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APPROACH FOR UGANDA.

BY R.B. MPABASO-AGWAI:

"OHI UGANDA, MAY GOD UPHOLD THEE,
WE LAY OUR FUTURE IN THY HANDS,
UNITED,
FREED FOR LIBERTY,
TOGETHER,
WE WILL ALWAYS STAND."

This is the first and opening stanza of Uganda's National Anthem coined as we received flag (political) independence from our British colonial masters in 1962. At that time, the people of Uganda, in which their nation-state they entrusted their destiny and fate, were religiously commuted to unity, Freedom and Togetherness. However, a rapid scan through Uganda's socio-political history since independence in 1962 but particularly since 1966 reveals a tale of total disrespect and a pronounced chronological violation of, this Ugandan peoples' commitment to national unity and free liberty. What commenced from a false political start in 1962 degenerated with time into a seemingly irreversible pilgrimage on the road to bloody internal conflicts that have immensely subverted our people's initial expectations of genuine independence, freedom, progress and unity.

* Paper presented at the International seminar on "Internal Conflicts" organised at Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda (24/4/87 - 25/4/87).
Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am delighted to have this opportunity of joining you at what I see as an extremely important and timely meeting for Uganda. The broad spectrum of distinguished participants gathered here makes it a double privilege for me to be addressing you on the conference theme of "Internal Conflicts." I have worn a number of different hats at various periods of my life and while I am today once again a national civil servant, my compelling and abiding interest in "Internal Conflicts" is rooted in my experience in the Uganda Crisis of the last six years in which I participated as a diplomat turned guerrilla freedom fighter. I am here as a prototype of one of a million Ugandans gravely concerned with the extent of destruction occasioned by incessant conflicts that have characterized my country for more than two decades now, claiming a total of about one million innocent lives, gross violation of the fundamental human rights of our people and imprisoning the whole populace in a terrified cocoon of political bankruptcy and crmnoioly.

My paper seeks to establish the contention that all facets of Uganda's internal conflicts are a corollary of the political dominance which the forceful and violent abrogation of our independence constitutional formula by Milton Obote's Uganda People's Congress (UPC) government in 1966 engendered - a perverted unitary republican constitution that was imposed on the people of Uganda up to the present hour. Political conflict, has been so overriding that I shall devote this paper to an alternative political development approach to the management of the affairs of Uganda and her people.
I shall deploy federal-republicanism as the foundation of the return to political normalcy, peace, progress, and economic development for Uganda and unquestionable respect of the human rights of her people. The central theme of my submission is therefore the tireless and unscrupulous fight for the cause of federal republicanism as the "ROCK OF OUR POLITICAL SALVATION"; as the sacred and inviolable palladium of our happiness and indeed as the primordial wish of my whole heart.

I am not an ideologue or an obscurantist, neither a doctrinaire though I love doctrine. I am distinctly more concerned with the "how" than the "why" of government. I am really more interested in how the people of Uganda can be persuaded to obey the commands of sovereign authority cheerfully than in the reasons why they should have to obey them at all; in discovering rules for the effective operation of government in general displaying the superiority of federal-republicanism to any other forms. I am also more interested in teaching the leaders and the rulers alike how to respond to public opinion, than in fixing external standards to which such opinion ought to conform. My submission labours to divine those wise, just and temperate maxims and political structures which will forever constitute the true security, felicity and democratic freedom of Uganda.

1. **Julian Huxley: The Cornerstone for Federalism**

All political speculation to be just must be founded on a clear understanding of the principles of human nature. Such is the truth in the management of public affairs; similarly true in the conceptualization of the knowledge of human nature, the science of policy.
No leader or people worth his name, certainly no builder of a
new political arrangement like federal-republicanism in Uganda
can afford to be ignorant of the most useful of all sciences—
the science of human nature. Some principles of human nature
are as infallible as any mathematical calculations. It is
this science that forms the bedrock of this paper's subject,
federal-republicanism, as the only solid and rational expedient
for the linking and preserving democratic freedom and national
unity in Uganda.

As you may be well aware, any leader of men without a
political theory should realize that no general principles
will hardly work much better than erroneous ones. Leaders
should be men of intellect in public life; they should value
learning, logic, wit, and judgement. This is because intellect
diverted from tradition and experience, as for intellect
diverted from conviction and morality is horrendous. In the
continual analysis of Uganda's political expediencies, the
ideologues are almost as dangerous men as the democrats.
People should hence those political doctors whose egotism
disclaims the admission of experimental instruction; those
whose minds have fallen prey to too great abstraction and refine-
ment and who by enveloping all their lives in the empyrean
theory, are constantly seeking for an ideal perfection. I
similarly deplore the reverses of philosophic politicians who
being mere specialists and opportunists, aim at more refinement
than suits either human nature or the composition of our nation.

To be able to gauge the relevance of human nature in
organizing or disorganizing men in society, several tenets
about men and society should be studied. First, the fact
that there exists an eternal and immutable law of nature and the capacity of natural reason, unwarped by dogmas to discover the commands and sanctions of this law. Secondly, the existence of certain natural and inalienable rights, including the right to property and to a free conscience which occur with them the natural duties of humanity. Thirdly, the fact of equality among all men in the enjoyment of these natural rights. Fourthly, the notion of public office as a public trust, of each officer as servant of the people, and fifthly, the persistence in the body and hearts of the people of an ultimate power to choose their own political destiny, whether peacefully by abrogating the old constitutions and establishing new ones or bloodily by offering armed resistance to manifest tyranny and fascist dictatorship.

In all questions about the advantages or disadvantages of forms of government or in similar questions with respect to all the sources of social happiness and national prosperity, the people of Uganda should critically observe the difference between the true politician and the political empiric. The political empiric will either attempt to travel out of human nature and introduce institutions and projects for which the people are not fitted and which perish in the imbecility of their own conception and structures, or with puzzling and embarassing every practicable scheme of administration which is adopted. The last indeed has been and shall continue to be the most usual because the easiest course, and in embrace in the practice all those hunters after popularity who, instead better, make a traffic of the weak sides of the human understanding and passions.
The true politician, on the contrary, takes human nature (and human society as its aggregate) as he finds it, a compound of good and ill qualities, of good and ill tendencies, induced with power and actuated by passions and propensities which blend enjoyment with suffering and make the ebb and flow of misfortune. In view of human nature he shall not attempt to warp or disturb its natural direction, he shall not attempt to promote its happiness by means to which it is not suited. He shall favor all those institutions and plans which tend to make men happy according to their natural bent, which multiply the sources of individual enjoyment and increase national resource and strength, taking care to infuse in each one all the ingredients which can be devised as preventive or corrective of the evil.

Every commanding leader of men should strive to learn and exploit certain pertinent themes about men and human nature. Several of these themes are discernable at a mere glance of society.

A - The universal, enduring depravity and frailty of men. In contriving any system of government and in fixing the several checks and controls of the constitutions, decrees, pronouncements etc., every man ought to be supposed a knave. Therefore he who believes in the dream of the perfectibility of men shall be shocked to find out that in every society or country there is the major theme is the depravity of mankind. Among those specific varieties of "natural depravity" that might occasionally take command of even the best of men are hatred, cruelty, envy, dishonesty, hypocrisy, treachery and avarice.

It is no accident therefore that the first cause of war and armed conflicts is the rapacious and vindictive nature of men. To judge from the history of mankind and as proof from the history of Uganda, one shall be compelled to conclude that the fiery and destructive passions of war reign in the human breast with much more powerful sway than the mild and beneficent sentiments of peace; and that to model our political system upon speculations of lasting tranquility is to calculate on the weaker springs of the human conduct.

Among the varieties of "natural frailty" are fear, pride, vanity, ingratitude, baseness, fallibility, insubordination, narrow-mindedness, obstinacy, and the capacity of self-deception. These evidences of human weaknesses are equally menacing hazards to social stability and political sanity. The supposition of universal venality in human nature is little less an error in political reasoning than the supposition of universal rectitude. Depravity is a permanent and ever manifest presence in the community. Man is a mixture of degrading vices, discouraging imperfections, and ennobling virtues. Human conduct reconciles the most glaring opposites like honor, generosity, bravery, manliness, love of liberty, and the sense of justice.
wickedness is not only more deeply planted than goodness in the human breast, it has a way of asserting itself with unusual vigor. It is a common observation that men, bent upon mischief are more active in the pursuit of their object than those who aim to do good.

II. Love of esteem, gain and power.

Esteem is another word for emulation, means an intense drive from a simple need for respect to a prodigious thirst for glory. Men can be roused to unaccustomed effort by the lure of place and honor. A noble emulation is the source of every excellent and such a feeling of emulation or esteem is an anxious desire, that is the love of fame, the ruling passion of a noblest minds, to plan and undertake extensive and arduous enterprises for the public benefit.

Ambition is a term that can be used to describe a number of related drivers, the most forceful of which is the desire of material gain. Ambition is as strong a drive as emulation and the operations of ambition in a well-ordered society can lead to happiness and prosperity on a broad scale. It is not the love of wealth as dominating an enterprise a passion stronger can be that of power and glory? These drivers are not virtuous, neither are they vicious in nature, but can produce good or bad results in men. In a man held to path of right behavior by the inner checks of reason and disciplined line and the outer checks of law and order, the above three drivers of esteem or emulation, gain and power can quite possibly work wonders of self-advancement and self-realization, and all society would be the gainer. Upon a man holding, a license to behave as freely and arrogantly as he wishes they would almost certainly bring down the sins of lust and corruption, and all society would be the loser.

