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Abstract

Julius Nyerere, the first President of Tanzania, is known as the ‘Mwalimu’ (the Great Teacher) for his roles and expansive thinking about the liberation of Africa. While he belongs to an older generation of politicians, it is opportune to reflect on his philosophical contributions at a time of extreme poverty and inequality in developing countries, and as Africa largely takes a backseat on the Russia-Ukraine war. Nyerere’s contributions tend to be forgotten, due to little contemporary academic work on his thoughts, criticism of his Ujamaa socialist policies, and ‘Nyererephilia’ (love/sentimentalism for Nyerere). This Nyererephilia remarkably persists even 61 years into Tanzanian independence. This paper uses excerpts from the vast archive of Nyerere’s speeches to reflect on how he subversively defined the Global South to implement African socialism, an economy based on interconnectedness and compassion, and a belief that Africa has to be concerned with foreign affairs. In his time, he was seized with grand questions like self-reliance, educational reform, international debt and global inequality, nuclear weapons, non-alignment, African independence, and African unity. A contemporary vision for confronting contemporary questions could lean on his conception of the Global South. In Nyerere’s view, the Global South was not the underdeveloped world but was the ‘Third World’, which meant the third vision/way/subjectivity. This ‘way’ can only be practiced through unity, otherwise the small states of the Global South are weak states that cannot participate as equals in the global system.
Introduction

Many have a simplistic view of the Third World or the Global South, but not Nyerere. He profoundly said: ‘I have claimed the third world does exist and has a meaning which can be used for the betterment of the masses of the poor people’ (1982: 440). The meaning was embedded in a deeply philosophical and practical rationale highlighted in this paper. I write this paper in order to bring out the role of Tanzania and Nyerere in conceptualising and fighting for the liberation of southern Africa and the Third World, and in order to push us to think about how we can perpetuate our legacies as Africa. This paper carefully reads Nyerere’s speeches and writings as a methodology in order to bring out his positive view of the terms ‘Third World’ and ‘Global South’. It is a story that shows the unselfishness of a country and its leadership to pursue the liberation of other countries at a great cost to its economy and a physical danger to its society. When one examines their sacrifices, one may ask: how can they be recognised, those who gave it their all, who put on hold several agendas as their assistance to others took a toll on them? One way of giving back is retelling and relearning from their love in order to understand their active efforts to end their own poverty and that of others.

African Socialism is not Marxism

What ideas of freedom and economic development existed in Africa before Marxism and capitalism – the two paths that apparently lay open for newly-independent states in Africa? Maintaining the colonial state structure under Black leadership would mean reproducing colonial structures of group, class, and race alienation. In other words, are Africans capable of developing their own political thought or ideas about freedom outside of these two paths? In the face of colonialism’s oppression, many felt that the vision of a future society could only be a collective effort of popular struggle. Socialism came closest to this ideal. However, the conditions in Africa would not allow for socialism along the same lines as elsewhere. Tanzania chose to go with a definition of socialism rooted in African culture. Nyerere called this ‘African socialism’. This kind of response was important since European ‘colonization of Africa was justified in terms of the cultural inferiority of the Africans or the non-existence of African culture’ (Mutiso and Rohio, 1987).

This resulted in the colonised reversing the argument, pointing out that they had a culture, and should be accepted as human and cultural persons, as defined in African humanism.

Re-organising the racially determined social stratifications was important to resolve racial strife, otherwise ‘as long as one community has a monopoly of political power and uses that power not only to prevent the other communities from having any share in political power, but also to keep those other communities in a state of social and economic inferiority, any talk of social and economic advancement of the other communities as a solution to racial conflict is hypocritical and stupid’ (Nyerere, 1969b: 23–9).

African socialism was the core idea put forward: a philosophy which advocated for the caring of fellow humanity, as was the practice in traditional African communal life, rather than another Marxist recipe. Nyerere (1969a: 162–71) stated that:

In a socialist state it is the attitude of mind, and not the rigid adherence to a standard political pattern, which is needed to ensure that the people care for each other’s welfare... In the individual, as in society, it is an attitude of mind which distinguishes the socialist from the non-socialist. It has nothing to do with the possession or non-possession of wealth... the man who uses wealth for the purpose of dominating any of his fellows is a capitalist... We must... regain our former attitude of mind – our traditional African socialism and apply it to the new societies we are building today...

