

May 2002

**Ethnicity, state power
and the
democratisation process
in Uganda**

**Juma Okuku Anthony
Department of Political Studies
University of the Witwatersrand**

IGD OCCASIONAL PAPER NO 33

**Published by:
Institute for Global Dialogue
P.O. Box 32571
Braamfontein 2017 South Africa
Tel: (27) 011 339 6585
Fax: (27) 011 339 6616
Website: www.igd.org.za
ISBN: 1-919697-58-6
©IGD**

**Series Editors
Garth le Pere
Noelle Lawson**

The author is a lecturer in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Makerere University, and also a doctoral candidate in the Department of Political Studies, University of the Witwatersrand. Thanks to Dr Garth le Pere and Prof Rok Ajulu for comments on earlier draft.

Glossary

CA	Constituency Assembly
CAA	Civil Aviation Authority
CADs	Constituency Assembly Delegates
CP	Conservative Party
DP	Democratic Party
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
GSU	General Service Unit
<i>Kabaka</i>	King of Buganda Kingdom.
KY	Kabaka Yekka, (King Only/Alone)
LRA	Lord's Resistance Army
Mcs	Movement Councils
NRA	National Resistance Army
NRC	National Resistance Council (NRM's Interim Parliament)
NRM	National Resistance Movement
PPU	Presidential Protection Unit
PSC	Public Service Commission
PU	Privatisation Unit
Rcs	Resistance Councils
SPLA	Sudanese People's Liberation Army
<i>Ssabataka</i>	Chief of Buganda Clan Heads
UA	Uganda Army
UFA	Uganda Freedom Army
UFM	Uganda Freedom Movement
UIA	Uganda Investment Authority
UNC	Uganda National Congress
UNLA	Uganda National Liberation Army
UNLF	Uganda National Liberation Front
UPC	Uganda People's Congress
UPC/KY	Uganda People's Congress/Kabaka Yekka (King Only) Alliance
UPDA	Uganda People's Democratic Army
UPDF	Uganda People's Defence Forces
UPDM	Uganda People's Democratic Movement
UPM	Uganda Patriotic Movement
UPU	Uganda People's Union
URA	Uganda Revenue Authority

'Museveni's claim that the opposition in Africa tends to be ethnic, and therefore by implication illegitimate, explains little, for where the opposition is ethnic it is more likely that the government is no less ethnic. It also ignores the fact that a legal ban on organising an opposition does not remove it, it simply tends to drive the opposition underground', (Mamdani, 1998:31)

'Museveni held talks with the clergy before the March 12 Presidential elections and agreed to be succeeded by a Muganda Catholic' (The Monitor, 20 June 2001).

1. Introduction

One of the post-independence political concerns in Uganda today is that ethnicity had been detrimental to national unity, democracy and development. There is no doubt that the conflicts in Uganda from 1964 to 1966 when Prime Minister Milton Obote overthrew President Edward Mutesa, have taken on an ethnic expression. The 1971 coup by Idi Amin, the civil war of 1981-86 and the insurgency in the North since 1987 have all had ethnicity as one of the driving factors. The central problem was and has been the politicisation of ethnicity, that is, its use for purposes of group mobilisation in social conflict that also involves the state. However, ethnicity cannot be taken as a given. The problem is not of ethnicity in itself. Ethnicity is more intimately linked to political and economic conditions, especially the unequal distribution of and competition for power and wealth.

The nature and role of the state, regime survival and political leadership accounts for the impact of ethnic consciousness on democratisation or authoritarianism. The issue is to explore the origins of ethnic consciousness, explain its causes and the mechanisms through which it can be managed. Uncontrolled ethnic consciousness is not inevitable and the answer to the problems of democracy and ethnicity is not to redraw the map of Uganda or delay the democratisation process by instituting so-called no-party democracy. Ethnicity in Uganda, as elsewhere on the African continent, has been historically constructed and subsequently reproduced. While democratisation may be problematic in the face of ethnic consciousness, the paradox is that the best way to reduce ethnic consciousness is more and not less democratisation.

This paper critically reviews the impact of ethnicity on the democratisation process in Uganda from colonialism to the present. The paper is divided into four parts. Part one is a theoretical overview of the issues of ethnicity and democratisation. Part two examines the nature of ethnicity construction and expression in the colonial period. Part three looks at the post-colonial political practices and their enhancement of ethnicity in Uganda. Part four discusses the possibility of deconstruction of ethnicity through democratisation and the no-party-movement system. In conclusion, it is argued that there is a need to understand the substantive underlying political, economic and social configurations that enhance ethnicity rather than denouncing them.

2. Ethnicity and democratisation: A theoretical overview

The relationship between ethnicity and democratisation remains contentious in democratic

theory. This theoretical overview is intended to provide a framework from which to explore and explain the paradox of ethnicity and democratisation in Ugandan politics. Ethnicity has exercised profound influence on Uganda's politics from colonialism to the present. However, there has been little theorisation of its bases and how it can be transcended. What exactly then is ethnicity?

2.1 Explaining ethnicity

Ethnicity has been variously conceptualised as a sense of ethnic identity consisting of the subjective, symbolic or emblematic use by a group of people of any aspect of culture in order to create internal cohesion and differentiate themselves from other groups¹. In the contemporary debate on ethnicity, consensus has emerged on two key features. One concerns the *formation* of ethnic identities and the other the *function* ethnicity performs in contemporary setting. It has been argued that ethnic identities are social constructs defined by the historical conditions in which they emerge. The first feature, *formation*, postulates that ethnic identity is based on ethnic groups which can be referred to as a historically formed aggregate of people having a real or imaginary association, a specified territory, shared cluster of beliefs and values connoting its distinctiveness in relation to similar groups and recognised as such by others².

¹ P.R. Brass, *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison*, New Delhi, Sage, 1991, p.8.

² John Markakis, 'Nationalism and Ethnicity: A theoretical Perspective', A paper presented at a workshop on *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, organised by Organisation of Social Science Research in Eastern Africa, (OSSREA), Addis Ababa, June 1996, 3-5, p.4.

The primordial conception of ethnic identity formation is the essentialist view of ethnicity in which ethnic groups are taken as givens. Ethnicity is viewed as an archaic reality underlying modernity. This static perspective has been predominant in social science as in the concept of plural society. It is the basis of a fundamentally pessimistic view of multi-ethnic societies. It ignores how 'tribes' themselves have usually been modern constructions through the intervention of colonialism, which froze the play of identities³. There is also the notion of the constructed or the 'invented' nature of ethnicity or ethnicity as an 'imagined' community, as politics⁴. The question that arises then, is what is the logic governing the process of construction or invention and what are the political consequences of this view? While this view takes distance from the essentialising claims of identity politics, its limitation is that it underrates or ignores the role of cultural meanings and symbolic resources, as if these could be flattened to straightforward economic or political choices. As Nederveen⁵ contends, ethnicity is an inherently unstable category. As a constructed or imagined community, like the nation, its logic is that of imagination and imagination is a social practice. It is a plural and contested category, shifting in between the narrow comforts of enclosure ethnicity and the contradictory pressures of competition ethnicity. The objective traits of a group that can form the basis of ethnic identification range widely and vary according to circumstances. Why and how ethnicity is instrumentalised politically is conditioned by prevailing historical circumstances. The second key feature of ethnicity is its *function* in contemporary settings. The objective of ethnicity is in most cases to obtain and use state power, in order to gain access to resources commanded by the state or defend ethnic identities from state intrusions. Because the pattern of resource distribution in both the colonial and post-colonial state is iniquitous, ethnicity has proved to be an effective means of political mobilisation for those who seek access to state power in order to change the pattern of resource distribution. Ethnicity, therefore, is a continuation of the dialectics of domination and emancipation. Ethnic mobilisation can be limited through the just exercise of state power by those in power. Ethnicity as such is not a permanent phenomenon. Since ethnicity is a construction, it is amenable to deconstruction. As Smith⁶ observes, if ethnicity is constructed and reconstructed by articulatory practices growing out of contemporary conditions and power relations among social groups and the interpretative meaning given to them rather than out of some timeless or primordial dimension of human existence, then the creative leadership by political and cultural elites and public intellectuals, as well as everyday interventions of ordinary people into the flow of racial and ethnic discourse do matter in the elimination of a feeling of exclusion. Democratisation - ensuring the expansion of social and political space, the building of democratic institutions for peaceful transition and the tolerance of alternative political views, is fundamental in this process.

2.2 Democratisation

Democratisation can be defined as the change of a non-democratic state into a democratic one. Mehra⁷ contends that a non-democratic society is not likely to have a democratic government. In

³ P.J. Nederveen, 'Deconstructing/Reconstructing Ethnicity', a paper presented at a workshop on *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, organised by OSSREA, Addis Ababa, June 3-5, 1996, p.2.

⁴ Terence Ranger, 'The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa' in E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, New York 1983, and P. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, Verso, London, 1991.

⁵ P.J. Nederveen, *op. cit.*

⁶ D Anthony Smith 'Chosen Peoples: Why Ethnic Groups Survive', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 1992, Vol.. 15, No. 3, p.526.

⁷ Ajay Mehra, 'Ethnicity, Democratisation and Governance: The Case of India', *Ethnic Studies Report*, 1993, Vol. XI, No. 2, July.

the context of society, democratisation refers to the transformation in its political culture from passive, non-participative citizens, not only insisting that the state be alive to its aspirations, but also keeping a check on state power and providing constructive direction to its policies through regular and active participation in the political and developmental process. The democratisation process involves the introduction of universal suffrage and genuine political competition with free and fair elections to decide who will take power constitutionally⁸. But democratisation and good governance involve more than these. It is much more than simply the pluralisation of politics and acceptance of political competition that constitutes democratisation. The core aspects are legitimacy in the exercise of power, construction of solidarity reciprocities, development of trust in state-society relations and institutionalisation of accountability⁹

⁸ M. Robinson and J. Healey, 'Democracy, Governance and Economic Policy: Sub-Saharan Africa in Comparative Perspectives', ODI, Development Policy Studies, 1992, London, p.151.

⁹ C. Young and B. Kane, 'Governance, Democracy and the 1988 Senegalese Elections' in G. Hyden and M. Bratton (eds.), *Governance and Politics in Africa*, Boulder & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1992, pp. 57-8.

Democracy is said to be problematic in ethnically plural societies. While this may be true under certain circumstances, the solution to the problem of ethnicity is not to suppress ethnic identities and consciousness. Ethnic configurations, the generation of ethnic consciousness and the impetus of ethnic protest, must all be understood in the context of the changing relationships between the state and civil society – that domain between the state and society – from which they derive significance and orientation¹⁰. While the democratisation process is bound to be problematic in the face of ethnic tension, the paradox is that the best way to manage ethnicity is more and not less democratisation as a tool of its deconstruction. Ethnic identities become amenable to political manipulation either when suppressed groups feel marginalised from the political and economic processes or when privileged groups feel their interests threatened. The solution to this is the expansion of social and political space, not its constriction, and the recognition of civil and political rights of every member of society. More broadly, as Magubane¹¹ observes, ethnic consciousness and expression in terms of conflict or cleavages must be derived from social structure and not relegated to psychological variables (tribalism) or to innate hatreds between ethnic and racial groups. Ethnicity has a social history. It is made through historical, political, economic and social processes. It is therefore through these very processes that ethnicity may be deconstructed. Democratisation, broadly conceived, appears to be an indispensable element in this transaction.

3. Ethnicity construction in Uganda: historical perspectives

The genesis of the ethnic crisis in Uganda, as in most parts of Africa, is mainly linked to the colonial intervention process and the particular organisation of power in society. The post-colonial practices simply enhanced it. Therefore, the formation of ethnic identities is a social construction defined by the historical conditions in which they emerge. Ethnicity is not a constant. Over Uganda's history, ethnicity has been continually redefined as the context has changed. The objective of this section is to present a historical examination of the colonial and post-colonial practices which created and sustain the ethnic phenomenon in Uganda's socio-political set up. Mamdani¹² contends that to understand the phenomenon of what is referred to as 'tribalism' it is necessary to look at it within a social context. This is why, rather than conceiving of an ethnic identity as simply invented by statecraft, as in Ranger¹³, or as 'imagined' by intellectuals, as in Anderson¹⁴, it would make sense to speak of the making of an ethnicity. Ethnicity is made through political, economic and social processes. It is these processes that we examine here.

3.1 Colonial intervention and the making of ethnicity

The problem of ethnicity and political power in Uganda has been superficially explained in a one-sided manner as mainly an outcome of the first 25 years of independence and the pre-industrial nature of Ugandan society.¹⁵ Mazrui advances another view, which attributes ethnic mobilisation

¹⁰ Martin Doornobos, 'Linking the Future to the Past - Ethnicity and Pluralism', in Mohamed Salih and John Markakis (eds.), *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala, Sweden, 1998, p.21.

¹¹ Bernard Magubane, 'Pluralism and Conflict Situations in Africa: A New Look', *Africa Social Research*, 1969, No. 7, July, p.541.

¹² Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1996, p.185.

¹³ Terence Ranger, 'The Invention of Tradition in colonial Africa' in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.) *The Invention of Tradition*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

¹⁴ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso, 1991.

¹⁵ Yoweri Museveni, *Sowing the Mastered Seed: the Struggle for Freedom and Democracy in Uganda*, Macmillan, London/Basingstoke, 1997, p. 187.

to tribalism in Uganda.¹⁶ Perhaps a more negative trend is one that attributes continued ethnicity in the country to the personalities of those who governed after independence¹⁷. It is historically partial, both theoretically and empirically narrow, to conceptualise the problem of ethnicity and political power in Uganda in this manner. It is important to trace the social history of ethnicity and power, particularly from the colonial practices, in order to interpret the current situation intelligently.

