

The Imperatives Of People-Centered Development

Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere

IT IS WITH HUMILITY AS WELL AS PRIDE THAT I accept the honor this university has conferred on me today. There are few men and women who can, individually, affect the course of human history — and I am not one of them. But I believe that each person has the duty to work with others for mankind's advance towards that human unity which, embracing our human diversity, is — to my mind — the destiny of *homo sapiens*.

*"The
South
Commi-
ssion's
self-given
responsi-*

*bility was to study the
development experience
of Third World countries
over the past three
decades, and to make re-
commen-
dations
leading to
greater suc-
cess in the
future. "*

That is how I have tried to use those accidents of history which gave me special responsibilities to my country and its people, and therefore to Africa. And that is what I believe my colleagues and I were trying to do during the work of the South Commission, and are still trying to do as we seek to disseminate the message of our report and to promote the implementation of its recommendations.

The South Commission was an independent body, made up of twenty-eight men and women acting in their individual capacities, and drawn from all the continents of the South. Dr. Solita Collas-Monsod from this university was one of us. You know her incisive mind and pleasant personality; you will therefore realize that she became a strong member of a team composed of people adhering to different political ideologies, belonging to different regions, and coming from different cultures and experiences.

This team, after many long discussions, was able to issue a unanimous report. That report contains very many recommendations on aspects of national development, of cooperation among the countries of the South, and of North-South relations and the management of the international system. And although the commission had no executive authority, the report is action-oriented. Its detailed recommendations are deliberately practical, and because of the current state of the world they are therefore very modest in comparison to the immensity of the challenge facing developing countries.

I am not so sure, however, about the modesty of the four major strategic recommendations. For many countries of the South, they demand a change of policy direction, and perhaps a recognition — however reluctant — of unwelcome facts about the management of our increasingly interconnected world and the place of the countries of the South in that management structure.

The commission's self-given responsibility was to study the development experience of Third World countries over the past three decades, and to make recommendations leading to greater success in the future. It therefore began by defining "development."

The report, entitled *The Challenge to the South*, takes three and a half pages to make absolutely clear the yardstick by which the commission was judging the past and making proposals for the future. I will quote just

a few lines. "Development is a process which enables human beings to realize their potential, build self-confidence, and lead lives of dignity and fulfillment...It is a movement away from political, economic, or social oppression...And it is a process of growth, a movement essentially springing from within the society that is developing." And again: "a nation is its people. Development has therefore to be an effort of, by, and for the people. True development has to be people-centered."

This definition is thus a call for democracy at all levels within the society. The mechanisms should be appropriate to the culture, history, and conditions of the people; but the mechanisms must at the same time establish and safeguard the freedoms necessary for the people's real involvement in the decision-making which affects their lives.

The commission's definition also has economic and social implications. A rapidly expanding economy is necessary to create the resources for an improvement in human well-being and the public services which contribute to that. But — and again I quote — "Not only the growth of the national product but what is produced, how and at what social and environmental cost, by whom and for whom, — all this is relevant to people-centered development..."

Such a definition leads logically to the commission's first strategic recommendation — the building of *national self-reliance*. The people's freedom as members of the national society requires freedom for their nation within the context of the world society; the people's democratic government must be free to make its own decisions in their interests. Its ability to do this is inevitably limited if the nation's economy is dependent upon other nations or the institutions they control.

Many countries of the Third World are currently in such a position — my own is one of them. The reasons for that are discussed in the report. The international economic environment of the 1980s was one factor which pushed all the economically weakest developing countries in that direction. Natural disasters, such as those which the Philippines experienced in the last few weeks, have often been another factor.

But failures within our countries have also contributed to a state of dependency. Among these have been militarism and corruption, which the commission does not ignore. But usually of greater importance has been the tendency to look out for our salvation — to search for models of development outside ourselves, to copy the institutions of others without regard to our own cultures or even resources, or to imagine that development could come from external sources.

National self-reliance requires a recognition that the responsibility for development in the South lies with the South. No one else will, or could, develop our countries. In essence, it is therefore a demand that we use efficiently, and to the maximum, the human and natural resources of the nation for the benefit of our people.

In building our productive capacity or our infrastructure, national self-reliance means choosing technologies which use more of the resources we have in plenty and less those which are in short supply. It means looking first at the needs and capacities of the domestic market, while building up an export capability sufficient to pay for the goods and services our nation needs to buy abroad. And of vital importance for the building of national self-reliance are education and training policies which increase the knowledge — including the technical knowledge — of the people and the number of its own experts.

There are in the commission's report discussions and recommendations on the whole field of national development policies. These include matters related to science and technology; the tasks and relationships of the state, of planning, and of the market in economic and social life; the actual and potential contribution of women; and the importance of cultural and environmental considerations.

The second strategic recommendation of the South Commission follows from the first; it is that through cooperation among themselves the nations of the South should build *collective self-reliance*.

South-South cooperation has been the official policy of almost all developing nations since the Bandung Conference of 1955. The numerous attempts to implement that policy, however, have run into many problems and have not led to anything like the benefits which were hoped for.

After surveying the problems, and the requirements of the world as it is and is likely to be in the coming century, the commission was convinced of one thing. The problems can and must be overcome by the South if it is to act in accordance with the imperatives of people-centered development.

The industrialized and developing countries of the North have recognized those imperatives. Consequently, we see the free trade area covering the United States of America and Canada, and the rapid development of a common market in Europe which will be in place next year. Yet almost any one of the countries involved in all those initiatives is stronger than whole continents of the South. We do not need to copy their institutions of cooperation — though we can surely learn from them; but we must emulate the North's moves towards unity and social and economic harmonization of policies.

South-South cooperation can expand the development options of each participating country; pursued with care and determination it can therefore lead to a strengthening of the economies of the individual countries of the South, and of the South as a whole.

