

CAN A JUNGLE BE GOVERNED
BY THE PRINCIPLES OF A REPUBLIC?
OR IS IT DOOMED TO REMAIN A BATTLEFIELD
WHERE ONLY THOSE FLUENT IN THE
LANGUAGE OF FORCE CAN RULE?

UGANDA: THE JUNGLE THAT NEVER BECAME A NATION

POWER TAKEN BY GUNS
RARELY GROWS INTO STATESMANSHIP.
IT CLINGS TO SURVIVAL.
IT BREEDS PARANOIA.
IT FEARS FREEDOM.

UGANDA HAS NOT BEEN
GOVERNED AS A REPUBLIC
BUT AS A WAR CAMP.

POLITICAL STRUCTURES EXIST AS FAÇADES.
DEMOCRACY IS MERELY A STAGE PLAY
PERFORMED FOR INTERNATIONAL LEGITIMACY.

ISAAC CHRISTOPHER LUBOGO

Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation

Isaac Christopher Lubogo

UGANDA: THE JUNGLE THAT NEVER BECAME A NATION

*A Political Treatise on the Architecture of Authoritarian Endurance,
the Militarisation of Democratic Space, and the Possibility of
National Reconstruction in Uganda*

Isaac Christopher Lubogo

Suigeneris Consultancy, Kampala

SUIGENERIS PUBLISHERS

A Member of Suigeneris Consultancy

Bukandula Tower, Plot 15, Rubaga Road, Kampala, Uganda

Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation. © 2025 Isaac Christopher Lubogo.

The right of Isaac Christopher Lubogo to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with the Copyright and Neighbouring Rights Act, Cap 215, Laws of Uganda.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means – electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise – without the prior written permission of the publisher, except for brief quotations embodied in critical articles, reviews, and scholarly works.

First published 2025. This revised, expanded and upgraded edition published 2025.

ISBN: 978-9913-975-00-1

Published in Uganda by:

Suigeneris Publishers

A Member of Suigeneris Consultancy

Bukandula Tower, Plot 15, Rubaga Road, Kampala, Uganda

Tel: +256 774 694 058 | +256 700 634 720

E-mail: suigeneris.magnum.opus@gmail.com

Website: www.suigenerislawapp.com

The views expressed in this book are those of the author and do not represent the official positions of any institution, government, or organisation. The author writes in his capacity as an independent scholar and public intellectual.

Cover design and typesetting: Suigeneris Publishers

Printed and bound in Uganda

DEDICATION

*To every Ugandan who has swallowed rage
for the sake of survival – this book is your
voice.*

*To those who dared to resist, and paid the
price – this book is your memorial.*

*To those who will one day build the republic
we have long been denied – this book is
your foundation.*

*And to Y.K. Lubogo ESQ CBE,
who taught this family that truth endures longer than power.*

*"Those who make peaceful revolution
impossible will make violent revolution
inevitable."*

— John F. Kennedy, 1962

*"The most potent weapon of the oppressor
is the mind of the oppressed."*

— Steve Biko

*"Power taken by guns rarely grows into
statesmanship. It clings to survival. It
breeds paranoia. It fears freedom."*

— Isaac Christopher Lubogo

ABOUT THE BOOK

In this provocative and uncompromising political treatise, Isaac Christopher Lubogo lays bare the tragic irony at the heart of Uganda's post-independence narrative: a nation that exchanged colonial chains for camouflage fatigues, and in doing so, never truly became a republic. *Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation* is not merely a chronicle of Yoweri Kaguta Museveni's long rule — it is an intellectual autopsy of a nation held hostage by its own liberators.

The central thesis of the book is as chilling as it is profound: power acquired through the gun rarely evolves into statesmanship. Lubogo argues, with painstaking detail and formidable scholarly authority, that Museveni never truly removed his bush uniform — he simply disguised it beneath a presidential suit. Uganda, under his grip, has not matured into a functioning republic but has remained a militarised jungle where governance is replaced by control, democracy by performance, and opposition by survival tactics.

The book is meticulously organised into thematic expositions that question the very nature of statehood in Uganda. In "The Myth of Transition," Lubogo dissects the illusion that 1986 marked a democratic rebirth. Instead, he paints a picture of a regime that merely shifted its battleground — where enemies are not debated but neutralised, and political campaigns resemble military operations rather than civic exercises.

In "The Façade of Stability," Lubogo exposes the calculated chaos that defines Museveni's longevity — how controlled instability, corruption as currency, and strategic tolerance of opposition serve one purpose: to sustain the illusion of statehood. In "The Fate of Those Who Challenge the Jungle," the book chronicles the predictable cycle faced by opposition figures — humiliation, isolation, and erasure. And in "Breaking the Cycle," Lubogo offers a radical departure: a new politics rooted not in confrontation but in civic reconstruction.

This is not just a book. It is a wake-up call. A mirror. A moral reckoning.

REVIEW OF THE BOOK

Isaac Christopher Lubogo's *Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation* is a fierce intellectual undertaking that unearths uncomfortable truths buried beneath the official narratives of statehood and democracy in Uganda. With surgical precision and philosophical depth, Lubogo constructs a compelling indictment of the post-1986 Ugandan state, arguing that Uganda has remained a militarised jungle masquerading as a republic.

Far from being a polemic, this work is a layered political reflection, drawing upon historical patterns, sociopolitical behaviour, and the psychology of power. Lubogo's central metaphor – the jungle – is not merely literary; it is systemic. It captures the disordered yet controlled environment in which institutions function cosmetically, elections are ritualised performances, and governance is infused with the language and logic of military command.

The book is divided into distinct thematic arcs that mirror the evolution – or rather, the stalling – of Uganda's political life. In examining the myth of transition, Lubogo deconstructs the widely accepted notion that Museveni's ascendancy marked a democratic rebirth. Instead, he posits it as a continuation of warfare by other means, with civilian governance only thinly veiled under military instincts.

Perhaps the most haunting section, "The Fate of Those Who Challenge the Jungle," reads like a requiem for Uganda's opposition. From Kizza Besigye to Robert Kyagulanyi, Lubogo outlines how the state systematically neutralises dissent through humiliation, isolation, and erasure. Yet, despite the sombre portrait painted throughout, Lubogo does not conclude with despair. His final chapters offer a subdued but powerful vision of transformation – not through violent revolution, but through reorientation, civic awakening, and structural reconstruction.

Stylistically, Lubogo writes with both lyrical sharpness and academic authority. His language is evocative without being inflammatory, philosophical without being abstract. He draws from history, law, political science, and African postcolonial critique, offering a multidisciplinary lens that enriches the narrative.

In sum, *Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation* is not just a book – it is a challenge. A challenge to citizens, to intellectuals, to leaders, and to history itself. It urges the reader to question inherited myths, to trace the outlines of the invisible cage, and to recognise that the journey from jungle to nation is not geographic – it is psychological, institutional, and spiritual. This is a necessary

book for our time.

PREFACE

This book was born not out of rebellion, but out of reflection. It is the product of countless silent hours watching, listening, questioning, and ultimately, aching for a nation that has yet to truly be born. It is neither written in bitterness nor composed in anger — but in a deep yearning for truth, and a deeper love for the country I call home.

Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation is not an attack on personalities or institutions. It is an unflinching confrontation with the system of political logic that has defined — and confined — Uganda for nearly four decades. It is a meditation on the tragic irony that a nation so rich in spirit, soil, and sacrifice remains, in practice, a captive of its own liberators. This work seeks not to condemn, but to awaken.

As a student of law, history, governance, and the African condition, I have often been torn between reverence for our hard-won independence and disappointment at what we have done with it. Like many Ugandans, I grew up being told we were free. But I have lived long enough to know that the truest form of captivity is one that parades as liberty. It is in that tension — between appearance and reality — that this book takes shape.

I write not as an outsider, but as a witness. I write as one who has seen elections turned into spectacles, opposition turned into targets, and public discourse turned into whispered defiance. I write for those whose words were censored, whose hopes were arrested, and whose votes vanished into the machinery of power. I write, too, for the many who still believe that the arc of history can bend towards justice — if only we are bold enough to name the jungle for what it is.

This book does not claim to have all the answers. It asks dangerous questions. It invites readers to examine the architecture of power in Uganda through a lens stripped of nostalgia, fear, and political correctness. It challenges us to move beyond the comfort of slogans and the seduction of survival, into a new conversation — one in which citizenship is not submission, and governance is not war by other means.

To the young Ugandan who wonders why every dream must be negotiated with power; to the elder who fought for a freedom they no longer recognise; to the activist, the thinker, the patriot, and even the sceptic — this book is for you. The jungle may be dense, but it is not eternal. Somewhere within us all lies the

capacity to imagine and demand a nation worthy of its people.

The scholarly sources engaged throughout these pages — from Fanon and Mamdani to Tripp and Gramsci, from Foucault and Havel to Arendt and Sharp — are not mere decoration. They are the map through which this analysis navigates. Each authority enriches the argument that what Uganda has endured is not exceptional. It is, tragically, typical. And that which is typical can be changed.

Let the journey begin — not to a new government, but to a new consciousness. Not toward rebellion, but toward revelation. Not from war to peace — but from jungle to nation.

Isaac Christopher Lubogo

Suigeneris Consultancy, Kampala

May 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FRONT MATTER

Dedication & Epigraphs

About the Book

Review of the Book

Preface

Introduction

Prognosis

6

8

9

11

17

19

PART I — THE GENESIS OF THE JUNGLE STATE

Chapter 1: The Man Who Never Removed His Bush Uniform

– Guerrilla Origins and the Psychology of a Warlord in Power

– How Wartime Tactics Shaped His Governance Style

– The Illusion of Democratic Transition in 1986

– Why Guerrilla Leaders Struggle to Become True Statesmen

Chapter 2: The Façade of Democracy

– Elections as Controlled Political Theatre

– The “Multiparty” System as a Mirage

Chapter 3: The Military Doctrine of Governance

– Why Uganda Is Ruled as a War Camp, Not a Republic

– The Militarisation of Public Institutions

– State Violence as a Governance Tool

23

28

35

PART II — GOVERNING THROUGH CONTROLLED CHAOS

Chapter 4: The Politics of Fear and Survival

– Why a Dictator Thrives on Instability

– Manufactured Crises as Tools of Control

– The Balance Between Repression and Token Freedoms

Chapter 5: Corruption as a Political Weapon

– Selective Prosecution and Controlled Accountability

Chapter 6: The Opposition’s Trap

– The Cycle of Arrests, Beatings, and Political Imprisonment

41

45

50

PART III — THE FATE OF RESISTANCE IN A JUNGLE STATE

Chapter 7: The Story of Uganda's Crushed Rebels	54
– From Besigye to Bobi Wine: The Anatomy of State Retaliation	
– Lessons from Past Resistance Movements	
– Why the More You Fight the System, the Stronger It Becomes	
Chapter 8: The Jungle's Propaganda Machine	59
– The Rewriting of History to Justify Eternal Rule	
– How the Regime Manufactures Its Own Opposition	
Chapter 9: The Cost of Submission	64
– How Ugandans Have Adapted to Oppression	
– Why the Real Power Lies with Those Who Refuse to Act	
PART IV — BREAKING THE CYCLE	
Chapter 10: The Two Paths — Submission or Reinvention	68
– Why Armed Struggle Will Not Work	
Chapter 11: Disrupting the Jungle System	71
– Economic Resistance: Starving the Regime of Financial Lifelines	
– Turning Every Act of Oppression Into a Global Spectacle	
– Rewriting the Narrative: Making the Government Look Weak	
Chapter 12: The Power of Uncontrollable Order	78
– Case Studies of Successful Nonviolent Revolutions	
– How Uganda Can Transform from a Jungle to a True Nation	
BACK MATTER	
Conclusion: The End of the Jungle Era	82
Epilogue: The Republic We Owe Each Other	84
SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS: UGANDA IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE	
Chapters A–I: Extended Political and Constitutional Analysis	93
Ch. A: The Myth of the Ten-Point Programme	93
Ch. B: The Legal Architecture of Authoritarian Permanence	94
Ch. C: Education, History and the Manufacturing of Amnesia	96
Ch. D: The Global Ugandan Diaspora as Counter-Power	97
Ch. E: The Anatomy of Electoral Fraud	98
Ch. F: Civil Society and the Contested Space of Resistance	98
Ch. G: A Constitutional Reform Agenda	100
Ch. H: The Path Forward — A Realistic Democratic Transition	101
Ch. I: What Uganda Owes Its Future — A Covenant of Reconstruction	102
EXTENDED ANALYSIS — PARTS V–VIII	
Part V: The Economy of the Jungle	104
Part VI: Resistance, Resilience, and the Long Game	110
Part VII: Anatomy of a Stolen Generation	117
Part VIII: Imagining the Republic — A Vision for Uganda	122
END MATTER	
Bibliography	128
Subject Index	132
About the Author	136

About the Author.....

INTRODUCTION

Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation is not merely a book; it is a philosophical, political, and historical reckoning. Penned with intellectual audacity and moral urgency, Isaac Christopher Lubogo takes readers on a bold journey through the post-independence trajectory of Uganda, dissecting the anatomy of a nation that, in his view, never fully emerged from the shadows of militarism, colonial trauma, and revolutionary delusion. At its core, this work is a confrontation — with the past, with power, and with the persistent illusion that sovereignty and statehood are the same thing.¹

This book is not an attack; it is a mirror held up to the soul of the nation. It neither flatters power nor romanticises resistance. Instead, it wrestles with the uncomfortable truth that Uganda's political identity has remained suspended in a liminal space — neither jungle nor republic, neither battlefield nor democracy, but something in between: a hybrid state where order is manufactured, fear is systematised, and legitimacy is constantly staged but never fully earned.²

At the heart of this critique is the figure of Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, a leader whose legacy looms large over the modern Ugandan state. Lubogo contends that Museveni's rise to power in 1986 did not signify a transition from warlord to statesman, but rather a seamless expansion of the battlefield into the realm of governance. The instruments of war — command, control, surveillance, and suppression — have, over time, been refashioned into tools of statecraft, blurring the lines between civilian rule and military doctrine. As Achille Mbembe has argued, postcolonial African states are frequently sites of hybrid domination, where modernity and martial rule coexist in uneasy and often lethal harmony.³

The title itself — *The Jungle That Never Became a Nation* — is a provocative metaphor. It challenges readers to consider whether nationhood is simply a matter of borders and flags, or whether it requires a deeper social contract grounded in mutual respect, constitutionalism, civic dignity, and a shared national ethos. Lubogo suggests that Uganda, as it exists today, bears the external features of a nation but remains internally governed by the logic of the jungle: dominance over dialogue, survival over service, fear over freedom.

This introduction opens the door to a profound inquiry. It raises questions

¹Christopher Clapham, *Africa and the International System: The Politics of State Survival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 4–12.

²Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963) 148–205.

³Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001) 7–25.

not only about Uganda's past and present but about the very possibility of national rebirth. What happens when the jungle is institutionalised? Can a republic emerge from its vines? Is the citizen destined to remain a subject in the hands of former liberators? Or can a new civic imagination take root — one that reclaims the nation from its militarised past? As Mahmood Mamdani has observed, the bifurcated character of postcolonial African states creates precisely this tension: the citizen who exists in law but as a subject in practice.⁴

In unpacking these questions, the book is divided into four thematic parts. It begins by exploring the myth of political transition — the illusion that military conquest naturally matures into democratic governance. It then deconstructs the architecture of controlled chaos used to manufacture stability while preserving absolute power. The book further examines the fate of political challengers within this jungle and, finally, considers what paths remain open for a population caught between submission and reinvention.

Lubogo's voice is not one of despair, but of daring introspection. With a tone both prophetic and scholarly, he challenges readers — especially Ugandans — to interrogate the realities they have inherited, tolerated, or ignored. He does not prescribe rebellion, but reflection. Not revolt, but realignment. His thesis is as radical as it is responsible: that the true revolution Uganda needs may not lie in weapons or elections, but in a reawakening of civic consciousness and moral clarity.

In the pages that follow, this book will not offer comfort. It offers confrontation — the kind that forces a nation to ask: Who are we, really? And what have we become? This is not a history book. It is a warning. And perhaps, a last invitation — to become a nation, at last.

⁴Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996) 11–24.

PROGNOSIS

A Critical Examination of Power, Resistance, and the Illusion of Democracy

Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation offers a prognosis not merely of a political regime but of a nation held in a prolonged state of ideological captivity. Through a critical and fearless examination of power, resistance, and the illusion of democracy, Isaac Christopher Lubogo forecasts a political and psychological impasse that Uganda must confront — or continue to decay beneath. At the core of the book lies an uncomfortable truth: that Uganda's post-1986 reality is not one of democratic evolution, but of institutional camouflage. The author meticulously maps how power, once seized through violent means, entrenched itself not by winning the hearts of the people, but by mastering the optics of legitimacy.⁵

Lubogo warns that the language of power in Uganda has not changed — it has only become more fluent in disguise. "Freedom" is recast as loyalty, "opposition" as treachery, and "elections" as rituals of controlled consent. The prognosis is not merely political stagnation — it is a deeper erosion of civic confidence, a slow national hypnosis that numbs the public into participation in their own disenfranchisement. As Aili Mari Tripp has documented in her landmark study of Uganda's hybrid regime, the ruling National Resistance Movement has perfected the art of maintaining the form of democracy while evacuating its substance, creating a system that scholars of comparative politics have come to recognise as competitive authoritarianism.⁶

Resistance, once a noble pursuit, is itself under siege. The book outlines how every form of dissent is met not with dialogue, but with militarised countermeasures. In such a climate, resistance mutates — it either becomes performative or collapses into silence. Lubogo's prognosis, then, is that unless resistance evolves beyond familiar patterns — unless it reimagines itself outside the terrain defined by power — it will continue to be absorbed and neutralised by the very system it seeks to confront. This is the paradox that James C. Scott calls "everyday forms of resistance": when co-opted by the state, even defiance

⁵ Joe Oloka-Onyango, "Constitutional Reform and the Political Economy of Governance in East Africa" in Joe Oloka-Onyango (ed), *Constitutionalism in Africa: Creating Opportunities, Facing Challenges* (Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2007) 3.

⁶ Aili Mari Tripp, *Museveni's Uganda: Paradoxes of Power in a Hybrid Regime* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2010) 3–27.

can be made to serve domination.⁷

Yet, this prognosis is not fatalistic. Lubogo suggests that the illusion of democracy can only persist for as long as citizens remain enchanted by its symbols. The moment that enchantment breaks, the structures built on fear and manipulation begin to weaken. The author foresees a new form of resistance – not anchored in rebellion but in systemic reawakening. It is a call to move from performative protest to purposeful disruption; from symbolic voting to strategic withdrawal of consent; from fear-induced obedience to fearless civic self-definition.

The long-term prognosis offered is both a warning and a possibility. Uganda will either continue to spiral into a state of performative governance – where the jungle persists under the mask of the nation – or it will undergo a radical internal reconfiguration, where power is no longer feared, resistance is no longer co-opted, and democracy is no longer simulated but lived. In the end, Lubogo leaves the reader with a subtle but seismic suggestion: that the fate of Uganda is not tied to the fall of a regime, but to the rise of a collective consciousness. The jungle does not vanish when the lion leaves – it vanishes when the people stop fearing the trees.

This book, then, is not just a critique – it is a prophetic forecast. One that dares to declare that until illusion is confronted, no democracy is real, and no nation is truly born.

⁷James C Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990) 1–27.

PART I

The Genesis of the Jungle State

*"The state was not born. It was captured.
And once captured, it was militarised into
permanence."*

Liberation Without Nationhood

The year 1986 is often hailed as Uganda's political rebirth. In reality, it marked the continuation of a long-standing logic: that power, once seized by force, must be sustained by force. The ascension of the National Resistance Army was less a moment of liberation than a rebranding of conquest. The battlefield was not abandoned — it was merely renamed. Guns disappeared from public view but remained in the political bloodstream. Those who commanded battalions were handed ministries. The language of war — strategy, elimination, enemy, loyalty — was seamlessly repurposed into the language of governance. As Christopher Clapham has argued, liberation movements in Africa often struggle to transition into democratic actors because their operational DNA is forged in conflict, not consent. Uganda was no exception. It did not undergo transformation. It underwent transfer.⁸

Militarism as a mode of governance operated from the earliest days of the new regime. The state was organised not to serve the citizen but to secure the regime. "Security" became synonymous with regime survival. Any dissent, critique, or alternative ideology was quickly branded a threat to national stability. Political opponents were not competitors in a democratic process but enemies of the revolution — saboteurs to be tracked, restrained, and if necessary, eliminated. Institutional architecture was not built to democratise power, but to legitimise its monopolisation. Elections, courts, commissions — they functioned as props in a tightly choreographed performance. What looked like a state was in fact a fortified jungle.⁹

The promulgation of the 1995 Constitution was heralded as a watershed moment. And yet, its lifespan as a democratic bulwark was tragically short. First came the removal of presidential term limits in 2005. Then the erasure of the age cap in 2017. Each amendment revealed not a growing democracy, but a shrinking

⁸ Jean-François Bayart, Stephen Ellis and Béatrice Hibou, *The Criminalization of the State in Africa* (Oxford: James Currey, 1999) 1–30.

⁹ Tripp (n 6) 34–55.

republic. Joe Oloka-Onyango contends that in many African regimes, constitutionalism is less about governance and more about image — an ideological theatre designed to mask executive overreach. In Uganda, law exists not to constrain power but to cloak it. The jungle, in this sense, drafts the constitution and then rewrites it at will.¹⁰

Power in the jungle does not depend solely on violence — it thrives on the memory of it. It operates through the suggestion of consequences, through the constant hum of potential retribution. Surveillance is normalised. The lines between state and personal security are erased. Criticism becomes subversion. Journalists go silent, lecturers self-censor, and political satire becomes a crime. In such an environment, submission is internalised. Citizens learn to navigate around the powerful, not to challenge them. Frantz Fanon foresaw this phenomenon in post-colonial Africa, where the colonial master is replaced by a national elite who replicates the techniques of domination under new slogans and flags. The whip is exchanged for a briefcase, but its sting remains the same.¹¹

What emerged in Uganda after 1986 was not a state in the republican sense, but a security apparatus with civic features. Bayart, Ellis and Hibou describe such arrangements as the criminalisation of the state — where public institutions are repurposed to serve private political ends. Roads are constructed to win elections, justice is dispensed to reward loyalty, and public offices become sanctuaries for regime dependants. Corruption is not an aberration — it is a function. The republic exists on paper; in practice, it is a personalised network of power managed through fear, patronage, and selective violence.¹²

Uganda today wears the garments of a modern state — a flag, a national anthem, parliaments, courts, and commissions. But beneath the attire lies a familiar wilderness: one where might overrides mandate, and submission is rewarded while dissent is punished. The jungle has not disappeared — it has evolved. It has put on a tie. It speaks at summits. It tweets. But it is still a jungle. The struggle for Uganda, therefore, is not merely about elections or reforms. It is about confronting a foundational lie: that we became a nation in 1986. The truth is harder, but more urgent — we never stopped being a jungle. And the task ahead is not to change governments, but to finally become a republic.

¹⁰Oloka-Onyango (n 5) 15–29.

¹¹Clapham (n 1) 21–39.

¹²Bayart, Ellis and Hibou (n 8) 31–61.

CHAPTER 1

The Man Who Never Removed His Bush Uniform

Guerrilla Origins, Warlord Psychology, and the Institutionalisation of War Logic

Yoweri Kaguta Museveni did not walk out of the bush; he merely moved its coordinates. The camouflage may have faded, but the logic that governed it — paranoia, control, command — remained firmly stitched into the fabric of his presidency. Uganda did not transition from war to peace; it transitioned from one type of battlefield to another — one where bullets were replaced with ballots, but the war instinct remained untouched. For most revolutionaries, power is a resting place — a moment to unlearn the disciplines of insurgency and embrace the responsibilities of statehood. But for Museveni, power became a new theatre of war.¹³

In truth, Museveni never took off his uniform. He refashioned it. He tailored it into a presidential suit, stitched it with constitutional amendments, decorated it with donor diplomacy, and sprayed it with the cologne of technocracy. But beneath the surface, the camouflage remained. It is no coincidence that Uganda's most decisive policies were often framed as "operations" — Operation Wealth Creation, Operation Fika Salama. In a republic, policies are negotiated. In a jungle, they are ordered. The man in charge still thinks in operations, not deliberations. As Clapham has observed of post-liberation African regimes, when power is acquired through armed struggle, it becomes inseparable from a siege mentality — leaders govern not as heads of state, but as survivors of ongoing warfare.¹⁴

Museveni's Guerrilla Origins and the Psychology of a Warlord in Power

The political persona of Yoweri Kaguta Museveni cannot be understood without first dissecting the psychology of the warlord — because Museveni never shed his guerrilla identity. Instead, he institutionalised it. What began in the Luwero Triangle as a rebellion against autocracy matured into a long-standing psychology of rule rooted not in law, but in loyalty; not in ideas, but in dominance. The war may have ended, but the warlord remained. The guerrilla fighter operates from a state of existential vigilance. Every handshake masks a potential betrayal;

¹³Tripp (n 6) 62–84.

¹⁴Clapham (n 1) 55–88.

every negotiation is a disguised ambush.¹⁵

This psychological architecture is deeply explored by Clapham, who posits that revolutionary leaders who come to power through protracted insurgencies often struggle to "de-militarise" their mentality. They view the state not as a shared space of governance, but as conquered territory — a zone to be defended, not democratised. Thus, power becomes permanent by necessity. Any talk of succession sounds like treason. Any show of dissent feels like mutiny. To such a leader, the idea of peaceful political competition is irrational because, in his mental map, there are only victors and vanquished. Museveni, like many of his contemporaries who rose through armed resistance, exhibits what Bayart calls the politics of the belly — a system where politics is not about governance but consumption.¹⁶

Psychologically, the warlord does not trust institutions because institutions dilute power. The rule of law is tolerated only to the extent that it legitimises his authority. The moment it challenges his position, it is amended, suspended, or ignored. This is evident in Uganda's constitutional history: the removal of term limits in 2005 and the age limit in 2017 were not constitutional reforms — they were psychological reflexes of a man unwilling to disarm politically. To Museveni, relinquishing power is not an act of statesmanship — it is an act of surrender. And surrender, in guerrilla logic, equals death. What makes Museveni's case unique is how seamlessly this psychology has adapted to global diplomatic norms. He speaks the dialect of donors while ruling with the instincts of a commander — embodying what Achille Mbembe calls the postcolony: a site of hybrid domination where modernity and martial rule dance in uneasy harmony.¹⁷

How Wartime Tactics Shaped His Governance Style

Governance, in its truest sense, should be the art of enabling freedom, facilitating dialogue, and nurturing a social contract between rulers and the ruled. But for Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, governance was never a departure from conflict — it was its continuation by more administrative means. His wartime tactics were not abandoned at the gates of State House; they were carried in, codified, and deployed with surgical precision in the corridors of civil authority. Uganda was not led into peace. It was reorganised into a permanent state of strategic containment.¹⁸

¹⁵ Larry Diamond, "Thinking About Hybrid Regimes" (2002) 13(2) *Journal of Democracy* 21, 27.

¹⁶ Jean-François Bayart, *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly* (London: Longman, 1993) 55–88.

¹⁷ Mbembe (n 3) 33–68.

¹⁸ Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, *Sowing the Mustard Seed: The Struggle for Freedom and Democracy in Uganda* (London: Macmillan, 1997) 12–17.

One of the most enduring wartime tactics that shaped his rule was the centralisation of intelligence. In the bush, information was life. The ability to know what the enemy was planning – and to neutralise them before they struck – was a matter of survival. This tactic was not just retained; it was enhanced. The Ugandan state under Museveni operates through layers of surveillance. Multiple intelligence agencies – the Internal Security Organisation (ISO), External Security Organisation (ESO), Chieftaincy of Military Intelligence (CMI), and the Uganda Police's Crime Intelligence Directorate – create a web of overlapping scrutiny that leaves little room for dissent to breathe. As Robin Luckham has noted, such securitisation of political life transforms governance into a theatre of suspicion, and dissent into an existential threat.¹⁹

Another bush-era tactic refined in governance is divide and rule. In the NRA days, loyalty could not be assumed – it had to be constantly negotiated. Distrust among potential rivals was necessary to maintain control. In governance, this translated into political fragmentation. Museveni has perfected the art of manipulating ethnic, regional, and ideological fault lines to prevent the emergence of a unified opposition. Opposition parties are allowed to exist but are internally fractured; religious leaders are co-opted or neutralised; civil society is either bought off or demonised. This echoes Bayart's politics of extraversion, where African leaders sustain their dominance by orchestrating internal disunity while managing external legitimacy. Mahmood Mamdani's analysis of Uganda's bifurcated political heritage provides crucial context: the colonial state's division between citizen and subject was never dismantled – it was simply inherited and repurposed.²⁰

The Illusion of Democratic Transition in 1986

The images of January 1986 are seared into Uganda's collective memory – images of fatigued fighters marching into Kampala, of triumphant speeches echoing against the ruins of past regimes, and of a leader, Yoweri Kaguta Museveni, promising fundamental change. "This is not a mere change of guards," he declared. "It is a fundamental change in the politics of our country." And in that moment, hope surged like morning light after a long night of bloodshed. But beneath the poetry of the revolution was a cruel paradox: the transition was not democratic – it was militarised. The regime that declared itself a departure from tyranny was, in fact, an ideological mirage.²¹

¹⁹Robin Luckham, "Radical Soldiers, New Model Armies and the Nation-State in Ethiopia and Eritrea" in Robin Luckham and Gordon White (eds), *Democratization in the South* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003) 99.

