Pan Africanism and the Security Dilemmas in the Security Complexes in the Great Lakes region: Uganda's Regional Foreign Policy under the Movementocracy governance.

By
Aaron K.K. Mukwaya
Senior Lecturer, International Relations and Security Studies,
Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Makerere University.
Fax: +256-41-530185
Email:deanfss@ss.mak.ac.ug.

Introduction.

Pan Africanism and the Security Dilemmas in the Security Complexes in the Great Lakes region: Uganda's regional foreign policy under the Movementocracy governance.

The ideals, ideas, dreams, vision, mission and practices of Pan Africanism have been a guarding and guiding light in the struggle for political, economic, social and intellectual emancipation of the African peoples and the African continent. The academia, let alone the intellectuals from Africa as well as the Africanists have argued the case and cause of Pan Africanism through a variety of fora and practical activities. There have, as expected, several challenges to the academia, policy makers, practitioners, civil society and general populace as to why and how far down the road and how the Pan African Ideal could be useful in handling new occurrences on the African continent and globally.

The Movementocracy governance began in 1986 after the NRM/A took over the realms of state power in Uganda. The struggle of the NRA/M was guided by some ideals of Pan Africanism to the extent that some domestic and foreign policies to date reflect such will and commitment.

It should be noted that Uganda and the Great Lakes region have been embroiled in violent conflicts, wars and insecurities. The crises have manifested themselves at the national and regional levels, through rebel activities, warlordism, political assassinations, inter-state and intra-state conflicts and wars, cattle rustling, insurgency, terrorism, cross-border incursions, fundamentalism; arms and drug trafficking, sub-and-chauvinistic nationalisms, and near or complete collapse of state mechanisms.

It should be noted that Uganda and The Great lakes region have taken on extremely heinous, brutal, inhuman and inhumane acts hardly seen in modern African history. Why? This state of affairs have pre-occupied scholars and other actors to find and analyse causes, trends, consequences and the way forward in order for Africa to continue the pursuit of the Pan African Ideal.

The real existence, survival and development of nation-state and the region have brought into question the prominence of the politics of security. It has been argued that the security concerns of one country depend on the security concerns of all the countries in the region, and the region dynamic, par excellence.

The title of the paper clearly illuminates this debate. The paper shall attempt to raise the chorus of the debate by discussing the position and role of the Movementocracy governance in a broader umbrella of the Pan African Ideal.
The Security of Uganda and the Great Lakes region have been at the heart of the Movementocracy. Therefore, the major thesis of the paper is: That given the violent political history of Uganda and the GLR, pursuit of the Pan African Ideal guided by International law and responding to regional and global dynamics, should be internalised by the Movementocracy governance in its regional foreign policy.

The Security Dilemmas in Uganda and the Great Lakes region need to be understood by all stakeholders. At the academic level, there is need to re-define, re-examine and re-analyse concepts, situations, actors (old and new), and the dynamics of varying factors and forces at the domestic (local and national), regional (and continental) and global levels. At the political and practical

levels, the Movementocratic leadership have advocated for Pan Africanism in dealing with security dilemmas at home and in the region. However, the paper shall engage into aspects of political convictions, political goodwill, political commitments and political practices in the analysis of the security dilemmas in the security complexes in the Great Lakes region. Why and how are the security dynamic handled at the political, economic, social, diplomatic and military levels in Uganda's regional foreign policy.

The stated "uniqueness" of the Movementocracy from the local, national, regional and global levels, shall be analysed guided by the Realist Theory applied in a wider Development Thinking perspective. The Development Thinking Perspective rotates around the interactions between Power, Ex/In-clusion and (In)Security; and why and how they interrelate and unfold from local to global domains and back again. And finally, to what extent has the Pan African Ideal been pursued within the Realist School of Thought confines by academia, policymakers and practitioners of foreign policies in Uganda and the Great Lakes region.

Data to be used in the paper is part of the on-going research on "Uganda's Foreign Policy in the Security Complexes in the Great Lakes region under the Movementocracy," by the author.

Since Ugandan's political independence in October 1962, it has been pre-occupied with the struggle for development. Development has been in all aspects of social life and taking different forms and methodologies. Genuinely or ungenuinely, the struggle for nation building demanded a rethink in the processes of democracy, economic development, security and conflict management in Uganda and the region.

At the eve of independence, Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania were intertwined in the same political, economic, and international arrangements. The three countries achieved political independence through the Lancaster arrangements; and all became members of the Commonwealth and the United Nations.

At the economic level, the three countries were members of the regional economic arrangement known as the East African Community which was connected to the EU through the Arusha treaties and the ACP-EU Lome agreements. It is important to note that their economies were peripherized within the capitalist global economies.

The background to the paper reveals that in the first three decades Uganda had experienced political crises which the other two countries had not, qualitatively and quantitatively . After the 1966 crisis Uganda was plagued with political turmoil and decay to the extent that it was labelled as ``a dying state at the centre of the continent: From the Pearl of Africa to the poor and pauper of Africa." The biggest question is ``What went wrong?"

There are several answers which have been advanced within the framework of colonialism, neocolonialization and the Africa State. Giving answers to the question is not enough, but to chat the way forward.
The struggle of the National Resistance Army (NRA) and the National Resistance Movement (NRM) fused together aimed at addressing the question and the Way Forward. The process is which is termed in the paper as ``Movementocracy."

The paper attempts to examine the theoretical and practical aspects of democracy and Uganda's foreign policy within the Great Lakes Security Complexes under the Movementocratic governance. The objective is to analyse the extent to which the NRM views foreign policy as processes or mechanisms for achieving domestic and regional stability, security, cooperation and development in the social, economic, political and international aspects.

To be able to understand and internalise the connections between the Movementocracy and Foreign Policy, the paper attempts to search relationships between the two within the context of national security of Uganda as expressed in the regional security complexes. The interconnections and interrelationships are examined using the Alternative Development Agenda as the theoretical framework for explanations.

While Uganda achieved political independence during the thick of the Cold War (the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis), the struggle and administration the NRM emerged at the eve of the post Cold War. The paper examines Movementocracy and foreign policy levels of interactions amongst the local, national, regional and international dimensions. By application of the Alternative Development Agenda, the paper draws out the interactions and interrelationships amongst Power; In-/Ex-clusion and marginalisation; and In-(Security) as they relate to foreign policy of the movementocratic governance within the security dilemmas of the Great Lakes region.

Uganda, just like most of the countries in the Great Lakes region is embroiled in crises, conflicts, instability, insecurity, wars, economic co-operation and diplomatic ping-pong. All these issues are expressions of the relationships resulting form power struggles, inclusion/exclusion and marginalisation, and insecurity which inevitably indicate a difficult search for achievement of national and regional security, stability, coexistence, cooperation, equality; equitability and positive development. The paper therefore, aims at adding new academic and practical dimensions to the on-going debate on security complexes in the Great Lakes region by examining Uganda's foreign policy under the Movementocratic governance, 1986-2002.

The Theoretical Debate on the Movementocracy and Foreign Policy.
It is important in theoretical examination of Uganda's foreign policy under the NRM to make a mention of the imprint of colonialism and neo-colonialism on Uganda and the Great Lakes region. When Uganda was graced or blessed with political independence, it landed into the neo-colonial situation. At the economic level, Uganda was peripherized into the global and regional capitalist economic systems. Uganda was bilaterally and multilaterally, through the East African Community, ACP-EU, tagged in a marginalized position.