This cooperation can be at many different levels — bilateral, sub-regional, regional, and global. The potential for it is much greater now than in the 1950s because South countries have advanced in different sectors and to different degrees. We are no longer all primary commodity

producers. Manufactured goods of all kinds are produced in different parts of the South. And while some countries now have high-quality scientific and technological education and research institutions, others have had considerable success in implementing mass education or family planning or health policies. The South even includes countries which look for profitable investments abroad! There is now a wider field than earlier for beneficial exchange and mutual learning.

In the past, however, South-South cooperation has been regarded as a matter just for the governments of the South. The commission does not take that view. It is convinced that cooperation in the South will really advance when the people themselves become active and take some initiatives. The media, public and private businesses, trade unions, universities and research institutions, non-governmental organizations of many kinds, all have a role to play in widening the area of cooperation among the peoples and nations of the South.

The commission's third strategic recommendation is the building of *solidarity* among the countries of the South in all their negotiations with the North. This is not a call for confrontation with the North. We are seeking — and I quote — “an undivided world, in which there would be no ‘South’ and no ‘North’; in which there would not be one part developed, rich and dominating, and the other underdeveloped, poor, and dominated.”

But that is not the world we have now.

Changes in the present systems of world governance are essential if these structures are to deal with the real and urgent problems of people in both North and South. For overwhelmingly, these problems are derived from the South's poverty and the gross North-South inequalities of development, of scientific capacity, of trading power, and in the use of the world's resources. Things like migration, environmental degradation, epidemics such as AIDS, and the general advance in human well-being, can only be effectively dealt with by the world when all peoples cooperate on terms of mutual respect and equity.

All nations are involved, everyday, in negotiations with one another on these and other-related matters at bilateral and multilateral levels. But when countries of the North and the South are involved, the negotiations take place between the strong and

“We are seeking an undivided world, in which there would be no ‘South’ and no ‘North’; in which there would not be one part developed, rich and dominating, and the other underdeveloped, poor, and dominated.”

*"The
countries of the strong
North stand together
when meeting
the countries of the
South .
The weak countries
of the South,
however,
are almost always
divided, thus losing
the capability and
strength they could
gain through
cooperation
and solidarity."*

the weak. Further, the strong North stand meeting the countries of the South at the conference table. The weak countries of the South, however, are almost always divided, thus in practice losing the capability and strength they could gain through cooperation and solidarity.

The developing countries have a responsibility to their own peoples and to the world to maximize their strength in these negotiations through greater solidarity. The poor are always the first and greatest victims of any social and economic imbalance; but sooner or later everyone is affected by it. This is recognized by many persons, non-governmental organizations, and some governments in the North. In working together for greater justice, the South has allies in the North with whom it can and should make common cause.

Following its discussions on all aspects of South-North relations, the report makes recommendations for concrete action by the South and the North — separately and together.

Finally, I must mention just one other recommendation of the commission. Throughout its report, it urges that a very much higher priority be given in the allocation of resources in our countries for the development of *science and technology*. More emphasis must be given to education, training, and research in these disciplines. We must take advantage of scientific advances in all our development activities.

Mr. Chancellor: I reiterate my sincere appreciation of the great honor accorded to me by this university today.

Thank you.

The Challenge from the Mwalimu: The South Must Act Together

QUESTION: IN YOUR BOOK, *THE CHALLENGE TO the South*, universalized access to primary education is seen as an effective population control policy. However, studies on Southeast Asian societies belie this. They show that those who had primary education had more children than those who had none.

Nyerere: If all you have in mind is fertility, you could make that judgment. But to those of us who are advocating universal primary education we do so because we see it as a right. It is the only education that is a right. Beyond that, education is no longer a right. This certainly was my own belief when I was president of my own country. I felt that primary education was a right that can be defined as a right of citizenship. How many years depend upon the ability of the state to provide. But I felt that seven years of education was a right of every child in the country. Beyond this it becomes a privilege. Since it is a right, in a sense we do not give it any value except that the people must have an education.

I am not quite sure if your conclusion is true for my own country. Our population was growing at 3.3 percent a year, which was very high. It is still very high today. But what are you going to do in order to bring it down? What can you do? In my own view education is the answer. How do you begin to talk to traditional women about the need to have a small number of children? It is very difficult. What do we say to my mother? Of course to my mother, it is now useless. But to my sisters?

I must explain this. This population thing is something to be talked about a lot. And I believe we should indeed deal with the problem of population. The question is how do we deal with this problem with a people that is completely traditional?

My father was a polygamist, so let me clarify that first of all. His first wife had four children, three died. His second wife had three children, two died, one lived. His third wife had four children, all died. So, of his first eleven children only two survived. His fourth wife had no children. My mother was his fifth wife. Under both Islam and Christianity, I am illegitimate. She had eight children, six lived, two died. Now, to my father my mother was tremendous. Eight children and six survived!

So you see, in a situation where a lot of children are dying, it matters very much how many children you have. So you cannot say to my sisters to have a small number of children. They would not understand what you are talking about. So education is what matters. They have to have good education.

"To those of us who are advocating universal primary education we do so because we see it as a right. Primary education is a right that can be defined as a right of citizenship."

In the last census our population growth is 2.8 percent, still it is too high, but it is going down. I made it a point that this information be included in the education of every girl because every young mother in our country is literate. Because we give education to everybody, every young mother is literate. So if you are going to talk about what to do, in order not to have a child every year, then there must be some way in which you can teach it. But to illiterate tribal women, I do not know how you are going to go about it. Even if fertility were all the objective, I would still say the girl who had seven years of education will probably say, "Well I have two, why do I want a third?" The girl who had no education would not ask that question at all.

