



THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

ARUSHA DECLARATION

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

1967

**PRINTED BY THE GOVERNMENT PRINTER
DAR ES SALAAM**

Price Shs. 2/20

ARUSHA DECLARATION

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

In the April, 1967 Meeting of the National Assembly, Vice-President Kawawa promised that answers would be provided to any questions on the Arusha Declaration which were submitted by Members.

Many questions were received, and we have made an effort to answer them. Unfortunately almost all the questions received related to just one section of the Arusha Declaration—that on qualifications for leadership. There was not even one question on Socialism and Self-Reliance.

SOME QUESTIONS ON THE ARUSHA DECLARATION

ANSWERED BY PRESIDENT MWALIMU JULIUS K. NYERERE

1. If a man sells his second house, what does he do with the money if he is not allowed to invest it and enjoy the income from the investment?

Any TANU and Government leader who sells a house or houses may invest the money by putting it in the Bank, by putting it in Post Office Savings, by buying Tanzania Government Stock from the Bank, or by saving through a Savings and Credit Society. On all these things he gets interest; he may receive that interest—and enjoy it.

2. Due to the Arusha Declaration, property values have gone down in Dar es Salaam; also there is a reluctance on the part of buyers to invest in property. If a man cannot sell his house before the end of the "year of grace", even although he tries hard to do so, what is he to do?

Before the Arusha Declaration speculators, and others who were able to borrow money, were exploiting the shortage of houses in Dar es Salaam and were charging exorbitant rents or selling at a huge profit. One good thing which the Arusha Declaration has already done is to bring prices down to a more reasonable level. But even if they fall further, no house is likely to have a sale price lower than its cost price—and prices will almost certainly continue to allow some profit. However little that profit is, it should be remembered that the owner has done nothing to earn it; he has obtained money just by being one of the few who were able to borrow the money necessary to build.

Before anyone says they have been unable to sell their extra house we should want to know what price he was trying to obtain for it. We certainly hope that there will be no success for the person who left Arusha and instructed his contractor to sell for £20,000 the house which had cost him £7,500.

If, however, despite the shortage of houses in Dar es Salaam and elsewhere, a leader does not succeed in selling his house, he has an easy way out in almost all cases. He can surrender the house to the organization which has a mortgage on it, i.e., the organization which lent him the money. Government will then consider in each individual case whether they should refund the money he paid to obtain the plot and the designs.

3. If a man has taken the lump sum pension he received after 15 years' service in the British Civil Service, and has invested that money in a house which he lets out, is it just to ask him to sell that house?

If the man in question has no intention of holding a leadership position, either in the Party or in the Government, it would be unjust to ask him to sell his house. No one is asking, or will ever ask, that he should do this. If, on the other hand, he wants a leadership position in the Party

or the Government, it is definitely not unjust to ask him to behave like 99.9 per cent of the people whom he says he wants to lead or serve. They feel themselves to be lucky if they have a house of their own to live in—at least in the urban areas. Real leadership demands understanding and identification; this cannot be achieved while the leader is in a position which enables exploitation. And although the man in this case originally earned his pension, he may be accused of using his reward for exploitative purposes.

It is important to be clear about this. Even if the individual is in fact receiving no more than a fair interest on his money—that is, no more than the Bank or Government would give—there are two other factors to be considered. The first is that he, a leader, will be in a position where he controls the shelter of another individual, who is probably not a leader and who might consequently feel himself at a disadvantage in any negotiations. The second is that either his tenant, or other people, may fail to understand that the rent being charged is a fair one so that they will believe him to be exploiting them even if he is not. A leader should not voluntarily get into such a position; it should be absolutely obvious that he is not in a position to exploit another human being.

4.—If a man is not allowed to invest in property by building and renting out a house, is this not barring Africans from participating in the development of Dar es Salaam and other towns, and handing this development over to Asians and foreigners? Is this right or wise?

