

TOWARDS THE AFRICAN SOCIAL REVOLUTION: THE CASE OF TANZANIA.

JIMMY K. TINDIGARUKAYO, *Makerere University.*

Every people on earth go through two revolutions: a political revolution that helps them recover their right to self-government from the hands of a despot who had imposed himself upon them, or free themselves from the domination of alien armed forces which had installed themselves in the land against their will; and a social revolution — a class conflict that ultimately ends in the realization of social justice for all inhabitants of the country. (G. A. Nasser.)

From a historical perspective, the concept of revolution has two facets as G. A. Nasser observes in the above quotation. First, there is a revolution, which out of sheer necessity for political freedom, sets out to get rid of imposed power upon the inhabitants. This imposed power can take a form of one person, as it was the case with the Russian Revolution and the Zanzibar Revolution, to overthrow the Czarist and the Sultan regimes respectively. It can also take a form of alien rule, without the due consent of the governed, as it was the case with overthrow of the imperial power here in Africa and elsewhere. Second, a revolution can also be social in content, aiming at changing the social, political, economical and cultural structures, so as to facilitate progress and harmony in a given society. Talking about the cultural revolution of the Libyan Arab Republic, the commentator had this to say:

The Libyan Arab people have endured harsh sufferings from reactionist ideological domination, Eastern and Western ideological invasion and infiltration. Therefore, it was a must to liberate these people from all aspects of cultural invasion and ideological domination. Deeply believing in the importance of man being the first and last fact in social construction, the revolution has realised that this aim cannot be achieved but through a cultural revolution, not only to expose importance of exported methods and to check reactionary, infiltrating and suspected ideologies, but also to present a substitute compatible with the nature of the revolutionary period our society is passing through. The aim is not to ban modern ideas, but to subject them through filters to choose what suits our heritage, traditions and needs and to leave what contradicts with them.¹

This quotation strikes a clear balance between the revolution for political freedom and the social revolution. Whereas political revolution aims at physical removal of the imposed leadership; the social revolution is pre-

occupied with the changing ideas, cultures and general behaviour, which have been inculcated into the society by the influence of the imposed leadership. Although the two are connected in this regard, they differ fundamentally, especially when we consider the methods used to effect them.

To effect a political revolution, more often than not, an element of violence is evident. The "Mau Mau" movement which claimed tolls of life to remove the imperial power from Kenya, and the bloodshed witnessed during the Zanzibar revolution of January 1964, organized by the Youth wing of the Afro-Shirazi party to overthrow the Sultan's Monarchy, are examples substantiating this notion.

Social revolution, however, in most of the cases, takes a more salient form. It would be better if it can be achieved through persuasion, although of course, there are some examples on the scene where coercion has become a second alternative. Even then, it can still be maintained that persuasion other than coercion remains the ideal method. This is precisely because, social revolution aims at the orientation of mind towards a set of certain values and ideals. It would be a layman's method to try to change one's mind by using force.

Given these two facets of revolution, it remains the concern of this paper to explore the social revolution, especially in connection with Tanzania. The landmarks of Tanzanian social revolution bear the core in the establishment of Ujamaa² Socialism, as a political philosophy which Tanzanian leadership was, and still is, to be guided.

It should be spelled out from the start that the Tanzanian Social revolution has been, and still is, spearheaded by Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, who is not only the leader of the ruling party, TANU, but also the President of the Nation since December 1962. In his elaborate article; "Ujamaa—The basis of African Socialism",³ a paper which he wrote during the interim period between his resignation as a Prime Minister in January 1962, and December 1963, when he returned to power as a President, Julius Nyerere defines and explains what he means by Ujamaa Socialism.

Socialism, like democracy, he argues, is an attitude of mind. As much as a wretched can be a potential capitalist, a millionaire can equally be a socialist. His analysis here distinguishes a capitalist from a socialist only by attitudes either of the two have towards the use of the available resources at hand. Anyone, whether poor or rich, who is preoccupied with the idea of using wealth to dominate others, is a capitalist at heart, while the one who would like the wealth to be put to the service of the society as a whole is a socialist.

