

What Nyerere said about Federation in 1960

THE argument of "bado kidogo" is the same argument the imperialists have always used to delay our independence.

Is it not going to be the most curious piece of irony if we, the African Nationalists, who have always wanted unity, were to inherit and use this argument in order to perpetuate colonial divisions?



The flattery and corruption of African leaders in order to keep them separated has already started. It will be intensified a million times when each of our capitals has the embassies of all those countries in the world which find power and prestige in the weakness and disunity of others. Those of us who so innocently produce this sweet argument of delay will find themselves in company with the greatest enemies of true independence and dignity of our Continent.

These embassies will be interested in the strength of their own countries and not in our unity. We shall find ourselves being flattered and filled with false nationalistic pride by reference to our virtues in contrast with the evil habits of our neighbours — and vice versa.

I know the advocates of delay will say that Uganda is different. It is one country already, where East Africa consists of several different units. Admitted. But we are adjacent countries, governed by the same Colonial power, doing many things in common already. The difference is one of degree not of kind.

There will be businessmen, capitalist businessmen, who will see Federation offering a large opportunity for profit-making, or neo-imperialism on a grand scale. There will be self-seekers who, having failed to make their mark on territorial politics, will want to try their luck on the federal plane. There will be people who will advocate Federation because a personal enemy opposes Federation They can form a strange mixture. But, I repeat, the case for Federation freely willed, designed and effected by our own people stands on its own merits.

The value of diamonds does not depend upon the character and motives of those who mine it. A mineral is a diamond or it is not.

Turn overleaf for full text

Freedom and Unity

IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST COLONIALISM the fundamental unity of the people of Africa is evident and is deeply felt. It is, however, a unity forged in adversity in a battle against an outside Government. If the triumph in this battle is to be followed by an equal triumph against the forces of neo-imperialism and also against poverty, ignorance and disease, then this unity must be strengthened and maintained.

The feeling of unity which now exists could, however, be whittled away if each country gets its independence separately and becomes open to the temptations of nationhood and the intrigues of those who find their strength in the weakness of small nations.

There is one way to ensure in East Africa that the present unity of opposition should become a unity of construction. The unity and freedom movements should be combined, and the East African territories achieve independence as one unit at the earliest possible moment. This means a Federation of the Territories now administered separately.

But a Federation of Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda and Zanzibar cannot and must not be imposed upon the people of these territories. It must be a decision of the people expressed through their elected representatives. Only by this method will the present sentiment of unity become an actuality capable of transforming the economic and social position of our territories. This means that discussions on the question of the establishment of a Federation of East Africa can only come after all the countries concerned have Governments which are responsive to the wishes of the people, elected by the people and which have full internal power. This position can be reached early in 1961. I believe it must be reached then so that the four Governments have an opportunity to put into political effect the unity now felt throughout our countries.

At the moment Tanganyika is more advanced on the road to independence than any of the other territories; the British Government could not refuse a demand from us for independence in 1961. I believe, however, that it is in the best interests of Tanganyika as well as of the other territories that we should unite into a Federation. I also believe that the attainment of complete independence by Tanganyika alone would complicate the establishment of a new political unit. If the British Government is willing to amend their timetable for the constitutional changes of the other territories and then those territories expressed a desire for Federation, I would be willing to ask the people of Tanganyika to join that Federation with the others.

Ever since we started discussing this question of a Federation of East Africa I have not found anybody yet either in East Africa or outside East Africa who is against the principle of Federation. Indeed, when the leaders of the PAFMECA Conference met recently at Mbale they unanimously agreed that the proposed Federation was worth supporting and that we should work out the details and how to bring it about. I think it is the details of this Federation and how to bring it about on which we are likely to have differences of opinion. I would like to express my own views, not on the details of ultimately what form of Federation we are going to have; those we must leave to the leaders, if and when they decide to frame in more detail the form of Federation they would

like to see. The views I want to express are how to bring it about.

I believe that if it is desired to bring about this Federation the right moment to do this is not after each country has separately achieved its own independence but before. Already there are people in East Africa who have expressed differences of opinion about this approach. There are people who believe, no doubt sincerely, that in order that the decision to bring about the Federation may be, and may appear to be, a free expression of the people of East Africa themselves, we must wait until the separate countries are completely independent. It is argued that if we were to achieve this Federation before the countries were completely independent there is a danger that it might appear that the Federation was imposed upon us by the Colonial power and that it was not a free expression of wishes of the people of East Africa.

