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Opening Contradictions

In February of 2008, (former) President George W. Bush visited Tanzania for the first time to officially sign the Millennium Challenge Compact, which provided development aid to Tanzania for its long standing political stability, dedication to democracy and free market economics, and a commitment to fighting corruption. Billboards displaying President Bush's smiling face and declaring the appreciation of the Tanzanian people lined the main highways of Dar es Salaam, and the news of his short tour was seen on televisions and heard on radios throughout the country. No more than one week prior to Bush’s visit, another story was spreading around the country: the resignation of Prime Minister Lowassa over one of the largest scandals ever to go public in Tanzania. The government was in complete disarray as President Kikwete dissolved his entire cabinet of ministers implicated in the scandal.

Amidst numerous conflicts in the region, Tanzania has been a beacon of relative stability, has served a mediator for many neighboring conflicts and regularly hosts refugees. The state in Tanzania has existed essentially in continuity since independence in 1961, withstanding dramatic changes in ideological orientation, beginning with a diehard commitment to self-reliance and African Socialism, and since the mid-80’s, transitioning to a dependence on international aid and capitalism with the rise of neoliberalism. There is no denying that, in this sense, Tanzania has been politically stable. However, the conflation of this stability with notions of functionality is false. Numerous examples of large scale corruption, including the incident just before President Bush’s visit, indicate that this stability has not been the product of a functional state, as popular logic and the praises showered upon Tanzania would seem to indicate.

The astounding contradiction between the praise showered upon the Tanzanian government and severe corruption received little public attention, but was certainly recognized
by citizens attempting to digest the events. Passing one of the aforementioned billboards, my friend, a woman named Josephine, leaned over and asked, “Do they think we don’t know?” “Of course not, but they don’t expect anyone to say anything about it,” I replied. And for the most part, this expectation is reasonable: Tanzanians live this contradiction between the popular notions of their country’s model success and the real situation of dysfunctional governance every day, and they are cognizant of it. In spite of this knowledge, there has been little challenge to the authority of Tanzania's relatively weak and benign state.

The assumption that political stability is the product of a strong and functional state has been central to theories of modernization processes in the developing world. It is considered to be a necessary precursor for development. For modernization theorists such as Daniel Lerner (1958) and Alex Inkles (1966), political stability is embodied in democracy, one part of a dual economic and political process of growth which necessarily leads to development. It is this line of reasoning that currently dominates popular approaches to development, resulting in agreements such as the Millennium Challenge Compact and the types of contradictions presented above. Even for Samuel Huntington (1968), whose theories radically challenged the modernization theorists’ notion that "all good things go together,” political stability in the context of economic development was predicated upon a strong and functional state.¹

As a country where political stability prevails, but the state is weak, Tanzania is a direct challenge to both modernization theory and Huntington’s refutation. Tanzania’s political stability rings more of stagnation than of growth, and more of barren offices than a series of institutions effectively channeling the demands of an engaged populace. For both modernization theorists and Huntington, there is an assumption that the institutions of the state inherently have reach

¹ The phrase “all good things go together” belongs to Robert Packenham (1973), Liberal America and the Third World. p 288.
over the population, by virtue of its position as “the state,” or in contrast, that a majority of citizens are too ignorant, poor and undeveloped to challenge or engage with the state. These views lead to false interpretations of Tanzania's political stability as a sign of state functionality, a lack of substantial economic development, or both.

In practice, Tanzanian citizens enjoy a large degree of autonomy from the state. Political stability is the product of an attempt to keep it that way. Much of the activity that goes on at the state level is inconsequential to citizens, at least in the most immediate sense. A Swahili saying, *ukila na kipofu, usimguse mkono,* captures the dynamic between state and society well. In other words, the state does not directly impact citizens’ ability to meet their day to day needs; hence, citizens enjoy a fair amount of autonomy. The various social structures of interdependence within society are predominant and serve the valuable function of meeting needs that the state cannot, and providing a network through which to evade the state. Many Tanzanians manage to “get by” in ways that are at least tolerable to them, if not ideal, with both minimal interference and little support from the state.

The Tanzanian state, taken on its own merit, does not provide an adequate understanding of political stability in Tanzania. Instead, we must explore the relationship between state and society in Tanzania. The question is not “how does the state manage political stability?” but rather, “how does Tanzanian society manage to negotiate the contradictions and interact with the state on a day to day basis in a way that facilitates political stability?” Within this new framework, I propose that political stability in Tanzania is characterized by a carefully and continuously negotiated relationship between society and state that comprises the “politics of getting by” for Tanzanian citizens. By “getting by,” I mean the myriad of ways in which the social structures within society and in local communities interact with the state. Similar to James
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2 If you eat from the plate of a blind man, just be sure not to touch his hand.
C. Scott’s “moral economies,” these social structures carry with them sets of values and norms that provide a basis for determining citizens’ responses to the state. I have identified two key ways in which citizens, in conjunction with these social structures, engage in the politics of getting by.

The first way is primarily economic corresponds to the meeting of basic needs and aspirations of citizens. This includes engagement in subsistence agriculture and informal economy, networks of interdependence within communities and families, and the ways in which citizens circumvent the state in order to achieve their aims. Of particular importance to political stability is the extent to which the state impedes, or does not impede, upon the ability of citizens to meet their needs and aspirations.

The second involves the strategic use of nationalistic rhetoric among citizens in an effort to uphold the state, keep it at a manageable distance and as such create breathing and operating room for local social structures. While it may seem contradictory that there is an effort on the part of citizens to keep the state intact, it is in fact a defensive act by which citizens protect their livelihoods, subsistence and informal economic activities. By keeping the state intact, citizens can at least rest (somewhat) assured that they will be able to continue to get by on a day to day basis. Political stability under the current circumstances, wherein citizens are able to meet their needs and aspirations is preferable to a more functional government.

The thesis is structured as follows. The first section will consider common notions and interpretations of political stability. The second section will detail methodological considerations and practices. The third section will discuss the politics of getting by or how citizens meet their needs and aspirations. The fourth section will explore the ways in which nationalistic rhetoric is used strategically by citizens in public dialogue to preserve political stability. In the conclusion, I
will explore the implications of Tanzania’s political stability for popular conceptions of development.