The historical conditions under which ethnicity was constructed in Uganda were buttressed by the establishment of British colonial administration towards the end of the 19th Century. In the 68 years of colonial rule, Britain systematically cultivated and firmly established an intricate system of domination in all spheres of Ugandan society. Politically, the origins of ethnicity and the obstacles it poses to the democratisation process can be located in colonial politics. At the same time ethnicity was a form of anti-colonialism. The cultivation of ethnic intricacies by colonialism can be analysed at several levels: the drawing of colonial boundaries, the organisation of power within the colony, the political and economic dominance of Buganda, the underdevelopment of civil society and finally, ethnicity and the anti-colonial movement.

¹⁶ Ali Mazrui, *Soldiers and Kinsmen in Uganda: The Making of a Military Ethnocracy*, Sage Publications, 1975.

¹⁷ Samwiri Karugire, *Roots of Instability in Uganda*, Fountain Publishers, Kampala, 1988, p.4.

First, the single-most important element that entrenched ethnicity in the body politic of Uganda was the arbitrary colonial act of boundaries. Driven by an overwhelming economic logic, British colonialism brought within the fold of one country peoples at different levels of social development and split nationalities into or among several countries¹⁸. One important colonial legacy is that Uganda is made up of societies that in the past were either antagonistic to each other or were not necessarily themselves part and parcel of a similar culture or society. The pre-colonial antagonism exploited by the forces of British colonialism to ease their military-political conquest fed into the pattern of 'collaboration' and 'resistance' to colonialism that kept ethnic consciousness alive. The north-south divide in Uganda today is one of the most enduring legacies of this colonial act. It must be noted, however, that the incorporation of different ethnic groups under the same rule does not in itself lead to antagonism based on ethnicity. It was the way power was organised in the colony that further enhanced it.

Second, the form through which power was organised in the colony underpinned the process of construction of ethnicity¹⁹. With the objective of divide and rule, colonial political structures encouraged polarisation of ethnic identities rather than trans-ethnic alignments and crosscutting cleavages. Instead, colonial power within the territory had ethnicity as the fulcrum as the British sought to use it as an instrument of divide and rule. This generated the basis of long-term ethnic consciousness. As Mamdani²⁰ observes:

Every institution touched by the hand of the colonial state was given a pronounced regional or nationality character. It became a truism that a soldier must be a northerner, a civil servant a southerner and a merchant an Asian.

The implication of this institutional 'division of labour', and the organisation of power, could only be realised during the post-colonial period with attempts to reform the state. The assignment of the north, for instance, as a source of soldiers and policemen had negative implications for stability as the ruling elite during the immediate post-colonial period, who were from the north, used this military predominance to acquire and retain power undemocratically. The differentiation amongst the colonised subjects inevitably led to the crystallisation of ethnic, religious and racial consciousness. This is because the emergence of ethnic consciousness is a matter of demonstrating how people come to identify themselves as different from others and how a community of identity and interest emerges, manifesting itself in the interaction with other groups²¹.

The religious dimension led to the creation of another cleavage. The Catholic Church lost the battle for political power to the Anglican Church in 1890s. In terms of political power, therefore, the Anglican Church came to identify itself as the church of the establishment. The centrality of the Catholic Church in the formation of the opposition Democratic Party, DP, in mid-1950s only exacerbated the polarisation as religion became a factor in the formation of subsequent political

¹⁸ R. Mukherjee, *A Historical Accident? Class, Nation and State Formation*, Africa World Press, New Jersey, 1985.

¹⁹ Mahmood Mamdani, 'Indirect Rule, Civil Society and Ethnicity: The African Dilemma', in G.W. Martin and M.O. West (eds.) *Out of One, Many Africas: Reconstructing the Study and Meaning of Africa*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999, p.29.

²⁰ Mahmood Mamdani, *Imperialism and Facism in Uganda*, London, Heinemann, 1983, p.10.

²¹ Holdger Bernt Hansen, *Ethnicity and Military Rule in Uganda*, Research Report No. 43, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala, Sweden, p.29..

parties.

Third, no colonial act was more catalytic in the whole process of ethnic consciousness than the special treatment of Buganda in the whole scheme of things, politically, economically and socially. At the time of colonial conquest, Baganda officers were used to colonise the Bunyoro Kingdom, the north and the eastern parts of the country. In these areas they were appointed as chiefs. This colonial policy created a political complication that still haunts Uganda today. To the other colonised ethnic groups Baganda chiefs and not the British colonialists were seen as the enemy. While the political system in Uganda was a pyramid of power that was effectively based on race, Buganda came to occupy a special status amongst the colonised. As a result, Buganda came to conceive itself differently as it was treated differently. This ethnic superiority complex came to the fore in the move towards independence. This special treatment became an obstacle in the 1940s and 1950s with increasing demand for democratisation²². To protect the interests of the chiefly elements, the Buganda kingdom adopted a variety of tactics, from opposing direct elections to the national assembly in Buganda, to the eventual establishment of a political party, *Kabaka Yekka*, (King Only), directed solely at the preservation of the *Kabaka* (king).

In economic terms, Uganda was turned into a reservoir of raw materials (cotton, coffee and tea) for British industry. Building upon pre-colonial differences, Britain turned the southern part (Buganda, Busoga and Ankole) into cash crop growing areas. But cash crop production was discouraged in northern areas. Their production was based on both peasant and migrant labour mainly drawn from the North, West Nile, Kigezi and Rwanda. In the north, principally Acholi and Lango, the colonialists recruited soldiers, policemen as well as labourers for factories and plantations in the south²³. The result of this 'division of labour' was the building of ethnic cleavages that would entrench ethnic consciousness in the long run. Therefore, through divide and rule tactics, one region was pitted against another and one nationality (tribe) against another.

Socially, most of the social infrastructure such as schools and hospitals was concentrated in Buganda. The distribution of schools in Uganda was unfair. For instance, in the 1920s there were 368 schools in Buganda, 44 in Western Province and 42 in Eastern Province and none at all in northern Uganda²⁴. This was a conscious colonial government policy of making northern areas reserves of cheap unskilled labour for the plantations, the army, police and prisons. Such a social policy could only deepen ethnic and regional cleavages.

Fourth, colonialism by definition is anti-democratic. The political and economic exclusion of the colonised simply enhanced regional, religious and ethnic consciousness. For the subjects, there were no rights of association, freedom of speech, press or assembly as the natives were excluded economically from trade and manufacturing for most of the colonial period. The late 1940s and 1950s saw a number of political and economic reforms as a result of the anti-colonial movement. Reforms allowed for enhanced rights of association, permitted the formation of co-operatives and trade unions and witnessed the removal of some racial restrictions on trade and employment. It was also the eve of the establishment of political parties²⁵. The problem with the reforms and the

²² Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'The Question of Buganda in Contemporary Ugandan Politics', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2, July 1997, pp. 174-5.

²³ Mahmood Mamdani, *Imperialism and Fascism*, 1983, p.10.

²⁴ T.B. Kabwegyere, *The Politics of State Formation: The Nature and Effects of Colonialism in Uganda*, East African Literature Bureau, Nairobi, Dar es Salaam and Kampala, 1974, p. 179.

²⁵ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'The Question of Buganda', 1997, p.174.

political organisations that emerged was that they did not transcend the intricacies of the colonial political economy, particularly ethnicity and regionalism.

The first political party, Uganda National Congress (UNC), was predominantly Protestant and Buganda based. Throughout the period of its existence, UNC remained a party of local grievances and never formulated a national manifesto beyond the slogan of 'Self Government Now'. Formed in 1956 to advance the interests of Catholics in the administration of Buganda Kingdom, the Democratic Party, DP, was overwhelmingly Catholic in membership and leadership. Uganda People's Union (UPU), founded in 1958, and was the forerunner of Uganda People's Congress (UPC), founded in 1960. This was an anti-Buganda party since it was formed primarily to oppose the concessions that Buganda was demanding from the colonial government²⁶. The co-operative and trade union organisations, which transcend ethnicity and regionalism, were highly circumscribed by colonial legislation. While permitting the formation of trade unions, the colonial state did not favour the growth of a strong trade union movement. The Trade Union Ordinance of 1952:

Made it illegal for anyone to organise general unions and required unions to be set up for each industry. (It must be noted that while general unions enhance the solidarity of the working class and express its general interests against the class of employers, separate unions divide workers into separate organisations, making it possible for the employers to confront each union separately). Furthermore, the colonial state also, by the same law, empowered itself to police union funds which were not to be used for political purpose²⁷.

By the end of colonialism, civil society – that domain mediating between the state and society and one of the building blocks of a democratic society, was basically underdeveloped. Colonial state practices had obstructed the emergence of autonomous organisations and a leadership determined and capable of putting the national interest above their individual and geo-ethnic group. It is only on this basis that the democratisation process could be advanced meaningfully. The combination of the above colonial practices led to the institutionalisation of ethnicity in the anti-colonial national movement. Due to the institutionalisation of ethnicity, the initial, even the later resistance to colonialism was fragmented along ethnic lines. The organisations that emerged were ethnically oriented as well. Even their demands were not for democratisation. They were limited to education and employment. As Mamdani²⁸ observes:

Everywhere, the local apparatus of the colonial state was organised either ethnically or on a religious basis. This is why one finds it difficult to recall a single major peasant uprising over the colonial period that has not been either ethnic or religious in inspiration. This is so for a simple but basic reason: the anti-colonial struggle was first and foremost a struggle against the hierarchy of the local state, ethnically organised Native Authority that claimed an ethnic legitimacy. Indirect rule at once reinforced ethnically bound institutions of control and exploded them from within.

What the colonial construction of power had done, in Shakespearean terms²⁹, was not to instil civilisation amongst the natives but to concoct a toxic ethnic 'witches brew'. While the nationalist movement externally espoused unity, internally it was fractured along ethnic and religious lines. The centrality of ethnicity in the political calculations of the nationalist movement precluded the restructuring of the colonial institutions that enhanced it. Instead, the colonial power structures and institutions were built on and became the basis of ethnic and anti-democratic practices in the

²⁶ Samwiri Karugire, *Roots of Instability*, 1988, pp. 37-42.

²⁷ Mahmood Mamdani, *Imperialism and Fascism in Uganda*, London, Heinemann, 1993, pp. 17-18..

²⁸ Mahmood Mamdani, 'Historicising Power and Response to Power: Indirect Rule and its Reform', *Social Research*, Vol. 66 No. 3, 1999, p.9.

²⁹ This is an allusion to Shakespeare's Three Witches in *Macbeth*, who were believed to possess magical powers. Here the reference is to the ethnically intricate system that the colonial state had constructed.

post-colonial period.

The contribution of colonial practices in the construction of ethnicity should not be underestimated, as these colonial practices became a major obstacle to the realisation of the nation-state project. In general terms, however, although the very process of colonial state creation accounted in part for the rise of regionalism and ethnic consciousness, it also gave rise to a shared nationalist, multi-ethnic aspiration for self-determination and self rule. Ethnicity is a continuation of the dialectics of domination and emancipation. This contradictory tendency of ethnicity led to the rise of the nation-state project by the time of independence.

4. Post-colonial practices and the reproduction of ethnicity

The post-colonial practices by the mainstream nationalists, who inherited the national state, saw the reproduction rather than the deconstruction of ethnicity in Uganda's body politic. To achieve a meaningful level of democratisation, colonial practices had to be transcended through a process of deconstruction of its bases. The major objective of any serious nation-state project should have been to dismantle and concurrently rebuild institutions for deconstruction of ethnicity and regionalism in the country's development process. The reforms by the political leadership that inherited the central state apparatus were limited as far as the deconstruction of the political bases of ethnic consciousness, restructuring the economy to defuse the ethnic and regional material expression and the liberation of civil society, are concerned³⁰.

The basic argument of this part is that the post-colonial practices enhanced rather than deconstructed ethnic consciousness. The tackling of the national question was not organically tied to the question of democratisation. This is discussed at a number of levels: the assumptions of the nation-state project, militarism, the stifling of civil society and the resulting rise of an ethnically organised post-colonial state. These are themes that run through all the post-colonial regimes in Uganda

4.1 The assumptions of the nation-state project and ethnicity

Uganda gained political independence in 1962 under a quasi-federal constitution, inheriting all the cleavages discussed above. The first government was a coalition between Milton Obote's Uganda Peoples Congress (UPC) and *Kabaka Yekka* (KY) (King only) of *Kabaka* Mutesa. The post-independence government led by Milton Obote (1962-71), had a number of assumptions. First, the task of nation-building called for uniting all the forces in society. To him the diversity of ethnic identities was inherently negative and obstructive to successful nation-building and development. As Obote stated in 1963:

The tribe has served our people as a basic political unit very well in the past. But now the problem of people putting the tribe above national consciousness is a problem that we must face, and an issue we must destroy³¹.

This set the stage for the clash between the UPC, a republican party and KY, an ethnic chauvinist and monarchist party devoted to the preservation of the special status of Buganda Kingdom in the post-colonial set up.

³⁰ Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject*, 1996, pp. 288-291.

³¹ H.B. Hansen, *Ethnicity and Military Rule in Uganda*, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Uppsala, Sweden, 1974, p. 63.

One explosive political problem the government handled constitutionally was the long-standing dispute between the Buganda and Bunyoro Kingdoms over the so-called 'lost counties'. These were counties that belonged to the Bunyoro Kingdom before the onset of colonialism but were given to the Buganda Kingdom as appreciation for its assistance in the conquest of the Bunyoro Kingdom by the British. The colonial government left it to the government of the newly independent state to settle this issue through a referendum. The referendum was held in 1964 as was required by the independence constitution. The population in the two counties voted overwhelmingly for their return to the Bunyoro Kingdom. This democratic solution to the problem of ethnic conflict instead provoked ethnic antagonism between Buganda and Bunyoro on the one hand, and the central government and the Buganda Kingdom, on the other. The Buganda Kingdom was not content with the way the dispute was handled by the government of Milton Obote. This resulted in a strain between the Buganda Kingdom and the central government culminating in the break-up of the UPC/KY alliance formed at independence³². The ethnic conflict, militarism and authoritarianism that followed between 1964-1971 during the Obote I regime had this tension as one of its sources. The leadership on both spectrums of the 1964 wrangle was rather antagonistic and confrontational, recipes that democratic practice are not made of.