It has also been argued that if we do not prepare for the separate independence of the East African territories but were to merge them into a Federation before they had separately achieved their independence, the merger might delay the independence of East Africa.

It is true that in order that this Federation may be a reality it must be willed, designed and put into effect by peoples of East Africa themselves. An imposed Federation like the Central African Federation has no chance of succeeding and is completely out of the question. I believe, however, that the expression of the wishes of the people of East Africa does not have to wait until these countries are completely independent. We in Tanganyika, for instance, have now a form of Government which we call Responsible Government. If the Legislative Council of Tanganyika were to seek the independence of Tanganyika, and this is what we are going to do in March, nobody, by any stretch of the imagination, can say that the expression of the Legislative Council of Tanganyika seeking the independence of Tanganyika is not an expression of the people of Tanganyika. Similarly, if the Legislative Council was to express a view that Tanganyika wanted to come out of Colonial status to independence as part of East Africa, that expression would be an expression of the views of the people of Tanganyika (unless, of course, the people of Tanganyika were opposed to such views). I realise that at present no other East African country has the same kind of Government. It is for this reason that I have suggested that if the people of East Africa want a Federation the right moment to bring it about is after each country in East Africa has reached the same kind of constitutional change as has now been reached by Tanganyika, and that we should insist that the elections which are due to take place in all those countries should result in Governments truly responsible to the people.

If after these countries have achieved elected Government they decided to achieve their independence separately, that decision would be a true expression of the views of the peoples of those countries. If, on the other hand, they all decided that they wanted to achieve their independence as one political unit and they have the backing of their people, they would equally be expressing the wishes of their countries. I do not see, therefore, that for the purpose of making sure that the desire to join a Federation is the wish of the peoples of those countries we have to wait until those countries have achieved complete independence.

It has been argued, largely by some of our friends in Uganda, that we must put our separate houses in order first, before we can contemplate Federation. I do accept this argument. If we were all in chaos it would be silly to add chaos to chaos (although one can ask the difference it would make). But when does one satisfy oneself that our house has been put in order? I say after Responsible Government. Some of my friends say after independence. I find it difficult to accept this. Surely, the argument of "let's put our house in order first" will be made stronger after independence than before independence. As I'll try to show later, Federation before independence can help to put each house in order. Federation after independence will not even have this attraction which appears to be so dear to our friends. If people resist a move now which has every chance of hastening the complete independence of East Africa, during a period when the struggle for independence is our unifying force, how can they help to resist Federation after independence has been achieved separately? Surely our friends who argue separate independence first cannot have considered the matter seriously.

The argument of "bado kidogo", "you are not ready", is the same argument the imperialists have always used to delay our independence. Is it not going to be the most curious piece of irony if we, the African Nationalists, who have always wanted unity, were to inherit and use this argument in order to perpetuate colonial divisions?

There are obvious disadvantages if we wait until all the countries of East Africa have reached complete independence before we begin to bring them together in one Federal unit. If each nation achieves independence separately any move by one of them in the direction of Federation is likely to be misunderstood and will certainly be subjected to a campaign alleging imperialistic designs and a search for personal power. For this reason the most honest and least selfish of the leaders will be strongly tempted to avoid the issue. Further, the leaders of each state will become so pre-occupied with the immediate problems of their own Government that the long-term advantages which can come from the establishment of a Federation will be crowded out of consideration.

We have to accept, too, that if each of the East African territories is independent we shall each have to open embassies in the main overseas territories, accept diplomatic offices in each of our capitals, and, because of our close ties, we shall even have to exchange diplomatic representation. All these things are a waste of scarce resources. But the main danger to the prospects of Federation comes from the proliferation of the foreign embassies in our respective territories. These embassies will be interested in the strength of their own countries and not in our unity. We shall find ourselves being flattered and filled with false nationalistic pride by reference to our virtues in contrast with the evil habits of our neighbours—or vice versa. We shall find in fact that the present sentiment of unity gets weaker and weaker.

