
CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN KABAKA MUTESA II AND SIR ANDREW COHEN (1953)

From D. A. Low (ed.), *The Mind of Buganda: Documents of the Modern History of an African Kingdom*. University of California Press, 1971. © various.

The Ministers of Buganda to the Governor of Uganda, Sir Andrew Cohen, 6 July 1953.

We have the honour to beg Your Excellency to be excused for addressing Your Excellency direct, a step which is unusual, but which has to be taken by us in His Highness's absence, on his own behalf and that of the people of Buganda, on the strength of the urgency of the matter in question.

Sir, the article which has appeared on the front page of the *East African Standard* issue of Friday of the 3rd July, 1953, is noted with misgivings and has confused this Government and our people as to the value of the assurances given to us in the name of Her Majesty's Government, on every occasion in the past, when the question of the Federation of the three British East African Territories was proposed, and when the setting up of the East African High Commission was suspected by Africans in Uganda as a stepping-stone towards the realization of a political fusion in the three territories.

Sir, the statement quoted in the article, as made by Her Majesty's Minister, the Secretary of State for the Colonies can not be taken lightly and for that reason we are compelled to state that it is bound not only to shake the foundations of trust among our people, but will also badly damage the good relations which hitherto obtains between the Baganda and the British. Representing His Highness's Government and the people of Buganda, we have to state once again that our attitude towards any such contemplated political fusion is firm, and that it should be communicated to Her Majesty's Government.

Sir Andrew Cohen to Kabaka Mutesa II, 27 July 1953.

Your Highness, I have the honour to refer to the Ministers' letter of the 6th July, addressed to me in Your Highness's absence, on the subject of the remarks made by the Secretary of State recently at the East African Dinner in London regarding the relations of Uganda with the other East African territories. That letter referred to an article which appeared in the *East African Standard* of the 3rd July and I must point out that that article contained not the text of the Secretary of State's speech, but an interpretation of it by the *East African Standard*. The text of the relevant passage of the Secretary of State's speech appeared in the *East African Standard* of the 2nd July.

As the Resident informed the Ministers on my instructions, I referred their letter to the Colonial Office immediately I received it and I have now been authorized to assure you

and the Ministers that you need have no fears in this matter. What will ultimately happen in the future is something which no one can foresee at the present time, and the purpose of the Ministers' letter was no doubt to ascertain the present intentions of Her Majesty's Government. I have been authorized to inform you, as regards the present intentions of Her Majesty's Government, that the Secretary of State's speech did not indicate any change of policy on the part of Her Majesty's Government; that the future development of Uganda and the other East African territories must be largely guided by local public opinion; and that the assurance which I gave to the Great Lukiko in my speech of the 23rd April, 1952, still holds good.

The text of that assurance is:

'Ministers of his late Majesty's Government in London assured you on several occasions that the establishment of the East African High Commission and Assembly was not to be regarded as involving the political fusion or federation of the East African territories. Your Ministers have recently drawn my attention to these assurances and I have informed them that the assurances still hold good.'

I have no doubt that you will regard what I have said above as satisfactory.

Extract from Sir Andrew Cohen's Statement in the Legislative Council of Uganda, 12 August 1953.

A good deal of interest has been aroused among the public by interpretations placed in the press on some remarks recently made by the Secretary of State in London on the subject of the relations of Uganda with the other East African territories. It is evident that much more has been read into these remarks by the public here than was ever said, much less intended. I have been authorized by the Secretary of State to say that any fears which there may have been in this matter are groundless. What may ultimately happen in the future no one can foresee at the present time; but, as regards the present intentions of Her Majesty's Government, I have been authorized to say that the Secretary of State's speech did not indicate any change of policy in this matter on the part of Her Majesty's Government; that future developments will take local public opinion fully into account; and that the assurance previously given by Her Majesty's Government, which I repeated to the Great Lukiko of Buganda last year, is not to be regarded as involving the political fusion or federation of the East African territories, still holds good. In fact there should not be read into the Secretary of State's speech any intention on the part of Her Majesty's Government at the present time to raise the issue of East African Federation.

Kabaka Mutesa II to Sir Andrew Cohen, 6 August 1953.

Your Excellency, I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated the 27th July, 1953, in reply to my Ministers' letter on the grave matters in relation to the Federation of the British East African territories, for which letter I thank Your Excellency.

