

INTERGRATING SOCIAL SOLIDARITY INTO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

George Olowo

Nkumba University, P O Box 237 Entebbe Uganda

Abstract

The concept of socialism is very broad and because of this, socialism has been politically misunderstood and demonised as a phenomenon that undermines development. This assumption is more especially held by the capitalist way of thinking. However this has been one sided way of thinking by the capitalist philosophers. If scanned deeply, besides political socialism there is also cultural socialism. In theory they may appear to be different but in practice they are intertwined and are interchangeably used.

In terms of development, socialism is applicable in all spheres of social, economic and even political progress in the society, and this is why it qualifies to be a broad phenomenon.

This paper is mainly concerned with the social and economic aspects hereby referred to as cultural socialism. Africans were naturally socialists. They preferred a social way of living whereby each member participated in an activity towards the benefit of well-being of others. Africa being a multi-ethnic region, different tribes have different ways of social living but all with similar motives towards achieving wellbeing for the good of others. The Jopadhola in Eastern Uganda practiced a culture of socialism in which they worked in-turns in the fields of one another with the aim of producing enough harvest at the end of the season. The Jopadhola enjoyed communal way of living by participating in “Misingo” and “wretch” through which every household in the

community produced enough food for consumption and surplus to sell. It meant that “misingo” and “wretch” are philosophical and a socialist way of socializing through which the Jopadhola organized themselves socially, economically and even politically to achieve wellbeing. This paper examined in detail how the Jopadhola utilized “Misingo” and “wretch” to achieve well being and community development compared to the present day when such solidarity have deteriorated due to foreign influence and other environmental factors.

Key Words: Development, community development, culture, socialism, cultural socialism, wellbeing, solidarity, community, philosophy, welfare, ill-being, inequality, *Misingo* and *Wretch*.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Socialism and wellbeing

In the political scene socialism was seen as the first step towards communism, a political system that dominated the Eastern Block; Russia, China, North Korea, Cuba and generally most countries in central Asia and the entire east. Within the African states socialism was predominant in Tanzania started by Mwalimu Julius Nyerere in 1967. Like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, Nyerere tried to establish a society free of exploitation of man by fellow man. One of the tenets of socialism is that the government should be the controller of all the factors of production, meaning that the government should be in-charge of people's welfare and people should be the recipients of this welfare. Equality of persons is also one of the tenets of socialism and it was impossible to maintain by status-quo other than by government. Inequality was the result of the weakness of governments in providing equitable services to the people (Marx, 1945). This inequality according to Marx could only be fought by socialism, whereby people come together to resist the evils of the government against the state. On the social and economic progress, the socialist way of living is when people come together to work for the good of every member of the group, community or society. This collective effort is the social capital that even if when one was lacking money, as a household they could still combine efforts with their neighbours and other members of the society to produce enough food for consumption and surplus for sell. It is this knowledge of socialism that Nyerere (1967/8) and his predecessors Marx and Engels (1948) applied in the political scene as a formula to establish a classless society. To Marx and Engels capitalism propagated inequality and individualism and private control over the factors of production. Philosophers of the socialist school of thought however, observed that capitalism isolates the rural poor people from the centre of economic power yet they are

