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“If the Greatest Challenge of Our Times is to Liberate Ourselves from the Dominance of Fellow Men, We must first Liberate Ourselves from the Weakness of Accepting and Using the Evil Tools they Give Us to Destroy Ourselves.”

(Distinguished Public Lecture Delivered at Nkumba University, Entebbe, Uganda, March 17, 2006)

1. Definition of Terms

(a) What Globalization Is Not

The concept globalization is one of the most misconceived ideas not only among scholars but also within a wider section of public opinion of our times. It is always misrepresented to refer to harmonious international connectedness or global village. It is associated with the process of rapidly growing trade relations, cultural homogenization, and peaceful co-existence. In this context, it is misconceived to be neutral. Of the dominant western scholars who have widely contributed to this misrepresentation are: Ali Mazrui (2001), he looks at it as a process of global interdependence; while Bayer Jennifer Marrie (2005), misrepresents it as the interconnectedness of nations and persons.

Focusing at the present ‘inclusive’ process of globalization under the leadership of USA, Francis Fukuyama (2002) misread it as the agent of peace and coexistence among nations and individuals in which he spoils that only USA is fit enough to organize the world under her order
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of democracy and state-led capitalism.

Samuel P. Huntington (1997-2005) is on the forefront of spreading the gospel of damaging controls and dominance of USA that she is the only state in the world with all the values that any other nations or individuals would ever wish to achieve, e.g., they claim to have superior language, political economic structures, ideas and practices such as democracy, human faces, etc. Hence, he concludes that the rest of the world must abandon what they have and adopt the model of USA as the universal harmonious figure of man. Never the less, you will agree with the fact that the plastic surgeries of the African pop star, Michael Jackson, have since come to fail.

(b) What Globalization Is

Globalization is a process by which one or few dominant states determine most affairs (e.g., scientific, social, economic, political values, etc.) of small and medium member nation-states of the international community. It as the condition in which supra-powers have a good deal of control, not only of, such processes as international trade, foreign aid, communication and the work of international organizations, but also of the relations among and within the majority of other nations. What is striking about local strategies (e.g., Uganda,) such as — decentralization, privatizations, gender and development, democratization, privatization, etc., is how un-local (foreign) they are! ‘Work-training,’ ‘virtues of international competitiveness,’ ‘public and private partnerships’ are determined by dominant states among small and medium member states.

In summery, the concept globalization refers to any one of the following terms: colonialism, empire building, regionalism, superpower making, hegemony, internationalization, selfishness, and or conquest. This understanding of the damaging controls of globalization in form of regionalism forces the questions:

(a) Does the process of globalization and world order contribute to the construction of good state for non-western states?
(b) Could we appreciate our capacities without hating imperial vices (so-called western virtues)?
(c) Cannot we see our enemies?
(d) What is most important to us?
(e) How do we participate in international affairs such as trade, etc?
(f) How do we position our selves in the divisive post-cold war world or where do we go from here?

(c) Theory of Regionalism in the Context of East African Community

Claude (1971, pp. 495-498) best explains the theoretical and practical foundation of regionalism as globalization or colonialism, thus:

“… regionalism is put forward as an alternative to colonialism, a superior substitute for the principle of universality. Emphasis is placed upon the bigness and heterogeneity of the wide world.”
This expresses the philosophy of dominance of USA enveloped under the Clinton Doctrine: “Enlargement and Engagement” (Graham, 1998). Hence, the process of imperialism exists when a stronger nation acquires from other nations movable and non-movable resources through the act of either physical or non-physical force. When this happens, an empire is consequently established: to sustain it — the conqueror must keep his/her victors as small as possible and in such a cage in where they are easily controlled as a unit (group) but not individually. It is from this practice that the theory of ‘regionalism’ is derived as an expression of ‘group think and or work,’ which means individual failure. Thucydides on the strong and the weak best explained such form of conquest:

“The standard of justice depends upon the equality of power to compel and that in fact the strong do what they have the power to do; the weak accept what they have to accept … this is the safe rule to stand up to one’s equals, to behave with difference to ones’ superiors, and to treat ones’ inferiors with moderation … you are discussing the fate of your country and that its future for good or ill depends upon this single decision which you are going to make…” (p. 72).