2. My Government has very carefully examined in great detail the assurances embodied in your letter, and have the following comments and claim to make.

3. For some years past, dating from 1922 up to the present the contemplation, and eventually the proposal of bringing the three East African territories into a political federation has, as Your Excellency knows, been causing much anxiety, trepidation, and forebodings to the people of Uganda, and more so perhaps those of Buganda. When the proposal for a federation was sponsored by the Kenya settlers who commanded racially the least proportion of the population in East Africa, a strong opposition, supported with convincing reasons, was put up by the late Kabaka, jointly with his Government in 1930. In fact, a deputation was sent to the United Kingdom to state, before the Parliamentary Committee set up on the Closer Union of East Africa, the reasons against the desirability of such a proposal. Since then many assurances have been given to us by Her Majesty's Government, whenever the proposal arises, through the Secretary of State, among which the following given in the Chief Secretary's letter No. 7153 dated the 18th March, 1922, is typical and sufficient for our present consideration:

‘ . . . The Secretary of State for the Colonies has requested that you may be informed that, if it should be decided to make any arrangements for effecting closer co-ordination between the Administrations in East Africa, whether by federation or other means, you may rest assured that no action will be taken involving infringement of the Uganda Agreement of 1900, and that in any event it is not contemplated that the Kingdom of Buganda or the Uganda Protectorate generally should be placed under the jurisdiction of any external legislative body in Eastern Africa, or that the Secretary of State's responsibility for the administration of the Protectorate should be reduced in any way.’

4. All these past assurances leave no shadow of doubt as to the intentions of Her Majesty's Government and, when examined alongside the assurance given in your letter, at once a conspicuous difference between the past and the current assurances emerges. To be precise, former assurances made by the previous Secretaries of State were never limited to the present, but committed themselves to the future too and definitely excluded the Kingdom of Buganda from any possibility of any future inclusion in to such a union, and even went as far as saying:

‘ . . . It is not contemplated that the Kingdom of Buganda or the Uganda Protectorate generally should be placed under the jurisdiction of any external legislative body in Eastern Africa.’

5. By the course of recent events in Central Africa, coupled with an apparent lack of security in the future as portrayed in the latest statements, it is crystal clear that our future has ceased to be guaranteed as had been previously, thus the more our fears and forebodings about the future, for Her Majesty's Government seems to have ceased to embody the element of certainty in the path of our political development, it being apparently concerned only with the present. On a recent visit which I paid to the

Colonial Office the Permanent Under-Secretary of State himself, in conversation, stated to me words very much to the effect that the ultimate political future of Uganda was unknown to Government! It is conceded that the future is not easily foreseeable but that is hardly a bar to making plans for that future and working for an objective, however distant that may be. You will, Your Excellency, no doubt appreciate the fact that our fears are not groundless.

6. As it is well known, and according to the framing of the 1900 Agreement, and all other Agreements prior to it, the Kingdom of Buganda is a protected state under Her Majesty's Government and consequently, the said Agreements were ratified by the Foreign Office under whose jurisdiction the affairs of Uganda lay since it was clear from the beginning that Uganda could not be treated as a Colony. But it was in 1902, for reasons not appreciated by the people of Uganda, that its affairs were transferred to the Colonial Office. Thus the status which is now accorded to Buganda is an indication of the direct result of Uganda's transfer to the Colonial Office. This transfer unmistakably reduced the status of the Kingdom of Buganda, in spite of its being a treaty state, to that of a colonial dependence, and Buganda came to be administered and recognised as not different from a colony. The reduction in status was so severe that the Kingdom of Buganda has reached a precarious degree of uncertainty and even insecurity.

7. Your Excellency, as regards the statement which has appeared in your letter, setting out a condition in the event of a political union of the three territories namely that such a union can only come about by the desire and the express of public opinion of the majority of local peoples, my people and Government have this to comment that as stated elsewhere in the foregoing paragraphs, recent happenings in the neighbouring territories, i.e. Central Africa, have shown that however many there may be Africans opposing a proposal, the wishes of the minority who are generally non-Africans must necessarily prevail, no matter what petitions, deputations and representations are sent to the highest authorities by the Africans. Some African deputations from Central Africa were recently not even shown the courtesy of being received in London, and the federation has merely been imposed upon them however much it goes against their will. It will not be unreasonable to compare the destiny of Uganda to that which has overtaken Nyasaland, both countries being Treaty states, and Protectorates, but Nyasaland has been forced into the Central African Federation. This evidently suggests that local opinion seems to mean the opinion of the least section of the population as long as that section happens to be the most vocal.

