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Abstract

When analyzing conflict in developing countries, scholars generally point to factors such as GDP and wealth distribution, military security, religious and ethnic divisions, and employment rates as indicators of whether or not a state is likely to remain politically stable and internally peaceful. Tanzania exhibits many factors that would seem to encourage conflict: extremely low GDP, highly volatile neighbors, vast ethnic and religious diversity, and high unemployment. Nevertheless, Tanzania has remained remarkably stable and peaceful in the 44 years since its independence. My thesis strives to explain the peace.

I argue that the Tanzanian peace is an example of path dependence, in which policies adopted after the 1967 Arusha Declaration established a political culture that has resulted in 44 years of peace. Economic policies that promoted equality and discouraged divisiveness, nation building policies that generated Tanzanian identity and national pride, and single party political institutions that created subject citizens all helped to establish this peaceful and self-reinforcing political culture. I argue that this political culture is the primary cause of Tanzanian peace.

In this thesis, I investigate the role of the nation building project in establishing a national identity and mitigating conflict through an analysis of nation building tools, including civics textbooks, symbolism, and the legal framework. With the end of the nation building project and the demise of the socialist economy and the single party political system in the 1980s and early 1990s, all the forces that created this political culture have disappeared. I argue that the peaceful political culture has become so ingrained in what it means to be a Tanzanian that it continues to mitigate the possibility
of violent conflict, even today. However, the recent liberalization has left the political
culture in flux, such that the Tanzanian commitment to internal peace is weakening.
Through analysis of data from a survey I conducted among students at the University of
Dar es Salaam, I examine the dynamics of and correlation between political culture and
attitudes towards violent conflict among the rising elite. I conclude that, in order to
remain on a peaceful path, the Tanzanian government must redefine and reinvigorate the
national political culture. The lessons of the nation building project can help in this task;
they offer a viable model of how to remake political culture for a new era.
Chapter 1: Introduction

“Unaonaje Tanzania?” is the first question Tanzanians ask most visiting foreigners. “How do you see Tanzania?”

In twelve months of living as a foreigner in Dar es Salaam, I answered that question several times each day. Eventually, I began to turn the question around on my questioners: “Na wewe?” – “And you? How do you see Tanzania?”

The responses were startlingly similar: “It is too poor. There are no jobs. The schools are too expensive. The water and electricity do not work. I can hardly afford to feed my family. But I am proud to be a Tanzanian – at least we have peace.”

The complaints are inevitable, given that Tanzania is among the poorest countries in the world. Far more noteworthy, however, is the fact that Tanzanians remain proud of their national identity despite their grievances, and the frequency with which they cite peace as a primary source of national pride. This thesis explores the ramifications of this anecdotal observation: how does the conception of peace as a primary national value affect the way Tanzanians interact and the way Tanzanian society functions? More specifically, to what extent does this attitude help to explain the relatively low level of violent conflict in the Tanzanian political sphere? I posit that Tanzania’s extensive post-independence nation building project has created a national identity that emphasizes peacefulness as a central national value. This identity serves as a frame through which Tanzanians view the possibility of divisive, violent conflict, leading them to reject calls for violence and ethnic and religious polarization.
Tanzania is an exception to the patterns of violence and instability in sub-Saharan Africa, particularly relative to neighboring countries. Given the presence of numerous destabilizing factors in Tanzania such as high poverty and unemployment, a large youth population, and regional insecurity, Tanzanian exceptionalism requires an explanation. By studying what went right in Tanzania, other young, diverse states can learn important lessons about how to build peace, stability, and unity.

This thesis argues that the social, political, and economic policies adopted by the post-independence government have created a political culture that is largely responsible for Tanzania’s peace in the four decades since independence. A self-perpetuating set of norms, values, and institutions has fostered widespread acceptance of national identity and rejection of political violence as being “un-Tanzanian.” This path-dependent peace, which has continued even in the absence of many of the factors that brought about the peaceful political culture, is in danger today. The rapid political and economic liberalization has left the political culture in flux. How the political culture is reconstituted over the coming years will determine whether or not Tanzania continues on its peaceful path.

Tanzania “should” be conflictual

According to many conventional theories of conflict, Tanzania “should” be beset by violent conflict. It has high unemployment, high poverty, a large youth population, highly heterogeneous ethnic and religious groups, and regional military insecurity. These are all indicators of a potentially volatile situation.

The level of GDP per capita is identified by the African State Instability Project as one of the strongest correlates of state instability. (Marshall and Gurr 2005) Tanzania’s
per capita GDP of $700 is extremely low, putting it at high risk of conflict. (CIA World Factbook, Tanzania) Another strong correlate identified by the project is dependency on foreign aid. (Marshall and Gurr 2005, 54) Tanzania is highly aid dependent. For example, in 2003-04 donors and international lending institutions contributed 45% of the Tanzanian government budget, according to the Minister of Finance. (Mramba 2004) The project also points to “neighborhood effects,” the instability in neighboring countries, as correlating with domestic turmoil and instability. (Marshall and Gurr 2005, 52) In Tanzania’s immediate neighborhood, the Great Lakes conflict has repeatedly engulfed the region. Sporadic instability in Kenya and Uganda is a threat. These neighborhood effects also extend to the presence of large refugee populations in Tanzania, currently numbering about 600,000, mainly from Burundi and the DRC. (CIA World Factbook, Tanzania) Tanzania’s long and porous borders make it difficult to prevent the passage of destabilizing influences that are prevalent in the region such as drugs, small arms, and people.

Demographically, Tanzania is in a dangerous position. Youth bulges, rapid urbanization, and lack of arable land are all highly correlated with conflict. Tanzania has all of these factors. Over half of its adult population is between the ages of 15 and 30. The urban population is growing at a rapid 5.3% per year. Only 0.13 hectares of land are available per person. Nearly one in ten working age adults will die within a five year span. These factors place Tanzania among the 25 countries in the world most in danger of civil conflict as a result of demographics for the years 2000-2010. (Cincotta, Engelman and Anastasion 2003)
Many researchers have found that conflict is far more likely in diverse countries than in homogeneous countries. Tanzania is extremely diverse. It has over 120 ethnic groups, all of relatively small size. Tanzania has 23 different ethnic groups that constitute more than 1% of the population, which ranks highest in the world in numbers of significantly sized ethnic groups. (Fearon 2003) The population is approximately one-third Muslim, one-third Christian, and one-third locally-based religions. Small but prominent populations of Indian and Arab Tanzanian nationals increase the heterogeneity. Ethnic diversity may not be quite as threatening as suggested in the case of Tanzania, since studies have found that a highly diverse society with no dominant group tends to reduce conflict in a society. (Collier and Hoeffler 2000) However, religious diversity in Tanzania should still be a major threat, since many Tanzanian Muslims perceive Christians as politically and economically advantaged, if not dominant. Perhaps of greater concern, Professor Cuthbert Omari of the University of Dar es Salaam estimated in 1998 that 20% of Tanzania’s Muslims were fundamentalist. (Frank 1998, A1) An increasing tendency to polarize religiously may lead to greater conflict.

This essay addresses two dimensions of conflict: polarization and physical violence. Both are highly damaging to states and societies. The damage caused by physical violence is relatively obvious – casualties, property damage, fear, unpredictability of institutions, and social distrust all result. Polarization along religious, ethnic, racial, class, or other lines is similarly damaging – social capital and social trust diminish, elections are seen as a zero-sum game, groups out of power may face discriminatory laws and police brutality, and minor disputes can easily flare up into major incidents. The interplay between the two dimensions increases the severity of conflict.
Polarization increases the likelihood, length, and severity of physical violence. Physical violence turns polarization from a threat into a reality and makes reconciliation more difficult. For the purposes of this essay, the level of violent conflict is conceived of as the degree of societal polarization and the scale, magnitude, and length of violent incidents.

**Tanzanian Conflict in Comparative Perspective**

The belief that Tanzania has low levels of violent conflict relative to its neighbors is so commonly accepted that authors frequently make this claim while offering no evidence of its veracity. However, given that violent incidents and instability have accompanied all three of Tanzania’s multiparty elections since 1995, particularly in Zanzibar, this claim must be examined further. In order to limit the scope of comparison, I will briefly examine five of Tanzania’s contiguous neighbors: Uganda and Kenya in East Africa and Rwanda, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo in Central Africa. Tanzania’s other three neighbors, Zambia, Malawi, and Mozambique, are not included in the analysis because they are part of the Southern Africa sub-region, which has been so heavily influenced by events in South Africa that it is largely incomparable. In addition, a lack of transportation links with Malawi and Mozambique has resulted in a low level of interaction between those countries and Tanzania. A comparison of Tanzania to Uganda, Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi, and the DRC suggests that Tanzania is, indeed, significantly more peaceful and less polarized than its neighbors.

Tanzania has never had a large-scale internal war, nor has it ever been accused of ethnic cleansing. Its one external war, a 1978 invasion of Uganda, came after a series of provocations, including Uganda’s backing of a 1975 coup attempt against Nyerere, and its invasion and occupation of the Kagera Salient in northwestern Tanzania. Tanzania’s
response, a full-scale invasion and toppling of Idi Amin’s tyrannical regime, was perhaps the best example of Just War in African history. Tanzania gained very little from the war. Economically, it was a disaster. (Avirgan and Honey 1983, 196) Politically, Tanzania also suffered from the war: despite Amin’s pariah status, the Organization of African Unity condemned Tanzania for violating its non-interference clause. In contrast to the official response, however, Ugandans largely welcomed the Tanzanian troops as liberators from the tyranny of their own army and government. (Brzoska and Pearson 1994, 209) Thus, Tanzania’s only major military conflict was primarily a mission of mercy for the people of Uganda.

Tanzania has not been entirely free of violent internal conflict. The military has been accused of unnecessarily harsh policing actions. Sporadic violence in the countryside is associated with cattle-rustling, witchcraft crimes, and vigilante justice. Al Qaeda bombed the U.S. embassy in Dar es Salaam in 1998, but the presence of some terrorist operatives in Tanzania does not necessarily indicate high levels of support from the population. In 1993, Balukta, a now-banned Muslim activist organization, incited riots in the primarily Muslim Mwembechi area of Dar es Salaam against butcheries that sold pork. (Heilman and Kaiser 2002, 696) Although these were quickly suppressed, a small number of other minor incidents occurred in the area in the following decade. Occasional clashes between supporters of opposing political parties or opposition supporters and the police and military have occurred since the reestablishment of multipartyism in 1995. The largest of these incidents during the 2005 presidential campaign season occurred in August, when the house of Jakaya Kikwete, the ruling party’s
presidential candidate, was attacked by a mob of disputed party affiliation while Kikwete’s wife and son were inside.

Overall, however, on the Tanzanian mainland violent incidents have occurred on a small scale and have not garnered sustained or widespread support. A nationwide survey conducted in 2000 by REDET (Research and Education for Democracy in Tanzania) found that 78% of Tanzanians believed that Muslim-Christian relations were generally positive, and that 86% believed that relations between their religion and the state were positive. (Heilman and Kaiser 2002 692) A 2001 Afrobarometer survey found that only 6% of Tanzanians believed that ethnic or tribal conflicts were a source of violence. (2001 Afrobarometer data) Although incidents have occurred, most Tanzanians do not believe that ethnic or religious conflict is a major problem.

Tanzania’s semi-autonomous islands of Zanzibar are the only example of sustained conflict in the country. The divisions there stretch back to colonial times and reappeared with the political liberalization of the 1990s. The electorate is almost evenly split between supporters of Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), which is the ruling party, and supporters of the Civic United Front (CUF), which is the leading opposition party. CUF has little support among non-Muslims, although this may be because its primary base of support comes from Zanzibar, which is 99% Muslim. CUF has also been accused of ties to foreign Islamic fundamentalists. As a result of these allegations, CCM has accused CUF of exploiting religious divisions and inciting hatred. Some Muslims claim that the CCM-led government has favored Christians over Muslims, particularly in access to education. (Forster, Hitchcock and Lyimo 2000, 104) While other Muslims repudiate this charge, its persistence and polarizing effects fuel the allegations against CUF.
A Zanzibari secessionist movement, which reached its zenith in the 1990s, has been associated with some of CUF’s leadership, particularly its perennial Zanzibar presidential candidate, Sheik Sharif Hamad. (Minorities at Risk, Zanzibar Chronology) Although this secessionist movement is based on the same resentment of unjust treatment as CUF taps into, at present, CUF does not advocate secession. The secessionist movement was mainly a war of words, rarely escalating into rioting or armed action. It is not known how much popular support the secession movement gained. In other words, the polarization in Zanzibar between parties and in Tanzania between Muslims and non-Muslims are important and worrisome, but they have not generated violence on a major, sustained level.

Elections in Zanzibar in 1995, 2000, and 2005 have been marred by violent incidents. Security forces are accused of harsh tactics, intimidation, and violence to keep opposition supporters away from the polls. CUF leaders are accused of inciting violence by encouraging their supporters to riot. The most egregious incident occurred on January 27, 2001 at an opposition demonstration against the October 2000 election. The police and military opened fire on the unarmed protesters, beating them even as they fled. “In the following days, the security forces, joined by ruling party officials and militia, went on a rampage, indiscriminately arresting, beating, and sexually abusing island residents.” (Human Rights Watch 2002) According to Human Rights Watch at least 35 Zanzibaris died and over 2000 fled to Kenya, although most have since returned. Smaller scale incidents between the opposition and military have occurred in the lead-up to the 2005 election as well. These events are discussed in more detail in the history chapter of this thesis, but for the purposes of comparison with Tanzania’s neighbors, it is important to
note that the conflict and divisions in Zanzibar, though serious, have not resulted in sustained violence and unrest.

In contrast, the rest of East Africa is far more polarized and violent. In Uganda, Idi Amin came to power in a 1971 coup and ordered the deaths of over 300,000 political opponents before he was toppled in 1979. Coups and guerrilla war throughout the first half of the 1980s caused another 100,000 deaths. (CIA World Factbook, Uganda) The Lord’s Resistance Army, an insurgent group, has terrorized northern Uganda for the past 18 years, displacing over 1.5 million people, kidnapping tens of thousands of children, and murdering thousands of civilians. (International Crisis Group, Northern Uganda) In addition to the wars, Uganda has a long history of ethnic polarization. In particular, a secessionist movement among the Buganda people has a great deal of popular support. Many Ugandan politicians rely on a narrow ethnic base, and ethnic divisions are commonly used for mobilizing political supporters. In contrast to Uganda, Kenya has not been involved in a major internal or external war. However, ethnic polarization is high. Political leaders have consistently favored certain ethnic groups at the expense of others. Approximately 350,000 Kenyans were internally displaced as of 2004 as a result of attacks in the 1990s by KANU, the ruling party, on ethnic groups that supported the opposition. (CIA World Factbook, Kenya) A 2005 constitutional referendum in Kenya had several violent incidents and further divided the already highly polarized country.

Central Africa is among the world’s bloodiest conflict zones. Rwanda had a series of ethnic cleansing incidents throughout its post-colonial history, culminating in the 1994 genocide, in which approximately 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus died. Similarly persistent smaller-scale ethnic cleansing occurred in Burundi and contributed to a civil
war that began in 1993 and continued until the end of 2004. In the DRC, decades of post-independence kleptocracy and sporadic internal violence ended abruptly in 1997 when Rwanda and Uganda conspired to assassinate President Mobutu Sese Seko. The war that followed led to nearly four million deaths, the rise of several warlords, and the military involvement of – at minimum – Uganda, Rwanda, Zimbabwe, Angola, and Namibia. (International Crisis Group, Congo) A treaty signed in 2003 offers a highly tenuous hope for continuing peace. It is a tribute to the ethics of Tanzanian foreign policy that its involvement in the Great Lakes conflict has been as a mediator and a host of over half a million refugees, rather than as a combatant.

Although Tanzania has experienced significant and troubling conflict on Zanzibar, in comparison to its neighbors, it has been remarkably stable, unified, and non-violent. Now that this assumption has been validated by comparison with conflicts in neighboring countries, it is necessary to ask why.

National Identity as a Pacifying Frame

Since its founding, Tanzania’s political leaders have emphasized the importance of just and moral policies, often to the detriment of the Tanzanian economy and other traditional measures of national interest. As a socialist state, Tanzania’s rhetorical emphasis on just and moral policies was not uncommon, but the high degree to which it actually implemented these policies set it apart from many other African socialist states. Tanzania carefully cultivated a benevolent public image, both at home and abroad. Domestic policies such as establishing *ujamaa* collective villages and creating a mandatory national service corps enhanced this image. Foreign policies such as heading the Frontline States, the independent African states that supported liberation movements
in Southern Africa, and outspoken principled opposition to Idi Amin’s regime in Uganda also contributed to this image. While this image was, to a large degree, deserved, it would not have spread so widely or become so prominent if not for the constant rhetoric, propaganda, and public relations campaigning of the government and its charismatic president, Julius Nyerere.

This image gave Tanzania high stature in the international arena, particularly among other non-aligned states, but it is the domestic, nation building role of this rhetorical campaign that is of primary interest for this thesis. What was the message of this campaign, and how was it passed to Tanzanian citizens? To what extent did Tanzanians reject or embrace it? How has this rhetorical campaign affected Tanzanian national identity formation, and how does this identity affect political conflict behavior? This essay assumes that such a prominent and sustained nation building campaign could not fail to affect the ways in which Tanzanians related to each other and to political activity. Rather, the ethnically and religiously inclusive nation building project created a strong Tanzanian national identity that helps to explain the low level of conflict.

I argue that this peaceful national identity is an important part of the explanation for Tanzania’s peace, but it is not a simple causal factor in reducing violent conflict. Rather, this identity forms a frame through which Tanzanians view politics and society. Conflict framing theory suggests that parties use frames to “understand why the conflict exists, what actions are important to the conflict, why the parties act as they do, and how [they] should act in response.” (Kaufman, Elliott and Shmueli 2003) Frames are often seen as contributing to divisiveness and conflict because they limit information intake, filtering and categorizing it according to each individual’s pre-existing identity and
values. In a deeply divided society, people may use these frames to interpret the same information in vastly different ways. Parties to a conflict may be unable even to agree on what they are fighting over, much less to agree on a solution. However, the limiting function of frames can also have a pacifying effect. An inclusive, peace-oriented frame may serve to limit violent behavior and filter out divisive influences.

This essay takes as a given that there will be disputes within all societies but that different societies address disputes in different ways. In some societies, disputes are addressed on their individual merits, while in others, disputes are politicized and become the cause or pretext for major societal divisions and violent conflict. Tanzania’s pacifying frame is widely accepted by Tanzanians because of the frame’s national, inclusive character. This frame does not preclude violence, but it diminishes its likelihood by shaping how people view the possibility of violence. Through this frame, certain actions are considered legitimate in certain circumstances. In other words, the frame determines situational ethics, creating a menu of acceptable or unacceptable responses to a given situation. The frame also helps determine the salience of different identity groups within a given situation. Tanzanians’ resistance to mobilizing politically along ethnic lines – one of the driving forces of conflict in neighboring countries – is largely a result of ethnicity’s lack of salience or legitimacy as a political organizing mechanism within the Tanzanian national frame. The mutually-reinforcing nature of peace and national identity is an important factor in the strength and persistence of Tanzania’s peaceful political culture.

