

FOREIGN AID AND SELF-RELIANCE IN POST-SOCIALIST TANZANIA (THE CASE OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF MOSQUITO BED NETS)

Dmitri M. Bondarenko, Jason Nkyabonaki,
Beatrice Mosha Mkunde

Abstract: Self-reliance was a cornerstone of Ujamaa socialism – the ideology of Tanzania from 1967 till the mid-1980s. In the post-Cold-War period socialist ideology was actually abandoned, together with the really valuable concept of self-reliance. As most African countries, Tanzania is crucially dependent on foreign aid. We argue that aid can play a positive part for Tanzania and countries like it, but only if it promotes their self-development which, in its turn, is possible only if a nation is or strives to become self-reliant. However, in contemporary Tanzania the culture of self-reliance has almost disappeared since national ideology has changed, and many people rely on foreign aid and national government, not on their own hard work. At the same time, the union of foreign donors and corrupt national bureaucracy results in Tanzania in aid without development that, as in the case of aid for mosquito bed nets, cannot promote self-reliance and, hence, socio-economic progress.

Keywords: *Aid, civil society, development, self-reliance, state, Tanzania*

Introduction

For over four decades after the end of World War II the world experienced a massive divide between the Eastern (socialist) and Western (capitalist) blocks. In particular, in the 1960s-80s, ideological belief with which a particular Third World state identified itself determined the means and volume of its support by these or those developed countries. Tanzania was a typical example of the aforesaid (Rugumamu 1997). Self-reliance was declared a basic principle of the country's development under Ujamaa ("community") socialism, the conception of which was elaborated by Mwalimu ("The Teacher") Julius Nyerere, the nation's founding father, and proclaimed by him in the Arusha Declaration in 1967 (Karl 1976; Okoko 1987; Lal 2012) the full official title of which is "The Arusha Declaration and TANU¹'s Policy on Socialism and

1 The Tanganyika African National Union, the only party in the country in those days, a predecessor, together with the Zanzibari Afro-Shirazi Party, of the still irre-

Self-Reliance". In Nyerere's opinion, self-reliance "... would allow keeping the feeling of uniqueness in the environment of technical modernization, would speed up development, and would contribute to saving human and material resources" (Kosukhin 2005: 8). So, "the Arusha Declaration called for social-ism *and* self-reliance, implying that the two aspirations were inseparable." Nevertheless, "despite the recognition of the importance of self-reliance, the country has become more, rather than less, dependent since the proclamation of the Arusha Declaration" (McHenry 1994: 159, author's emphasis; see also Rugumamu 1997). With the end of the Cold War which has seen aid beyond the inclinations of ideologies Tanzania continued to rely on the donating countries and did not transform her domestic production for self-reliance.

At present, though some, especially left, scholars and journalists argue that a "new scramble for Africa" is nowadays (e.g., Weinstein 2008; Cheru and Shubin 2009; Ingwe et al. 2010; Osita and Anigbo 2010; Carmody 2011), there is clearly no need for non-African powers to base their policy towards Africa on the Cold-War-time premises any longer. However, granting alms to Africa remain one of the biggest ideas of our time – millions march for it, governments are judged by it, celebrities proselytize the need for it. Few would deny that there is a clear moral imperative for humanitarian and charity-based aid to step in when necessary, such as during the current drought in North-East Africa. Aid-supported scholarships have certainly helped send African children, especially girls, to school (never mind that most of them will not be able to find a job in their own countries once they have graduated). This kind of aid can provide band-aid solutions to alleviate immediate suffering, but by its very nature cannot be the platform for long-term sustainable growth. Yet evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that in general, not co-operation with African nations in promoting their development but simple aid has made the poor poorer, and the growth slower. We acknowledge our own field information on mosquito nets aid in Tanzania by saying that the supply of such a type of aid definitely will not lead to any significant development. The insidious aid culture leaves African countries more debt-laden, higher inflation- and corruption-prone, more vulnerable to the vagaries of the currency markets, more unattractive to higher-quality investment, and so on. Notwithstanding calls for more aid to Africa that are growing louder among non-African social activists on the one hand, and not so few African high-ranking bureaucrats on the other (with respect to the latter see, e.g., Malone 2008), mostly destructive and counterproductive role of "aid without development" is evident for many academics in and outside of Africa. For them the move of giving aid primarily is a form of power hegemony and not a humanitarian intervention of alms giving (see, inter alia: Lancaster 1999; Orjiako 2001; Riddell 2007; Abbas and

movably ruling Party of the Revolution.

Niyiragira 2009; Moyo 2009; for a reflection of the opposite position in recent academic literature see Brown 2013).

Nevertheless, the harm of such aid is not only immediately economic, social, or political. We argue, and discuss this argument in the present article using the mosquito net distribution in Tanzania as a case-study, that most importantly in the long-run, aid that is not sieved in order to determine what kinds of it can promote self-development undermines and even atrophies the idea of self-reliance in many citizens' minds. It is a big problem, as only this idea can serve as the moral and mental (at the individual level) and ideological (at national) background for true development: economic, social, cultural – any (Ogundowole 2004: 97–115). Only self-reliance makes people a nation and can promote economic and social development (Ikoku 1980; Ogundowole 1988; Olaniyan 1996; Rugumamu 1997). This idea is popular not only among researchers but also among journalists, including African, who can be regarded as a horn of the most advanced (socially active, best educated and informed) part of African societies (e.g., Bajulaiye 2008; Jamieson 2010). Finally, the US President Barack Obama blessed Africa's search for self-reliance in his famous speech before the Ghanaian parliament on July 11, 2009 by saying that "Africa's future is up to Africans" (CBSNews 2009): "In one bold stroke, Barack Obama is now the world's most prominent spokesperson for African self-reliance. What white global leaders have never been able to say – *stand on your own two feet!* – a black man with, as he put it, "African blood" coursing in his veins, has declared," this is how the American Professor G. Pascal Zachary (2009) estimated the President's statement.

Nowadays in Tanzania not so few argue that after many years of economic liberalization the state should return to Nyerere's precepts, as "with Mwalimu our economic policy was based on 'Ujamaa na Kujitegemea' – Socialism and Self-Reliance – which gave the country a clear sense of direction" (Kilasara 2008: 24). Indeed, nostalgia for socialism is present in the Tanzanian society (Kamat 2008; Mkenda 2010: 35; Gathara 2011), although this feeling is typical for only a part of Tanzanian citizens (Bondarenko 2010). In any case, explicitly or implicitly, this is an appeal for true self-reliance as the background for socio-economic development, what in practice was not achieved neither in the time when the Arusha Declaration was the direct guidance to state and society nor later, after the end of the Cold War, and the liberalization in Tanzania since the mid-1980s, after Nyerere's resignation in 1985.

Statement of the Problem and Research Methods

It is not our purpose at all in this article to discuss (or rather speculate) what is better for Tanzania (Africa, the Third World, humankind...): capitalism or socialism. Moreover, the existing literature on Tanzania and Africa in general, though vast enough², focuses mainly on immediate economic, social, and political aspects of interrelation between aid and self-reliance, while the cultural aspect, basic in our opinion, is not given as much consideration as it deserves. So, what we are trying to do is to find out to what extent the very culture of self-reliance is inherent in the general population of Tanzania today and, especially, if this culture's strengthening is promoted or hindered by international aid.

The amount of foreign aid to Tanzania is great, and the scope of its use is extremely varied: according to official statistics, in the 2011/12 fiscal year "[t]he component of development expenditure that was financed by foreign funds was 1,450.4 shillings or 47 per cent of the annual target of 3,054.1 billion shillings" (Mgimwa 2012: 21). So, we have preferred basing our research on a case-study – the practice of giving away imported bed nets to combat malaria – to general reasoning on the subject. Fieldwork was conducted in two Tanzania's regions – Dar es Salaam (three urban municipalities) and Morogoro (two rural districts) in September – October, 2011. The major reason for such a choice was that Dar es Salaam stands as an area with social structure, which is most modern in the state, while Morogoro stands for an area in which social composition has not changed so considerably since the country gained independence.

The project covered common people from 20 households in each municipality and district giving a total sample of 125 respondents (67 and 58 from Dar es Salaam and Morogoro, respectively) of both sexes and different ages who filled out the questionnaire in the Swahili language (see Appendix I). 44 (35.2%) of them were mosquito bed nets immediate recipients while most of the others, the recipients' household members, were the nets users. 40.8% of our respondents were aware of the fact that the nets were a part of foreign aid to their country. Besides, 30 structured interviews (18 in Dar es Salaam and 12 in Morogoro) were done, including with those who were regarded by us as experts: people from higher learning institutions, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Co-operation, the Ifakara Health Institute, the Tanzania Investment Centre, etc. (see Appendix II).