The 1966 crisis, which resulted in the violent overthrow of the independence constitution, was a culmination of three political developments. First, the break up of the UPC/KY alliance, second, the leadership wrangle in UPC, using the Congo gold scandal³³ as an excuse to overthrow Obote. This resulted in Obote's detention of his own cabinet ministers for the plot and thirdly, the unilateral suspension of the Independence Constitution in 1966. Using authoritarian methods in what was essentially a civil conflict that could have been handled politically compounded the problem. The long-term effect of this was to exacerbate ethnic mobilisation and destroy any chance of democratic solutions to such cleavages. Because the opposition to Obote came from mainly Bantu politicians, the crisis came to take on a north-south dimension.

While it is true that Obote was trying to break up the heaviest concentration of power in the land in order to safeguard his position and perhaps concentrate on the nation-building objective instead of using democratic means, he did so through the use of ethnicity. The treatment of Buganda between 1966-71 lent little credibility to his declared intentions of reducing the significance of the ethnic factor in Uganda's politics. The Baganda were still regarded as so hostile and unreliable that the region was kept in a state of emergency throughout this period³⁴. Suppressing the Kingdom of Buganda and the imprisonment of southern politicians without trial simply politicised ethnicity in the country's body politic. Obote's partisan authoritarianism played a key part in keeping ethnic consciousness alive in the country waiting for an opportunity to reassert itself.

4.2 The suppression of political opposition and civil society

The second central assumption of the nation-state project was that only a one party state could carry out the tasks of nation building in a unitary set up. A major reason given by incumbent African leaders for the abandonment of political pluralism was the urgent necessity to rid Africa of cultural divisiveness, which western style multi-party politics seemed to be keeping alive and

³² Samwiri Karugire, *Roots of Instability*, 1988, pp.50-51. Forster Byarugaba, 'Ethnopolitics and the State - Lessons from Uganda', in M. Salih and J. Markakis, (eds.), *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala, 1998, p. 184.

³³ The Congo gold scandal refers to allegations by an opposition parliamentarian in 1965, that the Prime Minister Milton Obote, his defence minister Felix Onama, and army commander Idi Amin were involved in smuggling gold and ivory from eastern Congo. The Uganda army had been sent to aid the Lumumbist rebellion led by Mulele in eastern Congo in their military operations.

³⁴ H.B. Hansen, *Ethnicity and Military Rule in Uganda*, 1974, pp. 66-71.

which appeared to sap political and developmental energies in a multi-ethnic environment. This was complemented by the imposition of the almost worshipful notions of the national father figure³⁵. Accordingly, the suppression of opposition parties, internal opposition within the ruling parties, the subordination of civil society organisations such as trade unions and co-operatives was part of this authoritarian enterprise. Such authoritarianism could not lead to nation-state building.

³⁵ Adbeayo O. Olukoshi and Liisa Laakso, 'The Crisis of the Post-Colonial Nation-State Project in Africa', in Adbeayo O. Olukoshi and Liisa Laakso (eds.), *Challenges to the Nation-State in Africa*, The Nordic Africa Institute and Institute of Development Studies, University of Helsinki, Stockholm & Helsinki, 1996, pp. 14-15.

Uganda's post-independence experience has not been different from this general rule. The period 1964-66 saw the suppression of internal opposition within Milton Obote's own party, the UPC. After 1967, with the new constitution, Obote turned on all and sundry, culminating in 1969 with the banning of all opposition parties as dangerous societies that would adversely affect peace and order in Uganda³⁶. In the 1960s, as in the early 1980s, the UPC governments interfered greatly in the internal affairs of the trade unions and co-operative societies. The party manipulated elections so that the leadership that was not sympathetic to it was thrown out and a pro-UPC one brought in. This was achieved through intimidation and politically inhibiting elections³⁷.

These authoritarian practices could not resolve the intricate ethnic configurations in the country. The suppression of civil society organisations, which may have mediated the various pluralist interests in society and worked as bases for political/democratic resolution of differences and ensuring some meaningful level of accountability on the part of the state, precluded peaceful transition. The assumption that it was the one party state that could accomplish the nation-state project was essentially wrong. In practice, the one party state in Uganda as in Africa in general, suppressed alternative political organisations, relied on 'father-of the nation', fused party institutions to that of the state and was generally undemocratic. Thus the one party state that resulted did not resolve the issue of ethnicity and democracy. Instead it came to represent a thinly disguised monopoly of power by an elite drawn from a combination of ethnic and religious groups with the exclusion of others. Jabrin and Pereira³⁸ make a general observation that: 'one party rule in general is a major impetus for the promotion of ethnicity as it is a means of protection from the threat posed or perceived as posed to the given ethnic group by the party in power which is usually exclusive'. Far from getting rid of ethnicity, the one party state keeps it as one of its social bases to ensure dominance and monopoly of political power under the 'father figure', both within the party and the nation.

The centralisation of power which is characteristic of a one party state, with little respect for alternative political organisations and ethnic identities, is one of the factors in explaining the incidence of political conflicts and violence of the kind that has characterised political life in post-colonial Uganda. It could be argued that the persistence of the ethnic problem in Uganda is linked to the failure of democratic practice, not vice versa. Barongo³⁹ and Mudoola⁴⁰ attribute ethnicity to excessive centralisation of power and little respect for institutions in a multi-ethnic political context. The exclusion of some sections of society from political participation and the struggle of elite members of ethnic groups to control the centre, heighten and intensify political conflicts. According to Kasfir⁴¹, de-participation is the most striking feature of African political change since independence.

The persistence of the ethnic problem in Uganda is linked to the failure of democracy. In a democratic regime, stability could be maintained by means of democratic practice and broad participation. In general terms, the struggle for access to power and economic resources by different ethnic groups and lack of full participation in the political, civil and economic lives of their countries in most of Sub-Saharan Africa, result in ethnicity, that is, the political

³⁶ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'The Question of Buganda' 1997, p. 175.

³⁷ See John Jean Barya, *Law, State and Working Class Organisation in Uganda: 1962-1987*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Warwick, 1990; J.J. Barya, 'Workers and the Law in Uganda', Kampala: CBR Publications, *Working Paper* No. 17, 1991; and Nyangabyaki Bazaara, 'Civil Society and Poverty Reduction in Uganda: A Review Essay' presented at CODESRIA Seminar, Senegal, April 14-15 1999.

³⁸ Jibrin Ibrahim and C. Pereira, 'On Dividing and Uniting: Ethnicity, Racism and Nationalism in Africa' CODICE, CODESRIA, Dakar, Senegal, 1993, p. 13.

³⁹ Yoram Barongo, 'Ethnic Pluralism and Political Centralisation: The Basis of Political Conflict' in K. Rupesinghe (ed.), *Conflict Resolution in Uganda*, International Peace Research Institute, Oslo & James Currey, London, 1989.

⁴⁰ Dan Mudoola, Religion, *Ethnicity and Politics in Uganda*, Kampala, Fountain Publishers, 1993.

⁴¹ Nelson Kasfir, *The Shrinking Political Arena: Participation of Ethnicity in Africa Politics: A Case Study of Uganda*, University of California Press, San Francisco, 1976, p. 22.

mobilisation of ethnic identity in order to change the pattern of resource distribution. Perhaps far reaching was the introduction of the military in Uganda's politics and the restructuring of the bureaucracy amongst ethnic lines.

5. Ethnicity, militarism and the rise of an ethnically organised state

From colonialism through the post-colonial period in Uganda, one finds not a meritocratic state run along Weberian lines but an ethnically organised state. In spite of the various regimes' apparent aversion to ethnicity in Uganda, they have rested on distinctly ethnic political foundations and reproduced themselves on the basis of definable, and in most cases, narrow ethnic alliances. The ultimate result of authoritarianism, militarism and the stifling of civil society organisations was that it did not get rid of ethnicity and regionalism and construct a nation-state. Here, two elements in the reorganisation of the state will be discussed: the bureaucracy and the military.

5.1 Bureaucratic reforms and enhancement of ethnicity

The reforms by the political leadership who inherited the central state were limited as far as the deconstruction of political bases of ethnic consciousness is concerned. Important for any reform project should have been the restructuring of the bureaucracy on the basis of merit and efficiency. Instead, the inherited colonial bureaucracy was ethnicised. A politician and not a technocrat was appointed to head the newly established Public Service Commission (PSC) in 1963. A UPC politician from the Obote's home district, Abdala-Anyuru, was appointed to be Chairman of the Commission⁴². This dealt a death blow to meritocracy and insulation of the bureaucracy from political interference, a basic requirement for an autonomous and efficient bureaucracy. As Karugire⁴³, notes:

...Soon, abuses piled up, unsuccessful UPC politicians were made district commissioners, relatives of ministers embezzled public funds with impunity, appointment and promotion on merit were ignored and 'undesirable' civil servants were subject to prompt and frequent transfers, often by telephone, to hardship stations.

The local government 'reform' followed a similar trend. With the so-called native authorities, indirect rule came to be the principle form of colonial rule in most of Uganda. Indirect rule was grounded less in racial than in ethnic structure. What was needed was to transform these structures which enhanced ethnic consciousness. As Mamdani⁴⁴ observes:

After independence, however, there was a dramatic shift in the political focus of the nationalist leaderships, from local to the central state apparatus, from democratising local state apparatuses to a dual occupation: De-racialising civil society in the towns and restructuring unequal international relations.

The centre's increased power can be located at the level of the powers given to the minister of local government by the 1967 local administration Act. The 1987 Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Local Government System⁴⁵, observed that the act:

⁴² Samwiri Karugire, *Roots of Instability*, 1988, p. 59-61.

⁴³ Samwiri Karugire, *Roots of Instability*, 1988, p. 60.

⁴⁴ Mahmood Mamdani, 'Indirect Rule, Civil Society and Ethnicity: The African Dilemma', in W. G. Martin and M.O. West (eds.), *Out of One, Many Africas: Restructuring the Study and Meaning of Africa*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1999, p. 192.

⁴⁵ Uganda Government, *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Local Government System*, Entebbe: Entebbe Government Printers, 1987, p. 9.

Gave the Minister extensive powers over local authorities. For instance... he has control *inter alia* over the number of members of council, election of senior officials of council, election of council members themselves and the bye-laws they may pass. The Act also empowers the minister to take over a Local Administration...

The local administrations instead of being agents of democratisation and destruction of ethnic bases in the bureaucracy, remained centres of authoritarianism where a dictatorial centre rode roughshod over compliant local authorities. All regimes in Uganda have used local administration to advance their political interests, with Museveni's regime, since 1986, being slightly different due to decentralisation policy. Even then, the decentralised local government structures have been merged with National Resistance Movement (NRM) structures. They have become symbols of decentralised corruption as well as instruments of patronage for political loyalists of the NRM regime.

5.2 Militarism and enhancement of ethnicity in the 1960s

The other part of the state where the political leadership failed to transform its ethnic bases was the military. The introduction of militarism and the mobilisation of ethnicity in the military impacted negatively on political development in Uganda. During both Milton Obote's regimes in the 1960s and early 1980s, the Idi Amin's regime in the 1970s, including Yoweri Museveni's since 1986, militarism was and has been employed as a means of capturing and maintaining power. As a result the resolution of the problem of ethnicity through democratic means in the foreseeable future has been postponed.

The scourge of military power that looms throughout Uganda's post-independence period was introduced in Uganda's politics between 1964-66. Between 1964-66, democratic solutions were abandoned and Obote resorted to militarisation of the country's politics as a strategy for crisis management⁴⁶. The loss of the 1964-5 power struggle between the Prime Minister, Obote and the President, *Kabaka* Mutesa, within the UPC/KY ruling coalition, resulted in the retreat of Mutesa into enclave, chauvinistic Ganda ethnicity and aggressive, militarist ethnicity on the part of Obote, with a reliance on the army which was dominated by the northerners. By 1967, the army had been dragged into Uganda's politics, thereby eroding the relative degree of democracy and pluralism that had prevailed in the country between 1962-66.

Militarisation only exacerbated the ethnic question. This is because the army had been used in a showdown with an ethnic group in the 1966 invasion of *Kabaka's Lubiri*, (King's Palace). The army could no longer be regarded as an organ that was neutral in an ethnic sense⁴⁷. The deliberate recruitment of the Specialised Paramilitary Corps into the Obote regime along ethnic lines lent little credence to his fight against ethnicity. Obote initiated a massive expansion of a special paramilitary corps Special Force, and created a lavishly equipped intelligence service, the General Service Unit (GSU) under the command of Akena Adoko, his cousin, and recruited almost solely from his own ethnic group, the Langi⁴⁸. The result was the rise of an ethnically organised state. Obote failed to resolve the contradictions inherited from the colonial political economy. Every regime in Uganda since then, Yoweri Museveni's NRM included, has used ethnicity in the military and other state organs to retain power.

The attempts to transcend the reliance on the military and ethnic alliances through ideological manoeuvres came to nought. The launching of the '*Move to the Left*'⁴⁹ was intended to broaden

⁴⁶ P. G. Okoth, 'Democracy on Trial in Uganda', *UFAHAMU*, Vol. 23, No. 3, 1995, p. 123.

⁴⁷ H. G. Hansen, *Ethnicity and the Military Rule in Uganda*, 1974, p. 66.