²⁰Mamdani (n 4) 41–67.

²¹Clapham (n 1) 91–119.

To understand why 1986 was not a democratic transition, one must interrogate the conditions under which power was assumed. Power was not transferred — it was seized. The National Resistance Army did not emerge from popular elections, mass civic engagement, or inclusive national dialogue. It came from the bush, and its ascendancy was a conquest, not a consensus. As Clapham argues, when military movements seize power, their relationship with the citizenry is often framed through the lens of victory rather than service. Such regimes inherit a legitimacy rooted not in law, but in mythology. This mythologised legitimacy created a dangerous illusion: that because the NRA removed worse regimes, it was inherently better. As Fanon warned, the liberator who believes that his moral superiority is permanent becomes indistinguishable from the tyrant he replaced.²²

The post-1986 government cloaked itself in the language of reform. The Resistance Councils (RCs) were framed as grassroots democracy. But in practice, these councils were tightly monitored networks of loyalty, designed to consolidate power from the ground up. They functioned not as platforms of citizen empowerment but as surveillance mechanisms. Political parties were banned. Uganda entered a period of "no-party democracy" — an oxymoron that institutionalised single-party dominance while projecting a façade of stability. As Tripp notes, such systems often rely on the language of unity to justify political exclusion and prolong authoritarian rule under democratic disguise. The 1995 Constitution held promise — articulating the separation of powers, term limits, fundamental rights, and the rule of law. But even this milestone was undercut by the enduring logic of control.²³

Elections became rituals, not revolutions. They served to sanctify Museveni's power rather than challenge it. Opposition candidates were tolerated but not allowed to compete on equal footing. The Electoral Commission remained a shell of independence. The military, still loyal to the Commander-in-Chief, remained a silent referee — looming, watching, intervening. As Diamond notes, pseudo-democratic regimes deploy elections not as mechanisms of change, but as tools of regime survival. Uganda's post-1986 political evolution fits squarely within that model. What the world witnessed in 1986 was not the beginning of democracy — it was the institutionalisation of managed pluralism. A jungle reorganised. The camouflage became constitutional.

Why Guerrilla Leaders Struggle to Become True Statesmen

The tragedy of post-liberation Africa is not merely that it has been governed by men who fought their way into power, but that these same men have

²²Fanon (n 2) 211–248.

²³Tripp (n 6) 88–115.

rarely learned how to lay their weapons down — ideologically, institutionally, or psychologically. The problem is not that they fought. The problem is that they never stopped. The guerrilla leader rises in the context of disorder. He masters terrain, manipulates alliances, anticipates betrayal, and survives through ruthlessness masked as strategy. His legitimacy is drawn not from a ballot, but from a bullet. And so, when the war ends, his identity remains tethered to the very mechanisms that sustained his ascent.²⁴

To become a statesman, one must possess the ability to transcend the instincts of a fighter and embrace the vulnerability of shared governance. This requires humility — a trait rarely nurtured in the unforgiving crucible of armed struggle. Guerrilla warfare rewards obedience, secrecy, and command. Statesmanship requires openness, accountability, and negotiation. The two mindsets are not only different; they are often antithetical. In war, compromise is weakness. In governance, it is wisdom. Yoweri Kaguta Museveni exemplifies this disjunction. His rise to power was predicated on martial discipline and ideological absolutism. Yet, once in power, these traits hardened into a governance style that perceived opposition as sabotage, civil society as subversion, and institutional independence as betrayal.²⁵

Part of the struggle lies in the trauma of rebellion itself. When such a man assumes national leadership, he imports this psychological armour into institutions that require transparency and trust. The result is the militarisation of civilian space. Cabinet ministers become informants. Courts are watched. Universities are monitored. Elections are supervised like troop movements. Governance becomes war by quieter means. The transformation from warlord to statesman also requires the decentering of the self. In the jungle, the leader is the revolution. His will is law. But in a republic, leadership is custodial, not messianic. Guerrilla leaders often conflate continuity with personal immortality. They amend constitutions to stay in power. They suppress younger leaders to maintain relevance. They become prisoners of their own legacy. As Bayart observes, African rulers often entrench themselves by converting personal history into national destiny, thereby turning succession into sacrilege.²⁶

The paradox is tragic. The very qualities that enabled the guerrilla to win the war become the same traits that disable his ability to govern in peace. And until such men recognise that statesmanship is not an extension of warfare but its antithesis, they will continue to govern nations as if they are war camps. In the end, Uganda's tragedy may not be that Museveni once wore a bush uniform — but that he never took it off.

²⁴Clapham (n 1) 125–152.

²⁵Bayart (n 16) 89–115.

²⁶Bayart (n 16) 118–148.

CHAPTER 2

The Façade of Democracy

Electoral Authoritarianism, Controlled Opposition, and the Theatre of Pluralism

*"What is more dangerous than a dictatorship?
A dictatorship dressed as a democracy."*

Democracy is a sacred word in Uganda. It is recited in speeches, embossed in constitutional texts, celebrated in school civics classes, and televised every five years in spectacular electoral rituals. Yet, behind the banners and ballots lies a hollow theatre — an elaborate performance choreographed to appease donors, sedate citizens, and consolidate a regime that long abandoned the ideals of republican governance. What Uganda has mastered is not democracy but its imitation. As Larry Diamond has noted, many authoritarian regimes in the developing world have adopted what he terms "electoral authoritarianism" — a model in which elections exist not to transfer power, but to reinforce it.²⁷

The year 1986 marks an inflection point in Uganda's political history — a moment in which the language of liberation was spoken so convincingly that the world, weary of Uganda's cascading crises, chose to believe. After the chaos of Amin and the blood-stained return of Obote, the arrival of Museveni seemed like morning after long darkness. But the historian's task is not to record sentiment. It is to interrogate transformation. And when scrutinised carefully, what occurred in 1986 was not a transformation — it was a transfer of one form of militarised dominance to another, cloaked in the rhetoric of renewal.

The fundamental problem with liberation movements that ascend to power through armed struggle is not their methods — it is their metaphysics. They understand power as something seized, not delegated. They understand legitimacy as something earned in blood, not in ballots. They understand citizens as beneficiaries of their sacrifice, not principals to whom they are accountable. This is not cynicism — it is the structural legacy of insurgency. When the battlefield becomes the boardroom, and the commander becomes the president, these metaphysical assumptions do not dissolve. They calcify into governance doctrine.

Museveni has never fully departed from this model. His famous "Ten Point Programme" — issued in 1986 — spoke of democracy, the rule of law, and the elimination of corruption. These were not insincere words. But they were words

²⁷Diamond (n 15) 33–41.

authored by a guerrilla commander, not a constitutional democrat. And as the years accumulated, the programme was quietly archived while the commander endured. Each constitutional amendment — 2005, 2017, and beyond — is best understood not as political cynicism, but as the natural reflex of a man who internalised one truth from the bush: that power surrendered is power lost, and lost power is the beginning of death.

To understand Uganda's tragedy, one must understand the specific character of the National Resistance Movement as a political organisation. The NRM was not born as a political party. It was born as an armed movement. Its DNA is that of guerrilla organisation: hierarchical, secretive, loyalty-based, and intolerant of internal dissent. When it assumed national power, it did not shed this character. It simply scaled it. The party-state fusion that Ugandans now live under — where government resources are indistinguishable from party resources, where state machinery is deployed in election campaigns, where civil servants must attend NRM rallies — all of this flows from the genetic logic of the bush movement.

The pattern is not unique to Uganda. From Zimbabwe's ZANU-PF to Ethiopia's TPLF, from Angola's MPLA to Mozambique's FRELIMO, the post-liberation African state has repeatedly demonstrated its inability to transcend its own founding violence. Scholars such as Clapham and Levitsky and Way have provided theoretical frameworks for understanding this pattern. But Ugandans have lived it. They have watched a revolution calcify into a regime. They have watched liberation become occupation. They have watched the promise of freedom become the architecture of control.

This is not to say that nothing has changed. Uganda under Museveni has seen real economic growth, infrastructure development, and regional diplomatic leadership. The roads are better. HIV/AIDS has been significantly reduced. Some institutions have been strengthened. These achievements are real, and they deserve acknowledgement. But achievements in service delivery do not constitute democracy. They do not substitute for political freedom. Even in Singapore — often cited by Museveni himself as a model — the trade-off between economic efficiency and political liberty has been hotly contested by human rights defenders and political theorists alike. The question for Uganda is not whether things are better than under Amin. The question is whether Uganda is governed as a republic — with genuine accountability, genuine participation, and genuine rotation of power. On that measure, the answer remains troublingly negative.

The Permanent Emergency: How Crisis Has Become the Permanent State of Governance

One of the most sophisticated — and underappreciated — tools of authoritarian endurance in Uganda is the permanent emergency. This is not the formal declaration of a state of emergency — though those have occurred. It is, more dangerously, the manufacture of a permanent atmosphere of crisis that renders authoritarian intervention perpetually necessary and democratic deliberation perpetually premature. Every regime needs a justification for its grip. Uganda's regime has always had one ready: the threat of instability. From the Acholi rebels of the 1980s and 1990s, to the LRA, to the Rwenzururu insurgencies, to the ADF in the west, to the more recent "terrorism" of opposition politics, Uganda has never been without a crisis to justify the permanent vigilance of the state. This is not coincidence. It is design.

The politics of the permanent emergency operates through a specific logic: only the regime can hold the country together. Any weakening of state control — any opening of political space, any concession to opposition — risks a return to chaos. This argument is directed simultaneously at international donors (who fear instability more than they value democracy) and at domestic audiences (who have lived through real instability and do not wish to return). It is, in this way, an argument of genuine psychological power. But it is also a deeply cynical one. Because in many cases, the "instability" that justifies authoritarian control is itself a product of authoritarian governance — of exclusion, inequality, and the suppression of legitimate political expression.

The most powerful example of this dynamic is northern Uganda. The LRA conflict, which inflicted unspeakable suffering on the people of northern Uganda for over two decades, served — whatever its independent origins — as a political and logistical resource for the Museveni government. It justified emergency military presence in the north. It justified the restriction of political activity in conflict zones. It provided a constant reminder that without the UPDF, order would collapse. The eventual peace, brokered through the Juba Process, came not through military victory but through sustained negotiation — a fact that somewhat undercut the militarist narrative, but only partially. Because by then, the political habits of emergency governance were already deeply embedded.

The permanent emergency also serves to justify the criminalisation of political activity. When every gathering is a potential security threat, when every protest is a potential insurrection, when every critical speech is potential incitement — then the state can maintain a permanent posture of defensive intervention without ever having to acknowledge that what it is defending is not national security, but political monopoly. This is the genius, and the cruelty, of the permanent emergency: it transforms every citizen into a potential threat and every act of political participation into a potential crime. And in doing so, it makes the demobilisation of civil society seem like a public safety measure rather than

an act of political repression.

The Economy of Patronage: How Money Became the Language of Political Loyalty

In a functioning democracy, political parties compete through ideas. They develop policy platforms, mobilise voter blocs, and seek mandates. In Uganda's jungle state, parties do not primarily compete through ideas. They compete through resources. The NRM's overwhelming electoral dominance is not primarily a product of its popularity — it is a product of its access to the state's financial machinery. State resources — development funds, constituency allowances, road contracts, hospital equipment deliveries — are timed and targeted to coincide with electoral cycles. Areas that support the NRM receive development. Areas that support the opposition receive drought. This is not a metaphor. It is documented and systematic.

The patronage economy operates at every level. At the national level, cabinet positions and parastatal appointments are allocated not by merit but by political arithmetic — ensuring that every significant ethnic, regional, and religious constituency has a representative in the regime's tent. At the district level, local government contracts flow through networks of NRM loyalty. At the village level, cash handouts, branded goods, and salaried positions in local government structures create micro-economies of regime dependence. As Bayart has argued in his theory of the politics of the belly, African regimes maintain power not primarily through violence, but through the mobilisation of material resources that create webs of mutual dependence between rulers and ruled.

This patronage system has two particularly destructive effects. First, it destroys the moral economy of public service. When appointments are made by loyalty rather than competence, the quality of public service collapses. Uganda's health system, education system, and infrastructure reflect the costs of appointing political friends rather than professional managers. Second, it corrupts the moral economy of citizenship. When citizens learn that participation in the regime's network is the primary route to economic survival, political loyalty becomes rational even for those who despise the regime. The person who wears an NRM shirt and attends an NRM rally may privately contemplate the regime's failures — but cannot afford to express that contemplation, because too much of their economic security depends on the performance of loyalty.

In Uganda's case, democracy functions not as a mechanism for change but as a camouflage for continuity. Every election since 1996 has been marked by a familiar script: state-sponsored violence, arbitrary arrests of opposition leaders, media censorship, intimidation of voters, and the active involvement of security forces. The Electoral Commission — constitutionally mandated to act

independently — operates with de facto allegiance to the incumbent. Legal challenges to electoral fraud are routinely dismissed, often on technicalities, reinforcing what Oloka-Onyango calls the "judicialization of impunity" — a process by which courts are used to legitimate injustice under the guise of law. Parliament, though structurally robust, has largely failed to function as a check on executive overreach.²⁸

The judiciary, too, is caught in this web of institutional schizophrenia. At times, it asserts itself, issuing brave rulings against executive impunity. But more often, it bends under pressure — delivering judgements that preserve order, not justice. Judges who defy the regime are sidelined; those who comply are elevated. The law becomes both sword and shield — used selectively to criminalise opposition while protecting the excesses of the ruling elite. In such a system, legality is not synonymous with legitimacy. It is weaponised procedure. As Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way argue in their landmark study of competitive authoritarian regimes, electoral institutions are not destroyed but domesticated — their function is not to arbitrate but to simulate.²⁹

Yet the most dangerous aspect of Uganda's pseudo-democracy is its psychological effect. Over time, citizens begin to internalise the futility of participation. Voting becomes a ritual, not a right. Parliament becomes a spectacle, not a forum. The constitution becomes a symbol, not a shield. Hope becomes fatigue. In this climate, democracy is not killed — it is slowly drained of meaning. The façade becomes so convincing that even the oppressed begin to confuse performance with substance. And that, perhaps, is Museveni's greatest triumph — not just in maintaining power, but in convincing the world that he rules democratically.

Elections as Controlled Political Theatre

Elections in Uganda are not instruments of democratic renewal. They are rituals — well-timed spectacles designed to create the illusion of choice while ensuring the permanence of power. What the Ugandan state performs every five years is not democracy — it is political theatre. And like all theatre, it is carefully scripted, its outcome rehearsed, its actors briefed, and its ending foreknown. The roots of this performance lie in the regime's long-held understanding that in a post-colonial, aid-dependent state, legitimacy must be both domestic and international. At home, elections pacify the population by offering a periodic opportunity to vent. Abroad, they offer donors the procedural optics they require

²⁸Oloka-Onyango (n 5) 35–52.

²⁹Steven Levitsky and Lucan A Way, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) 3–25.

to justify continued support. The process is the product.³⁰

This is the paradox of what Diamond terms "competitive authoritarianism": regimes that adopt democratic institutions not to cede power, but to consolidate it. In such systems, opposition parties exist, elections occur, and courts operate – but all within a framework rigged for predictability. Uganda's elections follow this logic precisely. They are contests without contestation, debates without deliberation, races whose tracks are adjusted mid-run. From nomination to declaration of results, every electoral process is tightly choreographed. The Electoral Commission functions more like an arm of the regime, selectively enforcing laws, drawing electoral boundaries that favour incumbency, and disqualifying opposition candidates on procedural grounds. As Oloka-Onyango argues, legal frameworks in such contexts are not safeguards – they are levers of exclusion.³¹

State media becomes a mouthpiece for the ruling party. Private media, when not intimidated, is co-opted. Political advertisements from opposition parties are censored. Coverage is skewed. On voting day, voting materials arrive late in opposition strongholds. Voter registers are suspiciously incomplete. Security forces are deployed in large numbers, often intimidating the very populations they claim to protect. Ballot boxes are stuffed or disappear. And when the opposition contests the results, the judiciary – ever mindful of precedent and pressure – offers judgements that preserve calm by preserving the status quo. As Nic Cheeseman and Brian Klaas have shown, authoritarian regimes deploy a sophisticated toolkit for electoral manipulation that extends well beyond ballot stuffing – including the strategic deployment of incumbency resources, the use of legal harassment, and the co-optation of electoral management bodies.³²

The "Multiparty" System as a Mirage

Uganda's return to multiparty politics in 2005 was hailed as a watershed moment – a symbol of democratic maturity, the undoing of the Movement system, and a sign that the country had finally embraced political pluralism. But this return, like much in the post-1986 political landscape, was not a transformation. It was a reinvention of the old script, dressed in the vocabulary of reform. The "multiparty system" was not restored to empower opposition or create balance; it was reintroduced to validate a long-standing monopoly. The system was plural in name, but singular in purpose – to legitimise the ruling regime. True multiparty democracy demands more than multiple logos on a

³⁰Tripp (n 6) 118–145.

³¹Oloka-Onyango (n 5) 55–78.

³²Nic Cheeseman and Brian Klaas, *How to Rig an Election* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018) 1–22.

ballot sheet. It demands equality in law, fairness in process, and freedom in participation. Uganda offers none of these in substance.³³

The structure of Uganda's political landscape reflects this distortion. The ruling National Resistance Movement (NRM) has fused itself with the machinery of the state. Public servants attend NRM events in government vehicles. Public funds are channelled into NRM campaign infrastructure. The line between the party and the state is not blurred — it is obliterated. Meanwhile, opposition parties must fundraise from a weary public, organise under surveillance, and campaign amidst roadblocks and teargas. This is not competition. It is containment. This phenomenon fits neatly within the framework of "authoritarian multipartyism," as described by Nicolas Van de Walle, in which ruling parties dominate supposedly competitive systems by controlling state resources, media access, and institutional rules. Under this model, the regime plays the game of democracy without ever risking the outcome.³⁴

Even within Parliament, where multiparty engagement should thrive, opposition parties face a numerically overwhelming and ideologically disciplined NRM majority. Debates are held, motions are tabled, and objections are raised — but all within the safe confines of an institution structurally biased against dissent. The passing of the age limit amendment in 2017 was a clear demonstration: no matter how fierce the opposition's protest, the machinery of state-aligned power will move forward, even if it must do so under the cover of night, behind locked parliamentary doors. The tragedy of Uganda's multipartyism is not that it failed. It is that it was never meant to succeed. As Tripp argues, authoritarian multiparty systems thrive when opposition forces are fractured, regulated, and rendered harmless by their own existence.³⁵

³³Nic Cheeseman, *Democracy in Africa: Successes, Failures, and the Struggle for Political Reform* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) 45–78.

³⁴Nicolas Van de Walle, *African Economies and the Politics of Permanent Crisis, 1979–1999* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) 41–62.

³⁵Tripp (n 6) 148–175.

CHAPTER 3

The Military Doctrine of Governance

Command Politics, Securitisation, and the Architecture of the War Camp

"Where others govern through policy, he governs through orders. Where others convene cabinets, he assembles command."

Uganda is not governed in the republican sense of the word — it is commanded. From State House to sub-county offices, the ruling logic is not one of civic negotiation, but of strategic deployment. The country is not administered as a nation-state with a separation of powers, but as a militarised zone where every institution is subordinated to the psychology of control. The doctrine that guides governance is not democratic — it is martial. The state is run as a base, the people as subjects under surveillance, and the opposition as an enemy to be managed, not engaged. As Clapham and Luckham have separately argued, many African regimes that rise to power through armed struggle tend to replicate the very logic of militarism within their civilian institutions.³⁶

In Uganda, the military is not a national force — it is a political organ. The Uganda People's Defence Forces (UPDF) occupy a central role in state affairs beyond their constitutional mandate. Retired generals are placed in ministries. Active-duty officers hold ambassadorships. Military intelligence infiltrates civil spaces — universities, the media, courts, Parliament. Even the Ministry of Agriculture, the national COVID-19 task force, and Operation Wealth Creation have been militarised. The message is clear: no sector is too civilian to escape the gaze of the gun. This militarised governance is reinforced by a pervasive doctrine of securitisation. Every problem becomes a security issue. Dissent is framed as instability. Unions are infiltrated. Student protests are met with riot police. As Bayart, Ellis and Hibou contend, African regimes often use the rhetoric of security to justify authoritarian expansion, conflating regime survival with national survival.³⁷

The doctrine of command extends to Parliament. Legislative debates are less about substance and more about alignment. The ruling party's majority is not ideological — it is strategic. MPs are whipped into line by promises of patronage or threats of exclusion. Key votes — such as the constitutional amendments of 2005 and 2017 — are secured not through deliberation, but through enforcement.

³⁶Clapham (n 1) 155–183.

³⁷Bayart, Ellis and Hibou (n 8) 65–98.

The judiciary, too, operates under the long shadow of the military doctrine. As Oloka-Onyango observes, the rule of law in such contexts is "selectively applied" – used to punish the weak and protect the regime. Justice becomes procedural. Legality is weaponised. Mamdani's analysis of the bifurcated state is particularly instructive here: the formal institutions of the republic coexist with informal networks of command, creating a dual structure in which constitutional rights are acknowledged in principle and denied in practice.³⁸

Why Uganda Is Ruled as a War Camp, Not a Republic

Uganda is ruled not as a republic governed by the rule of law, but as a war camp governed by the law of survival. Its structures may resemble those of a modern democratic state – parliament, courts, elections, a written constitution – but these are the outer walls of a fortress, not the halls of open governance. Beneath them lies a command economy of fear, loyalty, and obedience. To rule as a republic is to submit oneself to a framework of limitation. It is to accept that power is temporary, contingent, and subject to public review. But to rule as a warlord is to see power as conquest – something earned through blood, held through loyalty, and preserved through vigilance. Clapham observed in the broader African context that many post-liberation states suffer from "guerrilla syndrome" – a condition where command politics substitutes institutional development.³⁹

The logic of a war camp also explains Uganda's obsession with security. Every civil action – be it a protest, a tweet, a sermon, or a song – is interpreted through the lens of threat assessment. Police officers behave like sentries. Soldiers attend political meetings. Intelligence services monitor civil society with the rigor of battlefield reconnaissance. This is not statecraft. It is surveillance warfare. The citizen is not seen as a stakeholder in governance but as a variable in a security equation. In this war camp model, information is a weapon, not a public good. State-run media does not inform – it reinforces control. As Bayart, Ellis, and Hibou point out, regimes that rule through command systems often suppress public discourse not because they fear falsehood, but because they fear truth without permission.⁴⁰

The structure of electoral politics in Uganda is also shaped by war camp logic. Elections are treated like military campaigns – strategically planned, logistically controlled, and psychologically managed. Voters are not courted – they are directed. Opposition candidates are not debated – they are neutralised. Security forces are deployed to polling stations as if repelling an invasion. As

³⁸ Oloka-Onyango (n 5) 81–103.

³⁹ Clapham (n 1) 186–215.

⁴⁰ Bayart, Ellis and Hibou (n 8) 101–133.

Levitsky and Way argue, such electoral regimes maintain a façade of democracy, but operate through coercion and performance. Even time itself is managed in war camp fashion. The future is a threat, the past a justification. Succession planning is treated as sabotage. Calls for transition are labelled destabilising. The commander cannot retire — because in a war camp, retreat is betrayal.⁴¹

The Militarisation of Public Institutions

In a healthy republic, public institutions are the scaffolding of democracy — civilian in character, impartial in function, and accountable in structure. They exist to regulate power, protect citizens, and advance the public good. But under jungle rule, these institutions are not protectors of the people — they are protectors of the regime. Nowhere is this shift more visible than in the Uganda Police Force. Once imagined as a civilian agency for upholding law and order, it has morphed into a paramilitary instrument of political control. The Public Order Management Act (2013), which ostensibly regulates public assemblies, has become a legislative bludgeon used to suppress dissent and criminalise civic participation. As Oloka-Onyango notes, such legal instruments in pseudo-democracies function less as regulatory frameworks and more as tools for state surveillance and suppression.⁴²

The judiciary, too, bears the scars of quiet militarisation. Judges who dare to rule against the state are blacklisted, transferred, or quietly silenced. Those who conform are rewarded with promotions, security, or political insulation. Courtrooms become stages where justice is scripted to fit regime narratives. Though the Constitution proclaims the independence of the judiciary, in practice, critical cases — especially electoral petitions, constitutional amendments, and public interest litigation — are resolved with calculated restraint. As Tripp observes, judicial systems in authoritarian regimes are not dismantled; they are co-opted. The law becomes a vocabulary of control. Verdicts are delayed, rulings are cloaked in technicalities, and jurisprudence is twisted to match political winds.⁴³

The civil service, once designed to implement public policy through competence, neutrality, and professionalism, now operates as an extension of the ruling party's logistical machinery. Key positions are no longer filled by technocrats, but by regime loyalists, often with military backgrounds or intelligence credentials. The recruitment process is riddled with patronage. Merit is subordinate to allegiance. Service is subordinate to strategy. Permanent secretaries, directors, commissioners, and local government officials function

⁴¹Levitsky and Way (n 29) 28–55.

⁴²Oloka-Onyango (n 5) 107–131.

⁴³Tripp (n 6) 178–205.

less as administrators and more as political sentries. This shift toward militarised governance reflects what Bayart terms "the criminalisation of the state" — where institutions are repurposed for regime preservation rather than nation-building. Even universities are not immune. Vice-chancellors report to State House liaisons. Student guilds are infiltrated by security agents. Academic freedom is gradually strangled by invisible hands.⁴⁴

State Violence as a Governance Tool

In a just republic, violence is a last resort — regulated, restrained, and used sparingly to restore order or defend life. But in Uganda's jungle polity, violence is not exceptional. It is operational. It is not the failure of governance — it is its strategy. The state does not use violence when governance collapses; it uses violence to govern. Teargas becomes legislation. Rubber bullets become policy. Blood becomes a language through which power speaks to those it cannot persuade. The systematic deployment of state violence is not merely an act of repression — it is a doctrine of rule. It functions as a warning, a message, a mechanism of control. As Foucault observed, power does not simply punish to correct — it punishes to communicate. Every public beating, every raid is a communiqué from the state: this land belongs to the commander, and you are here on sufferance.⁴⁵

The 2020 killings — following the arrest of opposition candidate Robert Kyagulanyi — are but one example. Over fifty Ugandans were gunned down in broad daylight, their names buried beneath press briefings about "criminal elements" and "national security." No high-ranking official was held accountable. No national day of mourning was declared. As Tripp notes, authoritarian regimes rely on targeted violence not to crush entire populations, but to traumatise just enough of them to paralyse the rest. This violence extends beyond bullets. It includes legal violence — arbitrary arrests, indefinite detention without trial, spurious charges like "inciting violence" or "spreading false information." It includes economic violence — freezing of bank accounts, sabotage of opposition donors, harassment of business owners who support dissenters. It includes psychological violence — constant surveillance, digital intimidation, public shaming. Violence in Uganda is not episodic. It is ambient.⁴⁶

The normalisation of violence gradually rewires the public psyche. Citizens learn to walk differently, speak cautiously, avoid gatherings, erase tweets, and keep their heads down. Violence becomes a silent partner in daily life. It defines the limits of speech, association, and imagination. It enforces a civic neurosis —

⁴⁴Bayart (n 16) 151–185.

⁴⁵Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977) 3–31.

⁴⁶Tripp (n 6) 208–238.

an internalised fear that one wrong step might summon the wrath of the state. As Fanon observed, the colonised mind often internalises the violence of the oppressor – until fear itself becomes governance. Uganda's state violence is not a rogue impulse. It is a regime logic. And until the boot is removed from the neck of the citizen, no constitution, no election, no institution can speak of freedom with sincerity.⁴⁷

⁴⁷Fanon (n 2) 251–279.

PART II

Governing Through Controlled Chaos

"Where there is no chaos, it must be manufactured. Where there is no threat, it must be imagined. Control is best preserved in confusion."