the majority of the members of the society and local populace thus narrowed down the scope of the society to only a class of the few wealthy people at the expense of the majority poor, hence undermines community development. Although capitalism looked at socialism as a scenario whereby the efforts of hard working people were undermined and a way of encouraging laziness in the society it runs short of holistic development whereby the wellbeing of the majority of the members of the society should be the strategy of achieving community development. Nevertheless this paper attempted to ascertain that socialism is not a new phenomenon. By nature of traditional culture, Africans have been social animals since time immemorial. They are bound by their belief in unity and togetherness. In his study on the Bantu people, Tempels (1945) described that what binds Africans together as the “vital force”, the central point and strong solidarity characterizes the behaviour of the Bantu people. This strong solidarity cuts across all African tribes and it has been carried on from one generation to the other. On the other hand Mbiti (1969) on his social philosophy referred to this African force to brotherhood”. Mbiti described it “motivational force to brotherhood” as the foundation of the nature of solidarity, the very basis of social capital. Connected to this, Masolo (1995) observed that “complex family and lineage groups formed separate units of labour force....to work together by rotating turns to work collectively on respective house plots”. The attempt of this paper is to iron out the negative feelings about socialism and the socialist attitude of the mind. According to Nyerere everybody including the capitalists can become socialists in such a way that they can share their proceeds or give a hand to others who are in need. Because of the way socialism works, Ishtiaq & Muriisa (2004) preferred to call it collective capitalism implying that one exists for the good of the others in the community, and further more an individual should be an asset of the community-if one doctor from the community would come back to serve the community. Socialism and socialist way of living

agree with the observation made by Anadha (2009) that, community development is a strategy through which its practitioners are involved in problem identification, identify assets, locate resources, analyse local power structures, assess human needs and investigate other concerns that comprise the community's character.

In this case the people through their own experience should be responsible for establishing the conditions of achieving their welfare which can only be best done through traditional way of socialism. The *Jopadhola* practiced socialism through communal work, group work, community meetings, food support and financial help. In particular this paper explains how “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” among the *Jopadhola* are forms of communal work and group work meant to fight a way ill-being and institute well-being in the society.

1.2 African socialism and wellbeing

Africans, the *Jopadhola* inclusive had traditional ways of organizing themselves socially and economically to achieve community development. Their forms of association were embedded within the lineage of birth and brotherhood in families and clans of kinship. The form of African socialism in the context of this paper refers to the traditional norms and values that Africans used to organize themselves socially, economically and even politically. Among the *Jopadhola* in Eastern Uganda there existed “*Wretch*” and “*Misingo*”. Instead of looking at Ujamaa familyhood in Tanzania alone, this paper has taken the task to relate and link other traditional norms and values to the role of Ujamaa in the fight against inequality and exploitation of man by fellow man in the society. Very much so, the role of social solidarity embedded within traditional culture cannot be ignored in the economic development of the community and more so the state such as Uganda. “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” also embedded within the norms and values in the *Jopadhola*

traditional culture are very important entities in ushering in community development. This importance of traditional culture has also been acknowledged by other scholars of culture and social development, and Moncrieffe (2004) states that it is important to understand the significance of culture in African societies, the root to both positive and negative perceptions and how cultural traditions influence forms of behaviour that can support or undermine development.

“*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” are forms of traditional solidarity among the *Jopadhola* in which families and groups of members of the community converge together to perform an activity that in the end improves on their social and economic standards. Furthermore solidarity should be related to African socialism that if the Ujamaa familyhood had borrowed, it would not have faced challenges and failures towards the end. The struggle to achieve wellbeing should have been in a way made easier by utilizing the cultural strength that has lived overtime. According to Mawa (2010) in his comment on the importance of African solidarity observed that, solidarity is a value and principle of inter-human relationship and is known to all societies whether traditional or modern, and in Africa solidarity is as old as the African societies are known to have existed. This now confirms the earlier belief and now the reality that Africans have been social animals since time immemorial, hence they practiced socialism either by their knowledge or not.

Scrutinizing the origin and knowledge about development and generally development among the African ethnicity and comparing with the fact that before the coming of Arabs, explorers and missionaries to East Africa, most Africans lived in chiefdoms and kingdoms Atuhaire, K.G (2009). These were institutions through which the pre-colonial Africans managed their affairs. Socially chiefs were the fountain of honour and they performed tasks of social nature and cementing cooperation and relationships for the good of the community. Generally the leaders carried

out social, economic and political mobilization for the development of the community. This culture of association cuts across all nations, developed or underdeveloped as had already been observed by Mawa (2010). This paper is comes out more clearly to reveal that social development is not a new phenomenon among the African race, the *Jopadhola* inclusive. Development initiatives like SACCOs, NAADS, Prosperity for all, operation wealth creation, Entandikwa schemes introduced by the National Resistance Government within the Ugandan communities and are being promoted through social mobilisation and cherishing modernization gospel towards development are not new phenomena. This is because their aims and objectives are embedded within the norms and values of the traditional culture.

