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Note on Sources

I employed four methods of gathering material. Documentary sources in the United Kingdom, Uganda, and Tanganyika were consulted. In particular, the private papers of certain British administrators and African political organizers and closed (i.e. non-current) files in regional and district government offices have been invaluable. Secondly, I personally interviewed scores of African leaders and British administrators in East Africa and in England. A few of these were important figures by any territorial or national reckoning, but most were primarily of local importance in Sukumaland. As I explain more fully in the introduction, it was my intention to discover the stuff and substance of politics at the local level by talking with those who ‘made’ politics at that level, rather than to limit interviews to more prominent men on what they thought happened at that level. Thirdly, I recruited several young men of the Sukuma tribe—some with previous research experience—to carry out a schedule of interviews in selected villages in the five Sukumaland districts to assess the extent of the ordinary citizen’s perception of and participation in the evolving political nationalism of the postwar years. Having achieved a working fluency in Swahili, I conducted most of my own interviews with Tanzanians in that language. The Sukuma assistants, however, were able to approach and talk with even the most unsophisticated Sukuma in their own language, providing a corrective for the inevitably limited contacts (however local) of a non-African researcher. Finally, to obtain data on personal biographies and political activities of certain important persons and office-holders in addition to those directly interviewed, several hundred leadership survey questionnaires were distributed in three of the five Sukumaland districts.

Files which were available to the writer in regional and district offices in 1964 have now been transferred to the National Archives in Dar es Salaam where they have been reorganized. Notes on material from these files is therefore limited to the office of origin and citation of the specific item of documentation. A substantial
portion of material in regional and district office files was in the Swahili language. All translations are by the writer. Where material quoted in the text appeared originally in Swahili, a notation accompanies the reference in the notes. Finally, all pronominal concords to African names (‘Ba,’ ‘Wa,’ ‘Bu,’ ‘Ki,’ etc.) have been dropped—except for certain inconsistencies in place names within Sukumaland.
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Tanzania is unusual in Africa today. This is not because her problems are different in kind from those of many other African nations. They are not. Indeed, some of the social, economic and political problems common to the new states of Black Africa appear more intractable in Tanzania than elsewhere. Nor does Tanzania’s uniqueness depend on a particular brand of political rhetoric. While Tanzania’s national leader and president, Julius Nyerere, is one of the most prominent and articulate exponents of ‘African Socialism’ and ‘one-party democracy,’ the differences between his doctrines and those of philosopher-presidents in other African states from Guinea to Zambia are less important than the similarities. But Tanzania is unique—so far—in that its political leadership, under one regime since independence, continues genuinely to attempt to give effect in practice to the mix of traditional and modern, socialist and democratic principles to which it is committed, and actually to succeed in partial but important pragmatic ways in this complex endeavor. The genius of Tanzania’s leaders is that they have acted with sufficient imagination and flexibility to preserve and enhance, rather than diminish and restrict, present and future possibilities for creative political responses to old and new problems.

While a list of shortcomings is only to be expected, the list of Tanzania’s accomplishments is significant in both quantity and quality, especially in comparison with other African states. Since independence Nyerere has insisted with some success on the maintenance of high standards of performance and personal conduct for the nation’s leaders and civil servants and, with characteristic school-masterly humor, on circumscription of the propensity for pomposity in high places. For the most part he has maintained in practice the commitment of the nation to a non-racial attitude. This meant the admission of non-Africans to the Tanganyika African National Union beginning in 1963 and deliberate rather than hasty Africanization (later ‘localization,’ which made the criterion explicitly citizenship rather than race) of the administrative
services in the years since independence. In 1965 in an electoral innovation of perhaps far-reaching significance, Tanzania held competitive elections within the framework of the one-party system—the only African state yet to do so. While economic development has lagged behind what had been hoped for, the government has continued to elaborate thoughtfully on basic principles and to devise practical means for making the most of the available human and natural resources, as evidenced most recently in the Arusha Declaration of 1967.\footnote{Excerpts from the Arusha Declaration are reprinted in "Africa Report,\" xii (Mar. 1967), 11–13.} The union with Zanzibar, while incompletely integrated structurally, has so far proved enduring. In foreign policy, Tanzania has continued to eschew dogmatic ideological identifications and to follow a principled and pragmatic policy of non-alignment.