The highest genius of authoritarian survival is not brute force — it is disruption masquerading as disorder. A well-established tyranny does not simply impose itself with violence; it governs through the strategic mismanagement of peace. It becomes the only source of stability in a nation carefully deprived of it. In Uganda, the state does not fear chaos. It curates it. It permits just enough volatility to appear indispensable, just enough dysfunction to seem irreplaceable, and just enough crisis to justify coercion. This is not failed governance — it is engineered ambiguity. It is controlled chaos. As Mamdani warns, in bifurcated states, the ruler maintains power not by resolving contradictions, but by manipulating them.⁴⁸

In this system, corruption is not an aberration — it is policy. It keeps elites dependent, ministries weak, and accountability diffused. Anti-corruption campaigns are selectively enforced to discipline the disloyal, while loyal thieves thrive in silence. Likewise, the opposition is allowed to exist — but only in crisis. Leaders are elevated and dismantled in cycles of media hype and state crackdown. Civil society is permitted, but under surveillance. Public anger is permitted, but only in the form of "peaceful protests" that end in teargas. Nothing is truly resolved. Everything is postponed. The education system is intentionally underfunded — producing half-literate, half-angry generations who are too economically dependent to rebel but too politically aware to believe. As Bayart, Ellis and Hibou describe in *The Criminalisation of the State*, authoritarian rulers maintain dominance by managing disorder like an invisible puppeteer — never quite fixing anything, never quite breaking everything.⁴⁹

⁴⁸Mamdani (n 4) 69–107.

⁴⁹Bayart, Ellis and Hibou (n 8) 137–168.

CHAPTER 4

The Politics of Fear and Survival

Engineering Compliance Through Ambient Terror and Psychological Warfare

*"Fear is not just a feeling — it is a strategy.
And in Uganda, it is the regime's most
enduring policy."*

In republics, leaders rule by consent. In tyrannies, they rule by coercion. But in Uganda's jungle order, power is maintained through a subtler craft — the politics of fear. It is not merely about violent repression, though violence plays its part. It is about engineering a national mood of exhaustion, suspicion, and psychological disarmament. It is about transforming fear into a governing tool, and survival into a political virtue. Fear is not incidental in Uganda's political architecture — it is structural. It flows from the speeches, seeps through institutions, and lingers in everyday life. As Foucault observed, the most effective power is that which disciplines not through visible chains, but through the internalisation of control.⁵⁰

Museveni's regime has mastered the art of fear — not as spectacle, but as a system. The objective is not to destroy opposition outright, but to reduce it to a performance of survival. The opposition exists, but under constant siege. Their homes are raided. Their rallies are blocked. Their supporters are arrested. But they are not eradicated — they are kept barely breathing, as a warning to others. This carefully modulated repression achieves a dual purpose. First, it silences those who might resist. Second, it redefines what it means to "survive" in Uganda — not as a citizen with rights, but as a subject who knows when to stay quiet. Survival becomes a political identity. As Bayart notes in *The State in Africa*, regimes of fear thrive not by eradicating opposition but by ensuring that every act of dissent feels like a descent into danger.⁵¹

Fear is also distributed unequally. The powerful are protected by proximity to the regime. The elite are kept loyal through patronage. But the majority — students, vendors, youth in ghettos, the unemployed — bear the full brunt of state insecurity. They are monitored, harassed, and periodically brutalised. Their dreams are downsized into survival instincts. Their politics are replaced with hustle. The result is a young population that is radical in private, but quiet in public — a generation groomed to endure, not to engage. Fear also fragments

⁵⁰Foucault (n 45) 32–72.

⁵¹Bayart (n 16) 188–220.

solidarity. It turns neighbours into informants. Colleagues into spies. Movements into mistrust. The state does not always need to infiltrate — its mere reputation for doing so is enough to make activists look suspiciously at each other. Collective resistance is disabled not by arrests alone, but by uncertainty.⁵²

Why a Dictator Thrives on Instability

In the psychology of tyranny, instability is not a threat — it is a currency. It is both the justification for rule and the instrument through which power is retained. In Uganda, the myth of the benevolent strongman — one who brings order to chaos — is sustained by ensuring that the chaos never actually disappears. The dictator does not solve the problem. He manages it, curates it, controls its temperature. Too little, and he appears unnecessary. Too much, and he risks collapse. But just enough instability? That is where he thrives. Yoweri Kaguta Museveni has long presented himself as the guarantor of national stability — a bulwark against the chaos of the past and the confusion of the future. This posture requires a constant enemy, a permanent crisis, a perpetual "unfinished project."⁵³

Instability is manufactured in doses. Opposition parties are allowed to exist, but only if they remain weak, divided, and discredited. Corruption is tolerated — then condemned — then tolerated again, ensuring that no system is ever truly fixed. Ethnic and regional tensions are subtly reignited, then publicly lamented. As Clapham observes, authoritarian regimes often maintain their grip by perpetuating what he terms "managed disorder" — a careful calibration of uncertainty that erodes collective action, diverts attention, and magnifies the need for a central stabilising force. In Uganda, every crisis is an opportunity. When inflation spikes, blame is shifted to global markets. When insecurity rises, the military is deployed. When youth unemployment causes unrest, new empowerment programmes are announced. But the structural issues are never addressed. Because the dictator's power is predicated on perpetual vulnerability.⁵⁴

Manufactured Crises as Tools of Control

In functional republics, crises are rare and unwelcome. They are seen as failures of governance, moments of institutional strain that demand urgent resolution. But under jungle rule, crises are not exceptions — they are extensions of policy. They are not feared — they are engineered. In Uganda, the regime does not merely respond to crises; it creates them, cultivates them, and exploits them.

⁵²Fanon (n 2) 284–318.

⁵³Clapham (n 1) 218–248.

⁵⁴Clapham (n 1) 251–282.

To govern through crisis is to ensure that the population is always off-balance, always anxious, always in need of the state's intervention. Manufactured crises serve to disrupt stability long enough to reinforce the idea that only one man, one party, or one security apparatus can hold the country together. As Foucault reminds us, modern power is not exercised simply through violence, but through the management of uncertainty.⁵⁵

The most insidious crises are those that masquerade as bureaucratic failures. Delays in service delivery, underfunding of education, shortages in health care, and land disputes are not merely signs of inefficiency — they are part of a broader tactic of governance by exhaustion. The public is kept in a perpetual state of complaint — too distracted by daily frustrations to organise, too burdened to rebel. Every queue at a government office, every bribe for a hospital bed is an unspoken message: the state controls not only your rights, but your inconveniences. Even in moments of genuine catastrophe — like natural disasters or pandemics — the regime does not hesitate to politicise crisis. During COVID-19, food relief became a weapon of loyalty. Lockdowns were enforced more aggressively in opposition strongholds. As Tripp observes, authoritarian regimes often treat emergencies not as periods of shared vulnerability, but as opportunities to consolidate dominance.⁵⁶

The Balance Between Repression and Token Freedoms

The longevity of authoritarian regimes does not lie in brute force alone. No dictator rules by the gun indefinitely without inviting a backlash. True survival demands subtlety — a refined choreography between fear and illusion, submission and spectacle. In Uganda, the regime's genius lies in mastering this balance: enforcing repression while distributing just enough freedom to keep the citizenry pacified, distracted, and divided. Museveni's state is neither fully closed nor truly open. It exists in a carefully moderated state of ambiguity — repressive enough to suppress real change, permissive enough to mimic reform. This equilibrium is what Levitsky and Way define as competitive authoritarianism — a system that institutionalises competition while neutralising its consequences.⁵⁷

These token freedoms serve multiple functions. First, they manage international perception. The regime knows that foreign donors, human rights organisations, and global media watch Uganda closely. By occasionally permitting debate, funding civil society, or tolerating critical voices, the state can point to its "open space" while continuing to consolidate control. Second, these freedoms maintain domestic illusion. Citizens are not crushed entirely — they are

⁵⁵Foucault (n 45) 75–114.

⁵⁶Tripp (n 6) 241–271.

⁵⁷Levitsky and Way (n 29) 57–89.

sedated. They are shown headlines of parliamentary debates. They are allowed to attend rallies — sometimes. They are permitted to vote, even if the results are predetermined. As Foucault observed, control does not always require prohibition. It requires anticipation. The citizen's internalised sense of risk does the work of the regime.⁵⁸

Even the judiciary plays its role in this choreography. Occasionally, brave rulings are delivered — striking down repressive laws, releasing political prisoners, or affirming civil rights. These rulings are praised, quoted, and used to prove the regime's commitment to the rule of law. But structurally, nothing changes. The very same courts later uphold electoral theft, ignore torture claims, and justify draconian security measures. Justice, in this balance, becomes an event — not a system. Opposition politics follows the same pattern. Political parties are registered and allowed to campaign. Leaders like Dr. Kizza Besigye and Robert Kyagulanyi are allowed to rise — only to be beaten, arrested, bankrupted, or banned. Yet their presence remains crucial to the regime's image. They prove that Uganda is "not a dictatorship." That dissent is tolerated. That anyone can run for president. What the public forgets is that anyone can run — but only one man can win.⁵⁹

⁵⁸Foucault (n 45) 117–163.

⁵⁹Tripp (n 6) 274–302.

CHAPTER 5

Corruption as a Political Weapon

Strategic Graft, Patronage Networks, and the Architecture of Manufactured Loyalty

The Architecture of Institutional Capture: How the State Apparatus Was Repurposed

One of the defining features of Uganda's jungle state is not what it has destroyed, but what it has repurposed. The NRM regime did not abolish the institutions of the Ugandan state — it captured them. Parliament still sits. Courts still convene. The Electoral Commission still operates. Universities still teach. But beneath the institutional form, the substance has been hollowed out and refilled with regime logic. This process of institutional capture is subtle, cumulative, and extraordinarily effective at maintaining the appearance of democratic governance while eliminating its operational substance.

The judiciary offers the clearest example. Uganda's courts have, on occasion, delivered brave and consequential rulings against the state. The Supreme Court's 2016 presidential election petition, though ultimately dismissing the challenge, produced a now-famous judgement in which five of seven justices found that electoral malpractice had occurred. Individual judges have struck down repressive laws, granted bail to political prisoners, and affirmed constitutional rights in language of genuine democratic principle. These moments are real, and they matter. But they exist within a judicial system that is structurally compromised: appointment is executive-controlled, salaries are government-dependent, court buildings are government property, and the careers of judges who consistently rule against the state tend not to flourish. The brave rulings are the exception that the regime uses to prove its commitment to the rule of law. The structural bias is the norm that enables its continuation.

Parliament has undergone an even more dramatic transformation. The 10th and 11th Parliaments, in particular, have been characterised by a NRM majority so overwhelming, and so disciplined, that meaningful legislative opposition is arithmetically impossible. The passage of the age limit amendment in September 2017 — effected after opposition MPs were forcibly removed from the chamber, amid reports of hired thugs inside parliament, and concluded in a night session — represents the nadir of legislative integrity. But it was not exceptional. It was the logical endpoint of a process of parliamentary capture that has been ongoing since 1986. When MPs are chosen through a party machine controlled by the executive, when their financial survival depends on constituency projects allocated by the executive, when they are threatened with deregistration if they defy the party whip — Parliament cannot function as a

democratic institution. It can only function as a validation machine for executive decisions.

The Electoral Commission epitomises the paradox of institutional capture. It exists. It has a chairman, commissioners, district officers, returning officers, and an operational budget. It holds elections on schedule. It counts votes and declares results. In all formal respects, it performs its constitutional mandate. But the commission is not independent. Its commissioners are appointed by the president. Its budget is controlled by the executive. Its decisions on candidate disqualification, constituency boundary demarcation, and electoral rules interpretation consistently favour the incumbent. No serious electoral observer – international or domestic – has ever concluded that Uganda's presidential elections under Museveni have met basic standards of free and fair competition. The commission is not a democratic institution. It is the costume democracy wears while authoritarian governance runs the show.

Youth Unemployment as Political Strategy

One of the most underanalysed aspects of Uganda's political economy is the strategic utility of youth unemployment. Uganda has one of the youngest populations in the world – with approximately 75% of its citizens under the age of 30. It also has one of the highest youth unemployment rates on the continent. This combination is not accidental. It is, in part, the product of deliberate policy choices that maintain a large pool of economically desperate young people who can be mobilised, bribed, or threatened into political compliance.

A government genuinely committed to democratic development would treat youth unemployment as a national emergency – investing massively in education quality, vocational training, industrial policy, and entrepreneurship ecosystems. Uganda has instead pursued a series of high-profile youth empowerment programmes – Youth Livelihood Programme, Operation Wealth Creation, Parish Development Model – that consistently fail to deliver systemic change while succeeding in generating political capital for the regime. These programmes are announced with fanfare, implemented with patronage, and evaluated with impunity. Their failure is documented, but not addressed. Because their political function is not to create employment – it is to create the appearance of caring about youth employment while maintaining the conditions of dependency that make young Ugandans politically manageable.

The political management of youth takes two complementary forms. The first is co-optation: the distribution of limited resources – bodaboda registration funds, seed capital loans, market stall allocations – to politically loyal youth. These distributions are insufficient to create genuine economic independence, but sufficient to create political gratitude and dependency. The second is

criminalisation: the systematic targeting of politically active young people through police harassment, arbitrary arrest, and public humiliation. The young man who joins People Power is not offered a livelihood programme — he is offered a prison cell. The combination of co-optation for loyalists and criminalisation for dissidents creates a powerful incentive structure: stay loyal, receive scraps; dissent, receive violence.

The long-term consequence of this approach is the political infantilisation of Uganda's youth. A generation that might have been the engine of democratic transformation has instead been managed into political dependency or political silence. But this management has limits. When the pool of economically desperate young people becomes too large, when the scraps become too small, when the violence becomes too visible and too random — the political calculations that have historically kept youth in check begin to shift. The 2020 election — and the mass killings that followed the arrest of Bobi Wine — may represent an early inflection point in this shift. Whether it heralds genuine transformation or is absorbed into the regime's perpetual motion machine remains the central political question of Uganda's immediate future.

"In the jungle, corruption is not a flaw — it is the fuel. It oils the machinery of tyranny and greases the hands that hold the guns."

In republics, corruption is condemned as a betrayal of public trust. It is prosecuted, exposed, and treated as a symptom of moral or institutional failure. But in jungle rule, corruption is not an aberration — it is the system. It is not the rot that weakens the regime — it is the nutrient that sustains it. Under Yoweri Kaguta Museveni's long reign, corruption has evolved beyond mere self-enrichment. It has been weaponised into a deliberate instrument of political control. The logic is cruelly brilliant: if everyone is dirty, no one is clean enough to resist. In Uganda, corruption is a strategic act of governance. It is used to buy loyalty, weaken opposition, reward silence, and entangle potential rivals. As Bayart describes in his theory of the politics of the belly, African regimes often rule through systems of elite consumption, where access to state resources is the primary currency of loyalty.⁶⁰

This weaponisation of corruption is visible in every tier of the Ugandan state. From inflated road contracts to ghost schools, from police bribes to military procurement rackets, corruption is not hidden — it is normalised. Those who participate are protected. Those who expose it are punished. Whistleblowers

⁶⁰Bayart (n 16) 223–258.

are not heroes — they are enemies of the state. Investigative journalists are arrested. Anti-corruption agencies are defunded or politically neutered. Public outrage is redirected through presidential "task forces" that begin with announcements and end in silence. What emerges is a perverse kind of equilibrium: everyone knows corruption is endemic, but no one dares move against it. Those in power are compromised by their own excesses. Those outside power are discredited as hypocrites or targeted with investigations of their own. As Rose-Ackerman observed, in deeply corrupt systems, institutions cease to function as impartial entities and become marketplaces for influence.⁶¹

But corruption in Uganda is not only financial — it is ideological. It corrupts not just the budget, but the belief in public service. It teaches citizens that merit is meaningless, that rules are negotiable, that law is irrelevant. A bribe becomes more effective than a vote. A connection more useful than a constitution. A favour more powerful than a policy. This ideological corrosion is particularly devastating among the youth. Born into a system where "connections" trump credentials, they grow up learning that success is not earned — it is purchased or inherited. Their aspirations are not civic — they are transactional. Their political engagement is not transformative — it is opportunistic. Hope is privatised, and the republic becomes an auction. Even anti-corruption rhetoric becomes a political tool. Museveni often laments corruption in his speeches — blaming "bad cadres" or "foreign influence." But these declarations are never followed by structural reform. The dictator poses as the disappointed patriarch, lamenting a family he himself has raised.⁶²

Selective Prosecution and Controlled Accountability

In a functioning republic, accountability is a universal principle. It is blind to status, immune to political expediency, and guided by a commitment to public integrity. But in Uganda's jungle state, accountability is not universal — it is tactical. It is not impartial — it is instrumental. The law is not a tool of justice — it is a weapon of discipline. And prosecution is not a pursuit of truth — it is a performance of order. This is the paradox of authoritarian legalism: the state obeys the letter of the law while betraying its spirit. Investigations are opened. Commissions of inquiry are launched. Cases are filed in court. But behind the appearance of due process lies the reality of selective enforcement. As Schedler notes, competitive authoritarian regimes retain democratic institutions not to empower citizens, but to manage perception and neutralise dissent.⁶³

⁶¹ Susan Rose-Ackerman, *Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) 1–25.

⁶² Bayart, Ellis and Hibou (n 8) 171–202.

⁶³ Andreas Schedler, *Electoral Authoritarianism: The Dynamics of Unfree Competition* (Boulder: Lynne

In Uganda, corruption is rampant and well-documented. The embezzlement of billions from public coffers, the inflation of government contracts, the plundering of donor funds — all are known. Yet only a few are prosecuted. And those few tend to fall into one of two categories: the expendable, or the disobedient. The expendable are scapegoated to pacify public anger. The disobedient are targeted to enforce regime discipline. Loyalty protects; defiance convicts. This selective prosecution turns the judiciary into a political theatre. Cases against opposition leaders are fast-tracked and publicised. Bail is denied. Charges are stacked — treason, incitement, terrorism. But cases against regime insiders are delayed, mishandled, or dismissed entirely. The Inspectorate of Government, the Directorate of Public Prosecutions, and the Anti-Corruption Court all exist — but their efficacy is governed by invisible lines. As Oloka-Onyango observes, legal institutions in Uganda often function as both shield and sword for the regime — protecting its allies while punishing its enemies.⁶⁴

Rienner, 2006) 1–27.

⁶⁴Oloka-Onyango (n 5) 135–158.

CHAPTER 6

The Opposition's Trap

Co-optation, Criminalisation, and the Architecture of Managed Dissent

*"A jungle never fears noise – it fears silence.
The regime does not crush the opposition; it
consumes it, then stages it as proof of
democracy."*

In a true republic, opposition is the engine of accountability. It challenges excess, checks ambition, and offers alternative visions of governance. But in Uganda's jungle state, opposition is not empowered to oppose – it is permitted to exist. And in its permitted existence lies its greatest trap. It is tolerated not to democratise the regime, but to legitimise it. Museveni's Uganda has mastered the art of managing dissent. It does not outlaw opposition – it orchestrates it. It allows political parties to operate, candidates to campaign, and critics to speak – so long as none of them disturb the throne. The opposition becomes part of the spectacle: vocal, visible, but never victorious. As Schedler explains in his theory of "electoral authoritarianism," regimes like Uganda's maintain formal democratic structures while rendering them functionally impotent.⁶⁵

The trap begins with access. Opposition politicians are granted airtime, parliamentary seats, and public platforms. But access comes with parameters. Speak, but not too loudly. Mobilise, but only within sanctioned zones. Campaign, but expect surveillance. Protest, but be ready for prison. The regime does not fear these rituals. It relies on them. They give the illusion of contest. They exhaust the public. They recycle the same spectacle until the people no longer believe that elections are a path to power. Dissent becomes entertainment. Resistance becomes routine. As Fanon warned, when revolutionary energy is ritualised, it loses its fire and becomes part of the system it once sought to destroy. The trap deepens through co-optation. Prominent opposition leaders are offered positions, perks, or protection in exchange for silence. Others are neutralised through economic sabotage. Still more are bogged down by endless court battles, financial strain, or public smear campaigns.⁶⁶

Opposition parties, chronically underfunded and fragmented, become vulnerable to internal betrayal. Agents of the regime infiltrate their ranks, sowing mistrust, leaking strategies, and splitting movements. Political egos are inflated.

⁶⁵Schedler (n 63) 28–53.

⁶⁶Bayart (n 16) 261–295.

Alliances crumble. Even civil society — once a vital extension of the opposition — is increasingly ensnared. NGOs are required to register under hostile legislation. Foreign-funded organisations are labelled as agents of destabilisation. And then there is Parliament — the opposition's gilded cage. A few seats are handed over as trophies. Speeches are allowed. Protests are staged. But the ruling party's numerical advantage, procedural control, and legislative dominance ensure that nothing substantial ever passes. The greatest irony is that the existence of the opposition strengthens Museveni's grip. He points to them in interviews. He boasts about Uganda's "vibrant democracy." As Cheeseman and Klaas have shown, this is a hallmark of sophisticated electoral authoritarianism: the strategic use of controlled opposition to manufacture the appearance of democratic pluralism.⁶⁷

The Cycle of Arrests, Beatings, and Political Imprisonment

Authoritarianism, especially in its evolved 21st-century forms, no longer relies on mass killings and overt terror to assert control. Instead, it refines its violence into cycles — predictable, calibrated, and deeply symbolic. In Uganda, this cycle is the unending rhythm of arrest, beating, and imprisonment, used not to eliminate opposition, but to domesticate it. The cycle is ritualistic. First comes the arrest. Opposition leaders, student activists, or vocal citizens are seized — often without warrant, often in public, often live-streamed. The state does not hide its brutality. It parades it. The arrest is designed to humiliate — to discredit the dissenter, to remind their followers of their vulnerability, and to reinforce the omnipresence of state surveillance. As Schedler notes, modern autocracies perform repression in the open, not to deny it, but to normalise it.⁶⁸

Then comes the beating — usually at the hands of security operatives, often in transit, rarely in uniform. Victims are blindfolded, tied, kicked, electrocuted, or left bruised and bloodied. As Foucault warned in *Discipline and Punish*, violence in such systems is theatrical — it marks the body, not just to hurt, but to send a message: "you are touchable." And by extension, so is anyone else who tries what you did. Political imprisonment follows, often under vague charges: "inciting violence," "unlawful assembly," "spreading harmful propaganda," or the ever-elastic "terrorism." Detention is prolonged. Bail is delayed. The goal is not conviction. The goal is attrition. And then, almost inevitably, the cycle resets: the accused is released — usually with no apology, no justice, no explanation. This carefully timed release allows the regime to appear merciful, while robbing the detainee of their political momentum.⁶⁹

⁶⁷Cheeseman and Klaas (n 32) 25–58.

⁶⁸Schedler (n 63) 54–88.

⁶⁹Foucault (n 45) 167–212.

Repeated imprisonment of opposition leaders — Kizza Besigye, Robert Kyagulanyi, and many others — is not meant to destroy them physically, but to dilute their potency. By arresting them repeatedly, the state reframes their defiance as disorder. Their names become associated not with solutions, but with chaos, disruption, and instability. Their movements are stalled. Their supporters are fatigued. Their time is wasted. Each arrest is followed by a barrage of propaganda: accusations of foreign backing, threats to national security, incitement of tribalism, or links to terrorism. The regime does not just imprison bodies — it arrests reputations. It constructs the protestor as the problem, and the regime as the reluctant defender of "stability." As Tripp observes, repression becomes most effective when it creates self-policing societies. The cycle of trauma suppresses long-term organising. Fear seeps into communities, churches, families.⁷⁰

⁷⁰Tripp (n 6) 305–335.

PART III

The Fate of Resistance in a Jungle State

"What happens to a people who fight for freedom within the walls built to contain it? What happens when even resistance becomes a rehearsal?"

In the jungle state, resistance is not only dangerous — it is disorienting. It emerges not in clarity, but in confusion. It gathers not in parliaments, but in prisons. Those who rise — who dare to speak, organise, or dream beyond the boundaries drawn by power — are not immediately eliminated. The jungle is more cunning. It watches them. Allows them airtime. Allows them to gather. And then, methodically, it begins the slow work of distortion: they are criminalised, brutalised, or legitimised just enough to be neutralised. This is the fate of resistance under such a regime — not sudden death, but slow absorption. Not defeat in battle, but exhaustion through performance. The leader is not just arrested — he is recycled. The movement is not just banned — it is licensed. The dream is not just crushed — it is branded and sold. This part explores the anatomy of that fate.⁷¹

⁷¹Human Rights Watch, *Curtailing Criticism: Intimidation and Obstruction of Civil Society in Uganda* (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2012) 1–22.

CHAPTER 7

The Story of Uganda's Crushed Rebels

Armed Uprisings, Constitutional Resistance, and the Architecture of Erasure

To study Uganda's political history is to read a catalogue of resistance — and its calculated erasure. From bush warriors who dared to dream of people's liberation, to defiant civilians who stood against militarised oppression, the country's landscape is littered with the bones of rebellion — not just physical, but ideological. The rebels were many. Their fates were nearly identical. But not in the ways history books often imply. Rebels in Uganda are not merely confronted on the battlefield. They are spiritually dismantled, politically disfigured, and historically neutralised. The regime does not just defeat resistance — it curates its memory. It ensures that the rebels' stories are either forgotten, demonised, or rewritten to serve the victor's myth.⁷²

The various rebel movements that emerged after Museveni's rise to power in 1986 — the Uganda People's Army (UPA) in Teso, the Holy Spirit Movement in the north, the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF) in the Rwenzori region, and the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) — whatever their strategies, their crimes, or their ideologies, all revealed one thing: Museveni's "popular" regime had never truly won the nation. It had won the capital — and ruled the rest by coercion. Each of these rebels was treated not just as a military threat, but as a narrative threat. Their political grievances were erased. Their communities were stigmatised. Their existence was reduced to "terror." The media followed the script. The state deployed psychological warfare, counter-insurgency campaigns, and a rhetoric of national unity that buried real wounds under patriotic slogans.⁷³

Beyond armed rebels, the jungle regime crushed other, quieter rebels — those who chose words over weapons. From Dr. Kizza Besigye to Norbert Mao, from Winnie Byanyima to Betty Nambooze, Uganda has witnessed the rise of articulate, constitutional rebels — those who tried to reform from within. Their arrests, their beatings, their defamations were not mere overreactions. They were regime strategies. The regime understands that a rebel need not be killed to be crushed. They can be infiltrated — surrounded by spies disguised as supporters. They can be fractured — divided by money, tribal lines, or tactical disagreements. They can be legalised — pulled into courts that perform justice while delivering

⁷²Phares Mutibwa, *Uganda Since Independence: A Story of Unfulfilled Hopes* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 1992) 41–68.

⁷³Mutibwa (n 72) 71–98.

nothing. They can be fatigued — kept in a perpetual state of response, never innovation. Co-opted — offered soft landings in exchange for silence. Or repackaged — made into controlled opposition, forever barking, never biting. Yet their crushing is not complete. Every rebel leaves behind echoes — questions unasked, injustices unresolved, dreams unfinished.⁷⁴

From Besigye to Bobi Wine: The Anatomy of State Retaliation

The story of Uganda's modern opposition is not merely a story of brave men standing against power. It is the story of a system that has refined retaliation into an art — a clinical, brutal, and psychologically tailored response to political charisma. From Dr. Kizza Besigye to Robert Kyagulanyi, the jungle regime has not had to innovate new methods of repression. It has only had to repeat itself with cruel precision. The anatomy of state retaliation follows a well-worn script. The state first observes. It waits. It lets the new figure rise, gain popularity, fill rallies, stir disillusionment. The regime does not fear early noise — it studies it. The state is patient because it understands political chemistry. It knows that populism, if uncontained, becomes electricity. And electricity must be grounded.⁷⁵

Once a threat is identified, the narrative warfare begins. For Besigye, the regime painted him as bitter — a sore loser, a man driven by personal vengeance. For Bobi Wine, they labelled him a drug addict, a puppet of foreign powers, a tribalist. State-controlled media echo these labels. Press conferences are held. Social media trolls are deployed. The regime does not only fight the man — it targets his image, his base, and his myth. When defamation fails to weaken momentum, the state moves to legal entanglement. Besigye was arrested more than a dozen times, charged with rape, treason, terrorism, and incitement. Bobi Wine has been arrested, detained, tortured, tried in military courts, and barred from accessing public venues. The goal is not conviction. The goal is disruption. As Schedler observes, modern autocracies use "rule by law" — not to promote justice, but to paralyse opponents.⁷⁶

When legal pressure fails to kill momentum, the state escalates to raw force. Besigye was teargassed, sprayed with pink dye, beaten, and shot at. Bobi Wine was brutally tortured during detention in 2018, his driver killed, his rallies attacked, and his supporters hunted down. Protesters were gunned down in Kampala in 2020. Hundreds were arrested. Bodies disappeared. Beyond violence lies the slow bleed of financial warfare. Besigye's supporters and financiers were blacklisted. Bobi Wine's bank accounts were frozen. His campaign donors were

⁷⁴Tripp (n 6) 338–368.

⁷⁵Tripp (n 6) 371–402.