An overdose of emulation results in vanity, of ambition in avarice, and the love of power in the lust of domination and in the abuse of power. Vanity, avarice and the desire to play the tyrant are evidence of corruptibility. A fondness for power is implanted in vast men and is natural to abuse it when required. Dictator Idi Amin, Africanascal Paulo Muwanga and Milton Obote, and fascist Tito Obsello have excelled in this abuse of power always acquired violently and illegitimately. This universal axiom drawn from the experience of all countries and all ages makes it the height of folly for Ugandans to entrust any set of men with power which is not under every possible control - constitutional control, so as Ugandans, have observed with tragic consequences how easy it is for men to change their principles with their situations; to be zealous advocates for the rights of the citizen when they are invaded by others, and as soon as they have it in their power, to become invaders themselves.
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in the encroachments of power, when it is in the hands of others, and the amount they get it into their own, to take holder consciences those they have invested in abuse of power and authority, Federal-republicanism in its fall political reality in its pretending leaders and rulers of men.

C- Public, private and self-interest.

No reasoning person can deny the fact that every man in one important sense, a self-contained unit in the social structure whose first obligation is to himself; self-preservation is the first principle of our nature so people, self-love is an indispensable duty, and self-interest is the most powerful incentive of our human actions. Everybody inclines inward, whether in gain, safety, power, pleasure, or simply survival and hence in no such point in telling him that he ought to pursue them in a spirit of moderation and with an eye set for the interests of others.

By their private interest government must govern, and by means of it, ask new cooperate to public good not with standing their inclinable vanity and ambition; without this, government shall in vain boast of the adorning of any political advancement (constitutional or unconstitutional), and shall in the end find that the people have no meaning for their liberties and possessions, except the whom or good will of their rulers.

The entire reliance of government, every type of government, is on man’s interest and this is a principle on human nature on which all political actions, to be just and penalty, must be founded. No statesmen man into a disinterested lot, for example the wealthy lot, and allow them to see the people could be most dangerous to the people’s liberties; as coming to government they will still be always endeavoring to undermine it and bring the people back to the objection of anti-people, foreign elements. For instance to forestall a violent and violent of violence at the violent overthrow of government, the most important task in to make it understand those citizens who, during the revolution or past regime, were opposed to the people, to be friends to the new popular government, by offering them not only protection, but a participation in its privileges, and they will undoubtedly become its friends.

However, there exists in Uganda and in society in a while a handful of men to whom the laws of human nature seem to apply imperfectly, or not at all. There may be in every government a few vicious spirits who can rise above their own ambition and act from more worthy motives. These are men of true virtue, such men can neither be disinterested nor men into a sacrifice of their duty - those should be available for public service.

While such men the “growth of few miles” so to say, they exist in sufficient numbers. They are evidence of the existence of a portion of virtue and honor among Ugandans and they provide a reasonable foundation of confidence in the outcome of the Ugandan gamble in democratization and search for strong national cohesion under Federalism.
There is an unending war in the minds and hearts of men between "reason and passion." Passion is used mainly as a short-hand term for each of the neutral driven or loves - interests, prejudices, vanity, anger, pride, ambition, caprice and unreason or bad reason. Reason is the faculty of thinking coolly, objectively, and decision; on the other hand passion is any trait or impulse from obstinacy to rage and frenzy (by way of ignorance, fear and prejudice) that corrupts and subverts reason and often drives it from the field.

We Ugandans have been convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that nothing is more fallacious than to expect to produce any valuable or permanent results in political projects by relying solely on the reason of men. Men are rather reasoning than reasonable animals for the most part governed by the impulse of passion. All changes of regimes have produced nothing but a rising expectation of hope but soon to be subverted by the rising negative passion of the rulers.

The bad side of human nature, always in a position of natural superiority in its contests with the good, is put in an even more commanding position by the fact of human association. Men in groups especially groups or factions unrestrained by law or custom behave worse than men on their own. For instance regard to protection has a less active influence upon the infinity of bad action is to be divided among a number of people than when it is to fall singly upon one person.

In conclusion, a sound knowledge of human nature is among the primary qualifications for lawgivers and political leaders especially those who set themselves the task of writing the constitution of the land, prescribing ethics to our political institutions and the establishment of a good government system of administration. The foregoing review of human nature has allowed us, who are interested in the causes, nature and solutions to internal social, economic and political conflicts, to discover several pertinent characteristics of man and society.

Somehow the vices of free men must be brought under control, somehow their virtues must be encouraged, somehow their loves must be directed toward healthy ends, somehow their powers of reason must be fortified for the endless duel with prejudice and passion. But most important of all the interests of men must be looked after, secured, gratified and thus enlisted in the service of the whole community. Federation shall be able to do exactly this for Uganda and her people.

2. ETHNOLOGICAL SYNOPSIS

To be able to fathom the complexities produced by human nature as far as political conflict is concerned in Uganda, an examination of the ethnic composition of the country is a vital point of departure. The present day national boundaries of Uganda cut across ethnic and language barriers, and place together over forty (40) ethnic groups which formerly had little in common.
and are even today may not understand each other's language and are a source of a multitude of social, ethnic and political categories that heat up more often to violent confrontation. Main ethnic groups encompass peoples of three distinct language families - the central Sudanic, the Nilotes and the Bantu.

a- The central Sudanic speakers like the Sukuma, Aruun and Alur are found in the north of West Nile province. They also extend east of the border into Uganda and Kenya. Their north-western neighbors to the north and west are the agricultural peoples, with a non-hierarchically social organization, from 1972-1979 these peoples formed distinct and violent major political and military movements all in the name of forces (many police, state research bureau, public safety unit, etc) in close criminal collaboration with their kin from Sudan - the Abubaker.

b- The Nilotic speakers can be categorized into two main groups:

(1) Northern Nilotes occupying the north-west of Uganda, such as the Acholi, Langi, Dukur and Akol. They are mainly agrarian, organized in villages.

(2) Southern Nilotes from the East of Uganda like the Karamojong and Iteso are related to the Karamojong and western Nilotes. Originally they were pastoral, with a social organization based on clans and age sets. From 1962-1971 the Nilotes, ruled by some Sudanic speakers dominated the security forces of Uganda and formed Milton Oboye's major base for political and military adventures. From 1966-1986, the Oboyes were the only major factor that guaranteed Oboye's regime second ascent to and descent from power in 1985.

c- The Bantu speakers who are fundamentally, but not exclusively agricultural, are found in the south, south-east and west of the country, and can be divided into three major groups:

(i) The more centralized societies (once governed by monarchic-royal dynasties) include the Eastern, Bunyoro, Baganda and Banyankole.

(ii) The less centralized societies include the Bapaga, Bugisu, Teso, Banyole, Ruhanga and Bugisu in the south-east; and the Sebei in the north-east and the Eastern, Agikuria and Bokonjo in the west.

(iii) In among (i) and (ii) above, these live in some places groups of specialized pastoralists, the Buhala and Bwumbi. Both groups establish supremacy over the agriculturalists in the areas where they settled - the Baganda over the Bajuda and the Bapaga over the Bokonjo. The Buhala and Bwumbi are collectively termed the Banyankole and the Bwumbi and Bwumbi are referred to as the Banyarwanda. The Bantu, having played a peripheral role since independence has regained prominence on the political scene since they launched a popular guerrilla uprising in 1980 to fight Milton Obote's reactionary fascist dictatorship.
They eventually triumphed over fascism in 1986 having led a guerrilla rebellion for six years in three major fighting movements - the National Resistance Movement (NRM), the Uganda Freedom Movement (UFM) and the Uganda Federal Democratic Movement (UFDM).

Figure 1 shows the ethnic composition of Uganda.

Since the emergence of the "winds of change" towards independence in Africa, a phenomenon called "tribalism" has been under frontal assault. It has been denounced by militant Pan-Africanists as a divisive force, a tool of the "divide and rule" colonialists. Patriotic nationalists have called it a negative manifestation of "sectarianism" or "factionalism". Cultural conservatives have publicly denounced it but leaned towards it as the rock of their political and military survival. Ideologues and forensic critics have exploited it to their own destruction.

Yet local nationalism, many times misbaptized tribalism remain an essential element of the Uganda scene as well as that of any other African countries. It has been and shall continue to be the primordial precipitator of social-political tremors. Uganda's political history reveals concerted attempts to constitutionally reconcile needs of the central government with the demands of local nationalists by guaranteeing both traditional or cultural entities and their leaders a place in the life of the nation. The conflict between local and regional nationalists has deep roots in the 20th century history of our nation. Centralism and separatism interacted upon each other continuously from 1894, when the powerful kingdom of Buganda became a British protectorate until 1962, when the entire country gained flag independence. Uganda then comprised the kingdoms of Buganda, Ankole, Bunyoro, Toro, and the territory of Mubende, which were federal states, and the districts of Acholi, Karamoja, Kajjansi, Nansana, Iganga, Nebbi, Saboti, and West Nile. The leaders of Buganda Kingdom, asserting that the Kingdom's relationship with Britain rested squarely on the 1900 Uganda Agreement (which established Buganda's rights within the Protectorate), felt free to act independently of central leadership on various occasions.

As a consequence Uganda centralism tended to be more apparent than real, and Buganda's sense of separateness from the rest of the country was not eradicated. The continuous tensions of this situation were evident in the negotiations establishing Buganda's federal relationship with the centre, the rise of a Buganda political party, Kabaka Yekka (KY) and the kingdom's determined opposition to integration into an East African federation.

