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This article explores the intellectual project of dissenting Protestant Ignatius K. Musazi, a key organiser of social protest in late colonial Buganda. Scholars of Uganda have positioned dissenting politics in the 1920s and 1940s alongside Bataka activism. But there were no less than two bodies of political dissenters in the 1940s: Bataka protesters and Musazi's Farmers' Unionists. While Musazi and Bataka both sought to push Buganda's colonial chiefs toward the margins, their projects were conceptually different in one important respect: whereas Bataka used Buganda's pre-monarchical past to critique Buganda's hierarchy and colonial power, Musazi imagined a distinctly royalist past where moral kings ruled Buganda with equity. Looking closely into Musazi's project, this article uses biography and emerging methods in global intellectual history to suggest new ways of enriching Uganda's social history. In particular, it uses Musazi's annotated library to show how global history and theological text were conterminously used to inform a certain moral philosophy of monarchy that was conceptually shaped by Bulemezi's royalist past, Harold Laski and the biblical prophets.
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Introduction: political dissent in Buganda reconsidered, c. 1900 to c. 1945

Buganda’s colonial monarchy was polemical, a contested body politic. Competing activists used history differently to complicate the past and to imagine dissenting visions of the state. Difference constituted a dynamic discursive arena, where discriminating land policies, agronomy, political restructuring and different religious allegiances and literacy precipitated new forms of doing politics. Individual actors and their respective communities imagined and debated monarchy from different perspectives and to very different ends.

The disproportionate distribution and privatisation of land in early colonial Uganda intensified local debate among Ganda activists concerning well-ordered monarchy, resulting in the Bataka controversies of the 1920s. Land controversies paralleled growing economic grievance among rural farmers, where distress was exacerbated by colonial cotton regulations. Indeed, due to its ideal climate, Uganda was the second largest producer of cotton in Britain’s empire by 1939 – second to India. With rising global demands for cotton in the early twentieth century, Ganda chiefs placed increasing pressure on farmers to produce. No later than 1909, ssaza (county) chiefs appointed assistants to travel throughout their respective districts to
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enforce cotton regulations. The manner in which Baganda cotton inspectors dealt with rural farmers caused considerable alarm among colonial officials. The superintendent of the cotton department noted: “These men often deal with peasants in a most high-handed way, calculated to make cotton culture distasteful rather than attractive to the natives.”

By the late 1940s, the *ssaza* of Bulemeezi, to which I will return, was Buganda’s largest producer of cotton. Here and elsewhere, farmers complained increasingly of cut earnings at the hand of Indian ginners, who became a focal point of political resistance in the mid-twentieth century. In a letter sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, A. Creech Jones, leading organisers of the Uganda African Farmers’ Union (UAFU), Ignatius K. Musazi, Erieka Bwete and Peter Sonko, complained that farmers had failed to receive “amelioration and removal of an oppression which brings to sheer robbery and [have not received] any redress from the Police who are responsible to see that any violation of the cotton ordinances be brought to book”.

The triumvirate spoke of “open robbery” and ginners who “accumulated enormous wealth at the expense of the illiterate cotton growers”.

Increasing economic tension accompanied broader political concern. The *Nnamasole* Affair, the acquisition of land for Makerere College and the resignation and assassination of Katikkiro (Prime Minister) Martin Luther Nsibirwa impelled seismic political change in Buganda. Social shift instigated unrest in 1945 and 1949, when activists organised protests to restore social order, to cleanse Buganda’s monarchy of corruption, first in Entebbe and then throughout Buganda. On 15 January 1945, “groups of intimidators were at work bringing pressure to bear and assaulting those who remained at work”. The Enquiry into the disturbances summarised: “They [protesters] were armed with sticks and stones and attacked Indian property as well as their servants. They invaded private dwellings including those of Europeans. Their object clearly was to force every African to stop work.”

The following day, riots climaxd when after 110 European and 48 Asian Special Constables were deployed, a police officer was shot and killed by a demonstrator. In September 1945, Katikkiro Martin Luther Nsibirwa was assassinated at St Paul’s Cathedral, Namirembe. For Musazi, a leading organiser of protest, the disturbances of 1945 defined the political timbre of the second half of the decade, including the eventual 1949 disturbances.

Scholars of Uganda have positioned dissenting politics in the 1920s and 1940s alongside Bataka activism. For example, Holly Hanson argues that in the 1920s, *bataka* (hereditary clan heads), royals, spirit mediums and in some instances chiefs, argued for “multiple structures of power that had characterized Buganda in the past”. To dispute colonial land policies and Apolo Kagwa’s centralising political project, observes Hanson, dissenting activists imagined a past when kings mediated their power through acts of reciprocity with clan heads.