⁴⁸ H. H. Hansen, *Ethnicity and the Military Rule in Uganda*, 1974, p. 88.

⁴⁹ *The Common Man Charter* was a political document issued in 1969 to place Uganda on a socialist path along

Obote's social base and for him become less reliant on the military. The rivalry in the army and Obote's increasingly radical stance in foreign relations with regard to the liberation of the then settler Rhodesia and apartheid South Africa resulted in the 1971 coup by Idi Amin relying mainly on ethnic groups from his West Nile region. Amin was assisted by the British and Israeli military operatives in the country who were training the Uganda army and air force⁵⁰.

The ultimate result of authoritarianism, militarism and the suppression of civil society organisations, was that it did not lead to the deconstruction of ethnicity and regionalism in the service of constructing a nation-state. Instead it meant that there would be no peaceful transfer of power in the country, hence the military coup of 1971.

6. The period of military dictatorship, 1971-79

with Julius Nyerere's 1967 *Arusha Declaration*, in neighbouring Tanzania.

⁵⁰ Amii Omara-Otunnu, *Politics and the Military in Uganda, 1890-1985*, Basingstoke and London, 1987, pp. 86-7.

The 1971 coup was a result of ethnic and power rivalry between the President Milton Obote and his Army Commander, Idi Amin. One of the primary reasons given by Amin for the 1971 coup was that Obote had suppressed multi-partyism and imposed a one-party dictatorship. Therefore on the face of it, the Amin military junta was committed to the restoration of multiparty democracy⁵¹. In the aftermath of the coup, the Amin regime conducted vicious campaigns of violence against the Langi and Acholi officers and men in the Uganda Army and Special Force, the principal power base of the Obote regime. Amin soon ordered the army's Acholi and Langi elements that he considered rivals for power, to return to barracks and had thousands of them killed⁵². Despite their knowledge of this, many Ugandans, especially those living in Buganda and dissatisfied with Obote's increasingly oppressive government, initially welcomed the coup. The release of detainees and Amin's allowing the return of *Kakaka* Mutesa II's body were popular measures. He also allowed the installation of Ronald Mutebi (the late *Kabaka's* heir) as *Ssabataka* (Chief of Buganda clan heads) but not as *Kabaka* (king)⁵³. One could have gotten the impression that Idi Amin was trying to resolve the 'Buganda question' which had haunted the country for the past 20 years. The initial euphoria, however, soon gave way to despair. The ethnic targeting of the Acholi and Langi soon spread to all ethnic groups, including those from Amin's West Nile home region, whom he suspected of any form of opposition to his regime. The targeting of particular ethnic groups and the spread of a reign of terror and murder, could not solve the question of ethnicity in Uganda's politics

Soon Amin created several new, ethnically and religiously based security organisations, which reported directly to him and which ruthlessly killed thousands of Ugandans. According to a report by the New York City Bar Association's Committee on International Human Rights, the estimated number of victims of Amin's reign of terror was between 100 000 and 500 000. According to the report⁵⁴:

Within three months after he took power... Amin suspended all democratic rights, gave the army dictatorial powers of arrest and punishment and set up a military tribunal to try political offenders. A period of terror administered by the army (now dominated by Sudanese mercenaries, the Anyanya, Kakwa and Nubian ethnic groups from Amin's West Nile region) and security forces followed

Ethnicity and religion once again had been used to reconfigure the state structures as a basis of power. The regional and ethnic cleavages had acquired a new lease of life. The promise of democratic elections at the time of the coup was shattered as Idi Amin declared himself life President and all talk of multi-party politics was quickly forgotten. As soon as he consolidated power he declared all political parties illegal. In his view, and using the current President Museveni's arguments against the restoration of multiparty politics, political parties were not only the breeding grounds of tribalism, religious sectarianism, subversion and disunity, but they were also potential agents of imperialism and Zionism. During the eight years of Amin's regime,

⁵¹ Justus Mugaju, 'An Historical Background to Uganda's No-Party Democracy' in Justus Mugaju and Joseph Oloka-Onyango, (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2000, p. 21.

⁵² Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy: The Movement System and Political Repression in Uganda*, Washington, 1999, pp. 31-32.

⁵³ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'The Question of Buganda', 1997, p. 176.

⁵⁴ Quoted in Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy*, 1999, p. 32.

multi-partyism was outlawed⁵⁵.

The overthrow of the Amin regime by a combined force of the Tanzanian Army, Tanzania Peoples Defence Forces, TPDF, and Ugandan guerrilla armies under the Uganda National Liberation Front/Army (UNLF/A) heralded a hope of return to normalcy. However, this hope was soon shattered as the Ugandan political elite jostled for dominance in the new system. The old cleavages of ethnicity and militarism soon broke down this transitional arrangement. The short-lived Uganda National Liberation Front (UNLF) experiment in 'umbrella politics' did not support the revival of formal multi-partyism either. This meant that change could only come through undemocratic means. Change did come and violently too, when the former President Obote loyalists in the Military Commission of UNLF, led by Paulo Muwanga, carried out a coup in May 1980 against the Lukwonga Binaisa government which had succeeded Prof Yusufu Lule who ruled for 68 days after Idi Amin. Once again the question of the military and retention of power were central in the coup.

7. 1980 elections, ethnicity, militarism and civil war, 1981-85

The period 1980-85 is characterised by an aberration of democracy, intensification of militarism, ethnic mobilisation and violence. There was a multi-party election on 10 December, 1980 organised by a partisan Military Commission. Four political parties participated, the Uganda People's Congress (UPC) led by A M Obote, the Democratic Party (DP) led by P K Ssemwogerere, the Uganda Patriotic Movement, (UPM), led by Yoweri Museveni, and the Conservative Party (CP) led by Joshua Mayanja Nkanji. The election results were disputed. The Chairman of the Military Commission, (the ruling military junta), Paulo Muwanga is believed to have rigged the election for his party, UPC. The return of UPC and Obote to power raised mixed feelings amongst a cross section of Uganda's population. Once again the hope of a democratic transition to power had been shattered.

⁵⁵ Justus Mugaju, 'An Historical Background to Uganda's No-Party Democracy', in Justus Mugaju and J. Oloka-Onyango (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda*, 2000, p. 22.

Ethnicity came to play a major part in the elections. For instance, most of the elected opposition members of Parliament came from the southern part of the country. Nearly all MPs in Buganda were elected on a DP ticket, the party they had rejected in the 1962 general elections. In West Nile where there may have been opposition MPs, being a region identified with the Amin regime which had been overthrown a year before, there was no election at all. The MPs from the area were declared unopposed and they were all members of Obote's UPC! As Mugaju⁵⁶, observes:

The disputed elections of 1980 broke all the principles and practices of multi-partyism. The nomination of party candidates was a farce. During the elections there was more talk about which party had which military commanders and 'meeting violence with violence, intimidation with intimidation' than which party programmes were likely to pull Uganda out of the post-Amin quagmire.

What resulted was a declaration of war against the government by Yoweri Museveni, the leader of UPM on the basis that elections had been rigged, although he lost to Sam Kutesa, a member of the DP. Ethnic mobilisation and militarism reached its zenith. Museveni took advantage of the intense dislike of Obote in Buganda and launched his guerrilla war by the National Resistance Army (NRA) in Buganda. Another guerrilla movement, the Uganda Freedom Movement (UFM) and its military wing, Uganda Freedom Army (UFA) led by Andrew Kayiira was also launched in Buganda as well. UFM was a Ganda chauvinist organisation, which did not have much appeal beyond Buganda. The major failing of UFM was the failure to mobilise on the basis of national issues. Second, their methods of struggle were mainly adventurist and terrorist as they planted bombs aimlessly, sometimes injuring civilians. NRA, on the other hand, mobilised the grassroots in the contested territory through the creation of Resistance Councils (RCs) in which the people elected their leaders and at the same time passed information to NRA on the movement of government troops, UNLA. However, one shortcoming of Museveni and his NRA was that he intensified regionalism in military politics, particularly after the Okello coup in 1985, as he preached 'Bantu commonality' in a country where there are different ethnic groups that do not necessarily belong to the 'Bantu commonality'. He ranted against the 'Anyanyas', animals, savages and criminals from the north that dominated the army, UNLA, he was confronting. This served as a basis for the hard line that Museveni has taken on the war in the north for the last 15 years.

Despite the repressive measures by UNLA, NRA continued to make significant progress against the Obote government. The strong ethnic anti-Obote sentiments in Buganda, where bad memories of Obote's first government remained entrenched, ensured NRA support in the region. In 1985, Obote's army commander, General Okello Lutwa together with the commander of the northern Brigade, Brigadier Bazillio Okello, ousted him. The overthrow of Obote itself was a by-product of narrowly ethnic intra-army hostility between Acholi and Langi, exacerbated by manoeuvres in favour of Langi, Obote's ethnic group.

The Okello government seized power on a platform of national reconciliation, urging all political and insurgent groups to join the new government. Although many insurgent groups joined the Okellos, NRM/A refused to join the military junta because of the number of seats given to them on the ruling Military Council. There followed peace talks in Nairobi, derogatively referred to then as peace jokes in Kampala, from August to December 1985 between NRM/A and the Military Council government. These months saw extensive mobilisation, recruitment and

⁵⁶ Justus Mugaju, 'An Historical Background to Uganda's No-Party Democracy', 2000, p. 22.

extension of territory by the NRA as peace talks took place in Nairobi. This was in preparation for taking power militarily. When the NRA felt militarily strong enough, Museveni scuppered the Nairobi Peace Agreement. On 26 January 1986, Museveni's NRM/A defeated the Okello government and captured Kampala.

The NRM/A inherited all the cleavages and intricacies that had bedevilled Uganda's post-colonial history: ethnicity, the north-south divide and militarism. A sense of political and economic sanity, mainly in the southern parts of the country was restored by NRM administration. However, force, intolerance, manipulation of constitutional provisions, suppression of alternative political views, the reconfiguration of power on distinctly ethnic/religious and political foundations, and the reproduction of state power on the basis of definable narrow ethnic alliances became the hallmark of NRM/A. The result has been the further entrenchment of a militarist, ethnically organised state, totally opposed to genuine competition for power.

8. The NRM, 'no party' democracy and the question of power

The NRM has used the notion of 'no-party' democracy to extend its grip on power. President Museveni loathes the idea of handing of power to his opponents in case of defeat in open contestation for power as he puts it in the statement below:

I'm not ready to hand over power to people or groups of people who have no ability to manage a nation... Why should I sentence Ugandans to suicide by handing over power to people we fought and defeated? It's dangerous despite the fact that the constitution allows them to run against me... At times the constitution may not be the best tool to direct us politically for it allows wrong and doubtful people to contest for power. (President Yoweri Museveni, addressing a rally in Western Uganda.⁵⁷

⁵⁷ *The East African*, February 12, 2001.

The NRM led by Yoweri Museveni came to power in Uganda in 1986 following a five-year guerrilla war by his rebel army, the NRA. Important proclamations were made during the armed struggle: the restoration of democracy, hence the rejection of militarism in Uganda's politics and the deconstruction of ethnicity and regionalism from the country. Without democracy, the NRM proclaimed, there can be no peace and no stability'⁵⁸. Some foreign academics sympathetic to the regime have claimed⁵⁹, that there has been a 'Removal of the army as a threat to life and property, and as a direct player in setting the political agenda, the elimination of the ethnic factor from recruitment and the end of the threat posed by civil war'.

A critical observer of Uganda's politics in the last fifteen years cannot fail to construe this as half-truth. As Kasfir⁶⁰ notes:

The twists and turns in Museveni's 'movement', 'no-party' democratic doctrine and its application since 1986 more closely reflect the political realities of legitimising and maintaining state power than they do to the emergence of a novel form of democracy.

The NRM has not transcended the distinctly regional, ethnic and religious political foundations inherited from the post-colonial dispensation, in that it has reproduced itself on the basis of these alliances. The loser in this enterprise has been democracy. Through militarism, constitutional manipulation, ethnicity, regionalism and sheer arrogance of power, President Museveni has managed to impose a one party state on Uganda. As Human Rights Watch⁶¹ contend:

Despite claims to the contrary, the ideology of the 'movement' appears to be leading to a reinstatement of one-party rule.

How has the NRM tackled the contradictions it inherited in Uganda's political economy, which have been obstacles to the democratisation process? When the NRM came to power its first act was to ban all political activities in the country⁶². Past political conflicts in Uganda were attributed to ethnically and religiously based political parties. The solution to this was sought in political conformity as expressed in 'no-party' rule. The major proponent of this view has been President Museveni and his inner circle of 'Movement' adherents. The solution to ethnicity,

⁵⁸ *Towards a Free and Democratic Uganda: The Basic Principles and Policies of the National Resistance Movement*, NRM, Kampala, p.4.

⁵⁹ See E.A. Brett, 'Neutralising the Use of Force in Uganda: The Role of the Military in Politics', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 1, 1995, p. 144.

⁶⁰ Nelson Kasfir, 'Movement' Democracy, Legitimacy and Power in Uganda', in Justus Mugaju and Joseph Oloka-Onyango, (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2000, p. 61.

⁶¹ Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy: The Movement System and Political Repression in Uganda*, New York. Washington. London. Brussels, 1999, p. 143.

⁶² NRM Legal Notice No. 1. 1986.

therefore, is the suppression of the likely ‘sectarianism’ through a no-party, all-inclusive system of governance until there occurs a crystallisation of socioeconomic groups upon which we can then base healthy political parties⁶³. This, for a number of reasons, cannot be a sustainable solution. The crystallisation of classes in Uganda is likely to take more than 50 years. In any case ethnicity is not inevitable the practice of democracy. As Horowitz⁶⁴ argues in general terms:

Uncontrollable conflict is not inevitable, and the answer to the problems of democracy and ethnic conflict is not to redraw the map of the world. Rather, it lies in the political structures that discourage polarisation of ethnic conflict and encourage trans-ethnic alignments and crosscutting cleavages.

