

IMPLEMENTING THE BUSHIRI AGROCITY: LESSONS LEARNT FROM THE MILLENNIUM VILLAGES PROJECT, RUVUMA DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, AND UJAMAA VIJIJINI INTERVENTIONS

By Kinai William, Brändle-Amolo Yvonne Apiyo, Bürgi Jörg

ABSTRACT

To pull itself out of the vicious poverty circle, Africa will have to assume responsibility for its problems and find an effective solution to its aid management by redesigning development strategies tailored to local conditions. Recognizing that African traditional institutions had been disrupted by colonization, Al Imfeld proposed the Agrocity model for the development of urban areas. The AgroCity Association is championing the Bushiri AgroCity, while drawing on lessons learnt from its predecessors. Examples of previous attempts to develop human settlements by external intervention are the Millennium Village Project, the Ruvuma Development Association and the Tanzanian ujamaa vijijini mass villagisation program.

Africa needs to face its pressing migration problem by working on a sustainable development framework that addresses its root cause and creates an innovative inclusive urban space like AgroCity in the rural area for its local and displaced people. For this reason, ACA would like to create sustainable alternative

sources of income in the agricultural sector in Bushiri, whilst incurring minimal damage to the environment. Together with the community members of BAC, ACA aims to construct an urban AgroCity that caters to the main limitations as identified by community members. Among others, these limitations include access to markets, capital, health, and a lack of modern equipment.

The first AgroCity in Bushiri, District Pangani, Tanzania, is already a promising work in progress. The Bushiri AgroCity will be developed on a 4 km² plateau area above the Pangani River. The local cooperative BAC and the Swiss association ACA have established a management system in accordance to ISO 9001 for quality and ISO 14001 for the environment which will be the base of their implementation.

KEYWORDS

AgroCity, Bushiri, Development, MDGs, MVP, RDA, SDGs, Ujamaa, Vijijini, Villagization

INTRODUCTION

According to the Human Development Indices and Indicators list, published in 2018 by the United Nations Development Programme, conventional capitalist, industrialization-driven, urban-oriented development models have failed to deliver desired economic advancement in African countries causing them to lag behind the Human Development

Index. This is especially evident through the steady decline of the global exports in the continent: from 7 percent in the 1940s, to 5 percent in the 1970s, then 3 percent in the 1980s, and finally to 2 percent at the end of 2016 (UNCTAD, 2018).

Increasing population pressure in rural areas (see Ogutu, 1993; Muyanga & Jayne, 2014; Mellor, 2014; Carter & Parker, 2009; Bryceson, 2000; Jayne, Chamberlin & Headey, 2014; Robinson, 2003, Jayne, et al, 2016; Vandercasteelen, et al, 2018, Goddard, 2018) and rampant subdivision of agricultural land (see Bertrand, 2019; Isaacs, & Manatsha, 2016; Badoux, 2018), are triggering en masse rural to urban migration (see Mulcahy & Kollamparambil, 2016; Tacoli, et al, 2015; Cobbinah, et al, 2015). With urbanization schemes preceding industrialization (see Ssozi, & Howard, 2018) millions of Africans are condemned to lead a life of squalor in urban slums. In 2014, 55 percent of Sub-Saharan Africa's urban population lived in slum condition (United Nations, 2015).

It is against this backdrop that the AgroCity Association seeks to provide an alternative development model which emphasizes sustainable urban development and social justice. Bushiri AgroCity at Pangani, Tanzania is the first sustainable urban development experiments supported by the AgroCity Association. The second section of this paper will examine the AgroCity Concept. The third section of this paper will review the Millennium Village Project. In the fourth section of this paper, we present the Agrocity Association philosophy and ideals. In the last section, the present status of Bushiri AgroCity development will be presented.

IMFELD'S AGROCITY CONCEPT

The AgroCity concept is mainly based on the ideas of Al Imfeld (2017). Imfeld argued that the evolution of African cities was curtailed historically by the migration African people out of the continent, depopulation of African communities as a result of slave trade, and colonialism.

According to Imfeld, colonization had disrupted the traditional agricultural lifestyle of many African communities, forcibly congregating the African communities in largely segregated, densely populated anti-social apartheid ghettos. These “native” ghettos were largely unplanned and had lack of social amenities (also see Parnell, 1991 and Christopher, 1983). African cities that developed during the colonial era were ill-equipped to provide for the needs of their inhabitants.

As a result, Imfeld suggested the development of an African AgroCity, a largely locally funded, people-centric community with a diverse socio-culturally and religion mix, accommodating an upper limit of 10,000 inhabitants' with the natural flair for sustainable eco-friendly lifestyles, devoid of the typical epicentres and slums. The AgroCity would have all the social amenities and infrastructure of a modern city yet mirror the traditional ambience of the local community utilizing the local materials and amplifying the cultural heritage. With the increment in the AgroCity, sister cities separated by a greenbelt would be developed within 20-30 kilometres radius to accommodate the growth.

Finally, Imfeld also stressed the need to maintain a fluid AgroCity concept that enabled its implementation and achievement to be a uniting learning process for both the locals and their international guiding partners.

THE MILLENNIUM VILLAGES PROJECT

The Millennium Villages Project (MVP) was a 10 year, multisector, rural development project, initiated in 2005, operating in ten sub-Saharan African countries to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Mitchell, et al., 2018). The project was undertaken in impoverished rural areas in 10 countries in sub-Saharan Africa with the cooperation of national and local governments and the communities (Sachs, 2018). The 14 Millennium Villages were Sauri and Dertu, Kenya; Koraro, Ethiopia; Mbola, Tanzania; Ruhiira, Uganda; Mayange, Rwanda; Mwandama, Malawi; Pampaida and Ikaram, Nigeria; Potou, Senegal; Tiby and Toya, Mali; and Bonsaaso, Ghana.

Sachs (2018), who was the director of the MVP, stated that the project implementation was guided by three principles: (i) an integrated rural development approach, with interventions spanning agriculture, environmental restoration, primary education, primary health care, and local infrastructure (water, sanitation, energy, and connectivity), (ii) an incremental donor investment aiming at \$60 per person per year; and (iii) community based delivery, with a focus on inclusive services for the community (farmer cooperatives, health systems, public education, and local

infrastructure) rather than private income transfers or credits for individuals or for businesses.