This is an old trick. It is the appeal to racialism by a selfish minority, which hopes to confuse the majority and thus secure benefit for themselves. The Arusha Declaration does not stop the activities of African capitalists, or would-be African capitalists, any more than it stops other capitalists, be they European or Asian. What the Arusha Declaration does is to say that if Africans or any other Tanzania Citizens chose to be capitalists, then they must forfeit their right to lead a Socialist Party or hold a position of responsibility in a Government committed to socialist objectives.

People who raise this question in these racial terms are really saying that they want the Party to install them as exploiters of the masses rather than leave the old exploiters, the majority of whom, in Tanzania, happened to come from the Asian community. The Arusha Declaration is a declaration of war on exploitation; it is not just a declaration of war on those exploiters who happen to be of a different colour. Does the man whose goods are being sucked through a *mirija* care what colour the suckers are? He is concerned to get rid of the *mirijas*; he will not be made any better off if he is told that the old suckers have been got rid of and the new suckers are black.

Some people seem to want it both ways. They want the opportunity to exploit the people, and at the same time they want the right to serve the people and lead them in the struggle against exploitation. They try to justify this contradiction the grounds that they are black! They say "the poor are black, and we are black, therefore it is alright for us to exploit them". But instead of putting it in these terms, when the masses

would immediately understand, they try to confuse the people by pretending that there is something more evil in a brown or white Tanzanian doing the exploiting than there is in a black Tanzanian doing it.

The Arusha Declaration applies to all leaders, whatever their colour. It applies to the Councillors of Dar es Salaam who are of Asian origin as much as those who are of African origin. The Arusha Declaration is in conformity with the first statement of belief in the TANU Constitution, which says: "I believe in the brotherhood of man". Those who try to undermine the Arusha Declaration by appealing to racialism in the manner of this question are showing that they do not accept that first TANU principle.

5.—What is a man to do with any savings he may have if he is not allowed to invest them in business or house property?

He may put his savings in a Co-operative Savings and Credit Society, in a Bank, in the Post Office Savings, or in Government Stocks. Then his savings will be used for the good of the people as a whole until he needs them, and the people will gladly pay him an interest.

6.—What happens to Post Office and other Savings Accounts? Are they to be discontinued?

Why should they be discontinued? We want our people to save so that the nation may have more money available for development. Rather than bring them to an end we should be persuading people to put their savings in the Post Office or in the Banks. Self-Reliance means that we have to rely upon ourselves for capital investment: savings can be an important element in this. But savings put in a hole in the ground are not any use at all. They may be lost, so that the saver has no benefit. And then nation does not have the use of them either.

Instead of asking this question, it would have been better to ask about an improvement in facilities for small saving. Or, better still, to make some constructive suggestions, or organize a Co-operative Savings and Credit Society.

7.—How is a man to get security for his wife and children in the event of his death if he is not allowed to invest for them or save for them?

The Arusha Declaration opposes exploitation. And exploitation is still exploitation even if it is undertaken with the intention of assisting one's children. Every millionaire in America will tell you that he is concerned to give a good inheritance for his children—and it will be true. It is wrong for a man to provide security for his wife and children by exploiting other men, women and children. Let a man work. Let his wife work. Let them save some of their income and put it in a Bank where it will earn interest. These savings will help towards security in the case of accidents. And this applies to everybody; it is therefore fair—although the vast majority of our people will still find it difficult even to put anything in the savings banks because they have so little to live on.

One day in the future the State will be able to provide old age pensions for everybody, and have widows and orphans insurance schemes for all. At present these are provided for only a tiny minority of wage earners, and especially civil servants. What this question is asking is why some of these same people, plus a few politicians, should not be allowed to achieve even more for themselves even if it means exploiting the people to achieve it. This is exactly what the Arusha Declaration will not allow. It denies the right of any leader in Party or Government to achieve security for himself at the cost of the people he is leading.