2 Besides references to a part of the more recent titles above, see a review essay covering literature on the case of Tanzania up to 1995: Nyagetera n.d.

The analysis of the data involved both qualitative and quantitative methods; hypothetical tests were given weight scores. Both descriptive and statistical analyses were carried out based on the data and information collected from the primary and secondary sources. The responses were coded, entered into a program and put into an application in statistical analysis. The program used was IBM SPSS Statistics 19.0.

Data Presentation and Discussion

Self-reliance and foreign aid (in mosquito nets): Tanzanians’ generalized views and attitudes

Do Tanzanians (to the extent to which our sample can represent the whole nation) see self-reliance as a necessity for their country? Most of the respondents (111 – 85.4%) gave a positive answer to the question if self-reliance is necessary for Tanzania’s social and economic development. 73.6% of them argue that not pressing for more aid but working hard is the true means of achieving economic independence. Also over half of them declared themselves as those devoted to the idea of self-reliance at the personal level, while the number of the respondents who see self-reliance as something negative remained small (table 1).

Table 1: What is your personal attitude to self-reliance?

Completely positive	Generally positive	Indifferent	Generally negative	Completely negative	Total
16 (12.8%)	60 (48%)	38 (30.4%)	11 (8.8%)	0 (0%)	125 (100%)

So, it looks like most of our respondents, although they are direct or indirect recipients of the foreign aid (at least in the form of mosquito nets), praise self-reliance as a true value. However, they clearly see its achievement in Tanzania as a realistic strategic task for the future rather than the agenda for the present (table 2).

Table 2: Is self-reliance possible for Tanzania now?

Yes	No, but it can become possible in the future	No, and it will never be possible	Total
18 (14.4%)	94 (75.2%)	13 (10.4%)	125 (100%)

As for today, 69.6% of the respondents believe that the government has no choice between accepting and rejecting aid, and 62.9% of the interlocutors see the pressure of the donating states for their own profit as its main cause. The majority of them find it also unreasonable to reject foreign aid but would advise the government to accept it not in kind (particularly, in the nets) but in money and technology to launch local production. In accepting this strategy they see both the best and most realistic way of gaining self-reliance. The acceptance of mosquito bed nets was rejected by most respondents and the idea of promoting local development through domestic initiatives was given consideration (table 3). As an interlocutor in Dar es Salaam said, it is proper not to feed someone for one day but to teach him how to farm for permanent feeding.

Table 3: Which of the options is the best for the government and which is most realistic for it today?

To accept foreign aid in mosquito nets		To accept foreign aid in money and technology to start producing high-quality nets locally		To promote local production of the mosquito nets without any aid from abroad		To let people solve the problem themselves		Total	
Best	Most realistic	Best	Most realistic	Best	Most realistic	Best	Most realistic	Best	Most realistic
1 (0.8%)	2 (1.6%)	68 (54.4%)	70 (56%)	41 (32.8%)	47 (37.6%)	15 (12%)	6 (4.8%)	125 (100%)	125 (100%)

Logically enough, our sample is generally negative in its estimation of the role of the aid of mosquito bed nets to the adoption of the idea and principles of self-reliance in the Tanzanian society: 95 (76%) of the respondents are sure that it definitely does not lead to self-reliance among Tanzanians. The respondents' strongly negative estimation of the influence of foreign aid in general on self-reliance manifests itself in their answers to one more question:

Table 4: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion?

It supports needy Tanzanians	It promotes Tanzania's self-development in the future	It makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption	It ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development	Total
4 (3.2%)	15 (12%)	65 (52%)	41 (32.8%)	125 (100%)

But what is important, is that the negative evaluation of foreign aid by the questioned Tanzanians is quite “theoretical”: As it has been pointed out above, most of them are either immediate recipients or users of the foreign mosquito bed nets. Furthermore, only 11.3% of our respondents told that awareness of the nets’ foreign origin could influence negatively their eagerness to accept them. All the rest 88.7% confessed that this fact did not mean anything serious to them, as they “just need a net”. A man in Morogoro said openly: “Let aid come from white people who have taken away our resources. We need their aid and they should provide us with as many things as possible. If they can assure us of not working and they sustain us, it would be something good”.

At the same time, rather unexpectedly, 42 (33.6%) respondents said it made a difference for them from what country the aid came. Most of this part of the sample favoured China, as in their opinion this donor makes fewer demands as conditions for aid than other, especially Western, states. Thus, although the overwhelming majority of our interlocutors actually think that all donating states pursue the same goals and affect Tanzania the same way, others still see China as more sincere, friendly, and altruistic (while some other Africans in different countries, including Tanzania would say that this is a manifestation of China’s political and moral unscrupulousness [Bondarenko 2010: 5]). On the contrary, the Western donating states are sometimes openly suspected in using aid as the Trojan horse for the sake of exploiting Tanzania, her people and natural resources within the frameworks of neo-colonialism or globalization, in this case virtually equated to each other: the latter is seen by not so few Tanzanians (including 30.4% of our respondents) as the contemporary incarnation of the former, as the newest link in the notorious chain “slave trade – colonialism – neo-colonialism” (Msellemu 2004).

Interestingly, however, being asked about the typical personal features of Europeans, Americans, and Chinese – representatives of the major donors, Tanzanians characterize them quite similarly: as aggressive but diligent and entrepreneurial. Besides, Europeans and Americans are regarded as intolerant; Americans are also considered as cunning. All in all, Tanzanians see people of

the donating nations as completely different from themselves (and probably in this difference they find an explanation to the current lie of the land). None of the characteristics the Tanzanians attribute to foreigners most often is present in their collective self-image and vice versa. For our interlocutors a typical Tanzanian is greedy, lazy, mistrustful, and arrogant but on the other hand kind and God-fearing (table 5). It is worth noting that such a self-estimation definitely cannot promote the psychological attitude on self-reliance.

Table 5: Which of the qualities listed below may you attribute to a typical Tanzanian, European, American, and Chinese?

Quality	Tanzanian	European	American	Chinese
aggressiveness	0 (0%)	24 (19.2%)	20 (16%)	48 (38.4%)
arrogance	12 (9.6%)	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	3 (2.4%)
benevolence	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	4 (3.2%)	3 (2.4%)
bigotry	0 (0%)	47 (37.6%)	16 (12.8%)	2 (1.6%)
diligence	6 (4.8%)	18 (14.4%)	11 (8.8%)	13 (10.4%)
enterprise	1 (0.8%)	16 (12.8%)	26 (20.8%)	29 (23.2%)
envy	1 (0.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
frankness	1 (0.8%)	3 (2.4%)	8 (6.4%)	2 (1.6%)
generosity	8 (6.4%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.4%)	1 (0.8%)
God-fearing	11 (8.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
greediness	27 (21.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.4%)	0 (0%)
guile	2 (1.6%)	2 (1.6%)	21 (16.8%)	7 (5.6%)
kindness	12 (9.6%)	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)
laziness	19 (15.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
malevolence	2 (1.6%)	7 (5.6%)	3 (2.4%)	1 (0.8%)
mistrustfulness	14 (11.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
reticence	2 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (4.8%)
sincerity	0 (0%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (2.4%)	5 (4%)

tolerance	2 (1.6%)	1 (0.8%)	2 (1.6%)	3 (2.4%)
vanity	4 (3.2%)	1 (0.8%)	3 (2.4%)	1 (0.8%)
Total	125 (100%)	125 (100%)	125 (100%)	125 (100%)

If we look at the collected evidence even more closely, we will see that for many respondents “theoretical” denial of the benefits from foreign aid means a call not for liberation from dependence on it but for its fair distribution by Tanzanian public officers. Only 32.8% of them argue that foreign aid is inevitably vicious, while 52% are sure that it could be beneficial if it were not for the local bureaucratic corruption manifestations of which actually every Tanzanian faces from time to time for a variety of reasons (Afrobarometer 2006) and about which now can read in periodicals (Tasseni 2010). The rest 15.2% believe that the aid is or will be beneficial anyway (table 4). However, as has been pointed out above (see also table 6), although the public opinion on this point is split (what is remarkable *per se*), many Tanzanians do not see a contradiction between focus on self-reliance and the acceptance of foreign aid. They believe that the latter, if used properly – for the sake of development, can promote instilling of the former in the future.