Sr. Mary John Mananzan (*St. Scholastica's College*): I think it depends on what kind of education they have in these first seven years.

There is the traditional education which is a very sexist education. No wonder the girls only perpetuate the values that are traditionally instilled and perpetuated in society. Especially in kindergarten, you cannot underestimate the influence of kindergarten teachers in the sexist education of children. So the statistics stems from the fact that this seven-year elementary schooling is what we could call a "malestream" education.

I think if the elementary teachers have inculcated in themselves values that come from the women's perspective, even these six or seven years of elementary education will educate them about fertility and all that. Because they would now be very familiar with what are the rights of women. I believe that the best population control that you can ever have is when all women would have a real control of their own bodies.

Prof. Randolph David (*Moderator, Third World Studies Center director*): Do you agree with that? I saw you nodding so you must agree with the sister?

Nyerere: Of course you must agree with a sister.

Prof. Jose David Lapuz (*University of Santo Tomas*): In your acceptance speech, you said you are not saying that there should be a confrontation between the South and the North.

I would just like to call your attention, your excellency, to the Latin American approach of dependency theory. It calls for a separation from the Western industrialized countries and explains that development is nothing more than a deeper integration into the Western system. I would like to ask whether you meant that there should be no abrogation from the industrialized countries?

I must confess, I have not read your books. I just listened to your acceptance address and you spoke of self-reliance. I would like to know if that self-reliance will take place among the countries of the South. What happens to the international system in which the South countries operate? Will there be reforms needed? And if reforms are needed, do they not in fact call for confrontation?

Nyerere: We are not calling for confrontation because who wants confrontation? We live on a single planet, and this planet is now very small. But there is a division of power in the world. And there is a division of power in countries. And there is no doubt that the developed countries are more powerful than we are. That is a fact of life. And they happen to be in the North. And you have the underdeveloped countries. They give them many names: underdeveloped, Third World, developing. All these euphemisms hide the fact that you are talking about countries which are not developed and therefore are powerless in relation to the North.

The vast majority of humanity lives in the South. And the countries in this division are not developed. There are exceptions like South Korea and Taiwan. But really, they do not make a slightest difference at all. We are not calling for a confrontation between the South and the North because the confrontation is in the division of power itself. In a sense, we are calling for the end of that confrontation. As long as you have that division of power, either global or internal, you will have confrontation.

In my own country, you have a small minority which has wealth and has power. And the vast majority has no wealth and has no power. You have confrontation there. If the majority is not revolting, it is because somehow they are still finding out how. But otherwise the actual confrontation is in the division of power itself. And one talks about ending it, because you cannot have peace at all with that kind of division.

So in a sense that is what we are doing. And I quote from our report: "We are calling for a world where there is no longer North and South. Where there is no longer a developed North with power and an underdeveloped South without power. A dominating North and a dominated South."

Now when we say be self-reliant, I think this is a simple statement of a strategy of government. We are asking the Filipinos, who do you think is going to develop your country? Who can develop this country? You say you have somebody, you have some "uncle" outside who is going to develop your country. We say this is nonsense. You have no uncle outside. You have nobody there who is going to develop this country for you.

The development of the Philippines must be a responsibility of the people of the Philippines. Nobody else has that responsibility. And the resources to develop your country are here. They are not outside. So please use your resources here. This is what you call self-reliance. Depend upon yourselves, your people, and your own resources. That is what you can call yours. For your development depends upon what is yours, upon your people, upon your resources. Develop your resources, develop your people. Give them the training. That is the basis of your development. Do not expect an uncle. The uncle mentality is no good for the South.

There is a lot of illusion. I was in Latin America the other day, and there is a lot of talk there about looking to the North. I was joking in one

country. I asked, "you think that the Americans are going to turn Latin America into another Japan? The United States of America is going to spend resources to create another Japan on their border? One Japan is not enough for them?"

So we are saying, to every country of the South, the basis of your development is national self-reliance. And then when you go out, do not go always to the North because there is always the South. The South is there. Because the mentality that the world consists purely of the North is absurd.

There is Asia. Asia can look to Asia for lots of things. Why do you have to look outside of Asia when you have neighbors here? So we are saying to the countries of the South, after national self-reliance, the next stage is collective self-reliance. This is what all trade unions do in order to reduce their weakness in bargaining with their powerful employers. So look to others, and build your collective strength.

Confrontation. Yes, confrontation in the sense that as long as there is a division of power, there is the "they" and "us." And when you have this "they" and "us," you have this inevitable confrontation. But you are not building for the purpose of confrontation. You are building for the purpose of reducing the imbalance which is there. We are not suggesting to the countries of the South to cut themselves off from the North. You cannot.

How can you do it? They have their technology and you need that technology. But, you do not always have to need the technology from the North because there is a lot of technology from the South you can use. When you go to the North you are going to pay a price for it. There is technology in the North, there is a market in the North, but there is also technology and a market in the South.

There is finance in the North and we need it too. When my country needs some money, they go to put on the strings for you. You cannot take their money without losing a bit of your freedom. And it is a problem. It is a judgment of how much strings you accept. To reduce these strings we have to work together.

"The basis of your development is national self-reliance. When you go out, do not go always to the North because there is always the South. The mentality that the world consists purely of the North is absurd."

We are not advocating a break with the North. We are advocating interdependence. Interdependence is between equals. A relation between reasonably equal entities. Without that equality it is really a system of dependence. And this dependence is wrong. So it is dependence that we fight.

When we say national self-reliance, we are not saying national self-sufficiency. There is no such thing as national self-sufficiency. You cannot have that. Not even China can have that. China is very big but it has to open up. It needs markets, finance, technology from abroad. Even if China is a billion people it cannot be self-sufficient.

