintained most of their own roads, and in as many ways as possible tried to be independent of the market economy.

But (and this is true of all peasant economies) they were not independent. One of the first actions of the Germans had been to force some of the peasants to grow cotton. The Germans and later the British had imposed taxes which had to be paid in money and this had been designed to force the local people to produce cash products (cash crops) for money. Later they had encouraged Asian traders to go into the remotest areas selling consumer goods in exchange for money, and by the time of independence the colonists had created a situation that in many parts of the country the desire for consumer goods could provide the motivation to earn money by growing cash crops. The peasants became accustomed to imported textiles, aluminium cooking pots, paraffin lamps, salt, sugar, tea, etc., and bus and lorry transport, so they became more and more dependent. To maintain their way of life they had little alternative except to grow some cash crops. They were thus trapped within the world capitalist system.¹

The production of cash crops led to a relative prosperity in certain regions. This was especially true in certain periods of times - the coffee farmers of Kilimanjaro, Bukoba and Tugueya in the 1950s (to some extent today), and the cotton growers of Sukumaland again in the 1960s.

But this apparent prosperity was totally dependent on the state of the world capitalist system. When this all but collapsed in the late 1920s and the 1930s and world prices fell the Mwanza cotton farmers got less than 10 cents per lb. of seed cotton, and the Bukoba coffee farmers less than 25 cents per lb. for their robusta coffee. At the time of the 1974-75 crisis (October, 1974) the world capitalist system has been thrown into a deep recession and few commentators think that a collapse similar in scale to the 1930s can be avoided.² If this happens coffee, cotton, sisal and other cash crop world commodity prices (at present held artificially high by speculative pressures in the world markets) will come crashing down. Tanzania will then be as bankrupt and defenseless as Bangladesh is today. The peasants will have no say in the matter. He will not be consulted, nor will he be able to challenge the system - he will simply suffer a drastic fall in his living standard. But he will survive. As a recent commentator

"It was this basic self-reliance which allowed overseas buyers to lower the prices for the colonial farmers' products beneath their labour value, which permitted an expensive transport system to be built with foreign materials to carry the produce to town and which made sure that the farmer would still carry on with his cash crop production after every economic crisis in the capitalist centres. In the case of such a crisis the colonial peasant could be expected to wait patiently until his labour was again demanded, 'subsisting' in the meanwhile from what he could produce by himself."³

In any case much of the short-term prosperity was confined to a few relatively richer individuals. Mount Kilimanjaro to this day supports some of the worst malnutrition statistics in the country. For many Chagga farmers the coming of coffee has meant a worse diet and more work as their cows produced less milk and as the grass to feed them had to be carried from farther and farther away.⁴ But meanwhile a few who were related to chiefs and who therefore had more land than the majority have been able to hire labourers to pick their coffee. Others who invested early in education have been able to build grand houses with the money sent back by civil servant relatives - but this has been possible because of the rate of expansion of the civil service and the parastatals more than because of the production of coffee!

For the majority of the people of Tanzania, the coming of colonialism and cash crops did not mean much of a change in their standard of living.⁵ It is true that some children went to school, that transport and communications and the possibility of travel increased, that imported textiles replaced traditional clothings, and that medical facilities increased. But the people still mainly lived in traditional houses, and in most parts of Tanzania many of them were still under-fed. Indeed in many areas they were worse fed than they had been in (say) the 1870s - for the coming of the rinderpest deprived areas as far apart as Handeni, Kigoma, Karagwe and Songea of cattle, and thus reduced the protein content of their diets and made them very vulnerable to any failure of the rains. The tsetse fly was then able to invade these areas and make it very difficult for cattle to come back. In such places the people today are more poorly fed, and have to work harder for less food, than they did in the days before the German conquest of Tanzania.⁶

The apparent relative prosperity of the coffee, cotton and cashew nut areas of Tanzania and the ideology of "progressive farmers" which supports it, has tended to hide the hopelessness of a development strategy based on a further development of these crops. For the system of "unequal exchange" between the developed and the underdeveloped world makes it impossible for these cash crops to provide sustained growth. For example, if coffee of sisal cultivation becomes very profitable, what can we expect to happen? There will be a rapid expansion of acreage in Tanzania and elsewhere, and this will lead to world over-production. The coffee and sisal prices will therefore be forced down and the period of prosperity will end. The overseas demand for these products is limited so that they cannot provide the basis for a sustained expansion.

The local market is equally unable to provide the basis for a sustained expansion. The peasant sector is, and will remain, so depressed that it will not provide wide markets for more than a few industrial goods. In this situation industrialists can only profitably establish a small range of import substituting and processing industries. They cannot profitably establish capital goods industries. The whole economy can therefore never expand in a self-sustaining way. It will always be dependent on outside manufacturers. Because of the need to keep taxes high to support an ever-expanding bureaucratic apparatus it will be impossible to raise farmers prices. The peasant economy can therefore only be depressed - a docile appendage of the capitalist system.

Peasants and Staff

The colonial Government hired "agricultural assistants" to ensure that farmers grew cash crops. These people enforced the Government's rules and regulations:

"The various regulations related to every conceivable aspect of farming practice and land use. ... Basically, however, they could be grouped together into three categories: those dealing with anti-erosion measures ..., those aiming at improved methods of cultivation ... and of animal husbandry ... and those designed to prevent famine"⁷

The peasants naturally opposed these rules, however well intentioned or technically sound they were (and many were not technically sound) for they interfered with their freedom to decide what they would grow and how they would grow it. Shortly after the founding of TANU the rules became unenforceable. Thus the policy of using rules and regulations to bring in better agricultural practices totally failed - indeed it was by opposing these unpopular measures that the TANU leaders obtained the support of the peasants and united the country for independence.⁸

The colonial government switched to using the desire for consumer goods as the main motivation to persuade farmers to give cash crops. The staff who had been policing the rules and regulations now became "advisers" who were supposed to teach the farmers better agricultural methods.

Government staff, however, have been exceedingly ineffective as far as teaching the farmers better methods. On the one hand many changes that have been enthusiastically taken up by farmers have not been introduced by Government staff. On the other hand most of the things the staff have tried to persuade peasants to do they have not done.

Here are some of the innovations in Tanzanian agriculture successfully introduced with little or no help from government staff:

1. The irrigation furrows on Mount Kilimanjaro
2. The agricultural system on Ukara island in Lake Victoria.

These two are included here as the peaks of pre-colonial agricultural innovation in Tanzania. The Ukara island system involves at least the following innovations:

- a) animal manure is carefully collected and carried to the fields; every part of the unirrigated arable land is provided with manure frequently and regularly
- b) green manure - leguminous crops are deliberately grown to be ploughed in before they are ripe to improve the soil. Leaves, household wastes and fertile soil from the lakeside is also carried to the fields and dug in.
- c) in upland areas furrow irrigation is carried out from streams.
- d) in lower areas a "closely inter-woven network of embankments, terraces and canals" is used to irrigate rice fields
- e) by the lake-side "water meadow farming" is carried out in low-lying areas flooded by the lake when the wind blows the water in. In the meadows elephant grass and other fodder crops are grown to be cut and fed to the cattle.
- f) weeds and crop residues are also used as fodder for stall-fed cattle, as are the branches of 39 types of trees and shrubs.

- g) stone walls lessen rain and wind erosion
- h) cattle paths are raised up to prevent cattle trampling on crops on their way to the fields, and the cattle wear special muzzles to prevent them eating crops on their way to the fields.

In this system the farmers have to work hard all the year round and (since they have no cash crops) by conventional standards they are poor. Yet the system supports a population density of 537 inhabitants per sq. mile (i.e., the density of population on Kilimanjaro) on soil like that of Sukumaland.⁹

3. hedge sisal in the Lake Regions. Production of this crop grew "spontaneously" against the wishes of the chiefs and the Government staff once a market for it had been established in 1949, and in 1950 it provided almost as much income as cotton: (Cotton at the time had been encouraged by staff and chiefs for over 30 years!)¹⁰
4. cardamom in the East Usambara was taken up following the initiative of a private capitalist. Government staff could not initially support the crop, since most of the land used was in forest reserves.
5. the cocoa crop in the Kyela area has grown rapidly with little emphasis by the staff.
6. cashew-nuts in Southern Tanzania, the export of which did not become significant until the 1950s, spread largely without the help of staff, since there were very few staff posted to the South.

Conversely, one can find some instances where staff do seem to have had some impact on the introduction of new crops. Tea and tobacco are obvious examples. But of course these were primarily cultivated by Europeans with very high prices but also involving considerable technical problems, so that peasants were highly motivated towards growing them, and depended on the staff to teach them the relevant skills. In such cases staff may have an impact - because the initiative comes from the farmers rather than from them - this situation is discussed further below.

But we can also find many studies of the ineffectiveness of Government agricultural extension staff. The most devastating study concerned cotton and was carried out by Hulls as part of the Sukumaland interdisciplinary research project. It involved interviewing a cross-section of the peasantry in various Districts of Sukumaland. Hulls found that the peasants were not accepting the better methods which the extension staff were trying to promote:

"Considered overall only 38% of the cotton was planted during the recommended period ... The average plant population was about half (50.8%) of the recommended Only seven farmers used fertiliser or insecticide, that is 3% of the sample. ... There is no evidence that contact with the bwana shamba has any influence on the numbers of farmers who planted at the recommended time. ... In short the failure to communicate modern agricultural technology to the vast majority of the farmers in Sukumaland appears to have been almost total."¹¹

He then carried out another test. He obtained some improved maize seed and provided mimeographed instructions as to how to use it. He and a student from the University of Dar es Salaam then set up 26 small groups of farmers who were very enthusiastic to try out the new seed and who were given the improved seed on the understanding that they would cultivate it together on a small communal plot, and follow the instructions of the extension worker. Again his conclusion was very depressing:

"This is probably the only time in the careers of any of the Bwana Shamba that their effectiveness in communicating new techniques has been critically examined. The performance of most of them leaves much to be desired. Each Bwana Shamba was given clear, written instructions on how to grow the crop. That so many groups failed to follow these instructions is the inescapable responsibility of the Bwana Shamba in charge."¹²

An important recent study by G. Tschannerl¹³ has shown how in at least one important case (rural water supply) the way that the Government staff and foreign aid donors have organised themselves leads them to actively discourage the peasants from offering self-help labour (arguing that self-help is unreliable and unpredictable and that it is simpler and quicker to hire labourers). Thus the peasants participate fully in neither the planning nor the implementation of the water supply projects. When the projects are finished they expect the government that built them to maintain them, and in any case because they did not participate in building them they do not fully understand how to repair them, and they are therefore compelled to depend on the government. Tschannerl describes all this as "technique in command" and contrasts it with the alternative of "politics in command" and under which it would have been the peasants who liberated themselves in which case their first concern would have been to discover techniques which they could manage themselves and they would have certainly used self-help.

All the studies of Government staff have noted that they tended to serve the richer kulak farmers first.¹⁴ This is hardly surprising when one considers that until recently it was government policy to give preference to such kulaks (they were called "progressive farmers"). These are being influenced to become small capitalists - with the mentality of using the money they have to make more money. Such people have an obvious interest in learning better methods and often educated a little and richer, and therefore good drinking partners for the staff.

"The wealthy peasants and the penetrators (staff) cooperate with each other in so many spheres. In fact reciprocal forms of assistance between the two groups are so numerous by comparison with the bonds that exist between government staff and the mass of the peasantry, that we may rightly consider the kulaks and the staff people to form a coalition."¹⁵

Finally we cannot avoid noting that time and time again the technical advice given by staff to peasants was technically wrong - due to failure to take account of the conflicting aims of a peasant farmer, or to try our research station results in local areas before recommending them. Here are just a few examples:

1. early planting of cotton conflicted with the need of the Sukuma farmer to secure his food supply by planting his maize first.
2. the advice to plant in pure stands was often only valid if insecticide was to be used. Otherwise mixed stands saved weeding and made better use of plant nutrients and moisture in the soil.

3. the spacing recommendations for cotton were only valid if fertilizer was used.
4. fertilizer was recommended (and forced on farmers) in parts of Ukerewe where the soil had been used over and over again and had thus gone acidic. The acid prevented the fertilizer having any effect.
5. fertilizer has been recommended on cotton and maize crops without awareness that it would also fertilize the weeds, and therefore require more weeding.
6. cotton has been recommended as a cash crop in the "Eastern Zone" where paddy, cashewnuts, and various pulses provide much higher incomes for less work.
7. fertilizer has been recommended in dry areas such as Dodoma, where in a bad year the crop fails anyway, so that in the very year when a peasant or village needs money to buy food, if it uses fertilizer it finds itself in debt.

One could go on with this list indefinitely, and many more examples can be found in the paper of Belshaw and Hall.¹⁶ But it should be clear that only one such mistake in an area will destroy any trust that peasants might have in staff. It was inevitable given the history of the staff that the relationship between them and the peasants would be antagonistic. These failures re-enforced this already inevitable fact.

Are Peasants Lazy?

When peasants will not do what the staff think they ought to do the staff react by calling the peasants lazy.

It is also objectively true that most peasants in Tanzania do not work as hard as peasants in India or China, and that they could work harder if they wanted to.