Successful military coups d'état have replaced more than a few of the independent African regimes so recently ushered on to the world scene. Unsuccessful coup attempts and mutinies have jolted a number of others, including Tanzania. Whether still under civilian or new military leadership, the direction in most, regardless of ideological coloration or lack thereof, has been decidedly and increasingly authoritarian. Against this background, Tanzania’s short but distinctive history as an independent nation, and her perhaps all too precarious promise for the future, should be of interest to other than Tanzania-philes.

Under discussion among students of African affairs when I first visited Tanzania in 1962 were the related questions: Is African socialism a doctrine of substance? Can a one-party state be democratic? Skeptics tended to feel that ultimately there would be no alternative to choice between authoritarian and democratic styles of government. Some viewed ‘one-party democracy’ as but a momentary theoretical outpost on a rationalized road to an authoritarian state. Others argued that for an interim period the requirements of unity, the need for full use of limited human resources, and the exigencies and priorities of development required an enforced single-party system. This might involve the temporary sacrifice of Western liberal conceptions of civil liberties and loyal opposition, but, in the view of this sub-group of those skeptical about African socialism, the future would permit the establishment of democratic two-party or multi-party systems.
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after the requisite economic and political bases for such systems had been attained. It is now barely a dozen years since Ghana became the first colonial black African state to achieve independence, and hence rather early to reach definite conclusions; but the authoritarian school of skeptics about African socialism seems now to have more of the preliminary evidence in its favor than do those who foresaw a trend toward parliamentary democratic systems.

Some African leaders, and a dwindling number of observers outside Africa, have elaborated the view that a third alternative exists. They believe the substance of democracy can be fostered within a single-party system. They would dispense with the outward forms of Western European and American variants of the representative system but shun also the elitist and totalitarian characteristics of communist state systems. They are confident that popular participation in government—mass membership in the party, internal discussion and criticism, true consent, even choice of political leaders—can be effected within a single-party system. For these advocates African socialism is not necessarily verbal sleight-of-hand; it is viewed as a practical possibility capable of unique innovation in the art of government.

Among the most self-conscious of the single-party regimes in Africa—and one of the few which has enshrined the one-party state in a new constitution—Tanzania has seemed for a variety of reasons to hold the most promise for the successful inauguration of something approximating to a democratic one-party state. Historically, the uniting of the country through the creation of the nationalist party, TANU, preceded for the most part the evolution of sharply differentiated and competitive social economic and political interests and groupings. Lacking historical African kingdoms and dominant individual tribes, Tanzania has largely avoided the internecine rivalries and conflicts which have rent the internal fabrics of other African states or, alternatively, led to an enforced unitary system in which important ethnic sub-groups were suppressed and the people suffered markedly from widespread loss of individual liberty, lack of popular participation in party and governmental affairs, and stifling of criticism and dissent. Tanzania is alone among African states in having an African language—Swahili—as the national language. A unifying factor for Tanzania's multiplicity of tribes, the pervasiveness of Swahili is conducive to popular political participation beyond the
Introduction

minority of Western-educated elite. Finally, Tanzania enjoys in President Nyerere a leader of unusual intelligence, foresight, flexibility and persistence: he is one of the few in Africa, or elsewhere, to ‘begin making the transition from rhetoric to reality.’

But what do African socialism and one-party democracy—however they may be viewed as theoretical constructs—mean on the ground? What is the relationship between national policies and people’s lives? What is the difference, if any, between what the party and the government say they are doing and what citizens at the grass roots see them to be doing, or not doing, and what they (the citizens) are willing or not willing to do as a result? Since theory and practice seldom coincide, it would seem that intensive study of administration and politics at the grass-roots level would be essential to any assessment of the successes and failures of national policies. It is no reflection on top leadership in a national capital to suggest that a complete picture of actualities in up-country localities is unlikely to derive from interviews in a ministry or departmental headquarters. Yet, it is precisely in up-country localities where doctrines of African socialism and one-party democracy do or do not achieve reality. It is only at the grass-roots level that theories about popular participation in the political system can be adequately tested and analyzed. There is a need for political scientists to study nationalist politics and problems of national political integration from below. There is likewise a need for anthropologists to study traditional societies in relation to the national political system.

