

Critics of African unity often refer to the wide differences in culture, language and ideas in various parts of Africa. This is true, but the essential fact remains that we are all Africans, and have a common interest in the independence of Africa. The difficulties presented by questions of language, culture and different political systems are not insuperable. If the need for political union is agreed by us all, then the will to create it is born; and where there's a will there's a way.

The present leaders of Africa have already shown a remarkable willingness to consult and seek advice among themselves. Africans have, indeed, begun to think continentally. They realise that they have much in common, both in their past history, in their present problems and in their future hopes. To suggest that the time is not yet ripe for considering a political union of Africa is to evade the facts and ignore realities in Africa today. The greatest contribution that Africa can make to the peace of the world is to avoid all the dangers inherent in disunity, by creating a political union which will also by its success, stand as an example to a divided world. A union of African states will project more effectively the African personality. It will command respect from a world that has regard only for size and influence. The scant attention paid to African opposition to the French atomic tests in the Sahara, and the ignominious spectacle of the UN in the Congo quibbling about constitutional niceties while the Republic was tottering into anarchy, are evidence of the callous disregard of African Independence by the Great Powers.

We have to prove that greatness is not to be measured in stock piles of atom bombs. I believe strongly and sincerely that with the deep-rooted wisdom and dignity, the innate respect for human lives, the intense humanity that is our heritage, the African race, united under one federal government, will emerge not as just another world bloc to flaunt its wealth and strength, but as a Great Power whose greatness is indestructible because it is built not on fear, envy and suspicion, nor won at the expense of others, but founded on hope, trust, friendship and directed to the good of all mankind.

The emergence of such a mighty stabilising force in this strife-worn world should be regarded not as the shadowy dream of a visionary, but as a practical proposition, which the peoples of Africa can, and should, translate into reality. There is a tide in the affairs of every people when the moment strikes for political action. Such was the moment in the history of the United States of America when the Founding Fathers saw beyond the petty wranglings of the separate states and created a Union. This is our chance. We must act now. Tomorrow may be too late and the opportunity will have passed, and with it the hope of free Africa's survival.

41 ♦ Julius Nyerere argues for African democracy, self-reliance, and socialism (1967)

While Kwame Nkrumah was the most prominent spokesman for pan-Africanism in the early 1960s, Julius Nyerere (1922–99), who in 1961 became the first prime minister of Tanganyika (and in 1964 the first president of Tanzania when Tanganyika joined with Zanzibar to form a republic), articulated a vision of a socialist Africa, one that did not follow foreign models but was distinctly indigenous, in which all commercial enterprises would be nationalized and active steps taken

by the state to reduce inequalities of income between the poor and the rest of society. Tanzania, he argued, could be self-reliant economically, should develop a special form of African socialism rather than borrow foreign models, and was inherently democratic. In the following selections, Nyerere argues that African democracy could flourish without an “official opposition” (as the West constantly demanded in its evaluation of whether democracy had been achieved in Africa). Africa, he contended, did not have to follow Western models because Africans were, within their small-scale village communities, traditionally—and indeed naturally—democratic. The second selection recounts Nyerere’s own discussion of the significance of his Arusha declaration of February 5, 1967. The declaration was regarded by many at the time as a blueprint for the development of African independence under socialism. At a teach-in held at Dar es Salaam University College in August 1967, after explaining that Arusha was “a declaration of intent; no more than that,” Nyerere goes on to describe in plain language how he believed the intentions of the declaration could be achieved.³

A. *The African and democracy*

By the end of this present decade the whole of the African continent will have freed itself from colonial rule. The African nationalist claims that the end of colonialism will mean the establishment of democracy. His present rulers, who have themselves shown little respect for democracy, are equally convinced that the African is incapable of maintaining a democratic form of government. They prophesy that the end of colonialism will lead to the establishment of dictatorships all over the African continent. This debate over the ability or inability of the African to be a democrat rages whenever the words “Africa” and “Democracy” are mentioned together.