In the face of strong tribal and ethnic loyalties Uganda has had to make unique political and constitutional adjustments. As a result, the country has had broad experience in political engineering. Uganda has known a federal government, as well as elements of unitarism, both existing side by side in an uneasy relationship under the same 1962 constitution.
Although provisions for federalism were included in the basic law in order to reconcile Uganda’s ethnic pluralism, it became increasingly difficult when a strong sense of national unity could flourish in such an environment. Consequently, the 1966/67 rebellion against the central government was carried out to strengthen Federal authority and plunge it into an astigmatism in which the unity of national unity was questioned. This was the precursor to the political era.

3.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

It is imperative to take an analysis of the political history of Uganda so as to situate the concepts of Federalism into the current context of this country. Before the arrival of the British, the area from which Uganda is later formed had a continuous history of tribal migrations, warfare and even diplomatic and commercial relations with other areas. As observed earlier, the territory was divided among different tribes and peoples. At the time, this pluralism had an important influence upon both the formal constitutional structure and the particular pattern of ethnic displacement which involved in Uganda. Controlled systems (such as the highly controlled political systems of Uganda) as well as communal systems had to be accommodated within a new framework, and such systems exerted an influence on the constitution formation, organization or disorganization of modern Uganda.

The tilting point of a British Protectorate over Uganda took place by stages. It began with the declaration of the protectorate status for the Kingdom of Buganda in 1894. This action was preceded by a series of events that began with the exploitation of Spence, who arrived in Uganda in 1862 and weakened Buganda’s interest in this land. Then Capt. Lugard (in charge of RAF) arrived in Buganda where, 10 years later, he found the kingdom ran by factional strife. The introduction of Christianity in the 1940’s had resulted in religious conflict in Buganda. Involving himself in the struggle only one year after his arrival, Lugard helped the Protestant opposition, a military victory over their Catholic rivals then headed by kabaka Mwanga.

Lugard’s intervention on the Protestant side at the climax of events undoubtedly played an important part in ensuring that Uganda became a British protectorate. Not only did the Catholic party triumph under Mwanga’s leadership the empire could scarcely have maintained a foothold in Buganda.

Shortly after this episode, Kabaka Mwanga signed a treaty with Lugard and British officers reluctantly began to realize that Buganda had become intertwined with its own. In May 1879, British commissioner Sir Gerald Portal signed a new treaty with Kabaka Mwanga, making Buganda a British protectorate, and the following year Parliament formally agreed to this new extension of British influence in Africa.
The next formal expansion of British influence occurred in 1896, when the western kingdoms Bunyoro, Ankole, and Toro and the territory of Busoga were gathered under her majesty's protection. In subsequent years, the British spread their authority to the north-east, north-west and south-west of the 1896 protectorate. The Lango loader, Kakungulu, conquered the area to the north-east in Britain's name, subduing such tribes as the Lango and the Iteso. In Buganda itself, the situation became stable only after the Protectorate government crushed Kabaka Mwanga's revolt against their authority and deposed him in favour of Saudu Chwa, his son. By the turn of the century, conditions were sufficiently settled that Britain could signal formal agreements with Buganda (Uganda Agreement) and Toro in 1900 and Ankole 1901. Buganda in 1902.

The special status of Buganda in Uganda was the most important legacy of the colonial era. It was specified in the 1900 Uganda Agreement (UA). The Agreement made Buganda a province of the Protectorate and declared, in Art 5, that the Kabaka of Buganda shall exercise direct rule over the natives of Buganda to whom he shall administer justice through the Lukiiko or native council, and through others of his officers in the manner approved by Her Majesty's government.

The Agreement had two important consequences.

1. A significant alteration of Buganda society took place. Freehold land was introduced, entrenching the power of those chiefs who controlled land at the time of Agreement, especially vis-à-vis other political contenders.

2. British sovereignty over Buganda was now clearly established. The Lukiiko and the Kabaka, before giving effect to their resolution, were required to consult and explicitly follow the advice of Her Majesty's representative. The Buganda rulers were bound not only by their own laws but by those of the Protectorate government.

Its interpretation and not so much its content was to prove crucial. Since so much apparently came to be based on the Agreement, it was natural for the Buganda to consider that their relationship was quasi-diplomatic. Moreover, given the concessions they had secured, the Agreement equally naturally, appeared to the Buganda as in some sense at least an agreement between equals.

A classic case of indirect rule and also an important concession made to Buganda was the assumption implicit in the Agreement that the British would rule in the kingdoms only through the tribal political authorities.

Unusually in Uganda, the situation was different. Appointed chiefs became the administrative and judicial authorities. Even where the local leaders were made chiefs, they operated within a new system of authority foreign to that in most of Uganda.
In view of the power of Buganda, with its wealth, size, and unity, and the limited power of British commitment, the British found that the direct colonial control of Buganda's affairs was not feasible. Indeed there was little British supervision over the internal administration of Buganda during the 19 years following the agreement. Such a policy was determined by reasons of finance and administrative convenience.

In the years that followed the signing of the Uganda Agreement, it was by no means certain that the protectorate would follow Kenya in the direction of wide settler-ownership. Sir Harry Johnston favored introducing large-scale plantation agriculture by Europeans in Buganda, but Sir Frederick Hollins, the Governor 1907-11, opposed extensive settlement by Europeans. The colonial office decided to prohibit the sale of land to non-Africans in 1908 which policy became final in government policy in 1911.

African suspicion of white settler domination lingered on and became reinforced by an attempt on the part of the Kenyan settlers to unite the three British territories of Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika. Why, they repeated, did the Europeans of Kenya seek union with Uganda but not to realize their influence and control over Buganda? A memorandum from the Buganda to the 1931 Joint Select Committee on closer union in 1931 declared:

"...the fear that if closer union is moved the white settlers may come into our country and take away our land as they have done in Kenya." Closer union and land problems became inextricably intertwined, producing any movement toward wider territorial integration or liberation.

A - ADOPTION OF "FEDERALISM"

By the 1920's the Protectorate government had begun to intervene directly in Buganda's affairs. Now and then it imposed its interpretation of the Agreement on the rulers of the kingdom. Protectorate influence in finance and in the supervision of land administration and personnel increased markedly during this period; by the 1930's, central supervision over traditional authorities had become extensive. In appearance at least, the administration of Buganda was beginning to resemble the administration of the other kingdoms and colonies in Uganda, and the country seemed to be moving steadily towards a unitary system of government.

But as the British increased their control over Buganda they also provided Buganda separatism. As early as 1916, the Kabaka had questioned the Protectorate's right to issue passports to Buganda, and a decade later constitutional crisis occurred over the independence of the Buganda Primacy (prime minister) from British control. Moreover, the deceleration in the rise of 1945 and 1946 in Buganda were directed against chiefs who were considered too subservient to British control. Then in the 1950's, as the British tried to pull direct elections and establish a military state in
Uganda's efforts provoked the most serious crisis of the colonial era. Buganda, unsure about its position in an independent Uganda and refusing to be treated like the other Ugandan regions, sought to limit the political involvement of the kingdom with the rest of the country. This assertion of the right to self-determination was an anticipated consequence of indirect rule. Paradoxically, both Buganda and the British stood their positions on the 1890 Agreement, an identity of claims which made a rapprochement inevitable.

In the 1950s, Britain's determination to build a unitary state in Uganda was reached a high point. The independence for Uganda became a serious possibility practical considerations such as the country's small size and population seemed to militate against launching a federal experiment. The 1953 Wallis report on local government assumed from the outset that a federal of active status was impracticable and that the country would be developed along unitary lines. In March, 1953, Governor Sir Andrew Cohen and Kabaka Edward Frederick Mutesa II of Buganda induced a joint memorandum which emphasized Buganda's special position in a unitary Uganda while at the same time devolving power to provincial authorities in primary and secondary education, rural hospitals, dispensaries, and health services, agricultural and veterinary field services. Moreover, a law enacted in 1953 defined and thereby limited the powers of local authorities in the northern, western, and eastern provinces. The purpose of both moves was to assure Uganda's continued evolution as a unitary state. The concession asked was considered excessive by Buganda. Sensitive to criticism that the devolution of additional powers was inconsistent with centralist objectives, Sir Andrew explained later that a failure to work in harmony with tribal Buganda would have been harmful or at least unwise, and the view taken was that strengthening the unity of the country would not be furthered by failing to recognize the attachment of the people to the parts.

Sir Andrew's dedication to the task of a unitary Uganda was put to the test shortly after the joint memorandum was submitted. Buganda faced for the future as one of the kingdoms in a unitary Uganda intensified their general anxiety over the question of East African Federation. Not only did the Kabaka seek assurances that federalism would not be imposed on his people, but he subsequently used the federation crisis to ask for Buganda's separation from the two eastern states as well. His refusal to back down as the question of Buganda's independence, devised by the British to a branch of the 1890 Agreement, led her Majesty's government to withdraw recognition from the Kabaka and to deport him to the U.K. In addition, who had acted in order to strengthen the unity of the protectionists, rode through the crisis and so the 1955 Buganda Agreement ensured the Kabaka to big terms as a constitutional monarch only, in effect, recognize Buganda's incorporation in a strongly centralized Uganda.
A constitutional committee, under the chairmanship of J.V. Alli, made important proposals in 1959 aimed at continuing the "african roll" basis for representative members to the legislative council and urged the development of political parties on a national basis - both controversial recommendations in an era when tribal associations played pre-eminent roles in the mind tenure of a sense of solidarity. On the establishment of federalism in Uganda the report was unambitious, correctly accepting the unity-based form of federalism in the eastern, northern, western provinces or the East African, but dissociating areas into separate areas. The Toro (Amuru) native council continued to press for federation, gaining a resolution in May, 1960, which called for a federal form of government. This, one which guaranteed autonomy for the status and dignity of the traditional rulers.