8. The White Paper 210 which set up the East African High Commission is another case in point for when it was desirable to sound local opinion, it was the opinion of the Uganda Legislative Council which was sought but the native councils were ignored completely: in fact, the Great Lukiko was forbidden to discuss the proposal at all. What has happened before and elsewhere may happen here: thus the profundity of our present fears.

9. It is hardly necessary to remind Your Excellency that from history we learn that the Kingdom of Buganda was a self-governing Sovereign State, and record at the time of the advent of Europeans, almost 100 years ago testifies to this that they found Buganda an established kingdom, independent, and with its own dependencies. Her Majesty Queen Victoria's Government when requested to protect this country two major Agreements were completed, namely the 1894 Agreement and the 1900 Agreement, the latter amplifying the former and being designed to provide for land settlement, taxation, defence and detailed administration. These Agreements read together are a testimony to what has just been described.

10. No better evidence of the entirety of the Kingdom of Buganda could be produced than that found in those two Agreements. But as soon as the affairs of Uganda were removed from the Foreign Office and transferred to the Colonial Office, the act of transfer simply reduced Buganda's character and subjected it to policies affecting the administration of Crown Colonies. For this reason and in view of the fact that the future of our country is insecure, I am moved to state our immediate and strong desire that the affairs of our country be managed by the Foreign Office as was originally done, and no longer by the Colonial Office. This step will give stronger assurance to us against the possibility of a political union with the adjoining colony and territory.

11. At the same time I must bring to Your Excellency's notice the fact that as it is the policy of Her Majesty's Government to lead countries under its protection to ultimate political independence within the Commonwealth, we ask Her Majesty's Government to prepare and put into effect a plan designed to achieve our independence and if possible within a short stated space of time. It might be pointed out that the generally accepted colonial theory of partnership will be unacceptable in the plan for Uganda, as has been indirectly refuted by Her Majesty's Government in the declaration of land policy in Uganda by the Governor in 1950, ruling out the possibility of non-African settlement in Uganda. In Uganda, as a Protectorate, co-operation with non-Africans should be the aim.

12. In conclusion, Your Excellency, I beg to state that the views set forth in this memorandum are supported by my Government and my people, and it is my ardent request that they are put before the Secretary of State and therefore to Her Majesty's Government for consideration.

These views are hereunder endorsed by my Ministers. [...]

Sir Andrew Cohen to Kabaka Mutesa II, 27 October 1953.

I have the honour to refer to your letter of the 6th August regarding the relations of the Uganda Protectorate with the other East African territories and to inform you that I duly referred this letter to the Secretary of State for the Colonies as soon as it was received. I subsequently discussed the contents of the letter with Your Highness and your Ministers and during my recent visit to London I discussed the matter with the Secretary of State.

2. The Secretary of State has instructed me to inform you that he has considered your letter with the greatest care and that he fully realizes from its contents and from what I have myself told him the strength of feeling on the part of the people of Buganda on the subject of Federation. Your letter and recent expressions of public opinion in Buganda reveal fears and suspicions about the intentions of Her Majesty's Government in this matter; the purpose of this reply which the Secretary of State has instructed me to convey to Your Highness is to dispel these fears and suspicions and to convince Your Highness and your Ministers, and the people of Buganda, that they are groundless. The Secretary of State attaches the greatest importance to removing these fears and suspicions and he has asked me, as Governor, to do everything in my power to achieve this object.

3. The reply which the Secretary of State has instructed me to make, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government to the points raised in Your Highness' letter falls into four parts. It deals first with past statements on the subject of federation; secondly it contains a further statement by Her Majesty's Government on this subject: while the third and fourth parts of the reply comment on your request that responsibility for Buganda affairs should be transferred from the Colonial Office to the Foreign Office and your request for the separation of Buganda from the rest of the Protectorate.