8. How can a man guarantee education for his children in the event of his death or loss of job if he cannot invest his savings?

This is another attempt to justify exploitation by an appeal to the sentiment of children's welfare. Children's welfare is of vital importance to every parent, and to every good Tanzania citizen. But to the Government and Party leaders every Tanzanian child ought to be of equal importance. Certainly there can be no justification for exploiting one child's father in order that another child's father may make provision for insecurity. In any case, it is absurd to use the question of education as an excuse for exploitation. Which leader in Tanzania has been guaranteeing the education of his children through his own savings and investments? Even where parents are asked to make a small contribution to primary school costs by payment of a "fee", the real costs are met by the taxpayers. Something like Shs. 10,000,000/- was received in 1965 in primary school fees; Central Government alone paid Shs. 47,000,000/- and Local Governments paid Shs. 39,000,000/- These taxes are paid by everyone—including some parents who can find no school places for their children. And all Secondary education and University Education in Tanzania is paid for by the taxpayer.

The only time Tanzanians pay for the education of their children is if they decide to buy privilege for them. That is, if the child does not succeed in the competition for a secondary school place, then there are a few "private schools" where fees are high—and the education of varying quality. If a capitalist decides he is willing to pay these fees, he is simply living up to his own creed—and we are not stopping him from doing so. But for a leader of a socialist Party to try to justify the exploitation of people in order to give a special advantage to his own child is inconsistent in the extreme. A leader in TANU should recognize that, even while he has a special emotional feeling for his own child, he has an equal responsibility for all the children of the people he represents.

9. How can a man make provision for his old age when he is too old to farm?

How do the people who elected the MPs make provision for their old age? Why should a TANU leader be any different? What is there which is so special about his case? The only special thing is that he receives, at least for five years, an income of £700 a year, plus allowances, as a reward for representing the people. Almost none of the people he represents will ever receive so much, however hard they work. They will be lucky if they receive in a lifetime what he receives in five years.

10. A politician has no security. Today he is a Minister, tomorrow not; today he is an MP, after five years he is not; today he is a Regional Commissioner or Area Commissioner, tomorrow he is unemployed; today he is Chairman of the Region, District, or Town, and tomorrow someone else may be elected in his place. Why does the Arusha Declaration prevent such leaders from providing by other means for their future?

What other means? Leaders ask this question more than any other question, and it is the most serious and dangerous question of all. The Arusha Declaration says that a TANU leader will be a peasant or worker. Before he is chosen as a leader he will be working as a peasant, working for wages, or working on his own account as a carpenter, blacksmith, goldsmith, etc. This is the work by which he meets his needs now, and through which he prepares for his future security. When he asks the people to give him the responsibilities of leadership, this job will be one of two kinds. Either it will be the kind which does not require full-time work, in which case he may be able to continue with his normal way of earning a living, or it will be a full-time leadership position which will require him to leave his normal employment. For example, a Minister or an Area Commissioner could not continue to be a carpenter or farmer. He must leave this work in order to fulfil his leadership responsibilities properly. But the cell leader, District Councillor, or Regional Chairman would not have to abandon his farm or his carpentering completely, because these are not full-time positions.

Leaders who are required to do full-time work are paid wages for their positions—some are paid a small wage and some have a bigger wage, but all are given wages which are good in comparison with the general standard of living in Tanzania. Very often these wages enable a leader to live at a higher standard than he did before getting his leadership position.

Tomorrow or the day after this leader can leave or can be dismissed from his leadership. If he is dismissed after he has held the job for only a short time, he will be able to return to his previous employment without difficulty, or if he does not wish to do this he can find another job like any other worker. Let us not forget that leaving a job, or being dismissed from it, is not something which arises just out of the Arusha Declaration; it is a quite ordinary thing in our country. It was only very recently that our TANU Government passed a law forcing employers to pay severance allowance to those whom they had dismissed when the worker was not at fault. And even now workers are still dismissed and have to find other jobs. And even although such a worker may have severance pay, and a dismissed politician does not, the severance pay really cannot be said to be sufficient to take care of the worker's whole future. And as we shall see below, the politician has a much better chance of safeguarding the future from his leadership income than has an ordinary worker.