But the question is: why should they work harder? A peasant in the coastal areas of Tanzania can get a very reasonable income (by the standards set by other areas of Tanzania) by planting cashew-nut and coconut trees, by growing cassava and by a little fishing.¹⁷ Why should he do more? Why, for example, should he grow a crop like cotton which will require a lot of work for rather a small additional income? And what use is that extra income? And what use is that extra income to him? Life goes on much as ever. If he has more free time and chooses to use it playing bao, dancing ngomas and discussing politics can one blame him? Provided that he is not parasitic on others can one accuse him of doing wrong? Presumably if he could see some point in working harder he would do so. So if he does not work terribly hard it is presumably because he sees little point in doing so. If he works harder he notices that somebody else gets most of the benefit - the corrupt cooperative official, the salaried staff member, or (very correctly) the foreign consumer who buys his cash crops. He thus does not think that more work can significantly change his life. And the historical record suggests that he is right.

A person who says that peasants are lazy cannot be a socialist. He is not asking why they do not work. He is not working among the people, or with them, for if he was he would have more sympathy with exploited peasants. Instead he dissociates himself from them, and blames them rather than himself for the problems of the country. If he was a socialist he would start by showing them how they are exploited, and he

would then show them how they can combine to throw off the exploiting classes, and build a new life. He would not talk about lazy peasants, he would talk about class struggle.

In fact a staff member who complains that peasants are lazy is a typical petty-bourgeois - sitting in security supported by a salary, not dependent on his own labour, and complaining about other people.

Paradoxically, if anyone is lazy it is the staff, as an important study by the Social Science Research Committee showed. The staff worked an average of only 31½ hours per week, and visited on average only ten farms per week, and the study concluded that

"the performance of the field contact staff is often characterised by several weaknesses or limitations. They work fairly short hours, miss work days, make few visits, are diverted onto a wide range of duties, spend much time on travel, wage payments, reports and other activities not directly productive. In addition we have seen that most fieldmen work in a fairly ad hoc way, calling on farmers and visiting areas almost at whim"18

The President has often argued that development cannot come from outsiders, that people can only develop themselves:

"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. ... No-one can be forced into an ujamaa village 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."19

In the same policy paper (Freedom and Development) he also explained that many mistakes had been made and that it was very important that the right lessons should be learnt from these mistakes:

"When we tried to promote rural development in the past we sometimes spent huge sums of money on establishing a settlement In other cases we just encouraged young men to leave the towns for a rural area and then left them to their own devices We acted on the assumption that there was a short cut to rural development in these rural areas. All too often, therefore, we persuaded people to go to the 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."20

He also emphasised that ujamaa living would have to start - as in China - with small groups of people rather than large villages:

"The policy is, in fact, the result from learning from the failures which we have had and from the successes of those small groups which began and grew on a different basis."21

And he writes about a possible village with only 7 members:

" ... 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. ... There is no other way forward, because ... 5 who come in unwillingly can destroy the efforts of 15 who want to work out a new pattern for themselves."

Such statements as these coming out in Presidential papers will amaze anyone who reads the newspapers in 1974. For by then the approved size of a village was 300-500 families, more than a million people had moved to new villages in one Region alone (and similar movements had occurred in most other regions) and most of them had moved within the space of a few months, and the newspaper headlines ("200 Peasants Face Court Action", "Bye-laws to Ensure Proper Land Usage", "Dodoma Tough on Lazy Farmers", and most revealing "Runaway Villagers to be Sent Home") proved that many of these moves were not voluntary.²²

How was such a complete change from the 1968 statements possible? The only way to understand this is to examine historically how the ujamaa programme developed. The following is a summary of the most important changes in the way ujamaa was approached:

- April, 1962. Publications of the President's pamphlet "Ujamaa - The Basis of African Socialism", proposing that all development must be based on the attitude of mind ("Ujamaa") of the "traditional" African extended family.²³
- December 1962. Nyerere's inaugural address as President: "The first and absolutely essential thing to do, therefore, if we want to be able to start using tractors for cultivation, is to begin living in proper villages For the next few years the Government will be doing all it can to enable the farmers of Tanganyika to come together in village communities."²⁴
- 1962 and 1963. A mass (about 1000) of spontaneous "settlement schemes" sprang up all over Tanzania. About half of these were under the leadership of the TANU Youth League, and about a third of the total tried to grow sisal. They had the enthusiasm of pioneers.²⁵ The Ruvuma Development Association which inspired many of the ideas in the President's 1967 papers dates from this period.
- 1963-1965. Problems of the spontaneous schemes led to a belief that "change must be planned". The bureaucracy could not supervise so many projects, and agriculture proved tougher than many settlers had expected. So the Government abandoned the spontaneous schemes, and concentrated on "supervised settlement schemes", in which there were never more than 40.
1966. The Ross Report (presented to the Government in late 1965 but never published) had made it clear that the 40 settlement schemes had been a disastrous waste of resources, being over-capitalised, badly planned, and through spoon-feeding the settlers (e.g. by providing them with too much free food).

January, 1967. The Arusha Declaration put the emphasis on self-reliance, at a national level ("gifts and loans will endanger our independence"), and at a local level ("hard work is the root of development").²⁶

September, 1967. The President's Paper, "Socialism and Rural Development" made Ujamaa the official policy of the Country ("Tanzanian socialism must be firmly based on the land and its workers". "We shall achieve the goals we have set ourselves if the basis of Tanzanian life consists of rural economic and social communities where people live together and work together for the good of all"). It was implied that the peasants themselves would start the villages.²⁷

1968. A few villages were started, but often (as in Handeni and West Lake) they were started by enthusiastic local politicians using force or threats of force. In October, therefore, the President issued the paper "Freedom and Development" (which is quoted at length above - e.g., "No one can be forced into an ujamaa village").²⁸

1969. In March "Presidential Circular No. 1 of 1969" directed that "All Government policies, and the activities and decisions of all Government officials, must therefore be geared towards emphasising the advantages of living together and working together for the good of all".²⁹ This policy change was fully reflected in the Second Five Year Plan for Tanzania which started in July 1969. From this time on all Government Departments started placing as many of their projects as they could in ujamaa villages. The Regional Development Fund was made available for financing small projects in ujamaa villages. Government staff could therefore promise provision of services to any group willing to work together and call itself an ujamaa village. The Government staff thus became the main initiators of ujamaa villages. But this method of starting villages broke any link that might have existed between success in production and receipts of aid - i.e., many unproductive and rather uncommitted villages received lots of aid. 1969 also saw the start of "Operation Rufiji", whose idea was to move the whole population of the lower Rufiji floodplain onto higher ground not so near the river, and the banning of the Ruvuma Development Association by the Central Committee of TANU, ostensibly for acting as a focus of opposition to the Party but perhaps for being too self-reliant and acting independently of the Government and the Party bureaucracy.

1970. Concerned about the number of new villages, and their apparent lack of organisation and planning, the President sent "Presidential Planning Teams" to the areas where there were many villages. Many members of these teams lacked local experience (though they were all Tanzanian), and they only had time to stay for a few days at most in each village. The plans they produced therefore consisted (mainly) of over-enthusiastic acreage targets, and long lists of "aids" to be given to the villages by Government departments. Three of the planning teams were sent to Dodoma where "Operation Dodoma" was conceived to solve the problems of Dodoma Region by moving all the people in the region into planned villages near water supplies. Under the dynamic (but somewhat authoritarian) leadership of the Regional Commissioner, Dr. Klerruu, 750 villages were started in Mtwara Region.

1971. Over 30,000 Gogo families moved into 190 villages in Dodoma. The villages were very large, two villages having more than 500 families. The Government ploughed 21,000 acres for them by tractor, but cultivation and harvesting were to be individual. Dr. Klerruu was transferred from Mtwara to Iringa, where, by the end of the year, 629 new villages had been started (there were only 22 in December 1970). He attempted to confront the African capitalist maize farmers of Ismani, and one of them shot him on Christmas Day, 1971.³⁰
1972. More "Operations" were launched in Chunya and Kigoma, and decentralisation measures implemented in July 1972 put many of the most able and experienced Government staff into the regions, where one of their main tasks was to organise Operations. However, there were problems with communal production - e.g., in some of the Rufiji villages which had been registered as "Producer Cooperatives" (the most advanced type of ujamaa village) there was in fact no communal cultivation at all. The tendency in such places was to emphasise black-farming and no longer to attempt communal agriculture. These trends were re-enforced by the Iringa Declaration ("Siasa ni Kilimo") of May 1972 which was heavily technocratic in orientation - it stressed the need to raise productivity and how this could be done using simple technology, but it put little emphasis on communal work.³¹
1973. "Operations" were implemented over all the low-density areas of the country, with de-emphasis of ujamaa and emphasis on "Development Villages" or "Songembele Villages" (after the Regional who started Operation Rufiji and was by then starting villages in Shinyanga). Mwalimu announced that villages should have up to 500 families, and then on November 6 that "To live in Villages is an Order" - to be carried out by the end of 1976. Meanwhile in 1973 Tanzania imported over 25,000 tons of maize. This was partly a consequence of drought, but also caused by loss of marketed production from such areas as Ismani where the operations had been implemented.³²
1974. The "order" was carried out with great speed (e.g., by October the Mwanza leaders were able to announce that in their region more than one million peasants had moved into planned villages). There were cases of destruction of property and use of force. One of the main requirements for the new villages was to be along main roads - and this was implemented regardless of the consequences for agriculture - e.g., in Karagwe where the roads run along the top of hills people were moved from the fertile valleys where they cultivated to the tops of hills, while in nearby Kibondo where the road ran at the bottom of fertile hills people were moved from the hills to the valleys. In Mwanza many houses were built on the most fertile cotton lands, and in many areas (e.g., Sumbawanga) people were moved to land around missions or water supplies which was of poor fertility and away from the distant areas where the soil was better and from where most of the surplus production came. The Rufiji move was also liable to upset the effective use of parts of the flood-plain - some of the potentially most productive land in the country. Meanwhile the country was importing 1,200 million/- worth of food for the period March 1974 - September 1975 and on August 15 the President warned that food imports would be impossible the next year as there would not be enough foreign exchange. As food plantings fell most districts re-activated colonial bye-laws to enforce minimum acreages (e.g., in Dodoma farmers were to have identity cards issued by TANU to show that they had cultivated 6 acres for each

wife and "nobody would be allowed to use buses, trains or planes without the identity card"). In the Western regions plans were made for "Runway Villagers to be sent Home". The foreign exchange situation was deteriorating. In October the National Executive Committee members went to the Regions to assess the moves, and their likely effect on food supplies.³³

The conclusions from this are very simple:

1. For most of the period the initiative to start villages did not come from the villagers. It came from the politicians and from the staff. The exceptions to this were the 1962-63 period of spontaneous settlement schemes, and (to a lesser extent) the 1968-69 period after the publication of Freedom and Development. But in each case the spontaneous movements were taken over by "planning" - in 1964 by planned settlement schemes and in 1970 by the Government's ujamaa planning teams.
2. From 1969 onwards there were instances of the use of force to start villages. But between 1969 and 1971 it was largely replaced by the "bait" of social services. After 1971 the main thrust of villagisation was threats of force.
3. The original aim was (a) to provide a happier life for people by living together and (b) to increase production by working together. But many peasants were hesitant about the first, and the second did not work (as can be seen conclusively by the fact that the Government had to pass minimum acreage laws to compel farmers to cultivate individually - if communal production had succeeded they would instead have been passing laws to limit individual production instead of expanding it.)
4. But we have seen that individual peasant production has no dynamic to transform the economy. The use of force is therefore bound to fail. It will never lead to the sort of enthusiasm among the peasantry that for example has led the Chinese and North Vietnamese peasants to transform their environments while waiting for the products from industry to change their techniques and uplift their standards of living. It is much more likely to lead to the sort of passive resistance which characterised the Soviet forced collectivisation from the top. (The Soviet Union with some of the best wheat land in the world is importing food to this day, 57 years after its revolution and 40 years after collectivisation was complete.)
5. The use of promises of aid or provision of social services is also bound to fail, since production will not rise fast enough to pay for the social services.
6. Increased prices paid to the producers of agricultural crops (especially food crops) have a role to play. But in the 1974 situation they cannot succeed alone, because they could only transfer a substantial amount of purchasing power to the peasants by taking it away from the non-productive classes and the workers, and these classes will not allow this. If purchasing power is given to the peasants without taking it away from somewhere else the only result will be shortages of everything that the peasants want to buy, more and faster inflation, and even more disillusionment among the peasants. This is in addition to the well-established argument that it would mean encouraging rural capitalism and class formation and would therefore be self-defeating in the long run.³⁴

There is, therefore, inevitably a struggle ahead. The peasants have to liberate themselves - or to be liberated. This struggle may be directed in the first instance against their most obvious exploiters in the co-operatives, in order to get higher incomes for the rural producers, but also against the bureaucratic class which continues to use up the surplus unproductively. It might lead to yet another attempt to establish capitalist development, but this development would not be independent, nor could it possibly succeed, as Nyerere himself has pointed out in "The Rational Choice".³⁴ The alternative is to build socialism from below, which means starting with small groups of politicised peasants who will have to march largely on their own. The groups of cooperating farmers have to be small enough to trust and discipline each other. The bureaucracy will have to be drastically reduced in size, and rural development will not be seen as coming about by Government staff or Government money, but by people who combine together to build a new life.³⁵ Even this cannot succeed without sensible industrialisation plans.³⁵ But the logic of the present situation is that the only immediate hope for socialism in Tanzania is a cultural revolution.