4. Past statements on the subject of federation made by or on the instructions of Ministers of Her Majesty's Government have been examined and it has been found that no statement has been made in the past ruling out the possibility of federation for all time. The statement in the letter of the 18th March, 1922, quoted by Your Highness, which was repeated in 1924, specifically referred to the possibility of federation of the East African territories, and it is clear from all the discussions which followed up to 1931, when H.M. Government decided on the advice of the Joint Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament not to proceed with the matter at that time, that this possibility included the Uganda Protectorate. East African federation, including Uganda, was being actively discussed in 1931, when a deputation from Uganda, including Mr S. W. Kulubya, went to London to give evidence on this subject to the Joint Select Committee.

5. No further statements on the subject are on record until 1945, when proposals were put forward, in paper Colonial 191, for the establishment of an East Africa High Commission and Assembly to deal with certain common services of interest to all three East African territories, in the spheres particularly of communications and research. Colonial 191 stated in paragraph 9 that the proposals then made involved 'neither political closer union nor the fusion of the East African Governments', and gave as the reason for this in paragraph 10 that 'H.M. Government in the United Kingdom have accordingly come to the conclusion after taking the advice of the East African Governors that political federation or fusion in any of the various forms which have been discussed in the last twenty years is not practical politics under existing conditions'. In his statement to Parliament of the 28th July, 1947, Mr Creech-Jones, in announcing that it had been decided to implement the proposals in the subsequent paper Colonial 210, said: 'The scheme is not to be regarded as a step towards political union or the fusion of the East African Governments.' Mr. Griffiths in his statement to the Great Lukiko on the 15th

May, 1951, said that the statement that the present inter-territorial organization did not involve the political union of the East African territories still held good. Your Highness will observe that none of these statements ruled out federation for all time and I am instructed in particular to draw your attention to the use of the phrase 'not practical politics under existing conditions' in paragraph 10 of the Colonial 191.

6. In my letter of the 27th July, I informed Your Highness, on instructions from the Secretary of State, that as regards the present intentions of Her Majesty's Government the Secretary of State's speech did not indicate any change of policy on the part of Her Majesty's Government; that the future development of Uganda and the other East African territories must be largely guided by local public opinion; and that the assurance which I gave to the Great Lukiko in my speech of the 23rd April, 1952, still holds good. I also said in my public statement of the 11th August, again on the instructions of the Secretary of State, that 'there should not be read into the Secretary of State's speech any intention on the part of H.M. Government at the present time to raise the issue of East African federation'. In the view of the Secretary of State this assurance, so far from falling short of past assurances, in fact went somewhat further in that, in addition to ruling out federation at the present time, it stated that future developments must be largely guided by local opinion. It appears to the Secretary of State that you may not have fully appreciated the importance of this part of the statement in my letter of the 27th July. But, in view of the terms of Your Highness's letter, the Secretary of State has decided that it is necessary to amplify the statement and make it more definite. I am accordingly instructed to inform you as follows.

7. Her Majesty's Government has no intention whatsoever of raising the issue of East African federation either at the present time or while local public opinion on this issue remains as it is at the present time. Her Majesty's Government fully recognizes that public opinion in Buganda and the rest of the Protectorate would be opposed to the inclusion of the Uganda Protectorate in any such federation; Her Majesty's Government has no intention whatsoever of disregarding this opinion either now or at any time, and recognizes accordingly that the inclusion of the Uganda Protectorate in any such federation is outside the realm of practical politics at the present time or while local public opinion remains as it is at the present time. As regards the more distant future, Her Majesty's Government clearly cannot state now that the issue of East African federation will never be raised, since public opinion in the Protectorate, including that of the Baganda, might change, and it would not in any case be proper for Her Majesty's Government to make any statement now which might be used at some time in the future to prevent effect being given to the wishes of the people of the Protectorate at that time. But Her Majesty's Government can and does say that unless there is a substantial change in public opinion in the Protectorate, including that of the Baganda, the inclusion of the Protectorate in an East African federation will remain outside the realm of practical politics even in the more distant future. The Secretary of State is confident that you will agree that in this statement he has gone as far as he possibly can and has given you safeguards which cannot fail to be regarded as satisfactory.

8. Having given the firm assurances contained in the preceding paragraph, the Secretary of State feels sure that you need have no further fears on the question of federation. Nevertheless he thinks that you will wish him to comment on the suggestions put forward in paragraphs 10 and 11 of your letter. He does not propose to comment on the remarks about Central Africa in paragraph 7 of your letter, but this must not be taken as meaning that he accepts these remarks.