If a man leaves or is dismissed from his leadership position after he has had it for a long time, he is still able to look for work like everyone else, even if he cannot return to his old job. But more than that, while

he was in this leadership position the workers have paid him a wage which was large enough to enable him to save at least something for the future. Rather than grumbling at the people, such leaders ought to thank the people very much for paying them enough to save, while the people themselves do not have enough income to be able to do so.

The other kind of leader is he whose job did not make him leave his normal work. For example, a Civil Servant who is chosen as a street cell leader; he did not have to leave his employment in order to be a cell leader because this is not a full-time job; it is something he was doing to serve the country. The same thing applies to a factory worker who is chosen as a Town Councillor, or a farmer who is chosen as a Member or Chairman of his district or village. Such people can just carry on with their normal work if they cease to be in their leadership positions, and there is therefore no need to give them any special allowance while they are finding new things to do. Nor can such a leader say that his leadership responsibilities prevented him from providing for his needs or for the future.

But having said all this, let us not forget the most important thing. That is, that leadership is not the work by which a man ought to expect to earn his living and look after his future. The difference between the work of leadership and other kinds of work is that in leadership what is sought is the opportunity to lead and to give leadership which will help the people; the thing which is desired by the "employer"—that is, the people—is therefore the service of leadership which has fruits for the people—not anything else. The purpose of the kind of leadership we are trying to build up in Tanzania must be the benefit of the people, not the benefit of the leaders themselves. The personal difficulties of the leaders are of interest to the people only to the extent that they might be of such a degree that the leader cannot do his work properly. It is this consideration which causes some leaders to be paid while they carry responsibility. Leaders often forget this, and especially do they tend to forget the purposes of leadership in a socialist Tanzania; it is a good thing if the Arusha Declaration and its leadership requirements act as a constant reminder.

Which is the politician who went to the people at election time and asked them to elect him so that he could provide for his future? Which Area or Regional Commissioner or other TANU worker got his job by saying he wanted to improve his personal position and get security for his future? Whenever a person seeks political work, whether it is through election or by appointment, he says he wants the opportunity to serve the people, to guard their interests and to further their aspirations. What right has such a person, once he has the appointment he sought on this basis, to use his responsibility for his own betterment?

This question is absolutely central to the Arusha Declaration and to the whole purpose of TANU and an independent Tanzania. For the question is asking why a politician may not be allowed to exploit his position, his importance, and the trust which has been placed in him, so that he may himself get security. A simple farmer will not be able to borrow money to build houses which he can then rent out at a profit.

Why then should the fact that he has become, for example, an M.P., change the situation? If it does change the situation it means that he is getting the opportunity to exploit people just because of his office, just because he is an M.P.

When we were struggling for independence how many of us did the capitalists invite to become directors? How many of us were able to borrow money to build houses for renting out? How many of us were lent money to buy large shambas on which it is necessary to employ labour? If we have acquired these things since independence most of us have done so because the capitalists want to involve us in their system of exploitation so that we shall become defenders of that system. The fact that this question is asked shows that this technique has had some success.

Government and Party leaders should have the same degree of security as the poor peasants and workers we were elected to serve. In fact we have more. For the period we serve we get a much higher salary than those we lead. We are able to save and earn interest on our savings. Then if we are not elected or if we decide not to stand, or if it is decided that we are unfitted for the jobs which require to be done, we already have an advantage over those we claim to have been serving. We go around telling the unemployed in towns to go and farm; we go to the peasants and tell them to work harder and with greater expertise. What right have we to tell the peasants and workers to do these things, if when the time comes we are not prepared to practise what we have been preaching?