Table 6: Is foreign aid necessary for self-reliance efforts?

Yes	No	Total
65 (52%)	60 (48%)	125 (100%)

The most widespread opinion – of 69.6% of the respondents – is that today the government still has no other choice but to accept the aid from foreign donors but it must use it fairly and reasonably for the sake of social justice and future development. Furthermore, 30.9% of the interlocutors expressed the conviction that the desire of those in power to get their share through corruption is the main reason for the government’s acceptance of the aid. So, it becomes clear that for common Tanzanians, the main enemy of their country’s development is not external (foreign donors with their aid) but internal – the corrupt bureaucracy. This argument makes us raise the question, if self-reliance and foreign aid really stand in sharp opposition to each other in Tanzanians’ minds.

Self-reliance and foreign aid in Tanzanians’ minds: A false opposition?

Clearly, Tanzanians’ individual characteristics, social and personal, influence their attitude to self-reliance and foreign aid. The importance or unim-

portance of the most basic of them could become obvious in the cross-tabulation of the respective evidence with answers to the questions about the attitude to self-reliance and foreign aid. We realize that the size of our sample cannot be regarded as large enough for making a convincing argument about the views and positions of individual subgroups. Yet, we do believe that the data represented in tables 7-10, 12, 14-20 below can at least predict the statistical direction of differences between them, what definitely makes their analysis valid though probably not conclusive. In particular, table 7 shows that men are significantly more inclined to self-reliance, what we can regard as a projection at the national level of their social role (and psychological state) of *pater familiae*, on the one hand, and the less interest of women in the suprafamily – social and political – problems (almost 36% of them are “indifferent”), on the other.

Table 7: What is your personal attitude to self-reliance? * Sex

Sex	Attitude					Total
	Completely positive	Generally positive	Indifferent	Generally negative	Completely negative	
Male	8 (13.8%)	34 (58.6%)	14 (24.1%)	2 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	58 (100%)
Female	8 (11.9%)	26 (38.8%)	24 (35.8%)	9 (13.4%)	0 (0%)	67 (100%)

Table 8 gives the impression of the relationship of generational differences to the idea of self-reliance. As it has been noted above, the idea of self-reliance was a keystone of national ideology in the time of Ujamaa socialism building that virtually ended with Nyerere’s resignation in 1985. Respectively, the respondents were divided into two age groups: those who can remember that time being over forty at the time of our research, and their younger fellow citizens socialized in another, later era.

Table 8: What is your personal attitude to self-reliance? * Age

Age	Attitude					Total
	Completely positive	Generally positive	Indifferent	Generally negative	Completely negative	
18-40	7 (11.7%)	28 (46.7%)	18 (30%)	7 (11.7%)	0 (0%)	60 (100%)
40+	9 (13.8%)	32 (49.2%)	19 (29.2%)	5 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	65 (100%)

Although the difference in attitude to self-reliance between the two age groups is not very big, yet it is clear that, as it could be predicted in the light of the aforesaid, senior people are more positive of it. However, it should be recognized that today there is largely a lack of devotion to hard-working among

not only the youth but also a big part of those over 40. The difference that can be called ideological, between the two age groups will become more evident at a comparison of their attitude to foreign aid (see table 15 below).

A comparison of the distribution of views on self-reliance within the Dar es Salaam and Morogoro subsamples can tell us much about the nature of contemporary Tanzanian society. As table 9 shows, there is virtually no difference between the two subsamples.

Table 9: What is your personal attitude to self-reliance? * Locality

Locality	Attitude					Total
	Completely positive	Generally positive	Indifferent	Generally negative	Completely negative	
DSM	9 (13.4%)	32 (47.8%)	20 (29.9%)	6 (9%)	0 (0%)	67 (100%)
Morogoro	7 (12.1%)	28 (48.3%)	18 (31%)	5 (8.6%)	0 (0%)	58 (100%)

This table has much in common with the next one, though the respondents' division by place of birth does not co-inside with that into the Dar es Salaam urban and Morogoro area rural dwellers, as the internal migration rate in Tanzania is high enough:

Table 10: What is your personal attitude to self-reliance? * Place of birth

Place of birth	Attitude to self-reliance					Total
	Completely positive	Generally positive	Indifferent	Generally negative	Completely negative	
Village	5 (10.9%)	23 (50%)	15 (32.6%)	3 (6.5%)	0 (0%)	46 (100%)
Town	6 (17.6%)	20 (58.8%)	4 (11.8%)	4 (11.8%)	0 (0%)	34 (100%)
City	2 (10.5%)	9 (47.4%)	7 (36.8%)	1 (5.3%)	0 (0%)	19 (100%)
DSM	3 (14.3%)	4 (19%)	11 (52.4%)	3 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	21 (100%)
Zanzibar	0 (0%)	4 (80%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)

The evidence of tables 9 and 10 may seem unexpected: The Dar es Salaam urban and Morogoro rural dwellers do not differ significantly in their attitude to self-reliance, while Dar es Salaam natives, who could seemingly logically be conceived as most advanced in their social views, show the least enthusiasm for self-reliance. However, at a deeper level of analysis these results become

not so surprising. The matter is that the social composition of Dar es Salaam is very motley. Although this *de facto* still capital city is really in the vanguard of the whole range of current social processes in the Tanzanian society (and not only positive processes, what should be noted), it ought not to be ignored that a significant part of Dar es Salaam citizens are first or second generation migrants. Of all changes of lifestyle they largely remain adherent to the foundations of traditional African sociality based on extensive kin networks that embraces even the most distant relatives wherever they live and is appreciated as a fundamental value (Bondarenko 2004: 459). Hence, even Dar es Salaam natives keep strong and diverse ties with their parents' and grandparents' homelands and in general can be characterized as people whose mentality is still partly urban and partly rural. The socio-cultural division of the Tanzanian nation into the urban and rural parts is incomplete even if we talk about Dar es Salaam. In the meantime, the least positive estimation of the idea of self-reliance by those born in Dar es Salaam could be expected from young low-brow urban lumpen, inhabitants of slums. These people do not only pass their socialization in the period when self-reliance is not an officially promoted value any longer, but also lose strong ties with the traditional social environment without the proper integration into the modern one. We suppose that just the position of people from this social stratum, typical for metropolises but not for smaller settlements, have predetermined such figures for Dar es Salaam natives in table 10.

Adherence to traditional culture might be a predictor of attitude to self-reliance. Among several questions (5-7 of the Questionnaire) aimed at revealing this degree we highlight the one related to ancestor cult (table 11), as it reflects the very basis of traditional African world outlook and religion (e.g., Fortes 1966; Bondarenko 1996; Grinker et al. 2010: 283-322). Today Christians and Muslims form the overwhelming majority of Tanzanians – about 80% in total. All our respondents profess one of these religions (and both Christians and Muslims told us repeatedly that the faith demands them to work hard). “Official” adherents of so-called “traditional beliefs”, about 1/5th of the country's population, live mainly in its distant parts³. Nevertheless, many Tanzanians combine belief in God or Allah with the belief in ancestor spirits, as well as in other local objects of worship. Ancestor worship seems to be mostly practiced by the residents in rural settings. However, the urban dwellers beliefs regarding the issue of making offerings to ancestors did not depart much from the rural setting for they talked of not forgetting their roots. For example, a respondent who has come to Dar es Salaam from the Kilimanjaro

3 Less than 1% of Tanzanians profess other religions. In particular, many migrants from South Asia and their descendants profess Hinduism and other religions they brought from the native region.

region told us: “Every December during Christmas, it’s mandatory, I go to my home for the ancestors to meet me and as well to please them for their continued support and protection.” This short quotation also exemplifies vividly the aforesaid about the close ties of many Dar es Salaam dwellers with the traditional, originally and essentially rural, culture and about many Tanzanians’ dual religiousness. The same informant pinpointed that there was a relationship between offerings to the ancestors and self-reliance. She upheld the view, typical for animists, that by making the offerings one thanked the ancestors for guidance, protection and success in the past and besought them of the same for the future.

Table 11: What is your personal attitude to self-reliance? * Do you think that it is necessary to make offerings to the deceased ancestors’ spirits, at least on important occasions?