Further, once the four nations each have their own representative at the United Nations, have their own flags and foreign representatives we shall have established centres of vested interests against unity. This is—not because we shall be increasing the number of human beings who have a personal interest in disunity—and because they are human beings most of them will be more conscious of the advantages of the present situation and the difficulties of change than of the long-term benefits which could come.

Furthermore, Federation after complete independence means the surrender of sovereignty and all the prestige and symbols of such sovereignty. Surely, if it is difficult now to convince some of our friends that Federation is desirable, when it does not involve

surrendering any sovereignty, it is going to be a million times more difficult to convince them later. As I'll try to show later, Federation now has the possibility, even probability, of hastening the independence of our countries, a prospect very dear to all our hearts. Federation after independence does not have this obvious binding force. The appeal of unity is much stronger now than it will be after independence. And yet the need for that strength-in-unity, which will enable us to preserve our hard-won independence, will be at least as great after independence as before. But, and this is very important, unless we emerge out of colonialism as one political unit, separate independence will have made us less united than we are at present, and will at the same time have reduced both the desire for unity and the chances of bringing it about.

We need no visas to cross our boundaries now. Separate independence will almost inevitably impose visas on us. Those unfortunate tribes who now find themselves divided by the present boundaries find it very awkward now. But they will find it more awkward, if awkward is the word, in future, for separate independence will, internationally, make Tanganyika as foreign to Kenya or Uganda, as China or America is. Their cousins on the other side of the border will be foreigners. We trade now without tariff barriers; separate independence may necessitate such barriers.

We have a common currency which could easily lead to a common Central Bank. Separate independence will almost inevitably lead to separate currencies and the establishment of National Central Banks to make separate independence a reality. One could go on almost ad infinitum to show that separate independence will encourage disunity, not unity. Separate independence means in effect that we shall find ourselves less united after colonialism than before colonialism. Independence will have resulted in greater disunity and the more or less permanent balkanisation of our region. The irony of separate independence is as stark as that.

THE BALKANISATION OF AFRICA

The balkanization of Africa is a source of weakness to our continent. The forces of imperialism and of neo-imperialism will find their own strength in this basic weakness of our continent. Surely, one would have expected that if we have a chance to undo part of the harm that has already been done by this balkanization of our continent, we would not hesitate in taking that chance. My contention is that our best chance of removing this balkanization of East Africa is a few months from now, after all countries have got elected Governments.

African Nationalists who resist this will find themselves in the same bed with the oddest of companions. There is the intelligent imperialist who knows without a doubt that the moment the East African countries have joined forces after reaching responsible Government separately, no-one can stop them from naming the date for independence of East Africa. He will resist this obvious strengthening of the forces of Nationalism. The same imperialist will know that since the advocates of Federation are linking it with the Responsible Government in all the East African countries, the gathering momentum in favour of Federation is bound to hasten the achievement of Responsible Government in the remaining two territories of East Africa. This is what happened in the case of British Somaliland. Those who would not like this to happen will resist it and help Africans too to resist it.

The imperialist who knows that the gathering momentum for a voluntary Federation will destroy any chance of maintaining an imposed Federation in Central Africa, will resist the establishment of a popular Federation in East Africa. This is no conjecture. When I was in London recently many intelligent people remarked

TRANSITION

that the success of an East African Federation voluntarily created by the African leaders themselves would spell the end of the unpopular Central African Federation. It was even bluntly said that I had gone to London to sabotage the Central African Federation. This was not true, but there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that a popular Federation cannot but hasten the collapse of an unpopular Federation next door.

The British Government itself is placed in a most awkward position by this talk of an East African Federation. If several years back we were mad enough to advocate a Federation for East Africa, Britain would have backed it up without any hesitation. Today matters have changed. (The Rip van Winkles are not aware of the change). The United Kingdom Government cannot back up a popular Federation without destroying or encouraging the destruction of an unpopular one. If we establish a voluntary Federation in East Africa, no argument, not even force could prevent our colleagues in both Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia from claiming the freedom to join that Federation.