⁶³ Yoweri Museveni, *Sowing the Mastered Seed: The Struggle for Freedom and Democracy in Uganda*, Macmillan, London/Basingstoke, 1997, p. 195.

⁶⁴ L. D. Horowitz, *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985, p. 682.

The political structures, which are indispensable in the transaction, are organised political social movements that cut across narrow ethnic or regional lines. As Doornobos⁶⁵ argues, ethnic pluralism and co-existence requires a give and take attitude. In its absence, the insistence on conformity is likely to engender increasingly embittered articulations of ethnic consciousness. The NRM sought to deal with this through coalition politics referred to as a 'broad-based' arrangement. The motives for coalition politics were only partially aimed at resolving the inherited ethnic and regional cleavages. The major objective was the expansion of the NRM social base and extension of its grip on power.

8.1 The broad-base, legitimacy and power

At the time of capturing power in 1986, NRM had a very narrow social base in the country. Its leadership was narrowly ethnic and regional. As Kasfir⁶⁶ observes:

At the time of capturing power in 1986, NRM had a very narrow social base in the country. Its leadership was narrowly ethnic and regional. As Kasfir⁶⁶ Nelson Kasfir, 'Movement' Democracy, Legitimacy and Power in Uganda', in Justus Mugaju and Joseph Oloka-Onyango (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2000, p. 63. observes:

No previous Ugandan political organisation was less well-known, and only the Okellos, and perhaps Amin, had been socially less representative than the NRM was at the moment it took power. No previous Ugandan political organisation was less well-known, and only the Okellos, and perhaps Amin, had been socially less representative than the NRM was at the moment it took power.

The answer to this dilemma of lack of legitimacy and the need to retain and expand the power base was the broad-based 'Movement' type of government. Individual members of the opposition Democratic Party (DP) and Uganda People's Congress (UPC) and Uganda Freedom Movement (UFM) were hand picked and co-opted into government as cabinet ministers. Their participation in government was basically on NRM terms, as individuals and not as representatives of their political organisations.

Notwithstanding the underlying motives, the 'broad-based' arrangement signalled a move away from single party monopoly to power sharing. With hindsight, however, the real function of the 'broad-base' was to legitimise NRM, an organisation with a narrow social base as it extended its grip on power in the country. As Kasfir⁶⁷ asserts:

The NRM appropriated ... a time-honoured Ugandan technique of governance ... the use of patronage to fill the important political positions to expand the NRM's claim to social inclusion. To make this technique serve a legitimising purpose, the leaders of the NRM incorporated their 'anti-sectarian' rationale and called it 'broad-based' government.

Gradually, the broad base increasingly became narrower. By about 1992, NRM had become exclusive. Democracy once again had been derailed. In 1986, the NRM self-mandated a four-year transitional period during which the economy would be reconstructed and free and fair elections

⁶⁵ Martin Doornobos, 'Linking the Future to the Past', 1998, p. 27.

⁶⁶ Nelson Kasfir, 'Movement' Democracy, Legitimacy and Power in Uganda', in Justus Mugaju and Joseph Oloka-Onyango (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2000, p. 63.

⁶⁷ Nelson Kasfir, 'Movement' Democracy, Legitimacy' in Justus Mugaju and Joseph Oloka-Onyango (eds.), 2000, p. 65.

conducted to return Uganda to a democratic form of government. Only a year later Museveni reneged on his pledge. Then followed the comprehensive ban on political activities other than those sanctioned by the regime. This indicated that NRM was not a transitional government. The suppression of the unarmed opposition activity was a blow to the democratisation process in Uganda. In fact the NRM transition period has been amended from four to twenty years, and is intended to end in 2006!

The second element in NRM consolidation of power was the introduction of Resistance Councils (RCs) into every village, parish, sub-county and district. This was a tremendous innovation in popular participation and mobilisation in Uganda's political history. However, as Oloka-Onyango⁶⁸ notes: When NRM was still a guerrilla (anti-state) movement struggling its way through the bush, RCs could certainly be said to have given expression to grassroots and popular aspirations. Once in power, the RCs became instruments of control rather than popular participation. At present RCs (now renamed Local Councils (LCs)), have increasingly become allied to the ruling party, NRM, as they have been integrated with the Movement Councils (MCs), which are organs of the ruling party as well as the local government structures. Perhaps a more ill-conceived understanding of RC structures in Uganda is that which equates them to a form of civil society organisation⁶⁹. During the various elections that have been conducted in Uganda since 1989, the RCs were critical in ensuring that Movement candidates retained their hold on power, negating any claim to neutrality and non-partisanship.

Third, by 1989 the National Resistance Council (NRC) had been elected to act as a national parliament. The election of the NRC was not conducted through universal suffrage, but by members of the RCs. Each sub-county had nine representatives who were to vote on the behalf of the rest of the citizens. Moreover, it was based on the queueing system instead of the secret ballot box. There was as well no formal involvement of opposition political parties in this arrangement, although several members of opposition were elected to it despite the obstacles placed in their way by the NRM. This made the election inherently undemocratic. With the election of the 'parliament', the NRM had created a framework for its national legitimation and extension of its grip on power.

The period between 1986-89 can be characterised as that of NRM's power consolidation. Several government ministers from the opposition, who had been co-opted into the NRM government, were arrested and charged with treason. Andrew Kayiira, minister of energy, was marked out as posing a serious threat to the leadership of NRM, particularly in Buganda. He and several other cabinet ministers were arrested and charged with treason, but were later acquitted due to lack of evidence. Shortly after his acquittal, Kayiira was assassinated under suspicious circumstances⁷⁰.

The most important event internally in terms of democratisation during this period was the

⁶⁸ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'New Wine or New Bottles? Movement Politics and One-Partyism in Uganda' in Justus Mugaju and Justus Oloka-Onyango (eds.), 2000, p. 41.

⁶⁹ Mikael Karlström, 'Civil Society and its Presuppositions: Lessons from Uganda', in John L. Comaroff and Jean Comaroff (eds.) 1999, *Civil Society and the Political Imagination in Africa*, London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999, pp. 104-123.

⁷⁰ Amii Omara-Otunnu, 'The Struggle for Democracy in Uganda', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 30,

setting up of the Constitutional Commission to collect views from citizens for drawing up a new constitution. Given the background to violent non-constitutionalism of the post-independence period, this was a step in the right direction.

Externally, the most important move in the regimes' consolidation power, was the total embrace by the NRM government of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank's structural adjustment programmes. It would seem the endorsement of Western economic growth strategies went some way to compensate for the lack of 'conventional democracy in Uganda'⁷¹. From the early 1990s onwards, the international community would tolerate the restriction on political rights and abuse of human rights in Uganda as long as the NRM regime pursued and encouraged private enterprise. This has had a negative effect on the democratisation process of the country and is elaborated below.

Thus, the notion of 'broad-based' government was not a charitable act on the part of the NRM. Their objective was the expansion of the NRM narrow social base, legitimisation of its rule and its consolidation of power. It had little to do with resolving the ethnic, religious and regional cleavages it had inherited from the previous regimes. Neither did it make sustainable achievements in terms of the emergence of novel forms of democracy such as observing the principle of genuine competition for power. This contention can be evidenced in the NRM's practices and manoeuvres during the constitution-making process.

9. NRM politics, constitutionalism and the consolidation of power

Towards the end 1988 a 21 member Constitutional Commission was appointed. Given the violent non-constitutionalism of the past, this was promising for democratic development. The Commission was to seek the views of the ordinary citizen through the holding of public meetings, debates, seminars and workshops throughout the country⁷². The limitation of the Commission's role in the constitutional-making process, however, was that it was merely advisory. The Commission had to submit a report, including a draft Constitution, to the Minister of Constitutional Affairs for his consideration!⁷³Towards the end 1988 a 21 member Constitutional Commission was appointed. Given the violent non-constitutionalism of the past, this was promising for democratic development. The Commission was to seek the views of the ordinary citizen through the holding of public meetings, debates, seminars and workshops throughout the country⁷⁴ Uganda Constitutional Commission Act, 1988, S. 4.. The limitation of the Commission's role in the constitutional-making process, however, was that it was merely advisory. The Commission had to submit a report, including a draft Constitution, to the Minister of Constitutional Affairs for his consideration!⁷⁴ Oliver Furley and J. Katalikawe, 'Constitutional Reform in Uganda: The New Approach', *African Affairs*, Vol. 96, 1997, p. 247.

The political framework within which the constitution-making process operated and by implication the underlying motives, have been critiqued by leading Ugandan scholars and some foreign observers⁷⁴. Oloka-Onyango⁷⁵ makes two pertinent observations on the composition and

⁷¹ J. Haynes, 'Limited' Democracy in Ghana and Uganda. What is Most Important to International Actors: Stability or Political Freedom', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2, 2001, p. 201.

⁷² Uganda Constitutional Commission Act, 1988, S. 4.

⁷³ Oliver Furley and J. Katalikawe, 'Constitutional Reform in Uganda: The New Approach', *African Affairs*, Vol. 96, 1997, p. 247.

⁷⁴ Mahmood Mamdani, 'Social Movements and Constitutionalism in African Context' in I. Shivju (ed.) *State and Constitutionalism: An African Debate on Democracy*, Harare: Sapes Books, 1991; John Jean Barya, 'Popular Democracy and the Legitimacy of the Constitution: Some Reflections on Uganda's Constitution-making process', Kampala: CBR Working Paper, No. 38, 1993; John Jean Barya, 'The Making of Uganda's 1995 Constitution: Achieving Consensus by Law?' Kampala. CBR Working Paper (forthcoming) 1998; O. Furley and J. Katalikawe, 'Constitutional Reform in Uganda: The New Approach', *African Affairs*, Vol. 96, 1997; Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'Governance, State Structures and Constitutionalism in Contemporary Uganda', CBR Working Paper, Kampala 1997; Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'New Wine or New Bottles? Movement Politics and One-Partyism in Uganda' in

operation of the Commission. First, almost to a person, the Commission comprised strong adherents of the movement system, incorporating both the political commissar of the NRM as well as his counterpart in the NRA. Second, the Commission was extremely circumspect about the mode of political organisation and system of governance in its mandate that it was 'educating' the public based on particular 'guidelines'. While this was supposed to be a 'people's' constitution, there are a number of issues that remained shrouded in an almost mystical type of secrecy. The question remains, why were other political organisations and social movements not formally accepted in this important exercise of making a national constitution?

Justus Mugaju and Oloka-Onyango (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala, Fountain Publishers, 2000; and Odoki Benjamin 'Writing of a Democratic Constitution', *East African Journal of Peace and Human Rights*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1993.

⁷⁵ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'New Wine or New Bottles?' in Justus Mugaju and Joseph Oloka-Onyango (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda*, 2000, p. 45.

Furley and Katalikawe⁷⁶ wonder why, in view of the government's declared intention to involve the people in the making of their constitution, the NRM found it necessary to have the people's views vetted by the NRM cadres. They contend that the idea that the 1995 Constitution was a 'people's' constitution was a noble lie. Far from being based on people's views, the 'people's' constitution is a product of the country's elite: it was designed, written and promulgated by them⁷⁷. The NRM was determined to keep the contending political forces in the country out of the constitution-making process. Some critics are of the view that the process was to ensure NRM's imposition of its own constitution upon the people of Uganda. The minister of constitutional affairs during the constitution-making process, Sam Njuba, accused the Commission of 'doctoring' the draft constitution. He claimed that there were "eight wise men who smuggled into the process draft proposals that were not contained in the peoples memoranda and left out others"⁷⁸. He was subsequently dismissed.

In terms of the democratisation process, the pertinent shortcoming was the formal exclusion of contending political forces in the entire constitution-making exercise. The guarantor of democracy cannot be constitutional safeguards engineered by consultants (in Uganda's case, hand-picked political loyalists and NRM cadres armed with guidelines). It must rather be the organised presence of social and political movements which need democratic freedoms for their very existence and which will therefore struggle to defend them⁷⁹. The major objective of the exercise would appear to have been the legitimisation of NRM and its monopolisation of state power by enacting laws that would disadvantage alternative political organisations in their legal contestation for state power. This objective can be observed in the Constituency Assembly (CA) debate on the draft Constitution, which is considered next.

9.1 Constituency assembly, CA, elections, debates and suppression of the opposition

The election of Constituency Assembly Delegates (CADs) took place in March 1994 and debates continued into 1995. Once again the contending organised social and political movements in Uganda were denied formal participation. The Constituency Election Act of 1993 provided an opportunity for the NRM regime to translate its administrative ban on political activity into a legal ban. The election rules provided that candidates would "stand and be voted for...upon personal merit" and any candidate who used or attempted to use any political party, tribal or religious affiliations or other sectarian grounds for purposes of the election would be disqualified⁸⁰. This did not apply to NRM and its candidates.

⁷⁶ Oliver Furley and J. Katalikawe, 'Constitutional Reform in Uganda' 1997, p. 251.

⁷⁷ Oliver Furley and J. Katalikawe, 'Constitutional Reform in Uganda' 1997, p. 252.

⁷⁸ *The Monitor*, 15 July 1994.

⁷⁹ Mahmood Mamdani, 'Democratic Theory and Democratic Struggles' in Eshetu Chole and Jibrin Ibrahim (eds.), *Democratisation Processes in Africa: Problems and Prospects*, CODESREA BOOK SERIES, Dakar, Senegal, 1995, p. 56.

⁸⁰ Constituency Assembly Elections Rules, Rule 11, quoted in Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy*, 1999, p. 39.