The need for such research has been increasingly recognized in the past several years as the limitations on our knowledge of African politics have become more apparent. Generalizations about the rise of nationalism and studies of new elites, types of political parties and various forms of state organization have provided us with a grasp of the historical stages of the anti-colonial struggle and with an outline of the roles assumed and the structures built by Africa’s nationalist leaders before and after independence. What we do not yet know enough about is how national and especially local leaders act and interact with the citizens whom they are meant both to lead and to serve; how the structures of the party and the government, especially at the local

level, really do function. It has become more apparent that political parties in Africa—whatever their structural characteristics and however radical their ideological underpinnings—do not and cannot rapidly or thoroughly transform the essentially rural society, even politically.

Attention thus has shifted from ideologies evolved at the center and from structural typologies of parties and discussion as to their authoritarian or democratic proclivities, toward an attempt to describe and analyze processes of national political integration. This leads in turn to more careful consideration of the nature of relationships within parties and government at all levels and between the representatives of these political institutions and the people and the problems of the society as a whole. The study of political development must perforce address itself to what actually happens when political ideas and instruments engage the environment to which they are attempting to relate and which they are, quite professedly, attempting to modify. This requires study at the grass roots. As Aristide Zolberg has pointed out: ‘in order to obtain a more general understanding of African politics we must examine what occurs at the more intimate and more particular level of the local community. What is involved is less the study of local government (in its institutional sense) than the study of government locally, or, to use another phrase, the study of micropolitics.’

The present work is a study in micropolitics because it is my belief that thorough and detailed case studies of selected areas within various nations are among the next necessary steps toward a fuller understanding of African politics, in both its pre-independence and post-independence phases. In Africa, as in other

---


2 It would be difficult, of course, to put forward generalizations about politics in Africa on the basis of a detailed study of politics in one portion of Tanzania. I have not attempted to build models or explore typologies. Nor have I attempted to make this study the vehicle for the elaboration of a theoretical framework—or even to appropriate, in what I believe could only be now an illusory and premature grasp at comprehensiveness and precision, the terminology of social theory as it has been applied to, or developed from, the African experience in the few attempts at synthesis to date. Thus, the present work does not pretend to be comparative, though it should ultimately provide, together with other micropolitical studies, the basis for useful comparative analysis. More sophisticated propositions about the development of national movements and the functioning of ruling parties could then be tested.
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parts of the emerging world of new nations, problems of national political integration and economic modernization have dominated the minds of the first generation of post-independence political leaders, as well as their scholarly analysts. Especially in Africa some form of indigenous socialism—frequently espoused but seldom practiced—has been the preferred means toward the attainment of the desired ends. But the political consolidation of a fledgling nation state and the exploitation and development of its largely untapped or meager economic resources—not to mention the structuring and functioning of what is held to be a popularly based political system—require not only the acquiescence but, in some degree at least, also the active participation of a predominantly rural population. The politics of the developing nations, to be understood, must be viewed and experienced, to the extent possible, from below.

The present work is also an historical study. Current reality is shaped by today’s objectives and theories. It is also shaped by the experience of the past. It would be possible to study developments in politics and administration in independent Tanzania alone; but post-independence successes and difficulties are better understood as outgrowths, at least in part, of pre-independence struggles.

The story of the development of nationalist politics in Tanzania did not even begin, as some have believed, with the formation of the Tanganyika African National Union in 1954. In some parts of Tanganyika it began at least ten years earlier, with proto-nationalist associations like the Sukuma Union and the Tanganyika African Association. Further, the rise of nationalist politics—though conforming to certain general stages of development from polite representation of grievances to protest, to incipient action, to overt organization for specified political objectives, to the consolidation of a popular mass movement bent on self-government, to post-independence administration and nation-building—varied in pace and differed in certain other respects in disparate areas depending on the impact of the colonial government’s policies, on the character of traditional tribal institutions, and on the nature of the economic and social environment.

If we wish to study politics in action and government in operation, an historical as well as micropolitical approach is not only desirable but necessary. Zolberg has rightly argued that major gaps in our knowledge make it
extremely difficult to reconstruct a reasonable base line from which later changes can be evaluated adequately. A more thorough examination of the period preceding independence would also afford us greater understanding of the development of political groups and cleavages, of their relationship to the non-political environment, and hence, in general, of the characteristic structures and processes which constitute the legacy which the new African states inherited.