This is so obvious, and for that reason alone, the friends of the unpopular Federation will resist the establishment of the popular one. But there is an even stronger reason. They, and their friends in South Africa and in Portuguese East Africa, would rather have Tanganyika alone as their neighbour than a free and united East and Central Africa with nearly 30 million people. They would encourage us "to put our separate houses in order first", not only before, but also after our separate independence. Why should they want a united Eastern Africa. They, together with the many others who would join them in encouraging the balkanization, would have a better chance of manipulating an East Africa so divided. They will flatter and bribe us and produce even greater arguments for the perpetuation of the balkanization of East Africa, and exploit our need for technical and financial assistance to keep us divided.

The flattery and corruption of African leaders in order to keep them separated has already started. As I said earlier it will be intensified a million times when each of our capitals has the embassies of all those countries in the world which find power and prestige in the weakness and disunity of others. Those of us who so innocently produce this sweet argument of delay will find themselves in company with the greatest enemies of the true independence and dignity of our continent.

It has been suggested by some stupid people that I advocate Federation because I am a stooge of the British and I want to impose on East Africa a form of Government acceptable to my British masters. I believe in the unity of Africa. I do not mind, therefore, what appellations stupid people give me as a result of that belief. But let us examine the true position.

We have always been advocates of unity. In our Nationalist Organisations we have constantly warned ourselves against the snares of the imperialists whose policy is "divide and rule". Whenever we have asked for our right to govern ourselves it has been the imperialist who has told us that we are not ready because we still have tribal, religious, communal and other differences. At the same time it has been the imperialist who has encouraged these divisions in order to continue to rule a weak and divided people. It is the fellow who fell into this snare of the "divide and rule" apostles whom we rightly regarded as a stooge of the imperialists.

When did this rule change? Are we now going to regard as true African Nationalists those who say we are not ready to unite? Are we now to regard them as our true heroes those who join the imperialists and the neo-imperialists in perpetuating the balkani-

zation of East Africa? Are we going to regard as stooges those who are now carrying the battle for unity beyond those artificial boundaries created by the imperialists to more natural boundaries of our own creation?

The answers to these questions are obvious. It is the apostles of "bado kidogo" (when they really mean "never") and the apostles of balkanization whom we must ask to produce their membership cards in the imperialist clubs. Those of us who want to see a united East Africa as soon as a free choice can be made are being absolutely consistent. We have nothing to explain or apologize for. If we want to look for stooges and tribalists we must look into the camp of the "bados".

Surely if the advocates of separate independence were consistent, they would, for instance, allow the dismemberment of Uganda now and try to put it together later. The suggestion is as illogical in the case of East Africa as in the case of Uganda.

I know that the advocates of delay will reply that Uganda is different. It is one country already, where East Africa consists of different units. Admitted. But we are adjacent countries, governed by the same Colonial power doing many things in common already. The difference is one of degree and not of kind.

Besides, in our pure Nationalistic moments we shout that we do not recognise these artificial boundaries which were drawn by the imperialists without consulting us. Either, we mean what we say or we are a bunch of hypocrites. If we mean it, we should refuse to recognise those boundaries now and demand our independence from the imperialists as one Federal unit. I am sure that the moment we do that the forces of imperialism will crumble in no time. If unity can also hasten our independence, what more can we want as African Nationalists determined to free our continent from the humiliation of colonial rule? If we have a chance to bequeath to our children a free and united East Africa, should we treat that chance lightly, or take it seriously as all true patriots should?

REASONS FOR FEDERATION

It would be naive to claim or leave the impression that all those who want Federation now want it for purely patriotic motives. Such a claim would be unfounded. Different people join great movements for different motives. In our own separate Nationalist Movements we have all sorts of people. Indeed the imperialists often try to exploit this fact to discredit our Nationalist Movements. But the case for independence from Colonial rule stands on its own merit. It does not derive its sanction from the sanctity of its advocates. If all the advocates of freedom from Colonial rule were selfish and evil minded people, that fact would not destroy the right of every people to govern themselves. Similarly with Federation. Among the advocates of Federation could be found people motivated by different considerations.

