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ABSTRACT

This study investigates how the heritage of Busoga has been (re)presented in the local as well as in the national domain. Busoga is a territory and kingdom in east-central Uganda. It is one of the kingdoms that were found in Uganda at independence and entered a federal arrangement with the new nation-state presenting a series of challenges around the question of traditional power vis a vis political power; national versus local heritage; contemporary versus ‘traditional’ and heritage poised against the throes of social and economic change. The argument presented here is that the heritage of Busoga as presented has been invented and created during the colonial and post-colonial times. Over time Busoga as a community and with it, a form of heritage posed as tradition, took shape. After the restoration of the kingdoms in 1993, through a constitutional enactment that reversed the 1967 order that had abolished kingdoms and established a republican and unitary order, kingdoms re-appeared as having been rooted in a timeless tradition assuming ‘naturality’ which but was a re-representation of invented traditions. Spaces, sites and palaces and a narrative thread developed and the institution of Kyabazingaship (kingship) became the central point around which the kingdom revolved. I argue through this study that the post-colonial state, like its colonial counterpart has played a crucial role in the invention of this heritage.
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**GLOSSARY**

**Kyabazinga**
The title of the cultural leader of the kingdom of Busoga and it means 'the one who wraps' and the other titles that accompany it, is the masculine *Isebantu* meaning ‘the father of the people’ and the feminine *Inebantu* ‘the mother of the people’.

**Kabaka**
The title of the cultural leader of Buganda kingdom and Kintu was the first Kabaka of Buganda.

**Omukama**
The title of the cultural leader of Bunyoro kingdom and Mukama was the king of Bunyoro.

**Busoga Lukiiko**
The Busoga Lukiiko is the legislature whereby members who constitute it are properly selected by every respective hereditary ruler of the eleven chiefdoms. The members of the representatives vary from chiefdom to chiefdom depending on the responsibility. There are also special nominees by the Kyabazinga.

**Chiefs Royal Council**
This is the highest body that comprises of the eleven hereditary rulers and it’s the same body that elects the *Kyabazinga* headed by its chairman also known as the Ssabalangira (chief prince). This includes the five princes from the royal Baisengobi clan and the six chiefs of the traditional chiefdom.

**Saza**
It is a Luganda (language from Buganda) word meaning County which came to be used in Busoga during the British indirect rule.

**Gombolola**
An equivalent of a contemporary sub-county, a term which literally meant to ‘arrange’

**Muluka**
Equivalent to an administrative parish, a term that literally means ‘putting together’

**Kisoko**
Means a small village

**Owekisoko**
Means the small lowest leadership in a particular village;

**Omutala**
The land between two/more than two swamps

**Owomutala**
Is the person responsible for the Omutala.

**Nkuni**
Are the spirits of the first men of each clan which arrived in the Busoga area.
Baisengobi

Those belonging to the clan of Ngobi (literally is a male name. The female variant is Nangobi) among the Baisengoni clan. The Baisengobi claim to be the royal clan in Busoga

Abaami

The term in the study means chiefs. In other social contexts it applies to men in a patrilineal setting

Mpumuire

The word literally means resting in both Lusoga and Runyoro languages but in text it also meant death in the context of kingship in Busoga.

Lusoga

A language from Busoga

Nyoro

A language from Bunyoro
INTRODUCTION

The primary objective of the study is to analyze the creation of a Busoga heritage in what has been called since 1993, the kingdom of Busoga, in Uganda. I look specifically at the institution of *obwa Kyabazinga bwa Busoga* (kingship of Busoga kingdom) and how associated heritage sites i.e. *Mpumuire* hill, a coronation site, and the *Igenge* palace, a royal palace, were produced and represented to become what is called Busoga’s heritage in the twenty-first century.

From 1993 Uganda saw a change when kingdoms were restored. A new national constitution was promulgated which proclaimed the restoration of kingdoms in Uganda. The Uganda constitution, Article 246 (16), of 1995 provides that “the institutions of traditional leaders or cultural leaders may exist in any community or area of Uganda in accordance with the cultural, customs and traditions or wishes and aspirations of the people to whom it applies”.¹ The kingdoms that were restored included, amongst others, Buganda, Bunyoro, Busoga, Ankole and Toro. The restored kingdoms, according to Article 246 (16) were also “not supposed to participate in partisan politics and exercise in any administrative, legislative or executive powers of Government or local government”.² A major emphasis is focused on the kingdom of Busoga in this thesis, and I engage with the idea that what is perceived as Busoga’s heritage today is a recent creation especially the *Kyabazingaship* that was invented by the British colonialists in 1939; the *Mpumuire* hill that was marked as a coronation site and heritage site after 1993 and the royal palace. These heritage sites today appear to be the centre of Busoga’s heritage, though there are a number of other sites that form part of Busoga’s heritage such as Bujagali Falls ancestral shrine, Kagulu hill, Buswikira tomb, Idinda shrine, Mwiri hill and Budhumbula shrine/palace.

---

The kingdom of Busoga is said to be a ‘cultural institution’ in the republic of Uganda which brings together the people living within the counties of Butembe, Bukooli, Bugabula, Bunhole, Bukono, Busiki, Kigulu, Bugweri, Luuka, Bunha and Balamogi. The ‘Ba-Soga’ consist of a large number of people that claim to be the people who inhabit Busoga territory that is today comprised of ten administrative districts namely Jinja, Iganga, Bugiri, Kamuli, Mayuge, Kaléro and Namutumba, Namayingo, Luuka and Buyende. Busoga is situated east of the River Nile, north of Lake Victoria, south of Lake Kyoga and borders the river Mpologoma to the east. Neighbouring districts include Kayunga, Mukono, Busia, Tororo, Palisa and Mbale where the people belong to other cultural entities or ethnic groups. The majority of the people live as traders, wage and salary earners working in offices and factories, and cattle and crop farmers under circumstances akin to neighbouring ethnic groups.

Today, the territory of Busoga is cosmopolitan, composed of people of different ethnic groups (Baganda, Iteso, Bagishu, Basamia and Acholi among others). These groups do not stake a ‘Basoga’ heritage but rather become enclaves within Busoga by professing their ‘otherness’ in cultural terms. This builds notions of identity on assumed differences and imagined belonging premised on the ‘cultures’ and ‘traditions’. But within the geographical confines of Busoga of what is today presented as the kingdom there are substantive claims to an identity of Busoganness. As part of this Busoga-ness there is a heritage complex that marks out the subject of this study.
The people living in Busoga speak several languages such as Luganda, Lusamya, Ateso, Lugishu, Lugwere and Lusoga. However, “Buganda’s influence over Busoga throughout historical time was so much that Luganda (language from Buganda) has become dominant and is today used as lingua franca in Busoga more than Lusoga itself”.

---

so many dialects of the Lusoga language that is has rendered orthographic complications.⁴

Busoga is broadly divided into two major dialects. “Across the northern zone, the dialects
Lulamogi and Lupakoyo are spoken. Lupakoyo closely resembles Nyoro (language from
Bunyoro). It had a close belt of Runyoro-associated dialects running east from Bunyoro across
the north-eastern Buganda, spreading into north-western Busoga and through Bugwere in the
east. In the southern part of Busoga a dialect known as Lutenga is still being spoken”⁵ These
dialects have a similarity and language affinity that collapses them into the main dialect that is
spoken in the areas of Butembe and Kigulu. Added to this have been the various languages of
migrant groups that have been adopted by Lusoga-speakers as an ever changing language.

Although Basoga territory had no central authority at the advent of the British rule around 1890
it had developed well organised small principalities, each with its own hereditary ruler and
centralised structure.⁶ Busoga was in the process of centralisation of wider territories than the
small existing chiefdoms. Busoga later in 1939 consolidated its central authority and acquired a
king known as the Isebantu Kyabazinga Wa Busoga (the father of the people, the king of
Busoga), with trappings of, more or less, a modern Kingdom premised on notions of tradition.
The post of Isebantu Kyabazinga of Busoga like those of all other traditional, cultural and
hereditary rulers was abolished in 1967 by the Ugandan government headed by Milton Obote
from 1962 to 1971 and then restored in 1993 by the National Resistance Movement government
headed by Yoweri Museveni.

Notions of centralisation and decentralisation both operate in Uganda under the 1995
constitution. Decentralisation is a form of governance involving the devolution of political and

---

⁴ For instance, during the study, I found out that in north Busoga, there is a distinct ‘H’ but people from southern
Busoga do not accept this ‘H’ as being appropriate to the Lusoga Language hence a lexical problem.
implementation of power to lower levels of local governments.\textsuperscript{7} Mukyala-Makiika has argued that “partly as a result of a number of ethnic and communal movements demanding cultural and collective rights and partly as a result of an ideological conviction of the need to empower local communities to take charge of their destinies through local institutions of self governance and resource mobilisation, the National Resistance Movement (NRM) government embarked on the policy of decentralisation in 1993”.\textsuperscript{8} In addition, the National Resistance Movement wanted to recognise the role traditional leaders played in the liberation struggles against Obote and Lutwa between 1981 and 1985.\textsuperscript{9} Mukyala-Makiika further argues that, “as a result of pressures from the several groups in Buganda such as Kirimutu and Abazukulu ba Kintu (this means the grandchildren of Kintu) as well as a strategy to ensure support for the National Resistance Movement during the Constituent Assembly (CA) elections, the government restored traditional leaders in 1993, the same year decentralisation was launched”.\textsuperscript{10}

Thus, decentralisation led to the devolution of broad powers of administration and implementation of the district authorities and other lower forms of local government, leaving the central government with responsibilities for matters of defence, and law and order. Additionally, decentralisation works in a way that there are usually representatives who are elected from the different constituencies throughout all the districts in Uganda. The representatives are elected through universal adult suffrage to serve in legislative bodies at various levels of the parliament of Uganda. Decentralisation works with ethnically-curved

\textsuperscript{7} On decentralisation as a policy of state, see Apolo Nsibambi. Decentralisation and Civil Society in Uganda: The Quest for Good Governance (Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 1988).
\textsuperscript{9} Princess Elizabeth Bagaya of Toro is credited for linking NRM to Chief Abiola of Nigeria who donated 200,000 dollars for the liberation struggle, while the Kabaka of Buganda visited the war zone in 1989, a factor which boosted the morale of the guerrilla fighters. Cited in R. Mukyala-Makiika, Traditional Leaders and Decentralisation in Apolo Nsibambi (Eds), Decentralisation and Civil Society in Uganda: The Quest for Good Governance, (Uganda: Fountain Publishers, 1998) p.96. Also for more discussions on decentralisation see D. Asimwe and N. B. Musisi, Decentralisation and Transformation of Governance in Uganda, (Uganda: Fountain publishers, 2007).
\textsuperscript{10} R. Mukyala-Mukiiko, Traditional leaders and Decentralisation, p96.
administrative units that are rooted in supposed ‘traditions’ of kinship, clan, kingdom etc and, heritage.

On the other hand centralisation is a form of governance rooted in the republican order that started in 1967 that swept away the monarchical system and its hybridisation with the state. All power was brought to the centre of the republic of Uganda in relation to policy making. Graham argues “what are apparently local initiatives, and are represented as such for policy purposes, are actually the outcomes of a system of centralisation which is legitimated by the rhetoric of local democracy”\(^\text{11}\). Likewise at the kingdom level there is also centralisation of power exercised by the kings. Thus, the kingdoms operate alongside the government of Uganda and they also have their own cultural governments (kingdom) that assume to govern the cultural aspects of the people. In this case Busoga kingdom has its own government and so it is with Buganda, Bunyoro, Toro and Ankole kingdoms among others. The Busoga kingdom today operates in a hierarchy of leadership in which the Kyabazinga is the supreme head, has the Chiefs Royal Council\(^\text{12}\) (comprised of the 11 Hereditary Saza Chiefs), Busoga Lukiiko\(^\text{13}\) (legislature/parliament), clan heads and the entire people assumed to be Basoga.

\(^{12}\) According to the Busoga Constitution, the Busoga Chiefs Royal Council is the highest body that comprises of the eleven (11) Hereditary rulers and its the same forum that elects the Kyabazinga headed by the Chairman also known as the Stabalangira (Chief Prince).
\(^{13}\) Busoga Lukiiko is the legislature or parliament of the Kingdom of Busoga, whereby members who constitute it are properly selected from the 11 chiefdoms by the 11 hereditary Saza rulers of the respective chiefdoms. The representatives vary from chiefdom to chiefdom depending on the responsibilities as per the chiefdom. There are also special nominees by the Kyabazinga.
Figure 1: An illustration of the restored Busoga Kingdom hierarchy of leadership.

![Busoga Kingdom Hierarchy Diagram]

The heritage of this Busoga as it exists today is built from shards of legends. These legends assert that earliest inhabitants of Busoga belonged to the group comprising of migrants said to have come from east (probably Mount Elgon), Bunyoro and Buganda. The earliest inhabitants in what is today called Busoga seem to have occupied the lakeshores areas far back in 14th century. The inhabitants were consequently organised under chiefdoms in the 19th century. In 1896 a British agent named Berkeley was granted authority by the British to add the kingdoms of Toro, Bunyoro and Busoga to the newly acquired protectorate of Buganda. Cohen suggests that “....by the end of the nineteenth century, the present Busoga came to be referred to as ‘Busoga’ by agents and administrators associated with the Buganda kingdom and the British Protectorate”. In 1906 the British protectorate completed an administrative amalgamation of the various principalities of pre-colonial Busoga into a Busoga kingdom.

Busoga does not possess a specific meaning just as its origins are not clearly known. What is known is that it is a reference to a territory near the source of the Nile River and a hill called Busoga in Bukooli in the south-east Busoga. According to Cohen’s work its use is as current

as the beginning of the 20th century. The territory and the people called Ba-Soga were built as a conglomerate of loose principalities from eleven princedoms. According to Fallers, people identified themselves not as Ba-Soga but as Balamogi, Bakooli. Thus a bureaucratic system of centralisation as well as common Soga territorial identity was built under the British protectorate. I shall argue therefore that Busoga as a kingdom was a colonial and recent creation and that it serves as a fine example of a tradition produced under these conditions.

This study is about Busoga’s heritage and how it has been created over time. The core argument is that what is viewed as contemporary Busoga heritage is built from traditions that pass as culture, conjoined with multiple cultures. Heritage is often purveyed through orality that assumes authenticity and therefore tradition. Minkley, in a related situation has analysed transmission and recovery of what is assumed to be heritage in the Eastern Cape. He notes that “[t]he figures who exemplified this tradition, who are presented as ‘orally’ are male ‘elders’ (‘our libraries’), chiefs and ‘community’ and ‘local struggle’ leaders.

Similarly Busoga’s heritage is overwhelmingly viewed through the kingdom and the Kyabazinga as the beacon under the aegis of restored cultural institutions in Uganda. As Reid has observed,

The Kingdoms have a very important influence on the perception of cultural heritage in Uganda.... This restoration of the kingdoms ultimately addresses contemporary politics.... This is hardly surprising. The kingdoms have never stopped being of considerable political importance: In the early days of the Uganda Protectorate the kingdoms were used as the major pillars of indirect rule.

---

Methodology

This study benefited from a rich variety of sources. Primary data included the oral interviews of the informants who gave different views relating to the topic of study. The process of identifying the interviewees for the study project started in December 2010 when on visit to the Uganda National Museum (in Kampala) where I met Nelson Abiti. Abiti pointed out that Chief Izimba Patrick Gologolo has fairly deep knowledge about Busoga and had been dealing with researchers both nationally and internationally. He is one of the 11 hereditary chiefs of the Busoga kingdom in charge of Kigulu County. This was both complicated and advantageous. Having dealt with more experienced researchers, Gologolo was not to be the best for an amateur in the field and the possibility of him imposing the ideas that he had reported on many times became high. However, the advantage remained that he knew the inside and outside of the cultural politics in Busoga and would at least provide some in-depth knowledge. The network involved the fact that Gologolo had telephone and residential contacts of the interviewees and thus many interviewees were sourced and became instrumental in shaping this knowledge.