The remarkable thing about this article, is that Nyerere is not only appealing to the people of Tanzania (by then Tanganyika) to aspire to the ideas of socialism, but to the entire African populace. The basis of his analysis is the African traditional political system. In precolonial Africa everybody was a worker in the sense of trying to contribute as much as he

possibly could for the society as a whole. A traditional African was neither an idler nor was he exploiter. He never aspired to the possession of personal wealth for the purpose of domination any of his fellows. The idea of exploitation, therefore, is not only anti-socialism, but it is also foreign to Africa. It came to Africa, hand in hand, with colonialism, and the only way Africans can recapture their traditional ideals, is to re-educate themselves to regain their former attitude of mind. Once this is achieved individuals will take care of the whole society and vice versa. In essence; this is a springboard upon which socialism as a political philosophy can operate. This is Nyerere's message.

There are some assumptions made in this article which may not be taken for granted. First, if socialism is an attitude of mind as Nyerere asserts, it follows then that an individual is born with it. As such, the environment in which an individual finds himself may only sharpen his attitude but may not change it. It is on this basis that a millionaire can as well be a socialist if he is born with a socialist mind. Likewise, a destitute can be a capitalist if he is born with a desire to exploit and dominate others if given a chance. If these premises are true, then the appeal for African orientation becomes futile, because what is inborn cannot be changed merely by the word of mouth. In any case, if socialism is an attitude of mind, then it is wrong to assert that the traditional African society was homogeneously socialist, because it would be too much of a coincidence for the entire society to be born with a uniform attitude. This leads us to the second shortfall of the concept of socialism as advanced by Mwalimu Nyerere.

Nyerere argues that in the "traditional" African society wealth was equally distributed and that nobody exploited others for purposes of building up his own personal power and prestige. This is amazingly inconsistent with the already established data. First, it is too presumptuous to assume that all traditional African societies behaved uniformly. The mode of behaviour depended, especially, upon the mode of the political system prevailing in each particular society, kingdoms such as Ankole, and Rwanda, had different strata of people within their society. Worse still, each strata was rewarded with wealth according to the status it had in the whole community. In Ruanda and Ankole, the aristocratic Tutsi and Hima respectively had clients. In the context of Ruanda traditional political system, Lucy Mair⁴ indicated that:

Every Hutu sought to be the client of some Tutsi, for the protection entailed in this relationship was highly significant; moreover, the status which the Ruanda scheme of value accorded to the Hutu was such that a Hutu who had a protector was at the mercy of any Tutsi; the Tutsi also sought the protection of other Tutsi richer and more powerful than themselves.⁵

This observation indicates that the Ruanda society had different strata, not only on the basis of aristocratic and non-aristocratic relationship, but also on the basis of wealth, since even some aristocratic Batutsi sought client-

ship from their aristocratic Tutsi, but who were richer than themselves. The lord-client relationship, in fact, can be equated with master-servant relationship in the contemporary capitalistic society thus:

The client had the duty of personal service to his Lord. He followed him on journeys, to court, or to war. He acted as his messenger, and was required to build and keep in repair a length of the reed fence around the Lord's homestead. A Hutu client also had to cultivate fields for his Lord and keep guard outside his house at night. A great man with many clients allotted different jobs among them, such as cooking or brewing.⁶

If, in the light of Julius Nyerere's judgement, this was not exploitation and domination of a man by another, then the two words have lost their meaning. And yet this was purely a traditional African political system, supposedly to be egalitarian in Nyerere's judgement! Even if Nyerere referred to the African traditional societies in the light of Tanganyika, of which he is part and parcel, the idea of an individual failing to amass wealth for his personal gain and domination of others does not arise.

Mirambo of Nyamwezi, who was one of the chiefs of traditional Tanganyika chiefdoms, used any means possible to gain wealth for his personal aggrandizement, for as Ronald Harvey observes:

It was his determination that all caravans must pass through his country and be subjected to dues. His dues were not light, and it is related that the price of ivory was doubled as a result of his policy. He wanted wealth. He offered merchants much security and in turn he wanted them to pay.⁷

Further, the London Missionary Society chronicle in 1884, asserts that: "Every thought of his (Mirambo) is directed towards conquest, plunder and acquisition of territory, the foundation of which is prowess".⁸ Given this evidence, from the traditional African societies, the base upon which Nyerere launches his appeal for the social revolution of Tanzanian peoples and Africa at large, becomes shaky. But even then, his message still holds water, for, any social revolution to be effective, there must be an underlying philosophy by which it can be guided. His philosophy in this regard, is Ujamaa Socialism.

