



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

A Comparative Analysis of the Concept of Happiness in
Aristotle and Nyerere in Relation to Community Life

verfasst von / submitted by

Salvator Alphonse Mselle

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2022 / Vienna, 2022

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on
the student record sheet:

UA 066 941

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on
the student record sheet:

Masterstudium Philosophie

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Angela Kallhoff

Plagiatserklärung

Hiermit erkläre ich, die vorgelegte Arbeit selbständig verfasst und ausschließlich die angegebenen Quellen und Hilfsmittel benutzt zu haben. Alle wörtlich oder dem Sinn nach aus anderen Werken entnommenen Textpassagen und Gedankengänge sind durch genaue Angabe der Quelle in Form von Anmerkungen bzw. In-Text-Zitationen ausgewiesen. Dies gilt auch für Quellen aus dem Internet, bei denen zusätzlich URL und Zugriffsdatum angeführt sind. Mir ist bekannt, dass jeder Fall von Plagiat zur Nicht-Bewertung der gesamten Lehrveranstaltung führt und der Studienprogrammleitung gemeldet werden muss. Ferner versichere ich, diese Arbeit nicht bereits andernorts zur Beurteilung vorgelegt zu haben

(Salvator Alphonse Mselle)

Vienna, 08.11.2022

CONTENTS

Plagiatserklärung.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
0. Scope, Method, and Objective of the Study	vi
0.1 Background of the Study	vi
0.2 Statement of the Problem	vii
0.3 Framework of the Problem.....	viii
0.4 Methodology	xi
0.5 Clarification of Key Concepts	xi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1.....	6
1. The Meaning of Happiness and Community Life in Aristotle	6
1.1 <i>The General View of the Terms Happiness and Community Life</i>	6
1.2 <i>Aristotle's View on Happiness</i>	8
1.2.1 <i>Happiness as the Ultimate (Highest) Human Good</i>	9
1.2.2 <i>Happiness as Human Function (Rational Activity)</i>	11
1.2.3 <i>Happiness as Rational Activity with Excellence of Virtues</i>	11
1.2.3.1 <i>The Moral Virtue</i>	13
1.2.3.2 <i>The Intellectual Virtues</i>	19
1.2.4 <i>Happiness Attainable Through the Course of Exercise during a Whole Lifetime</i>	21
1.3 <i>Aristotle's View on Community Life</i>	27
1.3.1 <i>The Meaning and Scope of Community</i>	28
1.3.2 <i>The Origins and the Ultimate Structure of the City-State (the Polis) Community</i>	29
1.3.3 <i>Account of the Good and Good Life</i>	34
1.3.4 <i>Citizenship and Its Limitations</i>	35
1.3.5 <i>Leadership and Governance: Its Formation and Roles, Challenge and Limitations</i>	37
1.3.6 <i>The End of the Community: Good Life, Happiness</i>	40
1.4 <i>Aristotle Views on Human Development in the Community</i>	41
1.4.1 <i>The Manner of Participation in the Community</i>	42
1.4.2 <i>The Social and Rational Nature of Human Being</i>	42
1.4.3 <i>The Forms of Constitutions and the Form of Rule or Governments</i>	45
1.4.4 <i>Aristotle's Views on the Meaning and Role of Community Education</i>	47
1.4.5 <i>Moral and Social Works</i>	49
1.4.6 <i>Human Relationships (Friendship)</i>	50
CHAPTER 2.....	52
2. The Meaning of Happiness and Community life in Nyerere.....	52

2.1 Nyerere's View on Happiness	52
2.1.1 The Event of Independence (or Freedom)	53
2.1.2 Unity	54
2.1.3 Peace	56
2.1.4 Social Works and Human Development	56
2.1.5 Equality and Justice	57
2.1.6 Education for Self-Reliance (Intellectual Virtue Aspect)	58
2.1.7 Loyalty	59
2.2 Nyerere's Ideas on Community	61
2.2.1 Social and Cultural Aspect of Community Life	61
2.2.2 Political and Economical Aspect of Community Life	63
2.2.3 Educational and Ethical Aspect of Community Life	65
CHAPTER 3	69
3. The Comparisons between Aristotle and Nyerere on Happiness and Community Life	69
3.1 Similarities between Aristotle and Nyerere	69
3.1.1 Human Development	70
3.1.1.1 Community Education	71
3.1.1.2 Self-reliance	77
3.1.1.3 Human Relationship	79
3.1.1.4 Art	82
3.1.2 Leadership and Community Governance	85
3.1.2.1 Wisdom and Knowledge	85
3.1.2.2 Equality and Justice	88
3.1.2.3 Discipline and Commitment	89
3.1.2.4 Integrity and Obedience to the Law	91
3.1.2.5 Dignity and Sustainability	91
3.2 Differences between Aristotle and Nyerere	92
3.2.1 The Level of Recognition and Participation in a Community Life	92
3.2.2 The Rule System in the Community (City State)	93
3.2.3 Ownership of the Property	93
3.2.4 The Notion of Human Equality	93
CHAPTER 4	98
4. The Contemporary Philosophical Contributions	98
4.1 Critical Appraisal	98
4.1.1 How Do Aristotle's and Nyerere's Thoughts Applicable Today?	101
4.2 Suggestions	107
4.2.1 Happiness and Community: Contemporary Understanding and Application	108

4.2.2 <i>The Nature or Essence of Happiness and Community in Aristotle and Nyerere</i>	114
4.2.3 <i>The Relevance of Happiness in Connection to Community Today</i>	116
CHAPTER 5.....	118
5. Model of Happiness and Community Life to Tanzania in 21 st Century	118
5.1 <i>Which Thoughts are Relevant to the Community of Tanzania in 21st Century and Why?</i>	118
5.1.1 <i>The Self-sufficient Character and the Idea of the End</i>	118
5.1.2 <i>The Spirit of Participation and Responsibility (Accountability)</i>	120
5.1.3 <i>Factors of Societal-Community Convergence in Aristotle and Nyerere</i>	121
5.1.4 <i>Factors of Societal-Community Divergence in Aristotle and Nyerere</i>	122
5.1.5 <i>Moral Education and Social Works</i>	123
5.1.6 <i>The Theory of Social and Political Justice</i>	123
5.2 <i>How and Where Are They To Be Applied?</i>	124
GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	127
Proposal for further Research Consideration	132
BIBLIOGRAPHY	134
Primary Sources	134
Secondary Literatures.....	135
Internet Sources.....	139
Abstract in German Language.....	141
Abstract in English Language	142

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this master's thesis would not have been possible without a great deal of help. I want to express my deep gratitude first of all to God almighty for keeping me healthy in all this time. Next thanks are to my parents, professors and for instructing and forming me in a philosophical way thinking, for allowing me to be part with them in learning and so for their great support and encouragement to make this work look the way it is. Thanks are also to my fellow colleagues and friends for their help and tips in the preparation with special mention of Madam Johanna Friedl and Family. I am grateful too to my brethren Salvatorians Fathers and Brothers for the great assistance of financial, materials and devices. Thanks also in a special way to my reader, editor and supervisor; Madam Univ.-Prof. Dr. Angela Kallhoff, for her good and interesting instructions during the seminars in the class about the subjects, for her patience, neatly directives and for encouraging me to write this essay. Finally, I am indebted to various authors contributions and for the permission to use their ideas to develop mine, which has broadened my knowledge and enhanced my understanding on theme of happiness and community life for both western and African cultural *milieu*.

0. Scope, Method, and Objective of the Study

0.1 Background of the Study

The search for the meaning of life, especially ‘a happy and good life’, is a question that seems not easy to answer despite much research done about it. The information that is provided by some governments in different countries about the development or growth of countries’ economies in relation to the life situation or wellbeing of the people in some countries seems to be in conflict with one another. Even in countries where conflicts dominate, one will hear that the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is high, but whether the high GDP reflects in the lives of the people is another question. Unfortunately, in most countries, this is not the case (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 25; cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 8ff, p. 23). A good example to explain this is the frequent information about illegal migration that regularly hits the headlines of the media, and which is increasingly becoming a challenge today.

Based on observation, some of the reasons those media, newsletters, and reports will give include the lack of stability in the values of some countries in terms of corruption, high rates of unemployment or loss of work, insufficient living standards, human trafficking, drought, starvation, catastrophes, furthermore, conflicts such as wars, kidnapping and hijacking, and terrorism. Civil demonstrations often communicate citizens’ total dissatisfaction with some matters such as the leadership, lack of rights and justice, or unfaithfulness and all other immoral dispositions found in the communities or states that illegal migrants are coming from. These are factors that mostly force people to leave their countries and move elsewhere in search of either refuge or a good life. They are searching for a good life that leads to the highest and ultimate good, which philosophers have long been pondering. Aristotle, and many centuries later the Tanzanian statesman and philosopher Julius Nyerere, both understood this highest good to be happiness.

Although illegal migration has long cost many lives and caused pain to human beings, even today there are people who are willing to risk their lives trying to cross borders and the waters of the sea to neighbouring countries. Naturally such people can hardly be happy about their own country’s or community’s life.

Aristotle and Nyerere are used in this comparative thesis to explain again the ethical and political principles—which were long ago laid down in their philosophy—pertaining to the good life (indicated by flourishing and happy life) in any community. In their arguments, they will show that in searching for a good and happy life the community is not separated from the individual, and that it is necessary to ensure the happiness of both the individual and the

community (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1097b8-11, IX.9, 1169b16-19; cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1253a14-15; Nyerere 1968, pp. 3-4; cf. Kenny 2004, p. 84f).

In their ethical thoughts Aristotle and Nyerere will offer us a thorough understanding of virtues (both ethical and intellectual) as tools on how to become good and suggesting that by pursuing a virtuous life individuals and community can achieve a good life that promises in the achievement of the highest good happiness (or *eudaimonia*).

In their political accounts both Aristotle and Nyerere will present the best possible community or city-state and argued that this can serve well as the ground where the virtuous life can be attained by its individual in a good way. According to them if the citizen pursues the virtues, they will make the community or city-state better and the best home to live. Also, the leaders who lead the community or city-state by pursuing virtuous will ensure a good environment where the citizens have every opportunity to become good and lead the virtuous life, a good life that fulfils their ultimate goal, happiness (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 23). If some of these previous principles or thoughts of Aristotle and Nyerere are developed, restructured, and encourage to be used to the different countries, then the contemporary community (society) will realize that there is no need to go elsewhere in search for happiness, because it is found in their own communities—so Aristotle and Nyerere.

0.2 Statement of the Problem

The possibility of open and controversial discussion on happiness, individual and communal, has brought an enormous number of benefits for mankind. The number of approaches and schools of thought on happiness, and people's quest and curiosity about what is the best matter or thought that will make them happy, is on the increase too. The previous thoughts and methods on the topic of happiness are good. This thesis aims to contribute to that good by linking Aristotle and Nyerere's thoughts on happiness and community. Their thoughts on happiness and community are described by their ethical arguments. For a number of reasons, Aristotle's ethics has made a considerable comeback in contemporary moral philosophy (cf. Höffe, 1995, p. 1; Wolf 2007, p. 14). The focus is largely on the question of the best kind of life to live and of the true human capacities that make a life into a good life. This focus now seems really important in contrast to a perhaps rather dryer approach that focused on deontology. The eudaimonological aspect of Aristotle's ethics makes it important.

There is, however, another aspect of his ethics that makes it important as well: his idea of 'ethical method'. Aristotle thought it very important to gather common opinions about ethics. He did not then just relay them, but he proposed that one really had to start by as if one were anchoring oneself in common opinions, putting them together, looking at where they

contradict each other, and finding a theory that best explained the majority of the common opinions. He brings some of his own more philosophical ideas to ethics as well. Aristotle's approach therefore comprises a very appropriate blend of common sense and a more theoretical underpinning.

0.3 Framework of the Problem

This thesis argues that individual as well as communal happiness in the sense of wellbeing or flourishing (especially for the community of Tanzania in the 21st century), is attainable as Aristotle and Nyerere comparably presented it and with consideration of time practice, commitment, and different capabilities among human beings.

Firstly, the statement with 'time practice' here means that to be happy (as Aristotle and Nyerere will show us in coming chapters) is not a one-day smooth activity rather it something an individual has to practice with some repetition in a period or a whole life (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1098a16-19; II.3, VI.8, 1142a10-20 tr. Ross; cf. Metz 2012, p. 104) sometimes including giving sacrifice, not get tired or not giving up because it is not an easy exercise it is challenging but fruitful if an individual will want to practice it even at its least level as Aristotle insists: "[...] therefore, since to hit the intermediate is hard in the extreme, we must as a second best, as people say, take the least of the evils; and this will be done best in the way we describe." (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.9, 1109a20-35).

Secondly, this process involves a 'commitment' in the sense that one is willing to be happy and therefore she or he will work hard, set the goal oriented, one will want and then choose to practice the right action, in a right way for the right purpose and for the right people in such a way that everything so done in virtuous way all being aimed for the ultimate good which is happiness (cf. Irwin 1999, pp. 333f). A good example to expose the thought I want to express here is to consider the question posed by Aristotle on book one of the *Nicomachean Ethics* when talking about choosing the chief good: "Will not the knowledge of it, then, have a great influence on life? Shall we not, like archers who have a mark to aim at, be more likely to hit upon what is right?" (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.2, 1094a23-25 tr. Ross).

Thirdly, with the term 'capabilities' it means that those who want to be happy have different capabilities that enable them to be happy because different people as one will think acquire the conversion of habit and conduct during the practices of different virtues differently¹ and therefore the capacities would determine the way one arrives at that final

¹ Aristotle invites us to consider and combine what is in the tradition together with that is evident to us that is why an individual is praised of being just, generous, or friendly a few to mention because of the character depicted by her or his virtuous life in seen by the community (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.5, 1095b1f; 1098b1f; II.7, 1107a26f; cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 27ff).

good, happiness or *eudaimonia* as Aristotle hold it. For example, for some might need only one kind of virtue to arrive at happiness, for some probably all the virtues, and for others maybe they would need a combination of the two or more virtues and the like as I would assume such other side of the scenario. One might hear a friend saying, ‘I would like to be a just person, that does not only make me happy but because it is important and a good thing to choose to be just’. The citizen will ask for a just nation, a just society or a just community. However, this does not mean that these people do not have practice the other kind of virtue, but it means something they hold more strongly among the many virtues and they are willing to be that kind of person (cf. MacIntyre 2007, p. 126). Aristotle believes that the crucial part of living the excellent human life is by possessing more virtues.

As I have argued above despite the challenges that might be involved in the process, it is fruitful to create and let the individuals and communities be shaped in terms of time practice, commitment, and according to different capabilities for happiness because doing so it means choosing building good future development of both individual and community endowed with good moral character and good life (that is with knowledge of ‘the good’ especially the ultimate good) that will have greater influence on our lives as human beings (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1094a22-24, cf. Sherman 1989, p. 12). After presenting the meaning of happiness and community life in Aristotle and Nyerere, the work will continue with the main claims of comparison between them.

The main claims of comparison between Aristotle and Nyerere on happiness and community life as in chapter three of this thesis will be divided and addressed in the following three major groups.

The first main claim is what I named ‘human development’. Aristotle and Nyerere were very concern about the question of human development, starting with human being as a person to ensure that she or he is good in all its dimensions: physical, spiritual and mental set and flourish, focusing on good moral character that brings about good life and especially the ultimate good which is happiness.² This first major claim will be discussed into several subtopics: community education, self-reliance, human relationship and art. The importance of

² Some thinkers think that this process has a certain historical structure and it took time from one phase of the process to another including the changes in the movement, a number of competitions and different forms inherited or learned from other cultures. They also find the teleological scheme as the example of basic structure Aristotle describes in his *Nicomachean Ethics* whereby there is within it “a fundamental contrast between man-as-he-happens-to-be and man-as-he-could-be-if-he-realized-his-essential nature.” And they think Ethics as science should take the job “to enable men to understand” the way “they make the transition from the former state to the latter” by assuming “some account of potentiality and act, as well as those who describe “the essence of man as a rational animal and his end or *telos*. The precepts which enjoin the various virtues and prohibit the vices as counterparts instruct human individual how to move from potentiality to act, how to realize their true nature and to reach their true end.” (MacIntyre 2007, p. 52).

‘work’ (both moral work and social work) will also be emphasized as the driving force relevant for moral education, practicing the virtues, leadership, relationship and community life. Aristotle offers arguments that to be happy one has to live according to the virtues which mean to practice the virtues. But in order to be able to practice the virtue and acquire them well (let say for her or him to flourish and become: just, courageous, faithful, generous, honest, friendly and the like) an individual needs some environments, tools, means and situations which support her or him on that. All these subtopics of the main claim number one mentioned above will therefore imply factors and tools that enable human individual and community to recognize ‘capabilities’³ and ‘energies’ and to develop well, that is, to cultivate virtues, to acquire good character, wisdom and to live a good life. They will therefore show that in order for an individual human being to develop well and flourish in all her or his faculties of life there is a sense of moral work and mannerism practices involved in the whole process.

The second main claim of the similarity between Aristotle and Nyerere is argument on ‘leadership and governance’ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1134b15, cf. *Politics*, 1254a5; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 28ff). Leadership or the act of ‘leading’ people or community be it from a wiseman or from good laws (constitution) it means on one side following and on another showing a way. An individual who or community which starts its journey toward good life, happiness needs good guidance. This is important because as we will see after claiming that man is social animal who has bond in the community life, and who search for happiness and good life, Aristotle compare this state (community) with the living being which has soul and body as its first elements, then he say that the soul is made up of reason and appetite. Principally, the soul leads the body, the rational part rule the appetitive part, similarly the one ‘show the way’ to follow to the other (cf. *Politics*, I.5.).⁴ Then Aristotle will talk about this political animal to consist of family of husband and wife and with property of master and slave all of which require proper guidance and examination in order to learn and understand how life works and how far is his concept of virtue and happiness related to communal life.

³ Martha Craven Nussbaum in her ‘capability approach’ argues that in considering human developmental goals it is important for the policy makers or leaders of the countries to considers the capabilities of each person in terms of what that person is able to do and to be. Also the measure of the quality of the life in the community should not be based on the increased figures of the sum of goods produced and services provided in the community per year (GDP) rather it should go further to know whether such good and services (or quality of life) equally affect the life of each single individual, that is if it were a share to know who has that share and whether any of it is for every single individual. Nussbaum finds that it is not the case because the provision of beautiful figures of GDP overlooks the alarming inequalities and deprivation between the communities and among people (cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp.8, 12, 24, and 27ff).

⁴ Aristotle points out something interesting about these two parts that: “the inferior class should be slave of the superior”, and the he asks: “if there is a difference in the body, how much more in the soul!” for “the beauty of the body is seen whereas the beauty of the soul is not seen” (cf. *Politics*, I.5, 1254b10ff).

This will also include knowing the fruits brought about when individuals in the community decided to practice a life according to virtues as well as to learn the way the community's functions be organized for its goals to be achieved (cf. *Politics*, 1277a6ff). This claim also will be addressed in the following subtitles: wisdom and knowledge; equality and justice; discipline and commitment; integrity and obedience to the law; and dignity and sustainability.

After stating the similarities between Aristotle and Nyerere, the differences between them will be accounted. These differences will involve factors such as: the level of recognition and participation in the community life; the rule system in the community; ownership of property; and the notion of human equality. Aristotle and Nyerere believed that a 'good life' can be attained when individuals and the community practice and live according to the virtue and wisdom. To truly being virtuous however, one cannot merely act virtuously on the outside rather it involves doing virtuous action both pleasantly and natural that means an individual taking the part of cultivating virtuous by choosing moral guide that will help that individual to figure out the sort of act the virtuous person would do (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1106a-b). There will also no doubt that it will be difficult to make changes on individual's habits, but over time it become easier and easier until finally the habit is so engrained that choosing the virtuous actions becomes easy. It becomes the part of what the person is. The contemporary contribution in connection to the thoughts of happiness and community will be used to develop this thought.

0.4 Methodology

This is a comparative analysis with reference to two thinkers Aristotle and Nyerere. Most of the discussion will touch the ethical and political account about happiness in relation to community life. Secondary source will be employed to get a wide and contemporary development of the topic.

0.5 Clarification of Key Concepts

Some foreign words or new terminologies will be listed here and short explained.

Eudaimonia – this term means 'happiness', 'flourishing', 'fulfillment' or 'success' (cf. Wolf 2007, p. 261).

Ujamaa – it means 'family-hood' or 'extended family' (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 12)

GDP – This abbreviation which means 'Gross Domestic Product', it is the sum the total value of goods produced and services provided in a country during one year—as defined in the Oxford Dictionary.

cf. –confer

p. or pp. –pages

f. or ff. – following page(s)

etc. –This is a short form for Latin term ‘*et cetera*’ which is used at the end of a list to indicate that further, or similar items are included.

et.al –*et alii*

ibd. –*ibīdem*, meaning “in the same place”

INTRODUCTION

Happiness and community are two important, yet complex and multidimensional terms related to human beings. It is often easier to think of and relate happiness with things such as material wealth, pleasure, knowledge, good reputation, and inner peace than with the community. However, two philosophers, Aristotle and Julius K. Nyerere, have drawn their special attention to these terms and argued in their ethical and political philosophy that the community is important when it comes to individual or community happiness. Since Aristotle is by far the earlier philosopher than Nyerere to argue about happiness in connection to community, it is, therefore, logical to say that his philosophical thoughts have been an influence on many cultures that have come in contact with them, including the Tanzanian socio-cultural *milieu*.⁵ There are three works on ethics attributed to Aristotle which have survived: the *Nicomachean Ethics* (in ten books), *Eudemian Ethics* (in seven books), and the so-called *Magna Moralia* or ‘great ethics’ (in two books) (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. vii, cf. Kenny 2004, p. 79).

In his *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle addresses, among other topics, the question of happiness. According to him, ethics is the inquiry into the ‘human good’. He argued further that if the question is posed of what is the highest of all goods attainable, the following answer is given by everyone (by which he means that there is a verbal agreement among the educated and lowly, healthy and sick): happiness, *eudaimonia*⁶ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4). He concludes that this happiness is the highest human good because it alone is an end in itself. That means that “when we aim at happiness, we do so for its own sake, not because happiness helps us realize some other end” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.2, 1094a19-1094b12 tr. Ross).

In this master’s thesis, I wish to compare and contrast Aristotle’s notion of happiness in relation to the community life with that of Julius Kambarage Nyerere (1922–1999), one of the sub-Saharan African philosophers who had been influenced by Aristotle’s philosophy. He is a Tanzanian politician and political theorist who had received his education in the west (at Edinburgh University in Scotland) and had learned — as did many African thinkers such as the theologians Bénézet Bujo (1940), John Samuel Mbiti (1931–2019), Desmond Mpilo Tutu

⁵ For Nyerere learning also means considering and applying thoughts, experiences, and whatever good other thinkers and leaders have done and wisely working with that (cf. Nyerere 1967, p. 9).

⁶ A translation of the Greek word ‘*eudaimonia*’ with the English word ‘happiness’ arguably does not tell us exactly what Aristotle meant. For us, ‘happiness’ often denotes a feeling or generates a state of mind, but for Aristotle it probably rather denotes a kind of life, the best life that a human being can live. Consequently, to find out whether someone is happy, for Aristotle, one does not need to ask them, but one should rather observe the kind of life they are leading and the kind of person they are. Some people think that the word ‘*eudaimonia*’ should even be translated with ‘flourishing’, ‘fulfillment’ or ‘success’ (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, pp. x ff.; xxff; cf. Wolf 2007, pp. 30ff.). The word ‘*eudaimonia*’ or ‘happiness’ will be employed throughout the thesis carrying Aristotle’s sense explained here unless otherwise noted.

(1931) and the philosopher Ifeanyi Anthony Menkiti (1940–2019) — some of Aristotle’s ethical thoughts, especially his political philosophy about happiness and community life (cf. Malony 2014, pp. 101ff; Bjerk 2015, pp. 23ff; Metz 2012, pp. 101f, Campbell 2010, p.47). Nyerere’s famous book (among many) is called *Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism* (1968). Being influenced by Aristotle, Nyerere uses some of these ideas (community, equality, and justice, friendship) to create his system and political philosophy known as *Ujamaa* (Nyerere 1968, pp. 1-186). On reading his work on *Ujamaa*⁷, one notices that Nyerere addresses these ideas mentioned above about community and others in a manner that reflects that of Aristotle. Aristotle and Nyerere, like many other thinkers, attempt to answer the question: What is the ultimate purpose of human existence?

According to Aristotle, ethics is part of political science and as a single inquiry, it seeks to discover the good for an individual and for the community.⁸ This ‘good’, as was said above, he argues to be happiness, exercised through virtues of character and virtues of thought as they will be describe in the coming chapters of this thesis (cf. Irwin 1999, pp. xv-xvi).

In order to successfully find out the good for an individual and community, ethics should necessarily begin with an examination of happiness (cf. Irwin 1999, pp. xv-xvi). Terence Henry Irwin, a scholar and philosopher specializing in ancient Greek philosophy and the history of ethics such as the history of Western moral philosophy in ancient, medieval, and modern times and also as the Professor of the History of Philosophy at the University of Oxford, in his translation of *Nicomachean Ethics* summarises as follows:

“In Aristotle’s view, a human being is a political animal insofar as human capacities and aims are completely fulfilled only in a community; the individual’s happiness must involve the good of fellow members of a community (1097b8-11, 1169b16-19)” (Irwin 1999, p. xxii).

After Irwin’s quotation above about Aristotle’s idea of community in relation to happiness, Innocent Sanga, a scholar at The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, offers us another quotation describing the same idea this time in connection to Nyerere:

⁷ *Ujamaa* is a Swahili word that means ‘family-hood’ or ‘extended family’. In his words, Nyerere says that *Ujamaa* is that which describes the socialism of Tanzania. He says, “it is opposed to capitalism, which seeks to build a happy society on the basis of the exploitation of man by man; and it is equally opposed to doctrinaire socialism which seeks to build its happy society on a philosophy of inevitable conflict between man and man” (Nyerere 1968, p. 12). In this sense, it means that a person becomes a person through the people or community. This means that abiding with *Ujamaa* does not involve “looking on one class of men as brethren and another as one’s natural enemies, or one does not form an alliance with the brethren for the extermination of the non-brethren”, says Nyerere, but that it rather encourages a spirit of “others”, bringing units of families together and fostering cohesion, love, and service (Nyerere 1968, p. 11ff). *Ujamaa* was the concept that formed the basis of Nyerere’s social and economical development policies in Tanzania (Nyerere 1968, p. 15ff).

⁸ According to Ursula Wolf’s description: “It is part of human nature to live in the *polis*, just as it is the task of the *polis* to guarantee a good life together and individually.” (cf. Wolf 2007, p. 17).

“Nyerere, like Aristotle, believed that an individual acquires full happiness by being part of the society not only because man is rational but also because the individual human being, both social and political, has always lived in some kind of society (Curtis, 1965). The chief good of an individual lies in his being a member of society.” (Sanga 2016, p. 6).

Following the above quotations, I am curious to investigate how far these two thinkers, Aristotle and Nyerere, are substantially similar or different, for the purposes of which I will be making a comparative study on the way in which they relate community with happiness.

The title of the thesis is ‘A Comparative Analysis of the Concept of Happiness in Aristotle and Nyerere in Relation to Community Life’. This theme has the main aim of addressing the question: To what extent can Aristotle’s and Nyerere’s concept of happiness be relevant to the people or community life in Tanzania in the 21st century?

The first thesis is: Aristotle and Julius Kambarage Nyerere, the two profound figures in philosophy (of political ethics), commonly agree that community is important when it comes to the happiness of its individuals. However, each argues for a different definition of the relationship between the community and happiness. Aristotle and Nyerere look to separate authorities for ethical (or moral) guidance and especially with strongly contrasting argumentative styles. They both argue convincingly, but who is right?

Should we obey the thoughts of a happy community as the highest of all goods attainable by everyone in that community, ‘*eudaimonia*’ (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4), even if the individual must tolerate a certain authority (*Politics*, I. 1252a24-1252b9; 1254b16–21) while concentrating on the kind of life the members of the community are leading and the kind of persons they are (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xx), as Aristotle would have us do, or should we stand up to injustice and instead obey the socialistic revolutionary ideology and measures of a happy community, emphasizing it as an act of mind that cares about human equality and self-reliance in search of independence as opposed to any kind of classes, inequalities, exploitation, and injustices as Nyerere thinks we should? (Nyerere 1968, pp. 12-13ff; p. 78).

In other words, would the community rather be a source of happiness to its individuals with the presence of classes (as in Aristotle’s arguments) or with the absence of classes (as in Nyerere’s arguments)?⁹ Even though Aristotle and Nyerere have many similarities, there are

⁹ One may understand the historical background of both Aristotle and Nyerere as preceded by the mode of life which was shaped by the exploitation of one man by another man, amounting to slavery. Aristotle seems to have justified slavery from the intellectual perspective with the best intentions (or on the grounds of expediency), whereby he holds that slavery is a natural thing and that the souls of slaves were not complete, they lacked some qualities, such as the ability to think properly. However, Aristotle would concede that they were not totally incapable of thought; otherwise they could be unable to work. Aristotle does not bless any exploitation of man by man as he says “[...] hence master and slave have the same interest” (*Politics* I. 1252a24-1252b9). Nyerere would ban the question of slavery completely in his argument, since he stresses that socialism is against exploitation and injustice (Nyerere 1968, pp. 2f, pp. 11f, pp. 78ff).

also quite a few differences. In comparing and contrasting the arguments, language, and support of both Aristotle and Nyerere, the thesis will attempt to reveal the strongest argument of all and find the balance between them.

To a certain extent, the thesis will deal with questions related to the history of philosophy, establishing a link of thoughts on happiness and community and tracing the continuity between Western (Aristotle) and African (Nyerere) thought, especially by trying to determine to which extent Aristotle's concept of happiness is an influence, a challenge, and an advantage to African cultures with reference to Tanzania's socio-cultural *milieu* while at the same time trying to determine what these cultures may learn from each other today. The objective of this work is first to trace and state that there is an influence of Aristotle's thoughts in Africa, particularly in Nyerere's work; second, to present comparisons between Aristotle's and Nyerere's arguments on how community and happiness are related; and third, to give a critical appraisal of the limits and scope of Aristotle's as well as Nyerere's arguments with respect to the community, however following the goal of finding better systems of happiness in relation to community that fit the Tanzanian community in the 21st century.

Chapter one presents the meaning of happiness and community in Aristotle. His argument about virtue, wisdom, and mean, education, friendship (that is, individual and other's welfare) as pillars to a good and happy life will be discussed.

Chapter two presents the meaning of happiness and community in Nyerere. His approach on virtue such as freedom, equality, friendship and his account of the brotherly belonging and participating in community life.

Chapter three addresses the arguments of comparisons whereby both Nyerere and Aristotle link the community with happiness, starting with points of similarities and then followed by those of difference between them. The discussion will take form of Aristotle's-and-Nyerere's major claims as pointed in the '*Framework of Problem*' above.

Chapter four introduces contemporary contributions for example from philosophers and theorists such as Marta Nussbaum and Thaddeus Metz, and others who try to develop and extend this link between community and happiness reflecting current time and society. This chapter will question the comparison done in chapter three, asking whether it suffices or to which extent it fits the requirement of the Tanzanian community in the 21st century.

Chapter five uses as by product the contribution from Aristotle, Nyerere and the contribution from these contemporary philosophers that will be discussed in this work to correct, polish, and perfect Nyerere's system and to develop (or suggests) a system that might

be more useful to the community of Tanzania in the 21st century as far as individual and community life and happiness are concerned.

CHAPTER 1

1. The Meaning of Happiness and Community Life in Aristotle

This part explores, discusses and develops the concepts of happiness and community life as found on Aristotle famous works. For example, by using his work in ethics the “*Nicomachean Ethics*” among others,¹⁰ we will define the word happiness together with its elements and then present the way Aristotle deals with the concept of virtues and with how we should behave if we want to be virtuous. This is relevant because according to Aristotle a happy life - both individually and collectively - can only be achieved through virtuous behavior. For Aristotle, virtues are attitudes that every human being is capable of, but which first must develop over the course of life.

Happiness, or *eudaimonia* is defined by Aristotle whereby he identifies it with “the highest human good, living well or doing well (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1095a18, cf.1139b3, 1140a28, 1140b7)”, also, it is considered as “the complete end, that is, the only one that does not promote any other end and it is self-sufficient, *autarkes*, because it lacks nothing (...)” (cf. Irwin 1999, p. 333) something which makes the definition happiness exceptional and controversial.

In his political philosophy we will see Aristotle’s concept of community whereby he present human beings as an animal (creature) which seeks community life in order to be strong, to get help, to survive, to find and realize oneself, to flourish and to be happy starting with the level of man and woman relationship for the sake of procreation (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1252a25ff.; I.12, cf. Pieper 2015, pp.17ff) all the way through up to the city-state (the *polis*) at its advanced level. He gave us an important argument in his *Politics* that is similar to his *Nicomachean Ethics* whereby he argues that the search of communal life is not merely for companionship but more for the sake of good life (noble life) something which Nyerere supports him in his political philosophy (*Ethica Nicomachea*, I.1, 1094b 11; *Politics*, III.9, 1281a3f.; Nyerere 1968, p. 235ff). Before talking deep about the meaning of happiness and community life in Aristotle let us have brief look on the general meaning of the terms.

1.1 The General View of the Terms Happiness and Community Life

The discussion and schools of thought that have attempted to address the question of happiness and community have pointed out various types, uses, and interpretations of these concepts. The first term to start with is the term ‘happiness’, and since the term is relevant but

¹⁰ According to Ursula Wolf, Aristotle’s text of *Nicomachean Ethics* which talks about happiness and good life can be thematic divided into the thoughts: first form of life of pleasure, second the life of a Citizen in the *polis* (the city state or community) and third the life of theory (cf. Wolf 2007, p. 20).

also complex—as was mentioned in the introduction: most philosophers have defined it roughly in two restricted senses. First, some associate the term happiness with the state of ‘well-being or flourishing’ and second, others use it in connection with ‘depression’ or ‘tranquility’, terms which are purely psychological and descriptive (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1104b20-25, cf. Haybron 2013, pp. 39ff; cf. Haybron 2020, p. 1). The discussion in this thesis will especially use the term happiness based on the former sense.

Historically it is mentioned that the term happiness and its nature was first examined by the philosopher Democritus in ancient Greece. Previously it was thought that happiness does not result from ‘favourable fate’, that is, good luck or other external circumstances, and Democritus argued that happiness was a ‘case of mind’, found not in riches but in the goods of the soul, and therefore, introducing a subjectivist view as to what happiness is (cf. Kesebir and Diener, 2008, p. 117; cf. Kenny 2004, p. 258f).

Next to him there was a more objective view of happiness which was introduced by Socrates and his student, Plato, whereby happiness was understood as the “secure enjoyment of what is good and beautiful” (Plato, 1999, p. 80, cf. *Laws* VIII 828d-829b, cf. *Crito* 48b-c cf. Craig 2019; Pieper 2015, p. 20). In his *Symposium* he argues that happiness and good life “the best life is one whereby a person is either pursuing the pleasure or exercising intellectual virtues” (Plato, 1999, p. 80)— an argument which, as we will see, the next key figure in the development of the philosophy of happiness, Aristotle, disagreed with (Waterman 1993, p. 678).¹¹ Plato assumes that there is the only idea of the good that is detached from the reality of experience gives that only this idea is perfectly and continuously good and that all other goods are approximately good through participation in this idea. Aristotle does not agree that a common idea of the good can grasp the goodness of all goods. Because for example when one name ‘the wealth’ a good and ‘the *aretē*’ a good, then it does not mean that both are the same property of goodness, but it means that both in different ways to be predicated of one thing in a way (*Nicomachean Ethics*, cf. I.6, 1096b5ff; cf. Wolf 2007, pp. 32f).

Moreover, Aristotle also disagrees because as we will see he will argue that happiness has to do with *eudaemonia*. Irwin writes that *eudaemon* denotes the activity of gods and therefore gods does not entail human character which for this case excludes pleasure.

Furthermore, in his reply to Thrasymachus, Plato also mean that justice is an intrinsic good and a component of the happy life whereby justice here for example consists in all

¹¹ Lesley Brown commented that, according to Aristotle regarding the relationship between pleasure and goodness, one needs to go much deeper into the question of how one should think of pleasure, and what it is, as well as asking the way it is related to the good. This includes taking into account the two treatments of pleasure in books seven and ten of the *Nicomachean Ethics* – that is, *NE* VII. 1152b1-54b31 and *NE* X. 1-5. 1172a16-1176a29 – (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. ix-x, cf. Kenny 2004, p. 274ff, Wolf 2007, p. 18).

citizens doing their own proper work in their category of belonging respectively (*Republic*, I. 340bff).

The next term is community that is talking about the meaning of community in general. Philosophers and various disciplines general define the terms community as a social unity of living things with shared common norms, beliefs, values, customs, identity, goals, affiliations and dignity which is situated in a particular geographical area.¹² Etymologically the word community has its origin from an old French word ‘*comuneté* or *communauté*’ that comes from Latin ‘*communitas*’ translated as ‘community’ in English language all together means ‘public spirit’ as explained in the Oxford Dictionaries (2014). In Ursula Wolf’s version Aristotle shows that there is no big difference between state and community because they have the same goal. She re-states Aristotle’s words that ‘anything called a state (*pólis*) is evidently a kind of community (*koinōnía*) which is formed and exists for the purpose of attaining some good (*agathón*)’ (cf. Wolf 2014, pp. 43ff). People in the community interact each other and share different experience characteristics, a sense of belonging and often by physical closeness. In this thesis the term community will be used reflecting the *polis* as the highest form of community with focus to the highest of goods such as that of Athens existed at the time of Aristotle and presenting comparisons with that of Tanzania. This begins with family, then a village and finally turns into a state which is the first form community. Aristotle and Nyerere have discussed happiness and community life in closely related terms. The following is an explanation of what the quest for happiness meant to Aristotle.

1.2 Aristotle’s View on Happiness

Aristotle begins the discussion about happiness with the guiding question as found in the *Nicomachean Ethics*: What is the best thing for a human being? And his answer to this fundamental question is happiness, ‘*eudaimonia*’ (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4, Wolf 2007, p. 261). With this he does not mean something that we feel, but rather a special good kind of life. That should be the ultimate purpose of human existence. The word *eudaimonia* (*εὐδαιμονία*) comes from two Greek words *eu* means ‘good, well’ and *daimōn* means ‘spirit’, ‘soul’. Thus, the word which is translated as ‘happiness’ literally meant ‘good soul’, ‘good spirit’ in antiquity. The *summum bonum* of life was to have a good soul, to have a good relationship with that inner guiding spirit that all human beings have and the person who embodied this idea is called ‘*eudaimon*’ (cf. Irwin 1999, p. 332, cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xiii). The translation to English with the word ‘happiness’ is however not so strong, and it

¹² Some think that a community is “a group or network of persons who are connected (objectively) to each other by relatively durable social relations that extend beyond immediate genealogical ties and who mutually define that relationship (subjectively) as important to their social identity and social practice” (James, et.al 2012, p. 14).

communicates something close to actualizing one's own potential, consistently expressing the best within oneself, which then causes the 'eudaimon' to experience the sense of *eudaimonia*, the sense of joy and well-being that comes when one is flourishing. Happiness consists of activities in which human beings use their best capacities, those ones that contribute to her or his flourishing as members of a community, and ones that allow them to engage in god-like contemplation (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.2, 1094b5-10 tr. Ross; cf. Störig 1985, p. 184). The discussion offered by Aristotle plays an important role in contemporary ethical writings, especially through his inspiring content on moral virtues such as courage and justice.

Furthermore, there is an important discussion on responsibility for actions, on the nature of practical reasoning, on friendship and its meaning within the best possible life. It is important to mention this, because these constitute the mechanism by which the new model of the concept of happiness and community for Tanzania in the 21st century is to be remodeled and encouraged.

Happiness, when formulated by using Aristotle's arguments, is defined as the highest of all goods¹³. It involves excellent rational activity in accordance with virtue attainable by individuals through the course of a whole lifetime exercise (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, tr. Ross; cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. x). From Aristotle's formulated account of happiness, several essential elements can be derived and explained. This includes the human good and human function (excellent rational activity) in accordance with virtue, attainable by individuals through the course of the exercise of a whole lifetime (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1098a13 tr. Ross).

1.2.1 Happiness as the Ultimate (Highest) Human Good

For Aristotle, ethics is about the enquiry after the best good for a human being and how one ought to live to achieve that utmost good. His argument is that happiness (*eudaimonia*) is the best good for human beings (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4, tr. Ross). In Aristotle's thought, in order for anything to count as the highest good of all, it must fulfill several formal criteria. The first criterion he gave is that it must be an end in itself, that is, something one wants for its own sake and not for any other reason. He also says it must be self-sufficient, which means it must be lacking in none of the intrinsically good things (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1097a15ff tr. Ross). As was mentioned above, a translation of the Greek word 'eudaimonia' with the English word 'happiness' arguably does not tell us exactly what Aristotle meant: For some people, happiness almost always denotes a feeling or it

¹³ Aristotle specifies the good in three division: first, external goods, then second goods in relation to soul or third goods in relation to body whereby he call the good related to the soul most properly and truly goods and psychical action and activities classified as relating to soul (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.8, 1098b10ff).

generates a state of mind; for Aristotle, it rather denotes a kind of life, the best life that a human being can live. To determine whether someone is happy, Aristotle suggests not asking but rather observing the kind of life they are leading and the kind of person they are (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4, 1095a25ff tr. Ross, cf. MacIntyre 2007, p. 122).