Prof. Merlin Magallona (*U.P. College of Law*): Your excellency, I did not know that your report is that thick. We just have the benefit of a few pages, but I think the essential features of your report are reflected in the few pages that I got. So may I base my comments and question on this.

First on the confrontation question. I am not sure if it is a correct reading of contemporary history that we should omit the confrontational framework. In fact, there were confrontations and the South lost many times. Initially, we have for example the 1973 oil crisis, and the South won. We had the emergence of the New International Economic Order (NIEO), and the South won. There was a strong current for a non-capitalist development in your own continent, Africa. There was a reversal of this process beginning with the explosion of the foreign debt in 1982. The South won, but the next time it lost. So I think the confrontation was unavoidable. This brings me to the next point.

I think from the very few essays written by you that I have read, I know that you are a champion of the Non-Aligned Movement and the movement for the NIEO. As I go over the part of your report entitled "The South on the Threshold of the Twenty-First Century," your analysis and strategies are not far from the three economic declarations issued by the summit of the non-aligned nations. Essentially, your report reflects the framework of the NIEO which has already been wiped out by international capitalism.

I ask now: what force are we now relying on that could be a vehicle for the translation of your analysis and strategies into a real path to development, a function in which the non-aligned movement and the NIEO failed?

And I note that in your report there is some balancing between the state sector and the forces of the market. Of course, I can see that the

"We are not advocating a break with the North. We are advocating interdependence. Interdependence is between equals. A relation between reasonably equal entities. Without that equality it is really a system of dependence."

forces of the market are winning. In your own commission, I am not sure whether the alignments are actually in favor of self-reliance.

When the foreign debt crisis exploded in 1982 or 1983, I thought it was the watershed because that was the time when the empire struck back. And from then on, the process of reversal, the dictation of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank conglomerates began to take its toll.

As a matter of fact, there was a period in the 1970s when there was a strong assertion for self-reliance in Africa. But we can see now that one after another the countries that adopted the path of non-capitalist development were swallowed up by the forces of the market. I am not sure if there had been a qualitative change in the alignment of political forces that could carry your recommendations through against the background of defeats in the Non-Aligned Movement and in the NIEO.

Nyerere: When we call for national self-reliance here, we are saying that your countries have no choice. If they do not accept national self-reliance and collective self-reliance, really then they should agree simply to be dependencies. You cannot be independent some other way.

Our report is not a socialist document. So do not confuse it with the call for socialism. This is not anti-capitalist. It is anti-isms of capitalism. It is anti-isms of socialism and so forth. So it is purely a reasonable, people-centered call for development.

Some people today think that the market can solve everything. No, it cannot. Do not leave everything to the market. Nobody does. Reagan never did it. And Mrs. Thatcher never did it also. So, nobody does leave everything to the market.

There is a place for the market. And we argue the case for the market. But we say, there is also a place for the state. Although we are saying that the state in many of our countries should reduce its activities as an entrepreneur, we say, this is not true of all Southern countries. If you do not have a well-developed national entrepreneurship, and you reduce the state as an entrepreneur, then you are simply giving your economy to others. You are simply inviting others to come in and take over. So we are saying that in countries where the internal private sector is not developed, perhaps there is no alternative to the state.

Dr. Ponciano Intal (*Deputy Director, National Economic Development Authority*): I consider your book a landmark book, together with the 1991 World Development Report. The title that you have is *A Challenge to the South*, which is actually a challenge to the world because to have the success of the recommendations that you are putting forth for the South requires strong cooperation from the North. The title of the 1991 World Development Report is *A Challenge of Development*. And what is striking, I think, is that here there is a group of eminent politicians and scholars from the South having nearly the same key themes for development as

the technocrats and researchers of the World Bank. And I think the 1990 decade brings out a consensus on a new paradigm of development, or a new approach to development. And in both that report and in your report, I think there are particularly three key themes for development.

First is that you have got to invest in people. Second, an outward orientation of the economy and increased domestic competition. The third key theme is on macro-economics stability.

Dr. Emerenciana Arcellana (*UP Department of Political Science*): I take note that you acknowledge the role of the state in the management of development. But I am afraid that the tendency now is back to *laissez-faire* again on the advice maybe of our Northern colleagues or advisers. I note that there is a frenzy for privatization amongst developing countries. Like we want to sell Philippine Airlines, we want to sell the Manila Hotel, we had sold Philippine Plaza. We really had a number of profitable enterprises in the auction block and I feel very unhappy about this because these are corporations that symbolize the Filipino people and their efforts to enter into the modern world.

And yet it seems that while we keep the non-performing assets, we dispose of the performing assets, i.e., the more profitable corporations.

Nyerere: The North is pushing for ideas like privatization. And like what you have just said, when you privatize, they will take over businesses which are running well. Those which are not running well they will not take.

I was just reading a report the other day where the World Bank sponsored a study of Tanzania's textile industry and there is a recommendation that we should privatize. And the factories which are listed for privatization are the ones doing well. With the ones that are doing badly, the recommendation is to wipe out the debts, and then privatize. I would put the Northern advice this way: Jesus was talking to a crowd of people, and he was saying to them, "these people," meaning the Pharisees, "occupy the seat of Moses. So listen to what they tell you. Do not do what they do because they do not practice what they preach."

All I want to say is watch out! Watch out for the advice we get from the North. They say depend upon comparative advantage. We say fine! Because there are certain areas in which the South is very good. One is textile. We can compete with the North in textile. But do you think they would let you compete? These cardinals of the free market will let you compete? They will not.

The North's farming sector is extremely incompetent and inefficient. The Europeans spend some \$67 billion a year subsidizing their agriculture. Now you cannot call that efficient agriculture at all. But these same people who eat subsidized food come to Tanzania and tell us not to give the slightest subsidy to our farming. Not the slightest! These people who know that their farmers cannot exist without subsidy would not allow us to

subsidize our own farmers. No subsidy in the fertilizers and pesticides they use, just leave the whole thing to the market, they say.

