

PREFACE TO
HENRY CHIPEMBERE'S ARTICLE

by

C. P. Luchembe

Although a great deal has been written on African socialism, more still remains to be written. Henry Chipembere's paper written in 1970, may appear outdated by what has transpired in Kenya and Tanzania. Also, future trends in the scholarship dealing with the issue may appear to make the article even more outdated. In spite of these possibilities we decided to publish the paper because we think it is a classic. It is a work derived from the theoretical and practical insights of a man at the centre of it all. Rarely does one find critical works of this kind by men and women who participated in shaping the events that characterized the Africa of the 1960's.

Let it not be forgotten that, not too long ago, the topic under review was a subject of intense debate among students of African politics. The debate has almost ceased. One would be hard put to raise the question of 'Kenya Socialism' since it is the consensus of scholars that Kenya is in fact a showcase of capitalism in independent Africa. Similarly, one is not likely to dwell on whether Tanzania is socialist or not, since the consensus is that Tanzania is on the road towards socialism.

The attention is now focused on the seeds of class struggles in Kenya where capitalism is being entrenched, and in Tanzania where the process of transition towards socialism is taking place. With the revolutions in the former Portuguese colonies of Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique and Angola, and with the imminent ones in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, we will witness the resurrection and intensification of the debates which began with Kenya and Tanzania. We may also witness a change from *African Socialism* to socialism in Africa. Chipembere's article offers an opportunity to begin from the beginning, and places on record a fragment of the thoughts of an illustrious son of Africa. We hope that this, and other fragments in other journals and publications will be put together someday as a tribute to the man.

* * * * *

KENYAN SOCIALISM AND TANZANIAN SOCIALISM: A COMPARATIVE STUDY.

by

Henry B. M. Chipembere

Introduction

The rise of socialism in Kenya and Tanzania is part of the same political trend; it was an outward manifestation of a current political thought which characterised the early years of self-rule in many African states. When the nationalist parties of Africa achieved independence or were within sight of it, their leaders began to embark on an eager search for a system of political, social and economic organization which would ensure or facilitate the most rapid realisation of that material prosperity and progress which was their next major objective. This search led to the discovery of a new concept, the concept of African Socialism.

There were other factors which contributed to the birth of this new concept. One of these was the urgent need to provide the people with a new unifying ideology, now that the fight against the common enemy, colonialism, had come to an end. The people had to be given a new sense of purpose and a new set of goals which could give a systematic and satisfactory answer to the question 'what next?'

The mythos of an African socialism developed as political leaders sought a doctrine to replace the outmoded unifying influence of anticolonialism. Anticolonialism had been a powerful force for unifying the African peoples during the preindependence era. With independence there was the need to find new doctrines that would continue to unify the African population.¹

In addition there was a rejection of western values and ideas because, in the African mind, they were associated with

the colonialism of the men who had brought them. The West was resented, and in some countries actually hated, for the detentions, deaths, and general suffering which Africans had undergone during the freedom struggle. The evolving of an ideology which would not only represent this rejection of the West, but would also be a way of asserting the sovereignty of the new nations and their right to conduct their affairs in their own way which shall be no imitation of other people's ways, became a major objective of policy.

Some, like Sekou Toure of Guinea and his Democratic Party of Guinea, looked to the East for a solution and produced a Marxist answer, but the majority of the leaders and parties took the view that what the new African situation called for was a rejection of the principle of imitation itself. They rejected imported solutions; at the root of this rejection there was, among other things, a fear that the importation of ideas from the East might bring in its train a new brand of colonialism, an Eastern colonialism. Thus Africa would have achieved only a change of foreign masters and not a change from colonialism.

This non-Marxist majority preferred, in other words, to look inward rather than outwards for a solution. They looked for an internal, that is to say an African, formula. Eventually they found a solution in Africa's own past and in the African people's traditional values and customs. They found that in the time honored traditional system of social organization, and in its attitude to man, there was much that could be adopted and applied to the new situation.

This trend of thought was greatly assisted by nationalism. African nationalism had, among other things, taught that the African people were in no way inferior to their white brethren and were in certain aspects of life ahead of the other people. The call for restoration of Africa's traditional values met with an enthusiastic response. The accent was on "African-ness". Something that was peculiarly African was to be preferred to anything non-African in origin or content.

