

AN EXAMINATION OF IDEOLOGY: JULIUS K. NYERERE AND THE TANZANIAN EXAMPLE

by

Eudene Luther

McMaster University

ABSTRACT

Anthropologists no longer view ideology as well integrated systems of ideas that reflect social reality. Instead, anthropologists have become aware that ideological systems contain contradictions and, therefore, can be best understood as a system of principals with which only attempts are made to regulate social life. Because of this the search for social determinants of ideology has largely been abandoned. Consequently social scientists, such as Geertz (1973), suggest that we study ideologies as socializing agents and analyze their symbolic content. Making use of Geertz' concepts I studied data from Tanzania and found that ideology used by Nyerere, Ujamaa, has been ineffective as a socializing agent, resulting in the use of repressive techniques to effect economic changes. This finding challenges the notion that ideologies necessarily function as effective socializing agents during times of social change.

Une Analyse du terme 'idéologie!': Julius K. Nyerere et L'exemple tanzanien

RESUME

Les anthropologistes ne voient plus l'idéologie comme des systèmes intégrés d'idées reflétant la réalité sociale. Plutôt, les anthropologistes ont pris conscience du fait que les systèmes idéologiques contiennent des contradictions et, par conséquent, doivent être vus comme un système de principes qui ne permettent que de faire des efforts pour régler la vie sociale. A cause de ceci, la quête des déterminants sociaux de l'idéologie a été en grande partie abandonnée. Conséquemment, les chercheurs en sciences sociales tel que Geertz (1973) suggèrent que l'on étudie les idéologies en tant qu'agents socialisants et que l'on analyse leurs contenus symboliques. Utilisant les concepts de Geertz, j'ai analysé des données de la Tanzanie et j'ai trouvé que l'idéologie employée par Nyerere, Ujamaa, a été inefficace comme agent socialisant, ce qui a résulté en l'emploi de techniques répressives pour effectuer des transformations économiques. Cette découverte met en question la notion que les idéologies fonctionnent nécessairement comme des agents socialisants efficaces dans les périodes de transformation sociale.

INTRODUCTION

That the study of ideology is one of "the larger and more impassable swamps currently existing in the intellectual territory of the social sciences" (Nellis 1972:18) becomes abundantly evident as one begins to review the literature presently available on the topic. Unanswered questions about ideology include: What is an ideology? Are ideas social forces? What is the relationship between ideology and social behavior? In an attempt to answer these questions, many social scientists are turning to Africa which is undergoing a vast process of modernization that includes both social and ideological change. Africa, therefore, provides the social scientist with an opportunity to examine both the content of ideology and its relationship to social action.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. First, I review anthropological conceptions of the relationship between ideology and social action as well as the familiar theories which postulate social determinants of ideology. Second, I examine the symbolic content of Julius K. Nyerere's ideology by using Geertz' (1973) concept of ideology. In addition, I explore the relationship between Nyerere's ideology and social action in Tanzania by examining the available data on the topic presented in the works of John R. Nellis (1972) and Clyde R. Ingle (1972).

By examining both the content of Nyerere's ideology and its relationship to social action in Tanzania, I found it contained symbolic representations of man and society which are used to justify programs for socio-economic development, to cement national unity and to motivate Tanzanians to act in accordance with ideological principles underpinning these programs. However, at the level of social action, Nyerere's ideology contains a major contradiction because actions and programs which can be justified by an appeal to one principle are not in accordance with another.

To conclude, I sum up what I have discussed in part I and part II of this paper and discuss the implication of the analysis for the role of ideology in Tanzania.

PART I. THE CONCEPT OF IDEOLOGY IN ANTHROPOLOGY

Anthropologists working within the framework of structural-functionalism postulate various degrees of congruency between ideology and social relationships (Moore 1978:33). Social systems are conceived of as being analogous to natural systems in which all the parts are interdependent, each serving in a complex of necessary relationships to maintain the whole (Evans-Pritchard 1976:362). Social systems therefore are assumed to be in a perpetual state of integration and, consequently, the all-absorbing question becomes: "What maintains integration?" (Honigmann 1976:263). Structural functionalists argue that integration occurs because people and groups interacting in different events use the same ritual symbols. Ritual symbols embodying a society's values and norms link events together with common meanings, and thereby produce structured

and integrated relationships. Furthermore, an explication of normative models is believed to be a reflection of reality or congruent with social structure.

In the 1950s questions were raised about the nearly automatic integration of social behaviour and ideology. In addition, the stability and regularity implied by the central concept, social structure, was questioned. Firth (1951:35) and Leach (1965:IX-XV) were the most outspoken critics of the structuralist approach to the study of society. They argued that such an approach ignored individual and group processes whereby culture and social structure are generated. In recent decades, therefore, there has been a shift in emphasis from the study of normative models to the study of specific situations and sequences of events (Moore 1978:37). This latter approach represents a shift away from the study of social structures to the study of social processes. This change in subject matter has resulted in an intensified awareness that ideological systems are frequently full of inconsistencies, oppositions and contradictions (ibid.). Moore suggests, therefore, that ideological models are cultural frameworks through which only an attempt can be made to fix social life because there invariably remains a certain range of maneuver and openness of choice which may lead to an alteration and transformation of social life.