FOOTNOTES

1. For a definition of peasants see J. Saul & R. Woods in T. Shanin (ed.), *Peasants and Peasant Societies*, London, 1971 page 105. For the way in which the peasantry in Tanzania was integrated into the world economy and trapped see B. Bowles, *Export Crops and Underdevelopment in Tanzania 1929-1961*, E. A. Social Science Conference Dar es Salaam, 1973, p. 3.
2. Anyone reading the British financial press (*Observer*, *Economist*, *Financial Times*, etc.) can see that nobody in the West knows how to handle the situation created by the rise in oil prices. Company bankruptcies have already started in Britain, *The Guardian Weekly*, in an editorial of 21 September, 1974, says that the following are "possible or probable" in Britain: inflation at above 20%, a million or more unemployed next year, bankruptcies including some big companies, pension funds in trouble, farmers forced out of business in spite of food shortages, no settlement of the oil deficits and another international payments breakdown, imports restricted by more countries and a downturn in world trade.
3. M. von Freyhold, "Rural Development through Ujamaa Vijirjini", mimeo, Department of Economics, Dar es Salaam, 1971, pp. 3-4.
4. T. Zalla, "Herd Composition and Farm Management Data on Small-holder Milk Producers in Kilimanjaro: Some Preliminary Results", *Economic Research Bureau Seminar Paper*, Dar es Salaam, 27 August, 1974, p. 2.
5. The result may be seen in the 1969 Household Budget Survey, Government Printer, Dar es Salaam, 1972, by comparing tables on pp. 26 and 74. In all but the richest regions the average household consumption including subsistence was less than Sh. 1,500/- per year, and for the first two income groups on p. 74 expenditure on Housing, Furniture, Household Durables and Other Household Equipment is negligible. This may be taken as confirmation of research published by I. Livingston in 1971 which suggested that a very high proportion of Tanzanian households owned the absolute minimum of tables, chairs, mats, beds and other basic household items.

6. H. Kjekshus, 'Ecology Control and Economic Development', History Seminar Paper, Dar es Salaam, 1973, p. 46. Also M. von Freyhold, 'The Potential for Ujamaa in Handeni', mimeo, 1971, pp. 1-7 for the story of the decline in Handeni.
7. L. Cliffe, 'Nationalism and the Reaction to Enforced Agricultural Change in Tanganyika During the Colonial Period', in J. Saul & L. Cliffe (eds), Socialism in Tanzania, Vol 1, Nairobi, 1972, p. 17.
8. An amazing editorial in the Daily News of 5 October, 1974 claimed that the system of rules and regulations "enabled the colonialists to get an abundance of whatever they wanted to milk from our country in any one year or years". This is clearly a rewriting of history to suit the interests of the present ruling class. The editorial concluded "it must be underlined that for 'ujamaa' there is no such thing as producing as one wishes".
9. H. D. Ludwig in H. Ruthenburg (ed), Small-Holder Farming and Small-Holder Development in Tanzania, Munish, 1968, p. 677 ff.
10. A. Mascarenhas, 'Resistance and Change in the Sisal Plantation System of Tanzania', Ph. D. Thesis, U.C.L.A., 1970, p. 153 ff and especially p. 167.
11. R. Hulls, 'An Assessment of Agricultural Extension in Sukumaland, Western Tanzania', Economic Research Bureau, University of Dar es Salaam, 1971, pages 4, 9, 12, 15 and 23. Cotton of course spread very rapidly in Sukumaland in the 1950, and early 1960s - but the implication of this research is that it did not spread because of Government staff. It spread because peasant farmers suddenly decided they wanted to grow cotton.
12. Hulls, p. 40. Anyone not convinced by the arguments in this paper should read that of Hulls.
13. Tschannerl, G. 'Rural Water Supply in Tanzania: Is 'Politics' or Technique in Command', Social Science Conference, Dar es Salaam, 1973, e.g., pp. 4-6.
14. Hulls, ibid., T. van Velsen, 'Staff, Kulaks and Peasants', in Saul and Cliffe, op. cit., Vol 1, p. 156 ff., M. von Freyhold, 'Government Staff and Ujamaa Villages', Social Science Conference, Dar es Salaam, 1973, passim; F. Petrini and Others, 'An Evaluation of Some Farmers' Training Centres in Tanzania', Nordic Project, Mbeya, for the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, 1970.
15. Van Velsen, p. 162.
16. D. Helshaw & M. Hall, 'The Analysis and Use of Agricultural Experimental Data', Mimeo, Department of Rural Economy, Makerere, n.d.
17. See M. von Freyhold's report on Chakachani Ujamaa Village (Mimeo, 1971).

18. Rural Development Research Committee, Rural Development Paper No. 5 "An Interim Report on the Evaluation of Agricultural Extension," University of Dar es Salaam, 1968, p. 5 and p. 14.
19. J. K. Nyerere, Freedom and Development, OUP, 1973, p. 67, my emphasis.
20. Freedom and Development, p. 66.
21. This and the next quotation are from Freedom and Development, p. 68, my emphasis.
22. Sunday News, 8, August, 1974; Daily News, 19, August, 1974; Sunday News, 1, August, 1974; Daily News, 11, September, 1974.
23. Nyerere, Freedom and Unity, OUP, 1966, p. 162 ff.
24. Ibid., pp. 183-184.
25. This and the next paragraph are based on the table on p. 133 of Saul and Cliffe (eds), Socialism in Tanzania, Vol. 2, Nairobi, 1973.
26. Nyerere, Freedom and Socialism, OUP, 1968, p. 231 ff.
27. Ibid., pp. 351-356.
28. Nyerere, Freedom and Development, OUP, 1973, pp. 60-68.
29. Presidential Circular No. 1 of 1969, p. 1, to be reprinted in "Towards Rural Cooperation in Tanzania", Tanzania Publishing House, due 1974. This selection will also contain a paper on the early history of the Rufiji operation.
30. On Dodoma villages see, "Wagogo Exodus puts Ujamaa Policy on Trial", The Standard, 29, July, 1971; "Focus on Chamwino Ujamaa Village", The Standard, 13, July, 1971; "Dodoma Responds to the Call of Ujamaa", Sunday News Interview, 24, October, 1971; "50% of Wagogo in Ujamaa Villages", Daily News, 17, November, 1973, "The Second Phase of Operation Dodoma", Daily News, 23, August, 1972. On Iringa see Awiti. For numbers of ujamaa villages see Table 43 of the Annual Economic Survey, 1971/72.
31. Siasa ni Kilima, TANU publication 1972, in swahili. English Translation available from East African Society and Environment, University of Dar es Salaam. For open public support of individualistic peasant production see, "Prizes for Best Cotton Growers", Daily News, 9, March, 1974 and "Rungwe: How Peasants Turned to Tea", Daily News, 12, September, 1974. For Chunya Operation, see, The Standard, 14, April, 1972 and 6, May, 1972 and Sunday News, 16, June, 1974. For Kigoma, see, Daily News 4, September, 1972 and 5, September, 1972.

32. For operations in Sukumaland, see, "1 Million Move into Mwan Villages", Daily News 11, October, 1974; "Geita, Moving the People into Planned Villages", Daily News 9, October, 1974; "Shinyanga, Operation Planned Villages Catches on", Daily News 10, October, 1974. Also note, "500 Families Ideal for Ujama", Daily News, 5, November, 1973, and "To Live in Villages is an Order - Mwalimu", Daily News, 7, November, 1974.
33. Daily News 11, October, 1974; information from students and travellers; on the Rufiji compare "Permanent Crops Best for Rufiji", Daily News, 3, October, 1974, with "Rufiji has 2c potential, but ..." the following day. Nyerere's speech on imports is in Daily News, 16, August, 1974. The reassessment announced in the Daily News of 5, October, 1974.
34. Nyerere, "The Rational Choice" in Freedom and Development, op. cit., p. 379 ff. At the time of writing the effect of in food crop prices announced 30, October, 1974 is very un-
35. C. Thomas, Development and Transformation, Monthly Review P. 1974.

A. COULSON,
Department of Economics,
University of Dar es Salaam,
8th November, 1974.

PART I

(R.R. Matango)

It started in October 1973, only two weeks after the 10th TANU bi-annual Conference (24/9 - 1/10/1973) ended its deliberations with Resolutions 14 and 15 calling for rapid Villagisation in the whole country before 1976.

The main purpose is to create development Villages at which the government can conveniently provide essential services like schools, dispensaries and water to people and introduce development projects easily in such villages. In Mara Region the Villagisation programme seems the likely method to get solutions to many problems. For instance at present only about 40% of the children of school age manage to get places in primary schools; and of those who go to Secondary Schools they form only 0.8%. The literates form only 35% of the total population - 544,125. Every year there is an increase of about 13,059 children in the Region. There are very few dispensaries and hospitals and so the health situation leaves a lot to be desired; out of every 100 children born 31 die before they are even 5 years old. Operation Mara can possibly bring a relief to Mara residents. This situation is not new in this country but it is worth noting that Mara Region in terms of death rate, is the second in the whole country; the first being Mbeya Region.

It is therefore hoped that all Regions should respond favourably to the villagisation programme so that within a foreseeable future Tanzanians can be rescued from this human furnace. However, the methods employed in moving the people to the villages by Mara Region officials merit serious attention. In many cases the officials usurped the democratic/representative powers entrusted to them by the public. They made decisions to move the peasants into these villages without letting the peasants, who in any way, shall benefit and participate in moving; discuss and decide on when, how and where they should move (to). Provided their decisions do not go beyond 1976 deadline.

The officials decided that people should move immediately and so the Police, TPDF, National Service and Militiamen were mobilised to move the people. People were ill-treated, harassed, punished in the name of TANU; under socialism and those who questioned it were told, "this is Nyerere's order," usually followed with a hysteric rebuke "wewe ni mpinzani mkubwa wa TANU na Rais". This is the paradox of democracy; it makes TANU alienated from the peasants whom it vowed to save from colonialism and neo-colonial bondage; peasants start seeing a different TANU. This is because of a few inefficient and irresponsible officials who have misrepresented and stage managed the TANU Policy to the peasants - the allies of socialist reconstruction in this country. The officials and leaders have failed to implement the TANU policy smoothly to the peasants and have now resorted to force under the pretext of TANU's orders. TANU has not given these orders. At least no TANU Committee has made such orders unless the few officials want to say that they are TANU.

I am afraid, and this should be noted that for those Regions which have not yet embarked on full-scale villagisation, they should not be deceived by a rosy picture painted by the press - through the praise accorded to Mara officials by Mara TANU Regional Committee - which appeared in the Party Paper - "UHURU" on 9/3/1974; also at N.E.C. meeting in Moshi, (Sunday News of April 7th 1973 and lastly in the Column 'Face the People' of Sunday News of 14th April, 1974. It is possible that the two Committees can be impressed by reports on paper, nicely written by a professional bureaucrat. But it was not expected of the TANU Regional Secretary who during the interview impliedly

hood-winked any suggestion that the masses were not adequately prepared to move or that there were any serious problems."

"...We first of all educated ourselves and educated the masses, so the people understood what this meant. We all agreed and passed resolutions and went on to abide by our own resolutions. Of course you get some people who are reluctant and so on but these were very very few indeed."

This is certainly expected in any democratic group of people; but one wonders if really the education to "ourselves" and to "the masses" was so timed that the deadline had to come two weeks after the TANU biannual Conference's call !! Again if discussions were held, resolutions passed presumably for the "objects" - (the peasants) was it necessary to use armed militiamen, police, TPDF and national service, if the peasants had agreed, and passed resolutions to move into these villages ?

Let me sketch out my personal observations and the study of this Operation in North Mara District in particular Inchugu Division. Prior to "Operation Mara", Inchugu had 4 Ujamaa Villages, and there was some talk as to whether the whole division should have only 5 Ujamaa Villages or more. It appears that the talk was over taken by events. The Division has 12,480 people; 20,000 cattle; 33,000 goats and sheep; about 100 donkeys and numerous chicken, dogs cats etc. If in this Division (Inchugu) it is decided that there should be ten Ujamaa Villages this means that every village should have about 1,248 people, 2,000 cattle, 3,300 goats and sheep but should the Division have 5 Ujamaa Villages then each village shall have double the figure of each of the above groups. This is no easy task to do, when it comes to really moving them and settling them in a Village. The actual number of each group to a village shall be determined by ownership and the will to settle in a certain village.

It is even a greater task to move one whole district (North Mara) population - 188,536 with 300,000 cattle; 215,000 goats and sheep; 600 donkeys and thousand of fowl.

WHAT HAPPENED

Many peasants in Inchugu were taken by surprise to see armed militiamen, climbing on top of their houses, taking away the thatch, in some cases the iron-sheets were torn-off, doors and windows removed or smashed into pieces; houses pulled down in some cases. Many people especially polygamists who had several wives, children and many houses, were faced with the problems of accommodation. Their homes having been destroyed and have the orders to move with all their property to the Village Building sites that same day; they moved with chicken, children, wives, cattle, goats and sheep, with beds and beddings, some of them settled under the trees for shelter provided they were within the village sites.

Then all other work had to be suspended until the shelter is build to accommodate the family. This was not a simple job because they had to start preparing the building materials - travel to the bush to cut, assemble and take all the building materials on their heads to the Village building sites; people had to travel to find the thatch; some people were lucky, they were invited to share (temporary) accommodation with families who had at least a house erected at the Village site prior to the move. Others with their children had to suffer from the cold and December rains under the trees.