Since the rejection of western values had already created a tendency towards some form of anti-capitalism this re-enthronement of African values was inevitably accompanied by socialistic ideas which varied greatly in popularity from country to country. The two trends converged and gave birth to the idea of an "African" socialism.

The form of consciousness that has emerged with enormous significance (albeit with little organisational power for the moment)

has been that of "African-ness." If there is little consciousness of being a Ghanaian, a Togolese, or a Nyasaland, Africans are nonetheless conscious of being African, and it is this sentiment that political leaders have sought to mobilise. Underlying the proliferation of ideas on African Socialism is the formulation of an ideology that stresses the identity of the people of the continent while rejecting the influence of the outside world. As consciousness of Africa has developed, those Africans who were socialists and believed socialism to be a universalistic doctrine found themselves inundated by the growing consciousness of the continent. With the achievement of independence, Africans who had been socialists disappeared, to re-emerge as African socialists.²

But it would be wrong to imply that these are the only components of African Socialism, for it has many ingredients. It is "a vigorous child born out of the conflict of ideas and reaction of African thinkers and leaders to colonialism, communism, the democratic ideas of the West, capitalism and the centuries-old kinship and communal ideas and practices of Africans themselves."³

It is for this reason that no universally acceptable definition of African socialism has ever been found, that no two African countries have an identical brand of socialism; nor does one find complete unanimity within any one country. There are always what Kenyatta class "conflicting theoretical and academic arguments" on its meaning.⁴

East Africa's states are no exception. There Tanganyika was the first to declare itself a socialist nation, and socialism was mentioned in the constitution of the ruling Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) some time before independence. Among other things, the TANU constitution declared TANU's desire "to ensure that this country shall be governed by a democratic socialist government of the people;"⁵ in addition TANU would ensure "that the government exercises effective control over the principal means of production and pursues policies which facilitate the way to collective ownership of the resources of this country."⁶ Kenya however was the first to offer a detailed definition of its socialism. This was done in a government document published in 1965 under the title: *African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya*, which was presented to the Kenya Parliament for debate as "Sessional Paper Number 10."

Brief Summary of the Arusha Declaration

The Declaration consists of five parts, the last and most important of which is the Arusha Resolution itself.

Part One is a restatement of the TANU Creed and TANU's aims and objectives. The principles set forth are those one would find in any declaration of human rights or bill of rights or preamble to a constitution; but some of them are distinctly socialistic. These have already been mentioned in the foregoing introductory paragraphs. Part Two tries to describe what the conditions in a true socialist state should be like and declares that Tanzania is not yet a true socialist state because, although it is a state of peasants and workers as a socialist state should be, it "still has elements of Capitalism and Feudalism and their temptations."

The major means of production should be under the control of the peasants and workers through their Government and co-operatives. These major means are mainly the land, forests, mineral resources, water, oil and electricity, communications, banks, insurance, import and export trade, metal industries, textile industries, and the like.

Other indispensable qualities of a socialist state are democracy and a firm belief in socialism. The Government that controls the means of production must be elected by the peasants and workers themselves; it must be a democratically elected government.

Socialism can only be established by people who believe in it and practice it. So all TANU members must truly believe in it and support all the people outside Tanzania who work for it.

Part Three brings in a new concept as an indispensable twin brother of socialism - the concept of self-reliance. It says that TANU's desired socialist revolution which will put an end to poverty, ignorance, and disease, cannot be achieved with money alone, nor with money as the chief weapon. There is at present too much emphasis on money which is "a weapon of the economically strong," which the poor people of Tanzania are not.⁷

Foreign financial assistance is no solution either, because this is never available on a scale sufficient for Tanzania to achieve all its development targets. Moreover, foreign assistance can endanger a country's independence for "he who pays the piper calls the tune."⁸

The Declaration then attacks Tanzania's great emphasis on industrial development. Since the Government has not enough funds of its own, national or borrowed, this can only be achieved by inviting more and more foreign capitalists to set up industries in the country, and you cannot build socialism with capitalists.

The wrong stress on money and industries has led to excessive stress on urban development. But development is largely achieved with foreign loans and these have to be repaid with foreign currency, and the chief foreign exchange earners of the country are the farmers or peasants who also comprise the vast majority of the population. It is not fair to them that urban development should take precedence over rural. Exploitation of peasants by urban dwellers is as bad as the exploitation of the workers by the capitalists and feudalists.⁹

So agriculture should be the basis of development and should have priority. In particular, the nation should aim to achieve higher levels of production which will not only earn more money but will mean more food for the people.