In contemporary society, happiness is seen as something that can be rated minute by minute or hour by hour (cf. Seligman 2004, p. 26ff). Aristotle would consider that absurd. For instance, he said that a child cannot be happy because it is not yet living the kind of life that could qualify as a happy life. One may, however, call a child ‘happy’ as a way of saying that there is a measure of promise of a good life in that child. Furthermore, slaves cannot be happy according to Aristotle, because they do not enjoy a life of the activities that constitute happiness (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII.11, 1161b2; cf. *Politics*, 1280a31–4; Wolf 2007, p.51), and neither can women. This is again because their circumstances do not allow them to develop the kind of capacities that he considers prerequisites for happiness (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xi). Some people think one should not really use the translation happiness but instead that one should translate the Greek word ‘*eudemonia*’ with ‘flourishing’ or even ‘successes’. Nonetheless, we will here keep to the word ‘happiness’, noting that it is very important to get rid of some of our preconceptions about what happiness is. Aristotle says it is equivalent to ‘doing well’, ‘living well’, or ‘faring well’ and that happiness is not a ‘state’ but it is a ‘kind of activity’, a ‘way of living’ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4, 1095a15ff tr. Ross; cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. x).

One of the greatest positive psychologists, Martin Elias Peter Seligman in his book *Authentic Happiness*, advocates the change of the word ‘happiness’ into ‘flourishing’ because he considers it more accurate. It should not be associated merely with happy faces, smiling, or laughing. Rather, it means something more than that: that is one is striving to express the best within one’s life in successive moments until one is successful do that. Only then does one experience *eudaimonia* and that is the ultimate end towards which almost everyone is striving (cf. Seligman 2004, p. 130, p. 335).¹⁴ This brings us to the second element of his definition of happiness: ‘human function or rational activity’.

¹⁴ Moreover, Lesley Brown writes that this is “a matter of long-standing dispute learned with three ‘lives’ in contention namely those of sensual enjoyment, of political achievement, and of intellectual contemplation” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.5, 1095b15ff tr. Ross). A fourth contender for the best life, the pursuit of wealth, was added to this category by Aristotle but swiftly dismissed by him again because wealth is thought for something else and therefore violates the criterion of the highest good (above) which for Aristotle must be wanted for itself (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. x).

1.2.2 Happiness as Human Function (Rational Activity¹⁵)

The above ‘formal criteria’ of and ‘end in itself’ (*telos*) and ‘self-sufficiency’ do not yet tell us completely what happiness really is. Aristotle now promises to elaborate the notion of happiness by looking at what he calls the function of a human being.¹⁶ This is a very controversial but important part of Aristotle’s approach. What does he mean when he says human beings have a function? Does he mean the kind of function that would be saving a bigger entity such as the state, or does he mean that human beings have a function because God has designed them with a certain purpose in mind? It seems he does not mean or believe either. What he does mean is that human beings have a function in the same way as he might say any natural species like an oak tree has a function, there are ways oak trees ought to be, so an oak tree would have a stout trunk, ought to have plenty of room to spread its branches, and so on. That is what makes a good specimen of an oak tree and similarly, there are ways human beings ought to be and ought to live to be a good specimen of a human being (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xi-xii). Now there are many things (or in Aristotle’s terms ‘many capacities of the soul’) that human beings share with other living things: they grow, they can move around, they have a perception, they have memory, and so on. But Aristotle would think that the function of a human being must be something special to human beings, and what is special, is the capacity to reason, the key to the best human life. This brings him to his famous definition of happiness as: ‘activity of the rational part or parts of the soul in accordance with excellence of virtue’ (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1.7, 1098a16). Now by ‘the soul’, he does not mean anything fantastic or metaphysical. He merely indicates that which any living thing has (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xi-xii). And when he says, ‘in accordance with excellence of virtue’, he divides the virtues into different kinds as explained below.

1.2.3 Happiness as Rational Activity with Excellence of Virtues

According to Aristotle, happiness is the ‘activity of the rational part of the soul in accordance with excellence of virtue’ and the Greek word for virtue is *arête*. Virtue are ‘mean’ or ‘intermediate’ state of character which make man good and which makes him to do his work well. For him, human virtue falls into two kinds: moral virtues, in other words, virtues of character, and intellectual virtues, that is, virtues of the intellect (cf. *Nicomachean*

¹⁵ Austin Fagothey considers happiness as “the end of man” and adds that “it is not inactivity, but action, else one could be happy while asleep. It must be the highest kind of action, not done for something else but-desirable for its own sake. [...] It is not action of the body or senses, but of what is noblest and best in us, our reason” (Fagothey 2015, p. 34).

¹⁶ The term ‘Function’ translates *ergon*, literally ‘task’ or ‘work’ (Ross and Brown 2009, p. x, cf. Wolf 2007, p. 260). The ‘function argument’ is used by Aristotle to find the human good through human function because he believed ‘there is a way human beings ought to be and ought to live’ (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1.7; cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xi).

Ethics, I.13, 1103a5f tr. Ross; cf. Kenny 2004, p. 81). The moral virtues which are developed through habituation to right conduct¹⁷ include the traditional ones such as fortitude and temperance, and others such as the virtue of liberty, sincerity, dignity, and conviviality. The intellectual virtues which can be acquired through instruction include scientific knowledge (demonstrative knowledge of the necessary and eternal), art (knowledge of how to make things), practical wisdom (knowledge of how to secure the ends of human life), intuitive reason (knowledge of the principles from which science proceeds), and philosophic wisdom (the union of intuitive reason and science) as found in the text (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.2, 1139b15-VI.8, 1141b30 tr. Ross).

Lesley Brown argues that Aristotle's considerations regarding the soul seem to distinguish between the intellectual part of the soul, which has reason in the full sense, and the appetites, which have reason in a secondary way (that is, semi-rational in Brown's formulation). The appetites are responsive to reason, though they are not rationality in themselves (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xiii). Aristotle seems to emphasize that 'a moral virtue' is the most famous because of his famous claim that moral virtue involves a mean (as in the coming discussion).

Regarding moral virtue or virtue of character, it is firstly very important for Aristotle that moral virtue does not only concern the way in which one acts but it also regards the matter of the emotions and feelings one experiences. He calls it a 'disposition', that is, a firm state of character which disposes of one both to feel and to act in an appropriate way. Now the term 'appropriate' is used here but Aristotle uses the term 'mean', sometimes translated into moderate, and people therefore often think that for Aristotle, the so-called golden mean is a doctrine of moderation (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1106a15ff tr. Ross, cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xiv). However, he is not advocating moderation. Instead, he is advocating doing the appropriate thing and feeling the appropriate way for any given circumstance. According to him, one cannot have a rule book setting out how to act in any given circumstance. What one instead must do to become a morally virtuous person is to grow up to be properly educated, to live with people who can set her or him a good example, and learn to understand what the appropriate feeling is and what the appropriate action is in any given situation (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 2.7, 1107b1-9; cf. Wolf 2007, p. 141).¹⁸

¹⁷The ethical or moral virtues are not naturally given to us rather they are qualities that are acquired by developing right habits through right action. That means an individual learn virtue by practicing it. At State level a good constitution and good laws are characterized by promoting the virtuous behavior of the citizens (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.1, 1103a15f).

¹⁸ In Thornton C. Lockwood's understanding there are some challenges in grasping Aristotle's argument of habit, habituation and formation of excellence character (cf. Lockwood 2013, p. 19).

In Aristotle's account of virtue, be it intellectual or moral virtue, be it the self-regarding ones (such as temperance) or the other-regarding ones (such as justice), the valuable aspect is living a life that is the best life for a human being. One should not only have, but also exercise virtue. Thus, without exercise one's life cannot be called happy (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1.8, 1099a1). This thought put into consideration that among human beings, individuals differ in their abilities, preferences, and goals. This is to be held very important and is true even for other living beings: animals help their young for a period of time to become physically, emotionally, and instinctually enculturated in the family and society as a whole (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xii tr. Ross).

Moreover, when Aristotle (and likewise Nyerere) insists on living with people who can demonstrate a good example of living, they indirectly speak about the relevance of community in education as we will discuss in the coming chapters (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.1, 1103b1f, *Politics*, VII.13-VIII.7; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 45ff, Nyerere 1967, p. 2). This makes us now to dive in deep in order to investigate more on virtues because according to Aristotle the good life is a life according to virtues and happiness (Wolf 2007, pp. 47ff). Let us now explain Aristotle's classification of virtues. According to Aristotle they are moral and Intellectual Virtues.

1.2.3.1 The Moral Virtue

The moral virtues are the first group of this classification of virtues. This is a state of character (genus) which is apart from passion and capacity that involves choosing between the intermediate (the mean) that is, the mean relative to us human being, this being determined by reason, and by that reason by which the man of practical wisdom would determine it (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1106a-b35ff, cf. Ross and Brown 2019, p. xiv; cf. Sherman 1989, p. 5). Through moral virtues human being is made good and is able to perform her or his work well. The moral virtues are discussed in books II, III, IV and V of the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

The first kind of moral virtue is courage. This is a moral virtue which is concerned with the feelings of fear¹⁹ and confidence helping us to feel them in an appropriate way (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1107a-b) for example concretely when it comes to the fear of death in battle (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.6, 1115a5f). The virtue of courage is important because it is the noble characteristics of the opposite vices, of cowardice and rashness. In this sense the fearful things by which the brave man is concern are the ones which are as Aristotle mentioned "with the greatest" [...] and "to stand his ground against what is awe-inspiring"

¹⁹ According to Aristotle fear is an "expectation of evil" and examples of evils that are fearful to man are things such as "disgrace, poverty, disease, friendlessness, and death" However, this amount of fear differs with magnitude, degree and from one person to another (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.6, 1115a1-15).

(*Nicomachean Ethics*, III.6, 1115a24-25). Courage is related to pain and pleasure because it involves the act of facing that which is pain and abstain from that which is pleasant for example in the situation where an individual is striving to manage the feelings of fear and foolhardy to have the virtue of courage which is not less confident but also not overconfident but confident. The experience shows often that it is easier to hold on that which is pleasant whereby an individual finds it 'not easier to abstain from that which is pleasant' than to facing that which painful whereby an individual finds 'difficult to face pain' (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.8, 1099a5ff).

The ultimate goal of the virtue of courage is a noble end (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.7, 1115a10-1115b24) in terms of praise and prize like a strong man or a runner who received a crown and honour in the city-states (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.12, 1101b10) but the path that leading to that achievement needs someone who is brave (courageous) who is able to persevere the toils of pain and fear for example like in the case of player in Olympic competition or student at the university. The virtue of courage²⁰ is divided into two five kinds.

First are the courage of the citizen soldier Aristotle calls this true courage seem to face dangers because of the penalties imposed by the laws and they are ready to be brave not under compulsion but because it is noble to be so.

The second type of courage is the experience with regards to particular facts exhibiting the dangers of wars without flying, fearing death.

The third kind of courage is passion that means acting from passion like wild beast with eager to rush on danger to attack when are wounded. Therefore, this occurs under the influence of pain especial in the case when one is afraid or wounded something which activate their bodily impulses and adrenaline to face the danger.

The fourth kinds of courage are sanguine people, they are referred to brave not for the reason of noble but because they have conquered often and against many foes and they are confident, that means they are so because they think they are the strongest and can suffer nothing, but it is not the case because they run when they are not succeeded. For example, drunken men, that is, a drunken man who while very drunk might attempt to cross an over-flooded river trying to proof to others his courage. This is not good because it is something which might be dangerous for his life. It is therefore not a good idea for him to do that even if it is for courage sake.

²⁰ Aristotle considers these kinds of courage as character of those who are thought to be brave in comparison to the brave men (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.8, 1117a28).

The fifth kind of courage is people who are ignorant of the danger are sought to be brave almost as the sanguine people. However, unlike sanguine who have control of themselves the ignorant have no self-reliance (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1116a16-1117a28).

The second kind of moral virtue is temperance which helps us to regulate the bodily pains and pleasure associated with food, drink and sex. This virtue is one of the four cardinal virtues. The virtue of temperance is characterized with individuals' effort to practice moderation or self-restrain in the use of things and as 'the mean' playing its role as the regulation between overindulgence and abstinence. Self-indulgence is according to Aristotle an excess in this virtue of temperance, and he however admit that there are rare cases of individuals having deficit in pleasure and for this reason he decides to name this kind of extreme 'insensible' individuals (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1107b; cf. Adler 1978, p. 103).

The third moral virtue is liberality (or generosity) which deals with giving and taking of money and helps individual to give and spend money well (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1107b10). The generous person gives the right amount of money, for the right reason, in the right way²¹ and to the right people for example to 'the need' the amount which is not too little but also not too much (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1106b1ff, IV.1, 1120a25f). There is possibility of giving money to the wrong people and for the wrong reason too. For example, when one giving money in order to show proud or in order to be love by others something which is not at all a good reason to give money, time or services away. A generous person gives all that she or he gives because she or he recognize the real need and wanting to do something for other people as determined by reason. In thinking about happiness and community, one notices that in the virtue of generosity the act of giving does not only involves giving money but also giving time, care and dedication one gives to the people, friends and for those who are in relationship the time one gives to the family wife, husband and children. The extremes in this virtue are prodigality as an excess and meanness as a defect. Aristotle says that in the former extreme an individual exceeds in spending and fall short in taking while in the later extreme and individual exceeds in taking and falls short in spending (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1107b, IV.1, 1119b25ff, 1121a10).

The fourth moral virtue is magnificent which deals also with giving and taking of money but in large amount of money as opposed to virtue of generosity (above) which concerns giving and taking money in small amount. Aristotle made a distinction between

²¹ The idea here is that one does not give the money in order to shame other people uttering the words of undermining particular culture or place. Also, one does not give the money stolen from the neighbour to the person in need. Also, one does not generously give the money while he had too little or equal nothing to offer or giving and fail to meet the needs of the family or people to whom that money belongs for example a father being too generous living the children and wife starving (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1107a1, IV.1, 1120a4ff).

magnificent and liberality where he states: “With regard to money there are also other dispositions — a mean, magnificence (for the magnificent man differs from the liberal man; the former deals with large sums, the latter with small ones) [...]” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1107b15-20), that means it involves spending in great expenditure that is why a magnificent individual is liberal but not necessarily on the other way round (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.2, 1122a18f). Regarding the extremes, the virtue of magnificent has tastelessness and vulgarity as its excess and niggardliness as its deficiency (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.2, 1122a30).

The fifth moral virtue is magnanimity ‘also called proper pride with regard to honour and dishonour’ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.3, 1123b20f). This virtue occurs when an individual in proportion to his ability is striving for greatness in life by pursuing that which is noble, things which shapes one in terms of what is excellent and beneficial as opposed to giving up doing great things (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.3, 1123b). For example, when an individual is working hard to achieve great and honorable things in life despite the difficulties and challenges might occur or might involve during the process. For this reason, the virtue of magnanimity can be referred or attributed to all human being famous and not famous, big and small who are ready to work hard using all the talents and gifts given to them as human being and by the virtue of courage to go outside their comfort zone and sincerely do the best version of themselves. However, excessive of pride and desire of honour lead to what Aristotle called ‘empty vanity’ while undue humility is its deficiency. This is because like in the virtue of magnificent, there is possibilities of desiring honour as one ought, but it can also be more or less desired than one ought. (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1107b21-28). This is paved a way to another virtue called right ambition. The virtue of ambition concerns the sphere of honour and is related to pride in the same way as liberality is related to magnificent. According to Aristotle an ambitious individual is the one who exceed in desire of honour whereas unambitious falls short of it (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.4, 1125b1f).

Aristotle talks also about good temper which is the mean in the virtue of patience, and which regulates the feeling of anger in an individual. The extremes in this virtue are irascibility (irascible) for the individual who exceed in anger and un-irascibility (unirascible) for the individual who falls short of the feeling of anger (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1108a4-9).

Moreover, Aristotle discusses three more virtues which are similar because of their concern with “intercourse in words and action” but differ by the fact that “one concerns with truth” and “the other two virtues concern with pleasantness” that is one of them “exhibited in

giving amusement” and the other exhibited “in all the circumstances of life”. (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1108a10-14).

First regarding the virtue of truthfulness, the mean or the intermediate is called truthful. The extreme for the virtue of truthfulness are on one hand ‘boastfulness’ when an exaggeration (excess) in truth occurs and on the other hand it is ‘mock modesty’ when the truth is understated (deficiency) (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1108a23-25, IV.7, 1127a15f).

Ready wit this is also the intermediate or the mean to the pleasantness in the giving of amusement and when there is excess it is called ‘buffoonery’ and when an individual falls short of it is called boor or ‘boorishness’ (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1108a).

Another moral virtue is friendliness which is the mean to an individual who is pleasant in a right way. The two extremes are ‘obsequious for an individual who exceeds and if an individual has no end in view, and ‘a flatterer’ if she or he is aiming at his own advantage and an individual who falls short is ‘unpleasant’ identified by a character of quarreling and surly someone who is unfriendly or impolite (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1108a26-30). Aristotle mentioned also modest as the mean between bashful individual that is one who is too much or ashamed of everything and an shameless individual the one who fall short or who is not ashamed of anything at all (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1108a35f).²²

The virtue of justice is the last in this classification of moral virtues. Generally, justice is a kind of state of character which make people disposed to do, to act and to wish that which is just and if one does, or act or wish otherwise, then one’s act becomes unjust. He named the lawful and fair individual as the just because she or he exercises virtues as a whole while the unlawful and the unfair are the unjust because of exercise of vice as whole (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.1, 1129aff). That means with justice we mean the demand that people have what is really rightfully theirs be it properties such as wealth and income, be it power and opportunities and all these things are distribute equally to avoid the worries that might appear to people feeling treated unjustly. Aristotle divide justice into two senses: first justice in a broader or general sense and second justice in a specific or particular sense (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.1, 1130aff). This virtue of justice in the former sense according to Aristotle has to do with conformity to authorities, to the laws, to the moral standards and to the tradition of the community as well as contributing to the happiness, to the well-being of the state and welfare of the people (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.1, 1130a-b). The virtue of justice in the later sense

²² This ‘mean’ is important especial when an individual recognizes that in his actions she or he is morally or socially wrong, that can be a good initiative force to compensate or repair the wrong and be aware of it in the future (cf. MacIntyre 2007, pp. 14f).

means ‘fairness or equality’²³ and this is further divided into two kinds first the distributive justice and second the corrective or restorative justice (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.3, 1131a4).

The distributive justice is the one which concerns fairness or equity that means the proportionate or equitable distribution of things such as goods, services, honours, recognitions, needs and provisions to different individuals who have just claims to share them (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.1, 1131a10ff). This is very interesting because Aristotle carefully observes the community that and sees that not all people are equal. There is variation among them in terms of rank, education, position, status, stature, assignment and for this reason he thought people should necessarily be treated equitably not in the same or equal way²⁴ and he thought that ‘the just’ ‘involves at least four terms’ and in some cases ‘according to merit’ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.3, 1131a-b). Similarly, justice is a proportionate²⁵ of goods, wealth, resource, honour, benefit, favour among community individuals. For example, individual differ in the amount of food they can take some eat more some eat less. Justice therefore is giving those who have more need of food more amount of food and less to those who need only be little among of food otherwise it will be unjust. The same applies to training and education Aristotle means that a good teacher or trainer will divide the exercise proportionally that means she or he will provide more tasks, assignments, or requirements to the students who are more advance or fast learners compare to the students who are not advance or slow learners otherwise it will be unfair and unjust to both of the group if the teacher will do the opposite. Aristotle demonstrates this idea with the example of line drawn from A to B, then B to C in equal division (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.4, 1132a30-1132b20, V.5, 1133b-1134a15; cf. Bavetta et al. 2014, p. 64).

The corrective or restorative justice is the one which concerns the restoration of the injustices or unfair acts done whereby the individual or state (perpetrator) owed is deprived of gaining or acquiring the unfair gain or its results and therefore take the responsibility to restore or return what the individual (victim) ought to have and so regulates the contractual

²³ Aristotle hold that justice implies a relation to persons, to things and to a just distribution.

²⁴ Aristotle insists in the consideration of education for the common good prescribed by the law when it come to the justice in distribution of good and services (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.2, 1130b25-1131a).

²⁵ Aristotle thinks that, that which the just is, should be ‘the proportional’ that is, not too much and not too small and he considers also that which violates ‘the proportional’ to be the unjust. Furthermore, Aristotle suggested that in the case of evil, ‘the lesser evil is rather to be chosen than the greater’ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.3, 1132b16f). One could think here on a not well-placed conception of political justice for example on the case between ‘the oligarchs’ to whom the thought would be that those who are superior in wealth should have superior political rights while ‘the democrats’ would oppositely to that hold that those who are equal in free birth should also have equal political rights. We remember here these two conceptions are not good because they are according to Aristotle not corresponding to the end of the city-state, which is good life, a life shaped by noble actions (cf. *Politics*, III.8, 1280b39-1281a4).

relationships between these two people (cf. Fabre 2007, pp. 133ff).²⁶ A good state therefore ensures an efficient and faithfully implementation of justice to his citizen while at the same time protects them against unjust acts and transactions.

After we have discussed the moral virtues, we turn to the intellectual virtues. Now at the begin of the moral virtue we say they are importance to the life of happiness because in one of its ingredients shows that moral virtues are the mean relative to us which is determined by right reason. In this sense there should be sorts of intellectual perfections in order to have flourish of the moral virtues that guides decision and actions toward the right mean and to form our habits. This is because according to Aristotle one ought not only to do the good but also to know the good. According to Aristotle also the soul is divided into two parts, the first one is the irrational part which includes things like emotion and appetites that is perfected by the moral virtues and the second one is the rational part which has to do with the perfection of reason itself. According to Aristotle, reason is divided mainly into theoretical and practical, and the third thing included by him to that is artistic ‘art or *Techne*’ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.4.). With theoretical it means the ability to know something especial eternally truths, with practical it means know things practically especial what to do and artistic means how to make things. The interesting thing is whereas the theoretical and practical part of reason are ‘intellectual virtues’ Aristotle believes that ‘art’ although it is a good thing it is not intellectual reason (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xxix).²⁷

1.2.3.2 The Intellectual Virtues

The intellectual virtues according to Aristotle are the one which are partly natural given (by birth) and partly grow and acquired through instruction or teaching. These are different from the moral virtues which come about only as a result of cultivating good habit, which means through practicing of the virtues (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.1, 1103a15). They are habits or disposition of the rational part of the soul that helps an individual to do things in excellence way especial to arrive at truth. The intellectual virtues are divided into chief intellectual virtues and minor intellectual virtues. We begin explanation with the former and then after that we tackle the latter.

²⁶ Unlike other virtues in which individual exercises them in their own affairs, Aristotle considers the virtue of justice “a complete virtue in its full sense” because it is an “actual exercise of complete virtue” and with the term ‘complete’ he means also an individual who possess the virtue of justice exercises it not only on her or himself but toward another (*Nicomachean Ethics*, V.2, 1129b30).

²⁷ Virtue is for Aristotle, something that perfects the human soul, it is an excellence of the soul. While theoretical and practical part of reason perfect the human soul art perfects the object that is being made since it aims at the good of the object and not of the subject and therefore it does not seem to necessarily make an individual who made them great or virtuous. For that reason, Aristotle thinks that “any activity that activities that are ends in themselves have more values than those who has an end beyond itself (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, X.7, 1177a-b).

The first intellectual virtue is scientific knowledge (demonstrative knowledge of the necessary and eternal). Aristotle describe the intellectual virtue of scientific knowledge as “a state of capacity to demonstrate, and has the other limiting characteristics which we specify in the *Analytics*; * for it is when a man believes in a certain way and the starting-points are known to him that he has scientific knowledge, since if they are not better known to him than the conclusion, he will have his knowledge only incidentally.” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.4, 1139b30f).

The second intellectual virtue is art (knowledge of how to make things). According to him there is difference between ‘making’ and ‘acting’. In this sense he thought that art is the matter of making and not of acting. (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.4, 1140a1ff). For example, he pointed out that all art is concerned with coming into being. The intellectual virtue of art according to Aristotle, is therefore “a state concerned with making, involving true reasoning, and lack of art on the contrary is a state concerned with making, involving a false course of reasoning; both are concerned with the variable” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.4, 1140a20).

The third intellectual virtue is prudence or practical wisdom in Greek *phronēsis* (Wolf 2007, p. 265) that is, (knowledge of how to secure the ends of human life). The man of practical wisdom argued Aristotle that is credited by being “in some particular respect when they have calculated well with a view to some good end which is one of those that are not the object of any art.” It is also “a true and reasoned state of capacity to act with regard to the things that are good or bad for man.” With this claim Aristotle believed that such individuals with such kind of virtue are open minded “because they can see what is good for themselves and what is good for men in general” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.5, 1140a29f).

The fourth intellectual virtue is intuitive reason (knowledge of the principles from which science proceeds). This is the knowledge of the first principle from which that which is scientifically known follows. (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.6, 1140b31f).

The fifth and last intellectual virtue is philosophic wisdom (the union of intuitive reason and science). Wisdom is “the most finished of the forms of knowledge” that’s why the wise man is the one who “knows what follows from the first principles,” as well as who “possess truth about the first principles.” It is as mentioned above “intuitive reason combined with scientific knowledge”, and this distinction is made by Aristotle because he believes that wisdom “is that which considers well the various matters concerning itself,” and “to that one will entrust such matters.” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.7, 1141a16ff). After explaining the chief intellectual virtues let us now turn to the minor intellectual virtues as explained too according to the translation of Sir David Ross and Lesley Brown.

The first such minor intellectual virtue is ‘good deliberation’. By deliberation Aristotle mean the act and capability of aiming in accordance with calculation at the best for man of things attainable by action. It involves therefore, aiming to ‘attain what is good and right in terms of both the end, the manner and the time’ through inquiring and calculation. It is correctness of thinking which involves reasoning (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.9, 1142b1f).

The second minor intellectual virtue is called ‘understanding’. This argued Aristotle that it is about the things which may become subjects of questioning and deliberating. Understanding has the same object as practical wisdom but it is not the same with practical wisdom because whereas on one side practical wisdom “issues command with and end of what ought to be done or not to be done”, understanding on the other side only judges. Understanding is called also “learning or exercise of knowledge especially applicable to the exercise of the faculty of opinion for the purpose of judging of what someone else says about matters with which practical wisdom is concerned and of judging soundly or well” (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.10, 1143a1-15).

The third minor intellectual virtue is ‘judgment’ is the right discrimination of the equitable. It is consisting of first, ‘sympathetic judgment’ which discriminate what is equitable in a correct way and second ‘correct judgment’ which is that which judges what is true. According to Aristotle: judgment, understanding, practical wisdom and intuitive reason converge to the same point because all these faculties are concerning with ultimates (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI.10, 1143a20-b15). The next discussion is how an individual and community acquires the virtue described above.

1.2.4 Happiness Attainable Through the Course of Exercise during a Whole Lifetime

This part now aims to present the idea of happiness as a lifetime exercise, starting with the way moral virtues are acquired and the way they ‘lie in a mean’. In other words, the next question will be: how does one achieve that *eudaimonia*, or how does one become ‘*eudaimon*’? In the *Eudemian Ethics*, the question is posed: what is the good life and how is it to be acquired? (*Eudemian Ethics*, 1.1, 1214a15). Several answers were offered by Aristotle to the former question. A good life means the one that embraces wisdom, virtue, pleasure, honour, reputation, riches, and culture. For the latter question, he said that this kind of life (the good life) is acquired by nature, discipline, divine favour, and luck (*Eudemian Ethics*, 1.1, 1214a32, b9). The development of Aristotle’s argument leads to some changes to these two questions about the good life. This is because, as we remember, Aristotle deals mostly with

things which human beings can achieve in this sense²⁸: “If happiness comes purely by nature or by luck or by grace, then it will be beyond most people’s reach and they can do nothing about it” (Kenny 2004 p. 266, cf. *Eudemian Ethics*, 1.3, 1215a15, cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4, 1095b1-10, I.91099b10f).

The challenge that arises when one tries to ponder with Aristotle on the question about the things that make life worth living includes negative occurrences in life such as sickness or pain. Certain patients who find themselves in situations of great suffering may want to give up life due to factors that make life not worth living. Alternatively, when one considers childhood events, an adult will not want to start behaving like a child again.

Furthermore, there are events in adult life that only serve as means to an end and therefore do not make life worth living in themselves (*Eudemian Ethics*, 1.5, 1215b15-31; Kenny 2004, p. 267). However, Aristotle has already suggested the criteria for good life. One of these is that it must be an end in itself, for example, the pleasure of food, drink, and sex which seems too brutish to be taken as the ultimate end for human life. But when such pleasures are combined with the pleasure of aesthetics and intellectuality, they become constructive to human beings.

Therefore, the changes that were made by Aristotle from the above list of ‘what good life is’, reduced it to three elements: wisdom which corresponds to philosophical life, virtue to political life, and pleasure to the voluptuary. These three forms of life—wisdom (or *phronesis*), virtue (or *arête*), and pleasure (or *hēdonē*)—are explained in detail by Aristotle and he claims that happiness incorporates the attraction of all three of them²⁹ (cf. Kenny 2004, p. 267).

First of all, in order to achieve happiness, the metaphysical analysis of potentiality and actuality is applied by Aristotle. According to him, there is a difference between a state (*hexis*) and its use (*chreia*) or exercise (*energeia*), whereby virtue and wisdom are both states while happiness is an activity—but also ‘a use or exercise of virtue’. Although happiness cannot be identified with either of them (wisdom and moral virtue because of their different states [*hexis*], they are relevant contributors to individual and communal happiness, something which the community should therefore invest in (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 10.8, 1178a16-18; cf. Kenny 2004, p. 267).

²⁸ According to Aristotle an individual acquires virtues much as she or he do skills such as making or furnishing a table in a carpentry, playing a musical instrument like guitar, or cooking a delicious food. For Aristotle in the course of performing these actions of moral and nonmoral skills individuals should necessarily do trainings and practices which then creates commitment, perseverance and endurance. The question of obligation play a less or no role in this account of acquiring the virtues. (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Irwin, 1103a32–1103b1; Beauchamp and Childress 2019 p. 14/25 digital).

²⁹ That means, in principle, people can lead either a virtuous-joyful life, a responsible-political life or a contemplative-philosophical life.

Thus, according to Aristotle, one achieves happiness via the virtuous activity of the soul³⁰, and the word he used for virtue—as we have seen—is excellence in character, *arête*, which means to live virtuously, expressing the best version of oneself in successive moments.³¹ This means making a comparison between ‘A’, ‘what one is capable of’ and ‘B’, ‘what one actually does’. There often is a gap between what one is capable of being in a moment and what one actually is in that given moment. In that gap is where one experiences anxiety, regret, and depression. When one closes the gap between ‘A’ and ‘B’ by living in virtuous activity of the soul as Aristotle described it in his ethics, one experiences joy in the sense of flourishing or *eudaimonia*. By paying attention to the voice of that which one is capable of and doing it then, one becomes able to live with integrity, i.e., as the highest version of oneself (*arête*) (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xii-xiii). The following considerations of capability provide a convincing argument for the Aristotle-Nyerere discussion that will be further developed in the coming chapters especial with the contribution from contemporary philosophers like Martha Nussbaum who present arguments about developing capabilities (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 28ff).

Another example Aristotle uses in connection to the way happiness is attained is the term ‘Olympics’ (which were formed in 776 BC in Olympia not far from Athens) as a metaphor. According to Aristotle, in the Olympic Games, the prize is awarded not by just looking at those who look the best. Rather, the prize goes to the one who is in the arena, who is competing, which means to the person who is in action. Aristotle compares this to life: one cannot merely know the ideas of happiness or simply talk about them to experience happiness. Rather, one must put the ideas into action as Aristotle himself contend: “[...] the present inquiry does not aim at theoretical knowledge like the others (for we are inquiring not in order to know what virtue is, but in order to become good,* since otherwise our inquiry would have been of no use) [...]” (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.2, 1103b26-29) and this practical activity of the virtuous life must be consistently because for Aristotle “one swallow does not make a summer”. This means that one virtuous act does not make a person *eudaemon*.³² One much rather needed to string together a series of these virtuous acts consistently over an extended

³⁰ Aristotle argues that happiness is acquired through life of virtue or excellence character. He thought that since human have rational souls their function is to live the life of reasoning by striving and doing their best seeking the truth and should not only fulfil their desire but cultivating virtue with the help of the rational thought in order to achieve this highest good, happiness (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.13, 1102a5ff; Wolf 2007, p. 47f).

³¹ According to the Dalai Lama, the accomplishment of most of the things one wants to achieve can be made easier through ‘constant familiarity and training’ and it is through this training that one can change and transform oneself (cf. Ben-Shahar 2007, p. 170).

³² Aristotle believes that the requirement for being happy in the real sense it should involve both “a complete virtue and a complete life” (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.9, 1100a 4-5).

period. Only then will one experience the joy of living with the integrity of virtuous activity of the soul (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1098a16-19; II.3, tr. Ross).

Furthermore, Aristotle talks about the doctrine of ‘the mean’. Since virtue as the activity of the soul is something which one is aiming for, Aristotle says, virtue has a vice of deficiency and vice of excess. Virtue is right at the mean, that is, not too little and not too much (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1106a25-35; cf. Wolf 2007, p. 72ff).³³ At this point, Aristotle discusses the different kinds of virtues we mentioned above. When he talks about ‘courage’ he means a virtue that vitalizes all the other virtues. Without courage, one is bound to live with ideas remaining ideas only. Courage is relevant for enabling a person to put the ideas into action, especially under difficult circumstances. For Aristotle, on the one hand, if one feels fear and takes no action then one has a vice of deficiency (he is a coward) and on the other hand, if one never feel fear that is not a virtue either, because that leads to rash behaviour, which is the vice of excess (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.7, 1107b1-16, cf. *Eudemian Ethics*, II.3, 1221b36-1221a12).

Aristotle’s emphasis in this doctrine of the mean is that individuals have different tendencies, whereby some individuals tend to move too far on the side of the deficiency-extreme and some tend to fall somewhat too far on the other side towards the excess-extreme. Aristotle consequently argues that one needed to know oneself, to know where one’s own tendency lies, and correct that tendency. Even though the statement might seem like a truism: Attaining the virtuous mean is truly difficult. A person attaining to it must bend himself in either direction that points towards the mean and that is not a one-time act. Rather, it demands continuous activity, with iterating successive moments of action, whereby one will be able to notice whether one was moving forward, growing and flourishing (*Nicomachean Ethics*, II.6, 1106b5ff). It is important to remember that for Aristotle life has a purpose, that the nature of humans is to be happy, and it is toward happiness that each human being strives. To understand this process toward the end and grasp concretely Aristotle’s idea of flourishing (happiness), we dive in deeply into a reflection to the role of the virtues explained in part 1.2.3.1 and part 1.2.3.2 above because these are the ones which Aristotle suggests that they should worked upon to have a good life that led to happiness or *eudaimonia* (cf. Frost 1962,

³³ According to Wolf, for example, to know the right middle (intermediate or mean) one might think of someone who wants is building a house, knows the stones, blocks in the right amount, and use them in order. Wolf asks how does the builder know how much, from which type of material he should take? Therefore, she concludes that the right means does not mean the calculation between the little and much rather the middle it means in the sense of taking from each material only that much that at the result brings about the possibly good house, and its job as a house should be possibly good fulfilled (cf. Wolf 2007, p. 72).

pp. 14ff). This will be helped by reflective and evaluative act to his method trying to grasp what Aristotle believe and wished that we should become after we have acquired the virtues.

The understanding of Aristotle's philosophical method is challenging for many philosophers because the writings available by which his philosophical method can be observed are among many his lecture notes (cf. Irwin 1999, p. xiv, cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. vii; cf. Davis 1908, p. 5). Methodologically, Aristotle approaches lecturing very systematically. His goal is to create categories and definitions that help him understand the world (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. vii). His background and interest in biology, particularly his method of characterizing and understanding species, are manifested too in his philosophy. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle demonstrates his devotion towards characterizing and understanding specific species of humans.³⁴ Other Aristotelian works display a similar argumentative structure.

In his *Physics*, Aristotle categorizes the natural world generally, especially providing an investigation into the principles and order of nature according to which Aristotle believed all natural processes can be explained. He would for instance argue that all the changes or processes we see happening involve something coming into being from its opposite. That is, a thing comes into being by acquiring its distinctive form. A baby, for example, becomes an adult; a seed becomes a mature plant, and so on (*Physics*, II.1, 192b32-33 Barnes trans.; cf. *Eudemian Ethics* 1216a11-1216a27; cf. SparkNotesEditors "Physics: Books I to IV").

In his work *De Anima* he characterizes and strives to understand different kinds of souls. According to Aristotle, there are different kinds of souls, such as plant souls, animal souls, and human souls. The term 'soul' (Greek: *psyche*; Latin: *anima*) refers to a source of movement. It is an intrinsic principle of animal and plant life, thus, to animate and therefore everything that moves has a soul (cf. *De Anima*, I.3, 402a7-10, *Nicomachean Ethics* I.7, 1097b25 ff., tr. Ross; cf. Polansky 2007, p. 1). According to Anthony Kenny, Aristotle conceives of a soul as "the actuality of a body that has life, where life means the capacity for self-sustenance, growth, and decay" (Kenny 2004, p. 242f, *De Anima* 2.412a20, b5-6). Aristotle is therefore interested in categorizing these different kinds of souls and understanding which things fall into each category and how they relate to these categories. It is therefore appropriate to think of him as a scientist. When one reads the *Nicomachean Ethics*, this text helps one to think about the way in which Aristotle is systematically trying to categorize all aspects of being a virtuous human being (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xx).

³⁴ Alasdair MacIntyre in his description of Aristotle's ethics he mentioned that the *Nicomachean Ethics* is "the most brilliant set of lecture notes ever written" and it is also referred as "the canonical text for Aristotle's account of the virtues" in which his "mature positions are to be found" (cf. MacIntyre 2007, p.147).

Remarkable, when one reflects this method in connection to ethics,³⁵ one observes that Aristotle has no difficulty applying the same set of concepts to human beings. This is where the *Nicomachean Ethics* and its theme of happiness as *eudaimonia* or flourishing of human individuals in the community come in. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle carefully considers what kind of material a human being is made of and what a human being's form is. Here one should not think of 'form' only in terms of shape. Rather, one should think of form in terms of aspects such as the human rational mind. The word *telos* is the Greek word for the 'end' or the 'final purpose' of a matter, also regarding its form and material. One can thus understand the *telos* of a human being as an indication whether a particular human being is flourishing or not, whether a particular human is succeeding in being that which he or she is supposed to be.³⁶

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle is considering human form and purpose. When humans depart too far from their particular excellences, that is, from the particular behaviour that is typically human, they cease being a good human. This means that the person stopped flourishing in the same way that an animal or a plant would stop flourishing if he would be interfered in its natural developmental process (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xi-xii). The question therefore is: how do we make human beings live as excellently as possible according to their typically human purpose? Somebody who can most closely follow human purposes, will be most successful and flourishing. That is the project of ethics, that is what Aristotle is interested describing to us and he is interested in motivating us to pursue. He wants to present to us the vision of what it is to be human and show us what it looks like to be a healthy, flourishing human being. Furthermore, he wants to convince us to try to pursue this aim³⁷ (cf. *Nicomachean Ethic*, I.3, 1094b15ff). One is supposed to try to become that very being that he is describing, that is, a healthy, flourishing human being. In many ways, his text might at first seem very academic, but its potential impact is oriented towards spiritual formation. This is a text that is asking one to think about the kind of shape, the kind of form one has.

Furthermore, one must ask whether one is existentially flourishing or whether there is a way to further develop one's virtues. Thus, virtuous thinking will determine: 'I am doing human things and I am doing it as a human should!' Therefore, Aristotle is helping us to

³⁵ Aristotle is one of the great philosophers whose defense of an ethical approach based on the concept of virtue is most valuable to the contemporary society because he "seems to combine rigor with concreteness, theoretical power with sensitivity to the actual circumstances of human life and choice in all their multiplicity, variety and mutability" (cf. Nussbaum 1987, p. 1).

³⁶ Therefore, flourishing is weighbridge that determines the developmental steps of any creature with respect to the amount of life it has and the range of innate capacities possessed by it (cf. Kallhoff *et al.* 2018, p. 51).

³⁷ It is to have a right plan for living in order to achieve the good life being thoughtful about ends to be pursued and the means for achieving. He thinks that an unplanned life is not worth living because it cannot be lived well and one does not know exactly where life is heading (cf. Adler 1978, pp. 77-78).

perceive where we are doing human things well and where we are not. He aids our quest to pursue what it is to be human, what it is to embody a flourishing, healthy human life. For Aristotle, a human being should work hard to develop herself or himself as individual to become a morally good or flourishing person.