This is true of regional groupings commonly known as “regional international governmental organizations” that dominant western states have since established during the process of exclusive and inclusive colonialism. This is the origin of international regional political economic disorders among partner states of the EAC (see Appendix 1).

2. Exclusive Regionalism

(a) The Case of the British Empire (1545-1945)

Under the British Empire (1545-1945) the following groupings were established for easy access and control of individual national resources: British East Africa, British East India, British West Indies, League of Nations, etc. They were constructed to exclude competing European colonial medium states from accessing resources from the empire, for example German, France, Italy, etc. In this period the exclusive regional method of access and control of resources took the forms of colonial projects, e.g., Kenya-Uganda Railway, 1897-1901, Customs Collection Center, 1900, East African Currency Board, 1905, Postal Union, 1905, Court of Appeal for East Africa, 1909, Customs Union, 1919, East African Governors Conference, 1926, East African Tax Board, 1940, Joint Economic Council, 1940.

In real political and economic terms, this grouping of resource areas did not improve the performance of partner states. First, the coming in of the Imperial British East African Company (IBEAC) forced leaders (e.g., Mwanga,) to sign an agreement with the company accepting British Direct Colonial Administration (Seftel, pp. 3-6). Soon after, the British government deployed Captain Lugard to conduct war against any possible resistance of the British Administration. He found Roman Catholics in Uganda supporting German and French
colonialists; he joined the war and finally defeated them. Upon this defeat, Britain declared Uganda a Protectorate in 1894. This meant successful acquisition of the country as a resource area for Britain. In the period 1894-1919, British armed forces used violence to conquer and pacify the region. This type of violence resulted into enormous loss of human and other physical loss of resources of member states.

The phase of “failing (states)” in the area had begun with European exercise of war. The British brought the economy of the EAC under their direct exploitation and sabotage. They undermined African labor by employing Asians mainly from India to construct infrastructures such as rails to export copper, wood, etc. The British licensed Asians to work on their behalf as middlemen in setting up commercial businesses and in the process-acquired land resources from African landowners. These colonialists also extended easy commercial loans; export licenses, and other credit facilities to British businessmen. Colonial Law on commercial trading strictly prohibited African traders from obtaining loans from British Banks and denied them import and export licenses. The Africans, whom the British found propertied from proceeds of their internal and external trade, made them impoverished under this form of political violence.

Generally, Africans were reduced to the status of providing forced labor of peasant production of crops for British trade. For the entire period 1889-1930, British commercial wars had destroyed the nation’s enterprising fiber.

In the mean time, World War II emerged in Europe in the period 1939-1945, and at the closing point of which opened up new doors for the coming in of the Cold War, which drastically redirected the course of exclusive colonialism as regionalism into new hands of USA against USSR in the period 1947/1962-1989.

(b) The Case of USA versus USSR in the Period of the Cold War (1947-1989)

In the period of the cold war (1947-1989), a condition emerged in which USA and USSR (now Russia) competed for the access and control of world resources. Both colonial nations acquired control of nations through measures of regional groupings that were preceded by ideological and monetary controls in form of financial aid. USA established more than 30 regional groupings as security and political economic blocs to isolate USSR. In response to this act, USSR constructed similar regional groupings to bloc USA from accessing resources of nations she acquired through the ideology of communism/socialism, for example, South-South Cooperation, Warsaw, Pan African Movement (PAM), etc. Such regional international governmental organizations did not benefit African, Asian and Latin American states.