Any person is allowed under the Arusha Declaration to "provide for his future" by investing in property. But he cannot do this while he is pretending to lead and serve the people. Let those who are worried about their future resign from their leadership positions and take on other work and exploit the people if they can. In fact very few will be able to do it, because for the vast majority of leaders the only way they can get into a position to exploit their fellows is by taking advantage of their position of responsibility—that is, by misusing it.

11. If a man has had no training or experience in farming, and no capital savings with which to buy implements, seeds, etc., how can he suddenly take up farming if he loses his job, or becomes old and has a wife and children to support?

This is not particularly a problem for politicians; it is a problem for all people who have been brought up in towns and who have been working in towns, and who then get unemployed. This still applies to a very tiny proportion of our people. Even the majority of those who are living in towns now have spent their youth in the rural areas.

There are a number of answers. First of all, however, it must be realized that if the genuine town-dweller (who has been brought up in town and who has been earning his income from wage employment) loses his job through no fault of his own, he will not be subject to being rounded up as a vagrant. Such a person should have priority in other wage-earning vacancies. But if there is no immediate prospect of his

being able to get a job in town, then he must accept that he has to earn his living in the rural areas. The Ministry of Agriculture has various training schemes for those who are educationally qualified, and also has farmers' training institutes for those without education. They would be very willing to help such a man who was in genuine difficulties of ignorance; so too would the agricultural field staff. He could get land through the Area Office, and could also get assistance in kind—that is, in seeds and basic agricultural implements, and food until the next harvest—through the Area Office if he has no relatives who can lend him these things. If there are any cases such as this, Government will instruct the Area Commissioners to prepare plans immediately for assistance.

The one answer to this question which is NOT possible is that such a man should be helped to exploit others. He can be helped to become self-reliant. That is all. But there are in fact very, very few Tanzanians who are in this position. It would be surprising—and something of a disgrace—if an M.P. representing a rural area were completely ignorant of agricultural practices. And he should certainly know of the services which are available in the way of technical advice for farmers; if he does not know these things, how can he be helping to encourage his constituents to modernize their farming practices? And if he does know, then if he should cease to be an M.P. or politician, he will know how to get the advice he needs.

12. Although the Arusha Declarations are basically right, are they not being put into effect too drastically and without thought and planning?

There is a possible element of truth in the suggestion that we have not done, and are not doing, enough planning to enable all the aspects of the Arusha Declaration to be implemented without some inconvenience and without some mistakes. But this is the responsibility of leadership in Party and Government. In saying this we are criticising ourselves—or we should be. We must think about the purpose of the Declaration, and the implications of self-reliance, and each one of us should be helping by coming forward with ideas about how it can best become a reality. These ideas should be being discussed now in the Party and in the Government, for if a thing is basically right then it must be put into practice—and quickly.

The trouble is that this question can so easily be, and so often is, used as an excuse for doing nothing. The Bankers are among those who are using this technique; they are saying "why did you not tell us so that we could make plans?" For what does it mean to talk of putting the Arusha Declaration into effect "drastically"? Either you nationalize or you don't; either you take a majority shareholding or you don't. If you are unemployed and there is no prospect of getting a job tomorrow, either you go out now and employ yourself on the land as the majority of our people do, or you sit around doing nothing. There is no half-way house. In the case of the leaders we have given time, so that if they chose to accept the future conditions of leadership they have an opportunity to clear their affairs.

This talk that something is "basically right—But" has been applied successfully to every major reform in the history of man. It is always used by privileged people to justify the retention or extension of their privileges. So we have people saying "Equality is basically right, But", "Non-racialism is basically right, But", "Caring about the poor is right, But". And in the end the "but" dominates, and the "basically right" thing goes on being basically right but not getting done. For us in Africa this is a bigger danger than making mistakes of over-enthusiasm.

13. By what right did Members of Parliament who have other jobs as well have their Parliamentary salary stopped without being warned, and before the "year of grace" is ended?