I have chosen to join the debate, in this article, not because I want to take sides but, because I believe the debaters have not bothered to define their terms. If they had done so, and particularly if they had cared to analyse the term “democracy,” they would probably have discovered that their conceptions of democracy were totally different; that they were, in fact, wasting their time by arguing at cross purposes.

I think one of the first things one should beware of, in thinking of “democracy,” is the tendency to confuse one’s own personal picture of it—a picture which, if examined, will usually be found to include the “machinery” and symbols of democracy peculiar to the society with which one happens to be familiar—with democracy itself.

More than one attempt has been made to define democracy; probably the best, and certainly the most widely quoted, is that of Abraham Lincoln: “Government of the People, by the People, for the People.” But I think the easiest way to eliminate the inessentials is to start by ignoring all such definitions and simply remember that the word means no more than “Government by the People.” Now, if the ruling of a country is to be in the hands of the people of the country, the people must have some means of making their voice heard. It is obvious that not all of them can take a personal part in the actual legislation and policy-making,

3. A, Julius Nyerere, “The African and Democracy,” in James Duffy and Robert A. Manners, eds., *Africa Speaks* (Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1961), 28–34; B, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, “The Arusha Declaration Teach-in” (Dar es Salaam: Information Services; n.d. [1967]), 4–11.



FIGURE 20 President John F. Kennedy welcomes Julius Nyerere to the White House in 1961. Nyerere was the first prime minister of independent Tanganyika (later called Tanzania) and later served as its first president from 1964 to 1985. He promoted a variant of socialist agrarian policies that he called “Ujamaa,” or “familyhood” in Swahili. Throughout the Cold War, Nyerere maintained a strictly neutral foreign policy for Tanzania, and although he was never able to dramatically improve Tanzania’s economic situation, he is widely revered as one of the continent’s ablest leaders. AP Photo.

so it is necessary for them to choose from among themselves a certain number of individuals who will “represent” them, and who will act as their spokesmen within the government. This may seem so elementary as to need no such elaborate explanation as I have given it here; but is it? If it is, why do so many people claim that “Africans cannot maintain democratic government in their own countries once they become independent”? And why do they always explain their doubts by saying that “Of course no African government will tolerate an Opposition”?

I do not think anybody, at this stage of our history, can possibly have any valid reason for claiming that the existence of an Opposition is impossible in an independent African state; but, even supposing this were true, where did the idea of an organization opposition as an essential part of democratic government come from? If one starts, as I have suggested, from the purely etymological definition of democracy it becomes clear that this idea of “for” and “against,” this obsession with “Government” balanced by “Official Opposition,” is in fact something which, though it *may* exist in a democracy, or *may not* exist in a democracy, is not essential to it, although it happens to have become so familiar to the Western world that its absence immediately raises the cry “Dictatorship.”

To the Ancient Greeks, “democracy” meant simply government by discussion. The people discussed, and the result was a “people’s government.” But not all the people assembled for these discussions, as the textbooks tell us; those who took part in them were “equals” and this excluded the women and the slaves.

The two factors of democracy which I want to bring out here are “discussion” and “equality.” Both are essential to it, and both contain a third element, “freedom.” There can be no true discussion without freedom, and “equals” must be equal in freedom, without which there is no equality. A small village in which the villagers are equals who make their own laws and conduct their own affairs by free discussion is the nearest thing to pure democracy. That is why the small Greek state (if one excludes the women and slaves) is so often pointed out to us as “democracy par excellence.”