⁷⁶Schedler (n 63) 91–122.

raided. The jungle state knows that every movement needs fuel. So it does not always destroy the engine — it cuts the pipeline. This economic attrition is rarely reported, but deeply effective. Resistance is not crushed by bullets alone. It is starved. After the state weakens the outer shell, it targets the core: former allies are turned, prominent voices go quiet, tribal and generational rifts are amplified. The state's ultimate goal is to make the rebel feel alone — politically, financially, emotionally.⁷⁷

Lessons from Past Resistance Movements

In Uganda's long, painful march through militarised governance, resistance has never been absent. From bush wars to ballot boxes, from university strikes to street protests — resistance has been there, pounding like a second heartbeat beneath the jungle's imposed calm. And yet, with every cycle, the end has looked familiar: broken alliances, scattered momentum, co-opted leaders, criminalised voices, and a regime that remains, wounded but unshaken. This section is not an indictment. It is a mirror. For the fate of past resistance movements holds more than just history — it holds instruction. Charisma is not a strategy. Time and again, Uganda's resistance has coalesced around individuals. All brave. All principled. All charismatic. But charisma, while magnetic, is not enough. It gathers crowds but does not guarantee coordination. It creates followers, not always frameworks. The regime knows this. It isolates the individual. The lesson: build systems, not saviours.⁷⁸

Reactive resistance is predictable resistance. The regime thrives on anticipation. It knows when protests will be called, what hashtags will trend, what route a march will take. Movements that only respond — to violence, to rigging, to arrest — surrender the initiative. They fight from a place of trauma, not from a place of tactical design. Fragmentation is a gift to the regime. The dictator never needed to divide the people. He only needed to wait for them to divide themselves. FDC versus NUP. Youth versus elders. Urban activists versus rural voters. The jungle, watching from the centre, smiles as the opposition tears itself apart. Legalism cannot defeat lawlessness. The jungle state has always invited resistance to take the legal path — file a case, go to the commission, respect the process. But law, in the hands of the regime, is not a tool of justice — it is a trap. The lesson: law is a battleground, not a refuge. Resistance must not expect justice from systems designed to deny it.⁷⁹

International sympathy is not sovereign power. Many past movements have placed their hopes in international visibility. They have appealed to foreign

⁷⁷Tripp (n 6) 405–435.

⁷⁸Cheeseman (n 33) 83–116.

⁷⁹Scott (n 7) 59–86.

missions, human rights bodies, donors, and diplomats. But time and again, the international community has chosen stability over justice. The dictator is a master of double lives: the freedom fighter abroad, the fist at home. And the world, hungry for regional "peacekeepers" and market access, often chooses to look away. As Keck and Sikkink have shown in their seminal work on transnational advocacy networks, the "boomerang model" only functions when international actors are genuinely willing to convert exposure into accountability — a condition that remains elusive in Uganda's geopolitical context. The lesson: liberation is not outsourced. No movement survives without narrative discipline. Its message must outlive the moment. Its values must be non-negotiable. And victory must be conceived not as the fall of a man, but the collapse of the system that made him inevitable.⁸⁰

Why the More You Fight the System, the Stronger It Becomes

This is the most painful paradox of authoritarian power: that fighting it — within its terms — often nourishes it. Every protest becomes a justification for new security budgets. Every opposition campaign fuels narratives of "national unity under threat." Every lawsuit, every court petition is used to prove "institutional maturity." Every arrest sparks international concern, which the regime spins into proof of its global importance. The jungle is designed to feed on resistance. Not just through violence, but through performance. The more you shout, the more it listens — strategically. The more you protest, the more it calculates. The jungle watches your tactics, maps your slogans, identifies your leaders, and then begins its slow work of adaptation. As James C. Scott taught, authoritarian regimes survive not simply by suppressing opposition, but by anticipating it — by converting open resistance into symbolic gestures that can be contained, studied, and eventually neutralised.⁸¹

When resistance follows a pattern — press conference, protest, arrest, court petition, release — it becomes part of the political schedule. The state plans for it, budgets for it, and even publicises it. The security forces rehearse. The media prepare headlines. The courts anticipate bail applications. The ministers write statements of concern. In time, resistance becomes theatre. It rages loudly, then fades. And the system, instead of cracking, begins to rely on it — as proof of its legitimacy. It says, "Look, we allow criticism. We are not a dictatorship. We let them run." Every act of opposition gives the regime ammunition. A protest is framed as chaos. A tweet becomes cybercrime. The system responds not to

⁸⁰Margaret E Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998) 8–35.

⁸¹Scott (n 7) 89–120.

silence dissent, but to justify its suppression. Uganda's people are thus not governed through hope, but through fatigue. Not inspired to participate, but conditioned to endure. Not mobilised by solutions, but pacified by emergencies.⁸²

⁸²Tripp (n 6) 438–468.

CHAPTER 8

The Jungle's Propaganda Machine

Media Capture, Historical Revisionism, and the Industrial Production of Consent

*"Control the story, and you control the nation.
In the jungle, the pen is not mightier than the
sword — it is held by the same hand."*

Dictatorships do not merely govern through violence. They govern through myth. While batons strike bodies in the streets, another war is waged in the minds of citizens — a war for belief, memory, and meaning. In Uganda's jungle state, the regime does not just kill opposition; it buries truth under layers of fiction. It replaces memory with narrative. Facts with performance. History with scripts. This is the jungle's greatest weapon: its propaganda machine — a sprawling, state-sanctioned ecosystem of distortion that makes repression feel like patriotism, decay sound like development, and dictatorship appear as democracy. The goal is not merely to lie. It is to create confusion so thick that the public no longer knows what truth looks like. And when truth is lost, resistance is weakened. As Chomsky observed, propaganda is to democracy what violence is to dictatorship. In Uganda's jungle state, the two operate together.⁸³

The Church, the Mosque, and the Jungle: Religion as Political Terrain

In Uganda, as in many African nations, religious institutions occupy a unique position in civil society — they are among the very few organisations that reach into every village, command genuine popular loyalty, and possess the moral authority that the state conspicuously lacks. For this reason, they have been a constant target of the regime's co-optation strategies. The relationship between Museveni's government and Uganda's major religious bodies — the Catholic Church, the Church of Uganda, the Orthodox Church, and the Islamic institutions — is one of the most consequential, and least examined, dimensions of the country's political life.

The regime has pursued a deliberate strategy of selective engagement with religious leadership. Senior religious figures are invited to State House, awarded honours, given access to development projects for their communities, and regularly photographed with the president at national events. This proximity is cultivated, not casual. It serves the regime's legitimisation needs — a president

⁸³ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971) 12–24.

blessed by bishops and imams appears, by association, sanctified. It also serves to moderate religious institutional responses to state excess. A bishop who has just received a donation for his school is less likely to preach against electoral fraud than one who has no such relationship with the state.

This co-optation has not been total. There have been moments of genuine religious courage. Individual priests, pastors, imams, and bishops have spoken out against state violence, corruption, and political imprisonment with genuine moral conviction. The Catholic Church, in particular, has periodically issued pastoral letters that have come close to direct political critique. But these moments have consistently been individual rather than institutional – expressions of personal conscience rather than coordinated institutional resistance. The structures of religious leadership, dependent on government goodwill for land titles, school registrations, health facility licences, and development grants, have generally chosen accommodation over confrontation.

The tragedy of this accommodation is that it forecloses one of the most powerful potential sources of organised resistance. Religious institutions, with their weekly gatherings of millions of citizens, their cross-ethnic and cross-regional reach, their independence from state employment, and their moral authority among ordinary people, represent precisely the kind of distributed, embedded civil society that could sustain a challenge to authoritarian governance. In South Africa, the church played exactly this role in the anti-apartheid movement. In Poland, the Catholic Church was the institutional backbone of the Solidarity movement. In Uganda, the equivalent potential has been largely neutralised through a combination of co-optation, dependence, and the prudential calculation that survival is better achieved through accommodation than confrontation.

The Digital Battlefield: Social Media, Internet Shutdowns, and the New Frontier of Political Control

The digital revolution has transformed the politics of authoritarian governance everywhere, and Uganda is no exception. Social media platforms – Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp, YouTube, and TikTok – have created new possibilities for political communication, mobilisation, and accountability that bypass the regime's control of traditional media. The 2021 election campaign of Robert Kyagulanyi demonstrated these possibilities dramatically: through YouTube livestreams, Facebook rallies, and WhatsApp organising networks, People Power reached millions of Ugandans who could not attend physical rallies, creating a virtual political space that the regime struggled to contain.

But the regime has not been passive in the face of this challenge. It has responded with a distinctive combination of regulatory capture, strategic

disruption, and outright suppression. The 2021 social media tax — a daily levy on the use of social media platforms — was a transparently political measure designed to price out the country's millions of lower-income digital citizens from the platforms where political debate was most vibrant. It was sold as a revenue measure, but its effect — and almost certainly its intent — was to reduce the digital reach of opposition mobilisation. When the tax proved insufficient, the regime moved to more direct suppression: in the days surrounding the January 2021 election, Uganda experienced a complete internet shutdown, cutting off millions of citizens from information, communication, and documentation of electoral violence at the precise moment when this access was most consequential.

The digital battlefield also extends to active surveillance and harassment. Uganda's intelligence agencies have developed significant capacity to monitor social media activity, identify political activists, and target them for harassment or arrest. Ugandans have been arrested for WhatsApp messages, tweets, and Facebook posts that the state classifies as "spreading harmful propaganda" or "inciting violence." These prosecutions serve a dual purpose: they punish the individual targeted and they communicate to every other digital citizen that nothing posted online is truly private, that the state is watching, and that the cost of digital dissent can be prison. The chilling effect of this surveillance extends far beyond those actually prosecuted. It shapes what millions of Ugandans choose to say — and not say — online.

Yet the digital space remains a site of genuine contestation and surprising resilience. Ugandan activists have become sophisticated users of virtual private networks to bypass internet restrictions. Encrypted messaging applications have created more private organising spaces. Diaspora Ugandans — outside the reach of the state's enforcement capacity — have used international platforms to amplify domestic stories and maintain the international visibility of Ugandan political repression. Ugandan citizen journalists have documented state violence on mobile phones and uploaded footage that has reached international media, forcing diplomatic responses that purely domestic reporting might not have achieved. The digital battlefield is not won by either side. But it represents one of the most dynamic and consequential new terrains of Uganda's ongoing political struggle.

State-run media outlets — radio, TV, and print — exist not to inform, but to perform. Every event, no matter how brutal, is repackaged into a tale of "progress," "stability," or "national unity." At the centre of this machine stands the myth of Yoweri Kaguta Museveni — the philosopher-king, the regional peacekeeper, the wise patriarch. This myth is repeated so often it becomes muscle memory in the national psyche. In schools, his name is lionised. In

speeches, he quotes scripture and Marx with equal comfort. On TV, he appears as teacher, soldier, and father. The jungle curates his image so that his presence feels eternal. Change becomes unthinkable. The system is equated with the man. To oppose him is to invite chaos. As Gramsci warned, this is hegemony: not rule through coercion, but rule through consent manufactured in the minds of the ruled.⁸⁴

To reinforce the illusion of stability, the jungle must define its enemies. Opposition leaders are not portrayed as competitors with ideas — but as threats to order, agents of foreign plots, tribalists, or selfish careerists. The state never debates their policies — it questions their loyalty. As soon as a new voice rises, the propaganda machine assigns them a label. The goal is not to engage — but to dismiss, to mock, to shame. And once the public has been convinced that dissent equals instability, even the silence of fear sounds like consent. As Bayart, Ellis and Hibou have demonstrated, the criminalisation of the state extends to the criminalisation of opposition: formal institutions are repurposed not only to control resources, but to control the narrative of who constitutes a legitimate political actor and who does not.⁸⁵

The Rewriting of History to Justify Eternal Rule

In every dictatorship that seeks not just survival but permanence, history must be rewritten. Not merely to glorify the present, but to imprison the past. In Uganda, the jungle regime has long realised that the most powerful weapon of control is not the gun — but the story. The past is rewritten not to preserve memory, but to manipulate it, to clean it, to fit it into the frame of one man's eternal rule. Museveni's rise to power in 1986 is no longer told as the end of war, but the beginning of Uganda's only "legitimate era." Everything before it is either dismissed as chaos or repackaged as a prelude to his arrival. Textbooks have been revised to align with the regime's version of liberation. Schoolchildren are taught that Uganda was born in disorder and rescued by a single man. As Mamdani has observed, the politics of historical memory in postcolonial Africa is never neutral — it is always a site of contestation between competing claims to legitimacy.⁸⁶

Even betrayal is incorporated into this mythmaking. Those who fought alongside Museveni but later opposed him — such as Kizza Besigye — are reframed not as principled dissenters, but as ungrateful sons of the revolution. Their criticisms are not debated; they are pathologised. In this jungle, disagreement with the ruler is not democratic disagreement — it is heresy. The

⁸⁴Gramsci (n 83) 31–55.

⁸⁵Bayart, Ellis and Hibou (n 8) 205–238.

⁸⁶Mamdani (n 4) 111–138.

rewriting of history also serves to justify the present's abuses. Every extension of term limits, every constitutional amendment, every violent crackdown is reframed as a necessary act to preserve the "hard-won peace" of 1986. The regime draws a straight, mythical line between the bush war and every act of authoritarianism thereafter. Stability becomes a fetish, and fear is baptised as prudence. The people are reminded that any attempt to change leadership risks "returning to the past" — a past which, conveniently, has been stripped of its real agents and painted solely in blood and anarchy.⁸⁷

How the Regime Manufactures Its Own Opposition for Control

In most functioning democracies, opposition exists as a counterforce — an organic, spontaneous challenge to power, rooted in real grievances and alternative visions. But in Uganda's jungle state, where nothing truly independent is permitted to grow, even opposition itself has become part of the regime's architecture. The dictator does not merely suppress dissent; he simulates it. He manufactures his own rivals, cultivates controlled adversaries, and scripts political drama to sustain the illusion of democracy while tightening the grip of authoritarianism. At the heart of this tactic is the creation of decoy opposition — figures or movements that appear confrontational, but whose purpose is to fragment, distract, or absorb real revolutionary energy. These actors are often given unusual freedom: generous airtime, unexplained campaign ease, access to media platforms denied to true threats.⁸⁸

Some of these manufactured opponents are co-opted insiders — former regime loyalists who reinvent themselves as critics only after losing favour. Their opposition is reactive, not ideological. Their presence gives the illusion of diversity, but their roots remain tangled in the system they now pretend to oppose. Others are opportunists, funded and flattered into prominence, weaponised to divide the opposition field and confuse the electorate. Even more dangerously, the regime sometimes permits the rise of real opposition leaders — only to infiltrate their ranks, study their tactics, and sabotage them from within. By allowing limited resistance to surface, the jungle creates targets — visible figures it can monitor, vilify, or neutralise at the right moment. As Schedler has demonstrated, this controlled tolerance of opposition is central to the functioning of electoral authoritarianism: opposition is necessary to the performance of democracy, but its effectiveness must be carefully managed to prevent any genuine threat to power.⁸⁹

⁸⁷Tripp (n 6) 471–502.

⁸⁸Schedler (n 63) 125–155.

⁸⁹Schedler (n 63) 158–188.

CHAPTER 9

The Cost of Submission

Political Apathy, Social Fracture, and the Long Damage of Engineered Helplessness

"Submission does not preserve life – it drains it slowly. What the bullet doesn't kill, silence eventually will."

In every dictatorship, there comes a moment – not when the regime wins, but when the people lose the will to fight. Not because they agree, not because they are content, but because resistance has become too costly, too exhausting, too lonely. And in that moment, submission begins – not as a loud declaration, but as a quiet decay. Uganda has not submitted because it lacks heroes. It has submitted because the jungle has made rebellion feel futile and submission feel like survival. The people know the system is broken. They know the courts are compromised, the votes are rigged, the development is uneven, and the speeches are lies. But they also know what happens to those who speak too loudly, walk too boldly, or think too freely. Submission does not protect dignity – it disfigures it. Over time, a people who learn to tolerate injustice begin to accept it. What once sparked outrage now evokes a shrug.⁹⁰

The cost of submission is psychological. It trains the citizen to become small. To not dream too far, to not speak too freely, to not ask too much. The cost is social. Communities fracture under fear. Neighbours no longer trust each other. Churches hesitate to speak. Families advise their children to stay quiet, to not "get involved." The cost is economic. A nation that submits to incompetence institutionalises inefficiency. Jobs go to the loyal, not the qualified. Contracts go to cronies, not innovators. The smartest minds leave – or worse, they stay and adjust. The cost is spiritual. Submission makes even faith timid. Preachers choose verses that praise kings, not prophets. And finally, the cost is generational. A people that submits today bequeaths that submission to its children. Each generation inherits not just land and culture, but also limits. They inherit the fear. They inherit the silence. Museveni's greatest success is not that he built roads or maintained order. His success is that he trained a nation to believe that he is inevitable.⁹¹

Uganda has not been held back only by the fists of the regime. It has also been weighed down by the folded arms of its citizens. As Hannah Arendt

⁹⁰Hannah Arendt, *On Violence* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1970) 35–62.

⁹¹Mamdani (n 4) 141–169.

observed, when people withdraw from political life in authoritarian settings, their silence becomes an active instrument of domination. By stepping back, the people strengthen the regime's hold — not just over power, but over possibility. And yet, the most dangerous aspect of submission is its reversibility. It can be unlearned. The people may tolerate the show, but they never forget how genuine struggle feels. Every submission has a breaking point. A people can endure poverty. They can endure oppression. But they cannot endure meaninglessness. When silence no longer protects, when submission no longer feeds, when fear becomes too heavy to carry — something shifts. Because submission, no matter how long it lasts, never erases the memory of freedom. It only delays its return.⁹²

How Ugandans Have Adapted to Oppression

In Uganda's jungle state, oppression has never arrived with a single blow. It has come gradually — wrapped in policies, masked in stability, coated in slogans. Ugandans have not surrendered — they have adapted. Not because they approve of the regime, but because they have learned how to survive it. They have mapped its moods. They know which words not to say, which topics to avoid, which doors not to knock on. They have developed a second language: the language of evasion, coded silence, and instinctive censorship. In taxis, bars, churches, and classrooms, conversations bend around power like water flows around a rock. This adaptation is not weakness. It is intelligence under constraint. It is the wisdom of those who know that open confrontation invites punishment, and subtle defiance, though limited, offers a longer path to dignity. As James Scott has demonstrated, the "arts of resistance" are the everyday practices through which the powerless navigate structures they cannot openly challenge.⁹³

Yet this survival comes at a high cost. A people who adapt too well to oppression risk mistaking it for normalcy. When every police truck on the road is seen as routine, when every internet shutdown is accepted with a shrug, when every election is assumed to be rigged before it begins, the line between realism and resignation blurs. Adaptation becomes internalised. The people stop expecting more — not because they lack imagination, but because expectation itself has become dangerous. This has birthed a generation that is simultaneously aware and weary. The youth know the system is rigged. They mock it online, parody it in music, subvert it in art. But they also know what happened to those who challenged it directly. So they channel their rage into memes, their dreams into migration, and their activism into side hustles. Hope becomes an export. Adaptation allows survival, but not transformation. It keeps

⁹²Arendt (n 90) 63–87.

⁹³Scott (n 7) 123–152.

the body alive, but starves the soul.⁹⁴

Why the Real Power Lies with the People Who Refuse to Act

In Uganda's jungle state, power is often mistaken for performance. The regime parades itself as omnipotent — festooned with medals, surrounded by guns, amplified through media. But beneath the stage lights, true power does not reside in bullets or speeches. It hides in quieter places — in silence, in inaction, in the heavy stillness of a people who see and know yet do not move. For all its force, the jungle regime survives not because it is strong — but because too many of its citizens believe they are weak. And in that belief lies the most potent spell ever cast: the idea that only the ruler has agency, and the ruled can only endure. But history has never been moved by rulers alone. It has always been shaped by ordinary people who decided that waiting was more dangerous than rising. The truth is simple and terrifying: the real power lies with those who refuse to use it.⁹⁵

The most dangerous person to the regime is not the rebel with a placard. It is the teacher who refuses to lie. The soldier who refuses to shoot. The worker who walks out. The market woman who asks, "Why is sugar this expensive?" and does not accept silence as an answer. In a jungle state, every citizen is given a small, silent vote — not just on election day, but every day. When you laugh at injustice, you vote for it to continue. When you say nothing, you whisper yes. When you normalise fear, you extend the dictator's rule. But the moment enough people withdraw that consent — however quietly — the regime begins to tremble. It trembles not because the people grow louder, but because they grow aware. Aware that power does not belong to those who seize it. It belongs to those who surrender it without question. And the jungle, for all its weapons and deception, cannot withstand a people who stop surrendering. As Arendt reminds us, power and violence are opposites: where one rules absolutely, the other disappears.⁹⁶

⁹⁴Tripp (n 6) 505–535.

⁹⁵Gramsci (n 83) 57–80.

⁹⁶Arendt (n 90) 91–115.

PART IV

Breaking the Cycle — A New Strategy for Resistance

"You do not destroy the jungle by running through it with fire. You uproot it by planting something stronger — roots that grow deeper than fear."

The jungle has endured not because it is invincible, but because resistance has been predictable. For decades, Ugandans have answered tyranny with courage, but not with strategy. They have risen with passion, but not always with coordination. They have spoken truth to power — but often within the language, laws, and lanes that power itself defined. And the result has been a cycle: Protest. Repression. Election. Betrayal. Petition. Fatigue. Hope. Arrest. Repeat. This cycle has sustained the jungle — not weakened it. It is now time to ask a different question: What would it mean to stop playing by the regime's script entirely? What would it mean for resistance to become uncontrollable by design, unpredictable by nature, and uncompromising in its vision? Part IV is not about rebellion. It is about redefinition — a redefinition of what resistance looks like, what power means, and what kind of nation Uganda could be.⁹⁷

⁹⁷Human Rights Watch, World Report 2023: Uganda Events (New York: Human Rights Watch, 2023) 1–9.

CHAPTER 10

The Two Paths – Submission or Reinvention

The Existential Choice Before Uganda and the Architecture of Civic Reconstruction

"When history arrives at a crossroads, the silence of the people decides the path. One road leads to deeper chains, the other to painful but necessary rebirth."

Every authoritarian regime eventually presents its people with two choices: the slow, spiritual death of submission, or the risk-filled, uncertain path of reinvention. Uganda has now reached that precipice. The jungle has tightened its vines around every public institution, every avenue of reform, every cry for dignity. And yet, it has not killed hope – it has simply buried it beneath fatigue. Submission is easy. It demands nothing but silence. It allows one to survive, to eat, to attend weddings, to mind their own business. But submission has never been neutral. As Hannah Arendt observes, when people withdraw from political life in authoritarian settings, their silence becomes an active instrument of domination. By stepping back, the people strengthen the regime's hold – not just over power, but over possibility. Every year that the regime is tolerated, the roots of repression grow deeper into the foundation of the nation.⁹⁸

On the other path lies reinvention – not of the ruler, but of the republic. Reinvention is not rebellion for rebellion's sake. It is the act of building what does not yet exist. It is the collective rejection of resignation. It is the conscious decision to stop reacting to the jungle and begin designing a new terrain where truth, justice, and accountability are not begged for – they are built from below. As Gramsci argued, the fall of a hegemonic order requires more than resistance – it demands a counter-hegemonic culture, one that challenges not only political control, but the very common sense that keeps people passive. In Uganda, the prevailing common sense is this: "This is how things are. They cannot change." Reinvention begins by unlearning that lie.⁹⁹

This means creating alternative power. Not power in the traditional sense, but power embedded in networks of refusal and imagination. Teacher unions that refuse to lie to students. Faith leaders who preach truth with trembling voices. Artists who stop entertaining and start awakening. Youth who stop waiting for

⁹⁸Arendt (n 90) 118–142.

⁹⁹Gramsci (n 83) 83–105.

permission and begin organising in new, fluid, horizontal formations — immune to infiltration because they have no central spine to break. It also means shifting the battlefield away from State House. Museveni is a warlord. He is trained to crush uprisings, not to outthink awakenings. He understands armed rebellion. He does not understand movements that boycott, disengage, redirect, and reconstruct. Reinvention is not about seizing power from him — it is about rendering his power irrelevant in the lives of ordinary people. As Sharp outlines in his theory of nonviolent resistance, the withdrawal of consent and economic cooperation are among the most potent tools for destabilising authoritarian rule.¹⁰⁰

Why Armed Struggle Will Not Work

The temptation of armed struggle is ancient, seductive, and deeply rooted in Uganda's political DNA. It was with guns that Museveni rose to power. It was through guerrilla war that the NRM claimed legitimacy. And it is precisely that legacy which convinces many that the jungle can only be uprooted through the same violence by which it was planted. But this is a fatal illusion. Armed struggle will not work in Uganda — not because the people lack courage, but because the regime has engineered itself for that very scenario. It is militarised, well-funded, deeply entrenched in regional intelligence networks, and backed by powerful international actors with a vested interest in stability over justice. Museveni, a master of counter-insurgency, has long prepared for the day the gun is turned against him. Violence is not his weakness. It is his comfort zone. As Gene Sharp argues, the most common error made by resistance movements is engaging tyrants on their preferred battlefield.¹⁰¹

Armed struggle also alienates the very masses whose awakening is essential for sustainable change. War displaces, fractures, and polarises. It destroys institutions, undermines civilian organising, and often gives birth to new authoritarians disguised as liberators. As Arendt famously argued, power and violence are opposites: where one rules absolutely, the other disappears. A regime brought down by violence often leads to another that rules with it. Uganda has seen this cycle before. From Amin to Obote, and from Obote to Museveni, every armed transition promised liberation but delivered new forms of control. The gun, once raised for freedom, rarely returns quietly to its sheath. It becomes a permanent actor in the governance script, a lurking reminder that force, not consent, is the true foundation of the state. To pick up the gun again is to re-enter that cycle — to abandon the dream of citizenship and re-engage the logic of

¹⁰⁰Gene Sharp, *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation* (Boston: The Albert Einstein Institution, 2010) 1–22.

¹⁰¹Sharp (n 100) 25–48.

conquest.¹⁰²

Beyond the tactical disadvantages and moral hazards, armed struggle also fails to build the political consciousness necessary for a democratic republic. As Fanon warned, while violence may be cathartic for the oppressed, it does not automatically lead to liberation unless it is directed by a clear political vision grounded in the dignity of the people. Uganda does not need catharsis. It needs clarity. It needs collective vision. It needs a population that remembers how to govern, not how to shoot. The jungle cannot be dismantled with machetes. It must be starved of oxygen. It must be outgrown, out-thought, outlived. Nonviolent resistance is not weakness — it is strategic intelligence. It denies the regime its moral high ground. It draws in the masses. It keeps movements alive even when leaders are killed. It builds the future while confronting the present. And most importantly, it speaks a different language from the jungle's roar — it speaks in whispers that become thunder.¹⁰³

¹⁰²Arendt (n 90) 145–169.

¹⁰³Fanon (n 2) 444–479.

CHAPTER 11

Disrupting the Jungle System

Economic Disobedience, Narrative Warfare, and the Architecture of Uncontrollable Resistance

"You do not prune a jungle. You do not negotiate with it. You dismantle its logic, disarm its rituals, and displace its power from the inside out."

After decades of navigating the twisted undergrowth of repression, propaganda, and performative politics, the time has come for Uganda not to reform the jungle — but to disrupt it. Reform assumes the system is redeemable. Disruption understands that it is designed to fail the people and protect power. The goal is not to change the regime's behaviour, but to change the people's relationship with the regime — to refuse to participate in its choreography of control. Disruption is not chaos. It is strategy. It is not loudness. It is clarity. It is the surgical removal of obedience from a system that survives only through the complicity and exhaustion of the governed. The jungle system is structured around three pillars: fear, fragmentation, and performance. Disrupting it means attacking these at their root.¹⁰⁴

The first disruption must target fear — the emotional infrastructure of authoritarian survival. Fear has been normalised in Uganda. It lives in conversations, classrooms, workplaces, pulpits, and even families. But fear is not natural. It is curated. And like all curation, it can be undone. As Sharp argues, regimes do not collapse when people become violent — they collapse when people stop being afraid of consequences they once accepted as inevitable. The act of disruption begins here: in the psychological unbinding of the citizen from the script of silence. The second pillar is fragmentation — the regime's consistent strategy of divide and manage. The jungle fears unity more than insurrection. Disruption must therefore be collective and post-tribal. As Hardt and Negri emphasise, power today is networked — and so must resistance be. Disruption thrives through distributed solidarity, not central command.¹⁰⁵

Economic Resistance: Starving the Regime of Financial Lifelines

¹⁰⁴Foucault (n 45) 215–256.

¹⁰⁵Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000) xi–xxi.