Offerings to deceased ancestors are necessary	Attitude to self-reliance					
	Completely positive	Generally positive	Indifferent	Generally negative	Completely negative	Total
Yes	12 (13.6%)	43 (48.9%)	27 (30.7%)	6 (6.8%)	0 (0%)	88 (100%)
No	4 (10.8%)	17 (45.9%)	11 (29.7%)	5 (13.5%)	0 (0%)	37 (100%)

However, the table shows that a person’s attitude to the nation’s self-reliance is largely independent of his/her adherence or non-adherence to the values and practices of traditional culture. (Although at the personal level the idea of self-reliance should be better understandable and more acceptable for non-traditionally minded persons, as traditional social life has mutual assistance as one of its pillars and favours collectivism at the expense of individualism.) The indirect proof of the unimportance of the relation to traditional culture for forming an opinion on self-reliance is that this opinion has also turned out unrelated to the attitude to the Western mass-culture.

The respondents from the rural setting seem to rely on ancestors only in terms of healing while in terms of hard-working they usually emphasized that it was no longer a subject of loyalty to them. Characteristically, a respondent from the Morogoro rural area said to us that “a place of birth matters to determine the value of work; for us who were born in rural areas we believe it is only work that can make one prosperous and it is only through traditional affiliations that one feels the need of becoming a hard worker.” Indeed, hard-working is a value invariably highly praised in the autochthonous cultures of

Tanzania's peoples. Nonetheless, nowadays it is a common phenomenon that, irrespective of the birthplace, the young generation seems to consider work as a punishment. A respondent in Dar es Salaam put it aptly: "We, young men and women, desire a lot and we need to secure a better life at little efforts." Our experts agree with his argument and express great concern about this problem: "Today, most people find work as a punishment and they regard working hard to be a renewed intensity of torture. Thus, most young men and women – those aged between 15 and 35 – tend to roam around aimlessly, and they come to find themselves in drug abuse, early pregnancies and above all engaged in criminality tendencies."

At the same moment we predict that what really matters is not the place of residence or birth, or relationship to traditional culture but education level. Table 12 confirms our prediction:

Table 12: What is your personal attitude to self-reliance? * Education

Education	Attitude to self-reliance					
	Completely positive	Generally positive	Indifferent	Generally negative	Completely negative	Total
Primary	2 (7.1%)	10 (35.7%)	15 (53.6%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)
Secondary	4 (18.2%)	10 (45.5%)	6 (27.3%)	2 (9.1%)	0 (0%)	22 (100%)
High school	2 (5%)	23 (57.5%)	12 (30%)	3 (7.5%)	0 (0%)	40 (100%)
College	7 (24.1%)	13 (44.8%)	4 (13.8%)	5 (17.2%)	0 (0%)	29 (100%)
University	1 (16.7%)	4 (66.7%)	1 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (100%)

A great part of the worst educated people actually show a lack of interest in the nation's problems: they simply do not think in those terms. Tanzanians with secondary and high school education are much more concerned with the problem of self-reliance and are most positive about the necessity to follow this principle. Yet, the figures for college graduates show that the dynamics is far from simple unilinear. (The number of university degree holders in the sample is too small for being statistically significant.) The college graduates are most enthusiastic for self-reliance and most negative for it at the same time. The former fact can be seen as natural for well-educated persons. As for the latter one, we are inclined to see it as a projection of many well-educated Africans' negative evaluation of the history of the relations between Africa and

the world as that of the Dark Continent’s constant exploitation and robbery. For a significant part of such people it is logical that now the world should pay for it by supporting Africa. From this standpoint, self-reliance is another ideological cloak for devastating Africa and escaping paying the bills. Besides, some experts complained of the contemporary national education system that it does not promote self-reliance. They argued that the education system in Tanzania should fulfil its socialization function by inculcating the culture of self-reliance again, as it was in the time when the Arusha Declaration was a real law of life – from 1967 to the mid-1980s. Indeed, the experts’ argument is in line with that of Julius Nyerere, who titled “Education for Self-Reliance” his policy booklet published the same year the Arusha Declaration was proclaimed (Nyerere 1967). In those days “education for self-reliance” “was a philosophy designed to produce primary school graduates equipped with an education suitable for integration into the predominantly rural Tanzanian society” (Swilla 2009: 3; see also Mwansoko 1990: 52). Of course, today the task must be understood more widely, and the education system higher levels should be imbued with this philosophy to not a lesser degree for the sake of bringing up patriotic and socially responsible intellectual elite. In any case, “[n]o educational system will be able to serve the African people productively and socially without a strong nationalistic philosophical basis. This basis cannot develop out of peripheral capitalism” (Lumumba-Kasongo 2000: 157). In Tanzania the idea of self-reliance can serve as such a basis, and should begin to play this role again: peripheral capitalism, symbolized vividly by aid without development, is really unable to propose a sensible alternative.

So, we can argue that the factors that influence people’s commitment or non-commitment to self-reliance are sex, age, and education, while place of birth and residence, attachment or non-attachment to traditional culture do not matter significantly. Answers to the question: “What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion?” are to clarify on what the individual attitude to foreign aid depends. The generalized picture looks as follows:

Table 13: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion?

Opinion				
Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	Total
4 (3.2%)	15 (12%)	65 (52%)	41 (32.8%)	125 (100%)

Table 13 first of all shows that the overwhelming majority of our respondents estimate foreign aid as a disaster. But not less importantly, proving our argument stated above, a significantly greater part of them see foreign aid as a disaster not because it works against self-reliance but because it mostly nourishes corrupt bureaucrats instead of supporting poor common Tanzanians. Obviously, if that had not been the case, more than half of our respondents would not object but rather even greet the aid. Note also that most of those who regard foreign aid as beneficial for Tanzania think that it is so because it promotes her future self-development.

The subsequent tables show how these assumptions look like in the light of different factors reflected in the respondents' individual characteristics. In particular, what is interesting in table 14 is that it shows that women are more critical of foreign aid, while table 7 have documented men's greater devotion to the idea of self-reliance.

Table 14: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion?* Sex

Sex	Opinion				
	Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	Total
Male	3 (5.1%)	9 (15.5%)	29 (50%)	17 (29.3%)	58 (100%)
Female	1 (1.5%)	6 (9%)	36 (53.7%)	24 (35.8%)	67 (100%)

Table 15 gives a really full impression of the difference between the positions on the research key issues of the two generations: socialized in Nyerere time and later. It shows unequivocally that those Tanzanians who experienced coming of age in the period when self-reliance was an inalienable part of the undisputable ideological doctrine are much more radical and firm in their assessment of foreign aid as not beneficial but disastrous for the nation.

Table 15: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion? * Age

Age	Opinion				
	Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	Total
18-40	23 (38.3%)	15 (25%)	13 (15%)	9 (21.7%)	60 (100%)
40+	16 (24.6%)	11 (16.9%)	18 (27.7%)	20 (30.8%)	65 (100%)

Analysing table 16, one can conclude that the location appears as unimportant with respect to foreign aid as it is with regards to self-reliance:

Table 16: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion? * Locality

Locality	Opinion				
	Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	Total
DSM	2 (3%)	8 (11.9%)	35 (52.2%)	22 (32.8%)	67 (100%)
Morogoro	2 (3.4%)	7 (12.1%)	30 (51.7%)	19 (32.8%)	58 (100%)

The same is equally true for place of birth (table 17):

Table 17: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion? Place of birth

Place of birth	Opinion				Total
	Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	
Village	2 (4.3%)	6 (13%)	24 (52.2%)	14 (30.4%)	46 (100%)
Town	2 (5.9%)	5 (14.7%)	16 (47.1%)	11 (32.4%)	34 (100%)
City	0 (0%)	4 (21.1%)	8 (42.1%)	7 (36.8%)	19 (100%)
DSM	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (66.7%)	7 (33.3%)	21 (100%)
Zanzibar	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	5 (100%)

Rather unexpectedly, those more committed to traditional culture are slightly more positive to foreign aid in general and especially for it as a possible promoter of the country's self-development in the future (table 18). In our opinion, this signifies that traditionalism as a commitment to local ethnic culture cannot be easily converted into the nationalism characteristic of modern nation-states.

Table 18: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion? Do you think that it is necessary to make offerings to the deceased ancestors' spirits, at least on important occasions?

Offerings to deceased ancestors are necessary	Opinion				Total
	Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	
Yes	1 (1.1%)	14 (15.9%)	44 (50%)	29 (33%)	88 (100%)

No	3 (8.1%)	1 (2.7%)	21 (56.8%)	12 (32.4%)	37 (100%)
----	----------	----------	------------	------------	-----------

There are less traditionalist-minded people among well-educated Tanzanians (Bondarenko et al. 2013). Just among them one can expect to see the expression of nationalist feelings, and indeed, people with college and university degrees are not only the smallest fans of foreign aid. They also form the only educational group for most of which members the negative effect of foreign aid is clear *per se*, as a manifestation of foreign dependence, intolerable under any circumstances: There are more college graduates who believe that aid is disastrous because it stops self-reliance and self-development than those who see its negative role in fostering corruption (table 19).