One would have expected that those M.P.s in this position would themselves have acted immediately after the Arusha Declaration was accepted, and would have seen that one or other of their salaries was stopped with effect from 5th February, if not earlier. The "year of grace" was to allow people who had property to dispose of it without loss to themselves. It was not meant to allow Party and Government leaders to have a final year of making money out of the people before they renounced such practices. This is, in fact, a classic example of someone saying "it is basically right, but". It is also a classic example of living up to the letter of the law but not its spirit. Party and Government leaders should not be trying to see how far they can protect their privileges, but how far they can serve the people. They are not asked to make great sacrifices to do this—certainly the Arusha Declaration does not demand that; they are simply asked to think of the people's interests once their own needs for food and shelter are adequately looked after. An M.P.'s salary does this.

If, however, there is an M.P. whose "other salary" is less than his Parliamentary salary, he could ask that his Parliamentary salary is the one which is maintained. He would, however, have to produce adequate proof that he was not receiving the other salary either in cash or in kind.

14.—By what right did the Regional Commissioner of Dar es Salaam make a law that employment passes must be carried? Isn't the National Assembly the only institution which can make laws in Tanzania? If not, why do we have it?

No-one has made a law that employment passes must be carried. Only the National Assembly can pass laws in this country. A Committee of which the Regional Commissioner, Dar es Salaam, is Chairman decided that checks would be made on the loiterers in the capital city, and that when discovered they would be repatriated. It was felt that the way to avoid inconvenience for workers would be for them to carry evidence of their employment; to avoid or reduce the risk of false evidence of this it was further decided that the evidence should take the form of a particular card which would be issued through the Ministry of Labour.

In fact Dar es Salaam is not the only area in which steps have been taken to deal with this problem of unemployed people becoming a drain on the resources of their friends and relatives, or taking to crime. Nor was it the

first area to do this. Other towns throughout the country have tried to deal with this problem; the publicity received by Dar es Salaam was the result of the size of the problem here and the fact that all the organs of publicity are here.

If M.P.s feel that the manner in which these Committees have tried to fulfil the objects of the Arusha Declaration were mistaken, then they could have done something constructive about it. They can bring forward alternative proposals, either in the form of a motion, or a Private Members Bill, laying down procedures, etc. But the problem has to be dealt with, and the Committees have tackled it when Parliament failed to do so.

15.—Isn't it dangerous to remove incentive from people who are trying to improve their lot in life? Will this not lead to frustration, despair and laziness?

What incentive has been removed? The Arusha Declaration specifically says that people must work for their living and the community must pay them a fair return for their work. How does this kill the incentive for people who are trying to improve their lot in life? It may mean that we should tie income more completely to output; it may mean that we should have tighter industrial discipline so that the man who does not do his work properly is dismissed or receives a lower wage. But these are practical problems of how you determine a fair return for work.

The Arusha Declaration does make it more difficult for a TANU or Government leader to improve his lot by exploiting others. That is its purpose. A man might "improve his lot in life" by burglary or theft. We do not allow him to do so. By preventing such actions are we "removing incentive", or laying the groundwork for frustration? A leader who gets fat on the sweat of others is little better than the thief, for while pretending to serve his master—that is, the people—he is really taking advantage of their trust to increase his own wealth by reducing theirs.

There is nothing fanciful in this. A man who borrows money from Government is borrowing money which is obtained from the taxes of the people. If he uses this to build a house in Magomeni which he then rents out at a profit, his tenant—who is one of the taxpayers—is both helping to provide the man with the money to build and also paying the man for having borrowed the money and built a house. If the individual had not borrowed that money, the Government would have been able to build an extra house itself; the tenant could still have rented the house, but would only have had to pay an economic rent. And if he did pay more than an economic rent he would have been putting extra money into the hands of the Government, which could consequently have built more houses, or undertaken other activities which would benefit the taxpayers as a whole. When the individual gets this profit only he himself (and his family) receive any benefit.