The Millennium Villages Project was initially conceived to demonstrate the ability of an integrated multisector approach at ending poverty and its associated ills (Bendavid, 2018). The multisector approach proved to be feasible in all the sites with a small leadership team of local staff providing support and continuity across hundreds of interventions spanning the major categories of farming, environment, health, education, and infrastructure (Sachs, 2018).

Investments and systems were successfully implemented in a phased manner (Sachs, 2018). The funding for the project was provided by governments, communities, and other partners (Millennium Villages Project - MVP, 2010) while grant financing was justified by citing that the project was developing community-based capital.

Sachs & McArthur (2005) advocate for this funding model stating that increased financing, linked to effective governance structures in low-income countries, can produce dramatic results. They argue that official development assistance should be adequate to pay for the financing needs of the projects aimed at improving the quality of life in rural areas, assuming responsible governance and that domestic resources are mobilized by the receiving countries. Cabral, et al (2006) observed that the MVP was based on the premise that to overcome poverty traps that hold captive many remote rural areas in Africa, colossal injections of capital will be required. All in all, the

total on-site spending decreased from US\$132 per person in the first half of the project to \$109 per person in the second half of the project (Mitchell, et al., 2018).

Cabral, et al. (2006) critiqued the MVP implementation approach arguing that it "... has many of the features of a blueprint approach where activities to be undertaken are already defined with little choice being left to the beneficiaries in devising solutions embedded in local environmental, socio-economic and cultural realities." They further noted that the MVP was implemented in the 'campaign' approach fashion with limited evidence of commitment to positive change by beneficiaries. This is in contrast to practice by NGO requiring beneficiaries to demonstrate a commitment for example by providing labour and materials before external interventions. Bendavid (2018) argued the centrally planned approach of the MVP which included the "provision of a streamlined basket of goods to each village" provided idealist, utopian remedies that were insensitive to local customs and constraints (see Munk, 2013). Throughout its project life cycle, the MVP lacked an evaluation plan (Bendavid, 2018) thus limiting the project's management effectiveness.

Nina Munk, who spent six years shadowing Jeffrey Sachs and reporting on the MVP, provides an insight into the quirks bearing on MVP, in her book *The Idealist* (Munk, 2013). She gave an account of the project's management insensitivity to local customs and practices, documenting criticism of the MVP's lack of empirically-grounded strategies.

Despite the MVP philosophical and impact assessment flaws, Mitchell, et al. (2018) assessed the project's impact, target attainment, and on-site spending by comparing project village outcomes with non-project villages. In agriculture and health outcomes, significant improvements were also reported in project villagers relative to comparison villages. On the other hand, no significant impact was recorded on consumption-based measures of poverty, despite the fact that project impacts on education and nutrition outcomes will largely inconclusive. Although the MVP villages reported improvements in a majority of outcome areas, Bendavid (2018) noted that the end of poverty—arguably the *raison d'être* of the entire project—was no closer in the MVP villages than in the comparison villages.

UJAMAA VILLAGES

The Ujamaa Philosophy

The Tanzanian Ujamaa philosophy is credited to Julius Kambarage Nyerere, the first President of Tanganyika in 1961 and Tanzania in 1964. In his Ujamaa socialist philosophy, Nyerere envisioned an economic development process based on African traditions and free of the exploitation of men by men (Mann, 2017). The Ujamaa socialist philosophy proposed the development of an attitude that would resist individual wealth accumulation, accentuated equality and solidarity of the pre-colonial African extended family (Nyerere, 1968). Nyerere envisaged a democratic socialist nation in which the Arusha Declaration and Policy on Socialism and Self-Reliance, Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) (1967) which stated that the “True

socialism cannot exist without democracy also existing in the society”, would be practised. These ideals were incorporated in the 9th Article of the Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania (URT) which states that: “ The object of this Constitution is to facilitate the building of the United Republic as a nation of equal and free individuals enjoying freedom, justice, fraternity and concord, through the pursuit of the policy of Socialism and Self Reliance which emphasizes the application of socialist principles while taking into account the conditions prevailing in the United Republic.” This meant that there would be no private ownership and that all economic activities will be under the control of the Tanzanian people through their government (Makulilo, 2012).

Nyerere (1967) wrote that Ujamaa would be based on 3 principles: (a) Mutual respect - the basic unit of production is the extended family where each member would receive respect from other family members provided they were fulfilling their role; (b) Common ownership - All resources used for production including land and farm tools and produce from the farm would be communally owned and consumed thereby socially moderating the accumulation of private wealth; and (c) Everybody living in an ujamaa village had a moral and social obligation to work to the best of their abilities. In his view, "... the basis of rural life in Tanzania must be the practice of co-operation in its widest sense – in living, in working, and in distribution, and all with an acceptance of the absolute equality of all men and women" (Nyerere 1968). The ideal Tanzanian society would be based on agriculture, collectivized village farmlands and organized mass literacy.

The objective and foundation of Nyerere's African socialism are based on the extended family, being translated as "Ujamaa" in the Swahili language (Arikawei, 2015). Makulilo (2012) notes that ujamaa was a political reform strategy for the existing colonial legacies. The Ujamaa philosophy intended to restructure the colonial political and socio-economic structures which broke existing ties, creating social classes and resulted in the biased distribution of resources. The Arusha Declaration espoused intention to create in Tanzania an egalitarian socialist society. A society which would be based on agriculture, collectivized village farmlands and organized mass literacy (Arikawei, 2015).

Colonial structures subjugated colonized people (see Pieterse, et al, 2011; Kayira, 2015; and Said, 1989) and exploited the resources of the colonies, creating dependence on external aid and perpetuated underdevelopment of the colonies economy (Makulilo, 2012). Old traditional industries, political and social systems were thoroughly destroyed, and the colonies were made to be cheap producers of raw materials (Mann, 2017). Further, surplus value and labour created in the former colonies were mostly exported to the imperialist centres.

Prior to the Arusha Declaration of 1967, the government of the United Republic of Tanzania approach to rural development was through the creation of settlement schemes. However, local initiatives such as the Ruvuma Development Association (RDA) and communal villages organized by TANU Youth League members across the country, since independence were engaging in cooperative agriculture across the country (Edwards, 1998; Pratt 1976; Mann 2017; Ibbott 2014).