**What Makes Political Stability?**

It would be incorrect to assume that because Tanzania is politically stable, it is entirely free from conflict. As a warning to newly elected President Kikwete, Mwesiga Baregu (2003) mentions some of the on-going conflicts in Tanzania, pointing to those places where volatile relations and “dangerous situations” can be found. Among them, he cites conflicts between agriculturists and pastoralists, diminishing access to food sources due to high levels of exports, and the spread of religious fundamentalism (22). Political stability is not to be confused with peace, but is more accurately understood as a well-managed relationship between state and society. Whether that management is performed more by the state or more by the citizenry is a subject for much debate. As a way of understanding this relationship in Tanzania, I consider approaches that rely on the state, interpretations of colonial history that help to explain political dynamics in post-colonial states as well as interpretations of stability that center upon society.

**States Make Stability**

Discussions of political stability and instability have more often than not focused on the role of the state. The most prominent take on political stability comes from modernization theory, which assumes political stability to be a product of the mutually reinforcing processes of democratization and economic development. It is assumed that economic development, indicated by increased modernization (i.e. urbanization, industrialization, etc.), results in increased democratization and overall political stability. Modernization theorists such as Alex Inkles (1966) and Daniel Lerner (1958) view development in this way, and see modernization a process that is inherently good for man. Inkles, for example, states that "[d]espite the idyllic image that
many people have of the countryside, the great majority of the world's peasants are in a state of culture shock produced not by modernity but by the hard conditions of rural life" (145).

However, as was indicated previously, this view of development and political stability presents contradictions. The notion that “all good things go together” assumes that economic development leads to democracy without offering any analysis of the ways in which democracy is implemented and maintained, and without acknowledging the plurality of interactions between states and societies. Tanzania presents some direct challenges to modernization theory, as it fails, for example, to explain how with nearly universal primary education, a majority of citizens in Tanzania have not "modernized."

In 1968, Samuel Huntington provided a scathing critique of modernization theory, arguing that that the source of violence (i.e. political instability) in developing countries is due to a high level of political participation, brought on by economic growth, coupled with a low level of political institutionalization or weak government. Political stability is to be gained primarily by increasing the authority of the state and its capacity to control the conflicting interests of society through formalized processes of participation. In Huntington’s model, Tanzania’s political stability in the context of a relatively weak and benign state would be explained by the lack of economic development or other changes that would increase demands upon the state. However, like the modernization theorists, Huntington does not acknowledge the complexities of state-society relations, ignoring historical foundations of governance in developing countries and possibility for interactions between state and society that escape his binary conceptualization.

In response to Huntington and others, Yusef Cohen, et al.(1981) argue that rather than being a sign of political decay, violence in developing nations may actually be viewed as the creation of political order. They contend that violence actually increases as the power of the state
expands, as measured by its ability to tax. This process occurs in developing countries where often the independent government is just as exploitative as the colonial. Their theory problematizes the unquestioningly positive association of political stability with development and modernization. Tanzania may present the inverse of their argument – the more or less stagnant political stability in Tanzania is an indication that there has been little “creation of order.” However, like modernization theorists and Huntington, Cohen et. al. provide an argument that puts much of the onus on the state and assume that the only response to state penetration is violence.

Despite the age of these state-centered interpretations of political stability, they are still quite prominent. In a more recent article by Goran Hyden (1999), the explanation for Tanzania's political stability follows a similar line of reasoning as that of the modernization theorists and Huntington. Hyden argues that Tanzania has remained stable because of its slow or "creeping" and "top-down" approach to democratization. In other words, the demand for democracy has not come from civil society, but rather from the "international community," making it so that CCM can stay in power and gradually open up the political sphere to greater participation. Media, too, has until recently been state-owned, so the dissemination of information has been controlled from the top. While an accurate observation, Hyden, like modernization theorists, denies agency to Tanzanian citizens and fails to recognize the complexities of the public sphere.

**An Historical Perspective of Political Stability in Post-Colonial States**

In their analysis of political instability, Cohen et. al. draw upon the work of Charles Tilly (1985), using the violent history of nation-building in Europe to make their claim about the role of violence in developing countries. While an important comparison, the colonial histories of developing nations and the particularities of transitions to independence are extremely different
than the narratives of nation-building in Europe; the comparison can only be taken so far. Instead, it is worth examining the particular effects of the colonial legacy on post-colonial states. The colonial administrative systems inherited by independent states, Tanzania included, have done much to determine the relationships between state and society in these countries.

There are a number of ways in which the colonial administrative system can be said to have impacted the relationship between state and society in post-colonial states. According to Peter K. Ekeh (1975), indirect rule, practiced by the British in Tanzania, created two distinct public spheres, one which he calls 'primordial' and is based on the moral constructs of the private sphere and another, the ‘civic public,’ which makes up popular politics and is parallel to the public of the colonial government. The model demonstrates the state as being not entirely removed from society, but rather as overlapping with it in certain areas. Ultimately, the “primordial” and “civic” publics do not share a common moral foundation. The civic public represents the extent to which the state has penetrated society, whereas the primordial public may be taken as an organic and pluralized product of the indigenous populations. Caught between these two publics, the tendency among lower classes is to dupe the state and civic public, taking from it only to serve the needs of the “primordial” public rather than fully engaging with the system. The notion that there are two publics indicates that citizens in Tanzania are not engaged in a direct relationship with the state but that they have some interaction with the civic public and the state when need necessitates it. This conception of the political order in postcolonial states indicates possibilities for the co-existence of alternative social systems alongside modern states. and as such provides a new avenue for analyzing Tanzania’s political stability that goes beyond binary state-society models, and greatly complicates the relationship between state and society.
Similarly, Mahmood Mamdani in *Citizen and Subject* (1996) claims that colonialism created a hierarchy of power with the colonial authority at the top, the majority of the colonized at the bottom and a class of middle men mediating and localizing the authority. The post-colonial independent state in most cases merely inverted the “decentralized colonial despotism,” centralizing it but maintaining a similar hierarchy of power, only now bent on nationalism and rapid development. In the Tanzanian context, early policies of the independent government, especially Ujamaa and Villagization, two stages of coercive resettlement for agricultural development can be partially understood in this light. If the independent government is not so different from the colonial government, as Mamdani suggests, this reinforces the notion that stability in Tanzania is based more upon the reactions of poorer classes to the state, than on the ability of the state to effectively manage society.

