

A direct democracy gives the voting population the power to; change constitutional laws, put forth initiatives, referendums and suggestions for laws, give binding orders to elective officials, such as revoking them before the end of their elected term.

DEMOCRATIC PRACTICES IN TANZANIA

The concept of democracy

Democracy is a form of government in which all citizens have an equal say in the decisions that affect their lives. Ideally, this includes equal (and more or less direct) participation in proposals, development and passage of legislation into law.

It comes from the Greek word *demokratía* which is a union of two words *demos* meaning common people and *kratos* which means power. Therefore democracy can simply be defined as the power of the common people.

There is no specific, universally accepted definition of ‘democracy’, but **equality** and **freedom** both have been identified as important characteristics of democracy since ancient times.

These principles are reflected in all citizens being equal before the law and having equal access to legislative processes. For example, in a representative democracy, every vote has equal weight, no unreasonable restrictions can apply to anyone seeking to become a representative, and the freedom of its citizens

is secured by legitimized rights and liberties that are generally protected by a Constitution.

Democracy came into existence because many people wanted freedom and equal treatment before the law and other aspects of human life related to socio-economic and political issues.

During the ancient times many governments were practising dictatorship in which citizens were mistreated and they were not given freedom to express their views, suggestions, and ideas on how they want to be governed.

Many governments were ruled by Kings and Dictators who came from a wealthy and powerful family/class. This can be traced back when Europe was under the Roman Empire. During that time, all the powers were vested to leaders. The citizens were just followers who were submissive to the ruling body. Therefore, people were forced to follow and obey anything coming from the government, whether good or bad. The citizens were not allowed to criticize, challenge or raise any objection to the government. The leaders were seen as God, so they were referred as Holy people.

These hardships catalyzed the birth of democracy which made people live as humans.

Genesis of Democracy

Democracy has its formal in Ancient Greece in the middle of the 5th to 4th Century Before Christ in some Greek city-states, especially Athens due to a popular uprising in 508 BC. This was referred as **Direct democracy or Athenian democracy**, and it came due to the movement of common people to demand

equality and freedom. Greece was a slave owning society characterized by inequality and lack of freedom. During ancient times in Greece, women, slaves, foreigners, and males under 20 years were lowly regarded, and they were not allowed to vote for the Assembly.

The term democracy first appeared in ancient Greek political and philosophical thought. According to Plato, democracy is an alternative system of monarchy (rule by one individual), oligarchy (rule by a small elite class) and timocracy (ruling class of property owners).

Although the Athenian democracy is today considered by many to have been a form of direct democracy, but originally it had two distinguishing features. First the allotment (selection by lot) of ordinary citizens to government offices and courts. Secondly the assembly of all citizens.

It was possible to practice this form of democracy as it covered a small area, the population was low and it involved a certain group of people only, i.e. males above 20 years old. Democratic practices were also evidenced in earlier societies including Mesopotamia, Phoenicia and India. Another possible example of primitive democracy may have been the early Sumerian city-states. A similar proto-democracy or oligarchy existed temporarily among the Medes (Ancient Iranian people) in the 6th century BC, which came to an end after the Achaemenid (Persian) Emperor Darius the Great who declared that the best monarchy was better than the best oligarchy or best democracy.

Although the term democracy was often not used for civilizations outside Europe in ancient times, there were organizations of

government very akin to democracy in some African societies such as the Igbo nation, what is now Nigeria. A serious claim for early democratic institutions came from the independent republics of India, Sanghas and Ganas which existed as early as the 6th century BC and persisted in some areas until the 4th century AD. Most historians suggested that independent and democratic states existed in India; however modern scholars urged that democracy at the 3rd century BC was degraded and could mean any autonomous state, no matter how oligarchic it was.

The evolution and spread of democracy;

There are many countries that played an important role in the evolution and spread of democracy, like Ancient Rome, Europe, North and South America.

The concept of representative arose largely from ideas and institutions that developed during the European Middle Ages and the Age of Enlightenment, the American and French Revolutions.

The right to vote has been expanded in many jurisdictions overtime from relatively narrow groups (such as wealthy men of a particular ethnic group), with New Zealand the first country to grant universal suffrage for all her citizens in 1893. The United States of America adopted the principle of natural freedom and equality in its Constitution in 1788 as important movement towards the creation of a democratic state. France passed through different stages in the implementation of democracy during the ancient times. In 1789 France adopted the Declaration of the rights of man and of citizen, though short lived. In 1792 the

National Convention was attended by males only. In 1848 there was a French Revolution which resulted to the introduction of the Universal male suffrage.

In 1848 there were several revolutions that took place in Europe as rulers were confronted with popular demands for liberal constitutions and more democratic government. Liberal democracies were few and often short lived before late 19th century, various nations and territories had also claimed to be the first with universal suffrage.

During the 20th century transitions to liberal democracy had come into successive waves of democracy resulting from wars (WWI & WWII), revolutions, decolonization and religious and economic movements.

After the Second World War, there was a cold war which divided the world into two blocs, the Western Bloc headed by the US and the Eastern Bloc headed by the former USSR. The Western Bloc was advocating democracy under the capitalistic ideology, while the Eastern Bloc was undemocratic and spread communistic/socialistic ideology. The formal collapse of the USSR in 1980s, led to the end of the cold war, hence the rapid spread of democratization and liberalization to the former Eastern Bloc members, plus other countries in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe. The spread of democracy to the entire world was ignited by the people's demand for equality and freedom, which was demonstrated through strikes, revolutions and civil wars.

Forms of democracy

Democracy has taken a number of forms since its birth. All these forms are brought by the nature of the people (cultural diversity)

and the way it is practised. For example, there is a difference between the way Europeans and Africans exercise democracy. There are different types of democracy:

Representative democracy involves the selection of government officials by the people being represented. If the Head of State is also democratically elected, then it is called a democratic country. The most common mechanisms involve election of the candidate with a majority or a plurality of the votes. Representatives may be elected or become diplomatic representatives by a particular district (or constituency), or represent the entire electorate proportionally. Proportional systems with some using a combination of the two. Some representative democracies also incorporate elements of direct democracy, such as referendums.

