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Panel 1: Regime Trends and the 2016 Elections

Jonathan Fisher and Stephen Hippo Twebaze

Regime durability in Museveni’s Uganda: Presidential authority beyond the liberation generation

On 29 January this year, Uganda’s Yoweri Museveni completed his third decade as the country’s president – having come to power as leader of the guerrilla National Resistance Movement (NRM) in 1986. Museveni’s longevity, together with that of the NRM, speaks partly to the relationship between regime sociologies and regime stability in post-liberation states. As Levitsky and Way (2012) argue, regimes emerging from ‘liberation movements’ can draw-upon the unity, loyalty and discipline engendered among now-ruling elites by armed struggle to build strong and durable polities in a way that those built primarily around patronage and elite bargains often cannot. Certainly the prominence of former liberation movements among Africa’s longest-serving ruling parties (in, for example, Angola, Chad, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, South Sudan and Zimbabwe) provides support for this thesis.

The passage of time and death or defection of key figures in the ‘liberation generation’, however, represents a major challenge to such regimes. Levitsky and Way suggest that in such circumstances, patronage becomes an increasingly central regime instrument for fostering and maintaining the support of new generations of political elites. In Uganda’s case, there is clear evidence of growing disenchantment and disaffection among the senior cadres of the liberation movement from the late 1990s onwards to the extent that Museveni’s two major opponents in the 2016 presidential context – Kizza Besigye and Amama Mbabazi – are former longstanding close allies and senior NRM apparatchiks from the ‘bush war’ era. The declining salience of liberation credentials in Ugandan regime maintenance has, arguably, been addressed by an increasing reliance upon patronage – particularly since the mid-2000s.

This paper therefore examines how the Museveni regime has responded to the set of challenges presented by an aging and increasingly hostile liberation elite. Analysing roughly the period since c.1997, the paper explores the evolution of patronage politics within the NRM since its establishment as a ‘formal’ political party in 2005 (including a comparison of NRM party primaries) as well as the recalibration of the party as a whole and the Ugandan security state since this time. The paper also considers, however, the continuing relevance of the liberation struggle and the place of this legitimising discourse in contemporary regime approaches to securing elite support and limiting the impact of defections.
Frederick Gooloba-Mutebi and Sam Hickey
‘I am a chameleon’: Why and how Museveni and the NRM dominate Uganda’s political landscape

The capacity of the Museveni government to maintain itself in power through the deployment of authoritarian strategies and support by external actors have been amply documented, not least because of his role in the war against terror and in helping maintain stability in an otherwise volatile and historical turbulent region. The role that electoral malpractice has played in enabling both Museveni and the NRM to win multiple electoral contests have also been much publicised. Less documented, less understood or disregarded but equally if not more significant, is Museveni’s capacity for maintaining power through the more subtle use of ‘soft power’ to win and maintain the support of diverse groups. This includes his responsiveness to popular concerns in terms of his poverty tours and distribution of development resources; his clever manipulation of popular fears about possible instability and a return to the bad old days, and the failure by his political rivals to counter his claims and schemes in ways that assure the wider public of continued peace, stability and prosperity were he to leave power before a ‘credible’ successor emerges. This paper will examine these neglected strategies in detail with specific reference to the 2016 elections, highlight their importance in sustaining what has become one of Africa’s most enduring post-colonial governments, and help us deepen or reformulate our understanding of the relationship between elections what some call ‘big-man politics’ in Africa.

Nic Cheeseman, Gabrielle Lynch and Justin Willis
The moral economy of elections in Uganda

Uganda’s recent presidential and parliamentary elections highlighted an interesting and ongoing tension in the country’s politics. According to a nationally representative survey designed by the authors, which was conducted in December 2015, the vast majority of Ugandans value democracy; they view multi-party politics as the best democratic system; and they view a wide range of activities that might broadly be characterised as electoral malpractice as not only wrong, but punishable. This suggests that there is what might be called a moral economy of elections – not a fixed set of rules, but a broad area of debate which shapes whether behaviours are acceptable.