9. The Secretary of State has asked me to say that your request for transfer of responsibility for the affairs of Buganda to the Foreign Office is evidently based on a misunderstanding. The Foreign Office is responsible for the relations of Her Majesty's Government with foreign countries outside the British Commonwealth. The Colonial Office deals with the affairs of territories inside the British Commonwealth for which Her Majesty's Government is responsible, whether they be Colonies, Protectorates, Protected States or Trust Territories. Your Highness has suggested in paragraph 6 of your letter that Buganda is a Protected State under Her Majesty's Government; but this is not correct in the accepted constitutional sense of the term. Under the terms of the 1900 Agreement Buganda is clearly stated to rank as a province forming part of the Uganda Protectorate (Article 3), a position which has recently been reaffirmed in the joint statement on reforms in Buganda issued by Your Highness and myself last March. Not only Article 3 but other articles made it clear that Buganda was to be merged both fiscally and legislatively into the Protectorate as a whole, and this in fact has been done. The whole tenor of the Agreement made it clear that Buganda was to be part of the Protectorate. Your Highness has referred in paragraph 9 of your letter to the 1894 Agreement as well as the 1900 Agreement. The Secretary of State is advised that it is the 1900 Agreement which must be regarded as the prevailing document and the instrument regulating the relations between Her Majesty's Government and Buganda. The Agreement was freely entered into and has ever since its signature been accepted both by H.M. Government, and by the Buganda Government and people as the document defining their relations with each other.

10. Even were Buganda a Protected State, which constitutionally it is not, its affairs would still be dealt with on behalf of Her Majesty's Government by the Colonial Office, as those of other Protected States within the British Commonwealth are. Your Highness has claimed in paragraph 6 of your letter that the transfer of responsibility for Buganda from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office in 1902 involved a reduction of status; but this is not correct. As has already been stated, the 1900 Agreement clearly laid it down that Buganda should be administered as part of the Uganda Protectorate. In these circumstances there could have been no alternative but to transfer responsibility to the Colonial Office, a step which in any case logically followed once Buganda came under the protection of H.M. Government.

11. Furthermore the Secretary of State has asked me to point out that, even if it were appropriate to transfer responsibility for Buganda to the Foreign Office, which constitutionally it is not, this would not alter the position regarding federation at all. As far as Her Majesty's Government is concerned it is not any particular Government

department or Minister who decides major constitutional issues of the importance of federation in the territories for which Her Majesty's Government is responsible, whether in East Africa or elsewhere; such major decisions can only be taken by Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom as a whole, where necessary with the approval of Parliament. It follows that, since Buganda is under the protection of Her Majesty's Government, it would make no difference as regards federation whether it were dealt with by the Colonial Office or some other department, since the ultimate decision on this matter could only be taken by Her Majesty's Government as a whole. Therefore it is clear first that this request cannot constitutionally be acceded to and secondly that even if it could be this would not achieve what Your Highness has in mind.

12. In paragraph 11 of your letter Your Highness has asked that a plan should be put into effect designed to achieve the independence of Buganda. It is not clear to the Secretary of State from your letter exactly what is meant by 'independence'; but I reported the subsequent discussions which I had with yourself and your Ministers and the Secretary of State understands that you are not asking to go outside the Commonwealth – the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 11 indeed implies that you are not asking this. The Secretary of State also understands that you have informed me during the course of the discussions that Buganda has no wish to leave the protection of Britain. The Secretary of State in fact understands that you were seeking, without leaving the protection of Her Majesty's Government, to safeguard Buganda against the possibility of East African federation in the future, either by separating Buganda now from the rest of the Protectorate or at any rate by removing Buganda from the jurisdiction of the Protectorate Legislative Council.

13. The Secretary of State asks me to say that he is glad that Your Highness does not wish Buganda to leave the protection of Britain because he is sure that this would not be to the advantage of the people of Buganda. Your Highness will no doubt agree that the Baganda have received many benefits from British protection and that the association between the Baganda and the British people has been fruitful over the years and continues to be so. You will also, the Secretary of State is sure, agree that, apart from the many benefits received by the Baganda in the past, there have recently been very significant advances. In the political field there are the reforms announced earlier in the year, under which the people of Buganda will play a greater part in their system of government and the Buganda Government will be given substantial increased responsibilities for the operation of certain services in Buganda. In the economic field important benefits have been brought to the Baganda by the work of the Protectorate Agricultural and Veterinary Departments for the improvement of agriculture and cattle-keeping; by the expansion of the co-operative movement through the efforts of the Protectorate Department of Co-operative Development; and by the cotton and coffee reorganization schemes. In the field of education, to which so much importance is rightly attached by your people, the Protectorate has embarked on a great programme of expansion both of general and technical education which will greatly benefit the Baganda, while Makerere College is continuing to expand, again to their great advantage. All these

are benefits which have been brought to Buganda through its association with Britain and through action on a Protectorate-wide basis. The Secretary of State is therefore sure that Your Highness is right both from the point of view of the present interests of the Baganda and their future interests not to wish to leave British protection.