The study was conducted in the area of Busoga Kingdom in which six chiefdoms were visited: Butembe, Bulamogi, Bunha, Kigulu, Luuka and Bukooli. This selection was made on random basis as well as accessibility which were predicated on the available resources. The study assumed that Busoga is a cultural region where a common heritage is claimed in which all the sites are situated. I selected two sites that proclaim Busoga’s heritage: the Igenge royal palace and Mpumuire Hill. The sites (Igenge Palace, Mpumuire Hill) were selected due to their accessibility, which minimised the costs and saved time that was spent on visitation and fieldwork. The sites were selected because of their linkage to each other and to a claim of a common form of heritage through notions of kingship.
The interviews conducted were one on one. In all a total of 17 people were interviewed. Out of 17 interviewees, 2 were women, 15 were people who claimed to be ‘typical Basoga’ people. 2 were officials and non-Basoga from the Uganda National Museum. One interviewee was a clan head, 5 were chiefs and 4 officials who have worked and others still working for the kingdom as officials. The general reception by the informants was encouraging. They were giving information willingly. Many more were willing to give information and share their aspects of Basoga heritage. It was also easy to understand and interact with informants since we spoke a common language (Lusoga). Only in few instances were interviews conducted in English at the informant’s choice. Some of the interviewees, especially the chiefs, provided photographs of their families especially fathers and grand fathers who were chiefs before them. This was to prove ‘authenticity’ and get into genealogical notions of heritage, as if to assume that hereditary chief-ship was heritage in itself.

The process of oral interview collection in general had some shortcomings. Several people had limited knowledge about the subject even when they were interested in being interviewed. Another challenge was the issue of time or period in which certain events happened. The interviewees’ knowledge of exact time in the past is very limited in relation to periods in which certain events happened. Some could only say that ‘it happened long time ago during the time of our fore fathers’ or ‘it happened before the coming of the Mzungu (white man), I do not know when it happened’. The past is therefore imagined and disappears in the throes of today. Many of the interviewees expected a tip (gift or monetary pay) after the interview sessions while others were generous enough as to provide meals and requests to ‘come back’. A sense of rapport prevailed and there were limited negative incidents during the fieldwork. For the more resourceful informants, a revision of the text usually culminated in new questions over the problem and another interview session would be arranged.
Furthermore, primary sources are also very crucial in this study. This included the archival research that was conducted at the Uganda National Archives, Entebbe. Important were the memoranda and correspondence between princes of various principalities in Busoga and correspondences between the kingdom and the colonial government, as well as reports from colonial administrators posted to Busoga. Libraries at the University of the Western Cape, Makerere University Kampala, Makerere Institute for Social Research and the Cultural Research Centre of Jinja Diocese were very important sites for extended reading on the subject of heritage and also written sources on Busoga and Uganda where immense information was derived. At Makerere University’s main library, journals, especially the *Uganda Journal*, old newspapers and old documents in the Africana Collections, theses and other available scholarly work on Busoga were important. Archival records (minutes, brochures, text books) at the office of the minister for the *Kyabazinga* Affairs, Jinja were also consulted. Other materials were derived from individual or personal collections.

I did not engage with the Uganda Museum’s archive because the museum has no properly arranged archive. Though I was not able to get access to the archives, I was able to engage with the museum galleries and exhibitions especially the cultural village to observe how Busoga heritage is reproduced and represented in comparison with other ethnic groups. Additionally, when I visited the Regional Archive in Jinja the documents in the archive had been destroyed by water, caused by the heavy rain which got its way through an opening in the basement of the archive.

Finally, in executing the study, a personal diary and notebook helped me construct field notes and planning the dates that I was supposed to meet the informants for interviews. The interviewees were engaged through recording interviews by field notes and electronic recorder. The electronic records were personally transcribed and analysed for this work.
A brief outline of the thesis

This mini-thesis begins by looking at colonial histories of Busoga and Uganda and the creation of the Busoga Kingdom. Further analysis is on how the notion of Busoga emerged especially in the 19th Century with the invention of *Obwa Kyabazingaship* (kingship) in Busoga and how this notion of *Kyabazinga* came to be Busoga’s heritage.

The next chapter gives a description and history of a royal palace within the context of Uganda’s postcolonial history and how the notion of the palace developed into Busoga’s heritage in the twenty first century. There are lesser palaces that are found in each of the eleven chiefdoms that are also briefly discussed. However, for the purpose of the study, I focus on the central palace that seemingly unites all the Basoga. The chapter also discusses the postcolonial histories and practises that the people of Busoga regard as their heritage. Further I examined the contestations emanating from the kingdom’s failure to elect a new *Kyabazinga* ever since the death of former *Kyabazinga* late Henry Wako Muloki in 2008. The chapter further outlines the influence of the current central government in the heritage politics of the kingdom and the political role played by the Busoga kingdom in the Uganda’s politics in recent years.

Chapter three is concerned with the construction of tradition at *Mpumuire* hill and its development into a coronation site and Busoga’s heritage. The chapter focuses on the description, history and representation of the site and how it developed into a heritage site of cultural significance to the people of Busoga, especially with regard to its purpose as a place for enthronement and initiation of the new *Kyabazinga* (king) before he commences his duties as the king. *Mpumuire* hill is said to be the place where Kabalega king of Bunyoro died on his way from Seychelles Island where the British colonial authorities deported him and where the ten Busoga chiefs stood with the British provincial Commissioner Mr. Spire when Busoga’s boundaries were marked.
The last part concludes the thesis and argues that heritage in the case of Busoga is not given but has been constructed in a social arena and in a political (colonial and post-colonial) environment. The part argues that Busoga’s heritage needs closer examination in the ways it has been represented.
CHAPTER ONE

Colonial history: Busoga, Uganda and the invention of Busoga Kingdom

Introduction
The main argument in this chapter is that the concept of Kyabazingaship (kingship) is a recent creation by the British colonialists in the 19th century. It explains how and why Baganda agents were used to administer Busoga as instruments of indirect rule and prominent among these was Semei Kakungulu Lwakirenzi. I argue that Busoga was created from a geographical territory on the east bank of the River Nile from many erstwhile autonomous communities and, in a fashion akin to other territories in the colonial state of Uganda, subjected to indirect rule where monarchical systems were created as part of the colonial enterprise. Tradition therefore becomes an important instrument of colonial advance.
Map 2: A MAP SHOWING THE CURRENT ELEVEN ‘TRADITIONAL’ CHIEFDOMS OF BUSOGA KINGDOM AND IGENGE ROYAL PALACE, MPUMUIRE HILL HERITAGE SITES,

Map Source: Chief Izimba Patrick Gologolo’s collections.

From the map above, what can be seen is the outlay of counties that corresponded to colonial boundaries that were claimed to be ‘Basoga’ which were amalgamated to become the new kingdom of Busoga during colonial rule. People’s identities have been as varied as the names
seen on this map. This study found that many today prefer for instance to refer to themselves as Banyole, Bakooli, Balamogi and so forth by citing their varied histories of origin and quoting differences of cultural and economic nature. Whereas this is a map of Busoga, inside this map are fundamental divisions that this study will discuss further. For instance “it hides the three-time shifting of the headquarters” of Busoga, its subsequent location near the commercial, colonial district and religious headquarters of Jinja near the source of the Nile River in the extreme west of ‘Busoga’. On the map stories of migrations into Busoga can be traced, Mukama coming from Bunyoro and entering Busoga from the north-west while Kintu entered Busoga from the south-east and re-entered Busoga from the west on return from Buganda.

In contemporary Uganda the reconstituted Busoga kingdom is defined as having 11 hereditary Saza chiefs that rule under the Kyabazinga, controlling what were coterminous defined as counties under the colonial order and who form the electoral college of Kyabazinga. But the Kyabazinga can only be elected from the Baisengobi (of the Ngobi clan which is the ruling clan in Busoga) chiefs. The idea of electing a Kyabazinga was not something that was started by the hereditary chiefs, but was started under the directive of the protectorate government represented by the colonial official, the District Commissioner, who mediated between the protectorate and the African local government. Flemming who was the provincial Native courts officer for the Eastern province Uganda observed that “the chairman of the principal council, called the District Council, is known as the Kyabazinga who is elected to this post for a term of years and whose position is becoming analogous to that of hereditary rulers elsewhere in the Uganda protectorate”.21

In Busoga chiefdoms were structured with a hereditary framework that the colonial state consequently changed/adopted to structures of indirect rule where areas were converted into

---

counties and their rulers given civil services appointments as chiefs of counties as illustrated in summary of the 11 chiefdoms originating from both Mukama and Kintu including the titles and names here below.

Fig 2: A table showing the present counties, names and titles of the respective chiefs (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of area/traditional chiefdom</th>
<th>Title (clan)</th>
<th>Name of the current hereditary Chief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kigulu</td>
<td>Ngobi (M)</td>
<td>Izimba Patrick Gologolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugabula</td>
<td>Gabula (M)</td>
<td>William Wilberforce Nadhiope IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulamogi</td>
<td>Zibondo (M)</td>
<td>Edward Columbus Wambuzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukono</td>
<td>Nkono (M)</td>
<td>C.J Mutyaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luuka</td>
<td>Tabingwa (M)</td>
<td>Willington Nabwana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukooli</td>
<td>Wakooli (K)</td>
<td>David Muluya Kawunhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busiki</td>
<td>Kisiki (K)</td>
<td>Yekosofati Kawanguzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunha</td>
<td>Luba (K)</td>
<td>Munulo Juma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butembe</td>
<td>Ntembe (K)</td>
<td>Waguma Yasin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunhole</td>
<td>Nanhumba (K)</td>
<td>Ntale John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugweri</td>
<td>Menha (K)</td>
<td>Kakaire Fred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND = M (Muisengobi); K (Kintu)

The British and Busoga

Busoga’s heritage was largely a creation by the British and packaged to appear as authentic. In constructing Busoga’s heritage, the British appeared in various forms. According to Kisubi a retired civil servant, the explorers coming to find the source of the Nile (in Busoga), the traders, explorers and the administrators (with their Baganda agents and indirect rule) played a key role in shaping what is seen today as Busoga and Basoga heritage. It is generally agreed that heritage is “a constructed phenomenon continuously recreated a new according to changing

---

22 Interview with Sendya-Kisubi, Male, 74 years, retired civil servant and son to a former chief, Jinja Town, 4 March 2011.
attitudes and demands”. Heritage includes places, values, traditions, events and experiences that are supposed to depict where we have come from, where we are now and gives context to where we are headed as a community. Heritage is therefore dynamic and ever changing. The Kyabazingaship is a ‘political institution’ which was invented to further colonial political control over Busoga and became a new layer on Busoga’s ever changing heritage apparatus. Each respective chiefdom/state in Busoga had a ruler called Omulangira (prince) who was the paramount and hereditary ruler of a chiefdom before the British consolidated these small states into one big entity called Obwa Kyabazinga bwa Busoga (Busoga Kingdom) under one leader called Isebantu Kyabazinga (the father of all people) for easy administration in 1939. As Nakabayashi maintains, the “Busoga kingdom was a colonial creation”.24

Inventions, creations, innovations and constructions that inform heritage usually start as habitus which gradually ingrains in the heritage landscape. This can even be imposed through political power. Tunbridge and Ashworth have argued that heritage is a form of power imposed on people to ‘serve’ their political interests “and that heritage is endowed with messages which are deliberately framed by the existing or aspirant power elite to legitimise the existing dominant regime”.25 Ranger has pointed out that traditions in Africa were invented. This notion has been developed further by Byarugaba who argues that the inventors of tribes were the colonial masters.26 The tribe was defined in colonial lingua as the unit of culture and heritage. I argue that the inventors of Busoga were the colonial administrators, who ‘imagined communities’27 transformed and produced cultures. These cultures were presented as, languages, ‘tribes’ and

---

27 B. Anderson, Imagined Communities: Reflection on the original and spread of Nationalism (New York: Verso, 1983). He regards communities as imagined, because all communities larger than primordial village are imagined. Communities are to be distinguished not by their falsity /genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined. He further pointed out that a nation is constructed from popular processes through which residents are seen to share nationality in common. P6.
customs. These inventions by Europeans during the nineteenth century affected different parts of colonial Africa. According to Terence Ranger, “the most far-reaching inventions of tradition in colonial Africa took place when the Europeans believed themselves to be respecting age-old African custom. What was called customary law, customary land-rights, and customary political structure and so on, were in fact all invented by colonial codification”. Busoga was unified into one political unit called a district occupied by one ethnic group, claimed to be the Basoga and, a cultural entity called the Busoga Kingdom. Thus, Nabwiso has stressed that “the amalgamation of the kingdoms into one native government from 1894 to 1967 enabled the people to develop allegiance towards Busoga as one region and began to proudly refer to themselves as Basoga”.

Centralization of Busoga

The centralization of Busoga was only completed through the establishment of the office of the presidency in 1906 and later the Kyabazinga in 1939. It cannot, however, be stated that this started entirely with colonisation. Informants indicated that closer cooperation between various communities was already in the pipeline and rulers in Busoga had started closer collaboration, which made it easier for Kakungulu and later the British to centralize, with chiefs losing their power to the newly established Kyabazinga’s seat at Jinja. The establishment of the Lukiiko and districts for Busoga was instrumental in this direction where all formerly independent chiefs were party. Kyobika an informant pointed out to me that “in 1907, there was the notion of working together (Okukolera walala) which was first adopted. The representatives from the different chiefdoms worked in Empalo (voluntary tasks) or Engobo (terms), where each

The meetings were first held in **Bukaleba** in Nyago-Zigombye Luba’s chiefdom- Bunha before 1939. This indicates that different shades of opinion over the shape of Busoga were being organised. The idea of a *Kyabazingaship* was not popular with everyone in Busoga.

In this development, **Bukaleba** became the first headquarters of Busoga from 1893 to 1899 which later on transferred to **Iganga** in 1899 and finally was taken to Bugembe in 1901 where it has remained up to today. The **Lukiiko** then stipulated that the **Kyabazinga** would rule for 3 years of term and not for life. “The representatives of the five chiefdoms who were working in the **Obwami** (chair representatives) of the **Kyabazingaship** were Yosiya of Bugabula, Wako Ezekieri of Bulamogi, Ngoni Obodha, Tabingwa and Nkono. These were the representatives whom the British first met”.

The election of every **Kyabazinga** was (is) done by the Chiefs Royal Council which comprises of the eleven (11) hereditary Saza chiefs who were formerly autonomous kings of their own.

The inclusion of election through a royal college of electors was the first of its kind in Uganda. Not even with the Buganda model, much praised and exported to various parts of Africa, was a royal elected. The position of the Kyabazinga was not assumed to carry a lot of weight. After all it was rotational with the bearer being also in control of his own territory. Territorial palaces of almost similar design were built in all the principalities and doubled as Saza (counties) headquarters. Upon the end of one’s term, the **Kyabazinga** would simply retire to his old title of **Kigulu**.

---

30 Interview with Kyobika Noah, prime minister of Obwa Ngobi bwa Kigulu, Male 90years, Ngobi’s office, Nakigo, 28 Jan 2011.


32 Interview with Kyobika Noah, Prime Minister of Obwa Ngobi bwa Kigulu, Male, 90years, Ngobi’s office, Nakigo, 28 Jan 2011.

33 Presently, there is however a council of representatives (Busoga Lukiiko) comprised of twenty-two persons or more with two persons from every territory, selected by the hereditary chiefs, whose functions were like those of a modern Parliament. I am grateful to Waguma Yasin, the hereditary chief of Butembe for making this point clear during the interview.
Zibondo, Gabula, Nkono, Tabingwa etc. Kyobika pointed out to me that “the creation of Kyabazingaship and the use of the title Kyabazinga instead of president also came along with the notion of election (okulonda) in the 1930s”.34 As Kaluba stated, “the chiefs were advised to elect one general name instead of the title of president thus, they thought of one person who could wrap the whole of Busoga as an entity and they called him the ‘Kyabazinga’”.35 The term president re-emerged in Uganda in 1962 at independence while the usage of the same in Busoga was eliminated in 1938!

Semei Kakungulu in Busoga

The idea of presidency and Obwa Kyabazinga (kingship) in Busoga relates to the contributions of Semei Kakungulu (of Buganda) during the colonial period. Kakungulu had been a senior general in the Kabaka’s army in Buganda and had struggled for power (the premiership) with Apolo Kagwa. Losing to the latter, he was encouraged to seek his fortune elsewhere and the east of Uganda seemed fertile for his ambitions especially after the capture of the two kings, Kabalega (of Bunyoro) and Mwanga (of Buganda). After his exploits in the east Semei Kakungulu was sent by the British to administer Busoga as the president of the Busoga Lukiiko in 1906.36 Mutibwa argues “as the Buganda model was new to the area, the British made use of the Baganda agents to supervise and advise the local chiefs appointed by the British to run the local administrations. From the east Kakungulu was dispatched by the British to Busoga, where he assisted the British to reorganise the local administrative into chieftainships based on the

---

34 Interview with Kyobika Noah, Prime Minister of Obwa Ngobi bwa Kigulu, Male, 90years, Ngobi’s office, Nakigo, 28 Jan 2011.
35 Interview with Kaluba John (Co-founder of the Jinja Cultural Research Centre and CEO Succeed Uganda), Male, 59years, Wakitaka, 11 Jan 2011.
Buganda model”. The British chose Kakungulu because he was familiar with the administrative practices having assisted the British in the conquest of Bukedi and Bunyoro earlier and he being a soldier, he was politically reliable. Thus the British believed he could administer Busoga and the entire eastern Uganda efficiently for them.