**Path Dependence**

National political culture did not develop all at once. It was slowly built and reinforced over the course of several decades. The growth of particular national values
and institutions set Tanzanian history on a self-perpetuating path away from violence and
division and toward a peaceful political sphere. James Mahoney’s model of path
dependence provides a useful explanation for Tanzanian political culture. Mahoney
argues that antecedent historical conditions make certain policy decisions more likely
than others. Thus, the possibilities for Tanzanian policy were largely determined by the
pre-existing demographic, economic, societal, and political situation. However,
Mahoney’s argument is not only structural: when the country reaches a “critical
juncture,” the choice of one policy option can set the country on a specific path.
(Mahoney 2001, 6) In the case of Tanzania, the 1967 adoption of the Arusha Declaration
was that critical juncture. In keeping with Arusha’s statement of principles, the
government undertook an extensive nation building project, a series of socialist economic
reforms, and a consolidation of single party rule. The combination of these societal,
economic, and political policies created a national political culture. This political culture
set the country on a long-term path of internal peace.

Mahoney argues that via “structural persistence,” the countries tend to remain on
the path they have chosen because values and institutions become self-perpetuating.
Elites pursue the continuance of institutions that benefit them. The government becomes
committed to certain institutions because it has staked its reputation on them, and because
it cannot afford to establish new institutions. Citizens “view institutions as legitimate and
voluntarily opt for their reproduction out of a belief that it is the right thing to do.”
(Mahoney 2001, 9) Whether Tanzanians became committed to their institutions for
reasons of personal profit, values, or expediency, they were simultaneously committing
themselves to and spreading national values. After the demise of the socialist and one-
party state, the institutions that had created the national values disappeared. However, Mahoney argues that “path-dependent structures and institutions endure in the absence of the processes that initially led to their establishment.” (Mahoney 2001, 9) In other words, even though the circumstances that created the unique Tanzanian national identity have passed, national identity and values remain strong and continue to provide a pacifying frame.

**Modeling Political Culture and Path Dependence**

The term “political culture” was coined in 1956 by pioneering political scientist Gabriel Almond, who defined it as “a particular pattern of orientations to political action.” (Almond 1956, 396) Political culture, though not entirely uniform in any country, has been used to explain differences in the way citizens of different states react to similar political stimuli. In the case of Tanzania, the political culture has served as a buffer from division and violence and has been the most significant factor contributing to peace. Figure 1 shows the path by which the Arusha Declaration led to the development of the *ujamaa* political culture and how that political culture perpetuated peace.
Although the Arusha Declaration was the not genesis of all the nation building policies, the commitment to economic equality, or the pursuit of single party politics – many of these policies began almost immediately after independence – the Arusha Declaration was a critical break with the past. I have specified Arusha as the critical juncture in establishing political culture because that was when Tanzania definitively committed itself to a coherent, long-term policy direction. African governments are famous for their loud, self-congratulatory announcements of policies that never get off the ground. This could have been the fate of any of those early nation building efforts, if

---

**Figure 1: Path Dependence Model of Tanzanian Peace**

Although the Arusha Declaration was the not genesis of all the nation building policies, the commitment to economic equality, or the pursuit of single party politics – many of these policies began almost immediately after independence – the Arusha Declaration was a critical break with the past. I have specified Arusha as the critical juncture in establishing political culture because that was when Tanzania definitively committed itself to a coherent, long-term policy direction. African governments are famous for their loud, self-congratulatory announcements of policies that never get off the ground. This could have been the fate of any of those early nation building efforts, if
not for Arusha. While many of the policies that would form the national political culture were already being put into place before 1967, it was the Arusha Declaration that firmly committed Tanzania to that path. After 1967, turning back was not an option.

I have divided *ujamaa* political culture into three components: national identity/pride, unity/non-polarization, and subject political orientation. The social policy of Arusha, an extensive nation building project, shaped a strong Tanzanian national identity where previously no shared identity had existed. The economic policies of Arusha – villageization, collectivization, and an attempt to prevent economic exploitation – contributed to unity and non-polarization because no group was favored and all were supposed to struggle together for development. The political policy of Arusha – all competition housed within a single, national party – firmly established a passive, subject political orientation among most citizens.

The elements of *ujamaa* political culture were mutually reinforcing. Subject political orientation left little public space for conflict and helped suppress dissent, which resulted in a more unified population. Having a strong national identity made it possible for otherwise distinct groups to share common goals, thus leading to greater unity. Likewise, the unified Tanzanian population worked together on shared national goals such as self-reliance, which promoted a sense of national pride and collective identity.

*Ujamaa* political culture was a major cause of peace, and the reinforcing effect of peace on political culture helped perpetuate this pattern. Subject political orientations caused Tanzanians to disapprove of public conflict, which left little support for violent disruptions to the peace. Even though strikes were a frequent occurrence in several professions, most citizens had more sympathy for government’s harsh treatment of
strikers than for the strikers, who were disrupting the much prized peace. For as long as
the country remained relatively peaceful, violent conflict did not create competing groups
to upset the subject political orientation of most citizens. Unity and a non-polarized
population contributed to peace because there were fewer divisions that could escalate
into violence. Peace contributed to unity because there were fewer violent conflicts to
divide people. National identity contributed to peace because being a peaceful nation was
central to Tanzanian national identity, so citizens engaging in political violence would
have been betraying their own identity. Peace was a major source of pride and identity for
Tanzanians, who defined themselves by contrasting their own relative peace with the
violence in neighboring countries. Thus, the mutual reinforcement between peace and all
three elements of Tanzanian political culture helped keep Tanzania on a peaceful path for
over 30 years.

In the past ten years, the peaceful political culture has come under threat. Most of
the policies that created that political culture are gone: the nation building project is
complete, and single party politics and *ujamaa* economic policies have been abandoned.
The subject political orientation is incompatible with competitive politics, but it has not
yet been replaced by a participant political orientation. Emerging differences in wealth
concentration and political party membership are creating more divisions in the
population. National identity remains strong on the mainland, but questions have
emerged in Zanzibar over ties to the African mainland versus ties to the Middle East. In
other words, the political culture is currently in flux. Given the importance of the
peaceful political culture in preventing violent conflict in Tanzania, the kind of political
culture that develops in the coming years may well determine whether Tanzania remains
on its peaceful path or whether emerging political and religious divisions bring the violent conflict that it has thus far avoided.

**Exploring Tanzanian Identity and Peace**

Having proven that Tanzania has historically had and continues to have a lower level of violent conflict than its neighbors, despite the presence of several factors in Tanzania that correlate highly with conflict, the rest of this essay seeks to answer the question of why. Chapter Two introduces several of the most important explanations for conflict and analyzes their relevance to the Tanzanian case.

Chapter Three provides a history of the nation building project in Tanzania to see how national identity and political culture developed and led to peace. It includes discussions of post-independence repudiation of racial preference, the union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, the Arusha Declaration and *ujamaa* village project, one-party politics, and the deliberate construction of a national culture. It also includes discussion of more recent challenges to national unity such as the structural adjustment program and economic liberalization, the Nyalali Commission and political liberalization, the Zanzibari secessionist movement, and the turmoil associated with the 1995, 2000, and 2005 presidential elections.

The fourth chapter examines some of the tools of the Tanzanian nation building project in more detail with the goal of understanding how Tanzanian identity has been created and attitudes about polarization and conflict have been ingrained. This chapter includes an analysis of civics textbooks and official use of symbols to see what national narrative and values the government is promoting. It also includes an analysis of laws
regarding the separation or involvement of religious and ethnic identity in politics to understand the official framework for avoiding polarization.

Chapter Five is an analysis of original survey data from a survey I conducted in 2005 of Tanzanian first degree students. The results are examined to determine respondents’ attitudes toward violence and conflict. The young, elite population examined in this survey offers an indication of how national political culture, which was conceived and propagated under one-party politics and a socialist economic system, has been rejected, or accepted and adapted by a generation that has grown up after the demise of both systems. Their attitudes offer an important glimpse of the future of identity and conflict in Tanzania.

The final chapter is a conclusion, summarizing the findings of what role Tanzanian national identity has played and will continue to play in preventing violent conflict. This chapter also puts the thesis in its larger context. For Tanzania’s 33 million people, maintaining national peace is vitally important. However, the conclusions of this thesis extend beyond the Tanzanian case study. This chapter suggests that promoting a strong sense of inclusive, national identity could be a useful project for certain other developing countries aiming to avoid violent conflict. The concluding chapter also offers concrete policy recommendations about how the Tanzanian government, political parties, and civil society can reinvigorate the national political culture so that it will continue to guide the country on a peaceful path for the next four decades.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Over the years, scholars have proposed numerous theories of violent conflict within states. Probably the most exhaustive review and comparison of these theories is James Rule’s classic book, *Theories of Civil Violence*. Rule traces Rational Choice theories of violence from their origins with Thomas Hobbes, through the markedly different perspective of Utilitarians, to the thinking of modern theorists such as Mancur Olson. The rational choice perspective, that citizens make conscious decisions about whether or not to engage in violence based on a cost-benefit analysis, is overly simplistic and unsatisfying. Nevertheless, when examining other theories, it is important to remember that citizens usually do give consideration to the potential negative or positive effects of the violence they engage in.

Rule also compares the diametrically opposed explanations for violence offered by Karl Marx and Vilfredo Pareto. Marx’s structuralist explanations are always important, but they are somewhat less applicable in the case of Tanzania because it was a committed socialist state almost from its inception. For the purposes of this thesis, the work of Pareto is far more important. Although Pareto has been vilified as an apologist for fascism, his theory that revolutions occur when the rising elite is barred from attaining political power and economic opportunity has been echoed in recent years by mainstream scholars such as Jack Goldstone. Goldstone’s arguments, which focus on demography in explaining violent conflict, are widely accepted among policy-makers today. He argues that “an expanding population of higher educated youth facing limited opportunities to obtain elite political and economic positions” is among the most likely determinants of revolution. (Goldstone 2002, 8) Goldstone’s argument is central to the logic of this thesis,
which surveys the attitudes towards violence of an elite youth population with limited opportunities.

Modernization and Dependency theory became highly popular in the 1960s and 1970s after most colonies in Africa gained their independence. Samuel Huntington’s 1968 book *Political Order in Changing Societies* challenges the view that newly emerging states must democratize as fast as possible. Instead, he argues that until political institutions have been thoroughly built and consolidated, mass political mobilization is a source of instability and conflict. Given that nearly forty years after that writing, few African governments can legitimately claim to have thoroughly consolidated power, any comparative attempt to measure Huntington’s claim would be an exercise in futility. However, the continent’s continuing instability in conjunction with its lack of political consolidation provides circumstantial support for Huntington. In this context, Tanzania’s top-down nation building project, strong one-party state, and extensive nationalization of the economy was an important means of institutionalizing a strong government. People were encouraged to mobilize politically only in a limited manner as prescribed by the party. Huntington’s theory may serve a useful explanation of how early Tanzanian public policy set the state on a path toward stability.

Also of concern for this thesis is Huntington’s controversial *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, in which he argues that the world’s major conflicts in the coming years will be between eight distinct civilizations. While that work is primarily concerned with international conflicts, the clash between Muslim and Christian civilizations is of concern within Tanzania, given the recent growth of Islamic fundamentalism and Christian revivalism in the country, as well as the rise in tensions
between religious groups. Unfortunately, Huntington offers little explanation of states like Tanzania that have incorporated fairly equal numbers of competing civilizations into one state relatively successfully. Whether or not Muslims and Christians can continue to coexist peacefully within Tanzania will determine how relevant Huntington’s clash of civilizations is within a multi-civilizational state.

Relative deprivation theories elaborated upon earlier theories that relied upon Marxian theories to blame conflict on absolute deprivation. Ted Robert Gurr’s book Why Men Rebel is a seminal work in the field of relative deprivation. He defines relative deprivation as the “perceived discrepancy between value expectations and value capabilities,” and argues that the likelihood of violence and rebellion increases as feelings of relative deprivation grow more intense or long-lasting. (Gurr 1970, 37) Relative deprivation is closely related to the Gini coefficient, a measure of inequality within a society. Because relative deprivation is based on people’s perceptions of what they have and should have, whereas the Gini coefficient is based on a numerical comparison of how much different groups actually have, the Gini coefficient is far easier to measure. Thus, although the survey conducted for this thesis attempted to gage satisfaction with future economic possibilities as compared to present economic conditions, the primary contribution of relative deprivation theory for an investigation into Tanzanians’ propensity to engage in violence comes in the form of Gini coefficient comparisons.

Gurr’s recent work on finding which variables correlate with conflict is central to the study of conflict today. In People Versus States: Minorities at Risk in the New Century, Gurr points to several variables that influence the likelihood of people to mobilize in rebellion including – of particular interest for this thesis – the salience of
various forms of identity. The globally exhaustive empirical data gathered for Gurr’s
Minorities at Risk Project is a part of a larger debate among scholars over how to reduce
violence by and against nationalist groups that are minorities within states. Should
minority groups be given greater autonomy within the state structure, or should they be
assimilated into the majority state? Gurr argues that greater autonomy for minorities will
reduce the likelihood of nationalist warfare by minority groups. A predecessor to that
work is Democracy in Plural Societies by Arend Lijphart, a consociationalist who agrees
with Gurr that minority groups must be separately represented. In Ethnic Groups in
Conflict, Donald Horowitz agrees that adequate representation of all groups is necessary,
but he challenges the view that the best way to avoid violence is by strengthening
minority groups so that they feel secure. Instead, he argues that too much autonomy will
only encourage greater divisiveness, and states must break down barriers and subsume
minorities within the majority fold in order to avoid violence. Horowitz’s position
supports this thesis in arguing that increasing national identity as a state at the expense of
smaller group national identities helps avoid violent conflict.

Although Emile Durkheim did not write explicitly about the causes of civil
violence, James Rule suggests that Durkheim would “expect levels of violent collective
conflict to vary inversely with the intensity of ordinary citizens’ attachments to moral
principles underlying major institutions.” (Rule 1988, 121) This is central to my
argument: violent collective conflict in Tanzania is low because ordinary citizens are
strongly attached to the moral principles of peacefulness and unity that underlie
Tanzanian national identity. In an essay entitled “Useless Durkheim,” prominent political
scientist Charles Tilly faults Durkheim for his simplistic assumption that moral principles
flow from only one source, and that people are not conflicted by attachment to multiple sets of principles. This criticism is apt, and it may explain some of the discord within Tanzania among citizens who do subscribe to widely held national values. However, Durkheim’s fundamental argument that people who believe in the goodness of their society are unlikely to wage violence against that society remains applicable.

In applying Durkheim’s theory to the Tanzanian case, this thesis focuses on the role of national identity in promoting a set of national values to which citizens may ascribe. It is thus important to examine some of the literature surrounding nationhood and its role in reducing conflict. Theorists of nationhood generally fall into two camps: the primordialists, who believe that nationalist sentiments are a natural and permanent part of human history, and the constructivists, who believe that nationhood is a distinctly modern social construction. Some scholars also identify distinctive perennialist, Marxist, or post-modernist views of nationhood, but for the purposes of this thesis it is sufficient to say that most scholars fall on a spectrum somewhere between primordialism and constructivism.

The seminal constructivist work on nationhood is Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*. Anderson’s greatest contribution to this thesis is his definition of the nation as “an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.” (Anderson 1991, 6) It is the ability to imagine and re-imagine the nation that made the Tanzanian nation building project viable. Under primordialist assumptions, the imposition of a Tanzanian national identity on more than a hundred disparate ethnic groups would have been fleeting and unsuccessful. However, this thesis argues that the national integration process was largely successful, and that the potential for violent
conflict is affected by which people are imagined to be part of the nation: All citizens? Black Africans but not Indians? Mainlanders but not Zanzibaris? Settled people but not trans-border herders? “Modern” people but not hunter-foragers? Under primordialist assumptions, these questions would not matter, but I will argue that self-definitions of the limits of the nation matter greatly in contributing to conflict or the lack thereof.

The central question that the nationalist literature must answer for us is: what is the relationship between nationalism and violent conflict within a state? The literature often blames intra-state conflict on conflicting nationalist aspirations, but is the reverse true as well? Can unified nationalist aspirations – a civic nation building project aimed at all citizens of a state – reduce the tendency for intra-state conflict? In *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism*, Adrian Hastings argues that “almost all modern states act on the bland assumption that they are nation-states.” (Hastings 1997, 3) If the people do not feel that they are part of the nation-state, they may feel disenfranchised or threatened by the state’s actions. According to Hastings, nationalism “arises chiefly where and when a particular ethnicity or nation feels itself threatened.” (Hastings 1997, 4) The out-groups’ perception of threat can lead to conflict with in-groups or with the government. However, when governments incorporate citizens into the nation, the citizens are less likely to perceive themselves as targets and more likely to see themselves as beneficiaries and members of the state or in-group. In other words, a successful nation building project reduces potential internal conflict by bringing more citizens into the unthreatened in-group.

Political scientist Crawford Young takes up the challenge of uncovering successful stories of national integration in his edited volume, *The Accommodation of*
Cultural Diversity. Although he acknowledges that societies are too fluid to identify any state as a permanent success, his volume points to several states that have used varying strategies to incorporate their citizens and reduce conflict. Among the case studies is Aili Marie Tripp’s examination of Tanzania. Tripp identifies numerous laws and institutions designed to ensure wide participation and equality within the state. She also identifies several policies and trends that created inequality and divisive feelings of victimization. The ambiguous conclusions of Tripp’s article suggest that further study of Tanzanian nationhood and its effects on reducing conflict will be a worthwhile addition to the literature on the causes of violent conflict.
In order to understand why Tanzanian national identity minimizes violent conflict, it is necessary to understand how and why that identity was created and propagated. Furthermore, we must examine what major conflicts and cleavages have occurred, and what role identity played in these conflicts. To that end, this section briefly examines the pre-colonial and colonial history of Tanzania and addresses the unique historical experiences of Zanzibar and mainland Tanzania that have led them on such divergent paths. These experiences are the antecedent historical conditions that “define[d] available options and shape[d] selection processes” after independence. (Mahoney 2001, 5) I then focus on the critical juncture that occurred in 1967, when the policies undertaken by the Nyerere government set Tanzania on a distinct historical path. I trace the effects of these policies under the single party system and the political changes that occurred following the introduction of multiparty democracy.

**Pre-Colonial and Colonial Tanzania**

Mainland Tanzania is highly diverse, with over 120 ethnic groups. Those groups came to Tanzania at different times and from different places. In fact, Tanzania is the only country in Africa to have indigenous ethnic groups that come from all four African linguistic groupings. Some of these groups practiced hunting and foraging, some were herders with highly complex social structures, and others were agriculturalists.

The Swahili civilization began with the arrival of Arab traders along the East African coast in the 1400s. As they established trade routes farther into the interior of the continent, the Swahili trading culture spread, including the development of the Kiswahili language. The relations between the traders, the African porters, and the indigenous
people were generally cordial, although the development of a lucrative slave trade introduced a degree of violence into the interactions. Over the centuries, Islam spread along the Swahili coast.

In the 19th century Christian missionaries began appearing in Tanganyika, bringing with them schools, hospitals, and a burning desire to convert the heathens tribes of Africa. Many of the missionaries established themselves near Mt. Kilimanjaro. Because of the early presence of European education and the English language, ethnic groups in that area, particularly the Chagga, gained the skills and experience necessary to conduct business with the Europeans. The implications of that exposure continue today, as the Chagga remain the wealthiest group in Tanzania, disproportionately represented in business and at universities, and resented by some members of less prosperous ethnic groups.