A characteristic of representative democracy is that while the representatives are elected by the people to act in their interest, they retain the freedom to exercise their own judgment as how best to do so. **Parliamentary democracy** is a representative democracy where government is appointed by parliamentary representatives as opposed to a 'presidential rule' wherein the President is both head of state and the head of government and is elected by the voters.

Under a parliamentary democracy, government is exercised by delegation to an executive ministry and subject to extent to which the will of the majority can be exercised against the rights of minorities.

Liberal democracy is a representative democracy in which the ability of the elected representatives to exercise decision-making power is subject to the rule of law, and usually moderated by

a constitution that emphasizes the protection of the rights and freedoms of individuals, and which places constraints on the leaders and on the ties. In a liberal democracy, it is possible for some large-scale decisions to emerge from the many individual decisions that citizens are free to make. In other words, citizens can "vote with their feet" or "vote with their dollars", resulting in significant informal government-by-the-masses that exercises many "powers" associated with formal government elsewhere.

Constitutional democracy is, also known as liberal democracy is a common form of representative democracy. According to the principles of liberal democracy, elections should be free and fair, and the political process should be competitive. Political pluralism is usually defined as the presence of multiple and distinct political parties.

A liberal democracy may take various constitutional forms: it may be a constitutional republic; as the United States, India, Germany or Brazil, or a constitutional monarchy, such as the United Kingdom, Japan, Canada or Spain. It may have a presidential system (United States, Brazil), a parliamentary system (Westminster system, UK and Commonwealth countries, Spain), or a hybrid, semi-presidential system (France).

Direct democracy is a political system where the citizens participate in the decision-making personally, contrary to relying on intermediaries or representatives. The supporters of direct democracy argue that democracy is more than merely a procedural issue.

A direct democracy gives the voting population the power to; change constitutional laws, put forth initiatives, referendums and

suggestions for laws, give binding orders to elective officials, such as revoking them before the end of their elected term, or initiating a lawsuit for breaking a campaign promise. Of the three measures mentioned, most operate in developed democracies today.

This is part of a gradual shift towards direct democracies. Examples of this include the extensive use of referendums in California with more than 20 million voters, and in Switzerland, where five million voters decide on national referendums and initiatives two to four times a year. Direct democratic instruments are also well established at the cantonal and communal level. Vermont towns have been known for their yearly town meetings, held every March to decide on local issues.

No direct democracy is in existence outside the framework of a different overarching form of government. Most direct democracies to date have been weak forms, relatively small communities, usually city-states. The world is yet to see a large, fundamental, working example of direct democracy as of yet, with most examples being small and weak forms.

Inclusive democracy is a political theory and political project that aims for direct democracy in all fields of social life: political democracy in the form of face-to-face assemblies that are confederated, economic democracy in a stateless, moneyless and marketless economy, democracy in the social realm, i.e. self in places of work and education, and ecological democracy which aims to reintegrate society and nature. The theoretical project of inclusive democracy emerged from the work of political philosopher Takis Fotopoulos in “Towards An Inclusive Democracy” and was further developed in the journal

Democracy & Nature and its successor The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy.

The basic unit of decision making in an inclusive democracy is the demotic assembly, i.e. the assembly of demos, the citizen body in a given geographical area which may encompass a town and the surrounding villages, or even neighborhoods of large cities. An inclusive democracy today can only take the form of a confederal democracy that is based on a network of administrative councils whose members or delegates are elected from popular face-to-face democratic assemblies in the various demoi.

Thus, their role is purely administrative and practical, not one of policy-making like that of representatives in representative democracy. The citizen body is advised by experts but it is the citizen body which functions as the ultimate decision-taker. Authority can be delegated to a segment of the citizen body to carry out specific duties, for example to serve as members of popular courts, or of regional and confederal councils. Such delegation is made, in principle, by lot, on a rotation basis, and is always recallable by the citizen body. Delegates to regional and confederal bodies should have specific mandates.

Sortition democracy

Sometimes called “democracy without elections”, sortition is the process of choosing decision makers via a random process. The intention is that those chosen will be representative of the opinions and interests of the people at large, and be more fair and impartial than an elected official. The technique was in widespread use in Athenian Democracy and is still used in modern jury selection.

Consensus democracy

Consensus democracy requires varying degrees of consensus rather than just a mere democratic majority. It typically attempts to protect minority rights from domination by majority rule.

Cosmopolitan democracy/World federalism

Is a political system in which democracy is implemented on a global scale, either directly or through representatives. An important justification for this kind of system is that the decisions made in national or regional democracies often affect people outside the constituency who, by definition, cannot vote. By contrast, in a cosmopolitan democracy, the people who are affected by decisions also have a say in them. According to its supporters, any attempt to solve global problems is undemocratic without some form of cosmopolitan democracy.

The general principle of cosmopolitan democracy is to expand some or all of the values and norms of democracy, including the rule of law; the non-violent resolution of conflicts; and equality among citizens, beyond the limits of the state. To be fully implemented, this would require reforming existing international organizations, e.g. the United Nations, as well as the creation of new institutions such as a World Parliament, which ideally would enhance public control over, and accountability in, international politics. The creation of the International Criminal Court in 2003 was seen as a major step forward by many supporters of this type of cosmopolitan democracy.

Democracy and human development

Democracy correlates with a higher score on the human development index and a lower score on the human poverty index.

Democracies have the potential to put in place better education, longer life expectancy, lower infant mortality, access to drinking water, and better health care than dictatorships. This is not due to higher levels of foreign assistance or spending a larger percentage of GDP on health and education. The reason is that, the available resources are managed better.

Several health indicators (*life expectancy, infant and maternal mortality*) have a stronger and more significant association with democracy than they have with GDP per capita, size of the public sector, or income inequality. In the post-Communist nations, after an initial decline, those that are the most democratic have achieved the greatest gains in life expectancy. Statistically, more democracy correlates with a higher gross domestic product (GDP) per capita.

However, there is disagreement regarding how much credit the democratic system can take for this. One observation is that democracy became widespread only after the industrial revolution and the introduction of capitalism. On the other hand, the industrial revolution started in England which was one of the most democratic nations of its time, within its own borders. (But this democracy was very limited and did not apply to the colonies that contributed significantly to the master's wealth).