Table 19: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion?* Education

Education	Opinion				Total
	Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	
Primary	1 (3.6%)	3 (10.7%)	12 (42.9%)	12 (42.9%)	28 (100%)
Secondary	2 (9.1%)	4 (18.2%)	11 (50%)	5 (22.7%)	22 (100%)
High school	1 (2.5%)	5 (12.5%)	27 (67.5%)	7 (17.5%)	40 (100%)
College	0 (0%)	3 (10.3%)	12 (41.4%)	14 (48.3%)	29 (100%)
University	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	6 (100%)

Foreign aid is still associated with the West to a considerable degree (although China and some other non-Western countries are now working actively and successfully on changing this impression). In its turn, the West can still be seen by some people in Africa as Christendom. Hence, we have admitted that Tanzanian Christians could be more positive of foreign aid than Muslims. However, table 20 shows that this assumption was wrong. Non-Western donors, especially China and also Japan, are already very visible in Tanzania, besides the West is seen as the colonizer to not a less (and actually even greater) degree than Christendom (Bondarenko 2010: 12), while com-

mitment to a religion is not a keystone of Tanzanians' identity (Bondarenko 2004).

Table 20: What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion?* Religion

Religion	Opinion				Total
	Beneficial (supports the needy)	Beneficial (promotes self-development in the future)	Disastrous (makes the rich richer and the poor poorer through corruption)	Disastrous (ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development)	
Christianity	1 (1.2%)	11 (13.4%)	42 (51.2%)	28 (34.1%)	82 (100%)
Islam	3 (7%)	4 (9.3%)	23 (53.5%)	13 (30.2%)	43 (100%)

So, the factors that determine the respondents' attitude to foreign aid are largely the same as those that influence their commitment or non-commitment to self-reliance (although these factors can work differently in relation to the two matters): sex, age, and education. Besides, in this case some importance can be attached to traditionalism.

As our evidence shows, the relation between self-reliance and foreign aid in the majority of the respondents' minds is not that of simple opposition: it would be wrong to say that those who support the idea of self-reliance insist on the immediate cessation of foreign aid, while those who do not accept that idea are completely for the aid. As it has been pointed out, many Tanzanians, in fact, tend to see the seat of the trouble not in foreign powers but in national bureaucracy. There are two forces that, working together, should eventually make Tanzanians and Tanzania self-reliant: the civil society and the state. Table 21 shows that our respondents assess their efforts to promote self-reliance quite differently. While the society's efforts are estimated as more or less satisfactory (though not at all as good), people are much more critical of the government's effectiveness in promoting self-reliance (what is especially evident in the distribution of opinions on dimensions ii, iv, and v). The sample's general assessment of the situation with promotion of the self-reliance culture in Tanzania is negative, too: 63.2% are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with it.

Table 21: How do you assess the efforts to promote self-reliance?

#	Dimension	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Total
i.	People's attitude towards self-reliance through working hard	0 (0%)	60 (48%)	63 (50.4%)	2 (1.6%)	125 (100%)
ii.	Strategies for inculcating self-reliance by the government	0 (0%)	19 (15.2%)	80 (64%)	26 (20.8%)	125 (100%)
iii.	Follow-up mechanisms to ensure everyone works accordingly	0 (0%)	41 (32.8%)	61 (48.8%)	23 (18.4%)	125 (100%)
iv.	The government utilization of domestic resources for self-development	1 (0.8%)	11 (8.8%)	45 (36%)	68 (54.4%)	125 (100%)
v.	The promotion of the self-reliance culture among Tanzanians by the state	0 (0%)	36 (28.8%)	84 (67.2%)	5 (4%)	125 (100%)
vi.	The promotion of the self-reliance culture among Tanzanians by non-governmental organizations and other civil society institutions	0 (0%)	60 (48%)	55 (44%)	10 (8%)	125 (100%)
vii.	The involvement of people in development plans by the government	0 (0%)	70 (56%)	51 (40.8%)	4 (3.2%)	125 (100%)
viii.	Whistle blowers motivation towards self-reliance on the government and individuals	2 (1.6%)	90 (72%)	31 (24.8%)	2 (1.6%)	125 (100%)
ix.	Incentives to enhance and nurture self-reliance	0 (0%)	53 (42.4%)	66 (52.8%)	6 (4.8%)	125 (100%)
x.	Citizens' capacity to combat aid to self-reliance	0 (0%)	46 (36.8%)	74 (59.2%)	5 (4%)	125 (100%)
xi.	General assessment of the efforts and strategies to promoting self-reliance in Tanzania by the government, civil society organizations and business community	0 (0%)	46 (36.8%)	69 (55.2%)	10 (8%)	125 (100%)

It must be noted that the questions in table 21 are not on the assessment of the interrelation between self-reliance and foreign aid. Even more so: only 9.6% of the sample is satisfied with how the government utilizes domestic resources for self-development. Hence, the government is blamed not for accepting the aid but for neglecting internal possibilities for development, in addition to being charged with aid-related corruption. Accepting aid clearly does not exclude the active use of domestic sources of development. So, the respondents' generally negative assessment of the situation with self-reliance's promotion in Tanzania is not determined primarily by foreign aid. To a greater extent it characterizes the citizens' view of post-Nyerere national governments as corrupt and ineffective, their latent failure to accept those governments' ideological, social, and economic ethos and policy.

Conclusions

We agree with our respondents' generalized opinion that self-reliance as a strategy for the future is necessary and it can be compatible with foreign aid today. However, this aid can be worthwhile only if it promotes development, that is approximates the time when economic, political, and socio-cultural self-reliance will become really possible. Hence, foreign aid must be transformed into international co-operation. The problem is that in fact neither foreign donors nor national bureaucracy are interested in the Tanzanian nation's progress toward the goal of achieving self-reliance, and the alliance of the former and the latter promotes satisfaction of their own interests more than of the Tanzanian people's. Due to it, though "no Tanzanian can deny that an ongoing and open discussion on corruption has been allowed, and some action against corruption has been made possible by President Kikwete" (Madaha 2012: 60–61), and the Tanzanian governments' efforts to take control of aid and transform aid into partnerships made since the mid-2000s are recognized by specialists as the most active on the continent (Wohlgemuth 2008: 36–38), they do not result in the effective use of aid for the development of national production (including of mosquito nets) and do not foster the nation's self-reliance. Reducing budgetary dependency on foreign aid still remains a task for the future, too (Mgimwa 2012: 53, 76). In particular, regarding mosquito nets, the Tanzanian government and the business community should jointly develop a home-based strategy to provide their production and distribution at subsidized prices. This would ensure developmental continuity and sustainability.

In the meantime, our analysis aligns with the views that such aid as that in mosquito nets we have studied is an obstacle to a positive thinking of self-reliance in Tanzania. In its turn, it does not allow the nationals to make a step

to sustainable development, for the ways of addressing problems using local means are hijacked. Today common Tanzanians themselves, though they criticize both the donors and the government, tend to hope for them more than for their own hard work. They regard aid as an award rather than as a supplement to development, welcome it, want to receive even more, and are convinced that donors are in historical and moral debt to them and must care sincerely of not their own but Tanzanians' interests. They actually wait for self-cleaning, self-reformation from the state that must paternalistically give people the good. This is especially typical for those who grew up after self-reliance was silently withdrawn from the ideological agenda, but the virus of not self- but other-reliance has infected older citizens, too. This situation hampers the economic and social development of the nation, leaves a lot of room for corruption and other social evils that people themselves dislike. An important reason for all this is that both civil consciousness and civil society institutions are still relatively weak in Tanzania, although there are signs of their development, like the growth in number and public recognition of the national NGOs and CBOs (Lange et al. 2000; Kiondo and Nyang'oro 2006; Haapanen 2007; Nassali 2009). "[T]he role of civil society in Tanzania is growing and... it engages a good number of the people in activities and operations. ... the impact of civil society in Tanzania is somewhat evident, but not yet at a high level" (Civil Society Index 2011: 67, 66). Besides, it can be so that the pan-African generalization of Daloz (2003: 279) is relevant for the particular case of Tanzania, at least on some occasions: "The significance of the massive proliferation of NGOs in Africa is essentially the reflection of a successful adaptation of the conditions laid out by foreign donors by the usual local Big Men who seek in this way to gain access to new resources." Tripp (2012) argues and proves that foreign donors play neither unambiguously positive nor definitely negative, but a contradictory, dual role in the civil society consolidation in Tanzania. Be that as it may, self-reliance of a whole nation in the international context is hardly possible without self-reliance of its citizens with respect to their own state.