At the political level, Uganda achieved political independence within the framework of the Lancaster-Westminster model, the Commonwealth and the United Nations systems. However, Uganda was not graced with the thinking, traditions, history, resources, expertise and experiences of foreign policy. Uganda's positive hopes for stability, security, development and co-existence were dashed. There were more things to be done that merely achieving political independence, as Kwame Nkrumah imagined. The paper will make mention of the colonial and neo-colonial situations but not in depths since the study period is 1986-2002.

> Given the historical and contemporary developments of the Movementocracy- its guidelines, programmes and projects, it could be argued that the form of governance experiment aims at engulfing the whole Great Lakes region and Africa. By

analytically examining the domestic application of the principles and programmes of Movementocracy, it is possible to implicitly and explicitly detect the regional motives, attitudes and dimensions of the type of governance.[1]

It has been argued that the "Movementocracy is a New African or Uganda type of governance that takes into account the historical and prevailing conditions which allows a New Thinking in light of the already existing notions and applications of Western democratic governance in Africa.[2]

> The movement political system is a unique initiative introduced in Uganda by the National Resistance Movement (NRM) administration since January 1986. It is based on democratically elected resistance councils from the village level to the National Resistance Council (Parliament).[3]

The village level local resistance councils were not new in Uganda. For instance under Idi Amin, Ugandans elected their local leaders within the framework of the colonial chiefs – known as Makakumi. During the Uganda National Liberation Front (UNLF), where Museveni was the Vice-Chairman of the ruling Military Commission, village committees were organised under the UNLF local committee system known as ten "cells" – (Mayumba Kumi).

The Movementocracy debate emphasises the failure of Western democracy in appreciating the African condition and peoples. It is argued that Movementocracy

> As a home-grown African type of democratic governance is a must in the ``Africa's solutions for Africa's problems" debate.  Movementocracy asserts that the concepts of democracy and ``good" governance are universal, but need to strictly embrace the ``African Condition."[4]

It should be noted that the Movement organisation in Uganda was intended as a combination of social forces committed to resolve the democratic crises in Uganda. Its success would be a great lesson to the region and Africa. The major problem is that this transitional or temporary approach has become permanent, exclusive and militarized phenomena in Uganda and the region.

When discussing the Movementocracy it is important to note that in principle and practices it embodies a ``POST-NEOCOLONIAL, POST-NATION STATE AFRICA" philosophies. At home (local and national levels), it is stipulated that all people should be involved in active participatory decision making process on matters that concern them. At the same time, all political forces should be part and parcel of the broad basedness of the movementocracy. However, some political forces are excluded from the mainstream; while others are included but peripherized (inclusion/exclusion). The opposition political forces therefore argue that the Movementocracy embodies principles which are too broad, basic, but non-specific to afford it with a guiding philosophy to withstand the test of time.[5]

It should be noted that Governance, which has economic, political, cultural, social and international dimensions, in an open concept which could be applied in a neutral manner. Generally democracy in the theory and application assumes a universal character. It is associated with freedom, individual liberties, security and order for citizens and the nation.

However, African States are not nations yet; there are struggling to build nations. At the global level, democracy is essential for achieving and maintenance of international peace, security and interdependence among states.

It remains to be stated that concepts arise from the minds and experiences of individuals and societies, in an attempt to justify emerging or already existing ideal or real situations.

The Movementocracy and Uganda's foreign policy could be explained in the foreign policy theoretical frameworks of Idealism, Decision making and Structuralism. At the Decision making level, the Rational Actor and Bureaucratic Politics models are major perspectives.

> The Rational Actor model seeks to understand foreign policy behaviour as the goal-directed consequence of rational calculation by decision makers: rational calculations that aim in some sense to maximise "the national interest".[6]
> The Bureaucratic politics model …….analyse policy in terms of the competing pressures exerted by different segments of the bureaucratic and political elites….to ensure that their own conception of the "the national interest" prevails.[7]

Structuralism in foreign policy presents three alternatives: "the Marxist", "World Society"

and "Structural-Realist" perspectives.

> The Marxist perspectives stresses the way in which the exigencies of the international capitalist system constraint the decision choices of national governments and seeks to establish why …..certain "fractions" of the capitalist class have benefited from Britain's post war foreign policy strategies.[8]

> The World Society perspective views foreign policy behaviour primary as a response to transactional processes and structures, placing particular emphasis on the extent to which the increasing interdependence of the contemporary world economy has eroded national decision, making autonomy.[9]

> Realism-as-structural-theory seeks to analyse changes in foreign policy strategy as the consequence of the shifting material and security interests of the state, concentrating particularly on the extent to which different states interests tend to converge or diverge over time.[10]

Expanding on Realism, Sanders argued that; there can not be `a global harmony of

interests' and therefore in a situation were the international system lack a world

government, the nation-state can never be sure that it is safe from external attack.[11]

The dominant theme or pre-occupation of foreign policy of any state is security.

Every state permanently risks being confronted by at least one potential aggressor which, if it is given the opportunity to do so, will seek to dominate and exploit any other state weaker than itself. ……..The overriding objective of a given state's foreign policy must be the achievement and maintenance of its security. This need to ensure security in turn requires both a strong defensive posture and the construction of alliances with other states which share similar security fears.

Ensuring security also requires that the state does all it can both to weaken the strategic position of its opponents and to ensure that friendly governments are installed (or maintained in power)..….in essence, is cynical, self-regarding calculation based on the paramount need to preserve national security.[12]

The other main perspective is the Idealism. It is true that Idealism does not determine foreign policy pursuits in real politi but has principles that guide or justify foreign policy.

Idealism is based on the assumption that all states ultimately share a common interest in avoiding war and in maximising mutually beneficial international economic exchange…Conflicts between states generally result either from injustice, mistrust or misunderstanding: a judicious combination of law and diplomacy can in principle remedy all three.[13]

However, post cold war developments have rendered the above theoretical perspectives inadequate. This has led to demands for new over-riding theory-searching in International Relations. As a result several scholars have come up with the Alternative Development Agenda or Thinking as a theoretical framework which attempts to bridge the gaps of other theories and to address the current contemporary developments in International Relations. The Alternative Development Agenda is therefore a major challenge to the existing theories in its attempts to "bridging the gap between theory and practice".[14]

The Alternative Development Agenda which relates Power to (In) Security and Ex/Inclusion demands several issues to be internalised and systematically analysed. First there is need to integrate research on a global, (regional), national and local levels.[15] For example, the process of globalisation is visible in the socio-economic and political dimensions, as these policies are streamlined globally. There is also a strong cultural impact imposing a western styled thinking.[16] Application of the Alternative Development Agenda on the theme of the paper puts Uganda's scholars at the crossroads of theory-building and/or theory application.

Second, the Agenda pays attention to Actor - oriented approach which emphasise the potentials of the actor to influence the structural condition and change. The Actor-oriented approach attempts to give an analysis of how a wide variety of people are able to find new development directions. The paper deals with new regional development directions of the Movementocracy and foreign policy. Here the bases and characteristics of power positions of the actors are examined within the Great Lakes Region Security complexes. Attention is put on persons in the decisions making process as well as public opinion. Here factual data and peoples' perceptions of the relationships and situations are mapped out.