In conclusion of this first part of Aristotle concept of happiness in one word we can say that all that he in his virtue ethics urges us to do in our struggle in life is more than just being a moral or noble exemplar, and I think he mean all the struggles should be directed on the question of what constitute ‘good character’ especial by using the proper tools he recommended to us among others wisdom or knowledge of the good and practice of it in our daily undertaking. This will have a positive effect on the community or society in which that individual live (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.9, 1099b25-30).

In this perspective ‘the community in Aristotle’s view’ will be our next discussion after we have seen the nature of individual flourish, well-being or happiness. In order to enrich the discussion, the following virtues namely: courage³⁸, justice, magnanimity and friendship will be used as example and be further discussed this time in connection to the community life because these touches the theme of happiness and community for both individual and community in a special way. However, during that discussion, a reference will be made on the other virtues for example wisdom and intellectual ones which are also important to individual and community happiness.

1.3 Aristotle’s View on Community Life

We have just seen how Aristotle has argued that happiness is the ultimate good of all human aims. It also is a continuous activity of living in accordance with the appropriate virtues. We have seen that being happy is no once-off activity, as is commonly conceived of. Rather, it is a continuous, committed exercise which involves evaluation. It must be tested properly according to the philosophical method of the moral virtues, and intellectual virtues described above which accounted the nature of individual happiness or well-being (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.13, 1103a5f tr. Ross, cf. Kenny 2004, p. 81). The thesis will now present several arguments about the community, a place where Aristotle thinks that happiness is found because he considers the state as one of the chief means through which an individual and community attains to happiness (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1097b8-11, IX.9, 1169b16-19 IX.9, 1169b10-20; cf. Irwin 1999, p. xxiii; cf. Davis 1908, p. 3). The best reference to

³⁸ I think courage is very important to individual and community because of its good qualities among others the act of facing dangers of fear and death, and in building a good sense of humor and a person to whom other can be relied: Alasdair MacIntyre states that: „Courage is important, not simply as a quality of individuals, but as the quality necessary to sustain a household and a community“ (MacIntyre 2007, p.122).

begin thinking about his notion of community is his *Politics*, a famous work in Western political philosophy. The flow of thoughts will start by present the meaning and scope of community, origins and structure of the community (city state or *polis*), then present its goal—that is ‘good life’—which this state or community should attain and then present ‘the how’, or the ways, or steps and methods (such as education, self-reliance, human relationship, constitution and good governance) should the community practice to pursue and reach that goal of good life and happiness.

1.3.1 The Meaning and Scope of Community

The community mean to Aristotle as a structural unity and partnership between the people living together in a place where the important values, character, the spirit of participation in carrying out different functions and actions are passed and learned by its individuals especially with the definite purpose of thriving and achieving the common highest good of all its members. If we refer to previous discussion Aristotle was mentioned as keen observer of the natural world. He argued that everything that one sees on it has a tendency to develop over time and have a purpose.³⁹ For example, the purpose of man was happiness—so too with community. Aristotle uses has natural origins elements as sample or pattern to indicate the way the community or the city-states carry its nature and meaning but its scope goes further to good life in large and wider community. Therefore, with this first argument that every community is established with a specific view or for some purpose that is good Aristotle pointed for us a central view or focus of his thesis by which the all the community efforts and activities ought to work with. Once the good (especially the highest one) is served in the city state then Aristotle believed in this way the community come into life. Despite having observed many communities, for him the city state—which was the highest form of governmental social organisation in his day—was or is the highest and best community of all.⁴⁰ And I think the reason for why he chose the city state to be the highest form of community is because of what he pointed out in the *Nicomachean Ethics* that “For even if the end is the same for a single man and for a state, that of the state seems at all events something greater and more complete whether to attain and to preserve [...]”. There are many different communities, of which the city state is the best. The most authentic community that exists

³⁹ In terms of nature, Aristotle thinks plants and animals have a natural existence because they have a nature or an internal principle which explain the way it comes into being and behave (*Physics*, II.1, 192b32-33). For example, if one put an acorn into a soil it will grow into an oak tree because of an inherent natural tendency imparted in it. When it comes to human beings Aristotle would argue that they have a natural function (cf. *Eudemian Ethics*, II.1, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, *Politics*, I.2.) in this background he argues in his *Politics* that man is by nature a political animal adapted for the life in the city state or community.

⁴⁰ The term ‘community’ in Aristotle’s thought is to be understood in two senses. Firstly: when “a group of associates place a certain number of goods in common”, and secondly: “the state of certain goods that are in common, that being-in-common of something” or of goods (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b10ff).

therefore must, according to Aristotle's sense, aim at the most authentic good (cf. *Politics*, I.1, 1252a1f).

Furthermore, it seems that, for Aristotle, the bigger the community is, the better (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.2, 1094b7-10) unlike his Master Socrates who claim that "the greater the unity of the state the better" something which was for Aristotle difficult to imagine (cf. *Politics*, II.2, 1261a2ff). In this way Aristotle considers the question of the size of the community right from the time of its establishment starting at small level all the way through into a big one. He was convinced that, in every step the community becomes more self-sufficient, providing for happiness by creating opportunities for participation, ability and more room to specialize in a series of tasks and developing skills and the like—occasions that in a small group like family are not feasible or easily practiced. Aristotle also believed that lower (or small) communities play their role as the building blocks, and grow naturally in terms of a multiplicity, a plurality, to form a large community (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1253b1f). However, Aristotle does not end his argument about the community to as only a natural thing, rather he made further steps as he thinks that states are formed by men "to secure a bare subsistence; but the ultimate object and end of the state is the good life" (Davis 1908, p. 7; cf. *Politics*, III.9, 1280a6). So the state has two aims: 'on one hand the state aimed at satisfaction of individual's social instinct and on the other hand it fits her or him for the good life' (cf. Davis 1908, p. 12).

For him, the *polis* is a society of many free citizens who have equal rights and who form the community of the city-state (cf. *Politics* III.12.). That is why he also defines man as a being that which is designed for the community of the *polis*. For him, on the one hand, human beings are bound to the society of their fellow human beings, on the other hand, the community is dependent on every single free human being, since it is made up of a large number of individuals. Let us look the way he structured the community.

1.3.2 The Origins and the Ultimate Structure of the City-State (the Polis) Community

Starting with argument about the origins of the community, originally the development of city state (also the *polis* or community) is "from simpler forms of community" which, according to Aristotle, "have arisen from natural needs" (Rapp 2012, p. 57). Aristotle mention social communication (or speech) between individuals, procreation, survival, seeking for help, social basic needs, cooperation social contact, as well as mutual support as examples of motivating factors that shows that the state is natural especial at its early stages (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b8f). As a result, the following structure of the state is formed in stages along the way.

The first stage of the city state (or community) is ‘the family’. This is the association created by nature for the supply of every day wants for its members. In his argument, he talks about several senses of family community: The first sense is a community of male and female—I anticipate including children as the product of the couple, as is the case with other animals and plants with the potentiality to pro-create. So, Aristotle sees for the sake procreation here as a natural need among them (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1252a25ff; I.12, I.2, 1252b5).⁴¹ The second sense is the community of natural ruler and subject that is, master and slave (*Politics*, I.2, 1252a25ff; cf. Ackrill 1981, p. 101). In Aristotle’s terms about this: “[...] there must of necessity be a conjoining of persons who cannot exist without one another [...] and the natural ruling and ruled, on account of preservation” (*Politics*, I.2, 1252a25ff). Aristotle says that out of these two relationships (male or female and master or slave) comes the family (cf. *Politics*, I.1, 1252b5). The family—in respect of what it later means—therefore does not only include the nuclear family but also the extended family and perhaps also the servants that work for the family. The two relations that of male and female, and that of master and slave which exists to satisfy man’s daily needs lead to the formation of household (*Politics*, I.2, 1253b).⁴²

The second stage of city state (or community) is the village. This is wider community which occurs when several families united with an association that aims at something more than the supply of the daily needs. Therefore, in order to be able to better secure survival, and to satisfy a wider range of needs, several households (each of which can only meet the most basic needs) join together to form a village (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1252b5-6f). This stage of man social development came after the two preliminary ones man and woman as well as master and slave. In Aristotle’s argument we learned that “by nature a village seems to be above all an extension of a household” (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b16). It is ‘natural’ too for the eldest to rule in the village. Even today, tribal societies respect the eldest or the strongest, and the elders are mostly highly respected as leaders (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 8f). The eldest naturally becomes king in the tribal context. Why do tribal rules (groups) tend to revere and obey elders? It is on account of their long life, greater experience, and greater knowledge. It stands to reason that current societies and generations need to hold this principle in high regard. Some would think and say that the elders can be compared to the father over the household. Changes have however already taken place. Because the father’s rule of the household has to do with

⁴¹ Aristotle believes that a city-state come into being because human beings are by nature political animal, who naturally want to live together and as community flourish together (cf. *Politics*, I.2).

⁴² Aristotle describes a household to have consisted of slaves and freemen. Then he mentions elements of a family starting with the least: master and slave, husband and wife and father and children or ‘parent and child’ (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1253b1f).

biology, in Aristotle's view, so the father of the family can be young but he will still be in the leadership position. In a village, however, it becomes right for the eldest to rule because of wisdom and not just because of gender or some other qualities (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VI. 8.). Aristotle argues that the village is natural because people naturally want to live well. Therefore, they naturally congregate to collaborate—again similar, as we shall see later, to Nyerere's thought in the implementation of rural socialism (cf. Nyerere 1973, pp. 6f). A state—as we will see in the third stage—is an association of similar persons whose aim is living the best possible life. If one family tries to live on its own and supply all its needs in what we now call a single homestead, it will probably not live as well as several communities or several families who have come together and built their homesteads together (cf. *Politics*, 1253a18-29). The more they come together, the more there can be an efficient division of labour. Thus, they will have more than just a minimum quota of life supplies for daily needs. They will be moving towards not only a life called self-sufficient but also toward an enjoyable life by cooperating and working together. As villages grow bigger, or when a couple of villages finally come together to constitute the state (as is also described in Nyerere's thought), people will not only attain life's necessities but also many other things. Thus, they gain luxuries, higher education, entertainment, etc., causing life to become much more than just a struggle for survival. When several villages come together and form a state, they are able to transcend the limits of local self-sufficiency for the sake of survival and they can remain in existence for the sake of living well. The great city-state is natural (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b30, 1253a2), and even more than natural (as Aristotle puts it, "prior by nature") compared to the kind of human community that existed before it (*Politics*, I.2, 1253a19). Aristotle says that it reaches the limits of total self-sufficiency. That means, supplying all and everything that human beings want, and not only the things that they need urgently.⁴³ Human beings by nature want to live in civilization and this is natural, but this also really assures that they thrive. In Aristotle's view, people only reach their full potential in a society where they have access to many good things, where they can develop themselves as people, and in self-confidence—as Julius Nyerere and Martha Nussbaum will show us in the coming chapters (cf. Nyerere 1973, pp. 9ff, cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 54ff). Outside of that, they can live happily but they cannot live the best life. Thus, Aristotle says, the state arises for the sake of living, but it remains in existence for the sake of living well – or for that which we may call 'the good life'.

⁴³ People arguably were supposed to behave and engage with their community (indeed their state) in the same way as the relation described by Aristotle. It seems, however, that state policy, education, the governmental system and especially state leaders early started to shun people's rights or confused them, denying the people the occasion to fully participate in that which comes from their nature – the state (cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 22ff).

According to Laurie M. Johnson the Professor of Political Science and Director of the Primary Texts Certificate at Kansas State University:

“Political change, if it is to be solid and permanent, must take into account the nature of the vast majority. If leaders and their people are given unreachable goals of goodness and justice, and if some of them actually try to reach these lofty goals, they will fail. They will fail either because their hearts are not up to the task of transformation or because the world is filled with people who will take full advantage of their moral principles” (Johnson 2015, p. 103).

It should be remembered that, according to Aristotle, what distinguishes man from the rest of other animals is his sense of the good and the bad, the just and the unjust, (cf. *Politics* I.2, 1253a18ff.). For him, ‘the good life’ refers to all things that come with a larger community (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.3, 1094b5-10). All of the connections one might make within the groups which one can be part of lead to higher ends, including the privileges of civic participation, recognition, higher learning, good social services health, infrastructures, quality education standards, freedom, entertainment and the like.

The third stage and the highest form of city state (or community) is the city or state. According to Aristotle, if several villages come together to form a single community, perfect and large and nearly or quite self-sufficient, one can already speak of a state under certain conditions. Aristotle pointed out that the earlier forms and end of the society and state are natural, and he consider also the end especial the self-sufficient one to be the best (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1252b8f). The key difference here is that the previous communities were all about survival that means ‘a union with no deliberative purpose’. Although this is also the first reason for the merger into a *polis*, it is linked to a further goal, namely that of the good life: “The perfect community that is formed from several villages is now [...] the state, which, how one may well say that it has achieved the ultimate goal of complete self-sufficiency, in that it comes into existence for the sake of mere life, but exists for the sake of perfect life.” (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b27ff.). The state according to Aristotle is at best a structure whose legal order aims to “make the citizens good and just” (*Politics*, III.9, 1280b12).

“It is clear that a state is not a mere society, having a common place, established for the prevention of crime and for the sake of exchange. These are conditions without which a state cannot exist; but all of them together do not constitute a state, which is a community of well-being in families and aggregations of families, for the sake of a perfect and self-sufficing life” (*Politics*, III.9, 1280b30ff.).

For this reason, Aristotle considers the state as “a community in noble actions (or good deeds) [...] and not in mere companionship (or living together)” (cf. *Politics* III.9. 1281a 3f.). Also, for him the act of achieving a good life cannot be separated from living together in a community.” (*Politics*, I.2, 1253a14f; cf. Rapp 2012, p. 55). The important thing to note is that: according to Aristotle the state is by nature prior to the family and to the individual

because he considers ‘the whole’ as necessarily prior to ‘the part’. Aristotle states that: an individual “who is unable to live in the society (community) or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a beast or a god” (*Politics*, I.2, 1253a13f). The community life is therefore relevant to make an individual not only complete human being, flourished and happy social being but also to avoid the extreme Aristotle mentioned that is from being god something which is not necessarily given to man and a beast which is also supernatural to man although some might unfortunately under certain circumstances become beast too (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1252b; cf. Ross 1995, p. 71). Also, the important consideration according to Aristotle is that, like an organism, all of the *polis*’ or city state’s, parts are supposed to work alongside each other as part of the whole. The city-state, (*polis*) as the community itself described by Aristotle seems to be a system of human relationships that is complex because it is a mixture of voluntary and coercive, personal and public. Aristotle seems to value the community highly in terms of political relationship, especially in his methodical analysis (cf. *Politics*, III.1, 1274b38-41) but it is also argued that it is not merely a political relationship because relevant things such as the establishment of a satisfying filial relationship, seeking education, professional practices, the gratification of a person’s aspirations, bound to fraternal relationships and most of all forming close personal friendship are open to the individual community. Aristotle and Nyerere believed that it is in the community that one can find good life which ultimately brings about happiness despite having this complex web of human relationships on it (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1252b27ff; cf. Nyerere 1968 p. 51; cf. Davis 1908, p. 7).

This further implies that, even though the ideas of city-state presented by Aristotle directly refers to his community in Greece, his thought could be applicable somewhere else with a similar effect, as is shown in his influence on Nyerere and other contemporary societies’ way of thinking (cf. Davis 1908, pp. 4ff). It seems that, according to Aristotle, the answer regarding the kind of regime needed, as posed at the beginning of this part, would be a mixture in which there is a balance in the interest of different classes while at the same time ensuring that the city is governed according to the rule of law.

Therefore, it comprises not just a set of laws, but rather a partnership between people and the community with the purpose of seeking the good life. This conclusion brings us to Aristotle’s fundamental question in this part of his political thought: which type of regime will best allow people to live according to their nature and achieve happiness? (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 10.9, 1181b12-23). In other words, Aristotle is guiding us to the

question: Which is the best constitution which will ensure or promise a good and happy life to its citizen and community as a whole?

1.3.3 Account of the Good and Good Life

According to Aristotle, in order to be able to answer the question of the “best constitution”, one must first clarify “which is the most desirable life” (*Politics*, VII.1, 1323a 14f.). Aristotle has already given descriptions of good life in which he said that all human effort and struggles are aimed at that which is good, the ultimate good. This is the reason why any individual do anything. He generally describes such goods into two senses: first, the instrumental goods which are desired for the sake of something else and second, the intrinsic goods which are desired for their own sake (*Nicomachean Ethics* I.6. 1096b1ff; cf. Sherman 1989, p. 9).⁴⁴ The later type is the one which is considered to bring about flourish and happiness.

However, according to Aristotle, there is still no single meaning of good even after this distinction.⁴⁵ In this context, Aristotle gives in a specific way the following types of goods. The first types of good are external goods or wealth which includes things such as assets, food, drink, shelter, clothing, and sleep; the second type of goods are goods of the body such as health, vitality, vigor, and pleasure; and the third type are goods of the soul such as virtues knowledge, skill, love, friendship, aesthetic enjoyment, self-esteem, and honor.⁴⁶ According to Aristotle “these are all necessary for happiness” (*Politics*, VII.1, 1323a26; *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.8, 1098b13-16) but hierarchy nonetheless: [For] everyone can observe that [...] the blessed life [...] is far more likely to come to those who are adorned to excess with the excellences of mind and character, while having only a moderate portion of outward goods, as those who have more of the latter than they can use, and are deficient in the former (*Politics*, VII.1, 1323a 41ff.). The most desirable life is therefore the one which is guided by noble actions.

The question of the ‘how’, has been one of Aristotle ways of presenting his thoughts (*Politics*, II.9, 1269a). The good life, happiness, and virtuous of all these are characteristics which are potential to individual human being but which should be actualized regardless their

⁴⁴ In the classification of intrinsic goods (we have virtue of excellence or *arête*, reason, pleasure and honour. Of instrumental goods (we have things like good fortune, wealth, skills and friends). In logical perception: ‘honour and pleasure’ ought to be instrumental or external good that means not complete good but they are considered as intrinsic or complete good because these two goods would be chosen even if nothing else results from them (cf. Sherman 1989, p. 9).

⁴⁵ Somewhere else one might find the concept of the good very detailed sometimes with varied approach but our use of the term the good or good will be in the Aristotle’s context (William 1993, pp. 38ff).

⁴⁶ Mortimer Jerome Adler suggests that the good of the soul might be referred to as or be called “psychological goods” and the good of the body “physical good”. For him we need the later good that is knowledge, knowhow and skill of thinking “not only in order to produce well-made things, but also in order to act well and live well” (cf. Adler 1978, pp. 96-97).

differences. As in Aristotle arguments about the two biological kingdoms in living things, that is, plants and animals found in our universe, human being are relate close to the latter (that of animal kingdom) but differ from them with the faculty of reasoning. The use of the word potentiality is to mean that unlike other animals, the animal 'human' is able to make deliberations and judgment on about what fit them at best by organizing and orientating themselves to this accordingly. That is why plants and other animals they do not have important institutions such as family, village, state, parliament, court, religious, secular, or determine right and wrong, just and unjust, punishment and rewards, and the like as it the case for the human individuals. This is because if every individual posses virtue, and happiness then she or he is fine or excellent and when many of them possess in the same manner then the whole community and its functions will also be fine and excellent (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xiii). From such belief Aristotle proposes an understanding of different forms, by which individuals and community should look like and ways and laws, it should take, use and act upon toward attain of the ultimate good of community life. This part will try to discuss all the important elements and bodies which Aristotle believed are involved in that process of the formation and development of the community. Consequently Aristotle believes also that when these are good practiced would enable every individual and community to earn the good life which is the ultimate goal for the community established at his time and even today. He believed that participation in the political life is one of the best ways to enjoy the ethical or virtuous life with moral education being prioritized in that political community. This is because through participating in the community life the best life of both individual the whole community is guaranteed and they can thrive or flourish and the specific character can be imparted to them and with this they will be made better and equip them with all that they need to do their responsibilities and actions in a good way (cf. *Politics*, VI.1, 1317a-b; cf. Richard, 2002, p. 30).

1.3.4 Citizenship and Its Limitations

Aristotle considers a state as a composite made up of many parts. The important parts which he talks about is the citizenship, that is, the meaning of a citizen and the criteria for belonging in the *polis* or community (*Politics*, III.1, 1275aff). Then discussion will proceed with the account of leadership and governance of the city state or community starting with meaning of leadership, its formation and roles, challenge and limitations. The discussion will also explain the forms of constitutions and the form of rule or governments.

In Aristotelian understanding being a citizen has nothing to do with possession of private rights such as by virtue of being born from parents and living in certain geographical

location as it might generally be understood rather it means having (or acquiring) some rights including possessing political power; ability to participate in deliberative or judicial office (*Politics*, III.1, 1275b18-21) the right to sit on juries and to attend in the council, the assembly and other important bodies of the state in decision making. (cf. *Politics*, III.1, 1275b17ff).⁴⁷ On one hand this definition shows that citizenship is an interactive activity of certain qualified individuals who directly participate in government (community) function in a democratic way of which they are in one heart. This further implies that it gives to the citizen the spirit of accountability because the act of participating in deliberation and decision making there are times whereby there will be challenges and therefore they will have the duty to discussion and find resolution of whether a particular thing of the community has advantages and disadvantages, acts which are good and not so good (or evil), there will be treatment with just and other day with unjust, friendly and unfriendly, moral and immorally. After a responsibly doing of the deliberation on such important matters of the community, what is decided and passed will be made into law or regulations for the whole community but which will be citizen by product (cf. David and Miller 1991, pp. 191-113; Onwuatiegwu 2020, pp. 62f). On the other hand this definition of a citizen Aristotle implies limitation in the sense of difficulties involved for a good number of human being to qualify for citizenship. For example it seems with such determining criteria for someone to be a citizen in Aristotle account will necessarily have to consider her or his age, gender and capacity (authority, ability). These criteria affect on the first place children, women seniors slaves and aliens resident. Consequently, when individuals from these classes mentioned are too young or too old they are excluded for the reason of 'age'. If they are female (women) it means they are put in lower status for the reason that they cannot control their passion because they are assumed to be incapable of virtue (cf. *Politics*, I.12, 1259b), and therefore they are excluded probably also because of people's mentality about gender and inequalities existed in the time of Aristotle (cf. Johnson 2015, pp. 75ff). When the individuals are too old, too young or disable they are excluded in terms of their ability. These criteria will similarly disqualify them both from ability to happiness and from the right to fully participate in community matters especially when it comes on the question of leadership as we will see afterwards. According to Aristotle do not have the deliberative element to rule. Non slave children have the element to rule but they lack maturity and for this he considers the person of children to be incomplete. It seems he thought that children should wait until the age of maturity to count as

⁴⁷ It is argued that the political power possessed by a citizen must be acquired in a just way (cf. Davis 1908, p. 11) such that a person has 'standing to demand' as Margaret Gilbert call it (cf. Gilbert 2018, pp.1 of 26f or pp. 68f digital).

citizen whereby at this age they can make decisions and participate in community functions (cf. Sherman 1989, pp. 174ff). Non-slave women have this element to rule but they lack authority. I think this exclusion of women is most likely because of the unequal treatment between girls and boys or women and men, following a tradition whereby men as ‘head of houses’ are given the priorities and opportunities to go to school and learn and also the role to lead the community a tradition which existed at the time and in some parts of the world even today (cf. *Politics*, I.5, 1254b7-8; cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 14ff). The old people are also excluded from the citizenship because at their age they cannot contribute or fulfill the criteria of fully and actively participating in the juries, assembly and other community developmental activities.

Aristotle also compares ‘citizenship’ with ‘friendship’ because he thinks citizen like friends they tend to share many events (cf. Ludwig 2020, p. 2). They are the one whom we share many things in a genuine way Aristotle call them ‘the greatest goods’ one can have because good friends do not hurt each another rather they work hard to maintain the virtues, justice, by avoiding the wrong things and doing the right things to each other (cf. *The Eudemean Ethics* 1234b20ff Kenny trans.).

1.3.5 Leadership and Governance: Its Formation and Roles, Challenge and Limitations

A leader of the community or the city state according to Aristotle is someone who is ready to learn to follow, and who is interested with those whom she or leading including understanding their needs and wants intimately. He learned this from his master Socrates and Plato and later he practiced it in his school at Lyceum (cf. Davis 1908, p. 2).

According to Aristotle, at family level a man is superior to a woman and therefore it is through this nature for the man to be a ruler over the woman (cf. *Politics*, I.13, 12601ff). The same applies when it comes to age; the elder has the first priority to rule over the younger because the former is more ‘complete’, mature and full of experience compared to the latter whom, he considers to be ‘incomplete’ with little or no experience on ruling matters. In another place Aristotle appreciate, uplift and complement a woman with the argument that though women are not rulers over men, as men are naturally rulers over the woman and over the entire family, but women have been gifted through nature with the ability to control the man. She must control a man (a wife for example must control his husband) not only to get what they want but also more important in order to strengthen, perfect him at his function (cf. *Politics*, I.12, 1259b1-15, cf. Johnson 2015, pp. 77ff).

Furthermore, at the level of household also between masters and slaves, the master rules over the slave although everything the master commands it is executed through slave’s

brain and power. Of slaves, Aristotle says that they are of two kinds: the first kind: there are slaves who are in this inferior status because they lost the war which they were fighting (also called inter-community) and were taken by the winners (or the strong ones) into captivity. The second kind: there are slaves who had acquired this inferior status because they happen to be born of the parents who were once or are still slave such that therefore they inherit this status.

According to Aristotle, most people might think that the forms of leadership that exists in the smaller communities are of the same nature as the leadership of the city-state. The types of leadership that can be compared here include that of the master over his household consisting of slaves and family, or the relationship between male and female, the leadership of the male, or the leadership of a small community such as a village. Aristotle would say that it is not true. There is also for example difference between art of ruling slaves and that of ruling free men (*Politics*, I.7, 1255b).

The reason why the leadership of the family household is fundamentally different from the leadership of the state is that (despite the presence of authority, decision-making in it, wellbeing, and so on) it is natural for people to think of the King or the top leader of the community as a fatherly figure (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b5ff). There are some differences between them.

The first difference is that there is no genetic connection, which causes a definite difference. According to Aristotle's argumentation, it is not possible for people to have the same level of affection towards outsiders as they have for the family. As such, he disagreed for example with Socrates' proposal for communism in Plato's *Republic* (cf. *Politics*, II.1-5). Socrates has proposed that all female and male should share the entire way of life saying that children, wives and property should be possessed and belong to all citizen in common such that no woman will live privately with any man, no parent recognize his own child or child his parent (cf. *Republic*, V. 457c). It is impossible, he argues, for all people to be sisters and brothers caring for each other as brother and sisters in the same way as husband and wife caring for each other and their children in the family (cf. *Politics*, II.3, 1262a28-30).⁴⁸ Aristotle gives another objection to Socrates' proposal: "For that which is common to the greatest number has the least care bestowed upon it. Everyone thinks chiefly of his own, hardly at all of the common interest; and only when he is himself concerned as an individual" (*Politics*, II.3, 1261b33-35).

⁴⁸ H.W. C. Davis argued in his analysis that the implementation of "communism of wives and children will destroy natural affection" However, he thinks that communism of property could be of advantageous only "if private property were used in liberal spirit to relieve the wants of others". Private property according to Davis's analysis could motivate individuals whereby it makes them happy and make possibly for 'them to cultivate the virtues such as generosity' (Davis 1908, p. 9).

A further argument against this idea is that the father of the family household is similar to the leader or king of a country. A king however has got more practical things that need to be taken care of. There is, for example, the military, building projects, and maintenance of buildings, thoroughfare shipping, and transits, public affairs, there are all these things to be supplied to help people create peace and order, which then leads to flourishing and happiness (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1262b16).

Another way is to use Nyerere's position as a counterargument to that of Aristotle, by saying that one can develop a love of one's country that is dissimilar to love of one's family through nationalism or patriotism, and therefore create a kind of loyalty and faith in one's country (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 11ff).

Aristotle does not actually speculate here as to why he makes the distinction between family and state (*Politics*, I.1, 1252a2-1253a12). He does not fully explain why he identifies these differences in leadership, while only giving some assertion at first on the different types of rules and on why it is incorrect to compare the head of a household or leadership in a small community to that of a larger community. Aristotle's distinction probably has to do with the level of participation in a larger community, of which he imagines that citizens in the large community are able to participate as free citizens (at least they should be able to do so). Consequently, participation opportunities are higher in the city whereas in a household there is natural subordination between husband and wife, between parents and children, and between master and servant. For Aristotle, there are household relationships between superior and inferior, leader and followers, whereas in a political community, at least as Aristotle wants it to be, citizens do not submit because they are inferior, but because ruler and followers share the same internal rules.⁴⁹ I think Aristotle would like to say here also (though not explicitly) that the first and best leader is an individual herself or himself: to exercise self examination, self control or self discipline, and to activate of will power everyday to do the good and avoid the bad. In addition, for Aristotle, political communities are natural in the same way (not the same mode one might say but they are natural just as the other lower communities are) "that is, every community has natural origins and natural arrangements for rule; male and female not by choice, but by nature" (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b30-1253a1). For example, if we compare his idea of community (city-state) with layers of an orange-fruit, at the centre or the core one has family and then comes a village at the second layer and then one has town at the third and then finally one has many towns (talents) forming a city-state. The

⁴⁹ According to Davis's contribution it seems Aristotle mean with this thought here that "in a constitutional state the good citizen knows both how to rule and how to obey. [...]" that is because they learn "to rule by obeying orders" and therefore their citizenship is as such "a moral training" (cf. Davis 1908, p. 12).

latter thus grows out of the initial existence of the families. In his words: “the complete community, formed from several villages, is a city-state, which at once attains the limit of self-sufficiency, roughly speaking. It comes to be for the sake of life and exists for the sake of the good life” (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b27–30). Therefore, even though the rulership of the city-state is different from that of the family, it is the family that originates first, and these several families together form villages, towns, and so forth, culminating in the final and greatest development, the city-state. Every community of whatever kind therefore has its natural origins. The first community of males and females, Aristotle says, has its natural origins because they associate together by nature and not by choice. By this, Aristotle meant that the human instinct of procreation is similar to that of other animals in the animal kingdom.

He thus views human beings as part of the animal species, which all show the need to procreate as a deep instinct, causing us to grow together. Arguably, Aristotle is saying that human beings largely have no choice about the drive towards mating, it is an instinct that drives people together and keeps the species growing. Some might argue here that not all people have those instincts, but here Aristotle is looking at the aggregate or the whole and at that which generally keeps species growing.⁵⁰ This assertion is difficult, and Aristotle seems to know that. This is why he would also say that by nature, master and slaves come together. Initially, he made a distinction between the master-slave relationship and the male-female relationship. “There is a natural distinction of course between what is female and what is survival, for unlike the blacksmiths who made the Delphic knife, nature produces nothing skimpily but instead makes a single thing for a single task, because every tool will be made fast. It serves to perform one task rather than many. Among non-Greeks however, a woman and a slave occupy the same position” (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b). What Aristotle is trying to say is that by nature, women are not servile, or are not the same as slaves especially when one knows what slaves mean to Aristotle. But he distinguishes between Greek and non-Greeks and in general one might say that the Greeks thought that the non-Greeks were almost a different kind of species. The Greeks thought that their way of life was the best way of life, and the natural way of life, and therefore they judge what is natural according to that. The Greeks did, and the barbarian did not. It therefore is a criticism of the barbarians to say that they treat their women like slaves.

1.3.6 *The End of the Community: Good Life, Happiness*

Aristotle is famous for his development of teleological thought. According to him, *telos* means ‘end’ and ‘goal’. The way that he conceives of the *telos* is that, for the first

⁵⁰ This point about some individuals’ lack of the capacity to exercise political right will be further developed by Martha Nussbaum, her text *Creating Capabilities* (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 31ff).

community of the family, there is the organic nature of growth. The family alone however does not suffice. People naturally group together, aiming through their communities for the best life. Consequently, the aim of the family, of the first community, and of the first village etc. is always the city-state –it is always the highest civilization possible. This way of thinking provides us with an ideal, the end is the ideal. In contrast to the ideal that comes from the mind of Plato in the form of (abstract) forms or ideas based on just reason, Aristotle's ideal comes from observation of the best societies, of where people are the happiest where they thrive (cf. *Politics*, 1280b39-1281a2). In other words, his idea originates in real life and not in abstract reasoning. This was the root of disagreement between him and Plato, as was mentioned above (cf. Kenny 2004, p. 81f). Plato conceived of the ideal having been in existence before we were born, that it was eternal, and that it is discoverable by abstract reasoning. Aristotle, on the other hand, says that we cannot know anything we cannot see. Thus, all of our knowledge comes from our actual experience and not just from abstract reasoning, and our reason develops as a result of our observation. Thus, of course, our ideals must come from our observation of what works best and makes people happiest. Aristotle will judge things by an ideal, but it is an ideal based upon observation and that is what is meant by teleology. It is looking at things according to their natural ends or purposes and judging them accordingly.⁵¹ If one is Aristotle and he is looking at an acorn, one sees an oak tree, and if one decided to grind the acorn up and eat it, it is not going to fulfill its mission, it is not going to fulfill its natural end, one has just disrupted the natural process. If something happens along the way that makes this acorn not turn into an oak tree, then it has not fulfilled its end or purpose (as similarly discussed above on happiness).

1.4 Aristotle Views on Human Development in the Community

Aristotle's aim of his philosophies especial ethical and political is among others 'human development'. This seems the reason for him to suggest and encourage the entire human individual to work hard on things which contribute to good life and happiness. This part wishes to construct and present such views as Aristotle argues and believe them to be important for human development. These include: his argument on participation in all things of community life (based on virtues, good character, justice, friendship, observance of the law); the social and rational nature of human being; obedience to constitution and the forms of

⁵¹ According to John Rawls "Teleological doctrines differ, pretty clearly, according to how the conception of the good is specified. If it is taken as the realization of human excellence in the various forms of culture, we have what may be called perfectionism. This notion is found in Aristotle and Nietzsche, among others. If the good is defined as pleasure, we have hedonism; if as happiness, eudaimonism, and so on" (Rawls 1999, p. 22).

government; education; moral and social works; human relationship (or friendship) and Arts and entertainments respectively.

1.4.1 The Manner of Participation in the Community

The question of participation in the community and its function as individual is fundamental disposition Aristotle holds as important practice to flourish and to attain happiness. It means to be part and parcels of the system in important matters about the community at large. This help also and individual to live the virtues, because the reason why should the an individual work hard to acquire the virtues is because an individual like to be happy but in that process of being happy there are some activities she or he has to done such as building character, practicing being just, honesty, doing some changes and regulation to reach the uprightness of behavior (character), to know the mean in our action, to be aware of the vices avoid doing bad and do good, to set some higher goals in the development, receiving appreciation the role of rewards or punishment, to know what is happening in about individual or community and so many activities of the like. In his arguments he proposes some thoughts and manner by which individual can full participate in the community function, the way one understands on reading his texts. In the introduction of this thesis above, a quotation from Aristotle (and later in Nyerere) about the importance of individual and community to happiness is mentioned and presented by Irwin: “In Aristotle’s view, a human being is a political animal insofar as human capacities and aims are completely fulfilled only in a community; the individual’s happiness must involve the good of fellow members of a community (1097b8-11, 1169b16-19)” (Irwin 1999, p. xxiii; cf. Davis 1908, p. 3, cf. Sanga 2016, p. 6). Following such thoughts it means, both individual and community contribute to the flourishing or happiness of the whole human individual and community in the following ways.

1.4.2 The Social and Rational Nature of Human Being

Aristotle believed that it is man’s nature to live together with purpose as it is mention at the beginning of this part. He obviously believes as people say that ‘a human being is not an island’. Aristotle is also famous for saying that “man is by nature a political animal” (in Greek language *Zoon politikon*, ζῷον πολιτικόν). As a physical body, he interacts with others and the community (*Politics*, I.2, 1252a24–1253a3). He means that human beings are by nature equipped with language, enabling them to communicate moral concepts such as justice, which are powerful concepts within the household and city-state (*Politics*, 1253a1-18). That is why out of the two categories of living things plant and animals that Aristotle as a biologist understood man belongs characteristically to the category of animals. However, man is very

distinct from the other animals for he is endowed with capacity of perception and reasoning. Aristotle believed that man as a political animal, tend to live together in order to maintain a community an argument he comes up with as he was making analogy of John Locke's state of nature. This distinction between man as 'an animal' and 'other animals' is interesting because for example when it comes to the determination of that which is just and unjust or the need of laws and regulations about what is moral good and what is moral bad that does not concern other animals but human being cannot live in harmony without creating laws by which all these values, rights and behaviour disposition are to be observed and lived. As this is very significant for later political thought, it is worth to dwell on the thought here.

In normal life, it sounds logical to the political science major (or at least all those who have been at school 'majored in politics' among others subjects) that 'we are all political animals'. Even if an individual happen to have participated only one time with others in the election activities for their leaders, this general conception we are all political animal simply embrace that individual too. Some people generally spend much time watching the television news and reading the newspaper, trying to follow politics. In real sense this kind of participation it is not all that Aristotle would like to communicate with the term participation as political animals. This is because if this interest on media and the like is to be subjected to some tests for some individuals one will notice some differences. If as such one is an interested person in politics and ever happen noticed such interest in others who lives in the community one's investigation would verify that many people are not very interested at all. I think if the real politically interested person would ask them, for instance, whether they know the current vice president, some or most of them showed did not even know who the vice president of their own country is. There are some citizen in my country in Tanzania whom when one asks them whom they are going to give the votes in the next general presidential election one finds that some citizen will mention a candidate who does not exist anymore, for example they will say they will choose Nyerere. Consequently, if not everyone is as aware of politics in their particular or respective countries, that makes one wonder whether human beings actually are all 'political animals!'

But the way Aristotle sees it is that people have developed a political community that does not encourage participation. This might partly be because the political community is set up according to ideas that the people are not primarily political animals, but rather that they are 'animal' individuals who want to be protected, to have property rights, to have freedom of religion, and freedom of speech. It is, however, not political participation for its own sake that is the ideal that is promoted here if one honestly thinks about it. People participate because

they are interested in something personal. From Aristotle's perspective, many people in our current world would not be full citizens because of their lack of interest in participation, and they would not be fulfilling their *telos* or their end because they would not be participating as citizens and mere voting would not be enough. Therefore, people would have to actually be more much more involved than that in order to become Aristotle's political animal. A real bonding will not be there and become the opposite of what Aristotle's political animal is supposed to look like. It therefore is questionable whether people or citizens of a country are really political animals in the strictest sense. Aristotle however would answer in the affirmative, because first of all citizens are social creatures and as such, as has already been seen, because of their social characteristics, they achieve their best when they work together.

Furthermore, if they work together, it means that they must communicate with each other. It is also natural to bargain with each other, to make arrangements and plans, and perhaps to celebrate together, and so forth (cf. Frost 1962, p. 183). That is the objective reason why Aristotle concept of community conceives man as a social creature '*zoon politikon*' (*Politics*, I.2, 1253a2), that is to say, he points out that man to be a social creature in three respects: First of all, people need help and cooperation; second, they seek social contacts even without this "need for mutual support" (*Politics*, III.6, 1278b21f.); they live together not only to ensure their survival, but also because they value the company of other people, at least in principle; and third, because of their ability to speak, they (also) arrange their coexistence according to the categories 'good' or 'bad', 'just' or 'unjust': "Because that's just what is characteristic of humans, in contrast to animals, that they alone are able to imagine good and bad, right and wrong. But the community nature of these ideas calls the house and the state into being." (*Politics*, I.2, 1253a15ff.) Aristotle says that if people ignore this tendency for themselves, then they are the worst of animals. In other words, if people do not live in a state with the best possible laws, if they are left to their own devices, then they become the worst of all animals (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1253a25-35). Why would it be that human beings will act worse than most animals if left unregulated by a community? Is that true? People should be able to live in a state with the best possible laws and as regulated by a community because people do not do evil things, for example killing others or causing pain to them like animal in order for them to survive. People thus are not like other animals who kill and cause pain in order to survive. Rather people harm others out of revenge, prejudice, and hatred (cf. Bagby 2009, pp. 107ff).

In addition, although Hobbes does not seem to agree with Aristotle on many things, both state that what distinguishes the human being from many other animals is that the human

being has among other things 'pride'. It is this pride or excessive self-love and free will, that can lead people to do things that seem like harmful to their interest on others (cf. Hobbes 1660, p. 52f; cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.3, 1124a1ff, cf. *Politics*, I.6, cf. Bagby 2009, pp. 105ff). For example, let say when John out of anger and pride shoot and hurt Maria badly because Maria has insulted him in some small way, or she has spilled his drink. But Aristotle considers pride as something good he calls it the crown of virtues something which is difficult to get. It is significant to have in mind that, people have this part of themselves that is very dangerous if it is not taken care of if it is not regulated very strongly to keep it from getting out of control. Aristotle seems to have experienced this with his fellow Greeks (cf. *Politics*, V.7, 1321a1ff). When government breaks down and when a civil war develops between two political groups, then authority too breaks down, when civil war develops, and people start killing each other (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1253a9-11). That sometimes involves not only the members of government but also, when government is removed; people continue harm other people whom they consider as enemies. This is not an attractive, but a very real feature of human nature. Therefore, the obedience to constitution and the forms of government which as Aristotle maintained were created aiming at the good of those who are rule. It makes helps them satisfies their social instinct and fit them for the good life (cf. *Politics* III.6-13.). Therefore, these can be reasonably and relevant tools to form, create, and maintain law and order which is also man's nature. In what follows to this perspective is a discussion about form constitution and forms of government and the way individual participate and benefit on that.