At present, two theories exist as alternatives to the structural-functional view of ideology: "interest theory" and "strain theory"; ideology is seen as the mask and the weapon of men who seek power. In "strain theory" ideology is seen as a symptom and a remedy to correct socio-psychological disequilibrium. "Interest theory" is based on the notion that the social systems and ideological systems that support them are well integrated. The fundamentals of "interest theory" were developed in the Marxist tradition. For Marx, material and economic forces were the most potent and autonomous determinants of conscious rational activity (Marx 1959). Therefore, ideologies were mere false superstructures which masked material interests. Furthermore, they could be useful weapons for institutionalizing a particular view of reality if the political power could be captured to enforce it (Geertz 1973:202).

There are several criticisms of this theory. For example, later observers of human affairs become disillusioned with man's capacity to reason and had serious doubts concerning his ability to understand his circumstances and pursue his moral and material interests with any degree of efficiency and consistency. Also, Geertz (1973:202) suggests that "interest theory" depends upon a view of social action as a never ending struggle for power which leads to an overly Machiavellian view of ideology as being a "higher form of cunning". Furthermore, he argues, such a view restricts the analysis of ideology to an analysis of tactics and strategy, turning attention away from its broader role as a socializing force. Also, "interest theory" depends upon the notion that ideology can be used to structure social reality. But, if there are contradictions in ideological systems as Moore (1978:37) suggests, then they are open to manipulation and can be viewed only as an attempt to structure social reality.

"Strain theory" departs from "interest theory" because it is based on the notion that society is in a chronic state of malintegration (Geertz 1973:203-205). No social arrangement can be completely successful in dealing with the functional problems it inevitably faces. Rather all human societies are riddled with social antinomies: between liberty and political order, stability and change, efficiency and humanity, and so forth. Ideology is viewed as a reaction to social strain and as a symbolic outlet for emotional disturbances generated by social disequilibrium. There are four explanations for how ideologies ease social strain: (1) The "cathartic explanation" postulates that emotional tension is drained off by being displaced onto symbolic enemies; (2) The "morale explanation" suggests that an ideology can sustain people in the face of chronic strain either by denying it or legitimizing it in terms of higher values; (3) The "solidarity explanation" refers to the power of ideology to knit a social group together; (4) The "advocacy explanation" suggests that ideology can be used to articulate the strains that impel them and bring them to public attention. Thus, whereas "interest theory" views ideologies as masks for material interests, "strain theory" views ideologies as masks for psychological motivations.

The main criticism of "strain theory" is that explanations invoke the concept of latent functions and postulate psychological motivations, neither of which are subject to empirical proof (Nellis 1972:20). Equally problematic is the assertion postulated by proponents of "interest theory"; i.e., that ideas are logically consistent with behavior aimed at the efficient attainment of goals. Furthermore, by reducing ideologies to material or psychological determinants both these theories dodge the issues of linkages between ideology and social action which makes them unsuitable for studying the use of ideologies in the Third World where they are being generated to justify radical change. As Nellis (1972:9) points out, the achievement of independence has created new political systems and thus a need for a symbolic structure which will justify the regime's calls for radical alterations of traditional behavior patterns. Thus, the relationships between ideology and social action become important objects for analysis.

The major form of escape from the methodological problems cited above, Nellis (1972:20-25) argues, is through the application of a form of functional analysis to the concept of ideology. Political ideologies are viewed as socializing agents which are especially called upon in times of rapid social change. According to this view, the uncertainties of the causes of ideology are just accepted and ideology is studied at the observable level. Geertz (1973:205-218) is one anthropologist who uses this approach. He argues that "stress theory" and "strain theory" go directly from causal analysis to consequence analysis without seriously examining ideologies as "systems of interacting symbols and patterns of interworking meanings". The problem of how ideologies transform sentiment into significance so as to make it socially available, he points out, is not addressed. He argues that ideologies should be viewed as systems of symbols that contain information concerning the organization of social and psychological processes. They are crucial, he says, in times of change when the information they contain is lacking.

