Uganda is a country located in east Africa, bordering Kenya in the east, Tanzania in the south, south Sudan in the north, Democratic Republic of Congo on the west and Rwanda on the south west. Formally a colony of the British Empire, the country gained independence in 1962, yet it is the time after independence that Uganda suffered devastating political instability, genocide and economic failure, under the rule of Milton Obote and General Idi Amin. Since 1986 the economy and political stability of the country have greatly improved, although the country still suffers from widespread economic poverty and social deprivation. Still a member of the commonwealth, the tragedies that occurred after independence have largely been blamed on British colonialism and their practices of ‘divide and rule’. Another contributing factor to the economic downfall of the country under Amin was the expulsion of the Asian population, who at the time, owned the majority of businesses and contributed greatly to the country’s economy. While slowly being encouraged to return into the country to revitalise the economy, deep tensions still exist between Asians and Ugandans as this paper will discuss. When analysing this process of racialization and its impact within colonial and post-colonial Uganda it’s fundamental to secure a clear definition of the term. According to Ian Law (2010) racialisation is ‘The dynamic process by which racial concepts, categories and divisions come to structure and embed themselves in arenas of social life whether in thought (Fanon 1967), British post-war politics (Miles 1989), policy and legislation (Banton 1977), national states or regional global systems (Goldberg 2002) ’(59).

Yet while the notion of ‘colonialism’ is largely rejected and denounced in the 21st century, using Goldberg’s (2009) ‘relational racisms’ method this paper will discuss how concealed forms of racialisation are being implemented by the influence of external forces. As Goldberg states, colonialism ‘[shapes] the contemporary, planted racisms’ roots in place, designed their social conditions and cemented its structural arrangements’ (2009:1280). Therefore it is paramount that a critical examination of Uganda’s colonial past is undertaken for an accurate explanation of racialisation in Uganda today. This paper argues that in retaliation to the increasing embodiment of westernization, especially in the economic and political structures of the country, Uganda is attempting to mobilize its ‘race’ to form an ‘African’ identity which is distinctly different and separate from the west. However, as the evidence suggests this desire to distinguish themselves is incredibly complex and problematic, causing a continued subjugation of dominance rather than a liberation from the colonial legacy.

A Colonial Legacy – ‘Divide and Rule’