When we examine the Arusha declaration, we discover that the document is a reflection of a well thought, clearly analysed and deep rooted work of a statement. When it was launched in 1967, the Kenya Weekly News commented that: "The document was followed by alarm, despair, despondency, resentment and joy."⁹ Later on, Professor Ali A. Mazrui had this to say about the same document: "Through the Arusha declaration and its aftermath, Julius Nyerere has indeed given Africa an alternative of political boldness."¹⁰ There is no doubt, therefore, that the importance of the Arusha declaration cannot be underestimated. In any case, it forms the core of the social

revolution for Tanzania and Africa in general, as Julius Nyerere spells out thus:

TANU is involved in a war against poverty and oppression in our country; this struggle is aimed at moving the people of Tanzania (*and the people of Africa as a whole*) from a state of poverty to a state of prosperity. We have been oppressed a great deal, we have been exploited a great deal and we have been disregarded a great deal. It is our weakness that has led to our being oppressed, exploited and disregarded. Now we want a *revolution — a revolution** which brings to an end our weakness, so that we are never again exploited, oppressed, or humiliated.¹¹

With the advent of the Arusha declaration, therefore, Ujamaa socialism, which forms the basis for African social revolution, and in particular Tanzanian revolution, seems to have crystallized into a coherent pattern for a more systematic social reorganisation than has ever been before. By looking at the ideals advocated by the declaration, as a step to a more systematic transformation, we can be in position to diversify indices so as to gauge its potential capacity to effect its objectives. A summary of the important aspects of the declaration is crucial here, if we are to understand it in its full perspective.

The first part of the document is the "TANU creed", made up of nine TANU "beliefs" and twelve "TANU principles aim and objectives". These beliefs, aims and objectives describe the underlying philosophy of Ujamaa socialism which is mainly concerned with equal distribution of the limited resources through the central control of major means of production, leading to the establishment of a democratic socialist society.

The second part of the declaration deals with "The policy of socialism". The introduction of this part defines the goals of the declaration. It is better quoted in full than in summary.

A truly socialist state is one in which all people are workers and in which neither capitalism nor feudalism exists. It does not have two classes of people, a lower class composed of people who work for their living and an upper class of people who live on work of others. In a really socialist country no person exploits another; everyone who is physically able to work does so; everyone obtains a just return for the labour he performs; and the incomes derived from different types of work are not grossly divergent!

This definition, like the definition of Ujamaa socialism, examined earlier in this paper, lays emphasis on classlessness and equal distribution of resources among the members of the society. This similarity is no surprise, since the documents in question are not only written by the same author, but have also a common theme. Despite this similarity, there is a remarkable shift in the thinking of the author. His emphasis is no longer on "the attitude of mind" of individuals as prerequisite for the establishment of a socialistic

state. Rather, the emphasis is on the mode of behaviour and patterns of relationship inherent amongst the people in a socialist state. Thus, the author comes down to human realities from a highly intuitive and hypothetical paradise. The confirmation of this shift in the thinking of the author becomes clearer later in the last section of this second part of the declaration: "Socialism is a way of life, and a socialist society cannot simply come into existence. A socialist society can only be built by those who believe in, and who themselves practice, the principles of socialism." Practically, the declaration asserts that in order to build and maintain socialism, there must be centralization of all major means of production, coupled, at the same time, with the establishment of democracy, whereby the government is chosen and led by the peasants and workers themselves.

Part three of the Arusha declaration is not only new in Tanzanian social evolution, but also demands urgency in peoples' orientation towards self-reliance. The part begins with a warning to the Tanzanians, and Africans as a whole, that they are at war against poverty and oppression, and that to win this war a revolution is inevitable. Further, the Tanzanian leader, warns against dependence upon money as a weapon for development. First, there is no enough money. Second, depending upon external aid money would mean selling the political independence which was won with bitterness. He also warns against putting too much emphasis on industries instead of paying heed to the peasants who, in the first place, contribute immensely towards the establishment of urban industries. He emphasises hard work, especially in agriculture as a basis for development, because people and their hard work are the foundation of development, and money is one of the fruits of that hard work. In concluding remarks of this third part, the author pinpoints the priorities for development:

From now on we shall stand upright and walk forward on our feet rather than look at this problem upside down. Industries will come and money will come but their foundation is THE PEOPLE and their HARD WORK, especially in AGRICULTURE. This is the meaning of self-reliance. Our emphasis should therefore be on the land and agriculture, the people, the policy of socialism and self-reliance and good leadership.¹²

The fourth part of the declaration briefly discusses the membership of the ruling organ of TANU. It is here that a radical departure in Nyerere's original conception of TANU's composition manifests itself. Originally, Nyerere had maintained that TANU was to remain as a mass movement with an open membership. In his article "Democracy and the party", and in connection with the party membership, Nyerere had noted that:

Supposing we accept the fact that there is only one party, and stop trying to follow the rules of multi-party system; then as long as TANU membership is open to every citizen, we can conduct our elections in a way which is genuinely free and democratic.¹³

Therefore, Nyerere had concluded that no party which limited its membership to clique could ever free itself from fear of being overthrown by those it had excluded.¹⁴

But the declaration fundamentally departs from this stand. TANU is no longer to be a party of all Tanzanians but a party of the peasant and workers. Even with workers and peasants, if it is discovered that a man does not appear to accept the faith, the objects, the rules and regulation of the party, then he should be deprived of his membership.

This departure, from the original stand, is very fundamental in Tanzanian political philosophy of Ujamaa socialism, which supports, first and foremost, to be incompatible with democracy.

In his discussion on: "Non-liberal democracy: The underdeveloped variant", Professor Macpherson¹⁵ advances three prerequisites for one party democracy. First, the party leaders should be controlled by the rank-and-file within the party, which he "calls intra-party democracy". Second, even with the fullest intra-party democracy, one party state needs, further, to have party membership open to all members of the society. Third, even with these two, one party state may fail to be democratic if the price of participation in the party requires a greater degree of activity than the average person can reasonably be expected to contribute.

The declaration, automatically, rules out the last two conditions above, because the party is only open to peasants and workers which, in essence, discriminates against those who are neither of these two groups of people. If it was open to all, there would not have been any reason to mention the two groups of people who qualify to be members. Even with the peasants and workers as the only qualified members of the party, their membership is not guaranteed till they accept and follow the faith, the objects, the rules and regulations of the party. I would consider these demands too strenuous for the average person to accomplish. In the light of the above interpretation of one party democracy, the Arusha declaration makes the Tanzanian ruling party devoid of democratic tendencies.

The last section of the document concerns itself with the central conduct of TANU members and National leaders. In sum, no TANU or government leader should be associated with either capitalist or feudal practices such as holding shares in any company, receiving more than one salary, becoming a director of any co-operation or owning houses for rent. This implies that a capitalist leader aspirant is not to be hindered, as long as he disengages from his former associations and practices, and rehabilitates his interior values. This gives an echo on what we have already observed that Socialism as an attitude of mind is now out of the game.

An overview of the Arusha declaration would indicate that it is a generalisation of the conceptions expressed by Nyerere in his essays and speeches since early 1958. Only two conceptions appear deviants in this generalization; TANU's restricted membership and the nationalization of major concerns.

With this in mind, how has this document, together with its predecessors, affected the social, political and economic change within the Tanzanian community? In essence, is social revolution in Tanzania attainable given all the proposals its leaders has thrown aboard?

From the analysis of the prevailing conditions in Tanzanian, Nyerere believes that the ideology can lay down, in specific terms, a concrete political and economic line for the Tanzanian people to follow. He sees ideas as a cloak behind which reality hides. He believes that ideas help man to control and change his environment.

The remaining part of this paper examines whether or not this conception is wishful thinking. In this regard, I will start with Nyerere's classical idea about Ujamaa as a fundamental basis for the establishment of a classless society that is democratic in form.