--- SEPARATION TENDENCIES ---

The British pushed centralisation in a more determined manner, regarding tendencies due to the force, unity government as a threat to tribal solidarity, and each advance on its behalf brought about crisis and determined opposition. In the final analysis, British policyWorkbooked on the forces of local nationalism, leading to the geographical expansion of power as the only realistic means of creating a united, independent country.

The storm centre of "tribalism" Buganda, who nationalist movements elsewhere, that in Buganda tended to be exclusive thereby causing serious strains in a plural community like Uganda. Although not always in evidence, Buganda separatism had been a factor in Ugandan politics since the signing of the 1900 Agreement. Separatist tendencies became manifest every time the protectorate government had attempted to impose authority or had acted against the Buganda's native council. In 1953, they took into the open the question of creating East African Federation; and in 1960, a Nakija (pro-secession) resolution proclaimed Buganda's secession from the Ugandan Protectorate.

Early in 1960, signs of a impending crisis became apparent. On Feb. 11, an information officer in the British government pointed out Buganda's intention to secure federal status for itself, spoke ominously of the possibility of secession. The move toward unity government was opposed, and one of the greatest reasons why Buganda desired to go its own separate way. Talks were held between the colonial secretary and a delegation from Buganda on constitutional questions affecting the kingdom. These talks broke down in September over such issues as the return of Buganda's sovereignty and the future form of government in Uganda. The Nakija thereupon voted overwhelmingly to petition the Queen to -decline the rest of Uganda.
Although all responsible British authorities rejected any question of any part of the Protectorate acceding from Uganda as long as Her Majesty's government in the protecting power showed little question that the ascendency move did much to force the British to surrender on the nature of Uganda's form of government. Buganda's action, observed the Uganda Relationships Commission, which advised on the future form of government in 1952, plainly led towards disaster. Such a conclusion forced the British to reconsider the existing scheme of government to reflect, in a permanent manner, Buganda's power and influence in the affairs of a new Uganda. Thus the trend towards a strong unitary government came to an end. Federalism had rightly trounced over unitary.

C. Reconciling local Nationalism:

The Relationships Commission report marked a major turning point in Uganda's constitutional history. Because a unitary system was no longer practical for political reasons, the commission proposed to incorporate elements of federalism in the constitution. Emphasis was placed throughout the report on reconciling local nationalism and central need. Uganda's unity was to be secured after independence by accommodating and placating particularism.

The commission denied the feasibility of establishing a purely given federal state in Uganda where one would have to be in an absence of a number of more or less self-governing states, on which a completely federal country could be composed. A federal relationship was proposed for Buganda and for Buganda alone. This violation of the equal equality of the constituent units in a federal system indicated the first in principle approach Buganda's administrative experience, size or the constituent. Perhaps more importantly, Buganda constituted a disruptive element under the management than in force, a federal system (about a unique one) seemed a small price to pay to overcome its reservations and ambitions.

The master commission also recommended a somewhat novel scheme for the three kingdoms of Kigez, Ankole and Buganda. On the ground that there were a large number of possible gradations between unitary and federal state in their pure form, it proposed that these kingdoms be given semi-federal status, this would safeguard local customs, institutions, and language while preserving central administrative leadership. A federal system, explained the commission, would be too weak and expensive for these kingdoms. If they were federal states, they could have to equip themselves with much more elaborate government machinery than they had then on. They had not the resources, either human or financial, for this task. For the rest of Uganda, the conclusion favored the continuation of strong unitary government. The remainder, tribes, taking hereditary rulers, had not argued for federal states.
Initially, the relationship between the federal government and the various territories under it included a degree of local autonomy. However, the autonomy was later reduced to the extent that the territories were treated as mere appendages of the central government. This led to a conflict between central control and local autonomy.

X - The Status of the Western Provinces

In the context of the Western Provinces, the federal government implemented policies that negatively affected the local culture and economy. The Western Provinces, which had a distinct cultural identity and a long history of autonomy, were subjected to policies that sought to assimilate them into the central government's agenda. This resulted in the erosion of their unique identity and the displacement of their traditional leaders. The federal government's policies were seen as a threat to the region's sovereignty and cultural integrity, leading to a growing sense of dissatisfaction among the local population.

Y - The Status of the Eastern Provinces

The Eastern Provinces, rich in natural resources and with a significant population of ethnic minorities, were subjected to policies that aimed at exploiting their resources for the benefit of the central government. The local leaders and communities were either co-opted or marginalized in these processes, leading to resentment and resistance. The federal government's policies were perceived as a violation of the region's rights to self-determination and autonomy. This resulted in a growing movement for regional self-governance, which sought to address the disparities in development and resource distribution.

Z - The Status of the Northern Provinces

The Northern Provinces, characterized by a mixed population and a significant presence of ethnic minorities, were subjected to policies that sought to consolidate central control and suppress local identities. The federal government's policies were seen as a threat to the region's cultural and linguistic diversity, leading to a growing sense of marginalization and resistance. The local leaders and communities were either co-opted or marginalized in these processes, leading to a growing movement for regional self-governance, which sought to address the disparities in development and resource distribution.

The federal government's policies were seen as a violation of the region's rights to self-determination and autonomy. This resulted in a growing movement for regional self-governance, which sought to address the disparities in development and resource distribution.
What all this amounted to, in brief, was a demand to be accorded the same rights and respect as Buganda.*

From the time of the Wild Report, Toro took the lead among the kingdoms in pressing for federalism and for a clarification of the position of traditional rulers in Uganda. On August 20, 1960, the Katikire (prime minister) of Toro cabled the colonial secretary, Ian Mcleod, making it emphatically clear that Toro would not support a unitary system: only a federal system, and nothing else, could properly safeguard its hereditary institutions. The Munster Report caused a lot of resentment in Toro by providing for no more than semifederal status, and the London conference, by devolving few powers to the kingdoms that were not also assigned to the districts, did little to mitigate this grievance. In January 1962, the Toro Akuruto (parliament) went to the length of cabling the new Colonial secretary, Reginald Macaulay, that Toro was not prepared to accept integration with the rest of Uganda unless full federal status were granted. It seemed just possible that a new secession crisis was in the offing. Toro leaders even spoke darkly of another “Congo*.

Although authorities in London were naturally reluctant to reopen discussion on forms of government only months after the conclusion of the 1961 conference, they were soon forced to take note of the pressures that were rapidly building up. On March 2, 1962, at the ceremony in which he was sworn in as Uganda’s first Prime Minister, Benedicto Mauwuko (murdered by Idi Amin in 1970’s) spoke of anxieties in the kingdoms and Busoga, as well as of the traditional rulers’ legitimate demands, indicating his intentions of making a fresh approach to British authorities on this matter, he asserted: “I can see no reason why federal status cannot be granted to the districts, this will help to allay the fears of the rulers and their subjects in those kingdoms and the result will be peace and stability of government.”

On the following day, Milton Obote, UPC leader associated himself fully with these sentiments, while in the National Assembly one of his chief lieutenants, Grace Ibingira, introduced a motion calling on the colonial secretary to negotiate with the kingdoms and Busoga with a view to granting them appropriate forms of federal status. Sensing of such pressures, the British authorities decided to re-examine the matter. The immediate reason for re-examining the extension of federal status was the involvement of this issue in the upcoming general elections in 1962. Uganda’s life of stability could not endure further than 1966 when Milton Obote opened our country’s doors to political militarism ushering in a one-man, pigeon hole constitution that imposed upon an unprepared populace an unpopular system of unitarian.
4. CONFLICTS, CHARACTERISTICS, AND PROBLEMS

Yugoslavia's experiences in federalism versus centralism or unitarism have been an experience of many stories, stories of victory and stories of defeat; of battles won, and battles lost. To comprehensively analyze the origins, nature, and extent of such experiences, let us examine what federalism as a political and social concept is all about.

A. Definition

Federatism and its kindred terms like 'federal', are used to describe the mode of political organization which unites separate units or entitles within an overarching political system so as to allow each to maintain its functional political integrity. This is done by distributing power among central or federal or national and constituent or regional or whole governments in a manner designed to protect the existence and authority of all the governments. Basic policies are required to be made and implemented through negotiations in 'the federal forum' among all people or governments concerned to share in the system's decision-making and decision-executing process.

Because of the difficulties in relating theoretical formulations to the evidence gathered from the actual operation of several systems, it is impossible to have a single definition of the term 'Federalism.' Federalism looks to the linkage of people and institutions by mutual consent, without the sacrifice of their individual identities as the ideal form of social organization. It is characterized by the desire to build society on the basis of co-operative rather than subordinative relationships and by the emphasis on partnership among parties with equal claim to legitimacy who seek to cultivate their diverse identities within a common social order.

As a political device, federalism is a kind of political order maintained by political principles that emphasize the primary role of sharing and negotiated coordination among several power centres, or states, as a prelude to the exercise of power within a single political system and stress the value of dispersed power centres as a means for safeguarding individual and local liberties.

I must hasten to point out that if we can have at one end of a definition like, an ideal federal system and at the other end of it, an ideal unitary system, one would discover that operationally, all present systems of government in the world fall somewhere in between these two ideals. Thus, a particular government system falls nearer to the federal ideal than it is labelled 'federal' while if it falls nearer to the ideal unitary system than that is labelled 'unitary.'
The distinction between the two systems stems basically from the division of powers and responsibilities between the national government and the governments of the parts. The unitary system has in place a government which is supreme and merely delegates power (at its own choice) to the governments of the parts. Indeed, the governments of the parts merely be administrative focal points for dispensation of services in their respective parts. Such administrative units have no legislative powers. They only have delegated executive powers.