While the operation was going on the leaders failed to even control the militiamen, or give them proper guidance. At Pamba and Kyoruba Villages some Militiamen looted the property of the peasants. There has been occasions when the militiamen have even opened fire (shocking) at a passenger bus and a lorry wounding and killing travellers in North Mara. One can easily understand the fact that the militiamen have just been trained and given the gun without TANU's ideology, but one wonders what the leaders should be doing when the militia - started by TANU for good purposes, should deliberately be so misguided and destructive. Peasants won't be able to know easily that the leaders have misused our militia as instruments of coercion, but they will blame TANU and its policy. It is true that these leaders have been entrusted to implement TANU policy but then they make mistakes they don't admit it instead they look for scapegoats.

In certain areas where the militia did not strike, people rushed in panic to build temporary accommodations in unplanned village sites. The entire division was in motion. Moving, moving in panic to the un-planned Villages. Thus creating new villages in areas which are not even surveyed, on water, on school or dispensary virtually no facility to maintain the population there or any plans to bring any, but only to serve the purpose of moving into the Development Villages. This haphazard, skimble-skamble movement has created problems which need an even urgent government attention and resources.

1. The Agricultural production has been adversely affected from five different angles:

- a) Timing for moving into villages coincided with cultivation period for the main crop year (November to March) the people have to divide their efforts for building and cultivation, consequently the labour input into Agricultural activities was reduced.
- b) In some areas where peasants had cultivated or planted crops for the 'quiet period' happened to building sites for the new villages. Their cultivated plots were turned into building sites and crops were destroyed without any compensation, as there was no one to whom one can send such claims.
- c) In unplanned villages (all of Inchugu) people who moved from far away found themselves with only either half an acre or one acre to build and no plot to cultivate as all land around was still under certain individuals. They were therefore forced to travel back to their old plots to cultivate. In some cases people have to travel about 3 to 5 kilometres to their old plots; of course with oxen - ploughs.
- d) The fact that a number of peasants were taken by surprise by militiamen or TPDF who pulled down their houses - building was given priority; especially by polygamists who had many wives and many children who have to be housed immediately, as the rains had started.
- e) The rains were not very favourable; this contributed to an already strained production cycle in the area. Rains came late than it is usually the case, therefore there was urgency to build houses to offer accommodation and there was another urgency to plant before the rains had stopped.

2. In the unplanned villages there is need to take immediate steps to have them planned so that peasants who can afford to build permanent houses can do so at once and the question of land use in the villages be settled. This will save the people who now have to travel far away to cultivate their private plots. It will even save people who must move again to other villages where there are some facilities already.
3. Health situation can very easily spread diseases or epidemics. In quite a number of these villages there are no dispensaries or First Aid Kits; there are no latrines, while the number of residents in most villages is between 450 to 700 people or even more.
4. Water for animals and domestic purposes is needed in some of the villages in this area. In some areas water is available it only needs sanitary improvements and protection against pollution.
5. Education, especially primary schools available need to be expanded; to build new ones in villages which do not have schools or are far away from primary schools.

These are some of the immediate problems that the government and the Party have to solve in these villages before embarking on development projects and the long march to socialism.

People have to move into the development or planned villages, this is not only rational but necessary if we have to make any developments and create a socialist society in our country. We are faced with all kinds of exploitation both from within and outside our borders. Under the circumstances one expects that the creation of internal unity is essential and it does not bring unity by pushing people around.

There is need to re-educate ourselves on issues of the peasants and their reactions to various government policies. Very good policies can be badly introduced to the peasants who reject them and are described as "ignorant irrational and backward". Forced terraces in Usambaras were badly introduced by the Colonialists, although the policy's aim was to conserve the soil; the peasants refused to comply to this day; despite the fact that lot of fertile land is terribly being eroded away now. Many politicians can not at present face peasants to tell them that terraces are good. In post Independence period people in Handeni were forced to plant cassava; peasant's reaction was to plant them upside down or boil them before planting but the programme was to help them out of constant famine.

Our development Villages are going to be occupied by peasants mostly. We want the peasants to develop at the same time they are the ones who produce much of the food we eat and earn this country about 90% of foreign exchange through export crops. Without the peasants producing that food, our factory workers, businessmen and all office workers could hardly survive and continue providing the present services or factory productions. This year Tanzania will spend about 600/- m. to buy food, most of which will be consumed by city and town residents, because our peasants did not have enough food or surpluses to sell to towns and other urban centres.

One should imagine the fate of thousand of people if peasants are mishandled in these villages with bad leadership. Should their reaction be directed against food production every one of us will be in for trouble. Also we expect to see all the peasants in these villages going socialist.

If we are not careful again we may end up with the creation of rural settlements like urban centres which are dominated by private interests. If peasants refuse to produce more communally or privately then the government might employ the police or army to force them to produce just as the Colonial Government did. We cursed the colonial government for that action because it was Colonial but when we start doing the same, it will not be colonial but a failure of implementing our own policies through democratic means. In fact our Party shall be blamed for this. I think there is necessity for the Party to re-examine the entire leadership bureaucracies in both the Party, Civil Service and the parastatals. It is not fair for the Party and the rest of the Tanzanians to tolerate the distortion of the Party Policies by a few leaders and thus consequently make the majority of the people to think that the Party has now changed its policy from pursuing the democratic principle to repressive principles.

PART 2

Let us examine the reasons that made peasants delay in responding to Ujamaa call since the Arusha Declaration. In 1969 the idea of Ujamaa living was introduced in Tshugu; public rallies were held and peasants at Kyoruba, Pemba, Getagasembe, Sirari registered themselves as members of these Ujamaa Villages. A few leaders attended short seminars. They started Ujamaa Farms mainly for Cash crops - maize and beans.

Kyoruba Ujamaa Village started in 1969 with 400 registered members. Those who have actually moved permanently to the Village by December 1973 were 12* only. In 1970 the first year of Ujamaa work, Village members were attending regularly to work. They cultivated 18 acres of maize and harvested 244 bags. (With an average of 13.55 bags per acre). In 1971 the same 18 acres were replanted maize and yielded 208 bags - with an average of 11.55 bags per acre. Towards the end of 1970 the working population had dropped from 400 to 280; in July 1971 the members actually attending the Ujamaa work had dropped to 150. In December 1973 the number that was attending work was below 50; the acreage under cultivation was 9 and those who were building at the Village site after their houses were pulled down by militia were about 64.

It has been noted that at Butiama Ujamaa Village, when the Ujamaa idea was first introduced in June 1968, "147 people were enrolled and a communal farm was started." By May 1969 this number had dropped to only 26; the time when a new constitution was made and the Ujamaa Village held elections and was re-organised, then did the membership increase again.

The district authority together with Mara Co-operative Union gave some aids into some of these villages between 1970 and 1971. Kyoruba Ujamaa Village was given 10 bags of fertilizers, 18 ploughs, 40 plough oxen, 10 chains, purchased out of RDF money. The Co-operative Union

* Most of these people did not move into the Ujamaa Village with cattle.

gave loans on building a store for 19,000/=-, a cash box, a safe and one scale plus office materials like register books, cash books, ledgers and receipt books. At the same time in 1971 Kyoruba Ujamaa Villages had a long shopping list of items that they expected to be given by the district authorities or Co-operative Union as aid or loan respectively. In fact some district officials and co-operative union staff gave candy promises of giving a loan to buy a maize mill for about Shs. 12,000/=- at the time they fully knew that the Ujamaa Village had 10,000/=- in the bank; so the villagers decided to divide up part of this money amongst themselves hoping to get a loan, however, the loan was never given. So was the case for maize shellers, (loan) Trailer (ox-cart) and 1 Tractor, corrugated Iron Sheets for village houses again which were never granted. The failure to fulfill these promises strained the relationships between the leaders from the government Cooperation Union and members of Village.

However these grants, aids and or loans made no significant increases in either Agricultural production or income generation in the village. A similar trend is also noted in Butiama Ujamaa Village where despite the fact that between 1969/70 and 1971/72 seasons, the village membership rose from 26 to 1,154, with the workforce of 275 people; loans, grants, aids and contributions in Form of money and equipment/materials rose from an insignificant amount to nearly 1 million shillings worth. However the production or income generated for this village was considerably low - Shs. 9,202 in 1969/70; Shs. 39,202/70 in 1970/71; and Shs. 19,352/25 in 1971/72. One has to be careful with these figures as the capital involved during this period is partly initial capital outlay and partly working capital. This does not however answer the questions of low income or production other than the fact that in 1971/72 season the Ujamaa Village failed to fulfill its Agricultural plans by 59.60%. From these two examples it shows that the increase of capital as loans or grants does not necessarily increase the income; other factors have to be considered too.

PRIVATE ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES:

The people in North Mara are engaged in Agricultural activities as well as livestock keeping. These two are traditional professions of the people. It would be wrong to say that livestock keeping is being phased out and in its place people are concentrating on Agricultural activities; especially when the number of livestock appears to be very small as compared to that in the Serengeti and Musoma districts or even in the Mara basin of the same district. This cannot be explained in the grounds that monetary economy is dominant at present and so, many social needs can be achieved if one has the money to use. It does not even suggest that the people could opt to do purely monetary business in commerce and trade and leave out livestock keeping and or cultivation. Cultivation provides them with essential food requirements and cash, and so with livestock. But the traditional values attached to livestock are so strong that some people opt to move into better grazing areas to increase livestock on the expense of cash crop farming - only cultivate to get food crops, and prefer to keep livestock which has several social needs as we shall see below.

VALUES ATTACHED TO LIVESTOCK:

Livestock is kept for quite different reasons and only the important ones may be mentioned here. The donkeys are kept solely as beasts of burden; while goats, besides the provision of meat and skins, are used as medicines for people who have ill-health, they are given goat-soup; the other values will be combined with cattle values.

Cattle have several different economic and social values among the residents of this area.

1. At the moment all cultivation is done by oxenploughs (using small number of donkeys) as such people are prepared to die the dairy cattle under difficult conditions but retain oxen for ploughing. Those who have no grazing areas or people to look after cattle, very easily get help from neighbours who are paid in kind.
2. All marriages are socially accepted as legal and genuine when cattle is used. Between 1950⁸ and 1960⁸ the brideprice (dowry) in this area was between 35 and 50 head of cattle, But now as many cattle herders have migrated to Mara basin, Serengeti and other plains with potential grazing areas, those who have remained behind have very little; so dowry has relatively dropped to about 25 to 30 at present.
3. Offerings and sacrifices to gods and ancestors are often made by slaughtering cattle or goats depending on the gravity of the matter. People believe that if gods are not offered something the whole society can easily perish. Under the circumstances, socially, cattle help to maintain the stability of social ecology in this respect.
4. Food. From cattle people get blood, meat, ghee, oil, milk, cheese, and others as food.
5. The by-products of slaughtered cattle -
 - (a) Hides used as drying facilities, bedding, or clothing.
 - (b) Tying facilities made out of hides - , belts, shoes, drums, etc.
 - (c) Manure for putting on shamba.
6. Presents to great friends are offered in form of cattle or goats.
7. Source of Pride, Prestige and honour to those who own great numbers of cattle.
8. Financial security and saving. Those who own cattle - invest their money in cattle; and so sell cattle any time they need money. This was much more demonstrated when people had to pay taxes and school fees.
9. Used to barter for food. During famine cattle is used to buy (barter) food crops from those who have it.
10. Cattle is the tribal symbol.

These and many others form the whole complex phenomena - of the interdependence of the life of these semi - pastoralists - strongly attached to the agricultural activities, livestock keeping and the monetary economy. Let us now turn to examine the problems facing these semi-pastoralists in the Ujamaa villages which are being established in their areas mentioned above.

WHAT DOES UJAMAA MEAN TO THESE SEMI-PASTORALISTS ?

The word Ujamaa or Wajamaa has some vagueness to them. Wajamaa means 'family-hood' or 'kins'. Some of these peasants say that the

Ujamaa living is staying together and co-operating at work with members of your kinship as it was in traditional days. But they also notice that they can not live as their forefathers; and this kind of Ujamaa the kinship system has pitfalls to national Unity; the kind of social security one is likely to get under the kinship system is very nominal when weighed against the kind of security one gets in a nation. Witchcraft is now a scapegoat, as "the indiscriminate settlement of people of different kinships in one village can make witches kill other people", so they argue. But this is not the important problem, though there are people who are believed to be witches.

However, it needs to be mentioned here that there is a fundamental contradiction between the traditional Ujamaa (family-hood) communalism a concept which the peasants in this area seemingly treat as being synonymous with the concept of Ujamaa or socialism which TANU advocates for. While under traditional communalism people worked collectively - "Ujima" and a large section of the property was collectively possessed, strictly speaking it was privately owned and expropriated by individuals or families. The Ujamaa policy requires settling together working together, and all property collectively produced should be socially owned and appropriated. It is the latter section which contradicts with the corresponding section of the former system in which ownership and distribution is based on capitalist norms.

When Ujamaa Policy is introduced in the areas where people accepted to form Ujamaa Villages mistakes were immediately made, implicitly they were not abandoned in time by the government officials and the villagers. Political education programmes at the village level were neglected and where they continued to operate it was ad-hoc, through visits by district officials and members of the co-operative union. To some extent the villagers have neither been able to get the necessary education, guidance nor opportunity to participate fully in their own development.