1.3 “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” among the *Jopadhola*

“*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” are forms of traditional solidarity that enabled the *Jopadhola* in coming together as households or individuals in groups to perform a task or activity to promote the social and economic progress of households and the entire community. “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” can also be described as associations formulated by the local people to carry out community or group work. They are forms of co-operate, associations formed through the principles of co-operatives and cooperative values. Self help, self responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, and solidarity are the co-operative values (Behayo, 2017). We can also put it clear that through “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” associations, the group is able to utilize the energy and efforts of other individuals for the good of other members in the group, something that could not have been achieved without the formulation of this association. Comparing the unity as one of the values cherished by the corporate group with that of the termites which can build a mountain- hill despite their small size, “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” like cooperatives are voluntary organizations, open to all persons able to use their services and willing to accept the

responsibilities of membership, without gender, social, racial, political or religious discrimination (Behayo, 2017). In “*Misingo*”, a large number of households or individuals in the locality can in a group work in the garden of one member of the group for a given period of time. They keep on alternating this activity to each respective member of the group. In *Misingo* the efforts of the members are paid at a later date in cash or kind. At most times a ceremony is organized after the bumper harvest to appreciate the members. This is done by brewing the local beer (kongo-kali) and preparing nice foods for the members. In the ceremony gifts were given to the participants and some of them can be money, hens, turkeys or even goats. These gifts are meant to strengthen the solidarity so that it flourishes for ever. On the other hand “*Wretch*” is a similar association but in it the participants are supposed to be appreciated just after work. Enough and good food is prepared with some little drinks to quench their thirsts. The major aim of “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” is to boost the efforts of the single handed individuals and households to produce enough food for the family and to become socially and economically sustainable.

“*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” can also be utilized in other tasks other than farming, like building houses etc. They can also be utilized in attitudes of communal nature, like in clearing roads, cleaning and opening water sources. For this case it is the clan chief or the local leader to mobilize the community to participate in such activities and totally nothing is given in return. This paper can further describe “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” to be the forms of traditional social solidarity and as philosophy behind community development. “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” used to be very strong among the *Jopadhola* but these days they have deteriorated mainly because of external factors. Like African traditional proverbs, “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” had a philosophical grounding attaching meaning to social development philosophy that should be scrutinized properly to bring

out additional knowledge that can be added onto social development planning. Much as traditional forms of solidarity are no longer strongly significant in contributing towards community development, it has strong connotation with social development perspectives.

1.4 Comparative analysis of Ujamaa family hood

Where-as capitalism is private ownership of all the factors of production it does not consider the inputs towards development by the rural poor. It is thus individualistic gain that leads to domination by the minority wealthy people over the majority poor creating classes in the society, the result of which is the emergence of the middle class. However, the class struggle of Kar Marx (1948) may not be the only means of eradicating capitalism and changing the society into socialism to achieve community development. These and among others things were the reasons upon which Nyerere (1967) started the Ujamaa family hood to answer the need for nationalization of all assets to be in the hands of government believed that if government owned all factors of production, this would pave way to equality in the distribution of goods and services in the society and by this the government found it easier to assist the people because they were centered in one village. The government of Tanzania looked at Ujaama as a means through which to increase production in both agricultural and industrial products. In Ujaama socialism the main focus was goods and services from the government. The kind of socialism this paper is talking about is literally similar to Ujaama socialism but different in practice because the focus is mainly about communal and group participation aimed at achieving economic wellbeing.

This paper is concerned about whether Ujaama socialism was a good project in improving the quality of life of the people of Tanzania.