There will be businessmen, capitalist businessmen, imperialistic businessmen, who will see Federation offering a large opportunity for profit making, or neo-imperialism on a grand scale. There will be self-seekers who, having failed to make a mark on territorial politics, will want to try their luck on the federal plane. There will be people who will advocate Federation because a personal enemy opposes Federation. (Just as there will be people who will oppose Federation because an enemy advocates it.) There will be all sorts of people on the side of Federation and they have all sorts of motives. They can form as strange a mixture as the mixture I have tried to describe of the "bado-kidogo" group. But, I repeat, the case for a Federation freely willed, designed and effected by

our own people stands on its own merit. It cannot be marred or helped by the motives, the character, the status or colour of its advocates. The value of diamonds does not depend upon the character or motives of those who mine them. A mineral is a diamond or it is not.

If the Devil himself appeared in person to support this scheme for Federation, that fact would not change my views on the Federation or the Devil himself. If the Devil is not a fool, it is easy to see how his mind would work. He knows exactly what Federation means. If he opposes it he will make it popular. If he supports it people will begin to have doubts. If he does not want the Federal scheme, his choice is quite simple: he will try to give it the kiss of death. Those who would otherwise have supported the scheme but for the "support" it received from the Devil would have fallen into a very simple trap, and the Devil would rejoice.

The suggestion that Federation can delay the independence of East Africa is almost absurd. I cannot see such a possibility. The only country in East Africa at present which is fairly certain of its approximate date of independence is Tanganyika: it is reasonable to assume that if the East African countries are going to achieve their independence separately Tanganyika is very likely to be the first country to achieve that independence. If, therefore, independence for East Africa was to come much later than the likely date for Tanganyika's independence, it would be Tanganyika which would have been delayed. But I cannot see how the very fact of the East African countries joining forces in demanding their independence would lead to the possibility of their achieving their independence later than if they had not joined forces in demanding their independence. I can foresee exactly the opposite. In March Tanganyika is holding a Conference with Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom to determine a date for Tanganyika's independence. After that date for Tanganyika's independence has been fixed, all of us in East African countries have three choices. If we decided to demand our independence together we can demand a date earlier than the Tanganyika date. In all those three choices, no choice is likely to be later than any of the other countries would have achieved its independence separately if we had not joined forces. It appears obvious, therefore, that the decision to demand independence together is likely to hasten and not to delay the independence of any part of East Africa. We have precedent before us: Somalia was a Trust Territory like Tanganyika: her date for independence had not been fixed, Somaliland was a Protectorate under the British: her date for independence had not been fixed. The two countries decided that they should emerge out of Colonialism as one unit. This did not necessitate the delay of independence for Somalia whose date had already been fixed; it did not necessitate the delay of independence for British Somaliland. The result in fact was exactly the opposite. The British Government, in order to meet the desire of the two countries to become one, deliberately hastened the independence of Somaliland which in fact achieved her independence five days before Somalia! With that precedent before us, surely the East African countries would be in a very strong position to demand that Tanganyika's date for independence should be the date for independence for the rest of East Africa. The argument, therefore, that there is any possibility of the decision to form a Federation delaying the independence of any part of East Africa appears to me to be quite unfounded.

But I believe in the unity of our countries. I do not want to leave the impression that no price need be paid for such unity. If I go into a shop and I want a packet of cigarettes I pay the price for it. If we believe that the balkanization of East Africa is an evil thing; if a price is necessary to remove this evil, then in all honesty to ourselves, we must say that we are prepared to pay the price, if it appears to be a fair price.

Supposing, therefore, that the people of Tanganyika fixed their independence for 1961. Supposing all the people of East Africa wanted a Federation. Supposing some Devil made it impossible for the Federation to achieve its independence in 1961 but fixed a Federal Independence date for 1962. Supposing my claim is correct, that separate independence would tend to perpetuate the balkanization of our region, and therefore Tanganyika's separate independence would contribute to this perpetuation of a balkanized East Africa, I, for one would be prepared to postpone the celebration of Tanganyika's independence for a few months and celebrate East Africa's independence in 1962 rather than take the risk of perpetuating the balkanization of East Africa.

Nigeria paid a similar price. The two Southern regions of Nigeria could, if they had so desired, have achieved their separate independence much earlier. They did not do so. After achieving internal Self-Government they decided to work for a greater Nigeria. Thanks to their vision, we have now on the Continent a country that has the potential of protecting its hard-won independence through strength.

But, as I have already indicated, this price on the part of Tanganyika is likely to be a theoretical one and I have tried to answer it theoretically. In actual fact we do not have to pay it at all.