The co-operative Union's policy was to turn its primary co-operative societies into Ujamaa Villages a policy which on one hand would involve the villagers in marketing; reduce some of the unnecessary overhead costs, on the other hand would greatly help to reduce the rate of smuggling cash crops into Kenya for sale. The co-operative Union then wanted to entice the Ujamaa Villages with loans. The Co-operative Union would extend credits to Ujamaa Villages and in turn the Ujamaa produce would be sold into the Union and this would make it easy to administer loan payments. This did not work satisfactorily in some of these Ujamaa Villages like Kyoruba. Co-operative Union prices for some of these crops were very low as compared to Kenyan prices. Maize for instance was sold to the co-operative society for 27/- per 93 kg., while in Kenya the middlemen offered Shs. 33/-. The Kenyan money was exchanged for Tanzanian currency and the recipient made 40% more in the process of the exchange. Now then the recipient actually sells his 93 kg. of maize for Shs. 46/20 (Tanzanian currency). This motivated people in the area at both individual and organisational level to smuggle maize and other cash crops for sale to Kenya. This was quite logical as far as financial gains were

* Blackmarket and price differentials on certain essential items caused the Tanzanian shilling to be exchanged for only cents 60 of Kenyan currency.

concerned; however, the national policy was greatly undermined, the leadership at the top and that at the village level were at variance in this respect.

The Co-operative Society was also buying the crops at certain seasons only while the area has two main harvesting periods the main-crop year and also what other areas call the "quiet period". So people took the advantage of co-operative unions poor services and sold the produce to Kenya when the Co-op., is closed.

Even in the established villages very little attention was paid to cattle rearing, no plans in these villages to indicate that this important profession could be taken care of by government. How could peasants move with their animals to the villages in which there were on plans for their up keep? This whole failure accounts for the very slow progress - or poor response to Ujamaa in this area. It has to be noted that the peasant can risk to undertake an experimental project which is communal rather than risk his own agricultural livestock activities. Ujamaa work and ownership to him was an experiment, it was communal, and not quite clear to him, that is why some people at Kyoruba attended Ujamaa work in the whole year 5 hours a day, for 3 days; 21 days, and those who were described as "committed members" attended for 108 days, 140 days and finally 157 days being the highest and earned herself Shs. 300/=.

Some members, in fact the majority of them concluded that Ujamaa Villages can bring poverty to people if they depended on the Ujamaa work. Precisely they know that they don't concentrate on the Ujamaa work but they compare their individual incomes with those accrued from the Ujamaa Village - Kyoruba was valued at Shs. 1/91 a day. While that of the individual is valued at a rate higher than 4/= a day particularly when we know that at his own home the individual has to cultivate food and cash crops and care for his livestock while in the Ujamaa Village it was mainly growing cash crops as such higher incomes were expected; also there is a division of labour.

These are some of the problems that led to the slow progress of the Ujamaa Vijijini in this area and there could be many more reasons. However the other reasons which prevent mass movement into Ujamaa Villages are listed below. They form a spectrum of interlocked problems of individual commitment to an extent of changing the capitalistic norms and concepts to socialist norms by both the leaders and the led.

1. THE LEADERSHIP:

It is quite unlikely that the leadership at the village level can assume the traditional form in both - the conduct of business and leadership qualities. While the old generation languish over the good old days when a leader was to be selected by members of his community, they at the same time regret for lacking the school qualifications which have become a stepping stone to almost every kind of leadership or job other than a ten cell leader. What this implies is that the present leadership is based on bookish knowledge rather than on traditional community service. Under the circumstances it is not

* The villagers surveyed had worked 4 days a week on their private farms (an average).

not wholly acceptable at village level. Secondly the leadership is manned by the young generation which is deficient of good experience in rural life. Their opinions about rural life is at wholesale - "backward and ignorant" especially among the government employees.

When I interviewed an old man of about 70 on this issue he vividly showed the dichotomy that exist not only between the leaders and the led, but also of the generation gap.

"Look, Mr. X is our leader but most of his past life is full of criminal records. In those days he would not have been accepted to lead people. But because he went to school; he leaves one kind of job into another. During the colonial days he became a co-operative society clerk. He embezzled our money, that is why the whole of this area is poor. He bribed his fellow corrupt magistrates who set him free. He was given another job - "Wakili". He imprisoned innocent people because they did not bribe him. He set free criminals who gave him money. From "Wakili" he became a "Mwanangwa". He harassed people, rounded up those who had not paid taxes, he sold their cattle at very cheap prices. He used to collect money for taxes from people and used it because he never gave receipts to the taxpayers. Right now he buys donkeys, brings them here, loads them with maize and smuggles it into Kenya and sells both the donkeys and the maize. The next day you see him at the village telling us that 'Ujamaa hauna Wanyonyaji wala Makabaila'. These are the 'wasomi' leaders." 4

The main emphasis on development is on the rural areas to-day, however, very little progress is made. The leadership disregards the presence of people in the villages and want to do everything itself. This kills the local initiative and often brings confusion to people when "those who know" face certain constraints. They can not go on with the implementation, but they expect peasants to do so. Sometimes the peasants know that the kind of advice they are given is wrong, yet they can't resist or give their true opinion because they are made to believe that good ideas on development have to come from experts. In most of the talks one hears words like "the government has decided to"instead of "in our village we have decided to

2. PEASANTS' IDEAS ON PROPERTY AND UJAMAA

- (a) LAND - Since the colonial period land was demarcated and each household was apportioned a piece of land. The size of which differed from one household to another but it was enough for agricultural activities and could maintain some livestock. The survey done shows that on the average each household has 28.4 acres out of which 11.4 acres are cultivated. The people in this area plant twice a year so the acres under cultivation have been computed for the two seasons. 17.1 acres are for fallow and grazing. Through crop rotation it is possible to cultivate the same place for three years and the whole land can be cultivated after 9 years before repeating the first fallow. If a peasant has many cattle during this period he could have moved his houses twice in the same area. This is because the cattle shed go deeper and become dangerous for livestock and difficult to clean cow dung especially during the rainy seasons.

The majority of the peasants think that they have been dispossessed of their big land; and will be confined in an Ujamaa Village with very little private land on which their families can not get all their food requirements. This fear

has been perpetuated by the fact that peasants had not been informed about the sizes of the private plots other than the one acre or half an acre given for building purposes. In fact this would have been done as the Ujamaa living was being introduced. The failure of the first Ujamaa Villages to produce sufficient food or cash crops, makes people feel that they will face famine as the Ujamaa shambas are less productive. Also the village productive plans have failed to incorporate the household requirements and ensure continuous flow of labour input.

- (b) WOMEN AND CHILDREN: - Many people believed that women and children would be public property" - "Mali ya Umma". This issue does not only scare the polygamists on what would happen to their many wives but it threatens the future of polygamy if in particular you have houses mixed in the village where you have no control over them. They say, they have been told that once a child is born it will be taken away from its mother and be kept by the state. These stories were first propagated by European Missionaries and also from the neighbouring country.

- (c) FOREIGN OCCUPATION. - There are rumours that certain Foreigners will occupy the land which is being vacated by those who move the Ujamaa Villages. There is for instance a proposal for growing tea in Kyoruba; the area has been surveyed already and people believe that the foreigners will settle there cultivating tea. This is carried further, that all people will be dispossessed of everything in the Ujamaa Villages and will be required to work for wages and thus becoming agricultural rural workers. This implicitly means that the proletarianized peasants will be the same as the SILABU (Sisal Labour Bureau), sugar and Tea Estates workers (manamba) who were concentrated in camps.

To be frank if the masses had been educated on these issues such nonsensical rumours could not be spreading in this area. Perhaps the leaders are not aware of these problems, yet they believe that masses have been educated !!

- (d) LIVESTOCK: - The peasants think that their livestock will be taken by government. "The present Ujamaa Villages are different from our traditional villages and they also differ with the voluntary village which the prophecy said. The present ones are planned like towns; and no peasant can go to stay with livestock in towns." One of the interviewees stated. The other reasons include the fact that livestock will be making the villages dirty at least the way these villages are planned; they will interfere with village peace, especially those who do not own cattle will be brought into contact with them daily. Normally the peasants move their houses within their plots after say six years because the cattle - shed has gone deep. This is partly the reason why even the relatively wealthy people decline to build permanent houses when they still have livestock at the same area. The majority of the semi-permanent houses are shops build - in trading centres. Under the circumstances peasants feel it difficult in the Ujamaa Village to move into another site when their cattle-sheds are eroded deep; because they are supposed to build permanent houses.

Should the Ujamaa policy try to avoid those problems then it means that peasants would at least have to separate with their livestock so as to place them in a wider grazing area. This raises some suspicion to the peasants who feel that this move does not only entail permanent forfeiture of their livestock but requires may be a few people to look after livestock. It means that people will share their milk with those who don't even know how to look after livestock. Families in traditional society in this area refused to give milk to their family members who did not take part in looking after cattle. So the villagers fear is not only that those who will be away grazing will refuse giving milk to those who will remain in the villages, but that even people who don't want to own cattle be given milk. This sounds like kitchen politics; but in reality here you have ignorance about Ujamaa living and individualism. At the same time they say a lot of their cattle were expropriated by TANU and Government leaders between 1966 and 1969 under the pretence of Mara Youth Settlement Farm, almost every villager was forced to donate a cow but after that they don't know where both the cattle and money went. The present villagisation is viewed as a step to controll the peasants and appropriate their cattle easily.

- (e) OXEN PLOUGHS:- Almost every one has an oxen plough which he does not know how to utilize in the Ujamaa Village where there will be very little land and or when cattle is taken away. Families will face frequent famine as the village organisation is unable to know family requirements in terms of food and other things.

3. AGE-GRADES: The age grade system is one of the very few traditional institutions remaining and its powers are being taken away bit by bit. The peasants highly appreciate the role the age grades play in society, and see its doom in the Ujamaa Villages where there will be different regulations and laws which leave no room for the age-grades. In fact the age-grades could be used as a mobilizing force in some developmental programmes, including settling in Ujamaa Villages.

Unlike the Development Villages where the people are required to settle together so that the government can provide essential services like schools, dispensaries and water to the people easily and economically; then when people are scattered about.

In the Ujamaa Villages the Socialist Ideology and commitment have to go hand in hand and spearhead any development which require peoples' participation. To arrive at this level there is need to have cadres who are clear with the ideology, capable of interpreting it correctly and committed to Party Policy. These in turn have a role to play in mobilizing the people - educating them, directing them and involve them in development activities which concern them. To minimise costs, simplify administration and provide essential services, the people have to be settled together. An Ujamaa Village is at a higher stage than a planned or development Village. People in an Ujamaa Village are expected to be much more conscious than those in the development villages, because Socialism is a movement of the oppressed people who have decided to bring about a revolution. To bring about a socialist revolution then, people must be equipped with socialist ideology, clarity, conscious of their objective conditions and must be committed in order to carry forward the socialist Revolution. It is the people themselves under proper guidance, who can bring a socialist revolution, and not the leaders alone.

CONCLUSION:

The impressions made here seem to suggest that the peasants in the area dislike Ujamaa, a statement which was made to me by some government officials. On the contrary, they certainly like Ujamaa, they have already demonstrated it. But the weakness heavily lies with the leaders who wanted to do everything in developing the "backward" peasants, but in so doing manifested a series of confusing issues and posing the peasants to insecurity. The leaders have failed to interpret the peasants' reaction to this as "rational". How can one expect to get all co-operation from someone who knows that the programme is badly planned and the final results will make him suffer?

The peasants need to be educated on many issues and need to be assured that both their economic and social activities would continue undisturbed when they go to Ujamaa Villages - they want to make sure that their livestock and its accompanying values are not separated from them; they want to be assured that their wives and children remain the properties of the individuals. Operation Mara has to provide the answers; "you never know till you try". But how should the operation be introduced to avoid antagonising the leaders and the potential allies in the socialist construction in this country - the peasants?

The Ujamaa village programmes are not very comprehensive and their failure adds to the uncertainty of Ujamaa success which lingers in the peasants mind. There is need to have leaders who must put what they profess into practice themselves first rather than force the led to do what the leaders don't live up with. The leaders have to clearly understand the party policies and interpret them correctly. The same leaders have to understand people's values and norms very closely before they get involved in a mass mobilisation whose success equally depends on the peoples' full participation and commitment in their own development. Villagisation in Mara will succeed without strain, without spending government funds, but building socialism in the area needs a different approach - more education to the leaders and the led, more democracy at the grassroots; cadres and members who are committed to Party Policies and who know them.

BARKING (Senkoro, F.E.M.K.)

"the revolution!"
 we are barking like hungry dogs!...
 but revolutions are not made that way!
 parroting fanon on revolutionary
 violence
 and to go back to lie sluggishly
 on soft beds - overfed, dizzy!
 revolution!
 that's blood! sweat! gunfire!
 life-giving deaths! jerbe....
 these nourish the gr at days
 pure and shining
 numerous like the milk-way galaxy
 the true joy of classless society
 where man is man
 "But the weapon of revolutionary
 theory!"
 you will cry, eyeballs red with beer
 swollen, blowing...
 fanon did not end barking only
 nor did amilcar

ah! i sigh a relief
 and take a deep breath
 and jump into the sea
 to fish out the hidden
 in the hands of a few monsters
 but the monsters are armed
 so let it be with me too:
 the pen,
 bring me my pen my son
 and let me infuse power
 into my comrades
 let me use something else
 this time it's no pen
 but a jerbe and my sweat, it's
 no barking, but gunfire and
 my blood
 no parroting
 but speaking the real language
 the language that they use too

* * * * *

THE FRIENDS WE LOVED (Senkoro, F.E.M.K.)