**Stability from the Bottom Up**

If we give greater weight to the role of the citizenry in creating and managing political stability, especially given the historical context of colonialism, we may begin to consider the notion of “political stability from the bottom up,” or the idea that political stability is managed primarily by society. It is here where theorists such as James C. Scott and Goran Hyden become relevant. While neither of these theorists discusses political stability explicitly, their work on dynamics between states and the structures within peasant societies in developing countries provides an informative starting place for an analysis the dynamics of political stability.

James C. Scott in *The Moral Economy of the Peasant* (1976) suggests that rebellion among peasants is caused by the disturbance of a subjectively conceived livelihood and moral order. Scott argues that the classes living close to the margin have a unique “subsistence ethic” which has its own particular set of values and objectives, distinct from those of the market
economic. Peasants seek to avoid failure and subsequent starvation rather than take risks for the sake of profit or surplus. The subsistence ethic provides for interdependence and mutual support within communities, although often within the realm of entrenched systems of unequal reciprocity. Though ostensibly and decidedly unequal, when this moral order is forcibly interrupted, conflict may occur. One may also assume that if such arrangements are left intact, there will be little cause for conflict. Scott provides a substantively different framework for understanding political stability. In this model, political stability would be determined by factors such as the level of state penetration and, more importantly, the ability of peasants to maintain a moral economy beyond the reach of the state.

In the same lineage, Goran Hyden’s 1980 work *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania* attempts to determine why various development schemes in Tanzania have failed. Hyden argues that the peasantry in Tanzania remains “uncaptured” by the state and by other social classes and therefore greatly hinders the success of development schemes attempted by the government. Although peasants comprise a majority of the population, they do not depend on other sectors of the economy to meet their “existential needs.” He claims that *Ujamaa* (socialist development policies) failed because of the peasants’ ability to take the “exit-option” and choose not engage with the system because they had alternative ways of meeting their needs.

It is possible that the tendency among peasants to take an “exit-option” also fosters political stability. The same dynamic that caused Ujamaa to fail may also be responsible for long term political stability in Tanzania. If the state has not successfully penetrated society and forcefully created a relationship wherein all parts of society, and in particular the peasant classes, are dependent upon its functioning, the result may be the sort of stagnant stability seen today in Tanzania.
What is lacking in the literature and study of Tanzania more generally is an attempt to understand political stability in light of a well articulated emphasis on society, and in particular peasant and lower classes. In what follows, I approach the question of political stability in this “bottom up” fashion by placing emphasis on local interpretations of everyday politics and interaction between local social structures and the state.

**Methodology**

My introduction to village life in Tanzania began in 2004 when I volunteered for a small community center in Kibaya, the central town of rural Kiteto District in northeastern Tanzania. There I stayed with a local family. So young myself, I was taken more as a child of their family than as a foreign guest. At the time, I knew very little about Tanzania, especially its politics and history. I knew only the common claim of political stability and the rhetoric of Tanzania as a "bastion of peace." My understanding of life in Tanzania came firstly through my experiences with this family, who introduced me to the day to day politics of getting by.

One of the first things I noticed was that Mama Heri, my host mother, regularly invited the children of neighboring households over for meals. By no means was the Msonde family wealthy, but they were more well off in comparison to some of their immediate neighbors. Although I understood this initially to be Mama Heri’s particular generosity, I later came to see that is was more of a duty and expectation within the community. During my time with Msonde family, not a single person who came to the door looking for something to eat was denied, even if they were complete strangers.

It was this experience, as well as later experiences, that I am terming participant observation. As a member of the Msonde household, I became a privileged participant in their daily lives. I learned of the struggles within their family and community, as well as their
relationship to larger politics. I watched, listened and interacted with them as they sought ways
to educate their five children and earn enough money to put food on the table. I observed the
myriad of economic activities they engaged in order to accomplish these goals, and the ways in
which they carefully navigated the system in order to meet their needs.

When I came to formally study political science, I saw that the very problem with the
dominant view of political stability in Tanzania, and more generally, is that it does not account
for the everyday experience and conceptions of individuals within the country, especially those
who make up the poorer classes in rural and urban areas, what James C. Scott calls "...the
lamentable tendency in behavioral science to read mass behavior directly from statistical
abstracts on income, caloric intake, newspaper circulation, or radio ownership" (Scott 1985: 38).
Taking solely this statistical view, it is easy to claim that Tanzania’s political stability is the
cause of either a functional state or disengaged and non-modern classes. Numbers do not tell you
how people actually live from day to day, and more importantly, how they understand their own
experiences.

My formal research for this project was undertaken while studying abroad at the
University of Dar es Salaam in 2008. I conducted more than forty interviews in two areas, one
rural and one urban. Orekesmut, the hub of the very rural Simanjiro District, has a population of
roughly 13,000 in the town, and 142,000 for the entire district. Ethnically, Orkesmut is
dominated by the pastoral Maasai tribe, with other tribes present in smaller numbers, oftentimes
occupied as local business owners and civil servants. The main road in town is populated by
guest houses and small tea shops that wait for twice daily buses running from Arusha to Kiteto.
My guide was the first woman who greeted me when I arrived. She ran the local stationary shop,
and happened to be related to someone I had worked with in Kibaya. Connections to Kibaya
were actually quite common among those I met in Simanjiro, as the two districts had until the mid ‘90s been one. Although I was a stranger to everyone I met, the connection helped people to feel more comfortable with me.

Magomeni is a densely populated neighborhood of Dar es Salaam’s Kinondoni District. It is a combination of planned and unplanned settlements. Many of the houses are in varying states of disrepair, with roofs caving in and doors falling off of their hinges, while other homes appear brand new, with tall red-painted gates. It is easy to get lost in the mazes of alleyways and corridors between houses. Small shops line each block. Here, I was guided by two local "ten house" representatives, who kindly led me to various households throughout the neighborhood, allowing me to select which families to visit. I was struck by how comfortable my guides were with individuals in the community. I initially had concerns that interviews might be tainted because I had been introduced by a local official. This, however, turned out not to be the case, as many of the interviews took place in intimate settings and as part of comfortable conversations.

I chose to include both rural and urban groups in this study to explore the everyday lives and existential problems of people who are marginalized in their relationship with the state. People living in rural and urban areas differ in significant ways such as the means of income
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generation, access to services and levels of state penetration, all of which impact their ability to “get by” on a day to day basis. Thus, in order to get a full picture of how political stability plays out in Tanzania, I wanted to speak with people living in both of these settings.