Although Geertz frames his view of ideology in terms of its functional role, his approach should not be confused with that of the structural-functional school of thought. In his critique of structural-functionalism, Evans-Pritchard (1973:362) points out that adherents of the latter school of thought view human societies as being analogous to natural systems in which all the parts are inter-dependent, each serving a necessary function to maintain the whole. "The aim of anthropology, therefore, is to reduce social life to laws or general statements about the nature of society which allow prediction" (ibid.). Ideology is viewed as maintaining the integration of the whole and is conceptualized as being a reflection of social action. By contrast, Geertz (1980) draws his analogy for society from the humanities. Instead of viewing society as "an elaborate machine" or "quasi-organism" he views it as being a serious drama, organized in terms of symbols whose meanings must be grasped if we are to understand its organization. The study of social life, therefore, is aimed at interpretive explanation by unpacking performed meaning. Ideologies are, according to Geertz, dramas of persuasion composed of symbols containing information about the organization of social and psychological processes and are crucial during times of change. This view of ideology put forth by Geertz represents a radical break with the structural-functional school of thought because ideology is no longer viewed as maintaining social structures but as socializing agents capable of changing social and psychological processes.

To summarize, then, anthropologists have rejected the concept of ideology as being well-integrated systems of ideas that reflect social reality. Instead, by studying social processes and change, anthropologists have become aware that ideological systems contain contradictions, inconsistencies and oppositions, and therefore can be understood as a system of principles with which only an attempt is made to regulate social life. Also, the search for social determinants of ideology has been abandoned because either it led to problematic assertions about human behavior or the concept of latent function had to be introduced which is not subject to empirical proof. Some social scientists, therefore, are studying ideology at the observable level as a socializing agent. Geertz (1973) suggests, further, that the symbolic content of ideology should be studied.

In the next section, I apply Geertz' concept of ideology to the ideology of Julius K. Nyerere and conduct a symbolic analysis of it. I then explore the way Nyerere's ideology is linked to social action in Tanzania, a linkage which reveals contradictions inherent in this ideology.

PART II. THE IDEOLOGY OF JULIUS K. NYERERE

Geertz (1973:218) has said that ideologies are crucial in times of great change when information concerning guides for behavior, thought or feeling are absent or lacking. Nellis (1972:26) also argues that in periods of drastic change, new and dynamic supporting belief structures must be formulated and propagated which rationalize the change to new goals or the directed alteration of behavior.

In Tanzania, the need for a new ideology can be traced back to the struggle for independence which occurred in a non-violent manner (ibid: 10). In almost all areas where this was the case, one requisite demand by the imperial powers was that nationalists had to demonstrate widespread support by its citizens. In circumstances such as these, the battle for support from the people was fought with verbal tools and success was judged in terms of how many citizens were persuaded to support the nationalist movement at the polls. In Tanzania, the anti-colonial battle was fought ultimately in the smaller towns and rural areas because almost ninety percent of Tanzania's population resides there (Ingle 1972:39). A widely utilized and effective argument was the appeal: support the nationalist movement and you will receive material increases in wealth and goods (Nellis 1972:11). This argument was based on the belief that a nationalist controlled regime could redirect resources previously drained off by the colonialists to the rural poor. Consequently, Julius Nyerere, shortly after independence, declared the primary goals of his new government were: (1) rapid economic progress; and (2) the creation and maintenance of material equality, racial dignity and national self-respect (Nyerere in Nellis 1972:7).

Six weeks after independence Nyerere resigned his position as president of Tanganyika -- now called Tanzania -- and spent nine months in the rural areas listening to the needs, hopes and desires of rural people (Hatch 1976:48). It is quite likely that he spent this time assessing the resource potential of these areas and the possibility of fulfilling his party's promises. It was during this time that Nyerere did some of his major political writings including his essay 'Ujamaa -- The Basis of African Socialism' (Nyerere 1966:162-171). These writings represent the formulation of a supporting belief structure designed to rationalize not only Nyerere's new goals but the alteration of behavioral and attitudinal patterns he saw as being necessary for the accomplishment of those new goals. This information is contained in symbolic forms which I attempt to uncover. I also show that when Nyerere attempts to transform his ideology into programs for economic and social development, a major contradiction is made visible at the level of social action.

A SYMBOLIC INTERPRETATION OF UJAMAA

Geertz (1975) has said that ideologies are systems of symbols that contain information concerning the organization of social processes and psychological processes. In his ideology Ujamaa, Nyerere uses the metaphor of the traditional African family in order to explain to his citizens the new and transformed society he envisions for the future. "Metaphor" says Nisbet "is the simplest way of proceeding from the known to the unknown. It is the way of cognition in which the identifying qualities of one thing are transferred in an instantaneous, almost unconscious flash of insight to some other thing that is by remoteness or complexity unknown to us" (Nisbet in Turner 1974:25). By using the traditional African family as a metaphor, Nyerere transfers the identifying qualities of it to the new nation and, at the same time legitimizes his regime by an appeal to tradition:

'Ujamaa' then, or familyhood, describes our socialism... We in Africa have no more need of being converted to socialism than we have of being taught democracy. Both are rooted in our past -- in the traditional society that produced us.... Modern Africanism can draw from its traditional heritage the recognition of 'society' as an extension of the basic family unit. But it can no longer confine the idea of the social family within the limits of the tribe.... Our recognition of the family to which we all belong must be extended yet further, beyond the tribe to the nation.... (Nyerere 1966:170).