On 1st-22 July 1944, USA initiated a conference at Bretton Woods in which European colonial powers were made to sign into law agreements prohibiting colonial control of African, Asian and Latin American countries. Also, the conference agreed upon the establishment of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) under Bretton Woods Agreements. The terms of the agreements required Britain to lift all controls on both administrative and financial restrictions over the colonies. In 1945, the United States of America emerged the new superpower and Britain assumed the second position in international power politics. The Bank
and Fund assumed international administrative and developmental roles of European colonial powers in Africa, Europe and Asia. Under the Bretton Woods Agreements, Britain accepted to assist USA through the World Bank and IMF to set and implement a Ten-year Development Plan, 1946-1956, in all her former colonies as a symbol of the end of colonial control of territories in the Third World Nations (Butanaziba, 1997: pp. 30-51). To this end, USA granted a sum of £1200 million to all former British colonies through the World Bank, IMF, and Britain through her Colonial Development Corporation (CDC) to implement the ten-year Development Plan, 1946-56:

“The United Kingdom and the Welfare Act provides a sum of £120 million for Schemes of Development in Dependent Territories [Africa] and set a ten-year period up to March 31st 1956, for assistance from the funds available under the act” (CO 1022/337, Progress Report, 1953, Para. 1).

Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania received approximately £5,000,000 each for the Plan. This programme created a new multilateral economic structure that paved the way for United States of America to take on the new role in the EAC as a new colonizer. “New States” had been founded under this arrangement.

The new colonial power (USA) cast EAC into new forms of colonial EXPLOITATIONS. One such form of violence was internally created through party politics under the guise of “democratization” process. The other type of violence involved the fight between socialism/communism led by the former Soviet Socialist Republics (present-day Russia) — hence, opening the period of the cold war in the country. The coming in of the former Soviet Socialist Republics (now Russia) in competition against USA over resources in Uganda reversed the mood of political violence in the country. USA had initiated such violence using democratic-party-politics and the fight against traditional leadership.

USA had wanted to continue with the agenda of the East African Community as long as the partner members follow a common capitalist economy under her control. For this to happen, a political federation had to be implemented by 1965. Earlier, in 1964, there was not a president in the EAC who was not sold onto the idea of the federation. Obote of Uganda, Kenyatta of Kenya, and Nyerere of Tanzania where chanting: “FEDERATION THIS YEAR.” However, the republic of Tanzania joined the enemy of the exclusive bloc of socialism lead by the former USSR. This move meant the Federation could not only proceed, but also the entire economic structure of the EAC had to be dismantled. Besides, Seftel noted another problem that led to the failure of the proposal for the formation of the EAC political federation:

“The odd man out, dragging his feet is Uganda and it is not difficult to see why. In Kenya, Kenyatta is the boss and there is not a man who questions it publicly or privately. In Tanzania Nyerere is exactly in the same position. But look at Uganda … sharing the spotlight is the Kabaka [king], who is king and emperor
to his devoted Baganda and three monarchs of Bunyoro, Toro, Ankole. Buganda long ago rejected the idea of federation [to EAC], fearing its identity would be lost. The Baganda are a proud nation with proud history and their fears of federation [to EAC] are real.”

Mutesa [king] and President of Uganda had asked Obote (the then Prime Minister) in 1966 not to involve him self in the communist/socialist-capitalist conflicts as they were dangerous for the country and Obote himself: “The existing tensions in the world today demand that we do our most to reduce them instead of adding to them in any manner” (Seftel, p. 54). However, Obote failed to understand this because he knew less about these: (a) Bretton Woods Agreements 1st-22 July, 1944, Bretton Woods-International Bank For Reconstruction and Development (IBRD tongue-twisted to World Bank, 1960s); Anglo-American Agreements (1944), International Monetary Fund (1944); Bandong Conference 1955, etc. In short, Obote like Kwame Nkrumah, Julius Nyerere, Kamuzu Banda, Lumumba, etc. They knew little that the international economic order that had emerged in 1944 under the leadership of the USA had arrived to continue accessing national resources through the tactic of violence of regionalism.

In May 1966, Obote ordered military forces to capture the King’s Palace. This marked the climax of political violence against traditional social, economic and political leadership in the name of regionalism and democracy. The American and British trick to flatter Obote so that he introduces democratic-party politics to Uganda had come to succeed. The Baganda, who were feared by the Americans as a limitation to foreign capitalistic strategies of accessing national resources, had come to an end. This event, however, unexpectedly opened the gates wide for the coming in of socialism/communism in Uganda through Obote. In the mean time, USSR exploited Obote’s ignorance of the new international economic order. They influenced Obote, and indeed accepted to adopt socialist/communist policies. This meant that USA stood to loose Uganda to the hands of USSR in the name of the struggle for the poor (socialism/communism). This happened when Obote Declared Uganda a socialist political economic system the One Man’s Common Charter in 1968, and followed this move with subsequent action plans in 1970:

“… Move to the left … the Charter lays down a practical strategy for the fulfillment of the aspirations of socialism and enforces the view that the entire country must be involved in, and committed to, the cause of national building” (Seftel, p. 75).