At the same time, many Ugandans are extremely cynical about their own political system. A poll conducted earlier on in 2015 suggested that the majority of Ugandans do not believe that it is possible to have a transfer of power through the polls, while the author’s survey confirmed previous studies in suggesting that almost half the population believe that the 2011 election was not free and fair – with many claiming to have witnessed electoral problems ranging from the bribing of agents and election officials to the failure of voting equipment. Nevertheless, the majority of respondents suggested that they would vote for the incumbent president, and thus for the state that is associated with many of the electoral shortcomings that violate the moral economy of elections.
Starting from an initial comparison with Kenya and Ghana, the paper argues that the moral economy of elections is different in each case. In Uganda, there is greater acceptance of a number of behaviours which would elsewhere be seen as electoral abuse, including the bribing of voters, restrictions on the behaviour of opposition parties, and the practice of locating development projects so that they benefit supporters. This particular moral economy may present serious challenges to donor and civil society efforts to improve the quality of elections, and provides the ruling party with few incentives to rethink existing political logics. Yet at the same time, the moral economy remains important, not because it absolutely defines what it is possible for candidates, officials or voters to do – things happen which are widely considered immoral – but because it shapes popular sense of the credibility of the process, and the nature of legitimacy.

**Discussant:** David Anderson
Lotte Meinhart and Anne Mette Kjær

'Land belongs to the people': politicians use of land issues in the 2016 election campaigns

The Constitution of Uganda states that ‘Land belongs to people’. This and other remarkable statements and manifestos on land, belonging and people are used by politicians during their 2016 election campaigns to mobilize votes. As regular elections become an institutionalized feature they increasingly have real implications, not only for the extent of democracy, but also for how resources are allocated. The use of electoral populism by politicians eager to mobilize votes in a context where property rights are in transition is an increasingly common phenomenon. In Uganda, land is a sensitive issue and, it has been observed, indeed too sensitive to be taken up by politicians in campaigns. Lauriane Gay, for example, argues that land in the 2011 elections was a ‘hot cake’ which was avoided, at least in the Buganda kingdom. However, politicians, we argue, use land in various ways in order to mobilize votes, some may be conducive for people’s access to land, some may increase land conflicts as various levels and ethnic tensions. The purpose of this paper is to explore the ways in which land is politicized during election campaigns. We do so by examining and questioning the personal manifestos of individual candidates in the districts of Kabong, Gulu and Kampala. We also draw upon interviews with land officers, land board members and other officials working with land in order to include their perspectives about the role of politicians in land issues around election times. Finally, we look into how the candidates from the three districts make use of different media for their campaigns and we follow and analyze media coverage of elections in relation to land issues.

Henni Alava and Jimmy Ssentongo

Religion, rumours and election fever in Uganda

Through prayer, civic education, sermons, pastoral letters and the public blessing of politicians, religious leaders are doing their best to influence the Ugandan 2016 elections. Many of the nation’s most prominent religious leaders, particularly the Inter-Religious Council of Uganda (IRCU) and the Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC), have campaigned audibly for the elections to be peaceful, free and fair, while individual clergy have used their pulpits and radio stations to openly campaign for particular parties and candidates. In a country where less than 1% of the population define themselves as non-religious, what religious leaders say has considerable clout. But what precisely is their impact on the elections? This article

Panel 2: Local Political Terrain
draws on ethnographic fieldwork in Kampala, and Acholiland, including interviews with Catholic, Anglican, Pentecostal and Muslim clergy, to explore this question.

The research advances four core observations. First, Ugandan religious leaders see it as their role to educate believers on civic duties, and Ugandans very broadly expect and accept their religious leaders to play this role. Second, the position of religious leaders in relation to elections is inherently paradoxical: to an important extent, religious leaders gain the authority to comment on issues of a political nature from their perceived political neutrality. But the more they comment on issues of a political nature, the more likely they are to be branded partisan, and hence, to lose their authority to comment. Third, we show that Ugandan religious leaders are deeply divided among themselves, with individual clerics’ viewpoints depending on much more than their church affiliation; for instance, their economic ties, historical indebtedness, doctrinal emphases, and their ethnicity. Finally, we suggest that while the role of religious leaders in spreading a message of peace during elections may have an important effect in curbing election violence, the message of peace may also serve to perpetuate the power of the non-democratic government. This seems particularly to be the case with Pentecostal churches, and with the inter-faith bodies, where demands for minimum consensus may effectively lend support to entrenching the status quo.