14. The points which require to be considered, therefore, are whether it would be possible or desirable in the interests of Buganda and its people, and whether it would affect the position regarding federation, either to separate Buganda from the rest of the Protectorate or to remove it from the jurisdiction of the Legislative Council. I have informed the Secretary of State that in discussion with me Your Highness has recognized that both these steps would involve amendment of the 1900 Agreement, since the Agreement lays down in Article 3 that Buganda ranks as a province of the Protectorate and in Article 5 that the laws made for the general government of the Protectorate are applicable to Buganda except in so far as they may be in conflict with the Agreement. Before discussing these suggestions in detail, the Secretary of State feels bound to say that he is surprised that they should have been put forward so soon after you had joined with me in stating at the end of our joint statement on the reforms in Buganda that 'the Uganda Protectorate has been and will continue to be developed as a unitary state. The Kingdom of Buganda will continue to go forward under the government of His Highness the Kabaka and play its part, in accordance with Clause 3 of the Agreement, as a Province and a component part of the Protectorate.'

15. As regards separation from the Protectorate, the Secretary of State seriously doubts whether this would be practicable, even if it were desirable in the interests of your people. Buganda geographically lies at the centre of the Protectorate and economically and in other ways its affairs are completely bound up with those of the Protectorate as a whole. These economic and general ties, reinforced by Buganda's geographical position, have been built up over many years and, in the Secretary of State's view, it would be virtually impossible now to break them down.

16. Nor does he consider that this would be in the interests of the Baganda. In recent years they have been playing an increasing part in the economic life of the country as a whole and they are now entering industries which are established on a Protectorate-wide basis. Your people, with a longer experience of organized government than many of the rest of the people of the Protectorate, are well fitted to play an increasing part in public life on a Protectorate-wide basis and are in fact doing so. If Buganda, while remaining under British protection, were to be separated from the rest of the Protectorate, Her Majesty's Government would of course continue to do its best to help the Baganda develop in the political, economic and social spheres. But this would be infinitely more difficult if Buganda were separated from the rest of the Protectorate than it is now. The Secretary of State is convinced that such a separation would gravely upset the economic stability of the country; would seriously interfere with schemes for the economic development of the Baganda and other Africans in the Protectorate which are now being actively carried forward; would reduce the amounts of money available for development and for the advancement of the people; and in a word would completely disrupt all that is

now being done to help the Baganda forward. The Secretary of State is certain, therefore, that such a separation would be prejudicial to the present and future interests of the Baganda. Moreover the separation of Buganda from the rest of the Protectorate might well be objected to by some sections of the public in Buganda and particularly the minorities, and might even lead in the case of the minorities to requests for separation from Buganda.

17. On the question of taking Buganda out of the purview of the Legislative Council, while retaining it within the Protectorate, this, in the Secretary of State's view, would be seriously damaging to Buganda's interests. There are many laws of great and sometimes of vital importance to the Baganda which could not be passed by the Lukiko because they affect not only the Baganda but also Europeans and Asians. Notable examples of these are the cotton and coffee reorganization laws; but there are many other examples. If Buganda were taken out of the purview of the Legislative Council laws such as these would have to be applied to Buganda by the Governor by proclamation, and there would be no opportunity, such as is provided by the Legislative Council, for members representing Buganda to take part in the discussion of them, speaking for the interests of the Baganda. Such a situation would be detrimental to the interests of Buganda and would give the Baganda legitimate grounds for complaint that their views were not being properly put forward. In the Secretary of State's view, therefore, it would be wrong to take Buganda out of the purview of the Legislative Council. Indeed the Secretary of State would go further than that and say that the members from Buganda ought to be selected by the Lukiko rather than nominated, seeing that this would link the members with the people whom they represent.