To achieve socialist political economic order in Uganda, Obote planned thus:

“We must resolve now, at the beginning of the decade [1970], to finance as much as possible of our development programmes [Ten-year Development Plan which had emerged under funding of USA-based World Bank and IMF] from local resources [not loans], and seek from our friends in other parts of the world [such as the USSR] any necessary assistance which will increase our capacity to develop
more of our human and material resources. Hence, Obote insisted: Listen to the People … if we listen to the people, we will sustain and maintain our political independence. If we listen to the people, we will win the war for economic independence. If we listen to the people, southern part of Africa will be free” (p. 75).

To these ends, Obote’s had afforded to trade off Uganda, an American created “New Sate (1945-1962),” into the other hands of USSR. The same American and British governments turned against Obote when he too, turned out to join the socialist/communist camp. Interestingly, the American and British governments founded political violence for Uganda when they flattered and super-imposed the weak Obote over strong and experienced leadership of kings. This time, the American and British turned to the military for the removal of Obote and his socialist regime. The American and the British realized that it was only military dictators that could help them in maintaining capitalism in Uganda.

USA borrowed the experience of installing dictatorial leaders from German and Italy in the 1930/40s and 1920s respectively. The Americans and British chose Idi Amin to perform dictatorial leadership role in defending capitalism against communism in the EAC. When communism threatened American investments in Africa, the American government sponsored military coups in most parts of Africa to oust either active or possible communist/socialist regimes throughout the 1960s and 1970s (Compare, Cammack, p.137). The Americans with the help of Britain (following the Anglo-American Agreements, 1944) elevated to power military dictators to serve the following purposes:

(i) To protect capitalism and protect private property from the conquest of communism
(ii) To be anti-party politics, fight any elements that would have caused social disunity, and unify different people under the unquestionable leadership of a ruler

Besides Idi Amin, African dictatorial leaders who emerged out this Americans and British plan included: Moi of Kenya, Mubutu Sesseko (Zaire), Anar Sad-at and Hassan Mubarak (Egypt), etc. Active struggle for resources and markets between Capitalist-USA and USSR had consolidated the construction of “failing states in Africa” in the period 1960s-1989.

The American and British Governments responded to socialist/communist “move to the left” in Uganda by causing a military coup led by General Idi Amin against Obote’s led-Socialist Regime on January 25, 1971. In the same year, the then Prime Minister of Britain Edward Heath visited Uganda and made policy directions towards maintaining capitalist structures under a dictatorial military leadership of Idi Amin. He immediately, returned the visit to Britain and extended another visit to Israel.

In the mean time, Obote exiled himself to the former Socialist Republic of Tanzania, while there he blamed American — British and Israel sponsorship of the coup against his socialist government. After the coup, Obote and his company of Soviet Socialist friends were beginning to realize that they had underestimated the strength of American-British governments. In a statement Obote blamed the American-British involvement in the coup thus:
“Whatever these rebels [American-British and Israel governments] might say, the people of Uganda believe, like many African countries, in socialism. They believe in the Common Man’s Charter, which has received popular support throughout the country. Now, a group of traitorous army personnel have come forward to say that they know everything, they are the saviors of Uganda … these people, I must say to you quite clearly, are the servants of foreigners: British, Israelis … having been involved in the bloody seizure of power by the Uganda army” (Seftel, p.91).

In order to protect Uganda’s market from any further communist/socialist infiltration, the American- British government helped the dictatorial regime of Uganda to stop trade relations with the Socialist Republic of Tanzania. This split the East African Economic Community. Such economic situations continued in Uganda in the period 1970s to the opening period of the downfall of USSR in 1985/89.