Third, Movementocracy and foreign policy need to take into account the relationships between Power positions and serious Exclusion seen as a major cause of insecurity. At the same time insecurity breeds exclusion from the development process. National and regional security, cooperation and development underpin the Movementocracy and Uganda's foreign policy. The paper should be seen in the light that the Region comprises states which are attempting democratic governance. In Uganda and the region, elements that make up state power, the quality or efficacy of the governmental structure that enables the state to stand up successfully to both internal and external challenges to its existence and operations are weak or totally absent. A nation state that lacks appropriate arrangements for governance is bound to suffer the prevalence of internal insecurity and conflict.[17]

Therefore, Movementocracy and Uganda's foreign policy are operated or operating in a region with the common destiny, characterised by a commonality of conflict, turbulence and insecurity. This form of common destiny poses a challenge to national and regional security, co-existence, co-operation and development. The Alternative Development Agenda is an essential theoretical framework in an attempt to analyse of the regional policy of the Movementocracy within the Great Lakes Region Security complexes. Buzan defines security complexes as:

> A group of states whose primary security concerns link together sufficiently closely
> that their national securities cannot realistically be considered apart from one another
> … Security complexes emphasise the inter-dependencies of rivalry as well as that of
> shared interests.[18]

The Alternative Development Agenda is an important theoretical framework in the analysis of the MOVEMENTOCRACY AND UGANDA'S FOEIGN POLICY WITHIN THE GREAT LAKES REGION SECURITY COMPLEXES.

A Historical Background to the Movementocracy in the Alternative Development Agenda debate

Several scholars and writers have analysed the Movementocracy from the times of the Uganda Patriotic Movement (UPM) in 1980 up to the present. They have overlaboured the type of governance in terms of domestic politics, missing the regional, continental and global dimensions. In this paper it is argued that the history of the Movementocracy highlights the inter- connections at the local, national, regional, continental and international levels of Uganda's foreign policy in the turbulent region.

Some scholars and writers have asserted that

> The movement system is too closely related to the phenomenon of one-party states,
> whereas political parties are part and parcel of the new era of African Liberation
> (second independence) from militarism.[19]

It is important to note that the Movementocracy has no direct semblance to a one-party, or non-party systems of governance. It is not a system, but a political organisation whose backbone is not politics but the military. The National Resistance Movement (NRM) and the National Resistance Army (NRA) are fused where the military override all political considerations. It is important to note that by its nature and characteristics the military is

exclusive and not trained to manage affairs of the state. However, one could argue that this assertion belongs to the old school in military science, but Africa needs to revisit this old school.

The pro-Movementocracy advocates contend that:

> The political system which is required should be that meets the needs of Uganda which as an African society needs a system oriented towards consensus rather than confrontation, a need which the movement system meets best. [20]

The Movementocracy, while putting too much emphasis on consensus, which is one of the ingredients of democratic practice, undermines the real essence of democracy. Confrontation, disagreements and other opposing or critique- views are all important for the development of the democratic traditions,, institutions and values in any given society. Confrontation is not the obvious scientific opposite of consensus.

During the NRM bush war, it is important to note that this rebel movement was unique in the region. It was the first successful rebel movement stationed in the country of origin to attempt to take over political power.

At the local and national levels the bush war inflicted untold sufferings on the people in the Luwero Triangle and Uganda as a whole. At the national level, resources by the central government were spent, to fend off the rebels. This affected several areas of national development and security; and also affected relationships between Uganda and her neighbours and the international community as a whole.

The British government attempted to achieve a soft landing of the NRM into political power, through foreign assistance to the central government, military training, logistics and training to the police as well as through the Nairobi Peace Talks. However, the NRA/M was bent on removing the ancient regimes in Uganda and the region.

The emergence of the struggle by the National Resistance Army (NRA) in early 1980s posed a major problem in Anglo-Ugandan relations. Attempts by the British government to restore stability during the NRA struggle was tremendous. The issue of law and order in Uganda continued to be a major problem as Museveni embarked on a guerrilla war to topple the Obote government. The Obote regime had lost grip with the conduct and discipline of the national army leading to the General Tito Okello's coup in 1985.

Given the strategic and historical relations with Uganda, law and order continue to be a priority for the British government. Note that Britain was the former colonial power in East Africa. Under the Okello administration, the British made an attempt to employ the British police volunteers in a bid to stop the rampant killings which had become a common place in Uganda.

> Now the British had stepped in with an offer to help the savaged commonwealth country. The Government has privately pledged to send military ruler Tito Okello a further pound 6 million, doubling the present level of aid. Much of it will go to beefing up the police force. The crack 80 strong trained team of British bobbies will be made up of volunteers.[21]

The above police assistance was purposed

> to train as quickly as possible a CID style force so that Uganda's sinister and savage secret police can be disbanded. The team will also organise a 999 emergency call network so police can pounce on the mobs of looters and muggers who roam free around Kampala. The plan is to increase the size of the Ugandan police force from 9000 to 13000.[22]

The British offer did not materialise. The conditions put before Okello by the British High Commission (Kampala) were impossible to fulfil under the circumstances pertaining in Uganda. Okello was also losing military and political grounds under the Museveni guerrilla war. The members of the House of Commons also disagreed with the offer on grounds of continued violations of human rights and individual freedoms in the Obote and Okello regimes. Under such conditions, the security and safety of the British police volunteers could not be assured.

The British High Commissioner in Kampala, Colin Mc Lean reaffirmed the conditions of the offer to Okello in these terms.

> To put his house in order and muzzle his gun totting troops. The law and order offer was secretly put to the warring factions by the British diplomats during peace talks in Nairobi which for three months have been trying to end the civil war. ….that those atrocities must stop and stop now. Unless they do, we cannot help at all.[23]

A similar message was made in September 1985 by the Foreign Minister, Malcolm Rufkind. The British economic assistance was to be increased on condition that Okello forms a stable political order. However, stability of Uganda was not forthcoming under the war-torn situation. Even after the overthrow of Tito Okello's regime by Museveni in 1986, Britain put emphasis on the development of the police. It should be noted that during President Museveni's visit to Britain in 1986 discussions were held on a wide range of issues, but law and order was the main concern as the basis for security, co operation, stability and development.

A new Britain police assistance package was agreed between Museveni and the British government. Under these new arrangements, the British government provided training and logistics to Uganda Police and Prisons. The package included 43 Land Rovers and communications equipments.

It should be noted that at the time of toppling Okello, the British Military Advisory and Training Team (BMATT) was still in Uganda. However, the BMATT had suspended army training in September 1985. The decision was taken because of the uncertainty of the outcomes of the raging Museveni guerilla war, increased indiscipline and torture of the people and the violations of human rights contributed as before.[24]

It should be noted that although military aid to Uganda was suspended the BMATT remained in the country because the contract had not expired. The presence of British troops in Uganda led to rebel Museveni making allegations that Okello was getting military support through Egypt from the Western countries. This was a major setback to the Nairobi Peace Talks. This was followed by the following argument that:

The British Government seems to have approved the employment by the Ugandan Army of Defense Systems Ltd., a British company (to fit out helicopters as gunships). …DSL doesn't operate abroad without the knowledge and approval of Whitehall.[25]

During the Nairobi Peace Talks, the Moi-Okello idea of a Commonwealth Peacekeeping Force was rejected by Museveni. The Britrish diplomats at those talks also supported the idea. The Commonwealth Peacekeeping Force was to establish stability and restore law and order in Uganda. This was to be achieved by separating and disarming the warring forces, training a new Uganda army and bringing in foreign police forces to Uganda.