In 1885, the Germans claimed Tanganyika as a colony at the Conference of Berlin, despite having a relatively weak presence there. Having little interest in their colonies, the Germans never effectively controlled life in remote areas of Tanganyika. However, they were brutal and demanding in those areas they did control. In 1905, a revolt broke out against German agricultural policy in what came to be called the Maji Maji Rebellion. By the time the Germans had put down the rebellion in 1907, about 100,000 people had died, mainly Africans. Although the Ngoni people suffered the worst losses in this defeat, the rebellion had spread to groups in geographically disparate areas. Despite having virtually no sense of Tanganyikan identity, many different groups could join together in their mutual grievances against the Germans.
After World War I, the British took over administration of Tanganyika. Their policy of indirect rule relied on playing ethnic groups against each other and ruling through pre-existing chiefs who would do their bidding. Working with the British administration required ethnic groups to have institutions that fit the pre-conceived British model of a “tribe.” This wreaked havoc on existing group structures. In order to gain patronage and power under the British administration, some individuals and ethnic groups redefined their identities. They created new dynasties, banded together with other unrelated ethnic groups, and established new “tribal” laws and procedures. This occurred in the case of the Chagga in Kilimanjaro and the Sukuma Confederation in Shinyanga and Mwanza. Several of the groups that transformed themselves to fit British structures and assumptions are now among Tanzania’s most educated and wealthiest groups. The British also forced ethnic groups to adapt their leadership and customs to the British notion of a “tribal” structure in order to be incorporated more conveniently into the indirect rule regime.

Such a sudden and major realignment of political and societal structures changed people’s self perceptions and identities. Even after all the ethnic realignments, Tanganyika still had a very large number of ethnic groups. Even the largest group, the Sukuma, was no larger than a million people, less than 20% of the population. The result was that, at independence, no group was able to dominate the newly forming government. The plethora of ethnic groups may be one reason why small scale agitations against colonial policies never mushroomed into a large-scale pro-independence war. For instance, the Luguru revolt against soil conservation policies in the Uluguru Mountains was a major disturbance, but it did not incite other revolts. It was difficult to organize a
large scale, committed organization out of such disparate groups with such different concerns and interests.

When a Tanganyikan pro-independence movement did eventually appear, it came in the guise of the Tanganyika African Association (TAA), a peaceful nationalist organization. The TAA established branches across Tanganyika among many different ethnic groups, thus becoming a truly national movement. This movement was in sharp contrast to pro-independence guerrilla wars, such as the Mau Mau Rebellion in Kenya, which brought independence at the cost of militarizing the population. By the time the Tanganyikan independence movement gained substantial strength, sustained fighting in other colonies as well as the rising economic burden of maintaining colonies had convinced the British that they would have to grant independence to their African colonies. Thus, Tanganyika benefited from the independence wars fought across the continent in the 1950s before its own independence in 1961 and was able to avoid militarizing its population. The non-violent history of the TAA and the Tanzanian African National Union (TANU) – the political party that eventually replaced it – and their inclusive campaign to gain supporters among all Tanganyikan ethnic groups helps explain the historical moment that allowed independent Tanzania to embark on a peaceful path.

One important reason for the lack of ethnic competition within TANU was the leader of the party and the new president, Mwalimu Julius Nyerere. Nyerere was a school teacher whom the British had sent to Scotland to study. Groomed for leadership by the British, Nyerere had a background as an academic, a civil servant, and a union organizer, unlike many new African leaders whose credentials were primarily military. Although
Nyerere embraced radical socialist policies, his methods remained, true to his background, relatively moderate and non-violent. In contrast to early national leaders in many African countries whose first loyalty was to a particular group, Tanzania’s “father of the nation” was genuinely a national figure.

After being granted independence in January 1961, Tanganyika slowly altered existing British colonial policies until adopting a radical departure with the Arusha Declaration of 1967. Prior to that, the major post-independence political event was the union of mainland Tanganyika with the three islands of Zanzibar: Unguja, Pemba, and Mafia Island. A brief history of Zanzibar makes it clear why the Zanzibari and mainland Tanzania cases are so different. This incomparability explains why Zanzibar has been somewhat of an exception to the Tanzanian peace, and why this thesis primarily addresses the policies and outcomes on the mainland.

**Pre-Revolutionary Zanzibar**

No one knows for sure who the original inhabitants of Zanzibar were, but the Shirazi Zanzibaris trace their ancestry to 9th and 10th century Persian traders from Shiraz. These people likely intermarried with migrant fishermen from the African mainland, producing a Shirazi ethnicity that is racially difficult to distinguish from native black Africans, and whose existence as a separate group relies heavily upon that founding myth. (Fisher 2003, 129) For many centuries after that, the Indian Ocean trading area was one of the world’s most vibrant regions. Merchants from South Asia, East Africa, the Middle East, and as far away as China and Portugal, established a major dhow-based trading economy across the ocean. The Sultan of Oman sent colonists to the islands of Zanzibar to establish a base from which to trade in the interior of East Africa. The Omani
traders brought African slaves to Zanzibar to work in their fields. By the 1800s, Zanzibar had become extremely wealthy as the East African transit point for gold, ivory, and especially slaves. Zanzibar hosted East Africa’s largest slave market. It also developed a thriving spice export economy as the world’s largest producer of cloves, also based on an extensive slaving economy. In fact, Zanzibar became such a wealthy and desirable location that in 1840 the Omani Sultan, Sayyid Said, relocated the base of his sultanate to Stone Town on Unguja Island.

Under the Sultan’s rule, the Zanzibari economy continued to prosper as the main export market for goods from the Swahili trading civilization that had developed along the east coast of Africa. Meanwhile, much of the indigenous population of Zanzibar had converted to Islam. Enslaved Africans were particularly likely to convert because of the better treatment Muslim slaves received in accordance with Islamic law. With its growing population of Muslims, its centrality to the slave trade, and its booming economy, Zanzibar attracted the attention of European crusading Christians and economic opportunists alike. Citing the moral imperative of abolishing the slave trade, the British took over Zanzibar over a period of several years. Zanzibar’s final resistance was broken when, in 1896, the British intervened in a succession dispute, winning a 45 minute war – the shortest in history.

British indirect rule relied on the Sultan to continue as the main ruler. Although the British officially abolished the slave trade, a clandestine trade continued well into the twentieth century, shipping captured Africans to the Middle East. A diverse population existed in Zanzibar by then: African former slaves, Shirazi people, Omanis and other Arabs, Indians brought over by the British as servants, and British colonial
administrators. British policies strongly favored the Arabs because the British considered them smarter and more civilized. Secondarily, the British favored Asians, and then the Shirazis. For example, during World War II, the British established a food rationing system whereby Arabs, Asians, and Shirazis were granted more and better food than Africans. (Fisher 2003, 131)

The British established a Legislative Council that included a small number of appointed Zanzibaris. Although the numbers of seats allocated each ethnic group changed during every election, they always granted Arabs and Asians representation far outweighing their size relative to the African population. The Arab-dominated Zanzibar National Party (ZNP) and the mostly Shirazi Zanzibar People’s Party (ZPP) formed a coalition, which was able to gain a majority of seats on the Legislative Council in the pre-independence election because of the gerrymandered districting, despite the African-dominated Afro Shirazi Party (ASP) winning 54% of the popular vote. (Muafaka 2004, 26) The Asians, who generally sided with the ZNP against the radical ASP, helped to swing the election. These divisions, particularly the divide and conquer policy that encouraged antagonism between the Shirazis and the formerly enslaved Africans, is at the heart of the political tensions that continue to this day.

On December 19, 1963, the British granted Zanzibar its independence as a constitutional monarchy under the rule of the Sultan. Furious at what they perceived as a betrayal of democracy and the majority African population of the islands, radical ASP members revolted on January 12, 1964. Overnight, they toppled the Sultan and proclaimed the Revolutionary Republic of Zanzibar. In that night of anarchy, approximately 5000 people, mainly Arabs on Pemba, were killed. Those deaths constitute
about 10% of the entire Arab population of Zanzibar, and many more Arabs fled. 

(Muafaka 2004, 27) Although the new government quickly moved to restore order and guarantee the safety of all parts of the population, the coercive steps it took to prevent a potential counter-revolution helped ensure that the divisions brought on by a century of exploitation and a night of vengeance would not soon be forgotten.

The Formation of the Union

Zanzibar’s identity had long been contested: was it an island outpost of the Arab world, or was it a part of black Africa? Its religious identity, now virtually 100% Muslim, tied it closely to the Arab world. However, eventually its location, thousands of kilometers from the Middle East and less than fifty kilometers off the coast of Tanganyika, inevitably drew it closer to mainland Africa. After the Revolution, on the basis of their close historical ties as part of the Swahili trading region, President Nyerere of Tanganyika and President Abeid Karume of Zanzibar negotiated an asymmetrical union between the two states. On April 26, 1964, The United Republic of Tanzania came into being, with a union government in place to govern both states and a separate, semi-autonomous Zanzibari government to deal with island specific issues.

The Union would later become a source of controversy, as some Zanzibaris felt that they had been co-opted into an exploitative political arrangement. That controversy was the issue over which strong support for opposition parties appeared in Zanzibar, even as those same parties found it nearly impossible to gain traction on the mainland.

Unfortunately, the fault lines on that issue closely resembled the pre-independence divisions. The “losers” of the Revolution – Arabs, Asians, and some Shirazis – felt that Zanzibar was systematically deprived of resources and opportunities for development. In
particular, the education system was significantly better on the mainland, and only a very small number of Zanzibaris went on to colleges and universities. This was perceived not only as ethnic discrimination, but also religious. The mainland was primarily Christian or animist. Zanzibar was almost entirely Muslim, along with most of the coast on the mainland. Neglecting Zanzibar’s development appeared to target Muslims in favor of Christians. Whether or not the Union government intended to discriminate – and I am of the view that, as least at the top levels of government, it did not – there was a notable lack of educational infrastructure on the islands, few Muslims went on to tertiary education, and the political party leadership was disproportionately Christian. That these issues came to be viewed in an ethno-religious context, rather than simply as a failure of the Zanzibari government, reflects the historical tensions at play and a failure of the government to reframe the issue. However, serious debate over the Union was not to appear for nearly three decades because Tanzania had simultaneously moved to adopt a one-party system, a step which left no political space for debate over an issue as basic as the existence of the Union.

**The Arusha Declaration**

In the years immediately following independence, the TANU government inched slowly toward the left while remaining relatively consistent with colonial policies. The first major political event was the union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar. In 1966, the newly united state adopted a new constitution, which legally created a one-party state, with provisions for competition within the party. In practice, this made little difference, since TANU was the only widely supported party on the mainland, and in Zanzibar the ASP did not allow the other pre-Revolution parties to participate politically. Despite the
constitutional change, it was not until 1977 that TANU and the ASP merged to form a single party, Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM). Although the party was centrally controlled, it had very active local branches even in the most remote parts of the country. Coupled with internal party competition, the activist roles that the local branches played helped mobilize the population to extremely high levels of support for the party, albeit generally in passive roles.

In 1967, TANU made a radical break from the past by adopting the Arusha Declaration, which declared TANU’s support for ujamaa, policies of socialism and self-reliance. The adoption of the Arusha Declaration and its subsequent implementation was a critical juncture in Tanzanian history. The policy decisions made in accordance with the declaration set Tanzania on a unique historical path, moving it toward domestic tranquility even as its neighbors moved toward factionalism and internal warfare.

The most important initiative associated with ujamaa was the establishment of ujamaa villages throughout the country. Most of Tanzania’s population had previously lived in scattered huts next to their small agricultural plots, making it nearly impossible to provide them with social services or mobilize them politically. The government set to work building villages throughout the rural areas. Schools, health huts, and party branches were placed in the villages. Each village was given a plot of communal land on which to grow necessary agricultural products with the goal of creating self-sufficient villages.

From the beginning, the ujamaa project faced skepticism. Most farmers did not want to move to the villages because that required abandoning their own land in favor of an unknown future. In particular, “progressive farmers” – private farmers who were
adopting new techniques and technologies to increase crop yield – resentment what they perceived as an attack on their initiative and success. By making enemies of this important group, the government lost a potentially powerful ally and reduced the enthusiasm of the poorest farmers, who saw the progressive farmers not as exploiters but as models of success to which they might aspire. (Lofchie 1976, 494) Additionally, some villages were very far away from the original homes of their inhabitants, meaning people had to leave their ethnic group and land where their family may have lived for centuries, and in many cases live in an ethnically mixed environment for the first time. The people who did agree to move were stigmatized, seen as being unable to succeed on their own. (Lofchie 1979, 494) When citizens were too slow in voluntarily moving to the ujamaa villages, the government began a policy of forced relocation. By 1976, it is estimated that 80% of the population lived in an ujamaa village, a remarkable feat given the short time period and the limited resources of the government. (Heights Productions 2002)

The government pursued several other policies at the same time to reach its goals of equality and poverty eradication. In 1967, most major industries including banking, agriculture, and manufacturing were nationalized. The civil service was Africanized, where previously it had been largely staffed by Asians. Educational opportunities were expanded, including a relatively successful campaign to establish universal primary education. Secondary school graduates were required to serve two years in the National Service. Most important for this thesis, the government embarked on an extensive nation building project designed to capture the support of the peasantry and form a sense of national unity.

**Collapse and Reform**
Observers of all ideological persuasions agree that the economic policies of *ujamaa* were a failure. The country’s GDP, which had been growing at an average of 3.3% per capita in the 1960s, fell to a growth rate of 1.8% per capita in the 1970s. By 1985, the year Tanzania caved to World Bank and IMF demands to undertake a Structural Adjustment Program (SAP), the per capita GDP growth was -2.2% and inflation was at 30%. (Kahama 1995, 5-7) Basic commodities were in such short supply that they were often completely unavailable. An extensive black market developed to bypass the government’s price controls.

The economic downturn cannot be blamed solely on *ujamaa* policies. Oil shocks in the 1970s strained the economy. The 1972 collapse of the East African Community due to tensions between Nyerere, Uganda’s Idi Amin, and Kenya’s Jomo Kenyatta, hurt Tanzania’s hopes for regional trade and prosperity. The Tanzanian economy was also crippled by its 1978 war with Uganda. It began when Idi Amin sent planes and troops across the border to attack Tanzania’s Kagera Salient. Furious at this attack, the latest in a series of incursions and provocations, Nyerere seized on the opportunity to topple his homicidal neighbor. He sent the previously untested Tanzanian army into Uganda, where it handily defeated Amin’s army. Most Ugandans welcomed the Tanzanian invasion, and the troops continued to occupy the country until Uganda’s opposition leaders managed to form a government. In addition to the thousands of Tanzanian lives lost and the lost revenue from soldiers being away from their farms or occupations, it is estimated that the war cost Tanzania $500 million USD. (Kahama 1995, 6)

By 1985, Tanzania so desperately needed loans that Nyerere was forced to accept the neo-liberal rigidities of the World Bank’s and IMF’s SAP. This included privatization
of national industries, and abandonment of price controls and the villagization project. In a particularly short-sighted demand, the SAP required Tanzania to drop its commitment to providing education and health care to its entire population.

These economic changes were accompanied by political shifts. In 1985, Nyerere became one of the few post-Independence African leaders to voluntarily relinquish the presidency. In so doing, he retained an important elder statesman role. With his powerful political influence and widespread popularity, Nyerere continued to play an important role in guiding Tanzanian decision-making until his death in 1999. His hand-picked successor, Ali Hassan Mwinyi, was a Zanzibari Muslim with a markedly different constituency, despite being a member of CCM. Mwinyi was unpopular, in part because of his austere economic policies in accordance with the SAP. His administration was also accused of corruption and of favoring Muslims.

**Multipartyism**

By the start of the 1990s, indigenous reform movements across Africa, as well as powerful forces in the West, were demanding political liberalization of one-party states. Seeing the writing on the wall, Nyerere embarked on a campaign to establish multipartyism in Tanzania, despite remaining the leader of CCM until 1990. The government appointed respected jurist Francis Nyalali to head a commission that would investigate the feasibility of establishing multipartyism in Tanzania. The findings of the 1992 Nyalali Commission Report are striking: 80% of Tanzanians supported maintaining a one-party system. (Kahama 1995, 27) It is important to note a related finding, though, that most Tanzanians supported other forms of liberalization that would increase political competition. Despite the public’s lack of enthusiasm for multipartyism, Nyerere and the
influential Organization of Tanzanian Trade Unions (OTTU) pushed for its adoption. Although Mwinyi and most of the CCM leadership opposed it, they eventually yielded. In 1992, Parliament officially adopted multipartyism, along with several other reforms recommended by the Nyalali Commission. This process of liberalization put Tanzania in an uncommon position, with political reforms pushed by elites in power and resisted by the masses. (Hyden 1999, 154)

Multi-party elections were first held in 1995. CCM’s candidate, Benjamin Mkapa won the presidency, but several other parties won parliamentary seats. The strongest competition was in Zanzibar, where the Civil United Front (CUF) just barely lost the Zanzibari presidency to the CCM candidate. There were allegations of fraud and cheating on both sides. Given the closeness of the election, that is perhaps not surprising. In the 2000 presidential election, results were nearly identical. Although the composition and relative success of the opposition parties changed significantly on the mainland, President Mkapa easily won re-election with a similarly high percentage of the votes. In Zanzibar, CCM again eked out a win over CUF under highly disputed conditions. The 2005 was similar. Despite the buzz on the mainland surrounding opposition party CHADEMA’s candidate Freeman Mbowe, CCM presidential candidate Jakaya Kikwete actually improved upon the already massive share of the vote gained in CCM’s previous landslides. Once again, CCM won the close election for the Zanzibari presidency with CUF rejecting the results and independent monitors expressing concern over conduct of both sides during the electoral process.

Perhaps of even great concern than the actual election results is the fact that the divisions on Zanzibar between supporters of CCM and CUF are almost identical to the
divisions more than thirty years earlier between ASP and ZNP. During single-party rule, CCM claimed to represent all Zanzibaris equally, and mention of ethnic and historic divisions was taboo. Yet, a full generation later, those same divisions remain strong. Increasing frustration with the process has led to violent confrontations between CCM and CUF supporters. The government has responded by sending the police and military to keep order, often harassing opposition rallies or intimidating potential opposition voters. The incident of January 21, 2001, when soldiers fired on unarmed CUF demonstrators, killing about 50 people and causing about 4000 party supporters to flee to Mombassa, Kenya, was only the most egregious incident. The Muafaka agreement between CUF and CCM has marginally improved relations between the parties, but tensions remain high.

Although the political climate in Zanzibar is far more antagonistic than the climate on the mainland, occasional violent incidents have occurred there as well. Voter intimidation by gangs of party youth is common, as is the deployment of police or military to harass opposition rallies. Rhetoric by leaders is largely peaceful, though, and the great majority of the population seems to repudiate the occasional violent incidents. Most telling, the population does not seem to have polarized around political parties. Friendships and marriages exist among supporters of different parties. Loyalties to opposition parties are understood to be in flux as the parties try to establish and position themselves to take substantial power from CCM. Whether these incidents on the mainland will remain relatively minor as political competition progresses, or they will increase and come to resemble the sharp divisions on Zanzibar, is a vital question that the final chapter of this thesis aims to address.
Chapter 4: Tools of Tanzanian Nation Building

Tanzania is widely acknowledged as having implemented one of the most extensive nation building projects attempted in any of the newly independent African countries. As already discussed, the Tanzanian population is highly diverse, and was, at independence, a particularly rural and unconnected population. Much of the coast and some settlements along old trade routes shared a loose affiliation with Swahili culture and some knowledge of Kiswahili as a trading language. Many of those people were Muslim, but they practiced different types of Islam, in some cases mingled with local beliefs and in other cases highly orthodox. Other ethnic groups shared the experience of Christian missionaries and had converted to Christianity. Again, they were members of different churches and had mingled Christianity with local religious traditions in different ways. All of the Tanganyikan population shared the experience of German colonial rule followed by British rule, the historical accident that had tied together previously unrelated groups into one political entity. Yet the colonial regimes had only been administrative in nature – they hardly conformed to the definition of a state, much less a nation. How did the post-independence government take on the daunting task of creating a Tanzanian nation?