African socialism as defined as such differed from that in the West or East. For Nyerere (1969a: 162–71):

‘Ujamaa’, then, or ‘familyhood’, describes our socialism. It is opposed to capitalism, which seeks to build a happy society on the basis of the exploitation of man by man; it is equally opposed to doctrinaire socialism which seeks to build its happy society on a philosophy of inevitable conflict between man and man. We in Africa have no more need to be converted to socialism than
we have of being ‘taught’ democracy. Both are rooted in our own past – in the traditional society which produced us. Modern African socialism can draw from its traditional heritage the recognition of ‘society’ as an extension of the basic family unit.

The extension of African socialism was elastic enough to cover all oppressed persons:

But it can no longer confine the idea of the social family within the limits of the tribe, nor, indeed, of the nation. For no true African socialist can look at a line drawn on a map and say ‘the people on this side of that line are my brothers, but those who happen to live on the other side of it can have no claim on me’; every individual on this continent is his brother. It was in the struggle to break the grip of colonialism that we learnt the need for unity. We came to recognize that the same socialist attitude of mind which, in the tribal days, gave to every individual the security that comes of belonging to a widely extended family, must be preserved within the still wider society of the nation. But we should not stop there. Our recognition of the family to which we all belong must be extended yet further – beyond the tribe, the community, the nation, or even the continent – to embrace the whole society of mankind. (Nyerere, 1969a: 162–71).

African socialism was therefore the social innovation, political thought, and action that sought to change through collectivisation and self-reliance, without using Marxist blueprints, the material conditions of a people who had been exploited and colonised for so long. After attaining independence in 1961, Tanzania remained a poor country with many exploited peasants and workers. This prompted Nyerere and others in 1967 to radically shift to African socialism through the 5 February 1967 Arusha Declaration. The Caribbean philosopher C. L. R James would describe socialism and self-reliance, the core ideas of the Arusha Declaration, as the highest stage of African resistance (Shivji, 2009). This built on and subverted Nkrumah’s (1965) declaration of neo-colonialism as the last stage of imperialism, and Lenin’s (1916) contention that imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism. African socialism urged a different approach to money, wealth accumulation, and distribution. Nyerere (1962: 204–208) argued that wealthy individuals should not be separated from the purpose of banishing poverty otherwise ‘there develops a ruthless competition between individuals; each person tries to get more wealth, simply so that he will have more power, and more prestige, than his fellows. Wealth becomes an instrument of domination, a means of humiliating other people. The very basis of socialism is the rejection of this use of wealth. And within socialist countries personal wealth is not, and should not be, a symbol of power or prestige; it is used to banish poverty.’ The Arusha Declaration is a document that announces Tanzania’s adoption of socialism and self-reliance by attacking the idea that a moneyed outsider will solve development and political problems. It calls on people to value hard work, to learn from peasants, and to prioritise rural development. Urbanisation was seen as disruptive of the precolonial lifestyle. The aim, rather, was to try to recreate the precolonial. A major way of doing this was to move people out of the city through a process called ‘villagization’, under which about 2,500 collective settlements were created and 10 million people forced to move. This resulted in displacements, which led to a lot of criticism that eventually culminated in the end of villagization in 1985 when Nyerere resigned (Komba, 1995).

What Nyerere identified as the basis of his political thought, African socialism or Ujamaa ‘familyhood’, forms the basis of what Hyden called the economy of affection. Hyden (1983: 2) identified an economy
of affection, a term he used to describe a ‘network of support, communications and interaction among structurally defined groups connected by blood, kin, community or other affinities, for example, religion. It links together in a systematic fashion a variety of discrete economic and social units which in other regards may be autonomous.’ This network serves to ensure human survival, social maintenance, and development. These networks of interdependence and communal care had been supposedly captured by capitalism. Peasant economies in southern Africa, including in Tanzania, had not yet been captured and thus remained un-proletarianized. This gave the peasants the option to benefit from both the market system and the abundant land in the peasant system. Waters (1992: 166) notes that the ‘peasant mode of subsistence is strong and likely to persist parallel to the capitalist/monetised economy as long as arable land is available at little cost. This is why relations between kin, family, and tribal networks are more important for Hyden than descriptions of emerging class and forms of industrialised production.’ The uncaptured peasants were seen as possessing the transformative character that would push Africa forward.