He points out that ‘tradition’ in Africa ‘includes the colonial experience.’\(^1\) We must examine the African response to that experience, both before and after independence, if we wish to bring perspective to bear on political development at the level of local African society—where, as Henry Bienen has said, ‘the major contributions to our understanding of African politics will be made.’\(^2\)

While they have traditionally engaged in local studies, anthropologists have only recently begun to give some attention to the presence or absence of political linkages from within the tribal unit or sub-unit to the national party or administration, and to the evolution of such linkages through time.\(^3\) On the other hand, as Ruth Schachter Morgenthau has observed, a generation of politically oriented Africanists saw the politics of emerging African countries from the capital cities and, on visits up-country, through the eyes of the elite—guides who, consciously or unconsciously, projected their view of the world to recipients who too uncritically accepted much of what they were shown and told.\(^4\) Political scientists have rarely travelled up-country far enough, or focused their attention on local units long enough, to probe beneath the too readily absorbing chronology of African political and constitutional advance and, after independence, of the evolution of national governmental and party institutions and policy, to discover what was—and what was not—happening politically on the ground. This is what must now be done. It must be done

---

1 Zolberg, p. 152.
2 Henry Bienen, ‘What does political development mean in Africa?’ (review article), World Politics, xx (Oct. 1967), 156.
3 For such an anthropological study in Sukumaland see Mary Read Nicholson, ‘Legal change in Tanzania as seen among the Sukuma,’ (unpub. Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1968). Nicholson analyzes Sukuma legal history, assesses the implementation of reaction to national legal change among the Sukuma, and considers post-independence retention of traditional mechanisms of dispute settlement—for example the headman’s court and communal action—in conjunction with the primary courts and primary court magistrates.
4 Professor Morgenthau made this point to a seminar of Africa scholars at New York University in the spring of 1967.
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through interviews as well as documents. It requires the use of vernacular as well as of European languages. It is what is here attempted for Sukumaland.

The value of an historically oriented micropolitical case study in Tanzania derives partly from the telescoping into fifteen or twenty years of virtually the entire evolutionary process of the rise of nationalism. In Sukumaland, for example, it is possible to begin in 1945 with the first suggestions of organization by Africans for mutual aid and expression of grievances and with the first African representative in the Legislative Council (a Sukuma chief) and proceed in a very few years to the later stages of independence, the formation of a republic, and the establishment of a one-party state.

For a variety of reasons Sukumaland seemed an appropriate locale for a micropolitical historical study. The Sukuma tribe is by far Tanzania’s largest, numbering over one million persons, or one-ninth of the nation’s total population. It has come to be regarded as one of the more active and industrious of Tanzania’s tribes. Since the war the Sukuma and neighboring peoples to the north and east have built the largest producers’ cooperative movement in Africa. Because of Sukumaland’s size and importance territorially, and what it deemed to be the homogeneity and malleability of the Sukuma, the British administration repeatedly used Sukumaland as an experimental area for local government reforms and economic development programs. Partly for this reason, Sukumaland (and the Lake Province generally) fostered the most active and politically oriented African voluntary associations in Tanganyika during the ten years between the end of the war and the birth of the Tanganyika African National Union in 1954. So bothersome was this penchant for political activity that the administration banned TANU from Sukumaland for four years—the only area in Tanganyika where proscriptions were so extensive in both spacial and temporal terms. It was in Sukumaland, too, that local government broke down in 1958 in the face of civil disorders—an event which, combined with external pressures, helped speed the course of change territorially toward African control and national independence.

The victory of TANU, however, did not solve the problems of modernizing politics and administration in Sukumaland. Opposition to TANU sprang up in some areas. While chiefs were replaced by administrative officers without much difficulty, the reluctance
of the Sukuma to embrace voluntary ‘self-help’ labor, to pay higher taxes and fees, and to adopt new methods in agriculture and animal husbandry has posed since independence a continuing problem for the political leadership and for nation-building efforts.

Thus, from 1945 to 1965 Sukumaland permits an intensive study of political integration and development at the local level. This in turn provides some historical insight into the development of African nationalism generally. The view from the grass roots places both the colonial administrator and the African nationalist—before and after independence—in a new and often revealing perspective. It clarifies the contradictions underlying British policy after 1945 and elucidates the strengths and limitations of African political organization in relation to the pre- and post-independence problems of up-country. It sheds light on the successes and difficulties of an independent African government involved in the attempt to integrate and mobilize an ever larger percentage of its population. It permits some assessment of the possibilities for one-party democracy within the ideological context of African socialism.