The Tanzanian government set out to create a common narrative and a shared culture through a series of nation building strategies. Leaders explicitly emphasized nation building as a goal, stressing that participation was a responsibility of the people and an important contribution they could make toward the development of the country. None of these nation building tools used by the government was unique to Tanzania. The reason these tools were so effective in Tanzania was that the government and TANU had
nearly free reign to pursue those policies, due to the lack of popular opposition and the widespread popularity of TANU, and the government made a significant, long term ideological and financial investment in the nation building project.

It is possible to explain the spread of Tanzanian nationalism and ideology during the *ujamaa* period with almost exclusive reference to the government and the party because CCM was able to monopolize the national discourse. Through state control of the media, schools, public services, and major industries, and party control of local party branches, major civic groups, and unions, virtually all means of widespread organization and discourse were incorporated into the governing apparatus. Thus, the government was able to control the message of the nation building project to a degree that is impossible since political and economic liberalization. This is not to say that there were no voices of dissent or alternate nationalizing narratives. However, these voices rarely reached much of the populace because of the government’s monopoly on political expression and organization. Thus, the nation building project’s successes and failures are almost entirely a product of the party’s and government’s efforts. For that reason, this section will address only the state-sanctioned nation building efforts.

The nation building project was so all-consuming that many more tools were used than could be addressed here. I will examine some of the most important tools, including the propagation of Kiswahili, the civics curricula in schools, and the official use of symbols and slogans. In addition, I will address some of the laws made to promote national unity and discourage divisiveness. Throughout this section, I will analyze how these tools specifically promoted a peaceful political culture.
Framing the Nation Building Project

The tools of nation building would not have had the impact they did if not for an over-arching vision to unite the people toward a common goal. The government needed a goal more tangible than unity, which was an esoteric concept for a people who were largely too rural to know the vast diversity of the Tanzania. The common goal settled upon and regularly referred to by the government was a war on the Three Enemies: Ignorance, disease, and poverty. Virtually every major policy undertaking and development project justified itself in terms of fighting the Three Enemies. For the leadership of local party branches, who may not have been well educated and were not privy to the complex motivations behind centrally-dictated decisions, the party’s directives could be understood and communicated to the people in the context of the war against the Three Enemies.

That the government chose those particular development challenges to emphasize is not surprising; virtually every Tanzanian could agree that ignorance, poverty, and disease negatively impacted his or her own life. Perhaps more surprising is that the government framed its struggle for development as a war. Why did the government of a country that prided itself on peacefulness deliberately emphasize war imagery in its national development goal? Ignorance, disease, and poverty could easily have been called the Three Challenges that had to be overcome, or the Three Underdevelopment Indicators that needed to be addressed. The choice of war imagery was not accidental. Not only is war a powerful and universally understood concept, even for people who have never experienced it directly, it is also an immediate threat. It requires sacrifice and perseverance on the part of all citizens. Those who do not participate are traitors. Nyerere
said this explicitly: “I look to every citizen of our country to join in the fight. And anyone who interferes with our war-efforts, I, for my part, shall look upon as a traitor and an enemy of our country.” (Meienberg 1966, 55) War imagery was useful in guaranteeing involvement and support from all citizens in development projects.

War was also a unifying factor. In wartime, citizens who might otherwise not associate with one another close ranks to fight the enemy. This is true across lines of class, race, ethnicity, gender, and political affiliation. Old enmities are put aside as citizens unite against the immediate threat. In this case, the threats in the war – poverty, disease, and ignorance – were prevalent throughout the country. The war on these enemies promised Tanzanians an opportunity to channel their aggressiveness, one of the main attractions of war, against enemies that were directly evident in their everyday lives. Although the aggression necessary in a military war is different, and guns and blood may bring a more satisfying adrenaline rush, the war on the Three Enemies was nonetheless a real war. The very real physical efforts of building dikes and digging irrigation tunnels, and the determination and patience necessary to participate in adult literacy programs or to change eating habits to promote nutrition, required sweat and sacrifice as intense as any war. By aggressively fighting non-human enemies through nation building and development, Tanzanians could unite against a common foe, unleash their aggressiveness, and still remain peaceful. In this way, Tanzania’s framing of its development efforts as a war helped to unify its people toward a common goal and prevent the outbreak of military war. The values instilled by this frame – that everyone’s efforts are necessary for the common good, and that violent conflict is a waste of
resources that could otherwise be used to fight more harmful, prevalent enemies – continue to inform Tanzanian perceptions of development and conflict.

**Swahili as a National Language**

The importance of Swahili to Tanzania’s peaceful trajectory and nation building project could hardly be overstated. States that do not speak a common language suffer economically from the challenge of communication and socially from the impossibility of unity. In Africa, where borders had been drawn haphazardly and relatively small ethnic groups predominated, virtually every state contained speakers of several different languages. In order for commerce and the civil service to function, states had to designate one or a few national languages. For most states, this was a losing proposition. Adopting the languages of a few large ethnic groups reinforced ethnic solidarity and sub-national divisions. Adopting the language of the colonizer was politically unpalatable and difficult to execute, given the lack of knowledge of English, French, and Portuguese. Language became an extremely contentious issue in many African countries, particularly in debates about the language of instruction in schools. The lack of a common language was crippling in many countries, both for practical reasons and in debates about identity.

The almost universal knowledge of Swahili is the factor that most obviously distinguishes Tanzania from all other African states. Like most African states, Tanzania came to its independence speaking a wide variety of languages. There was English, the language of the colonizer, spoken by the elites in society. There was German, spoken by only the small number of older people who had served the German colonial administration. There were over 120 indigenous languages, from all four African language families, with most of the rural population speaking only their own ethnic
language. There was Arabic, spoken by Arabs on Zanzibar and among some descendents of traders on the mainland. And then there was Swahili.

After decades of controversy about the origins of Swahili, a consensus has finally emerged among academics that Swahili is a Bantu language, like most of the indigenous Tanzanian languages. It developed as a trading language, spoken by Arab merchants and their African porters as they settled on the East African islands and coast and made their way inland. Through these trade routes, the language spread across a large portion of eastern Africa, as far north as Mogadishu, as far south as Mozambique, and as far west as the eastern DRC. Because of its history as a lingua franca, it attracted a large number of Arabic loan words; approximately 40% of Swahili words have their origin in Arabic. Past scholars mistook this to mean that Swahili was an Arabic language. This view was promoted by colonial administrators, who tended to give as much credit as possible for any East African achievements to the Arabs. The rediscovery of Swahili’s African origins and decisively Bantu grammatical structure legitimized its use as Tanzania’s official national language. Swahili became a source of shared identity for Tanzanians of all ethnic groups.

Although geographically widely spoken, the actual number of Swahili speakers at the time of independence was relatively small and concentrated along the trade routes. For that reason, most East African countries did not choose to promote Swahili actively. In Tanganyika, the colonial administration had promoted Swahili to a somewhat greater extent, even though it was spoken only by a narrow subset of the population. In Zanzibar, because there was no truly indigenous ethnic group, Swahili was already the common language for those who did not speak Arabic. Given the huge number of distinct
languages in the country, Tanzania faced a particularly egregious language problem, With Swahili’s deep historical roots as a basis, Tanzania embarked on a large-scale, remarkably successful campaign to create a literate, Swahili-proficient population.

Teaching Swahili was a central component of the nation building project. The government put many of its scant resources into the education system so that it could guarantee universal primary education. Students were taught in Swahili in primary school, and those few who attended secondary school continued to study Swahili as a subject, while taking the rest of their classes in English. Even students who entered primary school with no knowledge of Swahili soon learned and brought it home to their villages, where their parents began to pick it up as well. If most of the population had still lived on isolated homesteads, this emphasis on education might have made little headway, but with the 1967 Arusha declaration, the government began moving people into *ujamaa* villages. Children could viably attend schools because they were concentrated in one village with a teacher. *Ujamaa* villages generally included members of more than one ethnic group, so speaking Swahili as a common language became essential for day-to-day living.

Swahili rhetoric was highly important to the Tanzanian state, and great care was taken with the language in official pronouncements. Understandable, yet inspiring rhetoric made the ideals of the state accessible to Tanzania’s uneducated majority. In 1987, after a generation of the nation building project, it was “fairly easy for the ordinary citizen to reproduce the official stereotyped discourse but to introduce in it a context imbued with his aspirations.” (Martin 1987, 11) The accessibility of this discourse, and its careful linkage to concepts familiar to the masses, made it possible to explain the
overall rationale of the nation building project, which increased tolerance for less popular aspects of government policy.

The Swahili rhetoric chosen by TANU and CCM emphasized the concept of family. Martin argues that by creating a Swahili political discourse based on traditional notions of family interactions, the Tanzanian leadership framed the political arena as one in which violent conflict was unacceptable. (Martin 1987, 24) Within the traditional family setting, conflicts are inevitable, but they are resolved peacefully and with deference to the father, who is looking out for the interests of the whole family. To the extent that the government successfully imposed this dynamic on the political arena, citizens settled their disputes peacefully by trusting in the benevolence and good judgment of the leadership. Thus, Nyerere was baba wa taifa, the “father of the nation.” The citizens and even top political leadership referred to each other as ndugu, commonly translated as comrade, but actually a word for a relative, akin to “brother” or “cousin.” Ujamaa, the word for the Tanzanian socialist system, comes from the root jamaa, or family, and translates best as “familyhood.” Mwananchi, the word for citizen, actually means “child of the land,” which highlights the paternalistic orientation of the post-independence government. In this rhetoric, each member of society easily recognized his or her proper role in supporting the overall good of the nation-family.

Without everyone speaking Swahili, the introduction of a unified culture would have been almost impossible. Mixed-ethnicity ujamaa villages would have been impossible. Schools could not have brought together students from diverse backgrounds. Friendships, business partnerships, and marriages across ethnic groups would be rare among people who did not share a common language. Cities – particularly Dar es Salaam
– would have developed competing ethnic enclaves rather than highly integrated neighborhoods with such frequency of intermarriage that many children in the cities speak only Swahili, having lost their ethnic languages entirely. Citizens would be unable to communicate with civil servants. Political parties would not be able to reach out to penetrate the rural areas and would rely on narrow ethnic bases. Conflicts between groups would flare up more frequently as a result of miscommunication. In short, if the policy of spreading Swahili had not been so successful, Tanzanian society would have been significantly more parochial and prone to conflict, and other nation building policies would have been almost impossible to implement.

Civic Education

One of the most important aspects of nation building was involving the youth in the struggle for Tanzania’s future. While there was also a major emphasis on adult literacy and civics education, engaging the youth was particularly important for two reasons. First, some of the most striking changes in a culture happen simply through generational replacement. (Almond and Verba 1963) Thus, to a certain extent, the future of Tanzanian nationhood lay not so much in convincing the adults to buy into the concept of nationhood, since they already had a somewhat set identity, but rather in engaging the youth so that they would be committed to the nation as they grew up. The second reason is that, as already discussed, youth are among the most volatile segments of any population. If they support the government, they represent a source of energy, enthusiasm, and physical vigor to help with development. If they oppose the government, they represent a major threat to stability. For both of these reasons, gaining youth support for the young nation via civics education was a vital step for the Tanzanian government.
The goal of civics education is to mold the masses into good citizens. In the *ujamaa* years, good citizens were people who loved their country and were willing to work hard and sacrifice for it, with only a basic knowledge of how the government functioned. As one civics book stated, “Civics…is more than a collection of facts; it must build up in us a strong conviction: to use all our talents and energies for the building of a nation that is, and will be, truly democratic.” (Meienberg 1966, viii) A 1994 survey of Tanzanian adults asked respondents which civic issues were emphasized when they attended primary school, mainly during the *ujamaa* era. Their responses were: “love your country,” 34.9%; “obey authority,” 16.4%; “trust the leaders,” 15.3%; and “how the government is run,” only 4.5%. (*Tanzania’s Political Culture* 2001, 135) Given that few Tanzanians were educated beyond primary school, the civic education in that era seems to have focused almost entirely on nation building and promoting subject citizenship.

One civics text states that “opposition is something not traditional among Africans. When we discuss, it is not to fight each other, but rather to reach an agreement. It is so in our families, it has been so in our tribes, thus it can and must be so in the enlarged family, the nation.” (Meienberg 1966, 30) Thus, critical citizenship is associated with violence, while subject citizenship is the traditional, natural way in which a citizen should interact with the state.

Since the political liberalization, civics education has, in theory, aimed to create knowledgeable, questioning citizens who show their affection for their country by critically examining its institutions. This contrast is evident just from a comparison of topics covered in the different civics textbooks. While the 1966 and 1969 texts include long, relatively dry descriptions of every major government function and job, from
ministers to local party chairmen, the 2001 text forgoes discussion of many uncontroversial government functions, such as finance, to focus on controversies in government policy and structure. For instance, the 2001 text discusses the relative merits of a first-past-the-post electoral system versus a proportional representation system. It also includes an extensive section about the media, which was hardly mentioned in the other books, heavily criticizing the government for its suppression of the media and free speech. Present in the 1966 and 1969 books, but lacking in the 2001 book, are frequent inspiring quotes from leaders, exhortations to sacrifice for the country, and carefully framed national historical narratives. The implication of these differences is that a good citizen in the ujamaa years was a “subject” of the state, whereas a good citizen today is a “participant” in the process of political change. (Okema 1996, 4) A good subject citizen was loyal to all leaders and state institutions; a good participant citizen shows his love of the country by critically demanding that it do better.

The historical narratives in the 1966 and 1969 texts carefully frame the past, picking and choosing facts in order to emphasize national unity and peace. Both try to establish a link to the past, such that the Tanzanian nation is not new, but rather is a natural continuation and expansion of the pre-colonial social and political structures. One text states that “God gave us a homeland,” as if to claim a primordial tie between the nation and the land. (Meienberg 1966, 5) Another, referring to the Ministry of Youth, Sports, and Culture’s attempts to create a national culture, states that “some [tribal] traditions are now forming a basis for the renaissance of original Tanzanian culture.” (Derksen 1969, 82) The text attempts to legitimize the land collectivization policy by tying it to pre-colonial customary law, noting that colonial laws “are being changed to
bring them into line with the traditional ideas of the people in Tanzania.” (Derksen 1969, 61) By establishing a strong connection to the pre-colonial past, while avoiding mention of particular groups, the official historical narrative generated legitimacy for the idea of nationhood.

The narrative of colonial history points to the party as the national hero while emphasizing its continual quest for unity and peaceful cooperation. One text explains TANU’s founding as “an effort to unite all the different parts of the country, to bring together all the small groups and individuals who had been fighting their lonely little battles against the foreign government and its imposed decisions.” (Meienberg 1966, 9) This passage emphasizes not only the importance of the party to independence, but also the futility of struggle by a single group if not united with the rest of the nation.

Civics education with regard to Zanzibar, however, was frequently an exception to the policy of minimizing divisions and promoting unity. It frequently emphasized the evils of Arab rule and glorified the Zanzibari Revolution without acknowledging the many Arab deaths associated with it. For instance, one book states that “Zanzibar came to independence with a government which represented only a minority of the people. The Revolution of January 12th 1964 corrected this.” (Meienberg 1966, 11) By emphasizing the evils committed by Arabs, who were supposedly being integrated and welcomed into the nation like all other citizens, passages like this hurt national unity. They increased the sense of victimhood and resentment on both sides of the conflict and legitimized divisions in the population. Most importantly, they retained the salience of race in Zanzibari politics, a decision which continues to haunt politics on the isles. This strategy of defining the Self against the Other – in this case Zanzibari Africans in contrast to
Zanzibari Arabs, their fellow citizens – was an undercurrent to all facets of Zanzibari politics. By creating an in-group and an out-group in Zanzibar, Tanzania abandoned its otherwise inclusive policies. The reason Zanzibar is less peaceful and unified than the rest of Tanzania is that the nation building project in Zanzibar was not implemented as extensively or as sincerely as it was on the mainland.

For better or worse, the era of nation building, at least in civics textbooks, is long over. In contrast to the *ujamaa* era narratives, the 2001 text makes no attempt to romanticize pre-colonial governance or to find the roots of modern democracy in chieftaincy: “In ancient tribal chieftaincies in Africa all government powers – executive, legislative and judicial – were fused in the hands of the chief and his council of elders.” (Mushi 2001, 2-3) Nyerere, in contrast to his usual lionization, is mentioned only occasionally. He seems no more important than a powerful party leader: “In colonial Tanganyika, the leading nationalist party was TANU under the fierce politician, Julius Kambarage Nyerere.” (Kiondo 2001, 64) Whereas the nation building narratives frequently described Nyerere as humble, kind, thoughtful, and a visionary, the post-liberalization narrative calls him a “fierce politician.” To the extent that national heroes represent role models for civic virtue, a narrative so critical that it abandons national myth-making altogether may create citizens too disillusioned to fulfill their roles as watchdogs and transformers of the political system.

The three civics books analyzed here are only a small, non-representative sample of the many texts available. It is likely that the changes in on-the-ground civics education are not as striking as those noted here, and are happening at a much slower rate. The professors at teachers’ colleges are likely only beginning to change their own syllabi, and
in the meantime, new teachers reflect old education policy. The lecture and drill mode of education that is still generally used is far more conducive toward promoting uncritical loyalty than critical examination. In addition, textbooks are neither easily affordable nor readily available, so no matter what books may be assigned, most students and teachers are probably reading from old books, if they have any textbooks at all. Finally, despite a major curriculum overhaul in recent years, the high-level commitment to changing educational policy is ambivalent at best. This ambivalence was at play in the government’s October 2005 banning of Hakielimu, an education reform non-profit that had criticized the government’s failure to improve access to education. (“Government Bans Education NGO” 2005) However slow the pace of change may be, it is obvious that the context of civics education today is vastly different than the context during the *ufamaa* era. The new focus on critical, participatory citizenship and the decreased attention to national pride and unity both reflects and affects the political climate today. Whether or not the peaceful political culture will survive this change remains to be seen.

**Charismatic Leadership and Nyerere as a National Symbol**

Goran Hyden argues that Julius Nyerere’s presidency was the most “symbolic” in all of Africa, carefully framing the nation building project with the goal of “re-making the entire nation into a super-community.” (Hyden and Williams 1994, 93) In fact, one of the most important unifying national symbols is Nyerere himself. His image provides an important model for Tanzanian identity and civic values. It is significant that Nyerere was Zanaki, a small, relatively poor ethnic group along the shore of Lake Victoria. Whereas Nyerere’s highly visible and charismatic leadership might have been polarizing had he come from one of the largest or most powerful ethnic groups, his membership in an
obscure group had the opposite effect. A member of an obscure group could not come to power on the strength of that group; therefore, Nyerere was the president not on the basis of his identity as a Zanaki, but on the basis of his identity as a Tanganyikan. His prior professions, a school teacher and a union organizer, further contributed to bridging ethnic divides, since both professions worked for the good of the nation as a whole rather than any particular group. Nyerere was so careful not to favor his own ethnic group that people from Mara, his home region, actually resented his leadership for not distributing an extra share of patronage spoils to them, when it was widely assumed that he did. (Okema 1996, 78) Just as people in every nation strive to emulate the values of their national heroes, Tanzanians following the example of Nyerere tend to reject parochialism.