These three, then, I consider to be essential to democratic government: discussion, equality, and freedom—the last being implied by the other two. Those who doubt the African’s ability to establish a democratic society cannot seriously be doubting the African’s ability to “discuss.” That is the one thing which is as African as the tropical sun. Neither can they be doubting the African’s sense of equality, for aristocracy is something foreign to Africa. Even where there is a fairly distinct African aristocracy-by-birth, it can be traced historically to sources outside this continent. Traditionally the African knows no “class.” I doubt if there is a word in any African language which is equivalent to “class” or “caste”; not even in those few societies where foreign infiltration has left behind some form of aristocracy is there such a word in the local languages. These aristocrats-by-birth are usually referred to as “the great” or “the clever ones.” In my own country, the only two tribes which have a distinct aristocracy are the Bahaya in Buboka, and the Baha in the Buha districts. In both areas the “aristocrats” are historically foreigners, and they belong to the same stock.

The traditional African society, whether it had a chief or not and many, like my own, did not, was a society of equals and it conducted its business through discussion. Recently I was reading a delightful little book on Nyasaland by Mr. Clutton-Brock; in one passage he describes the life of traditional Nyasa, and when he comes to the Elders he uses a very significant phrase: “They talk till they agree.”

“They talk till they agree.” That gives you the very essence of traditional African democracy. It is rather a clumsy way of conducting affairs, especially in a world as impatient for results as this of the twentieth century, but discussion is one essential factor of any democracy; and the African is expert at it.

If democracy, then, is a form of government freely established by the people themselves; and if its essentials are free discussion and equality, there is nothing in traditional African society which unfits the African for it. On the contrary, there is everything in his tradition which fits the African to be just what he claims he is, a natural democrat.

It was possible for the ancient Greeks to boast of “democracy” when more than half the population had no say at all in the conduct of the affairs of the State. It was possible for the framers of the Declaration of Independence to talk about “the inalienable rights of Man” although they believed in exceptions; it was possible for Abraham Lincoln to bequeath to us a perfect definition of democracy although he spoke in a slave-owning society; it was possible for my friends the British to brag about “democracy” and still build a great Empire for the glory of the Britons.

These people were not hypocrites. They believed in democracy. It was “government by discussion” which they advocated, and it was discussion by equals; but they lived in a world which excluded masses of human beings from its idea of “equality” and felt few scruples in doing so. Today, in the twentieth century, this is impossible. Today the Hungarys, the Little Rocks, the Tibets, the Nyasalands, and the Bantustans must be explained away somehow. They are embarrassing in this century of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Man, the ordinary man and woman in the street or in the “bush,” has never had such a high regard for himself; and the demi-gods who try to treat him as their inferior are conscious of his power—this power frightens them, and they are forced to try to explain away their crimes. Today the “people,” whose right it is to govern themselves, cannot exclude any sane, law-abiding adult person.

There is no continent which has taken up the fight for the dignity of the common man more vigorously than Africa. In other countries men may shout “One Man, One Vote” with their tongues in their cheeks; in Africa the nationalist leaders believe in it as a fundamental principle, and the masses they lead would accept nothing less. “Equal Pay for Equal Work” is a catch-phrase in many countries which practise nothing of the kind; in Africa the leaders believe sincerely in the basic justice of this, and again their followers expect nothing less. In many countries which claim to be democracies the leaders come from an aristocracy either of wealth or of birth; in Africa they are of the common people, for if ever there was a continent where no real aristocracy has been built, whether of birth or of wealth, that continent is Africa. Tradition has failed to create it, and the spirit of the twentieth century will make it almost impossible for it to grow now. Indeed, it is one way of discovering the widely different conceptions we may have of “democracy” to listen to those people who would like to build a middle class in Africa “as a safeguard for Democracy!” To them, democracy is government by the middle class, albeit the masses may play their part in electing that government.

Add, then, to the African tradition her lack of an aristocracy and the presence of a moral concept of human dignity on which she is waging her struggle for independence, and place these in the setting of this century of the Declaration of Human Rights, and it becomes difficult to see how anybody can seriously doubt the African’s fitness for democracy.