The Commonwealth Peacekeeping Forces was to include Britain, Canada, India, Nigeria, Kenya and Tanzania. Museveni argued that the idea was driving Uganda back in into the Commonwealth Military Advisory and Training Team, which ceased in 1984. This time on a bigger scale. The peacekeeping force, like the Nairobi Peace Talks and Agreements of 17th December 1985, came to nothing.[26]

 The Movementocracy governance, 1986-2003.

Against that historical background, when the NRM took over state power in Uganda, it had a lot to do at home, regionally and globally. Under the Nairobi Peace Talks, the Ugandan problem was seen as a regional one. Instability in Uganda was seen as a threat to security and stability in the region. The collapse of the Nairobi Peace Talks were seen as a failure of Kenya and Britain in creating a new political order devoid of increased spill of blood. It was a victory of the rebel Movement of Museveni which was feared would spillover into the region. It should be noted that Britain was fed up with instability and coups in Uganda. This state of affairs led to a "pull out-back in" situation in the Anglo-Uganda relations.

It was also argued that instability in Uganda was a threat to the Commonwealth and British private and public economic and strategic interests in Kenya. The British decision to suspend all military aid to Uganda in September 1985 was aimed at reducing conflicts among the several warring factions.

It should be also noted that British involvement in the Nairobi Peace Talks was not symbolic but a practical move to achieve peaceful solutions to Uganda's political, constitutional and security problems. The British and other Western governments have been involved in several bilateral and multilateral operations in Uganda which aimed at achieving a stable democratic society and government. These include assistance to armed forces, demobilisation, civil service reforms, democratisation processes, educational, economic, financial and other assistances.

At the request of President Museveni the British Foreign Office Minister, Lynda Chalker paid an official visit to Kampala in 1986. She was accompanied by Major General Anthony Pollard. The Museveni-Chalker talks included financial and material assistance to the "boy" soldiers to be rehabilitated back to Kadogo schools, increase in the British defence training presence (BMATT). Major General Pollard, at the suggestion of Moi, was appointed the Head of BMATT to advise on military matters. President Moi made no secret of his anxiety

to see calm return to Uganda.[27] It should be noted that Uganda is the major market for Kenya. This include products from Kenyan, British and Western industries in Kenya. There is need to examine Uganda's position and role as Kenya's market to the security and stability of Uganda and the region.

New military relations between Uganda and Britain under the NRM emerged with different approaches and fears. However, when the BMATT contract expired in November 1986, it was not renewed. Museveni's argument was that the approach to reorganisation of the NRA was different from the British. Others reasons are that

> The BMATT contingent, which left Uganda in mid-November, was not popular with NRA (National Resistance Army) as it had trained the army of the former President, Milton Obote, which the NRA fought before it ceased power a year ago…….the obstacles to the renewal of BMATT contract is Kampala's refusal to agree that British soldiers who committed capital offences in Uganda may be tried in Britain. In compromise, Colonel Llewellin has been granted diplomatic status for his posting.[28]

Still the British appointed Colonel Robert Llewellin as Military Advisor to the NRA, re-emphasizes the long held British traditions in this area. This illustrates the global context of Uganda's and the Great Lakes security complexes from one of the former colonial powers.

It should be noted the NRA/M was very much aware of global trends, although it was still embedded into anti-colonial rhetoric in its domestic and foreign policies. This is emphasized by the NRM Ten Points Programme which put emphasis on Democratisation, Security, Regional and global interactions, and issues relating to domestic, regional and global ex /inclusion and (de)-marginalisation.[29] The Ten Points Programme should be assessed in the Alternative Development Agenda framework which examines the relationships between Power, Ex/Inclusion and (In) Security at local, national, (regional) and global levels.[30]

The NRM rhetoric about the West were soon hijacked by economic realities in Uganda regionally and globally. Uganda immediately embraced the British under the Lynda Chalker - Museveni arrangements and such a state of affairs have continued under the Museveni - Claire Short in 2001-2002. At the same time in 1987, the Museveni regime wholesomely embraced the World Bank/IMF conditionalities, save the western donor democratic agenda.

It should be noted that even if Britain, the Commonwealth and other Western countries do not officially approve of overthrowing elected governments and do believe in political pluralism, they have tolerated the NRM for bringing some sanity in the damned country, at the cost of democratic governance. The western governments have also played a role in delaying the democratic process in Uganda for the sake of their own national interests; and misreading the democratic trends in Africa.
For instance, the British government has continued to use kids' gloves to the democratisation processes in Uganda as opposed to an iron fist on Kenya, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe. However, some western governments have tended to read the political barometer in Uganda

and are beginning to put increased pressure on the NRM administration in regard to domestic and regional security and political pluralism.

It is true that under the NRM, Uganda's foreign policy has been very assertive and visible in relation to Kenya, DRC, Rwanda, Tanzania, Burundi and the Sudan. It has been argued by Uganda, the regional and the international community that the problems relating to ethnicity, strife, conflicts, wars, development and regional security and cooperation in the Great Lakes region cannot be understood or resolved outside Uganda. Uganda has given itself or has been given a high profile, visible and essential position and role in the Great Lakes region, which it has vigorously embraced at a high cost.

Stability, security and development of Uganda are important and fundamental to regional stability, security and development; and vice versa. The Museveni letter of October 2001 to UK's Claire Short regarding Rwanda's activities; diplomatic shuttling of Western, the Commonwealth, the EU and the United Nations; and Western support for Africa's regional arrangements like the East African Community and IGAD emphasize the position and role of western countries in the security and political imbroglios within the Great Lakes region.

It also emphasises the position and role of Uganda as the regional bridge between Anglophones and Francophones; and in the fight against Islamic fundamentalism in the Sudan and the region; and international and regional terrorism. The democratisation process and security are important for Uganda to acquire an increased assertive and visible stature, and capabilities in engaging domestic, regional and global issues as well as bringing western countries in the fore front in Uganda and the Great Lakes region in dealing with issues of security, conflict and development.

DEMOCRATISATION OR ``DEMOCRACISITIZATON" OF UGANDA'S FOREIGN POLICY UNDER THE NRM

This part of the paper attempts to put the theoretical, rhetorics and practices of the Movementocracy on a democratic- non-democratic continuum. The paper has alluded to the democratic theory and practice in the earlier part.

The arrival of the NRA/M into political power, even if through the barrel of the bush gun, in January 1986, symbolized some green light at the end of the political tunnel of Uganda's decadent political history. The NRM administration was seen as a transition to superior forms of democratic governance and therefore the most likely hope for Uganda. However, instead of NRM being a transition, there is permanency; and with all its 'democratisation" attempts, Uganda is experiencing "democracisitization" instead.