The qualities of the African family he wants to transfer to the African state are the principles of: mutual respect (by which Nyerere means the absence of exploitative relationships); mutual obligation to work; and sharing the fruits of labor. These principles are now to underpin institutions and social relationships in the new nation.

At the same time, Nyerere contrasts his ideology, Ujamaa with capitalism by using two rhetorical devices; 'symbolic inversion' and generalization (Renata 1978:234). The contrastive elements he uses to distinguish his ideology from capitalism are as follows: Capitalism is associated with the colonial regime and Ujamaa is associated with the Tanzanian regime; Money becomes the dominant symbol associated with the exploitative powers of the capitalist, and hard work becomes the symbol of power for the African socialist; Acquisitiveness, competitiveness, and exploitive behavior characterize the personal qualities of the capitalist, while sharing, cooperation and mutual respect for one's fellow man characterize the personal qualities of the African socialist. Furthermore, capitalists are either leisured (because they own the means of production) or loiterers and idlers (because they have no jobs). On the other hand, African socialists all work. The African socialists look after the less fortunate while the capitalists enjoy the discomfort of others. A capitalist society is characterized by individual ownership of land and accumulation of wealth. The socialist society is characterized by communal ownership of land and distribution of wealth. Socialism is based upon the unity of men while capitalism is based upon conflict between men (Nyerere 1966:162-171). By associating capitalism with the colonial regime and Ujamaa with the Tanzanian regime, Nyerere symbolically separates his regime from that of the colonizers. At the same time, capitalism becomes associated with evil people and the bad life while Ujamaa holds the promise for a good life in future.

By contrasting capitalism with Ujamaa, Nyerere has also constructed a symbolic representation of the ideal citizen and the ideal society. The ideal Tanzanian citizen is portrayed as a hardworking, cooperative and selfless individual who asks not "What profit would I myself get....[but] What benefit, and what loss, will be obtained by people who make up this society?" (Nyerere 1966:16). The ideal society is portrayed as consisting of institutions built on socialist principles: i.e., human equality (by which Nyerere means material equality), so as to ensure that people will work cooperatively; freedom (by which Nyerere means freedom from exploitation), because the individual is not served by society unless it is his; and unity, because only when society is united can its members live and

work in peace, security and well being (Nyerere 1966:8). These symbolic representations of the ideal society and ideal presented by Nyerere as the measures by which society and individuals will be judged. He expresses this sentiment in the following words: "Social principles are, by definition, ideals at which we strive and by which to exercise self-criticism" (ibid.:13).

Nyerere's ideology also contains information about the organization of psychological processes necessary to transform Tanzania into a socialist state. His symbolic constructions of the ideal society and citizen are used to justify the social and psychological processes he sees as being necessary for the accomplishment of this goal. The organization of psychological processes consists of either changing the attitudes of the people from capitalist to socialist or revitalizing the social ethic where it still exists. Nyerere believes that the intrusion of capitalism upon traditional African society has transformed many of the present day Africans from people who used to possess the qualities of socialists to people who now wish to exploit their fellow man. Therefore, he exhorts: "Our first step is to re-educate ourselves; to regain our former attitude of mind..." (ibid.:166). This transformation of attitudes or revitalization of attitudes is to be brought about by directing the modern educational system toward inculcating socialist principles (ibid.:14). In addition, all things broadcast on the radio and all things written in the press must be designed to inculcate socialist principles.

In addition to containing information about the organization of psychological processes, Nyerere's ideology also contains information about the social processes necessary for the transformation of Tanzania to a socialist state. Nyerere states: "...and in rejecting the capitalist attitude of mind which colonialism brought to Africa, we must reject the methods that go with it..." (ibid.:165). Therefore, Nyerere says that land in the new nation will be communally owned and the distribution of wealth will be communal. In addition, every citizen will be under the mutual obligation to work; prestige and authority will accrue to individuals on the basis of their service to society; and laziness will be a national disgrace.

The task of Nyerere's government, therefore, was to set the social and psychological processes in motion. According to Hatch (1976:184) this was to be accomplished in several ways. First, freehold land was abolished in order to ensure that private enterprise was conducted for the good of the community. Second, having identified the main barrier to building a socialist state as being the gap in material wealth which was developing between the rural peasant and the urban elite, Nyerere decided to narrow the gap by organizing scattered people into village settlements for the purpose of planting cash crops (Ingle 1972). These village settlements, he hoped, would raise the productivity of the rural area and bring about a more equal distribution of material wealth. In short, Ujamaa provided both the justification and motivation for rapid social change and economic development.