Nyerere’s personal appearance helped to promote unity. Although Nyerere was known as a devout Catholic, he was frequently photographed wearing a *kofiya*, the traditional Muslim hat. (See, for example, *Looking Back on Ten Years of Arusha* 1977, cover) In this way he visibly blurred the lines of division between religions and reassured Muslims that they were as much a part of the nation as Christians. He also frequently carried a small chief’s staff. Aside from a symbol of leadership, it was a sign that he had not forgotten the roots of the nation and the enduring power of the chiefs, even as he pushed toward a vision of modernity that reduced the role of chiefs. Finally, his manner of dress, a simple Mao suit or later a safari suit, which the government recommended as attire for all men, promoted an ideal of sameness and equality across the nation.

Pictures of Nyerere hang in nearly every shop and sidewalk stall in the country. After his death in 1999, all the makers of *kangas*, Tanzania’s traditional cloth, printed
memorial kanga with his picture, which many households still own. His ubiquitous presence is a reminder of the values that he promoted. Most Tanzanians refer to Nyerere either as Mwalimu (teacher), or as Baba wa Taifa (father of the nation). Both referents show Nyerere as an honored, benevolent, paternal figure, suggesting that citizens should be grateful and obedient followers. This is a problem for reformers promoting participatory citizenship, and this attitude has created problems with the implementation of multi-partyism. The use of Nyerere as a symbol promotes national unity but offers little for contemporary reformers. Since he is no longer alive to speak for himself, it seems likely that political leaders will, at some point, attempt to appropriate his popularity for their own purposes, reframing his past statements in the context of current debates.

Polarization and the Law

The Tanzanian government has taken an active stance against the use of religion, ethnicity, or race in politics. During the ujamaa years, all of these topics were considered taboo in public life. Because all the media was government-controlled, the policies prohibiting divisive statements in public forums were easily enforced. Groups formed on the basis of ethnic or tribal affiliation were banned. The University of Dar es Salaam discouraged research about ethnicity. After 1967, the census no longer included ethnic or religious categories. (Tripp 1999, 43) By radically de-emphasizing sub-national group orientations in public life, the government did not diminish the power these groups held, but it did successfully relegate them to private life. Group conflicts in private life occur, of course, but as long as they can be resolved without being seen as political, public issues, they are unlikely to spread widely across the country.
Recognizing the importance of appearing to represent all groups in order to gain widespread legitimacy for the nationhood, the government instituted policies to ensure that it would always include a diverse group at its uppermost levels. TANU declared that it would alternate its presidential and vice-presidential candidates, with one from Zanzibar and one from the mainland in each election, a policy that also had the effect of encouraging religious balance. The electoral districts were planned to be large enough so that they were not dominated by any one ethnic group. Civil servants were posted outside their home regions and moved frequently to avoid the appearance of patronage (Tripp 1999, 44) As a result of these laws and policies, it was difficult to perceive of the government as anything other than national, although a preponderance of Christians in leadership roles was a persistent problem.

One of the ways the leadership attempted to prevent divisions was by creating equal opportunities for all groups in schools. The government instituted school quotas that specified that equal percentages of different groups must be admitted to schools. It also nationalized all schools because under colonialism, more than half the schools were run by churches, which contributed to the Muslim education gap. (Okema 1996, 82) One of the challenges today is that even where opportunities were successfully equalized, the differences in where different groups started from have resulted in highly unequal outcomes, with some areas of the country much more developed than others. Whether citizens interpret these inequalities as a sign of government favoritism or as the unintentional consequences of development challenges depends largely on how they, and whichever leaders they trust, frame the issue. Thus, while legal requirements can help to
lessen inequalities, the citizens’ responses to inevitable slights and inequalities depend on how they are accustomed to framing issues.

The reason offered by many of the approximately 80% of Tanzanians who opposed the introduction of multi-partyism was that they feared that political competition would result in violence and conflict. The Political Parties Act of 1992, which introduced multi-partyism, included several provisions designed to prevent that from happening. Political parties had to be mass parties: they needed to have at least 200 members from each of at least 10 regions, at least one of which had to be on Unguja and one of which had to be on Pemba. They could not advocate the dissolution of the Union between Zanzibar and the mainland, could not support the use of violence in politics, and could not be organized along ethnic, religious, or racial lines. (Fisher 2003, 123)

Laws prohibiting divisiveness have simultaneously become more difficult to enforce, now that the media has been liberalized, and more important, now that there are many political parties. In competitive politics, the temptation to gain supporters through ethnic, racial, or religious scape-goating has increased dramatically. In a bid for political support in the 1990s, Rev. Christopher Mtikila, head of the Democratic Party, led his supporters to riot against Asians in Dar es Salaam. He also launched verbal attacks on Muslims. Unfortunately, this form of competition is likely to continue. Fortunately, it does not seem to have the support of the Tanzanian population, as most strongly disavow such behavior.

**Conclusion**

One of the most important effects of the nation building project was to create a cross-cutting national identity. The high tensions on Zanzibar are largely attributable to
the congruence of most forms of identity, including class, race, and political party, and
the lack of cross-cutting identities. (Lofchie 1965, 268-9) *This congruence contributes to polariztion and lowers the incentives for cooperation with other groups.* Mainland
Tanzania could have been in a similar situation: ethnic groups are relatively congruent
with religion, class, education level, and sometimes profession and political party. By
successfully establishing a cross-cutting national identity, the government reduced the
legitimacy of sub-group polarization and lowered the barriers to cooperation among sub-
groups. In this way, Tanzania’s relative peace is a legacy of the nation building project.

With the rise of independent media and other forms of non government-
sanctioned political expression, the ability of the government and its ruling party to
control national discourse has diminished considerably. Besides independent Tanzanian
voices, much of the new discourse comes either from foreign governments or from
Tanzanians with foreign financial backers. For instance, the civics curricula used during
the 1970s was written in the Ministry of Education and was heavily influenced by
government propaganda. By 2001, the newest secondary civics textbook on the market
was written by several prominent Tanzanian scholars, mostly from the University of Dar
es Salaam, and backed financially by the Danish Development Agency. Far from
extolling the virtues of Tanzanian policy, the book frequently criticizes the Tanzanian
government, both in its actions and in its constitutionally mandated makeup. Today, there
are many more voices in the political debate. Whether this will translate into a reasoned
debate between several legitimate viewpoints, a chance for extremists to gain followers,
or a lot of white noise that the ruling party can simply ignore, remains to be seen. It is,
however, significant that the government is no longer able to control even its own
message. While conceptions of Tanzanian nationhood will continue to change, the
planned nation building project is over. The extent to which it was successful in creating
a nation of peaceful, unified citizens will be seen in the next chapter.
Chapter 5: The Opinions of the Rising Elite

This thesis has discussed in detail the history and tools of Tanzanian nation building, and has singled out the nation building project as playing a unique role in Tanzania’s peaceful development. This project set Tanzania on a peaceful path, defining national identity so successfully that opponents of government policy must frame their grievances and arguments in terms of this TANU-shaped identity. This thesis has described how nation building was integrated into the social, political, and economic institutions of *ujamaa* and the one-party state. However, the Tanzania of today is not the country of *ujamaa* or single party politics. If the nation building project truly played an important role in sustaining peace in Tanzania, can peace continue in the absence of the institutions that defined the nation?

This question is not merely academic: the rapid changes in Africa since the imposition of SAPs in the 1980s and the end of the Cold War in 1990 have brought both tremendous opportunities and cataclysmic risks. Even previously stable countries have been torn apart by parochial tensions, opportunistic warlords, and political party divisions. Thus far, Tanzania has managed to avoid major violent incidents, but many observers see cracks in the veneer of peacefulness and unity. Are the conflicts that have occurred recently simply the growing pains of a nation adjusting to a newly competitive order, or are these conflicts harbingers of a collapse? In order to understand whether Tanzania truly is on a self-propagating path of peacefulness and stability, it is necessary to examine the attitudes of those who have grown up since the end of the nation building project. The opinions of today’s young adults, the first generation to grow up since the
dismantling of the *ujamaa* and single party institutions, offer the first glimpse of what path Tanzania will take in the coming years.

In order to determine the views of the youth, I conducted a survey of first degree students at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM). While these survey respondents obviously do not represent all Tanzanian youth, they do represent Tanzania’s rising elite. Today’s UDSM students are tomorrow’s political leaders, businessmen, professors, and NGO executives. The extent to which they are committed to peacefulness and pluralism in the public sphere will have an outsized effect on the direction of Tanzanian society as a whole. This chapter attempts to build a profile of the UDSM students who most strongly support and most strongly oppose the use of violence in politics. Although such a profile can in no way account for every person’s views, nor can it prove which students would actually engage in violence, it can give a general idea of which groups are or are not firmly committed to peaceful resolution of political conflicts. With this information, it will be possible to examine these profiled groups in the context of Tanzanian society and recent political events. How does the political culture among the most pro- and anti-violence groups differ from the political culture of the elite youth population in general? The answer to this question will illustrate how political culture contributes to Tanzania’s peace.

**Methodology**

This survey was conducted at the University of Dar es Salaam from May 10 – May 13, 2005. I administered the survey in a written questionnaire to Tanzanian first degree students at the university. (See Appendix B) I solicited survey respondents in the campus cafeterias over the course of two lunch periods and two dinner periods. Because virtually
all first degree students eat at the cafeterias, and I solicited respondents by asking every single Tanzanian student in the cafeteria at the time to fill out a survey, I can make a tentative claim to having obtained a random sampling of the UDSM undergraduate student population. Moreover, approximately half to two-thirds of the students accepted the questionnaire, and of the 500 questionnaires distributed to them, 457 were completed and returned. This response rate is high enough to suggest a fairly robust sampling of students.

The survey scored relatively well on available measures of validity as well. There should have been approximately equal numbers of first, second, and third year student respondents (and fewer fourth year respondents, since most degrees only take three years), and in fact, there were 110 first year students, 98 second year students, and 117 third year students. The gender breakdown of the survey respondents – 22% female and 78% male – is significantly off from the overall undergraduate gender breakdown of 37% female to 63% male because a larger percentage of females refused to take the survey. (Ministry of Science, Technology, and Higher Education 2005, 1) This gender difference may reflect cultural norms that encourage men to be more outgoing than women. However, because gender is not one of the variables under study, this flaw in the survey population does not invalidate the survey. Unfortunately, there is no official data on religious or ethnic enrollment, but data from a UDSM student survey conducted in the year 2000 indicates that approximately 85% of students are Christians and 14% are Muslims. (FCM Tracer Survey, 1) My survey population had equal percentages of this important variable – 84.3% Christians and 14.8% Muslims – which suggests that the data is valid. Although the survey population is probably not a completely accurate
representation of the UDSM undergraduate population, it appears to be representative enough to provide a valid picture of student views toward violence.

The survey had 41 questions, from which three indicators of tolerance for violence in politics were drawn. The first indicator is a pair of statements on a five-point Likert scale: “It is never okay to use violence in politics,” and “It is sometimes necessary to use violence in support of a just cause.” Answers to these questions are the most basic indicator of how tolerant respondents are of hypothetical violence.

The second indicator is a set of four questions on a Likert scale concerning the expected violence in Zanzibar during the 2005 presidential election: “If the 2005 election results are disputed, the losing side must not be violent;” “If the 2005 election results are disputed, violence is the only way the losing side might achieve fair results;” “If the 2005 election results are disputed, the losing side must make sure its supporters are not violent;” and “The police and army must prevent violence, even if this means restricting people’s rights.” The index of these questions indicates how strongly respondents feel that violence must be prevented, and at what cost. A score of four indicates the lowest tolerance of violence possible on the index, whereas a score of twenty indicates the highest possible tolerance of violence. This indicator is superior to the hypothetical questions in that most people believed that the election results would be disputed, so their answers reflected their tolerance for violence in a current, relevant situation. However, the specificity of this situation meant that people who had closer ties to the conflict – Zanzibaris and CUF supporters in particular – were more likely to have a violent, real life response, whereas those groups that were farther from the conflict responded in a more hypothetical manner.
The third indicator of tolerance of violence is an index of four questions about what respondents would do if the government took various coercive and anti-democratic actions: “Told you which religion to follow;” “Closed down newspapers that criticized the government;” “Suspended the National Assembly and cancelled the next election;” and “Interfered with results of an election so that the losing candidate was declared the winner.” Respondents were given five options: Do nothing, support the government, support an opposition party, join a non-violent protest, or join a violent resistance group. These questions were combined into a four point index, with respondents receiving one point for each response in which they would join a violent resistance group. The strength of this measure is that it determines whether respondents would respond violently to specific government actions that are almost-universally recognized as being tyrannical or anti-democratic. The weakness is that the percentage of people who assert that they would join a violent resistance group is probably significantly higher than the percentage that would actually do so if the situation occurred.

Because a questionnaire is not a reliable method of finding out whether respondents would actually *engage in violence*, these three indicators are designated as measures of *tolerance of violence* in politics. Respondents who score high on them would not necessarily engage in violence themselves, and they might even disapprove of violence that occurred. However, they accept that in some cases violence is justifiable or necessary, in contrast to the part of the population that rejects political violence in all circumstances. A high tolerance of violence does not signal that the country is teetering on the edge of explosive conflict, but it does signal that the political culture has shifted. When a low tolerance of violence is central to the political culture, citizens immediately
disassociate themselves from violent incidents or demagogues, making sustained or widespread conflict all but impossible. As tolerance of violence rises, sustained or widespread violent conflict becomes possible.

**Views on Violence**

The central question in this thesis is whether Tanzanians will actively support, passively tolerate, or actively oppose the use of violence for political ends, and why. Questions of violence are close to the hearts of many Tanzanians. Two-thirds of survey respondents indicate concern about Tanzania’s most prominent example of violence in politics, the Zanzibari elections. (Figures 2-7, Appendix A, 112-114) On the index of attitudes towards election violence in Zanzibar, students show a rigorous, but not single-minded, opposition to violence in politics. For example, a respondent who opposes every dimension of violence addressed in the question, but not strongly, will receive an 8 on the index. A respondent who has no opinion about three of the dimensions and agrees, but not strongly, with one dimension of violence will receive a score of 16 on the index. Considering only the respondents who score 16 or above on the index, only 7.1% of the population shows substantial support for violence in Zanzibari politics. The majority of the respondents fall somewhere in the middle of the index, with 60.2% scoring between eight and twelve. (Figure 8, Appendix A, 115) These scores suggest that, although most respondents are unwilling to demand peace and order without exception, they are decisively opposed violence. This anti-violence sentiment is evident in the leftward lean of the normal curve.

The most ambiguous response to the Zanzibar violence questions is when respondents are faced with a tradeoff between suppressing violence and curtailing civil
rights. (Figure 5, Appendix A, 113) Fewer than 40% are willing to give up rights in exchange for peace, while nearly half oppose making that tradeoff. This disagreement among students mirrors a debate in established democracies over how the extent to which civil liberties should be traded for security. Despite strongly opposing the use of violence in politics, UDSM students are largely unwilling to trade their rights for peace.

In addition to their qualified support for peace, many UDSM students are – or claim to be – prepared to fight against the government to defend freedom and democracy, should it become necessary. Presented with four hypothetical situations of anti-democratic or tyrannical action by the government, 44.6% of respondents indicate a willingness to engage in violence in response to at least one form of government coercion. This is nearly half the survey population that is open to the idea of personally joining a militant group. Religious coercion generates the strongest response from both Christians and Muslims. Overall, 83.7% of respondents say they would respond in some way to government attempts to control religion, 29% violently. Following close behind, 79.1% would respond to the government changing the election results, 26.3% violently. 79.7% would respond to government closing newspapers that printed things it did not agree with, 22.2% violently. Only 71.4% would respond to government closing parliament and canceling the next election, 21.3% violently. These results suggest that Tanzanians across religions feel most strongly about their religious freedoms, followed closely by an opposition to the government tampering with election results.

It should be noted, however, that most of the 44.6% of the respondents who indicate a willingness to participate in violent opposition to at least one of these forms of anti-democratic governmental coercion are unlikely to engage in actual violence in the
foreseeable future. It might be possible to engage some of that 44.6% in violence on occasion, if they were attending a protest that turned violent, for example. However, sustained involvement in a violent movement is not undertaken so lightly. Checking a box on a survey is a private act requiring little thought and no commitment. Actually participating in sustained violence and becoming affiliated with a group that engages in violence is a public act requiring great commitment and a willingness to sacrifice one’s own reputation or even life.

The willingness of that 44.6% of respondents to engage in violence in response to anti-democratic behavior by the government is called further into question by the fact that some recent actions by the government resemble the government behavior in the question, yet there has been little student support for militant movements. For example, many CUF supporters believe that the government interfered with the results of the Zanzibari presidential election in 1995, 2000, or 2005 such that CCM’s losing candidate was declared the winner. Despite the violence that occurred surrounding these disputed elections, the vast majority of citizens were not involved. This suggests that the 26.3% of respondents who believe they would protest violently were overstating their response. Likewise, when the government shut down several independent media outlets in the fall of 2005, there was virtually no response from citizens, despite the 22.2% who claimed that they would join a violent opposition group if the government attacked the news media. Although this data may not be accurate in estimating the percentage of students who would actually join violent opposition groups, it is useful in pointing out that nearly half of the respondents consider the use of political violence in defense of a just cause to
be not just one legitimate course of action, but also, in some cases, the right course of action.

In the general Tanzanian population, opposition to the hypothetical use of violence is strong. More than half of respondents to the 2003 Afrobarometer survey, which surveyed Tanzanian adults about a wide variety of topics, strongly agreed with the statement, “The use of violence is never justified in Tanzanian politics,” and 77.2% agreed or strongly agreed. This question was contrasted with an opposite statement, “In this country, violence is sometimes necessary in pursuit of a just cause.” Only 8.7% strongly agreed with that statement, with a total of 22.7% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Not only does this imply a rigorous disapproval of violence, but it also suggests that the peaceful political culture has not yet broken down in the general population.

However, responses by UDSM students in 2005 to the same statements, this time phrased as two separate questions rather than opposite sides of the same question, received a sharply different response. In the UDSM student survey, only 66.3% of students agreed that violence is never justified, and 53.6% agreed that violence is sometimes necessary. Putting aside the ambivalence of the many students who chose mutually exclusive answers to these questions, we see that over half of UDSM students believe that violence is sometimes necessary in politics, which is more than double the percentage who believe that in the general population.

Why do students appear to be so much more accepting of violence than the general population? There were no major political events between the undertaking of the Afrobarometer survey in 2003 and the UDSM survey in 2005 that are likely to have
caused a major shift in opinion nationally. This suggests that the student population is in some way different from the general population. Controlling for the most obvious ways students are different – age, income, and level of education – does not substantially affect attitudes toward violence. The 2003 Afrobarometer survey found no relationship at all between age and attitude toward violent conflict in politics. Answers were nearly identical between age groups. Both household income and education have a significant relationship with attitude toward violence in politics. As income and education increase, opposition to violence decreases. However, these correlations are quite small. (Tanzania Afrobarometer Data 2003) Wealthier and better educated people still, by a wide margin, oppose violence in politics under any circumstances, according to the Afrobarometer data.