Richard Vokes
Primaries, patronage and political personalities in rural South-western Uganda

This paper is an ethnographic study of the National Resistance Movement (NRM) Party primaries that took place in the constituency of Rwampara County, Mbarara District, between June and and November 2015. Based on fieldwork carried out during the primary campaigns, and on an evaluation of texts and images, it offers a detailed examination of the campaign strategies of the five (main) candidates in the run-up to the polls. It focuses in particular upon the ways in which they all sought to secure votes through making frequent public donations, of various kinds, both to collectivities and to persons.

Drawing on recent insights from a nascent anthropology of democracy, the paper argues that it is crucial to understand how these gifts were conceptualised, both by their givers and their recipients. In this regard, it finds that although these donations generally made sense to everyone involved in terms of long-standing cultural logics regarding the ‘proper’ operations of power (*amaani*), of patronage (*okuhaigira*), and of personhood (*obuntu*), this is not to say that they simply reflected cultural continuities.

On the contrary, throughout the campaigns, each of the candidates attempted to develop his own, innovative ‘style’ of gifting (*omuringo*). The paper argues that these ‘styles’ didn’t just reflect the personalities of the candidates involved, but were also significantly shaped by the shifting networks of elites in which they were positioned. Therefore, the study of these styles also offers insights into the changing nature of political patronage, and of ‘corruption’ in Uganda today. It also helps to answer what emerged as the central empirical question for this project: How and why, in the
Defections and independent candidates in the Ugandan electoral campaign: About the use of political nomadism

Defectors and independent candidates have become one of the major trends of the electoral campaigns in Uganda since 2011. This phenomenon led to numerous defections or contest within the NRM and the opposition, to partisan and legal debates about this issue in the inter-election period. It has become one of the parties’ campaigning strategies and grew to another stage during this latest campaign when President Museveni himself seemed to encourage losers of the NRM primaries to contest as independents. A large part of the literature analyses this phenomenon as a symptom of weakness of the political parties and of the inconsistence of partisan loyalties and ideologies. It would reflect the electorate democratic immaturity and its misunderstanding of multipartism. Based on three fieldworks following up group of defectors, party local leaders and mobilisers in Teso (eastern Uganda) since 2011, this paper would like to transcend this “ideological gap” debate to reflect on the use by actors of this “political nomadism” or transhumance as it is called in West Africa. It argues that defections and the way they are dealt with by the parties’ leadership impact on the meaning of voting itself and of political party affiliations. It is part of a popular perception of what party affiliation and what being in opposition means in a hegemonic party system. But it also reflects a survival strategy in local political economies and a very sharp popular understanding of the political party system in contemporary Uganda.

Discussant: David Gellner
Panel 3: Elite Finances, Relations and Defections

Sam Wilkins
Upward patronage: The cost of politics in rural Uganda's electoral-industrial complex

It is well theorised that entrenched patronage politics creates the popular illusion that public resources are the private gifts of personal rulers. In rural Uganda, a less reported consequence of this phenomenon is that voters expect candidates to prove that they are privately wealthy before they are deemed capable of delivering resources from public office. On top of the considerable logistical expenses of running a campaign through both party primaries and general elections, candidates are therefore expected by their electorate to give cash handouts at rallies, finance various community needs and even provide governance services before they are elected to office. Rather than being simple material transactions of 'vote-buying', these performances of wealth project a connection to imagined networks of political and commercial power, and are more a necessary than sufficient condition for winning votes. Given the competitiveness of the Uganda’s ever-expanding local political arena, local candidates from Local Councillors to MPs are under extraordinary pressure to finance these expensive campaigns against multiple rivals for up to eighteen months of campaigning. While there are financial conduits from above - parliamentary wages and allowances, public spending, partisan mobilisation funds, support from factional vested interests - most candidates across the spectrum still pay the majority of these expenses out of their own pocket, often after saving for years, mortgaging properties, and taking on enormous debt. This article investigates the cause, structure and extent of self-financed campaigning in three rural districts - Kyenjojo, Kayunga and Bigiri, where the author has conducted his concurrent PhD research on a related topic. By introducing the term 'upward patronage', it contends that the systemic sourcing of private campaign finance is more than just a by-product of the NRM’s collective electoral renewal, but in fact a structural pillar of it on par with the abuse of public funds.