Carol Summers, in her research on Buganda’s dissenting landscape in the 1940s, argues that Bataka constructed “a vision of citizenship rooted in the rights and responsibilities of grandfathers and grandsons [. . .]”. To marshal dissenters, activists used generational sensibility and “deployed understandings of power, identity, and connectedness rooted in specifically Ganda understandings of the relations between grandfathers and grandsons”. In so doing, activists employed the language of generational and moral responsibility and rights to rebuff “inequitable hierarchies”.
Hanson’s and Summers’ research is important and shows how activists such as Jemusi Miti and Ssemakula Mulumba used Buganda’s pre-monarchical history to anchor political critique. But there were no less than two bodies of political dissenters in the 1940s: Batak protesters and Musazi’s Farmers’ Unionists. While Musazi and Batak activists both sought to push Buganda’s colonial chiefs toward the margins, their projects were conceptually different in one important respect: whereas Batak used Buganda’s pre-monarchical past to critique Buganda’s hierarchy and colonial power, Musazi imagined a distinctly royalist past where moral kings ruled Buganda with equity. Whereas Batak in the 1940s sought to reorient Buganda’s political order around self-identified clan heads, Musazi aimed to create space where Buganda’s morally endowed kings could faithfully execute justice. Musazi believed that disparity was the result of a monarchy stifled by political compromise, that inequalities would not take place if Buganda had a strong monarchy to protect the economic and political interests of their kingdom’s rural citizenry.

This article uses new sources to rethink Buganda’s moral landscape during the 1940s, focusing on Musazi’s intellectual project in the late 1930s and mid-1940s. Looking closely into Musazi’s project, this article uses biography and emerging methods in global intellectual history to suggest new ways of enriching Uganda’s social history. In particular, it uses Musazi’s annotated library to show how global history and theological ideation were used to inform a particular political philosophy of monarchy. In the late 1930s, Musazi and mostly Balemezi dissenters – identified as Abazzukulu ba Kintu (the Descendants of Kintu) – used global history and biblical exegesis to rethink Bulemezi’s royalist past, primarily, and Batak grievance from the 1920s to a lesser extent. Dissidents were Abazzukulu ba Kintu, the political heirs of Buganda’s proto-mythical king. Marginalia illuminates the creative processes that Musazi used to build upon this past and conceptualise Buganda as an equitable monarchy, a moral kingdom governed by just sovereigns. Like Israel’s community in Egypt, Musazi believed that Buganda’s citizenry was oppressed by powerful chiefs. Through the practice of reading, Musazi imagined Buganda to be a kingdom “at war”, in need of “fundamental change”. Musazi and demonstrators argued that Buganda’s powerful chiefs sought to corrupt their kingdom’s young sovereign, to eat Buganda’s kingship “okulya Bwakabaka”. To contest Buganda’s hungry chiefs, Musazi advocated the historical and moral revival of monarchy – not clan heads – conceptually guided by Bulemezi’s royalist past, Harold Laski and the biblical prophets.

Ignatius K. Musazi (1905–90): early biography and Bulemezi royalism

Musazi’s political sensibilities were first shaped by the peculiar social characteristics of Bulemezi, Buganda’s second most populated ssaza. At the time of Musazi’s birth in 1905, northern Bulemezi was described as an outpost for Buganda in her perennial political and military struggles with Bunyoro. Richard Reid suggests that by 1875 the ssaza chieftaincy of Bulemezi, kangaawohiph, was identified as a military command post. And when the ssaza chiefs of Ssingo and Bulemezi were first described to Henry M. Stanley, they were portrayed as “military commanders in charge of certain stretches of frontier”. Ritual reflected bordered hostility and reminded Bulemezi’s chiefs of their vexatious relationship with their northern neighbour. One commentator in Munno suggested that when “kangaawo’s were
appointed they had to announce the spirit of the first dead kangaawo, Matumpagg- wa, who reigned in the times of the King Mawanda [sic]. As part of this initiation ceremony, guests and chiefs assembled at night to eat the liver of a sacrificed cow, in which under no circumstance could a Munyoro participate.

Life in Bulemeezi was exigent. Nyoro campaigns into northern Buganda in the nineteenth century resulted in the seizure of slaves from Ssingo and Bulemeezi. Due to constant military activity and forced migration, Bulemeezi experienced frequent plantation abandonment, resulting in the decline of agricultural productivity. One Ganda proverb reflected the adversity of life in Bulemeezi: “The Balemeezi are similar to banana stalks left in the cooking pot.” In consequence, Balemeezi were characterised by tenacity, as those who did not possess obuntubulamu, Buganda’s highest virtue in public morality. Obuntubulamu was aspired to in speech and social etiquette. Deference toward elders and clansmen characterised social interaction. By contrast, Balemeezi were renowned for shrewd manners. One proverb stated: “Bulemeezi teva muto: eva musisiirwa”, “There comes no simple/young child from Bulemeezi, only someone fully grown.”