Federalism on the other hand is an arrangement of government whereby powers within a country are shared between a country-wide national government (federal/central) and a number of regionalized governments. Each regional or state government exists as a separate and independent one from the others. It operates directly on persons and property within its territorial area, with a will of its own and its own apparatus for the conduct of its affairs. Regional governments have authority in some matters exclusive of all the others.

Federalism is thus essentially an arrangement between governments, or a device by which powers within a country are shared among two tiers of government. This yardstick is the true nature of federalism is almost universal to all forms be they America, Nigerian, Australian, Canadian, Indian, German or others.

B- Principles and Processes

The most useful way to understand how federalism as a political phenomenon has been at the root of Uganda's political conflicts, and in what ways shall its contribution to resolution of conflict be effective, let us survey the basic characteristics of federal systems, principles and processes.

The true federal relationship must be established or confirmed through a perpetual covenant of unity, inevitably embodied in a written constitution that outlines, among other things, the source of which power is divided or shared in the political system and which can be altered only by extraordinary procedure. Noble declarations in a constitution do not become a living principle unless they are faithfully implemented and respected. A written constitution, however, is the crucial element in the federal principle.

The political system must reinforce the terms of the constitution through an actual diffusion of power among a number of substantially self-sustaining centres that are generally coincident with the constituent political units or policies established by the federal compact. Such a diffusion of power may be termed non-centralization. It differs from decentralization - the conditional diffusion of specific powers to subordinate local governments by a central government, subject to recall by unilateral decision. It is also more than devolution - the special grant of powers to a subnational (regional) unit by a central government, not normally rescindable.
Non-centralization ensures that no matter how certain powers may be exercised by the central or state government at any point in time, the authority to participate in exercising them cannot be taken away from either without mutual consent. Constituent units in the federal system are able to participate as partners in national governmental activities, and to act unilaterally with a high degree of autonomy in areas constitutionally open to them because they possess effectively irremovable powers.

Autonomy, described as the separateness and independence of the regional or state governments in the first and second of the principles usually associated with federalism, is defined as the legal and physical existence of an entity of government like a legislative assembly, a governor, or an autonomous unit, which is able to exercise its own will in the conduct of its affairs, free from direction by another government. The position of each government which locally obliges one government to accept direction from another in the conduct of its affairs is not true federalism, where a central government is legally able to override the regional government in all matters, not autonomy or federalism.

While certain matters may be common or concurrent, as it were, to both the central and state governments, and while one may be permitted to prevail over the other in such concurrent matters, there must be certain areas over which each can operate to the exclusion of the other and without interference from it. Such an exclusive field should be substantial enough to give meaningfulness and reality to the autonomous existence of each government.

Autonomy further implies that neither the central nor the state government can confer functions or impose duties on the functionaries of the other without the consent of its chief executive (president or governor). Autonomy therefore encompasses the notion of equality, only equality of status as a government. Each government has, by virtue of its independent existence and equal status as a government with the others, equal rights, though not equal in size, population or resources.

The notion of equality extends not further than this — it stops in the factum of equality. Any conception of federalism implying a duality, between two equal and something, overemphasizes, therefore portrays an exaggerated and misleading picture.

Loosely defined as power is another principle ensuing from that of autonomy. There must be internal division of authority and power on an equal basis, that what in some federal systems may be called territorial democracy. Internal division is opposed to division on the basis of functional in terms for example accommodation of an area, religions, ideological differences, which may sometimes force federalism to give way to pluralism. Power and authority must be divided between equal and independent departments of government, the legal judges, the executive branches, and the judiciaries. Actually most people known as federalists and anti-federalists in Uganda and elsewhere base their arguments around the respective values of national and functional distributions of power.
Similarly from the autonomous existence of each regional (state) government and the primary character of the national (central) government flows the doctrine of mutual non-interference; a doctrine that the exercise of those powers is not impeded, obstructed or otherwise interfered with. But a proper balance must be struck in the national interest. Too much regional autonomy will tend to glorify the regions at the expense of the nation. If the regions are so powerful as almost to submerge the centre or to cause the citizens to think in terms exclusively, or mainly, of the regional government, then it will be hard for them to develop any loyalty to the nation.

From the premise that the federal relationship is between the national government on the one hand and the regional governments on the other, and not between it and each regional government separately, merges yet another greater principle: that the powers of the regional governments and their relations to the national government should be exactly the same. No state government could have more or less powers than the others or be accorded a special position in the national government. The lodging, constitutional or otherwise, of greater powers in one regional government would produce an attitude of superiority and arrogance towards the others, and thus destroy the equilibrium which must exist between them. The issue of equality between the regional governments has and a special relevance and significance to Uganda's past and shall play a bigger role in the future trends to federalism. The 1962 independence constitution of Uganda was an outstanding departure from the equality and equity rule. The arrangement as we have observed earlier on, entitled the national government and five regional entities, the kingdoms of Buganda, Ankaa, Bunyoro, Toro and the territory of Busoga. The districts of Nkole and others which were excluded from this federal deal served to complicate the dubious federal, semi-federal and unitary political structures. In the descending order, Buganda has a lion's share followed by the four kingdoms, and the least powers going to the remaining districts.

Necessarily, Uganda's overwhelming powers and financial resources automatically created an arrogance which induced it to always wish to impose its will on the national and other regional governments. The collapse in 1966 of this federal arrangement was an inevitable eventuality. It however is not testimony to the view that the federal doctrine is bad and unsuitable for Uganda. It merely meant that federalism had been initially wrongly conceived, misrepresented and in favour of accommodation and comprise, erroneously implemented. The federal republican approach is a livable determination to give federalism yet a full and fair trial under a different but more balanced and democratic power sharing arrangement.
For the successful establishment of this federal republic, equal and in harmonic proportions of its constituent parts is essential, and to embody the principle of non-controllability, the constituent units (states) should be fairly equal in population and resources, or at least balanced geographically or economically in their inequalities. The existence of a large state involving smaller states with which it is unreasonably associated in equal terms has often been one of the major defects of federalism. It is true that as regards the territory and populations over which the federal government exercises its power, equality is not constitutionally necessary, let alone being practically possible. However, to form a federal system of two regions is to pitch them against each other in a continual battle for supremacy and superiority. A federal system of four regions only for India, for instance in such the case, Federal-republicanism requires upon the multiplicity of interest groups and politics, reacting upon one another to produce a political equilibrium. Such a multiplicity of regions creates a feeling of interdependence, which in turn encourages cooperation and mutual tolerance.

As a consequence, the federal principle is one very essential elements of federalism. The decision-making public must recognize that the preservation of the constituent units is an important as the preservation of the nation as a whole. Federal republicanism for India looks at the country as an inextricable union composed of inextricable section. A system of many states forces upon each state an awareness of its relative insignificance vis-à-vis the whole country, and the futility of a policy of secession or annexation. In federal-republicanism, the multiplicity of states imposes sufficient equilibration in the system to guard against such wholly new jangal, fragmenting violating the spirit and purpose of federalism and seriously subverting the noble federal principle.

3. Republicanism -

Republic is a term used to describe a nation-state or political arrangement where the country is not ruled by a monarch or emperor. It is neither ruled nor dominated by a private or hereditary property but by a general public interest. Republic is a country where power is not directly in the hands of or subject to complete control by the people in contrast with a direct democracy. More broadly, it is used to describe an executive rare government that is actually or nominally on popular will. Republics are a directive, usually refers to such political arrangement. It is a technical designation for representative public government which dwells on the necessity for a system of checks and balances against the dangers of straight-jacketed administrative in legislative elected by majority on a single principle of representation.

As a term derived from the Latin word, re pública meaning public affairs or body, other than stressing absence of monarchy, republican emphasis moved concern for the common welfare of the state and for the public control or participation. The essential criteria of a purely republican government is that the principal organs of the executive and legislative departments be elected by the people and held
their offices by a responsible and temporary or defensible tenure. Federal republicanism necessarily implies not a federal system but a republic system that is federal. Uganda is a republic now and by subscription is that to re-establish peace, stability, national unity and cohesion, the federal arrangement must be instituted constitutionally to be composed of the several constituent districts that shall become autonomous federal states.

5. FEDERALISM AND NATIONAL UNITY.

4) Unity in Diversity;

Critics of federalism were several who fit their interests. Talk of federalism in Uganda is misrepresented by anti-federalist as curtailing monarchical or feudal tendencies. Other so-called ideologues and revolutionaries were whether carelessly or maliciously as an escape to criticize the ideas of non few degrees to their right or a conservative. Other catechists of anti-federalists said that federalism would encourage 'tribalism', whereby making it impossible for people to rise above tribal loyalty. This is fallacious. What true federalism does is to provide a local institutional base for an appeal to tribal community sentiment what some people prefer to call 'sectarian' sentiments. That creates such an appeal in not federalism per se, but the struggle for political power and the fear of domination. More important human nature, as we have already observed, forms the basis for such an appeal.

Uganda, a country whose borders are a historical accident determined by European interests during the scramble for Africa, is endowed with more 40 tribal groupings with a similar number of dialects and languages. Today's socio-normative structure besets of a homogeneous community. With the commercialisation and 'modernisation' (beside modernisation) of our economy, economic and social class interests have emerged creating heterogeneity within the society. Such is the nature and extent of the diversity which is supposed to yield to 'uniformity' in a nation government system.