There are those who argue that an independent Tanganyika will be in a much better position to hasten the independence of both Kenya and Uganda. Thus, it is argued, even if Federation before independence is not deliberately designed to delay East Africa's independence, such delay is bound to be its result, if, because of Federation, Tanganyika does not take her separate independence now.

This view is very flattering to Tanganyika. But it exaggerates the power of an independent Tanganyika and minimises the forces of Nationalism within both Kenya and Uganda. Tanganyika or no Tanganyika, the independence of both Kenya and Uganda is a foregone conclusion. If we achieved our independence separately, and Kenya and Uganda followed a few months later, I'd certainly be one of the last people to claim that Kenya's and Uganda's independence was due to the influence of an independent Tanganyika. In a very short time both Kenya and Uganda are bound to become independent. Thus independence of East Africa is no longer in any doubt except in the minds of nincompoops. What is in doubt, and in the minds of very intelligent people, is our unity, after achieving independence.

One need only to look at what happened in other parts of Africa and the world to see the truth of this. Separate independence did not help the unity of the subcontinent of India. Western Europe has a greater scope for unity than we have in East Africa. But the fact that Western Europe is already balkanized into different sovereign states rules out any prospects of political union. Western Africa has smaller units than we have in East and Central Africa. But the fact that those units are now sovereign independent states makes the problem of unity much greater than it is for us. This is true not only of the English speaking West African units, but also of the French speaking units. One could go on multiplying these examples which show that unity is very difficult after sovereign independence has been achieved separately.

One could equally go on giving numerous examples to show that it is easier to achieve such unity simultaneously with the achievement of independence. I have already mentioned the example of the two parts which form the present Republic of Somalia. There are numerous other examples. The U.S.A. is a federation. But the struggle for freedom from colonial rule and the struggle for

TRANSITION

unity were combined into one and the same thing. The thirteen original colonies came out of Colonialism as a federation. Canada is a federation, but is not a federation which was brought about by merging different sovereign and independent states. Freedom and unity were brought about in the same way. The Republic of India is a federation which was brought about at the same time as India achieved her independence. The negative lesson of India and Pakistan I have already mentioned. Nigeria, Africa's biggest nation, is a federation brought about in the same way. The Nigerians wisely and deliberately avoided an India/Pakistan situation.

In Africa we have only one exception to this rule. But it is one of those rare exceptions which *truly* prove the rule. There is unity between Guinea and Ghana. This unity was brought about after each country was a sovereign independent state. But it is not the kind of unity which has been achieved by the countries I have cited. It is in fact a strong friendship between two sovereign states. A very desirable thing indeed. Yet these countries are led by two of the most brilliant and far-sighted of the sons of Africa. No-one but a fool could say that their desire for African Unity is either half-hearted or selfish. It is neither. The fact is that there is the right moment for everything, and the right moment for unity is certainly not after the achievement of separate sovereign independence. If separate independence is inevitable we should certainly not give up trying, but it is going to be a much harder task to unite our countries. But in the case of East Africa separate independence is not inevitable.

The United Arab Republic is the only true exception I can think of. But if we really want to remedy the balkanization of our part of Africa we would be most unwise to act contrarily to the

clear lessons of history and assume that we will be another exception to this rule.

I have no doubt in my mind that history has given to us East Africans a unique opportunity. Let us use it now and earn the gratitude of future generations. If we really mean business, here's the challenge:

LET US MAKE 1961 EAST AFRICA'S YEAR OF INDEPENDENCE IN UNITY.

"It has been frequently remarked that it seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question of whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good governments from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force". Hamilton in *The Federalist*.

"Men at some times are masters of their own fates. The fault . . . is not in our stars but in ourselves that we are underlings".

"There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune: omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries. On such a full sea are we now afloat; and we must take the current when it serves, or lose our ventures." William Shakespeare.

Peoples of East Africa, Unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains!

"Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Psalmist.