Aside from age, income, and education level, there must be something distinctive about the beliefs of these students, another phenomenon at work besides their elite youth status. This phenomenon is a shift in the political culture. This shift has begun to affect the elite student population but has not yet reached the general population. While such a shift is difficult to prove conclusively, this chapter will point to evidence of a weakening in many of the factors that hold together Tanzanian political culture. With the weakening of the political culture, the feedback loop between peace and some parts of the political culture is undermined, and it is more difficult for Tanzania to remain on its peaceful path. The next section of this chapter will attempt to profile the respondents who are most tolerant of violence.
Which demographic groups are most tolerant of violence?

Religious affiliation is an extremely important factor in attitudes towards violence. In response to the four questions about how to respond to anti-democratic behavior by the government, 57.6% of Christians reject the use of violence in all four responses, while only 45.3% of Muslims reject violence in all responses. However, in responding to three of these questions, there is no significant difference between the religious groups. On questions about protecting democratic institutions – if the government closed newspapers, suspended the National Assembly, or manipulated election results – Muslims and Christians respond approximately equally. Thus, Muslims are no more or less militant on civic matters.

Religious affiliation, however, is significantly related to how respondents would react to government attempts to control religion, with a correlation of Cramer’s V= .188**. In the sample, 43.9% of Muslims say they would respond violently to a government attempt to dictate which religion they could follow, compared to only 25.4% of Christians. At first glance, this would seem to suggest that Muslims are more likely to perceive their religion as being under threat than Christians. This conclusion is logical, since better developed areas of Tanzania are disproportionately Christian, and few Muslims are members of the political elite. Tanzanians could easily conclude that, were the government to favor one religion, it would likely be Christianity. (Note that this survey was undertaken while Benjamin Mkapa, a Christian, was president. It is possible that the answers would change if the survey were given today under the presidency of Jakaya Kikwete, a Muslim.) Interestingly, however, more Muslims state that they would

---

1 Cramer’s V is a measure of correlation between two nominal variables or one nominal and one ordinal variable. Its value is between 0 and 1.
2 One asterisk signifies significance at the .05 level. Two asterisks signify significance at the .01 level.
support the government or would do nothing in response to a government attempt to control religion than do Christians. Since the 84.9% of Christians who would respond in some way is actually greater than the 78.7% of Muslims who would respond to such a government action, it is difficult to argue that Muslims take the threat of government religious control more seriously than Christians.

Having rejected the reasoning that Christians are blasé about government religious coercion, we must consider other potential reasons why Muslims would defend religious freedom with greater militancy than Christians. First, the current political climate throughout the Muslim world is one of a way of life under threat. Even in Tanzania, where religious interactions have been largely peaceful and tolerant, increasingly strident tones of some fundamentalist Muslim religious leaders may be leading Muslim youth toward greater militancy. However, finding another finding discussed later about how religious leaders influence militant attitudes, particularly among Muslims, casts doubt on this explanation. Second, Muslim religious teachings stress defense of the faith, through war if necessary. While war has also played a central role in Christian history, Christian biblical teachings focus on turning the other cheek. The centrality of Muslim self-defense to Koranic teachings may play a role in this religious disparity in attitudes. Third, a greater percentage of Muslim respondents than Christian respondents may be highly religious or may consider religion as central to their identity.

Despite the relatively unified national political culture of years past, Tanzanian political culture differs slightly within each sub-culture. This question uncovers some of the reasons behind the distinct flavor of the Islamic political culture in Tanzania: the
Muslim obligation to defend Islam; the perceived favoritism for Christians; the tensions between fundamentalist Islam and a more permissive African Islam; the tensions between Muslim Zanzibar and the mostly Christian mainland; Swahili Islam’s historical roots in the slave-trade; the contrast between centrally organized Christian denominations and essentially autonomous Muslim religious communities; the conflict between a pluralist, secular state and Muslim religious teachings that demand a Muslim state; and many more. Unlike citizens of much of the Islamic world, most Tanzanian Muslims are strongly anchored in Tanzania’s secular political culture. However, to the extent that Muslims and Christians show different levels of support for violence in politics, this different flavor of the Tanzanian political culture is an important reason why.

Muslims are significantly more tolerant of election violence in Zanzibar than Christians. Only part of this relationship can be explained by the greater proportion of Muslim CUF supporters. On the Zanzibar violence index, Christian CCM supporters score a mean of 9.24 compared to 10.17 for Muslim CCM supporters. Christian CUF supporters score a mean of 11.86 compared to 13.43 for Muslim CUF supporters. Although the number of cases available is too small for statistical significance, this data adds to the ambiguity over whether or not that the Muslim population in general is more tolerant of violence than the Christian population. More research on this highly important question is necessary.

While different religious groups show distinctly different levels of militancy, ethnic differences do not appear to have the same effect. There is no significant correlation between ethnic group affiliation and likelihood of engaging in violence in response to government tyranny. This is an encouraging result because it suggests that,
while pockets of militancy may exist, they are not concentrated within a specific ethnic group, thus lowering the likelihood of mobilizing that group for violent conflict. Ethnic differences do not seem to correlate with dimensions of political outlook, such as interest in politics or optimism about the motives of political leaders. Although it is undoubtedly the case that certain views are more prevalent in certain ethnic groups, among the survey sample, the large ethnic groups that formed a substantial enough portion of the survey sample to be compared do not significantly differ from each other in their responses. The lack of significant variation among ethnic groups in attitudes toward violence suggests that Tanzanian national political culture is prevalent nation-wide, and militancy has not taken hold among particular ethnic groups.

Surprisingly, there is no significant gender variation in attitudes toward violence. Despite the stereotype of young men stirring up conflict while women support peace, both sexes score approximately equally on all indicators of tolerance for violence, including the questions about whether they would personally join a violent movement. This finding should be taken with a grain of salt; experience and research suggest that most civil violence is undertaken by men. Nevertheless, the surprising level of support for violence from women suggests that the cause of violence today is less about a latent aggressiveness frequently associated with young men and more about a society-wide attitude. This attitude, which determines support for violence equally for men and women, is political culture.

**Does support for a political party affect tolerance of violence?**

The political party that a respondent supports is probably the most important variable in determining his or her tolerance of violence. In regressions for every indicator
of tolerance for violence, all other demographic variables fade into insignificance when political party is included. Despite the small sample of supporters of opposition parties, the significance of this variable easily overwhelms the other important variables, including religious affiliation and Zanzibar as a region of origin.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the factor with the strongest relationship to the Zanzibar election violence index is political party. With a gamma of \(-0.479^{**}\), this is among the strongest correlations found by this survey.\(^3\) With a mean score on the index of 9.37, CCM supporters are far less likely to support violence than members of other parties, particularly CUF members, who have a mean score of 13. Out of 147 CCM respondents, only one scores higher than 16 on the index. This contrasts with 31.7% of CUF supporters who score above 16 on the index. Since CUF has been accused of fomenting much of the violence, it is logical that CUF supporters would be more likely to consider that violence justified. Nonetheless, the high acceptance of violence among CUF supporters is alarming.

Data from the 2003 Afrobarometer supports the conclusion that support for CUF is closely related to support for political violence. On first inspection, religion appears to be an important explanatory variable. Only 68.8% of Muslims agree that violence is never acceptable, compared to 82.9% of Catholics, 77.2% of mainline Protestants, and 80% of evangelical Protestants. However, this relationship disappears completely after controlling for political party. Party is an important determinant of attitude toward violence, responsible for nearly a quarter of the variation in attitudes toward violence. Among CCM members, 81.4% oppose violence in politics. Among CUF members, only

\(^3\) Gamma is a measure of the correlation between two ordinal level variables or one ordinal and one nominal variable. Its value can be between -1 and 1.
48.8% oppose violence in politics, while 51.1% believe that violence is sometimes justified. This is not a simple case of cause and effect. CUF draws its support from groups that are frequently among the most alienated from society, and therefore more disposed towards violence. However, it is also likely that supporting a party that feels unfairly disenfranchised can lead to justifying violence as the only way of reaching CUF’s political goals. Thus, membership in CUF is both a cause and an effect of believing political violence is justifiable. About 70.2% of supporters of other opposition parties reject any role for violence in politics, a lower rate than CCM supporters, but significantly higher than CUF. (Tanzania Afrobarometer Data 2003)

The most interesting aspect of this finding is not that many CUF supporters are militant, a finding which could be inferred from reading any newspaper article about the Zanzibari election, but rather that very few CCM supporters are militant. In part, this is because supporters of the ruling party feel secure and unthreatened by the relatively weak opposition parties. Just as important, however, is that for nearly forty years, there was virtually no distinction between the ruling party and the government. Among CCM supporters today, that association continues. A vote for the ruling party is not necessarily a vote for particular policies. Rather, it is a vote of confidence in the peaceful political culture. Thus, the people for whom political culture has remained constant are those most committed to retaining peace above all else.

**Are civic-minded people more or less tolerant of violence?**

This question attempts to address the shifting political orientations of young Tanzanians: Are respondents who have adopted a more participatory orientation more tolerant of violence than those who retain the old subject political orientation? The
answer is a qualified yes. Citizens who have participated or would consider participating in certain civic activities are somewhat more likely to tolerate violence than those who have never participated. However, this relationship does not hold true for all civic activities. The most significant relationship is between taking part in a strike and tolerance of violence. The correlation between choosing a violent response to government coercion and taking part in a strike is relatively strong, with a gamma of .342**. The relationship between agreeing that violence is sometimes necessary and joining a strike is also moderately strong, with a gamma of .254**. Among students who have participated in a strike, only 17.0% agree that violence is never acceptable, compared to 41.3% who disagree. Among students who would never consider joining a strike, 51.9% agree that violence is never acceptable, compared to 33.8% who disagree. In other words, the portion of the population that would participate in a strike is relatively tolerant of violence. The relationship between attending a demonstration and tolerating violence is similar, reflecting the frequent concurrence of strikes and demonstrations.

This strike-violence relationship is a matter of concern since, unlike many other civic activities, striking is an activity that many students have experienced first-hand. 21.9% of students report joining in a strike, many of whom no doubt participated in the major student strike at UDSM in the spring of 2004. At the time this survey was given, speculation was rife that there would be another student strike. During the 2004 student strike, several students who had chosen not to participate were dragged from their dorm rooms, beaten up, and forced to join the strike. Strikes are not inherently violent, but they frequently degenerate into violence. Thus, it is of concern that so many strikers are tolerant of violence.
Strikes have been a frequent occurrence in UDSM history and are deeply embedded in student political culture. Although they are a means of taking forceful action against the status quo, they do not necessarily signify a participatory political orientation. Rather, strikes are one of the most common means by which Tanzanians in a subject political culture have stood up against the government for their own interests. If a subject citizen conforms to authority and a participant citizen contributes to authority, then striking is a dangerous middle ground – a way for citizens to confront authority when they do not have a voice. Students who have neither settled into a participant political orientation nor remained in a subject orientation are thus the most likely to turn to confrontational political action.

Students who have embraced traditional democratic means of civic involvement – those who are the most participant oriented – are only very slightly more likely to tolerate violence than those who have not. For example, those who have joined or might join a political party are no more tolerant of violence than those who would never join. As another test of this finding, four activities were selected that would require citizens to be personally identified in opposition to the status quo: signing a petition, writing a letter to a newspaper, posting a public statement on campus (a common form of political speech at UDSM), and contacting an elected representative. In regressions comparing respondents who say they would never participate in any of these activities with those who say they have done or might do them, these civic involvement variables offer virtually no explanation of tolerance for violence. Since these activities represent some of the most common ways that citizens with a participant political orientation take part in
politics, the lack of relationship suggests that political orientation does not affect tolerance of violence.

The conclusion to be drawn from these two conflicting findings is that students who have found a way to express their dissent through liberal democratic institutions of political involvement are no more likely to tolerate violence than students who disassociate themselves from the political process entirely. The students most likely to tolerate violence are those who feel a need to speak politically, but who feel their voice is not heard except through confrontation. This confirms the hypothesis that those whose political orientation is in flux are the most likely to engage in violent conflict.

Having examined the relationship between hypothetical civic activities and tolerance of violence, we will now examine actual civic activities during a recent political event. Because survey respondents are relatively young and the last nation-wide election occurred nearly five years prior to the survey, many of the respondents had not yet been eligible to vote or take part in political activities as of the previous election. Therefore, asking them about their political activities in a national election would have been largely irrelevant. For that reason, the survey included several questions about their involvement in the Dar University Student Organization (DARUSO) student government campaign that had taken place the previous month. DARUSO elections are relatively good indicators of future political involvement because they are taken very seriously by students. Student politics at UDSM have been the source of national crises in the past, including several strikes and closings of the University, so students recognize the potential impact of DARUSO’s policies. Campaigns are hard fought, and they feature the same mix of policy proposals, voter outreach, patronage promises, and character attacks.
as competitive national politics. Over 80% of survey respondents report having voted in the DARUSO election. The involvement of respondents in the DARUSO election provides a window into the civic culture among the rising elite.

Over half of the respondents report discussing the issues of the DARUSO campaign. Surprisingly, this percentage is almost exactly the same among voters and non-voters, suggesting that even many of the students who chose not to vote were civically engaged. Nearly one out of every five respondents report working on a campaign, a high number given that most students are already busy keeping up with schoolwork. More than 40% of respondents report taking part in one election-related activity, and another 42.9% took part in two or three activities. Only 2.2% of respondents report having no form of involvement with the election. This high rate of participation suggests that students are civically engaged and will participate in political activity when the opportunity arises. In the DARUSO election, students perceive the impact that political decisions will have on their lives. They believe they can impact the political process without putting themselves at risk of disfavor with powerful government elites. As the avenues for meaningful political participation in national politics grow, this enthusiasm for civic involvement is likely to translate to increased involvement in Tanzanian politics.

Involvement in DARUSO campaigns is one of the few factors identified in this survey that varies by ethnic group but not by religion. There is virtually no difference between the campaign participation of Muslims and Christians. However, certain ethnic groups participated a great deal more than others. For instance, the Sukuma participated in an average of 2.65 campaign activities, and the Nyakyusa in 2.76 activities, while the
Chagga participated in only 1.95 activities on average. This difference may, in part, be attributable to which particular candidates were running. Perhaps several Sukuma candidates were running, so their Sukuma friends became quite involved. However, it may be that certain ethnic groups consider campus political activity to be the province of other groups. In particular, the Chagga may be less involved with DARUSO activity because of their history of being less involved in national politics compared to other prominent ethnic groups. Although students were likely aware of which candidates came from which ethnic groups, ethnic affiliation was not an issue in the campaign.

Civic involvement during the DARUSO campaign is only slightly related to tolerance of violence. Scores on the index of overall campaign involvement do not correlate at all with any of the violence indicators. Considering each activity separately, a few forms of campaign involvement are related to violence. Working on a candidate’s campaign has the most consistently significant effects. For instance, 39% of DARUSO campaign workers strongly agree that violence is sometimes necessary, compared to only 18.7% of non-campaign workers. (Figure 9, Appendix A, 115) This correlation yields a gamma of -.259**, suggesting that students who became involved in campaigns are somewhat more tolerant of violence than students who did not. Since students who worked on campaigns are not significantly more likely to be Zanzibari, Muslim, or members of an opposition party, this finding suggests that the DARUSO campaign workers represent a distinct subset of the population that is tolerant of violence. The characteristic these campaign workers have in common is a desire to be actively involved in the political process over a sustained period of time. Thus, they represent the politically moderate section of the student population that is both participation-oriented
and tolerant of violence. By defying easy demographic explanations, these attitudes best exemplify the shift in political culture among the entire student population.

**What shapes the political opinions of those who tolerate violence?**

This section examines the responses to a list of potential influences on students’ political opinions and involvement, and which of these influences correlate with tolerance of violence. A series of several questions asked how much respondents’ opinions about and involvement in politics were affected by the following factors: parents, religious leaders, ethnic or tribal leaders, the Great Lakes Conflict, political conditions, economic conditions, personal reflection, and statements by political parties and officials. (Figure 10, Appendix A, 116) Since this thesis attempts to explain how ideas regarding violence in politics have been shaped, it makes sense to correlate the answers to this question of influences with the answers to questions about violence. By examining which factors most strongly influenced the political views of those who reject violence compared to the factors that influenced the views of those who accept violence, it is possible to see which influences shape violence-tolerant political culture.

I found that there is no correlation between attitude toward violence and the influence of several of the factors: statements by ethnic leaders, political parties, parents’ views, and personal reflection have no effect on how respondents feel about violence in politics. In response to the statement “violence is sometimes necessary,” the significant correlations are all from the issue-based influences – the Great Lakes Conflict and political and economic situation of the country – rather than the personal relationship-based influences, such as parents or leaders. Respondents who were most heavily influenced by issues are most likely to agree that violence is sometimes necessary. For
instance, the relationship between the economic situation as a strong influence on personal opinion and the belief that violence is sometimes necessary is significant, with gamma = -.163**. In other words, respondents whose views were shaped by Tanzania’s economic situation are more likely to tolerate violence. Likewise, those heavily influenced by the political situation are more likely to agree that violence is sometimes necessary, with gamma = -.213**. Those most influenced by the statements of political parties and their leaders are also most likely to agree, with gamma = -.130*.

These results provide an interesting insight: while parochial influences are often seen as igniting violence, in this case they have little or no effect on the willingness to engage in violent conflict. Instead, that willingness is greatest among those who have given the issues the most serious consideration. This may reflect a trend that we see in the world today, that violence comes not from sentiments whipped up out of nothing by extremists, but rather is rooted in the frustration and disenchantment of the most passionate political observers.

The influence and lack of influence of some factors on political views is surprising. Overall, 25.3% of respondents say that the Great Lakes Conflict influenced their political views “a lot”, and 39.6% say it had at least “some” influence. These percentages rank fairly high as compared to other influences. For instance, only 14.5% say that their parents had a lot of influence on their views, even though Tanzanians greatly value family relationships and respect for parents is deeply ingrained in the culture. Only 13.3% say that their religious leaders had a lot of influence on their views, despite the high level of religiosity in the country, and the importance political leaders place on gaining support from religious communities. Only 7% say that tribal leaders
influenced their views a lot, reflecting the disdain of this generation of elites for traditional leadership, which many see as an anti-democratic relic of a bygone era.

In establishing national identity, comparisons between one’s own nation and foreigners, particularly neighboring countries, become very important. In Tanzania’s region, the Rwandan Genocide of 1994 and the subsequent, long-running Great Lakes conflict weighed heavily on the consciousness of the nation. The tragic events were both a call to conscience, as when bodies of massacred Rwandans began surfacing on the Tanzanian shore of Lake Tanganyika, and a tangible issue, when hundreds of thousands of Central African refugees fled into Tanzania and remained in refugee camps for over a decade. The contrast between the relative harmony in Tanzania and the sectarian bloodshed just across the border could not have been starker. How did this contrast influence Tanzanian national self-definition and attitudes toward violence? Traditionally, genocide and warfare is thought to beget more instability and warfare, as when the Rwandan Genocide spilled over into the DRC. However, the implications of this thesis are that in the Tanzanian case, the opposite was true. Tanzanians watched the unfolding violence in horror and felt particularly grateful to be members of a peaceful, harmonious nation. This entailed a recommitment to their own Tanzanian identity. Defining themselves in contrast to the violent Other is an example of the phenomenon noted in the introduction to this thesis, Tanzanians’ propensity to define themselves as impoverished, “but at least...[living in] peace.”