After the Arusha Declaration (TANU, 1967), Tanzania adopted the Ujamaa village as the primary rural development strategy (Huizer 1973; Mann 2017). The frontal ujamaazation strategy resulted in the increase of Ujamaa villages from 809 in 1969 to 5,631 in 1973, with the membership growing from 531,000 in 1970 to over 2 million by March 1973 (Abraham & Robinson, 1974).

Ujamaa Villages in Southern Tanzania

Through speeches and radio broadcasts, Nyerere encouraged groups of farmers to relocate and reorganize themselves into small socialist communities (Edwards, 1998). Settlement schemes formed mostly by TANU Youth League spontaneously emerged, with limited assistance from the government. The scheme in the Ruvuma region was established by the TANU Youth League Farmers Scheme in Litowa lead by John Ntimbanjayo Millinga, the local secretary of the TANU Youth League Peramiho Branch and 14 colleagues in November 1960 (Huizer, 1973; Sanger, 1969; Mann, 2017).

This first attempt to establish a settlement was abandoned in February 1961 owing to the threat of wild animals and the lack of adequate food (Huizer, 1973; Mann, 2017). In 1962, a second attempt led to Litowa settlement members building houses for their families in their new nucleated villages (Huizer, 1973). The early settlers received technical advice from Ralph Ibbott, an Englishman who had been deported from Rhodesia (Brain, 1977).

Litowa settlement was based on cooperative ideas, which were later merged into communalism. The settlers cultivate seventy acres jointly, while only another twelve acres are individually owned (Sanger, 1969). Labour on the Litowa settlement farm was to be undertaken communally, and the profits shared amongst the scheme's members (Jennings, 2002). Sanger (1969) quoted Griff Cunningham who wrote after a visit in 1966 about the "atmosphere of bustle and pride in success visible at Litowa ... the tractors, piped water, an automobile, a dispensary, a self-help school and children with their own home-made uniforms, large fields of tobacco and tobacco barns."

The Ruvuma settlements soon became the role model for Ujamaa villages countrywide (Mann, 2017; Ibbott, 2014). The settlers at Litowa started to cooperate with other new ujamaa villages in the area (Mann, 2017). In the year 1963, Litowa settlers were visited by their Liweta counterparts who sought to learn about the practice of communal farming (Ibbott, 2014).

The Ruvuma Development Association (RDA) was formed in 1963. Litowa spread its influence after the RDA was formed (Sanger, 1969). In the same year, two new settlements had been established — Liweta and Njoomlole. The three villages subscribed to the guiding principles of the RDA. Although each village adopted its own structural forms, the founders of the Association assumed that the experience of labour on the communal farm would lead to permanent settlement in a nucleated village: 'working together' would lead to 'living together' (Jennings, 2002). Shortly after the formation of the RDA, there were fifteen settlements grouped in the RDA (Sanger,

1969). By 1963, there were about 1000 settlement schemes that had emerged spontaneously countrywide (Edwards, 1998; Nursey-Bray, 1980). With 16 villages under its auspices, the RDA was the closest example of Nyerere's early ideal (Nursey-Bray, 1980). The Ruvuma region became the Mecca of the new faith expressed in ujamaa villages (Sanger, 1969).

The RDA was governed by a Ruvuma Ujamaa Committee (Mann, 2017). Elections were held every year at which RDA members chose a chairman, manager and secretary/treasurer and management committee members. The term of the committee was three years (Huizer, 1973). A third of the committee members resigned every year and were eligible for re/election. The management committee consisted of the regional TANU party leader, Ibbott and Millinga (Mann, 2017).

Each ujamaa village had a village assembly. All important decisions in the ujamaa village were made democratically by the members' assembly, in which all inhabitants of the village over the age of 18 were eligible to participate (Kürschner, 1974). The Village and Ujamaa Villages Act of 1975 was enacted to provide for the registration of villages, the administration of registered villages and the designation of ujamaa villages (Kauzeni, et al, 1998). A settlement composed of a minimum of 250 households could be registered as a new village (Greco, 2016). On registration, the Ministry for Local Governments would appoint the village executive officer. The village executive officer, serving as the accounting officer, managed funds provided by the ministry and ensured compliance with administrative procedures.

In the early days of Ujamaa, RDA enjoyed cordial relationships with the local and regional TANU organs. The Ruvuma Ujamaa Committee developed a plan for the establishment of African socialism within the region. The principles formulated by the committee became the daily praxis of development among the RDA member villages. (Ibbott, 2014). The pivotal difference between authority and leadership in RDA and the leadership of the Tanzanian villagisation between 1970 and 1975 was that RDA interpreted leadership as empowering other people to self-consciousness, in order for them to utilize their abilities and development (Mann, 2017).

By 1967 the Association consisted of 17 villages with more than 400 families (Jennings, 2002). On the proclamation of the Arusha Declaration in 1967 and the adoption of Ujamaa as the national development policy, the RDA became the model Ujamaa village, making it the ujamaa praxis training centre particularly for state officials (Mann, 2017). Leaders of other ujamaa villages were trained by the RDA (Jennings, 2002) and in 1968, the Department of Ujamaa vijijini at the TANU headquarters was established, with Millinga as the head of this institution (Mann, 2017).

Members of TANU's Central Committee (CC) visited the RDA villages of Litowa, Liweta and Matetereka in 1969 to learn the workings of the pioneer ujamaa villages (Mann, 2017). The CC held a review meeting on 24 September 1969. At this protracted acrimonious meeting, in spite of Nyerere's spirited support for the Association, the CC voted overwhelmingly to disband the RDA (Edwards, 1998; Jennings, 2002). To ban the RBA, the CC invoked the Societies Ordinance of 1954 which gave the colonial governor 'absolute discretion' to declare a society unlawful if in his opinion it "is being

used for any purpose prejudicial to, or incompatible with the maintenance of peace, order and good government" (Mamdani, 1992). Subsequently, two announcements were made. The first was that the RDA Villages would be disbanded. The second announcement was that TANU would henceforth administer the Ujamaa vijijini program (Schneider, 2014).

Ujamaa Vijijini

After the disbandment, RDA assets that were initially confiscated by the state were returned to the respective villages. The government made substantial investments in the former RDA villages. However, the former RDA villages lost ownership of their projects. The government's ujamaa vijijini administrators took a condescending posture towards the peasants who were settled on the villages they administered (Mann, 2017). The authoritarian, top-down practices and the use of force transformed the mass ujamaa villagisation of the Tanzanian rural population into nucleated villages synonymous with forced resettlement (Kjekshus 1977; Moore 1979; Greco, 2016). The increased use of force signified the beginning of the second phase of villagisation from 1970 to 1973 (Mann, 2017). According to Mann (2017) in 1973, 2,028,164 people or 15% of Tanzania's total population lived in 5,628 villages. TANU considered this to be a mediocre accomplishment.