Several statistical studies support the theory that more capitalism, measured for example with several Indices of Economic Freedom which has been used in many studies by independent researchers, increases economic growth and that this in turn increases general prosperity, reduces poverty, and causes democratization.

This is a statistical tendency, and there are individual exceptions like India, which is democratic but arguably not prosperous, or

Brunei, which has a high GDP but has never been democratic. There are also other studies suggesting that more democracy increases economic freedom although a few find no or even a small negative effect. One objection might be that nations like Sweden and Canada today score just below nations like Chile and Estonia on economic freedom, but that Sweden and Canada today have a higher GDP per capita.

However, this is a misunderstanding, the studies indicate effect on economic growth and thus that future GDP per capita will be higher with higher economic freedom. Also, according to the index, Sweden and Canada are among the world's most capitalist nations, due to factors such as strong rule of law, strong property rights, and few restrictions against free trade. Critics might argue that the Index of Economic Freedom and other methods used do not measure the degree of capitalism, preferring some other definition.

Some argue that economic growth due to its empowerment of citizens, will ensure a transition to democracy in countries like Cuba. However, other dispute this. Even if economic growth has caused democratization in the past, it may not do so in the future. Dictators may now have learned how to have economic growth without causing more political freedom.

A high degree of oil or mineral exports is strongly associated with nondemocratic rule. This effect applies worldwide and not only to the Middle East. Dictators who have this form of wealth can spend more on their security apparatus and provide social amenities that lessen public unrest. Also, such wealth is not followed by the social and cultural changes that may transform societies with ordinary economic growth.

A recent meta-analysis finds that democracy has no direct effect on economic growth. However, it has strong and significant indirect effects that contribute to economic growth. Democracy is associated with higher human capital accumulation, lower inflation, lower political instability, and higher economic freedom. There is also some evidence that it is associated with larger governments and more restrictions on international trade.

If leaving out East Asia, then during the last forty-five years, poor democracies have grown their economies more rapidly than no democracies. Poor democracies such as the Baltic countries, Botswana, Costa Rica, Ghana, and Senegal have grown more rapidly than no democracies such as Angola, Syria, Uzbekistan, and Zimbabwe.

Of the eighty worst financial catastrophes during the last four decades, only five were in democracies. Similarly, poor democracies are half likely as no democracies to experience a 10 percent decline in GDP per capita over the course of one year.

Causes and challenges of multiparty democracy in Tanzania

The United Republic of Tanzania was established in April 1964, following the amalgamation of the former independent states of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The United Republic came about after a long and harsh period of colonisation. Tanganyika was first colonised by the Germans and later handed over to the British in 1920 under the trusteeship system through a mandate from the League of Nations. Tanganyika attained independence in December 1961 under the leadership of Julius Nyerere. The transition to independence,

however, was achieved without violence that dominated the struggle for independence in countries such as Kenya.

In 1962, when Nyerere assumed the mantle of power, the country effectively operated under a de facto one-party state. A de jure one-party state was proclaimed in 1965, after the adoption of recommendations by a Presidential Commission on constitutional matters.

The constitution was amended by Parliament. The role of national elections was retained, although the candidates for elections were selected by the political party (TANU). There was a stipulation that each seat could be contested by two candidates in order to ensure that no member could be elected without commanding a majority of support.

The 1965 election and subsequent national elections under the one-party system were conducted under these rules. Presidential elections were held at the same time as parliamentary elections and Julius Nyerere regularly contested elections every five years from 1965 to 1980.

At independence, it was unclear which development path Tanzania would follow. Nyerere espoused egalitarian concerns and indicated his preference for a socialist economic policy.

The first five-year development plan emphasised the Africanisation of the bureaucracy, the villagisation of the agrarian sector and the overhaul of manufacturing industries.

The plan was premised on the basis of a mixed economy and articulated a strategy that sought joint investment and private

capital. The failure to attract such capital led to a re-evaluation of the strategy. It was against this background that the Arusha Declaration of 1967 was proclaimed.

THE ARUSHA DECLARATION

The Arusha Declaration of 1967 tried to establish a more egalitarian society, placed emphasis on self-reliance, and avoided dependence upon foreign aids or loans. The strategy entailed that the state owns the main means of production and vital services. Consequently, commercial banks, industries, and leading import and export houses, were nationalised. Nyerere argued:

“We in Tanzania should move from being a nation of individual peasant producers who are gradually adopting the incentives and the ethics of the capitalist system. Instead we should gradually become a nation of Ujamaa system in which people form small groups and where these small groups cooperate in joint enterprises.”

Central to this strategy of self-reliance was the development of the agrarian sector. Nyerere’s version of socialism was based on the principle of Ujamaa, which emphasised a strong family solidarity found within traditional African societies. By deploying the values of Ujamaa, Nyerere sought to unite Tanzania, placing particular emphasis on communal living in Ujamaa villages. The pursuit of such a strategy was justified by Tanzania’s predominantly rural population whom the government sought to reach and encourage to unite in co-operative production.

For Nyerere, these villages were essential entities which would promote equality and prevent the emergence of too rich farmers. Ujamaa also sought to strengthen national identity which, Nyerere argued, had been undermined by colonial domination.

In the agrarian sector, the government introduced state marketing monopolies (parastatals) to handle crops and consumer goods. In 1970, under the Buildings Act, all buildings valued in excess of Shs100 000 were nationalised. The policy of villagisation or Ujamaa vijijini became one of the key strategies.

Initially, the government relied upon voluntary associations setting up villages in remote areas and providing inducements for new settlements. However, in 1973, the leadership started a programme of enforced villagisation, and by 1980, 91% of the rural population lived in Ujamaa villages.

Domestic problems and disillusionment with the Arusha experiment

By the mid 1970s, the Tanzanian economy began to falter rapidly as a result of the ambitious and, in most cases, unrealistic development policies that had been adopted. Despite the rhetoric of self-reliance, Tanzania continued to depend on foreign aid. The economy hit a crisis point by the end of the decade when it found it was increasingly difficult to meet its debt obligations.