This paper further concentrates on traditional forms of social solidarity that Mawa (2010) observed that it has ever existed with the existing

creation of mankind. The Ujaama familyhood was administratively implemented from top yet the people who were forced to live in together had different cultural backgrounds. Multi-ethnicity aspect was not considered important in as far as establishing Ujaama familyhood. What this paper considers to be African socialism should have been built on traditional forms of social solidarity which are the basis of humanity (Mawa, 2010).

Development is a multifaceted phenomenon that does not only mean economic growth but it goes beyond borders. The broadness of the meaning of the term 'development' has been clearly described by Todaro (1992), as the three core values of development to include life sustenance, self esteem and freedom from servitude. According to Todaro if any of the three core values is missing, we may state without reservation, that a condition of absolute poverty exists? Any society and culture develop it ways of self-esteem: how they want to be recognized or respected. In contrast today self-esteem is increasingly conferred only on the countries that possess economic wealth and technical power. Contrary to this, to some extent people should be free to use their traditional knowledge and potential to make themselves happy, hence freeing themselves from servitude or slavery. It is in this connection that this paper is taking a comparative analysis whether Ujaama familyhood would be more successful and value if it incorporated the traditional norms of the indigenous people. The way it was implemented came as a government instruction from government imposed on people in the already established villages, something that contradicted with the norms and values of the people. Political instructions cannot much well with traditional cultural instructions. It also contradicted the fact that man cannot be separated from his culture for culture made him (Mbakogu, 2004). In the Ujaama philosophy the social reality articulated by Mbiti (1969) as, "I am because we are; and since we are, therefore I am". This

kind of wellbeing availed to us by nature cannot be provided by coercion, neither by globalization and its dimensions did not guide the trend of Ujaama philosophy.

1.5 The philosophy behind “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*”

The major philosophy behind “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” is the push for economic sustainability. African proverbs are very good at stating the hidden meaning of an event which at most times turn out to become a reality. The words “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” are proverbs used in local mobilization of the community for “an economic activity.

“*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” affirm these incidences or events. By example, the *Jopadhola* have a saying that, “*Oyeyo achiel kikunyi buri*” translated in English it means that, ‘one rat cannot dig a hole’. This kind of traditional communal attitude induces members of the community to come together to perform task for the good of all members in the community. This proverbs further means that, two heads are better than one, and ‘together we can stand and divided we fall’. In other words, carrying out an activity in isolation is unaccomplishable. The truth about this is that an individual/household may find it too hard to overcome social and economic challenges. Hence the unity of members and household to pull together their energy is very important in resisting the social and economic challenges. African traditional proverbs, quotation and events such as that of the *Jopadhola* express mainly things in life most of which are developmental.

This paper is concerned with mainly the parts that are developmental. For example in whole, “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” express solidarity, and Mawa (2010) made it very clear that, the practical experience of solidarity in traditional experience of solidarity in Africa is out very clearly that “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” are forms of solidarity networks that enabled members manifest in its organizational nature, it is the ontological reality

that finds its practical expression of inter subjectivity. Mawa went ahead to affirm that, by its very nature and meaning, African socio-political organizations such as the family clan and tribe, manifest the practice of solidarity.

In response to particular problem of suffering such as poverty, many families, ethnic groups and neighbourhoods like villages establish special solidarity networks. It has now come of the community to come together to tackle specific problems. Attached to this explanation, Masolo (1995) also rightly observed that, “complex family and lineage groups formed separate units of labour force. This social organization might help to explain why most traditional societies attached great importance to communal life and loyalty between their members. Although it was common for households to work separately on their plots, it was not rare for a collection of different households to work together by rotating turns to work collectively on the respective household plots (Masolo, 1995).