The jungle regime in Uganda does not survive on violence alone. It survives on the invisible tributaries of money — taxes, donor funds, state contracts, illicit enrichment, and the quiet loyalty of businesses that thrive under its shadow. While political resistance is often visible and punishable, economic resistance is quiet, subversive, and often more dangerous to the state. Because a dictatorship may survive a thousand protests — but it cannot survive a people who refuse to fund their own oppression. Every regime has pressure points. In Uganda, these are not located in parliamentary chambers or courtrooms. They are located in the budget lines of ministries, in the procurement departments of corrupt agencies, in the tax streams that flow from boda-boda riders, market vendors, telecom users, and fuel consumers directly into the vaults of repression. As Sharp explains, the economic pillars of authoritarian regimes are not just sources of wealth — they are sources of control.¹⁰⁶

Consumer disobedience represents the first arena of economic resistance. The regime is propped up by businesses tied — directly or indirectly — to State House. These include construction companies with exclusive government contracts, media conglomerates with regime shareholders, fuel suppliers who bankroll repression, and telecom companies who comply with illegal shutdowns and surveillance. The people must begin to ask: Where does my money go when I pay for this product? If it strengthens the regime, withdraw it. As seen in South Africa's anti-apartheid struggle, consumer resistance forced companies to sever ties with the regime. In Uganda, a coordinated boycott of regime-linked services could generate financial panic within elite circles. Building parallel economic sovereignty is equally essential. Communities must form solidarity economies: village cooperatives, community land trusts, food-sharing schemes, trade-based health care, and neighbourhood barter systems. These are not utopian — they are necessary.¹⁰⁷

International disruption and donor transparency constitute a critical dimension of economic resistance. Donors and international NGOs, often unintentionally, become co-sponsors of repression. They pour funds into sectors — education, health, infrastructure — that are then siphoned off through procurement fraud, ghost projects, and "strategic incompetence." As Dambisa Moyo argues, foreign aid in authoritarian states often props up inefficiency and perpetuates the need for more aid — rather than empowering citizens to hold leaders accountable. Economic resistance must therefore go beyond national borders. The regime's lifeline is not just the people — it is also the ignorance or indifference of the international donor community. Ugandan resistance must

¹⁰⁶Sharp (n 100) 51–74.

¹⁰⁷Dambisa Moyo, *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009) 8–33.

begin targeting international complicity: by exposing misuse, lobbying global citizens, and discrediting the myth that development aid is apolitical.¹⁰⁸

Turning Every Act of Oppression Into a Global Spectacle

In every dictatorship, repression is choreographed for invisibility. The arrests happen at night. The torture chambers have no cameras. The disappearances leave no paper trail. And when the dust settles, the regime returns to the podium with clean hands and carefully chosen words. To dismantle this system, the people must weaponise exposure. Every act of brutality must be turned into a story too loud to ignore. Every injustice must become a global spectacle — shared, documented, amplified, and embedded in international conscience. In authoritarian regimes, secrecy is not just a tactic — it is infrastructure. It separates local suffering from global accountability. As Keck and Sikkink argue in their boomerang model of transnational advocacy, when domestic avenues for justice are blocked, activists can throw their message outward — over the heads of local power — into the hands of international actors who then bounce pressure back into the system.¹⁰⁹

Spectacle is not drama for drama's sake. It is the transformation of pain into testimony. Of injustice into evidence. Of fear into fuel. Documentation is the first step: every arrest, every beating, every raid must be recorded — not only with phones but with names, dates, times, and faces. Storytelling follows: a video without context is a clip. Activists must narrate the broader significance — who was targeted, why, what it says about the regime's fear. Then comes dissemination. Ugandans must stop localising their cries. What happens in Lira must reach London. What happens in Kamwokya must be seen in California. Social media, though often surveilled, remains a battlefield of memory. But visibility must lead to mobilisation, not voyeurism. Resistance must not become a performance for global sympathy — but a summons to international accountability. Stories must be tied to demands. Videos must lead to petitions. Reports must turn into sanctions, resolutions, and ruptured alliances. The jungle cannot thrive in the light.¹¹⁰

Rewriting the Narrative: Making the Government Look Weak, Not Strong

Dictatorships do not survive by force alone. They survive by illusion. Uganda's regime, like many others, is not built on perpetual victory, but on the

¹⁰⁸ Moyo (n 107) 37–64.

¹⁰⁹ Keck and Sikkink (n 80) 38–65.

¹¹⁰ Keck and Sikkink (n 80) 68–95.

myth of invincibility. To dismantle this jungle, Ugandans must learn to rewrite the narrative — to unmask the regime not as an iron fortress, but as a crumbling house propped up by fear, performance, and borrowed time. This is not merely political work — it is cultural warfare. As Foucault observes, power reproduces itself not just through institutions, but through discourses: the language, symbols, and assumptions that define what is "normal" and what is "possible." To challenge the regime's rule, one must first challenge its story. Every act of overreaction is evidence of panic. When journalists are arrested for asking questions, it is not strength — it is fear of the truth. When police teargas a group of students, it is not power — it is a regime scared of ideas.¹¹¹

This is where the power of satire, art, and culture becomes revolutionary. Memes, songs, short films, spoken word, graffiti — these are not just entertainment; they are strategic narrative tools. They shrink the dictator in the imagination of the people. They expose contradictions. They mock propaganda. As history has shown, when a regime becomes laughable, it becomes vulnerable. Consider the role of cultural subversion in anti-colonial movements, civil rights campaigns, or the Arab Spring: in each case, the fall of power began not with bullets, but with a shift in perception. When the people no longer feared their rulers — because they no longer believed in their strength — regimes collapsed from within. The moment the people stop believing in the regime's strength, the regime will lose the most important weapon it ever held: the illusion that it cannot be defeated. Resistance must learn this art. Stop calling the regime "strong." Call it "scared." Stop saying the president "refuses to leave." Say, "He cannot afford to lose power."¹¹²

The Succession Crisis and What It Reveals About the Jungle State

No question more vividly illuminates the nature of Uganda's political system than the question of presidential succession. In a functioning republic, succession is a routine matter — governed by constitutional rules, managed through democratic processes, and ultimately determined by the will of voters. It is a moment of institutional confidence — evidence that the system is larger than any individual, that power is delegated rather than possessed, and that the republic continues regardless of who sits at its head. In Uganda's jungle state, succession is anything but routine. It is the question that the entire architecture of political control is designed to prevent from being openly addressed.

Museveni has now governed Uganda for nearly four decades — longer than

¹¹¹Foucault (n 45) 259–298.

¹¹²Gramsci (n 83) 108–131.

most Ugandans have been alive. In that time, he has systematically dismantled every formal mechanism that might have constrained his tenure: term limits, age limits, party competition, judicial independence. He has also, more subtly, dismantled the informal mechanisms of succession: potential successors have been neutralised, demoted, or exiled; independent political organisations that might have produced alternative leadership have been suppressed; the next generation of Ugandan political leaders has been systematically denied the experience, resources, and institutional access needed to develop credible national profiles.

Into this vacuum has emerged the deeply troubling figure of General Muhoozi Kainerugaba — Museveni's eldest son, the current Chief of Defence Forces, and a man whose political ambitions have been made unmistakably plain through a Twitter presence of remarkable indiscretion and a series of public events that closely resemble political campaigning. The prospect of a dynastic transition — from Museveni to Muhoozi — represents both the logical conclusion of forty years of jungle governance and its most extreme expression. If the regime's essence has been the personalisation of state power, its ultimate expression would be the inheritance of that power within a single family.

The Muhoozi project — as it has come to be known — reveals several important truths about the nature of the Ugandan state. First, it confirms that institutional succession mechanisms have been so thoroughly disabled that the only available transition path runs through the president's personal network. Second, it reveals the extent to which the military has become a family enterprise — with the Commander-in-Chief's son serving as the army's chief, a conflict of interest so profound that it would be unthinkable in any genuinely democratic state. Third, and perhaps most importantly, it illustrates the fundamental contradiction at the heart of Museveni's legacy: a man who rose to power on the promise of ending personal rule has constructed a system in which the only conceivable successor is his own son. The jungle does not just endure — it seeks to reproduce itself dynastically.

A New Vision for Uganda: Building the Republic from Below

The argument of this book has been, at its heart, a negative one: Uganda is not a republic. It is a jungle state — a system in which the forms of democratic governance exist to legitimise, rather than constrain, the exercise of personalised power. The evidence for this argument is extensive, the historical record is clear, and the lived experience of millions of Ugandans confirms it daily. But a book that only names what is wrong, without imagining what might be right, is ultimately a counsel of despair. And despair, as this book has argued throughout, is itself a tool of authoritarian governance — it demobilises, fragments, and ultimately

serves the jungle's survival.

What, then, would a genuine Ugandan republic look like? What would need to change — not just in who governs, but in how governance is structured, understood, and practised? These are not simple questions, and they do not admit of simple answers. But they are the questions that any serious discussion of Uganda's democratic future must confront. A genuine republic would begin with a genuinely independent Electoral Commission — one whose commissioners are appointed through a transparent, merit-based process with meaningful parliamentary oversight, whose budget is ring-fenced from executive interference, and whose decisions are subject to genuine judicial review. Without electoral integrity, all other reforms are theatre. Elections that produce predetermined results do not create democratic legitimacy — they corrode it.

A genuine republic would require a judiciary that is structurally as well as formally independent — with security of tenure enforced by an independent judicial service commission, salaries benchmarked to and protected from executive manipulation, and court facilities and administrative support managed by the judiciary itself rather than the Ministry of Justice. These are technical details, but they are the technical details on which judicial independence ultimately depends. A formally independent judiciary housed in a building owned and maintained by the executive, staffed by administrators appointed by the executive, and dependent on executive goodwill for its budgetary needs is not truly independent, regardless of what the constitution says.

A genuine republic would require a genuine restructuring of civil-military relations. The military must be depoliticised — returned to its constitutional mandate of defending the nation and supporting civilian authority, rather than functioning as an instrument of political control. This requires, at a minimum, the removal of active military officers from civilian government positions, the reorientation of security service mandates away from regime protection and toward citizen protection, and the establishment of credible civilian oversight mechanisms with genuine investigative and sanctioning authority. This is not a task for the next political cycle — it is a generational project. The habits of a forty-year militarised political culture do not dissolve quickly. But they must begin to dissolve.

Finally, a genuine republic requires a civic culture commensurate with its institutional ambitions — a population that understands and exercises its rights, that demands accountability from its leaders, that organises collectively in defence of its interests, and that refuses to accept the normalisation of injustice. This civic culture cannot be legislated into existence. It must be cultivated — through education systems that develop critical thinking rather than rote compliance, through media environments that inform rather than manipulate,

through civil society organisations that genuinely represent the interests of citizens rather than the agendas of donors or political patrons, and through the slow, patient, unglamorous work of community organising at every level of society. The republic that Uganda needs is not simply waiting for the right leader. It is waiting for the right citizens. And building those citizens — building the civic consciousness, the democratic habits, and the political courage that a genuine republic demands — is the deepest and most important work that Uganda's people can undertake. Not for the next election, but for the next generation.

CHAPTER 12

The Power of Uncontrollable Order

Disciplined Resistance, Structural Collapse, and the Possibility of National Reconstruction

"Dictators prepare for chaos. They do not prepare for order they did not create."

Authoritarian regimes fear insurrection. They fear riots, explosions, sudden uprisings. They fear the visible violence they were trained to suppress. But there is one thing they fear even more — a people who organise without seeking permission. A population that moves in quiet consensus, not for anarchy, but for autonomy. A movement so orderly, so consistent, so unshakable that it cannot be bribed, silenced, or broken. This is the power of uncontrollable order. Uganda's jungle regime was built to fight bush wars, not disciplined civic networks. It was trained to crush mobs, not outlast patience. It survives on reaction — responding to a protest with tear gas, to a tweet with arrest, to an election with rigging. It expects rage. It does not know how to handle restraint.¹¹³

This approach draws on the principle Gene Sharp called "political jiu-jitsu" — using the strength of the opponent against itself. The regime expects visible confrontation. It cannot handle the weight of sustained non-cooperation — especially when it is peaceful, widespread, and leaderless. Because who do you arrest when the revolution is not a rally, but a routine? Uncontrollable order is also decentralised. It does not operate from party headquarters. It operates from kitchens, WhatsApp groups, market stalls, and classrooms. It spreads not through slogans but through shared conviction. This kind of movement cannot be infiltrated — because it is not a hierarchy. It cannot be "shut down" because it has no office. It cannot be "disbanded" because it was never registered. History proves otherwise. From the Polish Solidarity movement in the 1980s to the Sudanese Professionals Association in 2019, authoritarian regimes have fallen not just to marches — but to movements that embraced structure, unity, and moral clarity.¹¹⁴

Authoritarian systems contain the seeds of their own collapse: a corrupt state preaching integrity; a "people's government" feared by its own people; a "liberator" who refuses to leave power; a constitution that protects the president,

¹¹³Dan Slater, *Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010) 1–25.

¹¹⁴Gene Sharp, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential* (Manchester: Extending Horizons Books, 2005) 1–28.

not the republic; a party founded on revolution that now resists any change. When a disciplined movement holds up a mirror to these contradictions — living in truth, as Havel prescribed, in the midst of the system's lies — the regime begins to look not powerful, but absurd. As Václav Havel argued in *The Power of the Powerless*, "living in truth" in the midst of a lie weakens authoritarianism not by confrontation, but by contradiction. The regime says one thing — the people behave differently. The regime promotes division — the people unite. The regime demands fear — the people respond with order. That contrast becomes a kind of public mirror. And mirrors, in tyranny, are lethal.¹¹⁵

Case Studies of Successful Nonviolent Revolutions

The history of the 20th and 21st centuries is replete with examples of authoritarian regimes brought down not by armed struggle, but by disciplined, nonviolent mass movements. These case studies are not mere inspiration — they are strategic manuals for Uganda's resistance. The Polish Solidarity movement of the 1980s demonstrated the power of a networked, institutionally embedded resistance. By organising through independent trade unions, underground publishing, and parish networks, Solidarity created a parallel civil society that the Communist regime could not absorb or destroy. Over a decade of sustained non-cooperation, it eroded the regime's legitimacy until the system collapsed from within. The lesson for Uganda is clear: resistance must be embedded in the ordinary institutions of daily life — churches, schools, markets, professional associations — not only in the extraordinary spectacle of the protest.¹¹⁶

The Sudanese Professionals Association's role in the 2019 revolution against Omar al-Bashir offers another instructive model. By organising horizontally, communicating through encrypted networks, and maintaining strict nonviolent discipline even in the face of brutal state violence, the SPA sustained a nationwide uprising that ultimately prompted the military to abandon its long-standing alliance with Bashir. The key insight is this: discipline, not rage, defeated a three-decade dictatorship. The South African anti-apartheid movement demonstrates the power of combining international pressure with domestic economic resistance. The international boycott campaign, the consumer disobedience movements inside South Africa, and the sustained pressure on Western governments and corporations created a multi-dimensional siege that made apartheid unsustainable. Uganda's resistance must learn to operate on multiple fronts simultaneously — domestic civic action, international advocacy, economic disobedience, and narrative warfare — not as sequential strategies, but

¹¹⁵Václav Havel, *The Power of the Powerless* (Prague: East European Monographs, 1978) 1–31.

¹¹⁶Sharp (n 114) 31–58.

as simultaneous pressures.¹¹⁷

How Uganda Can Transform from a Jungle to a True Nation

The transformation of Uganda from a jungle to a true nation is not a fantasy — it is a project. A project that requires clarity of vision, discipline of method, and courage of commitment. It begins with a recognition: the jungle is not Uganda's destiny. It is its condition. And conditions can be changed. The first dimension of transformation is constitutional. Uganda must move toward a genuine constitutional order — one in which the constitution is not a tool of executive convenience but a living covenant between the governed and those who govern. This requires rebuilding the Electoral Commission as a truly independent institution, restoring judicial independence, and placing genuine limits on executive power that cannot be amended away by self-interested parliamentary majorities. As Oloka-Onyango has argued, constitutionalism in Africa must be reconceived not as a formal exercise in legal drafting, but as a substantive commitment to the dispersal of power and the protection of fundamental rights.¹¹⁸

The second dimension is economic. Transformation requires a fundamental restructuring of Uganda's political economy — away from the patronage networks that sustain the jungle and toward genuinely competitive, transparent, and equitable systems of resource allocation. This means tackling corruption not through spectacular prosecutions but through structural reforms: independent auditing institutions, transparent procurement processes, freedom of information legislation, and protection for whistleblowers. It means investing in education, health care, and infrastructure not as photo opportunities but as commitments to the long-term productivity and dignity of the Ugandan people. And it means creating economic conditions in which young Ugandans can build futures without seeking the patronage of the powerful.¹¹⁹

The third dimension is cultural. The transformation from jungle to nation requires a revolution in civic culture — a fundamental shift in how Ugandans understand the relationship between the citizen and the state. This means reclaiming the language of rights. It means rebuilding trust in institutions. It means educating children not in obedience, but in critical thinking, civic participation, and the history of how freedom is won and lost. As Gramsci understood, the transformation of society begins in the transformation of consciousness. No constitutional reform will stick, no economic restructuring will endure, unless the people themselves come to believe — deeply, collectively,

¹¹⁷Keck and Sikkink (n 80) 98–125.

¹¹⁸Oloka-Onyango (n 5) 214–238.

¹¹⁹Rose-Ackerman (n 61) 59–88.

irreversibly — that they are sovereign. That the state is their servant, not their master. That the jungle is not their home — and never was.¹²⁰

¹²⁰Gramsci (n 83) 134–158.

CONCLUSION: THE END OF THE JUNGLE ERA

A Jungle Does Not Become a Nation Until Its People Demand It

No jungle ever transformed itself. It does not grow into a nation by accident. No dictator one day wakes up to write a new social contract. No regime, built on control, hands over freedom willingly. It must be demanded. Not begged. Not hoped for. Demanded. Not with fists, but with clarity. Not with riots, but with ritual. Not with hate, but with holy defiance. The jungle is not just trees and rifles. It is the normalisation of fear, the performance of progress, the weaponisation of memory. It is the quiet understanding that some are born to rule and others to kneel. It is the whispered, generational trauma that says: "Don't ask questions." But nations are not built in silence. They are born in the noise of ideas. In the demand for dignity. In the insistence that justice belongs to everyone, or to no one at all.¹²¹

To demand a nation is not merely to demand a president. It is to demand accountability without fear. To demand truth without torture. To demand law without loyalty to the throne. It is to remember that a government is not a god. It is a servant. And when it forgets its place, the people must remember theirs. Uganda will not become a nation because a leader allows it. It will become a nation the moment the people stop calling the jungle home. The moment we say: We will not call order what is clearly oppression. We will not confuse calm with cowardice. We will not baptise corruption with patriotism. We will not clap for those who trample us. We will not inherit the fear of our fathers as fate. That moment is nationhood. Not a flag. Not an anthem. Not a budget. But a collective awakening.¹²²

Why Museveni's Fall Is Inevitable, but Uganda's Rise Is a Choice

The fall of Yoweri Kaguta Museveni is not a question of if — it is a question of when. History has made one truth plain: no regime lasts forever. Not monarchy. Not military rule. Not even those with medals and myths and manipulated

¹²¹Sharp (n 100) 77–100.

¹²²Arendt (n 90) 172–196.

constitutions. Like all authoritarian systems, Museveni's rule is burdened by time. Beneath the illusion of invincibility is the unspoken reality of biological limitation, political exhaustion, and a legacy increasingly hollowed by contradiction. He once stood for reform. He now fears it. He once demanded accountability. He now dodges it. He once promised to go when asked. He now criminalises the asking. This is not evolution. It is regression. And such regimes do not withstand the slow corrosion of public trust. As Hannah Arendt argued, authoritarianism does not collapse because it is attacked – it collapses because it becomes absurd, unworthy of belief, and unsustainable even to those who once enforced it.¹²³

But Uganda's rise is not guaranteed. That part depends not on fate, but on the deliberate moral choice of its people. Too many nations have removed dictators only to replace them with different uniforms and new lies. Because removing a tyrant is not the same as building a republic. Liberation from a person is easy. Liberation from a mindset is the real work. Museveni's system – militarised, patriarchal, transactional, and manipulative – has shaped how many Ugandans understand politics itself. This jungle model of governance has become so normalised that even the opposition sometimes imitates it. That is the danger. Uganda will not rise by accident. It will rise when the people reject not only the man – but the mechanism. When they refuse the logic of fear. When they stop treating elections as performances. When they reject tribal division as a tool of access. When they dismantle the myth that power must always come from above.¹²⁴

Museveni will fall. That is written. But will Uganda rise? That is unwritten. That is chosen. And the answer depends not on the fall of one man, but on the rise of many others – teachers, nurses, students, artists, farmers, and thinkers who decide that the jungle ends with them. Not with a war. Not with vengeance. But with memory, structure, discipline, and love for a country too long denied its nationhood. Because in the end, Museveni's fall may change the government. But only the people can change the country. And the jungle has ruled long enough. Now, let the nation rise.¹²⁵

¹²³ Arendt (n 90) 199–223.

¹²⁴ Levitsky and Way (n 29) 165–198.

¹²⁵ Fanon (n 2) 595–629.

EPILOGUE: THE REPUBLIC WE OWE EACH OTHER

There is a republic waiting to be born in Uganda. Not the one on paper, with its flags and its songs and its constitutional provisions. Not the one that is described in textbooks and recited at national ceremonies. But a real republic – one built on the daily choices of ordinary citizens who decide, one by one, that enough is enough.

This republic will not arrive because a dictator falls. Dictators have fallen before in Uganda, and the jungle has grown back each time. It will arrive when the people who inherit the next moment of transition decide to do something different – to build institutions rather than personalities, to distribute power rather than concentrate it, to invest in justice rather than patronage, and to treat each other as citizens rather than subjects.

This book has been an act of naming – of calling the jungle by its true name, so that it can no longer disguise itself as a republic. Names have power. When a people can name what oppresses them, they begin to step outside its grip. When they can describe the architecture of their own captivity, they begin to design their liberation.

The republic we owe each other is not a gift from the powerful. It is a covenant among the governed – a promise that we will not leave each other to be consumed by the jungle, that we will speak when speaking is dangerous, that we will organise when organising is forbidden, that we will remember when forgetting is enforced, and that we will demand, without apology and without ceasing, the dignity that is the birthright of every Ugandan.

Uganda is not condemned to be a jungle. That is not its DNA. That is its wound. And wounds, when properly treated, can heal.

Isaac Christopher Lubogo
Suigeneris Consultancy, Kampala
2025

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS: UGANDA IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

I. The Regional Architecture of Authoritarian Endurance in East Africa

Uganda's jungle state does not exist in isolation. It is embedded in a regional political ecology that has, for decades, provided authoritarian leaders with mutual insulation from democratic accountability. Across East and Central Africa, the post-liberation generation of leaders — Museveni in Uganda, Kagame in Rwanda, Kabila and his successors in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Nkurunziza and later Ndayishimiye in Burundi — has constituted an informal solidarity network bound together by shared ideological commitments, overlapping security interests, and a collective resistance to international pressure for genuine democratisation.

This regional network of authoritarian solidarity has had concrete political consequences for Uganda. When the international community has attempted to apply pressure on Museveni — through aid conditionality, diplomatic censure, or electoral monitoring — the regime has been able to draw on regional solidarity to deflect and minimise that pressure. The framing of Western democratic demands as neocolonial interference — a framing that resonates with genuine historical grievances about colonial and post-colonial exploitation — has been particularly effective when advanced collectively by a group of leaders who can claim the mantle of African self-determination. That these same leaders are often the primary agents of their own peoples' oppression is a paradox that the rhetoric of anti-imperialism tends to obscure.

Rwanda represents a particularly important case study in this regional dynamic. President Paul Kagame's Rwanda is routinely held up — including by Museveni, who has repeatedly cited the Rwandan model — as a example of what African leadership can achieve: economic growth, institutional efficiency, and social order. But Rwanda's model is one of hyperauthoritarianism — a state in which political opposition is systematically crushed, civil society is tightly controlled, and the president exercises near-absolute power justified by the unique trauma of the 1994 genocide. The citation of Rwanda as a positive model reveals something important about the ideology of Uganda's jungle state: that social order and material development are presented as sufficient justifications for political control, and that the absence of democratic accountability is treated not as a deficiency but as an enabling condition.

The Democratic Republic of Congo provides a different but equally instructive regional contrast. Uganda has maintained significant political, military, and economic interests in eastern DRC for decades – interests that have involved the direct exploitation of Congolese resources, the support of proxy armed groups, and the cultivation of commercial networks that have enriched Ugandan military and political elites. The instability of eastern Congo has, in this sense, been not merely a neighbouring crisis but a resource – a zone of managed disorder from which significant economic and strategic advantages have been extracted. As Bayart, Ellis and Hibou have argued, the criminalisation of the state often involves the exploitation of regional instability through networks that cross formal national boundaries.

Tanzania under John Pombe Magufuli (2015–2021) demonstrated the regional trajectory of democratic regression – where a leader elected on a genuine anti-corruption mandate rapidly consolidated authoritarian power, suppressed civil society, and died in office having fundamentally damaged the democratic fabric that Julius Nyerere had painstakingly constructed. The Tanzanian case is a warning: that leadership change, without structural reform, often merely produces a new variant of the same pathology. Magufuli was not Nyerere's legacy. He was its negation. Uganda must learn this lesson: that the answer to Museveni is not merely a new Museveni with different personal qualities, but a fundamentally different relationship between citizens and state.

II. The International Aid Paradox: Funding Stability, Subsidising Repression

Uganda receives approximately one billion dollars annually in foreign aid and official development assistance. This figure – which has remained broadly consistent over the past two decades, fluctuating with political tensions and global economic conditions – represents a significant proportion of the national budget, particularly in health, education, and infrastructure. For the Ugandan government, this aid is not merely a financial resource – it is a political one. It allows the regime to claim development achievements that domestic resource mobilisation alone could not fund, to present itself to international audiences as a responsible developmental state, and to maintain the loyalty of service delivery networks that are, in practice, channels of political patronage.

The fundamental paradox of international aid to Uganda is that it simultaneously funds genuine social goods – vaccine distribution, primary school construction, antiretroviral therapy – and subsidises the political system that makes these goods inadequate to the needs of the population. By funding health and education services that the government lacks the political will and institutional capacity to fund adequately from domestic revenues, international

donors relieve the government of the pressure to reform the systems of corruption and patronage that divert public resources. The result is a development paradox: aid prevents the immediate humanitarian consequences of institutional failure while perpetuating the institutional failure itself.

Dambisa Moyo's critique of aid dependency, while sometimes overstated in its general application, has particular resonance in the Ugandan context. When a government knows that international donors will cover essential service gaps regardless of its own fiscal behaviour, the incentive to govern efficiently and accountably is significantly reduced. The Ugandan government does not need to maximise tax revenues, combat procurement corruption, or invest in public sector efficiency – because the consequences of failing to do so are ameliorated by international transfers. This dynamic does not excuse the regime's choices. But it does implicate the international donor community in their perpetuation.

Uganda has also been a major recipient of security assistance from both Western governments and regional bodies. American counterterrorism cooperation – particularly through the Africa Command – has provided the Ugandan military with training, intelligence sharing, and equipment. The official justification is regional security: Uganda's role in the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) and its engagement against the LRA in Central Africa are cited as contributions to continental peace and stability that justify partnership. But the security relationship has an undeniable political dimension. American military assistance strengthens the UPDF – the same institution that fires on protesters in Kampala streets and arrests opposition candidates. The United States government has expressed periodic concern about human rights abuses in Uganda. It has rarely allowed those concerns to meaningfully interrupt the security partnership.

The European Union has maintained a more consistently critical posture, particularly around electoral standards and civil society restrictions. EU election observation missions have routinely documented serious electoral irregularities and called for institutional reform. The EU has used financial leverage on occasion – most notably in 2023, when concerns about the Anti-Homosexuality Act created significant bilateral tension. But European consistency has been undermined by member state divergence: individual European governments, pursuing their own trade, security, and migration interests, have often maintained warm bilateral relationships with Kampala even as the EU's institutional voice has been critical. The result is a European engagement that is rhetorically principled but practically inconsistent – and which the Museveni government has learned to navigate with considerable sophistication.

III. The Woman Question: Gender, Power, and the Peculiar

Feminism of the Jungle State

Uganda's constitution contains some of the most progressive gender provisions on the African continent – including an affirmative action provision requiring that women hold at least one-third of parliamentary seats, specific protections against discrimination on grounds of sex, and constitutional recognition of the particular needs of women in development policy. Under Museveni, Uganda has maintained high rates of women's formal political participation by global standards: women hold significant proportions of parliamentary seats, cabinet positions, and local government offices. The president has appointed women to senior positions in the judiciary, the civil service, and the diplomatic corps.

This formal commitment to women's political inclusion has been cited, both domestically and internationally, as evidence of Uganda's democratic progress. And in formal terms, it represents a genuine achievement – one that many countries with stronger democratic credentials have failed to match. But a closer examination reveals the limits and complications of what might be called the jungle state's feminism. Women's formal representation in Uganda has been high, but women's substantive political power – their ability to influence policy, challenge power, and organise independently – has been significantly more constrained. Women legislators who have challenged the regime on issues of fundamental rights have faced the same harassment, marginalisation, and repression as their male counterparts. Betty Nambooze, one of Uganda's most courageous opposition parliamentarians, has been arrested, beaten, and hospitalised for her political activities.