1.4.3 The Forms of Constitutions and the Form of Rule or Governments

The second way of participation Aristotle proposes is through the observance of the laws in forms of constitutions and showing obedience to the form of rule or governments. Aristotle considers monarchy as the best form of constitution, whereas tyranny is the worst form. The second best is aristocracy, the third is timocracy, the fourth is democracy, and fifth is oligarchy (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII.10, 1160b). Aristotle says that whereas democracy is the rule of the poor (who are mostly many), oligarchy is the rule of the rich (who in opposite are few). But of these two rules the numerical proportion does not play any role between the rulers and the ruled. Whereas equality is for the democrats important, the oligarch believed that the political rights should be unequal and proportional to wealth. However, both lack the important characteristic of the state which is virtue (cf. *Politics*, III.6ff).

Aristotle categorizes Monarchy into five kinds namely: the Spartan, the Barbarian, the elective dictatorship, the Heroic and the Absolute Kingship. The Absolute Kingship seems to be the best to some if the King would act as the embodiment of law (cf. Davis 1908, pp.13ff).

Aristotle says that it is natural for people to develop government and laws because without them, the human species would not survive. Just as birds build nests and ants build anthills, human beings build communities because without these communities we human beings will not survive (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII.1, 1155a1-28, *Politics*, I.2, 1252b8). And unlike those other creatures we can be in all ‘understanding’ because we do have free will. We have the ability to communicate, which can be used for good, but can also be put to ill use.⁵² We therefore need to have a much more sophisticated community than these other creatures, that is, we need a community not only for the sake of survival but also towards living a good and happy life (*Politics*, III.9, 1280b39-1281a2; Bagby 2009, pp. 3ff).⁵³

In Aristotle’s view, law is a natural development, whereas for Hobbes the law is an imposition we accept it because we must (cf. Bagby 2009, pp. 34ff). Aristotle said that law is a natural outgrowth, it is another part of this process (cf. *Politics*, III.9, 1280b5-6). People develop laws not only to survive but also to live well. For Plato and particularly for Aristotle, nature is the standard against which one judges all political systems and practices. This thought is important for current-day politics, because we still do disagree with each other. That means that the founders of our contemporary states, for example Tanzania, did not really think that government and law were natural. Rather, they seemed to have agreed with Hobbes that government and law are an artificial imposition. It is a choice that we make in order to survive, to guard our property and our liberty, and so forth (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 91ff, Nyerere 1973 pp. 72ff, pp. 344ff). In this point, Nyerere in his discussion about human and community development provided an argument that lines up with Aristotle. He argued that entrusted state leaders tended to impart a way of thinking with ‘blind hope’ to the people, giving the impression that ‘if they shift from one place to another, they will become rich’. Furthermore, for example, the act of averting their freedom of speech, that is, thinking, decision making, and acting, is not beneficial in terms of human and community development (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 66, Nyerere 1967, p. 8ff).

⁵² An example of this can be the trial at Nuremberg, Germany, in 1945–1946 whereby the German Nazi leaders were accused of war crimes because of wrongly use of laws which led to execution of innocent people (cf. Arnhart 2015, p. 91).

⁵³ Aristotle describes politics as the practical and the most authoritative science because it has to do with the noble actions (or happiness) of the citizen. It furthermore prescribes government and points out the suitable kind of science to be studied in the city state, for example military science, rhetoric, and household management (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.2, 1094b7-10; VI.8). For this reason, politics, for Aristotle, is a normative or prescriptive discipline and not a purely empirical or descriptive inquiry.

1.4.4 Aristotle's Views on the Meaning and Role of Community Education

Education is for Aristotle that part of discipline essential and prior for the comprehension of matters relating to moral and politics in the community. According to Aristotle education helps to the perfect practice of the virtues which are very important to the holistic development of an individual and the community acting as source of good life (that is, both goodness of intellect and character) all of which then led to the attaining of the ultimate good which for is happiness as discussed above (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.2, 1180b1f). He believed that through education an individual receive not only knowledge but also it creates and shapes an individual into a good life and finally makes her or him happy. Since most people have quest for happiness and are seeking that which will make them good and happy, Aristotle thought that through proper and continuous practice at the same time helped by nature, habit and reason this results in the acquisition of the virtues by that person (cf. *Politics*, VII.13.). The community consists of different individuals with different age, character, status and function now education helps to define them accordingly and make them fit and function well in their respective elements.

To start with children and those who are still in younger ages receiving early formation, Aristotle argued that they should be a good education system to help them grow well. "The citizens should be educated to obey when young and to rule when they are older." (Davis 1908, p. 22) and this is the thing they can do at the maximum as their function. From education an individual gets as results: habit and reason. For example he suggested or claims that women and children should be educated in order for them to count fit for the requirement of the community as he argues:

"For, inasmuch as every family is a part of a state, and these relationships are the parts of a family, the virtue of the part must have regard to the virtue of the whole. And therefore women and children must be trained by education with an eye to the state', if the virtues of either of them are supposed to make any difference in the virtues of the state. And they must make a difference: for the children grow up to be citizens, and half the free persons in a state are women" (*Politics*, I.13. 1269b15-16).

According to Aristotle there is no distinction between a good ruler and the good man, and for this reason he suggested to the community to work hard on education to produce many good men by helping this individual man to develop all his powers and fit him for all the activities of life while at the same time the supreme care of education remains as the highest of all powers and activities. Moreover, he thought the Laconian who had an education which is purely military does not care about this principle (cf. *Politics*, VII.14.). And here one is reminded by Aristotle to find the mean, the intermediate 'or the middle.'

Aristotle thought that the individual and the state need the most “the virtues of peace such as intellectual culture, temperance, justice and when it happens that individual are fighting and killing each other it means they want to protect themselves and to ensure that they are safe. Thus education is important here to keep her away from unnecessary conflicts, to ensure the government and community member are not harmed and to maintain the structure of the government (cf. Davis 1908, p. 22, cf. *Politics*, 1337a13-16).⁵⁴ The role of education he (Aristotle) suggested it ought to follow the natural order of human development by taking good formation and care of first of the body, followed with the appetites and ending with the training of the intellect (cf. *Politics*, VII.15.; cf. Davis 1908, p. 22). Aristotle did not forget the union of female and male he pointed out at the beginning of the structure of community. He argues that in order to have a healthy physique the lawmaker must do the following things: they must fix the age of marriage,⁵⁵ then regulate the physical condition of the parents, and provide for the exposure of infants, and to settle the duration of marriage (*Politics*, VII.16.).

After the marriage usually there are new born who came as the fruits of it and Aristotle considered these too by urging the lawmakers or representative to think about a proper physical training for infants and young children. In order to avoid the accusations faced by his predecessor like Socrates in philosophical thinking, Aristotle proposes that there should be also a good program for formation and education. For example he said that to ensure this safeness “in moral education the very young should be committed to overseers; these should select the tales which they are told, their associates, the pictures, plays, and statues which they see.” The preparation for intellectual training should be carried out when the children are five to seven years of age should be the period (cf. *Politics*, VII.17.; cf. Davis 1908, pp. 22-23; cf. Lord 1982, pp. 44f). According to Aristotle learning means combining mind and heart. Parent gave their children two gifts one is life through birth and another is good living and formation through good education. Through the experience Aristotle has with the conflicted community of his time in Greece, he believed that education can be used to determine the destiny of the state well being. He thought the state should control education and ensure it is provided equally to its citizen. This including looking at what we currently call the syllabus it provided to its pupils and students with the substance content which they could master without or avoid the material which can degrading their mind and body (cf.

⁵⁴ Aristotle believed despite the “many kinds of rulers and subjects” the better rule is the one “which is exercised over better subjects” that is “over men” and not “over wild beasts” (cf. *Politics*, I.5.).

⁵⁵ According to Aristotle: „Women should marry when they are about eighteen years of age, and men at seven-and-thirty then they are in the prime of life, and the decline in the powers of both will coincide“(*Politics*, VII.16, 1335a9).

Politics, VIII.1-2.). The subject such as how to read and write how to draw a picture, learning music, doing gymnastic exercise and many should be given to them because they are of higher value (cf. *Politics* VIII.3.). However, on gymnastics skills and training for the youth Aristotle thought that they should have some limitation too. He thought that badly training should be not extreme provided for children and youth to the extent that it replaces their rational training part—as it was done for the youth of Sparta. When the children are between the age range from puberty and three years after, the gymnastic should be reduced and made light.

Also with music if it is more of entertainment than educative then the parent and teacher should take control of it for it not to be taught to the children, rather it would be better for them listening to the professionals because music (cf. *Politics*, VIII.5.). He knows too that music has a moral discipline and a rational enjoyment and that if children are to be taught they can become better critics with good occupation (cf. Davis 1908, p. 24). He thought children should learn that kind of music which has ethical harmonies that inspires virtues and leave to the professionals that music which inspires valour, enthusiasm and if it involves playing difficult instruments. But he thought at some level of age they should abandon music. He finds the Dorian harmony to be is the best kind for education, and Lydian harmony seems beneficial to children; but the Phrygian harmony is not good for them (cf. *Politics*, VIII.5.ff).

Education of the state leaders and all who have a function in the government like financial people, nurses and doctors, professors was for Aristotle very crucial too. Aristotle points out that it is the responsibility of the state to look for the provision of proper education of its citizen starting with younger ages up to the old ones (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* I.2, 1094b1ff). These are expected to be future leaders in different sectors, and organs of the state.

Adult education and continue formation of a person a whole. Education to people such as Farmers and Pastoral and probably those who had no opportunity to get education at their younger time receive training through courses, seminars and educational or developmental talks. Also the elder member of the community shares their knowledge and experience to the younger generation and for those who are still at work or office they show and teach others by good example of words and deeds (cf. *Politics*, I.2.).

1.4.5 Moral and Social Works

Aristotle considers both moral and social works as something important and which ensures life in the community. The moral works are such those we discuss on the part of happiness above such as cultivation of the virtues, good character, moral education, relationships, discipline and the capability to have a continuous practice of all these actions.

Regarding social works Aristotle finds they differ according to man to man and according to place and place which favors them. He talks about the shepherds who live by gathering of wild food, hunting and cultivation. Some other live near water bodies they do fishing, other live by pursuit of birds or wild beasts. To all this groups soil was very important in the production of food (cf. *Politics*, I.8.). Moreover, Aristotle creates a distinction between members of the state and the servants. The work to be done by the later are such as to provide for food, to practice the arts, to bear arms, to carry out the work of exchange, supervision of state religion, to exercise political and judicial functions (cf. *Politics*, VII.8). Moreover, he excluded from the citizen body the mechanics, the traders, the husbandmen, Warriors, rulers, priests to remain as eligible for citizenship (cf. Davis 1908, pp. 21f).

The distribution of land says Aristotle should take into consideration two forms: those who own it in form of public demesnes and those who and all these kinds be entitled by slaves or barbarians of servile disposition. The choice of the city should be based on the following; namely to public health, to political convenience and to strategic requirements (cf. *Politics*, VI.10.).

The plan done on the ground of the city should be well organized and done with distinction in all of its dimensions, divisions and transparent enough to enable the defensive warfare simple and practical such as the building of walls, the arrangement of the buildings, and infrastructures, in the city should be carefully thought out (cf. *Politics*, VI. 12.).

1.4.6 Human Relationships (Friendship)

Aristotle's approach to the question of relationship between an individual with herself or himself and the relationship between and individual with others (the community) is well understood in his argument about the virtue of friendship as found among others in books VIII and IX of *Nicomachean Ethic* as well as in his book of *Politics*. This relationship or friendship can be locally established and practiced but also work well internationally.

The spirit of participation in relation with other people was considered by Aristotle (as it will be by Nyerere) as an important way in the improvement of individual's life as well as in the satisfaction of her or his important desires in a long term. This is because positive relationship makes an individual to do well and when that relation is kept it become a constitutive element of 'the good' of all who are in that bond of friendship. According to Aristotle human being have a social instinct, and it is strange if one decide to live without the community because that person will not as proof be able to be self-sufficient. This urgent about the need of friends or companion can be observed in difficult times but also in joyful times. Hence, intelligence and moral qualities can be natured well when and individual is

living in the state. This idea of the connection between an individual (and community) to happiness is found also in Julius Kambarage Nyerere's philosophy, the next chapter and discussion I now turn.

CHAPTER 2

2. The Meaning of Happiness and Community life in Nyerere

Aristotle defines happiness as the highest good of all achieved through the exercise of virtues for a period of time. He describes it as being preserved by the community and in the community. Nyerere does not explicitly say, as Aristotle does, that happiness is the highest good of all, but he seems to be assuming it, because in his arguments about the “human Brotherhood and the Unity of Africa”—which was for him very important—he embraces many elements of Aristotle’s idea of a good life for individual and community life especially his approach to moral responsibility and the best way to live (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 12).⁵⁶ This idea can be traced, starting with the event of independence in Tanzania, 09.12.1961, and then the implementation of his goal of brotherhood, in terms of belonging, and connection with the community as manifested in his texts and arguments. Like Aristotle, Nyerere was interested in the best way to live a good life (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 7f, pp. 78ff), and to cultivate virtues of character and virtues thought which its ultimate goal is happiness. The aspects offered by Nyerere in his arguments about a good life, a happy life to individual and community are mainly: independence (or freedom), unity, peace, social works, loyalty, equality, education (intellect) of which I would like to discuss here below. In these aspects one will notice the way Nyerere expresses the idea of virtuous life that lead to ultimate good which is happiness. The aspect which I have mention above such as freedom, unity, peace brotherhood and others were considered by Nyerere and by people of Tanzania as well as Africa at large to be ‘moral good’. These moral good acts were therefore ‘virtuous’ as opposed to acts such as tribalism, racialism, religious division, discrimination and division of people into classes, the underdevelopment especial in areas of health, education, forces of production and services which I will not discuss them in detail but a few to mention all these were considered as ‘moral wrong’ and so equivalency to Aristotle notion of vices.

2.1 Nyerere’s View on Happiness

The idea that human individual aim at the highest good which is happiness, caught the mind of Nyerere as well and he worked together with the citizen of Tanzania to try to create a country where everyone could live a happy, flourish and prosperous life. According to Nyerere the idea of happiness of an individual is connected with her or his being part of

⁵⁶ In his comparison between African and Aristotelian ethics, Thaddeus Metz explained the way African virtues are understood in connection to Aristotle’s or western understanding of virtues (cf. Metz 2012, pp. 105ff). In his own word he Metz wrote: “In sum, Aristotle’s philosophy and a typically African one are similar in maintaining that the best life is a communal one, at least in a broad sense” (Metz 2012, p. 110).

community (cf. Nyerere; cf. Sanga 2016, p. 6f). I think this is because in the community there is harmony in form of rationality and friendliness which is considered in African context particularly in Tanzania community as the ‘highest good’ (cf. Metz 2022, pp. 143ff; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp.12ff). Consequently, that means: the more all people live and sharing together community life in harmony the happier they are. His thoughts on happiness reflect most on Aristotle concept of happiness. According to the African understanding of happiness in connection with Aristotle we borrow the thought of Thaddeus Metz (Metz 2012, pp. 99-117).

2.1.1 *The Event of Independence (or Freedom)*

The first aspect is the event of independence (or freedom): The country of Tanzania—as it was for many African countries—was for a long time under colonial rule. If one could have asked Nyerere and the people of Tanzania (Africa) during this difficult time ‘what the ultimate purpose of human existence is’ I think the first answer would have been independence or ‘freedom’ (cf. Nyerere 1967, p. 9). Nyerere after he had finished his studies he started to work for the independence of Tanzania which was eventually granted or received on 9. December 1961. The whole country was again free and in the eyes of the Tanzania people and all neighboring countries were full of teas of joys which indicate happiness. The philosopher Aristotle (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IX.2, 1165a25-30), and the philosopher Epicurus argued that being set free is one of the major factors which make people happy because it creates tranquility (cf. Kenny 2004, p. 94ff). According to Nyerere, freedom depends on development and development depends on freedom too and consequently once people are developed in all their necessary things they mostly become happy (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 58ff). After the successful act of independence in Tanzania Nyerere does not stop there rather he participate also in the Africa liberation campaign (as explained in his biography) to make sure that all of Africa is free from any sort of oppressive and exploitative structure of the colonies (cf. Campbell 2010, p. 49f, p. 56). This is because Nyerere believed that only free people are able to think of themselves, build a community and make good deliberations about the factors which contribute to their well-being and development as whole as he urged that: „Only free people conscious of their worth and their equality can build a free society“ (Nyerere 1968, p. 54; cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 40ff).⁵⁷ To show that the aspect of freedom (independence) was very important for him he not only talk it to the people rather he

⁵⁷ According to Philip Pettit ‘non-domination is itself a form of power which represents a control enjoyed by a person relation to her or his destiny “and such control constitutes one familiar type of power: the power of the agent who can prevent various ills happening to them” (cf. Pettit 2000, p. 69).

also wrote the title of his works (essays) starting with the term ‘freedom’ such as *Freedom and Unity* (1952-1965), *Freedom and Socialism* (1965-1967), *Freedom and Development* (1967-1973) and so on (cf. Campbell 2010, p. 57). One of the themes found in these texts is the way Nyerere ensure the structure of the state of Tanzania by creating good constitution, laws and theory of communal life which safeguard the freedom granted to Tanzania and his people (Nyerere 1968, p. 56ff).⁵⁸

2.1.2 Unity

The second aspect is Unity. There is a proverb in the *Swahili* language ‘*Umoja ni nguvu utengano ni udhaifu*’ which in English translation means “unity is strength separation is weakness”.⁵⁹ According to Nyerere unity was the working force of the community in achieving their goals. In the national emblem of Tanzania, one of its content is ‘freedom and unity’ (*Uhuru na Umoja* in the *Swahili* language). Nyerere successfully manage to unite the people of Tanzania through his concept of *Ujamaa* and collective solidarity which was the permanent tradition of Tanzania. He works hard to build the new concept of inclusion and citizenship by using the concept of *ndugu* which was a gender-neutral concept which signifies brotherhood and sisterhood (cf. Campbell 2010, pp. 53-54). His belief in the need and relevance of unity does not end in Tanzania, he works hard to convince other African countries to unite together. In his state visit to West Africa he held a speech in Ivory Coast and stresses that African unity must accommodate diversity because he notice that there is some difference among them such as being a separate sovereign state, with its own internal affairs, different political philosophies socialism, for example, on one hand, Tanzania which at that time was deliberately trying to a socialistic state on the foundations of Tanzania’s tradition communalism, Ivory Coast on the other side had its political philosophy with the motto ‘evolution within freedom’. Still, the political and economical organization of the rest of African states was also different in terms of those who prefer socialist policies as opposed to those who prefer capitalism. Therefore, he thought that the only way forward was to accept the difference, for he was also convinced that unity must incorporate differences (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 12ff).

⁵⁸ This is the same applied to Aristotle’s fundamental argument about his constitutional theory where he states that the constitution which is correct and just without qualification is the one which aims for the common advantage but when it aims only at the advantage of rulers it becomes a deviant and unjust constitution because it led to despotic rule which is inappropriate for a community of free persons (cf. *Politics*, III.6, 1279a17-21).

⁵⁹ I think it is with the same spirit and belief that pushes President Julius K. Nyerere to convince President Abeid Amani Karume for Zanzibar to unite with Tanganyika on 26. April, 1964 and form the Republic United of Tanzania. The priority objectives of the union was among others the strengthening of brotherhood, economies, defense and development of both states.

According to Nyerere, the unity of Africa was important because it is help the African brotherhood to make progress and to flourish beneficial to every African country. Three basic things for the growth of unity (that is, oscillation movement through co-operation to unity, or through unity to co-operation) were suggested by Nyerere namely: first that the right for each people, and each nation to choose their own economic and political institutions and systems, in relation to matters exclusive to their system, second, to the recognition and need to compromise with the needs and desires of others regardless of the challenges, and thirdly, the acceptance of the paramountcy of Africa, the brotherhood and co-operation with Africa, overall outside relationships, has to be accepted by all African states (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 13). He also stresses that African unity does not and should never imply hostility to other parts of the world as he states: “Similarly, the movement towards unity in Africa does not have to mean hostility to Europe, or Asia or to America. For every individual is a member of many communities; he is a member sometimes of his clan, and also of his tribe” (Nyerere 1973, p. 13f). Unity must be worked for and every African state should think about it, make decisions, and set steps toward its achievement. This was important because according to Nyerere’s argument: “there must be one government which can speak for Africa to the outside world” in terms of defense, co-ordination and facilitation of the economic development of Africa as a whole, promotion of one currency, one tariff system, and institutions that works for economic growth to ensure well-being (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 15ff). In any case, Nyerere believed strongly in unity because it is for him an instrument of liberation as he mention that in his own voice in an interview with Nawal El Saadawi concern El Mussawar 1984 (cf. Saadawi 2010, p. 7). Common observation shows that, when a person or a group is liberated from bondage or any painful situation, that person tends to become happy for example the slave’s captivity in Egypt a transcontinental country of Africa-Asia.

Augustine Shutte—who was one of the first academic philosophers in the English culture to seriously investigate and deal with African Ethics—argued that human being, has a deep moral obligation to complete in her or his humanity and for this reason he has a tendency to deeply enter and form community with others. Although this has implication of fulfilling personal goal, it does not involve selfishness (cf. Shutte 2001, p. 30; cf. Metz 2012, p. 102). This thought is recognizable to Aristotle and the ancient Greek tradition. What is not recognizable is that: whereas Aristotle believe that man is the determinant of all things including her or his own well-being and happiness (self-regarding), the African ethical philosophy holds the idea of self-realisation which is mainly possibly through contact with ‘other persons or community’ that is through a communal relationship. That means in African

ethical context as written by Metz is that: “the *only* comprehensive respect in which one can live a genuine way of life is by communing or sometimes ‘being in harmony’ with other people” (cf. Metz 2012, p. 102).

2.1.3 Peace

The third aspect is peace which for him is to prevent freedom and unity among the people which ensures good life and happiness. According to Nyerere, the world situation has drastically being changed because of the unknown or unreported events that happen or the world faces throughout the years. For example, this can be seen in the culture of the people the way people use the wishes like that of New Year. A wish of a ‘Happy New Year’ changes or is modified to a wish of a ‘Happy and Peaceful New Year’ (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 1). This helps to remind the people of the world and particularly the citizen of Tanzania of the value of peace and why is it relevant to preserve it. According to Nyerere, “Peace on Earth’ is no longer a matter of academic or humane interest only; we are all too involved in one another for us to be indifferent to its breakdown, even thousands of miles from our borders. Peace everywhere is now something which matters to us all; our own human happiness and our economic and social progress are involved in it” (Nyerere 1973, p. 1).⁶⁰ Aristotle also argues that one becomes happy with the acts which are orderly to the virtue and with this he principally meant the ‘peace of the soul’ because the rational action or acting with right knowledge as he mention on inquiry, in art, in making choice or choosing between the alternative one end up on peace of the soul and one will not regret at the end. A peaceful community with peaceful individual is a happy place, so Aristotle and Nyerere (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* X.7, 1177b1ff).

2.1.4 Social Works and Human Development

The fourth aspect is social works and human development. Many authors have written that Tanzania and many African countries were very poor at the time they were set free. (cf. Campbell 2010, p. 53f).⁶¹ Since the same situation of underdevelopment and inequality which has existed for a long time in Tanzania too was very devastating, and because it is opposite to the idea of good life and happiness of individuals and community, Nyerere was very keen and had to do something against it. Now according to the above aspects that mean the community

⁶⁰ According to Desmond Tutu following an African idiom of humanness exhibition or *ubuntu* which holds that ‘a person is a person through other persons’ he believe that when individual of a certain country are able to forgive one another that live to peace and happiness because to forgive Tutu argues “is indeed the best form of self-interest since anger, resentment, and revenge are corrosive of that *summum bonum*, that greatest good, communal harmony that enhances the humanity and personhood of all in the community” (Tutu 1999, p. 35f).

⁶¹ I think this is because among other reasons its institutions and all things were at their formative stage (cf. Sahnoun 2010, p. 61).

(Tanzania state) is independent their citizen is free, united, it has peace and respect for each other. All these are factors which favours development and happy life among individuals and in the community. Seithy Chachage—who was a professor of sociology at the University of Dar es Salaam—wrote that: “It was the problems of development and equity that preoccupied Nyerere throughout his life” (Chachage 2010, p. 20). In his own words, Nyerere says: “Tanganyika today, is a poor country. The standard of living of the masses of our people is shamefully low. But if every man and woman in the country takes up the challenge and works to the limit of his or her ability for the good of the whole society, Tanganyika will prosper; and that prosperity will be shared by all people” (Nyerere 1968, p. 9). This is clearly stated in his famous Arusha Declaration (Nyerere 1968, pp. 12f). At another place, Nyerere says that “[...] it is the responsibility of the state to intervene actively in the economic life of the national so as to ensure the well-being of all citizens [...]” (Nyerere 1968, p. 13, cf. pp. 124ff). Also, in the implementation of his policy of self-reliance, he begins by saying: “We are at war against poverty and oppression in our country aiming at moving people of Tanzania and Africa as a whole from a state of poverty to a state of prosperity” (Nyerere 1968, pp. 17f). All these thoughts, enthusiastic and efforts to create a society which is self relied and with a well-being as its element is kind of self realisation (or *eudaemonia*). This is because it involve the questions such as why should one do all these, and why this and not another and why should the people switch or adjust themselves to such dispositions or character of working, of being reasonable and abide to the values. Once one tries to answer all these question which pushes Nyerere’s mind one will find out that it is because as Thaddeus Metz argues that “it would make *oneself a better person*” (cf. Metz 2012, p. 101ff). This corresponds to happiness because in Aristotle’s term *eudaemonia* it is translated above as happiness or flourishing. And flourishing is an element which is closely related to work and development.

2.1.5 Equality and Justice

The fifth aspect is equality and justice (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 80ff). The terms equality and justice can be used in Nyerere’s context to mean virtues. For Nyerere equality means the amount of opportunities and rights an individual has in the community for her or his entire development (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 107ff, p. 126ff). Nyerere believes that *Ujamaa*’s principle should essentially help community members to have a commitment to the practice of shared social wealth and the work necessary to achieve it. In the Arusha declaration of 1967, he mentions several rights some of which emphasize his concept of equality for example the right to dignity and respect, the right to democracy, and the right to receive a just wage (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 13-15). It was for him also equally important that every city should know

by heart that social wealth belongs to the masses of people who created it because if one member of the community possesses more wealth than the other this will trigger the problem of unequal distribution of wealth among them and therefore creating different status or classes, exploitative or oppressive relations between them and that will cause further challenges such as inequality, deprivation as well as suffering—which is the opposite from happiness—to increased (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 41-42, 119ff cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.3, 1131a10-30).⁶² All these challenges are vices too. I think Nyerere was very right in arguing that people should not necessarily commit themselves at the first place in the accumulation of wealth because as one might think with Nyerere, there are some other more important things in life such as human dignity and social equality for which the priority should be given.⁶³ Therefore, a good form of communitarian exchange Nyerere argued was ‘sharing wealth and cooperating’ (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 50ff). That means also following Nyerere’s principle of *Ujamaa* which is based on the hypothesis of human equality, with avoidance to domination or exploitation of another community member, at the same time based on the understanding that every individual anticipates to live in a society as a free individual person able to lead a decent life, in states of peace with her or his neighbor, all these factors promises a good life, a life of happiness. Aristotle treated in his virtue of friendship this question of equality and show that there are occasions in friendship whereby one love the other not because of what he is but because of some utility or pleasure and pleasant and he think this kind of friendship does not last long and therefore does not bring happiness when one is using the other for own benefit (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* VIII.3, 1156a1ff; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 102ff). Hence, for Nyerere as in Aristotle’s thinking, justice is a virtue, and people who work hard in life to be just person they are happy and bring happiness to other individual as well (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 79ff).

2.1.6 Education for Self-Reliance (Intellectual Virtue Aspect)

The sixth aspect is education for self-reliance (intellectual virtue aspect). Moreover, Nyerere believes like Aristotle on the gift of intellect (intellectual virtue) a way to achieve happiness and it should be developed. In his work *Freedom and Development* (1973) Nyerere discusses on the plan on how to implement and promote *Ujamaa* villages on a health basis he noticed the need of education for the people as he said: “In considering this question we have

⁶² The important thing to remember here is that: it does not mean that Nyerere was total against the creation of wealth not at all because he sometimes mentioned it to be a good thing and something we shall have to increase, so long the created wealth continue to serve humanity and not the opposite of that or causing the above vices (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 32ff).

⁶³ According to Nyerere if an individual possess wealth and power these by themselves does not make her or him virtuous person, but if this individual will use these possessions to serve the objective of the community then they become virtuous (cf. Nyerere 1966, p. 7ff; cf. Cornelli 2012, p. 117).

to remember that the vast majority of our people are still illiterate; they could not read and study this policy document even if it were easily available to them....” (Nyerere 1973, p. 6). This is one of the reasons that made him to set plan for education from child level up adulthood that means for Nyerere there was the occasion for people to learning in what is called adult education (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 45f, Nyerere 1973, pp. 137ff). Despite being somehow bothered by education and school system that existed in Tanzania that time, Nyerere was aware that any thought about implement or financing education must take into consideration the question why is education needed in Tanzania? And why is it relevant to the people and community of Tanzania? Again here the similar idea of the *telos* or the end in something as in Aristotle philosophy appears in Nyerere’s way of thinking. With this question Nyerere meant education must have a purpose, and the purpose of education to the community of Tanzania he states: “is to transmit from one generation to the next the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of the society, and to prepare the young people for their future membership of the society and their active participation in its maintenance or development” (Nyerere, 1967, p. 1; cf. Dill 2013, p. 76).

Moreover, as I have mentioned above that in his talks about the Arusha Declaration on the section of “principle aims and objects of TANU” he always mention and discusses the three enemies of human development: poverty, ignorance and diseases respectively (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 14). Education was according to him the first tool that will help to fight all these three enemies of human development because logically it provide us with knowledge (know how), which helps to know how to go about with ignorance, poverty and disease—especial to think, decide, and act on them (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 78f). This is the reason I think Nyerere was convinced that poverty is not the real problem of the contemporary world rather the division of mankind into rich and poor. He thought and acts in this same spirit because according to him human beings have the ‘knowledge and resource’ which enables them to overcome challenges that hinder their development in life (cf. Nyerere 1974, p. 82, Chachage 2010, p. 21). In his explanation about the importance and pleasure of reading Nyerere argued that the availability of book for us to read them is important because books “can teach us, can inspire us, or can refresh our minds with the pleasure of a good story well told” (Nyerere 1968, p. 108).

2.1.7 Loyalty

The seventh and last aspect is loyalty. These concerns being faithful to the principles and constructive thoughts that govern the community as a whole, implementing in the community people of Tanzania the spirit of preserving freedom and having responsibility for

another and for the community (cf. Nyerere 1973, pp. 26f). This includes cultivating a life of virtues and living values which were already available, having together a vision of the prosperity of the community, caring, justice and peace, generosity, equality, human dignity, and participation in social actions towards human flourishing and community development (Nyerere 1968, pp. 9f, cf. Campbell 2010, pp. 45ff). In his speeches, Nyerere reminds the audience that:

“In truth it is necessary for socialists to think about issues –about policies–and about how our institutions can serve the people of our society. To try and divide up the people working for our nation into groups of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ according to their skin colour, or their national origin, or their tribal origin, is to sabotage the work we have just embarked upon. We should decide whether a person is efficient in a particular job, whether he is honest, and whether he is carrying out his task loyally. But those of us who call ourselves scientific socialists must be scientific and objective in our thinking and in making such judgments. We must think about men, and an individual man, not about ‘Asians’, ‘Europeans’, ‘Americans’ and so on” (Nyerere 1968, p. 41).

Therefore, according to Nyerere this sense of the participation of the ordinary people in transforming their own lives, the right of people to speak their minds, to participate at every level of the state, freedom of the press, the equality of all human beings, unity and justice as opposed to inequality in the form of class divisions and injustices, bring happiness into the community. Perhaps there might still be a question here as to how possibly will this lead individuals and communities to happiness! I think because Nyerere thought that the more people are free and united the more they can take care of the community and value one another (Nyerere 1968, pp. 6f). In this sense therefore there will be an occasion to exercise all the aspects just explained above that necessarily keep the community’s relations or situations in harmony –and in this way favor happiness or flourishing. It seems logical to argue that (as opposed to countries where its citizen is constantly in conflicts) the availability of peace, justice, equality, and understanding are some of the elements which ensures development, well-being, good life, and eventual happiness or flourishing of a community–the element for which Nyerere worked hard to preserve and to develop among Tanzanians. This involves as an initial step the way the good intellectual structure which was established, encouraged, and cultivated in the mind of people and their regions in Tanzania. For example, there was a “deliberate attempt to fight intellectual arrogance because it was felt that such arrogance had no place in a society of equal citizens” (Othman 2010 p. 31). Peaceful means as a way of great achievements and happiness were very important in Nyerere thought and action. For example, during the struggle for independence, he believed in peaceful means in the struggle to achieve certain political ends. He calls for restraining in any temptation to do confrontation pressurized by the military. He was asked to choose between: either going to prison or paying a fine and he chooses the latter in order to avoid any violence that might erupt from the people

for him being put in prison for example. (cf. Othman 2010 pp. 39f). So, Nyerere holds and shows it by example the importance of the virtue of truthfulness (loyalty) in creating good character and good life that lead to happiness as Aristotle does (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* II.7, 1108a20f). Therefore, these factors and his specific emphases create the impression that he pursued the idea of happiness as did Aristotle as was explained above. The arguments of both Aristotle and Nyerere would imply that happiness and community go together as we turn nun and continue with Nyerere discussion about community.

2.2 Nyerere's Ideas on Community

The best and the foremost way by which Nyerere's thought on the community can be described is through his political philosophy of *Ujamaa* as "familyhood" or 'brotherhood' as found among others in his documents entitled: *Ujamaa: the Basis of African Socialism* (1962) and the *Arusha Declaration* (1967/1977) (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 1ff). The Swahili term *ujamaa* is important in his philosophy because it carries the message that what makes a person what she or he is, is the integration and belonging in community life. In his own words Nyerere talking about the principle that guided the kind of community he and his team wanted to create states: "We have said that we want to create a socialistic society which is based on three principles: equality and respect for human dignity; sharing of the resources which are produced by our efforts; work by everyone and exploitation by none" (Nyerere 1967, pp. 5f). These elements which mostly occupied Nyerere's mind motivate him to work hard and implement his philosophy of *Ujamaa* social community life which as a result played a great role which shaping the society of Tanzania and Africa at large. To understand this well the following aspects will be explained.

2.2.1 Social and Cultural Aspect of Community Life

Nyerere was very keen about how the community of Tanzanian could be best social and cultural organized. The main emphasis of *Ujamaa* philosophy was the unity of individuals intelligently working together as brothers and sisters communally sharing and equal division of working hours and fruits of work (Nyerere 1967, pp. 7ff). For the reason that Nyerere's advocacy on freedom makes Tanzania society members free human beings from what he called the three enemies of human development (as one source of happiness) namely ignorance, diseases, and poverty, he therefore, finds some ways to make this possible. His first conviction was that if people develop an attitude of working hard, being self-reliant, avoiding laziness and exploitation, respecting other human beings and respecting the work they are doing that could improve the lives of Tanzanians (Nyerere 1967, pp. 6ff). The community meant for Nyerere a place where individuals can possibly live together and find

all their basic needs such as food, cloth, and shelter (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 80f). This is without question preceded by a good traditional ground system which is open to procreation,⁶⁴ good relationship and good formation of its member. So in his *Policy booklet published in September 1967 about Socialism and Rural Development* Nyerere as Aristotle thinks that family which consists of father, mother and children is important because this is source of social and political community. This sense of ‘togetherness’ at different things and occasion such as at work working together, caring each other, finding the solution of problem together, and enjoying the fruits of labour equally together with especially observance of “the customs, manners and education” all hold the community together. As a result good leaders, engineers, farmers, animal keepers, scientists, labour force, creativity, and sort of experts are created (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 106ff; cf Nyerere 1968, p. 338).

Nyerere’s structure of the community was that it is formed through family ties, really “a small handful of people such as the member of a ten-house cell or an even smaller number” were right portion, to begin with. The reason why it should start in a very small portion is that in this way it would help the members of that community to know each other very well and be able to work together efficiently and without blame. Similar to Aristotle’s idea that a small community naturally grows into a large city-state (*Politics*, I.2, 1252b30-1253a1), Nyerere thought also that the community should start with a small group of communities such as extended family villages but they should not remain small family communities rather they should be large community (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 120).⁶⁵ The advantage for the community to starting a small Nyerere argued is because in such small unity it creates a good environment for its member to discuss “their problems together, and make decisions together for which they all feel equally responsible” (Nyerere 1973, p. 7). For that reason, Nyerere thought that: “If we can get a few of these villages communities working in every area, their success will lead to others also being started. The essential thing, therefore, is to begin” (Nyerere 1973, p. 7). But Nyerere does not mean that the work of starting and promoting *ujamaa* village should be done by the members without outside initiative or participation. He has on his mind also the illiteracy situation of his citizen especially those who are in the village community.

Moreover, according to Nyerere, there was recognition of mutual interdependence between the community and the individual in African societies the values by which the well-being of an individual was maintained and protected in traditional societies for they do not

⁶⁴ In his speech in Mafia Island he said: “The word *ujamaa* denotes the kind of life lived by a man and his family –father, mother, children and near relatives” (Nyerere 1968, p. 137).

⁶⁵ This thought can be compared to Aristotle’s argument about starting a community as he remarks: “Now we should begin by examining everything in its least elements; and the first and least part of a family are master and slave, husband and wife, father and children” (*Politics*, I.3, 1253b11f).

impede each other, rather they complement each other (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp.139f ; cf. Bujo, 1997, p. 28, Cornelli 2012, pp. 193f). As Seithy Chachage the late professor of sociology at the University of Dar es salaam commented: “Societies were supposed to be organized in such a way that they served social justice in what has been called the ‘revolution of rising expectation’” (Chachage 2010, p. 23). The community meant to Nyerere a socialist environment whereby virtue of its principles:

“all human being are equal”, and “every individual has a right to dignity and respect”, where “every citizen is an integral part of the national and has right to take an equal part in Government at local, regional and national level” , “every citizen has the right to freedom of expression, of movement, of religious belief and of association with the context of the law”, “every individual has the right to receive from society protection of his life and of property held accord to law”, “every individual has the right to receive a just return for his labour”, “all citizens together posses all the natural resources of the country in trust for their descendants”, and “in order to ensure economic justice the state must have effective control over the principal means of production, whereby also “it is the responsibility of the state to intervene actively in the economic life of the national so as to ensure the well-being of all citizens, and so as to prevent the exploitation of one person by another, or one group by another, and so as to prevent the accumulation of wealth to an extent which is inconsistent with the existence of a classless society” (Nyerere 1968, p. 13f).

The soul and heart of the community in Nyerere’s thoughts must, therefore, have as its goals the promotion of peaceful change, social equality, racial harmony, and human development which lead to happiness as opposed to tribalism and all forms of exploitation, racial and ethnic discrimination that reduces it. I think another advantage of community’s heart to work together is that it leads to an inclusive, open and authentic development of the community because in terms of decision making the who community is involved if a bill or a law is passed and start to bind people in times of difficulties no member will complain or make protest because they are aware of the passed bill or law and no one will blame or unnecessarily show objections. Also, since the question of decision making will be share by the member of the community then every member contributes ideas, knowledge, talent and efforts which are important and productive that leads to flourishing and happiness.