Any attempt at understanding racialisation in Uganda today, must have a deep knowledge of the impact of colonial rule on the country. Rather than being invaded, Uganda was gradually colonised by travellers in the late 1800’s. The first colonisers to settle in the
country were religious missionaries from Britain who arrived in 1877 (Mutibwa 1992:1). Although British imperialism fostered great divisions in the country, these divisions were only exaggerated by the British and not created. As Mutibwa points out, for centuries Uganda has been very ethnically diverse, with striking divisions between the north and south (1). As Mutibwa describes, ‘in the southern part of present day Uganda lived peoples who […] had been welded into centralised states with highly sophisticated political systems’ (1). This can be compared to the north where their societies were simple, rural and ‘segmentary’ (1). The south, before European arrival, was split into kingdoms, the best recognised of those has come to be Buganda, the originator of the countries name. The southern sophisticated political systems were attractive to the British colonialists, who established themselves in this area, increasing its economic, educational and political advancement over the north. It was to be the kingdom of Buganda that would benefit most from British imperialism. Using the natives of Buganda as ‘agents of their imperialism’ (3), the British employed them to invade and conquer the surrounding kingdoms. Deep rooted rivalries between the kingdoms of Buganda and the Bunyoro only heightened these tensions when the Baganda (the people of Buganda) were rewarded for their invasions by reclaiming land off the Bunyoro and earning cash from the British (3). The tensions between these two kingdoms was to effect politics in Uganda nearly a hundred years later, when the Bunyoro demanded the conquered lands back, causing fierce political tension and aiding to the political insecurity at the time. The Baganda’s success established the kingdom of Buganda to become a ‘mini-state’ (1992:3) dividing the country even further. The royalties and advantages that the British imposed upon the state created huge fractures within the country, with policy emphasising ‘differences in order to implement their policy of divide and rule’ (4). Despite the Baganda showing effectiveness in war, once authority had been established the army was disbanded with colonialists reserving unskilled labour for security force roles, such as soldiers, police men and workers for the plantations for people of the north (Anthony 2002:9). Southerners were encouraged in education and then influenced to join the civil service and business while the northerners were seen as more ‘naturally martial’ (Mutibwa 1992:6). While the educated natives and the white man settled, populated and developed the southern regions, Buganda became the ‘apex of Uganda’s economic pyramid’ (7) creating resentment amongst the rest of the country. While colonialists exploited the natural fertility of the southern regions to mass produce cash crops such as cotton and coffee, Asians who had immigrated to the country to build the railroad also benefited from this exploitation. As Mutibwa explains, Asians formed a ‘privileged class acting as middlemen between the Europeans and Africans’ (8), and as Anthony suggests, ‘the political system in Uganda was a pyramid of power that was effectively based on race’ (2002:9). Effectively while Ugandan’s formed the majority population, they became the inferior nationality. Improved economy resulted in improved communications, education and infrastructure and Buganda quickly surpassed its neighbouring kingdoms to become the dominant and most powerful kingdom in the country. Nevertheless, the harsh divisions created within the country, especially in terms of labour, made political stability and cohesion a momentous task for any leader. Although the British left the country to create its own state of independence, as Mutibwa points out ‘the irony of Uganda’s history is that its woes did not start with the arrival of the British rather it started with their departure’ (1992:22). The election of Milton Obote and Uganda’s independence in 1962 was just the beginning of Uganda’s political struggles. Among many things, the vast superiority of Buganda and the south in general meant there was a wide division in development in the country. Obote, in his attempt to solidify a hugely divided nation, was interested in creating a ‘one-party state’ (29) which would involve the dissolving of the kingdoms. This act, rather than creating solidarity, hindered it. People loyal to their kingdoms felt angered at their dislocation and at the loss of their cultures and heritage. Yet, these cultural distinctions and loyalties attributed to their kingdoms are arguably an artificial segregation under British rule, which was fundamental to ‘their political and economic management’ of the people (Thomson 2010:64). As Ian Law states ‘the elaboration of racial distinction as a means of exercising colonial
power involved stripping away of prior tribal/kinship identities and the social death of those who were subjugated’ (2010:11). In its place the British replaced former tribal identities with their version of them, categorising people into artificial and commonly misinterpreted groups, which created the ‘myth of the tribe’ (Thomson 2010: 64). This ‘myth’ became internalised over time by the people, and as the reaction to dissolving the kingdoms suggests, created strong ethnic loyalties despite its segregating and divisive effect. This racialisation brought in by colonial rule has a resounding effect on present day perceptions of African identity and nationalism.