In the heat of the preparation for CA elections, there were more growing voices and sentiments to boycott the exercise than to participate in it⁸¹, particularly in the multi-party camp and Buganda. Before the elections NRM used an ethnic calculation and restored the Buganda monarchy with all pomp and ceremony. However, this would appear to have been a calculated move to gain support in Buganda rather than resolving the long-standing Buganda question, the question of special status of Buganda vis-à-vis the rest of Uganda, one of the cleavages that has haunted post-independent Uganda. It aimed, first, at getting ethnic unity of the Baganda for CA election purposes and subsequent elections. Second, the NRM intended to shut out political parties as a factor in the electoral contest. Buganda, the stronghold of Democratic Party (DP) with a substantial percentage of the country's voters, was thus targeted. As Oloka-Onyango⁸² observes: The single factor that could secure the alliance of the Baganda across virtually all religious, sectoral, class and ideological lines was the issue of the monarchy. The monarchy was therefore hastily restored with a spotlight on the impending CA elections and Ronald Mutebi, became *Kabaka* (king) of Buganda but with apparently only cultural powers. This was a hollow divide between culture and politics as Oloka-Onyango⁸³ observes:

...the full hollowness of the 'cultural' proscription of the restoration of Buganda kingdom was revealed only days after the coronation when President Museveni attended the opening of the restored *Lukiiko* and did not even bat an eyelid on being introduced to the ministers and other officials of the Buganda government. Amongst the ministers were those in charge of 'constitutionalism', 'political affairs', 'human rights' and 'local government'. This in an institution that had been restored as purely cultural!

There is no doubt that the restoration of Buganda Kingdom was popular in Buganda. But it would seem it was an essentially political institution intended to serve particular NRM interests. As a result most of the Baganda turned away from the idea of a boycott. The alliance between the NRM and the Buganda monarchy was crucial in NRM's efforts to lock out political parties in Buganda. Here, the NRM was taking an ethnic and sectarian position, which according to Museveni is only common with political parties in Uganda and indeed Africa, to advance its political interests of consolidating power, contrary to its public professions.

When CA elections took place, the majority of the delegates, CADs, were NRM adherents in alliance with the Buganda contingent, struggling for its narrow monarchical interests, summed up as *Federo*, (federalism for Buganda vis-à-vis the rest of Uganda). Of course, there were secular Baganda CADs, but these were a minority. It is therefore not surprising that after the result of the elections for the CADs was compiled, President Museveni proclaimed victory and declared we have won and surrounded them Zulu style⁸⁴.

⁸¹ *Buganda's Position on the Draft Constitution: Views of the Buganda Lukiiko*, n.d. p. 4, quoted in Oliver Furley and J. Katalikawe, 'Constitutional Reform in Uganda', 1997, p. 248.

⁸² Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'The Question of Buganda', 1997, p. 180.

⁸³ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'The Question of Buganda', 1997, p. 182.

⁸⁴ Museveni was referring to Shaka Zulu's horn formation warfare that was supposedly used in his military conquests in southern Africa. One question remains though, since all Ugandan's belong to the 'Movement' who had they defeated and who had they surrounded in Zulu Style?

A number of issues stand out in the CA debates as far as the democratisation process in Uganda is concerned: the election of both presidential and parliamentary candidates on the same day; the political systems and the use of a referendum to change the political system. One of the issues that appeared simple and straightforward was the election of the presidential and parliamentary candidates on the same day. The draft provision read as follows: The Electoral Commission shall ensure that elections are held at times fixed and notified in advance to the public. Dick Nyai, a CAD member from Ayivu in West Nile and a member of opposition UPC, sought to add the following proviso: Provided that subject to the provisions of this constitution, presidential and parliamentary elections shall be held on the same day⁸⁵. The suggestion met the most hostile reaction from the majority of NRM CADs, who had by now formed a parliamentary caucus, as had the pluralists. The major reason was that the majority of NRM CADs staked their successful future campaign to become members of parliament on President Museveni's name. The voting for both presidential and parliamentary candidates on the same day was unpredictable, though good for democracy. On the one hand, it would not allow parliamentary candidates to use President Museveni's name to be elected. To President Museveni, even if he won the presidential elections, the composition of the parliament that would have been voted in on the same day was unpredictable. It was likely that it would not be a rubber stamp parliament, which would grant him all his policy wishes. Therefore, the rejection of presidential and parliamentary elections on the same day was mutually advantageous to both parliamentary candidate hopefuls and to President Museveni. An important element in democratic elections was defeated.

The other issue was the debate on political systems. The draft constitution provided for political systems: movement, multi-party, federal and any other form of democratic political system. It is with this provision that the NRM sought to achieve a number of objectives: to elevate the movement, which in essence is a political party, to a system, to suppress multi-partyism, since only one system is allowed to operate at a time and finally to conscript legally all Ugandans into the movement even those who were opposed to it.

By elevating the movement to a political system, the NRM was to acquire and retain power above what it really is, a state-based organisation⁸⁶, than was constitutionally provided for. This was given legal expression in the Movement Act of 1997, which legally bound all Ugandans in the movement by fusing its structures with those of the Ugandan state, and creating a pyramid of 'movement' structures from village to the national level. The Movement Act simply reinforces the monopoly of political space that the NRM has been intent on since capturing power in 1986.

The suppression and legal expression of conformity can be found in some provisions of the 1995 Uganda Constitution (Article, 269), which prohibits organised political dissent to the movement, since only one system can operate at a time. This goes against the notion of good governance and democracy. Yet as, Oloka Onyango⁸⁷ argues, '... a key element in any system of democratic governance is the right to organise an expression of disagreement with the existing status quo'.

The final issue during the CA debate and the resulting constitution was the use of a referendum

⁸⁵ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'New Wine or New Bottles', 2000, p. 49

⁸⁶ John Jean Barya, 'The Referendum on Political Systems in Uganda' quoted in John Jean Barya, 'Political Parties, The Movement and the Referendum on Political Systems: One-Step Forward, Two Steps Backward?' in Justus Mugaju and Joseph Oloka-Onyango (eds.), 'No-Party Democracy in Uganda', 1999, p. 35.

⁸⁷ Joseph Oloka-Onyango, 'Governance, State Structures and Constitutionalism in Contemporary Uganda', *Centre for Basic Research*, (CBR), Kampala, 1998, p. 46.

to change the political system in operation. For the past fifteen years political organisations have been constitutionally prohibited from opening and operating branch offices, holding delegates' conferences and political rallies. According to the new constitution there would be a Political Organisations Act, which would enable different political organisation to canvass their views during the referendum campaigns. The Political Organisations Bill was presented to parliament in 1998 and was withdrawn a few months later. The referendum took place on 2 July 2000 where the movement ran against itself but was largely boycotted by the pro-democracy activists. The movement won overwhelmingly. Essentially this was the last step in legal entrenchment of a one-party state in Uganda, which the NRM is all but in name.

As Human Rights Watch notes:

On February 2, 2001 parliament passed the Political Organisations Law with the view of relaxing some of the restrictions placed on political parties and their activities, but the president has yet to sign it into law. ...the law would fail to grant real freedom to political parties. ...under the law, political parties would still be unable to organise at grassroots level, allegedly for fear of confusing the people.⁸⁸

This law does not affect the movement since it is not a party but a system! The movement would operate, recruit, hold delegates' conferences and continue using its party, which in this case is a bus.

The stipulation in the constitution that the question of return to multi-partyism shall be subject to a referendum is a travesty of democracy. As Mamdani⁸⁹ notes:

The consequence of a movement election (as prescribed in the constitution) ... is to make organised opposition illegal. That this can be decided by majority vote in a referendum makes a travesty of the right to organised opposition, crucial to any democracy, since everyone knows that an opposition is just that, precisely because it is in a minority. The legal ban simply drives the opposition underground'.

Such warnings on the consequence of movement election bearing on the long-term democratisation and stability of the country are just ignored. What this makes clear is that NRM has very little respect for open democratic practices, which should pit it against other contending political forces in the country.

9.2 'No-party' democracy, ethnicity and regionalism

One of the major arguments for the constriction of political and social space in Uganda is that no-party movement democracy would reduce the negative impact of ethnicity, religion and regionalism in the country's politics. Three questions arise: how long will no-party movement democracy last?, to what extent has no-party movement democracy reduced ethnicity, religion and regionalism in Uganda's politics? And will the end of no-party movement democracy herald the arrival of pluralism?

⁸⁸ Human Rights Watch, *Uganda: Not a Level Playing Field - Government Violations in the Lead-Up to the Election*, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/uganda>, 2001, p. 5.

⁸⁹ Mahmood Mamdani, 'Clinton and Museveni had a Secret Agenda?', 1998, p. 31.

First, the NRM has not indicated how long the transition to a society where there is the crystallisation of socio-economic groups on which we can base healthy political parties⁹⁰, shall take. Uganda is nowhere near to creating substantial working and middle classes on which to base political pluralism. This reasoning is used to rationalise NRM's hegemony and particularly for President Museveni to monopolise power both in his party, the NRM and as a father figure of the nation.

Second, the no-party movement democracy is claimed to reduce ethnic and regional divisions. It is unclear whether the 'no-party' system in Uganda has had the effect of lowering the regional and ethnic divisions in the country⁹¹. According to Nelson Kasfir⁹², regional tensions have increased since 1986: 'Regional splits have deepened since the NRM came to power. Most of the top leadership of the NRM comes from the west, particularly from the former political unity of Ankole. More recently Mamdani⁹³ has reinforced this view by contending that:

Museveni's claim that the opposition in Africa tends to be ethnic, and therefore by implication illegitimate, explains little, for where the opposition is ethnic it is more likely that the government is no less ethnic.

⁹⁰ Yoweri Museveni, *Sowing the Mastered Seed*, 1997, p. 195.

⁹¹ Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy*, 1999, p. 49.

⁹² Nelson Kasfir, 'Uganda Politics and the Constituency Assembly Elections of March, 1994' in H.G. Hansen and M. Twaddle (eds.), *From Chaos to Order: The Politics of Constitution Making in Uganda*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 1995, p. 149.

⁹³ Mahmood Mamdani, 'Clinton and Museveni had a Secret Agenda?', 1998, p. 31.

Oloka-Onyango⁹⁴ observes that, The fact is that under the movement, the problems of ethnicity, religion and sectarian organising have not disappeared. Instead, other fissures have been introduced into movement politics such as commercialisation of politics or who is movement *enkomba* (concentrated) and who is movement *omufunguro* (dilute)⁹⁵, as if people can be reduced to chemical formulas.

When it suits him, President Museveni has not hesitated to deploy sectarianism in ethnicity or religion to retain power. He has used these sectarian mechanisms as long as they fit into his strategy for the retaining of power at all costs. The restoration of the Buganda monarchy prior to CA elections and the promise to mainly Buganda Catholic clergy, shortly before the 12 March 2001 presidential elections, that a Muganda Catholic would succeed him is revealing. The celebratory account of how 'sectarianism' (ethnicity) has been neutralised in Uganda by Muhereza and Otim⁹⁶, does not seem to correspond with the reality in Uganda today where there are underlying ethnic tensions and contradictory interpretations of some public policies. Such account is based on shaky evidence and it is a form of mindless empiricism that must be rejected.

Finally, will the end of no-party movement democracy herald the arrival of pluralism? From what we have observed, most of, if not all the cleavages inherited by the NRM have only been simply driven underground. The bitterness that is expressed in the north-south divide has deepened as President Museveni and the NRM have chosen a confrontational, militarist approach for ending the war in the north. There has also been increasingly unequal access to the resources of Uganda's economic success story trumpeted by the World Bank and IMF. These, together with the failure to build democratic institutions and civilian control of security forces, are unlikely to herald the arrival of pluralism and peaceful transfer of power in the country. It would seem Uganda today is like a house of cards: it will collapse once the father figure is removed, most likely violently.

The contradictory and self-serving changes in Museveni's rationale for movement democracy during the first decade in power suggests that he regarded it as an instrument of maintaining power rather than as a means to build democratic institutions. President Museveni and the NRM have often used movement democracy to entrench their own power rather than risk losing it in an open democratic process, conveniently citing ethnicity and pluralism as excuses⁹⁷. The obsession with power and fear of being seen as weak if he accepts peaceful resolution conflicts, is evident from Museveni's conduct of wars in the north and west of the country

10. Civil war, militarism and enhancement of ethnicity

⁹⁴ J. Oloka-Onyango, 'Governance Structure and Constitutionalism', 1998, p. 47.

⁹⁵ These terms are used to delineate the level of loyalty of individuals to the 'movement' type of governance.

⁹⁶ Frank Muhereza and O. Otim, 'Neutralising Ethnicity in Uganda', in M. Salih and J. Markakis (eds.), *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, Uppsala: The Nordic Africa Institute, 1998, pp. 190-203.

⁹⁷ Nelson Kasfir, 'Movement' Democracy, Legitimacy and Power', in J. Mugaju and J. Oloka-Onyango (eds.), 2000, p. 62.

NRM's claim to have demystified the gun as an instrument of power and settling of political disputes does not lend itself to much credence, if one looks at the attitude and conduct of the war in the northern and western part of the country. The eloquence of Olara Otunnu⁹⁸ summarises NRM's policy towards the conflict in the north. Far from Brett's⁹⁹ claim that the NRM has put to an end to threats caused by civil war, for 15 years civil war has raged on endlessly in the north. There are three major ingredients of this conflict: first, militarism by the NRM and the belief that the conflict can only be ended militarily, second, an ethnic mind-set of the NRM regime towards the people of the north which borders on a vendetta and racism. Third, the uncompromising stand taken by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) a brutal, ruthless rebel army led by Joseph Kony. In its occasional incursions into Uganda from its bases in the Sudan, it usually leaves behind death and destruction. It is responsible for murder, rape and abduction of children for its campaign against the NRM government. Citing Kasfir again: 'devastating civil wars have been fought in parts of the east and the north. The perception of the NRM as a 'southern' government, and the wars it has fought against remnants of armies of its former enemies, has reinforced regional cleavages'¹⁰⁰. The NRM government has not hidden its contempt for a peaceful resolution of the northern insurgency. A number of instances of this contention can be pointed out.