The book is divided into four parts. Part I, ‘The Setting’, very briefly describes the pre-Second World War historical background and postwar constitutional development, then examines in some detail the major policies and programs of the colonial administration in the postwar period as they applied to rural life and local government. The colonial government’s principal administrators and policy-makers in Sukumaland, and their approaches to economic and political development, are discussed. The traditional system of the Sukuma is outlined briefly. Thus, the opening section sets forth the context which must necessarily be understood before an analysis of African political activity at the local level—to which the remainder of the work is primarily devoted—may be undertaken.

Part II, ‘The Beginnings of Indigenous Politics’, explores the earliest manifestations of political concern among traditional and non-traditional local elites; the development of organizational

1 I treat the traditional system of the Sukuma only briefly, both because a number of other published works consider it in detail and because the subtleties of Sukuma social and political organization are not particularly significant for the development of African nationalist politics in Sukumaland or for the political administration of Sukumaland after independence.
structures with the potential for, and then a tendency toward, nationalist-oriented political activity; and finally the achievement by locally based organizations of a level of relevance and sophistication (in the two years before TANU was formed) sufficient to mobilize rural support in opposition to specific administration policies and ultimately to the administration itself. The view from below permits examination of the identity and the techniques of a politically essential—but often under-appreciated (both by scholars and by national leaders)—middle-level leadership group through whom the vital contact is made between a political organization, or government administration, and the people. The perspective of the latter on their own lives—and the extent to which they will or will not be concerned and involved with the affairs of politics and government—begins to emerge from the micropolitical study.

Part III, ‘The Struggle for Power,’ depicts the conflict which developed outright after 1953 between the by then clearly nationalist-oriented political movement in Sukumaland and an administration bent on the pursuit of established policies and on quarantining the increasingly vociferous, recalcitrant and well-organized political opposition. No longer was protest limited to an expression of views. Rather, protest took the form of political action: attendance at political meetings, refusal to abide by government regulations, marches, civil disobedience, telegrams to the Colonial Office and the United Nations, delegations to Dar es Salaam. Capitalizing on the weaknesses of the native authorities, on the mistakes of the colonial administration, and on their own strengths within an historical context favorable to the rapid development of African nationalism, the leaders and followers of this new brand of politics ultimately prevailed—with the assistance, of course, of external as well as internal pressures for change—in their struggle against the colonial regime itself.

While positive evidence provides the material for this section along the lines described above, negative evidence suggests something else of considerable interest: the virtual absence of influence or impact of the traditional system of political organization of the Sukuma (modified, of course, by colonial rule) on the political organization of the nationalist movement both before and after independence. I have specified the political organization ‘of the Sukuma’. There is no question but that nationalist leaders and associations in Tanzania, as in other African countries,
have accommodated appreciably in style, organizational structure, and even ideology to elements common to, or at least widely shared among, traditional political systems in a given area. The symbolic and ceremonial accoutrements of the charismatic nationalist leader, so reminiscent in some ways of the traditional chief; the existence of an elders’ section of the party; the invocation of the African past to provide an element of 'consensus democracy' for the concept of African socialism—these are cases in point from Tanzanian politics. What is largely absent, however, is evidence to suggest that, at the local level, nationalist political institutions are shaped by or adjusted in significant ways to the particularities or peculiarities of Sukuma political organization.¹

This I found surprising: speculating in advance on the probable findings of an in-depth study of political at the roots, I had expected the facts to be otherwise.

This is not to suggest, of course, that aspects of Sukuma traditional life were not of the utmost importance for the development of nationalist politics. Sukuma dissatisfaction with and, finally, resistance to colonial regulations which Sukuma considered inimical to established ways and to traditional economic and social organization provided the sparks for protests which eventually became overtly political. The nationalist movement capitalized on such sentiment and helped to mobilize it into organized