It would be unreasonable to expect in the foreseeable future that the state's role in integrating the nation "from above" will become secondary to the role of civil society's self-organization. The increased (compared to the West) role of the state in African countries is a natural outcome of these nations' nature. As a legacy of colonialism with its arbitrary conduct of borders within which very different, previously often unrelated (or related loosely, or conflicting) local societies, peoples, and cultures were united, contemporary independent African countries cannot but have the state as the main integrative force. The present-day African nations are not imbued with the idea of a national community to the degree when civil society can substitute the state in this capacity. Having no internal preconditions for the appearance in the present borders

and with originally Modern European political system, most African nations were created “from above” and still can remain viable only at the state’s big role in the social and economic spheres.

Thus, the problem of African countries is not that their states play a more crucial role than states play in the present-day West. The real problem is that African states remain ineffective from the viewpoint of their own historical and socio-cultural logic (Chabal and Skalník 2010). An African state, including Tanzanian, can play a positive part in the life of society, particularly by promoting self-reliance in ideology and socio-political practice, but for this it must really function for the public’s benefit, not for its own. This is where two lines cross: the state will have to change only in the course of, and due to the civil society’s further development, its eventual transformation from other-(state-and-donors-) to self-reliant.

We believe that from this perspective, Tanzania has an even better chance of becoming self-reliant than most other African countries. On the one hand, “The Teacher” Nyerere’s legacy can provide a solid ideological background for reestablishment of self-reliance as an important aspect of the national idea. It is obvious, that this idea has its own high value, so in the post-Cold War time it is no longer necessary to associate it with socialism, what could be unattractive for many citizens, especially well-educated. On the other hand, probably even more importantly, contrary to almost all post-colonial African states, in Tanzania national unity has originally pre-colonial cultural background – the Swahili culture and language (Bondarenko et al. 2013). Furthermore, this fact has been inflated and instilled in citizens’ minds by official ideology since the first days of the country’s independence (Blommaert 1999; 2006; Topan 2008).

As for now, 76% of our respondents argue that the aid of mosquito nets definitely cannot lead to self-reliance among Tanzanians. But 60% of them confess that in the future they would refuse to receive the nets through gratuitous foreign aid not if locally produced nets will be of better quality or for affordable prices but only if they are distributed completely for free, too.

Appendixes

Appendix I

Questionnaire

Dear Madam/Sir,

The Mwalimu Nyerere Memorial Academy in co-operation with the Institute for African Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences is conducting research into the meaning of foreign aid, particularly in mosquito nets, for Tanzania. We do appreciate your help and believe that our research will be beneficial for the Tanzanian people. Please note that the questionnaire is anonymous and predestined for scholarly purposes only. Be so kind as to answer the questions below:

1. Your sex: Male Female
2. Age _____ years
3. Marital status Single Married Divorced Widow(er)
4. Ethnic origin (e.g. "Gogo", "Nyamwezi"; if mixed, please specify: e.g. "father Gogo, mother Nyamwezi")

5. Do you know traditional songs and fairy tales of your people?
 Yes, many Yes, but not many Yes, but very few No
6. Do you think that it is necessary to make offerings to the deceased ancestors' spirits, at least on important occasions? Yes No
7. Whom would you consult in the case of disease?
 A professional doctor and, if he or she does not help, a traditional doctor
 A traditional doctor and if s/he does not help, a professional doctor
 Only a professional doctor
 Only a traditional doctor
 I do not know what "a traditional doctor" is
8. Place of birth
 village small town large town (city) Dar es Salaam Zanzibar
 outside Tanzania

9. In which of the 26 regions of Tanzania did you spend your childhood? _____

10. Secular education (highest level completed) primary school
 secondary school high school college university

11. Do you think that your education may influence your self-reliance spirit?
 Yes, positively Yes, negatively
 Yes, either positively or negatively No

12. Occupation (e.g. “student”, “driver”, “housekeeper”)

13. Do you think that your occupation may influence your self-reliance spirit?
 Yes, positively Yes, negatively Yes, either positively or negatively No

14. Religion (e.g. “Christian”, “Muslim”, “Animist”) _____

15. How often do you pray? Never On religious holidays only
 Not every day Every day (please indicate how many times a day: _____)

16. Do you think that your religion may influence your self-reliance spirit?
 Yes, positively Yes, negatively Yes, either positively or negatively No

17. How can you estimate your understanding level of the following aspects? (Please tick in the appropriate space)

No	Dimension	Very adequate	Adequate	Inadequate	Very inadequate
i.	Knowledge on aid from donors				
ii.	Understanding of the necessity of self-reliance for a nation				
iii.	Knowledge on the relationship between aid and self-reliance				
iv.	Knowledge on structures and organs to monitoring aid				
v.	Awareness of the aid's contribution to national development				
vi.	Knowledge on plans and strategies for promoting self-reliance				

18. How many hours do you work a day? less than 2 2-4 4-6
 6-8 8-10 over 10

19. How do you assess the efforts to promote self-reliance?

No.	Dimension	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
i.	People's attitude towards self-reliance through working hard				
ii.	Strategies for inculcating self-reliance by the government				
iii.	Follow-up mechanisms to ensure everyone works accordingly				
iv.	The government utilization of domestic resources for self-development				
v.	The promotion of the self-reliance culture among Tanzanians by the state				
vi.	The promotion of the self-reliance culture among Tanzanians by non-governmental organizations and other civil society institutions				
vii.	The involvement of people in development plans by the government				
viii.	Whistle blowers motivation towards self-reliance on the government and individuals				
ix.	Incentives to enhance and nurture self-reliance				
x.	Citizens' capacity to combat aid to self-reliance				
xi.	General assessment of the efforts and strategies to promoting self-reliance in Tanzania by the government, civil society organizations and business community				

20. Have you received mosquito nets from the government?
 Yes No

21. If yes, did you know that the nets had come through foreign aid?
 Yes No

22. Did or could know that the nets had come through foreign aid influence your eagerness to accept them?

Yes, positively (I am sure that a net produced abroad is of a better quality than produced locally) Yes, negatively (I am sure that Tanzania is able to produce good nets itself, and it's a shame to accept them as foreign aid) No (I just need a net)

23. How can you characterise your financial situation to buy mosquito net for your family? Very good Good Bad

24. Do you think the aid of mosquito nets can lead to self-reliance among Tanzanians? Yes, definitely Maybe yes, maybe no No, definitely I have no opinion

25. Do you think being given aid such as mosquito nets develops ceilings on individuals' minds for self-reliance? Yes, definitely maybe yes, maybe no No, definitely I have no opinion

26. Which way would you regard as the best for the government?

To accept foreign aid in mosquito nets To accept foreign aid in money and technology to start producing high-quality mosquito nets locally To promote local production of the mosquito nets without any aid from abroad To let people solve the problem themselves

27. Which of these options is most realistic today?

To accept foreign aid in mosquito nets To accept foreign aid in money and technology to start producing high-quality mosquito nets locally To promote local production of the mosquito nets without any aid from abroad To let people solve the problem themselves

28. Do you think that aid recipients such as the Tanzanian government have a real choice between accepting and rejecting aid? Yes No Cannot answer (have no clear idea)

29. If yes, what makes the governments like Tanzanian accept the aid?

Real necessity of aid for poor countries like Tanzania Pressure of the donating countries for the sake of their own profit Desire of those in power in the poor countries to get their share of the aid through corruption

30. What does foreign aid mean for Tanzania first of all, in your opinion?

It is beneficial because it supports needy Tanzanians
 It is beneficial because it promotes Tanzania's self-development in the future
 It is disastrous because it makes the rich even richer and the poor even poorer through corruption at the acceptance of aid and through its distribution
 It is disastrous because it ceases the formation of self-reliance culture and self-development in Tanzania

31. Is self-reliance really necessary for Tanzania's social and economic development? Yes No

32. Is self-reliance possible for Tanzania now?
 Yes No, but it can become possible in the future No, and it will never be possible

33. Is aid necessary for self-reliance efforts? Yes No

34. What should poor countries and their citizens do to be self-dependent economically? Work harder Press for more aid Cut the link with developed countries

35. What is your personal attitude to self-reliance?
 Completely positive Generally positive Indifferent Generally negative Completely negative

If you like, please comment: _____

36. Do you think that all donating states are the same in what relates to aiding the poor countries, or do you think that aid from some of them should be preferred to the aid from others?