The Declaration then outlines the conditions necessary for development. The first and most important is hard work. It calls for more working hours than the existing average of 45 hours a week. The practice whereby the men in the rural areas work only a little and leave most of the work to the women should come to an end.

The second condition is intelligence without which hard work will yield very little. The term intelligence is used to embrace such things as skillful use of the soil, agricultural implements, use of fertilisers, etc.

It calls for better use of the land and the creation of cooperative societies to help the people get the tools, training and leadership in modern methods of agriculture.

The people are the chief means for their own development. They have to be taught the meaning of self-reliance and its practice and to be proud of work, scorning laziness, drunkenness, and idleness. They should also be taught to defend their country and "to be on guard against internal stooges who could be used by external enemies who aim to destroy us."¹⁰

Self-reliance must begin with the individual citizen. No one must depend on the labor of his relation or be allowed to loiter in the towns or villages; each man must live on his own labor. If each individual is self-reliant then all groups of individuals, including the whole nation, will be self-reliant.

Good leadership is necessary for the development of the nation and for realization of socialism. TANU headquarters are called upon to draw up and implement plans for leadership training.

Part Four of the Arusha Declaration consists of two paragraphs and they state the conditions for admission to TANU. It lays down a new principle for membership recruitment. Henceforth emphasis should be on quality and not quantity as hitherto. TANU should not aim to have as many members as possible but as good members as possible. A member must be a person who is known to accept fully the policies of TANU and it has to be borne in mind always that TANU is a party of workers and peasants.

Part Five, which is the Arusha Resolution proper, lays down conditions for leadership. The conditions ensure that the leader should be a committed and practicing socialist.

It congratulates the Government for the steps it has already taken to apply socialism but urges it to take further steps in that direction. The current Development Plan should be amended so as to avoid excessive reliance on foreign loans and gifts and future plans should be designed to promote and apply the principle of self-reliance. All major national organisations are called upon to join the Government in implementing the Declaration.

Brief Summary of Sessional Paper no. 10

In his statement introducing the paper President Kenyatta presents it as part of a continuing process whereby the Government has been "deciding the measures that will ensure rapid economic development and social progress" for all citizens.¹¹ It is also an attempt to apply the principles contained in the manifesto of the ruling Kenya African Union (KANU) which had declared that Kenya would develop "on the basis of the concepts and philosophy of Democratic African Socialism and Eastern Communism and had opted for "a policy of positive non-alignment."¹²

The president goes on to state that the Government's entire approach has been dominated by "a desire to ensure Africanization of the economy and the public service."¹³

Finally he reveals that one of the aims of Sessional Paper No. 10 is to define clearly what its view of Democratic African Socialism is and thus put an end to the bitter controversy that had been going on in the country about what

African Socialism means or should mean. 14

Part I of the Sessional Paper proper attempts to spell out the characteristics of African Socialism. These are stated to be as follows: First it must be rooted in African tradition and must draw on the best of that tradition, especially its qualities of political democracy under which in the olden days there were no differences in political rights based on economic differentiation, and mutual social responsibility under which there was full cooperation among members of a community.

Secondly, African Socialism must be flexible and adaptable to modern conditions; in other words it must be efficient in its operation and not be hampered by the fetters of rigidity. In this context the paper severely criticises Marxism as well as laissez-faire capitalism and declares that both have been abandoned in part even by those who claim to follow them because they were written for their time and made no allowance for changing times and conditions.

Thirdly, African Socialism must not force Kenya into a satellite relationship with other nations. It should permit for learning and borrowing from others and for participation in world trade but not for external economic control.

In the remaining paragraphs of Part I the paper discusses what are called "operating characteristics" of African Socialism. While upholding the basic concept of common ownership of land, a concept which underlay traditional economy, the paper modifies it to mean that society has a common interest in ensuring that land is used well and for the good of all and not for individual satisfaction only. It rejects any denial of land titles because it believes that these are necessary for credit which in turn is indispensable for development. It calls for state control of the use of resources, but rejects state ownership of such resources. Provided the type and degree of control is adjusted or varied to suit changing conditions it can be more effective than outright ownership.

Under African Socialism, as in traditional society, there will be no class distinction as traditional political democracy and state control of resources will prevent the concentration of political and economic power in a few hands.

Foreign investment is welcomed and will play an increasing rather than a decreasing role. But it will have to comply with the tenets of African participation in shareholding and management.