A related key area of African socialism that Nyerere saw as a critical matter was educational reform. He believed that educational transformation was central in the post-colonial reconstruction (Nyerere, 1976). Education had to deliver liberating skills based on the understanding that people make themselves and cannot be liberated by another. Education was thus key in the expansion of consciousness over self, environment, and society. It was key to fighting disease, ignorance, and dependency. Nyerere’s educational reform vision was to create a scholar practitioner with the right attitude to support a policy for education and self-reliance. Education was tied to social action. In this regard, ‘education has to increase man’s physical and mental freedom’ (Nyerere, 1976).

In Nyerere’s view, ‘education is not a way of escaping poverty. It is a way of fighting it’ (Nyerere, 1976). The colonial education was linked to a slave mentality since colonisation was seen as an attack on the mind, such that personal and physical aspects of development cannot be separated. The entire education system had to be re-organised. The education system was designed to move away from attitudes that promote inequality and subservience. Nyerere strongly condemned what he called the ‘disease of acquisitive society’ from Tawney (1918), the tendency to wealth accumulation, which was promoted by western education. The colonial education system was modelled after the British system but ‘with even heavier emphasis on subservient attitudes and on white-collar skills. Inevitably, too, it was based on the assumptions of a colonialist and capitalist society. It emphasized the individualistic instincts of mankind, instead of his cooperative instincts’ (Nyerere, 1967: 267–90). The intention was ‘to create a socialist society which is based on three principles: equality and respect for human dignity; sharing of the resources which are produced by our efforts; work by everyone and exploitation by none’ (Nyerere, 1967: 267–90). Nyerere argued that schools and colleges should ‘become communities – and communities which practice the precept of self-reliance. The teachers, workers, and pupils must be the members of a social unit in the same way as parents, relatives, and children are a family social unit’ (Nyerere, 1967: 267–90). He saw no ‘reason why students at such institutions [university/post-secondary level] should not be required as part of their degree or professional training, to spend at least part of their vacations contributing to the society in a manner related to their studies’ (Nyerere, 1967: 267–90). These are very important ideas in educational theory or what Freire (2020) called ‘the pedagogy of the oppressed’. These ideas remain relevant in explaining Africa’s quest to address skills and capacity deficits.

Tanzania’s efforts to dismantle colonial and neo-colonial social and economic structures and to reconstruct new ones along African lines under Julius Nyerere present important lessons for Africa. It can be noted that ‘the pursuit of socialism became a mixture of policy thrusts, institutional change, attempts to gain control over resources, trial and error corrections of a vast number of projects, and efforts to muddle through the confusion of concrete situations’ (Resnick, 1981: 137). Extraordinary achievements in popular participation after the 1967 Arusha Declaration clashed with emergent class interests, resulting in class conflicts that were not fully defined or dealt with. Entrepreneurs emerged, gained wealth, and acquired power – while also entrenching workers’ and peasants’ poverty. The contradictions in the Kujitegemea (‘let us do it by ourselves’) reveal the difficulties of changing a social and economic structure. Yet amidst these challenges, Tanzania adopted a towering independent
approach to Africa and Third World issues. The power of African socialism and the economy of affection became evident when Nyerere died and people cried in Tanzania. He had stepped down from presidential office in 1985 and died in 1999. Citizens openly cried in the streets because they characterised his rulership with compassion, assisting the poor, and strong values of dignity, self-reliance, unity, and freedom.

Even after abandoning African socialism, the limits of this system became evident to Nyerere from his analysis of the skewed nature of international trade and economics. Just as Mkandawire (2003) in proposing a developmental state in Africa notes the effects of the Bretton Woods Institutions’ prescriptions in producing negative economic indicators after colonisation, Nyerere (1999) in an interview with Ikaweba Bunting notes: ‘In 1988 Tanzania’s per-capita income was $280. Now, in 1998, it is $140. So, I asked the World Bank people what went wrong. Because for the last ten years Tanzania has been signing on the dotted line and doing everything the IMF and the World Bank wanted’. Nyerere (1962: 204–208) had warned that ‘as we are emerging successfully from the first ‘Scramble for Africa’ so we are entering a new phase… but its purpose will be the same – to get control of our continent’ through exploiting differences between formerly colonised groups and the perpetuation of an unequal global order. In his view, ‘Karl Marx’s doctrine that there is an inevitable clash between the rich and the poor is just as applicable internationally as it is within nation states’ (Nyerere, 1962: 204–208). The poverty of African nations was maintained by the principle of the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Nyerere (1972) argued that ‘wealth produces wealth, and poverty, poverty… the poverty of the poor is a function of the rich. Each time he buys a loaf of bread a starving man contributes to the wealth of a baker who already lives in luxury’. Being producers of primary commodities and having little industrialisation meant that ‘on the world market we sell cheap and buy dear… The result is that the prices of our imports go up continually and our prices remain the same or even go down’ (Nyerere, 1972). Breaking from poverty could not be achieved through anything else other than altering the structure of international trade. This could not be done through more aid since ‘charity, however well meaning, is no way out of the present appalling poverty in the world. The poverty of the underdeveloped world is as much a function of the world economic organization as it is of anything else; and that cannot be changed by a developing country’s commitment to socialism’ (Nyerere, 1972). If this was the case, what was the solution for Africa and the rest of the Global South?