“*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” are forms of social organizations that cement social relationships pointing at and recognizing this kind of cooperation as a social capital strengthening. The role of social organizations towards community development. In a detailed search, Masolo further observed that, social organizations are not only “a system of mutual or inter-dependent social security” (Masolo, 1995); they also serve as vehicles for individual participation and community service for less advantaged persons is the reality about “*Misingo*” and “*Wretch*” among the *Jopadhola*.

1.6 The distorted meaning and impact of socialism

No doubt that socialism and socialist living cuts across the three perspectives of development, social, economic and political perspectives. In other words socialism could be used to generate and achieve a form of development at any cost. The distorted meaning of socialism started with

and by the way it was organized to mean by the brains behind it which made it to appear as it is a top down approach towards development. The central authority to disseminate development policies was the beginning deviation towards the expected meaning of socialism. Hence the practice of socialism the way it reached the people and as understood by the masses is a management and administrative practice of the oligarchy. The social nature of the philosophy was not broadly explained by the scholars behind it, making its importance to achieve development and community development in particular to be narrow in scope. The answer to this distorted meaning and perceptions of socialism was almost discovered by Nyerere when he fore-sighted the misplaced meaning of socialism. To this, he tried to mend the existing gap by contending that socialism is an attitude of the mind, hence one can become a socialist even if one is an African, rich or poor. This second thought about the meaning of socialism given by Nyerere explains the social nature and group bonding for a common purpose. And this group social bonding could be done best by giving priority to traditional forms of social solidarity like that of the *Jopadhola*.

Looking at the challenges faced by Nyerere's Ujaama familyhood, one of them was that it did not consider people's culture and traditional backgrounds. In this case through the policy people of different cultural backgrounds were forced into Ujaama familyhoods, which meant that they had to abandon their cultural backgrounds. In the African settings people are already organized in familyhoods as clans and tribes originating from the one fore-father hierarchy. This arrangement contravened with culture being the foundation of development as contended by Mbakogu (2004) that, "man cannot be separated from his culture, for he cannot develop in a vacuum".

It is mostly likely that Ujaama familyhood would have succeeded in Tanzania if people's culture and traditional background was considered.

The distortion of people's culture made socialism and Ujaama family in particular in Tanzania appeared to be a political directive from the regime in power to re-organise the society in a way that suits their own interest. As a result the familyhoods were marred with a lot of confusions and disorganization stemming from the destroyed 'vital force' that pulled this people together as clans or tribes. Clan/cultural leaders were ignored and power was channeled through government administrators, an indicator that Ujaama was not people's initiatives. With evidence, the outcome of the role of social solidarity on community proves that if culture and traditional background of the people were considered to be the foundation of the Ujaama familyhood, more success towards the achievement of community development would have been realized.

1.7 The economic perspective of socialism

The economic perspective of socialism is the key issue in this paper. People can organize or group themselves not only through traditional culture but also in accordance with their religion, youth, gender affiliations, etc as long as they best understand themselves that they have a common goal to accomplish. In the contrary, much as this would be so, socialism had been understood through the political perspective but also partially just looking at how the government cannot take care of the state through only one powerful source of judgment that all can be good for every citizen if the government owns all the factors of production. As a political ideology, socialism is seen to be a dictatorship political system that limits people's participation and as purported by capitalists. It deprives people's opportunity to own property. The issue limiting inequality through social associations of people in form of social relations and social networks as a public good and welfare of members was left behind the certain.