To summarize, Nyerere uses the African family as a metaphor to explain to his people the communal principles upon which the institutions of the new nation will be built. At the same time, he legitimates his

regime by an appeal to tradition. In addition, he symbolically separates his regime from the colonial regime by associating his regime with Ujamaa and the colonial regime with capitalism. Also, by contrasting capitalism with socialism, Nyerere presents symbolic representations of the ideal citizen and ideal society in terms of which Tanzanians must measure themselves and their society in future. These symbols are used to justify the social and psychological processes Nyerere and his ministers perceive as being necessary for transforming Tanzania into a socialist state. In short, Ujamaa is used as a justification for setting up collective villages designed to develop the rural areas and raise their productivity in an attempt to bring about the material equality Nyerere perceives as being a fundamental precondition for building a socialist state. In addition, Ujamaa is designed to motivate Tanzanians to change their behavior and support these government programs.

In the next section I discuss the response of Tanzanians to the village settlement program.

THE RESPONSE OF TANZANIANS TO THE VILLAGE SETTLEMENT PROGRAM

In his inaugural address of December 1962, Nyerere announced to the rural peasants his First Five-Year Development Plan to set up collective villages designed to increase production in the rural sectors (Nyerere 1966:176-187). Money was to be supplied by the world bank (*ibid.*). This was to be the first step toward building a socialist society. Nyerere announced his plan in the following way:

.... All of us have agreed that we must establish a true socialist society.... Two important instruments we shall use for this purpose are the Government itself and the Co-operative Movement. I would like to see every single one of us a teacher and an instrument of Ujamaa (*ibid.*:185).

The Co-operative movement was based upon a village settlement program aimed at settling scattered people in permanent village communities (Ingle 1972:50; Nellis 1972:114; Hutch 1976:189). The concentration of people in new settlements allowed the government both to provide the people with social services and to direct them in new agricultural techniques aimed at raising the productivity of the land (Nellis 1972:114). The settlements were organized by the central government's Village Settlement Agency and were recipients of large capital investments. In addition, spontaneous settlements sprang up throughout the country. Citizens cleared bushland, set up temporary housing and waited for roads, tractors, electricity and hospitals to appear. Unfortunately, these projects received only marginal assistance from the government and, therefore, they were probably destined to fail. However, these settlements indicated a measure of enthusiastic support by the peasants for Nyerere's plan.

The villages set up by the Village Settlement Agency received large amounts of capital for the purpose of planting and harvesting cash crops using modern agricultural equipment and techniques (Ingle 1972:a51). In addition, the government supplied health services, schools and thirty shillings a month. In return, the settlers were expected to put in a workday of approximately five hours on the farms and under the direction

of government managers. When the crop was sold, the profits were to be distributed between the workers (Nellis 1972:120). It was estimated by government officials that the average cash income of each settlement family, after repayment charges on the original capital investment, would rise significantly in the first five years of operation. Unfortunately, this did not occur. Despite all efforts, the life of the peasant farmer was hardly affected in a material way (Ingle 1972:59). Thus, by 1966, enthusiasm for the resettlement programs had waned because they were costing a great deal of money and settlers had not performed as government officials had expected.

Reasons given for the failure of the Tanzanian peasants to raise the productivity of the land appear to have varied according to the perceptions of people occupying different positions in the social organization of village settlements. For example, there is some evidence to suggest that managers of the program blamed the lack of productivity on the laziness and stubbornness of the settlers (ibid:91). Managers, therefore, were increasingly inclined to use force or the threat of force, as well as fines and the threat of imprisonment to compel the settlers to work on the communal farms (ibid.:63). The settlers, on the other hand, complained that the managers were exploiting them by using overly harsh methods and by paying them far less than the minimum wage they would receive in the towns (Nellis 1972:123-127).

However, there is no evidence in the literature to suggest that the settlers were either stubborn or lazy. Nellis (1972:124) found that when settlers were absent from communal farms, they were hard at work on their homestead plots. Ingle (1972:60) further suggests that what was perceived by managers as the peasants' stubbornness with respect to changing their accustomed behavior may be more accurately explained by the fact that their survival was so close to basic existence that there was simply no room for risk. Thus, he argues, that the survival of the peasants and their families was best secured by sticking to tried and true farming practices rather than adopting new methods as yet unproven in the stern East African environment (ibid.). In other words, the peasants may have believed that the material returns they could expect from their cash crops would not be worth the time, effort and commitment that was required of them by the managers.