To achieve such a society, Nyerere argues, the Tanzanians have to re-educate themselves to regain the traditional African attitude of mind, which in essence, is that of familyhood. The paradox here, is that the developing Tanzania, would like to make the quickest progress in the shortest time possible. As to whether it can ancientize and modernise at the same time remains the problem. Professor Ali A. Mazrui, commenting about Nkrumah on the same issue had this to say:

Involved in this very concept of rebirth is a paradoxical desire—the desire to be grey-haired and wrinkled as a Nation; of wanting to have antiquity. This is directly linked to the crisis of identity. In so far as nations are concerned, there is often a direct correlation between identity and age. The paradox of Nkrumah's ambition for his country was to modernize and ancientize at the time.¹⁶

This quotation about Nkrumah directly applies to Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, who wants his people to re-educate themselves so as to regain the African traditional attitude in the face of the current modern expositions.

In contradiction to what Nyerere advocates in his "Ujamaa—the basis of socialism", he had earlier observed that traditional beliefs, and attitudes had no place in the current (by then Tanganyika). In 1960, referring to the role of chiefs, Nyerere had said:

Tanganyika is not a traditional unit at all, if the chiefs want to have a place in this thing we call Tanganyika, they have got to adapt themselves to the new situation. There is nothing traditional in the central government of Tanganyika today.¹⁷

In 1960 Tanganyika was different from traditional Tanganyika, in 1967, when Nyerere wrote the Arusha declaration, the same nation is bound to have become even more different from the traditional Tanganyika. And yet, this is the period when the head of state is appealing to the people of Tanzania to "re-educate" themselves so as to appreciate and aspire to traditional ideals.

Despite all this, Ujamaa villages have been established, as a measure

to re-educate the Tanzanians to aspire to the African traditional ideas so as, later, to establish a classless society. This was the political aim. The economic aims, however, behind Ujamaa Ujijini were twofold: First, that families should be clustered together so as to ease the difficulties of providing expert agricultural advice and other services like, schools, hospitals, infrastructure, etc. Second, to improve the level of agricultural technology and methods of cultivation so as, ultimately, to increase crop production, as Nyerere well points out thus:

"...and if you ask me why government wants us to live in villages, the answer is simple: unless we do we shall not be able to provide ourselves with the things we need to develop our land and to raise our standard of living.¹⁸

The problem, however, comes in when we start analysing the setbacks involved in the implementation of this Ujamaa Ujijini policy. Issa G. Shivji¹⁹ mentions two important limitations.

1. Complete lack of any analysis of the differentiation among the peasantry in the area concerned and which sections can be potentially mobilized to effect the programme and which sections are likely to oppose it.
2. Bureaucratic (as opposed to democratic) and technocratic (as opposed to political) methods in implementing the programme.

The first limitation above, implies that not everybody in Tanzania can be mobilized to appreciate living in Ujamaa villages. Despite this, no analysis has been made to find out those who would appreciate and those who are completely opposed to the idea. This lack of analysis has led to some people forced into Ujamaa villages. Some of those forced ones do not have Ujamaa socialism, as a political philosophy, at heart, and they used the villages as their base to dominate others while at the same time exploiting the advantages of the programme. As Shivji once again says:²⁰

It should hardly be surprising that the lack of a discriminatory attitude toward the different strata of the peasantry has only resulted in the control of Ujamaa villages by the rich peasants or the so called government "staff". In either case the poor and the middle peasants remain politically dominated and economically exploited.

And yet the aims of the whole exercise was to exterminate domination and exploitation!

The second limitation given by Shivji implies that force has been used to get people into Ujamaa villages. This notion is supported by Frehold who writes that: "...ranging from threats to forced transport from old homes to short prison sentences under the pretext of tax arrears or minimum acreage violation."²¹

As mentioned earlier in this paper, social revolution, unlike political revolution, would better imply persuasion, other than coercion, as a method

to achieve its objectives. The use of force to cluster people in Ujamaa villages does not only fail to reflect the democratic tendencies it purports to promote, but is also inhuman and lacks direction. It is not surprising, that Dr. Kierru, regional commissioner of Iringa, was shot dead by one of the rich peasants attempting to mobilize peasants into Ujamaa villages.²²

This does not only show the use of inadequate method of mobilization, it also goes further to indicate that the policy behind Ujamaazation, does not have the blessing of the people it claims to serve. This is very crucial, in as far as revolution, in any form, is concerned. In order for any movement to be called a revolution, the whole framework of a society must be involved in it, and it must know its objectives and direction. A revolution, therefore, calls for commitment of those involved in it, ideologically sound and trained personnel, to explain its objectives and to give it a direction. It is not a question of few conscientious leaders, it is a question of political consciousness of all members of the society.