You are nearer to Japan here. Japan leaves everything to the market? Is that true? The Japanese protect. The Americans protect. The Europeans protect. But the South must not protect? You put me in a boxing ring with a heavyweight fighter and you say "Mwalimu, we want you to play according to the rules." I ask, "what rules?" Me with a heavyweight boxer, I will be murdered.

Highly developed transnationals, they come to Tanzania. They say that if the transnational banks should come to Tanzania, then we should give them the same rules which we give to a local Tanzanian bank which is just starting. This is really saying that we should not have any Tanzanian bank at all and just ask the Northerners to come and establish their banks in our country. Because no bank in Tanzania can compete with those banks unless we protect it!

"These same people who eat subsidized food come to Tanzania and tell us not to give the slightest subsidy to our farming. These people who know that their farmers cannot exist without subsidy would not allow us to subsidize our own farmers."

So you can say protect by this much. But to protect is necessary and this is what we are saying. You can say do not overprotect your industries. But to say do not protect at all, that is absurd! Who does it? The big fellows do not do it. If they do not protect openly they have secret ways of protecting their industries. They give money to people who go into business, they do business promotion in order to win contracts abroad. They give their contractors lots of privileges and so forth. That is how they develop. But to the South, no, you have to leave everything to the market.

Dr. Fermin Adriano (*Ateneo Center for Policy Studies*): I am sorry I have not had the chance to read your work, but while I was still a student in a graduate program, I was able to read the Brandt Commission report. Its unifying theme is the interdependence between the North and

South and argues quite well that the survival of the North also hinges on the development of the South. In your presentation right now, the theme that I can perceive is the need for national self-reliance. That is really a very good recommendation but there are two realities in the Third World which can serve as obstacles to the attainment of national self-reliance. There are others of course but I would just like to highlight two of them.

One is the foreign debt question. In the experience of the Philippines, it is squeezing a lot of our resources. Thus, even if we want to engage in

self-reliance it is impossible without confronting the issue of the foreign debt. And many countries, like Brazil, had literally bled dry using their resources, which had adverse environmental impact.

The other one is the obstacle presented by the people within the South itself who benefit a lot from the inequitable North-South relationship. And I am sure that in Tanzania you have the same problem. There is an alliance between the dominating forces in the North and the dominating forces in the South. How do you address this problem?

It is a great problem right now and some people are saying that we need to have a good state in order to advance the interest of the South. After all, Harry Johnson, the heralded Chicago economist, said that these multinational corporations and transnational corporations are not here for philanthropical reasons. They are here to rake profits. Therefore it is incumbent upon the state to play that equalizing role to be able to allocate resources to its people and to the nation.

There was this study by the World Bank through the World Development Report in 1983 in which it tried to statistically co-relate the removal of policy-induced market distortions to the level of development of countries. And to the surprise of the neo-classical economists, market distortions only had a co-relation of one-third. The removal of policy-induced distortions or liberalization only explains thirty percent of the whole development process. And two-thirds could not be explained by these liberalization measures. Probably it could be explained by socio-political forces like the ability and astuteness of the leadership, etc.

Question: Your excellency, allow me to go back to the question of confrontation. I understand that your message is to put an end to the situation that breeds confrontation, but is it not that we have to have confrontation first before we can reach that stage? We should confront patriarchy, sexism, and racism. And that is confrontation. And that is not only between the North and the South but within the South itself. Considering the fact that the South is a product of colonization, we have to de-colonize ourselves, and how can we do that without confrontation?

Nyerere: I speak as chairman of the South Commission. We do not avoid the confrontational situation which exists at a global level between the North and South. I repeat, when you have that kind of division, you have a built-in situation of confrontation between the haves and have-nots. This is true in the global level and it is true in the national level.

*“Work
together
in facing
the North!
We are not calling
for a confrontation,
we are calling
for a much more
effective strategy
of struggle in facing
the powerful.”*

“We have deliberately avoided using confrontation. Why? There is no point. You are right that when you have that kind of built-in confrontation the only way you do it is through struggle. I congratulated the Chinese the other day when we were having a discussion like this. I was very pleased because speaker after speaker mentioned struggle. I congratulated them and said I was glad the word “struggle” was still used in China because it was disappearing in the other parts of the South.

The call we are making here is people's participation at the national level. People have to work together, must have a say in the decision-making process of their own nation. It is a form of struggle we are calling for. The call to the countries of the South: maximize your own capacity to develop because if you depend too much on the powerful, you are also losing your capacity to be yourself by simply adopting an attitude of dependence.

But first of all, use your own resources to the maximum, that is what we are saying. Cooperate. And when you face the powerful, do not do it alone. When you talk about debt, do not talk to the North alone because they would not talk to you alone.

I will give you the example of my own country. Tanzania is a very poor country. I was asking our minister of finance, “What happens when you go to Paris?” He tells me, “Mwalimu, when I go to Paris, everybody is there. The British are there, the Americans are there, the Germans are there, the French are there, the IMF is there, the World Bank is there, everybody is there.” The North. And then we: Tanzania. Tanzania, poor Tanzania, as it goes and faces these giants, all of them together. So you sit there and you explain your point of view. And having explained your point of view, you are asked to retire to another room. So you retire to another room, and they consult each other. These powerful fellows consult among themselves and then they appoint their spokesman to tell the Tanzanian fellow what they have agreed upon.

That is what they do. They work together, the powerful work together even in facing Tanzania! So that is what we are saying to you people. Work together in facing these people! Because in that face-to-face there is a struggle but you are too weak if you are alone. So we are not calling for a confrontation, we are calling for a much more effective strategy of struggle in facing the powerful.