"Democracisitization", means merely talking about democracy by the political leadership, while the political framework, values, institutions and activities point towards suffocation, patronization and personalization of the democratic process. The state of democracisity breeds political anxiety, exclusion, marginalization, ambiguity, ambivalence and intolerance to any views from the local, national, regional, continent and international domains. Eventually the situation generates or degenerates into non- receiptivity, non-responsivity, intolerance and violence which spillover in the regional arena inviting sharp local ,national,

regional and international diplomatic, military and economic and other reactions and actions.

When transition becomes permanent and the basis for democratic governance monopolized by the former rebels, now turned New Breed of African leaders, elections violence becomes a weapon for the governments as well as the opposition groups, electrifying the local national and regional body politik. The re-packaged New Breed of African leaders, reduce democratization processes to purely and merely elections. It should be noted here that elections is one of the major pillars of democracy. However, there is need to have a competitive, free, fair , safe and quick election process where people express their free will, while remaining free and secure. In Uganda, elections are held regularly in order to legitimize the NRM regime, for fundraising from the donors, appeasement to donors and exciting or intimidating the populace. In Uganda, there has never been genuine political goodwill, political convictions, and political commitment on the part of the leadership to the democratization processes. Therefore, elections are held within the regime's legal, political, economic and social frameworks purposed at blocking any emergence of new political dispensations, especially those which appeal to the Western democratic ideals and Ugandan people. In regular elections, the NRM regime is fully equipped to rig and intimidate the populace , before, during and after the elections.

Such a state of affairs creates political stalemate or stand offs amongst politicians, activists and the people. This is punctuated by frustrations, fears, intimidation and violence. The emerging condition lead to more democracisitization on the part of the regime and the opposing forces ending in more oppression, repression, alienation of the ruling elite and political underdevelopment of the body-politik. In the Uganda case, such situations have spilled over into the regional and global foreign policy domains with greater consequences on the national and regional security, co operation and development.

The obvious situation leads to a climate of arrogant use of state and extra-state mechanisms in response to challenges from those who challenge the NRM's permanently transitional movementocratic governance. This is done by the leader or government in power in order to create regime survival and physical legitimizaiton conditions in its favour at any cost. Within the movementocracy there are two processes running counter to each other- verbally democratization and practically democracisitization; where the latter cancels out the
 "achievements" of the former. Thinking, timing and environment are necessary in pursuing this new interesting aspect of Uganda's "Two steps Backwards and One step Forward" approach to democracy. This is a recipe for more crises in Uganda and the region; and the search for security and development becomes more costly than before .

Ten Point Programme - the basis for the Movementocratic   Foreign Policy in the Great Lakes region.

The famous Ten Pont Programme produced during the NRM bush war was the ideological and rhetorical basis for the Movementocracy. The document was a mixture of old socialist rhetorics, modern capitalist and old Pan Africanist ideals typical of the neo-colonial situation. The NRM was aware of the changing global trends which emphasized globalization, liberalisation and democrcratisation. But the document was more for

domestic consumption by the military and the populace, but with heavy consequencies for Uganda, the region and internationally.

The Ten Point programme put a lot of emphasis on **Democracy, Security and regional cooperation** within the Pan African context.

The first point of the Ten Point Programme was **Democracy**. The NRA/M struggle was viewed as against unfair, unfree and rigged elections in 1980. The struggle for democratic change in Uganda waged by the NRA/M was protracted, internally organised and unique in the region. The struggle sent shock waves to the leadership and regimes in the region.

It should be noted that the 1981-1986 bush war attempted to justify its existence and operations using Marxist-Leninist principles and dogmas. This state of affiars attracted concerns among the Great Lakes regional leaders and some western countries. The NRM administration was also of the view that its form of democratization should start in Uganda and then spread to the region and eventually engulf the whole of Africa.

Emphasizing democracy was also a means to "conform" to the western global democratic agenda. The agenda stipulated clearly that the issues of security, peace, co-operation and development of the Two-Thirds World could only be achieved through democratization of their political systems. This was a new look at the world order in the absence of the soviet system.

> Since the beginning of 1990, distinct demands for democratization began to be made on African countries as a new condition for aid by both multilateral financial institutions, mainly the World Bank and the IMF, and the major Western countries.[31]

Therefore democratisation in the name of ``good governance" became one of the elements of foreign policies of donors, towards the developing countries. Apart from the collapse of the soviet system, many states emerged out of the system, increased chauvinistic nationalisms and proliferation of nuclear weapons demand the new element of `good governance" by the west. It emphasized redrawing and redesigning new political, economic, social and military relations with Africa. Taggling Aid to ``Good Governance" meant that Africa had to re- address and and and re-introduce new elements in its conditions in order to compete for assistance from the West.

Democratizaiton, especially regular elections, were used by the New Breed of African leaders to effect their political agenda of leadership survival and forceful legitimization. The NRM argued that apart from Western influence on Africa, Africa's fate was cemented by undemocratic and anti-people leadership. Therefore, the NRM was of the view that a new form of democracy should be planted in Uganda as to engulf the whole continent. ``There are a lot of mockeries of ``democracy" around the globe."[32]

On the point of **security**, the issue was conceptualised and practiced within extra-Uganda context by the Movementocracy. Security was seen in terms of personal security, security of property, end of state inspired violence and criminal violence, militarisation of the population, politicisation of the army and police, end to corruption; and above all militarisation and democratization of institutions and values.

Ugandans and many other Africans have been living under insecurity in the very elementary sense of the word-----It is only now in the liberated areas of NRM that Ugandans are beginning to know that African rule can provide security.[33]

On the point of **National Unity and Sectarianism**, the Ten Point Programme stipulates that
One of the principal causes of strife in Uganda and Africa in general has been lack of national unity. Not only did it enable foreign powers to colonize Africa and ensure the perpetuation of colonialism for much longer than would have been the case but sectarianism had enabled dicatators and idiots to emerge, take power illegally and perpetuate their stay in power with much greater ease.[34]

The other point which deals with **"Defence and Consolidation of National Independence"** is critical of "circumscribed boundaries" and independence itself. The document is very emphatic on the above Points and the blame is put squarely on African Leadership:
Nevertheless, the main blame for the failure of African independence must be on the African leaders themselves. It is escapist to blame the former colonial rulers or the United States. After all decolonisation—although tactical—was, nevertheless, a retreat resulting from the worldwide transformation of relations between the masters and subject peoples. If the African leaders had wanted, they could have exercised their independence. Many of them were, however, not equal to the task— intellectually, ideologically, politically, and particularly morally. They saw independence as a concession to be used for purposes of self-enrichment by all means including smuggling.[35]

Museveni on Leadership in the document continued to argue that

We are convinced that some of the post-independent African leaders are the ones that are just hopelessly out of depth and have got to look for scapegoats. Africa, since independence, has been tossed between, on the one hand idiotic quislings that are mere "caricatures" of the worst aspects of the European middle class and, on the other hand, middle-headed "revolutionary" ideologies of Fabian, murderers and a variety of other opportunists, who spend more time putting people in preventive detention, when they are not murdering them, and spew out policies and papers that are not within a thousand miles of real dynamics of the situation than solving the problems of the continent. That is why African independence has almost begun to look as if it is a non-viable proposition.[36]

The country to operate successfully in the global economy, the Fifth Point put emphasis on **"Building an Independent, Integrated and Self-sustaining National Economy"**. The document states that
Uganda, being a microcosm of the African situation, is a backward, underdeveloped country whose only progress is the "development of the underdevelopment".…. The fundamental cause of this underdevelopment is the structural intertwinement with the economies of the developed countries of the West on an unequal basis.[37]

The state of affairs as such resulted into "basic malformations, outflow of resources" and dependence on export of less competitive raw materials. In order to ensure the development of Democratic Governance in Uganda and the Great Lakes region emphasis should be put on reordering the economy. Several examples are given in the document which emphasise interlinkages among African countries in manufacturing, medicine, agriculture, tourism and other industries; new linkages and even de-linkages with the developed world in some aspects.