¹ Analyzed from the vantage point of the ‘grass roots,’ the fact seems to be that both the cooperative movement and the nationalist oriented political organizations set themselves up largely without reference to indigenous Sukuma institutions. When an individual decided to join one of these new associations, he paid his entrance fee, received his membership card, and entered a new world of economic or political, or both, activity and expectations—as did Tanzanians of any other tribe. Indeed, it seems to have been in areas of Sukumaland where traditional life was already most attenuated by the impact of non-traditional economic and political factors and by the ineffectiveness of native authorities that political activism prospered and that certain ‘traditional’ elements, who also had the requisite ‘modern’ traits, were enabled to play a new political role. A surprising number of lesser traditional figures were gathered into the new structures but their origins and traditional ties were incidental; it was their experience, education, qualifications, and political loyalty which counted. They worked side by side with and were directed from above by people who were implementing new ideas on the basis of new criteria. Thus, whether one is considering pre-independence economic and political associations; the elders’ section, the women’s section, the Youth League, or TANU as a whole; regional party conferences, district administration, or even village development committees after independence, what connections may have existed between nationalist political institutions and the traditional institutions of the Sukuma seem not to have resulted in the shaping of the former.
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political action. The traditional associational life of the Sukuma—
characterized by dance and work societies which cut horizontally
across many separate chiefdoms—may also have given the Sukuma
built-in receptivity to the idea of joining associations to further
certain desired ends, thereby facilitating the rapid rise of economic
cooperation and nationalist political institutions.¹

Nor do I intend to suggest that traditional Sukuma political
institutions were uninfluenced by the rise of nationalist organiza-
tions. TANU’s attack on the traditional authority system has
been, if incomplete in its effects, of such a fundamental character
as to alter that system more drastically even than had the British
through a combination of reformist design and unforeseen con-
sequence. The nationalist movement before independence
exploited certain dislocations in traditional life for political ends.
After independence it thoroughly reorganized local political
institutions in line with a uniform and non-traditional national
pattern. But only in the rarest instances did the organizers of the
new politics—who were mostly non-Sukuma in the first instance—
attempt to adapt nationalist organizations in Sukumaland to the
traditional institutions of the Sukuma. This lack of relationship
posed no appreciable difficulty to the political organizers as long
as the nub of politics was protest. But after independence, the
nub of politics became structural change, and planned economic
and political development. This has perforce raised the question
of how creative and sustained political links with the conservative
rural peoples—and even with the transitional middle-elites of an
earlier day—are to be maintained and further developed.

Part IV, ‘The New Regime’, therefore analyzes the programs of
the new African administration, both before and after inde-
pendence, and the responses of rural Africans to the indigenous
leadership. We shall discover that there are continuities and
similarities in the responses to centralized control and direction,
whether colonial or post-colonial, alien or indigenous. It becomes
clear that political development at the local level is one of the few

¹ This is not modification or adaptation of nationalist institutions—though it
may be the occasion for such for traditional institutions—so much as fortuitous
assistance to their growth. See Gottfried O. and Martha B. Lang, ‘Problems
of social and economic change in Sukumaland, Tanganyika,’ Anthropological
Quarterly, xxxv (April 1962), 86–101; also G. O. Lang, ‘Modernization in
East Africa through cultural continuity: the case of the Sukuma,’ unpub.
essay prepared for Lang and Peter F. M. McLoughlin, eds., Recent research
in Sukumaland: essays in social, economic and political development, forth-
coming.
Introduction xxix

reliable guides to national progress in a developing state such as Tanzania. Protest against specific administration programs, discontent with the authoritarian style of local party and governmental political institutions, and even the development of opposition movements characterize the immediate pre- and post-independence period. At the same time, significant progress becomes apparent in the gradual realization of the democratic as well as the one-party aspect of Tanzania’s goal for the political system. In Tanzania, as in many other nations new and old, the pursuit of ‘uhuru’ continues.

1 ‘Freedom’ is the best single English word for the Swahili ‘uhuru’. In the 1950s, ‘Uhuru’ with a capital ‘U’ came to mean ‘Independence’, i.e. national independence. It was the rallying cry of TANU and always came first when paired with other nouns in the popular slogans of the nationalist movement: ‘uhuru na umoja’ (freedom and unity), ‘uhuru na ujamaa’ (freedom and African socialism), ‘uhuru na kazi’ (freedom and work), ‘uhuru na afya’ (freedom and health), etc. It has been used since independence to emphasize the need for continued efforts to realize a fuller measure of freedom for all Tanzanian citizens through achievement of longer-range political, economic, social, and educational goals.