In the case of Tanzania, the TANU leaders, all of whom of course may not be committed to the party ideology, find themselves engulfed in an ocean of people who are not only ignorant of the party policy, but some of whom are even opposed to the policy. To claim, therefore, that the Tanzanian revolution will be effective in the near future, would not only be utopian but would rather be trying to nurse unhealing wound.

The role of the TANU party in the social revolution

The importance and role of a party in any social revolution cannot at any rate, be underestimated. David Apter²³ observes that in the area of political modernization, no single role is of greater importance than that of the party politician—since the primary function of parties is to organize public opinion and test attitudes and transmit these to government officials and leaders so that the rulers and the ruled are in a reasonably close accord. (Note that I am not confusing political modernization for social revolution, for it must be realised that the former is an ingredient of the latter.)

The role and aims of TANU in the political life of Tanzania are well stipulated in the party constitution. In sum, TANU serves as an inducement of solidarity and gives direction to the Tanzanian people. It is expected to achieve and maintain the goals of the state and public support. In so doing, eliminating all forms of inequality through the establishment of a democratic socialist state.

As to whether or not the party achieves these objectives is yet another matter. Henry Bienen²⁴ describes TANU as a National Institution that is not controlled from a central party headquarters. But rather that it is like a tree with many roots and branches that strike deep in some places but find no soil in which to grow in others. While the trunk of the tree is always clearly visible, some of the roots and branches have strayed so far and become so entangled in bush that their relationship to the main trunk may appear tenuous if visible at all.

This analogy implies that the party does not have evenly distributed support from the people of Tanzania. Neither is its influence evenly distributed over the whole of Tanzania. It further implies that it is neither controlled from the party headquarters, meaning the central executive nor from the grassroot masses. The "trunk" given in the analogy, ultimately remains the party. This trunk is obviously Nyerere who, with his charismatic leadership, has dominated the political scene of Tanzania so much that to think of the party is to think of Nyerere. This domination of the party by one man has made the party lack intellectual elites needed for the creation of grassroot mass involvement in the party politics and programmes. As G. Arrighi and J. Saul²⁵ observe; the lack of Tanzanian revolutionary intellectuals is a striking feature, suggesting a possible future drag upon the policy of genuinely transforming the nature of the elite. Thus, Nyerere continues to be the father, and the role of his subordinates, from whom they emanate, remain undefined.

However, his policy of self-reliance, if it had sufficient prophets to spread its gospel, would inevitably have positive results towards the achievement of social revolution. Also the nationalisation of all important economic concerns, if well administered would be a very contributive measure towards the equal distribution of the scarce available resources to the entire Tanzanian populace. The faults of poor administration are already evident in the Kilimanjaro region.

Thus, nationalisation if badly administered can intensify the exploitation, oppression and domination of the poor peasants and in so doing, draws even sharper lines of class differentiation of society than ever before. This is suicidal. It would be better not to engage in the exercise so as to kill the cock in order to save the hen. This would not be socialism. This would be capitalism restored.

CONCLUSION

Social revolutions, like any other revolutions, demand mass participation; the involvement of which makes the people conscious and aware of the goals, aims and objectives for which the revolution set off to achieve. A revolution led by a handful of elites without a following of grassroot masses is no revolution. If it is at all, it is a revolution without revolutionaries; which is a contradiction in terms. What is apparent is that there can be a set of revolutionary ideas. But such revolutionary ideas use revolutionaries to implement them. If the latter are not there, and cannot possibly be made, then the revolution cannot take off the ground on its own accord. Neither can the author of such revolutionary ideas be sufficient enough to implement his ideas alone to effect a revolution. There can never be a revolution of, and by, one man. This would be fantasy.