Unity as the Solution

Nyerere proposed unity amongst poor states as a solution against powerful countries. He would differ with Kwame Nkrumah on how to achieve this unity: ‘I tried to get East Africa to unite before independence. When we failed in this, I was wary about Kwame’s continental approach. We corresponded profusely on this. Kwame said my idea of ‘regionalisation’ was only balkanisation on a larger scale’ (Nyerere, 1999). Shivji (2009) believes Nyerere came to Pan-Africanism through nationalism. Nkrumah started from Pan-Africanism under the influence of the early Pan-Africanist conferences and individuals like George Padmore and W. E. B. Du Bois. Nyerere linked African socialism to nationalism. The nationalist impulse was interpreted by Nyerere (1999) as supposedly different in Africa: ‘the role of African nationalism is different – or should be different – from the nationalism of the past. We must use the African national states as an instrument for the reunification of Africa, and not allow our enemies to use them as tools for dividing Africa. African nationalism is meaningless, is anachronistic, and is dangerous, if it is not at the same time Pan-Africanism’ (Nyerere, 1999). Extending and agreeing with this explanation, Shivji (2009) cautions...
that Pan-Africanism is older than nationalism. Given the adverse international economic structures, African unification was seen by Nyerere as a goal to be worked towards to achieve full self-determination and to overcome poverty. Unity was a key aspect of both domestic policy and foreign policy, for it was argued that ‘[w]ithout unity there is no future for Africa’ and ‘[u]nity will not make us rich but it will make it difficult for Africa to be disregarded’ (Nyerere, 1997). Nyerere contended that ‘it is not enough to be technically free, to have a Parliament and a President and Ministers. It is also necessary to have real power to stand on your own feet and follow your own interests. It is necessary to have an economy which is sufficiently balanced, stable and large to promote and sustain its own growth, and to withstand shock waves from other parts of the world. In other words, Africa wishes to have the political strength to prevent other powers using her for their own ends, and it wishes to have the economic strength to justify and support a modern economy’ (Nyerere, 1965).

Shivji (2009) sums up Nyerere's ideas of African unity as being defined by three aspects: identity, the non-viability of small states, and sovereignty. The African identity connects Africa over any other identity; small African states cannot be viable (economically, politically, and socially); and sovereignty (the ability to make decisions) could not be practiced by tiny states on a global platform of powerful countries. Nyerere has been criticised for looking at unity through the agency of the state and not the people, specifically through a one-party state (Neocosmos, 2017). Shivji (2009) also points out that this dissonance in Nyerere's thought is largely because he was a philosopher king, both a man of principle and a man of practice. For example, Mamdani (2013) thinks forced villagization was necessary, while Neocosmos (2017: 292) notes that ‘popular narratives were not given a chance to develop possibilities for a different politics; national subjectivities that exceeded the representation of the nation enunciated by TANU were simply silenced’. The contradiction was that individual freedom and reconstructing the colonial state had to be achieved through the state. In 1964, Nyerere would declare at the OAU that colonial borders were inviolable, while he would go on to spend the rest of his life arguing for the destruction of colonial borders. These contradictions were perhaps necessary in maintaining a consistent and practical principle of African unity and freedom.

Recognising his critics, Nyerere said: ‘I am pragmatic because I lead a government. You cannot lead a government as a bishop or as a professor. When you lead a government, you have to achieve results, you have to do things’ (Nyerere, 1979: 21–22). Ujamaa (familyhood) and Umoja (freedom) were the principal twin policies of Nyerere’s Tanzania. The effect of their implementation was not always positive.