By contrast, Nyerere and his top ministers were predisposed to believing that settler underproductivity was due to the fact that managers were not adequately instructing the settlers in the principles of Ujamaa (Nellis 1972:128). Therefore, their reaction to the problem was to increase the number of official visits to village settlements for the purpose of making exhortative speeches to the settlers in order to motivate them to change their behavior. In addition, managers were instructed to stop using coercive methods and to teach by example and persuasion instead. Finally, however, when these 'dramas of persuasion' (Geertz 1980) failed to change the behavior of either the managers or the settlers, Nyerere and his ministers decided the village settlement program was unworkable and announced its end in April of 1966 (ibid.:129).

In the light of the above discussion, then, the reasons given for the failure of village settlement programs appears to have varied according to role people played in the social organization of the village settlements. That is, Nyerere and his ministers thought that the program failed because both managers and settlers failed to adequately understand the principles of Ujamaa. The settlers may have believed that the settlements failed because the returns they could reasonably expect from the cash crops were not sufficient to justify the amount of work and effort the managers expected. The managers believed the village settlements failed because the settlers were lazy and stubborn.

Having decided the settlement program was unworkable, administrators searched for new methods for developing the rural areas. In addition, Nyerere went on another long journey into the rural areas to speak to the peasants (Hatch 1976:192-194). His journey ended in the northern town of Arusha where he met with district commissioners and party officials to present them with the Arusha Declaration which was to be regarded as a new guideline for their actions. The document begins with a restatement of the government's commitment to build a socialist nation and again defines the principles of socialism. In addition, the document contains a leadership code which forbids any government leader or official to have anything to do with capitalism or feudalism. Instead, every government employee must be a peasant or a worker. In addition, the use of exploitative or coercive techniques by government officials were forbidden.

With respect to future development efforts, the principle of self-reliance was to take precedence over the use of money. Nyerere identified the use of money as being the prime reason for the failure of the village settlement program and expresses this sentiment as follows:

Our Five Year Development Plan aims at more food, more education and better health; but the weapon we put emphasis on was money.... We think and speak as if the most important thing to depend upon is MONEY and anything else we intend to use is of minor importance.... (Nyerere in Ingle 1972:4).

In a later speech he said:

...if we continue to encourage or even help the development of agricultural capitalism, we shall never become a socialist state. (Nyerere in Ingle 1972:8).

The Arusha Declaration was used by Nyerere to justify: the nationalization of all major sources of the economy; the compulsion of all university students, whom he feared were developing elitist attitudes, to contribute at least two years service to the rural areas; the compulsion of any government leader or official to give up their involvement in feudalistic or capitalistic enterprises (Hatch 1976:194-199). In short, Nyerere had decided that if the gap between the rural sector and the urban industrial sector could not be closed by instituting rural capitalism, then the development of capitalism in the urban centers had to be governed and used as a base from which to distribute the wealth more evenly (ibid.).

The Arusha Declaration was used, not only to justify the abandonment of the village settlement program but also to justify a new program for setting up Ujamaa villages (Nellis 1972:131-132). Government officials were now to put their energies into modernizing the agricultural techniques of existing traditional villages which were to grow from self-reliant activities of the villagers and be maintained with their own resources. Furthermore, government officials were to be elected by the villagers themselves and from amongst their own people. The role of the official was to introduce improved methods for growing food and to organize work schedules. However, they were to remain subject always to the wishes of the people.

Despite Nyerere's pronouncements, however, regional commissioners responsible for helping the people to set up Ujamaa villages continued to complain that people failed to respond to persuasion and that coercive force was necessary (ibid.:96). Nyerere, however, continued to tell them that persuasion and not force was the way to move society. In a speech to his people, shortly after the announcement of the new plan, Nyerere said:

The essence of these villages was that people had to be allowed to make their own decisions and their own mistakes and only if we accept this are we really accepting the philosophy of socialism and rural development (Nyerere in Ingle 1972:98).

Nyerere elaborated further by saying that his people had to develop themselves in an atmosphere of freedom which was absolutely fundamental to developing a socialist state. In essence, then Nyerere appeared to be abandoning his plans for rapid economic development and instituted a plan designed to give the rural peasants the freedom to develop themselves and their land at their own pace and with their own resources.

In light of the above information, it appears as though there is a major contradiction in Nyerere's ideology at the level of social action. An examination of the social action of Tanzanians, supports Moore's (1978:37) statement that ideologies can be viewed only as an attempt to fix social life because they contain contradictions which allow for a certain range of maneuver. For example, the principles underlying Nyerere's ideology are: the principle of material equality; the principle of freedom from exploitative relationships; and the principle of unity. There are three sets of actors involved in the development programs I have discussed above: Nyerere and his ministers; the officials and managers responsible for instituting and administering programs; and the rural Tanzanian peasant. The actions of each group of actors can be justified in terms of at least one of the principles outlined above while, at the same time they contradict another. That is, the coercive behavior of managers and officials administering the development programs can be justified by appealing to the principle of material equality. However, their actions violate the principle of freedom. The refusal of peasants to work as much as administrators thought they should be justified by an appeal to the principle of freedom but is not in accordance with the principle of material equality. The refusal of Nyerere and his ministers to allow the administrators of programs to use coercive measures can be justified by appealing to the principles of unity and freedom but is an

abandonment of rapid economic development based upon the principle of material equality.