I undertook these interviews in order to understand how these “ordinary citizens” conceptualize their experiences: their day to day existence as well as their relationship to the government. I attempted through interviews and participant observation to capture what statistics on income and caloric intake leave out: the local interpretations and definitions that make such statistics meaningful. It was essential for my analysis that respondents supply the content of terms such as "basic needs" and "development," as it seemed that any imported definition would ultimately be irrelevant to understanding how these concepts play into their relationship with the state. Some questions were more concrete and sought laundry lists of goods and services deemed important by those interviewed. With other questions, I sought more substantive answers, such as the local meanings of development and ideas about the role of government.

Simultaneously, my experiences as a participant observer were growing. Returning to Tanzania, I reunited with my host family and quickly fell back into a close relationship with them, being treated again as a child of the family. Friends from my first stay reemerged, our relationships granted a new reality and depth by no longer being relegated to a “once in a lifetime” experience. I also formed new relationships while living at the University of Dar es Salaam. The everyday unavoidable activities such as riding public transport, going to salons in Sinza and shopping at Ubungo have granted much perspective to this research. The interview data, then, is seated in the context of this participant observation. In processing all of the data collected, I attempt to interpret the function of particular responses and not just the words and phrases themselves. I take discrepancies between interviews with relative strangers and my
experiences as a participant observer to signify meaningful choices based on social context made by those speaking. In other words, the way people respond to a direct question from an interviewer may be different than the way they interact with friends and family. Participant observation provides a valuable contrast to interviews.

The Politics of Getting By

Ndívya Ilívyo – That’s Just the Way It Is

Behind a locked door in Mama Heri's house, she kept stored all of her most essential ingredients. When it came time to prepare a meal, someone would always be sent to the locked room and would return with a carefully measured quantity of corn flour or rice. The mboga or beans, vegetables, and meat were bought from the market each day. Water, fetched nearly every day, was kept in buckets lining the hallway. All that it took to produce a meal, albeit not the most nutritious, was a trip to Mama Heri's bedroom and a bit of water from one of the buckets.

I was often told that "you can never eat your ugali dry." Of course, plenty of people do eat their ugali dry, but doing so is often seen and experienced as being particularly unsatisfactory. Mboga is a luxury, yet it was always a sad state of affairs when meat was unavailable or too expensive. In the rural and isolated village of Kibaya, people often complained about how expensive it was to buy produce and meat at the market, compared to cities like Arusha and other more fertile areas. These goods are among those considered essential to “getting by.” Sometimes, even the most basic goods were difficult to come by as they were the products of local harvest and depended precariously on having a good season.

In Kibaya, as well as Simanjiro, corn is central to everyday existence. In other regions, bananas, rice or cassava might serve a similar function. And while not absolutely necessary, other goods can be just as important for individuals to live the sort of life that they deem
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4 Ugali is a simple corn meal porridge that serves as a staple food in many parts of Tanzania.
valuable. In order to run a household in Tanzania, there are certain basic requirements, understood and articulated consistently. Responses to direct questions about basic needs more often than not produced the same answers. In addition to the basic staples just presented, broadly identified as "food," and "good nutrition," many also said access to water, health (note, not healthcare), adequate housing, education and last but not least a little money for emergencies. These basic and subjectively determined needs provide a picture of what it means to lead a decent life in Tanzania.

Equally as important as basic needs are also aspirations and goals. Mama Heri, along with many others, desired above all to send her five children to school, so that they might obtain the “keys to a better life.” Many people live in houses that are at some point in the process of construction and speak endlessly of intentions to keep building. In short, these aspirations and goals are very tangible and occupy a similar place in people’s day to day lives as the basic needs cited above. Although one might argue that basic needs are more important, there is no clear line between needs and aspirations. Even within a given community the line between what qualifies as a need and what qualifies as an aspirations is blurred. The line may even vary from person to person.

These citizens struggle to meet their needs in what can be very difficult and trying circumstances. It seems that nothing is given. Individuals, households and communities struggle to get by on a day to day basis. One phrase in particular, ndivyo ilivyo, meaning “that’s the way it is,” was repeated numerous times in discussions of these topics. This sentiment seems to capture how ordinary citizens feel about their situation. While for many there is significant day to day struggle to meet their needs and realize their aspirations, this is perceived as being a normal state of affairs. This is further reinforced by the way in which respondents categorized themselves in
terms of class. The terms poor and ordinary were easily interchangeable self-descriptions. In short, for ordinary citizens, poor is normal. This is not to say that there is not some line where the soothing capacity of ndivyo ilivyo runs short, or a point when too much is lacking for too many people.

It is also difficult to determine when, at what level of deprivation, tolerance might end. Needs, just like aspirations, often go unmet or are precariously satisfied. In Mama Heri’s house, there were nights when no vegetables or meat were on the table, and in sending her children to school she has had to struggle and accept less than adequate alternatives for some of them. In Simanjiro, the most substantial deficiency reported was lack of access to potable water. It is a dry region and only a three wells service the entire community, including the more remote rural areas. The situation was termed deplorable by many local community members, but at the same time it was also accepted. People also expressed dissatisfaction with their housing, transportation and roads, among many other things. Many interviewed in the city claimed that they were lacking even enough food, let alone adequate housing.

How individuals, households and communities of the poorer classes in Tanzania manage to meet their needs and realize their aspirations constitute the politics of getting by. It is a politics created by their norms and values as well as their determination and vision of what a suitable life entails, in addition to the ways in which they attain it.

*Kimagomachi – A Little Bit Here, A Little Bit There*

A group of women in Magomeni described how they get by as “kimagomachi,” which translates loosely as “a little bit here, and a little bit there.” While others did not use this particular phrase, this approach to getting by is common. Individuals depend on a variety of unreliable sources for their income and hope that between combinations of these resources they
will make manage to make ends meet. Resources are any means by which people aquire their material needs or achieve their aspirations—anything from farming to labor to relatives counts as a viable resource.

In rural areas, access to land for farming is practically guaranteed. In Simanjiro, the local government provides a small plot for each household, making it so that rural inhabitants always have recourse to subsistence. Given a successful harvest, those who have plots can usually produce enough to feed their families. Their incomes are supplemented by money they make from small scale trade and business or labor. In urban areas, the informal economy provides the main source of income for many poor and even not so poor households. Men and women may informally work for temporary hire, sell produce on the street, or raise chickens and cows in their backyards.