2.2.2 Political and Economical Aspect of Community Life

The problem of development and the problem of equity are the major economic issues that occupied the mind of Nyerere as I have mentioned in his concept of happiness above and he consequently, know that good political and economical development plans and policies were relevant to approach these problems (cf. Chachage 2010, p. 20). He saw the community of Tanzania in two parts the first part consists of the people living in the town (in his time we call them the minority) and the second part of people living in the rural areas (in his time we call them the majority). He was very optimistic on the question of forming healthy *ujamaa* villages with some conscious precautions. He thought that first of all it should start but carefully at the beginning, that is, it should not, on one hand, be a rush and bullying act of

people by some enthusiastic members and on the other hand it should not be a result that nothing at all had happened, no action has taken place it should rather avoid the two extremes (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 6). So, there were questions of what, when, where, who, whom, which, whose, why, and how should the community (*Ujamaa* village) be started that much occupied his thoughts. Nyerere decided to encourage the peasants and workers to work hard for the community by setting the rural developmental programs based on communal farming in *ujamaa* social villages. By having this African socialism view in which the community naturally depended on agriculture he thought that the peasants and workers should devote themselves to cooperative at work following a special distribution and plan set by the state with the ultimate goal that they achieve the satisfactory human basic need for all citizens of Tanzania.⁶⁶ The emphasis given by his philosophy of *ujamaa* was of mutual cooperation for mutual gain that means; people should work together communally and develop (or gain) together to higher goals and Nyerere as individual who show a dislike to the cooperation that was a bad sign and a character which does not belong to humanity (cf. Nyerere 1974, p. 107). In one of his speeches, Nyerere holds similar to Aristotle that: “The community must own, control and run its own activities. They must be democratic and socialist working and living communities, in which the members are jointly responsible to themselves” (Nyerere 1973, p. 6). However, Nyerere argued that in the establishment of public goods in a socialistic society such as “the digging of a trench for a future piped water supply, or the making of a new road, or the improvement of village drainage” it is important that the decision is carried out by all member in deliberative way on how they can be “organized and run by a member for the common benefit”. He thinks that the advantage of acting this way will “re-established all the advantages of traditional African democracy, social security and human dignity” and at the same time we will prove ourselves that we are open to take advantage of modern knowledge and its advantages (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 127-129).⁶⁷

Concerning the question of leadership Nyerere believed that leaders are not merely born but are also made and improved through training. According to Nyerere a leader has many aspects among them the “quality of the mind [...]” such as “The ability to think

⁶⁶ The question of legal Tanganyika citizenship was marked by the event of independence on 9th December, 1961 whereby many people became independent, however, with a few people whose legal right of citizenship meant renouncing the citizenship of another nation within the period of time which was provided. According to Nyerere since then, the people became citizen by right of birth (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 258). Furthermore, for him it is wrong to introduce discrimination between Tanganyika citizens. The important thing for citizenship was good character, to accept all the duties, and receive all the rights implied by the citizenship of Tanganyika. This includes being “governed by the same laws, receive the same respect from his fellows, and have the same opportunities to earn a living and to serve the nation of which he is a member.” (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 259f).

⁶⁷ In addition to this Angela Kallhoff argued “public good support social justice and the sense of effective equality among citizen and [...] also provide a necessary background for the public forum” (Kallhoff 2011, p. 7).

logically, the capacity to express himself clearly and concisely, that mastery of his job which enables him to understand fully the implication of his decisions” and “[...] to appreciate a problem in a logical fashion,[...]” (cf. Nyerere 1966, pp. 124f). For Nyerere, the leaders were expected to constitute themselves in good moral character that a leader must possess, to show good example in following the principles, and to be with people for the people (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 17, cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 9).

2.2.3 Educational and Ethical Aspect of Community Life

Education and ethics are the two aspects by which knowledge, virtue, and social values are to be understood and practiced in the Tanzania community. To start with the aspect of education following Nyerere’s argumentative method it seems he was zealous in tracing all the dimensions of education. He looks back at the history and knows that although the existed community had no schools except some tribal initiation children had a little chance of learning by living and doing. For example, they learned the kind of grasses, their suitability, and purpose, the work to be done in crop starting from sowing, weeding, pruning up to work of harvesting, also animal care, tribal history and relationship with neighboring people and community’s spirits and they join the elder at all this work. These were the skills of the society, and the behavior expected of its members taught at home and on the farms and Nyerere find that although were ‘informal’ “they might have made the education more directly relevant to the society in which the child was growing up” (Nyerere 1967, p. 2). From this stage, Nyerere decided to set up new plans and purpose or *telos* of education starting with making amendments of the previous school’s though with the implementation of new policies, progressive measures. He was very enthusiastic in such a way that in the discussion about ‘Education For Self-Reliance 1967’ he wanted the education which was being provided to be very intense inclusive or all-encompassing like to “combine for primary schools pupils the same advantages of learning by doing as the secondary school pupils will have” (Nyerere 1967, p. 22), also it be cooperative, theoretical, practical, vocational and social. For him, there should be a balance and connection between primary, secondary, and university education in terms of quality of education and the manual activities the pupils and students have to do together with their teacher or with their parents when they are home. That means a child was admitted to primary school at the age of seven (7) and provided for seven and half hours (7 1/2 hours) of learning for seven compulsory schooling years (cf. Nyerere 1967, p. 10ff), consequently, that means when they finish standard seven they are thirteen years of age (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 20f). There were school farms where pupils in both primary and secondary day and boarding schools have the occasion to work, to ensure that some years in the

classroom and part of their time working together in the school farm or *shamba* and other activities like the cleanness of their environment and rooms, garden work, washing their dishes and the like (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 20ff).

The reason why pupils and students are taken to schools and universities for their studies is that the country is investing in the future experts in different sectors and fields such as doctors, engineers, politicians, teachers, professors, and agriculturalists (cf. Nyerere 1973, pp. 23ff).

Furthermore, it does not only aim at experts and elite but also education has a focus on the moral aspect of an individual. In Nyerere's view: "Government and Partly themselves tend to judge people according to whether they have "passed school certificate", "have a Degree", etc. If a man has these qualifications we assume he can fill a post; we do not wait to find out about his attitudes, his character, or any other ability except the ability to pass examinations" (cf. Nyerere 1967, p. 11). Education had also a role to prepare people who will then participate and engage with their communities when they are back home from school or college, showing total devotion and dedication to their needs putting service and work to the community at first place, and cooperating with them, share with them the knowledge one has acquired (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 24f), helping them, transforming them to a better life standard—as Nyerere remarks: "This is what our educational system has to encourage. It has to foster the social goals of living together and working together, for the common good. It has to prepare our young people to play a dynamic and constructive part in the development of a society in which all members share fairly in the good or bad fortune of the group, [...]".

Education in Nyerere's thought was supposed to encourage to the learner "cooperative endeavor, not individual advancement" (Nyerere 1967, p. 7) because for him when the education encourages "the individualistic instincts of mankind, instead of his cooperative instincts" (Nyerere 1967, p. 3) it falls into challenges for example such as race or difference in religion that will contradict the whole moral case of the independence movement which its goal was a rejection of racial distinctions (cf. Nyerere 1967, p. 4).

Also, Nyerere thought that the community members should be allowed to make their own decision and even make mistakes because the beginning is difficult and that is part of learning in the development process of the community of *ujamaa* village and Nyerere thought: "Only if we accept this are we really accepting the philosophy of Socialism and Rural Development" (Nyerere 1973, p. 8).

First of all according to Nyerere the community is of such kind where people are first of all free that means each is not bound bodily and mentally (cf. Nyerere 1967, p. 25).

His second emphasis of community was cooperation at work to fight the enemies of human development I have mentioned above and create discipline or respect of people each other in the community.

Thirdly, he emphasizes on being self reliant and confident the courage to begin doing oneself before putting the thoughts of assistance or help at the first place.

The fourth emphasis was on equality and loyalty in each sector and action of the community because he thought that the contribution of every individual is valued in the community and should be offered at the maximum efficiency possible with no unequal or decisive terms because it serves as the good life of the community which final goal is happiness or flourishing of the individual and the community (here the community it means for the benefit of others too since every individual of the community treats each other in a brotherhood-sisterhood relationship).

In his speech at the University of Liberia on 29 February, 1968 Nyerere says: “There is no doubt, of course, that the knowledge which has been acquired at schools and higher educational institutions can be used almost exclusively for personal gain, with benefits to the society being a mere by-product” (Nyerere 1973, p. 24). So, he argued that people should not behave like this after finishing their studies and getting employed because the education they acquire, they acquire at the expense of the community for the community. For him, there should be moral consideration at work such that even if an engineer who studies hard in the university, and at work draw a map and build a bridge for example should not necessarily receive a higher loan or better working condition than the labourer who carries bags of cement, working in water and so on is (cf. Nyerere 1973, pp. 24f).

According to Nyerere the division of mankind into rich and poor has two levels. The first level consists “of few individuals who have great wealth and whose wealth gives them great power, but the vast majority of the people suffer every degree of poverty and deprivation...” and this is found within national states. The second level is worldwide which consists of a collection of national states with “a few wealthy nations which dominate the whole world economically, and therefore politically; and a mass of smaller and poor nations whose destiny, it appears, is to be dominated” Similarly, that means when one recall the idea in Aristotle’s concept of the community discussed above would be reminded that the more people wealth they have the more the great power of control possessed by such people parallel to leadership too (cf. Chachage 2010, p. 21).

Haroub Othman writing about Mwalimu Julius Nyerere as an intellectual in power he described him as a person who was not just a leader but a statesman. Othman deliberately

avoided calling him a politician, because he thought that politicians come and go but Statesmen live on such that ‘the impact of their presence in society is felt for many years after their death’ (Haroub 2010, p. 28).

To sum up this part, Nyerere conceive the factors of happiness and source of virtues, good character and good life to be bound to the explained factors above such as independence (or freedom), unity, peace, social works, human development, equality, justice self relied knowledge and loyalty. The same as Aristotle Nyerere approaches the community in terms of social, cultural, political, economical, and educational and ethical way. This chapter two has laid down the meaning and principles of happiness and community as understood by Nyerere. The concept developed by Nyerere have in common the things which help a human being (as individual and as community) to flourish well, to constitute good character in relation to others and to her or his community and contribute to happiness to all. They both work hard to suggest the important things which enable individuals and the community to build up a good moral character essential for good, flourish, and happy life. The next chapter will now address the comparison between Aristotle and Nyerere based on the development of the thought and discussion about happiness and community above.

CHAPTER 3

3. The Comparisons between Aristotle and Nyerere on Happiness and Community Life

The comparisons between Aristotle and Nyerere regarding individual and community happiness will be explored from the discussion above and developed in several points in this next discussion here below. We will start with similarities which are many and then go to the few differences that appeared in the discussion above.

3.1 Similarities between Aristotle and Nyerere

The general similarities include the origin of their family in the sense that both Aristotle and Nyerere were born in a family connected to leadership, authority, and politics. Another close similarity is in terms of career they were both teachers whereby Aristotle was teaching different disciplines at the Lyceum and Nyerere was teaching biology and history at St. Mary's College in Tabora right after his studies diploma in education at Makerere University in Uganda 1945 (cf. Bjerk 2015, p. 23; cf. Kenny 2004, p. 69ff). Nyerere had a chance to acquaint himself with some philosophical works that sharpened his ideas and thinking in general, for example, the essays of the British economist-philosopher, John Stuart Mill⁶⁸ on representative government and on the subjugation of women (cf. Chachage 2010, p. 19), and what they agree one another is that community life is important for the happiness of individual and community because it preserves happiness (*eudaimonia*) by the creation of environment basis to good life (cf. *Politics*, 1.2, 1253a25-35). As Dr. Curtis S. J. a philosopher and an educationist also described this idea that Aristotle (and later Nyerere) is convinced that society had a natural origin in human nature and that individual is a rational, social, and political animal and therefore he had always lived in some kind of society, community, a family, a village, a city-state where he can only develop as a human being (cf. Curtis 1965, p. 182). Still, on community, they hold that it starts with a small unit and grows to city-states. They have the same interest in social life and thought it important at social works and economic progress of individual and community. They thought also the role of politics is not merely political expansion but also a more important ethical one, that is, the development of individuals to good community people. On education, they argue the same that it is an essential right to individual and it should be provided at the young age to adulthood. For the sake of clarity, all these comparisons (similarities and differences) between

⁶⁸ Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill who are the most famous advocate of utilitarianism are considered as a close reader of Aristotle (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xix).

them will be discussed in two main points namely: first, human development and second, leadership (and governance) of the community.

3.1.1 Human Development

Human development is the first and an important element which Aristotle and Nyerere (especial right after the independence or freedom in Tanzania) considered to be the most important. Nyerere believed that human development is not brought by money rather by humans (or people) themselves because money and wealth are the results and not the basis of development as Aristotle too would argue (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.4, 1095a15-25, 1096a5, III.12, 1119b21-35, Nyerere 1968, p. 28f). For Aristotle who as seen above was focused on practical matters and considers ethics as a branch of politics has the main question concerned human development that is how morally good behaviour, and the dispositions (the moral virtues) that prompt it, can best be developed. According to him child formation begins first with upbringing by parents, and second set forth by good laws. He proposes laws because ‘certain aspects of child-rearing can be ordained; the standards for good behavior can be set, and that the response of people to laws, seek to impose standards are better, compared to despots’ (cf. Brown and Ross 2009, p. xvii, cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 80). The four general prerequisites of development proposed by Nyerere are people, land, good policies, and good leadership (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 29), and as one continues to read his thoughts Nyerere would round up these different points into ‘hard-working and use of knowledge and intelligence’ as conditions of development in Agriculture (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 29) and in the industrial sector (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 98).

In the philosophy of Nyerere (*Ujamaa*), the government was committed its resources in the service of ordinary working people. That means the government for example used to collect taxes for the purposes of public provision of social and developmental services in a bid to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor and fight against poverty, disease, and ignorance. The aim was to move the poor Tanzanians from one status to another considering food, cloth, and shelter like Aristotle⁶⁹ and Martha Nussbaum (cf. Chachage 2010, p. 23, cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 13f, 28f.). “It is particularly important that we should now understand the connection between freedom, development, and discipline because our national policy of creating socialist villages throughout the rural areas depends upon it. For we have known for a

⁶⁹ Aristotle, for example, in his argument about the virtues especial the virtue of courage he meant that this is virtue which helps individuals to monitor feelings of ‘fears’. This is therefore an important virtue to fight the sources of fear or as Aristotle call it ‘an expectation of evil’ of which are many but a few of them are such as “disgrace, poverty, disease, friendlessness, and death” as mentioned by him (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, III.6, 1115a1ff).

very long time that development had to go on in the rural areas and that this required co-operative activities by the people . . .” (Nyerere 1973, p. 66).

Nyerere emphasizes that charity does not necessarily end poverty and he argued that one can get people to work, allowing them to work, they should be jobs for them, and they should be trained and be prepared to work. According to Nyerere’s observation, the operation of tax to people of Tanzania was, where I think the gap between the rich and the poor is very large the rich were more taxed in order for the tax collector to get more money. But it should be otherwise that the rich should pay more tax in order to try to reduce the gap between rich and poor, but they should not be asked to pay voluntarily. There should be as the end (or *telos*) the eradication of poverty, not alleviation of it (cf. Chachage 2010, p. 24). This reminds me of a famous saying attributed to Confucius that: ‘When a man is hungry, one should not give him fish rather it is better to teach him how to make a fishing rod and how to fish than to give him a fish. This is because if the man is given (provided) with a fish, he will eat it someday and once it is finished he will come again for aid, but if the same man is taught how to fish, then he will be able to catch fish for himself and always eat. Therefore, this will make some a difference in that man in what Aristotle and Nyerere the good life or transformation called flourishing. The thoughts which Aristotle and Nyerere have stresses regarding human development that are the bridge to human flourishing and happiness among many includes: education in the community, self-reliance, human relationship and art respectively.

3.1.1.1 Community Education

Contemporary societies tend to associate with academics, schools, institutions that it explicitly identifies as educational. But for Aristotle education takes place in a much broader way than one currently typically conceive of. For Aristotle, the family and the community also provide an important measure of education not only for citizens but for the children that are brought up within that community as well. The way I have understood Aristotle is that for him learning means among other things repetition and commitment. In Chapter ten of the *Nicomachean ethics* where Aristotle is talking about the relationship between pleasure and activities and argue that these two reinforce each other because he thought that what people enjoy they get better at because they do it more often, because they take pleasure, and they are willing to put more time into it. For example And then Aristotle use the example of somebody who really enjoys music such as people who are willing to put in the time to let us say practice an instrument and because of that they improve as musicians and the same applied with music students they learn more about their topic on the way which has against or the sort self-reinforcing dynamic that way, in fact, they get something out of it because they are better

at it, is more pleasurable (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, X.3, 1173a25-30, 1175a10-35). I think that can also be problematic in other respects because what we do not enjoy we probably do not want to put too much time into and we will not get good at. (I compare Aristotle's argument here with Nyerere's thought of education as he emphasizes people to learn working hard, independent and with committed and full of perseverance). The same thing I understood the discussion about practicing the virtuous life that is moral excellence and it is something similar to that kind of knowledge that is involved in knowing how to do something, understanding how to apply general principles or techniques within given circumstances then it is going to be important that one actually enjoy what one does. For example, there are some difficult or challengeable activities but someone tends to continue to do them despite causing much pain (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, X.9, 1179b-1180a5). This I think is a kind of idea Aristotle is present and this is because although one does not really enjoy it one is motivated and desire doing it, one is being self-controlled by privilege in one's reason or practical rationality over that, so sometimes it can be painful to act in virtuous ways even though one chooses to do that because one recognizes that it is good.⁷⁰ But over time through repetition, it becomes as Aristotle says second nature.⁷¹ So I think, this is the very important aspect of education in even the virtue and vices in the habits in general that we need to attend to.

In addition to that Aristotle also says something very interesting and this applies to his own work whereby he said that we are not made good by nature, or by habituation, or by teaching (or by the discourses on ethics) as some think. With this Aristotle meant that it feels pleasing, enjoyable, or warm when a person works hard in the seminar rooms to read books, to listen to all the audio, or to view all videos about his lecture or the lectures or of any other philosopher in ethics which describes or shows how to act well towards other people. However, that person having read all the books or listening to the lectures or seeing the videos by itself according to Aristotle are not by themselves sufficient to make a person better otherwise that a person has already some firm established moral disposition or exercising virtuous life already, or willing or wanting and therefore be ready to be transformed by them. That means the way farmers and gardeners prepare the field before sowing the seed, the same way should a person do preparation by start cultivation of good habits because these lead a

⁷⁰ Christine Korsgaard argued that the reason why individual choose to do thing demanded to them even if they do not want is because "the normativity of obligation is, among other things," a sort of what she call "a psychological force or necessitation" (Korsgaard 2009, p. 3).

⁷¹ There is implication for this for vice as well, as I have argued that vice can be second nature just as much as virtue can, so by doing the wrong sort of things over and over again one comes to enjoy those sorts of things. One knows by being greedy one learns by acting greedy how to get away with it and what sorts of things to do and what sort of things not to do and it becomes part of your mindset (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, X 5, 1175b-1176a).

person to act and think in good ways more naturally and the avoid bad habits by practicing virtue and cleaning the vices. Thereafter all the information from ethical books will work better and be useful to such a person (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, X.9, 1179b20-30, cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 62, p. 73). And here is where Aristotle really shows how important it is for any education to combine both theoretical and practical knowledge in order to determine the efficacy and competence of an individual in living a good life in a community. I compare this part too with Nyerere's argument where he uses this scenario to emphasize people combine theory with practice. He repeated saying that "socialism is an attitude of mind" (Nyerere 1968, pp. 1, 8, 10), that means socialism can be implemented well not only because people know about it but more when they want it and act on it—and he uses two terms 'hard work' and 'intelligence' (cf. Nyerere pp. 29-32). Therefore, one special valuable aspect of Aristotle's ethics—in my view—is his account of moral education, his account of how we become good people. It is a very common sense and practical approach but I think it is important. Aristotle thinks that we become good people by practice, that is to say, we have got to start when fairly young doing the right action, not really know why are the right actions at first but just getting into the habit of doing them thanks to a good example from our parents or teachers or whatever. They are the ones to say to the children what is right and wrong, or what is fair, or how to be generous, and by having praise and blame assigned to certain things. And once we have got into those good habits we can add a kind of a reflective notion and come to understand why these are the right actions and come to learn how to do a slightly different thing in different circumstances but the important thing for Aristotle is we have to come to enjoy acting in the right way and that is why he put so much on having the right feelings as well as doing the right things (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, II.3). This is because if a person simply does the right thing but hates doing it then that person is not really going to develop into a morally virtuous person. Lesley Brown thinks that is a tremendously important and actually important view of moral education (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xi-xii).

Aristotle like Nyerere recommends education to the community and that moral norms or ethics are absolutely an important academic subject and it should be taught to children when they are at school as well as when at home with parents. And that they need to feel pleasure and pain in the right way, right occasion, for the right reasons and not for the wrong reasons in which the community bring them up well, telling them when notice that they are feeling pleasure at the wrong way and can recommend them and encourage them to do something different or structure their activities in such a way a different balance of pleasure and pains can be promoted to them.

Another particularly interesting and relevant thing Aristotle says in this same point is that the nurturing and education should be handled by two things: the first is by law or normal as basic rules decide upon in an organization by the political community itself for Aristotle the Spartan is a good example among others (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.13, 1102a5f), and the second the parents or the family can also provide this sort of education especially when the political community is failing down on the job.

There is another important and relevant aspect to Aristotle's ethical writing and that is his view of the nature of ethical truth. Now many people think that if there are truths in ethics they have to be of the kind 'it is always wrong to do such and such', or 'it is always right, to tell the truth'. Aristotle was very sensible and recognized that it is very hard to find true universal generalizations of that kind. That different circumstance made different actions appropriate. But he did not think that we, therefore, throw up our hand in the air and say so there are no truths at all. He recognizes that there can be moral truth even if they do not take the form of universal true generalizations 'it is always wrong to tell a lie' for instance. And this position surprisingly is one that many people could learn from today because one will often hear a moralist saying if we cannot have universal moral truth, moral truth then it is all just a matter of relativism and the matter of opinion. I think Aristotle knew better than that!

Furthermore, both Aristotle and Nyerere argued that the importance of education is to put people of the community together socially in matters that pertain to life and work for the common good (cf. *Politics*, I.1, 1252a1ff). Nyerere for example argued: "This is what our educational system has to encourage. It has to foster the social goals of living together, and working together, for the common good" (Nyerere 1967, p. 7). This idea of living, work and design the common good together as community is also welcomed by the contemporaries (cf. Sherman 1989, p. 6).

Moreover, Nyerere considers education as a tool of or to liberation for both an individual and the society; a tool which an individual in all walks of life such as socially, economically, psychologically, culturally, physically, intellectually, and spiritually should liberate (Sanga 2017, pp. 1f) and I think because of the illiteracy situation that prevents people to find a way to the good life. Nyerere employs in education his philosophy of education for self-reliance, because he observed that Tanzania is gifted with different natural resources like other developed parts of the world, therefore that education should help people to use the available resources to develop themselves and the country of Tanzania (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 29, Nyerere 1967, p. 7). But in order to be able to work on natural resources people need self-confidence and freedom (independence of thought and action), they need to be responsible

work hard on fields and industries, they need to have democratic involvement to know about the politics of their country striving to create opportunities for all members of Tanzania to make meaningful contributions to decision making and seeks to broaden the range of all Tanzanians who have access to opportunities of education, they need to inform about the development steps all of which should be provided by education. A wide number had to learn to read and write to inform themselves about important things in life their history, their works, their community life, their development, and reduce the ignorance from the people. The people were very poor and the country too therefore education should add knowledge on the means of production and the way to utilize the natural resource to develop the country.⁷²

Diseases were taking the lives of people young and old in large quantities, the labour force was about to be wiped away and therefore through education and seminar people were able to inform themselves about health, avoiding prevention, treatment and health systems sustainability. Therefore, he thought also that it should add value to learners through an effective transformation that leads to the growth of society and the development of a nation.

According to Julius Nyerere “Education is not a way to escape poverty, it is a way of fighting it” (Nyerere 1973 pp. 137-141, Nyerere 1967, pp. 1ff). His conception of education embraces both vocational and social aspects of education (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 8f). The purpose of any education, as Julius Nyerere put it, ‘is to transmit from one generation to the next the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of the society, and to prepare the young people for their future membership of the society and their active participation in its maintenance and development which was then an appropriate education system for the societies (Nyerere 1968, p. 74ff; Othman 2010, p. 29). He knew that people need knowledge and courage in order to work with efficiency and accuracy in life and work. They need to be self-independent, responsible and they need to participate or involve themselves in democratic matters because the advantage is that when citizens are allowed to involve themselves and participate in democracy: the public trust in authorities will be increased, the political efficacy of the citizen will be improved, democratic ideals will be enhanced and the quality in deciding for the country’s different policies will be improved too and finally reduce the sharpness of over-reliance.

In order for education to fulfill well the above purpose, Nyerere recommenced that the kind of education that is to be offered in Tanzanian school should be relevant to the society such that the one who received it will ‘be in a position’ to practically live, and with all efforts

⁷² For Aristotle education is advantageous element because it can make people good judges of their action and enables them to act on their subjects properly –thus, seeing, judging, making choice or decision, and then acting on such a matter while accompanied with the knowledge is important (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* I.3, 1094b25f).

to offer and to transmit the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes of the society by which its contribution will be helping and uplifting his (own) community. For example, he remarks: “Most important of all is that we should change the things we demand of our schools. We should not determine the type of things children are taught in primary schools by the things a doctor, engineer, teacher, economist, or administrator need to know. Most of our pupils will never be any of these things” (Nyerere 1967, p. 16). It seems for Nyerere it is ridiculous for example for one to study hard in school about climbing the Alps Mountain range which lies entirely Europe or about the operation of the automobile manufacture machine in Japan, while he will live and work in Tanzania after his completion of studies where such things are not available or not applicable (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 15ff, cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 47). It is fact that the current community of Tanzania needs such people and such skills because of the wider need, interactions and possibilities available for job vacancy even in foreign states, but in his time the need of the time and the capacity of the student was different. That means the service of the educated people (learners) to the people is not separated from their presence in that society in which they are serving. It should not mean classes for example between a group of privileged elite somewhere there on the moon and a poor majority somewhere down there being ruled as Nyerere and *De la Rue* would formulate it (Nyerere, 1968, p. 7, Sanga 2016, p. 5) That is the reason Nyerere also argued that education should help one to serve his or her own society, at the same time in the vision of problem-solving and work-oriented (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 46ff, Sanga 2016, p. 2).

In his speech to the University of Liberia 1968 Nyerere implied that the society invests its effort to learners so that it becomes in return: “We are spending large and disproportionate sums of money on a number people so that in the future, they should make a disproportionate return to the society. Just the same way as we invest in our tractor, we are investing in a man’s brain: and just we expect the tractor to do much work for us which is many times as a hand-hoe, so we expect the student we have trained to make many times as great contribution to our well-being as the man who has not had this good fortune. We are giving to the student while he is at University, so that we may receive more from him afterwards. [...] we do not just have a hope, but expectation” (Nyerere, 1973 p. 24ff, Sanga 2016, p.4).

In the ‘Tanzania Ministry of Education 1982’ one can read the following proposed objectives of Education for Self-Reliance (ESR): “To equip learners with knowledge, skills, and attitudes for tackling societal problems; to prepare the youth for work in Tanzania’s predominantly agricultural society; and to enable learners to know, appreciate and develop a culture of Tanzania that preserves the national tradition, individual freedom, responsibility,

tolerance and respect” (Sanga 2016, p. 2). Therefore, according to Nyerere both formal and informal education has a purpose, and that is: “to transmit from one generation to the next the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of the society and to prepare the young people for their future membership of the society and their active participation in its maintenance or development” (Nyerere 1968, p. 45).

Similar to Aristotle’s concept of the four causes, Nyerere thought of education can be put in it that an individual is educated by the community or society with the ultimate goal that this learned individual came to serve his community in particular function after her or his completion. For example, a student of Medicine as ‘material cause’, the syllabus which the student of medicine normally take as ‘formal cause’, the act of writing researching, consulting books and teacher, writing reading taking the examination as ‘efficiency cause’ and then graduating as a Professional doctor working in the field of Medicine as ‘final end’. And I think this is an account of “the sense in which an intentional movement can be attributed to an agent as its author” as Christine Korsgaard describes Aristotle (cf. Korsgaard 2009, p. xii).

Consequently, according to Aristotle and Nyerere education as tool to development of both individual and community should have in its important elements: structure, scope, aim, strategy, means, and to consider the capacity of those who had to receive and the need of the society and should focus to that end of which is deliberately aimed.

3.1.1.2 Self-reliance

According to Aristotle lacking self-reliance makes a person inferior compared to the other who have self-reliance because self-reliance is one of the characters of a brave man among the five one’s as explained by Aristotle (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* III.8, 1117a20-25).

Nyerere believed that the development of the Tanzania community and its people should depend on the resources available in the country. It seems he thought if a person does not start to learn to think by herself or himself, making important decisions and act on such decisions that person does not flourish, and there is a danger of being dependent on others even for small things that one could do or afford by herself or himself. This is after he observed that citizens and leaders strongly convince themselves that without money there will be no development and therefore always think about, hope, and pray for money to come so that they can develop themselves. Nyerere, as well as Aristotle both, find this wrong idea. Instead what they, therefore, find good is the idea of self-reliance especially founded on “the people and their hard work” (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 33ff). Nyerere, for example, thought that after the independence of Tanzania people should be taught and start practice to be self-relied people independent of external financial help such as money, external aid, gift, loans, or

private investments, these he thought should not be used as weapons against poverty at the first place (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 100). This is because I think when one initially imparts the idea or ideology of external aid, money, gifts, loans in the mind of people, they will first of all not start to think by themselves or even stop that independent and creative thinking if they were such once, as I have explained on page 82 above by the example of the relation between ‘fish and fishing road to a hungry person’ as attributed to Confucius.

The reason which made Nyerere implement the policy of self-reliance in the mind of the people and to the community of Tanzania was because he thought that if people depend on money which does not exist or let themselves get used to the financial aid (money), gifts, and loans they will still dependent and there will be no reasons of describing themselves as independent country and second I think he thought also that ‘some of the money given by another government to our country as a gift for development scheme’ has its limitations and certainly its demands which are inevitable for example some will demand higher interest for their loans to us, he notices that some countries are also struggling with their poverty and they will not be ready to help us with loans to the extent that we are able to achieve our development targets (Nyerere 1968, p. 22ff). Therefore, he considers money—be it from within the country or from outside the country of Tanzania—as a wrong choice of weapon in the struggle against poverty or to run the developmental plans like more food, more education and better health that existed at that time because the government has no money or “the cow has no milk” as he said it metaphorically and second people need to be encouraged toward self-reliance programs starting taking part responsible in tax paying and hard-working (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 18ff).⁷³

It seems logical also to think that too much dependence on money especial as helps even in common circumstances cannot properly solve one’s problems because, the one who helps you with money will tell you also how to use that money that means reflecting with Nyerere: you will not be free on how you want to develop oneself, indeed one’s thinking capacity is limited or in control of the donor’s unpredictable decisions (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 25). This means also the act of flourishing and happiness of individuals and community will be in this way somehow determined by those who donate the money if they send them then the community members flourish and they are happy but if one time they will not send the money the people will not be happy because they are not used to that. So, Nyerere thought

⁷³ It should be mentioned also that Nyerere was not completely against external help and relation, rather he believes that these should not take the first priority tool when one is planning to develop people and a country—especial after such historical background (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 91ff).

that people should right at the beginning learn to work for their well-being and in case they lack something then they can go for help, but after they learned to work hard.

And when it comes to loans Nyerere thought that this will also be in one way or another a kind of restraint to our development goals especial when this money is given to our country is not as financial help or charity, but as a loan and must be repaid and perhaps attached with interests on it and so on. Also, for the private investments, that means investments in our country by individuals or companies from outside who expect their enterprise to bring them profit and safeguard it, Nyerere thought that will be a limitation to Tanzania's development because the investor would think more about their home countries that they would think on the development of Tanzania and its people (Nyerere 1968, p. 21ff). Fortunately, some measures have been recently made to correct some contracts which were not properly made with our investors.

According to Nyerere the tendency of not being strong and courageous enough to try doing things, to work hard for oneself might bring the people of Tanzania to the previous captivity as he summoned: "It is our weakness that has led to our being oppressed, exploited and disregarded" (Nyerere 1968, p. 18). Martha Nussbaum while explain about Vasanti's case she quoted "Gandhian notion of self-sufficiency" which states that a person can only win self-respect and freedom by first achieving self sufficiency with regard to its masters –that is, that person must first extricates her- or himself from dependence on their masters (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 21). One of the ways of cultivation of that character of brave man or character of strongness and courageousness suggested by Aristotle and Nyerere to work with human relationship and that will be following discussion. This will be particularly the question of friendship and family relationship explored in their works (*Nicomachean Ethics* VIII.I 1155a1– 1163b25, Nyerere 1973, p. 12-22).

3.1.1.3 Human Relationship

Friendship is one of the themes which Aristotle and Nyerere consider the most important when comes to human relationship because "it is a virtue or it implies virtue with a view to living" and according to them, it is the reason by which people choose to live because it surpasses all other goods such as wealth, good carrier, power, and even prosperity (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VII.1, 1155a1, cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 42, cf. Nyerere 1978, pp. 7ff). Aristotle like Nyerere explores and presents the role of 'other-regarding' concept in ethics (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. xiii) and according to him 'a friend is an extension of the self' or "...his friend is another self" as derived "from the proportional: X is to his friend as X is to X.", (cf. Ross and Brown 2009, p. 257) and also that "the extreme of friendship is likened to

one's love for oneself" (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* IX.4, 1166b1ff).⁷⁴ Similar to Aristotle, Nyerere would put that argument of friendship in African language and context in a famous maxim that "a person is a person through other persons" and "I am because we are" and I think the opposite is true (Metz 2018, p. 101). At this point, we find their unity of thought because they both think that an individual is not an island rather he needs others to complete herself or himself in different situations.

In David Ross's and Lesley Brwon's version of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, friendliness is grouped together with truthfulness, red wit and shame in the so called the 'virtues of social intercourse' probably because of the interchanging of words and deeds among men in a social way (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.6, 1126b1ff). The act of friendship is also considered a just act because it involves reciprocated goodwill. For example, John help Mary and John is helped by Mary without her being asked to do that in return. The advantages of having friends explained by Aristotle is that they are helpful in guiding your prosperity from being exposed to risks, preventing errors and weaknesses but most importantly it helps the stimulation of noble actions and the ability to think and act together. Aristotle, for instance, distinguishes between three types of friendship namely: the first one is 'based on utility' whereby person A derives some benefit from person B and person B derives it from person A therefore they benefit each other. The second one is 'based on pleasure', where person A is drawn to person B's pleasant qualities such as good looks, humor,⁷⁵ good character, friendlessness, and many others the same applies to person B. The third one is 'based on goodness', where both people A and B admire the other's goodness and help one another strive for goodness (Wolf 2007, p. 216ff). With this classification, one can notice that Aristotle and Nyerere show that justice and friendship are the important interconnected elements that are present in the community and they are determined by the extent of association between person A and person B. Aristotle also comments on that: "All the proverbs, too, agree with this, e.g. 'A single soul', and 'What friends have is common property,' and 'Friendship is equality,' []" (*Nicomachean Ethics*, IX.8, 1168b5-10). Aristotle and Nyerere considered the friendship both at the individual level and community level and this is the reason why this thesis treats it like that as Aristotle remarks: "All the communities, then, seem to be parts of the political community; and the particular kinds of friendship will correspond to the particular kinds of community" (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII.10, 1160a25-30). Moreover, there are according to Aristotle two

⁷⁴ Nancy Sherman suggested that: "[...] Aristotle's notion of a friend as 'another self' is compatible with the distinctive ways in which each individual realizes virtue within a shared life." (Sherman 1989, p. 119).

⁷⁵ Nyerere (as in anticipation Aristotle) is considered to have a kind-hearted and a sense of humour things which are important for friendship (cf. El Saaddawi 2010, p. 8).

essential factors that contribute greatly to friendship namely, “a common upbringing and similarity of age” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII.12, 1161b1–1162a30).

In Nyerere, the occupation with and on friendship is manifested not only in his arguments as found in most of his speeches but also more in his actions in the way he interacts with a multitude of people and countries try to call them to unite and work together. In most of his speech he encourage and motivate people and different nations to come together because he thought that could be the best way to get to know each other, to consider each other, to be strong, to move together, and to grow together as African countries ensuring harmony among its citizens and security of our countries and he welcome them to come to Tanzania too (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 148).

The second thing is justice. Both Aristotle and Nyerere have emphasized the question of the virtue of justice in the relationship. Equal share, equality is the words which both of them considered important to keep harmony and increase happiness within the community. With Aristotle, there are several kinds of justice.

Human relationship as conceived by Nyerere was from the family lever all the way through state relation up to the international relation. Good human relationship is important for human development because it embraces the terms of cooperation, unity, equality, care, and many that we have mentioned above that lead to the good life, and happiness as its ultimate end. In his speeches Nyerere argued: “We shall achieve the goals we in this country have set ourselves if the basis of Tanzania life consists of rural economic and social communities where people live together and work together for the good of all, and which are interlocked so that all of the different communities also work together in co-operation for the common good of the nation as a whole” (Nyerere 1968, p. 120). For example, Nyerere argues that in the typical African extended family⁷⁶ a socialistic individual does not look other individuals as natural enemies or non-brethren rather one “regards all men as his brethren –as members of his ever extending family” (Nyerere 1968, p. 11f). This idea is similar to Aristotle’s idea of friendship in which he considers a friend as an extension of one’s friend relation “for his friend is another self” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1166a25-30). Nyerere talking about education argued that: “There must be the same kind of relationship between pupils and teachers within the school community as there is between children and parents in the village” (Nyerere 1967, p. 17).

⁷⁶ John Samwel Mbiti in his description of the African family moral argues that: “Each person in traditional life lives in or as part of a family”. According to him “the concept of the family covers a wide range of members, including children, parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts, various relatives on both the father’s and mother’s side, and the departed” (Mbiti 1975, p. 176).

3.1.1.4 Art

Art is another interesting factor of similarity between Aristotle and Nyerere because one notices the way they use art in their works. For example, art played a great role in Aristotle's philosophy especially in the historical development of his aesthetics. Aristotle believed that when someone begins to think or to discuss beauty it is because behind it there is an artwork produced by an artist. The human mind is able to perceive these artistic realities and comprehend them as alluring and beautiful. Aristotle conceives all art as an imitation or mimesis of nature (cf. *Poetics* §1, 1447a14-1447a18).

In the *Poetics* Aristotle's thought about art is present but most it is in terms of poetry literature, but in other of his writings one finds more descriptions of it, its place in his philosophy and doctrine, and in this thesis, it is an important discipline which describes the idea of happiness of individual and community. In *Poetics*, Aristotle mentions that the poets have two factors that connect to human nature namely imitation and beauty (cf. *Poetics* §7, 1450b22-1451a15). Aristotle considers art, science, sensibility, wisdom, and intelligence as the vehicle by which the human spirit attains the truth (cf. Aristoteles 1998, p. 116). The sculptors and statues in ancient Greece representing different gods and peoples worship to them are some of the examples which Aristotle brings in his writings, such as the sculptor of Acropolis in Athens which were made with gold ivory and adorned with countless details. He also adds that man is not imitated by nature rather his capabilities imitate nature and that this ability exists to support nature and finish imitate the perfects of nature without finishing it or exhausting it. Aristotle in book seven which is the last of his *Eudemian Ethics* argued that one of the characteristics of friends is that they usually share the goods they possess example of such goods include some bodily pleasure as a contemplation on philosophy or artwork produced from one of them.

In book eight of his *Politics*, he explains the way musical education was an obligation to the youth and its central place in the ethical qualities rhythms, and melodies because in music the young meet all kinds of situations anger, courage moderate gentleness, and it's opposite together with the ethical and moral disposition (cf. *Politics*, VIII.2, 1337b1ff). Thus why when an individual listens to music, her or her life changes for it makes a sentimental alteration. Arts were for Aristotle wise men. And since the order, symmetry, and clearness are the attributes of between, Aristotle relates and compares with mathematics because of its artistic clear composition and arrangement and the way it is used in the sculptor work like Polycleitus, a sculptor from Argos.

In the opening of his book the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle write: “Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and choice, is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason, the good has rightly been declared to be that at which all things aim” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.I, 1094a1ff). In the description of virtues he gave an example concerning ‘the mean’ in doing the art work: “Thus a master of any art avoids excess and defect, but seeks the intermediate and chooses this — the intermediate not in the object but relatively to us.* [...]” (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1106b5f).

Like Aristotle in terms of art Nyerere is very acknowledged especially for his ability, love, contribution, and participation in the artwork and he really use his intellectualism as well as his artistic skill to express his philosophy and ideas.

First of all, he was able to identify the potential of many talented women and men in arts and as an artist and made efforts to initiate it to the country. For example, apart from their moral plays, traditional African theatre was seen by the missionaries and the church as demonic, repugnant also associated with witchcraft, and thus why was no established theatre institutions were. However, the colonial government had later their own art groups. The situation continues like this even after the second World War. (cf. Shule 2010, pp. 160ff). Beni Ngoma was one of the famous Tanzanian dances that came into existence after some lights of independence started to shine with the birth of the Tanganyika African Nation Union (TANU) in 1954, though with restrictions. Nyerere established the Ministry of Culture and Youth and outline its roles already in 1962 after the ritual of placing the torch and inauguration of the *Uhuru* torch race in 1961 on Independence Day. According to Nyerere arts play the role in shaping people’s consciousness towards a common goal (cf. Shule 2010, pp. 163ff). Examples of the groups of musicians and dancers included: the National Ngoma Troupe (1963), the National Acrobatic Group (1969), and the National Drama Group (1972). The first recorded performance in 1954 was *Amka Msilale* (Wake up, don’t sleep) which includes the concepts of nationalism and liberation in its work. Another artistic performance was the ‘ritual’ surrounding the union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar on 26 April 1964. Vicensia Shule writing about this event of the union says:

“In addition to the usual practice of signing the treaty and exchanging the Articles of Union, Nyerere mixed the soil of the two countries. Nyerere wore a shirt made of leopard skin. He used two gourds filled with soil from Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Then the mixing was done by pouring the soil in the pot. The two men who held the pot were both kneeling and dressed in kitenge (cotton fabric) tailored uniforms. The costumes, props and the mixing of the soil symbolised how Nyerere valued and treasured arts and his belief in the content of traditional theatre.” (Shule 2010, p. 165).