The task of creating and defending military borders not only fostered tenacity, it instilled the importance of political hierarchy. Geopolitical expansion presupposed a dynamic relationship between Buganda’s military chiefs and her monarchs. In Bulemeezi’s military culture, kingship was a vested interest that created intense feelings of monarchical loyalty. Musazi’s father, Nakyama Kangave, typified the tenacious and royalist spirit of Bulemeezi. Nakyama was a ggombolola (sub-county) chief in Bulemeezi, posted to the Buganda-Bunyoro border. As chief, he was referred to as “omulinda buzibu”, “one who waits for trouble”. Following the religious wars in the 1890s, Nakyama played a reluctant role in apprehending Kabaka (King) Mwanga from Acholiland shortly before the latter’s deportation to the Seychelles. Upon apprehension, Mwanga was detained in Nakyama’s village. During Mwanga’s incarceration, Nakyama demonstrated monarchical loyalty through prepared banquets and prostration, which infuriated Buganda’s aspiring premier, Apolo Kaggwa.

Musazi’s royalist project was closely associated with the politics of his father and Bulemeezi. Musazi’s heir, E.N. Musazi, recalled that his father had an unusually close relationship with Nakyama (see Figure 1). He suggested: “Some people said it was so because by the time of Musazi’s birth, his father was old.” Musazi, too, often confided to his children that his political affinity toward his father was a result of their relationship having been cultivated “at the time [Nakyama] had gray hair”. In other words, a time when Musazi’s active politics could be guided by his father. Bulemeezi owned Musazi as a son and her political constituency – throughout his long political career – publically and consistently offered its support. But to advocate the reform of Buganda’s Protestant monarchy beyond the borders of Bulemeezi and critique colonial power in the 1930s and 1940s, it was necessary for Musazi to re-imagine this inherited historical tradition. To do this, he used the tools that he acquired while preparing for Anglican ordination.

Ordinand training: God and global history

Bulemeezi was also Buganda’s largest Protestant county in the early twentieth century, where church membership statistics indicate religious fervour. The Church Missionary Society reported that by the 1907–08 colonial fiscal year Bulemeezi and
Buruli had 181 churches combined, with an average weekly attendance of 9260. In Buganda, this accounted for 26% of all churches and 28% of total Protestant membership. By 1939, Lukiiko (Buganda’s parliament) reports estimated that there were 81,019 Protestants in Bulemeezi and Buruli, with 69,160 of these being Balemeezi. For Bulemeezi and Buruli, this constituted a 775% increase from the 1907–08 fiscal year.

Musazi and his father were no exception to Bulemeezi’s Protestant fervour. Nakyama Kangave was a devout Protestant. When he recounted the religious wars in the early 1950s to George Shepherd – an American economist then working with Musazi’s UAFU – he employed the rhetoric of “God’s glory” and “God’s wrath”. With large portions of land to sell, he arranged for his son to pursue ministerial studies in England.

In 1925, Musazi matriculated at Trent College, Nottingham, after which he transferred to St Augustine’s College, Canterbury, no later than October 1927. Earlier at Trent, Musazi testified to a calling to missions. In a five-page letter to Bishop Willis, Musazi shared that at the age of nine he felt God’s calling upon his life.
to missionary service while in his father’s village, a calling that “kept on knocking within”. After Musazi’s village experience, he enrolled at Mengo High School (later merged as King’s College, Budo), where he was surprised to find two classmates with a similar calling. The three prayed regularly, asking God to make them “perfect to do His will”.  

As an ordinand, Musazi acquired a particular skill-set to mine texts, not the least the Bible. Examination for Orders required demanding exegetical assignments on biblical passages. Musazi exegeted passages from Isaiah and translated Greek texts, such as portions of Mark’s gospel and the Acts of the Apostles – passages that contained political implication. Musazi, moreover, wrote papers and sermons on Christology, pneumatology, pastoral theology, religious education and the question of race in relation to Christianity. In her recent study on St Augustine’s College, Hilary M. Carey shows that St Augustine’s three-year programme emphasised ancient languages. In the school’s early curriculum, first year students studied the history of the Bible, the Greek gospels, Latin and apologetics. In the second year, students studied Bishop John Jewell’s Apology of the Church of England (1562), Christopher Wordsworth’s manual, Theophilus Anglicanus, the Thirty-Nine Articles, as well as Hebrew and additional Greek. In their final year, students continued to study language, the history of Christian mission and Joseph Butler’s Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed (1736).  