*Here is a dangerous conceptualisation of national unity as national uniformity. Where social groups, religions shall identity and entwine themselves severally in the community. The religious traditions, customs and culture shall continue to play a major role in shaping their political opinion, their living, language, and behaviour. These are pure and simple facts. This is the political history, Federalism for Uganda should be based on the equality to the doctrine of 'UNITY IN DIVERSITY' with a major emphasis to provide a permanent and working solution to the tribal anomalies and hatred that have plagued our country's socio-political sense. to the detriment of the spirit of love and human rights. Any ideas that the state can force diversity with a nation-state by merely suppressing the religious, ethnic and cultural feelings or other affiliations to which the people themselves attach the highest political significance is*
Federalism is advocated for in this paper in connection with how the nation may be united, it is to unite people already linked by bonds of nationality under one modern republic since 1967. It is also to unify the diverse peoples in their social and cultural set ups for important but limited purpose, without disrupting their primary ties to the individual units that will constitute the Federal Republic of Uganda.

Federalism is expected to integrate the divergent principles of federal as well as communal tenets that still surface among nationalities and peoples of Uganda.

National loyalty and consciousness cannot be stimulated without tribal loyalty and consciousness. National unity, to be both possible and sensible, must be built on top of tribal and regional loyalties by creating a constitutional system of government in which all tribes, religions and regions feel that there is room for self-expression, self-preservation and self-advancement. This is human (natural) nature with pride. The doctrine of the Federal character must be enshrined in such a constitution. This doctrine is based upon the principle that all the people of Uganda possess a distinctive desire to preserve national unity, foster national loyalty and give every Ugandan a sense of constructively belonging to the nation.

ii) Guerrilla Movement

From 1960 to 1997, Uganda has experienced a special character of political development - the phenomenon of guerrilla warfare and its resultant strategies of counterinsurgency. In December 1980, the Ugandan People's Defense Force (UPDF) led by Milton Obote rioted the "Tribes" of guerrilla warfare and counterinsurgency. They formed the government with express military support of Tanzania which had helped dictator Idi Amin in 1979 in a bloody six months war of counter-insurgency.

Several guerrilla movements joined hands with the Ugandan forces to dislodge Amin. From about twenty or so anti-Amin groups, only three qualify to be considered as guerrilla movements. The first and most powerful was the National Liberation (special forces) Commanded by General Milton Opolot and the late Major General Gyato Okia (killed in a helicopter accident in 1969). These forces were under the command of Milton Obote and Conducted by the police. The second was the Front for National Salvation (FNSSA) led by Yoweri Museveni now President of Uganda and supported by Bentu speakers from western and southern Uganda. The last Ugandan movement (FUMU) led by the late Robert Serunungu, a Munyankole and Robert Serunungu, a Muyankole constituted the major political
brokers in the power struggle that followed the fall of Idi Amin in April 1979. Their internal contradiction based on tribe, religion and political ideology led to the impotence of their coalition government led by the late Yusuf Kironde Ilo and caused the collapse of three UNLF governments in succession until the re-emergence of the most powerful Milton Obote in 1980. Guerrilla warfare prior to Amin’s fall was basically external — and substantially more diplomatic and political than military.

When Prof. Pule, the first UNLF Chairman was deposed from the presidency of Uganda barely 68 days after assuming power on April 11, 1979, the cycle of guerrilla warfare was truly sent rolling. He soon founded in Nairobi, Kenya, the Uganda Freedom Fighters (UFF) to fight the then UNLF government led by Godfrey Binaisa, Br. Andrew Lutakome Kayiira (assassinated in Kay 1987) followed suit and formed the Uganda Freedom Movement (UFM) which he led till his death. On February 1981, Yoweri Museveni, then leader of the Ugandan Patriotic Movement (Political Party), attacked Kabamba Military Barracks to launch the Popular Resistance Army (PRA). He later joined with Ilo to form the National Resistance Movement. The UNLF was dissolved in late 1982 to give rise to the Ugandan Federal Democratic Movement (FEDEMU) led by the late Lawrence Semakula (murdered by Milton Obote’s regime in 1984). He was succeeded by Dr. David Lwanga. Tribal and ideological mistrust persisted between these movements and prevented real cooperation in their common struggle against Obote’s fascism.

Whereas the three movements were based in the central and western parts of Uganda, the northwestern part of west Nile was the base for yet other anti-Obote guerrilla groups, the National Rescue Front (UNRF) led by Moses Ali constituted the Sudanic speaking people who, though formerly were cohorts of Idi Amin, had rejected him. The Front of Uganda National Army (FUNA) was the vocation of Baati elements and were based, together with the UNRF in West Nile, Southern Sudan and Cairo.

In January 1986, the National Resistance Movement finally managed to put down a confessional totality of FEDEMU, UDA, UCUA, UNLA, FUNA, Uganda People’s Congress (UPC) and effectively turned the political clock of northern domination to move towards Toumba or Bantu emancipation and liberation. Since political leaders and academicians like to bury themselves in a world of political idealism thinking that a north-south drive (Nilotics, central Bantu — Bantu) is non-existent, in actual fact, it is real and alive and has been so since the colonial masters instituted their haphazard demarcation of soldier — worker (administrator) between the northern ethnic groups and the southern Bantu. As if Uganda’s problems were not enough, in August 1987, defeated armies of UNLA (Uganda National Liberation Army) began what has actually become the ‘Northern Rebellion’ in Kitgum and Gulu districts. The rebellion has now spread to Eastern Uganda districts of Teso, Karamoja, Kumi and Tororo. There are several organisations that have joined this rebellion against the NRM government and close scrutiny reveals a deep ethnic/tribal stratification of the forces inv
As these groups form for the partition of the north and the west according to their tribal affiliations, no eventual tie of place in the area (either own, ourselves or with the NLC) looks as distant as ever. Mutual mistrust and suspicion has led almost each major and some minor tribe in Uganda to arm themselves and found armies to protect and guarantee their survival. Stretching from the Ankole region in the west to Eastern Uganda through Ankole, Bunyoro, Teso, Karamoja and Nile in the northwestern, self-preservation, political power, and self-determination are threatening to bring the administration of Uganda into great jeopardy and national unity at the brink of total disarray, such as the special and aberrant political-military establishment in the 1960's draw to a close in Uganda. For all practical purposes, peace and stability can only reign again with an introduction of a constitutional framework that recognises and reconstitutes the tribal and ethnic heterogeneity of the country. Political power at the centre of internal conflicts must be divided into several autonomous units and divided into separate and independent legislative, executive and judiciary departments of the centre. This political arrangement must also be in the interest and necessity of all the people of this nation to cooperate in a peaceful co-operative venture to allow all to self-development without domination by any one group, race or color. Such must be a federal-republican arrangement. It must be republican to guarantee democratic federalism where the majority shall govern in respect of the minority rights. Republican because all public political offices must be held on a directly elective basis and avoid a return to feudal or monarchial dictatorship of the long past.

All political participants and observers on the Uganda scene should realize that at this material time, the political principles of our people can longer endure nothing but federal republicanism as opposed to monarchical and despotic systems. Our republic must no longer continue to be unity it has brought and bred nothing but bloodshed, suicide and political turmoil. It has been my observation which our country has gone through red with given an armed rebellion in the north and east, the passions of our people may be worked up to an uncommon pitch and pose a great danger of civil unrest. People who have been subjected to object oppression and tyranny by governments very naturally have developed passions of contempt and disregard of all authority except their own. When the minds of these are loosened from the restraints to dictatorships, such as armed forces and political parties, they seem to grow rigid and are apt to run into cruelty. These principles, too true in themselves and confirmed to me by experience, deserve extreme attention of those who happen to have the direction of public affairs. In such times, it indeed requires the greatest skill in the political pilots to keep all our people ready, steady and within proper bounds. Nothing can achieve this but Federal-republicanism.
6. FEDERAL-REPUBLIC OF UGANDA (PUB)

I am so affectionately attached to Federal-republicanism that my wish for our country is the establishment of a Federal Republic. Modern Uganda was established on principles of federalism; hence there has always been a federalistic tradition since her foundation. It assumed continuity when independence came on 9th Nov. 1962, the respective fields, powers and responsibility of the Federal government, the state government and the districts were spelt out in the 1962 independence constitution. Conscious of our citizens need to live at peace with oneself and in harmony with others, the federal republican arrangement I propose has indeed greatly modified the federal pattern which existed at independence. Fig 2 shows the nine states which should form a United Federal-Republic of Uganda.

Political, economic and social composition and levels of development have been my guiding principles in this decision. Each state shall arrange its own affairs through its own state government. Each state shall choose and develop a state capital at a site of their own choice. The Federal District (Kampala P.D.) shall remain in the establishment of the state capitals (5.6).

(a) EASTERN FEDERAL DISTRICT

The boundaries of Kampala P.D. will be as defined in the 1962 constitution. It will be a state in its own right under the Federal Government. The 1962 definition of the Federal District can be found in the Map of Kampala, 1968 edition M23 Kampala, 3000-16/1953 1: 50.

(b) EASTERN STATE: This shall be comprised by the districts of Soroti, Moroto, and Moroto. The population is about 1,000,000. They speak several languages but they are not written and they can speak and write Luganda language. The proposed state capital is Moroto.

(c) NORTH-EASTERN STATE: This shall include the districts of Amuria, Agago, and Bungoma. The total population is about 1,000,000 and speak Banyoro and other dialect languages. The proposed state capital is Amuria.