Nyerere writes of a revolution for which he appeals to Africans to re-educate themselves so as to regain the traditional African attitude. He neither provides the school nor the sufficient teachers to effect the re-education

process. He provides ideas but they cannot transmit themselves. The transmission process needs the teacher well versed in the pros and cons of the ideas. It also needs a very patient, longing mind to absorb them. The ideas, must therefore, be agreeable to both parties; the teacher and the student, otherwise a disagreement that may result into a feud is evident. It is undeniable a fact that some of the ideas Nyerere expounds, would transform the Tanzanian society into a more progressive one than it has been hitherto. But these ideas need to be diffused into the entire Tanzanian society, if their objectives are to be achieved. This diffusion process needs prophets who are very dedicated to the cause of these objectives. They have to be many, and in addition, to know the direction and destiny of these objectives.

As we have observed, Tanzania lacks these dedicated intellectuals to give the revolution shape and direction. The party members are overshadowed by the charismatic glamour of the protagonist of the revolution. And it appears, this has not enabled them to exploit, in full, their political potentialities. The intellectual elites that would be the vanguards of the revolution want also to have a share on the bigger cake of the nation. They claim that they have toiled for more than half of their lifetime for it. But to get such a bigger share on a national cake is anti-socialism. There has to be equal distribution of the scarce economic resources. So the intellectuals are denied what they consider to be their due share. They refuse, therefore, to be active members of a revolution that undermines their interests. Therefore, the party is devoid of such resourceful brains that would form a concrete foundation for the continuity and success of the revolution.

Further, social revolution, unlike political revolution, is very gradual. It needs time and a vigorous socialization process, both to make the unwanted values forgotten and to inculcate the new wanted values into the minds of the people. With the realization that Tanzanian Education for self-reliance aims at the creation of the type of people Tanzania wants for her development, on the basis of Ujamaa socialism philosophy as a guideline for this development, it is hoped that the future political trends in Tanzania will be different from the current ones. A school is one of the socialising agents. The school recipients after their socialisation would, in turn, socialise the rest of the populace. Such a reciprocal process would have positive results towards the appreciation and accomplishment of Tanzanian social revolutionary ideals. Only time will tell!

FOOTNOTES

1. The First of September Revolution Achievements 1969-1974, General Administration for information, Tripoli, L.A.R., 1974, pp. 12-13.
2. Ujamaa can be translated as familyhood.
3. *Freedom and Unity*, Oxford University Press, Dar es Salaam, 1966, pp. 162-171.

4. The Hutu were and still are the peasantry class of Rwanda who were dominated and subjected by the aristocratic Tutsi.
5. Lucy Mair, *Primitive Government* (Hazell Watson and Viney Ltd., Aylesbury, 1962), p. 168.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
7. Ronald J. Harvey, "Mirambo", *Tanganyika Notes and Records*, Vol. 28, 1948-50, p. 25.
8. *London Missionary Society Chronicles*, 1884, p. 17.
9. "What the World Thought," *Weekly News*, March 3rd, 1967, p. 14.
10. Ali A. Mazrui, "Tanzaphilia" in *Transition*, No. 31, June, 1967, p. 21.
11. J. Nyerere, The Arusha Declaration, Social and Selfreliance in *Freedom and Socialism*, Oxford University Press, E. Africa, 1968, p. 233.
12. Nyerere, The Arusha Declaration and TANU's policy on Socialism and Selfreliance in *Ujamaa Essays on Socialism*, p. 33.
13. Nyerere, *Freedom and Unity*, p. 200.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
15. Macpherson, C. B., *The Real World of Democracy* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1966), pp. 27-28.
16. Ali A. Mazrui, Nkrumah the Leninist Tzar. On Heroes and Uhuru—worship, *Essays on Independent Africa*, London, Longmans, 1967, p. 131.
17. Burke, F. Tanganyika, The Search for Ujamaa in C. Roseberg, W. Friesland, *African Socialism*, p. 201.
18. Nyerere, *Freedom and Unity*, pp. 183-4.
19. Shivji, *Class Struggle in Tanzanian* (Tanzania Publishing House, Dar es Salaam), 1975, p. 108.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
21. Quoted by M. Mbilinyi, The Translation to Capitalism in Rural Tanzania. University of Dar es Salaam Department of Education, 1974, p. 35.
22. Witi, A., Class Struggle in Rural Society in Tanzania, p. 34.
23. David Apter, *Politics of Modernization* (University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 267.
24. Henry Bienen, *Tanzanian: Party Transformation and Economic Development*, p. 80.
25. Arrighi and J. Saul, "Social and Economic Development" in *Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 165.