Another thing Nyerere as arts produces a variety of theatre works and translate some famous Shakespeare plays the result of his work include: Julius Caesar as Julius Kaizari (1968),

Macbeth as Makbeth (1968), and The Merchant of Venice as Mabepari were Venisi (1969) with the aim to add value to people theater, to promote the Swahili language which is the language of the nation and to encourage people that it is possible to read other people's work, to understand them and even translating them. The last work which was translated by Nyerere into Swahili but not yet published was Plato's the Republic (cf. Shule 2010, p. 165f).

According to Nyerere art is helpful in the development of thought. Nyerere as an artist was able to use fine arts and link it with his philosophy of *ujamaa* as depicted in one of Makonde sculptors Dimoongo which was made by Robert Yakobo Sangwani. For example, the speeches delivered by Nyerere were thought-provoking full of poetic creativity able to present some contentious national issues.

Another example of an artistic element in Nyerere was his writing skill since childhood on issues about the subjugation of women with background from his own family life –as influenced by philosopher John Stuart Mill–and in vision to improve and transform the lives of many people in Africa (cf. Shule 2010, p. 167).

Artwork is presented also in many national symbols of Tanzania for example the Tanzania coat of arms, by which different artists groups founded in his time, to work together–or to imitate nature as Aristotle has argued– and they come out with different painted human portraits and objects and for those who were sculptors, they carved different animals and objects. The development of the groups was that after the National Art Groups NAGs was dissolved a national art institute was formed in Ilala Sharif-Shamba in Dar es salaam 1980. In the following year, the institute was transformed and shifted to Bagamoyo and acquired a new status as Bagamoyo College of Arts (BCA) or as currently known the Institute of Arts and Culture Bagamoyo or TaSUBa. Also, opportunities for arts to sustainable production and have their own survival were created by Nyerere (cf. Shule 2010, p. 171f). Nyerere's speeches were used as the policy for the art groups and because he was also an artist one could sense his ideas, creativity, and passion for art these speeches.

Art contributes to the flourishing of individuals and communities because as entertainment it is very open and alluring to them at first then comes to the contemplation and enjoyment. For example, if a person sing, or dance or watches other people performing, or producing artwork like music, writings, drawings, paints and all the hand works of the arts as one might see them in the museum, in the market, or in the exhibition, or when one attends to the theater festivals they contribute to the end ultimate good, *eudaemonia* happiness as Aristotle and Nyerere conceived and presented them (cf. Coeckelbergh 2019, p. 41, pp. 60f). All these arts again are the result of intellectual and practical factual such as contemplation,

thinking, designing, and doing. In this sense Aristotle and Nyerere believed that the work of art contributes make philosophy or any other difficult discipline easy to understand even today moreover, they consist of the ancient values of moderation, goodness beauty, and accuracy.

3.1.2 Leadership and Community Governance

Our understanding of leadership in contemporary society shows that some thinkers use contingency and behavioral theories in their understanding of leadership but some of them are now seeking an alternate approach by turning to philosophy which plays the role of enhancement to their understanding of leadership and governance. The topic above about ‘human development’ goes hand in hand with the top of ‘governance and leadership’ and as we have seen Aristotle and Nyerere were very concerned in their political philosophy with both inquiry what kind of government is the best for the community as well as the policies (laws) and leader who govern the community (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 124-125). Aristotle and Nyerere have shown that human development towards flourishing and happiness is carried out in two dimensions: mental (or theoretical) and physical (or practical), this is the same when it comes to governance and leadership.

3.1.2.1 Wisdom and Knowledge

This means being equipped with a life of virtue a good leader is expected to have the ability of the lead to settle disputes, the ability of decision making and to lead by example. To begin let us see and state the meaning of the term ‘leader’. I think for Aristotle a leader is someone who should possess the virtue of magnanimity (and humility) and he means with this a person with the greatness of soul in the Greek language *μεγαλοψυχία* *Megalopsychia* (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, IV.III, 1123a, cf. Keys 2006, 145). This is because in his *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Politics*—the discussion we had above—does believe that some human beings (members of the community) lacked the intellectual capacity to participate (fully) in the truly happy life and therefore in some activities in the community. For example, he believed that people like children, women and slaves (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, VIII.11, 1161b2 – 8) cannot be happy completely for the reason we mention above that “happiness is available only to those whose age, gender, and civic status allow them to pursue a life of the excellent activities that make it up” (Brown and Ross 2009, p. ix).⁷⁷ In this way, he formulates also the hierarchy of leadership.

According to Aristotle, there are two types of human beings in the community. There are those who are capable of virtuous life and rationality and there are those whose life is

⁷⁷ Some thinkers see this thought different, they think the young as well as the old people should be given the opportunity to do philosophy and no one is young or old in all this matters acquiring knowledge including being happy, so it should not be postponed as Aristotle suggests (cf. Gerson & Inwood, 1994, p. 28).

guided by their passion. The former type builds the mentor and leaders of the community and the latter type does not rather than to be ruled as Aristotle formulated it. Also in his politics, he mentions a similar thought that: “Ruling and being ruled belong among not only necessary but also advantageous things. And immediately from birth certain things diverge, some toward being ruled, and others toward ruling [...]” (*Politics*, I.2, 1254a20-30). Despite such a two-element distinction in the leadership structure, Aristotle regard leaders as men of courage and temperance equipped with knowledge through learned, compassionate, whom because of the privilege of free time and time to learn thought about the ultimate good both for themselves and most importantly for the whole community (cf. Cawthon, p. 2021). Aristotle considers a leader as someone who has the capacity to enable the community entrusted to that person to reach its goals. Moreover, Aristotle suggests that for this reason they should be given more time to contemplate the ultimate good of the whole community something the latter group lacked. On reading Aristotle one could notice that the people who are going to be political leaders real need among others this ‘virtue of magnanimity’ in order or if they are to be excellent political leaders. The traits of Aristotle magnanimous person (Aristotle himself as a magnanimous man)... One might say that with the virtue of magnanimity the person or the leader is inclined to claim the greatest of honesty and it presupposes the four human excellences as described by Aristotle: the best of honor, noble and fine and good and to have perfected many of all other virtues. In the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle, insist on the best form or way of life and how one can live it. Aristotle makes one think apparently that Philosophy or political theories are not just an academic interest rather they challenge someone’s life—if it is all it should be. His thought makes one reflect on the question: ‘What is the best way to live one’s life?’ and ‘Am I living it?’ and ‘if I am not very yet, how do I get there?’ And not only how do I get successful but how do I become that person who is capable of doing really great things in life? And doing great things does not just necessarily make me have a nice life but that helps many other people to have a wonderful and rich existence as well (cf. Keys 2006, 145).

Another similar factor is now looking at the question of the citizen-leader relationship. For the reason that every leader is one of the citizens of a county who is chosen among other citizens and placed in charge for the service, and benefit of all the citizens and community, it is good to see what Aristotle and Nyerere argued in their philosophy concern the role and the relation between leader and citizens. On reading both Aristotle’s and Nyerere’s thought about leadership and citizen I think they seem to emphasize the same thing about citizen which is that a citizen at the very least is somebody who is not just voting once in a while, but

somebody who is actively involved in their community and fully informed about the society's issues able and willing to engage other citizens to try to deliberate and agree about the common good (cf. Nyerere 1967, pp. 124f). So, politics for Aristotle and Nyerere in the truest sense of the word is that deliberative activity amongst citizens aiming at compromise but more than that aiming at the common good (cf. Nyerere 1973, pp. 6ff, cf. *Politics*, 1275a22-23, b17-19). That which is argued by them presents—on my opinion—the proper understanding of citizens.

Now if one contrasts that with the liberal idea of citizen, one will see that there is been a real diminishment in what it means. The life of a citizen in a liberal society could literary be nothing more than belonging as in the case of Thomas Hobbes citizen who concerns internally to the social contract which is based on his self-interest primarily the avoidance of death and the ability to be safe and therefore hopefully to pursue one's self-interest economically (cf. Bagby 2009, pp. 104ff, cf. Johnson 2015, pp. 159f) and when we get to John Locke there is a little bit of an expansion in the sense that the citizen can vote for representatives but still, the activity is that of the individual the self-interested individual whose primary goal is to stay alive, safe and prosperous. And in the liberal conception, the citizen is pitted against others in completion in which some people and some groups are going to wing and others are going to lose on way given occasion.

According to Laurie Johnson, the majority will win the minority will lose but there is not any necessity for agreement ultimately or a notion of the common good that sort of overarches all citizens. The old notion of citizen is better in her view and in the older sense the Aristotelian sense. She thinks that we do not really have citizens. Even when our people are very strongly active which most of them are not if Aristotle could for example look at the typical citizen of the united states today, he will be seriously disappointed because of the lack of engagement, the lack of understanding of the current issues the way the government works, lack of concern for the views and opinions of their fellow citizens, willingness to listen, wiliness to deliberate instead of just arguing or shout or as currently seen in media react. And that is actually the activity of a more than a typical active citizen in the United States if they get angry about politics she think that there are somehow paying more attention than a lot of other people (cf. Johnson 2019, pp. 131ff).

One thing one has to remember about the older notion of citizenship was that it was not merely instrumental. The very act of engaging in political activity was an end in itself, it developed the person it was human activity (cf. *Politics*, 4.1, 2196b13-1301a12). In fact, Aristotle and Nyerere believed that one could not be fully human unless one actually engaged

in politics as a citizen in that truest sense. And so there is a sense in which Aristotle or somebody like Aristotle might see our current citizens in United State—and in some other countries too with a similar situation—as acting in a more instinctual or not quite human way, less than human. Now, why did liberal citizenship become thus diminished? Well because liberal thinkers like Hobbes and Locke very consciously decided that the price was too high because as the world got bigger and more diverse one might say there came so many moral opportunities to clash even within the societies not just external warfare but internal strife more and more ways that could happen and especial in Europe, of course, the religious wars and they decided it was not worth it that safety was more important. However, we have lost a lot and in the truest sense of the word not too many of us are citizens. So this is something that we need to contemplate and think about whether and how we could bring citizenship back and I think it is particularly important now at a time when if people are politically active it is usually on Facebook shouting at each other, calling each other's names, thinking badly about their neighbors, not able to empathize which granted is difficult sometimes but when one is confronted with them and one has to live with them it does become a little more necessary (cf. Johnson 2015, p. 334). But people tend to hide in their little holes and maybe particularly now they have an excuse for doing so.

3.1.2.2 Equality and Justice

The leader required to rule with equality and justice. Aristotle treated justice as virtue and he divide justice of the city in tow main groups: in general (universal) sense and particular sense. With the former Aristotle meant two dimensions, that the just is equal to the lawful (*Nicomachean Ethics*, V.1, 1129b12-14), that means all the lawful things are in a sense the just things. In another place of the universal justice he brings the second dimension considered the lawful things to be only by accident the just things (*Nicomachean Ethics*, V.9, 1137a11-12).

Also according to Aristotle: “the only stable state is the one in which all men are equal before the law”. With the latter, Aristotle considers the just equals to the equal (*Nicomachean Ethics*, V.2, 1120b30-1131a1). This particular sense of justice is divide by Aristotle into: First, distributive justice (which includes geometric proportions, equal shares for equals, unequal for unequals, different in different regimes) and second into corrective justice (which took arithmetic proportion: subtract unjust again of one party to make up for loss by other party). The corrective justice was further divided two element voluntary transactions (such as selling, buying, lending at interest, giving security for a loan, investing, depositing and renting) and another element in this division is involuntary transactions (which consists in

furtive and by force). The furtive element (includes thing like theft, adultery, poisoning or ‘*pharmakeia*’, procuring or ‘*proagogeia*’, enticement of slaves, assassination by treachery and false witness) and the by force element (consists of things like assault, imprisonment, murder, seizure, rape, maiming, verbal abuse and slanderous insult). It means the one who leads should take good governance by having an open eye on both virtue and vices available in the community in ensuring a ‘just state’ (cf. *Politics*, III.9, 1280b5-6).

Aristotle defined a state as an association of similar persons or citizens in a constitution whose aim is the best life possible (cf. *Politics*, 1276b1-2). Nyerere urged about individual and community happiness achieved through social works equality community life especially that everyone gets a share of the produce. Work was like a virtue for him relevant because it gives one dignity, equality, and respect to her or his community. Nyerere argued that what he means by the term ‘worker’ does not mean word ‘worker’ as opposed to ‘employer’ rather ‘worker’ as opposed to ‘loiterer’ or ‘idler’ and according to him “loitering was an unthinkable disgrace” in traditional African society (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 5f).

3.1.2.3 Discipline and Commitment

Aristotle addresses the question of the discipline of leaders in a broad way. In the different forms of constitution or governments which he pointed above, Aristotle believes that democracy is the worst form⁷⁸ when it comes to governance because it is ‘people majority’ and in this way, it allows the uneducated and the people who are not strong enough to lead the community compared to the best suited ones. This leads to the breaking of the discipline and tenets which ensure justice in the community. The world has been witnessing some corruption and some dictator kind of leadership which most causes pain to citizens. Some of them were not read accept to leave their sit easily after losing the elections, some cause deficits and a bad situation for the county and its citizens like conflicts, divisions, and wars.

The idea of governance and leadership of the individuals and community was according to Nyerere an act of serving as opposed to being served (or of being a ruler or a dominator). If one would have to describe Nyerere’s personality as a leader one will mention his commitment and leadership, he is known for his realistic and inclusive strategies, his capacity to inspire and galvanize people from very different backgrounds and his serene confidence, his eloquence, and his unfailing good humor was excellent. Chambi Chachage writing about Mwalimu Nyerere he argued that he was such a person leader who was able to

⁷⁸ “Democracy is the least bad of the deviations: perhaps because in tyranny and oligarchy bad men are in power, while the fault of democracy is that all (adult male) citizens have a share in power however poor and lowly” (*Nicomachean Ethics* VIII.10. 1160b, *Politics*, III.7.).

generate public debate on issues of importance to society and named it ‘legacy of the Nyerere’ (Chachage 2010, p. 3).

Aristotle states in *Magna Moralia* that: “If therefore one is to act successfully in affairs of state, one must be of a good character” (*Magna Moralia*, I.1, 1181a25-1182b28). For Nyerere, the type of governance and leadership were to relate to the needs of the people and the kind of country policies he wanted to establish with reference to that time socialism-nationalism. A leader was for Nyerere the one who lead with wisdom and higher understanding. A leader is somebody who understands the policy and laws of the country, the one who sees the need of the people and is ready to serve them accordingly. The leader is the one who inspires and teaches the community members. In his discussion Nyerere points out:

“In one sense all that I have been saying so far is a call for leadership. We need people to lead others into an understanding of the concept of ujamaa villages, to lead the members in the villages, to promote good methods of husbandry and practical methods of organization; we need people to rally the member when they get discouraged, show them the way out of their difficulties, and so on. Progress in socialist rural development does in fact depend almost entirely on leadership at all levels; it needs leadership to get the group started, and it needs leadership to maintain them and have them grow. [...] A good leader will explain, teach, and inspire. In an ujamaa village he will do more; he will lead by doing. He is in the front of the people, showing them what can be done, guiding them, and encouraging them” (Nyerere 1973, p. 9).

According to Nyerere to lead does not at all mean to control people, to intimidate or bullying them rather educate people about social, ethical, spiritual, political-cultural, and human community values and to inspire and encourage them when they face challenges, or difficult. This in the state when those who are being lead want to despair and therefore to give a guide or showing them what can be done especially in *ujamaa* village a leader was required to lead other by example or by doing. That means here more was demanded on what a leader has to do to the people entrusted to her or him. The tendency of leading like the way remote control works was discouraged a leader is supposed to be with those she or he leads giving directions both theoretical and practical. Nyerere emphasizes: “You can lead the people only by being one of them, by just being more actives as well as more thoughtful, and more willing to teach as well as more willing to learn—from them and others” (Nyerere 1973, p. 9).

In one of his speeches, he gave one example of how a leader is supposed to react to a situation and need of citizens with different opinions on the project establishment, as he said: “Let me give one example of the kind of leadership which is needed. Suppose a group of families have decided to start a co-operative farm and village, and are discussing where to build their houses. A good leader who is a member of this group may argue that it is better to build on the hill and face the drudgery of carrying the water until they can afford a pump and pipes;...” (Nyerere 1973, p. 9f).

3.1.2.4 Integrity and Obedience to the Law

Integrity and obedience to the law is considered by Aristotle and Nyerere to create discipline, harmony and humanity to community individuals because otherwise they can become as he mentioned above the most savage of animals (cf. *Politics*, 1.2, 1253a25-35). They thought without the justice and law of Integrity and obedience to the law are important tools for the political stability and good governance especial in time of crisis, conflict to maintain peace and order. Aristotle put forward good laws and leaders something which Nyerere supported him (cf. Brown and Ross 2009, p. xvii, cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 80).

According to Aristotle when it comes to business he will argue that the question of integrity is very important. For example, the art to know the demarcation to the extremes that are placed by 'the mean' on matter concerning financial, trade and exchange of goods and services. How is the money to be acquired or which kind of business is legal, which is not? (cf. *Politics* I.9. 1257a1ff) What should be kept secret and what should not when giving evaluation or accountability concerning matter of the community. The question of salary used for different workers of the community. The method or principle employed on economic growth. All these should respect the integrity and law.

3.1.2.5 Dignity and Sustainability

The two thinkers Aristotle and Nyerere thought and discussed about dignity of individuals and community and their sustainability in the future. The leaders were supposed take care that the dignity of the community members is respected for example in his *Ujamaa* text Nyerere pointed human out that dignity a socialistic society created was based on three principles and one among many was equality and respect for human dignity which was present in National Ethic, the Arusha Declaration resolutions and many other documents (cf. Nyerere 1967, p. 5f). For example, his discussion about unity, freedom, right to participation in the community, equality and respect of all human beings and in sovereign relationship, right of recognition in terms of social status as well as belief or faith (religious status) shows that he cares and support right of the dignity to people. He argues in one of his speeches: "[...] 'what we have won is the right to work for ourselves, the right to design and build our own future'. The real commitment with independence was thus to 'build the nation', and to establish 'dignity for all'" (Nyerere 1973, p. 269).

Moreover, the creative thinking about the ongoing progress and maintenance of the individual and community conditions were about the good life reflecting on the future. For example, in talking about the intellectual needs of the society Nyerere shows the way education should be aimed for the sustainability of the whole society in the future: We are

investing in a man's brain in just the same way as we invest in a tractor [...]. (cf. Nyerere 1973, p. 23f)

3.2 Differences between Aristotle and Nyerere

There are slightly but interesting differences between Aristotle and Nyerere based on the way they describe individual and community in connection to happiness and community life. The general overview of the relevant distinction and emphasis which can be observed in both Aristotle and Nyerere as pointed at the beginning is that they attempt to treat happiness in the sense of 'well-being or flourishing' or doing well as opposed to depression or tranquility. The former has more to do with 'being good' and the latter has more to do with 'feeling good'. For example, if one eats a piece of chocolate, it feels good, and it makes happy in this later sense but if one read a good book or help people who need his or her help, he and the people become happy (McMahon 2006, p. 65). The evaluation of this will be done by Martha Nussbaum and other contemporary philosophers in the coming chapters.

3.2.1 The Level of Recognition and Participation in a Community Life

The first difference is based on the level of recognition and participation of members in a community life. This means the question of equality and freedom of individual and community and their ability to attain happiness or to participate fully in the community is in Aristotle a little bit limited compared with Nyerere. Happiness is not capability to every individual and participation or belonging as citizen and member of the community is not the right of everyone.

In this is the discussion about relationship between slaves and master and the way Aristotle considers the position of women and children in the participation on happiness one will notice that in Aristotle's view there is a distinction between citizens and other inhabitants. For example, all resident aliens, children, slaves, seniors and ordinary workers are unqualified citizen and therefore are excluded in the participation in deliberative or juridical office (cf. *Politics*, III.1, 1275b18-21). Aristotle has managed to analyze the question of slavery in all in a wide dimension trying to see whether it is right, just and therefore fits in the community or not at all and according to many commentators his defense come out with success or in positive way. However, I think what distinguishes him from Nyerere is his argument about the division of the citizen in the *polis* and the rights that are reserved to each of them for example the right and opportunity to participate in the court and government. On one hand this division causes challenges or difficulties in running the government (state community) because of the inferiorities that might arouse out of the differences. On the other hand, if it is in the sense of rational capacity then this could be a reason however should be

done with wisdom. The solution to that is to embrace the spirit of equality not in terms of mathematical calculation as we have also seen in the previous discussion but the right and room for opportunities that are available and the wisdom in dividing or sharing the resources among members of the community. Whereas Aristotle seems to differentiate them completely, (cf. *Politics*, I.4, 1254a1ff) Nyerere considers them on one side as having probably genetic differences and on other hand as having all the equal human rights (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 13ff).

3.2.2 *The Rule System in the Community (City State)*

The second different is with regard to the number, the type of political party governments and the policies the aspect of egalitarian and the position and participation of that political community. Nyerere maintained only one part to rule one government⁷⁹ whereas Aristotle seems to have a broad choice involving different forms of rule from Monarch form of government all the way up to tyranny one.

3.2.3 *Ownership of the Property*

The third difference is about property ownership; Aristotle thinks that in order for an individual to live well should “be provided with necessities” (cf. *Politics*, I.3.). The different is that according to Aristotle the use of property in the community life should be shared but its ownership should be private (cf. *Politics*, II.5, 1268a1f). That means for Aristotle, if someone owns something in a community can take pride in their possession and get pleasure out of sharing them with community (cf. Kenny 2004, p. 84) while Nyerere would specify some of the things to be privately owned and the ones which must be communally owned (Nyerere 1968, pp. 81ff). According to Nyerere the ownership of property should not mean to exploit and control others. Another important criterion for private ownership for example of a piece of land Nyerere argues that the one who own it should as well make use of it in a good way, otherwise it should be taken away and given to those who can make use of it as Nyerere remarks: „That is to say a member of society will be entitled to a piece of land *on condition that he uses it*“(Nyerere 1968, p. 8).

3.2.4 *The Notion of Human Equality*

The question of equality and belonging in the community unlike Nyerere who include all people in the citizenship, Aristotle’s account excludes almost everybody and accept only few rich and settled male household-owner because Aristotle rejects completely the idea of universal citizenship and it seems for him to be unimaginable as he remarks in his politics:.

⁷⁹ However, he later came to accept the changes for example the introduction of multi-partism in Tanzania which involves many parties apart from the official single ruling party (cf. Omari 1995, p. 29).

The citizen means for Aristotle someone who is possessing political power and credibility of sitting on juries and in the assembly. It mean one who is full formed through reason and language to care both individual and common good. For example for Aristotle one might be a citizen in democracy but will not be the same thing in oligarchy. (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, V.3, 1130b; *Politics*, III.1 1275a1ff).

However, another view of it is that when Aristotle would mean that the only criteria to be a citizen is to meet certain standard (let say to poses the virtues or to be virtuous) then I think Aristotle might have overlooked what he presented in his arguments that the role of the *polis* (the state community) is to shape it its people and made them fit in that particular *polis* and then enable or give them access to search and work for the ultimate good (cf. Davis 1908, p. 11). I presume that Aristotle must have known (as Kraut call it) the ‘qualitative’ and ‘quantitative’ need of the state because the state need both virtuous people and enough continuously number growth of its member and no state can deny this fact. For this reason, I think he should not exclude them because it is not the fault of those who are aspired to be citizen to be the way they are. It is—I believe—the right responsibility of the government to prepare or educate them and make them to reach the minimum or maximum standards which Aristotle think they should reach. But when they are excluded as Aristotle wishes then the struggle for survival will not work the same for everybody and there is a danger that some will remain non-citizen for the rest of their lives. The only challenge which I see is that since there are different form of constitutions and governments then there should be a way to define the citizen following their respectively government and in accord to the type of constitution they ought to follow (cf. *Politics*, III.1, 1275a2f ; cf. Kraut 2002, pp. 394ff).

On the contrary to Aristotle, Nyerere’s account does not exclude its member from being citizen, for Nyerere believed that all member are by birth citizen and have right to participate on the society even at early stage of their lives regardless of their age, status and gender (Nyerere 1968, pp. 13f).

Another thing which both Aristotle and Nyerere similarly reflected on was the question of equality of share in a community. They both agree that community is relevant on individual and community happiness and that there is a possibility of sharing some aspects in the community such as sharing things with friends in Aristotle (*Politics*, 1268a) or communal ownership of the means of distributions, such as railways, or the lorries in Nyerere thinking (Nyerere 1968, p. 83f) but they disagree or question some aspects of the thought presented by Socrates about equality in the sharing of community life (cf. *Politics*, II.2, 1261b6-1262b10; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 78ff).

According to Aristotle it is not possible to have a community of or with absolute equal share and he find that will be a problem (cf. *Politics*, II.3, 12624ff). For example a worry that communism of wives and children as claimed by Socrates will destroy the natural affection (cf. Davis 1908, p. 9). This was also the case with Nyerere as it brought some challenges on how this could be applied (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 81ff). However, unlike Aristotle, Nyerere seems to embrace a good number of beliefs on that equality (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 95). First of all I agree with them. However, I gave a suggestion of how I think there is some way to bring harmony on that matter. On one hand reflection on the matter in question as Aristotle brought it into discussion: the community of all humanity is unthinkable but on the other hand of that reflection is that we human being in one way or another we are or we find ourselves in many situations as community and we cannot completely escape from that form (cf. Douglas 1986, pp. 91ff). For example if we take a picture of creation of the world and all its belonging one will discover that the classification that is taught in Biology depict a kind of ‘being together’ communally, belonging, sameness, or at least the species of one group having the same characteristics, form, function, goal and the like. When one for example makes a general observation one will at first have a picture that all that is found on the earth (things like mountains, water bodies, plants, wild and tame animals, creature living on water, other living on air, other living on land, human being of all gender, colour, races, young and old, small and big) and one judges or concludes that all that it belong or relates together and have harmony in many ways (cf. Adler 1978, pp. 109ff). Therefore through classification all these can be put into different groups sometimes with their very fine and minor elements they share. This example, attempts to explain the doubt which Aristotle and Nyerere had on the possibility of a shared communally life. If we put this on the context of human being starting with geographical picture one will see that the classified human beings belong together in terms of ties such as family ties, villages ties, institutions ties, regions ties, towns ties, cities ties, countries or national ties, continental ties and worldwide (universe).⁸⁰

Another way of seen these picture of all that is found on the earth is that they relate on the type of activity they do together. For example, a community of schools starting from kindergarten up to the university, the community of works such as army, industries, business, agriculture and animal husbandry with co-operations such as of wine growers, coffee grower, milk producers, animal care, climate care), religions, sports, entertainments, clubs, talents,

⁸⁰ It is argued that human beings come together for procreation and family association regardless of incomplete community (state) formation because they “are naturally disposed to live together” and to cooperate in all different matters such as politic life, communication through language, and morals (cf. Miller 2007, pp. 13-14).

same interests and hobbies. All these activities might be both temporal and permanent.⁸¹ That is to say for example in all of student's school time an individual has been in community and when the school time ended this individual join another community that of workers despite the kind of job or work she or he has joined. There is also a kind of initial and continue formation of the individuals in the sense that when children are at home they are taken care by the parents, when at school or college they are taken care by teachers and professors and when they are at work they are under the care of the Boss or Employer. And there is possibility of looking at this thought back and forth. For instance when they are working at the same office in sharing experience with observation and evaluations, one might notice the certain common or different elements, such as efficiency, quality, specialty, durability, behaviours, common between them. On noticing that one can refer to such student (who might be from one university or different university) according to their respective universities by uttering that they must have been schooling together in the same class, with same professor, and get influenced from the same thinker, and acquire same interest and thus why they are interested on the same player or one team to another and so forth. This is that which I think if the cotemporary could call it in mind that we are in many ways together then everyone would make more effort to make this world community a better place to live.⁸² This is because individuals will be able to think and care especially when it comes to questions like peace, justice, dignity, conservation, sustainably and many other which contribute to the wellbeing and happiness of individual and community.

In addition, it must be admitted also that there are some differences which are therein and which are also logically observed and exists in such kind of union. For example this riddle can be used here as one of the way to think about it and draw awareness of the differences: A man wants to bring a lion, a goat, and grass across the river. The boat is tiny and can only carry one passenger at a time. If he leaves the lion and the goat alone together, the lion will eat the goat. If he leaves the goat and the grass alone together, the goat will eat the grass. How can he bring all three safely across the river? At first everything seems to have a close relation. But when it comes to the act of crossing the river there arises some differences. However, the man will cross the river because he as a rational being is able to

⁸¹ The idea goes to Students who are coming from different families they met at school and live together under one roof sharing the same room or bed. Patient who met at hospital (hospitalized) they form a community of people who are in treatment sharing all they have in common. The same applied to those who met at working places, at prison and the like (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 67, 71 and 83; cf. *Politics*, III.4, 1276a1f).

⁸² There is possibility for human being through their nature to form binary categories which enable them to understand the world around them. For example they can make a category of things which are in order or rightly placed (as safe, good and pure) as oppose to things which are not in order or wrongly placed (as unsafe, bad and dangerous) as described by Mary Douglas in her book *Purity and Danger* (cf. Douglas 1984, pp. 5f, pp. 36ff).

relate with the lion, grass and the goat and with a good calculation he will be able to take them all safely to the other side of the river (cf. Goldstein 2013, p. 17).

CHAPTER 4

4. The Contemporary Philosophical Contributions

Three points will be addressed in this closing chapter: first is critical appraisal to Aristotle's and Nyerere's arguments, second is suggestion and contribution and third is restructuring of a model the concept of happiness and community life that should or ought to be adapted in Tanzania 21st Century.

4.1 Critical Appraisal

This critical appraisal will be extracted from the Aristotle's-Nyerere's comparison given above however focusing on the thoughts on happiness in relation to community life. Aristotle and Nyerere theories—as it is for many thinkers in the history—face some criticism. To start with Aristotle, he is criticized among others things for his justification of slavery (cf. *Politics*, I.5, 1255a1) and his condemnation of usury—as found in his political teaching—and it is important to discuss these criticism because they touches and affects to some extent the idea of individual and community happiness (in its process to flourish). The practice of slavery has been considered by different discipline as unjust act something which Aristotle also agrees although he believed that some people are marked out as master 'to rule' and other to be slaves 'to be ruled'(cf. *Politics*, I.5, 1254a-b). Aristotle consider slaves as the living tools however he is willing if it were possible that the non-living tools could achieved the same purpose hence slaves and this notion would be replaced because no one would need them any more as Aristotle himself remarks “if every instrument could achieve its own work obeying or anticipating the will of other, like the statutes of Daedalus ... if the shuttle could weave and the plectrum pluck the lyre in a similar manner, overseers would not need servants nor masters” (*Politics*, 1.4, 1253b35-54a1). Another thought is that “in an age of automation, Aristotle would no longer defend slavery” (cf. Kenny 2004 p. 86).

Aristotle is criticized of condemning usury. According to him people possesses things for two senses proper and improper. He gave an example with the case of shoe and he said if one uses the shoes by wearing them then this is proper use of it but when one uses the shoe for trade sell them or exchange them then he is using the improper (*Politics* 1.9. 1257a9-10). Aristotle was against any unlawful action or practice of giving somebody the loan of money at 'unreasonably high rates of interest' (*tokos*) “which means birth of money from money because an offspring resembles its parents,” says Aristotle (*Politics*, 1.10, 1258b5-7). The trade in luxury was for Aristotle unnatural (cf. Kenny 2004, p. 86).

Another criticism which I think Aristotle might face goes to his thought about ‘the mean’ because to find the mean or middle might seem a limitation to especial situations which do not require balance or it become a bit hindrance or delay to the motivated or goal-oriented people who want to pursue many goals in life or for example the business people who want to reach higher goals, or for example the researchers all of them encounter his thought of the mean. This is because Aristotle insists on find a mean but for people who want to acquire higher goals would opt or think one has to do much. For example, if someone is overweight and she or he want to lose some kilos from her or his bodyweight she requires by the training team to do more exercise and when it comes to reducing food or fasting, they tell that they should be also extremely low. Now the rule of the mean does not work well here. Another example, I think for someone whose job is to help others should he or she does more or little or middle way? Where is the mean in helping others? For a doctor who she or he is working hard to save life of patient should she or he apply the rule of the mean? Should the good to the in serving life be done in the middle way (that is done with the mean) as Childress and his colleague would differently think? (cf. Beauchamp and Childress ²1983, p. 148).

Ursula Wolf argued that if one make a reflective reading on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* will find out that the *eudaimonia* or happiness arise from three ways: Practice (exercise) or through God’s gift or by chance. There is also another possibility that *eudaimonia* arise through nature which is mentioned in *Eudemian Ethics* but not in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Then she says that if *eudaimonia* is acquired through practicing or learning then this leads to a broad contingent problem. And if it arises by chance or by nature then there would be no hope for most to arrive at (*Eudemian Ethics*, 1215a12ff) The only possibly one can arrive at them is if it is through practice (1099b18ff) although again it is not for all. There are individual who through formation have no possibility to train, to practice, especial those whom grew up in a not good situation as protected children, those who lacked good parenting or formation that is, lacking of formators or parents who also know the ethical virtues and who practicing them (cf. Wolf 2007, p. 51).

Wolf brings another argument to question Aristotle’s consideration of *eudaimonia* (happiness) as the highest good for which everyone should work for or the life orientation should seek to arrive at.⁸³ According to her there are people who their highest life goal or end

⁸³ In different discussions one might notice that the notion of happiness has many faces and meaning on it, and many thinkers have view it on other perspectives, for example, they claim that happiness „consist in finding out precisely what the ‘one thing necessary’ may be, in our lives, and in gladly relinquishing all the rest“ and many others definitions as does in Sissela Bok’s text (cf. Bok 2010, pp. 59ff).

is not more to attain their own happiness but in the giving themselves as sacrifice to others to create a better society situation (cf. Wolf 2007, p. 55).

Regarding the good life as we have seen above almost everyone believes the final end and human is happiness or faring well or flourishing (a premise that Aristotle argued holds nearly universal agreement). Everything else one desire is ultimately for the sake of happiness but one never desire happiness for the sake of something else. This common agreement however is the basis for the greatest dispute about what constitute happiness or *eudaemonia*. The question here is what is it, or what does it consistent? Not only individual disagree, the same individual disagree with himself at different times, and this is because when one is sick health seems to be the final end when one are impoverished wealth seems so and so on. Now given a vast array of claim about happiness examining them all might seem like an impossible task. Fortunately, Aristotle gives a warning that when it comes to matters like this one must look not just at ‘what people say’ but it has ‘how they act’. On that basis Aristotle finds a very limited set of opinions that are dominant in his society, and I would say in us (ours) as well more precisely in chapter five of the *Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle takes up for examination three and actually turns out to be four popular views.

According to Burger Aristotle begins by distinguishing the view of “the many and the most vulgar” from “the more refined and the active” He talk about the life of pleasure, the political life and life of contemplation. For example, with pleasure we think of ‘the gentleman’ who have some ground perhaps for looking down on the multitude whom they see identifying the good or the final end with pleasure and embracing the life of enjoying devoted to it. With political life that he means the more refined, the best for the human being or the life of the action which looks to honor as its end. The third is the life of contemplation or the theoretical life though he gives us no indication of what the final end is toward which that life is oriented. That omission actually raises a very difficult question: How exactly is a way of life defined by its final end. Does this what Aristotle calls “the life of enjoyment” requirement require that every moment be filled with pleasure? Is there no enjoyment in the life of action or the theoretical life which are supposed to be altogether other? This radical speculation may explain the need to return to the topic of pleasure at the beginning of book ten (book10) to ask again whether are any pleasure that are distinctively human. As Aristotle argues there for any living animal to be alive most fully is to be aware for other animals that is through perception, for human animals that is through perception and thinking. Those are our modalities for awareness. And when such awareness is in its best condition the experience that accompanies it is pleasure that is how he is defining pleasure at that point. It follows along with this

experience of being aware which is what it is to be alive. Pleasure and life are inextricably bound together indeed Aristotle find it impossible to answer the question he possesses whether we live for the sake of pleasure or we experience pleasure for the sake of life (cf. Burger 2008, p. 5ff).

Alasdair MacIntyre in his Book *After Virtue* argued that although the claim of criticism is posed against virtue ethics in this sense Aristotelian school of thought, he admit that Aristotle's ethics has solved some of the moral dilemmas well compared to some contemporary approaches to those same problem (cf. MacIntyre 2007, pp. 146ff).

4.1.1 How Do Aristotle's and Nyerere's Thoughts Applicable Today?

The common thought which any reader of both Aristotle and Nyerere works on ethics and politics has is that they both present and defend the thought that there is among other things the ultimate good for which all things and activities of human being are directed to. The characteristic as we have seen is a good wanted for its own sake. This is a good theory. I think if each and everything is done in this manner and if one will be enabled to calculate the values to pursue such a good at community level that will bring societal harmony. That means if everyone will take into consideration let say the community justice as the ultimate good to which everything must or ought to be done to possess it this will mean practicing to be just for myself, to my friends, to my community, to my country and to the whole world. If everyone will be taught that peace and freedom are the goods for which everything and struggle must aim at, and indeed with all heart be part of it and practice it, then means we will have the harmoniously world. The same applies to environmental preservation if every newborn child from now will be taught to take that as the most important good and to value it right from the beginning this will end the chain of environmental degradation, destruction, and crisis we are facing for the time being (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 58ff, pp. 72ff). This is the thought which Aristotle and Nyerere want to give us in their theory of real wanting and working for that ultimate good that actualizes our action that lead to happiness, *eudaemonia*.

Nyerere wish for example that equality and respect for human dignity is observed in all human beings. That is why Nyerere decides in his politics to somehow find the mean in his political thinking. Aleck Humprey Che-Mponda a former senior Lecture Grade I in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration at the University of Dar es salaam describes Nyerere as truly non-aligned political philosopher oscillating between Western democracy and Eastern Communism (cf. Che-Mponda 1984, p. 63; cf. Nyerere, 1978, p. 6). And as we have also seen in the discussion above, Nyerere dismissed both 'capitalism' and 'dogmatic socialism' as not proper developmental strategies for developing Tanzania to copy

because Nyerere's *Ujamaa* theory was in opposition "to capitalism which seeks to build a happy society on the basis of exploitation of man by man" and he was also in opposition "to doctrinaire socialism which seeks to build a happy society on a philosophy of inevitable conflict between man and man" (Nyerere 1966, p. 170-171, Nyerere 1968, p. 12). The reason which he always gave was that man cannot develop well in all her or his capacity and dimension in such an environment and therefore not able to arrive at the end which was aimed for her or him as well flourishing human being. This is about whether Aristotle and Nyerere thoughts are still applicable today, and if so, in which ways.

As we have seen above both Aristotle and Nyerere were interested in the question of the way humankind and community can develop, flourish, have a good life and attain happiness, a discussion that included concepts such as education, democracy, politics, socialism, and liberation. For example, Nyerere had the following practical and vital thoughts regarding development today. Historically Tanzania as one of traditional African countries is composed by people of many tribes in total number one hundred and fifty-nine (159 tribes). This would mean different tradition, language, customs and relationship. Therefore, during the planning for independence 1950s Nyerere already thought that right after independence people of Tanzania and Africa at large need unity which will keep them away from consequences of tribalism, racism, differences and discrimination. Therefore, unity is what Nyerere fought for and is a heritage today starting with Tanganyika and Zanzibar which became Tanzania, but also, he participate in the organization of African Unity.

After unity people were motivated to social works on what Nyerere called self-reliance. Nyerere with his philosophy of *Ujamaa* made people to work together to maintain equality and development in organized *Ujamaa* villages. *Ujamaa* system leads to the creation of a good relation and good neighborhood among the people of Tanzania (cf. Shivji 2010, p. 120ff, cf. Manji 2010, p. ix-x). This cultivates also the spirit and a sense to community individuals of valuing each other, sharing, helping each other during the socio-economic problems such as sickness, wedding, and funeral ceremonies the practices which are held by the people all over Tanzania since then till today. Education for self-reliance is still encouraged and practice in schools and in villages to integrate the education values, skills and knowledge with works for example in agricultural, (weeding, livestock keeping), carpentry, nursery projects (horticulture), cleaning of environmental, games and sports a few to mention.⁸⁴

⁸⁴ Annar Cassam who was a former personal assistant of President Julius Nyerere admit that Nyerere's philosophical thoughts, life and action has left a positive influence to the contemporary people of Tanzania especial in the 21st century (Cassam 2010, p. xii).