In this process of concentrating economic power in domestic hands care must be taken to ensure that it does not result in a few wielding excessive political influence. On the other hand in preventing this, the accumulation of savings and inflow of private capital should not be discouraged, nor large-scale production prohibited.

Excessive individual accumulation of wealth will further be prevented by applying progressive taxation and by closing all loopholes in the imposition and collection of taxes, although in such a way, as not to force capital out of the country.

Enterprises owned by the state as well as jointly owned by the state and private investors are acceptable methods of diffusing wealth, since whatever is owned by the state belongs to all.

Co-operatives are rooted in African tradition and will be encouraged but with increased discipline and training.

Part one ends with an important statement. It states that the modern form of a company is different from the individual firms Marx wrote about. The modern company by permitting a large number of people to hold shares in it makes for diffusion of wealth.¹⁵

The first few paragraphs of Part II discuss basic economic problems of Kenya. These are first, the shortage of domestic capital which stems from a low rate of domestic saving. To solve this problem the borrowing of capital from abroad is advocated although as a purely transitional and temporary cure. The ultimate solution will lie in achieving a higher rate of growth which will make saving possible.

The second basic problem is that of lack of skilled manpower which is so serious that there are not enough men even to draw up applications for foreign aid! The solution lies in rapid education in all its forms.

The third problem is lack of foreign exchange not only to pay for goods and services purchased from abroad but also for repayment of foreign loans. This scarcity of foreign exchange is not yet a serious matter, but it is necessary to ensure that "steps taken to promote development, including our foreign policy, do not create this problem." Quantitative controls to counteract capital flight are disapproved but may be resorted to if mere creation of investor confidence proves insufficient. Trade with countries whose currencies are not convertible is not favored since it may cause serious reduction

in Kenya's supplies of convertible currency.

Fourthly, there is the problem of proper use of domestic resources. The paper calls for more productive effort, an end to idleness and wanton destruction of resources of land, fertility, vegetation, and the like caused by poor methods of farming, curbed by means of education and legislation.

There follow paragraphs which attempt to suggest answers to the various difficult choices facing the nation.

On nationalization of means of production the paper reveals that some nationalization has already taken place and that the governing party is already committed to it. But "indiscriminate" nationalization is rejected and conditions which would necessitate nationalization are spelled out in paragraphs 75 through 77. Full compensation for nationalized property is assured, and it is firmly stated that African-owned individual enterprise is as much subject to nationalization as non-African owned enterprise.

Africanization of the economy should be carried out in such a way that it does not constitute unequal treatment of citizens which is strictly forbidden in the Bill of Rights. Moreover Africanization can be so costly as to have on Africans an effect opposite to the desired one. This has been experienced in certain forms of land transfer in which the Government has spent much money on surveys, reorganization, registration, etc., which could have been used more profitably on development of lands already owned by Africans. Moreover, it has at times resulted in a reduction of jobs available to Africans.

The provision of increasing welfare services of various types by the Government is one of the objectives of African Socialism, but to provide them fully and freely now "would bankrupt the nation and mortgage economic growth for generations."¹⁶ Family planning is advocated as a method of maintaining and increasing the rate of economic growth by reducing the number of job seekers and dependent persons (i.e. children).

In order to encourage domestic saving compulsory saving is advocated, but voluntary saving will also be made more varied and be encouraged. Foreign lotteries will be outlawed and Kenyan ones be nationalized to ensure that their profits are used in Kenya. There will be more control of banks, insurance firms, and other financial institutions and a central bank for Kenya or all East Africa be established.

Direct taxation of low-income groups will be progressive-

ly abolished and present industrial incentives and protection be reviewed so as to eliminate excessive protection. Idle resources and undeveloped land will be taxed so as to encourage efficient use and development.

On land tenure the paper says that although titles to land have been accepted for all races, African agricultural land will not be re-sold to non-Africans without Government approval and people owning land will be compelled to join co-operative agricultural and other projects where Government considers them necessary.

Education including University education will be closely controlled by the state so as to ensure uniform standards and to relate educational development to the needs of the country.

Greater state control of certain privately operated services such as urban and cross-country but services is advocated and promised.

In the field of trade and industry more control of monopoly profits, discriminatory prices, unfair marketing practices, prices of basic commodities, rents, etc., is envisaged and there will be more state participation in commercial activity through various state organs such as the National Trading Company, the Industrial and Commercial Development Corporation, etc.