There are no "better" or "worth" donating states There are donating states whose aid should be preferred (please explain: aid from what states should be preferred, from what states it should be avoided, and why: _____
_____)

37. Do you want to receive mosquito nets through foreign aid in the future?
 Yes Yes, if they are of better quality than produced in Tanzania No, if locally produced nets are distributed for free, too No, if prices for locally produced nets are affordable No

38. Are you interested in national and international politics? Yes No

39. Which of the arguments below is closer to the truth?
 Colonialism did mainly harm to the peoples of Tanzania
 Colonialism was nothing more than a short episode in the country and her peoples' long history
 In the colonial time the background of the present-day unity and progress of Tanzania and her people was laid

40. What is your attitude to the Western mass culture?
 Very good Good Indifferent Bad Very bad

41. What is your attitude to globalization?

Very good Good Indifferent Bad Very bad I do not know what it is

42. What are your sources of information?

newspapers television radio internet public meetings friends, neighbours or teachers other (please indicate: _____)

43. Please underline which of the qualities listed below you may attribute to a typical Tanzanian citizen: aggressiveness, arrogance, benevolence, bigotry, diligence, enterprise, envy, frankness, generosity, God-fearing, greediness, guile, kindness, laziness, malevolence, mistrustfulness, reticence, sincerity, tolerance, vanity

44. Please underline which of the qualities listed below you may attribute to a typical European: aggressiveness, arrogance, benevolence, bigotry, diligence, enterprise, envy, frankness, generosity, God-fearing, greediness, guile, kindness, laziness, malevolence, mistrustfulness, reticence, sincerity, tolerance, vanity

45. Please underline which of the qualities listed below you may attribute to a typical American: aggressiveness, arrogance, benevolence, bigotry, diligence, enterprise, envy, frankness, generosity, God-fearing, greediness, guile, kindness, laziness, malevolence, mistrustfulness, reticence, sincerity, tolerance, vanity

46. Please underline which of the qualities listed below you may attribute to a typical Chinese: aggressiveness, arrogance, benevolence, bigotry, diligence, enterprise, envy, frankness, generosity, God-fearing, greediness, guile, kindness, laziness, malevolence, mistrustfulness, reticence, sincerity, tolerance, vanity

Thank you for cooperation!

Appendix II

Expert Interview General Plan

I. Personal questions

1. Can you describe your family? How long have they lived in this area? Do you have parents, brothers and sisters, spouse, children? Do they all live with you? If any of them lives separately, do they live in the same settlement as you? How often do you communicate with them and with more distant relatives?

2. How old are you?

3. Where did you study?
4. What is your occupation and position?
5. What is your mother tongue? Can you speak any other languages? If yes, what languages?
6. What is your religion and denomination? Have you any relatives among people of other religions or denominations? If yes, who and of what faith?
7. What is the name of your people (ethnic group, tribe)? Have you any relatives among people of other ethnic origins? If yes, who and of what origin?
8. Have you ever been abroad? If yes, in what countries and in what capacity?

II. General questions

1. How do you rate your tribes culture to influence your entrepreneurial spirit and self-reliance?
2. Do you think a denomination matters when it comes to working hard for self-development?
3. Do you think that there are some tribes in Tanzania, people of which are more or less inclined to self-reliant hard work than others? If yes, please specify.
4. What are the features social or personal of a self-reliant person?
5. What are the features social or personal of a dependent person?
6. Does an education level of a person matter to choose between self-reliant and dependency life style?
7. Which social classes do you think to be more prone to self-reliance or to dependency than others and why?
8. What are the major problems in Tanzania in general?
9. Do you think there is a “Tanzanian nation”? Why? If yes, when was it formed? What are the distinctive characteristics of Tanzanian identity and Tanzanian culture? If no, are there prospects for its formation? Is it desirable?
10. What do you think of globalization?

III. Thematic area of study

1. Do you have any idea how much foreign aid flows into Tanzania?
2. What does an average citizen of your country know and think about foreign aid? Has his/her opinion changed in the course of time, particularly, because of the end of the Cold War?
3. What foreign countries are most visible in your area (and Tanzania in general) as international donors?
4. Do you think all donors are the same in their attitude to, and usefulness for Tanzania, or should some of them (foreign states or international organizations, like the IMF or World Bank) be preferred to others? If yes, which and why?
5. Should past (for example, during the Cold War) and current policy of this or that foreign state – international, including toward Africa, and home – matter to choosing or not choosing it as a donor?
6. Does a country such as Tanzania have a real choice in accepting or rejecting aid?
7. At present, would a country such as Tanzania survive without aid of whatever kind from donors?
8. In your opinion, is the aid now received by Tanzania distributed and utilized in the most rational and just way possible? If no, what would you suggest?
9. Do you consider aid flow post 1980s to be a base for recipients' self-reliance initiatives?
10. Would you consider the provision of mosquito bed nets to be a mile stone in Tanzanians' self-reliance initiatives?
11. Do you consider the mosquito bed nets provided to be beneficial to Tanzanians?
12. Given the global capital competition, are mosquito nets a free lunch from the donors?
13. What do you consider to be the implications of aid in mosquito bed nets to both the donor and the recipient?
14. What should aid recipients such as Tanzanians do in order to promote a self-led development?

15. Are poor countries such as Tanzania able to redefine their way from donor-led development to self-led development in the future? When can it become possible? What and by whom must be done for that?

16. Do you see any specific features of Tanzania that could make this transition easier or harder compared to other Third World countries, including African, particularly immediate neighbours?

References

- Abbas, Hakima and Niyiragira, Ives, eds. 2009. *Aid to Africa: Redeemer or Coloniser?* Cape Town: Pambazuka Press.
- Afrobarometer. 2006. *Combating Corruption in Tanzania: Perception and Experience*. Available at: http://www.povertymonitoring.go.tz/nonstate/afrobaraometer_on_corruption_in_Tz_2006.pdf (2.2.2012).
- Bajulaiye, Olumide. 2008. "Self-Reliance Key to Continent's Survival – Tinubu." *Daily Trust*, March 19. Available at: <http://allafrica.com/stories/200803190134.html> (7.12.2011).
- Blommaert, Jan. 1999. *State Ideology and Language in Tanzania*. Cologne: Rudiger Koppe.
- Blommaert, Jan. 2006. "Ujamaa and Creation of the New Waswahili," In: *Living through Languages: An African Tribute to René Dirven*. Ed. Christa van der Walt. Stellenbosch: SUN Press, 5–22.
- Bondarenko, Dmitri M. 1996. "Kul't predkov kak tsentral'nyy element traditsionnykh religiozno-mifologicheskikh system Tropichestkoy Afriki" ["Ancestor Cult as the Central Element of Traditional Religious and Mythological Systems of Tropical Africa."] In: *Afrika: obshchestva, kul'tury, jazyki (problemy teorii i metodologii)* [Africa: Societies, Cultures, Languages (Problems of Theory and Methodology)]. Eds. Igor V. Sledzevski & Dmitri M. Bondarenko. Moscow: Institute for African Studies Press, 81–95.
- Bondarenko, Dmitri M. 2004. "The 'Fruit of Enlightenment': Education, Politics, and Muslim-Christian Relations in Contemporary Tanzania." In: *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations* 15, No 4, 443–468.
- Bondarenko, Dmitri M. 2010. "In the Red Banner's Shade: The Image of Post-Soviet Russia in Africa." *Africa Review* 2, No 1, 1–14.
- Bondarenko, Dmitri M., Krishna, Kamini and Krishna, Radhe. 2013. "A View from Campus: The Attitude of University Students to the European and South Asian Minorities in Tanzania and Zambia Compared." *Anthropos* 108, No 1, 77–95.
- Brown, William. 2013. "Sovereignty Matters: Africa, Donors, and the Aid Relationship." *African Affairs* 112, No 447, 262–282.