By 1972 it was evident that the voluntary formation of ujamaa villages was proceeding too slowly, and that some areas were particularly antagonistic towards abandoning the traditional rural system (Moore, 1979). In September 1973 the TANU Biennial

Conference announced the forthcoming villagisation programme and resolved that by the end of 1976 the entire rural population should live in ujamaa villages (Edwards, 1998). This resolution ushered in a third villagisation phase.

The third phase of villagisation entailed the deployment of increasingly authoritarian tactics to move people en masse into ujamaa villages. In this phase, the use of force was a constant feature of the villagisation policy (Ergas, 1980). Through a series of military-style operations, the whole country was villagised by 1975 (Sundet, 2006) with 9 million people living in ujamaa villages (Mann, 2017). The friction of forcing the peasantry into a project it did not embrace does not appear ever to have been considered (Schneider, 2004).

Agricultural activities were disrupted resulting in a severe food crisis (Watzal 1982; Lofchie 1978). Between 1972 and 1975 Tanzania's supply of domestically produced grain, predominantly maize, fell precariously below the national needs (Lofchie, 1978). Lofchie concluded that the collective villagisation bore most of the responsibility for the food crisis.

As the ujamaa villagisation evolved over its 3 phases, the concept of working together in "cooperative villages" became diluted and "living together" in nucleated settlements became the principal objective of the villagisation program (Mann, 2017). From 1972 onwards, communal work at ujamaa villages was de-emphasized with the staff-villager relations becoming increasingly bureaucratic (Freyhold, 1979). Communal farming was regarded simply as a necessary expedient to avoid governmental sanction or

interference or to qualify for material assistance which might then be applied to private plots (Lofchie, 1978). The level of cooperative production in these villages was often minimal, consisting, of a token communal plot, in many, with as little as half a hectare in extent, so as to qualify for ujamaa status and, hence, for financial and other support (Moore, 1979). Ergas (1980) concluded that the wajamaa felt in general that they could not afford to neglect their private farms in order to concentrate on the communal shamba. They could not abandon their private farms from which they derived sustenance at the new underdeveloped ujamaa villages.

There were positive effects of living in nucleated rural settlements. Many new villages were culturally and linguistically heterogeneous (Boone and Nyeme 2015). Residents of the new ujamaa settlements adopted Swahili, the national language, as are their lingua franca. Swahili, offered tremendous practical advantages, as well as serving as a vehicle for a common national identity (Blommaert, 1997). Greco (2016) notes that Tanzania's ujamaa also left behind twin legacies of villages and cooperatives.

The policy of ujamaa socialism roused formidable obstacles (Ergas, 1980). Ujamaa had to contend with a hostile TANU Central Committee, bureaucratic village administration, and policy-induced food shortages (Edwards, 1998; Jennings, 2002; Mann, 2017; Watzal 1982; Lofchie 1978). The implementation of Ujamaa was rather hasty, whilst tending to create wide aspirational gaps between popular expectations and actual performance (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003). Ibhawoh & Dibua stated that by 1975, it was clear to policymakers that any development policy that was primarily

centred on nationalization could neither solve the problems of underdevelopment nor offer expedient paths to economic self-reliance.

End of the Ujamaa Villagisation Program

Chama Cha Mapinduzi, the ruling party in Tanzania maintains that it holds onto the socialist ideals of its predecessor TANU (Makulilo, 2012). However, both socialism and the ujamaa villagisation have fizzled out over time. Edwards (1998) wrote that the only ujamaa village surviving at that time with its democratic and communal institutions intact was Matetereka in the north of the Ruvuma Region. Mann's research conducted in 2015 found that Matetereka Village ujamaa institutions had been abandoned in 2000 (Mann, 2017).

For the better part of the 1970s decade, Tanzania was a country in crisis. The country had undergone the coerced resettlement of its entire rural population and a food crisis that was associated with the disruption of agricultural production during the period of forced villagisation (Lofchie, 1978). Adverse impacts of oil price hikes of 1973 and 1979 and concomitant global recession (Lal, 2015). The need to import food and higher oil prices drained the country's foreign exchange reserves (Ergas, 1980 & Makulilo, 2012). Tanzania's foreign exchange reserves were virtually exhausted at the end of 1974 (Lofchie, 1978), a situation which eventually led to the breakup of the East Africa Community a regional trading bloc that Tanzania was a member in 1977 (see Eken, 1979). In 1978 and 1979 Tanzania went to war with Uganda to liberate the Kagera

region which has been annexed by Uganda (Makulilo, 2012). These crises diverted much-needed attention from the Ujamaa villagisation program.

Notwithstanding the above-mentioned challenges, the demise of the ujamaa villagisation is largely attributed to IMF and World Bank lending conditionalities. During the 1970s, Tanzania's government borrowed heavily from the IMF. By 1977, Tanzania had become heavily indebted to the IMF, who in turn dictated, the liberalization of the national economy, the devaluation of the national currency, the lifting of price controls and cuts in government expenditure (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003) as conditions for further donor loans. According to Ergas (1980), the World Bank virtually threatened to withdraw current and future aid unless Nyerere suspended his ujamaa programme. Edwards (1998) inculpated TANU of paying paid lip service to the ideals expressed in the Arusha Declaration as government policies became increasingly capitalist-oriented, partly in response to demands from the World Bank and IMF.

Makulilo (2012) argues that the conditions from the IMF and World Bank were the "last nail in a coffin to socialism in Tanzania." Within a few years, Tanzania had essentially abandoned its course of agrarian socialism, as the limits of national development had become all too clear (Lal, 2015). Osafo-Kwaako (2011) argued that the experiment of development villages was largely halted in 1982 following the repeal of the villages legislation (see Kauzeni, et al, 1998); and the commencement of an IMF economic liberalization program.

Cognizant of the failure of the ujamaa socialism and nationalization policies and his reluctance to implement the conditionalities of the IMF and the World Bank, President Julius Nyerere stood down as President in 1985 (Southall & Melber, 2006; Haapanen, 2011; Johnson, 2000).