Additionally Kakungulu became effectively engaged with Busoga because Buganda was expanding and therefore Kakungulu was interested in introducing the Buganda administration indirectly. Moreover, he had been in a bitter conflict with Apolo Kagwa, the Prime Minister of Buganda Kingdom. Losing the war with Kagwa and nursing ambitions of power, he had headed east, capturing eastern Uganda. But the British appointed him in 1906 as chairman Busoga Lukiiko and Busoga became his next staging point. As a Muganda, he was familiar with the culture of Buganda’s eastern neighbours, the Basoga, and thus a centralized and more advanced form of administration was seen to make him acceptable by some Basoga. Moreover, he was martial and his imperial exploits in the east of Uganda for his British overlords were well known to some people in the British protectorate. Thus, prior to the merging of all the principalities of Busoga as one entity by the British, he became the first president of the Busoga Lukiiko from 1906 to 1912 before the title of Kyabazinga was first adopted in 1939.

The invention of the Kyabazingaship

The colonial period involved the arrival of the British in Buganda around 1890 and the spread of their control over the various parts of Uganda, such as, Bunyoro, Ankole, Toro and Busoga where they had attained full control by 1928. Nakabayashi has observed that “when the British came to colonise Busoga, they found a number of small chieftdoms occupied the place. In the meantime these independent chieftdoms were made to combine themselves in order to have a

unitary Busoga government”.

This kind of centralisation of power was created as a way of enabling the British to administer Busoga effectively. Agriculture in the form of cotton growing in northern Busoga had also occasioned the extension of the Uganda Railway to Mbulamuti by 1903.

In addition, Busoga had experienced previous periodic raids from Buganda for slaves and ivory. By the time of colonization, Busoga lay along the long-distance route from the lacustrine area to the coast. Together with Buganda, their occupancy of the lands at the source of the Nile made the area even more strategic for the British Empire. As Fleming has observed, “......in order to administer the area the British made use of the Baganda who were possessed of an established administrative system which the British aided by them, translated to Busoga”. At the time of the British occupation of Buganda was a centralised kingdom with the Kabaka as their king, unlike Busoga that had no king. Buganda was administratively organised with a hierarchy of leadership with the king at the top, Saza (county) chiefs, Gobolola (sub-county), parishes etc. This local but highly organised and bureaucratic system became attractive to the British and became a model for indirect rule, a system through which British colonialism would manipulate well organised traditional rule in administering colonial territories.

Like all other kingdoms of Uganda: Buganda, Bunyoro, Ankole and Toro, “the Busoga kingdom used to be simply a political institution in the sense that it was made for a device of the British ‘indirect rule’, although many features of Basoga culture were certainly adopted from the original Busoga chiefdoms”. Busoga was recognised as a district unlike Bunyoro, Buganda and Toro that were already kingdoms at the advent of colonial rule. Thus, Batambuze Joy

---

pointed out to me that “there was no indigenous institution which united Busoga except the pre-existent independent chiefdoms which, the colonial administration reorganised and became counties”.

Busoga therefore became somewhat a mixed system with the Kyabazinga as cultural head of a territory geographically constituted as the district of Busoga, in effect ruled over by a colonial officer called District Commissioner. The principalities became Sazas, territories equal to a county also under a county chief. In 1955 when the District Commissioner sat in the Kyabazinga’s seat in the Lukiiko hall, it prompted dissent over what was seen as the desecration of culture.

In the colonial era, the traditional rulers (princes) were transformed into chiefs under the new civil service dispensation. The chiefs were the agents of the colonial masters in which the provincial officers were powerful than the chiefs. In other words the chiefs were subordinate to the colonial officials and the choice was with the chiefs to choose either the more powerful position that went with colonial power or remain down-trodden chiefs without recognition. In this case, more modern colonial forms were put in place. Even after 1939 when the title of Kyabazinga was obtained, the notion of Kyabazinga was perceived in different ways by the colonial masters, the chiefs and the people of Busoga. Batambuze pointed out that “to the colonial masters the Kyabazinga was not seen as a traditional ruler of Busoga but an administrative unit or person while to the chiefs and the people, he served as a tribal unity and honour (kitibwa)”. That is why in some instances the chiefly groups were offended that the British did not accord to the Kyabazinga treatment worthy of an African ruler.

Mudola has noted that “the District commissioner Roper aroused indignation in a Lukiiko meeting when he came dressed in a short-sleeved shirt and short pants and, to add insult to

---

41 Interview with Batambuza Joy, Female, 85 years, Budondo 10 March 2011.
43 Also For the colonial disrespect for kingdoms in Uganda, see Sir Edward Mutesa, The Desecration of My Kingdom (London: Constable, 1984).
injury, sat on the Kyabazinga’s chair, which in the eyes of the chiefly groups, was a ‘throne’”. The throne carried different meanings to different powers. To some Basoga, it was a symbol of progress and unity meaning a united Busoga on a par with other cultural entities such as Buganda while to the British, it was an ineffectual seat occupied by another protégé more less at the whims of the local colonial administrator. The seat had become among some Basoga as a symbol of the new heritage of Busoga. Equally what we note here is that even when colonial ways were seen as the modernising force and therefore worth copying, certain aspects of colonial culture were resented as an offence to Basoga norms. One of these was the colonial dressing of khaki shorts by colonial officers.

The created counties (Bugabula, Bukooli, Bulamogi, Butembe, Kigulu, Bunha, Bukono, Bunhole, and Luuka among others) were ruled by the chiefs appointed by the colonial officials and were coterminous with the geographical extent of formerly autonomous chiefdoms. To the colonial system, maintaining these seemingly cultural boundaries and their allegiance together with the paramount/hereditary chief was a form of entrenching indirect rule. The Kyabazinga had the British to thank for his throne rather than the Basoga. It was British heritage transferred to work in Busoga. Chief Patrick Izimba said to me that “the counties were subdivided into Igoloza /gombolola, an equivalent of a contemporary sub-county, (a term which literally meant to ‘arrange’ or ‘arranging’), Muluka (equivalent to an administrative parish, a term that literally means ‘putting together’), Kisoko (small village)” [italics are words of respondent, brackets are paraphrased/translated respondent statements]. Owekisoko- portended the small lowest leadership in a particular village; Omutala-the land between two or more than two swamps and Owomutala was the person responsible for the Omutala.

---

45 Interview with Chief Patrick Izimba Gologolo, Male, 48 years, Nasuti, 20 Jan 2011.
At the advent of British rule a new Buganda administrative system and geographical demarcations were adopted in Busoga in which districts were created where they combined traditional counties (Saza) and sub-counties (Gombolola) into districts and gave them a new name. The numerous clans were then fused into ten counties: Butembe-Bunha, Bunholi, Bukooli, Luuka, Bugabula, Kigulu, Busiki, Bulamogi, Bukono and Bugweri. In 1922 Butembe and Bunha were separated to make independent counties to make a total of the present 11 counties that make up Busoga kingdom. The boundaries of sub-counties ran along side local administration in some kind of a bureaucratic order.

In effecting the political mission in Busoga, an unnamed colonial officer observed that “the British argued that we delude ourselves if we suppose that by extending the Buganda administrative divisions of Saza and Gombolola to other areas and ourselves appointing “Chiefs” of these artificially created divisions, we have established a “Native Authority” any more than by calling a meeting of these official a “Lukiiko” we have established a tribal council”. The princes in traditional Busoga were formerly appointed as Saza chiefs and were regarded by the British as government officials who were responsible to the British government in all matters concerning Busoga district. For instance Daudi Mutekanga the Katikiro (prime minister), to Yosia Nadhiope the prince of Bugabula, was appointed by the British when Yosia died in 1913. Karugire has pointed out that:

...the African chief was to be the grass root instrument by which British control was to be established and consolidated in Uganda. By this chiefs were given wide ranging powers to enable them discharge their new duties. They were to maintain law and order in their respective areas of jurisdiction and they were given all powers necessary to enable them prevent the commission of crimes: powers of arrest of offenders.

---

46 See map 2 showing the current eleven ‘Traditional’ chiefdoms of Busoga Kingdom.
48 Saza is derived from a Luganda dialect that means a bounded territory under a chief (Owesaza) which has been translated into English as a ‘County’. It was a form of administration which originated from Buganda when the Buganda model of administration was exported and adopted to rule the Busoga province during colonialism.
49 U.G.A.E. S. M. P. 1561/1908, Provincial Commissioner Fredrick Spire’s letter to Entebbe, 20-1-1913 was declaring Yosia Nadhiope’s death (Uganda National Archives, Entebbe).
prohibition of carrying of arms by African, the requisitioning of free labour for public projects and so on.\textsuperscript{50}

It was a kind of decentralisation of power exercised by the chiefs after the 1919 Native Authority Ordinance was introduced in the protectorate. Fleming further pointed out that on becoming a government agent, the ruling clan head or Saza chief, as he was styled, had to fulfil a dual role both as a government representative and traditional landlord”.\textsuperscript{51} Mutibwa argued that “...the Provincial Commissioners with their hierarchies of District Commissioners and District Officers were the real rulers of the colonised. The chiefs were appointed, paid their meagre salaries, and told what to tell their people; if they did not, they would be sacked”.\textsuperscript{52} Therefore, in an earlier report in 1904 provincial commissioner G. Boil stated clearly that, “in time I hope that it may be found possible to amalgamate the people of several sections of the same ‘tribe’ into one ‘tribe’ under one paramount chief who would then have sufficient power to control his ‘tribe’ without outside interference”.\textsuperscript{53} As discussed earlier in 1906 the British deployed Semei Kakungulu a Muganda from Buganda to rule Busoga and to introduce the Buganda model of administration. Luganda became a sort of official language but still failed to replace the Basoga words that were used to refer to spaces.

**E.T Wako as the first Kyabazinga of Busoga**

Education and the establishment of schools and churches resulted in strengthening of the notion of Kyabazingaship (kingship). Young chiefs from Busoga and Buganda were taken to schools in Buganda such as Mengo High School and King’s College Buddo, located on the outskirts of Kampala. The chiefs emerged with administrative qualities desirable to the British and were

\textsuperscript{53} A. B. Boil to H.M. Commissioner, Entebbe, Report from Busoga and Bukedi Districts for February submits No. 12 Jinja 14 March1904.
deemed to be able to administer Busoga on behalf of the British colonial government. Some of the princes were deployed in the civil service while the children of the chiefs were sent abroad for further education. But the chiefs were numerous and some were deployed as chiefs of the mutaala and kisoko ranks.

Ezekieri Tenywa Wako for example became the next Saza chief of Bulamogi in 1913 and successor to his father. He became the next president of the Busoga Lukiiko in 1918 five years after Kakungulu’s dismissal in 1913. Kakungulu was dismissed because of the wrangles among the chiefs and clans, in which most Basoga retained association to their chiefs and clan, and he was rendered powerless. Real power lay still with the chiefs of the individual chiefdoms. Therefore, “the Lukiiko structure collapsed and Kakungulu was dismissed by the British.” The British were not to give up on Busoga after dismissing Kakungulu. But there was no immediate replacement either from Buganda or Busoga itself and a formula was designed to have one from the various (11) Basoga ruling houses to chair the Lukiiko. For five years, the Lukiiko was not presided over until the election of E.T. Wako in 1918.

54 Interview with Kayaga Nabwana, (care taker of the throne of Tabigwa of Luuka) Male, 85years, Bunafu, 26 Feb 2011. They were then picked from there to succeed their fathers on the hereditary thrones, some of them often disdainfully neglecting the duty that regents and caretakers were often appointed who during this study were cagey about their regent-ships but claimed full authority.
55 Interview with Sendya-Kisubi (retired civil servant and son to a former chief), Male, 74years, Jinja Town, 4 March 2011. He was sent to China for his education.
57 Interview with Kyobika Noah, Male, 90years Katukiiro (Prime Minister)of Obwa Ngobi bwa Kigulu, Ngobi’s office, Nakigo, 28 Jan 2011.
**Figure 3:** A table showing the presidents of the Busoga Lukiiko and the *Kyabazingas* that have ruled Busoga since 1906 to 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidents and Kyabazingas</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Year (From)</th>
<th>Year (To)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semei Kakungulu Lwakirenzi</td>
<td>President Busoga Lukiiko</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. T. Wako</td>
<td>President of the Busoga Lukiiko</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.T Wako</td>
<td>Isebantu Kyabazinga</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir William Wilberforce Nadiope</td>
<td>Isebantu Kyabazinga</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. H Henry Wako Muloki</td>
<td>Isebantu Kyabazinga</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were desires in 1939 to make the office of *Kyabazinga* appear more traditional by adopting a traditional title for it instead of the title of president. In this sense, its cultural rendition was applied to an institution, making it ‘authentic’. The word itself means ‘the one who wraps’ and other titles that accompany it such as the masculine *Isebantu* means ‘the father of the people’ and the feminine *Inebantu* ‘the mother of the people’. The first one (*Isebantu*) refers to the *Kyabazinga* while the second (*Inebantu*) is used to refer to the *Kyabazinga*’s wife. Over time, the idea of Busoga as an entity gained ground and an all-Busoga throne became recognised.

During the *Lukiiko* elections of 1938, E.T Wako was elected first *Kyabazinga*, beating other candidates namely Zefania Nabikamba Saza chief of Luuka and Samwiri Wakooli of Bukooli,
according to Chief Mulaya.\textsuperscript{58} Ezekieri won because of his previous record as president of the Lukiiko, he was a Mulangira (prince) from the Ngobi clan, and besides, was a college graduate, being one of the first educated princes from Busoga, acceptable to the Basoga especially the Lukiiko (composed of princes) as well as to the British colonial administration. British backing appeared as unequivocal Informants to this study also indicated that those at the centre of Busoga did not wish to give up their hereditary thrones in favour of the Kyabazingaship, and hence the Kyabazingaship was left to those from the periphery. Some chiefs were not willing to leave their chiefdoms to move to Jinja to become the Kyabazinga. Kaluba suggested to me that “the Abaisengobi were of the view that it was not easy for us to leave our chiefdoms and go and work for the people called Abazungu (white men). That is why they sent Ezekieri Tenya Wako who was more exposed to the white man, hence becoming the first Kyabazinga”.\textsuperscript{59}

Upon resignation of office of Kyabazinga in 1949, E.T Wako wrote of how he had become the Kyabazinga:

I humbly beg to address this letter to you and to inform you that I hope to retire from my duties of leader of the tribe as Kyabazinga of Busoga at the end of March 1949.

I have served both my country Busoga and the protectorate government for 34years. After completion of my education at Mengo high school and finally at King’s collage Buddo, in December 1913, I started my services as Saza chief Zibondo of Bulamogi at the beginning of 1914. I served as Saza till the end of 1918 when I was appointed leader of the tribe of Busoga as President Busoga Lukiiko.

In 1922 when Butembe was recreated, this county was given to me to work as President Busoga Lukiiko and Owesaza Butembe, when Butembe County was taken away from me, after the introduction of councils in Busoga District Council. In 1938 when the title of leader of Busoga was changed from that of

\textsuperscript{58} Interview with Chief David Kaunhe Wakooli, (Acting Kyabazinga), Male, 52years, Magwa, 15 April 2011.
\textsuperscript{59} Interview with Kaluba John, (Co-founder of the Jinja Cultural Research Centre and CEO Succeed Uganda NGO), Male, 59years, Wakitaka, 11 Jan 2011.
president Busoga Lukiiko to the of Kyabazinga, I was re-elected by the
Busoga Lukiiko as Kyabazinga of Busoga on account of the reasons given
above.\textsuperscript{60}

Wako’s own version of events seems to miss the point that several of my informants made. It is
fairly possible that the chiefs in central Busoga despised the periphery and, allowing someone
from a peripheral territory such as Bugabula and Bulamogi to occupy this office was also a form
of passive resistance to colonial rule. The Kyabazinga did not seem particularly attractive at the
onset. Maintaining the more traditional role with a direct contact with the local Basoga in their
own territories seemed to make more sense to them. Moreover, resistance to colonial rule take-
over was more manifest in the outlying territories like Bukono than central Busoga. Quite often,
as informants to this study would allude, kings rarely allowed their children to go far away and
only those of despised mothers were surrendered to the English for education. In effect, Wako
was not necessarily the heir, neither was he sent to school for the purpose of becoming a future
king of Bulamogi and later Busoga.\textsuperscript{61} Therefore, Ezekieri Wako and the other leaders like
Semei Kakungulu were British surrogates because they worked on behalf of the British to
accomplish the intended colonial administration in the Eastern Province and elsewhere in the
Protectorate.