Michaela Collord
The effect of party selection procedures and campaign finance on executive-legislative relations in Uganda

This paper focuses on the political economy of intra-party competition among NRM parliamentary candidates, highlighting its implications for cohesion within the ruling party elite and, ultimately, executive-legislative relations. The paper first indicates how the combination of high candidate numbers and failures to institutionalize NRM candidate selection procedures contribute to soaring campaign expenditure and a
highly candidate-centric politics. It then demonstrates how these high costs and personalization of elections have somewhat contradictory implications for ruling party unity in parliament. On the one hand, the impression among many NRM MPs that they effectively won their seats on the basis of 'individual merit,' using their own resources and networks, helps explain episodic backbench rebellions against the NRM party line. On the other hand, the high cost of elections provides Museveni with a disciplinary tool, which helps substitutes for the lack of strong party institutions. In order to manipulate the financial interests of MPs, Museveni makes use of his control over (1) state resources as a form of patronage and (2) access to credit and legal protection for entrepreneurs, who's business interests involve staying in the good graces of the President and his inner circle. While these disciplinary efforts reinforce the President's hold on the NRM parliamentary elite, his influence nevertheless remains precarious; his manipulation of resources leads to an inflationary politics and, crucially, must be repeatedly renegotiated, particularly at the start of a new parliamentary session when a fresh cohort of MPs have yet to be schooled in the consequences of adopting a more independent political line. This tension between a more fragmented, candidate-centric politics and countervailing efforts to centralize control over patronage ultimately helps explain the often fraught nature of executive-legislative relations in Uganda, as parliament is turned into an arena for intra-elite struggle and conflict management.

Moses Khisa
Managing elite defection: Uganda’s 2016 elections in perspective

Elections in semi-authoritarian regimes are a double-edged sword. On the one hand, they play a legitimation role but they also present the possibility of defeat. How do incumbents avoid defeat? Some scholars have accented the absence of multiethnic coalitions (Arriola 2013), an uninspiring opposition slate (Conroy-Krutz and Logan 2012), and robust incumbent parties versus weak opposition parties (Levitsky and Way 2010; Brownlee 2007; Magaloni 2006). But the role of elite defection remains undertheorized and less empirically analyzed. Yet, sufficient elite defection poses the single most important danger to a semi-authoritarian regime. The way the incumbent leader and party negotiate this ever lurking danger is critical. In Uganda, President Yoweri Museveni has had to deal with significant defections from his ruling National Resistance Movement (NRM) on the eve of general elections in 1996, 2001, 2006, and 2016. The exception was 2011 when he pulled off reverse defections, luring prominent members of the opposition to defect to NRM while simultaneously nipping in the bud potential defections from his party. This paper places the 2015 defection of former Prime Minister Amama Mbabazi, in the run to the 2016 elections, in the broader perspective of previous elections. The paper shows that Museveni skillfully employs both the stick and carrot to mitigate the impact of defection, using both patronage resources and measured coercion. Going into the February 2016 polls, he has managed to forestall sufficient defections to the camp of his former Premier. He has done this mainly through ministerial appointments and cash handouts along with the targeted use of state coercive apparatus, chiefly the police, thus denying Mbabazi the numbers and wherewithal to mount a serious challenge.
Nicole Beardsworth  
*Of miscalculations and missed opportunities: The TDA and the 2016 election*

Contrary to the experience of many African countries, opposition coalitions are a frequent feature of elections in Uganda. A product of previous alliance efforts and a concerted effort by sections of civil society to facilitate coordination between parties, the Democratic Alliance (TDA) was the most cogent collective to date. The alliance fragmented just three months before the election as the Forum for Democratic Change (FDC) pulled out over the selection of the joint presidential candidate. This paper will look at the logic behind coalition formation in Ugandan elections, as well as the key reasons for their collapse. The 2016 coalition was scuppered by bribery, mistrust, ego and urban bias as well as a lack of coherent strategy and inordinate concentration on the presidential race at the expense of the parliamentary poll. The TDA process appears to confirm Wahman’s (2012) conclusion that opposition coalitions are more likely to cohere when there is a realistic chance of an opposition victory, a result that was always implausible in Uganda in 2016.