I referred earlier in this article to the “machinery” and the symbols of democratic government. Many of the critics of African democracy are to be found in countries like Britain or the United States of America. These critics, when they challenge our ability to maintain a democratic form of government, really have in mind not democracy but the particular form it has taken in their own countries, the two-party system, and the debate conducted between the Government party and the opposition party within the parliament buildings. In effect, they are saying: “Can you imagine an African Parliament with at least two political parties holding a free debate, one party being ‘for’ and one ‘against’ the motion?”

Ghana and Nigeria would be understandably annoyed with me if I were to answer such critics by saying that I *can* “imagine” such countries; for they exist, and they are not figments of my “imagination.”

But let us suppose they did not exist. To the Anglo-Saxon in particular, or to countries with an Anglo-Saxon tradition, the two-party system has become the very essence of democracy. It is no use telling an Anglo-Saxon that when a village of a hundred people have sat and talked together until they agreed where a well should be dug they have practiced democracy.

The Anglo-Saxon will want to know whether the talking was properly organized. He will want to know whether there was an organized group “for” the motion, and an equally well organized group “against” the motion. He will also want to know whether, in the next debate, the same group will be “for” and the same group “against” the next motion. In other words, he will want to know whether the opposition was organized and therefore *automatic*, or whether it was spontaneous and therefore *free*. Only if it was automatic will he concede that it was democracy!

In spite of its existence in Ghana and Nigeria, however, I must say that I also have my own doubts about the suitability for Africa of the Anglo-Saxon form of democracy. Let me explain:

In his own traditional society the African has always been a free individual, very much a member of his community, but seeing no conflict between his own interests and those of his community. This is because the structure of his society was, in fact, a direct extension of the family. First you had the small family unit; this merged into a larger “blood” family which, in its turn, merged into the tribe. The affairs of the community, as I have shown, were conducted by free and equal discussion, but nevertheless the African’s mental conception of “government” was personal—not institutional. When the word government was mentioned, the African thought of the chief; he did not, as does the Briton, think of a grand building in which a debate was taking place.

In colonial Africa this “personal” conception of government was unchanged, except that the average person hearing government mentioned now thought of the District Commissioner, the Provincial Commissioner, or the Governor.

When, later, the idea of government as an institution began to take hold of some African “agitators” such as myself, who had been reading Abraham Lincoln and John Stuart Mill, and we began demanding institutional government for our own countries, it was the very people who had now come to symbolize “Government” in their persons who resisted our demands—the District Commissioners, the Provincial Commissioners, and the Governors. Not until the eleventh hour did they give way; and free elections have taken place in most of our countries almost on the eve of independence.

The new nations of the African continent are emerging today as the result of their struggle for independence. This struggle for freedom from foreign domination is a patriotic one which necessarily leaves no room for difference. It unites all elements in the country so that, not only in Africa but in any other part of the world facing a similar challenge, these countries are led by a nationalist movement rather than by a political party or parties. The same nationalist movement, having united the people and led them to independence, must inevitably form the first government of the new state; it could hardly be expected that a united country should halt in mid-stream and voluntarily divide itself into opposing political groups just for the sake of conforming to what I have called the “Anglo-Saxon form of democracy” at the moment of independence. Indeed, why should it? Surely, if a government is freely elected by the people, there can be nothing undemocratic about it simply because nearly all the people rather than merely a section of them have chosen to vote it into power.

In these circumstances, it would be surprising if the pattern of democracy in Africa were to take—at any rate for the first few years—the shape familiar to Anglo-Saxon countries. It would be illogical to expect it to; but it is unjust to African democrats to assume, therefore,

that their own pattern of democratic government is less dedicated to the preservation of the rights and freedom of the individual, an assumption too often made by the very people who have delayed the establishment of democratic institutions on this continent.

I have already suggested that the nearest thing to pure democracy would be a self-governing village in which all affairs were conducted by free discussion. But I have also said that the government of a nation must necessarily be government by “representation”; therefore there must be elections and discussion-houses or parliaments. As a matter of fact, in Africa the actual parliament buildings are necessary rather for reasons of prestige than for protection against the weather. (Our weather is quite predictable!)