Moreover, Nyerere established the revolutions in agriculture which serves the lives of many Tanzanians today contributing 78 percent as source of food and capital. Agricultural is a source of work for unemployed too. This effort went outside Tanzania especially in terms of teaching of his many books he wrote about future sustainable development, about elections and the ethics of people and leaders, about capitalism and possibility of exploitations as inscribed in the documents of Arusha Declaration which act as a mirror and example to other nations in the liberation of mankind in African countries and worldwide.

The interesting thing is that, currently there is a firm established tradition of academicians at the university of Dar es salaam, politician and student to annually meeting together a forum known as *Kigoda cha Mwalimu* where they discuss and share many issues from Nyerere's philosophical thoughts on politics, social and economic life. For example: As I have argued above that: 'another way is to use Nyerere's position as counterargument to Aristotle, by saying that one can develop love of her or her country that is so dissimilar to love of one's family through nationalism or patriotism and therefore create kind of loyalty and faith in one's country'. It means I take time to reflect on Nyerere's arguments and sometimes discuss them with friends in such occasions. Hence, it is through discussions and debates on the thoughts of Nyerere can one come to such an idea or counterargument.

When we turn again to Aristotle, generally the frequent criticisms that are posed to his theory of virtue by the contemporary virtue theory is the thought that it is connected with 'relativism' because they claim it reject "the general algorithms and abstract rules in favour of an account of the good life based on specific modes of virtuous action" (cf. Nussbaum 1987, p. 2). In concrete sense, they consider his approach on 'the position of women which is established by the traditions and communities of the world, the question of slaves and racial inequality, religious intolerance, aggressiveness and war plots, the imbalance normal of material distribution that they should be worked upon not in an Aristotelian approach but with a Kantian or utilitarian view point' (cf. Nussbaum 1987, p. 2).

However, Nussbaum find this claim as insufficient reason that is being posed against Aristotle because they overlooked the way he is a keen defender of both an ethical theory based on virtues and that of a single objective account of the human good or human flourishing as emphasized also in this thesis.

Nussbaum argued further that, when one pay attention would see the way Aristotle shows a deep concern and criticizes the existing moral traditions not only in his own city but also in other cities too. Aristotle's criticizes the unjust oppressive and all that is incompatible with human flourishing. This claim party attempts the question we posed at the introduction

above on page 14 above that since “both argue convincingly who is right” or whom should we follow? With this argument from Martha, this means both Aristotle and Nyerere cares about justice of people and community, hence both can be followed.

In his *Politics* for example one can see the way he uses his account of virtues as a basis to criticize the local traditions by arguing against social forms while pointing the ways in which the development of some important human virtue were neglected or hindered (cf. Nussbaum1987, p. 2f). According to Aristotle it is compatible to have an ethical theory based on the virtues and defending the singleness and objectivity of the human good because these two are mutually supportive. Nussbaum finds it is very interesting to establish that Aristotle does indeed have an interesting way of connecting the virtues with a search for ethical objectivity and with the criticism of existing local norms and seriously consider its development (cf. Nussbaum1987, p. 3).

Aristotle stresses that virtue does not “involving the regulation of listening to attractive sounds, or seeing pleasing sights”, and yet, “each family of virtue and vice (or deficiency words) attaches to some of such sphere”. A “progress in ethics” can be understood “like progress in scientific understanding in finding the correct fuller specification of a virtue, isolated by a perspicuous mapping of the sphere of the grounding experiences. This involves an attempt to understand the kinds of problems encountered by human beings in their lives with one another, the circumstances faced by them, the type of choice required this will give an access to complete assessment of those problems and offer knowledge of what it mean to act well in the face of those human problems (cf. Nussbaum1987, p. 9).

Nyerere’s theory that aim at the wellbeing or the good of the society (happiness, flourishing)⁸⁵ is criticized as it was to Aristotle’s case. Here are some of the criticisms posed to Nyerere which have proved wrong in the contemporary society and that both Aristotle and Nyerere were right in some points.

Nyerere had a thought that “history can tell us something about the present; that people learn from the past”. Some of his theory were criticized which I find academically logic but then when one critical look at the current situation in Tanzania and in some African countries where his system was formerly influential but people have now taken into grant or abandon completely his thought one will notice that things are not as good as it was in the time of Nyerere. There are some concrete values in Nyerere’s theory of happiness and

⁸⁵ One discovery is that the use of the term well-being and happiness are treated by people as having the same meaning but theoretically they are quite different and it is argued that the latter contributes to the former and the opposite (cf. Fletcher 2016, pp.144ff).

community life which are useful even today and probably could reduce the challenges Tanzania facing today. I will mention and explain some few examples and at the end I will state the things which on my view can genuinely be criticized from the philosophy of Aristotle and Nyerere. I will use argument from contemporary philosophers mainly Martha Nussbaum, Thaddeus to make it these critics to a model more useful in Tanzania community 21st century. Nyerere as it was for Aristotle above is criticized in some points proposed in his theory of *Ujamaa* by using self-reliance and brotherhood and African unity as its end all these preceded and initiated by the act of independence.

First of all, since people were now free from past oppression, they were now in the position to work. In this perspective, with his theory of *ujamaa* Nyerere emphasizes work together by depending on their effort for production of basic needs for their families, communities as well as for the uplifting of the economy of the country. This is because right after independence he wanted that individual and community right away start to flourish and to make this theory in practice he concentrate his effort in the rural areas on different agricultural works. His point of starting with rural is because at that time the majority of residents of Tanzania community (state) were dwelling in rural areas compared to urban residents (Nyerere 1967, p. 6, p. 16, Nyerere, 1973, pp. 6ff) and because he has already read some ideas of the philosophy of the British economist philosopher John Stuart Mill, (utilitarianism) too, he thought to start with the greatest number which will bring greatest value of development and at the end the community will enjoy the maximum value of happiness as possible (cf. Chachage 2010, p. 19f). The second reason seems to be because of the situation of the country at the time he receive the leadership which was very poor, with great population without education that means high rates of illiteracy and so practical works like agriculture and animal rearing at least was for Nyerere the less evil way of starting developing such people. However, Nyerere is criticized for having such a decision of developing rural community. As a result after Nyerere's era the term rural development is unheard in contemporary political and economic discourse of Tanzania. It is as if it died with the death of Nyerere and worse enough there is still no one to properly speak for its development.

Another criticism posed to Nyerere: Nyerere is criticized against his policy of eradication of poverty in Tanzania. However, Chachage writes that: "The contemporary 'conceptualisation' of poverty, its history, causes and remedies, is done imprudently, lacking organic links with the accumulated knowledge and experiences of our societies" (Chachage 2010, p. 21). That means the situation is worse today because no one cares or think about the

other (even for those who are strong in term of ability and wealth) every one look at his own. The thought that dominate or is being planted to the Tanzania is that the poor people were born to be and stay poor and the rich people were born to be and stay rich and such a thought does not encourage flourishing something which was not the case during Nyerere's reign.

In Nyerere's time—argued Chachage— “the assault on poverty was premised on the belief that poverty eradication was possible” and he continue to argue that democracy as practice was the main factor which is well connected to the idea of eradication of poverty and ensure equal and equitable social development because it has access and control of productive resources “rather than simply the existence of a multiparty system and the political parties’ competition for state power” (Chachage 2010, p. 21f). A good example to explain this “solely competition for state power” is the promises which are put forward by candidates in the election campaigns. These promises are never put into practice after the candidate is elected and the election is finished. Most of them they forget the problem of the people they promised to help or finding a solution and in some situations, they even made them more worse.

A concrete example for this argument: it was a government's tradition during the time of Nyerere to support its citizen. It used to divide studying materials like exercises books, pens, pencil, chalk, course book for pupils, teachers at primary schools and some student at higher learning as support for the starting school year and everyone could get several of them for free. But this tradition came to an abruptly end and parents must now afford all these with their own financial efforts. That means for the parent who cannot afford that, the child has to remain at home. In some school there are no enough teachers, no enough learning or teaching materials the desks or classroom are old and no one cares about them more, in some school there is a large number of pupils than the classroom can take (accommodate) them. This situation would not be observer in Nyerere time because of his effort to balance or to put equal division of the resource and affordable environment for all members of Tanzania community.

According to Nyerere the explosion of what is known as globalization and the introduction of capitalistic relations has brought some changes with it such as simplicity in journey, communication and information technologies production and consumption of goods and services and trade between the countries in one hand. In other hand these advances of science and technology has increases interdependence and division between people and fun enough Nyerere maintained that the world is not one anymore, “its people are more divided now, and also more conscious of their divisions, than they have ever been” (Nyerere 1974, pp. 86-87, Chachage 2010, p. 22). There are the powerful against the powerless, the dominator

and dominated, the exploiter against the exploited. Therefore, the chances to survive and flourish together in such environment as community are unrealizable. Actually, Nyerere in his trip and conference in Atlanta (in USA) presented that: “what was needed to overcome poverty was ‘a system of trade which does not have a built-in mechanism that transfers wealth from the poor to the rich’ (Nyerere 1974, pp. 86-87, Chachage 2010, p. 23) something which the contemporary community in Tanzania is invited and encouraged to practice. Human development was mean to Nyerere not “simply an increase in the national income figures of the poor countries, nor listing of the huge increases in the production of this or that industry,’ new roads, factories, farms, etc” (as we will also see when we come to Nussbaum) rather the economic growth argued Nyerere “must be of such a kind, and so organised, that it benefits the nations and the peoples who are now suffering from poverty” (Nyerere 1974, pp. 86-87, Chachage 2010, p. 23f).

Nyerere is also criticized that as a man his agricultural and economic policies were male centred. That health and investment were demanded by the African women in the provision of food, clothing, shelter, environmental justice and safety. Horace Campbell believed that “*Ujamaa* project was valid and its validity will be tested in another period when the struggles for peace and reparations move from opposition to structural transformation of the old colonial economic realities” (Campbell 2010, p. 53). The situation of the country and agricultural activities in Tanzania today does not depict such differences between women and men. This is because the number of women involving themselves in development activities within the country such as agriculture, business, leadership and many other is large enough to create a balance with men (cf. Mascarenhas and Mbilinyi 1983, pp. 44ff, cf. Ellis et.al. 2007, p. 24). After we have seen the criticism posed against Aristotle and Nyerere, to suggestions which shade some lights to such criticisms.

4.2 Suggestions

In chapter one we mentioned that the notion of happiness dealt in this paper is not in the sense depression’ or ‘tranquility’ rather in the sense of wellbeing or flourishing. The theory presented by Aristotle and Nyerere above are now going to be further developed with contemporary philosophical theories⁸⁶ as an attempt to restructure a model that fit for Tanzania in 21st century. The contemporary philosophers—I think—valued their argument and what they try to do is to improve them or add to them knowledge which can be applicable in

⁸⁶ According to Nancy Sherman Aristotle as state in his text urges the contemporary philosophers to act as ‘co-workers and co-discover’ in the development of his theories by trying to interpret it on the manner that reflects the contemporary and future society (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1098a22, cf. Sherman 1989, p.4).

today's individuals and community. The thoughts that will be developed by Martha Nussbaum is the not only the theoretical and practicability suggested by Aristotle and Nyerere in striving for good life that lead individuals and community in the ultimate good happiness but also he goes a steps further and consider the capability of each individual to recognizes her or his capacity and the extent to which she or he can participate efficient to the common good of that particular good (cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 19ff. I assume that Aristotle and Nyerere assumed the same too but they did not explicitly put in their theories. Thaddeus will enrich the discussion with thoughts about another way of understanding a close relation between western (Aristotle, Martha and others) culture and African cultures (Nyerere and others).

4.2.1 Happiness and Community: Contemporary Understanding and Application

The theme or theories of happiness in relation to community for the goal of achieving good life, happy life or flourishing life of individual and community as advocated by Aristotle and Nyerere are very helpful because they set a theoretical and practical structure of how such a life can be perfectly lived and the way such a goal can be reached. Now when we come to the contemporary philosophers, they have the following to contribute.

The first philosopher's contribution comes from Martha Nussbaum. She observes the relation between social life and happiness of individual in the community and discovered that the quality of life in a nation was measured by an increase of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita by economists, policy-makers, and bureaucrats does not reflect peoples life situation. Therefore she suggests a theory called capabilities approach which compares the quality of life assessment and which theorizes basic social justice. According her instead of the economist or policy-makers to do a general comparison in approaching people's quality of life and social justice they should consider in their research the question: "What is each person is able to do and to be" (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. x).

This is because according to Nussbaum this general equation of economical data overlooks the alarming inequalities, the living standard of their poorer inhabitant's health and education, which typically its improvement depends on and is determined by the economic growth (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. ix). This means that one will find that even the poor countries; they work for economic growth alone to keep their GDP international reputation at a good position instead of improving an adequate quality of life to its entire people (Nussbaum 2011, pp. 15-16). It should be understood that the act of working for GDP as it is done in many countries is not for itself something bad because it measures, determine and show where the

country economic is going, however more relevantly the life of all citizen should be affected by it in a positive way too.

Another important thought Nussbaum contribute to the philosophy of Aristotle and Nyerere is the involvement of women more in the community rights and activities. She presents in her text a case of young woman called Vasanti, who lives in Ahmedabad-Gujarat in northwestern India. She lives with her husband who was a gambler and a alcoholic and in this situation he treated her in inappropriate abusive way. The message given by Nussbaum in this context is that in our world even in Tanzania where the focus of this thesis is, there are women like Vasanti especial the childless one who are vulnerable to domestic violence, sex work on the street and the like. Unlike Aristotle, Nussbaum thought that women should be given more consideration, freedom of speech, activities like holding position in leadership and decision-making things which will empower them like it was for Vasanti that she joined to Self-Employed Women's Organisation (SEWA) which works with poor women (Nussbaum 2011, pp. 2ff). The same chance should also be given to other groups which were excluded from the Aristotle's constitution theory like children, slave if any as well as all other women. The empowerment and protection of women is of vital important because of their special contribution in the community. This should also include children, old people and disabled. All these people need to be happy too and to have right to be part of the community.

According to Nussbaum the notion of our governments to equate the flourish or doing well (for a state or a nation) with an increase in GDP per capita, or wealth would be successful and fruitful on and only if that wealth or GDP per capita allows the government to adopt policies that will make a difference to lives of its citizen—the members of the community rural and urban. Otherwise, it will be and remain superficial like presenting the citizen with a table full of delicious foods, only they cannot have any (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 13).

In the discussion above Aristotle and Nyerere were compared in all elements in which they emphasis or de-emphasize the aspect of human development, and they attempt very well with their principles or theories to answer this question they posed at the beginning: what is the ultimate purpose of human existence? The contribution of the contemporary philosophers such as Martha Nussbaum would work on this same problem by asking another question as an extension to this previous one that: What are people actually able to do and to be? What real opportunities are available to them? (Nussbaum 2011, p. x, p. 14). The aim is to answer these questions in order to get from Aristotle and Nyerere as well as the contemporary contribution a model which define the state of Tanzania in 21st century. These two questions arise because

as we have seen one of the challenges to human development are social injustices (as suggested by Aristotle) or social inequalities (as suggested by Nyerere) among community (or countries) individuals.

In this perspective Martha Nussbaum also has noticed this challenge of human inequalities and she argued that its root cause is when the development of countries (or community) and its people (in terms of quality of life and basic social justices) are measured by using Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Nussbaum suggested “the capabilities approach” as an alternative to GDP measurement of community’s well-being. The so called “Human Development Approach or the Capability (or in plural form) Capabilities Approach” in Nussbaum’s investigation was previously “associated, historically, with the Human Development Report Office of the United Nations Development Programme and its annual Human Development Reports”. According to Nussbaum, this type of approach uses “the notion of capabilities as a comparative measure rather than as a basis for normative political theory” and she thinks that it does not incorporate all the important elements which it should have (Nussbaum 2011, p. 9, p. 27). Therefore, she prefers the term “Capabilities Approach” more than the term “Human Development Approach” because she wants to deal with the capabilities of nonhuman animals as well as human beings. (Nussbaum 2011, p. 9, p. 28). The background of these terms: “Capability Approach” and “Capabilities Approach” were once proposed by Amartya Sen who is an Indian economist and philosopher. He uses them as the key terms in his works such as *Inequality Reexamined* and *Development as Freedom*, to propose political and economical programs as the best framework to state reasons of the superiority comparisons of life quality, “to utilitarian and quasi-Rawlsian approaches” (Nussbaum 2011, pp. 17-18).

Nussbaum prefers to use the term “Capabilities,” in its plural form instead of its singular form, because she believes and wants to insist that “the most important elements of people’s quality of life” such as “health, bodily integrity, education and other aspects of individual lives are plural and qualitatively distinct”, and they therefore “cannot be reduced to a single metric without distortion”. Also she thinks it “provides a fine basis for a theory of justice and entitlement for both nonhuman animals and humans”. This key element approached or idea of plurality and non-reducibility was similarly emphasized by Amartya Sen (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 18).

According to Nussbaum ‘the Capabilities Approach’ is “as an approach to comparative quality-of-life assessment and to theorizing about basic social justice which holds that the key question to ask, when comparing societies and assessing them for their

basic decency or justice, is, “What is each person able to do and to be?”⁸⁷ (Nussbaum 2011, p.18). In this Approach Nussbaum does not only “takes each person as an end, asking not just about the total or average well-being—as Aristotle and Nyerere in previous discussion did—but also she goes further and asks about the opportunities available to each person. As features of the approach Nussbaum argued:

“It is focused on choice or freedom, holding that the crucial good societies should be promoting for their people is a set of opportunities, or substantial freedoms, which people then may or may not exercise in action: the choice is theirs. It thus commits itself to respect for people’s powers of self-definition. The approach is resolutely pluralist about value: it holds that the capability achievements that are central for people are different in quality, not just in quantity; that they cannot without distortion be reduced to a single numerical scale; and that a fundamental part of understanding and producing them is understanding the specific nature of each. Finally, the approach is concerned with entrenched social injustice and inequality, especially capability failures that are the result of discrimination or marginalization. It ascribes an urgent task to government and public policy—namely, to improve the quality of life for all people, as defined by their capabilities” (Nussbaum 2011, pp. 28-29).

Nussbaum argues that this approach has two versions because it was used for two different purposes. In her version’s approach, Nussbaum attempts “to constructs a theory of basic social justice” whereby she “adds other notions in the process (those of human dignity, the threshold, political liberalism)” —elements which were also considered by Nyerere in his socio-political and economical discussions (Nussbaum 2011, p. 29; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 3ff). She also brings in “a specific list of the central capabilities”. According to Nussbaum the theories and advice provided by the economist and their international agencies such as the IMF and the World Bank have directly or indirectly influenced the choices of political leaders and policymakers whenever they try plan development and to improve their quality of life (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. ix, p. 46). These influences are strongly on poor nations which mostly depend on this agencies’s policies whereby they actually not improve the quality of life efficiently. Therefore, a proper considering of the issue of development theories Nussbaum suggests means considering a decent quality of life strived by people in every nation (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 46).

Nussbaum pointed out that the economists have used for many years the measurement of country’s progression by looking at economic growth as measured by GDP per capita because first, this approach was relatively easy to measure second, it has an attractive transparency which makes difficult from manipulation and third the influence of the trickle-down theory whereby the benefits of economic growth are bound to improve the lot of the poor irrespective of action taken to it (Nussbaum 2011, p. 55).

⁸⁷ Capabilities that is that which ‘each person able to do and to be; or ‘the substantial freedoms’ as called by Sen is defined as “a set of (usually interrelated) opportunities to choose to act [...]” also “the alternatives combinations of functionings that are feasible for her to achieve” (cf. Nussbaum 2011, p. 20).

However, according to her it is not the case for the theory has been proved by other authors that increased economic growth do not automatically improve quality of life in important areas such as health and education. According to her when one measures people's quality of life it to know how these people are really doing. According to her, GDP approach does not do that because:

First of all an "increase in GDP is not very well correlated with increase in average household income because sometimes in global world profits may be repatriated by foreign investors without contributing to the spend power of a country's citizen".

Second, it does not take into account the question of 'distribution' because as average it can give high marks to countries which have a huge and alarming inequalities with small number of people living well while the rest having a miserable way of life. Therefore, she observe that one might have been praising a certain country for doing well economically but in the same country people are unhappy because struggling for lives that are worthy of their human dignity that is the meaningful lives for themselves. This is because the government overlooks its focus and purpose for development which is to create and enabling such an environment for people to live long, healthy and creative lives.

Third, it funnels all parts of human life together in a single number and therefore it does not tell one how people are really doing in separate areas of life that especially the important information which one really want to care about, such as health, education, political liberty, race relations, and many other things that bear on the quality of human life (cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 48ff). Because of her interest on constitutional law, Martha Nussbaum made a list of ten capabilities Approach as an alternative to GDP Approach which I will mention them as follows:

1. *Life*. Being able to live to the end of a human life of normal length; not dying prematurely, or before one's life is so reduced as to be not worth living.
2. *Bodily health*. Being able to have good health, including reproductive health; to be adequately nourished; to have adequate shelter.
3. *Bodily integrity*. Being able to move freely from place to place; to be secure against violent assault, including sexual assault and domestic violence; having opportunities for sexual satisfaction and for choice in matters of reproduction.
4. *Senses, imagination, and thought*. Being able to use the senses, to imagine, think, and reason—and to do these things in a "truly human" way, a way informed and cultivated by an adequate education, including, but by no means limited to, literacy and basic mathematical and scientific training. Being able to use imagination and thought in connection with experiencing and producing works and events of one's own choice, religious, literary, musical, and so forth. Being able to use one's mind in ways protected by guarantees of freedom of expression with respect to both political and artistic speech, and freedom of religious exercise. Being able to have pleasurable experiences and to avoid nonbeneficial pain.
5. *Emotions*. Being able to have attachments to things and people outside ourselves; to love those who love and care for us, to grieve at their absence; in general, to love, to grieve, to experience longing, gratitude, and justified anger. Not having one's emotional development blighted by fear

and anxiety. (Supporting this capability means supporting forms of human association that can be shown to be crucial in their development.)

6. *Practical reason*. Being able to form a conception of the good and to engage in critical reflection about the planning of one's life. (This entails protection for the liberty of conscience and religious observance.)

7. *Affiliation*. (A) Being able to live with and toward others, to recognize and show concern for other human beings, to engage in various forms of social interaction; to be able to imagine the situation of another. (Protecting this capability means protecting institutions that constitute and nourish such forms of affiliation, and also protecting the freedom of assembly and political speech.) (B) Having the social bases of self-respect and nonhumiliation; being able to be treated as a dignified being whose worth is equal to that of others. This entails provisions of nondiscrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, caste, religion, national origin.

8. *Other species*. Being able to live with concern for and in relation to animals, plants, and the world of nature.

9. *Play*. Being able to laugh, to play, to enjoy recreational activities.

10. *Control over one's environment*. (A) Political. Being able to participate effectively in political choices that govern one's life; having the right of political participation, protections of free speech and association. (B) Material. Being able to hold property (both land and movable goods), and having property rights on an equal basis with others; having the right to seek employment on an equal basis with others; having the freedom from unwarranted search and seizure. In work, being able to work as a human being, exercising practical reason and entering into meaningful relationships of mutual recognition with other workers." (Nussbaum 2011, pp. 33-34).

The above list of Capabilities Approaches can be taken as Nussbaum's suggestion in structuring our model and it fits in many ways not only to the international economic development but also to local individual and countries development. Nussbaum's main objective here is creation of capabilities, for every individual human being, an opportunity and way by which they can develop themselves. This list of capabilities acts as an advantageous factor additional to our discussion of how 'the ultimate purpose of human existence' is to be achieved and enjoyed by every human individual. This is because for example Aristotle's approach to happiness was faced with the challenges and criticisms one of them being inability to encompass or involve all human being at a time if we refer women, children, slave, old, strangers were consider either incapable of being happy or incapable of participating full to community rights, functions and life (cf. *ibid*, cf. Miller, Jr. 2007, pp. 13ff). This list of capabilities is therefore, a wide field to choose and discern on that which 'people actually able to do and to be' at same time to evaluate and determine the real 'opportunities are available to each of them'. In any community of people such elements listed above as: "1. *Life*, 2. *Bodily health*, 3. *Bodily integrity*, 4. *Senses, imagination, and thought*, 5. *Emotions*, 6. *Practical reason*, 7. *Affiliation*, 8. *Other species*, 9. *Play*, and 10." (*ibid*) *Control over one's environment* they related close to the discussion we had about happiness and community life. Some of them are things which are directly involved in human happiness, some help to create environment that facilitate a life of virtue which lead to good life.

Thaddeus Metz wrote a paper and presents the theme of Eudaemonist or self-realisation perspective versus self-realisation in Afro-communitarianism context (such as

Ubuntu, or *Ujamaa*) which I think his contributions could help to extend this argument. According to Metz, both Aristotle and Africans (or in our context Nyerere) present an interesting form of life, whereas the former gives an attractive account of good life the later ‘promises to serve as an attractive account of right action and attitudes corresponding and applicable to our contemporary’ community, the one which one can understand them as virtues (cf. Metz 2012, p. 101). Metz argued that most sub Africans believed and hold firmly that the act of self-realisation is only possible if an individual has relation to other person that means by living in a community one acquires the program which shape her or his character, life perspectives, and creates harmonious and good person with good life. That is to say an individual outside the community is likely to be incomplete (cf. Metz 2012, pp. 102f).

Thaddeus Metz believed that there are many commonalities between the two ethics, namely the traditionally Sub-Saharan ethics (Nyerere) and the classically Greek ethics (cf. Metz 2012, p. 100); and he find out that there are ‘two logically distinct elements of community-harmony which among many others characterizes African ethicists which are: firstly, participating by being bound up with and belonging and secondly, is sharing in the sense of promoting the good and serving’ (cf. Metz 2012, p. 103f). For example according to Metz, when the community relationships perceived in its two ethical element that one of “identity or sharing a way of life” and the other one that of “solidarity or improving others’ quality of life” are taken together they form both “a fair specification of what many African theorist have in mind as well as a reconstruction of the ground of a plausible moral theory (Metz 2007, 2012; Metz & Gaie 2010)” (cf. Metz 2012, p. 104). Also he argues that combination of the act of sharing a way of life and the act of improving others’ quality of life can be compared to the virtue of “friendship or a broad sense of ‘love’” (cf. Metz 2012, p. 104).

4.2.2 The Nature or Essence of Happiness and Community in Aristotle and Nyerere

This part wants to reflect from the past and the present day, by question that when one look and compare between the past and present: do people think completely different on the matter? The question is: did the past look different from today when it comes to morality of happiness and community life? Were individuals more communal and happier than today or today is the level of and concept of happiness in community more vividly manifested? To attempt this question, we look at the history of philosophy back to the time these two thinkers lived and then focus on the way their theories about happiness and community life come into existence. At the time Aristotle was doing philosophy among many about happiness and community life the situation in Greece was not always complete conducive or calm to

happiness and community life of individuals. There were also some challenges of the time like conflicts, wars, dissatisfaction, corruptions all of which encircled the social, political, cultural and historical situation of the time (cf. Johnson 2015, pp. 71f). This applies also to Nyerere time people were right post colonial and then came the time to build the country in time of variety of difficulties such as poverty, diseases, ignorance or lack of knowledge and resources. This tell us that the theory which were developed by Aristotle and Nyerere concerning happiness and community life of the individuals did not come into existence as in the form we have today as a lived experience of Aristotle or Nyerere with the people of their times rather these were what Aristotle and Nyerere had as imagination trying to figure out how could their thought be realized in the society or community people in the future (cf. Anthony 2010, p. 8). That means ‘we’ the contemporary generations are the ones who are more benefited from the Aristotle’s and Nyerere’s project.

Now what happened to both of them (Aristotle and Nyerere) and how does this shape the way they develops their philosophy? Aristotle begins (as we have seen) with practical things and he center man at the process of all development and assign him the responsibility to lead the course which actualizes her or his path toward ultimate good, *eudemonia* or happiness. Nyerere believed on the individual’s unity, cooperation and brotherhood-sisterhood-belonging that is found in the community. In Africa ethics this is understood based on the idiom mentioned whereby a person realizes oneself when that person lives by thinking about the other, it means that person belongs, participates, shares, is in harmony, shows friendliness and the community is a great good or *summum bonum* to that person—as Desmond Tutu argued (cf. Tutu 1999, pp. 35f, cf. Metz 2012, p. 103; cf. Hord and Lee 2016, p. 5ff). Ethics norms encourage individuals to “express commitment to the good of the community in which their identities were formed, and a need to experience their lives as bound up in that of their community” as Nyerere and other theorists maintained (cf. Nyerere 1968, p; cf. Nkondo 2007, p. 91; Metz 2012, p. 103).⁸⁸ Some other virtues which are understood in African point of view are such as: forbearance, practical wisdom, improvisation, forgiveness, and justice, (Paris 1995, p141-156, Metz 2012, p 104); also there are some actions which came out of the communitarian concept (*ubuntu* and *Ujamaa*) such as “kindness, compassion, caring, sharing, solidarity, and sacrifice” (Metz 2012, p. 104).

⁸⁸ Metz argued that: “This purely relational, and specifically communitarian, interpretation of self-realisation makes good sense of the virtues that are salient in the African tradition” such as “generosity, kindness, compassion, benevolence, respect and concern for others” (Metz 2012, p. 104). Among these the virtue of beneficence is highly praised in Africa because it demonstrates the goal of community (cf. Paris 1995, p. 136, cf. Metz 2012, p. 104).

4.2.3 *The Relevance of Happiness in Connection to Community Today*

The goal which this thesis attempts to reach is to explain the way Aristotle and Nyerere thoughts on happiness and community life can be beneficial to today's 21st Century Tanzania society. In the discussion and evaluation, the work suggested that most of the thoughts can be hone and continue to be used in today's society. This is because the thoughts we see that the contemporary philosophers of Aristotle and Nyerere are influenced with are by product what these two thinkers had once in their mindset as ideal of which they were convinced that could one day in the future be realized. So, it is not that the mode and system of their thoughts that we have as treasure were the one which shaped the individual and community happiness and life in the time, they were still alive. In this sense happiness is relevant in connection to today's community for the following reason. The contemporary community is in a better position than in the time of Aristotle and Nyerere "to see the true place of the city-state in the evolution of society, to appreciate its limitations, to condemn its evils, and to draw the moral from its failure" (Davis 1908, p. 4). Therefore the introduction of the two traditions of Aristotle and Nyerere by this thesis to our time has an advantage as a help to trace and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the contemporary perspectives and offer clarifications if needed.

First of all is that happiness creates a good life, by shaping good individuals and good society. This is because pursuant to happiness or *eudaimonia* involves living according to the virtues. According to the number of virtues, the type of virtues and their role in an individual and community implies that through the pursuit of happiness will mean that we have more courageous individuals, more just people and just society, more friendly and prudent people and the many advantages which are or will be the outcome of creation of such disposition to individuals and society. All these benefits and advantages will bring harmony to the problem conflicts, dissatisfactions and immigration of individuals (citizens) and all that which was introduced at the beginning 'the background of study' of this thesis. I think the important thing is to invest on the knowledge of the good (or the highest good) in each and everything that as action and goal the aim is. Aristotle believes that aiming and searching for the good should necessarily also include the knowledge of the good: "This argument has some plausibility, but seems to clash with the procedure of the sciences; for all of these, though they aim at some good and seek to supply the deficiency of it, leave on one side the knowledge of the good" (*Nicomachean Ethics*, I.6, 1097a3-6). It will be unworthy (in Aristotle's view) for example aiming and searching of the highest good (happiness) without wanting to know this highest good.

The second relevant factor of studying happiness today is harmony, peace, order and flourish of individual and community as a whole. From the background of the study of this work we saw that some of the reason which moves people from their countries to other place is the problems, challenges and dissatisfactions found around their areas and community life in general. It is relevant to study, research, talk about and even search happiness because a happy person in Aristotle's conception cannot wish or have desire to evil disposition, cannot yearn for something that which will hurt people such as terror actions, corruptions, injustices, because as we have seen happy persons are equipped with virtuous life. Aristotle and Nyerere are expecting an individual or a community having practiced the virtues is expected to act virtuous knowing the good, doing the good in a right way and with the right goals. At least every virtuous person has this when acting and therefore nothing bad is expected to happen to individual, neighbour or to the community having all these factors of a happy person fulfilled, considered and even kept constant.

Another relevance of happiness today is the aspect of human being social beings as conceive by both Aristotle and Nyerere. Unlike other creature, human beings have language as their social nature which enables them to communicate in their daily undertakings. That means other animals usually makes sound to one another and expressing only their emotions such as pain and pleasure whereas human beings speaking words to another with reference to what they find good or bad for them. This aspect of communication is very important to a community because it draws them into moral discussion and reflection of the virtues whereby, they are inclined to form dialogue of what is good and what is bad, that which is just, fair, right and that which is unjust, unfair and not right (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1253a1ff). In this way human being as rational beings, can share their lives something which the current society need to continue applying.

Another relevant thing is the importance and the role of law, order and justice in the community. The law is defined by something which serves to the perfection of man without which he is become as Aristotle says: "the worst of all". The same apply when he lacks virtue becomes unholy and the most savage of animals full of lust and gluttony and he become more dangerous because it will depend the way he uses the arms of intelligence and moral qualities given him at birth (cf. *Politics*, I.2, 1253a14f). That means even the discoveries, the invention, the science and technology and all that man is able to do with his knowledge, ought to be guided by the moral and intellectual virtues especial wisdom as discussed in chapters one and two above.

CHAPTER 5

5. Model of Happiness and Community Life to Tanzania in 21st Century

The journey of the discussion about comparison between happiness and community life that has been taken by Aristotle, Nyerere and the contemporary philosophers above shows that Aristotle and Nyerere proposes a kind of life and community (city-state) that can be realized.

The first thought from these two thinkers by which the model of Tanzania can be suggested is for its individual and the community in generally to cultivate the life of virtues because that is the thing that led to good life and eventual to happiness. Cultivation of virtues means doing away with the vices which both the philosopher Aristotle, Nyerere and the contemporaries have exhorted that they are not fruitful for moral dispositions and for health human flourishing. The situation of moral of the people of Tanzania should be further developed. The immoral standards which existed in some systems, and which held us back as community for many years should be learned from the mode provide by Aristotle and Nyerere. The topic of equality, justice, loyalty, commitment, friendliness and prudence and many other factors as proposed by the discussion of virtues are to be strengthened.

Another thing which can be learned from Aristotle and Nyerere as mode to the Tanzania is his suggestion that a ruler should be equipped also with knowledge not only of his political system but also with knowledge form different types of political systems (cf. *Politics* III.4, 1277a7-9; cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 35). The advantage of having this varied knowledge is to enable the rulers to find solution for any challenges or issues that arises within the state or community.

5.1 Which Thoughts are Relevant to the Community of Tanzania in 21st Century and Why?

Many thoughts that have been discussed above have the potentiality to be used or exercised in Tanzania society. However, a few of such thoughts will be suggested in the following explanation.

5.1.1 The Self-sufficient Character and the Idea of the End

Aristotle insisted in his philosophy about being self-sufficient on matters pertaining to happiness, community life, virtues life, political life and the like. According to him all these must be exercised in a self-sufficient mode and an individual who what to be happy to live a virtues or community or political life must have these: 'Virtuous life' especial justice, courage and magnanimity. This concept of self-sufficient in Aristotle ethics reflects in a way and has a close relation to the concept of self-reliance in Nyerere's philosophy of *ujamaa*.

Self-sufficient the way I understood Aristotle's arguments it means being without need of help, in itself complete, competent, no support lacking nothing, having all its relevant resource in a production of something (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* I.7, 1097b5-20). The following thoughts come to mind when I hear the word Self-reliance. It means starting doing it for yourself, be and do it independent, by using your own knowledge, method and efforts, even decision decide it for yourself. Examples of self-reliance in real life are such as: when children leave their parent home and starting their own families, when students sit for examination most of the cases every student attempts the examination question alone. Similarly, in Nyerere application of the word self-reliance that means after colonial rule and after receiving independence all that which were done by them things like leadership, planning, decision making, working and finding solution for problems were left on the hand of all the people of Tanzania and as independent people they must continue to build the country alone in the own ways and efforts. I should mention one relevant thing that self reliance does not mean that one should extremely restrict oneself and doing all work or each and everything alone, it does not mean that rather it is like coming out with own resource and means on that which must be done. It is believed that before Nyerere and many other thinker to use the word self reliance it was already brought in use by Ralph Waldo Emerson who is American transcendentalist philosopher in his essay *Self-Reliance* which was written in 1841 (cf. Emerson 2005, pp. 31ff). Now the idea of 'the natural end' is the one which regulate self-sufficient character.

In connection to that is the idea of the end whereby Aristotle and Nyerere viewed the things according to their end, goal or (as called in Greek *telos*) that is in a teleological way. They believe that all hard working aims at some excellence the ultimate end which is *eudaimonia* or happiness is that at which all struggle and efforts of human individual are directed (cf. *Politics*, III.9, 1280b39-1281a2; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 92ff). Aristotle look at nature and gave an example of seeds which and argue that their aim is to germinate into a tree (acorn or oak-nut into oak-tree) and that is their end or *telos* but if it happen that a bird or human being damage the seed then this goal will not be reached the process will not reach its end. Similarly, are human action should be well disposed in order for man to have good character, good life and happiness. This fits the requirement Tanzania in 21st century because once every individual citizen work hard to make their actions as Aristotle argued achieve such intended function in great noble goals then they are good. This notion will help to regulate the good, proper and wise use of their free will, rationality and language whereby instead of separate themselves from social nature and forming own laws, or meaning of what is good

and what is bad in a relative way which may lead to dictatorship and conflict, it helps instead to create good character which enable an individual to think about the common good and to remain social, virtuous and well flourishing creature. In a community or state hold by dictator (as unfortunately seen in some part of the world) this is not realized and that is the significance of the use of this normative nature of the self-sufficient character and the end individual's actions (cf. Hughes 2001, pp. 12ff, cf. *Politics* III.14, 1285a).

5.5.2 *The Spirit of Participation and Responsibility (Accountability)*

The spirit of participation is an important factor to be imitated in Tanzania because both Aristotle and Nyerere have argued that the only way to do good on all matters concerning life, happiness, flourish and development of an individual require that people are necessarily be involved and that they participate in thinking, decision making and doing or executing the thought or that which is aimed at the ultimate good of the whole community. Universal availability and participation of people in the community at country-wise and international-wise can lead to the explosion and promotion of the values which each as human beings and member of the community has to offer. It is obviously that each single individual has something to offer through knowledge, skills, talents, abilities and energies or working force. Participation helps individuals to discover that which is within them and what they can offer to the community they live. In order to emphasizes the question of participation Nyerere argued: "We have schools, irrigation works, expensive markets, and so on -things by which someone came and tried to 'bring development to the people'. If real development is to take place, the people have to be involved. Educated people can give a lead-and should do so." (Nyerere 1973, p. 25).

Other point to be explained and be adapted as already explained above but this time mentioning them as relevant including that which Aristotle and Nyerere have emphasizes as an approach in relationship strengthening of Loyalty, discipline among leaders and their citizen and in viewing life and the ultimate good in terms of a sustainable goals on human dignity, equality, freedom and peace (cf. *Politics* V.3, 1303a1ff, V.8; Nyerere 1968, p. 41).

Another thing which can be taken into account in Tanzania community for 21st century is 'the relationship' through the observation that Aristotle and Nyerere have some points of convergence as well as some points of divergence which for the most part have been pointed above in the similarities and differences between them. To extend the discussion this will be analyzed again but this time not as whole rather some those close key factors will be extracted and be outlined here below starting with factors by which they converge and then followed by factors in which they diverge.

5.1.3 Factors of Societal-Community Convergence in Aristotle and Nyerere

The first factor is a belief that the community life plays a role in the happiness of individual and community is the point which Aristotle and Nyerere have converged as we have seen in the discussion of this thesis. In Aristotle's and Nyerere's argument of the relationship between happiness and community gives the community priority over the individual person, as quoted here below.

Aristotle: "a human being is a political animal insofar as human capacities and aims are completely fulfilled only in a community; the individual's happiness must involve the good of fellow members of a community (1097b8-11, 1169b16-19)" (Irwin 1999, p. xxii).

Nyerere: "an individual acquires full happiness by being part of the society not only because man is rational but also because the individual human being, both social and political, has always lived in some kind of society (Curtis, 1965). The chief good of an individual lies in his being a member of society." (Sanga 2016, p. 6).

I think one of the most profound things I also discovered about the sense of community from both thinkers Aristotle and Nyerere is their use of 'plural form' in emphasizing the most important and valuable thoughts about human and community development. They use the plural form 'we' or 'our' in expressing their thoughts (cf. Nyerere 1968, p. 39-43, p. 124f). This sign made a reader to think that even their mind were if not complete then at least very well tuned not much in self-regarding but more on other-regard or communal thinking, particularly manifested in the virtues of friendship and justice that corresponds to African ideas of reciprocity and mutual aid (cf. Metz 2012, p. 105). For example MacIntyre writes:

"[...], with all the disadvantages of occasional compression or repetition or inaccurate cross referencing, we can almost hear in them from time to time the tone of Aristotle's spoken voice. It is magisterial and it is unique; but it is also a voice that seeks to be more than merely Aristotle's own. "What do we say on such and such a topic?" is a question that he continuously asks, not 'What do I say?' Who is this 'we' in whose name he writes? Aristotle takes himself not to be inventing an account of the virtues, but to be articulating an account that is implicit in the thought, utterance and action of an educated Athenian. He seeks to be the rational voice of the best citizens of the best city-state; for he holds that the city-state is the unique political form in which alone the virtues of human life can be genuinely and fully exhibited." (MacIntyre 2007, pp. 147-148).