Not only can the actions of the different sets of actors mentioned above be justified by an appeal to a particular principle or principles, but also, I suggest, the actors may have been motivated to act by the principle or principles. That is, I suggest that Nyerere perceives his role in terms of maintaining national unity and that his decision to abandon his goal of rapid economic development in favor of allowing the peasants to develop at their own pace was motivated by the principle of unity. Furthermore, that Nyerere and his ideology have become symbols of national unity (Pothholm 1970:170; Nellis 1972:193) is probably due to the fact that he acted as he did. Also, the administrators, perceiving their role in terms of raising the material productivity of the rural areas, were motivated by the principle of material equality and, therefore, saw the use of coercive force as being justified if it increased the peasant's material benefits. The peasants, perceiving their role in terms of providing for the subsistence needs of their families, chose to do this in the way they thought was best. Thus, their actions were motivated more by the principle of freedom than by the principle of material equality. With respect to this latter, Barker (1979:95-124) observed that the most basic obstacle to the success of Ujamaa villages is the settlers' commitment to their relative autonomy and self-subsistence within the family unit. This fact, he argues, is the major reason for the growth of inequality in rural Tanzania, budding capitalism among successful Tanzanian farmers and the resistance of families to give up their economic and social power to village badoes -- a power they have maintained by spending more time on their private plots than communal plot.

What I am suggesting is, that in a situation where actions based on one principle contradict another or others, then a choice must be made with respect to which principle will provide the motivation for social action. In the case of the village settlements, the actors' role in the settlement organization appears to have determined which principle was chosen to motivate their actions. However, since no data is available on the motivation of various actors, this latter remains an empirical question.

At the beginning of this section I conduct a symbolic analysis of Nyerere's ideology, Ujamaa. That analysis can be used to show that the village settlement program was a contradiction in several major ways to Nyerere's ideology. First, in Ujamaa, Nyerere had identified money as being the symbol of power for capitalists, yet the village settlement program was based on the assumption that settlers would work very hard to make money from the sale of cash crops. That the settlers were not willing to do so may indicate that their actions are not based upon the kind of economic rationality that could have led to economically successful enterprises. Second, in Ujamaa, Nyerere symbolically separates his regime from that of the colonizers. However, the village settlement program was based on the same kind of economic enterprises that the colonizers had tried to introduce (Nellis 1972:15) and, in some cases, officers from the post independence period were used to give advice to the peasants (Ingle 1972:60). It must have been evident to the settler, then, that the first Five-Year Development Plan offered little more than had

been offered by the colonizers. Third, Nyerere had symbolically separated his regime from that of the colonizers by associating capitalism with the colonial regime and socialism with the new Tanzanian regime. But, by Nyerere's own admission, the village settlement scheme represented the institution of agricultural capitalism (Nyerere in Ingle 1972:8). Fourth, Nyerere legitimizes his ideology by making an appeal to tradition, yet administrators of the village settlement programs were asking settlers to radically alter their traditional way of life. This task was never accomplished despite all attempts to instruct the settlers in the principles of Ujamaa. This suggests that, while an appeal to tradition gained Nyerere nominal support for himself, Ujamaa was ineffective as a means of changing the behavior of settlers.

Nyerere's abandonment of the village settlement program and his subsequent plan to set up Ujamaa villages can be interpreted as an attempt to bring government programs back in line with his ideology. In the Arusha Declaration, Nyerere identifies self-reliance as the principle that would underpin rural development in future. In a sense, Nyerere was saying that hard work, the symbol of power he identifies with the socialist, would take precedence over money. Furthermore, freedom from exploitative relationships becomes the fundamental precondition for developing a socialist state. This emphasis on the principle of freedom represents a shift away from an emphasis on the principle of material equality that had underpinned Nyerere's goal for rapid economic development. Also, by encouraging the modernization of existing traditional villages, he was placing more emphasis on traditional ways of life.

In sum, the adoption of the new plans for development represented first, an admission by Nyerere that the first Five-Year Development Plan had contradicted the symbolic meanings contained in Ujamaa, and second, an attempt to bring development plans back in line with those meanings. However, the new plans for development also represent an abandonment of Nyerere's hopes for achieving material equality between the rural and urban sectors. Thus, Nyere's new plans for development, while placing considerable emphasis on the principle of freedom, are not in accord with the principle of material equality.

CONCLUSION

In the first part of this paper I review the anthropological literature and show that the conceptualization of the relationship between ideology and social action has changed. Anthropologists working within the framework of structural-functionalism believed that ideologies were well-integrated systems of ideas that reflected social life or were congruent with social structure. In recent years, however, anthropologists have been studying social provisos and change rather than social structure. As a result, they have found that ideological systems contain contradictions and, therefore, can be viewed as only an attempt to structure social life and as socializing agents.