In summary, I argued that what is seen today Busoga’s heritage with the re-creation of the
kingdoms is largely a recent creation by the British colonialists. The concept of the Kyabazinga
which now appears as central to Busoga’s heritage was a reformulation of the concept of the
presidency of Basoga, making it appear in 1939 as more authentic. Yet at the time, as we have
seen above, there was reluctance from some to take this position as it was associated with
colonial administration.

\textsuperscript{61} Interview with Sendya-Kisubi, Male, 74years, retired civil servant and son to a former chief, Jinja Town, 4
March 2011.
Not only the institution of the Kyabazinga has been central to Busoga’s new found heritage since the 1990s but spaces and sites have been invented, assumed and therefore imagined as Busoga’s heritage. These spaces like the Igenge palace (Kyabazinga palace) will be discussed in depth in the next chapter.
CHAPTER TWO

The heritage of the palace(s)

Introduction

The kingdom of Busoga eventually emerged to become a central authority and power to rule the Basoga using the notion of the Kyabazinga as a ‘traditional’ title and the evolution of the idea of a single palace for the whole of Busoga. The Busoga kingdom today is identified with the main ‘royal’ palace which is the residence for the Kyabazinga with Bugembe considered as the headquarters and administrative unit (office) for the whole kingdom. The palace is located on Igenge Hill in Wanyange suburb, Butembe County (Jinja district) with an overview of the Jinja town centre. It is about 2 kilometres from the Bugembe headquarters of Busoga kingdom.62

This chapter discusses the history, description and the development of the Igenge royal palace as heritage and heritage site. The palace is assumed to be where Busoga’s heritage is imagined, produced and represented, packaged, appropriated and disseminated. In Busoga, public history is produced and represented through the palace and therefore, what is seen as heritage in Busoga has hitherto constituted the histories of African communities such as Basoga has been largely palace history rather than the history of the common people. It is fair to state that what was largely written was the narrative of the princes rather than the larger Basoga population.63 The chapter further discusses the destruction of Busoga kingdom and the other monarchies of Uganda such as Buganda, Toro, Ankole and Bunyoro in 1967, by the government of Milton Obote and its restoration and the other kingdoms in 1993 by the government of Museveni Yoweri.

62 Two palaces exist near each other, one for the hereditary chief of Butembe located at Wanyange while that for the Kyabazinga is according to tradition supposed to shift with every new Kyabazinga. Its present location is more politically than culturally determine. In the recent past, the Kyabazinga has often used private homes to carry out regal functions.

63 Most of the works cited in this study heavily relied on princely informants. In this case, the narrative captured and chronicled was of palace nature.
The palace is the cultural, social, economic and political capital of Busoga representing an amalgam of culturally different and divergent units. It can also be seen as a metaphor representing a trajectory of societal development and acquisition of new values that assume to portray the Basoga as a ‘modern’ group, on a par with other communities in Uganda. Visitors to this palace have more to do with its architecture and more with the presence of the state than culture. The idea that the palace under construction is the work of the central government with less input by the Basoga seems to divorce its self from Basoga heritage. In addition, this palace can be seen to represent a shift in the balance of power cultural or otherwise, between the past and present, young and old, state and culture etc. A new dimension in the discourse demanding for ‘ebyaiffe’ or ‘our heritage’, represents shifting identities of nationhood in Uganda.

As earlier noted, Busoga kingdom today is made up of 11 chiefdoms and each has a palace since these were autonomous chiefdoms before the amalgamation of Busoga. Even when one overall ruler (Kyabazinga) of Busoga was created in 1939 according to Chief Kaunhe, “the chiefdoms maintained their status as autonomous states with the princes as the caretakers of the different counties”. These palaces have continued to exist albeit in a state of disrepair. It is fair to understand what powers lay in these palaces vis a vis the Kyabazinga’s main palace, how the power balance was tilted towards the latter, hence eroding the former and, what levels of power the princes wield in their different chiefdoms in spite of being part of the politics of Busoga.

---

64 See J. L. Matory, ‘The ‘New World’ surrounds an Ocean: Theorizing the Live Dialogue between African and African American Cultures’, *Afro-Atlantic Dialogue: Anthropology in the Diaspora*, in K. A. Yelvington (ed.), 2006. Metaphors can be understood as descriptions, figure of speech and symbols. Matory suggests that all perception and thought are mediated by metaphors, which involve the comparison of one domain of experience (the metaphoric “target”) with another (the metaphoric “source”).

65 There seems to be a conflict of identity with ethnic forms taking proud precedence over national forms. Once is more proud in reference to being a Musoga, Muganda etc than being referred to as a Ugandan. After the reinstatement of cultural institutions in 1993, cultural pride, manifested in cultural sub-nationalism has threatened the very notion of Uganda, a colonial creation itself that has remained without a defined heritage rather than the heritages of the different groups that constitute it. This explains the conflict between the centre that has been called republicanism and the cultural groups.

66 Interview with Chief David Kaunhe Wakooli (Acting Kyabazinga), Male, 52years, Magwa Kavule Crescent, 15 April 2011.
selection of a Kyabazinga. Even in the gradual process of becoming one Busoga, the princes inadvertently accepted the shift of their powers to the Kyabazinga, a spectacle that has resulted in contemporary conflict that will be discussed later. It is thus fair to discuss palaces instead of a single palace, since even the Kyabazinga has an original palace to which he retreats when the ‘term’ of office expires. In the table below, we attempt to locate the various palaces today and the hereditary titles in each.

**Figure 4: Showing the palaces of the respective principalities since 1922**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Palace</th>
<th>Saza(Principal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngobi</td>
<td>Bulubandi</td>
<td>Kigulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zibondo</td>
<td>Kaliro</td>
<td>Bulamogi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabula</td>
<td>Budhumbula</td>
<td>Bugabula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkono</td>
<td>Ivukula</td>
<td>Bukono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabigwa</td>
<td>Kiyunga</td>
<td>Luuka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntembe</td>
<td>Wanyange</td>
<td>Butembe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakooli</td>
<td>Bugiri</td>
<td>Bukooli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menha</td>
<td>Ibaako</td>
<td>Bugweri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luba</td>
<td>Bukaleba</td>
<td>Bunha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisiki</td>
<td>Kayiti</td>
<td>Busiki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanumba</td>
<td>Kityerera</td>
<td>Bunhole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to the table above there are meanings related to the concepts principality, Saza or County. The concept ‘principality’ represents the different boundaries that were ruled by the princes in ‘traditional Busoga’.

The Kyabazinga’s palace has a shallow history. It is a recent creation at the advent of British colonial rule in Uganda. The idea of a palace as a residence for the president Busoga Lukiiko.

---

67 The county of Butembe was then separated from Bunha to make a total of eleven chiefdoms. See E. T Wako correspondence with the Busoga Lukiiko quoted in Dan Mudola, *Chiefs and Political Action, in the case of Busoga 1900-1962*, (Kampala: Makerere University, 1974), p377.

68 The Busoga Lukiiko is the legislature whereby members who constitute it are properly selected by every respective hereditary ruler of the eleven chiefdoms. The members of the representatives vary from chiefdom to chiefdom depending on the responsibility as per the chiefdom. There are also special nominees by the Kyabazinga.
could have started around the time when the headquarters were shifted from Iganga to Bugembe in 1901 till the time when the title of Kyabazinga was adopted in 1939. This carried with it a sort of recognition of a traditional rank above other traditional chiefs whereas the ‘president’ was English and ‘Kyabazinga’ was Lusoga. The use of a vernacular title was an appeal to tradition. The word ‘Kyabazinga’ was new in the Lusoga vocabulary, a neologism intended to appeal to traditionalism to accord service allegiance to the new hierarchical order.

As discussed in chapter one the Busoga Lukiiko headquarters was first located in Bukaleba relocated to Iganga and finally to Bugembe in 1901 where it is today. Why were there shifts from one administrative location to another? The headquarters were first located in Bukaleba in 1894, as the missionary Bishop Hannington first settled in Bukaleba, in Luba’s chiefdom. He was subsequently murdered on Kabaka Mutesa’s orders, a death that was coincidental with the outbreak of sleeping sickness and therefore easily found its way into Busoga folklore. It is probable that the shift of the headquarters from Bukaleba in Luba’s county to Iganga can also be attributed to the outbreak of this sleeping sickness in 1901.69

The other reasons could be the commercial activities and accessibility. Iganga had become a trade route, a commercial centre and a highway to Kenya as a result of Jinja’s improved infrastructure that linked to the border with British Kenya. According to the annual report of 1907-1908, “the township Roads have been improved and some of them metalled. Two European foremen were sent by the public works department to superintend the making of the Jinja-Iganga and Jinja-Kakindu Roads”.70 An informant to this study added “the offices moved because there was need for the headquarters to be in a place or area which was more developed and therefore, Jinja was suitable and developed at that time.

70 Busoga District Annual Report for 1907-1908, p.6.
Also Bunha was infested with sleeping sickness that claimed many lives”. Bugembe (a Jinja suburb) seemed to be convenient in administering Busoga since Jinja had increasingly developed into an administrative town and an industrial centre. In addition, the shift could be linked to the inflow of colonial administrators, educators, missionaries, traders and blue-collar men plus people from other areas of Uganda into Jinja during that period.

The idea of a palace in Busoga’s heritage started to evolve in the twentieth Century. It stretches from the time of E.T. Wako who was the president of the Busoga Lukiiko in 1918, and not a king, and who later became the Kyabazinga in 1939. In pre-colonial era, Busoga did not have a united kingdom and a palace as in Buganda, Bunyoro, Ankole and Toro. The amalgamation of Busoga was late. Each of the chiefdoms had their own ‘palace’.

**Figure 5: The Palace of the hereditary chief of Kigulu**

The Palace of the hereditary chief of Kigulu. Standing is the Chief and informant to this study, Prince Izimba Patrick Gologolo. Photograph by Nabirye Zaina, 27 Feb 2011.

---

71 Interview with Kadaya Musa, (Head of the BaiseWakoli clan), Male, 60years, Budaya, 18 Nov 2011.
The palaces were noted for their grandeur and large size, easily standing out as the ‘largest’ homestead in their areas of jurisdiction. Even in their derelict status today, they betray their colonial origins. These palaces, ‘butaka’ or traditional royal burial grounds occupy a salient space in the gardens located behind the homestead. Buried there are former hereditary chiefs and their spouses and children. Yet at family levels, graves exhibit unmatched grandeur of lived good times and pride in tradition and family heritage resides there whether the family is utterly Christian, non-Christian or Moslem or mixed.

Kadaya adds that “in the early years when the Kayabazingaship was introduced there had never been a Busoga palace but, each of the Kyabazingas that ever ruled Busoga had official or personal residential homes around Jinja”. Therefore, when Ezekieri Tenywa Wako became president and later Kyabazinga in 1939, the British constructed a residential house where he was based while he performed his royal duties at the headquarters in Bugembe. Kadaya pointed out that “to most of the people the house was referred to as the ‘Kyabazinga House’”. Furthermore, Chief Mutyaba pointed out that “when the headquarters moved to Bugembe, the chiefs could reside in the guest house at the headquarters every time they came for the Busoga Lukiiko. Meanwhile the Kyabazinga was constructed a house that was known as the Kyabazinga house”. What is peculiarly important is the fact that no Kyabazinga has been buried at Busoga kingdom headquarters. Their bodies are repatriated to their original chiefdoms.

In 1952 William Wilberforce Nadhiope Kadhumula, the Gabula of Bugabula was elected Isebantu Kyabazinga of Busoga. In his book, Kanusu stated that “he [William Wilberforce Nadhiope Kadhumula] served for two terms before and after His Royal Highness Henry Wako

---

72 Interview with Kadaya Musa, Clan head of the BaiseWakoli, Male, 60 years, Budaya, 18 Nov 2011.
73 Interview with Kadaya Musa, Clan head of the BaiseWakoli, Male, 60 years, Budaya, 18 Nov 2011.
74 Interview with Chief Christopher James Mutyaba, Male, 68 years, Ivukula, 23 June 2011.
75 For instance, when Wako Muloki died in 2008, his remains were interred at Kaliro, the traditional headquarters of Bulamogi chiefdom where he originated from before becoming Kyabazinga.
Muloki, OBE (Order of British Empire) came into office. The provincial commissioner invited the Lukiiko councillors to vote in the Kyabazinga elections that took place in 1955. Muloki received 55 votes to and Nadhiope’s 47 thus enabling Muloki to become the Kyabazinga between 1955 and 1962. Chief Mutyaba pointed out that “when Nadhiope bounced back as Kyabazinga in 1962 and 1967 Lukiiko elections, he hesitated to reside in the Kyabazinga house. Thus he constructed his own personal residential house in Budumbuli (Bugembe suburb) due to some political rivalry reasons”.

The years after 1945 saw heightened political activity in Uganda as political parties were formed. In 1954, the first political party emerged (the Democratic Party) which was followed by the Uganda National Union in 1958. Each of these parties had a religious lining to it and they developed out of the activism of the Bataka party that staged revolts in Buganda between 1948 and 1952. Events moved fast towards Uganda’s independence. Those that enjoyed immense patronage and clientage with the colonial powers demanded a federal arrangement, Busoga included. In chapter IV, section 36(1) of the independence constitution for Uganda and the Presidential Elections Act, Cap.251 of 1962, it was explicit that only cultural institutions would produce a President and vice president for Uganda, to serve as a ceremonial head of State while executive powers lay with the Prime Minister to be elected through universal adult suffrage. Within this order of things, cultural leaders such as the Kyabazinga jostled for political positions. Under the post-independence arrangement, Kabaka Mutesa of Buganda became

---

77 Interview with Chief Christopher James Mutyaba, Male, 54 years Ivukula, 23 June 2011.
78 Interview with Kayaga Nabwana, Male, 85 years, (care taker of the throne of Tabingwa of Luuka) Bunafu, 26 Feb 2011.
President while *Isebantu Kyabazinga* William Wilberforce Nadhiope of Busoga became Vice President of Uganda.

It is instructive to bring the afore-stated situation down to Busoga. Henry Wako Muloki was a member of the DP (Democratic Party) and Nadiope was in the UPC (Uganda People’s Congress). Kalende Hassan pointed out in an interview that “William Nadhiope supported Milton Obote and when Obote became prime minister he chose William Nadhiope to become his Vice-president and at the same time the *Kyabazinga* of Busoga. Thus, that is how Wako Muloki of the Democratic Party lost the post of *Kyabazingaship* in 1962”.81 Despite the fact that it was Henry Wako's father Ezekieri Wako who first resided in the *Kyabazinga* house, Nadhiope hesitated to reside there due to political and rivalry reasons and personal fears. Nadhiope was UPC and his opponents over the *Kyabazingaship* the political tensions that gripped Uganda and were a corollary towards the crisis of 1966.

The 1966 crisis, emanating from the question of the lost counties grabbed by the British from Bunyoro at the turn of the 19th Century constituted the earliest challenge to Uganda as a nation-state. Bunyoro kingdom wanted the counties back while the absentee Baganda landlords wanted the territories in Buganda. The Kabaka of Buganda was torn between being president of Uganda, signing a law after the referendum transferring the territories back to Bunyoro and, being Kabaka of Buganda serving the interests of the kingdom. The prime minister, Milton Obote invaded the Kabaka’s palace with army units and exiled the Kabaka, the second exile within a span of fifteen years. William Nadhiope, the vice president and *Kyabazinga* of Busoga had his own fears related to the throne of Busoga. A fall from political grace meant a loss of cultural power. The *Kyabazingaship*, given the political bread that came along with it, became contested with many aiming to occupy the seat in the 1960s.

---

81 Interview with Kalende Hassan, (Chairman, Bugiri NGO Forum), Male, 55years, Kasita, 18 Nov 2011.
As noted earlier, William Nadhiope’s return as the Kyabazinga between 1962 and 1967 led to the initiation of the building of the official palace at Igenge in the 1960s. Chief Christopher pointed out that “to some people the palace is literally known as ‘Nadhiope’s Palace’”.82 This is due to the fact that he initiated the idea of building the palace with the help of the Busoga District government and the Uganda government, which approved that the official palace be constructed at Igenge Hill.

**Figure 6: The dilapidated old palace, 1960s**

The dilapidated old palace structure on Igenge Hill outside Jinja town; the structure was constructed in the 1960s with state support. It became dilapidated after the abolition of monarchies in 1967, especially in the Idi Amin era in the 1970s. Photo copied by Nabirye Zaina, 2011; photo courtesy: Mutebe Yekoyada’s collections (member of the Busoga Lukiiko representing Butembe County), male, 75years, Budondo, Jinja, 14 March 2011.