In light of these difficulties, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank urged the Tanzanian government to abandon its socialist policies and adopt a structural adjustment programme (SAP). President Nyerere, undaunted, refused to accede to these demands. The economic crisis was exacerbated

by the rapid decline in exports and Tanzania's inability to import even the most basic commodities.

The villagisation programme was also seen as a failure as it became evident that peasant farmers were not producing as effectively on a co-operative basis, leading to an overall decrease in agricultural production. The economy was further affected adversely by the fuel oil shocks in the 1970s, also by drought and by the war with Uganda.

In an attempt to rescue the economy, a National Economic Survival Programme (NESP) was launched in 1980. This plan, however, proved ineffective as it was designed on the principles of self-reliance, albeit with a large external resource component. When external funds were not forthcoming, the plan effectively collapsed. By 1982, the country had plunged further into economic chaos as smuggling became rampant and the secondary economy became the only means of survival for the majority of the population. Even though Nyerere accepted an SAP, he was never willing to accede to the demands of the international donor community. As Booth points out, the process was designed to appease the IMF and the World Bank in order to obtain sorely needed aid rather than to restructure the economy fundamentally.

In 1985, Nyerere stepped down as President and Ali Hassan Mwinyi took over. Nevertheless, Nyerere continued to be an important political figure by retaining the position of chairperson of the ruling party Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), which was formed in 1977 after the amalgamation of the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) and TANU.

The departure of Nyerere from the presidency allowed the new government to embark upon a World Bank-IMF sponsored Economic Recovery Programme (ERP) that lasted for three years. The emphasis was on the correction of external imbalances, reducing budget deficits, reducing inflation and providing adequate incentives to producers, as well as exchange rate adjustment, trade liberalisation and reduction of the public sector. Little attention was paid to social services and infrastructure such as education, health and roads which, as a result, declined rapidly during the course of the recovery programme. Consequently, at the end of the life of the ERP, Tanzania remained in serious crisis with inflation hovering well in excess of 30%.

In 1989, when the term of the ERP expired, an Economic and Social Adjustment Programme (ESAP) was adopted. The deleterious effects of the ERP on the population, with a real decline in wages, increasing inflation, increasing unemployment, as well as a growing unequal distribution of income coupled with a decay of social services, led the ESAP to emphasize the rehabilitation of infrastructure and the provision of essential services, albeit on a cost sharing or user pays basis.

The negative effects of the ERP and growing opposition to the government, no doubt assisted by the democratising wave that swept through Africa in the early 1990s, led to demands for political liberalisation.

The impetus for liberalisation came not only from opponents of the ERP who blamed the one-party state for the country's economic woes, but also from the fatigued international donor community under the aegis of the World Bank which advocated good governance as an essential part of the reform process. The

calls for political liberalisation were spurred by the critical role of Julius Nyerere, who challenged the ruling party's legitimacy in a public speech in February 1990, arguing that it had lost touch with the people. In 1991, Nyerere resigned from his position as chairperson of the CCM and advocated that Tanzania should move towards a competitive political system.

Political liberalisation and competitive politics

Nyerere's influence on the politics of Tanzania meant that the CCM finally relented and President Mwinyi appointed the Nyalali Commission to recommend whether Tanzania should operate in a multiparty environment. The commission presented a draft report to the President in December 1991, in which it recommended the adoption of a multiparty system. In addition, the commission recommended that 40 pieces of repressive legislation should be repealed and a body established to oversee the transition. A Constitutional Commission was to be appointed and a programme of political education in democracy was to be instituted.

In February 1992, the CCM repealed the single-party clause and paved the way for the parliament to pass a Political Parties Act in June, 1992. Effectively allowing for a multiparty system.

The Act stipulated that new political parties had to be registered with the Registrar of Political Parties with a minimum of 200 members each from the 10 regions in the country, including Zanzibar and Pemba. In addition, parties had to satisfy the Registrar that they were not formed on an ethnic, regional, religious or sectarian basis.

The delay in implementing this legislation provided an important opportunity for the CCM to consolidate its position.

During the one-party system, the state and the party had become inseparable, with the latter financially dependent upon the former. In the new environment, the CCM had to be financially self-reliant. The party mounted a campaign to recruit new members in the light of declining numbers during the 1980s. The result of the campaign was that, in virtually all regions of the country, the party was able to increase its membership.

The delay in legalising the multiparty system proved disadvantageous to opposition parties who were unable to operate as a result of prevailing constitutional requirements. The opposition's difficulties were compounded by the President who decreed that the debate on multipartyism was to be restricted to the **Nyalali Commission**, effectively gagging the opposition.

The opposition, undaunted, coalesced to form the Steering Committee for the Seminar on Transition to Multiparty Democracy. After the seminar was held, the committee transformed itself into the National Committee for Constitutional Reforms (NCCR). The NCCR elected Chief Abdullah Fundikira as its chairperson and established a secretariat.

The NCCR argued that the Nyalali Commission was an unnecessary waste of scarce resources, because it could not deny people their most fundamental human rights. The NCCR threatened the government that unless it legalised the multiparty system within a year, the opposition would go ahead regardless of the legal requirements. In addition, it called on the President to establish a transitional government while preparing for multiparty elections.

While the opposition initially gained a great deal of momentum and support, it began to suffer from problems of disunity

once the government acceded to its demands for a multiparty system. These problems not only exposed the opposition's poor organisational skills but also its lack of a social base. The problems of disunity in the Tanzanian opposition mirror those that plagued the Kenyan opposition that also split once a multiparty system was established.

Once the task of freeing the political system was achieved, the opposition in both countries found themselves in disarray as sectional interests became paramount. In Tanzania, the disunity of the opposition was evident with the declared intention of 24 political parties to seek registration. The majority of these parties were led by discontent former CCM members. They either had been marginalized by or expelled from the ruling party had endured detention or had been exiled. This was the case with opposition parties such as the Union for Multiparty Democracy led by Chief Abdallah Fundikira, the Tanzania Democratic Alliance Party led by Oscar Kambona and the Civic United Front led by James Mapalala and Seif Hamad.

The opposition called for a national convention as was recommended by the Nyalali Commission to lay the foundations of a democratic agenda for Tanzania. Furthermore, there were calls to establish a Constitutional Commission to draft a new constitution, which was to be ratified by a constituent assembly specifically convened for this purpose. However, these demands, were rejected by CCM.