(d) SOUTH-EASTERN STATE: This shall be the district of Karamoja, Kajo, and Kadoi. It speaks, Banna which is in writing, they can not write Banyima. Proposed state capital is Kajo.

(e) SOUTHERN STATE: This shall be the districts of St. George, Aja and Aja. With the total population of about 1,200,000 they all speak Aja. Proposed state capital is at St. George.

(f) SOUTHWESTERN STATE: This shall include the districts of St. George, Arau and Guli. The total population is about 1,200,000 and they speak several different dialects but
have a common culture. Proposed state capital is RHINO CAVE.

(c) CENTRAL STATE: This shall consist of the districts of Kвол, Labé, Tanoro, Berekata, Kafia, and Babu. With a
total population of about 3,500,000 they all speak and write
Kwall. Proposed state capital is GARE.

(d) SOUTH-WESTERN STATE: This shall consist of the districts of
Dawad, Bokone, Bokola, and Bokoro. With a total
population of about 2,600,000, they speak Kanyima/Sudawa. The
proposed state capital is WELLA.

(e) LEVER STATE: This shall consist of the districts of
Gowa, Bokuma, Kondag, and Kondajo. With an
estimated population of 1,780,000, they speak Kanyima/Botoro.
The Bokom and Bokoro speak all three different dialects
but write and understand Kanyima/Botoro.

(f) NORTHERN PROVINCE: This shall include the
present towns of Kipeto, and the Lake Victoria Islands of
Kose etc. With a population of about 780,000, they all
speak Kanyima. The territory forms one of the
Federal provinces, and includes the present State House
of the Federal Republic of Uganda. International
airport shall also remain at Entebbe F.K.T.

The Federation of the Federation of Uganda (U.R.U.) into
the above states has been based on the following
pertinent objectives:

a) To create a country of people.

b) To create a country where the people have a common
language or similar languages, and a similar
or common culture like traditions and customs.

c) To create a country that are politically and
economically viable allowing independence and autonomy
to be meaningful in terms, the people’s standard of
living.

d) To create a country that have similar climate and
physical conditions as well as similar natural
resources to allow development and integration.
The economic principle of competitive advantage in the agricultural and industrial (manufacturing and mining) production sectors.

In accordance with the above objectives the following criteria
have been established for each state:

a) Each state has a population of more than one million
people.

b) Each state has a permanent source of water like lakes,
rivers and swamps.

c) Each state has a common border with a neighboring
country, either Tanzania, Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi or
Zaire.

d) Each state has the ability to exploit natural resources
as far national and state parks are concerned. Each state
The major contribution to Uganda's political violence has stemmed from lack of commitment on the part of leaders to constitutionalism. When the thoughtful Ugandan pledges his allegiance to democracy, he really means constitutional democracy – a system of popular government in which power is diffused by means of a written constitution and the wielders of power are held in check by the rule of law. When a Ugandan sings the praise of freedom, liberty and justice, he means constitutional freedom, a condition of ordered liberty whose terms are set down for all men to read in the "Freedom Charter".

I am a zealous, painstaking constitutionalist, and a firm advocate of the double-barreled principle that the governors of men should think, explain, and bargain before they act, and that they should act only through established procedures in making administering and enforcing public policy. The constitution should be their creed and standard and ought never to be departed from, because departure from it is full of uncertainties and errors.

If federal-republicanism is to establish peace of mind and body among the hearts and bosoms of Ugandans, constitutional government is the only guarantee of our people's freedom and our nation's unity and cohesion. The Freedom Charter I propose for the Federal Republic of Uganda is designed towards the establishment of an energetic national government which is to face the main problems. First is the problem of peace, that is the task of providing for the security of the nation in the face of a world of hate, envy, mutual unwarranted and widespread militarization of the political life. The second is the problem of growth, that is the task of discovering and then applying the best means of exploiting the unique talents and resources of the Ugandan people so that we may carry the whole country from backwardness and underdevelopment to grandeur and progress. The constitutional federal government shall be decisive but not arbitrary, energetic but not untrammeled, and I am convinced with a skillfully written charter, our entire
and our entire community will show widespread devotion to it. In this charter I have searched and found the rules or law that might restrain men of power without paralyzing them, that could balance the energy of the government and the safety of the people in a working equation for political and social freedom.

Our people have expressed fear and have explained it from concentrated and unfeathered power - the essence of despotism of unitary government. The Federal system, in an uncertain time, envisaged the stoutest of all defences to lack the charge of power. Those most approved and well-founded maxims of democratic freedom, which require that the legislative, executive, and judicial authorities should be deposited in distinct and separate hands. Convinced by the bitter experience of the inefficiency of mere parchment decoration of the boundaries between the agencies of power, the charter spells out the techniques with which to check power with power, to balance ambition against ambition and to ensure national unity in national diversity.

- Structure: I shall give a few major elements or articles which should feature most prominently in the Federal Charter.

(i) There shall be two houses of the legislature, the Federal Forum. The lower house shall be National House. The upper house shall be the Peoples House.

(ii) The National House of the Federal Forum shall be composed of people elected for 5 years by the people of the states or regions comprising Federal District (including sub-Federal Territory). The voters in each state shall have the qualification requisite for voters of the most numerous branch of the Federal Forum.

(iii) No person shall be a Representative in the National House who shall not have attained the age of 25 years and be a citizen of Uganda by descent, birth (or by naturalization) and resident in Uganda continuously for 20 years, and who shall not have been elected to an Inhabitant or a legislature in which he shall be elected.

(iv) When vacancies occur in the representation from any state, the Executive Authority thereof shall issue writs of election to fill such vacancies.

(v) The Peoples House of the Federal Forum shall be composed of three members from each state elected by the legislature thereof. For six years each member shall have one vote.

(vi) Leaders of or their permanent representatives of the Church of Uganda, Orthodox Church, Anglican Communion and Catholic Church shall be members of this house and shall have one vote each organization.

(vii) No person shall be a member of the Peoples House who shall not have attained the age of 35 years, and who shall not be an inhabitant of that state for which he/she shall be chosen.
(xii) The People's House shall have the power to try all impeachable and conviction to be carried with the concurrence of at least two-thirds of the members.

(xiii) Indictment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than the removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit, but the party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to indictment to the law of the land.

(xiv) The privilege of the Writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended unless in the case of rebellion or invasion, the public safety as may require and only the Federal Forum has the power to declare a state of emergency.

(xv) A person charged in any state with treason, felony, or other crime who shall flee from justice, and be found in another state, shall on demand from the executive authority of the state from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the state having jurisdiction of the crime.

(xvi) No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner prescribed by law.

(xvii) The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, shall not be violated and no search shall be made, but upon probable cause, supported by oath, or particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

(xviii) The enumeration in the Federal Charter of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

(xix) The powers are delegated to the Federal government by the Federal Charter, nor prohibited by it to the states are reserved to the state respectively or to the people.

(xx) No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice and no other person who has held office of the President for more than three years of a term in which another person was elected, President shall be eligible to electing the office of President.

(xxi) The Federal Republic of Uganda is a Democratic, free, and sovereign Federal Republic. The state and all the state power and authority originates from the people. It shall be exercised by the people in a democratic voting and by specific legislative, executive, and judicial organs.

(xxii) All Ugandans shall have the right to assist any person or persons seeking to abolish this constitutional order should no other remedy be possible.
(xxix) Acts tending to and undertaken in the intent to disturb the internal stability and or personal relations between the country and other countries, especially to prepare for aggression or armed internal rebellion shall be unconstitutional. Acts of succession are strictly unconstitutional.

(xx) By referendum, the territory of the Federal Republic of Uganda may be reorganized to ensure that the states by their size and capacity are able to effectively wield the democratic powers vested upon them. The referendum shall be given to regional, historical, and cultural ties, economic expediency, regional policy and the requirements of urban and rural planning.

(xxi) The preservation, conservation and protection of the environment shall be inviolate. To twenty manage and plan for rational use of the natural resources shall be the duty of all federal and state authority.

The above elements of constitutionalism ensure that federal-republicanism is not similar to other related political systems. It differs from a dual or multiple role where the central constitutional character is that union exists only in the person of the sovereign and is maintained only through the exercise of executive power by the state. Democratic trends are absent as the sovereign becomes overwhelmingly dictatorial and seeks to be annulled in preserved through royal succession. Federal republicanism also differs from local allowing cultural home rule, for instance Soviet Union where the uncontestable power. In such cases, highly centralized modern political authorities, possessing a virtual monopoly of power decide, for reasons of policy to allow local populations with different ethnic or cultural home rule, provided so they remain politically dominated by the imperial regime. There is no real local autonomy and no local efforts to transform cultural home rule into political power are invariably met with suppressive force from the central government. Federal-republicanism also differs from a decentralized unitary rule, even though such a state may allow local governments or districts considerable autonomy in some ways, it is invariably restricted to local matters as determined by central authorities. They are also subject to central supervision, restriction and even withdrawal without consultation. As exemplified by the Ugandan experience of 1966-67, even powerful traditions and institutions supporting local autonomy have not stood in the way of great concentration of power by democratically elected or self-proclaimed parliamentary majorities. When such forces are called in, decentralized unitary can become into feudal dictatorships. A decentralized unitary state for Uganda would therefore be a short and wrong jump in the right direction.

The constitutional establishment of the system seeks to solve the five fundamental causes of interna-
tional political and armed conflicts that have plagued Uganda for the last two decades.

1) The division and diffusion of power and authority between the nation (federation) and the states.