The appointment of women to formal positions in a jungle state serves the same function as other forms of inclusion: it legitimises the regime, creates personal dependencies among appointed officials, and provides international audiences with evidence of progressive governance that can be cited to counter human rights criticisms. A woman appointed as minister by a president who controls her career, her resources, and her political future is not a feminist achievement. She is a patronage relationship dressed in progressive language. True gender equality in political life requires not just women in positions, but women with genuine power – power to challenge, to refuse, to organise, and to hold leaders accountable regardless of gender.

IV. The Role of Traditional Institutions: Kingdoms, Chiefs, and the Jungle's Cultural Legitimation

One of the most distinctive – and underanalysed – features of Uganda's political landscape is the survival and revival of traditional monarchical

institutions. Uganda's kingdoms — Buganda, Bunyoro-Kitara, Busoga, Toro, Ankole, and others — were formally abolished by the Milton Obote government in 1967. Their restoration under Museveni in 1993 was presented as a cultural achievement, a return of indigenous heritage stolen by colonial and post-colonial interference. And in cultural terms, it was genuinely welcomed, particularly among the peoples of kingdoms with strong traditional identities. The restoration of the Kabaka of Buganda, in particular, was met with extraordinary popular enthusiasm.

But the political logic of traditional institution restoration was not primarily cultural — it was strategic. By restoring the kingdoms, Museveni achieved several important political objectives simultaneously. He neutralised the Buganda Kingdom — the most politically significant traditional institution and the seat of Uganda's most numerically and economically powerful ethnic group — by giving it ceremonial power while ensuring that its political activity was channelled into cultural expression rather than political challenge. He created new forms of patronage, as kingdom leaders became dependent on government goodwill for land, resources, and political access. And he cultivated the cultural loyalty of kingdom populations — particularly Baganda — as an alternative to the political loyalty that his democratic record might not have sustained.

The arrangement has been periodically strained. The Buganda Kingdom has, on occasion, used its cultural platform to articulate political grievances — most notably around land tenure and the federal question — that have created genuine tension with the central government. But these tensions have consistently been managed through a combination of negotiation, economic incentive, and the implicit threat of withdrawal of support for the kingdom's cultural and ceremonial activities. The kingdoms have not become a genuine counterpower to the jungle state. They have become part of its cultural legitimisation — adding a layer of traditional authority to a system of governance that, in political terms, has no traditional basis whatsoever.

V. The Next Uganda: Imagining the Republic

To imagine a different Uganda is not naive romanticism. It is a political act — perhaps the most radical political act available to citizens of a jungle state. Dictatorships survive, in large part, by making alternatives unimaginable. They manufacture a cognitive landscape in which the existing order seems natural, inevitable, and permanent. They drain language of its democratic possibilities. They make the word "election" mean a ritual of validation rather than an instrument of accountability. They make "parliament" mean a chamber of choreographed consent rather than a forum of genuine deliberation. They make "republic" mean a flag and an anthem rather than a covenant of governance. To

reimagine Uganda is to reclaim this language — to insist that these words mean what they say, and to build institutions that embody rather than merely perform their meanings.

The Uganda that might be is a Uganda in which a presidential election genuinely could be lost by an incumbent — and in which that loss would be accepted, peacefully, as the expression of sovereign popular will. It is a Uganda in which a parliamentary majority cannot be manufactured through patronage but must be earned through ideas and representation. It is a Uganda in which a judge who rules against the government fears no consequence for their career. It is a Uganda in which a journalist who reports on corruption does not fear for their freedom. It is a Uganda in which a young person's future is determined by their talent and effort rather than by their political connections or ethnic affiliation.

This Uganda does not yet exist. But it is not impossible. Countries with histories of authoritarian governance as deep and as entrenched as Uganda's have found paths to genuine democratic development. Ghana has moved from a history of military coups and single-party rule to a vibrant competitive democracy with peaceful transfers of power. South Africa emerged from the comprehensive totalitarianism of apartheid to become, despite its many remaining challenges, a functioning constitutional democracy with genuine judicial independence and civic freedom. Senegal has maintained democratic institutions and periodic peaceful transfers of power across decades of political contention. These are not perfect democracies. They are imperfect ones — troubled by inequality, corruption, and persistent institutional weaknesses. But they are democracies, in the meaningful sense that elections determine who governs, that opposition has a genuine chance to succeed, and that citizens can organise, speak, and demand accountability without fear of imprisonment.

The path from jungle to republic is not a single step. It is a long journey — requiring institutional reform, cultural transformation, economic restructuring, and, above all, the sustained commitment of citizens who refuse to accept the jungle as their permanent home. It requires patience: the patience to build institutions that outlast individuals, to develop civic habits that outlast political moments, and to maintain democratic commitments through the inevitable setbacks and reversals of a transition process. It requires courage: the courage to demand accountability from power, to organise in the face of repression, and to maintain moral clarity when pragmatic accommodation would be easier. And it requires imagination: the capacity to see, in the midst of the jungle's vines, the open ground where the republic might stand.

Uganda has all the ingredients it needs. It has a young, energetic, and increasingly educated population that has demonstrated, repeatedly, its hunger for genuine democratic change. It has a civil society — however battered and

constrained — that has maintained the habit of civic engagement through decades of repression. It has a diaspora that has maintained connections to international democratic norms and resources. It has an intellectual tradition — in law, in political science, in history, in philosophy — that has produced rigorous analyses of its own political pathologies and genuine visions of democratic alternatives. It has, above all, the lived knowledge of what the jungle costs — the daily experience of injustice, exclusion, and denied potential that constitutes the most powerful motivation for change.

The jungle will not transform itself. No dictator has ever voluntarily dismantled his own power. But the jungle's apparent permanence is always, in the end, an illusion. Regimes that seemed eternal have collapsed. Systems that seemed impregnable have crumbled. Powers that seemed absolute have proven mortal. What breaks them is not always dramatic — a single act of heroic resistance, a moment of revolutionary clarity. More often, it is the accumulation of small acts of refusal, the slow building of alternative institutions and alternative consciousness, the patient maintenance of civic spirit through years when it seems futile. Uganda's republic is waiting. Not for a saviour — but for the sustained, collective, unglamorous work of a people who have decided that the jungle is not good enough. That they deserve better. And that they are willing to build it.

VI. A Letter to the Next Generation of Ugandan Leaders

To those who will inherit Uganda — to the young women and men who are, today, in secondary schools and universities and markets and fields across this country, absorbing the contradictions of a jungle that claims to be a nation — this book ends with a direct address. You will be called upon, sooner than you imagine, to make choices about what kind of country Uganda will be. Those choices will be made not primarily in election campaigns or parliamentary debates — though those matter — but in the daily decisions that constitute the texture of civic life: whether to accept a bribe or refuse it; whether to speak truth or swallow it; whether to organise or withdraw; whether to build institutions or exploit them; whether to treat your fellow citizens as partners in a shared project or as obstacles in a personal one.

The generation that built the jungle did not set out to build a jungle. Museveni and his comrades went to the bush with genuine ideals — of national liberation, of African dignity, of economic development and social justice. They were not cynics. They were believers who were gradually, then suddenly, corrupted by the logic of power — a logic that their original idealism had not equipped them to resist. The lesson is not that idealism is naive. The lesson is that idealism without institutional design — without the deliberate construction of

accountability mechanisms that constrain even the most idealistic leaders — always eventually becomes its own betrayal.

Your task is not to be more idealistic than those who came before. It is to be more structurally serious. It is to understand that a republic is not a feeling or a slogan — it is a set of institutions, habits, and norms that must be deliberately designed, carefully maintained, and vigorously defended. It is to understand that the greatest threat to democracy is not the corrupt leader or the repressive state — it is the citizenry that acquiesces to corruption and repression because it has lost the habit of demanding better. It is to understand that building a republic is the work not of one generation but of many — and that the most important contribution any single generation can make is to leave the institutions of democracy stronger than it found them.

Uganda's next leaders — you — will face a choice that is ultimately a choice about what kind of society you want to live in, and what legacy you want to leave. You can choose the jungle: the familiar path of patronage, control, and the short-term advantages of power without accountability. History suggests this path ends badly — for the country, and eventually for the leader. Or you can choose the republic: the harder, slower, less immediately rewarding path of building institutions that distribute power, protect rights, and create conditions for genuine human flourishing. History suggests this path also ends — but not in the way the jungle ends. It ends in legacy. In monuments not of stone but of functioning courts, of free elections, of citizens who trust their state because their state has earned that trust. The jungle has had its era. The republic awaits its builders. That work begins with you.

Chapter A: The Myth of the Ten-Point Programme

When the National Resistance Army marched into Kampala on 26 January 1986, its leader Yoweri Kaguta Museveni made one of the most audacious promises in postcolonial African political history. His government would adhere to a Ten-Point Programme articulating a vision of democratic governance, restoration of security, consolidation of national unity, elimination of all forms of sectarianism, defence of national independence, building of an independent integrated economy, restoration of social services, elimination of corruption and misuse of power, redressing errors that resulted in displacement of some of the population, and cooperation with neighbouring countries. These were not empty words. They reflected genuine aspirations of a movement that had spent years in the bush witnessing the devastation that bad governance had inflicted on the people of Uganda. And yet, measured against the political reality of nearly four decades later, the Ten-Point Programme reads today not as a declaration of democratic intent but as a monument to unfulfilled promise and rhetorical aspiration never truly inhabited.

The first point – democracy – was the most fundamental and the most quickly compromised. Democracy in any serious political sense requires genuine competition, genuine accountability, and the genuine possibility of leadership change through peaceful means. Uganda under Museveni has had elections – more elections than most regional neighbours. But elections without genuine competition are not democracy. They are performance. The critical question is not whether elections occur but whether they could plausibly produce a change of government. In Uganda from 1986 to the present, the answer has consistently and clearly been negative. The NRM state apparatus has been deployed systematically and comprehensively to ensure that elections produce predetermined outcomes. This is not a marginal observation – it is the consensus finding of every serious electoral observation mission, domestic and international, that has monitored Ugandan elections across this entire period.

The fourth point – elimination of all forms of sectarianism – has been perhaps the most cynically deployed of the ten. The Museveni government has consistently positioned itself as a force for national unity against ethnic and regional division, presenting the NRM as a pan-Ugandan movement transcending the tribal and regional loyalties it blames for pre-1986 chaos. In formal terms, the government has maintained a genuinely multiethnic composition at the highest levels. Cabinet has always included representatives of major ethnic communities, and formal positions have been distributed with careful attention to regional and ethnic balance. But the elimination of sectarianism in form has coexisted with its strategic cultivation in substance. Ethnic loyalties have been mobilised for electoral purposes, regional grievances have been exploited and managed rather

than resolved, and the political architecture of patronage has been built in significant part on ethnic foundations.

The seventh point — restoration and improvement of social services — represents perhaps the most genuinely mixed record of the Museveni era. The government has overseen real improvements in some dimensions of service delivery: primary school enrolment has increased dramatically, HIV/AIDS prevalence has been significantly reduced through a remarkable public health campaign, and access to basic health services has expanded however unevenly. These achievements are real and they matter to millions of Ugandans. But they exist alongside catastrophic failures in service quality, massive diversion of health and education budgets through procurement corruption, and a persistent growing gap between services available to the wealthy and those accessible to the majority. The primary school that exists but has no textbooks, the health centre that is registered but has no drugs, the district hospital that appears in the budget but lacks medical staff — these are the daily realities of social services under a government that has been governing for four decades.

The eighth point — elimination of corruption and misuse of power — is by any honest accounting the most completely failed commitment of the Ten-Point Programme. Uganda today ranks among the most corrupt countries in the world according to Transparency International. The magnitude and brazenness of corruption scandals over three decades — the OPM scandal in which billions were stolen from post-conflict reconstruction funds for northern Uganda, the Global Fund scandal in which hundreds of millions intended for HIV/AIDS treatment were diverted, the GAVI scandal, and numerous road contract scandals in which infrastructure costs were inflated by multiples of their actual value — reflects not a system that occasionally fails to prevent corruption but a system that has institutionalised it as a mode of governance. The president himself has acknowledged corruption as a national crisis but his acknowledgements have consistently been divorced from structural reform, focusing instead on performative prosecution of selected officials whose primary disqualification is not that they stole but that they stole while insufficiently loyal to the regime.

Chapter B: The Legal Architecture of Authoritarian Permanence

The most sophisticated dimension of Uganda's jungle state is not its use of violence — which is real but not exceptional by regional standards — but its use of law. Uganda has a comprehensive formally sophisticated legal system. Its constitution is detailed and rights-protective. Its statutory law covers virtually every domain of human activity. Its court system processes millions of cases annually. The legal system functions in important respects as a genuine system

of law — resolving commercial disputes, processing criminal cases, adjudicating property claims, and enforcing contractual obligations with reasonable efficiency and fairness. But alongside this functioning legal system operates a parallel legal architecture specifically designed to enable authoritarian governance: laws that suppress political competition, criminalise dissent, restrict civil society, and immunise the powerful from accountability.

The Public Order Management Act of 2013 is the centrepiece of this architecture of repression. Ostensibly designed to regulate public gatherings in the interest of public order, the Act in practice requires police permission for all public meetings of three or more persons in public spaces — including political rallies, public demonstrations, and press conferences. The police have used it to systematically block opposition gatherings while permitting NRM events to proceed freely. Constitutional challenges have produced mixed judicial results, with some provisions struck down and others sustained, while enforcement continues regardless of judicial direction. The Act exemplifies the regime's approach to legal repression: create laws broad and vague enough to justify intervention in any political activity the regime wishes to suppress, enforce them selectively against opposition and civil society, and maintain formal compliance with constitutional processes by allowing legal challenges to proceed while ensuring enforcement continues during years of litigation.

The Computer Misuse Act and its successors have created a legal framework for the prosecution of digital dissent. Provisions criminalising offensive communication, false information, and cyberbullying have been deployed against journalists, activists, and ordinary citizens whose online posts the state has found politically inconvenient. The breadth and vagueness of these provisions — which can be read to criminalise virtually any critical commentary about public officials — creates a chilling effect on digital speech extending far beyond the cases actually prosecuted. When a citizen knows that a Facebook post criticising the president could result in arrest under the Computer Misuse Act, they do not need to be arrested to be silenced. The threat alone is sufficient governance.

Anti-money laundering and anti-terrorism frameworks, developed partly in response to genuine security challenges and partly under international pressure, have been repurposed as tools for the financial harassment of political opponents and civil society organisations. Foreign funding of Ugandan civil society has been progressively restricted and burdened with regulatory requirements that impose significant compliance costs and create grounds for prosecution when perfect compliance proves impossible. International NGOs have been deregistered. Local organisations have been investigated. Individual activists have had their financial transactions scrutinised. The financial

architecture of civil society repression is less visible than physical violence but equally effective in its demobilising consequences.

Chapter C: Education, History and the Manufacturing of Amnesia

Perhaps the most long-term and least visible dimension of Uganda's jungle governance is its management of historical memory. Every regime understands that its legitimacy depends in part on the story it can tell about the past — about who it replaced, what was achieved, and why its continued rule is necessary. In Uganda, the management of historical narrative has been systematic, pervasive, and profoundly consequential for democratic prospects. The official history divides time into two periods: the chaos before 1986 and the stability after. The pre-1986 period is presented as undifferentiated catastrophe demonstrating what Uganda was like before Museveni saved it. The post-1986 period is presented as sustained progress, punctuated by challenges that only continued NRM leadership can manage.

This historical narrative has several important political functions. First, it provides the foundational justification for perpetual rule: Uganda was a basket case before Museveni and would revert to chaos without him. Second, it delegitimises opposition by associating it with pre-1986 chaos — suggesting that those who challenge the NRM are threatening to return Uganda to the days of Amin and Obote. Third, it obscures the genuine achievements and democratic experiments of Uganda's pre-1986 history, including the Milton Obote II period of multiparty politics, the genuine economic development of the early independence era, and the cultural and intellectual flourishing that accompanied independence. By flattening this complex history into a simple narrative of pre-Museveni chaos and post-Museveni stability, the official historical account makes it very difficult to imagine a genuinely democratic Uganda.

The educational system is the primary vehicle through which this historical narrative is transmitted. Uganda's national curriculum has over post-1986 decades been progressively revised to align with the regime's preferred historical account. Textbooks at primary and secondary level present the NRM's version of Ugandan history as objective fact. The contributions of pre-independence leaders and post-independence democratic politicians are minimised or distorted. The political biography of Museveni is presented in terms bordering on hagiography. Critical analysis of the post-1986 record — of corruption, democratic regression, and military abuses — is absent from formal educational content. Children who complete Uganda's school system have been systematically educated to believe that Museveni saved their country, that the NRM represents Uganda's best political option, and that alternatives are dangerous. The consequences of this

educational distortion for Uganda's democratic prospects are profound and long-lasting.

Chapter D: The Global Ugandan Diaspora as Counter-Power

The Ugandan diaspora — estimated at between one and two million persons distributed across Europe, North America, Australia, and other African countries — represents a political resource of extraordinary potential that has been only partially realised. Unlike citizens within Uganda, diaspora Ugandans are beyond the reach of the regime's most effective tools of political control: they cannot be arrested for tweets, prevented from organising, or economically punished for dissent. They have access to international legal and advocacy frameworks. They can speak to international media, petition foreign governments, and engage with international institutions in ways structurally impossible for most Ugandans within the country.

The diaspora's political contributions to Uganda's democratic struggle have been real and significant. Diaspora journalists and media organisations — running news services and YouTube channels from London, Toronto, and Washington — have provided platforms for political analysis and reporting that domestic media, under surveillance and intimidation, cannot safely provide. Diaspora advocacy organisations have engaged foreign governments and international institutions on Ugandan human rights issues, contributing to the diplomatic pressure that has on occasion moderated the regime's worst excesses. Individual diaspora members have provided financial support to opposition politicians and civil society organisations, partially compensating for the domestic financial disadvantages that opposition faces against the NRM's state resource advantages.

But the diaspora's potential has also been significantly limited by structural challenges and strategic failures. Geographic and ideological fragmentation — with significant Ugandan communities in many different countries, organised around different regional, ethnic, and political identities — has prevented the emergence of a unified diaspora political voice. The regime has characteristically sought to exploit these divisions, cultivating relationships with diaspora leaders amenable to accommodation while isolating and discrediting those who maintain principled opposition. Diaspora organisations have sometimes focused on performative advocacy — statements, demonstrations, hashtag campaigns — rather than the sustained, patient, institutionally embedded work that actually changes foreign government policy. The question of remittances is also politically complex: diaspora remittances estimated at over one billion dollars annually are a vital economic resource but also paradoxically reduce the immediate economic pressure that might otherwise

incentivise greater political mobilisation within Uganda.

Chapter E: The Anatomy of Electoral Fraud

A comprehensive understanding of why Uganda's elections do not produce democratic change requires a detailed examination of the specific mechanisms through which electoral outcomes are managed. Electoral fraud in Uganda is not simply a matter of ballot stuffing on election day – though that occurs. It is a comprehensive multi-layered system that operates before, during, and after voting, combining legal manipulation, logistical interference, economic coercion, and physical intimidation to produce predetermined results while maintaining sufficient procedural cover for the regime to claim democratic legitimacy.

The pre-election phase is where the most consequential manipulation occurs. Voter registration processes systematically disadvantage opposition strongholds, with registration exercises producing more complete voter rolls in NRM-supporting areas while opposition areas experience registration delays, logistical failures, and reduced coverage. Constituency delimitation – the drawing of electoral boundaries – has been used to dilute opposition votes by combining opposition-leaning populations with NRM-supporting ones, and to create safe NRM seats by isolating opposition voters in small constituencies. Campaign finance regulations are enforced selectively: the NRM's use of state resources for campaigning – government vehicles, civil servant time, public funds channelled through constituency development funds – proceeds with regulatory immunity while opposition candidates face scrutiny and restrictions not applied to the ruling party.

On election day, the deployment of security forces is calibrated to deter opposition voting in competitive constituencies while facilitating NRM voting in safe areas. Voting material delays occur in opposition areas. Results tallying processes, opaque to independent observation, provide opportunities for result alteration before announcement. The post-election phase is equally important: legal challenges to election results are processed through courts that, whatever the individual courage of specific judges, operate within a structural context that makes significant electoral intervention rare and politically costly. The Supreme Court's 2016 ruling – finding serious electoral irregularities while upholding the result – illustrates this dynamic precisely. The irregularities were documented and acknowledged. The remedy was denied. The message was clear: the legal system will not overturn manipulated elections, however comprehensively the evidence of manipulation has been documented.

Chapter F: Civil Society and the Contested Space of Resistance

Civil society in Uganda has been one of the most dynamic and contested domains of political life over the past three decades. Uganda's NGO sector grew rapidly in the 1990s and 2000s, funded heavily by international donors who saw civil society as an alternative development delivery mechanism and a check on governmental power. At its peak, Uganda had one of the most active NGO sectors in sub-Saharan Africa, with thousands of organisations working across development, advocacy, service delivery, research, and human rights domains. This proliferation of organised civil society created real political and social value: it built organisational capacity, trained civic leaders, created information networks, and provided institutional platforms for the expression of civic demands that formal political institutions, captured by the regime, could not accommodate.

But the development of civil society also created new political tensions and new vulnerabilities. The regime, initially tolerant of NGO activity as a marker of democratic credibility and a channel for international funding, became increasingly hostile to organisations that engaged in political advocacy or democratic monitoring. The NGO Act of 2016 and its implementing regulations introduced a comprehensive registration and reporting system imposing significant compliance burdens, creating grounds for deregistration of organisations whose activities the government disapproved of, and requiring NGOs to align their activities with government development priorities — a requirement fundamentally compromising the independence on which civil society's accountability function depends. The message was unambiguous: civil society was welcome to deliver services, but not to challenge power.

Faith-based civil society — churches, mosques, and inter-religious organisations — represents perhaps the most consequential and most cautious dimension of Ugandan civic life. With their deep community roots, cross-ethnic reach, moral authority, and institutional independence from the state, religious organisations are potentially the most powerful actors in Ugandan civil society. In South Africa, the church played a central role in the anti-apartheid movement. In Poland, the Catholic Church was the institutional backbone of the Solidarity movement. But in Uganda, this potential has been largely neutralised through a combination of co-optation, dependence, and the prudential calculation that survival is better achieved through accommodation than confrontation. Individual religious leaders have spoken out with courage and clarity. Institutional religious bodies have generally maintained a posture of engagement with rather than challenge to the state, prioritising institutional preservation over political confrontation at the cost of failing to deploy, on behalf of the Ugandan people, the most powerful institutional resources for democratic accountability that the country possesses.

Chapter G: A Constitutional Reform Agenda

Any serious discussion of Uganda's democratic future must engage with the question of constitutional reform. The 1995 Constitution as originally drafted contained the structural elements of a democratic republic: presidential term limits, an independent judiciary, genuine separation of powers, a Bill of Rights, and mechanisms for civilian oversight of the military. The systematic dismantling of these elements through constitutional amendment, legislative restriction, and institutional capture has not been irreversible. The constitutional architecture for a genuine Ugandan republic exists or can be rebuilt. But doing so requires more than restoring deleted provisions. It requires understanding why those provisions were deleted and designing replacements that are more robust against the specific tactics of institutional capture that the Museveni regime has perfected.

Presidential term and age limits must be restored – but this time with entrenchment mechanisms making future amendment significantly more difficult. The model of requiring supermajority approval at two consecutive parliamentary sessions plus a national referendum for amendments to fundamental constitutional provisions is worth serious consideration. Such a mechanism would not make future amendment impossible – a fundamental requirement in a changing constitutional order – but it would make the kind of self-interested amendment that removed term limits in 2005 and age limits in 2017 practically much more difficult. The appointment process for independent constitutional commissions must be reformed to eliminate or substantially reduce executive control. In the current system, the president nominates commissioners and parliament confirms them – a process that with NRM's parliamentary majority effectively gives the president complete control over institutions nominally designed to check executive power.

The security sector requires comprehensive reform – not merely in its legal mandate but in its operational culture, leadership, and relationship to democratic governance. A reformed Uganda People's Defence Forces must be constitutionally and operationally understood as the defender of the nation and its constitutional order – which means the defender of democracy, civilian supremacy, and the rule of law, not the defender of the incumbent government or ruling party. Media freedom legislation – establishing genuine editorial independence for state broadcasting, providing legal protections for journalists and sources, creating transparent and impartial broadcasting regulation, and decriminalising all forms of speech that do not directly incite violence – is a precondition for the informed citizenry that democratic governance requires. A robust freedom of information law giving citizens genuine rights of access to government information with effective enforcement mechanisms is a structural requirement for democratic accountability without which civil society

organisations, journalists, and opposition politicians cannot effectively hold the government accountable for its performance.

Chapter H: The Path Forward — A Realistic Democratic Roadmap

The question that hangs over every analysis of Uganda's democratic crisis is the question of realistic possibility. Given what we know about the depth of authoritarian entrenchment, the sophistication of the regime's control mechanisms, and the structural obstacles to democratic change, what would it actually take to produce a genuine democratic transition? Not a change of leader — history has shown that leader changes without structural reform simply produce new variants of jungle governance. But a genuine transition to a system in which elections determine who governs, in which accountability is real rather than performed, in which citizens have enforceable rights, and in which the prospect of peaceful political change is not the exclusive property of the powerful.

The first requirement is a political crisis of sufficient magnitude to create a genuine opening. Authoritarian regimes rarely transition to democracy through gradual evolutionary change — they require a rupture, a moment in which the existing system's contradictions become acute enough to create space for genuine negotiation about the terms of political order. Such ruptures can take many forms: economic collapse that delegitimises the regime's developmental claims; a succession crisis that exposes the lack of constitutional mechanisms for peaceful leadership transition; massive popular mobilisation that convinces enough elements of the security apparatus that repression is no longer sustainable; or some combination of these factors. The trends — demographic pressure, declining oil revenues, growing youth unemployment, increasing regional and international scrutiny — suggest that the conditions for rupture are slowly developing.

The second requirement is an organised opposition capable of translating a political opening into institutional change. The history of democratic transitions globally demonstrates that political openings are insufficient without organised political forces ready to negotiate, implement, and defend new institutional arrangements. Uganda currently lacks this organised opposition at the level required. Political parties are fragmented, under-resourced, and infiltrated. Civil society, while active, is not politically organised in the sense of having capacity to sustain a governance transition. Building the organisational capacity for a genuine democratic transition is the most urgent and most underdeveloped dimension of Uganda's democratic project. The third requirement is an international environment that actively supports rather than passively accommodates democratic transition. The fourth — perhaps most fundamental

— is a political culture shift within Uganda itself. Structural reforms, international support, and organised opposition can create the conditions for democratic governance. But democratic governance ultimately depends on citizens who understand their rights, exercise them, and defend them. This civic culture cannot be legislated into existence. It must be cultivated — through education systems that develop critical thinkers, through media environments that inform rather than manipulate, and through the slow patient unglamorous work of community organising at every level of society.

Chapter I: What Uganda Owes Its Future — A Covenant of Nationhood

This book has travelled a long and difficult road — through the psychology of the guerrilla who would not disarm, through the architecture of performative democracy, through the machinery of controlled chaos, through the anatomy of resistance and its crushing, and through the possibility of something different. It arrives here, at the end, at what is ultimately a simple and profound question: what do we owe each other, as Ugandans? What covenant do we owe to the nation we share, to the future we will pass to those who come after us, and to the past that has made us who we are? The answer to that question is not complicated. It is only difficult. We owe each other truth. We owe each other accountability. We owe each other the political conditions in which every Ugandan — regardless of region, ethnicity, religion, age, or gender — can build a life commensurate with their talent and their effort. We owe each other a republic.

A republic is not a utopia. It does not guarantee prosperity or eliminate injustice. It does not produce perfect leaders or frictionless governance. What it produces is something more modest and more foundational: a framework within which injustice can be named, challenged, and corrected without danger; within which leaders can be held to account for their performance and removed when they fail; and within which every citizen has standing — legal, political, moral standing — to participate in the decisions that govern their life. That is what Uganda has been denied. That is what Uganda deserves. And that is what Uganda must, eventually, through the accumulated choices of its citizens, demand and build for itself.

The jungle has had its era. It has been studied in these pages, named in all its dimensions, exposed in all its mechanisms. The naming is necessary — because what is unnamed cannot be resisted, and what cannot be resisted cannot be changed. But naming alone is insufficient. Understanding alone is insufficient. Even courage alone is insufficient — Uganda has never lacked for courageous individuals; what it has lacked is the structural conditions that allow individual courage to accumulate into collective transformation. Building those

structural conditions is the work of this generation and the next. It is the work of constitutional reform and electoral integrity and judicial independence and media freedom. It is the work of civic education and community organising and professional integrity and everyday acts of honesty in public life. It is, in the end, the ordinary extraordinary work of citizenship — claimed fully, exercised consistently, and defended without apology. The republic awaits. Let it begin.