Zanzibar has always been treated as an exception. Zanzibar politics revolve around the manner in which the union was created. The violent overthrow of the Arab Sultan, and the fact that the terms of the union were never openly discussed, remain

divisive. As part of this arrangement, the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) was permitted to operate within the one-party system.

The Nyalali Commission was forced to address the Zanzibar question as the rift between politics on the mainland and the island widened. The commission proposed institutional changes to the structure of the union - from a union with two governments to a federation with three governments.

The commission's proposal was in recognition of problems and concerns over citizenship, the control of foreign exchange, the collection and distribution of taxes and customs duties and the formula for contributions to the Republic's expenses.

The commission recognised discontent with the union agreement, which had created neither a federal nor unitary state. Rather, it had allowed for a separate Zanzibar government with its own president and institutions of power, as well as a union government which controlled the mainland with jurisdiction over foreign affairs, defence, communications, currency and higher education for the entire country.

A highly contentious point was the fact that mainland citizens were denied the opportunity to purchase land on the island and required a passport to enter Zanzibar, while no such restrictions were imposed on Zanzibaris. CCM rejected the recommendation and in a speech to parliament on 30 April 1992, the prime minister argued:

“Honorable Members will agree with me that the solution to these problems will not be obtained through the introduction of a Federation with Three Governments. On the contrary, that will

be the beginning of an erosion of unity and co-operation of the Tanzania which has been built since 1964. It will create a fissure which enemies of the union will use to break it. That will not be in the interest of Tanzanians as a whole ... We do not see that there is any sound argument, legal or political, for changing the present structure of two Governments, and starting another of three. We believe that a structure of three Governments will weaken our Union politically and economically.”

Despite overwhelming support for this position, however, the parliament later passed a unanimous resolution demanding that the government introduce a bill which would allow for a Government of Tanganyika thereby adopting a three government structure.

This change was precipitated by concerns about the election of the Vice-President and Zanzibar's decision to join the Organisation of Islamic Conference (OIC). The election of the vice-president was necessitated by changes to the constitution as a result of the introduction of the multiparty system. In order to deal with these constitutional changes, President Mwinyi appointed a committee to recommend changes with Mark Bomani as chairperson.

The Bomani Committee proposed that, in the light of the practice of having two vice-presidents, the prime minister of the union government and the president of Zanzibar, there should be a single vice-president for the United Republic. It further recommended adopting the American model of choosing the Vice-President with the proviso that the vice-president come from a different part of the union as the president thus ensuring that all of the union's interests were represented.

It was felt that the American system where the president stood for election with a vice-presidential candidate would ensure that both came from the same political party. While this recommendation received support on the mainland, it was unacceptable in Zanzibar.

The CCM Central Committee recommended to the National Executive Committee (NEC) that the system in place, in deference to Zanzibar's opposition, should be retained. It was at this point that Nyerere aired his views, pointing out the problems that existed with the introduction of a multiparty system. The NEC, however, failed to deal with the issue and instead referred it to parliament, requesting a period of two years in which to consider the recommendation further.

In 1992, as political liberalisation became a reality, events in Zanzibar threatened the very nation which Nyerere had forged. A private newspaper, *Motomoto*, reported that Zanzibar had joined the OIC. Although the revelation sent reverberations around the government with regard to the making of foreign policy, President Mwinyi initially defended the Zanzibari position on the grounds that it was constitutional. However, when the Parliamentary Constitutional and Legal Affairs Committee investigated the allegations, it concluded that Zanzibar's actions were unconstitutional and recommended its withdrawal from the OIC.

In addition, the committee called for those officials who were involved to be punished for undertaking such an 'illegal' action. During the debate in the National Assembly where the parliamentary committee's report was being considered, the deputy speaker, Pius Mseka, cut short the debate when the National Assembly resolved to shelve the committee's report for

a year to allow the governments of Zanzibar and of the union to discuss the issue.

President Mwinyi, recognising the tensions within CCM, asked Julius Nyerere to mediate. At the very time that Nyerere was attempting to resolve the crisis, a number of mainland parliamentarians from the single-party CCM parliament tabled a motion demanding the establishment of a Government of Tanganyika.

Nyerere was finally able to convince Zanzibar to withdraw from the OIC, as well as to accept the Bomani Committee's recommendations regarding the procedure for electing the vice-president. However, the mainland parliamentarians did not withdraw the motion, but instead tabled a motion calling for a referendum to decide on this issue. Despite the previous opposition by the government, in a surprising turn of events, the parliament unanimously accepted the motion without debate. Nyerere explained this dramatic acquiescence:

"It appears that what our Leaders were actually afraid of was the debating, for they would be forced to show their true colors ... So our Government simply fizzled out, like a punctured balloon. I think even the MPs who had tabled the original motion were amazed!"

The issue was decided finally by a referendum of CCM party members in which nearly 40% of the total membership voted. The vote, as reported to the NEC of the party in 1994, was that 62% of the members wished to retain the existing system, while 29% favored a single government and only 9% supported a three government structure.

The transitional period coincided with the timetable for elections that were to be held in 1995. During this time, the CCM consolidated its position and controlled all institutions. It established the rules under which new political parties were to operate and frequently intervened in the ‘national interest’.

The CCM represented itself as the party that upheld Tanzania’s record of peace, stability and solidarity in contrast to the opposition that threatened the very fabric of the nation by articulating particular interests. In particular, it refused media access to the opposition by not relinquishing its hold on the sole national broadcasting agency, Radio Tanzania.

In addition, it refused both to repeal the 40 pieces of repressive legislation which made it difficult for the opposition to function, as well as to mount a democracy education programme. This allowed the government to intimidate the opposition. Critically, during the transition phase, the CCM remained dominant and the boundaries between the government and the party remained blurred.

The long transitional period meant that it was difficult for the opposition to maintain a coherent position. The initial euphoria of multipartyism waned as the opposition was unable to provide a viable alternative set of policies. A further problem for the opposition was that it found it extremely difficult to penetrate the rural areas where the CCM had its strongest support, making them largely an urban party.