When income is not sufficient for meeting basic needs and aspirations, as is often the case, people rely on substantial networks of interdependence within families and communities. It is not uncommon to have one “bread winner” for an extended family of twenty people. So, for those individuals who do not have a source of income, there is often at least one person in their family who will provide housing and basic needs in exchange for domestic service. There is also interdependence within communities. Many respondents confirmed that in times of emergency, such as severe illness or the death of a relative, collections taken up from the community are almost expected. These practices ensure that people can meet their basic needs even when they do not have the resources to do so. Mama Heri’s practice of inviting the neighborhood children over for meals is an example of this interdependence within communities. It should be noted, however, that Mama Heri was not expected to invite the parents of these children. There are
limits and rules to interdependence as practiced by communities and families, but nonetheless many people rely on them to a great extent.

This reliance on interdependence, subsistence agriculture and informal economy points to the existence of “moral economies,” or a “subsistence ethic:” basically a set of norms, values and means of achieving needs and aspirations that comprise a coherent system. As Scott writes, “[p]atterns of generosity, forced reciprocity, communal land, and work-sharing helped to even out the inevitable troughs in a family’s resources that might otherwise through them below the subsistence line.” The practice of “kimagomachi,” and all the means by which people meet their needs, and the rules and norms that guide them comprise something of a moral economy. However, I take subsistence to be defined as all of the needs and aspirations previously discussed, not just subsistence in terms of the minimum amount required to keep from starving. Subsistence is determined by a number of normative judgments about what might be considered a decent life. The safety nets of this subsistence ethic come into play long before base line subsistence is threatened. This subsistence ethic determines which conditions are tolerable, and which are not, in addition to providing the social arrangements that allow individuals to get by or negotiate meeting their needs and aspirations. The moral economy of these communities includes practices as diverse as sharing bicycles, taking in relatives when they are ill and pooling money in addition to subsistence agriculture and informal economy. Because it is so broad and actually quite distinct from Scott’s notion, I employ the phrase “the politics of getting by.”

A few practical and very real situations help to demonstrate the ways in which the politics of getting by play out on an everyday basis as well as in response to particular situations. In order to earn enough money to run her household and take care of her children, Mama Heri used a variety of means. While she was married and received some support from her husband,
she was the second wife, so she and her children received much less than Baba Heri’s first wife and family. To make up the difference, Mama Heri for a time dyed fabric to sell in the city, kept bees and sold the honey in old liquor bottles, and also sought loans from friends and relatives. In addition, the family farmed a considerable plot of land. As needs arose among herself, her five children, and the whole network of family members who depended upon her (her sister had died, leaving Mama Heri to take care of family and household), Mama Heri would fix her attention on finding a way to meet that need – be it a basic need such as food or school fees. When her son Mbwana had to leave Kibaya for school, she persisted until she had raised money together to send him and found him a relative to stay with in Arusha, This was no exceptional circumstance. Mama Heri does something similar each and every time a major expense arises. And even on a day to day basis, needs are met in a similar fashion and reciprocity plays an especially significant role, as do the generous credit policies of local store owners.

*From the Politics of Getting By to Political Stability*

Education more generally is good example of the politics of getting by in action. People want education and many consider it to be a primary need. Schooling in Tanzania is characterized by hard and fast benchmarks. One of the most important exams is the Standard 7 final exam for entrance into secondary school. A poor score, and even worse a failing score, means the end of the road for many students. With this as the institutional reality, it is commonplace to take side roads to education. Frequently, children who do not pass the exam will be sent to live with a relative in a different region, their name changed just slightly, and they repeat the grade and retake the exam. Private schools also proliferate, and those that have the money or can raise it through family have this as an option. When people speak of having enough money to send their children to school, it is often in anticipation of this alternative, or of
avoiding the public school system all together. Private schools offer an alternative, however it is expensive, resulting in a search for benefactors or, more importantly use of community and family resources to ensure that children will be educated.

Amidst conflict in Kenya, residents of the northern areas of Tanzania were illegally transporting maize across the border, where there is a high demand for it following the turmoil of the elections and a Tanzanian ban on the export of maize to Kenya (Chambo 2008). Due to low capacity, it is difficult for Tanzanian officials to monitor the borders, and trucks easily crossed the border during the night with full knowledge of the local authorities. Situations such as these are commonplace, and often also involve petty bribery of local police officers. Played out here is Peter K. Ekeh’s conception of the two publics in Africa, the primordial and the civic. Instances such as the illegal cross-boarder maize trade demonstrate how, as Ekeh describes, the “primordial” and “civic” publics interact, with the resources of the civic public often serving the primordial public. This is why bribery is possible and why having familial connection in government helps to ensure that a child will be educated.

In both of these examples involve some interaction with the state. The state plays a number of different roles in the politics of getting by. In some cases, the state facilitates subsistence and getting by, such as in the provision of plots of land to rural villagers or the low levels of law enforcement seen in the context of informal economy in urban areas. In these instances, the state is doing or neglecting to do something, and as a result, there is a particular space created in which citizens can meet their needs and aspirations with little concern for the state. At other times, the state is something to be actively subverted, as in the case of education and the midnight lorries to Kenya. The politics of getting by depend both upon the policies of the state that allow for subsistence and informal economy as well as the ability to subvert the state
when necessary. Within the current dynamic, lower classes in Tanzania exercise a certain practical autonomy from the state. As Michael Bratton says “autonomy is the quintessential weapon of the weak, enabling any social organization, at minimum, to disengage from the political fray” (Bratton, 236). The strength of ordinary citizens is that they are not forced to engage in the system; instead, they are able to work around it. However, it should be noted that by no means is this autonomy guaranteed.

Equally important to the way in which people interact with state is what they expect from the state. In general, interviews produced no real critique of the state, no attempt to say that the state has failed them or the state somehow withholds the means of achieving more consistency and improvement in their lives. Instead, people tended, when asked, to place blame for material deficiencies in their lives upon themselves, claiming a personal responsibility for their situation as well as for their own development. If their families were not provided for, or if they had inadequate income or housing, it was they themselves they had to blame. When probed about the role of government, some replied saying that the government “sometimes has job openings,” and one respondent quietly mentioned that the government might be responsible for building and improving roads. Otherwise, there was no distinct placement of role or responsibility upon the government. Expectations of the state among citizens are very low, and the state is only marginally included among the myriad of precarious resources sources people draw upon to meet their needs and aspirations.