Sr. Mananzan: But the problem precisely is that there are Northern people in the South who have the same interests as the Northerners in the North. So we have to control these Northern people in the South first before we can say let us come together and work together. They are also working together.

Nyerere: I led my country to independence. It was easier then. Because we were able to mobilize everybody against the British! Everybody! There is no way in which you could not join us and not appear to be a traitor. So, we mobilized the whole population against the British and, of

course, we won. Maybe because they were a declining power but nevertheless they were still more powerful than we were.

Nowadays it is very difficult to mobilize everybody. I say "Let us talk about economics." And they say "What is Mwalimu talking about? Mwalimu does not want us to become rich." So now you have people within the country who feel that their interest may lie in cooperation with the dominating power outside.

And that is why in one sense this report is much better than a socialist report. A socialist report can be much more divisive within a country. What you are facing is really the trouble outside. You know, you want maximum unity inside so you can face the outside. And therefore, perhaps it is easier if you have simply good developmental, people-centered policies, so then you can also have local capitalists who accept good people-centered policies.

On that basis you can have a maximum national consensus which means that it includes the people and your own internal capitalists. You give them confidence so that instead of investing outside, your own capitalists will invest inside the country. The Japanese have done it. Their capitalists are Japanese capitalists. So it is possible, I feel, to mobilize the internal resources.

We have some of our own capitalists who do not want to invest in our own country. They invest abroad, which is very bad. And then we go abroad to ask for money. Somebody was telling me the other day, "The difference between your people and our capitalists is that our capitalists invest in your country and they demand the dividends back. Your capitalists invest in our country and they leave their dividends there. They do not transfer their dividends and reinvest in their own country."

Dr. Roger Posadas (*Dean, UP College of Science*): I think no country in the South will reject national self-reliance. The problem however is in its operationalization.

Basic to national self-reliance is the attainment of self-reliance in science and technology because basically the division between the North and South is a technological division. It is a knowledge gap.

In most countries in the South, if not all, the problem is that we are confronted with a vicious circle. We need modern technology in order to modernize our production sector but because we have a weak technological and scientific capability we have to go to the North to acquire the technology at a price. In the process, the elites or the private sector in the Southern countries develop a vested interest in the importation of technology because they tie up with the companies and multinational firms in the North.

The states in the South do not find a need for developing local scientific and technological capacities because the economic advisers of the governments are usually people from the private sector who can count on

"Spend more resources on science and technology and then look within the South. There are certain technologies which the South has that you do not have to go to the North at all to acquire them."

technological importation for their own needs. So, they do not find a need to invest in local scientific and technological development. And because of this, the weakness of the Southern countries in science and technology is further reinforced.

What steps do you think are necessary to overcome this vicious circle?

Nyerere: First of all, let me say that we agree with you and we put it almost exactly as you said. That is one way to describe the difference between North and South. The North spends more resources on the development of science and technology than the South. And if you analyze the South itself, the more successful countries are the ones spending more resources on

science and technology although, of course, not as much as the North. We have called upon to look at these countries and see what they have done. What are the policies of some of these countries which have been more successful in the South?

I say adopt a policy of spending more resources on science and technology and then look within the South, at what have been done. We say that this is also an area where countries of the South can work together because there are certain technologies which the South has. You do not have to go to the North at all to acquire them.

India is very developed technologically. China, Brazil, and even the small countries have developed technologically. I do not know about your people because I have not had the time to see how much you have done. But if we were to accept that we have a problem about science and technology, if all of us in the South realize that this is a problem, we can help one another.

There are many achievements even in high technology. Little Cuba is very developed in bio-technology. Let us put our heads together. What we have done here is exactly to bring out the importance of science and technology. And that you will find in almost every chapter of our report.

Prof. Felipe Medalla (UP School of Economics): Earlier this afternoon at the start of the forum you said something to which I agree with very strongly but which probably would not be very popular to the students of this university and that is free access to elementary but not to secondary and tertiary education.

But I think that position is consistent with your position that we have to spend a lot of money in improving our science and technology. Because if

you give free access to secondary and tertiary education, you will have no money for science and technology. Is this a real dilemma in terms of actual resource allocation in government?

Nyerere: First of all, our countries will have to make a strategic decision to give more resources to science and technology. That decision has to be made and we are saying many of our countries have not actually done it.

On the question of how to get primary and secondary education. Well in my own country, when we became independent we were very backward. A great part of our population was illiterate. A very small number of our children were going to school. We did not have enough teachers. So for the first thirteen years of our independence, we did not do very much more for primary education than simply maintaining the proportion of children of school-going age to those who are actually going to school. Both their numbers were increasing but the proportion did not increase at all. We simply maintained that for thirteen years because we did not have the teachers.

In the meantime, we expanded secondary education because it is where we are going to get our teachers. So that when we were sure that we had an area where we can get enough teachers, we then called for universal primary education and expanded it to seven years. And all education was free. We did not have much education so we had to make it free. So primary education was free, secondary education was free, universal education was free. The whole thing was free, right up to the top.

We now know we cannot do it. We now realize we cannot do it at all. So even primary education which we call a right is not completely free. So is secondary school. They are now beginning to pay. We can pay only some of it.

Now the demand for secondary schools is very great. Although at first we only had public schools, private sector participation now is quite big because the government by itself cannot provide all the schools. So I think now in Tanzania there must be as many private secondary schools as there are public schools. And all those private schools are for pay. So now we are paying for secondary education. And even in the public schools we are paying more now than we were paying before. Yes we are still paying less than what one pays in the private schools. But that is the distinction we are beginning to make, that we subsidize primary school because it is a right; that if the parents would demand it free, we would have to give it free. But secondary schools we cannot give free. In reality we cannot.