3. Inclusive Regionalism

(a) USA in the Period of Post Cold War (1989 to Present)

In 1989, USA defeated the former USSR (now Russia) in the struggle for control of world resources. As the result, Russia fell to her victor (USA) together with the socialist regional groupings such as Warsaw, South-to-South Cooperation, Pan African Movement (PAM), etc. The nations that USA had excluded from her camp during the cold war came to be included. This constituted the inclusive colonialism in which there is one dominant state controlling international affairs. In reference to the EAC, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, and even Sudan and the Congo are becoming increasingly part of the grouping. Else where, the following inclusive regional groupings have emerged under the controlling policies of USA: EU, AU, SADAQ, ECOMOG, IGAD, NEPAD, etc.

(b) Lake Victoria Basin as Zone of Common Economic Interests: A Case Study

Findings indicate that, today, the process of accessing and control of resources through the EAC by USA and her allied western states, unfolds itself in the making of borderless nation-states (political federation), Lake Victoria Basin as Zone of Common Economic Interests, Inter University Council for East Africa, Common Inland Waterway Transport, Partner States on Central Statistical Bureaux, Customs Union, Common Currency Vision, Common Security Programmes — as of the Dar Es Salaam 19-20 November 2004, Declaration on Peace, Security, Democracy and Development in the Great Lakes.

This programme reveals the access and control of Lake Victoria Basin by USA and her allied western nations and their attending regional groupings through initiating and financing commercial projects in the following sectors: Fisheries, Agriculture, Tourism, Water Supply, Industry, Trade and investments. The so-called founding interests for which the integration of Lake Victoria basin is conducted among partner states is faulty. It states thus:
“The majority of people living in the lake region are in the rural areas, most of which are characterized by poverty and lack of infrastructure and social amenities. The EAC partner states identified and designated the lake and its basin an economic growth zone and an area of common economic interest to be exploited jointly in a coordinated implementation process in order to maximize economic and social benefits and … to provide effective environmental management and protection. Under this strategy, the EAC Secretariat was mandated to establish a mechanism and framework for the sustainable management of the entire lake” (EAC/CM/O4/2002, pp. 4-5).

In the first instance, the areas of lake Victoria Basin cannot share similar projects due to their varying geographies. Similar production of goods would also make irrelevant the necessary interdependence. The background to this unworkable programme is the motive by USA and her allied western states to access and control the resources of the area. This is found in the “EAC strategy for Lake Victoria Basin Development” No. 7: “The CLVDP is mandated to coordinate all aspects of the Lake Victoria Development Programme. It is charged with responsibility within the basin, providing policy guidance and coordination with donors [colonialists] and international institutions.”

The process of controlling and accessing resources of Lake Victoria Basin by western colonialists through the EAC is further revealed by the Regulations for the Lake Victoria Basin Strategic Partnership Fund. It provides thus: Pursuant to the provisions of Article 6 (d) of the Partnership Agreement between the East African Community and the Government of Sweden, the Government of France, the Government of Norway, the World Bank, and East African Development Bank on the promotion of sustainable development in the Lake Victoria Basin, the regulations for the Lake Victoria Basin Strategic partnership is hereby made:

“Development Partners” means the regional and international organizations, bilateral and multilateral agencies with which the East African Community fosters Co-operative arrangements.”

Such cooperative arrangements are revealed in the regional strategy, entitled, “Indicative Prgramme of the European Community involving Eastern, Southern, and Indian Ocean Region for the period 2002-2007.” The plan forwards that there are three main focal areas (Economic Integration, Natural Resource Management and Transport and Communication) selected for financing because they address the major constraints to economic development and poverty alleviation in the EAC. That regional economic integration allows countries of the region to continue pursue economic liberalization policies at the regional level, within the framework of USA-led WTO, which help the region’s producers to obtain market access and attract investment into productive sectors. Programmes in Natural Resource Management aim to improve the economic development of the region through the more efficient and sustainable management of
the region’s resource base. The programme in transport and communications aims at assisting reduction in costs of transport and communications through improved utilization of existing infrastructure and services and through the development of a master plan, which will address the most immediate requirements in this focal sector.