---

82 Interview with Chief Christopher James Mutyaba, Male, 54years Ivukula, 23 June 2011.
The new rehabilitated structure of the *Igenge* Palace

Photograph by Chief Waguma Yasin, the chief of Butembe County, 12 Feb 2012

The new palace is monumental and contrasts with the grass thatched round huts that were a hallmark of a traditional leader’s palace and homestead in pre-colonial period. The floor of the double-storey complex is laid with marble tiles as well as the kitchen and bathrooms, bedrooms for the (*Kyabazinga*, visitors and children), a conference hall, board rooms and office for the *Kyabazinga*. The house has a ceiling painted white and other different colours painted on the interior walls such as white, cream, green and maroon especially at the back of the complex. The house is roofed with red iron sheets and also has a balcony on the second level above the entrance. The palace is connected with electricity and water. There is a perimeter wall that is around the expansive palace grounds that command a panoramic view of Jinja town. There is a main entrance/gate leading to the compound of the palace. At the time of writing, landscaping of the palace compound was in the process of development with grass, trees, and flowers of

---

83 Interview with Kayaga Nabwana, Male, 85years, (care taker of the throne of Tabingwa of Luuka), Bunafu, 26 Feb 2011. Such round huts were numerous but included the main one for a local *Lukiiko* where the chief would confer with his vassals and lesser chiefs plus subjects and another for the spirits and ancestors.

different species being planted to give a sense of grandeur. There are also walk ways that lead to
the main entrance to the palace and the back entrance through the kitchen. Besides the palace,
there is also a smaller house constructed for the Katukiito (prime minister’s) office.

The original palace was constructed during the reign of Sir William Wilberforce Nadhiope in
1965 as Kyabazinga and Vice president of Uganda in Milton Obote regime. This meant that he
was the first Kyabazinga to reside at the palace, and stayed there until 1967 “when the
government abolished monarchies in Uganda”.85 But later the palace was ransacked by Idi
Amin’s soldiers in 1979 and it remained abandoned with overgrown bushes.86 When kingdoms
were restored in 1993, President Museveni pledged to rehabilitate the palace and work started in
2004 funded by the central government of Uganda. This in the view of this study constitutes
heritage patronisation by the state that has continued the old colonial practice of using the
cultural institutions as buffers for power. Although not complete yet, it is now the main official
palace of the Busoga kingdom. The other lesser palaces of the respective 11 chiefdoms
subscribe to it, but they also scramble privately for state recognition, patronage and help.

The exterior of the new palace seems to look different in comparison with the old ruined
structure. But Chief Waguma pointed out that “the structure [of the new palace] maintained its
original design or plan though the painting might have changed”.87 Most importantly, he argued,
the authenticity of the structure was preserved and making this building appears as heritage. The
new palace presents itself as an improvement of the dilapidated structure, maintaining its
original design saves for an extension that is being added and the perimeter wall to safeguard
the property and a sentry post plus a new out hut within the compound. Before official functions
the palace is guarded by soldiers from the national army, the Uganda People’s Defence Forces

85 Robert Kanusu, ‘114 years of Busoga kingdom: enhancing Busoga’s potential and pride’, unpublished
mimeograph, 2008, p35.
86 Interview with Chief Waguma Yasin, Male, 43years, Kyamagwa village, Jinja, 25 August 2011.
87 Interview with Chief Waguma Yasin, Male, 43years, Kyamagwa village, Jinja, 25 August 2011.
(UPDF). When the army guards a cultural site, a series of restrictive rules and regulations are imposed, which limit a free interaction with the space.

One crucial issue to note is that the royal palace is found on top of the hill, much like some other heritage sites (such as Mpumuire and Kigulu hills) elsewhere in Busoga and Uganda more generally. Kaluba, one of the informants to this study pointed out that “when Mukama came to Busoga he distributed very suitable areas to his sons and that is why chiefdom palaces are located on hills. The idea of settling on hills was inherited right from their fore fathers (Babito) in Bunyoro. They were rulers and in actual sense they came to conquer this land (Busoga) and therefore to oversee the land they had conquered, they had to live on the hills”.88 Residing on the hills was a way in which security was also observed, according to Kalende Hassan: “The chiefs resided on hills because they wanted a place where they could monitor whatever was invading their area. In other words building on the hills was for security precaution or measures”.89 In order to protect their chiefdoms, they usually had their subjects reside in the valley. Pennacini (2010), in a study of Mubende hill, has observed that hills were important for surveillance over the dominions.90

Furthermore, Kadaya gave another perspective with regard to the hills. He stressed that “a hill is usually considered to be a place for the honourable people. Residing at the hill was a way one would be respected and it signified power and authority. Further, the hills were (are) sometimes associated with ancestral spirits therefore, if a chief or owner responsible for the spirits on the particular hill wanted to occupy the hill then he would be accepted more than any other

88 Interview with Kaluba John Patrick, (Co-founder of the Jinja Cultural Research Centre and Chief Executive Officer, Succeed Uganda) Male, 59 years, Wakitaka, 11 Jan 2011.
89 Interview with Kalende Hassan, Male, 55 years, Chairman Bugiri NG O Forum, Kasita village, 18 Nov 2011.
person”. Cultural hills are like thrones where kings base to supervise their subjects. The hill and the throne shared a symbolic similarity and attained metaphorical meanings being that the Kyabazinga remained the individual person higher above all else, with the rank ‘His Royal Highness’. In addition, Busoga traditions beliefs assert such kings to have been closer to the god(s) and therefore commanded spiritual power.

In analysing the concept of sacredness and sanctity and its relation with geographical landscapes, Friedland and Hecht hypothesized a model of the profane and the sacred with the sacred occupying higher ground and the profane the lower valleys as a religious notion. This model is illustrated here below and works for our notion related to the location of both palaces and nkuni shrine sites on hills in Busoga.

**Figure 8: An illustration of a hill in relation to sacredness**


---

91 Interview with Kadaya Musa, Male, 60 years, (Clan head of the BaiseWakoli), Budaya village, 18 Nov 2011.
The notion of settling on hills reflected the way the traditional seats (throne) were made in the different chiefdoms even before Busoga got the Kyabazinga. Chief Patrick Izimba stressed that “the chair that the Omwami (honourable person) sat on was ever high that if the honourable sat he could see his subjects clearly”.\textsuperscript{94} When the Kyabazingaship was created, the royal throne was also situated at a high point, just like that of the Kabaka of Buganda, the Omukama of Bunyoro and the Omugabe of Ankole and the Omukama of Toro. The king was seen as a paramount and extraordinary among his subjects. Kalende pointed out that “the Kyabazinga chair is related to that authority. If one wants to be above others by physical presence then the chair represents that authority. For example in the current set up the president is usually placed at a higher position when addressing the people”.\textsuperscript{95} It is related to a hierarchy, both socially and politically. This heritage is observed in relation to the chairs (throne) that the Kyabazinga and the rest of the hereditary chiefs sit on in their respective chiefdoms.

This kind of status enjoyed by the Kyabazinga ceased when kingdoms were abolished in 1967. There was an unusual mix of political and cultural power at Uganda’s independence in 1962. A marriage had been built on a political coalition between the central government and the kingdoms which had derived their status from the agreements that were signed at the beginning of the twentieth century. In post-independence, they negotiated power to attain a federal status in which the state became an active actor in the cultural politics of individual communities. In spite of the weak and loose coalition, Mutibwa argues that “the mistrust between the two sides that existed before independence did not go away. Mengo (the headquarters of the Buganda Kingdom) never forgot the utterances and venomous vows made by UPC’s anti-Buganda leaders e.g. that when independence would come they would wipe out Buganda from the map of

\textsuperscript{94} Interviews with Chief Izimba Patrick Gologolo, Male, 48years, Nasuti Village, 20 Jan 2011.
\textsuperscript{95} Interview with Kalende Hassan, (Chairman Bugiri NGO Forum), Male, 55years, Kasita village 18 Nov 2011.
Uganda, and that they would destroy the arrogance, pride and hegemony of the Buganda and their kingdom”.  

A major crisis on this issue emerged over the issue of the lost counties. The lost counties were Bunyoro territories awarded to Buganda by the British in recognition of the latter’s collaboration in extending British suzerainty over Uganda. Given that the Kabaka of Buganda doubled as Uganda’s president, the referendum of 1964 over the lost counties took a national shape and cut across the cultural frontiers. “The Baganda had claimed that the counties were part of Buganda and yet the Banyoro who were the inhabitants could not allow becoming part of Buganda”. Due to the disagreements between Bunyoro and Buganda, a referendum was organised for the people in those two counties. The Kabaka, acting in defence of Buganda’s interests against Uganda’s ferried thousands of Baganda, especially World War II veterans into the counties with a hope to influence the results but lost. The Kabaka’s palace was attacked in 1966 and the Kabaka fled into exile where he died in 1969.

The problems that emanated from this development affected Busoga in the sense that William Nadhiope, the Kyabazinga was also the Vice President. The constitution of Uganda was changed to a new republican one of 1967 that swept aside the ‘ancient’ monarchical order in favour of a centralised republican state. Within the national and the constitutional changes of 1966/7 the Busoga kingdom too was abolished. Mutibwa further stressed that, “The most outstanding change introduced was the abolition of kingship and making Uganda a republic. Thus the kingdoms of Buganda, Busoga, Ankole, Bunyoro and Toro were erased from the map of Uganda, thereby fulfilling Obote’s ardent desire and ambition to remove from Uganda any

97 The ‘lost counties’ were territories snatched by the British from Bunyoro and as a punishment given to Buganda; with a Bunyoro heritage, especially the burial grounds for Banyoro kings as well as the ancient sites such as Ntusi, Bigo Bya Mugenyi and Mubende. Animosity over these territories with a predominantly Banyoro population became an explosive national issue resulting in a referendum in 1964. Divided loyalty marked the period towards the abolition of kingdoms in Uganda.
98 Interview with Kalende Hassan, Male, 55years, Kasita village, 18 Nov 2011.
centres of loyalty and authority other than the president’s (now his own) emanating from the central government”.99 This meant that the expectations of the traditional rulers did not remain with Obote’s idea of Republicanism. In the republican sense, a unitary system was put in place for the whole country and small chiefdoms were no more, including the federal arrangement of 1962 where kingdoms had been regarded as federal states with some leverage of political power.

Furthermore, another critical reason that could have led to the abolition of monarchism in Uganda was that the kings had subject people whom they claimed as their own. According to the speech that Dr Milton Obote delivered to the people of Busoga in Luuka County in 1968 on his visit to the 6 counties (Saza). He was quoted in the Luganda Newspaper called MUNNO,

President wa Uganda Dr. A.M. Obote bwe ya abadde ayogera e Naigobya mu Ssaza ly’e Luuka, Busoga mu kulambula kwe okwamuyisizza mu masaza omukaga aga Busoga, yabotodde ensonga eyasindika UPC okuggyawo obwakyabazinga mu Uganda eggwanga ne lifiuuka REPUBLIC. Yagambye nti UPC yakiraba nga tekisaana omuntu okufuga abalala olw’okubanga yazaalibwa gundi eyali afuga awatali bantu kumala kumwesiimira ne bamulonda okubafuga olw’ebisaanyizo bye. Kwe kukyukira obwakyabazinga n’agamba nti ekyabuggvisaawo lwa kubanga Kyabazinga yali addidde abantu ba Uganda n’abeekomya ng’abayita abantu be, ye ku bubwe. President kwe kubuza abantu oba nga bakyabazinga baali batuufu okubayitanga abantu babwe, bonna ne baddamu nga bagaana nti nedda.100

The president of Uganda Dr. A.M. Obote gave a speech at Naigobya in Luuka County during his tour through the six counties of Busoga. He stated the reasons that led to UPC to abolish the Kyabazingaship (kingship) in Uganda and made Uganda a Republic. Obote said that UPC foresaw that it was not relevant for one to rule others because he was born of somebody who was a leader without people voting in favour of him to rule with regard to his qualifications. That is why, he claimed, he turned to the Kyabazingaship. He gave as the reason for the abolition the Kyabazingaship was that the Kyabazinga had dominated the people of Uganda calling them his own people. The president therefore asked, in a somewhat rhetorical fashion, whether the Kings were right to call them their own people, and all of them replied and said no. Hence Obote associated kingdoms with anti-democratic

100 Excerpt from MUNNO (Luganda Newspaper) ‘KATONDA NE UGANDA OMWOYO GUMU N’EMMEEME EMU’, vol.58 No. 56 Lwakubiri, 05 March 1968. Ekyaggyisaawo bakabaka kyabotoleddwa mu Busoga (Courtesy: Chief of Luuka Willington Nabwana’s collection, article in Nabwaba’s tutelage).
practices and he decided to abolish kingdoms out of Uganda by basing his claim on what was stipulated in Uganda Constitution of 1967.\textsuperscript{101}

After the abolition of Busoga, the royal regalia and many heritage pieces were taken away by the state and stored at the Uganda Museum, with some displayed as curios for visitors. At the museum, many Busoga heritage relics are still displayed alongside many other ethnographic objects from other cultural groups from Uganda. It is now impossible to isolate those that were taken away from the palace upon abolition of the kingdom and those that were collected through the various ethnographic studies. These relics of Busoga’s past are only seen by school children that visit the museum. The museumification of these articles serves a very important element both in preserving material heritage as well as de-contextualising them from their Busoga community into a ‘national’ property, placing them in a consumer circuit of museum visitors and rendering them new meanings. The Uganda Museum has often been referred to by Baganda as a ‘house of fetishes’\textsuperscript{102}, a reference to the displays of material culture that is collected there, part of a distant past that was ‘animist and pagan’. The artefacts are also not properly curated as a result of the politics of financing, high levels of corruption and the news that the museum will be replaced by a 62-story commercial building.\textsuperscript{103}

**Busoga, 1993 and after**

It was after 1993 in Museveni’s regime that Kingdoms were restored. Why did Museveni restore kingdoms in Uganda and particularly Busoga in 1993? This can be analysed against personal political ambitions of particular presidents. First, Obote believed in having monachism alongside republicanism but later thought that it only caused divided loyalties and threatened centralised power. Museveni thought that perhaps by restoring kingdoms it could

\textsuperscript{101} My translation.
\textsuperscript{103} Nelson Abiti, (Conservator for Ethnography Uganda Museum) personal communication, 28 June 2011.
help him achieve his vision of peace, development and modernity. Chief Waguma pointed out that “all their intentions have political inclination because Obote was not comfortable to lead Uganda alongside monarchism while Museveni did not see any problem to rule alongside monarchism. Each individual has deployed a political ideology to achieve his ambition. Museveni saw that he could not mobilise people without kingdoms, thus helping him to mobilise people to achieve development under their king”. This however can be read differently. Whereas the elimination of kingdoms caused a political problem for Obote, it is the same gap that Museveni used to wage a guerrilla war, mobilising a strong cultural sentiment to gain support for a war that brought him to power in 1986. He remained indebted at least to the areas where monarchical order had a stronger base such as Buganda, Busoga and Toro. Kingdoms were to be resurrected as ‘cultural’ institutions, more weakened in form, content and structure than they were before, more as instruments of the state. This partial restoration accounts for the continuous bickering between the state and the restored kingdoms and ‘appeasement’ of the kings from Buganda, Busoga and Toro with material rewards seems to soothe matters related to the demand for full restoration including the demand for political power.

Mudola has pointed out that in public discourses about strategies by politicians; there is always a ‘public transcript’ which consists of the propaganda that is used for mobilisation, sanitising an activity and, a ‘private transcript’ which presents the inner strategies of political leaders. It may be vital to consider a debate beyond the superficiality of the assertions in the paragraph above. The restoration of monarchies in Uganda was related to ‘unseen’ agreements used for
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104 Interview with Chief Waguma Yasin, Male, 43years Kyamagwa village, 19 Jan 2011.
105 In Ankole for instance, a former kingdom, restoration has not been made since the personal will of the president does not favour that. Besides, the constant demand for ‘ebyaffe’[ours] is reminiscent of the 1966 crisis between Buganda and the Central Government when the former ordered the latter to relocate its capital.
mobilisation during the guerrilla war that brought Museveni to power between 1981-1986, the demand for fulfilment championed by Buganda where the war was largely waged and by elites who supported the cause on a premise of a promise of full cultural restoration with kingdoms wielding immense political power as it was in the past. The timing was arranged around the desire to extend the ruling tenure of the National Resistance Movement government and the upcoming elections.