THE AGROCITY ASSOCIATION

Based in Vordemwald, Switzerland, the AgroCity Association (ACA) was founded by Dr Jörg Bürgi and friends on 3rd September 2018. The mission of the ACA is to implement, manage, and finance AgroCities in Sub Saharan Africa. ACA's AgroCities development activities are guided by Al Imfeld concept of an African AgroCity. The AgroCity Association aspires to abate the global, South to North and the local, rural to urban migration while prioritising the rights of women and girls, particularly those affected by forced displacement, migration and existing gender inequalities. ACA is a nonpartisan, secular, non-profit organization whose members volunteer their services.

ACA board comprises of six members four of which are active while the other two are passive members. The active members are Angelika Dahlin, a development specialist and educator is in charge of development. Mrs Dahlin has been working in the Tanga region for 30 years and an anti-female genital mutilation activist.

The BAC Bushiri AgroCity Board also gets inputs from Jörg Bürgi PhD, President of ACA, inter alia long-time lead auditor for ISO 9001 (quality) and ISO 14001

(environment) and visiting professor at a Kenyan university. Our ACA board member Ms Brändle-Amolo, a member of the Swiss parliament, a United Nations Human Rights fellow and internationally renowned fem-activist is in charge of communication and research. William Kinai, a member of ACA, management consultant and lecturer of Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Nairobi, is our onsite business and financial consultant. Our passive members include Christian Meyer Abbot, President of the Swiss Congregation, Benedictines of Engelberg with activities in Cameroon since 1932 and Yvonne Frei, member of the Swiss national parliament.

The ACA is working on creating a Bushiri AgroCity, located at Bushiri outside the city of Pangani in Tanzania. An AgroCity will accord residents with a dignified quality of life by providing opportunities to develop a decent shelter for resident families, ensuring food self-sufficiency, as well as providing for the conveniences of contemporary urban space in the form of shopping facilities, fresh produce markets, recreation, medical services and public transport. The ACA coaches local residents to develop and manage their AgroCity.

ACA requires the local AgroCity implementation partner to develop the project in accordance with Imfeld's AgroCity model. AgroCities are constituted as cooperatives whose membership consists of diverse ethnic communities and religious beliefs. A typical AgroCity will ideally be spread over an area of least 2 square kilometres, an area which can accommodate 1000 two-storey houses. Each house will have a generously sized homestead garden.

It is expected that the AgroCity will be food self-sufficient. Each AgroCity has a dedicated 25 km circumventing agricultural belt where two-thirds of the city's food demand will be produced. Food surpluses may be traded. AgroCity Communities will attain food self-sufficiency by producing their own food on conventional farms as well as on space-efficient vertical farms.

Medical facilities, sports clubs, and places of worship will be built and financed by the AgroCity community. Ideally, educational and medical facilities will be provided free of charge. Over time, it is expected that AgroCities will attract families interested in settling, sponsors, social scientists, and experiential tourists. Visitors will be accommodated at hostels and homestays operated by AgroCity residents.

At the beginning of an AgroCity project, the area will be planned and relevant approvals of the subdivision plan obtained from relevant local authorities. In these plans, provisions will be made for roads, water reclamation, sewers, rainwater management, solar power distribution lines, internet access, and security assets. The AgroCity will be powered by sustainably solar power generators. Fossil powered vehicles will not be permitted in the AgroCity.

ACA collaborates with interested partners who share their vision for sustainable African AgroCities. In conjunction with the Eckernforde Tanga University, ACA conducts research, teaching and learning activities aimed at developing the capacity for planning and implementation of the Bushiri AgroCity project. Knowledge created

through joint research activities will be applied in the development of other AgroCity projects.

AgroCity Association's first project is the Bushiri AgroCity, located at Bushiri outside Pangani, Tanzania. In the following section, we will present the development status of the Bushiri AgroCity.

THE BUSHIRI AGROCITY

The Bushiri AgroCity will be located in the Bushiri area of Pangani, Tanga Region, Tanzania. Tanzania is a politically and socially stable nation. The country's stability and social cohesion are attributed to the ujamaa philosophy and villagisation championed by the country's first president Mwalimu Julius Nyerere (Wangwe, 2005; Edwards, 2014; Chaligha, et al, 2002).

Nonetheless, Tanzania is one of the most underdeveloped nations. In 2017, the Tanzania Human Development Index score was ranked 154 out of 178 nations. Tanzania's gross national income (GNI) is meagre USD 2,655 per capita. In comparison, that of Qatar is USD 116,818 per capita (UNDP, 2018). Tanzania's agricultural production accounts for 29.1 percent of the country's gross domestic product (GDP) (Ministry of Finance and Planning, 2017). The implementation context of the BAC is expected to be one of the relatively weak provisions of social services and low-income population.

The BAC is located at Bushiri, Pangani District, Tanga Region. Although the ecosystems within the Bushiri region are incredibly rich in biodiversity, the majority of the Bushiri population is poor. There are no formal job opportunities in the Bushiri ward. According to Slocum (2010), the most common livelihood activities include fishers as well as small businessmen, both of which normally overlap. Fishing activities are dominated by men, while women are involved in the collection of shrimps and the collection of fish from the shore. The local population is a mix of Christians and Muslims. Along the coast, there are more Muslims. Inland there is a larger number of Christians.

The Bushiri area has rich terrestrial and marine ecosystems. The people in the Bushiri region rely either directly or indirectly on marine resources as a source of livelihoods. Shechambo (2004) notes that forests in the Bushiri area are home to a number of rare plant species. There have been reports of recent sightings of vulnerable dugongs in the Pangani area (Muir, et al, 2015; Marsh & Sobotzick, 2015). Offshore is an expansive habitat for coelacanths, turtles, and other non-fishery marine life (Muhando & Rumisha (2008). However, biodiversity levels have been sorely depleted over the last fifteen years due to the widespread destruction of the coral reefs which contribute a very high proportion of this biodiversity. Burgess, et al (1992) apprise that at the present rate of destruction the Tanzanian coastal forests and their globally important flora and fauna may be completely removed.