DOCUMENT

THE SCHEDULE

THE ARTICLES OF UNION

between

THE REPUBLIC OF TANGANYIKA AND THE PEOPLES' REPUBLIC OF ZANZIBAR

WHEREAS the Governments of the Republic of Tanganyika and of the Peoples' Republic of Zanzibar, being mindful of the long association of the peoples of these lands and of their ties of kinship and amity, and being desirous of furthering that association and strengthening of these ties and of furthering the unity of African peoples, have met and considered the union of the Republic of Tanganyika with the Peoples' Republic of Zanzibar:

AND WHEREAS the Governments of the Republic of Tanganyika and of the Peoples' Republic of Zanzibar are desirous that the two Republics shall be united in one Sovereign Republic in accordance with the Articles hereinafter contained:—

It is therefore AGREED between the Governments of the Republic of Tanganyika and of the Peoples' Republic of Zanzibar as follows:—

- (i) The Republic of Tanganyika and the Peoples' Republic of Zanzibar shall be united in one Sovereign Republic.
- (ii) During the period from the commencement of the union until the Constituent Assembly provided for in Article (vii) shall have met and adopted a Constitution for the united Republic (hereinafter referred to as the interim period) the united Republic shall be governed in accordance with provisions of Articles (iii) to (vi).
- (iii) During the interim period the Constitution of the united Republic shall be the Constitution of Tanganyika so modified as to provide for—
 - (a) a separate legislature and executive in and for Zanzibar from time to time constituted in accordance with the existing law of Zanzibar

- and having exclusive authority within Zanzibar for matters other than those reserved to the Parliament and Executive of the united Republic;
- (b) the offices of two Vice-Presidents one of whom (being a person normally resident in Zanzibar) shall be the head of the aforesaid executive in and for Zanzibar and shall be the principal assistant of the President of the United Republic in the discharge of his executive functions in relation to Zanzibar;
 - (c) the representation of Zanzibar in the Parliament of the united Republic;
 - (d) such other matters as may be expedient or desirable to give effect to the united Republic and to these Articles.
- (iv) There shall reserved to the Parliament and Executive of the united Republic the following matters—
- (a) The Constitution and Government of the united Republic.
 - (b) External Affairs.
 - (c) Defence.
 - (d) Police.
 - (e) Emergency Powers.
 - (f) Citizenship.
 - (g) Immigration.
 - (h) External Trade and Borrowing.
 - (i) The Public Service of the united Republic.
 - (j) Income Tax, Corporation Tax, Customs and Excise.
 - (k) Harbours, Civil Aviation, Posts and Telegraphs.

And the said Parliament and Executive shall have exclusive authority in such matters throughout and for the purposes of the united Republic and in addition exclusive authority in respect of all other matters in and for Tanganyika.

- (v) The existing laws of Tanganyika and of Zanzibar shall remain in force in their respective territories subject—
 - (a) to any provision made hereafter by a competent legislature;
 - (b) to such provision as may be made by order of the President of the united Republic for the extension to Zanzibar of any law relating to any of the matters set out in Article (iv), and the revocation of any corresponding law of Zanzibar;
 - (c) to such amendments as may be expedient or desirable to give effect to the union and to these Articles.
- (vi) (a) The first President of the united Republic shall be Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere and he shall carry on the Government of the united Republic in accordance with the provisions of these Articles and with the assistance of the Vice-Presidents aforesaid and of such other ministers and officers as he may appoint from Tanganyika and Zanzibar and their respective public services.
- (b) The first Vice-President from Zanzibar to be appointed in accordance with the modifications provided for in Article (iii) shall be Sheikh Abeid Karume.
- (vii) The President of the united Republic in agreement with the Vice-President who is head of the Executive in Zanzibar shall—
 - (a) Appoint a Commission to make proposals for a Constitution for the united Republic.
 - (b) Summon a Constituent Assembly composed of Representatives from Tanganyika and from Zanzibar in such numbers as they may determine to meet within one year of the commencement of the union for the purpose of considering the proposals of the Commission aforesaid and to adopt a Constitution for the united Republic.
- (viii) These Articles shall be subject to the enactment of laws by the Parliament of Tanganyika and by the Revolutionary Council of the Peoples' Republic of Zanzibar in conjunction with the Cabinet of Ministers thereof, ratifying the same and providing for the Government of the united Republic and of Zanzibar in accordance therewith.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF Julius K. Nyerere, the President of the Republic of Tanganyika, and Abeid Karume, the President of the Peoples' Republic of Zanzibar, have signed these Articles, in duplicate, at Zanzibar, on this twenty-second day of April, 1964.