By the time of the 1995 multiparty elections, 13 political parties were granted registration. The government’s rules prohibited any independent candidates from contesting either the presidential or parliamentary elections.

This stipulation was successfully challenged in the High Court, which ruled that these provisions were unconstitutional as they impinged on the rights of all citizens to participate in government. Despite the High Court ruling, the government successfully passed a constitutional amendment which made these provisions subject to the newly enacted electoral laws. The problems with such a tactic were highlighted by Nyerere who argued:

“This is very dangerous. Where can we stop? If one section of the Bill of Rights can be amended, what is to stop the whole Bill of Rights being made meaningless by qualifications of, and amendments to, all provisions? I am saying that the basic Rights of the Citizens of this country must be regarded as sacrosanct. The right to participate in Government is essential to democracy. The Right to vote and the Right to stand for elective office are Rights of Citizenship.”

The main opposition political parties included Chama Cha Demokrasia na Maendeleo (CHADEMA), under the leadership of its founder Edwin Mtei. Mtei was a former CCM treasury minister who resigned after differences with Nyerere over adopting IMF policies. CHADEMA did not contest the presidential election, but established close connections with another opposition party, the National Convention for Construction and Reform (NCCR-Mageuzi), which had fielded a candidate. The two parties also agreed to an arrangement that they would form a coalition if they were called to form the government. The NCCR-Mageuzi was the party which gained prominence after Augustine Lyatonga Mrema, a former CCM deputy prime minister, took over the leadership.

The party with the strongest base in Zanzibar was the Civic United Front (CUF) led by Shariff Hamad. It was the most significant party in Pemba and most observers predicted that the CCM would find it difficult to compete with the CUF in the islands. Although it did not have much support in the mainland, it fielded a presidential candidate, Professor Ibrahim Lipumba. Some of the other major political parties included the National Resistance Alliance (NRA), the National League for Democracy (NLD), the Popular National Party (PONA), the Tanzania Democratic Alliance (TADEA), the Tanzania Peoples Party (TPP), the Union for Multiparty Democracy (UMD) and the United Peoples Democratic Party (UPDP).

A large number of opposition parties, as well as opposition disunity clearly favoured the CCM. Nevertheless, the opposition presented a potential challenge to the CCM and was able to point to the rampant corruption and economic mismanagement that had occurred under the aegis of the ruling party.

Leadership in the CCM

While the multiparty elections heralded a new phase in Tanzanian politics, the most important political machinations remained within the CCM. President Mwinyi, under the stipulations of the constitution, was only permitted to serve two terms and this necessitated the identification of a presidential candidate by the CCM. In order to elect the CCM presidential candidate, the party established an elaborate procedure. Aspiring candidates' names had to be submitted to the party's Secretary-General who, in turn, submitted them to the Central Committee. The committee was empowered with the task of drawing up a shortlist of five candidates who were recommended to the NEC which could either

accept or alter the list. Finally, the NEC presented these names to the party congress which elected the candidate by secret ballot.

Although there were 17 candidates for the CCM presidential nomination, based on party's procedures, Benjamin Mkapa was elected by the party congress.

The influence of Julius Nyerere in the election was paramount. In May 1995, he castigated the CCM leadership for corruption and exposed major problems in the party. He made it clear that he would support a candidate who was untainted regardless of the political party which such a candidate represented.

Mkapa's election was endorsed by Nyerere in a speech at Chimwaga. Mkapa, a journalist by profession, had been Nyerere's press secretary and had served as foreign minister both under Nyerere and Mwinyi.

The multiparty elections

The official election campaign was punctuated by confusion. The elections were conducted first in Zanzibar and then in the mainland. The separate Zanzibar elections, made problematic by the major debates over the way in which the union was to be governed, exposed major divisions on the island. The election process was plagued from the beginning by CUF complaints that it was being hindered and intimidated by the CCM. There was a general feeling among the opposition that a free and fair election was not possible.

The CUF campaign emphasised economic liberalisation and closer co-operation with the Arab Gulf states. It was precisely these close ties with the Islamic states that the CCM played

upon, arguing that this was an attempt to exert Arab control over the islands. On 25 October 1995, the CUF claimed victory. However, the final election results were delayed, and the electoral commission declared the CCM presidential candidate, Salmin Armour, as duly elected after attaining 1 565 more votes than the CUF candidate, Seif Shariff Hamad. In the parliamentary elections, the CCM was declared to have won 26 out of 50 seats.

Despite efforts to monitor the election process, it was apparent that the elections were fraught with difficulties when the number of votes counted in two constituencies exceeded the number of voters registered. It was not surprising, therefore, that international election monitors noted major discrepancies in the election process. CUF members have since boycotted the Zanzibar House of Representatives. The European Union and other donors cut aid in what was perceived to be fraudulent elections.

The union elections, held on 29 October 1995, were also disrupted by administrative disorganisation in Dar es Salaam where the elections were postponed and rescheduled for 19 November. The opposition argued that this was a means to promote disorder in areas where the opposition had a big support. In protest, the opposition refused to contest the presidential elections in the re-run in Dar es Salaam. This was an important mechanism for the opposition to gain legitimacy, given that provincial results ensured a CCM victory. Nevertheless, the opposition contested the parliamentary elections.

The election results witnessed the return of the CCM to power. In the presidential race, where four candidates had sought election, Mkapa received 62% of the vote while the opposition candidates

amassed 38%. The election results showed that the CCM was being challenged and that it could not attain the kind of popular support it enjoyed under Nyerere. In the parliamentary elections, the CCM won 186 of the contested seats with the CUF attaining 24 and the NCCR-Mageuzi 16. Because the National Assembly includes a number of nominated seats, the final configuration consisted of the CCM with 214 seats and the opposition with 60.

Although the ruling party, the CCM, retained power, it confronted an economy riddled with problems. There was rising unemployment exacerbated by SAPs, the collapse of infrastructure and poor industrial performance. The state was unable to provide even the most basic social services. This is reflected in the fall of life expectancy figures from 52 years in the early 1990s to 48 years in 2000, as well as the highest infant mortality rate on the continent. The decay of health services can be seen in the banning of x-ray services because of defective machines.