In sum, it can be said that ordinary citizens in Tanzania do not rely on the state in their day to day lives. This disengagement from the state on a practical level is one of the characteristics and partial causes for Tanzania’s political stability. The state is not seen as an effective means of creating change in their lives, nor do they see government as a tool for
personal empowerment. In addition, ordinary citizens have a substantial amount of autonomy from the state. Easy access to land in rural areas and low levels of law enforcement in urban areas make it so that citizens face little interference from the state. They are for the most part able to go about their daily business unhindered. There is very little done by the government that might force these citizens into a dependent relationship with the state.

The ways in which Tanzanian citizens get by provide the foundation of the relationship between state and society. This is characterized by autonomy and a strong ability to circumvent the state whenever necessary. This dynamic mitigates any possibility of outright conflict with the state. Because people have alternatives, and the state does not prohibit and sometimes even supports these alternatives, there is no need for the state to meet and particular standards. The state can be corrupt and dysfunctional, so long as it does not impact this dynamic. Although clearly a tenuous balance, it has and continues to foster political stability in Tanzania.

The negotiated approach to meeting basic needs and aspirations, or this articulation of the politics of getting by, contributes to political stability by keeping the tensions between state and society to a minimum. Instead of engaging with the state, there are informal means of meeting needs and aspirations such as subsistence agriculture and informal economic practices, interdependence in within communities and families. Low expectations of the state to meet needs and aspirations, plus a sense of personal responsibility for meeting one's own needs and a reasonable tolerance of scarcity and disappointment keep the tension between the state and the citizenry low. And where there might be tension, such as in the education system, citizens are able to maneuver around these obstacles. In essence, the hand of the blind man has not been touched. It is not as if improvement is not desired or insufficiency not recognized. Ultimately, people are able to get by on a day to day basis about as well as they expect to. Certain types of
struggle are simply the norm, and this remains the case even when people have a more articulated understanding of the problems of the state.

**The Maintenance of Political Stability**

In the previous section, I attempted to show that lower class Tanzanians, in fact a majority of Tanzanians, exercise an important practical autonomy from the state. Their day to day activities are largely uninhibited by the state, and through networks of interdependence, people are adept at maneuvering around state policies that might inhibit them. While citizens certainly endure problems of resource scarcity, sensitive harvests, and erratic employment (to name just some), this dynamic and the freedom it entails are relied upon by many Tanzanians. There is no real push from among the population for a more just political order.

The claims of political stability and peace made about Tanzania at the national and international levels are also echoed among citizens. Not only is it heard among the international community and national government, it is in schools, homes and on the street. It is a substantial part of Tanzania’s own nationalist rhetoric. The claim to stability amidst regional turmoil is a source of pride within the country, and is embraced publicly as part of Tanzanian identity. It is patriotic. The fantastic and endearing stories of how Tanzania has overcome tribalism and is united through a single language, of how Julius Nyerere won independence for the country through peaceful means, and others, permeate public discourse.

The idea that Tanzania is an “island of peace” has a profound effect. According to Mwesiga Baregu (2003), “…the image of ‘island of peace’ is at once description and propaganda. As description, it seeks to present the reality in the country but as propaganda it seeks to create the impression that Tanzania is exceptional and unchanging” (3). There is no doubt that Tanzania has been relatively stable; however, this rhetoric also serves to perpetuate
this stability by bolstering and cushioning it. This might be compared to the United States, where the persistent claims of democracy, equality and opportunity serve in part to construct our understanding of the U.S. In this way, language can be very powerful in the creation and maintenance of certain realities including political stability.

**Rhetoric as a Strategic Defense**

Much of the rhetoric described above was echoed in the interviews I conducted and in casual conversations I had with strangers. “Tanzania is a peaceful country,” one respondent reassured me. And when I asked, “why does CCM continue to win in elections?” many replied that it is “because they have brought us peace and stability.” At first, these answers like these seemed insignificant because they were so run of the mill; respondents seemed disconnected from their experiences. For Marxists, this type of response is entirely predictable. “One may claim that the exploited group, because of a hegemonic religious or social ideology, actually accepts its situation as a normal, even justifiable part of the social order. This explanation of passivity assumes at least a fatalistic acceptance of that social order and perhaps even an active complicity – both of which Marxists might call “mystification” or “false consciousness” (Scott 1986: 39).

The comments themselves seemed not to reveal anything substantial about how these communities perceived the government, aside from possibly indicating that people had bought the storyline of the state. When I brought up the issue of the recent scandal with Lowassa, many were hesitant to comment or to even acknowledge that they knew anything about it. Those who did comment merely suggested that they very surprised and disappointed. It seemed as if those I spoke to were attempting to deflect or avoid the question or criticism of the state. Furthermore, in conducting interviews, it became clear very quickly that if someone knew in advance that I was a
student of political science they would not agree to speak with me. People have a general and rather acute discomfort when it comes to talking about politics. It was this particular way of consciously using nationalistic rhetoric to avoid answering questions that gave the responses greater significance.

Adding yet greater complexity and meaning to the use of rhetoric is that it is not used consistently. While interviews and conversations with relative strangers produced these predictable answers that echoed nationalist rhetoric, in more intimate and personal conversations, a much different analysis became apparent. Sitting around the table at my good friend Mary’s house, with her husband, they began to explain that since this scandal with Lowassa, they have become absolutely disgusted by CCM. Their frustration with the government, with ongoing corruption, was well articulated. They recognized very clearly that the state was denying them valuable resources and services.

On a somewhat fated bus ride from Simanjiro to Kibaya, I heard more of this honest political analysis. We set off from Orkesmut at a crawl, the mud was thick and the rain was coming down with a fury. It was fully night by the time we got to the next village. The buses headlights were on the fritz and passengers were pleading with the driver to put over for the night. He finally agreed so all fifty of us curled up together in that bus. Everyone had been sitting all day so no one was actually ready to sleep. People griped, complained, joked and argued about everything from the weather to politics to their husbands and wives. One man stated that if Lowassa hadn’t stolen all that money, they could have a fine road from Arusha to Kiteto. His comment was well received by fellow passengers.