2) The role of the judiciary as guardians of the fundamental law.

3) The nature and extent of the powers of country's legislature.

4) The nature and reach of the President as the head of the executive.

5) The nature, extent and respect of the country's diversity of people and nationalities.

I am not a federalist by de-or-die conviction, but I harbour convictions that do not prevent me from believing a federalist by absolute necessity for I look upon a federal government for Uganda as an institutional rendering of the principles of natural law and human nature. My real, ardent concern is resultant not into empty talk, into structure, effectiveness and not abstract principles. I strongly adhere to the universal political axiom that "for forms of government let the contest, not unless new energetically to promote stability and to protect liberty is best. It is not the forcible elimination of all traces of serenity that produces or even that I contemplate federal republican government, but the forcible introduction of the ele-
ment of popular - the play of popular will and will, the sway of passion and fiction, in one word - demo-
cracy.

Democracy is such an escapist word that clarifi-
cation of the democracy envisaged by the federal approach is essential. At a glance, many leaders love talking of direct democracy, the immediate untram-
seled rule of the majority of the citizenry. The pur-
port of democracy is the assembly of the collective body of the people, the assembly who resolve in the name of the people, in all forms are traditions and
torrential. The ancient democratic of this nature, in
which people themselves dallied, never passed the feature of good government. Their very character was tyranny, their figure generally, the "popular" concept is subject to several doubts, because it is a collec-
tion of all the prejudices and passions of the peop-
Because it enlists factions or sectarian elements like
iniquities in a sweep, because factions clash with
sect and creed causes of commonwealth, and because out of
society, just as soon as literature the tyrant-reduc-
tion to bend the so-called wants of the people
to his own will, as were men, exposed to inter-
ference from external maturity, every irregular
leaders and subject to every breach of faction, how
on the assembly over the sulm, unburdened and
emotional view of the issues before it and thus
often at lest distant sight of the public and nation-
al interest?

Power should therefore be used as a shorth-
and for the concept of the sovereignty of the people
and the related concept of the welfare of all the
people as the principal aspect of government, the
conclusion of the union of federation is to
provide a legal and valid basis of government, which
and government is grounded on the consent of the people
and designed to protect, through the consensus and
persuasion of equal laws, the rights of all citizens
regardless of status, merit, ethnicity or religion,
Democracy has been a notion of a government
whose existence everybody wills and in whose blessings
everybody shares. Through indirect, direct and
staggered elections, constitutional constraints
checks and balances, education and instruction, the
leadership of the wise and good nationalists and
patriots, popular and democratic government could be
made to work in the federal republic of bangladesh.

Such a government would have several pertinent
ingredients, first among them being strength, in
fact and in appearance. As to the fact of strength,
which is to be realized that a weak and humble
and government never fails to be unpopular. It attaches to
itsself a disrespect incident to weakness, and un-
able to provide the public happiness, its influence
is seldom in favor of armed resistance, hence, it is,
when it appears in
means, it ought to appear like an elephant and inspire
respect by the display of strength. It is true that
weak governments, not strong ones, get caught up in
wars that are not of their own choosing; strong govern-
ments, not weak ones could trust their fate to the
process of diplomatic negotiation and internal re-
conciliation. For, logic must work things to a solution
acquired one practiced by diligence, by perserver-
ance, and by practice. The federal government must
keep a constant supply of experts in this science of duty
and a large supply to reserve. A strong, well-armed dis-
cliplined and modern army supported by a large popular
militia will prove a respectable military posture as
the best method of securing our peace, independence
and our property. Give us as an essential element and
guarantor of the federal republic in a united form.
Second ingredient of the popular and democratic federal government is good faith and the willingness to honour obligations. Reputation as a course of action is to, justified and considered on grounds of both right and policy. States, like individuals, who observe their engagements are respected and trusted.

The principle here is that the established rules of morality and justice are applicable to nations as well as to individuals, that the former as well as the latter are bound to keep their promises; to fulfill their engagements to respect the rights of property which others have acquired under contracts with them; without this there is an end of all distinct ideas of right or wrong, justice or injustice, in relation to society or government. There can be no such thing as rights, no such thing as property or liberty, all the boasted advantages of a constitutional government vanish into nothing.

Popular federal government is identified with a measured exercise of public authority and at the same time with a measured regard for the rules of public etiquette - one word, dignity. No nation could be counted great if its agents in government behaved like thugs, cowboys, corrupt opportunists and speculators. Public men must be gentlemen and the government they serve must be firm and unmoving.

Ain't nothing in God for everything, strait is good for nothing. Law and unambitious views are indisputable, follow the suggestions of pride nor timidly ought to guide. There ought to be much cool calculation, even cold fortitude.

The success of popular government depends largely on efficiency, that is sound administration. The federal arrangement spells out how power and authority could be most effectively and systematically wielded. It stipulates that when power should be granted, where it should be located and how it should be checked. The true test of a good government is its aptitude to produce a good administration. For example, a good form of government like an oligarchy or priesty could not be directly used by the single fact of a respectable and prosperous administration of affairs, but a good form of government like a constitutional federal - Republic - could be said to be by a want of methodological and energy in the administration. Efficiency is a quality indispensable for government to display as was dignity of nature, as after the carefully perverted and restricted, he scatter the well-trained the people and well-founded their leaders, the federal system of federalism would even into rules an efficient political science of administration are not quickly instituted. Hence the value and continuance nation of the great business of government with which unity government been run. In this connection, it is worth to note...
negative effects of administrative incompetence of legislatures (national assembly, national consultative council, national resistance council), the irritations of autocratic government, the continuance of inefficient government. Equally important is the need for special knowledge and skills in public administration and the importance of a decent compensation and status for civil servants.

Confidence and devotion to liberty.

Strength, good faith, dignity, efficiency, in one encompassing word, energy, to this catalogue of qualities of the ideal government for the Federal Republic of Uganda, we must add a final imperative - devotion to liberty. Liberty was the natural God-given heritage of man. The Federal Republic envisages a society of industrious, well-trained, self-disciplined Ugandans who, even when they may be proudly conscious of the blessings that they have living in a famous community, live private lives and pursue private affluence in which the government and no right or cause to greatly interfere. The clear voice of natural justice has always spoken, even in the darkest hours of Uganda during the Regime of Idi Amin, Milton Obote, and Tito Okello, for personal rights and self-government. The people must not only enjoy the common privileges of subjects under the same government but have to share in its conduct.

If liberty is a natural blessing, it is also a social necessity. Only men who get a taste of its sweets could be moved to make the kind of effort - persistent, intelligent, legislative - out of which a sound economic progress would come. I have high hopes for the unexplored (though most often subverted and frustrated) spirit of enterprise of the people of Uganda, and I know perfectly well that this spirit would function only under conditions of immediate, political, social and economic liberty.

However, the tree of liberty and freedom bears sour fruits as well as sweet ones. While liberty is the nursery of learning, prosperity and virtue, it is also the freely ground of faction, envy and corrupt opportunism. An excessive concern for liberty in public administration could lead to weakness, disorder and ultimately to anarchy. An excessive pursuit of liberty by private citizens could lead to licentiousness, the dishonesty of obedience, and ultimately to licentiousness. But the gamble for freedom is evidently worth making. Self-discipline, morality, religion and constitutionalism are the political and cultural conditions for a successful gamble. The people of Uganda...
have reached a point when the important question must be asked and answered. People must choose whether to be governed by law or by force. If they choose law, they also choose authority, which alone can provide the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, factionalism, sectarianism and of anarchy. The rights of government are as essential to be defended as the rights of individuals. The security of the one is inseparable from that of the other.

The right to own private property and to enjoy the fruits thereof and freedom of economic choice are at the foundation of the principle of liberty itself. In Uganda, the desire for property, especially land, is founded on such strong principles in the human breast that property itself must be regarded as a universal appendage of man, regulated by law yet enjoyed by right. Closely linked with property is the element of confidence.

The first of the great and essential principles for the support of government is an active and constant interest among the people in supporting it. The greatest calamity that can befall a nation is to destroy its peoples' confidence in government. Since government began to actively participate in the violation of our peoples' human rights and freedoms in the name of power, confidence in government has been greatly shaken. As of now it is held in balance. One of the main objectives of the establishment of federalism is to reestablish this crucial element in public government by permitting the people to govern themselves and control the use of the instruments of violence - the army and police. No popular government could expect to endure for long unless it prevented all those acts which would humiliate and render it to the people, while the conviction of the government with a special interest in order and security, in essence to secure, so too, is the confidence of the people at large. Unless men of every class and station, measure of affection, esteem, and reverence towards the government, and looked upon that government as the guardian and protector of their interests, even the best federal constitution would not save Uganda. The federal government as well as that of each state, must be able to address itself to the hopes and fears of individuals, and to attract to its support those masses which have the strongest influence upon Ugandan property and liberty factions, most prominent. It has been the federal republic of Uganda shall be founded and its government, as the offspring of our people's own choice, unimpaired, and named, completely true in its principles, in the diffusion of its powers, unity, energy with safety,
and contain in itself a constitutional provision for its own amendment; all Ugandas will undoubtedly answer it with reciprocal confidence and support. Indeed, respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enforced upon our people by the fundamental axioms of true liberty. The basis of the federal system is the right of the people to make and alter its constitution and government. Our liberties do not come from charters; for these are only the declaration of preexisting rights. They do not depend on parchments or seals, but come from the king of kings and Lord of all the earth.

I say all this convinced that

"THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE"

IS

THE VOICE OF GOD"

(VOX POPULI VUX IN I)
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