Musazi used his courses to reflect upon the political implications of early Church history. In Acts, global dissemination of the gospel was considered a “liberating idea” by Musazi, a phrase he used four times to describe inexorable propagation, a time when Christians used conversion to resist political power. Musazi first used the phrase to describe Pentecost, when early Christians were believed to have first received a supernatural ability to speak different languages for the purposes of evangelisation. In his second and third usage, Musazi applied the phrase to Acts 4.18–20, where Peter and John were commanded by hostile rulers to cease evangelisation. In response, the two replied: “we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard”. In its final usage, Musazi employed the phrase to refer to the diffusion of “the word”, made possible by a persecuted diaspora. In short, Musazi used ante-Nicene history to reflect upon a “going to and fro” for the dissemination and increase of knowledge. In Acts, Musazi noted a subversive political community that used conversion to undermine empire and entrenched religious elites, a moral language that he could easily translate to conceptualise Protestant dissent in Bulemeezi.  

Musazi’s studies coincided with his growing interest in global political struggle and the relationship between faith and politics, an interest he cultivated while at St Augustine’s. After all, St Augustine’s founder, Edward Coleridge (1800–83), situated his political nationalism alongside the English Church, an agenda he inherited from his forebear Samuel Taylor Coleridge (1772–1834). Musazi’s stay in England coincided with the general strike of May 1926, which shaped further his developing sense of social activism. Organised by the Trade Union Congress over low wages and poor working conditions among coal miners, the strike demonstrated to Musazi the importance of protest and labour strikes – strategies he incorporated in the 1940s. Further, the general strike fuelled Musazi’s growing interest in the history of peasant struggle in nineteenth-century France. And he returned to Uganda considering Émile François Zola one of his favourite writers and activists. Indeed, his deep appreciation for Zola resulted in effort to persuade his sister to name her son,
Émile. Having failed to convince his sister, he lobbied the name of his second favourite French writer, Victor Hugo, and succeeded.69 Musazi studied French70 and read Zola’s *J’Accuse*, the central literary document of the Dreyfus Affair (see below).71

**Abazzukulu ba Kintu: The reform and revival of monarchy**

Musazi completed ordinand requirements at St Augustine’s, but was not permitted to remain in England for ministerial appointment. He was instructed to return to Uganda for six months of local parish ministry, which “annoyed Musazi greatly”,72 Musazi later expressed to George Shepherd that “he could not accept ordination because of the discrimination against Africans by the Church of England”,73 frustration further exacerbated by circumstances surrounding an engagement he had with an English woman.74 After returning to Uganda, Musazi taught at King’s College, Budo, where he worked from 1928 to 1933. Initially, Musazi read additional books required by the Church,75 but formal ministerial pursuits ceased after the Bishop of Uganda expressed strong disapproval toward a homily Musazi preached.76 After Budo, Musazi slowly transitioned into full-time politics, concerned increasingly by an evident disparity between Mmengo elites and rural farmers.

Musazi believed that social inequality was the result of a monarchy stifled by political concession. And to advocate the reform and revival of Buganda’s monarchy, Musazi and a cadre of dissenting Baganda established *Abazzukulu ba Kintu* (the Descendants of Kintu) in 1938.77 The immediate circumstances surrounding the formation of the organisation were economic, political and historical. Economically, members of Uganda’s first registered trade union, the Uganda Motor Drivers’ Association (whose membership largely constituted *Abazzukulu*),78 critiqued the colonial government’s plan to restrict African-owned public transportation services.79 Politically, *Abazzukulu* reacted strongly against the Native Administration Ordinance, which if passed would “amalgamate the Native Government of Buganda with any of the other Native Administrations of the Protectorate”.80 For *Abazzukulu*, this was reasoned “absurd”, a ploy to undermine Buganda’s sovereignty.81 In Buganda’s long history, *Abazzukulu* politicking reflected the forceful, discursive character of Bulemeezi royalism, in the first instance, and earlier Bataka critique in the second. Like Bataka, *Abazzukulu* argued that Buganda’s regents were no longer concerned for the welfare of ordinary Baganda.82 However, their project was noticeably different in at least one important respect – *Abazzukulu* aimed to situate political authority alongside Buganda’s kings, not clan heads. On 19 September 1938, for example, Musazi and *Abazzukulu* forwarded a 19-page missive to Kabaka Daudi Chwa, whom they believed should rise up and defend the rights of Buganda’s exploited commoners. *Abazzukulu* accused Buganda’s regents of intimidating members of the *Lukiiko*, mismanaging kingdom estates and misappropriating revenues.83 *Abazzukulu* argued that chiefs no longer cared for the “interests of the people in general and their business enterprises in particular”.84 Out of fear of compromising potential promotion, chiefs no longer represented the interest of their people.85 As sons of Buganda’s proto-mythical king, Kintu, *Abazzukulu* appealed to their current king for justice: “We suffer injustice; we dread the future; will your Highness then now turn a deaf ear to our miseries? It is the duty of our Protector to guard us against any evil.”86 In so doing, *Abazzukulu* hoped that Buganda’s king would resurrect Kintu’s moral project.
Why did Abazzukulu assert political authority alongside kings, and not clan heads or commoners? One reason is because Bulemeezi activists directionised the movement. As shown, Musazi was a son of Bulemeezi. Also, earlier Bataka, Bulemeezi-based activists, Kangaawo Samwiri Mukasa and his son, Shem Spire Mukasa, Daudi Chwa’s personal secretary, were important leaders in Musazi’s movement. Another important organiser of the movement was Revd Reuben Spartas Mukasa (see below), whose Orthodox devotees in Buganda were primarily Bulemeezi.