Trade Unions will be given an opportunity to play greater role in economic activity and in maintaining workers' discipline; but various measures intended to facilitate government control of unions are envisaged.

Comparison of the Two Documents

Both the Kenya Sessional Paper and the Arusha Declaration do not confine themselves to merely defining socialism. They take the opportunity to discuss at some length the various economic ills of their respective countries. Popular misconceptions are attacked and an appeal is made to the people to work hard; to sacrifice a little more, and to appreciate that there are no short-cuts for solving their economic difficulties. The Arusha Declaration attacks too much reliance on money and foreign aid and other similar misconceptions,¹⁷ the Sessional Paper attacks idleness and wanton destruction of resources. They are both a kind of treatise on their nations' economic problems and how they can be solved. The leaders are trying, in a sense, to say what they might have said in any public statement calling for more economic development effort, but

their words carry more weight here because they form part of important and historic documents. In this respect the Kenya paper is longer and more detailed. In terms of intellectual expertise it is more ably written, no doubt a reflection of the fact that it was drawn by highly trained experts in a Government ministry,¹⁸ while the Arusha Declaration was drawn up by politicians at TANU Headquarters and "amended in a number of particulars" by the party's National Executive Committee.¹⁹

This brings us to one of the basic differences between the two documents, namely, that while the Kenya one is a Government document, produced by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development under the leadership of its minister, the late Tom Mooya, approved by the cabinet and finally debated and approved by Parliament, the Tanzania one is a party document, debated and adopted by the ruling party's chief policy-making organ, the National Executive Committee.

Since in both countries the leaders of the ruling party and the leaders of the government tend to be one and the same people, in practice it makes no difference whether it is party or the government that drew the document, but it does reveal a basic difference between the political systems of the two countries. In Kenya leadership and initiative are provided by the party. Moreover, the Kenya document tends to place the responsibility for implementation of its principles on the government and makes little mention of the party's role; the Tanzania one tends to regard TANU as the chief instrument for implementing its principles. We are therefore introduced to a major difference between the two types of socialism. The Tanzanian one is the mass or people's type of socialism that one finds in the eastern countries with the party playing a crucial role while the Kenyan type is the government-directed one that is found in places like Norway and Sweden.

So significant indeed is the role of the government in the Kenyan type of socialism that it re-enforces the view that what Sessional Paper no. 10 creates is not a socialist state but a Welfare State, one, in other words, which undertakes to shoulder the responsibility to provide extensive social and other services normally provided by private enterprise.²⁰

There is a significant difference on attitudes to nationalization. The Arusha Declaration calls for more steps to implement socialism²¹ after declaring in the creed that all principal means of production must be in the hands of the state,²² the Kenya paper expresses reservations on nationalization. It rejects what it calls "indiscriminate nationalization," says that nationalization involves the government in

large payments of compensation which means diverting state funds from other vital needs, and concludes by saying that "nationalisation will be considered if the need is urgent, if other less costly controls are ineffective" and if it is certain that the industries nationalised will not be operated at a loss.²³

While both types of socialism claim to be based on African tradition, the Kenya document lays great stress on this aspect. Indeed, it can be deduced that the founders of Kenyan Socialism regard African tradition as basis and justification for their socialism, stressing that the "socialist" concepts of common ownership, "mutual social responsibility" and democracy are not importations from abroad, but are rooted in the African past.²⁴ In contrast, the Arusha Declaration is almost silent on African tradition. People say that Tanzanian socialism is based on African tradition because Nyerere had declared in 1962 that the traditional extended family would be the basis of African Socialism;²⁵ but the Declaration does not say so.

Similarly, the two documents differ in their rejection of capitalism. The Kenya one rejects only what it calls "laissez faire capitalism"²⁶ while the Tanzanian one declares that it is against all forms of capitalism and feudalism. The Kenya document states that the company type of capitalism is a different thing from what Marx knew and spoke against in his day. It was the "laissez fair" or individual type of capitalism while the modern company type is a diffused type in which many people hold shares. It does not concentrate economic power in the hands of an individual or of a few.²⁷ Because of this it can in certain cases be acceptable. The Tanzania one makes no such reservations in its condemnation of capitalism.