This ability to make a direct connection between their immediate circumstances and national politics clearly refutes the notion that people are experiencing “false consciousness,”
and that there is some other reason why nationalistic rhetoric is so widely used and expressly in unfamiliar or potentially compromising contexts, or in public dialogue. Citizens evaluate situations and decide whether or not it is “safe” to be critical of the state. Lower class citizens use patriotic rhetoric because they want to protect the autonomy they have from the state and their ability to “get by” on a day to day basis. They fear political upheaval, conflict and above all changes in the current political dynamic that would negatively impact their autonomy and livelihood. Although changes in political party or government structure could potentially benefit them, it makes far more sense to play it safe and stick to the dynamic they know, rather than pursuing some promised benefit and having it turn out to be worse. This is evidenced by general responses to conflict within the country as well as in Kenya.

During my time at the University of Dar es Salaam, a large scale student strike occurred, as well as a riotous protest. Students were enraged over the dismissal of their favored candidate for student body president, in addition to tuition increases and retraction of student loans, as well as water shortages. In one protest, students went so far as to tear down gates and stands on campus, knock over the large water tanks that service the dorms, and throw rocks through dorm windows. One day of the student strike culminated in the arrival of the national guard and the use of tear gas on groups of students rallying. The main reaction to the strikes and protests at the University among the general population was to wonder, with scorn, why these kids insisted upon stirring the pot, or upon creating conflict. Many wondered if the strikes and protests were really worth it, and it was often commented that such actions were reckless. There was not, however, a criticism of the students’ complaints, no accusation of entitlement. It was the means they had chosen that seemed to disturb people. Even the many students at the University who chose not to engage in the strike or riot admitted that the students had good reason for doing it.
They also articulated that their main motivation for not participating was because the consequences were too great: many of them wanted to get their degrees and move on.

Similarly, when violence erupted in Kenya over the elections in 2007-2008, the biggest concern among Tanzanians was that the violence would spread to Tanzania. It was feared that Tanzanians might get “funny ideas” take similar action against their own state and long-time ruling party. Tension at that point in time was running high and many Tanzanians looked on and hoped for a quick resolution to the situation. For many Tanzanian citizens, stability is more important than creating an optimal or more just national politics. While inequalities, injustice and dysfunction are all recognized by citizens, it is assumed that any alternative might be worse, and if nothing else would involve rupturing the political stability and particular state-society dynamics that allow citizens to get by.

*Don’t Vote for Change*

Voting tendencies among citizens also bear some similarity to the question of nationalistic rhetoric. While ordinary citizens do not engage with the state in practical terms, allowing them a significant degree of autonomy, they do interact with the state in other ways, primarily by voting. Of those interviewed, everyone reported having voted in the most recent election. This is consistent with national polls that show 68% of the voting age population turned out for the 2005 presidential election (IDEA 2009). With such a high voter turnout, it is difficult to imagine a population as significantly disengaged from the state as was described in the previous section.

In addition to asserting that they vote, the vast majority of those interviewed also stated that they had voted for Chama cha Mapinduzi (CCM), the ruling party. When questioned as to their reasons for choosing CCM, a variety of answers were reported; however, the general reason
given was that CCM is the party that won independence for Tanzania, and that under CCM the country has experienced peace and stability. “CCM is all that we know,” one woman in Simanjiro exclaimed. “We vote for CCM because they won us freedom and we have been peaceful,” replied another.

Thus, one must ask, why do citizens vote as such a high rate and so consistently for CCM? Given that many individuals do have some dissatisfaction with the government, it is perplexing that they would continually vote for the same party instead of electing in one of the many other political parties. However, if seen as an act of preservation, this tendency begins to make more sense. At the very least, people know what to expect from CCM. While conditions may not be great, they are at least ensured of the ability to maintain some autonomy from the state by keeping CCM in power. With this understanding, the statement that “CCM is all we know,” takes on a new meaning and accurately expresses the desire among citizens to stick with the party they know and thereby preserve their autonomy and ability to get by. This is also precisely what CCM promises in its slogan: “solidarity, peace and tranquility…”

“Tanzania is free from tribalism”

And in response to questions about identity, namely whether or not they identify more as Tanzanian or more as a member of a particular tribe, everyone claimed that they considered themselves firstly to be Tanzanian, and only after that as a member of a particular tribe, oftentimes citing Julius Nyerere and his grand accomplishment of unifying the country. In essence, the responses seemed like answers to a Standard 4 civics exam.

One of the many claims made about Tanzania is that it has “erased tribalism and ethnicity as a factor in politics. (Hyden 1999, 150)” Hyden states in particular that “it is now impossible to make a political career in Tanzania by appealing to tribal values and preferences. (146)” A
common language, Kiswahili, and a fair amount of intermixing between tribes provide convincing evidence that tribalism does not exist. Most often this is attributed, not without substantial nostalgia, to the policies of Julius Nyerere. By emphasizing primary education, instituting Kiswahili as the national language, and even through the more coercive policies of Ujamaa and Villagization, Nyerere promoted the creation of a national identity.

Overall, these claims assert that tribal or ethnic identity is completely inconsequential in Tanzania. However, when one takes economics into consideration, tribe matters. It is one of the largest determining factors of social mobility. People of particular tribes, who come from particularly developed regions, have more opportunity for education and usually better access to certain services. This uneven development stems directly from the colonial legacy in Tanzania, an effect of the “development for exploitation” policies wherein services and infrastructure were provided in areas where the colonial administration desired a high amount of profit extraction. The differences between these regions are easily observable. Among the more developed areas are Bukoba, Kilimanjaro, Arusha and Mbeya. Tribes are geographically organized, so these areas each represent one or more tribes. The effect of this is easily observed at the University of Dar es Salaam, where the vast majority of students are Wachagga or Wahaya.

While tribe matters, it is also true that ordinary citizens identify as Tanzanian. A vast majority of those interviewed identified firstly as Tanzanian. It seemed to be the most natural statement to make, and an easy answer for all those questioned. However, the responses run contrary to more general observations, and it seems common knowledge that tribe matters in Tanzania. Ask anyone to describe the Maasai tribe and you will get roughly the same response: aggressive, stupid and relatively wealthy. It is a well known fact that the Wachagga are good in business, and one should be warned before talking to one of them about money. These
stereotypical characterizations of ethnic groups are common and influential. While there is intertribal cooperation, and a growing population of people of mixed descent, these identities are still strong.

Citizens have adopted the nationalistic rhetoric, and use it to pay lip service to the state while simultaneously disengaging from the state in more meaningful ways. Rhetoric is used strategically and discussions of contentious politics are not had publicly so as to preserve stability. In short, the discrepancies and frustrations people have with the state are intentionally masked with a patriotic affinity for the state and potential conflicts are glossed over and suppressed so as to maintain political stability.