18. It remains to discuss how the separation of Buganda from the Protectorate, or its removal from the purview of the Legislative Council, would affect the position regarding federation. It is evident from what Your Highness has said to myself in discussing this matter that you fear that the Legislative Council could of its own act bring Buganda into a federation; but the Secretary of State has asked me to point out that this is not so. So long as Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom is ultimately responsible for the administration of the East African territories, any scheme of federation which might be put forward could only come into force with the approval of Her Majesty's Government; with Buganda under British protection this would apply whether Buganda was separated from the Protectorate or not. Her Majesty's Government would of course take into account the views of the Legislative Council of the Protectorate, but would also take into account the views of the Buganda Government. Separating Buganda from the rest of the Protectorate or taking it outside the purview of the Legislative Council would not therefore alter the position regarding federation – a position that is in any case safeguarded by the assurances conveyed to Your Highness in paragraph 7 of this letter. In so far as it would affect the situation at all, taking Buganda outside the purview of the Legislative Council would weaken rather than strengthen the position of the Baganda in this matter; for the Legislative Council, with its substantial number of African members, would provide an important mouthpiece for the expression of African opinion should

this matter ever be raised. With Buganda members on the Legislative Council, these would have full opportunity to express the views held by the Baganda on this subject; but if they were not on the Legislative Council this opportunity would be lost.

19. For all these reasons the Secretary of State does not agree that the separation of Buganda from the rest of the Protectorate or its removal from the purview of the Legislative Council would be in the interests, either present or future, of the Baganda; nor would either of these steps alter the position regarding federation. The Secretary of State has instructed me strongly to advise Your Highness that the proper course is not to suggest breaking up the Protectorate into separate parts, but to strengthen its unity and to work for its future political, economic and social development. If the Protectorate were to be divided into separate parts, each of these parts would be much weaker economically and in every other way than the Protectorate as a whole; and not only much weaker, but much less able to hold its own in dealings with the neighbouring territories. A strong and united Protectorate rather than weak separate units must therefore be the aim of all our efforts in the interests both present and future of the people of the Protectorate.

Draft telegram from Kabaka Mutesa II to Britain's Colonial Secretary (Mr Oliver Lyttelton), [30 November 1953].

[From Uganda Protectorate. Withdrawal of Recognition from Kabaka Mutesa II of Buganda, Cmd. 9028, H.M.S.O. London 1953.]

Attended Governor Uganda at his request with my ministers stop presented with document being an excerpt from your communication to Governor demanding my signature certain undertaking as follows:

(1) An undertaking by the Kabaka to accept the decisions of Her Majesty's Government conveyed to him by the Governor in his letter of the 27th October in reply to the Kabaka's letter of the 6th August and confirmed in the statement handed to him by the Governor on the 27th November in reply to the Lukiko resolution and memorandum of September on the subject of federation. As part of the above, an undertaking by the Kabaka that he will not make any statement opposing these decisions, that he will not by word or deed encourage other persons to oppose them, and that he will inform the Great Lukiiko publicly at the opening of its next meeting that these decisions of Her Majesty's Government must be accepted.

(2) An undertaking that the Kabaka will positively co-operate in the future progress of Buganda as an integral part of the Uganda Protectorate; and a reaffirmation by him of paragraph 16 of the memorandum on Constitutional Development and Reform in Buganda issued jointly by the Governor and him in March, 1953, which reads as follows:

‘The Uganda Protectorate has been and will continue to be developed as a unitary state. The Kingdom of Buganda will continue to go forward under the government of His Highness the Kabaka and play its part, in accordance with

Clause 3 of the Agreement, as a Province and a component part of the Protectorate.’

As part of this general undertaking, a particular undertaking by the Kabaka to submit names of Baganda members for appointment to the Legislative Council and to inform the Great Lukiiko publicly at the opening of its next meeting that he will submit these names, since he realizes that the Great Lukiiko does not wish to do this itself.

(3) An undertaking by the Kabaka that he will co-operate loyally with Her Majesty’s Government and the Protectorate Government in the organization and administration of Buganda in accordance with the terms of the 1900 Agreement and will conform to the laws and regulations of the Protectorate so long as these do not conflict with that Agreement.

Have replied Governor unable to affix signature without consultation with Great Lukiiko stop informed Governor affixing signature nullifying my position with my people and contrary to democratic principles stop grateful early reply as Lukiiko meets shortly.