The Great Lakes Conflict affected not only Tanzanians’ self-perception, but also, for many, their attitudes toward violence. Respondents who say that the conflict influenced their views on politics are more likely to believe that violence is sometimes
necessary and less likely to believe that violence is never acceptable. In the survey population, 68.3% of respondents who were strongly influenced by the Great Lakes Conflict agree that it is sometimes necessary to use violence in support of a just cause, as compared to only 47.6% of those who were not at all influenced by the conflict. (Figure 11, Appendix A, 116) Presumably, that 68.3% is not supporting the genocidaires and the necessity of using violence against rival groups in society. This interpretation is supported by answers to another question in the survey, in which respondents were asked how to deal with inequality in Tanzanian society. In the inequality question, there is no significant difference between the responses of the group that was influenced by the Great Lakes Conflict and the group that was not; both groups reject violent attacks on the most powerful groups by about 95% to 5%. Thus, if the Great Lakes Conflict-influenced group is more disposed toward violence, it is not balkanized, identity group based conflict that they support. Quite likely, these respondents instead support the necessity of groups such as the Rwandan Patriotic Front, the Tutsi army that fought its way into Rwanda in 1994 and stopped the genocide, or Tanzania’s 1979 invasion of Uganda. If this interpretation is correct, these people are realists who support the necessity of occasional violence to prevent more devastating violence. This interpretation does not suggest a more militarized population, but rather a redefinition of what is necessary in order to live in peace. This is an example of how Tanzanians are redefining political culture to fit the realities of a new era, without compromising their essential commitment to peace.

Further research on would be worthwhile on whether it is possible for the government to frame a conflict in a neighboring country such that the citizens of the first
country are actually less likely to engage in violence, rather than more so. If this is, indeed, a matter of framing the issue, then studying Tanzania’s example could be of use for other countries that border conflict zones.

**How do identity, national pride, and social trust affect tolerance of violence?**

One of the most striking facets of Tanzanian identity can be seen in a response to an open ended question to describe one’s identity on the 2001 Afrobarometer. On that survey, 75.8% of Tanzanians described themselves with reference to their occupation compared to 24.7% of all countries surveyed. Only 3% of Tanzanians identified themselves based on their ethnicity, compared to 23.9% of all countries. 8.6% of Tanzanians described their gender, compared to only 2% on the continent overall. 5.2% of Tanzanians identified themselves by their religion, compared to 14.7% overall. 3.2% of Tanzanians identified with their class, compared to 10.3% across Africa. (Afrobarometer 12-Country Comparison Data 2001) Tanzania stands out for the non-divisive nature of its most common identities. Given the unlikelihood that a country would polarize along occupational or gender lines – since most people acknowledge the importance of having both genders and many different professions in a country – this finding suggests that the type of subgroup with which Tanzanians identify most strongly is an important source of the non-polarized atmosphere of the country.

The 2003 Afrobarometer asked respondents to choose between their identity as Tanzanians and the other identity they selected. Of those who responded, only 18.2% chose their sub-national identity, while 44.7% chose their Tanzanian identity. Another 33.9% refused to identify themselves with another identity group besides Tanzanian. (Tanzania Afrobarometer Data 2003) The 78.6% of the population who consider
themselves Tanzanian first or only will be difficult to divide for parochial purposes, suggesting that unity remains relatively strong among the general population. Are the remaining 18.2% potentially a threat to Tanzanian stability? It seems unlikely. One encouraging sign is that those who chose their sub-group over their Tanzanian identity were no more likely than others to believe that political violence was justifiable. This means that dividing Tanzanians against each other and inciting them to violence would be seen as illegitimate among all Tanzanians, even those whose first loyalty is to their sub-group. Prioritizing identities is less relevant to respondents’ feelings about violence than their belief that their identity group is treated unfairly. Those who believe their group is treated unfairly are significantly more likely to accept that political violence is justifiable than those who believe their group is treated fairly.

Identity groups are more or less likely to support violence depending on the type of group. Tanzanians who identify with ethnic groups are among the most strongly opposed to violence, with 80.7% rejecting violence. They are closely followed in their disapproval of violence by people who identify by occupation (77.9%) and people who only identify themselves as Tanzanian (74.3%). The only major identity group that falls significantly below that is religion, with only 60.9% of religiously-identifying people rejecting violence. (Tanzania Afrobarometer Data 2003) Once again, religion is the dividing line between acceptance and rejection of violence.

Recent scholarship cites the importance of social trust in establishing a peaceful society. Social trust is an important part of unity, one of the building blocks of political culture, and was rumored to be very high in Tanzanian in the ujamaa years. Today, among students, it is quite low, with only 60.5% of UDSM survey respondents agreeing
that “most people can be trusted.” (Figure 12, Appendix A, 117) Respondents recognize that social trust was higher during the previous generation, with 83.6% stating that there is less trust today than during *ujamaa*. This fall in social trust is central to the shift in the political culture. As Tanzanian rhetoric deemphasizes the image of nation-as-family and political competition increases the incentives for discord between groups, trusting strangers outside of one’s own extended family or identity group becomes more difficult.

There is a significant correlation between religious affiliation and social trust. Muslims were significantly less likely than Christians to show lack of trust toward other Tanzanians. However, this difference can be explained by the greater involvement of Muslims in CUF. After controlling for party, the religious differences in levels of trust decrease to below the margin of error among CCM supporters. Among CUF supporters, the numbers of respondents are too small to be significant. Thus, we see that controlling for party support negates or largely diminishes the effects of religion on trust.

As social trust falls, tolerance of violence rises. The relationship between high social trust and agreeing that violence is never acceptable in politics is significant, with gamma = .170**. The relationship between low social trust and score on the Zanzibar violence index is also significant, with gamma = .156**. In other words, those respondents who trust each other more, like in the days of *ujamaa*, have high social cohesion and strongly disapprove of violence, which would interrupt that cohesion. However, those who trust each other less are more focused on competition and are unconcerned about social cohesion. With the disappearance of social trust, the peace in Tanzania is significantly weakened.
National identity is a difficult concept to measure. Perhaps the closest possible measurement of how strongly citizens embrace their national identity is to ask respondents how proud they are to be Tanzanians. On this measure, the UDSM students score extremely high, with 72% strongly agreeing that they are proud and another 19.5% agreeing. (Figure 13, Appendix A, 117) However, only 82% of Muslims agree that they are proud compared to 91.5% of the respondents overall. This discrepancy is significant at the .01 level, suggesting an important difference in how some Muslims perceive themselves in relation to their country. Since pride is one of the best indicators of loyalty and commitment to the success of a state, it is used here to gauge whether or not people have bought into the concept of Tanzanian nationhood. That significantly more Christians than Muslims have bought into Tanzanian nationhood is of great concern.

The difference between Muslims and Christians in national pride is explained by political party affiliation. Controlling for membership in CCM or CUF causes the relationship between religion and national pride to disappear entirely. Since party membership is an intervening variable between religion and national pride, this is a case of interpretation: party membership, and not religion, causes the discrepancy in national pride. Controlling religion for region of origin produces replication of the original results, suggesting that the same factors that determine national pride – in this case, political party – hold true in Zanzibar as they do on the mainland.

Since the national pride variable is used to represent the extent to which respondents have embraced Tanzanian national identity, one of the building blocks of my political culture model, the relationship between national pride and violence is an important test of my argument. In fact, national pride correlates strongly with agreeing
that violence is never acceptable in politics, with a relationship of gamma=.339**. National pride also correlates strongly with the Zanzibar violence index, with a relationship of gamma = .348**. Tanzanians who feel strongly attached to their national identity have a more difficult time tolerating violence within what they see as a unified whole. Conversely, the small numbers of Tanzanians who never embraced their national identity, or who have since rejected it, are far more tolerant of violence within Tanzania, which they see as a political entity rather than as an organic whole of which they are a part.

**Are politically and economically discontented people more tolerant of violence?**

Discontentment with the political system or class structure of society is among the most traditional explanations for violence in society. This section explores the extent to which frustration and a sense of being outside the system cause violence. These explanations for conflict and peace are alternatives to political culture argument put forward in this thesis. It is true that optimism about one’s personal economic situation and the improvement of Tanzania’s quality of life are important causes of peace. However, the evidence of political disillusionment or class struggles as being causes of conflict is surprisingly weak.

Pessimism about quality of life correlates strongly with tolerance of violence. While 73.3% of respondents believe that quality of life is better now than it was during *ujamaa*, those who believe it is worse now are more likely to tolerate violence. (Figure 14, Appendix A, 118) On the Zanzibar violence index, this relationship has a strength of gamma= -.175*. On the index of violent responses to anti-democratic government behavior, the relationship is even stronger, with gamma = -.300**. Thus, those who
believe that life is getting worse are far more likely to accept violence in particular situations, even if they are no more likely to accept its hypothetical legitimacy. Economic disillusionment is a powerful cause of tolerance of violence. One very strong correlation, with a gamma of .257**, is between disagreement with the statement, “If I work hard, I can have a good life,” and score on the Zanzibar violence index. Those who do not believe they have an opportunity to make a good life for themselves have a mean score of 12.00 on the index, compared to a mean of 9.83 for those who believe they can achieve a good life. Respondents who perceive themselves as powerless over their own lives, particularly their economic situation, are more accepting of violence as a means of asserting power. They also tend to disagree with the statement that violence is never acceptable in politics, with gamma = .327**. While the violent bent of powerless elites does not come as news to anyone, the starkness of this finding suggests that the government can undercut support for violence on Zanzibar by increasing perceptions – and hopefully reality – of opportunities for self-improvement.

The impact of political disillusionment on tolerance of violence is ambiguous. The 80.5% of respondents who agree that most politicians are self interested, a disillusioned view, are more likely to agree that violence is sometimes necessary, with a gamma of .192**. (Figure 15, Appendix A, 118) The disillusioned respondents who believe that they cannot influence politics score higher on the index of response to government anti-democratic behavior, with a relationship of gamma = -.199**. However, those same disillusioned respondents are less likely to agree that violence is sometimes necessary for a just cause, a correlation with a comparable gamma of .186**. Unless this
last correlation is a statistical error despite being at the .01 level of significance, political disillusionment has no predictable effect on attitudes towards violence.

In response to a question about how to respond to inequality in society, the fewer than 15% of respondents who choose responses that would hurt the wealthiest groups are more likely to respond violently to anti-democratic behavior by the government than those who prefer responses that will not hurt any groups. (Figure 16, Appendix A, 119) For instance, respondents who support the government seizing the assets of the wealthy are slightly more likely to respond with violence, with Cramer’s V=.165*. Respondents who support boycotting the businesses of the wealthiest groups are also slightly more prone to a violent response, with Cramer’s V=.165*. Respondents who support attacking the wealthy score even higher on the same index, with Cramer’s V=.206**. However, this index is the only violence indicator with which any of these three variables correlate significantly. In other words, respondents who support class warfare or land seizures are slightly more willing to defend their democratic rights with violence than others, but they are no more likely to approve of hypothetical violence or in the case of Zanzibar. This finding suggests that Marxist explanations of violent conflict are largely inappropriate in the Tanzanian context.

**Conclusion: Who commits violence in Tanzania?**

When the 2003 Afrobarometer asked respondents why conflicts arise between different groups in Tanzania, the most cited causes were religion (4.5%), political party or leadership disputes (11.3%), and land disputes (6.1%). As already discussed, religious tension is a rising issue in Tanzania. Political disputes are at the heart of the challenge of embracing political competition. Land disputes have not been discussed in this essay.
because they have seldom spread beyond isolated incidents in Tanzania. In many countries, land disputes have taken on an ethnic character and have turned violent, such as recent massacres in northern Kenya between rival ethnic groups competing for grazing land. However, in Tanzania I have not classified land disputes as a form of ethnic conflict, since they rarely escalate into violent conflict. In support of this view, only 1.3% of respondents say ethnic or tribal differences are a primary cause of conflict. (Tanzania Afrobarometer Data 2003) The two remaining major causes of conflict cited by Tanzanian, political disputes and religion, are two of the main causes of violence evident in this data.

The picture of Tanzania that is beginning to emerge is of a country in which the significant fault line dividing people is not ethnicity but rather religion. The typical student who is highly tolerant of violence is a Zanzibari Muslim who is a member or supporter of CUF, who participates in strikes and demonstrations, who believes that life is worse today than during the ujamaa years, who has low social trust or national pride, who doubts he can improve his life through his own efforts, and who confronts the political system because he cannot find a way to participate. However, upon closer examination, religion is not as significant a determinant of violence than is often assumed. Rather, Muslims are more likely than Christians to belong to CUF or to come from Zanzibar, two sub-populations that are more militant or have been exposed to more conflictual, polarized politics. It is these variables, and particularly CUF membership, that are decisive factors in attitudes toward violence. Affiliation with other opposition parties also has an effect, although not so great an effect as CUF affiliation. Ethnicity and gender have no effect on violence.
Other factors also play important roles. As national pride and social trust decrease, social cohesion falls. National identity is no longer the driving force it once was, now that political competition has created greater incentives for Tanzanians to break each other’s trust. These changes reduce the mutually reinforcing nature of political culture and peace.

Tanzanians who are economically pessimistic are more likely to accept violence. Those who tolerate violence are generally serious about politics, perhaps having attended demonstrations or joined strikes. They are civically involved and may have campaigned for a DARUSO candidate. Their opinions about politics are not passed down from parents or parochial leaders, but rather come from their own reflection on the political and economic situation and the statements of their political party. They are on the cusp of a participant political orientation – eager to take part in political power, but unable to find a peaceful avenue for doing so.

These rising elites are the recipients of a rapidly disappearing legacy, a political culture that has supported 44 years of peace. The building blocks of that political culture are weakened or have disappeared entirely, but the political culture continues to support the peace. In order to strengthen that culture, it will be necessary in the coming years to replace the building blocks that have been removed with newer, more durable supports. Unity and national identity will remain, but they must be buttressed by a sturdy participatory political orientation. Only after the building blocks of the political culture are reinforced will it be able to support another 44 years of peace.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

This thesis supports current democratization theories, which point to the period of democratization – after subject political orientations have been abandoned, but before avenues and norms of participation have been institutionalized – as being the least stable period in a state’s political development. My findings suggest that subject citizens and participatory citizens are similarly opposed to violence, but citizens whose political orientations are in flux are far more supportive of violent conflict. Among the building blocks of Tanzania’s peaceful political culture, national identity and national pride remain strong, as evidenced by the extremely high levels of pride cited by survey respondents. However, other elements of the peaceful political culture are under threat. Although Tanzanians almost universally praise their country for its low level of violence, survey respondents’ commitment to finding peaceful solutions to political conflicts is not absolute.

In considering Tanzanians’ attitudes toward violence, it is important to acknowledge that tolerance of violence is not a normative value. While the implications of this thesis are that Tanzania’s lack of violent conflict should be celebrated, rejecting violence without exception is not necessarily a good thing. Citizens who would join a violent resistance group in response to extreme government coercion or human rights violations may be better for peaceful, liberal democracy than citizens who would respond passively or not at all. However, in any state, particularly a democratizing state such as Tanzania, the government and dissenting groups will inevitably take some missteps. Citizens who react to every incident with violence and inflammatory rhetoric rapidly destabilize a state, which often has far worse effects than the initial incident.
Although it would not be possible, or even desirable, to replicate all the factors that formed the Tanzanian political culture, other states can still learn from the Tanzanian example. The most important lesson for democratizing states is that political culture is important. Nation building is not simply a feel-good exercise for those countries that can afford it. Rather, it is a vital step for young states to take in order to gain legitimacy for the existence of the nation and promote peaceful interactions among the people. Conflicts are inevitable, but cross-cutting identities such as occupation, and particularly the all-encompassing identity of nationality, help diminish the likelihood that conflicts will divide the nation or will turn violent for sustained periods. Diversity presents a challenge to national unity, but it is not insurmountable if the political leadership is genuinely committed to deemphasizing sub-national identities in the public sphere. Rhetoric, symbols, and civics education can create a strong national identity. However, they must be paired with legal protections and equal treatment of all groups in order to reduce the salience of sub-national loyalties in politics.

Citizens are most committed to peace when they feel that they are being treated fairly and can participate meaningfully in the political process. Outsider citizens act confrontationally in conflicts. Insider citizens – those who feel like they are incorporated into the political process and the nation – resolve conflicts peacefully. These two forms of incorporation are mutually reinforcing. Thus, for a state to get on a self-perpetuating, peaceful path, it must make policy choices that incorporate all citizens into the national political culture.

Looking back at the model of Tanzania’s path dependence, we see that at least one of the building blocks of the political culture has shifted. Where subject orientation
once under-girded unity now the orientation is a question mark. This effect is magnified by the addition of political competitors appealing to divisions within the population, playing off of frustrations long suppressed by the lack of competition. These changes hurt unity, another of the building blocks of the political culture. Consequently, this eroding political culture is a less rigorous support for peace. With more violent conflict, the feedback effects of peace are reduced, thus weakening the final building block of the peaceful political culture: national identity/pride. Tanzania has not yet departed from its path of peace, but its position will remain precarious until it is able to adapt its political culture to competition.

Of the three building blocks of political culture, national unity and the lack of polarization is probably the most important factor in keeping Tanzania on its peaceful path. That most students strongly oppose violence or, indeed, any form of coercive action against powerful and wealthy groups reflects not only the membership of many students in those groups, but also the lack of polarization and the sense of brotherhood among Tanzanians. This feeling of brotherhood, a direct outgrowth of the nation building project and the *ujamaa* commitment to family-hood, makes parochial divisions non-salient in the public sphere.

One of the most successful aspects of the nation building project was inculcating the people with the idea that they could be good Tanzanians and also have other, cross-cutting identities. In addition to the important step of creating a strong national identity, the nation building project included the equally important step of showing how to have multiple identities without having divided loyalties. In particular, many *ujamaa* efforts emphasized occupation as an identity, with the effect that the majority of Tanzanians
point to occupation as their most important non-national identity. Because most Tanzanians have several, cross-cutting identities, polarization and manipulation of identities would divide the loyalties of many citizens. As a result, attempts to divide citizens by playing off of parochial tensions are generally unsuccessful. Such tensions exist, but in the public sphere, most Tanzanians would prefer to be Tanzanian first and any other identity second. Since major conflicts cannot exist long-term in the absence of significant divisions in the population, Tanzania has been unable to sustain any violent conflicts. Thus, the peaceful path that Tanzania has taken is highly dependent on the national unity that developed out of the *ujamaa* and nation building policies.

National identity and a sense of unity are insufficient on their own to create a peaceful political culture. Also necessary is a political orientation that is congruent with the demands of the citizens as well as the avenues of political involvement available. Under the *ujamaa* era government, subject political orientations were appropriate – the state had the capacity to channel people’s energies toward national development rather than competitive political action. While many Tanzanians wanted their views heard on certain issues, overall the demand for citizen participation in politics was relatively low. The congruence between the supply and demand for political freedom made the political culture feasible and helped to contribute to peace. Today many citizens are demanding more political freedom, while others fear the effects of too much political competition. The state has supplied many new avenues of participation, but it also strongly resists criticism or public involvement in many ways. Because the supply of and demand for modes of meaningful political participation are not in equilibrium, the political culture is in flux, and the Tanzanian peace is at risk.
Under single-party rule, the party resolved its conflicts before they became public, and presented its policies to the people in a unified manner. Now that political competition has brought conflict into the public sphere for the first time, the political culture is in flux. The subject orientation established under the single-party system is unworkable under political competition. The current period, in which the political culture is being adapted to fit multi-party politics, offers both a danger and an opportunity. However, in transitioning to a participant orientation, Tanzanians risk straying from the peaceful path the nation has followed since independence. In order to remain on that path, Tanzanians must redefine their political culture to accept peaceful political conflict as necessary and healthy in a democracy, while continuing to reject political violence.