Conclusion

Contrary to the notion that political stability in Tanzania is the product of either good governance or a non-modern population which currently dominates thought and policy on the matter, I have argued that political stability in Tanzania arises from the particular dynamics in the relationship between state and society. Furthermore, I have shown that political stability is managed more by citizens than the state.

The first step in realizing this dynamic was rejecting the idea of a binary relationship between state and society. This relationship can take on a plurality of forms. Society does not simple pull when the state pushes, and it does not necessarily push back either. In addition, society is not one cohesive group. Different individuals and communities have unique ways of interacting with state. Here, I have focused on those citizens who are marginalized by the state or who do not hold any particular power within the state. Similar but distinct from the traditional notion of a peasantry, these citizens engage primarily in subsistence agriculture and informal
Political stability in Tanzania is predicated on the fact that these citizens have considerable autonomy from the state. Their needs and aspirations, as they define them, are met through social networks and resources that are beyond the reach of the state and comprise a system: “the politics of getting by.” The state also helps to facilitate the existence of this system by providing easy access to land and by allowing the informal economy to function because of its low capacity to enforce regulation. In addition, these citizens have very low expectations of the state, therefore it matters little how dysfunctional or corrupt the state might be. So long as this dynamic persists and is not ruptured by any force be it from society, the state or an entirely foreign actor, political stability may continue on as it has for more than fifty years.

Sustained political stability in Tanzania is also the product of an attempt to maintain this dynamic. In short, many citizens prefer stability to the prospect of a more functional government. This is evidenced by the strategic use of nationalistic rhetoric among these citizens, the tendency to continually vote for CCM even when it is clear that the party is corrupt and ineffective, and also the claim to a unified Tanzanian identity even though tribalism is prominent. This is all done in an effort to gloss over and ignore potential conflicts and tensions so as to preserve stability. It is better to pretend that everything is fine, and thereby remain stable, than to allow conflicts to come to the fore and rupture the delicate dynamic of stability, within which people manage to get by in ways that are at least tolerable to them.

This analysis of political stability is admittedly incomplete. An exploration of the “politics of getting by” deserves far more attention and the details of this dynamic could be elaborated at great length. In this paper, I have only indicated that there is something like a moral economy. Also, this section of society includes both rural and urban dwellers and makes up a majority of the Tanzanian population.
economy among the marginalized classes in Tanzania and given several examples of its existence. Discovering and articulating the rules, limits and internal dynamics that allow it to function would be an interesting next step for scholarly research on the subject. In addition, this system of getting by is most likely not limited to just the marginalized classes. Each class or group within society may well have its own system of getting by in the context of a weak and dysfunctional state. These classes and groups must also be factored in to complete the picture of state-society relations in Tanzania.

Similarly, the ways in which people act to preserve political stability are in need of closer examination. It is clear that people prefer stability to conflict, even when conflict might ultimately produce benefits. But, to what extent is the use of nationalist rhetoric the product of a genuine fear of the state or a feeling of inadequacy among marginalized citizens? While I have asserted that this rhetoric is used intentionally and strategically, there may be other reasons. Understanding the roots of this rhetoric would require a deeper analysis of the independent state and especially the early policies and events by which much of this rhetoric was created.

In addition, the state plays a very important role in facilitating political stability that here has been treated only in passing. It may well be wondered what interest the state has in allowing citizens to “get by.” Does it mean that the state does not have to be accountable to citizens? Or, is it that the state would prefer an engaged citizenry but simply does not have the capacity to enforce policies that would help realize this goal? My hunch is that it is a mixture of both.

Even as I performed the research for this project, the political dynamics in Tanzania were changing. The large scandal with Prime Minister Lowassa, for example, created a great stir. It was one of the first times that corruption of this magnitude came with a clear price tag – many Tanzanians knew that had this scandal not occurred, each and every Tanzanian could have been
given $9,000. Having such a tangible notion of the harm done by the state bears down on scale that is used to weigh the relative benefits of political stability over a new political order. While it is imprudent to make predictions, it should be noted that it is widely anticipated that the 2010 elections in Tanzania will be the most intense to date. It seems that someone may have touched the blind man’s hand.

This look into the dynamics of political stability will hopefully generate an interest in reevaluating the conceptions of political dynamics elsewhere. If nothing else, the Tanzanian case shows that the state can take up any number of policies that might impact society negatively, however, so long as people are able to get by in ways that they deem tolerable or satisfactory, state policies matter little. It is worthwhile to explore whether or not instances of conflict in other countries can be traced to an interruption of people’s ability to “get by” as conceived of subjectively.

My argument suggests that political stability has more to do with the preservation of social networks and “moral economies” than with functional states. When the state or other forces keep people from meeting their needs and aspirations, conflict can occur. Entirely beyond the scope of this paper is a consideration of forces external to Tanzania that might impact political stability. Tanzania, while rather rich in resources, has not been the target of much attention from multi-national corporations and the like, as countries such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo have been. It is fairly well accepted that conflict in the DRC is due to a scramble for its resources, among other factors. It is possible that Tanzania’s lack of such resources helps the country to maintain political stability.

Also, the particular policies of the colonial administration and the independent government could be examined more closely. It is the case that in Tanzania, colonialism was
“softer” as it was a mandated territory, entrusted to the British with directions to develop the capacities of the indigenous population in anticipation of independence. This is far different than British colonial policies in Kenya. There colonial rule was much bloodier and independence was won through conflict. This historical comparison may also shed light on why Tanzania has been stable, and why Kenya has seen more conflict.

Possible causes for political stability in Tanzania are endless, and I do not believe that I have pinpointed a cause in this paper. Instead, I see this paper as contributing to an understanding of how political stability plays out in Tanzania. While the dynamics between state and society in Tanzania are most likely not the primary cause of political stability, they are in part the product of the particular sort of stability witnessed in Tanzania. These state-society dynamics also show how political stability is maintained in the context of severe corruption and dysfunction in the state. In short, the politics of getting by help us to understand the contradictions that arise when one attempts to understand Tanzania in the linear and binary categories provided by modernization theorists and Samuel Huntington, as previously cited. Tanzania is full of contradictions, but Tanzania’s political stability is predicated on such contradictions.
Works Cited