The day is coming
 we have sighted it
 an oasis of hope which will irrigate
 the desert land created by them.
 it is coming
 when the spilt blood of
 the friends we loved will be repaid
 in the greater glory of victory...
 it has oozed
 on the furrowed faces of the
 agony of death of
 the friends we loved
 it is germinating - that day
 thus, we are not mourning
 for new life is springing up
 new life - ah! the melody of
 the word
 a life free from all miseries
 when man is real man...
 hark! the drums are talking
 guns are echoing in reply
 waking up the despirited bodies
 in the talking drums
 and the echoing guns
 are hidden the voices of
 the friends we loved
 urging us, living in us....

we are going to nourish the
 germinating seed!
 (by the way, i call myself a
 but a poet is no poet
 if he can't face the enemy
 face to face, at gun point
 to help regain the spilt blood
 of the friends we loved.)

.

WHY SOCIALISM

By D. W. Nabudere

The question 'Why Socialism' presupposes another equally important question: 'Why not Capitalism'. This is so because we hold that in the historical process CAPITALISM must die and be replaced with a higher form of social organisation under SOCIALISM. This we also hold has to give way to a still higher form of social organisation under COMMUNISM where the state as a coercive force of a particular ruling class disappears. This view is not a mere prophecy but it is based on general observation of historical process and a scientific study of man through his different stages of evolution and the different forms of productive activity.

The view that socialism is bound to replace capitalism has been refuted by many bourgeois ideologists who have advanced the view that socialism will not necessarily replace Capitalism (at least in the near future) and hold that more reliable observation of history and of economic and social phenomenon indicate that there is a new society which is emerging to replace capitalism. For instance James Burnham advances the theory that the Managerial Society is the more likely to replace Capitalism. He states:

"The only way out of the theoretical jam is to recognize that the assumption must be dropped, that socialism and Russia's notion has been toward neither capitalism nor socialism, but toward managerial society, the type of society now in the process of replacing Capitalist society on a world scale."¹ . . .

More recent writers like Rostow have also propped up with their own manifestos of non-socialist development by propounding a number of "theories" of the "stages of Economic Growth" which are designed to "constitute an alternative to Karl Marx's theory of modern history" . . .² (i.e. against Marx's ideas of socialism D.W.N.)

Still more recently John K. Galbraith a liberal American economist has come out with a monumental work (if only in size) in which he examines "The New Industrial State" and observes "convergent tendencies of industrial societies, however different their popular ideological billing, the convergence being to roughly similar design for organisation and planning".³

All this as we can see is an attempt to either beautify capitalism and imperialism or to neutralise popular forces struggling for socialism as an "alternative" system, on the tit-for-tat basis that if capitalism is no good socialism is also no good either. In this exercise we observe that Marx is tied to particular countries e.g. Russia or China etc. the theory being that if socialism has failed in Russia it is bound to fail say in Uganda. This as we shall point out later is unacceptable. This exercise is further tied up with the idea that Marxism and Leninism or ideas of Mao Tse Tung are "foreign ideologies" which are not applicable to other countries. This also is unacceptable. We shall now proceed to examine the real world of capitalism. Why we think Capitalism is dying and why we think it is socialism which can come to replace capitalism.

Why Capitalism Must Die

Capitalism must die because it has all along had too much rope to play about with which has eventually closed on to its throat with the passing of time through its period of parasitism and decadence. According to the classical economists the system of capitalism solved

the problems of man better because unlike the preceding system of organisation under feudalism, it gave "freedom" to the citizen to engage in economic activity without too much power coming from above. It was better, because it was a self-correcting system where economic power was checked. It also gave free play to free competition and according to Say's Law of Markets, it was held that the act of producing goods under the Market provided the purchasing power, neither too much nor too little for buying them. Thus it became clear later that this system of competition "required that there be considerable number of sellers in any trade of industry in informed communication with each Each informed as to the prices at which others are selling or buying (which checked prices, so that) no buyer or seller is large enough to control or exercise an appreciable influence on the common price."⁵

This system of "perfect competition" because of the "Changes in the underlying reality — disintegrated"⁶ and in its place evolved a new phenomenon very foreign to the idea of "free Capitalism". In place of freedom under capitalism a new very powerful clique of capitalists (along with the entrenchment of political power in its hands) took the stage of production under oligopolies⁷ and later monopolies,⁸ creating the realisation among the ideologists of free competition that "An economy where the typical industry is shared by a few firms is awkwardly inconsistent with a theory of Capitalism which requires that power to affect prices or wages or out-put, or investment be impersonally governed by the reactions of the many".⁹

It became clear after the 1930's after several studies that this new phenomenon was becoming a permanent feature of the economy in the U.S.A. as one observer stated: "over an important sector of the American economy individual markets are shared by a small number of producers" and further observing that this was becoming a dominant pattern.¹⁰ With monopoly capitalism firmly in the saddle the basic tenets of free competition lost meaning. Parliamentary democracy became ... "a mere formality behind which the hand of the monopolist became the real power. All this led one of the American "liberal" capitalists to cry out against the new power:-

"everyday in our lives monopoly takes its toll.

Stealthy it reaches down into our pockets and takes part of our earnings — monopoly these days is seldom, if ever, a blatant affair; it lies behind the lines, unobtrusive and unseen..... Excess prices constitute one important consequence of monopoly — Those who hold jobs are affected by monopoly (as rigid high prices affect the volume of sales) —

This means that productive capacity in the monopolised industry lies idle, and worker face period of lay off and chronic unemployment

He continued:-

"Small business is also deeply affected by monopoly. Everyone, at one time or another in his life, has seen economic power throw its weight around. — The continued increase in industrial concentration in this country has resulted in the diminishing role for small business. This is given dramatic expression in the rising number of failures and bankruptcies in recent years. — Each of us is also a taxpayer. The best protection monopoly can find government sanction for its practices — Monopoly can, with audacity, dip its hand deeply into the public coffers. The very business executives who seize the opportunities monopoly offers to wrest favours from government are among those who do attack social measures, such as medical care for the aged, as inflationary. Apparently to some minds government aid to private monopoly is one thing; government aid to improve the living standards of the deprived segments of our population is quite another."¹²

I quote Euse Kaufeyer extensively if only because it is always better for the imperialists to speak for themselves about themselves. It is always an encouraging change. It is clear that in order to solve Kaufeyer's problem capitalism must give way to other system. There are other very important reasons why capitalism must die.

Firstly capitalism came into being among other thing as the result of the African slave who was exported like a commodity to create the wealth to build capitalism. A very profitable "profitable" triangular trade developed. "The slave ship sailed from the home country with a cargo of manufactured goods. These were exchanged at a profit on the coast of Africa for Negroes, who were traded on the plantations, at another profit, in exchange of a cargo of colonial produce to be taken back to the home country — The profits obtained provided one of the main streams of the accumulation of capital in England which financed the Industrial Revolution."¹³

The story of the slave trade is a story of colonialism. The same imperialist force which engaged in slave trade quickly realised that they could reap equally huge profits by colonising the African continent itself. Slave trade was becoming expensive to maintain. So instead of carrying the African slave to the "New World" and the West Indies to cultivate sugar and cotton, it was cheaper to keep the slave of the ivory which was becoming more profitable.

The struggle for independence was a genuine effort on the part of the exploited African people to rid themselves of this system of exploitation under colonialism. The imperialists however very quickly realised that colonialism like slave trade was becoming expensive for them. Instead of keeping White Colonial Governors, p.C's and D.C's, Army and Police to administer the colony, they decided to take advantage of the pressure for independence to "grant independence" to their colonies and replace their administrators with Black ones. The result was that in almost all the former African colonies we now have semi-colonies in the so-called independent African "Republics" with the same capitalist exploitation of the African peoples under NEO-COLONIALISM. As Nkrumah has pointed out:

"The essence of neo-colonialism is that the state which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside."¹⁴

One of the ways in which neo-colonialism continues to control the economies of the semi-colonies in Africa is through aid. By exporting masses of capital in form of "aid" and investment the imperialist countries take back in profits more money than they brought in. Thus, we observe that whereas in the period 1870 - 1913 Britain invested abroad a nett amount of 2.3. billion pounds, in the same period they earned 4.1 billion pounds from this investment a profit of roughly 70 per cent.¹⁵ It is also observed that the same trend persisted in relation to American investment. During the period 1950 - 1963 the nett outflow of capital from the United States was 17.4 billion dollars, which earned in the same period 29.4 billion dollars, which works out almost exactly to 70 percent profit.¹⁶

This fantastic exploitation has created a serious problem for capitalism at home and abroad. Here we observe that capitalism not only brings misery to the workers and other sectors of the population in the metropolitan countries but also for the semi-colonial peoples of Africa. In order to liberate themselves the African people and other exploited peoples must "Kill" capitalism and since capitalism is inconsistent with the aspiration of the majority of the peoples of the world it must die.

in private bank accounts. It is the state which is coming in more and more to invest and/or force investment through budgetary means. The capitalist himself is unwilling to invest on his own initiative.¹⁹ "This mass unemployment of private money is scarcely less indicative of the death of capitalism than the mass unemployment of human being."²⁰ Side by side with this, capitalism is no longer able to use its own technological possibilities for the benefit of man e.g. in the provision of housing and other social services.

Fifthly capitalism has become wasteful. It is as if the other side of the equation of 'Exploitation is 'Wastefulness', taking off the misery that it sets in motion for the exploited people. This flagrant wastefulness of resources has become a permanent feature of particularly the United States economy that one social researcher has concluded that "Wastefulness has become part of the American way of life".²¹

This seems to stand to reason. If too few people own too much, they are bound to use it carelessly. So with the system of capitalism. The vast wealth that capitalism has created for the few monopolist has reached a stage when waste in the time of want is not seen as waste but as a virtue; Capitalism must therefore die in order to eliminate waste.

Lastly but not less because of the strait-jacket in which capitalism finds itself, it is unable through its ideology to convince the people that it has a future. The bourgeois ideologies have become impotent in the face of a new more dynamic ideology of socialism based on the fundamental ideas of Marx and Lenin and enriched today by the ideas emanating from the Chinese and Cuban revolutions. "History, sociology and anthropology are not yet much as sciences; but they are enough to show every serious person that the concepts of the bourgeois ideologies are not written in the star. They are not universal laws of nature but are at best just temporary expressions of the interests and ideals of a particular class of men at a particular historical time".²²

It is clear that since capitalism has no clear vision of itself, with the bourgeoisie losing confidence in itself, it must die and give way to a system that has boundless faith in itself with a clear vision of the future namely SOCIALISM.

Why Socialism

Now that we have seen the real world of Capitalism, let us see why SOCIALISM should be the basis of organising our societies. Before we proceed further it is necessary for us to define what we mean by Socialism. We defined Capitalism as a system based on a market where individual buyer and seller were supposed to play the predominant role in the economy. This was later replaced by MONOPOLY CAPITALISM which concentrated the market in the hands of the few monopoly corporations. We have also looked at the contradictions which this monopoly creates. Socialism comes in to solve and remove all these contradictions in the capitalist system. It is a higher system of social organisation wherein the means of production like land, mines, raw materials, factories and machines are publicly owned by the whole society instead of by a few private individuals and forcing the majority to sell to it its labour power ²³ for a wage in order to earn a living. The surplus value of the worker which the capitalist appropriate to himself is then put in a common purse for raising production and creating employment opportunities and social facilities for the worker and other working people.

Socialism as a system of social organisation is not a new thing. A study of the evolution of man through the ages indicates that man has lived under some form of primitive socialism, usually referred to as Communalism. This we find was more pronounced in Africa at the communal stage of development. In our clan societies we find the major means of production - land and tools of production were commonly owned.

Socialism in modern form had its popular beginnings not in Russia or China but England and France. Already by the beginning of the seventeenth century capitalism had shown its inequity and this was reflected in the debates of the time. Among the pioneer socialists of this time was Robert Owen of England who immediately organised socialist colonies to counteract the evils of capitalism. His efforts met with failure because his colonies operated under the general laws of capitalist economy and since Owen was operating in "enemy territory" of capitalist jungles, he was bound to fail. In France the pioneers were Charles Fourier and Comte Henri de Saint-Simon. These two wrote widely and influenced many people at the time. They have been referred to as Utopian Socialists because they did not seem to draw a line between reality and the idea. They not only denounced capitalist society but they worked out in detail the society they desired. They all advocated the abolition of capitalism. They preferred a planned society which would be efficient and just instead of the wastefulness and unjustness of the capitalist society. They believed common ownership of the means of production would remove the evils of capitalism. Their ideas remained dreams for although they knew what they wanted they did not know how to get there. They thought they could convince the rich to give up their society of capitalism in preference to socialism. They found the capitalist class had already entrenched itself and was controlling the state, which it used to further its interests. For the state had always been in the words of Thomas Moore in *Utopia* "a conspiracy of the rich, who on pretence of managing the public pursue their private ends, and devise all the ways and arts they can find out: first that they may without danger, preserve all that they have ill acquired, and then that they may engage the poor to toil and labour for them at as low rates as possible, and oppress them as much as they please."²⁴

The mere humanitarian sense of injustice of the Utopian socialists could not change society, and new ideas were therefore required to deal with the situation.