The two essentials for “representative” democracy are the freedom of the individual, and the regular opportunity for him to join with his fellows in replacing, or reinstating, the government of his country by means of the ballot-box and without recourse to assassination. An organized opposition is *not* an essential element, although a society which has no room and no time for the harmless eccentric can hardly be called “democratic.” Where you have those two essentials, and the affairs of the country are conducted by free discussion, you have democracy. An organized opposition may arise, or it may not; but whether it does or it does not depends entirely upon the choice of the people themselves and makes little difference to free discussion and equality in freedom.

B. “*The Arusha Declaration Teach-in*,” August 5, 1967

MEANING OF SELF-RELIANCE

What, then, is the meaning of self-reliance, and what are its implications for our future policies? First and foremost, it means that for our development we have to depend upon ourselves and our own resources. These resources are land, and people. Certainly we have a few factories, we have a small diamond mine, and so on. But it is important to realise that when measured in 1960 prices out of a gross domestic product estimated at Shs. 4,646 million in 1966, some Shs. 2,669 million—that is, more than 57%—was the direct result of agricultural activities. Only Shs. 321 million was the combined result of mining and manufacturing; that is to say that all the mining and manufacturing of Tanzania produced last year less than 7% of the gross domestic product.

The only thing we certainly do not have is money searching for investment opportunities. The per capita income in terms of 1966 prices, was about Shs. 525/- last year. That does not allow very much to be withdrawn from current consumption and invested in development. Indeed, we did very well last year to find Shs. 135 million (that is, about Shs. 14/- per person) from internal resources for development.

But to provide one job in a highly mechanised industry can cost Shs. 40,000/- or more. To build the oil refinery cost more than Shs. 110 million. To build a modern steel mill would cost rather more than that.

AGRICULTURE MAIN STAY

On the other hand, it is possible to double the output of cotton on a particular acre by spending Shs. 130/- on fertiliser and insecticide; it is possible to double a farmer’s acreage under crops by the provision of ox-plough at a cost of Shs. 250/- or less, and so on. In other

words, whereas it is possible to find the sort of investment capital which can bring great increases in agricultural output from our present resources, it is not possible for us to envisage establishing heavy industries, or even very much in the way of light industries, in the near future.

To be realistic, therefore, we must stop dreaming of developing Tanzania through the establishment of large, modern industries. For such things we have neither the money nor the skilled man-power required to make them efficient and economic. We would even be making a mistake if we think in terms of covering Tanzania with mechanised farms, using tractors and combine-harvesters.

Once again, we have neither the money, nor the skilled man-power, nor in this case the social organisation which could make such investment possible and economic. This is not to say that there will be no new modern industries and no mechanised farms. But they will be the exception, not the rule, and they will be entered upon to meet particular problems. They are not the answer to the basic development needs of Tanzania.

FUTURE IN AGRICULTURE

This is what the Arusha Declaration makes clear in both economic and social terms. Our future lies in the development of our agriculture, and in the development of our rural areas. But because we are seeking to grow from our own roots and to preserve that which is valuable in our traditional past, we have also to stop thinking in terms of massive agricultural mechanisation and the proletarianisation of our rural population.

We have, instead, to think in terms of development through the improvement of the tools we now use, and through the growth of co-operative systems of production. Instead of aiming at large farms using tractors and other modern equipment and employing agricultural labourers, we should be aiming at having ox-ploughs all over the country.

The jembe will have to be eliminated by the ox-plough before the latter can be eliminated by the tractor. We cannot hope to eliminate the jembe by the tractor. Instead of thinking about providing each farmer with his own lorry, we should consider the usefulness of oxen-drawn carts, which could be made within the country and which are appropriate both to our roads and to the loads which each farmer is likely to have.

Instead of the aerial spreading of crops with insecticide, we should use hand-operated pumps, and so on. In other words, we have to think in terms of what is available, or can be made available, at comparatively small cost, and which can be operated by the people. By moving into the future along this path, we can avoid massive social disruption and human suffering.