**Racial violence – the Asian Expulsion**

The Asian expulsion under Idi Amin’s rule in 1972, is probably one of the most well documented racial discriminations in Uganda’s history. As it has already been stated, Asians were brought over to the country to build the country’s railroads, although the majority left the country after independence, around 6500 stayed (Mutibwa 1992:92). Due to their superior status to native Ugandan’s under colonial rule, Asians continued in their roles of authority and ownership within finance, manufacturing, agriculture (especially in the sugar trade) and administration after independence (92). The residuals of colonial rule and the impact of the ‘divide and rule’ tactic still resided with the Asians population, who were criticised for largely not integrating with the native community. Amin ‘harangued leaders of the Asian community, telling them that in the 70 years they had been in Uganda only six Asian women had married Ugandan men’ (Dowden 1992: No page number). In addition, the vast majority of them owned positions of power and became objects of resentment within the Ugandan community, they were blamed for ‘sabotaging the economy’ and were accused of ‘corruption, currency racketeering and bribery’ (Dowden 1992: N/A). The first acts of racial violence towards Asians were in 1945 and 1949 when riots took place against the Asians in Buganda who were in positions of power, especially those who were dominant in trade (Mutibwa 1992:8). Nevertheless Asians continued to dominate the wealthiest positions in society, which led to continued resentment among Ugandan’s. As a result Amin’s declaration to exile Asians was largely supported by the Ugandan people (92). When trying to explain the reasons for racial violence, especially the riots of the 1940’s and the expulsion in 1972, the evidence suggests that economic inequality had a resounding influence on its eruption. As Law (2010) explains, one way of understanding its formation is through ‘meta explanations’ such as ‘competition theory’ (135) where motives for racial violence are explained through observing external factors outside of the individuals control. ‘Ethnic competition theory’ explains how violence arrives between ethnic groups when there is a scarcity for resources, as a result each ethnic group competes to gain the most out of the limited amount available (Cunningham 2012:505). In the Ugandan case, the scarce opportunities to own positions of authority in trade, finance, administration etc. caused violence to erupt towards the Asian group as they compete for the same roles. However, competition theory is generally based on a ‘macro-level’ understanding where racial violence is blamed purely on movements that are taking place elsewhere to the location of the racial violence (507). To a certain extent this rings true in the Ugandan case. The Asian population gained positions of authority through the racialisation process of colonial rule, an action largely out of the control of local Ugandan’s.

Yet this does not explain the societal or even individual reasons for racial violence. As Law (2010) points out ‘there appears to be no direct correlation between patterns of unemployment and economic activity and patterns of racist violence’ (135) which can be partly argued in the Ugandan case. While under Obote the general population endured increasing hardships, with the price of living increasing and fewer jobs available for young people (Mutibwa 1992:93). Nevertheless this doesn’t fully explain the motives for the racial violence as the country’s economy only collapsed after the Asian population left, suggesting that overall there was gradual economic improvement in the country, although unequally distributed. Therefore it is crucial to observe other environments around the time which may
have contributed to the racial violence against the Asian population. Aside from the economic environment, the ‘local environment’ also lead to increased hostilities between the ethnic groups, which Law defines as ‘the level and nature of social interaction across ethnic/racial line’ (Law 2010:138). As Amin’s statement about the lack of interracial marriage suggests, there was a lack of integration between the groups leading to increased suspicion and resentment by the Ugandan people. Unfortunately the Asian population continued to isolate themselves which continued to implement a colonial like policy of ‘divide and rule’, creating a divide between the ‘us and ‘them’. The ‘National environment’ at the time must also be considered a factor towards the racial discrimination of Asians. This is described as ‘political and media messages on migration, ethnicity and racism which shape racial hostility’ (138). As it is well documented, Amin’s political stance was openly opposed to Asian occupation in Uganda. In his infamous declaration exiling the Asians, he declared he was directed by God to do so (Mutibwa 1992:94). Along with the political rhetoric at the time, media coverage and propaganda also incited racial hatred with Mutibwa claiming that ‘not one single editorial expressed criticism of Amin’s decision [to expel the Asian population]’ (94). The media’s influence over racial violence in Uganda has also been noted as being an important factor in the recent racial attacks against Asians. In an attempt to revitalise the country’s economy the Ugandan government in 1986 invited expelled Asians back to reinstate their business and property that was taken from them by Amin. Notably the biggest Asian businesses to flourish since the invitation has been the sugar companies of the Mehta group. Recently the government backed program the ‘land give away scheme’ has approved a plan for the Mehta group to purchase a sizable chunk of Mabira rainforest for sugar production. This move has created tensions between the government and populace with Rønningsbakk (2011) arguing that the media coverage has been reinstating racial difference and vilifying the Asian population. As she discusses, the division in agreement towards the ‘land give away scheme’ has created a ‘parasitic’ portrayal of Asians in the media which accumulated in a racial attack of an Indian man (Rønningsbakk 2011). What this suggests is that to grasp an explanation for racial violence and hatred towards Asians, there are far more complexities than simply attributing it to ‘competition theory’. A series of processes which involve national, economic and local environments all contribute to the continued stigmatisation of the Asian population in Uganda.