- Carmody, Pádraig. 2011. *The New Scramble for Africa*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- CBS News. 2009. "Obama: 'Africa's Future is Up to Africans.'" *CBSNews*, July 11. Available at:
<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/07/11/politics/main5152235.shtml>
(7.12.2011).
- Chabal, Patrick and Skalník, Peter, eds. 2010. *Africanists on Africa. Current Issues*. Berlin: LIT Verlag for The University of Hradec Králové.
- Cheru, Fantu and Shubin, Vladimir. 2009. "Globalization and the 'New Scramble for Africa': The Need for Policy Space." In: *Fifth International Conference "Hierarchy and Power in the History of Civilizations"*. Eds. Dmitri M. Bondarenko & Oleg I. Kavykin. Moscow: Institute for African Studies Press, 76–82. Civil Society Index. 2011. *Civil Society Index (CSI) Project. Tanzania Country Report 2011*. Available at:
https://www.civicus.org/images/stories/csi/csi_phase2/tanzania%20acr%20final.pdf (3.2.2012).
- Daloz, Jean-Pascal. 2003. "'Big Men' in Sub-Saharan Africa: How Elites Accumulate Positions and Resources." In: *Elite Configurations at the Apex of Power*. Ed. Mattei Dogan. Leiden: Brill, 271–286.
- Fortes, Meyer. 1966. "Some Reflections on Ancestor Worship in Africa." In: *African Systems of Thought: Studies Presented and Discussed at the Third International African Seminar in Salisbury, December, 1960*. Eds. Meyer Fortes & Germaine Dieterlen. London: Oxford University Press for International African Institute, 122–142.
- Gathara, Patrick. 2011. "Have Tanzanians Kept Faith with Nyerere's Ideals?" In: *The East African*, December 12-18: 8.
- Grinker, Roy Richard, Lubkemann, Stephen C. and Steiner, Christopher Burghard, eds. 2010. *Perspectives on Africa: A Reader in Culture, History, and Representation*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Haapanen, Toni, ed. 2007. *Civil Society in Tanzania*. Helsinki: KEPA.
- Ikoku, Emman A. U. 1980. *Self-Reliance, Africa's Survival*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Ingwe, Richard, Okoro, James and Ukwaiyi Joseph K. 2010. "The New Scramble for Africa: How Large-Scale Acquisition of Sub-Saharan Africa's Land by Multinational Corporations and Rich Countries Threatens Sustainable Development." *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 12, No 3, 28–50.
- Jamieson, Alastair. 2010. "Self-Reliance Ethos Sets Africa Charity Apart." *The Telegraph*, January 29. Available at:
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/telegraphchristmasappeal/7092502/Self-reliance-ethos-sets-Africa-charity-apart.html> (7.12.2011).

- Kamat, Vinay R. 2008. "This is not Our Culture! Discourse of Nostalgia and Narratives of Health Concerns in Post-Socialist Tanzania." *Africa* 78, No 3, 359–383.
- Karl, Marilee. 1976. *Ujamaa and Self-Reliance: Building Socialism in Tanzania*. Rome: IDOC.
- Kilasara, Joseph. 2008. "Go Back to Socialism and Self-Reliance." *Tanzanian Affairs* 90, No 1, 23–26.
- Kiondo, Andrew S. Z., and Nyang'oro, Julius Edo. 2006. *Civil Society and Democratic Development in Tanzania*. Harare: MWENGO.
- Kosukhin, Nikolai. 2005. "Julius Nyerere: Statesman, Thinker, Humanist." In: *Julius Nyerere: Humanist, Politician, Thinker*. Ed. Yuri N. Vinokurov. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers, 6–13.
- Lal, Priya. 2012. "Self-Reliance and the State: The Multiple Meanings of Development in Early Post-Colonial Tanzania." *Africa* 82, No 2, 212–234.
- Lancaster, Carol. 1999. *Aid to Africa: So Much to Do, So Little Done*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lange, Siri, Wallevik, Hege and Kiondo, Andrew. 2000. *Civil Society in Tanzania*. Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute.
- Lumumba-Kasongo, Tukumbi. 2000. "Rethinking Educational Paradigms in Africa: Imperatives for Social Progress in the New Millennium." *African Voices in Education*. Eds. P. Higgs, N. C. G. Vakalisa, T. V. Mda & N. T. Assie-Lumumba. Cape Town: Juta, 139–157.
- Madaha, Rasel Mpuya. 2012. "The Corruption Noose: Will Tanzania Ever Develop?" *Africa Review* 4, No 1, 48–64.
- Malone, Barry. 2008. "African Union Said Aid to Africa Could Fall Due to Global Crisis," *Ethiopian Review*, October 30. Available at: <http://www.ethiopianreview.com/content/13084> (6.12.2011).
- McHenry, Dean E. 1994. *Limited Choices: The Political Struggle for Socialism in Tanzania*. London: Lynne Reiner Publishers.
- Mgimwa, William Augustao. 2012. "Speech by the Minister for Finance Hon. Dr. William Augustao Mgimwa (MP), Introducing to the National Assembly, the Estimates of Government Revenue and Expenditure for the Fiscal Year 2012/2013." Available at: <http://parliament.go.tz/docs/4d634-BUDGET-SPEECH-JUNE-2012-----FINAL.pdf> (18.8.2013).
- Mkenda, Adolph. 2010. "Nekotorye razmyshleniya po povodu ekonomicheskogo naslediya Mwalimu Dzh. N'erere" ["Some Thoughts about the Economic Legacy of Mwalimu J. Nyerere."]. In: *Dzhulius Kambarage N'erere – pervyy prezident nezavisimoy Tanzanii [Julius Kambarage Nyerere – the First President of Independent Tanzania]*. Ed. Yuri N. Vinokurov. Moscow: Institute for African Studies Press, 34–43.
- Moyo, Dambisa. 2009. *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is Another Way for Africa*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

- Msellemu, Sengulo Albert. 2004. "Globalisation is Neocolonialism." *Vostok / Oriens*, No 6, 90–96.
- Mwansoko, Hermas J. M. 1990. "The End of Swahilization for Post-Primary Education in Tanzania?" *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 40, No 1, 51–59.
- Nassali, Ann Marie. 2009. *Non-Governmental Organizations, Governance and Human Rights in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and South Africa: Conceptual and Strategic Questions*. Pretoria: University of Pretoria. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.
- Nyagetera, Bartholomew M. n.d. *Investment, Foreign Aid and Self-Reliance in Tanzania: A State-of-the-Art Review*. Dar es Salaam: Economic and Social Research Foundation.
- Nyerere, Julius K. 1967. *Education for Self-Reliance*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.
- Ogundowole, E. Kolawole. 1988. *Self-Reliance: Philosophy of a New Order*. Ikeja: John West Publications.
- Ogundowole, E. Kolawole. 2004. *Philosophy and Society*. Lagos: Correct Councils.
- Okoko, Kimse A. B. 1987. *Socialism and Self-Reliance in Tanzania*. London: KPI, 1987.
- Olaniyan, R. Omotayo. 1996. *Foreign Aid, Self-Reliance, and Economic Development in West Africa*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Orjiako, Humphrey. 2001. *Killing Sub-Saharan Africa with Aid*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Osita, Eze, and Anigbo, Chike A., eds. 2010. *New Scramble for Africa*. Lagos: Nigerian Institute of International Affairs.
- Riddell, Roger. 2007. *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rugumamu, Severine Mushambampale. 1997. *Lethal Aid: The Illusion of Socialism and Self-Reliance in Tanzania*. Trenton, NJ: African World Press.
- Swilla, Imani N. 2009. "Languages of Instruction in Tanzania: Contradictions between Ideology, Policy and Implementation." *African Study Monographs* 30, No 1, 1–14.
- Tasseni, Miki. 2010. "Media Power and Political Power in 'War against Corruption' in Tanzania." *Scribes*, No 3, 4–10.
- Topan, Farouk. 2008. "Tanzania: The Development of Swahili as a National and Official Language." In: *Language and National Identity in Africa*. Ed. Andrew Simpson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 252–266.
- Tripp, Aili Mari. 2012. *Donor Assistance and Political Reform in Tanzania*. Helsinki: UNU-WIDER.

- Weinstein, Lena. 2008. "The New Scramble for Africa." *International Socialist Review* 60. Available at: <http://www.isreview.org/issues/60/feat-africa.shtml> (4.2.2012).
- Wohlgemuth, Lennart. 2008. "Can Africa Make Use of the New Aid Architecture?" *Africa Development* 33, No 4, 31–41.
- Zachary, G. Pascal. 2009. "The Apostle of African Self-Reliance: 'Africa's future is up to Africans.'" *Africa Works*, July 11. Available at: <http://africaworksgpz.com/2009/07/11/the-apostle-of-african-self-reliance-africas-future-is-up-to-africans/> (7.12.2011)