Rooted in his unique conceptualisation of African socialism, Nyerere saw unity – emanating from the principle of collective responsibility – as an important part of African liberation, defence, and imperative for participating in the international system. He thought ‘the requirements of African Unity – the purposes of it – necessitate the establishment of a new international entity to replace the present small international entities which now exist in our continent. Until we have achieved that we shall not be free from fear of the rest of the world. A continent-wide state, single and individual, must be established, which cannot be broken up again because it is one unit and not a collection of units’ (Nyerere, 1965). Disunity meant that each African state is so ‘weak in isolation with relation to the outside world that we compete with each other, without unity economic growth would be delayed. Economic unity should lead to political unity’ (Nyerere, 1965). If the threat to Africa were external, he was clear: ‘in relation to the outside world there must be just one authority in Africa’ (Nyerere, 1965). This one authority could be called various names: All-African Government, United Nations of Africa, the United States of Africa, or another name.

It was Nyerere’s (1968) argument that ‘no nation has the right to make decisions for another nation; no people for another’. From understanding Nyerere’s conception of African socialism, it was apparent that a mission beyond the borders was inevitable (Msabaha, 1995). Africa’s need to involve itself in international affairs emanated from both the expansive nature of its socialism and its historical circumstances, such that the independence of Tanzania was intricately bound with the independence of Africa. Nyerere went on to demonstrate and live the international or communal dimension of African socialism on the international stage. He insisted that Africa should have a say in grand questions of nuclear weapons, climate change, and international trade because the world was interconnected. Nyerere’s African socialism enabled
him to understand the meaning of nuclear weapons in an interconnected world and he urged the Global South to take interest in this issue (Nyerere et al., 1976). He wrote a letter to the Commonwealth challenging South Africa’s membership and, as a result, apartheid South Africa decided to leave the Commonwealth. He went on to support freedom fighters in South Africa for 30 years from 1963 until 1994 when South Africa obtained its freedom. He did the same for Namibia from 1968 to their freedom in 1990 (Saul, 2002). He was a leading advocate for the formation in 1963 of the Organisation of African Unity (OAU) and the OAU Liberation Committee. When Ian Smith of Southern Rhodesia unilaterally declared independence from the U.K. in 1965, Nyerere through the OAU called all member states to break ties with Southern Rhodesia. He argued that the honour of Africa was at stake and that Africa had a responsibility to uphold the OAU resolution, if not as a continental body then as individual states (Nyerere, 1965). He became a strong critic of both UDI and Britain (Martin and Johnson, 1981). In the Lusaka Manifesto of 1968, he elaborated on the reasons for armed struggle. He was the First Chair of the Front-Line States in 1976 and organised the 1976 Rhodesia Conference between the warring sides in Southern Rhodesia as part of talks to majority rule (Martin and Johnson, 1981). He supported several militant groups in Africa like the ANC from South Africa, MPLA from Angola, Frelimo from Mozambique, and ZANU/ZAPU from Zimbabwe. He also supported academics like the Guyanese scholar Walter Rodney who found a safe haven from which he wrote the famous book How Europe Underdeveloped Africa (1972) (Bly, 1985). In 1978 and 1979, in an economically devastating war for Tanzania, Nyerere invaded Uganda and removed Idi Amin who was destabilising East Africa. Such decisions were not easy ones. He had also unpopularly indicated his intentions to militarily intervene in Rhodesia (Coggins, 2014; Swoyer et al., 2011). Nyerere was also broker in several crises, such as in Rwanda and Burundi. As more states joined the UN, he was at the forefront in pushing for the reform of the UN and organising the African position on UN reform which has come to be known as the Ezulwini Consensus (Abdulai, 2010).

Nyerere was also a very active member of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), an intercontinental formal position which decided to not take sides between the West and the East in the Cold War (Sathyamurthy, 1981). He was critical at the 1968 Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned countries. NAM was the middle way, the peaceful third way which also saw colonialism as an affront to its founding ethos. At the 1986 NAM Conference in Harare, the South Commission was established. This has eventually become the South Centre in Geneva and focuses on challenging global inequality and debt (Pratt, 1999). Over 120 states (containing half of the world’s population) have become part of NAM (Novaković, 2021). NAM’s relevance has been questioned on the basis that it promotes an outdated agenda of non-alignment in an age without alliances (Keethaponcalan, 2016). One indicator is the decreasing head of state attendance at NAM meetings. Unfortunately, as the impacts of the 2022 Russia–Ukraine war have shown, such an approach is limited and reflects a lack of concern for international affairs and understanding of the global political economy (Lopes, 2022). The international economic structures that maintain African poverty still persist. Now more than ever, continued concerted solidarity is important. As Cold War tensions resurface and justifications for grand strategic military deployments seem necessary, the unity of nations in the Global South could help not only fight poverty, but also serve as a defence against external security threats. Small African states are arguably not even full states, but rather powerless ‘statelets’ in the face of powerful countries and neoliberalism. Africa has been warned of the possibility of being colonised again if it does not unite (Lumumba, 2021; Mheta, 2019). Unity based
on African socialism presents a possible solution to poverty and insecurity in the Global South.