The non-focal areas include programmes in conflict prevention, resolution, and management; capacity building, higher education, and culture. Involvement of non-state actors is a process in development and cross — cutting issues (such as environment, capacity building, and gender) concerns will be mainstreamed in all programmes for the distribution of 223 million among these sectors which makes irrelevant in stimulating growth within partner states because it turns out to be too small to stimulate any growth as the integration itself turns out member states to loose identity, sovereignty, national interest, and confidence in the group.

4. Conclusion

The East African Community (EAC) like any other governmental regional grouping is a real problem to the making of good life for partner states. While it continues to serve the foreign interest of its founding states, in part it has since made worse the already poverty stricken African member states. It is a big problem, in fact, Prof. Makiko Toda recently visited North Eastern Kenya on her research behind the causes of poverty in the region. She finally arrived at the right observation to the problem and summarized it once and for all, hence: “Placing blame on the corruption of African elite is too simplistic, and is not the answer. We can find its root-cause in modern western domination of Africa that has manifested itself in the long historical sequence of slave trade, colonialism, neo-colonialism, civil wars of the cold war, structural adjustment programmes of 1980s, African countries entered the 1990s with crises in such major areas as food security, population, housing, public health, education, energy, industrial production, trade, debt, and environment.” Hence, this leads us to the recommendations/way forward to address the fundamental question of the research thus: **From here where do we go?**

5. The Way Forward

1. To re-capture the idea of a political federation, it would be possible to begin with a nucleus state upon which partner states could hinge themselves for progress. Partner states of the EAC would need an example from Uganda, USA, German, Britain, Japan, Malaysia, etc. To reach there we must begin somewhere — We must have a superior alternate plan of force of arms for some members that will attempt to resist our “good will” to federate. Federation failed in 1965 because Uganda under Milton Obote had not re-captured the foreign orientation of integration into local structures.

2. There should be proper application of intelligence, tactic, physical and non-physical efforts to recapture the process of globalization from the imperial agendas of USA and her allied western states as seen from the political-economic disorders of the EAC (Not Yet Uhuru — do not
3. The professed objective of the EAC to alleviate poverty through the allocation of 223 million and the Global Funds (Millennium Development Funds), could be achieved by changing the erroneous method of distribution. The wrong method requires that the fund be distributed across a large spectrum of sectors among many states (and in some cases to every individual “perceived” poor person, this makes the fund too small to stimulate any substantive growth. For example, the allocation of 223 million to the EAC is made worthless by the following distributions: (a) Economic Cooperation 45%-55% (b) Management of Natural Resources 15%-25% (c) Transport and Communication 15%-25% (d) Non Focal Areas 10%-15%.

4. Avoid Jeffrey Sachs’s wrong distribution approach of loan funds. That USA through the World Bank and IMF should spend “Spend $150 Billion per year [in loans in Africa] to Cure World Poverty by the year 2015.” He advocates that the fund be allocated to every poor person ($100) per year. However, the proposal is faulty because poverty cannot be transformed by allocating massive funds and shared equally by every individual poor person in Africa, in Sachs’s sense of imagination. If $150 Billion were to be allocated to the 5 million poor people in Africa, of course in faulty perception of poverty from the western sense, each would receive about less than 10 cents of $1 USD per year. In Uganda this has been adopted as a “fund for all.” However, it would be meaningful if such funds were allocated to selected institutions and individuals capable of eradicating poverty through projects with multiplier effects. This would elevate Uganda into an economically and politically superior partner in the EAC.

5. The EAC is a ‘pseudo- supra-structure’ because it is a mere post office that only transmits messages from dominating states to African partner states. It can neither borrow nor lend funds nor work as collateral; it is economically and legally useless. But, the EAC may wish to use this weakness to get there.

Appendix 1


“WHEREAS formal economic and social integration in the East African Region commenced with, among other things, the construction of the Kenya-Uganda Railway, 1897-1901, the establishment of the Customs Collection Center, 1900, the East African Currency Board, 1905, the Postal Union, 1905, the Court of Appeal for East Africa, 1909, the Customs Union, 1919, the East African Governors Conference, 1926, The East African Tax Board, 1940, the Joint Economic Council, 1940.