The difference between the two in this respect is almost the same as that between outright capitalism and Marxist socialism. Indeed some observers have referred to Kenya's socialism as being "very moderate indeed, or even capitalism."²⁸

Both documents accept foreign investment on certain conditions,²⁹ but the Tanzania one devotes several strongly-worded paragraphs to pointing out the dangers of foreign private investment. Among other things, the Arusha Declaration says, private investment will mean building a socialist state with capitalists³⁰ i.e. using capitalism to build socialism. This is felt to be dangerous to socialism itself. Moreover, it will destroy or discourage TANU's idea of self-reliance.

Similar differences can be discerned in the related field

of foreign aid. Kenya regards foreign loans and grants as desirable and at present indispensable, while Tanzania regards them as a danger to be dispensed with as soon as possible.

The Kenya paper tends to see the private sector of the economy, including that part of it which is controlled by the foreign investor, as complementary to, and in harmony with, the public sector, while Tanzania sees the two as basically in conflict. The Tanzania view is shared by the strongest Kenyan critic of the Sessional Paper, Oginga Odinga, who has this to say about the contents of the Paper:

*Throughout the confused talk about African Socialism for Kenya there is the basically false assumption that there can be a harmony of interests between private capital, including private foreign capital, and the Government as the representative of the public interest in Kenya.*³¹

Regarding the motive behind the production of the Paper Odinga says:

*These politicians want to build a capitalist system in the image of Western Capitalism but are too embarrassed or dishonest to call it that. Their interpretation of independence and African Socialism is that they should move into the jobs previously held by the settlers.*³²

This in fact is the main thrust of the criticism that has been levelled against Kenyan Socialism as propounded by Sessional Paper No. 10 - that it is capitalism masquerading in the guise of socialism. Tanzania is among those which hold this view of Kenyan Socialism, although the view is seldom articulated, for fear of diplomatic repercussions.

The attitude of Tanzanians towards Kenya's Sessional Paper No. 10 is summed up by a Tanzanian who is cited by Odinga to have said that the paper sounds as if it had been drafted by someone who was neither an African nor a socialist, and Odinga states that it was in fact drafted by "an American professor advisor".³³

These views are shared by another well known Kenyan, Ahmed Mohiddin, who says that the Sessional Paper is neither African nor socialistic but a masterpiece of classical capitalism and adds:

No drastic changes in the economic system

*are proposed, but only modifications and these are in the nature of making the present system work more efficiently.*³⁴

He believes that what is proposed is mere Africanization of capitalism. In other words, Mohiddin probably wants to see Kenyan socialism do what, according to Lowenkopf, Tanzania's socialism is trying to do, namely, to forestall the birth of a black capitalist class.³⁵

These criticisms were answered at some length by the late Tom Mboya, one of the authors of the Paper. He said that most of the criticisms were purely ideological and were based on the fact that the paper did not meet certain particular definitions of socialism. No attempt was being made to find out to what extent the paper's ideas could help in realization of the main objective of a higher rate of growth and higher living standards for all.³⁶

In other words, to Mboya, as to many of its other advocates, African Socialism must, or rather aims to, "look on the development process" not as an end, but as a means towards increased prosperity for all. It is not bothered by the Puritan code of ethics which makes saving, at the expense of other peoples consumption a virtue, nor by the Hegelian mystique that the future is in some way more important than the present" (and must be guided) "by the very different economic situation in which modern African finds itself."³⁷

But one must stress that some of the differences between Tanzanian and Kenyan Socialism are superficial; many of the fundamental goals seem to be the same, such as, for instance a higher rate of economic growth, higher living standards for the people, and the like.

Alan Rake refers to the difference as one of approach, (i.e. method) rather than fundamentals, and he observes:

*Kenya and Tanzania start with many fundamentals in common but their approach is entirely different. Kenya uses a well tried system, Tanzania experiments with the economic framework, and yet both expect about the same rate of growth.*³⁸

Of similarities there are indeed many and one notes, in addition to all the similarities we have already mentioned, that even the concept of self-reliance, which is a major part of the Arusha Declaration, had already been advocated earlier

by Kenya's Sessional Paper.³⁹ But Rake does concede that the ultimate however-distant goal of Tanzanian socialism is to bring about a radical transformation of society which, as we have seen, some critics of Kenya's Socialism say the latter does not aim to achieve.