The second point of convergence is the way they argue and value education (especial moral education in the process of human development and international relationship or friendship (cf. Kirstjansson 2007, pp. 2ff).

Another thing of convergence which appears in both of the philosophers is man center responsibility. According to the conception of 'man is the measure of all things' from Protagoras which it is believed influences Aristotle and Nyerere consequently they develop their thought by assign the work of human development to human themselves as center. Aristotle starts with acquiring the virtue perception of the good and transform to that good as

goal. Forming good people is by human themselves to decide to be good and to put motivation and efforts in what they want to achieve as Katja Maria Vogt argued (cf. Vogt 2017, pp. 6ff). Nyerere took that idea too without violation to the African values expressed by the idiom of *ubuntu* to develop his *ujamaa* and his argument while addressing the issue of adult education at in the *Declaration of Dar es Salaam* is that when talking about development of man he argued that:

“it is true that in the third world we talk a great deal about economic development about expanding the number of goods and services and the capacity to produce them. But the goods are needed to serve men. Services are required to make the lives of men more useful, more peaceful and more truthful political, social and economical organization is needed to enlarge the freedom and dignity of men. Always we come back to man...liberated man as the purpose of activity, as the purpose of development. That man can only liberate himself or develop himself. He cannot be liberated or developed by another for man makes himself. It is his ability to act deliberately for a self-determined purpose which distinguishes him from other animals. The expansion of his own consciousness and therefore of his own power over himself over his environment and his society. Must therefore ultimately be what we mean by development” (Nyerere 1978, pp. 29-30).

Another point of convergence between Aristotle and Nyerere is their sense of love, heart and consideration for the poor because they focused on developing a human being as a whole. They thought that the allocation of resource should follow an order and system by which the poor, the young, the disabled, will be uplifted from their difficulty (cf. *Politics*, II.7 1266b1ff; cf. Nyerere 1968, p. vii, pp.15ff; cf. Ludwig 2020, pp. 318ff).

The idea by which they sharp converge is that they find out accumulation of money (or wealth) without limit for private use is unnecessary because such form of life disposition has the “intent upon living only and not upon living well” (cf. *Politics*, I.9,1258a1; cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 18ff).⁸⁹

5.1.4 Factors of Societal-Community Divergence in Aristotle and Nyerere

The factors of divergence between Aristotle is first of all is in virtue of those people who are capable (or incapable) of virtuous life and hence happiness (or *eudaemonia*). Aristotle model need much of intellect to be happy but for Nyerere children have also the ability to be virtuous and happy. According to Nyerere through the upbringing from parents,

⁸⁹ This thought following the example that was given by Aristotle it is difficult and one would want to know which intention different individual have when making money or working. The quality of courage says Aristotle is not to make money but to inspire confidence. And when for example the Generals plan and go to war-fight it is not because they want to make money but to have victory; or when a physician is working on a savior patient at the hospital the aim is not to make money although she or he will receive salary at the end of the month but bring health to that patient. Or when an Author is writing a book does she or he intend to give knowledge to people or to make money what comes first to mind, I think that would be Aristotle question here. Or when a farmer grows grains does the farmer aim to feed people in all its different use and form or to get some income? When cooker is cooking and selling food does she or do that so that people who eat that food will become health or for the intention of making money first? Is the opposite also true that Generals, Physician, Author, Farmer, and Cooker ‘knows’ that they are doing good to the people and is that ‘knowledge’ the immediate reason for their happiness? (cf. *Politics*, I.9, 1258a17-18, I.13.).

family relatives and even neighbours a child is be able to learn to be a good person full of happiness (cf. Nyerere 1968, pp. 55ff). Nyerere does not draw concrete line of the people who can fully participate on happiness and in the community.

Another thing when it comes to slave and master relationship unlike Aristotle who believe there is a ‘partially’ existence of such a relation among humanity (slave and master) at least at cognitive level though for the benefit of all, Nyerere is rigorous opposite to the idea of one man dominating or exploiting another man and he has argued this repeatedly. This is really a challenging divergence among these two thinkers although their countries share at some points same background.

5.1.5 Moral Education and Social Works

Education is considered by many thinkers to be the key to many good things in life because as a pillar it has values and knowledge.⁹⁰ Aristotle (and Nyerere later) these two thinkers have a very, very strong sense of: that’s good, and that’s bad. This is what they argued to be moral education. They apply their moral education in every theme they wish to address and see what its application and effect to their audience could be.

5.1.6 The Theory of Social and Political Justice

The theory of justice discussed by Aristotle and Nyerere aims at uplifting the poor and the people who live under vulnerable situations in the community (cf. *Politics* V.10, 1311a1f, VI.2, 1318a1f). They point out the practices which are overlooked or are forgotten in the distribution of goods and services available in the community. In today society it is not something to wonder to find one person is possess an area of land which is equal to an area which could be a village and inhabit many people who do not have place to live. Aristotle’s position about this example of land possession for example is for the rich people to take care of the poor. And in the division of whatever goods and services the poor should get more than the rich according to Aristotle. In Nyerere position he first of all argued that any citizen who possesses a piece of land (farmland) should use it and make it productive. Consequently, failure to do that if a piece of land is possessed by someone and that person does not use it

⁹⁰ According to Kristjan Kirstjansson there are at least three reasons why Aristotle’s thoughts of education are relevant in today’s world. First Aristotle’s thoughts have “important things to say about most issues relevant to moral education” and provide “a great philosophical illumination”. Although they cannot provide the “last word on any contemporary educational issue, but they can offer a useful first word and sometimes grant us a certain philosophical edge” including a variety of thoughts on “emotions and education” intelligence and constitution of worthwhile goal. Second, is that “Aristotle’s views are already so frequently cited and used as critical ammunition in the current educational literature” in the sense that he has influence in peoples mind and he is always invoked by everyone for relevant just as one does in “hobbyhorse” . Third, is that “Aristotle is a stickler for systematization and a master of broad-range thinking” in the sense that when one compares the current discourse issues pertain moral education seems to occur in a theoretical vacuum and does not really focused of being directed to “the ultimate goals of living and therefore requires “education for the good life” in continuation as Aristotle (and later Nyerere) would like it to be (Kirstjansson 2007, pp. 6-7).

productively and leave it idled then this will be taken by the government and be given to people who will make use of it.

5.2 How and Where Are They To Be Applied?

The central place to apply these few thoughts which are selected from the two thinkers is in the individual and community of Tanzania (and any other developing state which is open to the thoughts suggested by them) because ‘exactly these’ they are the one which should be helped to practice them, to change, to get transformed by them, to have and live a good life and to attain the ultimate good which is happiness. The theme of virtuous life which is very important for the good life should be given priority on our list of the things which are to be applied. Now the application should be through practice and teaching or training. The place is right in the family where the citizen, leaders and future generation in different walks of life are born and developed. As closing part I would outline few concrete sectors, places and human situations in Tanzania which these though which are learned from Aristotle, Nyerere and from the contemporary philosophers discussed in this thesis can be applied.

The first place I am thinking about is the question of education sector, the moral education both theoretical and practical is something needs to be improved. The current situation is not that much bad compared to some period before. Tanzania has for example more schools and teachers but some improvement are still needed. In terms of value given to education, people need to be encouraged to value education in all its dimensions. Aristotle and Nyerere were working hard to communicate the idea that at least every member of the community should be admitted to school and know small basic things like how to write and read because it will be useful for all other things they have explain. In order to practice the rule needs to know them and in order to know them one must be in the school or be given some formative training the same as children are formed by parents and society to know things well and to become good people when they are adult. For those who had no opportunity to be in school there should be good plan how help them. For example Aristotle and Nyerere propose adult education or extra classes. For the people with special disabilities such as albino Tanzania needs to learn more how to handle this as well.

Caring for the poor, the need and the marginalized people in our communities is another thing to be applied. The gap between rich and the poor has been increasing for many years. The work does not blame capitalism but it criticizes some of the principles it uses or applies in the development of human beings such as social justice, human relation, the form of rights, wealth, opportunity distributions and all we discuss in this work. Aristotle has pointed

it in his *Politics* to be “the birth of money from money” or “usury” (cf. *Politics*, I.10, 1258b1f).

Other forms in Tanzania for example if one looks on the demand and supply produced goods and services does not always occur in good way. This can be seen when the state is fighting with the problem of corruption, illegal or escape from legal rules such paying tax, inequalities in the division of goods and services especial in a wide range like a community or state this can be noticed as an unequal allocation of the resources between those who live in urban and those who are in villages, also the ‘forging’ that means presenting a product or service and goods in the right amount, with the right quality, right quantity and the like. Human relationship or friendship, equality, and loyalty were one of the points which Aristotle and Nyerere have emphasized but then seem at risk if not traumatized. The question how can the people in today’s society be possibly made to establish that friendly relationship again, regardless how poor or rich a person is. This is because, with the development of humanity from primitive mode of production up to capitalism it meant on one hand progress and development of human being with new mode of production, advanced means and tools and with great results. On the other hand it meant the opposite too that is the birth of some classes, the increase of the distance and gaps between the different modes of production and one can notice that if one wishes to compare them. The suggestion here is not that people should go back to these primitive way of live not at all rather the suggestion is to look back on the system to see the values which were lost as we were advancing in different modes, those values important practices should be picked up and combine with our current mode of life—and in our context good human relationship. Justice (social justice) is what Aristotle, Nyerere as well as the contemporary philosophers have suggested to us in the discussion in this thesis.⁹¹ The rich people should be encouraged to share or to allocate their resources in the manner that the poor people can be helped (cf. *Politics*, IV.3, 1290a1ff; cf. Nyerere 1968, p. vii). In Austria and many other European Developed Countries they are doing quite good in that and what one may notice is that the sharpness of life even to the very poor families is reduced.

The issue of leadership and governance of the community is another important thing to be considered in this application. The state of Tanzania as it is other African countries has the

⁹¹ For example Martha Nussbaum and other thinkers have pointed out that the use of GDP as measure of well-being to individual or communities does hides many important details which should be exposed and be focussed on, things that makes life worthwhile such as „the beauty of our poetry, the strength of our mariages, the intelligence of our public debate, or the integrity of our public officials [...] our wit nor our courage; neither our wisdom nor our learning; neither our compassion nor our devotion to our country“ (Bavetta et al. 2014, p. 2; cf. Nussbaum 2011, pp. 41ff).

system of General election of their leader. The period of being on reign last for five years term, there after followed by call for new elections. Tanzania is also in Multi-party system since 1992 that mean the citizen who are the votes have broad field to choose starting from the ruling part to the oppositions. The political education and discipline during Election and in some sector during leadership should be improved. It will be good if one day they will be no conflict and the election is conducted in a harmonious and peaceful way respecting the opinion of the citizen who also offer full cooperation and participation to the political matters pertain to the future of their families, their countries and the world as a whole.

In some developed countries the whole idea (of election activities) is practiced with the help of technology to ensure that the citizen participation in some important community activities is conducted well, but still there are some lamentations and dissatisfactions with the system and its results. It would be good if one day in our societies people will not worry (or for some be intimidate) about the conflicts that might arise with dissatisfactions during participation on community function of election or if they will not be provoked⁹² to join the conflicts brought by when it comes to the time when they are obliged to show their participation in community functions such as election, agreement on some countries policies, contribution on some developmental and sustainable projects, plans and activities aiming for well-being, flourishing, *eudaimonia*, good and happy life for human being, animals and our environments. Unfortunately, most of the critical topics about critical challenges such as human conflicts, human dignity, human trafficking, human freedom, environmental destructions and challenges, diseases and catastrophes that the current world is facing the question which not only seeks scientific solutions but even more ethical and political solutions.

⁹² However, Cécile Fabre in her *Cosmopolitan peace* believed that there are still some spots of possibilities to deal with such provocative emotions and possible correct them by the help of parental formation and moral education (Fabre 2016, pp.252ff).

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The analysis of this thesis has attempted to understand and describe the comparison between Aristotle and Nyerere concerning the meaning of happiness and community life. The discussion has shown that there is close relation between happiness and community because the later act as the environment by which the former can be created. The discussion has point out also that there is an existence of happiness, which is the ultimate good for which all inquiry, choice and aims of human being living in the community are directed. This ultimate good which is happiness or *eudaemonia* which also mean living well or doing well is chosen as ultimate good because it is self sufficient, the complete end, lacking in nothing, it is end in itself for there are no other end to be realized once one has attain to happiness.

The discussion has shown also that happiness is also a rational activity in accordance to virtues. Both Aristotle and Nyerere have argued that virtues are attitudes that every human being is capable of, but which first must develop over the course of life. Aristotle divided the virtues into two major groups the moral virtues and the intellectual virtues. Nyerere's classification of virtues was structured the way he applied them in terms of all the 'good deeds' for human being such freedom, unity, peace, social works, loyalty, equality, education which lead man to good life and happiness and in this way he paralleled with Aristotle. They point out that every human individual or community which aims to have a good life, and good character and then to be happy must first of all choose to live according to the virtues. This means that practicing the different virtues they pointed out such as courage, justice, friendship, moderation, magnanimity and the like by which indeed we saw and mean that after a practicing of virtuous life, one become just, courageous, moderate, and good or noble person in her or his action and character.

Another way they suggested is that they believed that participation in the political life is one of the best ways to enjoy the ethical or virtuous life with moral education being prioritized in that political community. In talking about the community life we saw that both Aristotle's and Nyerere's concept of community life presented human beings as an animal (creature) which seeks community life in order to be strong, to get help, to survive, to find and realize oneself, to flourish and to be happy. As it was the aim of practicing virtues to seek the good life and become good this is also similar that the aim of the community is to form an individual and to enable her or him to attain the good life and to be happy. There are some criteria they laid out to know whether an individual is doing well in practicing the virtue which we mention to be 'flourishing individual'. This is when the human being does what he is aimed or meant to be. This is similar to a seed which is sown in the farmland to develop to a

tree and finally to produce expected fruits. They believe also that a human life has a purpose, and that is to attain the end which it was aimed. According to Aristotle for example human being consists of soul and body and to grow well the soul should rule the body because this would help to constitute ‘good character’ which define an individual as human being. They motivate and encourage the thought that a human being should work hard to develop herself or himself as individual to become a morally good or flourishing person. In support to this would be the factor which I found of distinction in Aristotle and Nyerere that is the way they give emphasis on the role of moral education for every member of the community from children up to the adults especial the state leaders. Instead of striving for the quest to rule or conquer others one should learn to have another mind of helping them especially helping everyone if possible. Aristotle and Nyerere teach us this through their thought on community whereby it is people’s nature to come together not only for survival but supporting each other to achieve a good life. This means including in good and bad time they will work hard to enable each other to reach fulfilled ultimate good and happy life (cf. Anthony 2010, p. v). In this sense, some human beings and the instrumental good are involved every time individuals are acting.

In the discussion about the comparisons between Aristotle and Nyerere two main point were chosen and explained in detail namely; first ‘human development’ and second, ‘leadership and community governance’. The factors which were important and explained by the former comparison include: education in the community, self-reliance, human relationship and art. Regarding the latter point of comparison the factors such as wisdom and knowledge, equality and justice, discipline and commitment, integrity and obedience to the law, dignity and sustainability were considered. In the discussion and application of the theories proposed by both Aristotle and Nyerere there were some challenge, differences and limitations too. For example the question of slavery, or the different inequalities in the distribution of demands, rights and opportunities between men, women, children, old, disabled, poor and rich which put some limitations to the theory of flourishing, development, good life and happiness or *eudaimonia*. However, Aristotle’s and Nyerere’s ethics and politics are the disciplines that continue to guide us even today throughout this practical knowledge and on how to act in the world despite such challenges. With the former ‘or ethics’ we explain the concept of the good life, character, happiness and flourishing and the way one can attain them. With the later ‘or politics’ which is practical knowledge of political science we studied the tasks of the politicians (state persons) and analyze the appropriate types of constitutions, forms of governments (from monarchy to tyranny) laws and rules that guides the form of education for

citizens and community development. In a special way these two disciplines both deal with happiness and community pointing out the role practice of virtue, constitution of good character and life of wisdom as the criteria of good and happy life. Also in their arguments about the relationship between citizen and their leaders, relationship between individual members and their community and between rich (the-haves) and poor (the-have-nots), the role they have for one another and the way they can live together in harmony was of profound and should be imitated.

In addition to this the contemporary philosopher gave their contribution on matters pertain to social justice and the quality of life whereby Martha Nussbaum for example proposes and presented a theory called 'capabilities approach' which compares the quality of life assessment and which theorizes basic social justice. She argued that instead of the economist or policy-makers to give a general comparison in approaching people's quality of life and social justice they should consider in their research the question: "What is each person is able to do and to be. According to her they should not only dealing with the total or average well-being but more important they should determine about the opportunities available to each person. The model of happiness and community life for Tanzania was suggested by the element of virtuous life, self-sufficient character, the goals or end, the spirit of participation and responsibility or accountability to the community's functioning, the strengthening and enhancement of the human relationships especial with arguments proposed by Thaddeus Metz and Alasdair MacIntyre, that is, the consideration of both 'self-regarding and other-regard or communal thinking' in that relation. Also this applies to moral education and social work which all were to be applied in areas described on chapter five of this thesis.

Moreover, it should be admitted that Aristotle was criticized on the argument that an individual who wants to attain happiness apart from practicing living according to virtue in her or his practice the desire, emotion or pleasure must be separated from the virtues. In this we saw the account from Ronna Burger and others who believed that there is somehow the involvement of pleasure in the process of happiness, something which is difficult to avoid and that when there is an omission it, it actually raises a very difficult question. Burger pointed out the three lives present by Aristotle namely; the life of pleasure, the political life and life of contemplation. Then she question whether the life of enjoyment is absent in the other two that is the political life and life of contemplation. She discovers that in the beginning of book ten (book 10) of the *Nicomachen Ethics* Aristotle gave a definition of pleasure and talked about perception and thinking as our modalities for awareness. And when such awareness is in its best condition the experience that accompanies it is pleasure.

In reading Aristotle on the argument of pleasure and trying to combine with experience found in the life of pleasure, some challenges of comprehension and practical applicability arises too because in order to have strong will power to accomplish anything of a good deed, or any other highly goal some desire for that good are involved in the process as the driving force which pushes one to want doing all good and possible things and with all effort (enthusiasm) to achieve that goal. A thing is desired because at the end it has some benefit or pleasure. For example, the strong desire to complete my work or examination or my job is because of among other of the outcome which are expected at the end and this expresses also or are accompanied with pleasures. At the end of the goal there is some pleasure too involved in form of enjoyment of that good coming as reward. This pleasure is emotion which contributes to happiness (*eudaemonia*) and the difficult thing is how the mind can be separated from the bodily pleasure knowing happiness in its 'being and essence' as Aristotle claims. How will one be able to know that: 'now I am happy', without having some desires and feeling, emotions or pleasures involved in it or out of it (cf. MacIntyre 2007, p. 149).

Aristotle and Nyerere contributed to that challenged question by introducing the concept of happiness as an activity that requires practices of virtuous life, to have a deep thirsty to attain the best ultimate good in our actions and practice by choosing the right mean or balance for goals, means and way, action and person. With this principle he first of all teaches individuals and the community to seek happiness for things which are morally acceptable. For example, with his concept of the contribution of pleasure and other means to happiness I reflect that Aristotle want to say that instead of seeking happiness from non-moral values like alcohol, cigarette, sex, to establish moral standards that helps to control these actions which are socially acceptable by human beings. To put this, he goes on to state that thus why it needs and it takes time, commitment and capability to practice and to cultivate the virtues that gave individual and community real happiness. Otherwise, the other pleasure that lead to happiness seems to Aristotle I think like a glimpse of light which occurs quick and lost or fade away. That is why one will find a person is one moment happy and after another two hours he is unhappy. The discussion is also open to the all who believe like saint Augustine that happiness is attain at the end of one's earthly life. But Aristotle meant something more than that, to be good, noble and to enjoy to be happy.⁹³ These glimpses I think they are the result of happiness something which for an individual to whom these glimpse were rigid

⁹³ This is different from Aristotle because for him happiness is an 'activity' therefore once one is dead she or he cannot be happy since the element of activity found in Aristotle conception of happiness cannot be practiced in death. Also such acts of flourish that imply happiness and choice making, decision making, inquiry which related to life are contrary to not living or at death (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics* I.10, 1100a10ff).

cultivated with good dispositions, virtuous life, such that we are able to recognizing 'the mean' of our action, then one will be in the position not only to arrive at ultimate good that make her or him happy but one is able to stay long happy that it is for that which I named glimpse, enjoyment or results of true happiness.

Aristotle's ethical and political thoughts are practical applicable not only to politics as mention above but also to religion ethics and teaching especial when consider them through the synthesis or philosophical ideas of saint Thomas Aquinas (cf. Johnson 2015, p.69; cf. Arnhart 2015, pp. 89ff). This plays a great role on the spiritual part of the soul as well as the appetitive part. Apart from ethical thoughts Nyerere too used to refer to religion in his preambles which were aimed as exhortation for moral or virtuous life teaching to the people he was leading.

The thoughts of Aristotle and Nyerere on education shows that the power of moral education can be use to change also some challenges face the world today. When one will happen to have conversation or had already talked with someone who lives in the past will hear the situation was not as bad as we have today. It should be noted that with this statement the past is used to justify the challenges we have today rather if one compares even in the statistical given by climatic changes or by the increase of the catastrophes diseases and all forms of cruelty (criminality) the current statistics are heavier than the past. Some critics may be posed against this claim that the past there were no many discoveries or technologies as we have today. Or that today we have good technologies which have improve if not enhance the life of human being and the earth in all its dimensions compared to the past. But many agree that a combination of the good values found in the two different era events (the past and the present) creates a balance in facing the current challenges and this is the reasons why thoughts of Aristotle and Nyerere we have seen in our discussion are relevant.

The status of women, children, the old people and perhaps people with special needs have been the challenge of many years now. For example when one reads the book from the past such as the Bible will notice this exclusion of women even from the community. One will find out the reading says: "And those who ate the loaves were five thousand men" (Mk. 6:44) without noticing that women and children and the like were also there at the multitude. These are phrases which also when used without being good understood, might encourage the thoughts to passive women as complete different from other living things and it is easy to forget their right of belonging participation in the community life. This is thanks to the authorities in the community (states) which work hard to eliminate the difference, and as initial positive results are seen, the attention to the women rights and the empowerment of

women in now better compared to the past where they were deprived even freedom of expression. The situation starting to change now the community understands the position of women and value them and this includes also the position and value of the rest marginalized groups I have mentioned in the community. A good example is the good number of women chosen to higher position in the parliaments, in the state in institutions other organs of the community. This creation of balance and harmony between female and male members is relevant because it is difficult to speak of happiness or happy community life while at the same time there the majority if not all women, children, old, the disabled are marginalized and traumatized in the same community. People participate more in the community life too.

I think the role the community plays for the happiness of its people is reciprocal to that which the happy people could do for their community. Aristotle and Nyerere as the key figure of the discussion in this thesis and their contemporaries have told this story in a way that is so compelling. I think it for Tanzania and every other country should wanting or willing to be a part of telling that story, I mean to create better community life that as result produce happy and better people in character who again preserve that happiness and the whole community. Therefore, I think any individual and community (in particular that of Tanzania) which follows Aristotle's and Nyerere's advice by pursuing a virtuous life will likely lead to the improvement of the well-being of such given individual or community. These all thoughts and many other described above were the goal of the discussion which this thesis has tried to attempt or to approach.

Proposal for further Research Consideration

I found as outcome from the whole discussion the practice of virtue and descent way of life to form good character offers a good foundation to regulation the challenges in the community because it gives us principle which an individual or community (state) can search and employ if it wishes to have such kind of good, flourish and happy life in the future within that frame work. The more interesting thing one might think as discussion in the future is that which Aristotle and Nyerere propose that the practice of virtues and participation in the community life aimed not only to know the good rather to truly be happy, that it is a transformation of an individual or community. I think this can be to take them to another level by investigating the 'human acts' both voluntary and involuntary with respect to happiness and the result that might come out. For example to consider factors or reasons which makes people (individual but also communal) who knows the good but to chooses the bad and what are the possibility to change or put that in order. I think this will be interesting to discuss.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Aristotle: *The Eudemian Ethics*. Anthony Kenny trans. New York: Oxford University Press 2011.
- : *Aristotelis Ethica Nicomachea*, Ingram Bowater (editor). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2010.
- : *Ethica Nicomachea*, Herausgegeben von Ingram Bywater. Oxford: Clarendon 1962.
- : *The Nicomachean Ethics*, Lesley Brown, David Ross. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- : *The Politics of Aristotle*, Ernest Barker [Translator], London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 1977.
- : *Aristotle's Politics, Translated by Benjamin Jowett With Introduction, Analysis and Index by H. W. C. Davis* (Classic Reprint), Chicago, London: Forgotten Books 2018.
- Barnes, Jonathan (ed): *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, Vol. 1. 1. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1984; 1991.
- : *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, Vol. 2. 2. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1984; 1991.
- Nyerere Julius K.: *Freedom and Unity: Uhuru na Umoja: A Selection from Writings and Speeches (1952-1965)*, Dar es salaam, Nairobi, London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1966, 1967.
- : *Education for Self-Reliance*, Dar es salaam: the Government Printer 1967.
- : *Freedom and Socialism: Uhuru na Ujamaa: A Selection from Writings and Speeches (1965-1967)*, Dar es salaam, Nairobi, London, New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- : *Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism*. Nairobi, London, New York, Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press 1968.
- : *Freedom and Development: Uhuru na Maendeleo: A Selection from Writings and Speeches (1968-1973)*, Nairobi, Dar es salaam, Ibadan, London: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- : *Man and Development*, Dar-es-Salaam: Oxford University Press 1974.
- : *Crusade for Liberation*. Dar es salaam: Oxford University Press 1978.

Secondary Literatures

- Ackrill, J.: *Aristotle the Philosopher*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1981.
- Adler Mortimer J.: *Aristotle for Everybody: Difficult Thought Made Easy*. New York, London: Collier Macmillan 1978.
- Aristotle: *Nicomachean Ethics: With Introduction, Notes, and Glossary*. 2nd edition Terence H. Irwin (ed. /trans.), Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co. 1999.
- Aristoteles, Ursula Wolf, Franz Susemihl: *Aristoteles Politik*, neu herausgegeben von Ursula Wolf, nach der Übersetzung von Franz Susemihl mit Einleitung, Bibliographie und zusätzlichen Anmerkungen von Wolfgang Kullmann 2014.
- Arnhart, Larry: *Political Questions: Political Philosophy from Plato to Pinker*, Fourth Edition, Long Grove, Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc 2015.
- Bagby Johnson M. Laurie: *Thomas Hobbes: Turning Point for Honor*, New York: Lexington Books 2009.
- Bavetta, Sebastiano et al.: *Freedom and the Pursuit of Happiness: An Economic and Political Perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press 2014.
- Beauchamp, Tom. L. - Childress, James. F.: *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, ²1983.
- : *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. Oxford University Press 2019. digital.
- Bjerk, Paul: *Building a Peaceful Nation: Julius Nyerere and the Establishment of Sovereignty in Tanzania, 1960-1964*. Rochester, New York: University of Rochester Press 2015.
- Bok, Sissela: *Exploring Happiness: From Aristotle to Brain Science*, New haven, London: Yale University Press 2010.
- Burger, Ronna: *Aristotle's Dialogue with Socrates: On the Nicomachean Ethics*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press 2008.
- Campbell Horace: "Julius Nyerere: between state-centred and people centred Pan-Africanism" in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.
- Cassam Annar: "Introduction" in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.
- Chachage Seithy: "Reading history backwards with Mwalimu" in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.
- Chachage, Chambi – Cassam Annar (eds): *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.

- Curtis, S: *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. London: University Tutorial Press 1965.
- Coeckelbergh, Mark: *Moved by Machines: Performance Metaphors and Philosophy of Technology*, (Routledge Studies in Contemporary Philosophy) New York: Routledge 2019.
- Davis H. W.C.: *Aristotle's Politics, Trans. By Benjamin Jowett, with Introduction, Analysis and Index by H. W. C. Davis, M.A.* Oxford: Clarendon Press 1908.
- Dill, Brian (auth.): *Fixing the African State: Recognition, Politics, and Community. Based Development in Tanzania*, (Africa Connects), New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2013.
- Douglas Mary: *How Institutions Think*, (The Frank W. Abrams Lectures), Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press 1986.
- : *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*, London, New York: Routledge 1984.
- El Saaddawi, Nawal: “President Nyerere talks to El Mussawar (1984)” in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.
- Ellis, Amanda - Blackden Mark - Cutura Jozefina: *Gender and Economic Growth in Tanzania: Creating Opportunities for Women* (Directions in Development) 2007.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo: *Compensation and Self-Reliance*. (Cosimo Classics Philosophy), New York: Cosimo Classics 2005.
- Fabre, Cécile: *Justice in a changing world*. Cambridge: Polity press 2007.
- : *Cosmopolitan peace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2016.
- Fletcher, Guy: *The Philosophy of Well-Being: An Introduction*, New York: Routledge 2016.
- Frost S. E. Jr.: *Basic Teachings of the Great Philosophers*, New Garden City, York: Doubleday, 1962.
- Gerson, L.P.–Inwood, B., Eds. & Trans.: *The Epicurus reader: Selected writings and Testimonia*, Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing 1994.
- Gilbert, Margaret: *Rights and Demands: A Foundational Inquiry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2018.
- Goldstein, Jack: *101 Amazing Brainteasers: Riddles and Puzzles for All Ages*, Andrews UK 2013. digital
- Haroub, Othman: “Mwalimu Julius Nyerere: an intellectual in power” in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.

- Haybron, Daniel M: *Happiness: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2013.
- Hicks, Robert Drew (ed.): *Aristotle: De Anima, with translation, introduction and commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1907.
- Hobbes, Thomas: *Leviathan* (1660), digital.
- Hord, Fred Lee – Lee, Jonathan Scott: *I Am Because We Are: Readings in Africana Philosophy*. Amherst & Boston: University of Massachusetts Press 1992. 2016.
- Hughes, Gerald J.: *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Aristotle on Ethics*. London: Routledge 2001.
- Höffe, Otfried: *Political Justice: Foundations for a Critical Philosophy of Law and the State*, Cambridge: Polity 1995.
- Johnson, M. Laurie: *Political Thought: A Guide to the Classics*, Wadsworth: Kansas State University 2015.
- : *Ideological Possession and the Rise of the New Right: The Political Thought of Carl Jung*, New York, London: Routledge 2019.
- Miller, Fred D.: “Aristotelian Statecraft and Modern Politics” In: *Aristotle’s Politics Today*, (SUNY series in ancient Greek philosophy) Lenn Evan Goodman and Robert B. Talisse, Editors. New York: State University of New York Press 2007.
- Kallhoff, Angela: *Why Democracy Needs Public Goods*. Lanham: Lexington Books 2011.
- Kallhoff Angela, Marcello Di Paola, Maria Schörghenheimer (eds): *Plant Ethics, Concepts and Applications*, London, New York: Routledge 2018.
- Kenny, Anthony: *Ancient Philosophy: A New History of Western Philosophy*. Volume 1. Volume 1, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2004, 2006.
- Kesebir, P: Diener, E. In pursuit of happiness: empirical answers to philosophical questions. In: *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, (2008) pp. 117-125.
- Keys, M. Mary: *Aquinas, Aristotle, and the Promise of the Common Good*. Cambridge University Press 2006.
- Kirstjansson, Kristjan: *Aristotle, Emotions, and Education*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing 2007.
- Korsgaard, Christine M.: *Self-Constitution: Agency, Identity, and Integrity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2009.
- Kraut, Richard: *Aristotle: Political Philosophy. Founders of Modern Political and Social Thought*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2002.

- Lockwood, Thornton C.: "Habituation, Habit, and Character in Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics" In: *A History of Habit: From Aristotle to Bourdieu*, Tom Sparrow and Adam Hutchinson (eds): Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Plymouth: Lexington Books 2013.
- Lord, Carnes: *Education and Culture in the Political Thought of Aristotle*. New York: Cornell University Press 1982.
- Ludwig, Paul W.: *Rediscovering Political Friendship: Aristotle's Theory and Modern Identity, Community, and Equality*. New York: Cambridge University Press 2020.
- Manji, Firoze: "How we wish you were here: a tribute to Mwalimu Nyerere" in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.
- Mascarenhas, Ophelia-Mbilinyi, Marjorie: *Women in Tanzania: An Analytical Bibliography*. Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Swedish International Development Authority. Motala: Motala Grafiska 1983.
- McMahon, D.M. *Happiness: A history*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press (2006).
- Metz, Thaddeus: "Ethics in Aristotle and in Africa: Some Points of Contrast" *Phronimon* 13 (2):99-117 (2012).
- : *A Relational Moral Theory: African Ethics in and beyond the Continent* New York: Oxford University Press 2022.
- Molony, Thomas: *Nyerere: The Early Years*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Boydell and Brewer 2014.
- Mbiti, John S.: *African religions and philosophy*. Oxford: Heinemann Educational Books 1969.
- Nussbaum, Martha C.: *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011.
- : "Non-Relative Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach", *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 13 32 (1988).
- Nyerere, Madaraka: "A short biography of Julius Nyerere" in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.
- Omari, Cuthbert K.: "The Management of Tribal & Religious Diversity" In: *Mwalimu: The Influence of Nyerere*, Colin Legum-Geoffrey Mmari (eds). London, Dar es salaam: Africa World Press 1995.
- Paris, Peter J.: *The Spirituality of African People*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1995.
- Pettit, Philip: *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford Political Theory, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000.

- Pieper, Josef: *Glück und Kontemplation*. Herausgegeben von Berthold Wald, Band 766, München: Verlagsgemeinschaft topos plus, Kevelaer 2015.
- Polansky, Ronald: *Aristotle's De Anima: A Critical Commentary*, Cambridge University Press 2007.
- Rapp, Christof: *Aristoteles zur Einführung*. 4., vollständig überarb. Aufl. Hamburg: Junius 2012.
- Rawls, John: *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press 1999.
- Ross, Sr. David: *Aristotle: With an introduction by John L. Ackrill*. Sixth edition. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Sahnoun, Mohamed: "Nyerere, the Organisation of African Unity and liberation" in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Pambazuka Press Kampala Uganda 2010.
- Sanga, Innocent: "Education for Self-Reliance: Nyerere's Policy Recommendations in the Context of Tanzania". In: *African Research Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, Vol. 3, 2016.
- Seligman, Martin E.P.: *Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment*, New York: Atria Books, 2002, 2004.
- Smith, William E: *Nyerere of Tanzania*. London: Victor Gollanz 1973. digital
- Shule, Vicensia: "Mwalimu Nyerere: the artist" in: *Africa's Liberation: The Legacy of Nyerere*, Capetown, Dakar, Nairobi, Oxford: Pambazuka Press 2010.
- Störig, Joachim Hans: *Kleine Weltgeschichte der Philosophie*. 13. Aufl. (1. Aufl. 1950) Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GmbH, 1985.
- Vogt, Katja Maria: *Desiring the Good: Ancient Proposals and Contemporary Theory*, New York: Oxford University Press 2017.
- Williams, Bernard: *Morality: An Introduction to Ethics*. (Canto), New York: Cambridge University Press 1993.
- Wolf Ursula, *Aristoteles' Nicomachische Ethik*, ebook Ausgabe. 3. Darmstadt: WBG (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft), 2007.
- Che-Mponda, Aleck Humphrey: "Aspect of Nyerere's Political Philosophy: A Study in the Dynamics of African Political Thought". In: *African Study Monographs* 1984, 5: 63-74.

Internet Sources

- Biola University. "Janelle Aijian: Putting the Nicomachean Ethics in Context - Torrey Honors Lecture." Online Video Clip. YouTube, uploaded by Biola University YouTube 9.

- Jun 2015. Web. Accessed December 12, 2020
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kuCajsvjOCk>.
- Cornelli Evaristi Magoti: *A Critical Analysis of Nyerere's Ujamaa: An investigation of its foundation and its values*, University of Birmingham 2012.
https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/3793/1/Cornelli_12_PhD.pdf
- Craig, Heather “The Philosophy of Happiness in Life (+ Aristotle’s View)” Accessed July 10, 2020 In: <https://positivepsychology.com/philosophy-of-happiness/>
- James, Paul; Nadarajah, Yaso; Haive, Karen; Stead, Victoria; Sustainable Communities, Sustainable Development: Other Paths for Papua New Guinea, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press (2012) p. 14.
- James, Paul: Globalism, Nationalism, Tribalism, Bringing Theory Back In – Volume 2 of Towards a Theory of Abstract Community London: Sage Publications 2006.
- Haybron, Dan, “Happiness”, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/happiness/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/happiness/).
- Anthony, Kyle Brandon: “Aristotle and the Importance of Virtue in the Context of the Politics and the Nicomachean Ethics and Its Relation to Today”, (2010). Honors Theses. 21. https://digitalcommons.bucknell.edu/honors_theses/21
- Onwuatuegwu, Ignatius Nnaemeka: “Concept of Community: Aristotle’s Perspective” Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Arts, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. In: *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation (IJRSI)*. Volume VII, Issue VII, July 2020 . ISSN 2321–2705 www.rsisinternational.org Pages 60-64.
- SparkNotesEditors “Physics: Books I to IV.” SparkNotes.com. 2005. Accessed December 12, 2020*. www.sparknotes.com/philosophy/aristotle/section3/
- Waterman, A. S.: “Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment.” In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(4), (1993), pp. 678–691. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.64.4.678>

Abstract in German Language

Die Suche nach dem Sinn des Lebens, insbesondere nach einem „glücklichen und guten Leben“, ist eine Frage, die trotz vieler Forschungen nicht einfach zu beantworten ist. Die Informationen, die von einigen Regierungen in verschiedenen Ländern über die menschliche und gemeinschaftliche Entwicklung bereitgestellt werden, scheinen miteinander in Konflikt zu stehen. Auch der Fokus und die Lösungen für die Herausforderungen, (Korruption, hohe Quoten von Arbeitslosigkeit, unzureichender Lebensstandard, Menschenhandel, Katastrophen, Konflikte, Zivildemonstrationen, Unzufriedenheit der Bürger mit Führungspersonlichkeiten, Rechten und Gerechtigkeit) denen Menschen in solchen Gemeinschaften gegenüberstehen, scheinen mit den Bedürfnissen und Problemen dieser Menschen nicht übereinzustimmen.

Denn die meisten Menschen streben nach einem guten und sinnvollen Leben. Wenn solche Herausforderungen, Probleme und Bedürfnisse zunehmen und unerfüllt bleiben, sind die meisten Menschen gezwungen auf der Suche nach Zuflucht oder einem guten Leben anderswohin zu ziehen, trotz der Risiken, die auf ihrem Weg damit verbunden sein könnten. Sie suchen nach einem guten Leben, das zum höchsten und ultimativen Guten führt, worüber Philosophen seit langem nachdenken.

Deshalb sind Aristoteles und Nyerere, die das Glück als höchstes Gut verstanden, in dieser vergleichenden Arbeit verwendet, um die in der Philosophie grundgelegten ethischen und politischen Prinzipien für das gute, blühende und glückliche Leben in jeder Gemeinschaft zu erläutern. Inwieweit ist das Glückskonzept von Aristoteles und Nyerere für das Gemeinschaftsleben in Tansania im 21. Jahrhundert relevant? „Menschliche Entwicklung“ und „Führung und Führungsstile“, werden diskutiert, gefolgt von einigen Unterschieden um ein Modell des Glücks und der Gemeinschaft für Tansania im 21. Jahrhundert zu präsentieren, das in anderen Ländern anwendbar ist.

Abstract in English Language

The search for the meaning of life, especially ‘a happy and good life’, is a question that seems not easy to answer despite much research done about it. The information provided by some governments about the human and community development in their countries seems to be conflicting. Furthermore, the solutions provided for the challenges (corruption, high rates of unemployment, insufficient living standards, human trafficking, catastrophes, conflicts, civil demonstrations, dissatisfactions with leadership, rights, and justice) that face people in such communities seems not to correspond well with their needs and problems.

This is because most people are striving for a meaningful life. When such challenges, problems, and needs increase and citizens’ needs remain unfulfilled, people are forced to move elsewhere in search of refuge or a good life despite the risks that might be encountered on their way. They are searching for a good life that leads to the highest and ultimate good, which philosophers have long been pondering.

Therefore, Aristotle and Nyerere, who understood this highest good to be happiness, are used in this comparative thesis to explain the ethical and political principles pertaining to a good, flourishing, happy life in any community. To what extent can Aristotle’s and Nyerere’s concept of happiness be relevant to community life in Tanzania in the 21st century? ‘Human development’, ‘leadership’ and ‘community governance’ will be discussed, followed by a few differences, to present a model of happiness and community for Tanzania in the 21st century applicable in other countries.