The conclusions of this thesis are in accord with recent scholarship that points to the period of democratization as more dangerous than both stable democracy and stable single-party governance. (see, for instance, Mansfield and Snyder) This phenomenon is a result of the pressures of citizen participation in the absence of institutionalized modes of involvement. Thus, the growth of a participant political orientation is a potential cause of violent conflict until citizens have learned how to effect political change peacefully, and the government has given them sufficient avenues for doing so. In Tanzania, the students who are most serious about politics – those whose views are most heavily influenced by the political and economic situation – are also the most tolerant of political violence. Students who want to participate but do so confrontationally – those who get involved in demonstrations and strikes – are the most likely students to tolerate violence. This participation-oriented but politically alienated population represents the perils of democratization. In contrast, students who get take part in political participation on their
own initiative through activities such as writing a letter to the editor or signing a petition are no more likely to tolerate violence than those who do not. These students represent the first wave of institutionalized political participation. Thus, the population for whom political culture is in flux is the population that is most likely to become involved in violent conflict.

Tanzanians are already beginning to redefine their national identity for a new era. Although they have always defined themselves in contrast to their neighbors, as all nations do, this mode of self-definition has taken on a new relevance since the explosion of conflict in the region in the 1990s. Having seen the need for occasional violence in defense of basic human rights, Tanzanians who have embraced a shifting political culture do not necessarily consider violence completely off-limits in the political sphere. However, they retain their commitment to peaceful conflict resolution whenever possible, since this is viewed as being the only authentically Tanzanian way of addressing disagreements. Therefore, even as the political culture adapts to changing circumstances and the hypothetical necessity of violence, national identity reinforces the desire to avoid violent conflict.

Because the political culture is so important to sustaining Tanzania’s peace, it is vital that political parties, civil society, and government all commit to remaking the political culture for the new era. Each of these groups has a long term interest in shifting the political culture to a peaceful, participatory model. However, in politics it is often difficult to see beyond the next election. For that reason, the rest of this section makes recommendations to parties, civil society, and government, explaining what steps each of
these groups can take to transform the political culture in a way that will further their own self-interest as well as the cause of peace in Tanzania.

**Recommendations for Political Parties**

The most important lesson opposition political parties can learn is that it is in their self-interest to pursue only peaceful and non-divisive modes of competition in Tanzania. Violence may bring them attention in the short term, but even a few violent episodes or the perception that they are trying to divide the electorate will undercut their chances of gaining widespread support. Most Tanzanians have little patience for violence and divisiveness in politics, and they will turn against any party that does not seem committed to preserving the peace of which Tanzanians are so proud. When the Nyalali commission released its report on multi-partyism in the early 1990s, most Tanzanians opposed multi-partyism out of fear that political competition would lead to polarization and violent conflict. Many of those citizens were what I call “cautious democrats” – they supported the liberal political reforms proposed by the commission, but feared the chaos that might result from open conflict. Today, Tanzanians show very high levels of support for competitive politics, in part because political competition has not divided the nation or brought widespread violence as was feared. Much of CCM’s support comes not from support for its particular policies or confidence in its leadership, but rather from cautious democrats who see a vote for CCM as a vote for the peaceful political culture. If opposition parties can prove that they represent the same peaceful political culture as the ruling party, they will be able to enlarge their base of support among the cautious democrats.
According to the data on attitudes towards violence in Zanzibar, UDSM students strongly favor peace but are unwilling to accept tradeoffs in terms of their rights. In other words, they want a self-imposed peace, with losing parties accepting defeat graciously. Opposition political parties should take note: although their base may accept the necessity of political violence, if they hope to enlarge their support enough to be viable alternatives to CCM, they must appeal to some of these discontented but violence-averse voters. It is in their self-interest to actively prevent violence and the appearance of militancy among their members and sympathizers. This is particularly relevant in Zanzibar, where CUF is only a few percentage points away from a majority. Its vote count has remained nearly constant for the past three elections; many Tanzanians are unwilling to vote CUF because of perceptions of its ethnic affiliation, historical baggage, and militant political culture. However, there is a large population in Zanzibar that is dissatisfied with corruption in the ruling party, perceived unfairness in the union with the mainland, and the rate of economic development. If CUF cut its ties with ethnic politics and showed a substantive, rather than merely rhetorical, commitment to preventing violence on the isles, it might be able to gain support from some of these CCM-voting discontents. Frustration with the status quo will only overwhelm fear of violence, ethnic divisions, and retribution for historical wrongs if CUF is perceived to have abandoned those qualities in favor of a sustained commitment to the peaceful political culture.

Opposition parties should also recognize that Tanzanians do not distinguish between conflict sanctioned by party leadership and violence committed by their supporters. Respondents oppose both forms of violence in almost equally large numbers. Therefore, if CUF hopes to change its image, it must prevent not only violence
engineered by party leadership, but also violence stirred up by the militant rhetoric of some of its leaders. CUF leaders may take issue with this analysis, since CCM has also repeatedly been accused of tampering with election results and instigating violence and intimidation at the polls. However, regardless of the truth of accusations against either side, it is primarily CUF that has an image problem. In addition, as long as CCM remains in power and protests against electoral tampering remain ineffective, CUF must look for different ways to get elected – particularly by expanding its base.

The ruling party must recognize that CUF and other opposition parties will attract disillusioned CCM supporters as soon as the opposition parties can convince voters that they are committed to peace. However, as long as CCM is seen as standing on the moral high ground and keeping the country peaceful, it will retain the support of many cautious democrats. In addition to the obvious human rights interest in not attacking peaceful protesters, CCM must recognize its own self-interest in avoiding incidents such as the shootings on January 21, 2001 or the intimidation of voters at the polls in 2005. Given the rising elite’s opposition to martial law as a means of guaranteeing peace, strong-arm tactics will eventually hurt CCM. CCM should retain its hold on the cautious democrats by committing to a more peaceful and transparent process, such that it can vie for the peace and stability voters. Thus, both CCM and the opposition parties should recognize that controlling violence by supporters and promoting peaceful political competition is in their self-interest.

**Recommendations for Civil Society**

Because Tanzania is already on a peaceful path, it has a longer grace period than most democratizing countries in which to establish a new culture of peaceful political
competition. That grace period will not last interminably, though, so civil society must take decisive action to promote a peaceful participant political culture among the citizens. Some steps are already being taken, such as the educational projects undertaken by REDET (Research and Education for Democracy in Tanzania). More such projects should be undertaken.

Efforts to reach citizens must take into account the differing orientations toward democracy. There are a small number of experienced political participants who have found ways to participate meaningfully through citizen activism. Their efforts should be encouraged, and they should be nurtured as future leaders in government or civil society. There are a larger number of participation-oriented citizens who cannot find adequate avenues for meaningful participation. These citizens are the most dangerous during the democratizing period, but they are also the population within which competitive politics will likely take root. Civil society should actively target these citizens with seminars, pamphlets, newspaper articles, and any other means available to teach them how to influence a democracy through participation rather than confrontation.

The majority of the population is cautious democrats, who support the idea of political competition but fear its implementation in practice. These citizens play a vital role in avoiding violent conflict because it is they who immediately reject divisiveness as being un-Tanzanian and refuse to support parties that threaten the peace. In order for peaceful political competition to take hold, the cautious democrats must be encouraged to play a greater role in civil society and opposition politics. Their moderating influence will help opposition groups reach out to more of the population without compromising the peaceful political culture in the country. For these citizens, national unity and identity
remain powerful concepts, and their presence among more disillusioned opposition party members would help incorporate these citizens into the peaceful political culture. Civil society could contribute to this effort by spreading the idea that being a good citizen of Tanzania means participating in peaceful but public disagreement. By tying participation to national identity, civil society can redefine what it means to be a Tanzanian in a way that is both peaceful and relevant to the modern era.

In addition to encouraging peaceful participation among the citizens, it is the job of civil society to ensure that avenues for participation actually exist. While the Tanzanian government has taken many steps toward fair political competition in the past 15 years, it has shown varying degrees of commitment to the integrity of the electoral process and the involvement of citizens in decision-making. Much of the pressure to liberalize politically has come from donor organizations and Western countries. A vocal domestic civil society will serve as a more rigorous and independent watchdog of the government, demanding that avenues for citizen participation be available and meaningful. In addition, civil society is an ideal avenue for citizens who want to participate in politics but see no way of influencing government. Traditionally, the masses have participated in large numbers in community organizations and self-help groups, but politically-oriented civil society has been the province of a few elites. In order for civil society to reach its potential in Tanzania, it should reach out to small community groups, creating networks for grassroots political participation. By creating avenues for political participation, civil society can help strengthen political participation orientations, and in so doing, can keep Tanzania on a peaceful path.

**Recommendations for the Tanzanian Government**
The most important way the government can promote continued peace is by allowing more political competition and participation. The government’s vacillating support for fair contestation has endangered peace. By allowing opposition groups to develop but then giving them good cause to feel that their rights to organize and run for political office have been violated, the government has created a group of domestic discontents. There will be no return to a single-party political structure; the only way to remain peaceful is to commit fully to allowing real competition.

The government’s uneven response to domestic dissent is partly a result of differing feelings throughout the levels of government about whether dissent is traitorous, patriotic, or something in between. The government must commit to framing dissent as a service to the nation, or at least as a neutral activity, and must propagate this view throughout its hierarchy. While this may go against the short term interests of political leaders, it is vital to ensuring peace in the long term. Dissent and electoral competition are, at this point, inevitable. However, their effects on peace and conflict are still undetermined. If political participation, including dissent, is framed as being integral rather than anathema to Tanzanian national unity, opposition supporters will be brought back within the fold of the nation. If dissent is framed as being an attack on the nation, dissenters will be pushed further away from mainstream Tanzanian political culture and will become alienated from their national identity. In the best case scenario, Tanzanians would proudly incorporate peaceful political competition into their national identity, fueling a self-reinforcing cycle of national pride and peace, much like what existed during *ujamaa*. In the worst case scenario, dissenters would be pushed to the margins of society and would respond to government provocation with violence. At present, the
government has chosen to ignore the issue or deal with it using a piecemeal approach, which has led differing and unpredictable responses to opposition activity. In the interest of ensuring long term peace, the government should make it a priority to reframe participation and dissent as a patriotic act in keeping with Tanzanian identity and values.

Framing dissent would require a revival of some techniques used in the nation building project, although it would not need to be so ambitious. It would first require a popular, charismatic leader who was committed to the reframe. President Kikwete, who was elected by a wide margin and is immensely popular with the youth, could be such a leader, if he so chose. Secondly, it would require a rhetorical campaign. Since local CCM offices can no longer be used as village-based outposts of the government, it might be somewhat more difficult to reach the population than during the nation building project. However, the most important population to reach first – the urban and peri-urban citizens who are most likely to dissent or to come into contact with dissenters – have easier access to media than in the past due to the recent proliferation of independent television, newspapers, radio stations, and internet cafes. While independent media are more difficult to control than government-owned newspapers, they still cover the president’s speeches and activities virtually every day. If President Kikwete made important symbolic gestures such as sharing an Iftar with the leaders of CUF or immediately firing policemen involved in beating up an opposition supporter, his example would quickly find its way into the newspapers, radios, and conversations in millions of Tanzanian homes.

Aside from symbolic gestures, the government must invest in the long term political culture by shaping the views of the youth. Civics textbooks and curricula should
emphasize the importance of political participation and criticism of the government, but should not shy away from promoting national pride as well. For example, the introduction to a civics book might state: “Developing our country requires every Tanzanian to speak his or her mind so that we can decide which ideas are the best and change the policies that do not work well. Tanzanians should be proud that we can disagree respectfully without fighting or hating each other.” Different variations on this statement should be stated not only in the classroom, but in any speech given about political competition.

This tolerant rhetoric will only have an effect if it is backed up by action. Since violence is often fomented by gangs of youths affiliated with parties, the ruling party must be seen actively repudiating the actions of its own militant youth. The next time CCM youths pick a fight with opposition party members, President Kikwete should personally demand their prosecution and should see to it that CCM expels the youth from the party. It would only take a few instances of such strict behavior to send a signal to members of all political parties that violent conflict will not be tolerated under any circumstances. In addition to this strict approach, the government should sponsor roundtable discussions between youth of opposing political parties, not only to resolve issues that emerge, but also to introduce the idea that respectful dialogue can yield good ideas and mutual understanding.

Leaders of the ruling party tend to avoid making any unnecessary concessions to the opposition out of fear that, if citizens think they will not be persecuted for joining the opposition, many people will defect from the ruling party. However, political leaders in power have seldom been penalized for proclaiming the opposition’s right to dissent and
contest political offices freely. Rather, this sort of proclamation makes the leader in power look magnanimous. President Kikwete should not fear that encouraging a dissent-tolerant political culture will hurt his party. As when Nyerere ensured continuing CCM dominance by encouraging the adoption of multi-partyism before a domestic demand for it existed, Kikwete can retain support for CCM today by making it the party of political tolerance. Reinvigorating the political culture of Tanzania today is both a necessary step in continuing on a peaceful path and an opportunity for any leader who can stake out the moral high ground of promoting unity and national pride while supporting meaningful political participation.

Tanzania has defied geopolitical expectations by remaining peaceful for the past 44 years, a result of the peaceful political culture that developed out of the 1967 Arusha Declaration. National identity, lack of polarization, and a subject oriented political culture have kept Tanzania on a peaceful path. The situation that gave birth to that political culture has changed, and today, the peaceful political culture is in flux. Only by remaking national political culture for a new era will Tanzania remain an oasis of peace.
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Violence is the only way the losing side might achieve fair results.

Note that in this table blue represents disagree and red represents agree, so red always represents a higher score on the Zanzibar election violence index.
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Police and army must prevent violence, even if this means restricting people’s rights.
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The Zanzibar violence shows why Tanzania should return to one-party rule
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Influence of Various Factors on Political Opinions and Involvement

Correlation Between "Violence is Sometimes Necessary" and Influence of the Great Lakes Conflict on Political Views

How much has the Great Lakes Conflict influenced your opinions about and involvement in politics?

- a lot
- not at all
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Social Trust

Most people can be trusted
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- No Opinion
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.49%</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.04%</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.46%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12

National Pride

I am proud to be a Tanzanian
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- No Opinion
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71.95%</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13
Quality of life now compared to ujamaa

Is life better today than under ujamaa?
- Life is worse today
- Quality of life is the same
- Life today is better
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Views of Politicians

Most politicians are self interested
- strongly agree
- agree
- no opinion
- disagree
- strongly disagree

Figure 15
How should Tanzanians respond to inequality?
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Appendix B: UDSM Student Survey

Dear Students,
Please only fill out this survey if you are a UDSM first degree student. This survey is for research purposes only. It is anonymous. Your name will not be attached to it, and no information you provide will be used to identify you. Thank you for your help.

Demographic Data:
1. Age: _____  Sex: _____  3. Major and year of study: ______________
4. Region: ______________  5. Tribe/ethnicity: ______________

Survey Questions:
1. During the recent DARUSO election, which of the following activities did you participate in? (circle all that apply)
   a. Vote 
   b. Run for office 
   c. Tell your friends or colleagues to vote for a particular candidate 
   d. Work on one of the candidates’ campaigns 
   e. Get into an argument or fight about the election 
   f. Discuss the issues of the election 
   g. Join a campaign rally/celebration/march 
   h. Try to prevent opposition supporters from voting
2. How did you choose what DARUSO candidates to vote for? (circle all that apply)
   a. Personal relationship with candidate 
   b. Recommendation from a friend 
   c. Candidate’s posters, fliers, speeches, opinions, or personal campaigning 
   d. Candidate’s history of leadership or involvement in university issues 
   e. Rally/march/celebration hosted by candidate 
   f. Did not vote
3. Some people believe that certain groups in Tanzania have an unfair amount of wealth and power compared to other Tanzanians. How do you think Tanzanians should respond to this issue?
   a. Tanzanians should not do anything. Inequality is not a problem. 
   b. Tanzanians should not do anything. Inequality is a problem, but any response would have too many negative effects. 
   c. The government should have policies to reduce inequality without causing great harm to the most powerful groups. 
   d. The government should take over land and assets of powerful groups. 
   e. The people should boycott businesses of the most powerful groups. 
   f. The people should engage in violence against the most powerful groups.
4. Do you think Tanzanians today trust each other more, less, or the same amount as Tanzanians did during ujamaa?
   a. Trust each other more today than during ujamaa 
   b. Trust each other less today than during ujamaa 
   c. Trust each other the same amount today than during ujamaa
d. Don’t know

5. Do you think the quality of life in Tanzania today is better than, worse than, or the same as during *ujamaa*?
   a. Quality of life is better today than during *ujamaa*
   b. Quality of life is worse today than during *ujamaa*
   c. Quality of life is the same as during *ujamaa*
   d. Don’t know

6. The following are several ways citizens take part in politics. Mark the box to show whether you have done, might do, or would never do each activity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have done it</th>
<th>Might do it</th>
<th>Would never do it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sign a petition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Write a letter to a newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Post a public statement on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Attend a demonstration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Join a strike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Join a political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Attend a political rally or event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Help with a candidate’s campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Contact your elected representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. What would you do if the government took any of the following actions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Do Nothing</th>
<th>Support Government</th>
<th>Support Opposition Party</th>
<th>Join a Non-Violent Protest</th>
<th>Join a Resistance Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Told you which religion to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Closed down newspapers that criticized the government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Suspended the National Assembly and cancelled the next election</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Interfered with results of an election so that the losing candidate was declared the winner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How much has each of the following influenced your opinions about and involvement in politics? Please mark one box for each option on the left:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Parents’ views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Religious leaders’ views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Tribal leaders’ views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Great Lakes Conflict (Rwandan Genocide and/or war in the DRC (Zaire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Tanzania’s economic situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Tanzania’s political situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Please read the statements on the left side of the grid. For each statement, show how much you agree or disagree by marking the appropriate box on the right.

(The word “I” refers to the survey taker):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Most Tanzanians can be trusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. People should be proud to be Tanzanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I care a lot about politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. When I get together with friends, we often discuss politics or political issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. People like me can influence the government’s decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Most politicians are only looking out for themselves and their friends and family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. If I work hard, I will make enough money to live comfortably</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. It is never okay to use violence in politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. It is sometimes necessary to use violence in support of a just cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Zanzibar has experienced violence during the 1995 and 2000 national elections and the 2005 election registration period. For each statement, show how much you agree or disagree by marking a box on the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I am very concerned about the situation on Zanzibar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If the 2005 election results are disputed, the losing side must not be violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. If the 2005 election results are disputed, violence is the only way the losing side might achieve fair results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. If the 2005 election results are disputed, the losing side must make sure its supporters are not violent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The violence in Zanzibar is an example of why Tanzania should return to one-party rule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. The police and army must prevent violence, even if this means restricting people’s rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2005, from University of Colorado at Boulder Conflict Research Consortium, www.beyondintractability.org/m/framing.jsp
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