Dr. Jose V. Abueva (UP President): In the report of the South Commission, there is a very ringing summary of the challenge to the South. It is not too long, so let me read a few parts of it:

The challenge to the South is to reaffirm, in words and action, that the purpose of development is the promotion of the well-being of its people, with economic growth directed at satisfying their needs and fulfilling their purposes.

The challenge to the South is to strengthen democratic institutions so that its people may live in freedom and chart their own path to development in harmony with their culture and values.

The challenge to the South is to use its own resources more effectively to accelerate its development, giving priority to meeting the basic needs of its people and freeing them from poverty, disease, ignorance, and fear.

The challenge to the South is to enable its people to realize the full potential of their talents and creativity, and to develop self-confidence, and to mobilize their contribution to the well-being and progress of their societies.

The challenge to the South is to enlarge its capacity to benefit from advances in science and technology in securing a better life for its people.*

However, to do this effectively and successfully requires leadership at all levels. This brings out the issue of the kind of leadership that a developing country in the South would need.

I recalled to you that strangely, after fourteen years of dictatorship and only five years after the end of that dictatorship, we now hear commentators saying that perhaps what we need is a strong leadership, a benevolent authoritarian leadership of the Lee Kwan Yu mold. Now, I say it is strange because we seem to have such a short memory.

I remember interviewing Prime Minister Nehru, after Gen. Ayub Khan had taken over in Pakistan. He said that the general explained that Pakistan was not ready for the Indian kind of democracy and, therefore, they need some kind of tutelage under a military rule. Nehru argued however that to learn democracy is like learning how to swim. You just jump in the water. No amount of lectures will make you learn how to swim.

And yet the experience of countries in the South shows us that there are also difficulties in mustering this kind of leadership for the goals that you set out in your report and for meeting the challenges. So now I would like to have the benefit of your reflections and wisdom on leadership for meeting the challenges of the South.

In your experience in your own country and in other countries of the Third World in trying to mobilize the people to meet these challenges that your report has defined simply yet eloquently, can you really rely on authoritarian leaders to meet these challenges?

NYERERE: I think, in a sense, we are saying it here in this report. We have said development had to be people-centered. People must participate. They have got to participate in their own development. And so we have called for democracy there. There is no call there for some form of dictatorship for the purpose of development at all. You cannot find it there

* South Commission, *A Challenge to the South*, p. 23.

"We really have to have systems of government which respect people; which respect human rights; which allow participation; which are chosen by the people. How you organize this choosing of the people, I do not know. But let the leadership be accountable to the people."

and certainly none of us would believe that dictatorship is a form of developing people-centered development. It has got to be democratic. On that we have no doubt and we are totally committed to it. Development has to be democratic.

But we can differ in the way we define our democracy. Everybody defines one's own democracy. And now the North is very clear. It knows what democracy means. It wants to tell us that we must do exactly what it tells us. Now, even I doubt this kind of democracy.

We really have to have systems of government which respect people; systems of government which respect human rights; systems of government which allow participation; systems of government which are chosen by the people. How you organize this choosing of the people, I do not know. Whether you have two parties to choose from, three parties or ten parties, I do not know. I do not care myself. But choose people and let people be accountable. Let the leadership be accountable to the people. Somehow you have got to have this accountability to the people. It is a necessary part of democracy. How you do it is what will make us go on debating with our friends in the North. But democracy is necessary to development. I cannot believe myself choosing dictatorship.

What we have to avoid which is far from democracy is chaos. And that is the problem, that is a real problem to many of our countries.

Our friends in Eastern Europe also, like us in Africa, do not know democracy at all. I was surprised when during his trip in the United States, Yeltsin said "Now, in our country, we are going back to democracy." I say going back to *what* democracy? The Russians are talking about going back to *what* democracy? This way of looking to the West makes the Russians think there is some kind of democracy which they gave up and that now they have to go back to it. But I think that is completely ridiculous. I do not understand it at all.

So you have got to give the Russians and the East Europeans a chance to develop democracy. You have got to give this people an opportunity to

develop. And this is what I see might happen because they see Western Europe, they will say, "Ah, that is democracy." They want freedom. Okay, fine. And they will look at Western Europe, and they will say, "That is what we want." My own fear is that they will end up with a chaotic situation. And in a chaotic situation people will begin to say, "It was better when it was tyrannical."

So, a democratic government is not necessarily a weak government. I believe I was democratic. But I could not accept that democracy means no authority. We have agreed in a system under which you exercise joint authority. But it has to be authority so that everybody knows the rules. When the light says green, you go through, and when it is red, you stop. These are rules and when you have established the rules you accept the rules. And you know the rules under which you get a license so you get it according to rules. And when you know you have fulfilled the rules you expect your license.

But then many of our governments are not precisely strong. And because they are not strong, they become corrupt. Because the only way you can get your way is to bribe people. When there are rules, you cannot bribe anybody. So when the rule is bad, you say the rule is bad so you change those who make the rules, then you change the rules.

So when the system of making the rules is known and the rules are being enforced, you do not bribe anybody. When the rules are not being enforced, you bribe. And when you have that government, people would say it is better to have a dictator.

But to really establish democratic institutions, effective governments are important. What we must avoid is to identify democracy with weakness. So that is democracy with chaos. That is very dangerous.

Democratic governments must be supported to be stronger. That is really the strongest government. Because any elected government ought to be a strong government. It is a popular government and it acts according to its mandate given by the people. So what we must avoid is to identify democracy with weakness, and to identify democracy with corruption, indecision, and so forth. And then you have this idea that it is better to have a strong dictator. But it is very dangerous to have dictators.

Mr. Mon Isberto (*Inter-Press Agency*): Your excellency, I have two questions. One I ask to you in your position as the chairman of the South Commission and the other as a statesman of Africa.