As argued by Moncrieffe (2004) that people are fundamentally social creatures and acts destroying their cultural background dooms their possibility of acceptance when they are posed to a situation whereby everything and particularly personalities are exceptionally new. This was the case for Ujaama familyhood. Yet it is perfectly relative for persons to act in ways that uphold shared values and ways of living and agreed understanding, even where these actions do not serve individual interests (Barneq, 2000). Economic development could be promoted through traditional forms of social solidarity as communal works, group work, community meetings, food supplies and financial help. The traditional forms of social solidarity worked very well in mobilizing communities for development initiatives. Hence the role of traditional forms of social solidarity among the *Jopadhola* in community development. Moncrieffe further contends that, people's identities can resolve around their ethnic and other social group, which confers culturally specific practices and a unique set of symbols and a sense of belonging that helps to define their interactions with both insiders and outsiders (Mare, 1993:23). Agreeing with Mare, one of the problems that faced the Ujaama familyhood was that people of different social backgrounds were found to converge in different social groups or familyhoods. As a result they wondered how and why their social backgrounds could be destroyed by government and comparing the notion of familyhood, and interest because they were collected from different regions of the country. This contravened with the reality and what Moncrieffe clearly clarifies that the social cultural norms that people observe influence their attitudes and choices. People need not-and in many societies often do not-act autonomously. Therefore, by ignoring or underestimating social/cultural norms and values, policy makers can miss potentially fruitful entry points and/or over work some of the potential blocks to the policies they recommend.

Policies of government should not be one sided, for example as a government they only bound politics towards what they want to achieve rather than what the people want to achieve, hence ignoring their responsibility to provide the public good. In other words the people hardly own the policy instead they perceive it as an instrument of coercion rather than development. The development group initiatives introduced by the government of Uganda are politically initiated. In politics there is denying and giving hence the groups are owned by the people who already know how to manipulate the system for their own selfish ends, and instead perpetuates exploitation of the majority by the minority. As a result there is decline in community development.

It is believed that development programmes would score more success if chance was given to the communities to mobilize themselves through communal work, group work, community meetings, food support and financial help which have got attachment with traditional forms of behaviour. Together with the philosophy behind *Misingo* and *Wretch* encouraging communal work and group work there was increased agricultural output. People were able to produce enough food for consumption and surplus for sale. The situation is now different as people have become more individualistic and this has affected mostly the poor people in the society who form the nucleus of any country in the third world. The question about community development initiatives is whether its implementation should be concentrated at the top or at the bottom—the grassroot where the majority poor people are found. Analyzing why government programmes on NAADS, Entandikwa scheme, SACCOs, Bona bagagawale (prosperity for all), youth livelihood programme and operation wealth creation, have not received much acceptance in local communities in Uganda it appears to be self-imposed, coming from above and politically motivated. This narrows down the scope of community development to politics rather economic growth of communities.

1.8 Traditional forms of social solidarity and socialism

The analogy behind socialism is to be able to share what one has obtained with others, and according to Karl Marx (1945) capitalism had failed to enable people to achieve wellbeing because of self interest that left people divided with the minority people in the society exploiting the majority. To Marx and others it is only the state which can institute good life in the society. Whereas Nyerere described socialism to mean either wealth or poverty. To him one could become a socialist even if one is an African, implying that socialism is all about having affection for the economically disadvantaged group of people in the society. Throughout research findings this paper upholds that this form of group sharing to achieve wellbeing can be perpetuated by traditional forms of social solidarity. This is a form of economic socialism that can be instituted by the state through traditional forms of social solidarity like that of the *Jopadhola*, Eastern Uganda. Communal work, group work, community meetings, food support and financial help.

Although the current trend of global political economy praises and upholds the capitalistic political economy as the only one way through which modern economies can be hanged on by most centuries of the world, whether poor or rich, there is no doubt that capitalism has also failed to usher in development in some regions of the world. In the same way some countries have also prospered through socialism; the case for Cuba. Bad politics have eaten up the good whims of socialism. The notion of traditional forms of social solidarity is all about socialization which Schaefer and Lamm (1995) defined as the process whereby people learn the attitudes, values and actions of a particular culture. Therefore traditional forms of social solidarity should without doubt be elements of socialization. Socialism is just the act of socialization where a particular group of people share and participate in an activity that benefits them

economically. This social solidarity spirit is hailed and practiced by different ethnic groups in Uganda and the entire regions of Africa.