The rural/urban divide- Neoliberal racism

The tactics of ‘divide and rule’ implemented by the British created deep rooted divisions within the country. This divide was mostly prevalent between the Buganda kingdom and the rest of the country, which created severe inequalities in economy, education and infrastructure between the north and the south. These inequalities were mostly created due to the heavy prominence of British personal being resident in the Buganda Kingdom, yet since independence and the withdrawal of the majority of the British nationals, huge inequalities still fracture the north and the south. With the north reserved primarily as a rural area and the south housing the urban metropolises of Kampala, Entebbe and Jinja, the inequalities between rural and urban Ugandan’s has been reported by the Ugandan Strategy Support Program (2012). Despite the economy growing due to a more stable government since the 1980’s Uganda is still one of the poorest countries in the world and this is argued by the program to be deeply rooted in the unequal development of rural communities (25). The paper finds that the majority of Ugandans work in the agricultural sector, around 70%, yet the sector only generates 20% of overall economic output as measured by GDP (17). These figures are problematic when the paper argues that despite agriculture only generating around 20% of economic output this figure is also steadily declining (17). While rural families, about 85% of the Ugandan population struggle in the agricultural sector, it is
noted that the civil service and economic services receive more of the governmental budget despite employing fewer Ugandans (19/23). Therefore the paper concludes that the lack of employment opportunities for Ugandan’s in modern sectors such as the service sector, civil service etc. encourage the increasing amount of Ugandan’s to engage in agriculture employment, rather than seek jobs in urban areas (25).

This inequality in employment and funding between the rural and urban areas could be argued a form of ‘neoliberal racism’ (State and Law 2015), which conceals patterns of racism by disguising them as neoliberalism. As the Strategy Support Program suggests, ‘newly independent governments […]believe they] should be based on western economic development models […] showing a strong urban bias […] with a much more limited focus on rural development’ (Mukwaya 2012:22). As State and Law suggests, this ‘development model’ relies on the notion of ‘diverging trajectories of wealth and income driven by the operation of international capitalism’ (State and Law 2015:1) which they argue will ‘never lead to de-racialization’ (1). Neoliberalism obscures racism by promoting a ‘value-laden moral project’ (1) which thrives on the ideology of individualism and economic prosperity, disregarding the need for government intervention of markets and the reduction of social welfare. In Uganda’s situation this inequality in the rural to urban divide and its connections to neoliberal racism, is situated in the urban’s higher population of European expatriates, especially in the capital of Kampala. As a newspaper article suggests, attracting expats draws economic benefits for the country, as multinational companies judge potential destinations on quality of living, therefore encouraging countries to improve services for foreign workers (Waithaka 2015). This superiority of the expatriate over the African has also been noted by Redfield (2012) who examines the difficulties that NGO’s face when desiring to reduce the inequality between foreigners and natives. As he states ‘concern for life should transcend human differences; deliver of aid should not replicate colonialism’ (377). Yet, as he argues, the ability of the expat to travel freely gives him natural superiority over the fixed local, giving him the status of the foreign ‘expert’. This authority that westerners take over the development of African countries has been described as the ‘white saviour complex’, where it is assumed that the native people are unable to help themselves but need the superiority of the ‘white man’ to do it for them (Cole 2012). Neoliberal racism then, doesn’t just veil racism but legitimises it, by portraying the western expat as expert and superior not only in economy but also in personal wellbeing, it suggests a sense of indebtedness towards Europeans. It makes it difficult for African countries to accuse actions of racism when it appears that the westerners are providing a voluntary and public service for the ‘good’ of the African people. Neoliberalism redefines colonialism, it no longer becomes a top heavy domination and exploitation of the people, but appears to be mutually beneficial. In reality, the subtle authority that Europeans hold in Uganda cause stifling inequalities for the Ugandan people. Under the neoliberal rhetoric these inequalities can easily be overcome by individual action and greater efficiency of workers.