**Discussant:** Nelson Kasfir
Panel 4: The NRM’s Security and Cultural Strategies Over Time

**Rebecca Tapscott**  
*Preventing change and protecting the regime: Gulu’s crime preventers, local livelihoods, and the 2016 Ugandan elections*

In Uganda’s 2016 national election, international and national commentators raised questions about the role that the government’s Crime Preventer Programme would play. Many claimed that they would be used “as tools” to rig the elections, intimidate voters, and be manipulated into a voting block for the ruling NRM regime. Based on over 250 interviews and eight months of ethnographic fieldwork from February 2014 to February 2016, this paper presents a study of the Crime Preventer Programme in Gulu District, examining how it developed from an innocuous community policing intervention into a highly structured auxiliary force and intelligence network. In particular, I ask why the government was able to foster a program that connected unemployed, marginalized and disenfranchised youth, who theoretically could have used their newfound organization to challenge the state, whether through votes or violence. I examine specific instances when Gulu District’s Crime Preventers were mobilized to support overtly political ends, such as altering the voter registration list and blocking movement of Opposition candidates. I use these anecdotes to analyze why youth participate while posing neither a threat to the government, nor inspiring a meaningful backlash from the Opposition. I find that—despite low and unpredictable rewards and a high social and psychological cost of supporting a government that many Acholis find reprehensible—the high rate of participation in Crime Preventers and obedience to state authorities can be explained through the militarization of Uganda’s neo-patrimonial system and the concomitant securitization of livelihoods.

**Kristof Titeca and Anna Reuss**  
*The 2016 elections, coercion and the erosion of the NRM’s traditional support networks*

As was shown by a number of analyses of the 2011 elections (Perrot et al. 2014), the 2011 electoral victory of Museveni and the NRM regime highlighted primarily electoral rather than political or ideological support. While the 2011 elections results were still a reflection of people’s views, they also reflected a range of other issues, such as NRM’s coercive power, in which it successfully projected the idea that it was not going to leave power soon. This presentation will argue how during the recent election campaigns, these processes further intensified: similar to the 2011 elections, these results do not necessarily reflect the political legitimacy or the political unity of the Museveni regime. Instead, the regime again convincingly managed to project its coercive power, which had a significant impact on people’s voting patterns. In this
piece, we aim to show how the intensified degree of coercive power is closely related with the increasing internal and external erosion of the NRM’s traditional support base. While this crumbling of the support base has been a continuous process, several factors have contributed to public exposure and an acceleration of the disintegration process. Concretely, the paper will give attention to the ways in which these coercive processes manifest themselves (both through 'hard' means such as the crime preventers and 'soft' means such as the use of financial means), and how these relate with the erosion of traditional support networks within the NRM and the security apparatus, and in wider society (i.e. the simultaneous process of the erosion of the traditional generational support base and the emergence of the – largely unemployed – youth as an important electoral player).

Derek Peterson
Toward a history of culture in the NRM’s Uganda

The National Resistance Movement came to power in 1986 with millenarian energy and reformist zeal. Its cadres set out to transform Uganda's public life, purge superstition, put an end to ethnic division, and promote local democracy. I have worked in a half-dozen local government archives, most in western Uganda. They fairly bulge with paperwork generated by energetic district officers, who keenly set about documenting the shortfalls in the infrastructure of administration. Within five years, much of this reformist energy had subsided, and local government was increasingly dominated by kings, kingdoms and other anachronisms. This paper is an effort to explain how these things came to pass. It argues that the heritage economy of the late 1980s and early 1990s offered local powerbrokers a new set of marketable resources to tap. In an economy increasingly shaped by cultural tourism and alive to the international market in heritage products, NRM officials turned to kings as brokers of tradition and as managers of heritage work. The restoration of the kingdoms of Buganda, Toro, and Bunyoro under the 1994 act was among other things a piece of heritage management, for it was in the architecture of royalism that the Museveni state found a means of managing the problematics of culture in its hinterlands.

Discussant: Jason Mosley
**Participants’ Biographies**

**Henni Alava** is a PhD candidate in Development Studies at the University of Helsinki. Her thesis, which draws on altogether 9 months of fieldwork in Kitgum, explores the intersections of mainline Christianity and politics in post-war Northern Uganda.
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