The final point (10th Point) of the programme document deals with **"Cooperation with other African countries in defending Human and Democratic Rights of our brothers in other parts of Africa"**. The document states that
> One of the weaknesses of Africa is the balkanization of Africa into small and sometimes, uneconomic units…..Greater unity gives them (the West) a larger market for their industries and a diversity of resources. In Africa we have got more reasons to search for this type of cooperation."[38]

The NRM administration has attempted to emphasize regional economic cooperation through Preferential Trade Area, (PTA), Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), and the revival of the East African Economic Cooperation.

However, on the issue of political cooperation the document spells out a historically important and fundamental view point of the Movementocracy governance:
> The existing boundaries of Africa have no logic at all except for the colonial interests they were designed to serve. Even the represent boundaries of Uganda were fixed in an off-hand way. The same is true of the Kenya-Uganda border, Uganda-Rwanda, etc, etc.
>
> The point here is not to encourage wrangles over borders but rather to highlight the irrationality behind the present entities and re-enforce the argument for close co-operation among African states in order to defeat the balkanisation and maximise advantage among themselves to be able to usefully compete with other world powers.[39]

The issue of economic and political cooperation is seen in terms of Democratic governance, leadership and resources in Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, Burundi, Sudan, DRC and even the Greater Horn of Africa as well as the whole of Africa. The document also puts emphasis on "an economic strategy of mixed economy".[39] Movementocracy in its principle and practices embodies a " post neo-colonial,post-nation state" philosophy, which has no sympathies with existing African boundaries and states.   The existing boundaries are foreign and undermine Africa unity, development, stability , security and an African common market.

The document advances several solutions to the Uganda, the Great Lakes region and Africa's problems. However, at the basis of all is the issue of Democratic Governance:
> Apart from seeking cooperation with other African countries, Uganda, having suffered so greatly at the hands of primitive dictators, ought to play an active part in defending the human and democratic rights of the African people in general. Dictators impede progress because they stop debates on development options and

allow thieves and nincompoops to remain in power doing whatever damage they are capable of. Without democracy and the human dignity of the African people, Africa will never develop it, even mere debate about, let alone the actuality of development is hardly taking place. The people are too frightened to comment on the actions of the omnipotent rulers that have got powers of life and death over every citizen of their countries. Rulers can squander resources with impunity; they can violate human rights of the people with impunity. Democracy, therefore, becomes a sine-quanon to development. We ought to oppose dictatorship in Africa.[41]

The "Movement Fifteen Point Programme" (1999) did not only emphasize Uganda in the region but the region as the key to Africa's ills.[42] Uganda's ills can only be solved by handling Africa's ills first and fast or at the same time. Movementocracy governance therefore believes that African ills could be solved through a combination of foreign investment, force and diplomacy. Here, again the issues of exporting and imposing democratic governance outside Uganda falls under heavy scrutiny in terms of national, regional and international values, norms and laws.

By examining the principles and programmes of the Movementocracy is it possible to implicitly and explicitly detect the NRM's regional perceptions, motives, attitudes and dimensions embedded in them. Let it be noted that scholars and writers on the guiding principles of the NRM have over-laboured the debate in terms of domestic politics. However, right from the beginning of the NRM emphasis was on changing the basics and dynamics of the economy and politics in the Great Lakes region and Africa as a whole.

Movementocracy in a Wider Context

When the NRM came to power, the country was in ruins; and the new administration promised Ugandans and the world a new democratic Uganda, **NOW!:**
> NO ONE should think that what is happening today is a mere change of guard: it is a fundamental change in the politics of our country. In Africa, we have seen so many changes, that change, as such, is nothing short of mere turmoil. We have had one group getting rid of another one, only for it to turn out to be worse then the group it displaced. Please do not count us in that group of people: the National Resistance Movement is a clear-headed movement with clear objectives and a good membership".[43]

In Muveseni's swearing-in address on 29th January 1986 entitled **"Ours is a fundamental change"** he stated that
> Our deliberate policy to ensure that we uplift the quality of politics in our country….The first point in our programme is the restoration of democracy. The people of Africa—the people of Uganda—are entitled to democratic government. It is not a favour from any government: it is the right of the people of Africa to have democratic government. The sovereign power in the land must be the population, not the government. The government should not be the master, but the servant of the people.[44]

The swearing-in address was received with skepticism by the Western countries, donors, Africa, and Ugandans. It was pregnant with Marxist/Socialist rhetorics which did not augur well with free market economics and Western "Good" governance agenda of the time.

Uganda needed assistance from the West and therefore there was need to change the tone in NRM rhetorics. The end of the Cold War demonstrated that Africa was in total dire-straits. Uganda needed to improve on its image internationally. Museveni quickly captured the situation. This was the time when the United States and some western countries had been discredited as supporters dictators.[45] The West was shopping for new African allies to clear their name and clean their image on the African continent:.

> Africa was led by despots and dictators protected by the West for economic gain or through "we- do not-care" attitude….(however) The United States, Western Europe and other donors made new demands in an attempt to control or streamline Africa. The New political conditionalities were tried to aid… democratisation, good governance, free market, aid, transparency, accountability, openness, good government, human rights were the new menu for Africa.[46]

The styles of removal of decadent (ancient) regimes in Uganda, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Eriteria with Museveni as one of the central figures encouraged the West to count on him as the leader of the New Breed of African Leaders. To fight fundamentalist (Islamic) regimes in Africa, especially in the Sudan, Museveni was seen by the West as the right human weapon for this venture. However, the contradiction here is that Museveni was also a "very good friend" of Mummar Al Gaddafi of Libya. Museveni and Gaddafi claimed to have "politically correct lines" to be exported continentally and internationally. The Third Universal Theory and the Movementocracy share some common elements. In this context however, the Movementocracy was practically being seen by Western governments to fulfil their foreign policies of engaging Gaddafi through Museveni. Given Uganda's historical and contemporary situations, it is very easy to bend Uganda to Western demands than Gaddafi's Libya.

Movementocracy was given full support by the Western English speaking countries to deal with Rwanda, Burundi and Zaire (DRC) for various reasons. However, the consequences are still felt and alive. This is not part of our debate in this paper.

 Movementocracy and the Crises in the Great Lakes Region

There are fundamentally several crises in the Great Lakes region: the economic, political, military, diplomatic and international in dimensions but manifesting themselves in various shades.