"North" and "South" are terms and concepts that are very powerful and very vivid, but there are questions that have been raised on how applicable and how realistic they continue to be. In the South for example, you have a great deal of differentiation that has already taken place and some people say that a portion of the South has detached itself and gone to the North. How do you see this phenomenon? Where do you think is

this going and how much further can you push the concept of the South and the North?

And my second question, sir, is what is your reaction to the decision of the United States to lift the economic sanctions against the Pretoria government?

Nyerere: When I was asked to establish this commission, it was true the question had been asked, "what is the South?" Usually, that questioning was coming from the North. They say that there is no such thing as the South.

Only last week, we were discussing this report in Geneva. The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) was discussing this report in Geneva and the ambassador of the Netherlands criticized us for not having recognized the fact that the South is very differentiated. It is just not monolithic. And so the North asks, "What does Tanzania have in common with China or Brazil?" And it is true. China is a nuclear power. Brazil sells aircrafts. Tanzania sells cashew nuts. So what can you have in common?

But the North in the meantime is defining itself. The North has no shame in defining itself. There is a clear North, there is no doubt about it. There are the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries. How many are they? I think twenty-five. Who started that club? Clearly there are countries which are developed. They were divided, East and West. But the division is going out, and now the North is coming together.

There is this Group of Seven leading the Western developed countries. Now Gorbachev is knocking on the door. And I am quite sure he is going to be admitted.

There is something called the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. That Helsinki conference has the United States and Canada in it. It is a European conference, but it has the United States and Canada.

So who wants to apply from the South? When the North has defined itself, in a sense they have defined you *by exclusion*. By exclusion you people have been defined, and it is no use, no use in saying you are different. You do not sell cashew nuts like Tanzania and therefore you want to write an application to the North? You cannot be admitted.

You are not going to be admitted because this is a division of power. You see, this is a division of power and in that group of the powerful, you do not belong. China does not belong to the North at all. And China knows it. China knows that it has a population. But having a population is not enough. So the Chinese have to think. The Chinese have to say, "If only we have the economy of Belgium."

So China is an underdeveloped country. India is an underdeveloped country. Brazil is an underdeveloped country. If those Brazilians want to

be a Japan, as I asked them, "Do you think the Americans are going to turn you into another Japan?" They will not. They would not because you are too close to them and one Japan is enough for them, why would they spend a lot of money to turn you into another Japan? But you can be a Japan or two Japans, because you have the resources which Japan does not have. Provided you make up your mind that you can make yourself into another Japan.

So about this definition, I know the North tends to pooh-pooh this thing about the South. They say, "You people are very different." But when it comes to power, we belong to the class of the powerless. And that includes Tanzania, and that includes Brazil, and that includes India, and that includes China. We are powerless until we develop.

And we are saying we can enhance that capacity to develop by two things. One, national self-reliance. Two, cooperation. Cooperate among ourselves and together we can see how we can increase our strength so that we can influence this New World Order. When one side is united and the other side is not united, the side that is united will dictate the New World Order.

Of course we have leaders in the South who are very Northern, but so what? We have people in the South who invest money in the North and they live their lives in the South like Rockefellers in the North. But so what? So what? In some respect, they are used by the North. Their base is a weak base.

And I do not think there is justice even in Tanzania. In my own country, we have a fellow with a university education in Tanzania. You cannot say he is the same with the fellow who had only seven years of education. Of course, there is that difference. And even in Tanzania, I think we are now beginning to have millionaires. We are beginning to have a few millionaires but so what? So what? They belong to all the developed countries, these millionaires in underdeveloped countries.

Kuwait had a per capita income perhaps the same as the United States or higher. So what? Saudi Arabia spends a lot of money on armaments.

*"I know
the North tends
to pooh-pooh
the South.
They say,
'You people
are very
different.'
But when
it comes
to power,
we belong
to the class
of the powerless."*

So what? It had to ask the Americans to come in and help them. Even Saddam Hussein, he spent a lot of money on armaments. So what? Iraq is an underdeveloped country. It had some very sophisticated weapons that could not be used anyway. They are all underdeveloped countries. So there is no use pretending that you have some club which looks like a Northern club, and you think that you have joined the North. It is not true.

All of us in the South have a long way to go. And here we are trying to suggest how we can come together and try to make it.

About apartheid. Bush has removed the sanctions. And I think some of the Europeans are going to remove their sanctions. And they are doing this because some changes have taken place and they believe these changes deserve removing the sanctions.

I do not accept this. I am totally opposed to this nonsense.

Why? Mandela was in prison for twenty-seven years. He had been sent in by an apartheid government. He was brought out by an apartheid government. So we say, "Very good. Mandela is now out." And the others are out. I think they are not all out now, but they will be out soon. Those who were sent in by the apartheid in detention will be out soon, all of them. So we will be celebrating.

Other stupid laws of apartheid have been removed. Before, they could not swim in the same pool. Now they can swim in the same pool. Now Mandela and De Klerk can swim in the same pool. It was a very stupid law.

They could not swim in the same beach, now they can go to the same beach. You see how stupid apartheid was. They could not own houses in the same residential area, now they can. They could not ride on the same bus, now they can. Black could not marry white, white could not marry black, now they can, if they want to.

But the basic law which made these stupid laws which is now removing them is still there. The basic power division that put Mandela in prison — and they can put him back now — where power was based on color, which said you and I cannot swim in the same pool, is the same law that says now we can swim in the same pool. So the basic one is still there.

Mandela cannot vote. Mandela is not even a citizen of South Africa. He is not a citizen of South Africa according to that basic law. Mandela has no vote because of his color. How can you remove sanctions until that has gone? Here is a country where the basic law is still based on color.

Mandela cannot vote in his own country because he is black. And we think that the struggle has ended because now they can swim in the same pool? This is stupid!