Musazi and Samwiri Mukasa embodied the Protestant fervour that characterised activism in Bulemeezi, where, like Catholic politics in Buddu, religious allegiance and local politics were closely unified. In 1938 – as Abazzukulu was being organised – Bulemeezi church leaders and ggombolola chiefs developed a consolidation fund to simultaneously fund priests, the kangaawo with his assistants and a mutaka (clan head). The stated intent of the fund was to further peace and stability in the county. For Bulemeezi’s ministerial trainee, Musazi, and former Bible translator Kangaawo Samwiri Mukasa, the Bible provided extensive moral capital from which to reconceptualise Buganda’s monarchy, language that activists readily employed in their lament to Kabaka Chwa:

We are the only most precious heritage bequeathed to Your Highness by Kintu; we are the only people on the earth whom the Good God has placed under your protection and governance. But still, your humble servants and petitioners will not loose [sic] heart; we know that in your lifetime your right hand will ever stretch out to defend us. [92]

For Musazi and his colleagues, Buganda’s kingship was reasoned an equitable monarchy established by a God believed to be “no respecter of persons”, one “who inspires men with truth and justice to work and live for the welfare and protection of their fellow men”. Rendering themselves the political heirs of Kintu, Bulemeezi’s Abazzukulu activists used the Bible to imagine a monarchical revival to contest corrupt rulers.

By using the Bible to contest Buganda’s monarchy, Musazi and his political community employed a practice that Ganda Christians had come to use to complicate historical claims made by Protestant chiefs who used the past to legitimise the exercise of power in Buganda’s colonial state, especially Apolo Kaggwa. This point warrants emphasis. Recent scholars, such as Neil Kodesh, argue that Protestant Baganda used their Bibles and biblical teaching to “consolidate their position at the apex of the reconstituted political order”. But Protestantism clearly was not a hegemonic community in Buganda and neither was the Protestant Bible used only to consolidate power. In 1939, Revd Bartolomayo Zimbe published his extensive history, Buganda ne Kabaka. His use of scriptural reasoning throughout the work demonstrates the extent to which early Protestant converts mined the Bible for a moral grammar to imagine competing claims of political authority within Protestant Buganda. The purpose of Zimbe’s history was to complicate Apolo Kaggwa’s functional histories, Bassekabaka be Buganda (1901) and Ekitabo Kye Mpisa Za Baganda (1905). Zimbe noted:

We read these books [Bassekabaka and Empisa] with great interest and appreciate that without them it would be difficult for us to get the history of Buganda at present. […] In this book I intend to write about other things which you cannot find in those books, and I have attempted to correct those I found untrue […]
Kaggwa had used his books on Buganda’s precolonial monarchy to historicise his political project, to present a lineage of administrative kings committed to social progress. In so doing, Kaggwa positioned himself as a faithful executor of a project to which he could historically point. Unlike Kaggwa, when Zimbe talked about Buganda’s monarchy he talked about the morality and responsibility of power:

The meaning of this name Kintu is “Kintu kya Mukama” The person of God (Katonda). The Baganda distinguished Katonda (God) as the creator of all things in the world: people and animals. Accordingly, Kintu was called “Muntu wa Mukama” and when a person stabbed his enemy while fighting in the battle he would refer the blame to the Kabaka; saying, “Kulwa Kabaka” meaning I have killed you but on behalf of Kabaka because I have no power to kill the man of God. They know that God gave only Kabaka the power of killing another person and also to give judgement to the people. Even [as] a person stabbed an animal whilst hunting would say “Kulwa Kabaka” (on behalf of the Kabaka).

Like Abazzukulu, Zimbe did not create an historical narrative steeped in the language of Bataka. His project focused on an equitable living monarch – Buganda ne Kabaka, Buganda and the [living] King. Through the biblical reinterpretation of Buganda’s past, Zimbe aligned Buganda’s historical kingdom along an existing morally endowed monarch, bringing into question Kaggwa’s history of dead kings – Bassekabaka. A history of a living moral monarchy in contrast to a history of deceased administrative kings – the difference could not be more stark.