**Conclusion**

Julius Nyerere’s formative influence in African socialism, foreign policy, unity, and ideation in the Global South is important. His other nickname was ‘Baba wa Taifa’ (‘father of the nation’) in recognition of his role in birthing the independence of Tanzania. This name could also signify his concern for foreign affairs as a logical outgrowth of a certain approach to interpreting human freedom, national independence, and human development (Nyerere, 1997; 1969). His commitment to fighting disease, ignorance, and poverty serves as an example in understanding and approaching common issues plaguing the Global South. He defined the Third World and Global South as positive concepts. The Global South was more than a geographical location or the exploited. It had a meaning ‘which can be used for the betterment of the masses of the poor people’ (Nyerere, 1982: 440). Instead of a pejorative and derogatory understanding of the ‘Third World’, he defined the First World and Second World as the ways of the West and the East, in no particular order of importance. The Third World was, for him, another way of seeing things and he urged Third World countries to understand that they did not only have to look at the other two ways (Nyerere, 1982). This perspective had its basis in an ethical foundation: ‘that while many of Nyerere’s policy initiatives failed, they rested on an ethical foundation and on an understanding of the challenges which Tanzania faced, which were vastly more insightful than anything offered by his critics. An increasing number of students in African development are belatedly coming to recognize this truth. Perhaps, in contrast to them, ordinary Tanzanians have always recognized it’ (Pratt, 2002: 40).

Tanzania will forever hold a cherished place in the history of Africa in general and in the history of southern Africa in particular. Tanzania was selfless in providing military bases and training camps to launch the African liberation struggle and the Frontline States. The great African stories of young people who trekked their way to various camps in Tanzania make up so many heroic tales woven into the fabric of African national construction. These include Namibians in the South West Africa People’s Organisation (SWAPO), South Africa’s African National Congress paramilitary wing uMkhonto we Sizwe (MK) cadres, and Zimbabwean liberation fighters – all of whom have fond memories of Kwango and Morogoro military training camps in Tanzania (Msabaha, 1995). But perhaps the most difficult thing that Tanzania did, and also the most important for us as academics, was to provide thought leadership. This is the significance of the Mwalimu – the Great Teacher – not only as Nyerere but also as the able artisan, statesman, and intellectual. The concept of African socialism is important to African knowledge and continues to be relevant as a decolonial epistemology. It is relevant as we seek new ways of ending poverty and international insecurity. It is also relevant to new modes of learning and teaching in Africa and the Global South.

From Dodoma and Dar es Salaam, ideas of Pan-Africanism reverberating from Ghana under Nkrumah found capable interpreters and interlocutors in the people of Tanzania. They did not take their independence lightly, as it came much earlier than the rest of Africa. They approached their independence with intellectual zeal, deciding to tackle the broad questions of the day even beyond their borders. They resisted the temptation of simply mimicking Marxism or other -isms, but instead went deeper to innovate from African culture and ways of life and to re-member the psyche of a dismembered people (to use Ngūgi wa Thiong’o’s 2009 term). They began to theorise the liberation of Africa and the Global South in a very practical sense.

Amidst this liberation diplomacy, great social innovations in development, democracy, and politics were conducted. We look at Tanzania’s willingness to tear down the ruinous and oppressive past with a keen eye. We look at Tanzania to learn what it is to innovate and not fear innovation. We look to Tanzanian independence to see what to do with freedom and independence. This paper has shown that while the temptation may be to celebrate Nyerere only, the best way is to contextualise him within a community tradition and leadership role. His true legacy lies in demonstrating the interconnectivity of people and nations beyond narrow definitions of colonial borders and economic depravity. Nyerere was extraordinary in his capacity to combine action with deliberation. This enabled him to explain, interpret, and predict patterns of politics and economics working for and
against the Global South. Against great odds facing the Global South, Nyerere (2019) said: ‘My warning to my people is directed at both ends. Never be complacent. Can’t you do better. Couldn’t you do better. But don’t be so self-critical that you despair. Despair is the unforgivable sin. There is still a long way to go but we have come far’.
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