1.9 The philosophy of socialization as exhibited by African traditional values

The philosophy of socialization is well exhibited through African proverbs, sayings and songs. These proverbs, sayings and songs carry the hidden power of unity through socialization, which if utilized properly it can be used to fight famine in the community, improved economic stand of the people or as mobilization tools for local and national politics. For example the Baganda have a saying that, “agali awamu gegaluma enyama”. In English this means that where there is unity thus the only way to bite the meat. The implication is that it is only through unity that everything is possible. Other tribes in Eastern Uganda refer to this kind of unity as Obwoko by the Samia, the Basoga refer to it as Kikinsu, and the Bamasaba refer to it as kibaga and so are other tribes within and outside Uganda. Among the *Jopadhola* this kind of group socialization is referred to as bedo kanyaciel which they carry out in two forms; *Misingo* and *Wretch*.

The birth of socialist political ideology originated from the merits and positive impacts that socialization creates in the society hence gives the name “socialism”. People with the socialist view assume to be bearing the nationalistic heart for other economically disadvantaged people in the society.

Besides politics, the social aspect is that people can come together to share their ideas and work together to achieve economic prosperity. In general terms this is the basis and contribution of socialization towards community development. When the traditional forms of social solidarity existed, the rural households used not to lack food stuffs because

through social solidarity each household produced what was enough. Hence besides just acquiring new culture from other people-the way socialization is claimed to be, but the only difference being that could be an adjective while socialism being a noun. From these two terms there is a very minimal distinction. Connected to this if politics is the authoritative allocation of goods and resources in the society, the one way through which this can be done is by emulating the nature of traditional forms of social solidarity especially the *Jopadhola* case. It would be easier for government to implement community development programmes through these forms of associations from which they have been born and nurtured hence they understand them much better than the new emerging forms of social solidarity. To the local people to own government programmes it takes time as these programmes come with government targets that are political. Government political targets contravenes with the notion of government provision of the public good.

Conclusion

Social solidarity makes socialism as political ideology not a new phenomenon. This paper ascertains that socialism had its foundation from social solidarity. Hence this is an indicator that traditional forms of social solidarity existed in different parts of the world. The major content of socialism being to create a society free of exploitation and domination. Socialism was specifically concerned with economic equality being the foundation upon which the society could be built. This paper attempts to make it clear that through traditional forms of social solidarity, economic inequality can be reduced or minimized. Participation in communal work, group work and community meetings gave opportunity to individual households realize each other's potential as meaningful substitutes in the community.

Aiming at achieving holistic development people and their traditional culture should be the pivot in public policy making, and more-especially the social policy that tends to see how society can be re-organised for better social and economic achievements.

References

- Schaefer T. & Lamm R.P (1995) *sociology*. Fifth edition McGraw-Hill, Inc .USA.
- Moncrieffe J.M (2004) *The role of culture in development* (online)
- Mawa, M (2010) *Solidarity, social capital and rural development in Uganda*. Journal of development studies 1(1) (2010), 131-145.
- Mbakogu, I.A (2004) University of Ibadan culture and development-nexus <http://www.academia.edu/1138/50>
- Masolo D.A (1995) *New perspective in African philosophy*: Henri Maswrier and Julis K.
- Anandha, K. (*History of community development*), <http://andanadharumaran.blogspot.com/2004>
- Marx, Karl; 1933 (1849) *Wage Labour and capital*, New York: International Publishers Co.
- Mbiti M.B (1994) *Rural sociology and rural development*. It is applciaiton in Kenya, Nairobi: kenya Literature Bureau.
- Mbiti J.B (2003) *Introduction to African religion, 2nd ed.* East African Publishers, Nairobi Kenya
- Mbiti J.S (1969) *African Religious and philosophy*. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Nyerere K.J (1986) *Ujaama-Essays on socialism* Dar-es-Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- Tempels P. (1945) *Bantu Philosophy*. Paris: Presence Africaine
- Todaro, M.P (1992) *Economics for a Developing world: An introduction to principles, problems and policies for development*, 3rd edition, Longman, London.