SMALL INDUSTRIES

At the same time we can develop small industries and service stations in the rural areas where the people live, and thus help to diversify the rural economy. By this method we can achieve a widespread increase in the general level of people's income, instead of concentrating any economic improvement in the hands of a few people.

Such capital as we do have will make the widest possible impact by being invested in fertilisers, in credit for better breeding stock, in improved instruments of production, and other similar things. These, although small in themselves, can bring a great proportionate increase in the farmers' income.

This does not mean that there will be no new investment in towns, or that there will be no new factories. When you have large numbers of people living together, certain public services are essential for public health and security reasons. It would be absurd to pretend that we can forget the towns, which are in any case often a service centre for the surrounding rural areas.

FACTORY SITES

Factories which serve the whole country also have to be sited in places which are convenient for transport and communications. For example, if we had put the Friendship Textile Mill in a rural area, we would have had to invest in special road, building etc. for it to be of any use, and in any case the number of its workers would soon mean that a new town had grown up in that place.

But even when we are building factories which serve the whole nation, we have to consider whether it is necessary for us to use the most modern machinery which exists in the world. We have to consider whether some older equipment which demands more labour, but labour which is less highly skilled, is not better suited to our needs, as well as being more within our capacity to build.

There are, however, two respects in which our call for self-reliance has been widely misunderstood or deliberately misinterpreted. The doctrine of self-reliance does not imply isolationism, either politically or economically. It means that we shall depend on ourselves, not on others.

TRADE WITH OTHERS

But this is not the same thing as saying we shall not trade with other people or co-operate with them when it is to mutual benefit. Obviously we shall do so. We shall have to continue to sell enough of our goods abroad to pay for the things we have to acquire. Up to now Tanzania has always done this; indeed, we have had a surplus of our balance of payment for many years. But the things we sell are the products of our agriculture, and this is likely to continue to be the case despite the problem of commodity prices in the world.

The things we import will increasingly have to be the things which are essential for our development, and which we cannot produce ourselves. Up to now we have been importing many things which a little effort would enable us to provide for ourselves, such as food, as well as luxury items which simply arouse desires among our people which could never be satisfied for more than a tiny minority.

Self-reliance, in other words, is unlikely to reduce our participation in international trade, but it should over time, change its character to some extent. We should be exporting commodities after at least some preliminary processing, and we should be importing the things which we cannot produce and which are necessary for the development and the welfare of our whole people.

TANZANIA WANTS CAPITAL ASSISTANCE

The other thing which is necessary to understand about self-reliance is that Tanzania has not said it does not want international assistance in its development. We shall continue to seek capital from abroad for particular projects or as a contribution to general development. It is clear, for example, that if we are to achieve our ambition of getting a railway which links

Tanzania and Zambia, we shall have to obtain most of the capital and the technical skill from overseas.

Overseas capital will also be welcome for any project where it can make our own efforts more effective—where it acts as a catalyst for Tanzanian activity. It is for this reason that the Government has made it clear that we shall welcome outside participation—whether private or Government—in establishment of many different kinds of factories, especially those which produce consumption goods or process our crops and raw materials.

Capital assistance for education of all kinds is another of the many fields in which outside assistance can be valuable, provided it is linked to our capacity to meet the recurrent costs. The important thing, however, is that we in Tanzania should not adopt an attitude that nothing can be done until someone else agrees to give us money.

There are many things we can do by ourselves, and we must plan to do them. There are other things which can become easier if we get assistance, but these we should reckon on doing the hard way, by ourselves, only being thankful if assistance is forthcoming.