It is said that this possibility of individual profit is an incentive for house building. This would be more valid if the man used his own money to build the house. But which TANU or Government leader has saved enough to build himself a house to live in, and also others which he can

rent out? But even then, why should he be allowed to use his money in this way? What he is saying is "because I happen to have a lot of money through inheritance or something—I will make someone else pay me at a very high rate if they want to have shelter. A 'fair return' for my savings is set by the community; but that is not enough for me, so I will not put my money in the bank; I will buy a house and get a bigger return". Such a man may be acting in accordance with the law of the land, but he is not living up to the principles of the Party he is claiming to lead.

16. What rewards will there be for hard work, higher education, etc., if the Arusha Declaration is carried out to the letter?

The reward for hard work is fair pay. People with higher education also receive a higher wage than those who do not have that education; but at least this higher wage must be fair, and must bear some relation to the general level of incomes in the country.

In the kind of society we are trying to build, education will be paid for by the community. The community surely has a right to demand a fair return from the people in whom it has invested money. Even now the vast majority of the education costs are paid for by the community—and have been in Tanzania even under the colonialists. Some of our present educated people had their parents make a contribution to the cost. But it is unlikely that anyone paid for everything. In 1960 the central Government spent £1,360,000 on African primary education, and Native Authorities another £341,000. £848,000 was spent on Middle School Education by these same authorities, and £254,000 on Secondary School education. This money was paid by the community—by the taxpayers—and was in addition to any amounts which were paid by parents in schools fees. In other words, from the beginning of education in Tanzania the community has borne heavy costs. No educated person can say that he owes nothing to the community, but only to his parents.

If anyone feels that the reward for higher education is not great enough he need not receive it. When offered a place in Secondary School, University, and so on, he can say "educate someone else; under socialism there is no reward for education and I would rather remain uneducated than use the facilities offered to me on the conditions imposed".

17. What promise for the future does the Arusha Declaration hold out to the young?

The Arusha Declaration promises every young man a chance to work for himself, his family, and his country. It protects him against exploitation and refuses him the right to exploit others. It promises an opportunity to be useful to the community of which he is a member, an opportunity to be honoured because of his service. It refuses him the opportunity to be a parasite on the body of society, especially if he is pretending to be a leader of the society.

The Arusha Declaration is the best thing which could happen for our young people. It promises them an opportunity to serve without their having to risk their livelihood. They serve by working, and for working

they will get a fair return. A young person can live in friendship with all other members of the society instead of trying to beat them economically and knowing that they are trying to beat him.

There is no greater promise. Young people the world over ask just that. Only sadists receive their satisfaction by knowing that other young people are going hungry, sick, and without shelter in order that they may live in luxury. Once young people understand a challenge, almost all of them respond to it. Our task now is to explain the challenge of the Arusha Declaration's call for self-reliance.

18. Is it right to push some people down because you want to raise other people up?

If one man is sitting on top of a pile of maize while another is grubbing for roots because he doesn't have any, then it would certainly be right to pull some of the maize out from the pile of the first in order that the second may have a decent meal.

But the relevance of this question to the Arusha Declaration is unclear. For that Declaration simply says that no leader may exploit the people; that our nation must be self-reliant; and that we shall organize our society on the basis of human equality. It cannot be said that leaders are being pushed down when they are given the choice between acting in a capitalistic fashion or holding positions of responsibility in a socialist society.

19. Is it right to remove the pictures of Religious Leaders from public places because these leaders are foreigners while we must be self-reliant?

Whether or not pictures of religious leaders are shown in public places has nothing at all to do with the Arusha Declaration, nor with self-reliance. Freedom of religion is part of our constitution; our socialism does not affect it in the slightest. No-one may force his religion on another person. But everyone may worship as he pleases, and it is of no concern to anyone else whether a particular religious leader is white, black, brown, living or dead.