First, the revenge attacks on the former UNLA, by the 35th battalion of NRA in Kitgum District¹⁰¹ in 1986-87, led to the rise of the Uganda People's Democratic Movement/Army (UPDM/A) to resist this humiliation. Between 1986 and 1992 the people of Teso and the Acholi were subject to military brutality which drove them into the bush to wage war against the Museveni government. It is a bit insensitive to the plight of the people of Teso and Acholi to claim that:

Although NRA soldiers continued to commit atrocities, including the murder of civilians, the brutal treatment of large numbers of people moved from their homes into camps (the so-called protected camps in Acholi today) and illegal detentions, *these were never comparable with atrocities committed in Luwero*¹⁰² (*emphasis added*).

The fact that atrocities in Luwero by both the UNLA and NRA took 5 years, and those in the north have taken fifteen years, does indeed, make them incomparable! The issue here is not the number of years that sections of Ugandan society have suffered as a result of political differences, but that it was necessary to avoid these atrocities by using peaceful conflict resolution. To target a particular section of society by a government, which claims to be the most enlightened in post-independent Uganda, for a period of fifteen years based mainly on personal ego and ethnic vendetta, is basically criminal. Olara Otunnu¹⁰³ contends that the war has become a cynical pretext for the systematic destruction of a people, indeed of an entire society:

Over the last fifteen years, the children of northern Uganda have endured and witnessed things beyond belief. Fifteen years of massacres, atrocities, and dying made all too banal. Fifteen years of systematic dehumanisation, discrimination and humiliation employed as deliberate instruments of policy. Fifteen years of a people trapped between the atrocious crimes and impunity of those

⁹⁸ Joseph Olara Otunnu, 'What shall I tell the Children?', A speech to the 57th United Commission on Human Rights at Geneva, April 10, 2001, p.1. Olara-Otunnu is Uganda-born United Nations Under Secretary-General and Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Children and Armed Conflict.

⁹⁹ E.A. Brett, 'Neutralising the Use of Force', 1995, p. 144.

¹⁰⁰ Nelson Kasfir, 'Uganda Politics and the Constituency Assembly Elections', 1994, p. 149.

¹⁰¹ E.A. Brett, 'Neutralising the Use of Force', 1995, p. 145.

¹⁰² E.A. Brett, 'Neutralising the Use of Force', 1995, p. 148.

¹⁰³ Joseph Olara-Otunnu, 'What shall I tell the Children?', Geneva, April 10 2001.

supposed to protect them and the brutality of LRA coming in from the bush. Fifteen years of a land reduced to desolation, of a people reduced to an existential shadow of a once vibrant society.

The notion that the NRM government is committed to the peaceful resolution of the conflict in the north needs qualification in the light of its practice in the last fifteen years. We examine some cases below of peace negotiations between the rebels and the government as well as aspects of government policy, which were apparently aimed at the peaceful resolution of the conflict.

10.1 Striving for an elusive peace

In March 1988 a Peace Agreement¹⁰⁴ brought the UPDM/A out of the bush. Charles Alai, one of the political leaders of the group became a Deputy Minister in the NRM government. This soon turned out to be part of the process of military resolution of the conflict. Betty Bigombe was appointed as a Minister of State for Pacification of the north. The idea of pacification lacks any pretence of peaceful resolution of the conflict. This compares well with the colonial notion of pacification of primitive tribes of Lower Niger, which Chinua Achebe alludes to in his novel *Things Fall Apart*¹⁰⁵. In less than two years after the Peace Agreement, the military officers of former rebel UPDA who had been integrated into the NRA were arrested in January 1990 and charged with treason. Several of the officers, among them, Lt Col Ochero-Nangai and Maj Mark Lapyem died in detention in unexplained circumstances while Maj Mike Kilama was shot by the NRA while reportedly trying to escape to Kenya. Lt Col Walter Odoch escaped from the country and now lives in United Kingdom. Capt Okumu Cana escaped from Mbuya Military Hospital after years in detention but died in Sweden in 1996.¹⁰⁶ Charles Alai was later dismissed from the Cabinet. Was this indeed a fair and peaceful resolution of the northern conflict?

Far from the claim that by 1994 the civil war was virtually over, leaving behind little more than criminal gangs¹⁰⁷, the situation in the north continued to deteriorate. To the contrary, the civil war had intensified with the further loss of trust in the government by the people of Acholi as UPDA officers who had been integrated into NRA, now renamed the Uganda People's Defence Forces (UPDF) disappeared without trace. The LRA was making inroads in its war of attrition in the region as they received military support from the Sudanese government, which was reacting to continued support by the Museveni regime of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army (SPLA) led by Colonel John Garang. This is why, once again, the government found it necessary to engage in peace talks with the LRA.

Betty Bigombe, Minister of State for Pacification of the north, headed the government negotiating team with Joseph Kony, leader of LRA rebels, in the 1993-4 peace talks. After long negotiation a peace agreement was reached in 1994. However, LRA demanded six months to reorganise themselves in returning from their bases in the Sudan. This unreasonable demand on the part of LRA played into the hands of President Museveni who was at pains to accept the peaceful resolution of the conflict instead of his preferred military conquest of the north. Rather than set a reasonable time period, say one month, for the LRA to return from their Sudan bases, in March 1994 President Museveni issued an ultimatum to LRA to surrender within a week or else they

¹⁰⁴ The Peace Agreement between the Uganda Government and the Uganda Peoples Democratic Movement, 3 June 1988, quoted in E.A. Brett, 'Neutralising the Use of Force in Uganda', 1995.

¹⁰⁵ Chinua Achebe, *Things Fall Apart*, London: Heinemann, 1958.

¹⁰⁶ I owe this information to Paul Omach, Lecturer in the Department of Political Science, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

¹⁰⁷ E. A. Brett, 'Neutralising the Use of Force in Uganda', 1995, p. 149.

would be crushed. Ironically, this was on the day the government and LRA were supposed to sign the agreement. Once again, a peaceful resolution of the conflict had been shattered. The one-week ultimatum has turned into years and the war still continues to rage.

It would seem that the other two attempts at peaceful resolution of the conflict in the north were public relations exercises. First, there was the Defence and International Affairs Committee of Uganda Parliament. It was mandated to discuss and explore ways in which the conflict in the north could be brought to an end. Not surprisingly, the Committee, which was dominated by NRM adherents from southern Uganda, recommended a military solution. A minority report by two northern MPs, Nobert Mao and Omara Atubo, urging peaceful talks with rebels, was brushed aside by Parliament. Second, was the enactment of an Amnesty Act, 2000. This was promulgated at the prodding of the donor community, which wishes to see the image of a warrior president cleaned. However, war drums from the government to crush the rebels continued. More than 400 000 people in the north now live in protected villages, which are no less than detention camps.

Therefore, due to the intransigence of LRA and NRM's preferred military solution to the conflict, the north remains under siege by these uncompromising parties. The result has been a blatant abuse of human rights, murder and abduction on the part of LRA and systematic dehumanisation, discrimination and humiliation used as deliberate instruments of policy by the NRM government¹⁰⁸.

Olara Otunnu writes¹⁰⁹:

What shall I tell the children of northern Uganda, when they write and ask: 'How come the champions of human rights gathered in Geneva are also the ardent champions of those responsible for such dark deeds in our land? Does anybody out there really care about our fate, about what is happening to our parents and us?' We hear your deep silence. How shall I explain to the perplexed children that those on whom they had counted to defend their human rights have instead become cheerleaders and chief providers of succour and support for a structure which practices and celebrates systematic repression, ethnic discrimination and hatred, impunity, corruption and anti-democracy, a structure which routinely and chillingly gloats about destroying 'those people' --- 'those people' and their children?

As a result the majority of the northerners have been alienated by this deliberate, punitive government policy. This explains why the north has consistently voted against NRM in general and Museveni in particular in the last 12 years of electoral games in Uganda.

Despite the claim by Brett¹¹⁰ that there has been elimination of the ethnic factor in recruitment and promotion, NRM has essentially relied on ethnic identity for promoting officers in the army. This moves the NRM progressively close to an ethnic, military dictatorship. For instance, during army promotions in 1996, the promotions reflected the essentially NRM south-western ethnic dominance:

Of the 35 army officers promoted and published in the press, 23 are westerners. All of them speak Runyoro-Rutoro-Runyankole-Rukiga, which was recently named Runyakitara, and live in one area,

¹⁰⁸ I have deliberately left out reference to the rebel activities in western Uganda due to space. However, as in the north, the government preferred solution is a military one.

¹⁰⁹ Joseph Olara Otunnu, 'What shall I tell the Children?', Geneva, April 10 2001, p. 2.

¹¹⁰ E. A. Brett, 'Neutralising the Use of Force', 1995, p. 144.

the west and south-western parts of the country. Of the 23 western officers promoted, 18 are Banyankole. 16 of the Banyankole are Bahima (Museveni's sub-ethnic group amongst the Banyankole), who form only 20 percent of all the Banyankole.¹¹¹

¹¹¹ *The Monitor*, 16-19 August 1996.

More dramatic was the recent revelation by the army Chief of Staff, Brigadier James Kazini, that Nyabushoshi, President Museveni's *county*, not district, of origin has contributed 6000 officers and men to UPDF. This is almost as many officers and men as the entire Uganda Army (UA) of 6700 at the time of Obote's overthrow in 1971, and 10 percent of the current UPDF, all from one county¹¹². The military still plays a direct role in setting the political agenda in Uganda. In fact the politics of Uganda has been re-militarised and ethnicised.

10.2 Deepening ethnicity and militarism: The Presidential Elections

This can be evidenced by the 12 March presidential elections. Despite President Museveni relying on a biased legal framework, he used the state machinery as well to obstruct a transparent and fair electoral process. In addition to Museveni's financial and structural advantages, arbitrary arrests, attacks and intimidation were directed against the opposition, its supporters and agents¹¹³: As Human Rights Watch put it then:

Since the start of the electoral campaign on January 11, reported cases of violence and arbitrary arrests implicate army soldiers, military intelligence officers, the police and Presidential Protection Unit, (PPU), (*under the command of President Museveni's son, Lt Muhozi Keinerugaba*), as well as local defence units that are trained and armed by the government. (*Emphasis added*).

As the going got tough, and there was a real possibility of Museveni's failure to get 50 percent of the vote to be declared winner on the first ballot, Museveni threw all caution to the wind and *called out the army to supervise elections, (emphasis added)*.¹¹⁴ This was tantamount to putting the country under martial rule. Museveni also employed the sectarian religious card, which according to him is only common with political parties. A few days before Election Day on 12 March 2001, he invited the Catholic clergy, mainly from Buganda, to State House. These were most likely to campaign for the opposition since most of them are likely members of DP. He made a strong case for their votes and promised them that a Muganda Catholic would succeed him.¹¹⁵

President Museveni took the challenge from Rtd Col Dr Kizza Besigye, his 'bush doctor' and political ideologue in the first five years of his rule as ethnic betrayal. The violence meted out to Colonel Kiiza Besigye's supporters, particularly in western Uganda, was unprecedented since it was the home region of both contenders. To Museveni, Besigye was a spoiler in this game of regional hegemony. Similar violence was repeated in the June 2001 parliamentary elections.

The militarism and ethnic mindset used both in the civil war in the north and in electoral processes has left the country under the grip of ethnicity, militarism and authoritarianism. Democratic practice, which could have gone a long way to resolve these long-standing intricacies in Ugandan politics, has been thrown to the wind. The rejection of peaceful resolution of conflicts around the country has long-term consequences for Uganda's national unity and development. Finally, one has to stress the conspiracy of silence in the 'international community' in the restriction of political rights, abuse of human rights and in the consolidation of an ethnically

¹¹² H. G. Hansen, *Ethnicity and the Military in Uganda*, 1974, p. 75.

¹¹³ Human Rights Watch, *Uganda: Not a Level Playing Field, Government Violations in the Lead-Up to the Election*, <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/Uganda>, 2001, p. 2.

¹¹⁴ *The Guardian*, 9 March, 2001.

¹¹⁵ *The Monitor*, 20 June 2001.

organised one-party state in Uganda.

11. The international community and the democratisation process in Uganda

Since the early 1990s, many western donors have predicated their aid on progress in the democratisation process. Unlike other countries in sub-Saharan Africa, for example Kenya and Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) which have been demonised by IMF and the World Bank and which have aid cut-off, Uganda's progressive entrenchment of a one-party state seems to be compatible with donor interests. Uganda has never been threatened with harsh donor conditionality like other African countries. Instead, the western donors have opted for 'dialogue' based on flawed engagement and conspicuous silence on issues of political rights and human rights abuses in the country. As the Human Rights Watch¹¹⁶ observes:

The International community seems to accept the serious human rights abuses in Uganda as a minor issue, and has not engaged in much critical discussion with the Museveni government about these abuses.

It would appear that the most important element in this flawed engagement is the symbiotic benefits to both NRM government and western donors in general, and the World Bank in particular. Uganda is one of the few African countries that has been willing to embrace the stringent and unbridled structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) which the World Bank considers essential to restoring fiscal discipline and monetary stability. Uganda has also served as an important advocate for the World Bank's programmes in Africa. At the same time the World Bank has invested very heavily in making Uganda an economic success story. As a result the World Bank is loath to see Museveni criticised¹¹⁷.