Dissenting activists used biblical interpretation together with world history to critique missionary Christianity and colonialism. As referenced, Abazzukulu was an early political platform for Revd Reuben Spartas Mukasa, whose Orthodox project was shaped by text and a certain interpretation of world history. Born in the late nineteenth century, Spartas began his formal education at an Anglican school in Nakanyonyi. Spartas’ exceptional performance was recognised by Archdeacon Daniel, who arranged for Spartas to live in his home at the diocesan theological college in Mukono (now Uganda Christian University), where Spartas completed his primary education in a nearby school. From Mukono, Spartas earned a scholarship to attend King’s College, Budo, where he considered pursuing priesthood in the Anglican Church. However, “during the course of his reading […] he discovered that ‘Anglicanism was a mere branch of the true Church’”, in due course, while serving in the King’s African Rifles during World War I, Spartas read Marcus Garvey’s Negro World, where he learned about the African Orthodox Church in America before establishing the Orthodox Church in Uganda. Mukasa used the history of Orthodoxy – a more ancient faith – to critique the colonial state and Anglican paternalism.

Like Spartas, Musazi used global intellectual capital to critique colonial rulers. As discussed earlier, by the time Musazi returned from Britain, he had familiarised himself with the history of European dissenting politics. And in the late 1930s and 1940s, Musazi argued that if Britain was going to govern Buganda, it was expected that they would rule in the historical (imagined) tradition of British justice. In a 10-page letter sent to the Secretary of State concerning the high-handed dismissal of leaders within the Lukiiko by the colonial government, Musazi expressed prayerful hope for the application of “the principle of human liberty […] English justice and fair play”. Moreover, Musazi used language that closely resembled Émile François Zola’s to critique British policy. The dismissal reminded Musazi of Captain Alfred
Dreyfus’ controversial sentencing and, to chide Uganda’s governor, Musazi used a format that paralleled Zola’s open letter to President Faure:

[I]f anyone lying under the flag of the British Justice can be dismissed without having his case first tried by the Lukiiko, and if this becomes a custom, many people are liable to suffer a doom when those People in authority know very well that they can do whatever they like without being checked.109

Following this initial letter to Uganda’s governor, Abazzukulu produced further correspondence, drawing explicitly from seventeenth-century English Civil War history:

We are decided and determined to fight their [British] tyranny, although remains unchecked for ever; unceasingly in the same way as was done by the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England and Scotland; Oliver Cromwell, in 1654–1659, when he said to the tyrant Parliament that “Begone and make room for better men”. So, unceasingly, we will fight for our country and our constitutional Kabaka, as long as we live under the UNION JACK which bespeaks of Justice, Freedom and Fair-play.110

Abazzukulu's use of English history is innovative and illustrates how African intellectuals could rethink the canons of official history, using global history to engage in a wider sphere of local political debate. Oliver Cromwell is not used to advocate the dissolution of Buganda’s political monarchy. By contrast, the abolition of the Stuart monarchy is referenced to draw attention to colonial injustice. By undermining the moral integrity of Britain’s colonial project, Kintu’s “descendants” questioned the social practice of Britain’s imperial monarchy, using the terms of colonial protection to advocate for the rights and power of Buganda’s own monarchy.

Reading revolution: Harold Laski and the prophets

Musazi’s private library shows that to imagine his politics in the 1940s, he continued to use global history and the Bible. Musazi’s existing library of 100 books is the vestige of a collection once far more voluminous.111 In his 1927 copy of H.M. Gwatkin’s Early Church History, Vol. II, Musazi recorded that the book was the only one remaining from a personal library of 300 volumes destroyed in 1966.112 From his library, one can see that Musazi was an avid reader. His library indicates that he was actively engaged in reading from the time of his education at King’s College, Budo, in the early 1920s to at least 1987. Among the 82 texts I have analysed – texts he actually autographed – no fewer than 2156 passages are underlined and 297 annotated.113 In the library are two books that Musazi clearly read more than any other – an English Authorized Bible used from 1924 to at least 1946, and an English Book of Common Prayer used during the same period.114 With no fewer than 1321 underlined passages and 226 annotated texts combined, Musazi’s Bible and prayer book constitute roughly 62% of all underscored text and 76% of all annotation in the library. Next to the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, Musazi’s most read book was Harold Laski’s Reflections on the Revolution of our Time (1943), which he read in 1944.