Uganda's involvement in Rwanda has got a long history.[47] However, total commitment to resolving the Rwandan crises was spearheaded by the Movementocracy leadership. Right from 1986 the Movementocracy governance was bent on resolving the Rwandese refugee issue, leadership and a new political dispensation in Rwanda.

The Gabiro 1st October 1990 invasion of Rwanda after several half baked negotiations amongst states in the Great Lakes region, raised Uganda at a high profile in the region. Uganda had to ensure that what could have been the Gabiro debacle must positively changed at whatever costs. The Uganda government put in financial, material, materiel, human power, and political energies

and resources to ensure that the Rwandese refugees from Uganda take over political power from Habyarimana in Rwanda. This was in the national interest of Uganda in light of resolving the crises in Uganda, Rwanda and the region. There was need to have change in leadership and relationships with Rwanda. This was the bottom line of the NRA/M (and RPA/RPF) struggles and administrations.

The creation and maintenance of the Rwandese Patriotic Front (RPF) and Rwanda Patriotic Army (RPA) were within the NRA/M perspective. A framework meant that Uganda had taken on a foreign policy of direct involvement in Rwanda and the Great Lakes region.

> Most of the young men and women who had participated in the Uganda guerrilla war were Banyarwanda refugees living in Uganda. Some of them acquired very high ranks and positions in both the government and army.[48]

Discussions among the leaders in the Great Lakes region aimed at solving the Rwandan refugee problem amicably. However, the Gabiro and the subsequent genocide created a new situation for the NRM administration. The NRM administration put a lot of pressure on Habyarimana administration on bilateral and multilateral levels positive but results were not forthcoming. The NRM solution was to remove the political obstacles by encouraging the RPA/F to take over power in Kigali. The RPA/F took over power in Kigali.

The NRM administration tried all its best to ensure that the new RPF regime in Rwanda had to survive. Already Rwanda and the Great Lakes region had been put in turmoil. There was also the danger of the RPF, RPA and the Rwandan refugees returning to Uganda when the RPF regime collapses in Kigali. The Movementocracy was, already in the thick of Rwanda providing financial, personnel, logistics, political and other material support to the RPF/RPA.

Other explanations could be raised. The presence of Banyarwanda in top political and military positions as well as their role in Uganda proved a threat to the Movementocracy governance before the Gabiro incident. Other scholars have put emphasis on the ethnic connection between the Hima in Uganda, and the Tutsi in Rwanda. Other scholars have put emphasis on Uganda assuming the role of a regional hegemon.

The situation in Burundi was also worsening. Democratic governance could not take root amidst ethnic and military battle lines. Two presidents were assassinated and a Buyoya coup took place. The NRM administration was the first to demand the imposition of sanctions against Burundi while at the same time providing sanctuary to the Burundian renegades. Since then Uganda has been the vanguard for restoring order and stability in Burundi! President Museveni is the Chairman of regional and continental initiatives to restore security, stability and the functioning state in Burundi.

The Movementocracy since 1986 has experienced alot of domestic resistance in Northern Uganda, West Nile, Kampala, the Eastern and Western Uganda. The Northern and Western resistance were attributed to the support of the Sudanese government. It is the Movement position that the people of Southern Sudan should have the right to make decisions that affect their lives. Uganda's support for Garang is well known. This stand earned the NRM support from the United States and western Europe. But for reasons of fighting Islamic fundamentalism in the Great Lakes region. Let it be noted here that Uganda severed diplomatic and other relations with the Sudan. And in 2000, Uganda successfully de-campaigned the Sudan on the UN Security Council.

Finally, Uganda's deep involvement in Zaire and later the Democratic Republic of Congo has sunk the Movementocracy into muddy waters and a bloody situation. Uganda's involvement in the removal of Mobutu could be explained in several ways. As stated earlier Mobutu regime represented the Ancient Regimes in the Great Lakes region. Mobutu was no longer an asset or a liability for the West. Museveni after swallowing the IMF and World Bank new conditionalities wholesale was the probable candidate by the English speaking West to the position and role of the regional leader and statesman.

Since Uganda was the key sponsor and sustainer of the RPF regime in Kigali, it was inevitable for Uganda to come to Kagame to assist him in the fight against the Interahamwe stationed in Zaire (DRC). The departure of Mobutu left a political vacuum which Kabila and his Uganda and Rwandan sponsors could not easily fill. The issues of nationalism, natural resources, new configurations of political and strategic forces began to show cracks in the Kabila-Kagame-Kaguta concoction. The cracks were sharpening to the level of Uganda sending more troops to the DRC to remove Kabila. Even after the assassination of Laurent Kabila in January 2001, Uganda has increased its troop presence in the DRC under Joseph Kabila. Uganda has been the King maker or King destroyer of the rebel groups fighting the Kabila regime.

It was in the interest of Kagame and Museveni to get rid of Kabila before cementing himself in power. This arrangement backfired. Up to now the Great Lakes region is in total hot war. It is very important to emphasize here that there is need to demilitarize political dialogue domestically and in the Great Lakes region.

Concluding Remarks

The paper has attempted to discuss a wide range of issues related to the Movementocracy governance experiment with reference to the Great Lakes region. The Movementocracy governance has had mixed feelings at home and abroad. However, the foreign observers and analysts have for long applied the `Wait-and-See' or `Give-it-a-chance' approach. Let it be noted here that the Movementocracy governance has come under serious fire fro western countries and people during the 2001 Presidential elections. There are cracks in the organisation especially during the election campaigns on issues of foreign policy and militarism of the NRM administration in the Great Lakes region.

By 1986 Uganda was labelled as a "collapsed state" by Western scholarship and political practitioners. However, the Movementocracy had restored some political and economic sanity. Marxist-turned-Free Marketeer, Museveni could do "good business" with the western financial institutions and donors. This meant that countries in the Great Lakes region needed to learn from the new experiment in Uganda in order to be accepted and accommodated by the Western donor community.

Movementocracy was clothed in concepts like broad-based, non-sectarian, people participation, democracy and transparency. For instance the Resistance Committees (RCs) and Resistance Councils (RCs) were of interest to Uganda, the Great Lakes region and to the donors. RCs aimed at ensuring people participation in democratic decisions that affect their lives in terms of the "grassroots" democracy. This approach could be experimented in the Great Lakes region.

However, in Uganda itself these committees and councils were recaptured by the NRM organisation and the NRM state. Therefore, in practice the Movementocracy was slowly but surely removing people from the "democratic" process. It is of interest to note that while the 1995 Constitution of Uganda enshrines what is in practice is a somewhat "one-party", "no-party", "party-less", "non-party" system of governance, Museveni preaches and encourages democratization in the Great Lakes region as the only way forward for stability and development. The Museveni Gospel is even backed up by the use of hot war and converting donors especially the Clintonian administration into his regional militaristic crusade. Let it be noted here that ACRI collapsed due to the militaristic and adventuristic nature of the Movementocracy governance. Also the 2001 President George W. Bush administration has argued that the Clinton administration has been sympathetic to the war mongering regime of Museveni by using kids gloves. And that Bush administration is going to influence the international financial institutions especially World Bank and IMF to stop financial assistance to Uganda if it does not pull out of the Congo and stop supporting Congolese rebels. At the moment, the Bushian administration is embracing the Sudanese, Kenyan and Tanzanian governments more than Uganda, especially after the World Trade Centre terrorist attack and the Al-Queda war.