This ideology that places superiority on western concepts of development and economic exchange has been noted by Cheney (2004) as having implications on the way Ugandan people view their own society. In her study she notes the adult perceptions of rurality, who appear to have internalized the colonial beliefs of viewing the village as the “archetypal village” as stagnant and mired in locally instilled “traditional” beliefs antithetical to development goals (12). Rather than viewing the village as an environment that holds a strong cultural legacy, the adults perceived it as environment which was kerbing the ability of the country to progress. Like the neoliberal complex they are not believed to be underdeveloped because they are discriminated against but rather because they are perceived ‘as inherently unable to be developed due their naturalized affinity for underdevelopment and their lack of knowledge about “modern” things’ (13). While this not only gives advantage to urban areas, which consequently host the majority of the white population, but by viewing the rural society as ‘backwards’ and unnecessary justifies ethnic discrimination. As the Minority Rights Group International (2005) states, indigenous tribes
such as the Karamojong and the Acholi suffer discrimination, stigmatisation and have suffered from successive human rights abuses by the Ugandan government. Under the banner of ‘forced disarmament programme’, which was advertised as an attempt to restore peace to the region by forcibly removing weapons from the people, the Ugandan army has been accused of ‘torture, inhuman and degrading treatment, the rape of a woman, and the widespread destruction of homesteads’. This desire to contain rural communities and to forcibly promote western development upon them has also been observed by Delany (2011) who examines how the Karamojong are being encouraged to give up their traditional cattle herding traditions in favour of more ‘sustainable’ and static crop growing investment. Although arguably done to encourage self-sustainability and reduce dependency on food aid, the initiative still requires a forced change upon the Karamojong towards the westernised ideas of development. Debatably we see here how neoliberal racism advantages not only Europeans, but becomes internalised by the Ugandan people who begin to ethnically discriminate against their own tribal people in aid of economic sustainability and ‘development’.

**Breaking free from the colonial legacy – post-colonisation in Uganda**

What this paper has explored is the ways in which the influence of colonial rule still deeply effects the racialization of Uganda. Yet in the 21st century and the aftermath of independence it could be argued that the process of decolonisation is taking place. This argues that Uganda desires to separate from its colonial past and replace it with a renewed sense of ‘Africanism’. Part of this attempt to reinvent Uganda away from colonial rule has been the replacement of road names, statues and colonial buildings which have been renamed or replaced (Nsibambi 2015). Letters to Ugandan newspapers also highlight the growing desire of the Ugandan people to engage their nationalism to enable it to develop faster and lift it out of poverty (Anon 2005). New laws introduced by the Ugandan government try to reduce the inequality of employment and economic disadvantage by restricting NGO’s on the hiring of expatriates, first they must prove that a Ugandan can’t do the same job (Butagira 2012). Kaheru reveals a yearning to embrace virtues of being Ugandan building on an ‘old sense of national pride, unity and nationalism’, and sees the developing individualism of capitalism as a threat to these traditional Ugandan values (2014: No page number). In Cheney’s study of children’s perceptions of village life, there was contrast to the adult’s view of seeing the village as ‘backward’. Instead children viewed the village as a place of cultural nostalgia, holding strong ties to their ancestry and identity, which had been taught through the national curriculum (2004:16). Rather than the village being viewed as a helpless, uncivilised place which cannot develop, the children viewed the village with an optimistic foresight for improvement, seeing it as a place of ‘cultural value and potential investment’ (16). The children saw the village as a place that was crucial to the further development of the country, not somewhere that should be marginalised or ignored (16). This significant antithesis in opinion between the older and younger generation suggests that a new view of rural life is being formulated, based around the notions of ancestry and tribal heritage, unlike the neoliberal ideology which favours economic competition and urban transformation.