Marginalia raises interpretative questions about literacy and textual criticism in colonial Africa. Social historians of Africa tend to emphasise the public, political utility of text – interpreting reading and literacy as a social process of self-positioning.115 As this study also shows, Musazi and other activists in the late 1930s
mined their books to inform social critique, to find words to use. But words and the development of personal libraries are not only functional tools that actors use to practise empirical politics. Textual marginalia provides a rare glimpse into the life of the mind, the constitution of a particular subjective reality. In the creation of annotation, subjective being (expressed in marginalia) and social context (the text being annotated and the social purposes for which it is chosen) is comprehensibly and simultaneously observable. In turn, marginalia provides unique insight into the heart and mind of a social subject. By analysing how Musazi responded to a particular text through the creation of marginalia, the historian observes what later Wittgenstein rendered, “a social conscious activity of the mind”. When Musazi read text, he observed, took notes and intellectually and emotionally responded to narrative with meaningful reflection and commentary that paralleled the discursive character of his public activism during the late 1930s and mid-1940s. Annotation and underscored text, therefore, reflect meaningful and intentional action, discourse and embodiment of a peculiar epistemological paradigm. In the remaining discussion, I will focus on Musazi’s most read texts in the 1940s, Laski’s Reflections and the Bible. Musazi’s marginalia in these texts show how he reasoned alongside global history and theological metaphor to conceptualise local politics in the 1940s.

In 1944, on the eve of protest in January 1945, Musazi was reading Harold Laski (1893–1950), Labour parliamentarian and lecturer at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Laski’s Reflections was published in 1943 and is one of only two books dated to the 1940s that remain in Musazi’s library. Musazi’s copy of Reflections contains 12 annotated passages and no fewer than 53 underscored sections; Buganda’s political landscape is specifically referenced five times. The first four read:

Laski text: The challenge to our system of values is, if this argument be correct, the outcome of our failure to maintain the right to hope; and that failure, in its turn, is born of the fact that our relations of production do not enable us to exploit with sufficient adequacy the forces of production at our disposal. [...]  
Annotation: Yes So it is in Buganda now.

Laski text: [...] and we are entitled to conclude that where, to-day, that development is not organized it is because those who refuse to attempt it have vested interests enlightenment would weaken.  
Annotation: True with Buganda of today.

Laski text: For any society in which the few are so wealthy and the many so poor that their minds are driven to perpetual consideration of their wealth and poverty is, in fact, a society at war, whether the fight be open or concealed. It is a society, once its power to expand is arrested, which cannot think in terms of a common interest because whatever is taken from one class is given thereby to another.  
Annotation: Is Buganda not challenged?

Laski text: The public opinion of this country is ready for fundamental change. Its traditional habits have been profoundly disturbed.  
Annotation: Buganda too
Annotations show that Laski’s political metaphors captured Musazi’s economic and political critique on the eve of protest. Musazi and his colleagues believed themselves economically and politically undercut by corrupt Baganda with vested interest, Indian ginners and colonial bureaucrats. Appropriately, Musazi’s marginalia emphasised public morality and justice, equality and emancipation. Alongside Laski, Musazi reasoned a kingdom adversely impacted by “relations of production”, a polity ruled by leaders whose “interests Enlightenment would weaken”. Consequently, Buganda was considered a “society at war”, a kingdom “ready for fundamental change”. Moreover, Musazi used Laski to resituate economic struggle in Buganda beyond the historical contingencies of eastern Africa:

Laski text: [...] It is expressed again in the French Revolution by the Enragés, and by those who, with Babeuf, made the last despairing effort to recapture the fraternity for which men hoped in the great days of 1789 when those “petty lawyers and stewards of manors” whom Burke regarded with such contempt, legislated a new world into being. We catch again the same accent in the spacious dreams of 1848 and, above all, in that supreme optimism which enabled Marx and Engels, in a hundred pages, to trace the whole pattern, past and future, of human evolution. It is present, again, in that sudden sense of emancipation felt by the whole world when the Russian people struck off the chains of Czarist despotism. [...] 

Annotation: True[;] May it come in Buganda of today?130 

Laski’s Marxist historicism captured a compelling narrative to imagine colonial critique and peasant struggle. But like his earlier reflections on the dissolution of the Stuart monarchy, Musazi does not use Laski’s analysis of French and Slavic monarchs to bolster republican ideology. To the contrary, for Musazi the moral critique of colonial and chiefly power was intimately bound with the political revival of Buganda’s monarchy, an ideal he cultivated by reading his Bible.