Like the British administration and its support to Busoga kingdom, the government currently has a budget towards kingdoms in Uganda in monetary and material terms giving an allowance and a new car upon installation to traditional leaders especially in Busoga. According to Nyiracyiza “the Kyabazinga is given 15 million Shillings per quarter which means that the Kyabazinga is given 5 million Shillings per month”.\footnote{Nyiracyiza Jacqueline, Female, 31 years, Conservator Archaeology and history, Uganda National Museum, Kampala, 21 June 2011.} This has brought about a contestation over the state’s selective patronage, as the chiefs of the different principalities are not given such monetary support yet they play a crucial role in the Chiefs Royal Council that elects the Kyabazinga to the throne. In this case, the patronage may lead to increased proselytization, where the king acts as a state surrogate, as well as alienation, where the king appears divorced from his community. Thus, according to a chief “they do appeal to the government that such financial assistance be extended to the chiefs because they have programs that are run in their chiefdoms and need individual budgets”.\footnote{Interview with Chief Patrick Izimba Gologolo, Male, 48 years, Nasuti village, 13 June 2011.}
Role of Busoga kingdom and the influence of the government in the discourse of Busoga’s heritage

The current infusion of traditional leadership with presidential politics has led to a questioning as to who the true ruler of Busoga is today according to Chief Izimba Patrick. The fact is that the authority of the Kyabazinga tradition (invented or not) lies in a contested terrain. For example, conflicts have persistently existed between Prince Edward Columbus Wambuzi and Prince Gabula Nadhiope IV for the Kyabazinga throne since the death of Henry Wako Muloki in 2008. The kings found in Busoga are in effect surrogates of the present political order, under the pay of the state, just like during colonial times. When weighed, the Kyabazinga is more of a state functionary than a doyen of Busoga’s heritage. Since the 1950s party politics have played a big role in the leadership of the Kyabazinga institution. Different Kyabazingas were supported by the different political parties. For instance Henry Muloki’s first time to be the Kyabazinga between 1955 and 1962 seemed to be for Democratic Party (DP) and Sir William Wilberforce Nadhiope’s second time to be the Kyabazinga between 1962 and 1967 was for Uganda People’s Congress (UPC). In the present, it seems connected with Museveni’s ruling National Resistance Movement.

The politics for which the chiefs wanted the institution of the Kyabazinga was more related to status as well as the possibility of producing a president who under the 1962 arrangement was only selected from traditional leaders. Already, there had been tension when both Nadhiope the Kyabazinga of Busoga and Mutesa, the Kabaka of Buganda struggled for the presidency at independence. Additionally, whereas the fact is that the Chiefs Royal Council has a significant
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109 Interview with Chief Patrick Izimba Gologolo, Male, 48 years, Nasuti village, 13 June 2011.
role in electing the *Kyabazinga*, their role, as spelt in a special schedule to the Uganda 1962 constitution in relation to Busoga (Busoga constitution) was certainly ignored.

The involvement of the *Kyabazingaship* in national politics has led to conflicts such as struggle for kingship and complex situations that have nearly led to its collapse. The Uganda Constitution 1995, Section 16 Article 246 states that “the institution of traditional leader or cultural leader may exist in any area of Uganda in accordance with the culture, customs, traditions or the aspiration of the people to whom it applies”. The constitution gives an opportunity to the traditional institutions to exercise traditional authority in their respective capacities as cultural institutions devoid of political engagements. This provision holds as long as the cultural leaders do not deviate from the government ideology. In instances where greater autonomy has been demanded reference is made to the incidents of 1966-67 known as the Buganda crisis. Aili Mari Tripp argues that in the constitution it is stated that “these leaders will be in charge of selection of clan leadership, clan, ‘traditional’ and customary matters; matters relating to cultural funeral rites, cultural succession and customary heirs; ‘traditional’ lands, sites, shrines and installations; and ‘traditional,’ customary and cultural practices”. Given the circumstances, each traditional leader struggles to increase his status through his indirect linkages with political powers. On the other hand, political powers have manipulated the traditional leaders in a bid to ascend to and maintain power. The heritage institution, though appearing as safe through patronage, is dressed in archaic attire through the politics of the colonial and post-colonial state from which it has failed to extricate itself.

Some informants for this study stressed that the *Kyabazingaship* is rotational as it was at the initial foundation of *Obwa Kyabazinga* in 1939. Chief Patrick Izimba argued that, “it was in that
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line that Ngobi Obodha of Kigulu was forwarded to head the new institution. In his place, he seconded Ezekieri Tenywa Wako as *Kyabazinga*, with an understanding that the throne would be assumed on a rotational basis*. This means that installing Columbus, son and heir to Muloki’s from Bulamogi chiefdom as the *Kyabazinga* for the whole Busoga would cast the *Kyabazingaship* in an inheritance mould, as inherited from father to son. The Busoga constitution, stipulates that the throne is rotational among the chiefs descended from the *Abaisengobi* line. However, it was observed during the study that, several variants of the Busoga Constitution were seen in possession by different chiefs. It was unclear which one was being followed. Given that the seat of the *Kyabazinga* was vacant and several of the eligible chiefs were interested, each one produced a variant and claimed to be the authentic constitution of Busoga. It is fair to conclude that the process of constitution-making will only generate an ‘authentic’ constitution after the ascension to the throne of the new *Kyabazinga*. Through the development of constitutions, cultural institutions in Uganda are being re-invented.

The Busoga constitution was initially put in place in 1962 as a schedule to the main Uganda Constitution. Wilberforce Nadhiope, the then *Kyabazinga* was among its framers as one who was in the Lancaster House Conference that negotiated the Uganda independence Constitution. Ironically, he also amended the Busoga constitution because it had given him less power in comparison with others (kingdoms) of his rank elsewhere in Uganda. The Busoga constitution mainly dealt with the power systems within Busoga, especially the privileges of the *Kyabazinga* and the *Lukiiko*. It also spelt out the relationship between the political and civil authorities and the *Kyabazingaship*. The *Kyabazinga* retained some level of political power and wielded much influence locally and nationally. Nadhiope broke the principle of ruling three years after

amending the Busoga constitution to rule for five years unchallenged, given that he was the vice president of Uganda.

After the restoration of kingdoms in 1993, Henry Wako Muloki was made *Kyabazinga* by a consensus of the elders as he had been *Kyabazinga* before. He was then re-elected as *Kyabazinga* by the Busoga Chiefs Royal Council in 1997.\(^{114}\) To get the electoral mechanism in place Henry Wako accounted for an extra year beyond the stipulated three-year term. An informant to this study pointed out to me that “the elders and the head of clans were involved in the process of the re-election of the *Kyabazinga* in form of consultation, but the decision was made by the Busoga Chiefs Royal Council”.\(^{115}\) But another informant was of the view that Muloki’s re-election was political and not cultural: “When president Museveni restored kingdoms for the case of Busoga, he thought Muloki could serve his purpose to stay in power. Having been a *Kyabazinga* earlier Muloki could mobilise the Basoga to vote for Museveni in the 2001 and 2006 elections. Though the clan heads and the Chiefs Royal Council got involved, the government still played a big role in the re-election”.\(^{116}\)

After Muloki’s re-election, he remained *Kyabazinga* till his death in 2008. There could be other underlying factors behind the re-election of Muloki than what is argued here. It does not explain why he became a sort of lifetime *Kyabazinga* in spite of the constitutional arrangements. Kadaya again pointed out to me that “some of the Baisengobi objected to it arguing that Henry Wako was *Kyabazinga* before and therefore there was need to elect some other person who has

\(^{114}\) According to the Busoga Constitution, the Busoga Chiefs Royal Council is the highest body that comprises of the eleven hereditary rulers and it’s the same forum that elects the Kyabazinga headed by its Chairman also known as the Ssabalangira (Chief Prince).

\(^{115}\) Interview with Kalende Hassan, (Chairman Bugiri NGO Forum), Male, 55 years, Kasita village, 18 Nov 2011.

\(^{116}\) Interview with Kadaya Musa, (Clan head of the BaiseWakoli clan), Male, 60 years, Budaya village, 18 Nov 2011.
never been Kyabazinga like Ngobi of Kigulu, Tabingwa of Luuka and Nkono of Bukono, ever since the institution was created”. 117

It is probable that after the restoration, Henry Wako Muloki was able to claim and he was more experienced in comparison with the other hereditary Saza chiefs. Chief Patrick Izimba pointed out to me that, “Since Henry Wako Muloki was still alive and had ruled Busoga before as Kyabazinga and much more knew what to do and had friends within Uganda and abroad we (Busoga Royal Council) sat and resolved that Wako could be the rightful Kyabazinga of Busoga”. 118 Only here can the power and the attendant weakness of the chiefs be discerned. Borrowing from what Nakabayashi put forward relating to the notion of mediating and group networking of the Saza chief’s work. “Chiefs are certainly situated in the middle between the state and the citizen both of which are constituents of a modern nation state, while at the same time they are regarded as the upholders of traditional customs”. 119 Kaluba affirms that as “traditionally chiefs are mediators between the people (subjects) and the high authority – the Kyabazinga, thus it became fitting to reinstate Wako as Kyabazinga in 1993 due to his influence”. 120

The current wrangles prevailing in Busoga as noted earlier regarding the installation of a new Kyabazinga has its roots in the restoration of Henry Wako. Bringing back Wako as Kyabazinga had some drawbacks to bear on the future of the Kyabazingaship as it deviated from the assumed norm of ‘rotation’. Within the circumstances of equality, Muloki, like any hereditary prince was equally eligible and could win at any proper election given his personality and wide
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117 Interview with Kadaya Musa, (Clan head of the BaiseWakoli clan), Male, 60 years, Budaya village, 18 Nov 2011.
118 Interviews with Chief Izimba Patrick Gologolo, Male, 48 years, Nasuti Village, 20 Jan 2011.
120 Interview with Kaluba John Patrick, (Co-founder of the Jinja Cultural Research Centre and CEO Succeed Uganda NGO) Male, 59 years, Wakitaka village, 11 Jan 2011.
experience. It could also be argued that the institution, following the cultural patterns of other similar ones could have turned itself into hereditary without a time limitation. Busoga could be a case example. A series of elections have been held, that have been disputed by other eligible candidates but both the central government and cultural currents have focused on Edward Columbus, son of the late Kyabazinga Henry Wako Muloki. This in fact does not subsume the idea of rotation. Rotation in this respect does not essentially mean that the seat has moved to another geographical region. Viewed from this angle, the seat in Busoga has rotated between two territories, Bugabula and Bulamogi. Whereas Nadhiope was from Bugabula, E.T Wako, the first Kyabazinga was from Bulamogi just like Wako Muloki, the last one. The other Baisengobi princes/chiefs of other hereditary chiefdoms have been reduced to ‘electors’.

**Busoga Heritage and Non-Governmental Organizations**

From 1987, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) became a new phenomenon in Uganda. They were to be a jack-of-all trade and participated in anything. Churches were also regarded by the state as NGOs just like cultural institutions such as kingdoms. For the churches, especially the Catholic Church, the active ‘Africanisation’ of the church meant adopting cultural practices from local communities that would satisfy liturgical systems. Traditional dances were appropriated into liturgical activities and some elements of Basoga heritage appeared to be Christianised. Besides, foundations, heritage and cultural associations etc sprang up, not necessarily to safeguard Basoga heritage but to tap into the available donor funds from international NGOs. Chiefdoms that have less activities have NGO-ised themselves in order to compete for the same funds with local associations and churches.\(^{121}\) Heritage has then been taken to the marketplace as a tool to secure funding.

\(^{121}\) See [http://butembeculture.blogspot.com/](http://butembeculture.blogspot.com/), which belongs to the hereditary chief of Butembe.
Therefore, there are a number of organisations responsible for reproducing and representing culture of Busoga. For instance, the Cultural Research Centre-Jinja Diocese under the Catholic Church has taken the responsibility to ‘research, preserve, display; promote’ the ancestral and life giving cultural heritage and a sense of identity for the Basoga. The library has a wide range of collections in form of documents and books which the institution provides to educate the communities especially schools. Some of the books include a *Lusoga Dictionary*, *Ritual gestures in Busoga*, *Lusoga-English Riddle Performance: Diikuula’s love Riddles*, and *Traditional socio-economic clan relations among Basoga*. Kaluba maintains that “the cultural Research centre has really helped and it has pioneered the writing of the Lusoga literature, promotion of Lusoga teaching in schools and advocated for discipline, culture and the heritage of Busoga kingdom”. It is interesting how a Catholic research centre has become the vehicle to promote ‘tradition and heritage’ in Busoga.

The Research Centre is creating a heritage for Busoga in a sense that they are concerned with research and production of exhibitions and setting up a sound recording studio in order to record both audio and videos on culture for purposes of providing information to Basoga population and for preservation purposes. Heritage production is witnessed in the form of the permanent exhibition in the small museum at the premises. The exhibition displays cultural artefacts such as musical instruments, hunting equipments, traditional stools, skins of animals, water pots and preserved food staffs among others with captions labelled on them. There are framed photographs of the former *Kyabazingas* (Ezekieri Wako, William Nadhiope and Henry Wako
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122 Dictionaries and Bibles were often written by the missionaries. These two stabilised languages and standardised orthography. Since heritage is coded in a language, then the contribution of the church to the configuration of contemporary Basoga heritage cannot be overestimated.
126 Interview with Kaluba John Patrick, (Co-founder of the Jinja Cultural Research Centre and CEO Succeed Uganda) Male, 59 years, Wakitaka, 11 Jan 2011.
Muloki) which are hung on the exhibition walls. The temporary mobile exhibition is targeted for the young generation to understand Busoga heritage, its values and relevance to the society today and also to understand their pasts, present and future. The temporary exhibition for example, was once held at St. Jude Primary School-Jinja, on its Cultural Day in December 2010. Activities that were performed included, Basoga dance, preservation of food, cooking of traditional foods, traditional dress code and riddles.

**The Museumfication of Busoga Heritage**

The Uganda National Museum, founded in 1908 is located in Kampala City. It has played a big role is the production and representation of Busoga heritage and the general history and heritage of Uganda’s ‘different’ communities such as Baganda, Batoro, Basoga, Banyakole, Bagishu, Iteso, Karamajongo, Alur, Acholi. Lin argues “museums and murals both act as repositories of collective sentiments and representations of ethnic heritage. They maybe silent sites in the daily sense but are focal centres for educating, volunteering, commemorating and for festive life” \(^{127}\)

The Uganda museum houses artefacts that are classified as ethnographic, ethno-history, archaeology, natural history and music. \(^{128}\)

The museum underwent a change in 2007 when a cultural village was created during the Commonwealth summit. The Museum intended to reproduce and represent the heritage of the various communities and to promote tourism. Nsibambi argues that the museum “preserves and presents the diversity of cultural expressions from most of Uganda’s ethnic groups as represented by the different vernacular architectural designs of the cultural village behind the national museum” \(^{129}\). This was done through the installation of artefacts in the created votive
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\(^{128}\) Information gathered during a guided tour in the museum, 28 June 2011.

huts or traditional huts for the different groups. There seem to be a broad representation of artefacts on display in the cultural village compared to the museum interior. Take for example Busoga’s displays in the museum in general. The displays of Busoga’s heritage includes a Soga Mask, milk containers, arms, pictorial displays of recreation (wrestling, sliding instruments) and musical instruments such as the xylophone (Embaire) and the tube fiddle (Endingidi). In the Basoga hut in the cultural village there are more artefacts like banana fibre, smoking pipes, spear and shield, stool, drum, cooking pot, cups, calabash, bark cloth and a portrait of the former Kyabazinga of Busoga, Henry Wako Muloki. The games and the musical artefacts are intended to represent social aspects which are supposed reflect the ways in which the Basoga recreate in their leisure time and during ceremonies such as marriage, coronation etc. The spear and shield are intended to symbolise the ways in which the Basoga protect themselves for cases of insecurity. Also the spear, shield, stool and the Kyabazinga portrait signifies the existing monarchical system in Busoga and Busoga as a kingdom headed by the Kyabazinga who also is given a spear, shield and made to sit on the stool during coronation as a sign of power to protect his kingdom.

It is noted that there are more of ethnographic displays for Buganda in the museum compared to the rest of the ethnic groups. This could be attributed to the fact that the archaeologists or collectors collected a lot more of Buganda artefacts. Initially the museum was often referred to as the ‘Buganda museum’ or ‘house of charms’ by the people of Buganda. Buganda artefacts dominate the displays, not because it was referred to as a Baganda museum but rather because more studies were carried out in Buganda, given its centrality during colonial rule and this gave a larger collection to the museum. The former curator, from 1958 to 1962 Professor Merrick Posnansky focused on objects in line with art and a great deal of archaeological materials. This was a shift from the collections of ‘witches’ that had been the hallmark of the museum founded in 1908. There was less cultural representation to depict the particular group of people. The
Museum displays are ‘ethnically’ classified and labelled and therefore maintain a genre of a colonial museum. There are now new exhibitions on display such as, ‘Famine and food security’, ‘Medicines in Uganda’, ‘Transport in Uganda’ and ‘Sports in 2010’. How much the Uganda Museum will separate the ethnographic displays from nature remains an elusive question.