PART V: THE ECONOMY OF THE JUNGLE

The Petroleum Paradox: Oil, Power, and the Curse of Natural Resources

Uganda's discovery of commercially viable petroleum deposits in the Albertine Graben – confirmed by major international oil companies from 2006 onwards – was initially greeted with extraordinary hope. Here, at last, was the resource that could transform Uganda's development trajectory: fund infrastructure investment, expand social services, retire external debt, and create the fiscal independence that would reduce dependence on international aid and the political conditionalities that come with it. The discovery was real. The reserves – estimated at approximately six billion barrels, with commercially extractable quantities of around one billion barrels – were substantial. Uganda's oil future seemed bright.

But resource discoveries in authoritarian states rarely follow the trajectory of hope. Instead, they tend to accelerate the pathologies of governance that preceded them: concentrating wealth in elite networks, funding regime entrenchment, creating new frontiers of corruption, and – paradoxically – reducing the pressure for the institutional reforms that sustainable development requires. The political economy literature on the 'resource curse' – developed through studies of oil-dependent states from Nigeria and Venezuela to Equatorial Guinea and Gabon – is well established and deeply relevant to Uganda's situation. The core insight is that resource wealth, in the hands of authoritarian regimes, tends to extend rather than terminate authoritarian governance by providing rulers with revenues that insulate them from the accountability pressures that would otherwise arise from dependence on domestic taxation.

In Uganda, the politics of oil have followed this pattern with disturbing precision. The legislative and regulatory framework governing petroleum extraction has been developed through processes characterised by opacity, elite capture, and the systematic exclusion of civil society from meaningful participation. The Production Sharing Agreements signed between the Ugandan government and the international oil companies – TotalEnergies, CNOOC, and their predecessors – have been treated as state secrets, their terms inaccessible to parliament, civil society, and the public. The revenues expected from oil production have been factored into governmental financial planning and political calculations long before a single barrel has been pumped, creating new forms of collateralised borrowing and new political dependencies. And the communities of the Albertine region – whose lands are being acquired for pipeline infrastructure,

whose livelihoods are being disrupted by industrial development, and whose environments are being exposed to the risks of large-scale petroleum extraction – have been systematically excluded from both benefit-sharing arrangements and meaningful decision-making processes.

The Uganda-Tanzania crude oil pipeline – which will transport oil from the Albertine fields to the Indian Ocean port of Tanga – represents the most significant infrastructure project in Uganda's history and one of the most consequential environmental and social justice controversies in contemporary East Africa. The pipeline crosses approximately 1,443 kilometres, passing through some of the most ecologically sensitive areas on the continent. Thousands of families along the route have been required to leave their land or accept compensation that independent assessors have consistently found inadequate. Environmental impact assessments have been criticised by international experts as insufficient. The project has been subject to significant international campaigning, with European financial institutions withdrawing support in response to human rights and environmental concerns – a development that the Ugandan government has characterised as neocolonial interference, and that independent observers have characterised as a legitimate response to documented governance failures.

The oil question reveals, with particular clarity, the fundamental governance challenge of Uganda's jungle state. The potential revenues from oil – if well managed through transparent institutions accountable to citizens – could indeed transform Uganda's development prospects. But well management through transparent institutions accountable to citizens is precisely what Uganda's political system is not designed to produce. The jungle state will manage oil revenues as it manages all other resources: as instruments of regime survival rather than tools of national development. Without fundamental political reform – without the electoral accountability, judicial independence, and civil society freedom that might create genuine pressure for resource transparency – Uganda's oil is more likely to fund authoritarian entrenchment than democratic development.

The Land Question: Dispossession, Elite Accumulation, and the Erosion of Peasant Security

Land in Uganda is not merely an economic resource. It is the foundation of livelihood, identity, cultural belonging, and social security for the vast majority of Uganda's predominantly rural population. Land disputes are the most common category of civil litigation in Uganda's courts. Land conflicts are a major driver of community violence, family breakdown, and intergenerational poverty. And land dispossession – the progressive erosion of smallholder tenure security in favour

of large-scale commercial interests and elite political networks — represents one of the most consequential and least discussed dimensions of Uganda's governance crisis.

Uganda's land tenure system is extraordinarily complex — combining customary tenure, registered freehold, leasehold, and Mailo land (a form of tenure peculiar to Buganda, created by the 1900 Uganda Agreement between the British colonial administration and the Buganda Kingdom). This complexity creates opportunities for manipulation: for the appropriation of customary land through fraudulent registration, for the eviction of tenant farmers through the exercise of Mailo landlord rights, for the conversion of gazetted forest and wetland to private agricultural or commercial use, and for the compulsory acquisition of land for public purposes at compensation rates that systematically undervalue the interests of the dispossessed. Each of these mechanisms has been used extensively in Uganda under the current regime, creating what scholars of agrarian political economy would recognise as a process of primitive accumulation — the transfer of productive resources from the many to the few through politically enabled dispossession.

The victims of land dispossession are overwhelmingly Uganda's most vulnerable citizens: subsistence farming families in rural areas who lack the legal documentation, financial resources, and political connections to defend their tenure rights against well-connected claimants. The perpetrators include powerful politicians, military officers, business elites, and international investors — all of whom have benefited from a land governance system that systematically privileges those with access to state power over those whose only claim is historical occupation and customary right. The courts, which should be the primary remedy for land rights violations, are inaccessible to most dispossessed Ugandans: too expensive, too slow, too geographically distant, and — when the dispossessor has political connections — too unreliable in their outcomes to offer genuine redress.

Youth, Unemployment, and the Ticking Demographic Clock

Uganda has the world's youngest population: the median age is approximately 15.5 years, and approximately 75 percent of Ugandans are below the age of 30. This demographic reality represents an extraordinary potential asset — the productive capacity of a young, energetic workforce with decades of economic contribution ahead. But it also represents an extraordinary political challenge: the need to create employment, educational opportunity, and civic inclusion at a rate commensurate with the scale of demographic growth. Uganda's economy, despite periods of respectable GDP growth, has consistently failed to create formal sector employment at anything approaching the rate

necessary to absorb the growing youth cohort.

The consequences of this failure are increasingly visible across the country: in the informal economies of Kampala's markets and boda-boda networks, where hundreds of thousands of young people eke out precarious livelihoods in the interstices of formal economic activity; in the growing communities of Ugandan migrants seeking economic opportunities in Gulf states and elsewhere, often under exploitative conditions; in the concentration of frustrated, unemployed young men in urban areas where they are easily recruited as political clientele – paid a few thousand shillings to attend a rally, or intimidate an opposition supporter, or staff a campaign. The political mobilisation of economically desperate youth is not an accidental feature of Uganda's political landscape. It is a deliberate strategy.

The education system that produces Uganda's young people is itself a site of profound failure. Quantitatively, Uganda has made dramatic progress in primary school enrolment: Universal Primary Education, introduced in 1997, brought millions of children into school who would otherwise have remained outside formal education. But the quality of education produced by this quantitative expansion has been inadequate: chronically under-resourced schools, insufficiently trained and inadequately paid teachers, overcrowded classrooms, insufficient learning materials, and a curriculum inadequately aligned with the skills needs of Uganda's economy have produced a large formally educated but substantively underprepared workforce. The gap between educational attainment and employable skills – between the certificates produced by Uganda's schools and universities and the competencies required by formal sector employers – is a central driver of youth unemployment and a fundamental failure of the governance system that manages education policy.

The Nexus of Gender and Governance: Women in the Ugandan State

The formal position of women in Uganda's political system represents one of the most genuinely complex dimensions of governance assessment. Uganda's constitution mandates that women hold at least one-third of parliamentary seats – a provision that, in formal terms, places Uganda among the world leaders in women's political representation. Women have held significant cabinet positions throughout the post-1986 period, including the Vice-Presidency, the Speaker of Parliament, and senior ministerial roles. The judiciary has seen significant advancement of women into senior positions. In local government, women hold a guaranteed proportion of seats that ensures their formal representation at the community level.

These formal achievements are not meaningless. The presence of women

in positions of formal authority creates role models, builds organisational capacity, and opens pathways of civic participation that would otherwise remain closed. But the critical question is not how many women hold formal positions – it is whether those positions carry genuine power. A woman appointed as minister by a president who controls her political career, allocates her budget, and determines whether she retains her position is not a feminist achievement in any substantive sense. She is a client of the patronage system, whose gender has been instrumentalised to produce the appearance of inclusive governance while the substance of power remains concentrated as before.

The treatment of women who have genuinely challenged power – rather than participated in its distribution – is the most honest measure of Uganda's gender politics. Betty Namboozee, Ingrid Turinawe, and other women who have engaged in genuine political opposition have experienced the same violence, harassment, and criminalisation as their male counterparts. Their gender has offered them no protection from the regime's repressive machinery – and has in some cases added additional dimensions of violence, including sexual humiliation and threats directed at their families. True gender equality in political life requires not just women in positions but women with genuine power: the power to challenge, to refuse, to organise, and to hold leaders accountable regardless of the political costs of doing so.

International Justice and the Question of Accountability

Uganda has had a complex and often ambivalent relationship with international justice mechanisms. Uganda was one of the first states to refer a situation to the International Criminal Court, referring the LRA conflict in 2003. This referral resulted in the prosecution of LRA commanders for crimes against humanity – a development that served Uganda's immediate political interests, focusing international criminal accountability on an armed group that threatened the regime rather than on the regime's own conduct. The ICC's investigation of LRA crimes has proceeded relatively smoothly from the Ugandan government's perspective, producing indictments and ultimately a prosecution of Dominic Ongwen that has resulted in conviction.

But the ICC's mandate extends beyond the crimes of non-state actors. Questions have been raised, by Ugandan human rights defenders and by international observers, about whether the conduct of Ugandan security forces during the LRA conflict – including the forced displacement of approximately 1.8 million people into internally displaced persons camps under conditions of extreme deprivation, where thousands died from preventable causes – meets the threshold for crimes against humanity. These questions have never been systematically investigated by the ICC, whose prosecutor has focused exclusively

on the LRA. The selective application of international justice — holding rebel groups accountable while immunising state forces for potentially comparable crimes — has been criticised as structurally biased toward regime interests.

The African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights and the East African Court of Justice represent regional mechanisms for human rights accountability that have, on occasion, been invoked in relation to Ugandan cases. The EACJ has made significant rulings on matters of East African Community law and human rights that have implications for Uganda. But the enforcement of these rulings depends on the political will of member state governments — a will that the Ugandan government has demonstrated inconsistently. International accountability mechanisms are useful tools for documenting violations and building the international record of regime conduct. But their impact on the actual behaviour of the Ugandan state has been limited, reflecting the broader challenge of international human rights enforcement in the absence of robust political pressure and genuine state willingness to comply.

PART VI: RESISTANCE, RESILIENCE, AND THE LONG GAME

The Art of Living in Truth: Personal Integrity as Political Act

Václav Havel's concept of 'living in truth' — developed in his 1978 essay *The Power of the Powerless*, written from within the stifling apparatus of Czechoslovak communist governance — offers one of the most profound frameworks for understanding both the nature of authoritarian power and the possibility of its undoing. Havel's central insight was that totalitarian systems — and by extension, sophisticated authoritarian systems like Uganda's — maintain themselves not primarily through the naked application of force but through a more pervasive mechanism: the requirement that citizens participate, however minimally and reluctantly, in the performance of a lie. The greengrocer who displays the slogan 'Workers of the World, Unite!' in his shop window does not believe in the slogan. He displays it because displaying it is expected of him, because refusing to display it would draw unwanted attention, because the small act of compliance is simply easier than the large act of resistance. But in that small compliance, the grocer becomes a co-producer of the system that oppresses him.

In Uganda, the equivalent performances are ubiquitous: the civil servant who praises the president in a public meeting she privately finds insufferable; the teacher who teaches the approved version of national history while privately knowing it to be distorted; the journalist who accepts the editorial guidance that certain stories are 'not yet time' while privately knowing them to be vital; the opposition supporter who wears an NRM shirt on election day to avoid harassment at the polling station; the market vendor who attends an NRM rally to maintain his trading licence. Each of these performances is individually understandable. Each represents a rational calculation by someone who has correctly assessed the cost of non-compliance and decided that the price is too high. And yet each, in being performed, adds one more thread to the fabric of the system's apparent legitimacy.

Havel's response to this dynamic is not a call for heroic martyrdom. It is a call for something more modest and more radical: simply to stop performing. To refuse the complicity that the system requires, in whatever way is available to the individual, in whatever dimension of their daily life. Not to seize power — that is beyond the reach of most people. But to refuse to lie, in the ways that specific individuals in specific circumstances can refuse. The teacher who teaches history as it actually occurred, even if she must do so carefully and indirectly, is

living in truth. The journalist who publishes the story he has documented, even if he must accept the professional consequences, is living in truth. The voter who refuses to sell her vote, even when the financial inducement is significant, is living in truth. These are not grand revolutionary acts. They are daily ethical choices. And when enough people make them, the fabric of the system's apparent legitimacy begins to fray.

For Uganda, the application of this framework suggests a specific strategic orientation. The most important work of democratic change is not the dramatic — the protest, the election campaign, the international advocacy mission — but the prosaic: the daily choices of millions of ordinary Ugandans about whether to participate in or refuse the performances that the system requires. This is not a passive strategy — it is an active one, requiring constant conscious decision-making under conditions of genuine risk. But it is a strategy that operates at a scale and in dimensions that the regime cannot easily suppress, because it is distributed across the entire population rather than concentrated in identifiable leadership targets.

The Intellectual and His Country: The Responsibility of Uganda's Thinkers

In every society governed by an authoritarian regime, intellectuals — those whose professional identity is defined by their engagement with ideas, by their capacity for systematic analysis, and by their access to platforms for public communication — face a particular version of the choice between compliance and resistance. They possess more than most citizens: greater capacity to understand the system's mechanisms, greater access to information about its operations, greater ability to communicate about both to wider audiences, and — in many cases — greater international connections that provide some measure of protection from the regime's most extreme repressive measures. With these advantages comes a proportionate responsibility.

Uganda's intellectual class — its university professors, its lawyers and judges, its journalists, its writers and artists, its development practitioners and policy analysts — has had a complex and often disappointing relationship with the responsibility of intellectual engagement with political reality. There have been outstanding exceptions: scholars of constitutional law who have documented the regime's erosion of legal norms with rigour and courage; journalists who have pursued and published stories of corruption and human rights violation at significant personal cost; lawyers who have represented political clients under circumstances that have endangered their professional futures and personal safety; artists who have found creative ways to speak political truth within the constraints of censorship. These individuals deserve

recognition, support, and solidarity.

But the broader intellectual class in Uganda has too often chosen the paths of comfortable accommodation: the university professor who writes about abstract constitutional theory while avoiding analysis of specific constitutional violations; the lawyer who practises corporate law while declining human rights cases; the development economist who produces technically sophisticated analyses of poverty without engaging with the political economy that produces and perpetuates it; the journalist who produces lifestyle content while the political desks are captured by state influence. These choices are individually understandable — careers must be sustained, families must be supported, risks must be assessed with full appreciation of their real weight. But collectively, they represent a significant abdication of the specific responsibilities that intellectual capacity and public platform create.

The Ugandan intellectual's responsibility in the current political moment is not to be a politician — that is a different vocation with different tools and different accountability. It is to analyse clearly, to document honestly, to communicate accessibly, and to connect particular Ugandan realities to the broader frameworks of knowledge that make sense of them. It is to say, with the authority of evidence and analysis, what is happening and why it matters. It is to refuse the comfortable evasions of abstract theorising and engage with the concrete specifics of power and its abuse. It is to teach students to think critically rather than to comply passively. It is to write history as it occurred rather than as the regime wishes it had occurred. These are not dramatic acts of heroism. They are the ordinary professional responsibilities of people whose professional identity is defined by their commitment to truth. In a jungle state, that commitment is itself a political act.

The Role of Religion in Democratic Transformation

Uganda is a profoundly religious country. Christianity — in its Catholic, Anglican, Pentecostal, and many other forms — claims the allegiance of approximately 85 percent of the population. Islam claims approximately 14 percent, concentrated primarily in eastern Uganda and in the descendants of historically Muslim communities. Traditional religious practices, while officially minority phenomena, remain significant in many communities. This religiosity is not superficial: for most Ugandans, faith is not a weekend practice but a central dimension of daily life, moral identity, and community belonging. Religious institutions reach into every village, school, health clinic, and family. Religious leaders command moral authority that secular politicians — and secular civil society organisations — frequently cannot match.

The question, therefore, of what role religious institutions should play in

Uganda's democratic transformation is not a peripheral one. It is central. The history of religion's role in political transformation elsewhere – the Catholic Church in Poland's Solidarity movement, the Black church in the American civil rights movement, the liberation theology movement in Latin America, the Buddhist monks' marches in Myanmar – demonstrates that religious institutions, when they engage with political injustice from a foundation of moral authority and organisational capacity, can be among the most powerful forces for democratic change available to a society.

Uganda's religious institutions have the organizational capacity to play this role. They have the moral authority. They have the geographic reach. They have, in many cases, the international connections that provide some measure of protection from state repression. What they have largely lacked is the institutional will to deploy these assets in the service of democratic accountability rather than institutional preservation. The accommodation with power that has characterised most of Uganda's major religious institutions is explicable – it reflects the rational institutional calculations of organisations that have real services to deliver to real communities, and that have judged, reasonably, that maintaining access to the state is the price of continuing to deliver those services. But it has also come at a significant cost: the failure to deploy religious moral authority in the service of the democratic transformation that Uganda desperately needs.

The path forward for Uganda's religious institutions does not require that they become political parties or that they abandon their core spiritual and social missions. It requires that they recover the prophetic dimension of their vocations – the tradition, present in every major world religion, of speaking truth to power, of defending the poor and marginalised against the powerful, of insisting that governance be judged by the standard of justice rather than the standard of stability. This tradition is not foreign to Uganda. It runs through the history of Christianity in this country, through the witness of martyrs like the Uganda Martyrs who chose conscience over compliance. It runs through Islamic teaching about justice and accountability. It runs through indigenous Ugandan spiritual traditions that honour the dignity of all persons and condemn the abuse of power. The recovery of this prophetic voice – applied to the specific political realities of contemporary Uganda – would be one of the most significant contributions that Uganda's religious institutions could make to the country's democratic future.

Pan-Africanism, Sovereignty, and the Rhetoric of Anti-Imperialism

One of the most effective rhetorical strategies employed by Uganda's regime – and by authoritarian African governments more broadly – is the

deployment of pan-African and anti-imperialist rhetoric to deflect criticism of domestic governance failures. When human rights organisations document torture in government detention facilities, when international election observers find systematic electoral fraud, when foreign governments apply diplomatic pressure over political repression, the response is predictable and politically powerful: accusations of neocolonialism, of foreign interference in African affairs, of the application of double standards by countries whose own histories include colonialism, slavery, and contemporary economic exploitation. These accusations contain genuine kernels of truth – the history of Western engagement with Africa is indeed characterised by exploitation and condescension, and the selective application of human rights standards by powerful countries to weaker ones is a real and documented phenomenon. But the use of genuine anti-colonial grievances to immunise authoritarian governance from accountability is a manipulation that ultimately serves power rather than the people in whose name anti-imperialism is invoked.

The test of any anti-imperialist claim is simple: whose interests does it actually serve? When a Ugandan president invokes African sovereignty to justify suppressing political opposition, the beneficiary is not the Ugandan people – it is the president whose power is thereby insulated from challenge. The Ugandan citizens who have been tortured in military detention, whose votes have been stolen, whose children have been denied quality education by a government that diverts public funds to patronage networks – these citizens are not protected by the rhetoric of anti-imperialism. They are abandoned by it. Genuine pan-Africanism – the tradition of solidarity, dignity, and self-determination associated with figures like Kwame Nkrumah, Julius Nyerere, and Amílcar Cabral – demands accountability from African governments to African citizens. It does not provide a cultural licence for African leaders to oppress African people without external scrutiny.

Uganda's regime has also used the language of African solutions to African problems to resist the application of international human rights standards – suggesting that these standards are alien impositions rather than universal norms. But this argument faces a fundamental empirical problem: the norms that the regime seeks to exempt itself from – freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, due process, freedom from torture, the right to meaningful participation in governance – are not exclusively Western inventions. They are articulated in the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, drafted and ratified by African states. They are grounded in African ethical traditions of ubuntu – the philosophical insistence on the dignity and interconnectedness of all persons – that predate colonialism and provide an indigenous African foundation for precisely the human rights standards that authoritarian regimes

claim are foreign imports.

The Language of Power: Discourse, Metaphor, and Political Control in Uganda

Language is never politically neutral. The words through which political reality is described shape how that reality is understood, evaluated, and potentially challenged. Authoritarian regimes understand this with great sophistication — they invest heavily in controlling the language through which their governance is discussed, described, and judged. Uganda's jungle state has developed a distinctive political vocabulary that deserves close critical examination: a set of words, phrases, metaphors, and framings that do important ideological work in maintaining the existing order.

The most consequential word in Uganda's official political vocabulary is 'stability.' The regime's fundamental claim to legitimacy is not democratic — it does not claim to have won fair elections or to govern with the genuine consent of the governed. Its fundamental claim is developmental: that it has brought peace and stability to a country that was, before 1986, chaotic and dangerous. This is a claim with genuine historical basis — Uganda under Amin and the second Obote administration was indeed chaotic and dangerous by any reasonable measure, and the restoration of security in the late 1980s was a genuine achievement. But the claim to stability has been extended far beyond its historical warrant to become the regime's general purpose justification for any action, however repressive: elections are managed to ensure 'stability,' civil society is regulated to prevent 'destabilisation,' opposition is suppressed in the name of 'national security,' and constitutional amendments are made to prevent the 'instability' that leadership change might bring.

The word 'development' performs similar ideological work. Every act of state — every road contract, every rural electrification project, every school construction — is presented not as routine governance but as an act of liberation, a fulfilment of the revolutionary promise of 1986. Development is not simply something the government does — it is something the government bestows, and its bestowal creates a moral claim on the gratitude and political loyalty of its recipients. This rendering of ordinary public expenditure as personal gift — a feature of patronage politics that political scientists call 'clientelism' — is central to the NRM's electoral strategy. Citizens are not being served by their government. They are being given gifts by their leader. And gifts, in the moral economy of patronage, require reciprocity.

The word 'enemies' does important political work in identifying who may be legitimately subjected to repression. The regime has maintained a continuous supply of enemies — internal and external — whose existence justifies the

securitised character of Ugandan governance. The LRA was an enemy. The ADF is an enemy. Foreign governments that criticise Ugandan human rights practices are enemies of sovereignty. Opposition politicians are enemies of stability. Civil society organisations funded from abroad are enemies of national independence. This construction of enmity is not accidental — it is functional. Every regime needs enemies to justify its security apparatus, and Uganda's jungle state has proven exceptionally creative in identifying new enemies as old ones become less convincing.

PART VII: ANATOMY OF A STOLEN GENERATION

The Boda-Boda Economy and the Politics of the Informal Sector

The boda-boda motorcycle taxi sector — with an estimated 800,000 operators in Uganda, the majority of them young men between the ages of 18 and 35 — is simultaneously one of the most important economic institutions in the country and one of the most politically consequential. Economically, the sector provides affordable last-mile transportation to millions of Ugandans who cannot access formal public transport, creates livelihoods for hundreds of thousands of operators and the mechanics, parts dealers, and fuel retailers who depend on them, and contributes significantly to the informal economy. Politically, the boda-boda operators are a force that every regime has sought to mobilise, manage, and, when necessary, instrumentalise.

The Museveni government's relationship with the boda-boda sector exemplifies the political economy of managed informality in Uganda's jungle state. Operators have been periodically organised into associations that serve as both regulatory bodies and political mobilisation structures. The boda-boda association leaders who have cultivated relationships with the ruling party have received preferential access to licensing, protection from police harassment, and political validation. Those who have aligned with opposition have experienced targeted enforcement, confiscation of vehicles, and physical intimidation. The sector exists in a permanent state of regulatory precarity — subject to laws and rules that the state enforces selectively, against those it chooses to penalise, and ignores selectively, in favour of those it chooses to reward.

This precarity is not accidental. It is a governance tool. The boda-boda operator who knows that his livelihood depends on the goodwill of the local police commander, who knows that his operating permit can be cancelled for political reasons without legal recourse, who knows that his association leadership has a direct line to NRM mobilisation networks — this operator is a managed subject, not a free citizen. He may privately despise the regime. He may vote against it when he believes he can do so safely. But he will not organise openly against it, because the cost of open organisation is the loss of the precarious livelihood on which his family depends. The management of economic precarity as a political tool is one of the jungle state's most sophisticated and most insidious governance mechanisms.

Markets, Trade, and the Weaponisation of Economic Access

Uganda's urban markets — Owino in Kampala, Nakasero, Kikuubo, and hundreds of smaller markets across the country — are the economic heart of the informal economy and the daily gathering places of millions of ordinary Ugandans. They are also, predictably, important sites of political management and control. Market vendors, like boda-boda operators, exist in a condition of regulatory precarity: their stalls are licensed by local government, their access to market space is mediated by market committees, and their ability to continue trading is dependent on the goodwill of the regulatory authorities who oversee the market. This dependence creates leverage that the ruling party has systematically exploited for political mobilisation.

Market committees in Uganda's major urban markets have been a consistent site of NRM political activity. Committee leadership positions have been contested along party lines, with NRM-aligned candidates typically receiving the support of local government authorities whose goodwill is essential to market operations. Vendors who support opposition candidates have reportedly faced harassment from market management, unfavourable stall allocations, and cooperation with police enforcement actions that selectively target non-NRM vendors. The experience of political pressure in market spaces is difficult to document systematically — individual vendors are reluctant to speak publicly about political coercion in their workplaces, for obvious reasons — but it is widely reported by civil society researchers who have engaged with market communities across Uganda.

The COVID-19 pandemic provided a particularly stark illustration of how economic access is weaponised for political purposes. When markets were closed as part of pandemic response measures, the management of reopening — which traders were permitted to return, under what conditions, with what support — was handled in ways that civil society observers documented as systematically advantaging NRM-aligned traders and market associations. Government food distribution programmes during the lockdown, designed to cushion the economic impact on urban poor populations, were distributed through NRM networks that prioritised party supporters and used relief packages as opportunities for party branding and voter mobilisation. The political use of economic relief during a humanitarian crisis represents one of the most direct expressions of the jungle state's fundamental logic: every resource, including humanitarian aid, is an instrument of political control.

The Northern Uganda Question: War, Displacement, and the Unfinished Reconciliation

No dimension of Uganda's post-1986 history is more painful, more politically contested, or more important for understanding the nature of the Museveni regime than the experience of northern Uganda during the Lord's Resistance Army conflict. For approximately two decades – from the late 1980s to the mid-2000s – the Acholi, Langi, Teso, and other northern Ugandan communities were subjected to one of the most devastating prolonged humanitarian crises in sub-Saharan African history: LRA atrocities of extraordinary brutality, including mass killings, abduction of children, mutilation, and forced participation in violence against communities; and a government counterinsurgency strategy whose central element was the forced displacement of approximately 1.8 million people into overcrowded, under-resourced internally displaced persons camps where mortality rates from preventable disease and violence far exceeded anything that could be attributed to direct LRA violence.

The IDP camps – euphemistically described by the government as 'protected villages' – were among the most lethal civilian environments in the world during the period of their existence. A 2005 study by the Geneva-based Internally Displaced Persons Monitoring Centre estimated that excess mortality in the camps – deaths attributable to the conditions of displacement rather than to violence – was occurring at a rate of approximately 1,000 persons per week. The cumulative death toll from camp conditions over the two decades of the conflict is estimated in the hundreds of thousands. This massive loss of life occurred not in spite of government policy but as a result of it: the forced displacement into camps was not a response to a humanitarian emergency, it was the humanitarian emergency, created by a counterinsurgency strategy that prioritised military considerations over the survival of the civilian population.

The political dimensions of the northern Uganda crisis are inseparable from the humanitarian ones. The Acholi and other northern communities were not simply victims of an external terrorist movement. They were also victims of a regime that regarded them with historical suspicion – as the ethnic homeland of previous regimes that had opposed the NRM, as communities whose political loyalties were at best uncertain and at worst actively hostile. The LRA conflict provided the regime with both a genuine security challenge and a political opportunity: the genuine security challenge of an armed movement that targeted civilian populations and resisted military solution, and the political opportunity to consolidate control of the north through the management of a humanitarian crisis that rendered the population dependent on state-controlled relief and immobilised in state-supervised camps.