20. How is a man to educate his son to be a Doctor or a Lawyer on the average salary of a Civil Servant, M.P., or leader, if he is not allowed to accumulate savings and increase his income? If he cannot do this, where are we to find our Doctors and Lawyers?

It costs more than Shs. 20,000/- a year to keep a student at the University of East Africa. If we relied upon individuals to give their sons the seven years' education at University level which are necessary to become a Doctor, how many Doctors could we get in Tanzania? And what guarantee is there that the few individuals who could raise this kind of money have sons with the intellectual ability to benefit from the hard academic disciplines of a medical course? Wealth and intelligence are not father and son, one following from the other!

This question is either based on a basic misunderstanding of the costs of education, or it is a deliberate attempt to confuse the people. No-one—not a single individual—in Tanzania has “educated his son to be a Doctor or Lawyer”. Some have in the past paid fees which contributed to such an education. That is all. And even that is not being done now by many Tanzanian citizens.

The principle we have to hold on to is that higher education must be given to those who can absorb it best and who will put their knowledge to the service of the community. And ideally every Tanzanian child should have an equal opportunity to be selected for such training regardless of the income of the parents. We have not reached that position yet, for almost half our children do not even get to primary school. But of those that do, we must select on the basis of this principle and not give privileges to a particular child because his father or mother is wealthy, nor even because his father or mother made a great contribution to the national welfare.

21. What will the Regions do with the unemployed and known criminals who are being returned to them from the towns? If these people are not provided with food and work, will this not lead to a widespread outbreak of crime? Is it fair to add this burden of unemployed and known criminals to the already overburdened farmer?

First, those without work. We can divide those who are unemployed into two groups. The first group consists of those who left their farms to come to the town to seek work, but who have been unable to find any. The second group consists of those who were born in the towns.

We can divide the first group still further. There are those who have relatives in their home areas and who come from places where there is plenty of land. Such people as these can easily go back to their own homes and start farming like everyone else does in that district. There is no need for any special Government help to be given to them; they will be assisted by Government in the same way and to the same extent as any other farmer is assisted.

But among those who come from the rural areas to the towns there are some who would be happy to farm but who have no relatives to help them get started, or who come from areas where there is a land shortage. For example, a Mchagga from Kilimanjaro could easily be in the position where he is willing to farm but cannot find any land in his own area. A person such as this is in a similar position to that of a man who was born in the towns but who has no knowledge of agriculture and no way of getting started on a farm, even if he could find the land. This kind of person does need assistance. Government must help him to get land, tools, seeds, fertilizers, and food, etc., until the time comes when he can be self-reliant. The Government will set aside some money for this work. The citizen who is willing to work on the land, but who has no land or no relatives, or who is completely ignorant about farming techniques, should just tell the TANU leaders in his town about his problem, and plans will be made to help him.

Second, those who have been breaking the law. Criminals are a problem wherever they are. But for the most part they do not carry on their activities in their own home-areas and where they are known and their activities are known. It is much easier for them to hide away in the towns and to carry out their robbery and so on without being caught. If they do break the law once they are returned to their homes, it will be easier for the police to take the necessary steps because the local community will have the necessary knowledge to assist in the prosecution.

But what we really want is to give a new chance to such people. In towns they have constantly been tempted to hope that next week or the week after they will get a job; when they are repatriated they will be forced to recognize that they will get their living by work. Most of these people already have homes to go to, homes which they simply left. In effect, they are being forced to face up to facts—to the fact that the way to get food and shelter in Tanzania, and the way to get a better income, is to work on the land.

The repatriation is a problem, and there is no easy answer. The basis of success for all Tanzanians, those of the towns and of the rural areas alike, must be self-reliance; the self-reliance of our country and of every citizen. But it is quite certain that the farmers and peasants are not helped by increasing parasitism in the towns.

PUBLISHED BY THE
INFORMATION SERVICES DIVISION
P.O. Box 9142, DAR ES SALAAM
TANZANIA