Livelihoods are largely affected by the seasonality of activities; fishing depends on the monsoon winds, and agriculture depends on the amount of rain. Kaskazi (October to April) is a perceived relatively stable time for the community when the weather is mild. Kusi (May to July), however, often presents grave threats including dangerous rough seas for fishing, disease, and poor harvests. Most of the local people usually migrate during the Kusi period to the urban cities (Tanga and Dar es Salaam) in order to survive this harsh period.

The Bushiri AgroCity is managed by the Bushiri AgroCity Cooperative Society Limited (BAC) registered as a Cooperative on 15 May 2018. The founding committee of 10 members was led by Mr Akida Boramini, the Chairman. BAC is a nonpartisan, secular, cooperative society. The BAC is guided by the Tanzanian spirit of unity and the pursuit of the United Nations Organisation 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

The BAC is oriented towards the achievement of the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The objectives of BAC are stated as: (i) To build sustainable multi-ethnic, secular communities; (ii) To support homeless persons in realizing homeownership and self-sufficiency; (iii) To develop alternative clean energy sources; (iv) To harvest and conserve rainwater; (v) To provide access to education institution through the establishment and operation of primary, secondary, and vocational training institutions and to ensure residents access to university education; (vi) To collaborate with local and international professionals and organisations allowing for the interaction of sustainable development theory and praxis; and, (vii) To be a corruption-free community.

The relationship between BAC and ACA is defined in a memorandum of understanding signed by the two organizations. The duties and rights of the BAC residents are defined in the BAC Constitution. The Pangani District Commissioner, who is a member of the Cooperative serves as a linchpin between the BAC and various government agencies

Every BAC resident is required to be a member of the Cooperative. On joining the cooperative, the member is allotted land on which to build a house. Ideally, a two-story house will be built powered by photovoltaic cells and/or a biogas digester. The house is designed to have residential rooms and one where the resident can pursue business activities. Within the compound, the resident may choose to plant a kitchen garden and or breed domestic animals. The Cooperative will develop the social services and amenities infrastructure including hospitals, schools, and commodity markets.

BAC entered into a sales contract with Mr Steven Samson Idutubija, to purchase farmland located in the Bushiri Ward in 2019. The land is 1000 acres or slightly more than 4 km². The property is a flatland situated on a plateau fronted by Pangani River. According to Richard Balmer, an agronomist who is providing extension services to BAC, the land is suitable for a variety of food crops and agroforestry.

Implementation and funding raising of the BAC will be concurrent. External financing will be raised progressively. The first couple of instalments have been paid to Mr Idutubija. Based on the BAC 2018 - 2022 strategic plan, it is expected that the BAC

will have attained financial autonomy at the end of 2022. Upon commencement of settlement activity, parts of the land may be used for agricultural activities. The BAC may engage in communal agricultural activity.

BAC will promote, document, implement sustainable resource use of innovations relevant to the development and living in an urban environment in collaboration with multidisciplinary local and international partners. BAC will disseminate its learning on sustainable development solutions through its collaboration with the Eckernforde Tanga University (ETU) providing training in trace research activities intended to develop innovative solutions for the AgroCity development challenges for individual communities.

LESSONS LEARNT

To be successful, the ACA will endeavour to avoid “blueprint approach” And “campaign approach” that characterized the MVP. It is necessary to empathetically learn the needs, preferences, capabilities, inhibitions, and cultural limitations of the beneficiaries.

Munk (2013) documents criticism of the MVP’s lack of empirically-grounded evaluation strategies. Consequently, it is essential that the ACA develops an empirically based evaluation strategy for its activities in the development of AgroCities.

Between 1961 and 1969 Millinga lead TANU Youth League members to establish well-functioning, democratic, prosperous ujamaa villages under the auspices of RDA. Membership of the villages was voluntary. The RDA became the benchmark against which the Tanzanian state would model its compulsory villagisation program. After the disbandment of the RDA in 1969, the Tanzanian government commenced forceful villagisation of the Tanzanian rural population between 1970 to 1973. At the end of the second phase of villagization, a paltry 15% of Tanzania's total population had been villagization. A performance that TANU deemed mediocre. The instructions of TANU to conclude the legislation by 1976, the Tanzanian government embark honour militarized relocation of rural population to nucleated villages countrywide between 1973 and 1976. The target of the third villagisation phase was achieved. However, the disruption of agricultural countrywide results in severe food crisis between 1972 and 1975. Ujamaa villages became a living together setup. Literally, the RDA ujamaa villages were they good, phase two villagisation became bad, phase three became the ugly. Key lessons were learnt from the ujamaa vijijini program are (i) coercion did not work, and (ii) new settlements must develop democratic governance institutions if there are to function properly.

The BAC is located in an area endowed with kaleidoscopic terrestrial and marine biodiversity. The BAC shall develop and operate procedures for assessing and mitigating the environmental impact of the individual as well as community activities.

CONCLUSION

The ACA has provided leadership in developing democratic nonpartisan secular and multi-ethnic AgroCities in Africa. The BAC is in its formative stages. However, the ACA should empathetically learn the needs, preferences, capabilities, inhibitions, and cultural limitations of beneficiaries. To function properly, the BAC should develop democratic governance institutions. BAC will be required to institute procedures for assessing and mitigating the environmental impact of its individual activities and their impact on the community.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, P., & Robinson, F. (1974). *Rural Development in Tanzania: A Review of Ujamaa*. Studies in employment & rural development series; no. SER 14. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Arikawei, A. R. (2015). African Socialism in Tanzania: Lessons of a Community Development Strategy for Rural Transformation in Developing Countries. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(4), 540.
- Badoux, M. (2018). Ambiguous title deeds: contesting values of land and documents in Eldoret, Kenya. *Critical African Studies*, 10(1), 31-46.
- Bendavid, E. (2018). The fog of development: evaluating the Millennium Villages Project. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(5), e470-e471.
- Bertrand, M. (2019). "A cadastre for Mali?" The production of land titles and the challenge of property data on the periphery of Bamako. *Land Use Policy*, 81, 371-381.
- Blommaert, J. (1997). Intellectuals and ideological leadership in Ujamaa Tanzania. *African Languages and Cultures*, 10(2), 129-144.
- Boone, C., & Nyeme, L. (2015). Land institutions and political ethnicity in Africa: evidence from Tanzania. *Comparative Politics*, 48(1), 67-86.
- Brain, J. L. (1977). Is transformation possible? Styles of settlement in post-independence Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 76(303), 231-245.
- Bryceson, D. F. (2000). African peasants' centrality and marginality: rural labour transformations. *Disappearing Peasantries*, 37-63.
- Burgess, N. D., Mwasumbi, L. B., Hawthorne, W. J., Dickinson, A., & Doggett, R. A. (1992). Preliminary assessment of the distribution, status and biological importance of coastal forests in Tanzania. *Biological Conservation*, 62(3), 205-218.