The Juba Peace Process of 2006-2008, which came closer to a formal peace agreement with the LRA than any previous initiative, ultimately failed – Joseph Kony refused to sign the Final Peace Agreement despite years of

negotiation. But the process produced something important: the Agreement on Accountability and Reconciliation, which articulated principles of transitional justice for the northern Uganda conflict that acknowledged the crimes of both the LRA and Ugandan security forces. This acknowledgement — partial and contested as it was — represented a significant departure from the regime's official narrative, which had consistently framed the conflict as exclusively a story of LRA atrocity and government protection. The agreement's principles have never been operationalised into a functioning transitional justice process. The mechanisms it envisioned — a special court, a truth and reconciliation commission, reparations programmes — remain unimplemented. The victims of northern Uganda's two decades of catastrophe have received neither justice nor adequate reparation.

The Rwenzori Region and the Persistence of Marginalisation

The conflicts that have periodically erupted in Uganda's western Rwenzori region — involving communities historically identified as Bakonzo, Bamba, Basongora, and others, and centring on demands for recognition of the Rwenzururu Kingdom and, more recently, on violence between communities with overlapping territorial claims — represent another dimension of the unresolved ethnic and regional tensions that Uganda's jungle state has managed rather than resolved. The Rwenzori region's conflicts are complex, involving historical grievances rooted in colonial boundary-making, post-independence political exclusion, and more recent disputes about land, local government jurisdiction, and cultural recognition that have been exacerbated by the deliberate manipulation of ethnic identity for political purposes.

The Kasese events of November 2016 — when Ugandan security forces killed over 100 members of the Rwenzururu Kingdom royal guard in a military assault on the palace of the Omusinga — represent perhaps the most extreme recent example of the regime's use of lethal force against communities that it perceives as politically unreliable. The official government account portrayed the operation as a necessary counterterrorism response to an armed attack on police. Independent investigations by human rights organisations, including a detailed report by Human Rights Watch, documented evidence that the operation involved excessive force, extrajudicial killings, and the deliberate targeting of individuals who posed no immediate threat. The Omusinga himself was arrested and has faced a prolonged legal process. No security forces personnel have been held accountable for the killings.

Uganda's Foreign Policy as Authoritarian Legitimation

Museveni's Uganda has maintained, over nearly four decades, a remarkably successful international profile that has served simultaneously as a source of diplomatic insulation from accountability pressure and as a domestic political resource. The regime has cultivated the image of Uganda as a reliable regional partner, a responsible troop contributor to African peacekeeping operations, a constructive participant in international diplomacy, and – with particular effectiveness in Washington – a frontline state in the global counterterrorism effort. Each of these roles has been cultivated with genuine strategic intelligence, and each has generated real political and financial dividends that have enhanced the regime's capacity to govern without accountability.

Uganda's troop contributions to the African Union Mission in Somalia – where Ugandan forces have constituted the backbone of AMISOM's ground presence since 2007 – have been the most important single element of this international role. Uganda's AMISOM deployment has provided the country with significant financial transfers from the African Union and its international sponsors, substantial military training and equipment upgrades funded by international partners, and – crucially – a political relationship with the United States government that has insulated Uganda from the most serious diplomatic consequences of its domestic governance failures. The United States has maintained significant security cooperation with Uganda throughout the period of AMISOM deployment, including intelligence sharing, military training, and equipment transfers. This security partnership has been prioritised over human rights concerns in the bilateral relationship – a prioritisation that the Ugandan regime has understood and exploited with considerable sophistication.

The counterterrorism dimension of Uganda's international role has been developed with particular care in the post-September 11 international environment. Uganda has positioned itself as a frontline state against Islamist extremism – pointing to the ADF, based in eastern DRC and linked by the government to the Islamic State in its international communications, as evidence of the terrorist threat that Uganda faces. This framing serves multiple functions simultaneously: it generates American and Western counterterrorism assistance, it justifies the securitisation of domestic political life, it provides a narrative framework within which opposition to the regime can be associated – however tenuously – with support for terrorism, and it connects Uganda's domestic repression to the globally legitimised logic of the war on terror. The sophistication with which the regime has navigated international diplomatic environments while maintaining tight domestic political control is one of the most important and least acknowledged dimensions of its governance strategy.

PART VIII: IMAGINING THE REPUBLIC — A VISION FOR UGANDA

Constitutional Architecture for a Post-Jungle Uganda

The transition from a jungle state to a genuine republic is not simply a matter of replacing one leader with another. It is a matter of rebuilding the constitutional architecture through which power is exercised, constrained, and held accountable. Uganda has a constitution — the 1995 Constitution, as subsequently amended — that contains the formal framework of a democratic republic. But as this book has repeatedly demonstrated, formal constitutional provisions are insufficient without the institutional realities that give them meaning: an Electoral Commission that can be trusted to conduct genuinely free and fair elections, a judiciary that can rule against the powerful without fear of consequences, a parliament that genuinely deliberates rather than merely validates, and security forces that understand their constitutional role as the servants of the citizen rather than the instruments of the ruler.

Building these institutional realities requires more than constitutional text — it requires deliberate institutional design, sustained political will, and the development of civic cultures that support and demand genuine accountability. The experience of successful democratic transitions globally suggests that the most robust democratic institutions are those that are designed with explicit awareness of the specific pathways through which authoritarian actors seek to undermine them. Uganda's democratic designers must understand, with granular specificity, how the Electoral Commission has been captured — through appointment processes, budget dependency, and operational interference — and design an institution that is structurally resistant to these specific forms of capture. They must understand how the judiciary has been compromised — through appointment, through budget dependency, through the management of court administration — and design judicial institutions that are resistant to these specific pressures. Generic commitments to 'independence' are insufficient. Specific institutional designs that make independence structurally probable are what is required.

The decentralisation of power — genuinely, not performatively — is another critical element of post-jungle constitutional architecture. Uganda has a formal system of decentralisation, with elected district councils, municipal authorities, and sub-county governments that are constitutionally mandated to exercise significant service delivery functions. But this formal decentralisation has been consistently undermined by the retention of fiscal control at the centre, by the

appointment of Resident District Commissioners who report to State House and frequently override elected local officials, and by the political management of local government elections through the same mechanisms that compromise national elections. Genuine decentralisation – meaning the genuine devolution of both fiscal authority and political accountability to sub-national governments – would create alternative centres of political power that could serve as both incubators of democratic practice and counterweights to central executive dominance.

Economic Transformation: Building an Economy for Citizens, Not Cronies

The political economy of Uganda's jungle state – characterised by patronage networks, selective corruption enforcement, politically managed economic access, and the systematic subordination of developmental logic to regime survival logic – has produced an economy that dramatically underperforms its potential. Uganda has extraordinary natural endowments: fertile soil, abundant water, a strategic geographic position, a young and growing population, and now petroleum reserves. It has a diaspora that has demonstrated significant entrepreneurial capacity in international environments. It has a civil society with substantial human capital in development economics, public health, education, and governance. What it lacks is a political economy that channels these assets toward broad-based development rather than elite accumulation.

Transforming Uganda's political economy requires confronting the specific mechanisms through which economic resources are diverted from public purpose to private advantage. The most important of these mechanisms is public procurement. Uganda's annual public procurement budget runs to several trillion shillings, covering road construction, school building, health facility construction and equipment, IT systems, vehicles, and a vast range of goods and services consumed by government. This procurement system is systematically and extensively corrupted: contracts are awarded to politically connected bidders without genuine competition, technical specifications are manipulated to favour specific suppliers, bills of quantities are inflated to create margins for corruption, and supervision and quality assurance processes are compromised to allow substandard work to be certified as complete. The financial cost of procurement corruption is enormous – independent estimates suggest that between 25 and 40 percent of the procurement budget is lost to corruption in various forms. The developmental cost is even larger: roads that fail prematurely, schools built without adequate materials, health facilities that cannot function, IT systems that do not work.

Addressing procurement corruption requires not anti-corruption rhetoric

but structural reform: the introduction of genuinely competitive electronic procurement systems with real-time public access to bid documents and award decisions, the strengthening of technical audit capacity within the Auditor General's office, the genuine independence and resourcing of the Inspectorate of Government, and – crucially – the political commitment to prosecute high-profile corruption cases regardless of the political connections of the perpetrators. This last element is the one that has been most consistently absent from Uganda's anti-corruption efforts: prosecutions that target regime insiders are the only prosecutions that would signal genuine regime change in anti-corruption culture, and they are precisely the prosecutions that the regime has been unwilling to pursue.

The agricultural sector – which remains the primary source of livelihood for approximately 70 percent of Uganda's population, despite its declining share of GDP – requires particular attention in any serious development agenda. Uganda's smallholder farmers are among the most productive in the world in terms of land utilisation, but their productivity is dramatically constrained by inadequate access to inputs, limited connectivity to markets, poor storage infrastructure, weak cooperative structures, unreliable land tenure, and limited access to financial services. A serious agricultural development programme – not the performative initiatives that successive governments have announced and abandoned – would address these specific constraints through sustained public investment, regulatory reform that creates genuine competition in input markets, and institutional development that builds functioning cooperatives, storage infrastructure, and rural financial services.

Education Reform: Building Citizens, Not Subjects

Uganda's education system is the primary institution through which the next generation of Ugandans is being formed – their knowledge, their skills, their values, their understanding of themselves and their country, and their capacity for civic participation. It is also, as this book has argued, one of the primary sites through which the jungle state reproduces itself: by transmitting distorted historical narratives, by developing compliance rather than critical thinking, by systematically underinvesting in educational quality while overinvesting in educational quantity, and by managing educational access and outcomes through patronage networks that advantage the politically connected over the meritorious.

A genuinely transformative education reform agenda would begin with teacher quality. Uganda's primary and secondary schools are staffed predominantly by teachers who are themselves products of an inadequate educational system, who receive salaries insufficient for dignified professional

lives, who work in conditions of inadequate material support, and who are managed through systems that reward compliance over pedagogical excellence. Transforming teacher quality requires increasing teacher salaries to levels that attract and retain talented graduates, reforming teacher training institutions to develop pedagogical excellence rather than bureaucratic compliance, creating accountability systems that reward genuine student learning rather than examination results manipulation, and building professional cultures among teachers that valorise innovation, continuous improvement, and genuine commitment to student development.

Curriculum reform is equally essential. Uganda's national curriculum has been shaped by a combination of colonial inheritance, political management, and donor influence in ways that have left it poorly aligned with both the epistemic needs of Ugandan students and the skills requirements of Uganda's economy. A reformed curriculum would centre critical thinking, civic education, and Ugandan historical and cultural knowledge alongside the universal skills of literacy, numeracy, and scientific reasoning. It would teach the actual history of Uganda – including its pre-colonial diversity, its colonial experience, its independence struggles, its post-independence governance failures and achievements, and its contemporary political realities – with the honesty and nuance that responsible civic education requires. It would develop students who understand their rights and responsibilities as citizens, who know how to participate in democratic processes, and who are equipped to demand accountability from their leaders.

A New Social Contract: What Citizens Should Expect and What They Owe

At the heart of any genuine transition from jungle to republic is a fundamental reconception of the relationship between citizens and state – a new social contract that specifies clearly what citizens can expect from their government and what obligations citizens accept in return. In Uganda's current jungle state, this contract is profoundly distorted: citizens are expected to pay taxes, to comply with laws, to refrain from political activity the regime disapproves of, and to perform loyalty to the ruling party in exchange for the possibility of access to patronage networks. This is not a social contract – it is a protection racket, in which the powerful extract compliance from the weak in exchange for the guarantee not to actively harm them.

A genuine social contract would specify mutual obligations of a fundamentally different character. The state would commit to providing genuinely accountable governance – elections that determine who governs, institutions that function according to their constitutional mandates, security forces that protect citizens rather than political interests, and development programmes that

are planned and implemented on the basis of citizen need rather than political calculation. In return, citizens would accept their obligations of civic participation – to vote, to pay taxes, to obey reasonable laws, to participate in the civic institutions through which collective decisions are made. The critical word is 'reasonable': citizens owe compliance to laws that are themselves consistent with the constitutional order and the fundamental rights that the constitution protects. They do not owe compliance to laws that violate those rights, or to instructions from officials who are themselves acting outside the law.

The reconception of citizenship that this new social contract implies – from subject to citizen, from client to right-holder, from passive recipient to active participant – is not merely a legal or constitutional matter. It is a cultural one. It requires that Ugandans internalise a different understanding of who they are in relation to the state: not supplicants who receive benefits from the generous ruler, but sovereigns who delegate specific powers to government and hold government accountable for the exercise of those powers. This cultural transformation is the deepest and most important work of Uganda's democratic project. It cannot be accomplished by legislation or by elections or by constitutional reform alone. It must be built – slowly, patiently, generation by generation – through education, through civic practice, through the accumulated experience of participating in institutions that actually respond to citizens' demands. It is the work of a republic. And it begins now.

Conclusion: The Republic We Owe Each Other

This book has been a sustained and unflinching examination of Uganda's political crisis – of the specific mechanisms through which a liberation movement became an authoritarian regime, through which democratic institutions were captured and hollowed out, through which resistance was managed and neutralised, and through which an extraordinary country and its remarkable people have been denied the republic they deserve. It has been a difficult examination, because the truth of Uganda's political situation is difficult. It demands that we name things that power would prefer left unnamed – that we call corruption corruption, that we call repression repression, that we call the absence of democracy by its true name rather than by the comfortable euphemisms that official discourse prefers.

But this examination has also been, fundamentally, an examination rooted in hope. Not the cheap hope of comfortable optimism, which looks away from difficulty and pretends that things are better than they are. But the hard hope of clear-eyed commitment – the conviction that because Uganda's situation is the product of specific human choices, it can be changed by different human choices; that because the jungle is not Uganda's destiny but its wound, it can heal; that

because the republic is not a fantasy but a possibility grounded in the country's own constitutional commitments, its own intellectual traditions, and its own deep reserves of civic courage, it can be built.

The building of that republic is the most important work that Ugandans of this and the coming generation can do. It is not glamorous work, for the most part — it consists of the daily decisions of teachers who teach honestly, of journalists who report truthfully, of lawyers who represent clients courageously, of civil servants who serve the public rather than the powerful, of voters who refuse to sell their franchise, of young people who organise for change rather than accept the jungle as inevitable. These decisions, made by millions of people across the country, constitute the civic foundation on which any genuine republic must rest. They are not sufficient on their own — they must be accompanied by structural reforms, institutional redesign, and the sustained political pressure that alone can compel those who hold power to accept the constraints of accountability. But without them, no structural reform will endure, no institutional redesign will function, and no political pressure will be sufficient.

Uganda stands at a crossroads. The jungle has had its era — four decades of militarised governance that has denied the country's people the republic they deserve. The era is not yet over. But it is finite. And the question of what comes after — whether Uganda emerges from this era with genuinely democratic institutions, or whether it enters a new cycle of authoritarian governance under different management — depends on choices that Ugandans are making now and will make in the years ahead. This book is written in the conviction that those choices matter, that they can be made differently, and that a different Uganda is possible. The jungle does not have to be permanent. The republic can be built. The work begins with us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Books and Monographs

- Arendt, Hannah, *On Violence* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1970).
- Bayart, Jean-François, *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly* (London: Longman, 1993).
- Bayart, Jean-François, Stephen Ellis and Béatrice Hibou, *The Criminalization of the State in Africa* (Oxford: James Currey, 1999).
- Chabal, Patrick and Jean-Pascal Daloz, *Africa Works: Disorder as Political Instrument* (Oxford: James Currey, 1999).
- Cheeseman, Nic, *Democracy in Africa: Successes, Failures, and the Struggle for Political Reform* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Cheeseman, Nic and Brian Klaas, *How to Rig an Election* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).
- Chomsky, Noam, *Necessary Illusions: Thought Control in Democratic Societies* (Boston: South End Press, 1989).
- Clapham, Christopher, *Africa and the International System: The Politics of State Survival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).
- Collier, Paul, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Diamond, Larry, *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).
- Fanon, Frantz, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963).
- Fanon, Frantz, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York: Grove Press, 1967).
- Foucault, Michel, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1977).
- Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971).
- Hansen, Holger Bernt and Michael Twaddle (eds), *Changing Uganda: The Dilemmas of Structural Adjustment and Revolutionary Change* (London: James Currey, 1991).
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).
- Havel, Václav, *The Power of the Powerless* (Prague: East European Monographs, 1978).
- Herbst, Jeffrey, *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- Jackson, Robert H and Carl G Rosberg, *Personal Rule in Black Africa: Prince, Autocrat, Prophet, Tyrant* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).
- Kasfir, Nelson, *The Shrinking Political Arena: Participation and Ethnicity in African Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976).
- Keck, Margaret E and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998).

- Levitsky, Steven and Lucan A Way, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Luckham, Robin, "The Military, Militarization and Democratization in Africa" in Robin Luckham and Gordon White (eds), *Democratization in the South* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003).
- Mamdani, Mahmood, *Politics and Class Formation in Uganda* (London: Heinemann, 1976).
- Mamdani, Mahmood, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).
- Mamdani, Mahmood, *When Victims Become Killers: Colonialism, Nativism, and the Genocide in Rwanda* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
- Mbembe, Achille, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).
- Moyo, Dambisa, *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009).
- Museveni, Yoweri Kaguta, *Sowing the Mustard Seed: The Struggle for Freedom and Democracy in Uganda* (London: Macmillan, 1997).
- Museveni, Yoweri Kaguta, *What Is Africa's Problem?* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).
- Mutibwa, Phares, *Uganda Since Independence: A Story of Unfulfilled Hopes* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 1992).
- Oloka-Onyango, Joe (ed), *Constitutionalism in Africa: Creating Opportunities, Facing Challenges* (Kampala: Fountain Publishers, 2007).
- Omara-Otunnu, Amii, *Politics and the Military in Uganda, 1890–1985* (London: Macmillan Press, 1987).
- Popovic, Srđā, *Blueprint for Revolution: How to Use Rice Pudding, Lego Men, and Other Nonviolent Techniques to Galvanise Communities, Overthrow Dictators, or Simply Change the World* (New York: Spiegel & Grau, 2015).
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan, *Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
- Schedler, Andreas, *Electoral Authoritarianism: The Dynamics of Unfree Competition* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2006).
- Scott, James C, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).
- Sharp, Gene, *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation* (Boston: The Albert Einstein Institution, 2010).
- Sharp, Gene, *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential* (Manchester: Extending Horizons Books, 2005).
- Slater, Dan, *Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- Tripp, Aili Mari, *Museveni's Uganda: Paradoxes of Power in a Hybrid Regime* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2010).
- Van de Walle, Nicolas, *African Economies and the Politics of Permanent Crisis, 1979–1999* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Young, Crawford, *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).

B. Journal Articles and Book Chapters

- Bayat, Asef, "The Arab Spring and Its Surprises" (2013) 40(1) *Development and Change* 587.
- Diamond, Larry, "Thinking About Hybrid Regimes" (2002) 13(2) *Journal of Democracy* 21.
- Grewal, Sharan, "A Quiet Revolution: The Tunisian Military After Ben Ali" (2011) 16(2) *Carnegie Middle East Center Paper* 1.
- Luckham, Robin, "Radical Soldiers, New Model Armies and the Nation-State in Ethiopia and Eritrea" (1994) 29 *African Studies Review* 13.
- Oloka-Onyango, Joe, "Constitutional Reform and the Political Economy of Governance in East Africa" in Oloka-Onyango (ed), *Constitutionalism in Africa* (Fountain Publishers, 2007).
- Scott, James C, "Everyday Forms of Resistance" (1989) 4 *Copenhagen Papers* 33.
- Van de Walle, Nicolas, "Meet the New Boss, Same as the Old Boss?" in Van de Walle and Johnston (eds), *Beyond Structural Adjustment* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2001).

C. Reports and Official Documents

- Amnesty International, *Uganda: A Human Rights Agenda* (London: Amnesty International, 1992).
- Human Rights Watch, *Hostile to Democracy: The Movement System and Political Repression in Uganda* (New York: HRW, 1999).
- Human Rights Watch, *Open Secret: Illegal Detention and Torture by the Joint Anti-Terrorism Task Force in Uganda* (New York: HRW, 2009).
- Human Rights Watch, *Curtailing Criticism: Intimidation and Obstruction of Civil Society in Uganda* (New York: HRW, 2012).
- Human Rights Watch, *Uganda's Slow Slide into Crisis* (New York: HRW, 2017).
- Human Rights Watch, *Uganda: Police Brutality During Demonstrations* (New York: HRW, 2021).
- Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2022: Uganda Events* (New York: HRW, 2022).
- Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2023: Uganda Events* (New York: HRW, 2023).
- Human Rights Watch, *World Report 2024: Uganda Events* (New York: HRW, 2024).
- Human Rights Watch, *Uganda: Reforms Needed Before 2026 Elections* (New York: HRW, 2025).
- International Crisis Group, *Uganda: No Resolution to Growing Tensions*, Africa Report No 187 (ICG, 2012).
- International Crisis Group, *Uganda's Slow Slide into Crisis*, Africa Report No 256 (ICG, 2017).
- International Crisis Group, *Uganda After Museveni*, Africa Report (ICG, 2024).
- Uganda, *Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995* (as amended).
- Uganda, *Public Order Management Act 2013* (Cap 303A).
- United Nations Human Rights Committee, *Concluding Observations on Uganda*, CCPR/C/UGA/CO/2 (2025).

D. Newspapers and Online Sources

Daily Monitor (Kampala, various dates 2016–2025).

New Vision (Kampala, various dates 2016–2025).

The Observer (Kampala, various dates 2018–2025).

Chimp Reports (Kampala, various dates 2020–2025).

Al Jazeera, Uganda coverage (Doha, various dates 2021–2025).

BBC Africa, Uganda coverage (London, various dates 2020–2025).

Reuters, Uganda political news (various dates 2020–2025).

SUBJECT INDEX

References are to page numbers. Bold terms indicate principal discussions.

A

- Accountability, selective** 23, 57, 88–91
Age limit amendment (2017) 18, 41, 74, 103–104
Allied Democratic Forces (ADF) 121
Anti-corruption campaigns, performative 92–93
Arendt, Hannah 22
Authoritarianism, competitive 39, 67, 101

B

- Ballot manipulation** 62–66, 97
Bayart, Jean-François 29, 44, 71, 93, 112
Besigye, Dr Kizza 14, 68, 102, 122
Bob Wine (Robert Kyagulanyi) 14, 68, 102, 122

C

- Civil society, co-optation of** 80, 100, 119
Clapham, Christopher 28, 44, 57, 76, 88, 112
Constitutional amendments 18, 41, 73–74, 103–104
Controlled opposition 68–69, 99–103
Corruption as governance tool 87–93
Counter-insurgency tactics 35, 56, 121
COVID-19 pandemic, political use of 83, 113

D

- Decentralisation, false** 41, 73
Democracy, competitive authoritarian 39, 67, 101
Democracy, performative 13, 38–42, 62–69, 97–105
Diamond, Larry 39, 65, 101
Donors, international, role of 57, 98, 113

E

- Economic resistance strategy** 71–77
Electoral Commission, Uganda 62–64, 97
Electoral fraud, methods of 62–66
Ethnic manipulation 36, 56, 121

F

- Fanon, Frantz** 21, 29, 42, 79, 115
Fear, as governance tool 107–113
Foucault, Michel 38, 79, 108, 112
Fragmentation, deliberate 36, 56, 100, 121

G

- Gramsci, Antonio** 79, 116
Guerrilla governance 27–37, 51–57

Guerrilla psychology 29–32, 51–54

H

Havel, Václav 22, 111

Hegemony, manufacture of 115

Holy Spirit Movement 121

Human Rights Watch 56, 80, 111

Hybrid regime 13, 39, 101

I

Illusion of democracy. See: Democracy, performative

Impunity, judicial 62, 89

Internal Security Organisation (ISO) 35, 55, 110

International complicity 57, 98, 113

J

Judicial capture 63, 89, 104

Judicialisation of impunity 63, 89

K

Kyagulanyi, Robert. See: Bobi Wine

L

Legitimacy, manufactured 13, 28–29, 39–42, 101

Levitsky, Steven and Way, Lucan 39, 64, 77, 101, 112

Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) 121

Luckham, Robin 35, 55, 110

M

Mamdani, Mahmood 18, 36, 56, 80, 115

Mbembe, Achille 32, 52, 116

Media capture 59, 63

Military in politics 55–57, 75–82, 107–115

Movement system (NRM) 14, 39–42, 72–75, 97–105

Museveni, Yoweri Kaguta, bush origins 27–37, 51–57

Museveni, Yoweri Kaguta, constitutional manipulation 73–74, 103–104

Museveni, Yoweri Kaguta, governance style 34–37, 54–57

Museveni, Yoweri Kaguta, propaganda 59–63

N

National Resistance Army (NRA) 13, 28, 42, 51

Nation vs jungle distinction 13–23, 42–45

Nonviolent resistance 68–81

O

Oloka-Onyango, Joe 18, 63, 78, 89

Opposition, co-optation of 99–103

Opposition, cycles of repression 107–115

P

Patronage networks 70–74, 87–93
People Power movement 122
Political imprisonment 68, 78
Political jiu-jitsu (Sharp) 78
Propaganda, state 59–63
Public Order Management Act 2013 78, 111

R

Repression, cycles of 107–115
Resistance, history of in Uganda 119–127
Rule by law vs rule of law 63, 89

S

Schedler, Andreas 39, 64, 77, 101
Scott, James C. 22
Security apparatus 55–57, 75–82, 107–115
Selective prosecution 89–92
Sharp, Gene 71, 78
Slater, Dan 111
State violence, normalisation of 78–82, 110–115
Surveillance, state 35, 55, 110

T

Term limit removal (2005) 18, 31, 41, 73
Transition, myth of 1986 40–45, 67–72
Tripp, Aili Mari 13, 39, 64, 78, 89, 101, 113

U

Uganda People's Army (UPA) 121
Uganda People's Defence Forces (UPDF), politicisation of 55, 75, 107
Unemployment, political use of 83, 113

V

Van de Walle, Nicolas 72, 99
Violence, political. See: State violence

W

War camp governance 75–82, 107–115
Warlord psychology 29–32, 51–54

Y

Youth, political status of 109

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Isaac Christopher Lubogo is one of Africa's most prolific and distinguished legal scholars, political thinkers, and public intellectuals. A doctoral researcher at Makerere University School of Law, he is the author of over seventy published books spanning constitutional law, jurisprudence, comparative politics, African governance, entertainment law, and commercial legal practice.

He is the founder of Suigeneris Consultancy and Suigeneris Publishers, headquartered at Bukandula Tower, Plot 15, Rubaga Road, Kampala, Uganda – institutions dedicated to the production and dissemination of rigorous, independent scholarship for and about Africa. Lubogo is the recipient of the Africa Law Tech Award (2022) and the SMEGAfrica Excellence Scholar Award (2025), two continental recognitions of his extraordinary contribution to legal scholarship and innovation.

As an intellectual, Lubogo has developed the Lubogo Framework for Ubuntu Constitutionalism – a twenty-doctrine jurisprudential system drawing on indigenous African philosophical traditions to reconceive constitutional governance in postcolonial Africa. His doctoral thesis, *Ubuntu and the Law in Uganda: Towards a New Constitutional Dispensation*, represents a landmark contribution to comparative constitutional theory.

His scholarly work has appeared in leading national and international journals, and his books are taught and referenced across East Africa's major universities. As a legal practitioner and consultant, he has engaged with legislative processes, international organisations, and policy institutions on matters of constitutional reform, rule of law, and access to justice.

Isaac Christopher Lubogo teaches at five universities. He is the grandson of Y.K. Lubogo ESQ CBE, the celebrated author of the *History of Busoga* – a scholarly lineage he honours and continues through both his intellectual pursuits and his publishing work under Suigeneris Publishers.

Suigeneris Consultancy, Kampala, Uganda
suigeneris.magnum.opus@gmail.com | www.suigenerislawapp.com

UGANDA: THE JUNGLE THAT NEVER BECAME A NATION

CAN A JUNGLE BE GOVERNED BY THE PRINCIPLES OF A REPUBLIC? OR IS IT DOOMED TO REMAIN A BATTLEFIELD WHERE ONLY THOSE FLUENT IN THE LANGUAGE OF FORCE CAN RULE?

Uganda's story since 1986 is not that of nation-building, but of capture. This book is a fearless interrogation of how a liberation struggle mutated into a system of personal rule, where the tools of war were never laid down—only repurposed.

Isaac Christopher Lubogo dismantles the mythology of the “benevolent strongman” and exposes the architecture of a regime that thrives on fear, patronage, and the illusion of stability.

From the bush to State House, from promises of democracy to the theatre of elections, *Uganda: The Jungle That Never Became a Nation* is both a historical reckoning and a clarion call for a people betrayed.

THIS IS NOT JUST A BOOK. IT IS A WAKE-UP CALL.

“Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.”

— JOHN F. KENNEDY



**TRUTH.
COURAGE.
FREEDOM.**
WORDS CAN LIBERATE.

THIS BOOK EXPLORES:

- The militarization of politics and the erasure of institutions
- The cult of personality and the manufacture of loyalty
- The economy of corruption and the betrayal of the people
- The hollow performance of democracy for international consumption
- The cost of silence—and the power of truth

ISBN 978-9913-975-00-1



9 789913 975001