The Tanzanian government has faced an ever increasingly vigilant donor community demanding accountability and transparency. The most pressing concern for international agencies was the failure of the government to collect taxes and curtail the high levels of corruption. The World Bank's refusal to disburse funds was echoed by the donor community which refused the balance of support payments as a result of the Paris Club meeting in 1995.

In 2000, Tanzania held its second multiparty elections. These elections were seen as a foregone conclusion with President Mkapa assured of a second term in office. The opposition parties'

inability to field a single candidate meant that Tanzanians were highly sceptical of the electoral process.

For the average voter, the real issue was the continuing decline in their standard of living. Although the government adopted and met World Bank-IMF expectations, high unemployment, insufficient health services, lack of educational facilities and sheer poverty still remain.

The 2000 elections were not different from the 1995 elections with the CCM able to ensure that they were not operating on a level playing field. The abolition of state subsidies to political parties meant that the opposition was unable to fund their campaign adequately. The problem of the differentiation between the CCM and the state remained.

CCM was again able to intimidate the opposition through the use of police supervising political rallies. In addition, it denied the opposition access to the dominant government media. Although the private media had been permitted to operate, in general, it had little impact on the political agenda. Most significantly, the media, public or private, failed to raise the key issue of economic management.

The opposition, under the aegis of the National Convention for Construction and Reform-Change called for the resignation of Judge Lewis Makame, the chairperson of the National Electoral Commission, on the grounds that he favoured the CCM. Furthermore, the opposition was unable to make any significant electoral inroads. The same four presidential candidates ran for office and it appeared that the opposition had learned nothing from the previous election. International observer teams reported

that the election was relatively fair and free on the mainland. As expected, President Mkapa and the CCM easily retained power.

In the first multiparty elections in 1995, the CCM, with less than a 1% margin, claimed victory in Zanzibar. The opposition CUF claimed widespread rigging and boycotted the assembly. This led to the suspension of donor aid to the island. The 2000 election sadly mirrored the 1995 election. The 2000 election was marred by claims of electoral fraud and violence with troops patrolling the streets.

Although the constitution prohibits religion to be the basis of a political party, the ruling CCM accused the CUF to be an essentially Muslim party. Ironically, the label of an Islamic party helped the CUF to gain further support from the Islamic community. The detention of 18 CUF members without trial for treason exacerbated tensions further. These CUF members were declared to be 'prisoners of conscience' by Amnesty International.

The election was annulled due to irregularities in 16 of the 50 constituencies. The Commonwealth team of observers commented that the election was a shambles. Despite the opposition's demand that a new election should be held, the CCM rejected this, leading to further violence on the island. The re-run was boycotted by the CUF and Amani Abeid Karume was sworn in as Zanzibar's President and the Vice-President of Tanzania. In an attempt to forge unity, Karume's first act was to release the 18 CUF members.

The opposition to CCM rule on Zanzibar nevertheless continued with clashes between the opposition and government. The repression of the opposition resulted in the fleeing of a large

number of Zanzibaris to Kenya, including 14 CUF members of parliament. This crisis represented the biggest challenge to the Tanzanian government, which has always prided itself as a peace loving nation. It is clear, however, that the events in Zanzibar represent the repressive nature of the system that continues to exist in the country.

While most sub-Saharan African countries have endured a great deal of instability - marked by ethnic rivalry, military takeovers, regional and religious conflict - Tanzania has been, until recently, a stalwart of stability.

Tanzania has been at the forefront of the liberation struggles, a haven for refugees from neighbouring countries, and has played an important role in fulfilling the ideals of pan-Africanism. These achievements are in no small measure a testament to the legacy of its founding father, President Julius Nyerere who died on 14th October 1999. Although obituaries from all sides of the political spectrum praised Nyerere's achievements, there have been dissenting voices such as that of R.W. Johnson who portrayed him as a flawed hero. The neo-liberal agenda epitomized by Johnson fails to recognise Nyerere's achievements primarily because of his vehement opposition to Western domination.

In the 2000 IMF review of its loans to Tanzania, the IMF commended the Mkapa government for implementing macroeconomic reform. The World Bank and the IMF, that have become the major proponents of contemporary modernisation theory, currently set not only the economic but also the political agenda for sub-Saharan Africa.

The chief executives of the IMF and the World Bank recently travelled to Tanzania to set the economic and political agenda.

It is clear that policy makers in these institutions have the power to determine what counts as knowledge by setting the agenda — whether 'basic needs', 'sustainable development' or 'good governance' - which in turn legitimises their very authority.

Although Tanzania has escaped the more overt political turmoil that its neighboring countries have endured, in the aftermath of the 2000 multiparty elections, the country appears to be open to inter-ethnic rivalry due largely to the Zanzibar question which threatens the union itself.

Zanzibar is the site of the greatest opposition to the ruling CCM party which has been in power since independence. The challenge faced by the current President Kikwete is to deal with the dysfunctional economy and to meet the ever growing demands of its population which has seen a rapid decline of social services. The ideal of self-reliance which was espoused by Nyerere is no longer a choice, but increasingly a necessity.

Democracy in Tanzania

It can be traced back before the attainment of independence in 1961 and even the Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar which merged to form Tanzania in 1964.

Tanganyika (Tanzania Mainland) had a multiparty political system, The Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), established in 1954 was the overwhelmingly a dominant political party in pre independence Tanganyika. Other political parties were United Tanganyika Party (UTP), the African National Congress (ANC) and All Muslim National Unity of Tanganyika (AMNUT).

In Zanzibar (Tanzania Islands) there were three important political parties prior independence. These included ZNP-Zanzibar Nationalist Party, ASP-Afro Shiraz Party and ZPPP-Zanzibar and Pemba Peoples Party.

The multiparty general election in Tanganyika prior to independence took place in 1958, 1960 and 1962 when Tanganyika became a republic and Mwalimu Nyerere as the first President.

Although all the political parties struggled to bring independence in Tanganyika, soon after the attainment of independence, the ruling party (TANU) under the Chairmanship of Mwalimu Nyerere, denounced opposition parties and introduced the single party system in 1962.

Tanganyika united with Zanzibar in 1964 which led to the birth of The United Republic of Tanzania in which TANU became the only political party in Tanzania Mainland and ASP in Zanzibar after the dissolution of other political parties. This was followed by the introduction of the single party constitution in 1965.