In the second part of this paper I used Geertz' conception of ideology to analyse the content of Nyerere's ideology, Ujamaa. I found that it contained symbolic representations of man and society which are

used: to justify and explain programs for social and economic development; and to motivate citizens to act in accordance with its ideological principles. However, by examining the relationship between Ujamaa and social action, I discovered that Nyerere's ideology contains a major contradiction because actions and programs based on one of its principles were not in accord with another. As a result Nyerere has had to choose the principle which will receive the most weight when designing development programs. On the other hand, then, a symbolic analysis of Nyerere's ideology reveals that it is a system of symbols and meanings that contains information concerning the reorganization of social and psychological processes necessary for the institution of a socialist state in Tanzania. As such, it seems to have played a crucial role in legitimizing the activities of the new regime and effecting national unity. On the other hand, an examination of the response of Tanzanians to Nyerere's attempts to institutionalize the ideal images of man and society contained in his ideology reveals that the principles upon which they are based contradict one another at the level of social action. Thus, Ujamaa can be viewed only as an attempt to socialize citizens and therefore to restructure social life. The data I present above suggests that Nyerere's ideology has been highly ineffective in altering the behavior and lifestyles of Tanzanians. That Nyerere is aware of these difficulties is evident by the following statement:

Unless the purpose and socialist ideology of an Ujamaa village is understood by the members from the beginning ...it will not survive the early difficulties (Nyerere 1974:68).

The latter statement suggests that Nyerere believes that a change in people's ideology will necessarily be followed by a change in the economic base. However, since 1976, the occurrence of forced villagization, the introduction of coercive agricultural legislation and the establishment of tightly regulated crop schemes testifies to the ineffectiveness of Nyerere's ideology as a socializing agent (Bolsen 1979:141). Bolsen argues that Nyerere's ideology has been replaced by a bureaucratic modernization ideology based on the belief that the role of the educated minority is to bring 'modernization' to the masses, who, being less educated, will not understand change and therefore resist it. It appears, therefore, as though Nyerere has had to abandon his strategy of first trying to change people's ideology to effect change in the economic base. Instead, he appears to be endorsing the institutionalization of authoritarian elitism in order to first change the economic base. But whether or not a change in the economic base will eventually change the ideology of the Tanzanian citizen in the long run is a question requiring further empirical research. Ultimately, the Tanzanian case calls into question the view that ideologies generated by new regimes in the Third World function as social forces capable of changing the economic base. Rather, the attempt by Nyerere to create a society composed of institutions that both provide for man's freedom and his equality remains a splendid ideal and a difficult goal.

REFERENCES

- Barker, Jonathan
 1979 The Debate on Rural Socialism in Tanzania. In Towards Socialism in Tanzania. B.V. Mwansasu and C. Pratt, eds., pp. 95-124. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Boesen, Jannick
 1979 From Ujamaa Villagization. In Toward Socialism in Tanzania. B.V. Mwansasu and C. Pratt eds., pp. 125-144. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E.
 1973 Social Anthropology: Past and Present. In High Points in Anthropology. Paul Bohannan and Mark Glazer, eds. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Firth, Raymond
 1951 Elements of Social Organization. London: Watts and Co.
- Geertz, Clifford
 1973 Ideology as a Culture System. In The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.
 1980 Blurred Genres. In American Scholar, 49:165-179.
- Hatch, John
 1976 Two African Statesmen. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Honigmann, John J.
 1976 The Development of Anthropological Ideas. New York: Dorsey Press.
- Ingle, Clyde R.
 1972 From Village to State in Tanzania: The Politics of Rural Development. Ithaca: Cornell Press.
- Leach, Edmund R.
 1965 Political Systems of Highland Burma. New ed., Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marx, K.
 1959 Marx and Engles: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy. S. Feurer, ed., New York: Doubleday.
- Moore, Sally Falk
 1978 Uncertainties in Situations, Indeterminacies in Cultures. In Law as Process: An Anthropological Approach. Sally Falk Moore, ed. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Nellis, John R.
 1972 A Theory of Ideology. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Nisbet, Robert A. in Turner, Victor
1974 Dramas, Fields and Metaphors. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Nyerere, Julius K.
1966 Freedom and Unity. Dar Es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
1974 Freedom and Development. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Potholm, Christian P.
1976 The Theory and Practice of African Politics. New Jersey:
Prentice Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs.
- Renato, Rosaldo
1978 The Rhetoric of Control: Ilongots Viewed as Natural Bandits and
Wild Indians. In The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in
Art and Society. Barbara Babcock, ed., pp. 204-207. Ithaca:
Cornell University Press.