Two of the key measures pursued by the NRM government and the donors, which must be appreciated, have been civil reform and demobilisation of the armed forces without any civil disturbance, primarily aimed at saving salary costs. As Haynes notes: The size of the civil service was reduced from over 300 000 staff members to a third of that number in the 1990s¹¹⁸. Similarly, the armed forces were demobilised substantially. However, these apparent achievements have been eroded by government and donor policies. Concurrent with the civil service reform, the government and donors embarked on the creation of new specialised agencies to implement aspects of civil structural adjustment. These included Uganda Revenue Authority, Uganda Investment Authority, Civil Aviation Authority and Privatisation Unit, among others. The negative side to the creation of these organisations was that the NRM saw it as an opportunity to reward its political and ethnic clients from the south-western part of the country with jobs. This ethnically based recruitment raised concern. When the press raised the issue President Museveni simply retorted, after all westerners (his place of origin) are more educated. This can only but enhance ethnicity in the country.

¹¹⁶ Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy: The Movement System and Political Repression in Uganda*, Washington, 1999, p. 145.

¹¹⁷ Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy*, 1999, pp. 151-2.

¹¹⁸ J. Haynes, 'Limited Democracy in Ghana and Uganda', 2001, p. 197.

The demobilisation of the armed forces was also wiped out with the NRM's militarist stance in the region. With the invasion of the DRC in 1998, the demobilised soldiers were integrated in the army to aid in war efforts. Therefore, both the civil service reforms and armed forces demobilisation have not been as successful as the donors and the government would want us to believe.

Uganda's relations with western donors in the 1990s obstructed the democratisation process and peaceful conflict resolution in the country. The resort to 'dialogue' rather than coercive methods may be attributed to a number of factors. As Hauser¹¹⁹, summarises, donors were concerned by:

...The destruction from which Uganda was recovering, the need to present Uganda as a success for economic liberalisation, and donors' needs to maintain good relations with Uganda in order to pursue their foreign policy goals. The resulting donor-recipient relationship has however created dangers for the maintenance of long-term sustainable democracy in Uganda, by condoning divisive policies, and neglecting the need for coalition-building and conflict resolution.

The recovery from decades of destruction in Uganda through donors' and the NRM government policies in the past 10 years must be appreciated. However, the practice by Western countries of focusing on individuals or personalities as the solution to national dilemmas other than alternative political organisations, in this case President Museveni, needs a re-think. There seems to be a view that Ugandans and Africans in general do not deserve the same rights as peoples elsewhere, and that strong men are what is needed to keep the volatile African countries at peace. It would seem the argument by Haynes¹²⁰ that 'Western demands for democracy in Africa in the 1990s were sometimes not much more than rhetoric: what Western governments wanted primarily was political and economic stability, not necessarily democracy is largely accurate.

Finally, the implication of treating Uganda as a special case, where political and human rights abuses are condoned based on narrow foreign policy goals, is that it undermines the moral authority of western donors' positions on human rights and democracy elsewhere on the continent. The long-running conflicts between the NRM and rebels and regional monopoly of power in the country by the NRM itself imply a lopsided economic 'miracle'. This is because where there is conflict and regional and ethnically defined access to power and hence, economic resources, there remains iniquitous resource distribution in the country, a source of future conflict.

Sections of the Ugandan society have increasingly become pessimistic about the 'international community's' support for the Ugandan democratisation process. The space for democratic organisation and association remains constricted with the tacit support of the donor community. Ugandans have to rely on internal resources to push forward the democratisation process. Given the determination by NRM to monopolise power indefinitely, the situation opens the gate for methods that lack any democratic pretension. The tragedy of Uganda is that there has emerged a militarist, autocratic, ethnically organised state, which relies on ethnic chauvinism and resists the democratisation of state power since the regime's survival hinges on ethnic hegemony over state

¹¹⁹ Ellen Hauser, 'Uganda Relations with Western donors in the 1990s: What impact on democratisation?', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 4, 1999, p. 621.

¹²⁰ J. Haynes.

resources.

12. Conclusion

It is the argument of this paper that much of the explanation of the causes of ethnicity, ethnic conflict, militarism and the possible solutions to them in the Ugandan context, obstructs an understanding of the substantive underlying political, economic and social configurations that enhance ethnicity. The intricate ethnic configuration and militarism in Uganda's politics lies in their historical construction and continued reproduction since independence in 1962. Ethnicity is neither primordial (archaic) nor static. All societies are plural because human organisation is based on cognition of different levels of identity - family, clan, village, tribe, religion, language region or nationality. Pluralism in itself is not problematic except when certain groups perceive that they are being excluded from what they consider to be their rights, whether political, religious, administrative, economic or linguistic. The central problem posed by exclusion is domination. Since ethnicity is made or constructed it can be deconstructed. The answers to the dilemma posed by ethnicity and forces of its deconstruction must lie in structural changes, which address political, social and economic inequity and imbalances in power in a given society. The answer, in other words, points to good governance and democratisation. Rather than resist or negate the process of group definition, it is more useful to evolve less antagonistic ways of promoting co-existence between groups. Democratisation of state power is fundamental in this process.

Bibliography

- Anderson B. (1991), *Imagined Communities*, London: Verso.
- Barango, Y. (1989), 'Ethnic Pluralism and Political Centralisation: The Basis of Political Conflict', in ?????? Rupesinghe, K. (ed.), *Conflict Resolution in Uganda*, International Peace Research Institute and London: Oslo and James Currey.
- Barya, J.J. (2000), 'Political Parties, the Movement and the Referendum and the Referendum on Political Systems: One-Step Forward, Two Steps Backward?' in Mugaju, J., and Oloka-Onyango, J., (eds.) *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- _____ (1998), 'The Making of Uganda's 1995 Constitution: Achieving Consensus by Law?' Kampala: CBR, *Working Paper*.
- _____ (1993), 'Popular Democracy and the Legitimacy of the Constitution: Some Reflections on Uganda's Constitution-Making Process, Kampala: Centre for Basic Research (CBR) *Working Paper*, No.38.
- _____ (1991), 'Workers and the Law in Uganda', Kampala: CBR Publications, *Working Paper*, No .17.
- _____ (1990), *Law, State and Working Class Organisation in Uganda: 1962-1987* Ph.D. Thesis, University of Warwick, UK.
- Bazaara, N. (1999), 'Civil Society and Poverty Reduction in Uganda: A Review Essay', presented at CODESREA seminar, Dakar, Senegal, 14-15 April.
- Brass, P.R. (1991), *Ethnicity and Nationalism: Theory and Comparison*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Brett, E.A. (1995), 'Neutralising the Use of Force in Uganda: The Role of the Military in Politics', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol.33, No.1.
- Byarugaba, F. (1998), 'Ethnopolitics and the State: Lessons from Uganda', in Salih, M., and Markakis, J. (eds.), *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, Uppsala: The Nordic Africa Institute.
- Doornobos, M. (1998), 'Linking the Future to the Past - Ethnicity and Pluralism' in Salih, M., and Markakis, J., (eds.), *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, Uppsala: Nordic Africa Institute, Sweden.
- Furley, O. and Katalikawe, J. (1997), 'Constitutional Reform in Uganda: The New Approach', *African Affairs*, Vol.96.
- Hansen, H. B. (1974), *Ethnicity and Military Rule in Uganda*, Uppsala: Research Report, No.43, Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Hauser, E. (1999), 'Uganda Relations with Western Donors in the 1990s: What impact on Democratisation?' *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol. 37, No.4.
-]Haynes, J. (2001), 'Limited' Democracy in Ghana and Uganda. What Is Most Important to International Actors: Stability or Political Freedom? *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 19, No.2.
- Horowitz, L.D. (1985), *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Human Rights Watch, (2001), *Uganda: Not a Level Playing Field: Government Violations in the Lead-Up to the Election*, <http://www.hrw.org/organisation/reports/2001/Uganda>.
- _____ (1999), *Hostile to Democracy: The Movement System and Political Repression in Uganda*, Washington, London, New York.
- Jabrin I. and Pereira, C. (1993), 'On Dividing and Uniting: Ethnicity, Racism and Nationalism in Africa', CODICE, CODESREA, Dakar: Senegal.
- Kabwegyere, T. B. (1974), *The Politics of State Formation: The Nature and Effects of Colonialism in Uganda*, Nairobi, Dar es Salaam and Kampala: East African Bureau.
- Karugire, S. (1988), *Roots of Instability in Uganda*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Karlstrom, M. (1999), 'Civil Society and its Presuppositions: Lessons from Uganda', in Comaroff, John. I. and Comaroff, Jean (eds.), *Civil Society and the Political Imagination in Africa*, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kasfir, N. (2000), 'Movement' Democracy, Legitimacy and Power in Uganda' in Mugaju, J. and Oloka-Onyango, J. (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- _____ (1995), 'Uganda Politics and the Constituency Assembly Elections of March, 1994', in Hansen, H. G. and Twaddle, M. (eds.), *From Chaos to Order: The Politics of Constitution Making in Uganda*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- _____ (1976), *The Shrinking Political Arena: Participation of Ethnicity in African Politics: A Case Study of Uganda*, San Francisco: University of California Press.
- Magubane, B. (1969), 'Pluralism and Conflict Situations in Africa: A New Look', *Africa Social Research*, No.7, July.
- Mamdani, M. (1999a), 'Historicising Power and Response to Power: Indirect Rule and its Reform', *Social Research*, Vol.66 No.3.
- _____ (1999b), 'Indirect Rule, Civil Society and Ethnicity: The African Dilemma' in Martin, G.W. and West, M. O.

- (eds.), *Out of One, Many Africa: Reconstructing the Study and Meaning of Africa*, Urban and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- _____ (1998), 'Clinton, Museveni had a Secret Agenda? What was the Trip all about?' *The Monitor*, 10 April, 1998.
- _____ (1996), *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- _____ (1995), 'Democratic Theory and Democratic Struggles', in Esheto Chole and Jabrin Ibrahim (eds.), *Democratisation Processes in Africa: Problems and Prospects*, CODESREA, Book Series, Dakar: Senegal.
- _____ (1991), 'Social Movements and Constitutionalism in African Context', in Shviji, I. (ed.), *State and Constitutionalism: An African Debate on Democracy*, Harare: SAPES Books.
- _____ (1983), *Imperialism and Fascism in Uganda*, London: Heinemann.
- Markakis, J. (1996), 'Nationalism and Ethnicity: A Theoretical Perspective', A paper presented at a workshop on *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, organised by organisation of Social Science Research in Eastern Africa, (OSSREA), Addis, Ababa, 3-5 June.
- Mazrui A. (1975), *Soldiers and Kinsmen in Uganda: The Making of a Military Ethnocracy*, London: Sage Publications.
- Mehra, A. (1993), 'Ethnicity, Democratisation and Governance: The Case of India', *Ethnic Studies Report*, Vol.XI, No.2 July.
- Mudoola, D. (1993), *Religion, Ethnicity and Politics in Uganda*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Mugaju, J. (2000), 'An Historical Background to Uganda's No-Party Democracy', in Mugaju, J. and Oloka-Onyango, J. (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Muhereza, F. and Otim, O. (1998), 'Neutralising Ethnicity in Uganda' in Salih, M. and Markakis, J. (eds.), *Ethnicity and the State in Eastern Africa*, Uppsala: The Nordic Africa Institute.
- Mukherje, R. (1985), *A Historical Accident? Class, Nation and State Formation*, New Jersey: Africa World Press.
- Museveni, Y. (1997), *Sowing the Mastered Seed: The Struggle for Freedom and Democracy in Uganda*, London/Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Nederveen, P.J. (1996), 'Deconstructing/Reconstructing Ethnicity', A paper presented at a workshop on *Ethnicity and The State in Eastern Africa*, organised by OSSREA, Addis Ababa, 3-5 June.
- NRM Legal Notice No.1, 1986.
- NRM Secretariat: *Towards a Free and Democratic Uganda: The Basic Principles and Policies of the National Resistance Movement*, Kampala.
- Okoth, P.G. (1995), 'Democracy on Trial in Uganda', *UFAHAMU*, Vol. 23 No.3.
- Olara Otunnu, J. (2001), 'What Shall I tell the Children?' A speech to the 57th United Nations Commission on Human Rights at Geneva, 10 April.
- Oloka-Onyango, J. (2000), 'New Wine or New Bottles? Movement Politics and One State Partyism in Uganda', in Mugaju, J. and Oloka-Onyango, J. (eds.), *No-Party Democracy in Uganda: Myths and Realities*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- _____ (1998), 'Governance, State Structures and Constitutionalism in Contemporary Uganda', Kampala, *Centre for Basic Research*, (CBR).
- _____ (1997), 'The Question of Buganda in Contemporary Ugandan Politics', *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol.15, No.2, July.
- Olukoshi, A. O. and Laakso, L. (1996), 'The Crisis of the Post-Colonial Nation-State Project in Africa', in Olukoshi, A.O. and Laakso, L. (eds.), *Challenges to the Nation-State in Africa*, Stockholm and Helsinki: The Nordic Africa Institute and Institute of Development Studies, University of Helsinki.
- Omara-Otunnu, A. (1987), *Politics and the Military in Uganda, 1890-1985*, London and Oxford: Macmillan.
- _____ (1992), 'The Struggle for Democracy in Uganda', *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, Vol.30, No.3.
- Ranger, T. (1983), 'Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa', in Ranger, T. and Hobsbawn, E. (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, M. and Healey, J. (eds.), (1992), *Democracy, Governance and Economic Policy: Sub-Saharan Africa in Comparative Perspectives*, London: ODI, Development Policy Studies.
- Smith, D. A. (1992), 'Chosen Peoples: Why Ethnic Groups Survive', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.15, No.3.
- Uganda Government, (1987), *Report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Local Government System*, Entebbe: Entebbe Government Printers.
- Young, C. and Kante B. (1992), 'Governance, Democracy and the 1988 Senegalese Elections', in Hyden, G. and Bratton, M. (eds.) *Governance and Politics in Africa*, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.