The people who came in to deal with this situation were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, whose names are now associated with scientific socialism and communism. These two gentlemen were neither Russian nor Chinese. They did not come from poor homes but from propertied families in Germany. Their main preoccupation was with how the capitalist system came into being. Marx spent a good part of his life doing "surgical" examination of the capitalist system and the result, of his effort was his monumental work Capital: A critical Analysis of Capitalist Society. In his Contribution to the critique of Political Economy Marx wrote:-

"The first work which I undertook for a solution of the doubt: which assailed me was a critical review of the Hegelian philosophy of right My investigation led to the result that legal relations as well as forms of state are to be grasped neither from themselves nor from the so-called general development of the human mind, but rather have their roots in the material conditions of life, the sum of which Hegel, following the example of the Englishmen and Frenchmen of the eighteenth century, combines under the name of 'civil society', that, however, the anatomy of civil society is to be sought in political economy The general result at which I arrived ... can be briefly formulated as follows: in the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations.... relations of production which correspond to definite stage of development of the material productive forces. The sum-total of these relations of

~~production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real~~
 foundation, on which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.
 The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political
 and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness
 of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their
 social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage
 of their development, the material productive forces of society come
 in conflict with the existing relations of production, or what is but
 a legal expression of the same thing - with the property relations
 within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development
 of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then
 begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic
 foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly
 transformed"25

The economic change Marx wrote about was socialism. His
 views as to how this change could come about were however different
 from the Utopian socialists and the whole of his idea of how things change
 was to come about was through political struggle against the capitalist
 ruling class. In their Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels
 pointed out the way how the proletariat were to proceed to wrestle power
 from the bourgeoisie, pointing out that "the history of all hitherto
 existing societies is a history of class struggle". The role of state
 under capitalism was "The executive Committee for managing the common
 affairs of the whole bourgeoisie" whose duty was to defend private
 property in the means of production which was the essence of the domination
 of the capitalist class over the working class. They argued that it was
 therefore the duty of the working class (or proletariat) to overthrow
 the state of the capitalist class through revolution and not through reform
 of the system, and after its overthrow: "In the place of the old bourgeois
 society, with its class antagonism, we shall have an association in which
 the free development of each is the condition for the free development
 of all".

Marx's vision of revolution in Europe did not materialise according
 to detail. This was not his duty to work details of revolution of
 each country. His contribution was the general theory of revolution to
 change society. It was to be a guide only and not a dogma as Marx himself
 pointed out. It was not therefore surprising that guided by the scientific
 theory of society of Marx, Lenin with the Russian proletariat should be
 guided by these ideas to make the first socialist revolution in Russia.

Lenin, guided by Marx, went a step further and examined capitalism
 at the stage of imperialism. This was important for our understanding
 of our present day colonialism and neo-colonialism. In his work Imperia-
lism, the Highest stage of Capitalism, he observed "The enormous growth
 of industry and the remarkably rapid process of concentration of
 production in ever-large enterprises are one of the most characteristic
 features of Capitalism" pointing out:

Capitalism in its imperialist stage leads right up to the most
 comprehensive socialization of production; it, so to speak, drags
 the capitalists, against their will and consciousness, into some sort
 of a new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition
 to complete socialization.

"Production becomes social, but appropriation remains private.
 The social means of production remain the private property of a few.
 The general framework of formally recognized free competition remains,
 but the yoke of a few monopolists on the rest of the population becomes
 a hundred times heavier, more burdensome and intolerable."26

He further observed that although the old capitalism of free competition the export of goods was the order of the day, under imperialism with monopolies export of capital was the new feature. "The export of capital influences, greatly accelerates, the development of capitalism in those countries to which it is exported. While, therefore, the export of capital may tend to a certain extent to arrest development in the capital exporting countries, it can only do so by expanding and deepening the further development of capitalism throughout the world."²⁷

His efforts went to consolidate the gains of socialism in the Soviet Union as the first ever socialist state - a state of the proletariat. The success of the Chinese Revolution in 1949 added further strength to the forces struggling for socialism.

The success of the socialist revolution in these countries did not mean that the struggle against imperialism and the capitalist class in these countries was over. On the contrary after its overthrow the capitalists and landlords intensified their struggle against the new state of the proletariat. In order to achieve total victory against the old forces the new state of the proletariat had also to intensify its class struggle against those forces. The Chinese Cultural Revolution was one form of such struggle. After the proletarian state has finally suppressed the capitalist and other exploiting classes, it shall then cease to have any useful purpose and the power shall pass to the people by way of their social organisations. This stage is the stage of communism where the existence of antagonistic classes would have been eliminated, although differences between individuals would still remain.

After this, we would like to relate what has been said to the situation in Africa. Many a politician today in Africa would say that the struggle for independence was a struggle for equality and against foreign domination. Many of them pay lip service to socialism. Many of them have failed to see the struggle for independence as a struggle for socialism. We said that the struggle for independence was a struggle for equality and hence for socialism. This follows naturally out of the forces which were engaged in this struggle. The struggle was between the African people and imperialists. The imperialists were and still are the monopoly capitalists of Western Europe and of the United States. Imperialism, Lenin has told us, is the highest stage of capitalism. So the struggle of the African people was clearly:

The African People. The Western Monopoly Capitalists.

This has never changed. It follows therefore that the African people did not fight Western capitalists only to replace them with African capitalists for it is the system of capitalism which created colonialism. They fought against colonialism for a more just system. They are content with shouting slogans about independence, freedom, equality. African socialism, our own brand of socialism, etc., etc.,

In spite of all these slogans one thing remains clear. While some of the African leaders talk too much about socialism, they are doing nothing to create the conditions for a socialist Africa. These prerequisite conditions are that the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism must continue to be waged against those forces which are still bent on exploiting the African people and Africa's resources. The revolution for complete independence is therefore far from complete. As pointed out earlier, the imperialists realised it was becoming expensive to rule the colonies directly and they therefore decided to "grant independence" to their colonies. The intention of the imperialists was to hi-jack the African revolution for real independence by blinding the "nationalists"

as to their true intentions. Having done so the exploitation of Africa continued as to make many African leaders also to realise that "the gap between the rich (i.e. imperialist) countries of the world and the poor countries is growing each passing day."

In spite of this realisation very few of these leaders if at all have tried to disengage themselves from the betrayal of the African revolution.

The Youth of Africa must reinstate the hi-jacked revolution and give imperialism the final blow.

REFERENCES AND NOTES.

1. James Burnham: The Managerial Revolution, Penguin Books, 1962 reprint page 54. Burnham was writing in 1922 before the Chinese and Cuban revolutions and before most of Eastern Europe came to form part of the socialist system.
2. W. W. Rostow: The Stages of Economic Growth Cambridge University Press 1966, page 2.
3. John Kenneth Galbraith: The New Industrial State, Harvish Hamilton, London, 1967 page 389.
4. John Kenneth Galbraith: American Capitalism: Penguin Books 1963 page 27.
5. " Op cit. p. 28
6. " Op. cit. p. 44
7. Oligopoly means a group of big companies or trusts who control the prices and production of a section of the market.
8. Monopoly is a giant corporation owning and controlling a section of the economy. Galbraith estimates that about 500 monopoly corporations own and control 213 of the American economy.
9. John K. Galbraith: American Capitalism: page 49
10. " Op. cit. p. 52/3
11. Estes Kefauver: In a few Bonds; Penguin Books 1966 p.23. Kefauver was U.S. Senator and was Chairman of a committee of the Senate which investigated Antitrust laws and Monopoly in America. This book contains the essence of the committee's work.
12. Kaufever: Op cit. p. 23/25
13. Eric Williams: Capitalism and Slavery: Andre Deutsch paper back 1964 at page 51/2. Dr. Williams first wrote this book as a thesis when he was a student in America in 1943. He is now the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago.

14. Kwame Nkrumah: "Neo-colonialism: The Last Stage of Capitalism," Nelson 1965 Page ix.
15. Paul Sweezy: The future of Capitalism, Paper read at a Conference in London on the Dialectics of Liberation, Penguin Books: The Dialectics of Liberation, London 1968 at Page 104/5
16. Ibid p. 105
17. Peking Review No. 21, May 23, 1969. page 17.
18. I should be criticised for using the term "the capitalist himself" since in a capitalist state, the capitalist ruling class is the state! so that if the state invests it does so on behalf of the capitalist ruling class. But the fact that individual capitalists are reluctant to do so is evidence of the capitalist cancer of decay of "capitalist psychosis".
20. James Burnham: Op cit. page 41
21. Vance Packard: The Waste Makers, Penguin Books 1960 p.19
22. James Burnham: Op. cit. p. 41.
23. Surplus value means the difference between the price of the product which a worker produces and the wage which the capitalist pays him for producing it.
24. Quoted by E. H. Carr in "The Bolshevik Revolution" Penguin Books 1966 part I p. 238.
25. Karl Marx: Selected Works p. 363 volume I.
26. Lenin: Imperialism: Moscow
27. Lenin: I-bid.

The environment and the productive forces in
the development of Tanzania

by M.P. Bhaavan

The theme of this symposium as it applies to Tanzania today can only mean a discussion of the use of science and technology in the socialist development of Tanzania. That is why I have chosen to speak about the interaction between the Tanzanian environment and Tanzanian productive forces. The character of this interaction depends entirely on the economic strategy pursued.

The dominating feature in a self-centred economy is the relationship which is established between the producer goods sector and the mass consumption goods sector. This is the case in all developed economies of the world, whether capitalist or socialist. In contrast to this, the feature which governs the economies of the underdeveloped countries of most of the Third World is the connection between the export of primary produce and the import of luxury goods for consumption by the ruling classes. Another way of putting it is that the underdeveloped countries of the Third World are at the periphery of the international capitalist system to which they are firmly linked. This is not the place to analyse in details how these relations (phenomena) come about. Suffice it to say that they are a result of the mode of accumulation of capital, the production relations which govern such an accumulation, and the class interests of the social class which control the accumulated capital. I refer you to the brilliant and profound analysis made by Samir Amin¹ over this question.

Tanzania is trying to break out of the process which is underdeveloping it. This means two things: First, the potential economic surplus² must be released and controlled by a social class that stands for the interests of the peasants and workers; second, this surplus must be invested in establishing and developing the dominant feature of a self-centred economy, namely the connection between the producer goods sector and the mass consumption goods sector.

The question of the environment comes into both these stages. Let us start by looking at the first. Potential economic surplus is the difference between the total output of goods that could be produced in a given natural and technological environment and the essential consumption. Tanzania's potential economic surplus will come in the initial stages from agricultural and mineral resources. The questions we have to address ourselves are: What choices in technology and technique does one make, and what technical skills does one develop and how, in order to maximize the extraction of the potential surplus and at the same time generating producer and consumer goods industries.

We begin by looking into the technological inputs into agriculture. These are chemical fertilizers, chemical pesticides, irrigation facilities and storage facilities. An overwhelmingly large part of these available inputs are directed to boosting the production of export crops like cotton, coffee, tobacco and tea. Only 15 per cent of the cotton is used for the production of textiles for mass consumption. The rest 85 per cent is exported as primary produce, and so are all the coffee, tobacco and tea. The total output of these crops has been increasing: for example,

* This paper was read at a plenary session of the symposium on "Science Technology and Environmental Conservation" held by the East African Academy in Nairobi from 26 to 29 September 1974.

the production in 1972-73 was above that in 1971-72 by 17 per cent for cotton and cashew, 54.7 per cent for coffee, 19.1 per cent for tobacco and 10.8 per cent for tea. But due to falling prices in the capitalist markets, this increase in production has not led to any appreciable increase in foreign exchange earnings. (The increase in primary commodity prices that come in the wake of the cutback in petroleum production was a six months wonder; the prices are falling again.) Their real purchasing power is being severely eroded by the sharp and continuing inflation in the prices of goods imported from the metropolitan capitalist vounytird. In the meantime, the foreign exchange cost of "manufacturing" chemical fertilizers in Tanzania at the Tanga factory³ has increased rapidly because the prices of the inputs, all of which are imported from abroad, have shot up due again to the deliberate cutback in production and deliberate increase in prices of petroleum products by the oil monopolies. As a result, the cost to Tanzania of the locally assembled chemical fertilizer is higher than the price at which it can be bought in world markets.

Similarly with chemical pesticides. Let us consider one example which is fairly typical: Some 50,000 cotton growing farmers in Sukumaland have been supplied with an oil based pesticide called Endosulfan which is sprayed with the help of an ultra low volume spray. Hoechst Farbwerke has a monopoly on the manufacture and sale of Endosulfan, which is assembled in a plant in Tanzania out of chemical intermediate products all of which are imported from abroad. The ULV sprayers are not made in Tanzania either. These costs are not balanced by the expected 20 per cent increase in cotton production as a result of the spraying, because of the falling commodity prices. (It is by no means established that the use of this pesticide will lead to any significant increase in cotton production over and above the increase due to favourable climatic conditions.)⁴

Similar considerations apply to the use of tractors and the building and maintenance of huge silos.⁵

So we see that technological agriculture is misdirected in its purpose to boost export crop production. It is used for generating surplus which is exported as a primary produce instead of being used for local manufactures. This technology is not locally generated, is not adapted to local conditions, but merely reproduced out of imported inputs. It neither transfers any technical skills to Tanzanians nor does it allow for any choice in techniques. Tanzania is constrained to accept inappropriate capitalintensive technologies with respect to agriculture, which at best give employment to some unskilled workers and a few mechanics who do the minor repairing and maintenance of machines. Productive forces are stifled. Thus the present mode of interaction between technology and agricultural environment perpetuates the structural dependency of underdevelopment. Tanzania is not alone in this; this is true of a great many Third World countries which export primary produce. This also explains the apparent paradox of the World Bank putting money into Ujamaa Villages in the Tabora region; that's because these villages almost exclusively produce tobacco for export to metropolitan capitalist countries.