Events in Uganda, Rwanda, the Sudan, Burundi, Kenya, Tanzania (especially Zanzibar), DRC, Congo Brazzavile, Eriteria and Ethiopia indicate that the Movementocracy governance has several loopholes which need to be cleared at home before being marketed in the Great Lakes region and Africa. It indicates that the MRM experiment has in-built weaknesses and could only held by personalities and militarism. In itself, this is detrimental to national and regional security, democracy, co operation, stability and development.

Issues relating to economic, political and diplomatic relations indicate that the type of governance in Uganda is not focussed at the domestic and external levels. However, Uganda's history, NRM militarism and diplomacy, and donor support have painted Uganda in different shades. Therefore, the transition road to real democracy where people's liberty, freedom, fraternity, liberation, equality and thought are realised have got sharp bends.

At the domestic level the Movementocracy has been dogged by disagreements, corruption, ethnicity, regional imbalances, militarization and this has affected the economy and political stability and development. The Movementocracy which promised **"Fundamental Change"** in 1986, had moved to **"No Change"** in 1996. At present the Yellow Bus symbolizes Hobbesian philosophy of **"Perpetual Fear of Change"** in the 21st Century. The 2001 election campaigns clearly indicate that state of affairs.

Communism for seventy two (72) years was tightly in control in the USSR, the Movementocracy governance experiment need to take lessons from the Soviet experiment. Note be made that the role and position of the people in transition to democracy should be encouraged. Institutionalized leadership than personalized leadership should be encouraged. Theoretically and practically the state should be seen as a protector and facilitator of people's wishes and national interests rather than an instrument of oppression and personal self interests. There could be light at the end of the tunnel when the Movementocracy encourages its leadership to open up political space. However, up to now the Movementocracy governance does not encourage competition and democracy in the movement organisation itself and actually hates multiparty democracy. Alas! The closure of the political space has led to militarization of domestic and external politics in Uganda and the Great

Lakes region. The Movementocracy could help in solving regional problems if it puts its house in order and also avoid setting fire on the neighbours' houses. Since 1986 the Movementocracy governance has set burning fire on the neighbours and then turns around to act as the Fire Brigade in the region.

The advocates and practitioners of the Movementocracy have not convinced the opulation and even themselves that the rule could led to development, security, stability, regional peace, regional cooperation, freedom and democracy itself. By constitutionally and politically freeing political pluralism, Movementocracy would show itself to the whole world that the form of governance is actually new in Uganda, the region and Africa; and could stand a test of time. However, historical and contemporary situations are full of live and living examples that Movementocracy can only be sustained through personification, patronalization and militarization of political and economic power at home and in the region. De-personalization and de-militarization of the Movementocracy governance could be a new domestic and regional re packaging which could be marketable! But up to now it has been difficult, next to impossible, to sell the Movementocracy governance - in principle and practice in the Great Lakes region, let alone in Uganda itself. The domestic and foreign policy under the Movementocracy should re-address the issues of real democratisation and backing off drom democracisitisation , by opening up political space and using peaceful foreign policy tools, than war, in its foreign policy in the region. The March 2001 Presidential elections raised a lot of issues in the foreign policy domain which the Uganda government should embrace and address in order to achieve national and regional peace, security, cooperation, co-existence stability and development.

1. Aaron K.K. Mukwaya (2000) "Uganda's Movementocracy Experiment with Special Reference to the Great Lakes Region, 1986-2002", presented at the OSSREA conference, November 2000, Addis Ababa, p.1
2. *Ibid*. p.1
3. The Republic of Uganda, (1993), The Report of the Uganda Constitutional Commission, Analysis and Recommendations, Entebbe, UPPC, p.197.
4. Aaron K.K. Mukwaya (2000), *op.cit* p.2.
5. *Op.cit*, The Report of Uganda Constitutional Commission, p.207.
6. Sanders, David (1990), *Losing an Empire, Finding a Role, British Foreign Policy since 1945*, London, Macmillan, p.11
7. *Ibid*, p.11
8. *Ibid,* p.11
9. *Ibid,* p.11
10. *Ibid,* p. 11-12
11. *Ibid*, p.12
12. *Ibid*, pp. 12-13
13. *Ibid*, p. 12
14. Norman, Anders (1997) "Development Thinking- Bringing the gap between theory and practice", *Geografiska Annaler,* series B. Human Geography, Svenska, vol. 79B, No.4, 1997, pp 217-225.
15. *Ibid*, p.217

16. *Ibid*. p.228
17. *Ibid*, pp 217-225
18. Buzan, Barry (1991), *People, States and Fear: An Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Gold War Era,* (2nd Ed), Boulder: Lynne Reinner Publishers, p.90.
19. *Op.cit* The Report of Uganda Constitutional Commission, p.208
20. *Ibid*, p.208
21. *The Daily Telegraph* (London), 16 December, 1985.
22. *Ibid*.
23. *The Times* (London), 19 February 1986.
24. *Ibid*.
25. *Ibid*.
26. Michael Woodrich, (1986), BBC East African Correspondent on BBC Radio Channel 4 Four, *"From Our Own Correspondents" programme*, Saturday, 15 February, 1986.
27. *The Times* (London), 11 February, 1986.
28. *The Independent* (London), 22 January, 1987.
29. Museveni, Y. (1985), *Ten-Point Programme of NRM,* Kampala, NRM Publications.
30. Mathoma, P., G. Mills and J. Stremlau, (eds) (2000), *Putting People First,* Natal, SAIIA, Natal Witness.
31. Barya J.J. (1993) "The New Political conditionalities of Aid: An Independent View from Africa", *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 1993, p.16.
32. Museveni Yoweri (1986) *Ten-Point Programme of NRM,* Kampala, NRM Publications p.6.
33. *Ibid*, p.8.
34. *Ibid*, p.8.
35. *Ibid* pp 10-11.
36. *Ibid,* pp. 13-14.
37. *Ibid,* p.14
38. *Ibid,* p. 25
39. *Ibid,* pp. 25-26.
40. *Ibid*, p.28
41. *Ibid,* pp 27-28.
42. NRM Secretariat (1999) *Movement Fifteen Point Programme*, Kampala, NRM publications.
43. Museveni, K. Yoweri, (1992) *WHAT IS AFRICA'S PROBLEM?* Kampala, NRM publications, p. 21.
44. *Ibid*, pp 21-22.
45. Barya J.J. *Opcit*, p.16
46. Mukwaya, A.K.K. (2000) *Clintonian Policy towards the Crises in the Great Lakes Region into the 21st Century*, A paper presented at the conference themed "Conflict and Peace-making in the Great Lakes Region" organized by the American Centre (Kampala), Entebbe, 10-12 July 2000, pp 7-8.
47. IPEP Secretariat (2000) *Rwanda the Preventable Genocide*, The Report of IPEP to investigate the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda and the Surrounding Events, Addis Ababa, IPEP.
48. Kakwenzire Joan and Dixon Kamukama, (1999) "The Development and Consolidaiton of Extremist Forces in Rwanda", in Howard Adelman, Astri Suhrke (eds) *The Rwanda Crisis from Uganda to Zaire, The Path of a Genocide,* Uppsala, Nordiska Africainstitutet, p.65.