- Cabral, L., Farrington, J., & Ludi, E. (2006). The Millennium Villages Project—a new approach to ending rural poverty in Africa. *Natural Resource Perspectives*, 101, 1-4.
- Carter, R. C., & Parker, A. (2009). Climate change, population trends and groundwater in Africa. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, 54(4), 676-689.
- Chaligha, A. (2002). *Uncritical citizens or patient trustees?: Tanzanians' views of political and economic reform* (No. 18). Michigan State University, Dept. of Political Science.
- Christopher, A. J. (1983). From Flint to Soweto: reflections on the colonial origins of the apartheid city. *Area*, 145-149.
- Cobbinah, P. B., Erdiaw-Kwasie, M. O., & Amoateng, P. (2015). Africa's urbanisation: Implications for sustainable development. *Cities*, 47, 62-72.
- Coulson, A. (1975). Peasants and bureaucrats. *Review of African Political Economy*, 2(3), 53-58.
- Edwards, D. M. (1998). Matetereka: Tanzania's Last Ujamaa Village, Occasional Paper. Centre of African Studies, Edinburgh University.
- Edwards, S. (2014). Is Tanzania a success story? A long-term analysis. In *African Successes, Volume I: Government and Institutions* (pp. 357-432). University of Chicago Press.
- Eken, S. (1979). Breakup of the East African Community. *Finance and Development*, 16(4), 36.
- Ergas, Z. (1980). Why did the Ujamaa village policy fail?—Towards a global analysis. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 18(3), 387-410.
- Goddard, A. D. (2018). Population movements and land shortages in the Sokoto close-settled zone, Nigeria. In *Modern Migrations in Western Africa* (pp. 258-280). Routledge.
- Greco, E. (2016). Village land politics and the legacy of Ujamaa. *Review of African Political Economy*, 43(sup1), 22-40.
- Haapanen, T. (2011). Rural food system change in Tanzania during the post-Ujamaa era. A case study from Western Bagamoyo District.
- Huizer, G. (1973). The Ujamaa village program in Tanzania: new forms of rural development. *Studies in Comparative International Development (SCID)*, 8(2), 183-207.
- Ibbott, R. (2014). Ujamaa: the hidden story of Tanzania's socialist villages.
- Ibhawoh, B., & Dibua, J. I. (2003). Deconstructing Ujamaa: The legacy of Julius Nyerere in the quest for social and economic development in Africa. *African Journal of Political Science*, 8(1), 59-83.
- Imfeld, A. (2017). *AgroCity: The City for Africa*. Rotpunktverlag.
- Isaacs, S. M., & Manatsha, B. T. (2016). Will the Dreaded 'Yellow Monster' Stop Roaring Again?: An Appraisal of Botswana's 2015 Land Policy. *Botswana Notes and Records*, 48(1), 383-395.
- Jayne, T. S., Chamberlin, J., & Headey, D. D. (2014). Land pressures, the evolution of farming systems, and development strategies in Africa: A synthesis. *Food Policy*, 48, 1-17.
- Jayne, T. S., Chamberlin, J., Sitko, N., Muyanga, M., Yeboah, F. K., Nkonde, C., Anseeuw, W., Traub, L., A. Chapoto, & Kachule, R. (2016). *Africa's Changing Farmland Ownership: The Rise of the Emergent Investor Farmer* (No. 1879-2017-1674).

Jennings, M. (2002). 'Almost an Oxfam in itself': Oxfam, Ujamaa and development in Tanzania. *African Affairs*, 101(405), 509-530.

Johnson, R. W. (2000). Nyerere: A flawed hero. *The National Interest*, (60), 66-75.

Kauzeni, A. S., Shechambo, F. C., & Juma, I. (1998). Private and communal property ownership regimes in Tanzania. *Reforme Agraire, Colonisation et Cooperatives Agricoles (FAO); Reforma Agraria, Colonizacion y Cooperativas (FAO)*.

Kayira, J. (2015). (Re) creating spaces for uMunthu: postcolonial theory and environmental education in southern Africa. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(1), 106-128.

Kiragu, K., Mukandala, R., & Morin, D. (2004). Reforming pay policy: techniques, sequencing, and politics in Levy, B., & Kpundeh, S. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Building state capacity in Africa: new approaches, emerging lessons*. World Bank Publications.

Kjekshus, H. (1977). The Tanzanian villagisation policy: implementational lessons and ecological dimensions. *Canadian Journal of African Studies/La Revue canadienne des études africaines*, 11(2), 269-282.

Kürschner, F. (1974). Ujamaa Villages in Tanzania: The Example of Malili (1). *International Journal of Politics*, 4(4), 88-101.

Lal, P. (2015). African socialism and the limits of global familyhood: Tanzania and the new international economic order in sub-Saharan Africa. *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development*, 6(1), 17-31.

Lofchie, M. F. (1978). Agrarian crisis and economic liberalisation in Tanzania. *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 16(3), 451-475.

Makulilo, V. B. (2012). Where is socialism in Tanzania. *Elixir Social Science*, 46, 8170-8180.

Mamdani, M. (1992). Africa: democratic theory and democratic struggles. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2228-2232.

Mann, D. (2017). *The Smell of Ujamaa is Still There: Tanzania's Path of Development Between Grassroots Socialism and Central State Control in Ruvuma* (Vol. 121). Würzburg University Press.

Mapolu, H. (1973). *The social and economic organisation of Ujamaa villages* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Dar es Salaam).

Marsh, H., & Sobotzick, S. (2015). Dugong dugon. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015: e. T6909A43792211.

Mbonile, M. J. (1994). Trading centres and development in a remote district in Tanzania. *Review of African Political Economy*, 21(59), 7-20.

Mellor, J. W. (2014). High rural population density Africa—What are the growth requirements and who participates? *Food Policy*, 48, 66-75.

Millennium Villages Project. (2010). *The Millennium Villages Project. The Next Five Years: 2011 - 2015*. Millennium Villages Project.