EXPATRIATES AS WELL

But it is not only capital which we must welcome from outside, it is also men. Few things make me more angry than a refusal to accept and to work with people from other countries whose participation can make all the difference between our plans succeeding or failing. It is not being self-reliant to refuse to carry out the directions of a foreign engineer, a foreign doctor, or a foreign manager; it is just being stupid. It is absolutely vital that Tanzanians should determine policy; but if the implementation of a particular policy requires someone with good educational qualifications or long experience, it is not very sensible to allow that policy to fail through pride.

We must look at this question of employing expatriates scientifically and without prejudice; we must assess the interests of our development as a whole, not the interests of a particular person who feels that he would like the high post concerned but is neither ready for it nor prepared to go on learning from someone else.

NO FALSE PRIDE IN THIS MATTER

Let us take note of the fact that the developed countries have no false pride in this matter. Western Europe and North America recruit trained people from countries like India and Pakistan, and West European countries complain bitterly about what they call the “brain drain” caused by the richer United States offering high incomes to educated and skilled people.

It has been alleged that the United States has saved itself billions of dollars by attracting workers on whose education it has not spent one cent. Yet while wealthy and developed countries adopt this kind of attitude, we in Tanzania appear to rejoice when we lose a trained person to Europe or North America.

We rejoice on the grounds that it provides us with an opportunity for Africanisation, or for self-reliance! Anyone would think that we have a problem of unemployed experts. It is time that we outgrew this childishness; and we must do so quickly if we intend to tackle this problem of modern development really seriously.

SOCIALISM

What, then, of socialism—the other aspect of the Arusha Declaration? First, it is important to be clear that nationalisation of existing industries and commercial undertakings is only

a very small part of the socialism which we have adopted. The important thing for us is the extent to which we succeed in preventing the exploitation of one man by another and in spreading the concept of working together co-operatively for the common good instead of competitively for individual private gain. And the truth is that our economy is now so underdeveloped that it is in growth that we shall succeed or fail in these things.

The nationalisation of the banks, of insurance, and of the few industries affected, was important; but much more important is whether we succeed in expanding our economy without expanding the opportunities and the incentives for human exploitation.

Once again this really means that socialism has to spread in the rural areas where our people live. In this we have an advantage over many other countries, just because of our lack of development. Up to now exploitation in agriculture is very limited; the greater part of our farming is still individual peasant farming, or family farming. But although this is not capitalist, neither is it very efficient or productive in comparison with what it could be.

Indeed, it is true that where people work together in groups—and that is mostly in those restricted sectors of capitalist farming—there is often a greater output per worker and per acre. Our objective must be to develop in such a manner as to ensure that the advantages of modern knowledge and modern methods are achieved, but without the spread of capitalism.

HUMAN EQUALITY—THE ESSENCE OF SOCIALISM

Socialism, however, is not simply a matter of methods of production. They are part of it but not all of it. The essence of socialism is the practical acceptance of human equality. That is to say, man's equal rights to a decent life before any individual has a surplus above his needs; his equal right to participate in Government; and his equal responsibility to work and contribute to the society to the limit of his ability.

In Tanzania this means that we must safeguard and strengthen our democratic procedures; we must get to the position where every citizen plays an active and direct role in the government of his local community, at the same time as he plays a full role in the government of his own country. It also means that we have to correct the glaring income differentials which we inherited from colonialism, and ensure that the international imbalance between the wages of factory and service workers on the one hand, and of agricultural workers on the other, is not reproduced within our own nation. We have, in other words, to ensure that every person gets a return commensurate with the contribution he makes to the society.

But at the same time we have to make dignified provision for those whose age or disability prevents them from playing a full role in the economy. We have also to spread—although it can only be done gradually—equality of opportunity for all citizens, until every person is able to make the kind of contribution to our needs which is most within his capacity and his desires. But, most of all, we have to reactivate the philosophy of co-operation in production and sharing in distribution which was an essential part of traditional African society.

42 ♦ The African National Congress (ANC) adopts a policy of violence (1961)

After the Sharpeville massacre of March 21, 1960, when members of the South African police shot dead (mostly in the back) sixty-nine Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) members demonstrating