All general elections since 1965 to 1990 were held in a single party system, though they were competitive in nature.

The single party political system didn't give the citizens freedom to join in or form the political parties, even though they were not pleased by the ruling party. The presidential position had one candidate and a shadow or blank, in which the electorate is required to vote for YES for a candidate or NO for a shadow. This system violated the citizens' rights of electing the leader they wanted.

On February 5, 1977, TANU and ASP merged to form Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) a revolutionary state party. It became the sole legal political party in Tanzania.

All candidates had to be approved by CCM and were permitted to campaign only under the CCM platform. Elections within a single party framework were competitive. For example in October 1985, there were 328 candidates competing for 169 elective seats in the National Assembly.

The multiparty political system was officially reintroduced in 1992 after the collapse of the USSR in 1980s and pressure from the donor countries (USA and Europe) the World Bank and International Monetary Fund conditionalities forced the less developed countries including Tanzania to adopt the multiparty system in order to get financial assistance in terms of loans, grants and aids from the donors and financial institutions.

Surprisingly, the majority of Tanzanians refused the introduction of multiparty due to the fear that the political parties will lead to civil wars and disruption of the long existing unity and peace.

The late Mwalimu Nyerere played a major role in educating the Tanzanians on the importance of multiparty system. Surprisingly, he was the one who banned the political parties soon after independence. He realized his mistakes and because of his influence and reputation as the father of the nation, multiparty system was officially signed on 1st July, 1992. This marked the era of true democracy in Tanzania, where many political parties registered, including the ruling party (CCM) which was the first party to get the certificate of registration, followed by CUF,

CHADEMA. There after other parties followed suit. These were: NCCR-Mageuzi, UMD, NLD, TPP, UNP, TLP, TADEA, NRA, UPDP, PONA, PPT-Maendeleo etc

In 1995 there were 13 political parties that participated in the general election; however there were a number of irregularities.

Although Tanzania amended her constitution in 1992 to become a multiparty state, CCM still controls the government till today (2011).

Challenges of Practising Democracy in Tanzania

The implementation of democracy has faced a number of constraints in Tanzania, as follow;

Historical challenges;

Tanzania had a multiparty political system before the attainment of her independence in 1961, the political parties were TANU, ANC, UTP and AMNUT, but soon after independence Mwalimu Nyerere who was TANU Chairman and the first President of Tanganyika, announced a single party political system in 1962 and banned other political parties although they all struggled for independence. Hence a Single Party Constitution was introduced in 1965 and TANU became the only party. All citizens were forced to join TANU whether they liked or not. The first monoparty election was held in 1965, and Mwalimu Nyerere won the presidency.

All Tanzanians were much influenced by the good leadership of Mwalimu Nyerere and the single party system as a unifying factor. The monoparty system lived for more than thirty years (1962 up to 1995) where the first multiparty election was held. It took a long period of time for Tanzanians to be in monoparty system, it was therefore difficult to change them. This can be evidenced in Nyalali Commission of 1992. The public opinion on the reintroduction of multiparty system, revealed that the majority of Tanzanians voted for the single party. Some Tanzanians still fear other political parties that they can be the source of chaos, as a result, they continue voting for the ruling party CCM. The multiparty system is still young in Tanzania, that's why it has not yet received enough public support.

Nature of the citizens;

The majority of Tanzanians are illiterate and most of them live in rural areas. This is a great challenge for the practice of democracy, as democracy grows quickly in a literate society which has a wide awareness on pertinent issues. Also most of Tanzanians, especially those living in villages don't have access to the mass media like televisions and newspapers, therefore they are less aware of what is happening in the country and the world at large. Furthermore, they do not command civic education because of their low level of education. All these act as an obstacle for the implementation of democracy, since they are most easily tricked and they can't make firm decisions or held their leaders accountable, or be aware of their rights and responsibilities.

The ruling party and government leaders;

The ruling party (CCM) does not want any criticism or challenges from the opposition parties, and it always tries to create a negative image towards opposition parties so as to

diminish their public support. Also the ruling party has enough resources. It is therefore capable to run many political campaigns to bind and convince its members, compared to other political parties. Some of them can't afford to rent an office. This can be compared as a struggle between an elephant and a bull, where a winner is always the elephant. There must be a fair distribution of resources in order to have a fair play in a political ground. One party should not accumulate many resources while others are not even able to hold a public rally. Also most government leaders strongly support the dominancy and supremacy of the ruling party as opposed to opposition parties.

Public perception to opposition parties;

The public still has a negative attitude towards the opposition parties as majority of citizens assume that opposition parties will fuel civil wars and ruin the long existing unity among the Tanzanians. That's why they are still supporting the ruling party, which claim to embrace peace and unity. Some of the opposition leaders are referred as traitors (betrayers), this made them lose hope of bringing changes in the government, others were completely disappointed and they decided to return to the ruling party, while some are still dreaming of bringing changes.

Opposition party leaders;

Most of the opposition party leaders came from the ruling party and some of them had leadership positions, others joined the opposition because they lost their positions in the ruling party. Therefore some didn't join the opposition for the desire to bring changes. Some of the opposition leaders are disorganized, this is seen when an opposition leader is found supporting the ruling party and defaming his fellow opponent. Other factors that

contribute to poor opposition, is lack of good leaders who are able to bring changes, internal conflicts, and lack of commitment among the opposition leaders.

The level of development of a country;

Tanzania is a developing country, this is a challenge in practising democracy, since it is difficult to implement democracy in a poor country. Democracy goes hand in hand with the dissemination of knowledge, civic education and awareness rising. All these issues require both human and material resources. Sub-Saharan countries are less developed, therefore they encounter constraints in the implementation of authentic democracy.

Other challenges;

They include, lack of transparency and accountability by the government officials, different ideologies of political parties, corruption and bribery during general elections, fear to join opposition parties among the civil servants, little involvement and participation of citizens in decision making, gender inequality, nepotism and favoritism in leadership positions, unequal distribution or ownership of resources between the political parties, vote fraud, geographical constraints due to poor transport and communication, absence of an independent National Electoral Commission (NEC).