In conclusion the chapter has dealt with a brief history and the development of the Royal Kyabazinga palace at the Igenge hill as Busoga’s heritage and heritage site. I argued that the Igenge Palace has constituted a new layer of heritage and invokes notions of what constitutes authentic heritage. The chapter also raised issues concerning post-colonial histories and how it affected kingdoms for instance the abolition of kingdoms in 1967 and the restoration of kingdoms in 1993. Debates regarding the roles of Busoga and the influence of the government in the discourse of Busoga’s heritage were explored in depth, which I argued that has also contributed to the failure to install a new Kyabazinga.
CHAPTER THREE

Mpumuire hill: a coronation site and Busoga’s heritage

Introduction

This chapter deals with Mpumuire hill, one of the heritage sites in Busoga. Other sites include Mwiri hill, Idinda ancestral site and Bujagali Falls among others. The study assumes that this site carries both generic and particular characteristics of many a site that would be described as a heritage space. It can be argued that the hill has a layered and chequered history that negotiates in and out of Busoga’s heritage. The hill has served as a ritual site for the hereditary chief of Butembe. Equally, the death of the returning Omukama of Bunyoro, Chwa Kabalega II on this site adds another layer, and the memorial stone with inscriptions of the Mr Spire’s name who was the colonial Governor of Busoga from 1909 to 1918 and the names of the 10 Chiefs who were present at the time Busoga’s boundaries were marked by 1902 yet another. Currently, owing to the afore-stated impetus and its central location as well as proximity to the Kyabazinga’s palace makes it a suitable site for the coronation ceremonies. This history and especially its heritage elements are unravelled in this chapter.

Mpumuire hill is located along the Kamuli road in Mpumudde division Kimaka in Jinja Municipality. It is found in Butembe County in Jinja district presently under the custodian of Chief Waguma Yasin, (the Ntembe130 of Butembe County) and the entire Busoga kingdom. The site is located on a hill which overlooks Lake Victoria, the Waguma and Igenge hills, approximately 2kms from the Bugembe headquarters. The reasons as to why Mpumuire hill became a coronation site may also be related to its strategic location on a long distance trade route. The only crossing point on the River Nile, which connected Buganda and the East
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130 The title of the hereditary chief of Butembe.
African coast in the 19th and early 20th century long distance trade route, was here. In addition, the Bugembe headquarters, the location of Igenge palace close by made it an ideal site. As Chief Waguma pointed out that:

They did not want the ceremonies to be performed very far. Though each chief is coronated at his own hill in their respective chiefdoms- Kagulu hill for the coronation of Nadhiope, Luwulo for Zibondo, Bukaleba for Luba, Ngobi at Kigulu hill, Niembe at Mwiri hill, Menha, Namakoko for wakoli and Nanumba at Kityerera - they chose Mpumuire hill because it is next the Bugembe headquarters.131

The proximity to the palace as well as its ritual value has made the hill assume a Busoga-wide importance. However, its closeness to the growing urban centre of Jinja makes it a prime space in the quest for building space. At best, developments observed at the site indicate a serious problem on its heritage vitality, as fewer and fewer lesser rituals are performed on the site. The lack of mapping, marking and seclusion of the actual extent of the ritual site allows the continued encroachment.

The chapter also dwells on analysis of two crucial historical structures: the pre-colonial structures of princes of the 10 principedoms related to legendary figures, both Mukama and Kintu whose ruler-ship is also folkloric with hills as central markers, and the colonial structure of the nation-state, the district, Saza etc132 the latter being an equivalent of a county. The history of the hill relates to Omukama133 (king) Kabalega of Bunyoro and the British and how the hill developed into a special coronation site for the Kyabazinga and the hereditary chiefs and the cultural elements at the hill that are taken to represent a heritage of Busoga. The chapter also discusses the significance attached to it as a heritage site and some of the contestations around the hill.

131 Interview with Chief Waguma Yasin, Male, 43years, Kyamagwa Village, 19 Jan 2011.
132 The concept ‘Saza’ is a Luganda word which means county. The word came with indirect rule adopted from Buganda as a mode of administration by the British to administer the rest of the Uganda protectorate.
133 Omukama is a dynasty of kings that was started as a result of the Lwo migration and settlement. This dynasty was called the Bito dynasty because the founders were the Jo-Bito clan of the Lwo and the kingdom came to be called Bunyoro.
A history of the hill

Mpumuire hill has a deep history and ranks as Busoga’s prime heritage. Current Busoga culture is possibly a result of inventions by the different groups of people who settled in Busoga. As such, there does not exist a ‘typical’ and ‘original’ culture of Busoga but a product from different origins, of the Baganda, Banyoro, Bukedi, Budama and Jopadhola. Mpumuire Hill’s history gained prominence starting with Omukama Kabalega who died on this hill on his way back to Bunyoro in 1923 while returning from a colonially imposed exile in the Seychelles Islands. It is unclear whether the creation of a royal Coronation Hill was based on the traditions associated with Kabalega, or with the connection with Mukama as founder of royal lineage in northern Busoga, or as an ancient ritual site. In my opinion, the recognition of a Busoga-wide importance of this site especially its heritage value was made in 1996 during the coronation of Henry Wako Muloki as Kyabazinga. The site belonged to Ntembe the chief of Butembe a non-Baisengobi but the legendary claim of Bunyoro origin and a remote link with Kabalega’s place of death placed the site within a post-colonial’ narrative related to national heroism. The site as a space of heritage was also woven with a national rhetoric regarding Kabalega’s resistance to British colonialism.

During early colonial times Kabalega the king of Bunyoro emerged as a powerful figure and a threat to the British imperialism from 1876, when he defeated Sir Samuel Baker\(^\text{134}\) at the battle of Masindi. In 1899, he was captured at his stockade in Lango, on the northern side of Lake Kyoga and exiled to the Seychelles together with his Buganda counterpart, Kabaka Mwanga. The latter died in exile while Kabalega died in Busoga on his way back to Bunyoro. Kabalega, unlike his counterparts elsewhere in Uganda, chose to resist British intrusion and administration.

\(^{134}\) Samuel Baker was an agent of the Anglo-Egyptian Condominium over Sudan and was intending to extend Egyptian influence down the Nile, coming to Bunyoro and fighting Kabalega in 1876.
in the Bunyoro Kitara\textsuperscript{135} Kingdom. Kabalega was born in 1851, named Chwa II while in exile in Bulega in Congo with his mother over palace quarrels, but was able, according to custom to return and bury his father Kamurasi in 1869 and claim the Bunyoro throne with ambitions of restoring the ancient all-powerful Bunyoro-Kitara. Bunyoro-Kitara controlled most of the great lakes area and a Bachwezi\textsuperscript{136} heritage was stamped on most societies, including Busoga.\textsuperscript{137}

Kabalega became King of Bunyoro in 1869, when he was only 18. Though young, he led a revival of the kingdom and registered several victories in reclaiming lost territories, organising his people based on increased food production, cattle keeping and trade. Bunyoro was the centre of iron smelting at the time and had the Kibiro Salt Works.\textsuperscript{138} Kabalega’s attempt to rebuild Bunyoro was tested when faced with the British colonialists under the umbrella of the Imperial British East African Company (IBEA Co). Kihumuro, who has written an ‘official’ history of Bunyoro, has stressed that ‘Kabalega was militarily organised and had guerrilla war tactics’. He ‘thus, was able to fight against the British forces for nine years, until his kingdom became a British protectorate in 1900 and he was captured and imprisoned’.\textsuperscript{139}

Some of the informants whom I spoke to in 2011\textsuperscript{140} mentioned that Chwa II Kabalega the exiled king of Bunyoro died on Mpumuire Hill on his way from Seychelles where the British had exiled him. Chief Waguma pointed out that “he became sick and exhausted due to a long journey he made while returning to Bunyoro. Thus, when he arrived at the hill, he decided to

\textsuperscript{135} Kitara was also called the Bachwezi Empire or kingdom before the Lwo assumed power as a result of their migration and settlement in the south of Uganda. See also Murindwa-Rutanga. \textit{The Nyabingi Rebellion in Kigezi} (Kampala: Centre for Basic Research Working Paper, 1994).

\textsuperscript{136} For a deeper discussion of Bachwezi, see Chapter 1. See also Dunbar, A.R. \textit{A History of Bunyoro Kitara} (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).


\textsuperscript{138} A. D. Kihumuro. \textit{A Thousand Years of Bunyoro Kitara: The people and the rulers} (Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 1994).

\textsuperscript{139} A. D. Kihumuro, \textit{A Thousand Years}, p508.

\textsuperscript{140} Interviews with Kadoko John, (in charge of the Kyabazinga affairs adviser), Male, 80years, Gadumire village, 20 Jan 2011, Chief Waguma Yasin, Male, 43years, Kyamagwa Village, 19 Jan 2011.
rest and he eventually died on the hill."141 The hill belonged to a local chief of Butembe-Bunya who offered Kabalega a place to rest before he could embark on his journey across the Nile River westwards. Although he died here, his remains were carried to be interred at Mparo, in a royal burial ground for Banyoro kings. But memories of his resilience against the British were already strong and often inspired minor revolts in Busoga which resulted in loss of chieftainship for some ruling families in Busoga.142 Mpumuire can therefore, be seen as a site of strong memory in Uganda’s narratives of the nation.

It is worth considering the etymology of the word ‘Mpumuire’. In both Runyoro (the language of Bunyoro) and Lusoga (the language of Busoga) dialects; it means ‘rest’ but it could also refer to ‘death’. Tradition builds heritage on a base of euphemistic and idiomatic language and the assertion that a king does not die, but rest or goes to hunt is in effect a metaphoric reference to departure of what had increasingly been regarded as ‘semi-divine’. That the semi-divine is assumed to be omni-potent and omni-present is the basis of the so-called ancestor worship which has been interwoven in the religious heritage of Busoga. As suggested by Kadoko; “a king does not die (okuufa) but rests (Okuwumula) that is where the name Mpumuire originated from”.143 Rest could therefore mean that royalty continues through re-living the traditions achieved by the departed king. It also alludes to an assumed semi-spiritual condition regarding kings that they join their ancestors and continue to safeguard the living, and therefore ‘a living dead’.144 In Busoga traditions, burial sites, death sites, burial ceremonies and graves are highly
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141 Interview with Chief Waguma Yasin, Male, 43years, Kyamagwa Village, 19 Jan 2011.
142 The popularity of Kabalega’s resistance had reunited erstwhile enemies, his nemesis Kabaka Mwanga of Buganda, in resisting colonial rule. Both were captured in Lango. Their exile in Seychelles had rendered them heroes to whomsoever resisted the vagaries of colonial rule.
143 Interview with Kadoko John (in charge of the Kyabazinga affairs adviser), Male, 80years, Gadumire village, 20 Jan 2011. Also according to Chief Waguma he stressed that, when king Kabalega was exiled, to Seychelles by the British, on his way back as he walked for along time he became sick and tired and therefore, he decided to rest as the ‘tradition’ says but he died on the hill.
revered, especially those of elders. This assumes that they are not dead but live on in a different (spiritual) world. This is the basis of the nkuni tradition and sites widely discussed by Cohen.

Shrines were built and kept for the most important mizimu (spirits) in each home. Associated with the mizimu were the nkuni, typically the spirits of first men of each clan arriving in Busoga. Nearly every clan had an nkuni, and the nkuni had a special dwelling place located where the clan first settled or first arrived in Busoga.\textsuperscript{145}

However, there appears to be a marked shift in the way the dead are revered with grand modern graves, replete with marble, elegies, eulogies, tombstones, decorations etc, which stands in contrast with traditions of planting the ficus tree on the grave of an ancestor as a way of ‘habituating’ the spirit of the departed.\textsuperscript{146} In a related study concerning the production of history and heritage through memorialisation of the dead, Rassool\textsuperscript{147} maintains that resistance biography is a created heritage and that the burial sites feature prominently in this. He gives examples of the grave of Enoch Sontonga (composer of Nkosi sikele l'Afrika) at the Braamfontein cemetery and the cemetery where Biko had been buried. At other sites such as Freedom Park,\textsuperscript{148} in South Africa for example, although not an actual burial site, is a physical space and a memorial, a symbolic place for those who ‘sacrificed’ their lives in the liberation struggle. The elements of the Freedom Park include a symbolic burial ground, surrounded by eleven boulders known as Lesaka, a body of water at both entrances for baptism and drinking, and Umlahlankosi trees.

\textsuperscript{146} Interview with Kisambira E, Male, 56 years, Busambira village, 27 March 2011.
\textsuperscript{147} C. Rassool. ‘The Individual, Auto/biography and History in South Africa’, Chapter 4 pp.223-226, where he discusses the notion of memorialisation and gave examples of resistance biography as heritage.
Figure 9: Photograph of the burial sites with *omukaire* (ficus) tree planted on an earlier grave.

Photograph by Nabirye Zaina, 27 Feb 2011

Figure 10: A grand modern grave for the Late Amulaferi Kisambira (former Head of clan for the Baiseigaga clan)
The photographs above, taken at Kisambira family contain the remains of the Basambira ancestors, with the bottom one (figure 10) being of Amulaferi Kisambira, the hereditary Muisengobi (of the Ngobi clan) of Kisambira area in Busoga (Kigulu Chiefdom). Their outlook and architecture demonstrates the shifting nature of burial heritage in Busoga. Whereas as earlier stated the grave site was also constituted as space for the veneration of the ‘spirits’ of departed ancestors and their domestication through the symbolic planting of the *ficus* tree, the more modern grave at the bottom demonstrates not only the respect for the spirit, but the remains of the dead as well as displaying an aesthetic based on prestige, power and wealth. The enduring nature of the construction and the writing on the tombstone serve to preserve memory beyond the generation of those who personally knew Amulaferi Kisambira. The site therefore, serves as a strong space of memory where tradition is preserved through elements of modernity. This need to be pointed out however, that in the case of *Mpumuire* Kabalega’s remains was never interred there but were repatriated back to Bunyoro and buried at Mparo, alongside his
royal ancestors.\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Mpumuire} appears to have significance for other reasons. It had been a well known resting place for travellers, given its proximal location on the Nile River’s east bank, close to the only fording point on this expansive torrent, at least during the time of the long-distance trade. The death of Kabalega on the hill thus amplified a narrative of importance of \textit{Mpumuire} hill. Moreover, a memorial stone which carries the colonial Governor’s name and the 10 Chiefs in appreciation of Spire’s work in governing or ruling Busoga from 1909 to 1918 does not bear Kabalega’s name since Kabalega died later. Moreover, being a colonial memorial, Kabalega would not befit the honour of inscription.

There is a common misconception that a cairn of heaped stones at the hill-top alongside the \textit{ficus} tree is Kabalega’s grave. The stones however, have continuously been heaped by the visitors and the local people in honour of Kabalega, which has grown into a habit that is gradually woven in the heritage of the site.\textsuperscript{150} The hill is a pilgrimage site in honour of Kabalega. What then is seen on \textit{Mpumuire} hill and Busoga’s heritage generally is the reconstitution of a largely Bunyoro heritage re-packaged as Busoga heritage.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{149}] Interview with Kadoko John, 80years, in charge of the Kyabazinga affairs adviser, Gadumire village, 20 Jan 2011.
\item[\textsuperscript{150}] Interview with Mohamed Samanya, 52years, Director for Culture, Busoga Kingdom, Mpumudde Division, Jinja, 19 Jan 2011.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
There are different writings about *Mpumuire* and the narrative of Kabalega. For instance, Businge has written thus:

> Even after 24 years of his imprisonment, and his old age, the British could not allow Kabalega to return to Bunyoro-Kitara alive, fearing the resolve and inspiration he might inject in the people of Bunyoro to further resist colonial rule. Kabalega was kept in Jinja at a place called *Mpumuire* from where he died in 1924.\(^{151}\)

Such a statement seems inaccurate, given that the British had released Kabalega after his conversion to Christianity, while in exile in the Seychelles Islands and had been renamed Paul. There is no reason to believe that either he was imprisoned at the hill or barred from getting back to Bunyoro alive given that his and Bunyoro’s power to resist had been broken completely while he was still in exile. It does point to how *Mpumuire* is given another meaning, a place of imprisonment. It suffices to state that the return of Kabalega and his death at *Mpumuire* has

---

created contested meanings over the site, which has implications for the heritage that has been created since the 1990s.