Musazi’s 1944 reading of Laski is thematically consistent with two biblical passages annotated during the same period. Following the 1945 disturbances Musazi was deported to northern Uganda,131 where in July 1946 he believed that God “revealed” to him the meaning of Isaiah’s “trust fast”;132 Isaiah’s prophecy reinforced Laski’s ideals of social justice and emancipation:

Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? [...]133

In the same year, Musazi read Amos, a book in the Hebrew Bible that explores a shepherd’s prophecy in the ancient Levant. Amos castigated Israel’s elites, those “[t]hat pant after the dust of the earth on the head of the poor, and turn aside the way of the meek”.134 For Amos, monarchical opulence at the expense of the poor resulted in “a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord”, or what Musazi simply called “A Hungry World”.135 Throughout Musazi’s Bible, these dated themes are consistently annotated. It is apparent that Musazi focused his reading on the interdependence of political justice and the necessity of morally robust monarchies, which helps explain why Musazi
imagined Buganda as a place where just kings should hold corrupt chiefs, Indian ginners and colonial officials accountable. In biblical narrative, God used kings to redress social rupture, particularly in the Hebrew Bible. And with the Bible’s repeated critique of corrupt monarchs – often for the purpose of restoring and strengthening monarchy – it is little wonder why the Bible was Musazi’s most annotated text.

Musazi annotated the themes of justice and kingship in Daniel and the canonical gospels, where kings and kingdoms are morally condemned for failing to advocate for the poor and economically oppressed. In Musazi’s annotated texts, political kingdoms progressed or collapsed according to their ability or inability to ensure social rectitude. In Daniel, Musazi focused mostly on chapters two, four and seven, which record a series of Nebuchadnezzar’s and Daniel’s dreams, and Daniel’s subsequent political interpretation. In Daniel 2.44 Musazi noted Daniel’s claim that unjust kingdoms on the earth would collapse eschatologically with the advent of God’s equitable kingdom. In Daniel 4.3, 4.34, 7.13–14 and 7.27, Musazi annotated “Everlasting Kingdom”, “His Kingdom from generation to generation”, “His Kingdom not to be destroyed”, and “Whose Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom”. God’s kingdom was compared with the Exodus narrative recounted in Daniel 9, where in Israel’s deliverance from social oppression, Musazi observed a “Righteous God” and a political template for Buganda. Similarly, in II Chronicles 18.1–3 and 19.2 Musazi observed divine judgment exhibited toward corrupt monarchs and rulers. In Isaiah, again, he specifically noted that God removed royalty from power for refusing to protect and provision for agrarian communities. Failure to care for the disenfranchised was intrinsically linked to the “perishing of kingdoms and nations”. For Musazi, God’s work on earth and in consequence, the function of political monarchy – was to facilitate a “habitation of justice”.

In the New Testament, Musazi noted how state sovereigns interacted with John the Baptist and Jesus. In the Markan narrative, John the Baptist loses his life on account of corrupt sovereigns in the royal palace. The Baptist was arrested for speaking against conjugal infidelity between Herod and his brother’s wife. Initially, John was protected from Herod’s lover’s desire to have him executed. As Musazi noted, Herod feared John because he was a “just man”. However, through a bizarre sequence of promises, Herod executed John. For Musazi, this reflected the historic struggle between just peasants and corrupt royals. John and Herod’s confrontation was considered a “moral battle”, and having defined this narrative as moral, Musazi applied the story to his immediate political context, annotating: “live as it was 1,900 years ago”.

Matthew 27 tells the story of Judas’ suicide and Jesus’ trial and crucifixion. In the text, the governor who tried Jesus’ civil case, Pilate, is portrayed as someone who knew with some degree of certainty about Jesus’ innocence before his accusers. In this regard, the story is not unlike Herod and John the Baptist. Regardless of Jesus’ innocence, though, Pilate capitulated to the demand of the masses due to “fear”. In Musazi’s words, Pilate “fear[ed] to do justice”. But whereas Pilate refused to administer justice due to political expediency, Musazi noticed Jesus’ willingness to confront Judas, the corrupt and bribed. In Matthew 26, Jesus exemplified for Musazi the “courage of a true man”. In short, just monarchs were obliged to care for their subjects, protecting them from ill-informed masses and royal politics. Clearly Musazi understood Pilate and Herod as corrupt for having failed to do either; again, themes easily translatable in Buganda’s moral landscape.
Conclusion: complex conceptions

Musazi’s remaining library illuminates some of the different discursive layers that undergirded his evolving political philosophy in colonial Buganda. Musazi’s sophisticated project was well situated within the long history of Bulemeezi’s royalist past. But his advocacy cannot be merely reduced to the politics of a particular region or long history. Nor can his project be strictly bound to one discursive register. Musazi’s activism was conceptually guided by a particular historical genealogy, but it was also informed by – though not limited to – a critical interaction with various revolutionary moments in global history and monarchical-focused themes in biblical narrative. As such, Musazi’s social project was politically and theoretically coterminous: theology shaped the political and the political informed the theological – neither was epiphenomenal. And holding these varied and complex knowledge bases in tension, Musazi practised a conceptually expansive politics; one intellectual project out of many in Buganda’s polemical kingdom.
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