It was perhaps inevitable that Kenya and Tanzania should pursue different paths in their pursuit of African Socialism. Tanzania was already committed to a kind of revolutionary road. It had a one-party system while Kenya was a two-party state. Tanzania's leader was young, radical, and modern in outlook while Kenya's Kenyatta was an elderly man, moderate and cherishing deeply many of Africa's ancient traditional values and attitudes. A man who had authored several books on the customs of his people, Kenyatta was a traditionalist not likely to approve of a radical change. His outlook was strengthened by having as his strongest cabinet member, Tom Mboya, a man with extensive links with the west generally and with British socialists in particular.

Tanzania had been born of a recent union of the mainland and Zanzibar and the latter had brought with it its Marxist Revolutionary Council into the nation's leadership. Members of the council and Zanzibar's ruling Afro-Shirazi Party were not going to be contented with the type of moderate socialism that Kenya was preaching. Kenya had had a revolution of some kind in the form of the Mau Mau. It had been a prolonged tragedy in which many lives had been lost and much property destroyed. Now a kind of revulsion against any form of extremism or radicalism had set. Tanganyika had come to independence by peaceful evolution. Many of its young men had not seen a revolution and were fascinated by the idea of passing through one. Kenya was a relatively wealthy country and, although most of its wealth was in the hands of Europeans and Asians, some Africans had been able to rise to considerable wealth. Some of the wealthy men were powerful in the ruling party and in the Government. They stood to lose by any introduction of radical socialism. Tanzania was relatively poor and there were not more than a handful of Africans who were going to lose much by socialism. Indeed, one of the amusing remarks I heard attributed to Kenya politicians critical of Tanzania's socialism was that Tanzania could afford to distribute its wealth because it had no wealth to distribute and that what the Arusha Declaration will achieve is not equal distribution of wealth but equal distribution of poverty.

Footnotes

1. Friedland W. H. and Rosberg C. G., "The Anatomy of African Socialism," in Friedland and Rosberg, eds, *African Socialism*, p.4.
2. Friedland and Rosberg, *Op. cit.* p. 5.
3. John Dumoga, *Africa Between East and West*, p. 19.
4. "Statement by the President, introducing Kenya's Sessional Paper No. 10.
5. TANU Constitution, The TANU Creed, Aims and Objects (C).
6. *Ibid.* (j)
7. The Arusha Declaration, Dar es Salaam, 1967, p. 5.
8. *Ibid*, p. 10.
9. *Ibid*, p. 13.
10. *Ibid*, p. 18
11. "Statement by the President", *op.cit.*, para. 1.
12. *Ibid*, para. 2.
13. *Ibid.*, para 3.
14. *Ibid*, para 4.
15. Sessional Paper No. 10, para 47.
16. *Ibid*, para 85
17. pp. 6-11
18. President's Statement, *op.cit.*, p. 2.
19. Julius Nyerere, *Freedom and Socialism*; Ch. 26, para 3 of the editor's introduction to the chapter.
20. Paras 11 and 85
21. Part Five, Section B, para 2.
22. Belief No. (h) and aim No. (j). (And the announcement of

the Declaration on Feb. 5, 1967 was followed by extensive nationalisations, "Public ownership in Tanzania" by J. K. Nyerere, Appendix I to Arusha Declaration, p.21.

23. Paras 73-77.
24. Paras 8 - 14.
25. Julius Nyerere, "Ujama, the Basis of African Socialism," (Par es Salaam, Tanganyika Standard Ltd., 1962), pp.2-8.
26. Sessional Paper, para 21.
27. Sessional Paper para 10.
28. John Dumoga, op.cit., p. 30.
29. Arusha Declaration p. 10 and Sessional Paper para 38-40.
30. Arusha Declaration, pp. 10 & 11.
31. O. Odinga, *Not Yet Uhuru*, p. 311.
32. Ibid., p. 302.
33. Odinga, op.cit. p. 310=11.
34. "Socialism or Capitalism? Sessional Paper no. 10 Revisited," *East Africa Journal*, March 1969, p. 8.
35. Martin Lowenkopf, "The Meaning of Arusha," *Africa Report*, March, 1967, p. 8.
36. Tom Mboya, "Sessional Paper No. 10: It is African and it is Socialism," *East Africa Journal*, May 1969, p. 15
37. Ralph Clark "Does African Socialism make Economic Sense?, *Transition* No. 26, 3, 1966.
38. Alan Rake, "Kenya and Tanzania: Five-Year Plans Compared," *African Development*, July 1970, p. 13.
39. Sessional Paper No. 10, para 70.

* * * * *