Mpuumire Hill is also inscribed as a site where the kings of Busoga stood with the British colonialists when marking boundaries for the abaami (chiefs) who were proposed to rule Busoga. So, while the hill and Kabalega is associated with resistance, the boundary setting is associated with accommodation. When an agreement was reached between the colonial authorities and the ruling houses of the major chiefdoms, forming the 10 principalities, names were inscribed on a slab in memory of those leaders who were present at that time. A monument in a form of a slab was put up with the names inscribed on it in recognition and memory of Spire, the provincial commissioner of the eastern province from 1909 till 1918. The 10 chiefs whose names were inscribed on the slab include Daudi Gabula, Gidioni Ngobi, Ezekeri Zibondo, Tabingwa, Wakoli, Ludigo nanyumba, Yusufu Luba, Nuwa Menya, Obara, Ngango Igaga

Figure 13: A photograph of the Memorial stone at Mpuumire Hill

Photograph by Nabirye Zaina, 19 Jan 2011
The inscription is written thus; and translated:

“Entumu ya mainja eno ye yokujukiranga

Omwami F. Spire C.M.G.

Provincial Commissioner wensi yaffe Bu

Soga eyatubera okuva 1909

Okutusa 1918 ngabwetwawandika mukitab

O kye kijukizo kye”

Daudi Gabula      Ludigo Nanyumba

Gideoni Ngobi     Yusufu Luba

Ezelieri Zibondo  Nuwa Menya

Tabingwa          Obara

Wakoli            Ngango Igaga

This heap of stones is for remembrance

Mr. F. Spire C.M.G.

Provincial Commissioner of our country Bu

soga which he ruled from 1909

To 1918 as we recorded in the book

for his memory

Heritage elements on Mpumuire

Although Mpumuire would easily pass for a Bunyoro site and also a site of British demarcation and memorialisation, it becomes the site of coronation of Busoga, which constitutes our very interest in this space. The hill has been used as a site of cultural performance for the Basoga especially on the day of the Kyabazinga coronation. The last coronation occurred here in 1996.

The drama and spectacle of coronation, being at the centre of the performance, uses a variety of local artistic paraphernalia appropriated over historical time and integrated in the heritage narrative; assembled for the ceremony that could double as a ritual.
The composition of the royal throne includes the skins of the most powerful animals for example, a lion and leopard. The drum, which is present, and the biggest that can be found in Busoga, essentially made for the occasion, symbolic of royal power. Basoga informants asserted that its sound signifies that the king can be able to speak both to the people and the gods. The spear is the epitome of masculinity and it is phallic shape seems to confirm male domination. The royal spear, like the royal drum, cannot be touched/played by women in a highly gendered and masculine dominated society of the Basoga. A woman, for now can neither sit on the Kyabazinga’s throne nor become one.

The instruments maintain a mythic discourse relating to power of the Kyabazinga that is assumed to equal that of powerful feline animals such as, lions and leopards. When examined closely, one sees an imagined heritage built in a short historical period. The Kyabazingaship is a 20th century creation of British colonialism. These ceremonies have been adopted from the coronation ceremonies of the lower level oligarchies that dotted Busoga, and had built credible traditions which were combined with ideas imported, especially from Buganda and those allowed were only in as far as colonial authorities could permit. To assume that the performances consisted of age-old tradition is to stretch the imagination. Fallers extensively dwelt on how bureaucracy developed in Busoga but neither he nor the historian David Cohen came out explicitly to explain how practices that ultimately led to these performances developed over time. This subject has been skipped in Nobuhiro Nakabayashi’s work as well. By the 1996 Kyabazinga coronation, a marked ceremonial distinction of rituals added onto traditional

---

152 Batambuze Joy, (former member of the Busoga Lukiiko), 85years, Budondo village, 10 March 2011 and Chief Izimba Patrick Gologolo, 48years, Nasuti village, 20 Jan 2011.
153 For a deeper discussion on the idea of masculinity and its markers in a patrilineal community and how they shape an imagined heritage, see Thomas Spear and R Waller (eds). Being Masai: Ethnicity and Identity in East Africa (London: James Currey, 1993).
ones could be witnessed. The grandeur of the occasion, the robes, the *isebantu*, and the chiefs-turned-princes and the many *Abaisengobi* and elders adorned in *kanzu* (tunics) which are of Arabic and subsequently Buganda origin marked the Busoga moment.

There exists no developed catalogue of the material culture for the hill. For instance some of the trees that grow on the hill such as the cultural tree called *ficus nateliensis* (*omugaire*) may have been planted as are done at *nkuni* sites in northern Busoga to mark the cultural vitality of the site or just as diffused free growing plants. It does not have a cultural interpretation attached to it, at least at the time of the study. But the *ficus* tree has all the same been taken as part of the hill’s impetus and cultural landscape by the royally adherent Basoga, in broader relation to the other traditional roles the tree played that have been discussed elsewhere in this study. Other trees without an associated cultural narrative grow there like the eucalyptus that is increasingly being planted by Chief Waguma Yasin of Butembe County, the custodian. He is a cultural leader and he is not paid for the tree planting at the hill. There is also a cairn of stones besides the memorial slab which come from the visitors from within and outside Busoga and who leave stones in honour of Busoga’s assumed heritage.

In order to develop a better understanding of this site, our attention is drawn to a related coronation site in Buganda. Naggalabi /Buddo is a coronation site in Buganda, with heritage elements such as the ‘big root found at Nakibuuka and the one near Namulondo mound’157 and the other elements such as trees, temporary votive huts, a pond and rocks. The material components used in constructing the votive huts include the reeds, bricks, poles, mud and grass and often, iron sheets. Buganda’s heritage has been built over a longer period than that of

---

157 W. Gordon, ‘The Traditional Places in Buganda’, (Kampala: Wavah Books, 2004), p.20, Gordon gives an in-depth discussion of the places or sites (Nnabulagala/Kasubi, Naggalabi/Buddo and Kabaale/Kkungu) that make up the Buganda’s heritage. He further analysed how the elements of heritage came to exist and be called the current names based on the legends or mythical tales related to them.
Busoga and therefore more perfected and elaborate in imagination.\textsuperscript{158} Contrasts and similarities in the case of \textit{Mpumuire} hill can be drawn. For instance, most of the more or less permanent elements found at \textit{Buddo} and \textit{Naggalabi} do not exist at \textit{Mpumuire} hill. The votive huts in Busoga’s case are usually constructed when the coronation is to take place and are more temporary.\textsuperscript{159} The shape and symbolism imbued in these huts is similar to that of Buganda. During coronation, the enthroned \textit{Kyabazinga} sits in one of the huts on a stool.

There are differences and similarities in the notion of a coronation ceremony and its accoutrements defined by the length of time each community has taken in shaping traditions and translating them into heritage. The longer the community has been bureaucratic, the more likely the practices are woven neatly into heritage, assuming the spectre of non-invention. Given that Busoga is a more recent creation than Buganda, the practices are still required to deepen in the imagination to perfect the otherwise rudimentary material culture and practices at \textit{Mpumuire} and other heritage spaces this study covered. Assumptions are usually part of heritage and largely constitute traditions. But once practices, assumed or not become \textit{habitus}, part of routine and daily practice, they take the spectre of age-old traditions assumed to be inherited.

\textit{Mpumuire} hill is dotted by huts of temporary nature representing the 11 chiefdoms which are usually constructed by older men and clan elders from the respective areas. The significance of the hut(s) is taken to represent an assumed traditional way of taking over office and a stool is a sign of assuming the throne. The stool is usually made from the root of a \textit{Mvule} tree with a round shape and a depression at the top and three legs. The same type of stool is also used in divination by spirit mediums. Its three legs are symbolic, sharing meanings with the fire hearth that also has three fire stones and the family represented by the father, mother and children. The

\textsuperscript{158} For more information on Budo and Naggalabi, see S. Kiwanuka. \textit{A history of Buganda from the Foundation of the Kingdom to 1900}, (Makerere University Kampala, May, 1971), See also Sir A. Kagwa. Basekabaka be Buganda, \textit{Journal of the African Society, Vol. 12}, (K.C.M. G. London: Luzac and Co, 1912).
\textsuperscript{159} A sample of the Basoga votive hut has been put up at the Uganda museum in Kampala.
invention of the legs in the case of the royal stool remains a conjecture. Smaller versions of the stool are present in Basoga homesteads, placed on goat skins and usually reserved for the household head implying a deeply rooted heritage practice based on masculinity. It is noted that such rituals performed by the Kyabazinga at the coronation depend on the Baisengobi ‘traditions’ and the chieftdom of that of the Kyabazinga’s origin. To belong to the Baisengobi clan is now assumed to be coterminous with belonging to the clan of power.

Another aspect that forms part of the coronation is the Baswezi (spirit mediums) who usually reside or stay at the site for approximately three days in preparation for the coronation day. Batambuze Joy, an informant, pointed out that, “the Baswezi are always present on the coronation day and guide the Kyabazinga through the coronation rituals”.\textsuperscript{160} The work of the mediums is to intercede between human beings and the spirits, the contemporary and the past, thus implying that the king holds power and the spirits. The evening before and at the coronation day the mediums go into trance and do other performances such as singing and dancing, in order to make the ceremony have a spiritual dimension and authenticity. It is assumed that the mediums approve or otherwise of the Kyabazinga. In case the Kyabazinga is not approved by them, a further election would take place. But no Kyabazinga has ever been disapproved of through this process (medium-ship) although contestation sometimes arises whose resolution is often achieved through the intervention of mediums. Given that the Kyabazinga is sourced through a collegial election of one prince, one vote – a modern arrangement- the presence of the Baswezi gives the occasion a veneer of heritage and blinds the people over the fact that the institution is not ancient as it may seem.

After the coronation on the Mpumuire hill, the Kyabazinga proceeds for more cultural ceremonies at the well called Igenge on Igenge hill. What happens at the well? Kadoko asserted:

\textsuperscript{160} Batambuze Joy, (former member of the Busoga Lukiiko), 85years, Budondo village, 10 March 2011.
“The Kyabazinga is taken to Igenge for rehearsal and to wash his hands for a blessing. Afterwards he returns to Bugembe for the official ceremonies”.\textsuperscript{161} This practice started after the restoration of kingdoms in 1993. What happens also is that notions of tradition and culture are infused with Christian rituals in the coronation ceremony. Mutebe suggested that “Mpumuire hill is basically for cultural aspects while Bugembe Cathedral is for religious performances like prayers and blessings to the new Kyabazinga before taking over office”.\textsuperscript{162} Only Henry Wako Muloki has been crowned on this hill and therefore, the crowning practices are not deeply rooted. Earlier Kyabazingas did not undergo ritualistic ceremonies, except those that took place at their investiture as hereditary chiefs in their respective chiefdoms.\textsuperscript{163} Mpumuire was therefore invented as a Busoga kingdom coronation site.

However, there is little attention given to the preservation of heritage especially the heritage sites discussed in the study underlines the significance. Limited resources aside, the value in preserving the sites does not appear ingrained in the practices in Busoga. The fact that Mpumuire hill has been excavated to produce red earth (latisol) for the construction of the Jinja-Kamuli road, construction of houses, schools and churches etc, making a ‘pyramid’ of the ritual hill cast doubt on the future of the site with its grand heritage narrative and calls for a discourse on sites and spaces that carry both resources (needed for modern development as well as heritage).

I conclude by arguing in the chapter, that Busoga tradition is constructed and can constantly change as exemplified by the shifting notions surrounding Mpumuire hill. The chapter presents the idea that communities are social constructs and therefore imagined and, the heritage they

\textsuperscript{161} Interview with Kadoko John, Male (in charge of the Kyabazinga affairs adviser), Male, 80years Gadumire village, 20 Jan 2011.
\textsuperscript{162} Interview with Mutebe Yekoyada Kaitaita (Member Busoga Lukiiko representing Butembe Chiefdom), Male, 77years, Budondo Village, 14 March 2011.
\textsuperscript{163} Interview with Kadoko John, (charge of the Kyabazinga affairs adviser), Male, 80years, Gadumire village, 20 Jan 2011.
profess is usually a result of an amalgam of many strands brought together into space and cemented by longevity.
CONCLUSION

The study carried out a history-based analysis of the heritage practices, sites and spaces, exploring how each site and institution has gradually been invented, developed and represented, thus becoming Busoga’s heritage. This gradual production of heritage is epitomised in how the Kyabazingaship, the palace and the Mpumuire Hill, have been represented to become Busoga’s heritage. Through interviews and visits to the sites, a general view of how heritage has been produced and packaged in Uganda, especially in Busoga over historical time has been rehabilitated.

Secondly, in this work, the word Busoga as has been used describes an area inhabited by a wide range of people such as the Acholi, Basamia, Baganda, Bagishu and those who identify themselves as Basoga. The latter term can be contested first from an etymological perspective due to Busoga’s imagined status given that even the Baisengobi, who claim origin in Bunyoro, had no Basoga left behind in Bunyoro to have claim of Busoga-ness. Secondly, the ideology Busoga was an invention by the British in the late nineteenth century that used the name to refer to a geographical territory. A heritage of colonial rule remains stamped in Busoga’s heritage. Its social agency was to bring a variety of communities (Bagabula, Bakooli, Balamogi, etc) into a new single society bounded by geographical boundaries called Busoga, established a stately new civil order as well as kingdom assumed to represent culture. In this way, Busoga was invented and imagined. The longer these structures have endured, the more they have been perceived as heritage.

Informants to this study demonstrated that even old forms of knowledge and practices were not uniform and, new practices do not necessarily instil a memory complex among Basoga. The heritage as reproduced and represented through the Kyabazingaship, the palace and Mpumuire coronation sites are not centres of memory and heritage but new forms of power mixing
tradition and modern state-type power based on relations between Busoga on one hand and the government of Uganda on the other. These power relations between kingdoms that assume to carry heritage and the state determine the selection of what constitutes heritage in Busoga. The new forms of power, exemplified by the kingdom do not necessarily adopt or build on traditional ones but adopt selectively those strands that fit within the contemporary narrative of being Busoga. Then questions remain of how these sites developed into heritage spaces. The tell-tale markers related to these sites (nkuni, folktales of Kintu and Mukama, heredity, clanhood, occupational differences, death of Kabalega, coronation site, ritual site, and performance site for Baswezi etc) gradually ingrain the impetus of many a site and it becomes a cosmological marker/historical site carrying the vestiges of heritage.

The study focused on three heritage sites not as representatives of Busoga’s histories and heritage but to elucidate on the process of heritage invention and the imagination of Basoga in contemporary times. The spectacular nature of the Kyabazingaship, the palace and Mpumuire Hill and associated histories demonstrate that even with the older sites, the process was similar. There many more sites whose history is similar and repetition would not serve the study. Moreover, the study made an attempt to geographically cover what is Busoga. At these sites, an understanding develops on how these sites have been centres where heritage is produced and represented in the context of Busoga. Nobuhiro Nakabayashi has pointed out that ‘obuwangwa’ [culture] does attain a sense of meaning through the Kyabazingaship (kingship) which was invented in 1939, abolished in 1967 and restored in 1993. As viewed from here, some Basoga claim that the Kyabazingaship as their heritage usually celebrated on annually on 11 February as Kyabazinga Day.

---

For this study, the ways through which heritage information was conveyed was a concern. The limited information and concrete historical documents about the palace and the *Mpumuire* sites was revealing, especially to tourists and history students. The status of the regional archive at Jinja is a testimony to this. While a number of informants interviewed talked about Kabalega dying at Mpumuire Hill, little tangible evidence can testify to it. In discussing the power of subtlety of heritage, Deacon, Dondolo, Mbulelo and Prosealandis\(^{165}\) have argued that intangible heritage can often be more powerful than the tangible. In Busoga, intangible appears to mean ‘forgotten’. To negotiate between forgetting and tangibility, new practices of remembering the dead are being invented.

Some informants claimed that Kabalega was buried on the hill where the cairn of stones is heaped. Others were of the view that Kabalega’s remains were repatriated to his ancestral home in Bunyoro. There is a desire to negotiate ‘heritage and truth’. The study recognises the complexity of developing a heritage narrative from this maze of information and relied heavily on interviews with informants of advanced age.

The study questions the Basoga’s perception of their own heritage as well as the seeming abandonment or shifting of heritage notions under the throes of modernity, making heritage a reflection of how modern a community is through the spatialization of ‘common’ memory. Heritage then as a modern notion builds on an assumed ‘tradition’ as a form of heritage, especially in Busoga. Yet it is nongovernmental organisations such as the Catholic Church, through an ‘Africanization’ program are attempting to salvage some remnants of Busoga’s heritage. Past practices do not necessarily get reconstituted into contemporary heritage but are selectively repackaged and presented as heritage at sites and spaces and through practices.

These threads of history are woven into the fabric that becomes heritage.

---
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