What would the interaction between technology and the agricultural environment look like if Tanzania were set on the path of a self-centred economy? It would for one thing lead to maintain in the production of industrial crops like cotton, sisal and timber at levels which are entirely used up in local producer and consumer goods industries. The surplus conserved in not growing that volume of the cash crops which would otherwise merely be exported can be channeled into growing more food crops. As is well known, Tanzania, like many other countries of the Third World is going through a grave shortage of food production.

This is not merely due to recent droughts. Several severe droughts that have occurred in China over the last twenty years have not led to famines, whereas the droughts in India, the Sahel and Ethiopia have. Droughts lead to famines if the mode of production and relations of production are antagonistic to the interests of the masses. Claude Meillassoux and Lionel Cliffe show this in the case of the Sahel and Ethiopia.⁶

Imports of foodstuffs have been rising over the last six years including years of good climatic conditions. The decline in food production is traceable to the boost given to export crops at the expense of food crops. This year Tanzania has committed foreign exchange of about 1,300 million shillings to finance its food imports. A fraction of this sum offered to peasants in the form of increased prices will immediately provide the incentive to produce more food crops.

Tanzania is vast and fertile country with a very low population of 14 million. Except for the dry central plains, the rest of country has high agricultural potential. Its fertile river valleys and deltas can produce not only enough food for the whole population, but also for export to other African countries which are less well endowed agriculturally. In the immediate future, food production can be increased by several times without the use of chemical fertilizers, chemical pesticides and tractors, but by following the rules of basic good husbandry such as proper ploughing with the use of draught animals, sowing in rows at the correct time, weeding at the correct time with animal drawn hoes and fertilizing with locally available green and animal manure. In respect of fertilization, one can follow the example of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam which decided to concentrate on generating hundreds of thousands of tons of organic manure instead of importing chemical fertilizers which she could not produce herself.

This is not to say that chemical fertilizers and chemical pesticides will not be needed in the future. Their use will make sense firstly only when they can be manufactured almost entirely from local inputs: this is one example of the necessary integration of agricultural and industrial development. And secondly only when agricultural output and productivity has reached a certain level. For instance, the People's Republic of China did not take recourse to technological agriculture on a big scale till the early 1960s when she had reached a fairly high level of output using traditional methods of good husbandry combined with a thorough-going land reform. To give another example, the use of tractors in maize production in Tanzanian conditions is sensible only when the land is already yielding about 15 sacks of maize per acre. The failure of mechanised farming in Zambia with its dismal results in maize production bears this out.⁷

Now we come to the other major source of potential surplus: mineral resources and timber. Tanzania's industrial minerals are lying in reserve still untapped. She has an estimated 70 million tons of iron ore with a relatively high percentage of titanium and 1500 million tons of high grade coal, and considerable reserves of lead and tin. She has big deposits of phosphates and sodium salts and clays and limestone. Natural gas has just been discovered. She has huge reserves of soft and hard timber. With a population of only 14 million that is growing at the rate of 2.7 percent, the presently known mineral sources are more than adequate to meet her requirements in producer and consumer goods industries. Future geological surveys may reveal further deposits.

Chenery and Watanabe⁸ have made a study of the structure of industrial production of developed capitalist and developed socialist countries. In both cases they discovered that at the basis of the multiplicity of industrial goods lie certain basic materials sectors. These are iron and steel, textiles, industrial chemicals, cement, paper, timber products, glass, leather and plastics. All these sectors have high forward and backward linkages. Fortunately, Tanzania has all the necessary resources to generate these basic materials sectors. The choices in technology and the choices in technique that one has to make are determined by the nature of the product and socialist priorities fulfilling the materials needs of the masses. For instance, the reduction of the titanium rich iron ores of Njombe district in the south-west of the country will require very high temperatures which at present only electric furnaces can provide; and electric power will be available in plenty from the Kidatu and Stiegler's Gorge hydroelectric projects.

But the iron ore in Chunya district north-west of Njombe perhaps contains less titanium and can perhaps be reduced using the usual blast furnaces. Tanzania has accepted Chinese aid and technical assistance in developing her Chunya iron and steel complex. The sectors of iron and steel and industrial chemicals obviously call for capital-intensive, highly concentrated complexes. Cement, paper, glass, leather and plastics can use less capital intensive and more labour intensive methods of production, in decentralised units throughout the rural area.

If and when Tanzania gets going on generating a self-centred economy with its central connection between producer and mass consumer goods, she will have a great opportunity of making choices in technologies and techniques that are appropriate to the needs of her masses. For one thing she can build in resource conserving and anti-polluting measures into the technologies. Some of the anti-polluting measures she could take right now are the following: review the use of both DDT based and non-DDT based pesticides in the countryside. For instance, Endosulfan, which although non-DDT based, is still highly toxic and can destroy sources of fish in Lake Victoria if it gets into the water systems of Sukumaland. It is toxic for human beings as well. Endosulfan caused tremendous damage to the Rhine river in West Germany and Holland a few years ago, creating near panic to the communities using its water supply. The polluting chemical effluents from the petroleum refinery and textile mills in the Dar Es Salaam region and the fertilizer factory in the Tanga region can be counteracted by bio-degrading them using cheap and universally applicable methods developed in China. Plants take up only about ten percent of the chemical fertilizers put into the soil, while the rest leaks out into the water-systems, building up the level of pollution. This is also a great waste of valuable resources which could otherwise be used productively. So there is a case for reviewing the use of chemical fertilizers as well.

A necessary step for Tanzania in conserving her environment is to forbid the import of heavily polluting technologies from abroad, whichever country they come from. There are very definite moves on the part of multinational corporations to hoist polluting technologies on to the Third World countries, which are forbidden in metropolitan capitalist countries, e.g. Japanese technology operating in South Korea.

Another necessary step in resource conservation is to forbid the export of non-renewable resources. For too long, the metropolitan capitalist countries have siphoned off valuable non-renewable resources from Third World countries, undermining their potential for industrialization.

Yet another step to take is to ensure the conservation of marine resources. At present, Japanese fishing fleets are trawling indiscriminately in the coastal waters of Tanzania, causing grave damage to the breeding grounds along the coral reef. This should be stopped forthwith. In the meantime, local fishermen should be trained in modern methods of fishing and given medium sized boats with suitable intermediate technology fishing gear to increase their yield which would provide plenty of cheap protein food for the masses in Tanzania. This will automatically stop the present pernicious and illegal dynamiting of the coral reef by those fishermen who are looking for easier methods of fishing. The dynamiting is laying waste the coral reef, destroying its capacity to engender organic life and with it the renewable resources of fish.

Finally, I would like to mention the extraction of valuable by-products from what is at present regarded as 'waste'. The following are some examples on which Tanzania can take action right now: the use of bagasse and molasses from sugar mills in the making of paper, chemicals and animal fodder. Here Cuba has shown the way and one can learn from that technology. The use of cashewnut shell liquid to obtain industrially important phenols. The utilization of vegetable wastes and animal dung in generating methane fuel and fertilizer systems.

Acknowledgments: It is a pleasure to thank my colleagues Carol Barker, Ahmed Hassanali and David Wield for valuable discussions.

References:

- 1 Samir Amin: The theoretical model of capital accumulation and of the economic and social development of the world today. Monthly Review Press, New York.
- Samir Amin: Development and structural change: The African experience 1950-70.
- 2 Paul Baran: The political economy of growth. 1973 edition Penguin books.
- 3 Andrew Coulson: The Tanga fertilizer factory Mimeo. Department of Economics. University of Dar es Salaam.
- 5 Claude Meillassoux: Development or exploitation: is the Sahel famine good business? Review of African Political Economy, No. 1, August 1974. Merlin Press, London.
- Lionel Cliffe: Feudalism, Capitalism and the Famine in Ethiopia. Review of African Political Economy. No. 1 August, 1974. Merlin Press, London.
- 7 Rene Dumont: Tanzanian agriculture after the Arusha declaration. 1968.
- 8 H.B. Chenery and T. Watanabe: International comparisons of the structure of production.

LETTER TO THE EDITORThe Big Lie

On December 12th, 1974, a certain American Missionary, a 'great man of God,' a 'faith-healer', the Right (or better still 'Wrong') Reverend Morris Cerullo, D.D., kept a big assembly of Tanzanian believers and a few non-believers hypnotized for more than two hours at Jangwani Grounds.

After delivering his neurotic and highly stereotyped sermon, the preacher made an appeal to the congregation to come back to the same grounds at eight in the morning of the following day—a working day — for another dose of the Christian ideological pill. Fortunately the Tanzania government banned any further gatherings before the planned mammoth meeting could materialize.

While commending the government for its timely and pragmatic decision to nip Cerullo in the bud, Tanzanians should also be asking themselves several basic questions about the incident. In particular we should ask ourselves: Who is this man, Morris Cerullo and what ideological and class forces does he represent? Who gives him the funds to tour around the Third World? And why tour the Third World in particular? What in political and objective terms is the hidden purpose of Cerullo's mission?

It is true that Cerullo claimed from the beginning that he was not representing any political doctrines. However, his incessant harping on the theme of Christ as 'the answer' to 'all' our problems shows clearly in which camp he belongs. For once Christ becomes the answer to all problems then all human struggle for liberation and greater mastery over nature and social forces becomes meaningless. Need one add that Christianity has existed in the world for 2000 years now and yet Man's problems have been aggravating instead of being solved 'by Christ'?

A hundred years ago, a horde of missionaries and telescopic 'philanthropists' from Europe and America invaded Africa ostensibly to spread the Gospel, and before long our continent fell under the iron heel of Western spiritual and politico-economic imperialism. Thus it came to pass that the Africans who had cordially welcomed the missionaries learnt the bitter lesson that there was no difference between God and Mammon. Like John the Baptist, the missionaries had come to the wilderness and baptised the people with water in preparation for the colonial soldier-administrator, who was to baptise them with cannon and machine-gun fire.

This realization precipitated the Africans' political and military resurgence against imperialism; a resurgence which all the military might at the imperialists' disposal could not curb. Against odds, and against threats of eternal damnation from the church the freedom fighters were undaunted and eventually won victory. Needless to say, this victory was not due to any divine assistance sent by Christ, God or any other deity. Indeed it is the colonial forces that used to go into the battlefield carrying bibles in their kit-bags, and of course accompanied by Christian chaplains.

Any assistance the Africans ever received in their struggle came from the communist countries, some of which have either never heard of Christ or have since liberation relegated the bible to the museums where it belongs.

Now that we have won, the west has decided to bombard us with yet another wave of reactionary missionaries camouflaged as

'faith-healers'. Having failed in their bid to 'stamp out communism' from the globe by military means, they are now resorting to the old but effective Victorian tactic of 'spiritual aggression first - the rest will follow.'

They know that due to their sustained onslaught on our human and economic resources, we inevitably suffer from disease, poverty and ignorance. Hence it would be easy to deceive and recapture us (if they have not already done so) by fabricating for us (not for themselves) the panacea of Christ in the form of Cerullo's "miracles" as a short-cut to better health and a better future. This hoax is definitely calculated to stop us from making any fundamental changes in our dependant economies and neo-colonial superstructures.

While real friends, the Chinese, the Cubans, and other communist countries are helping us to rebuild our countries through our own efforts, by mobilizing the greatest resource we have - our people; and while they are helping us to build railways, roads, schools, and training institutions for our technical cadre, the Western bourgeoisie is plaguing us with useless and frustrated missionaries to put wool into our eyes for the benefit of their monopolies.

As there no blind, deaf, or crippled people in America and Europe that Cerullo and his like should fly all the way to come and 'cure' Africans? But of course there lies the rub, for while in their own countries they are building better and more modern health facilities, while their scientists are paid large amounts of money to do research into new techniques of combatting disease, to us they are recommending Christian witch-crafts as the answer!

Cerullo never tires of telling our people that they are sinners and should be purged through his prayers. But against whom have our oppressed people 'sinned'? Can this be another attempt to revive the old myth of ham's curse? It is precisely the Cerulllos themselves, the Western bourgeois, who are the most deadly sinners. It is they who are daily sinning against two thirds of humanity! Let them lay the blame where it belongs.

Once Billy Graham, another spokesman of the American bourgeoisie who parades around the world as God's emissary, was asked by some American young men whether it was right for them to go to Vietnam to massacre the Vietnamese peasants in the name of 'defending democracy', and he replied that it was right and proper, for by going to Vietnam they were doing an act of patriotism to their fatherland - did not the Lord command the believers to love their country and obey their king? And this is precisely the mission of these reverend preachers from Europe. They may not be consciously aware of it themselves, but all the same objectively that is what their pious sermons amount to.

To sum up, let those mystified Africans who believe in twentieth century miracles know that even if Cerullo's witch-craft could physically cure the deaf and the blind (and there is no proof that it can), the greatest disease of all, the germ of all ills, social disease, and its concomitant social blindness, cannot be cured by Cerullo or Christ. On the contrary, this missionary haranguing, by blindfolding the people, help to intensify the social disease which is at the core of the physical disease it purports to cure. Cerullo himself is critically in need of a miracle dose to cure him from his social and spiritual blindness.

The spread of European missionary activity in the Third World in recent years cannot but be a sign of the beginning of another attempt by the West to recolonize us. These preachers are the harbingers of a new and more vicious colonialism. The Oppressed people of Africa and the Third World should be vigilant lest history repeats itself before our very eyes.