Ministry of Finance and Planning, The United Republic of Tanzania. (2017). *The Economic Survey 2016*. Ministry of Finance and Planning, The United Republic of Tanzania.

Mitchell, S., Gelman, A., Ross, R., Chen, J., Bari, S., Huynh, U. K., Harris, M., Sachs, S., Stuart, E., Feller, A., Makela, S., Zaslavsky, A., McClellan, L., Ohemeng-Dapaah, S., Namakula, P., Palm, C., & Sachs, J. (2018). The Millennium Villages Project: a retrospective, observational, endline evaluation. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(5), e500-e513.

- Moore, J. E. (1979). The villagisation process and rural development in the Mwanza region of Tanzania. *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 61(2), 65-80.
- Muhando, C. A., & Rumisha, C. K. (2008). Distribution and status of coastal habitats and resources in Tanzania. *Institute for Marine Sciences, University of Dar es Salaam*.
- Muir, C. E., Sallema, A., Omari, A., De Luca, D., & Davenport, T. R. (2003). The dugong (Dugong dugon) in Tanzania: A national assessment of status, distribution and threat. *Wildlife Conservation*, 22.
- Mulcahy, K., & Kollamparambil, U. (2016). The impact of rural-urban migration on subjective well-being in South Africa. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 52(9), 1357-1371.
- Munk, N. (2013). *The Idealist: Jeffrey Sachs and the Quest to End Poverty*. Signal.
- Muyanga, M., & Jayne, T. S. (2014). Effects of rising rural population density on smallholder agriculture in Kenya. *Food Policy*, 48, 98-113.
- Nurse-Bray, P. F. (1980). Tanzania: The development debate. *African Affairs*, 79(314), 55-78.
- Nyerere, J. K. (1967). Socialism and rural development. *Mbioni: The Monthly Newsletter of Kivukoni College*, 4(4), 2-46.
- Nyerere, J. K. (1968). *The Arusha Declaration and TANU's Policy on Socialism and Self-Reliance*. Ministry of Information and Tourism.
- Nyerere, J. K. (1968): Socialism and Rural Development. In: Nyerere, J. K. (Ed.): *Ujamaa. Essays on Socialism*. Dar es Salaam, 106–144.
- Ogutu, Z. A. (1993). Responding to population pressure in the rural Kenya. *GeoJournal*, 30(4), 409-419.
- Osafo-Kwaako, P. (2011, November). Long-run effects of villagization in Tanzania. In *NEUDC Conference held at Yale University*.
- Parnell, S. (1991). Sanitation, segregation and the natives (urban areas) act: African exclusion from Johannesburg's Malay location, 1897–1925. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 17(3), 271-288.
- Pieterse, A. L., Howitt, D., & Naidoo, A. V. (2011). Racial oppression, colonization, and identity: Toward an empowerment model for people of African heritage. *Counseling People of African Ancestry*, 93-108.
- Pratt, C. (1980). The critical phase in Tanzania 1945-1968. Nyerere and the emergence of a socialist strategy. *VRÜ Constitution and Law Overseas*, 13 (4), 417-419.
- Robinson, P. S. (2003). Implications of rural settlement patterns for development: A historical case study in Gaukeni, Eastern Cape, South Africa. *Development Southern Africa*, 20(3), 405-421.
- Sachs, J. D. (2018). Lessons from the Millennium Villages Project: a personal perspective. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(5), e472-e474.
- Sachs, J. D., & McArthur, J. W. (2005). The millennium project: a plan for meeting the millennium development goals. *The Lancet*, 365(9456), 347-353.
- Sachs, J., McArthur, J. W., Schmidt-Traub, G., Kruk, M., Bahadur, C., Faye, M., & McCord, G. (2004). Ending Africa's poverty trap. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2004(1), 117-240.
- Said, E. W. (1989). Representing the colonized: Anthropology's interlocutors. *Critical Inquiry*, 15(2), 205-225.

- Sanger, C. (1969). *Half a Loaf: Canada's Semi-Role among Developing Countries*. Ryerson Press, Toronto, Ont., CA.
- Schneider, L. (2004). Freedom and unfreedom in rural development: Julius Nyerere, Ujamaa vijijini, and villagization. *Canadian Journal of African Studies/La Revue Canadienne Des Études Africaines*, 38(2), 344-392.
- Shechambo, F. (2004). Coastal Forests of Tanzania: An Assessment of the Resource. *WWF Tanzania Programme Office. Institute of Resource Assessment, University of Dar es Salaam, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania*.
- Slocum, S. (2010). Sustainable Community Tourism Development: The Case of Tanzania.
- Southall, R., & Melber, H. (2006). *Legacies of power: Leadership Change and Former Presidents in African Politics*. Nordiska Afrikainstitutet; HSRC Press.
- Ssozi, J., & Howard, E. (2018). The non-classical structural economic transformation of Sub-Saharan Africa: urbanization with premature deindustrialization. *Africagrowth Agenda*, 15(Jan/Mar 2018), 8-12.
- Sundet, G. (2006). The formalisation process in Tanzania: Is it empowering the poor. *Prepared for the Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania*.
- Tacoli, C., McGranahan, G., & Satterthwaite, D. (2015). *Urbanisation, rural-urban migration and urban poverty*. Human Settlements Group, International Institute for Environment and Development.
- TANU (Organization), & TANU (Organization) Publicity Section. (1967). *The Arusha Declaration and TANU'S policy on Socialism and Self-reliance*. Publicity Section, TANU.
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2018). *Export Diversification and Employment*. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2018). *Human Development Indices and Indicators: 2018 Statistical Update*. United Nations Development Programme.
- United Nations. (2015). *The Millennium Development Goals Report*. United Nations.
- United Republic of Tanzania. (1975). *Villages and Ujamaa Villages Act 1975*. Government Press.
- Vandecasteele, J., Beyene, S. T., Minten, B., & Swinnen, J. (2018). Cities and agricultural transformation in Africa: Evidence from Ethiopia. *World Development*, 105, 383-399.
- Wangwe, S. (2005). Culture, identity and social integration: The Tanzania experience in social integration. In *World Bank conference on New Frontiers of Social Policy: Development in a Globalizing World, Arusha, Tanzania, December* (pp. 12-15).
- Weaver, J. H., & Kronemer, A. (1981). Tanzanian and African socialism. In *Socialist Models of Development* (pp. 839-849). Pergamon.