AND WHEREAS provision of was made by the East Africa (High Commission) Orders in
Council, 1947-1961, the East African Common Services Organization Agreements 1961-1966, and the Treaty for East African Cooperation, 1967, for the establishment respectively, of the East Africa High Commission, the East African Common Services Organization and the East African Community as successive joint organizations of the said countries to control administer certain matters of common interests and to regulate the commercial and industrial relations and transactions between the said countries and means of a central legislature to act on behalf of the said countries laws relevant to the purposes of the said joint organizations.

AND WHEREAS in 1977 the Treaty of for the East African Cooperation establishing the East African Community was officially dissolved, the main reasons contributing to the collapse of the East African Community being lack of strong political will, lack of strong participation of private sector and civil society in the cooperation activities, the continued disproportionate sharing of benefits of the community among the partner states due to their differences in their levels of development and lack adequate policies to address this situation.

AND WHEREAS upon the dissolution of the East African Community the said countries signed on the 1thy day of May, 1984, at Arusha, in Tanzania the East African Community Mediation Agreement 1984, hereinafter referred to as the Mediation Agreement for the division of the assets and liabilities of the former East African Community.

And Whereas pursuant to Article 14.02 of the Mediation Agreement the said countries agreed to explore and identify areas for future cooperation and make arrangements for such cooperation.

AND WHEREAS on the 30th day of November, 1993, provision was made by the Agreement for the Establishment of a Permanent Tripartite Commission for Cooperation between the Republic of Uganda, the Republic of Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania for the establishment of the Permanent Tripartite Commission for Cooperation hereinafter referred to as the Tripartite Commission to be responsible for the coordination of economic, social, cultural, security and political issues among the said countries and declaration was also made by heads of state of the said countries for closer East African Cooperation.

AND WHEREAS on 26th day of November, 1994, provision was made by the protocol on the Establishment of a Secretariat of Permanent Tripartite Commission for Corporation between the Republic of Uganda, the Republic of Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania, for the establishment of the Secretariat of the Permanent Tripartite Commission for Corporation between the Republic of Uganda, the Republic of Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania to act as the Secretariat of the Tripartite Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Secretariat of the Tripartite Commission.

AND WHEREAS on the 29th day of April 1997 at Arusha in Tanzania, heads of state of
the said countries after reviewing the progress made by the tripartite Commission, in the development of closer co-operation between the said countries in the fiscal, monetary, immigration, infrastructure, and service fields and hereafter approving the East African Cooperation Development strategy for the period 1997-2000, directed the tripartite Commission to embark on negotiations for the upgrading of the agreement establishing the Tripartite Commission into a Treaty.

AND WHEREAS the said countries, with a view to strengthening their co-operation are resolved and adhere themselves to the fundamental and operational principles that shall govern the achievement of the objectives set out herein and to the principles of international law governing relationships between sovereign states.

AND WHEREAS the said countries, with a view to realizing a fast and balanced regional development are resolved to creating an enabling environment in all the Partner States in order to attract investments and allow the private sector and civil society to play a leading role in socio-economic development activities through the development of sound macro-economic and sectoral policies and their efficient management while taking cognizance of the developments in the world economy as continued in the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, 1995 referred to as the “WTO” and as may be decided by the partner States, the development of Technological capacity for improved productivity;

NOW THEREFORE, the republic of Uganda, the republic of Kenya, and the United Republic of Tanzania;

DETERMINED to strengthen their economic, social, cultural, political and other ties for their fast balanced and sustainable development by establishment of an East African Community, within an East African Customs Union and a Common Market as transitional stages to the integral parts thereof, subsequently a Monetary Union and Ultimately a Political Federation.

CONVINCED that co-operation at the sub-regional and regional levels in all fields of human endeavor will raise the standard of living of African peoples, maintain and enhance the economic stability, foster close and peaceful relations among African states and accelerate the successive stages in realization of the proposed African Economic Community and Political Union.
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