However, despite the children feeling some nostalgic longing towards their tribal roots, Cheney does suggest that this interest in village life is only with the view to economically invest and develop the area. With the children viewing it as their responsibility as the next generation of workers to serve their country, their ‘self-deprecating attitudes toward their own knowledge and abilities indicate the extent to which they have internalized westernised concepts of idealized childhood’ (2004: 18), they romantically view the village as a place of cultural heritage but have no desire to revert back to rural life. As Howard Winant suggests, countries that attempt to decolonise and move into the post-colonial era are riddled with complexities and contradictions (2006:987). Subordination of colonial rule which is sought to be removed is often replicated in ‘political, economic and cultural forms’ (987). The children who view themselves as the next generation of workers, also see themselves
as the next generation of developers, who ultimately see rural life as another frontier to
dominate, invest in and ‘develop’. While reviving renewed appreciation for the village, these
views have been distorted by the opportunity for economic prosperity. This tension between
celebrating Ugandan heritage and its role within a new and rapidly developing Uganda has
significant influence on creating a sense of Ugandan identity. This anxiety can clearly be
seen in the new anti-homosexuality laws, which many see as an attempt to demonstrate an
anti-western rhetoric. Yet as Winant argues, while trying to enter a ‘post-colonial’ period,
Uganda rather ‘display[s] substantial continuities with the bad old days of empire’
they problematically internalise beliefs of colonialists and portray them as their own, as ‘the
real import into Africa was not homosexuality but homophobia’ (Tatchell cited by Smith 2014:
No page number). This process of decolonisation reveals the tensions of post-colonial states
to create a nationalistic identity under the historic wrath of colonial rule and modern day
westernisation.

These actions taken by Uganda demonstrate how decolonisation has not resulted in
a diffusion of ‘race’, but rather a mobilising effect, where Ugandan’s use their ‘African’
identity to divide themselves from the west. In this way it could be argued that racialization
has enabled Ugandan’s ‘emancipation and liberation’ (Law 2010:218) from the pressures of
colonial legacy. For Goldberg (2002) this classification of oneself into racialised groups is
inevitable in the modern bureaucratic state, a system that Uganda is increasingly adopting,
which operates to ‘order and administer the population’ (249). While categorising oneself can
have limiting effects, Goldberg also notes its ability to liberate racialised groups to gain civil
rights, as he states, ‘the promotion of national belonging over and against the threatening
outside in moments of created crisis often becomes the most effective moment […] to gain
(civil) rights and civic standing’ (247). This attempt in Uganda to mobilise their ‘race’ in a
post-colonial era to resist the confines of white supremacy and gain international autonomy
and power unfortunately has its complications. The desire to solidify a national ‘race’
becomes increasingly problematic when the distinctions between racial identities are
becoming increasingly blurred in a globalised and arguably ‘post-racial’ world (Law
2010:219). As the ‘anti-western’ rhetoric of homophobia suggests, in an attempt to mobilise
an ‘African race’, the distinctive markers which are believed to divide the ‘us and them’,
become not so distinctive, when principles which appear unique are actually internalised
beliefs from the ‘other’ or in the Ugandan case, from western imperialism. Therefore, the
project of mobilising ‘race’ is partly liberating but also dominating as it stagnates the
possibilities for individuals to develop hybrid identities and become involved within a
globalised community. Decolonisation in Uganda while trying to ‘shake off’ the colonial
legacy through mobilisation of ‘race’, regrettably inverses its effects and ends up dominating
its own people, restricting them in their ability to develop hybrid identities which reject the
notion of ‘race’ altogether. This is for Gilroy the fundamental problem with the concept of
‘race’, in a post racial world he argues that using the term ‘race’ reinforces historically
constructed notions of the idea of ‘race’ (St Louis 2002:659). He rejects the idea that ‘race’
should be sustained as an ideology for people to categorise themselves to, as it has no
scientific rationality, and suggests that decreasing peoples identities to the simplicity of a
racial category has dangerous and malicious implications for ‘domination and subjugation’
(659). This certainly could be argued in the Ugandan case where in an attempt to develop
economically, gaining more sovereign power in the process, there is an inevitable need to
create this through westernised capitalist structures. So Ugandan’s, by dividing themselves
through their African ‘race’ as something different from the west, have consequently caused
their domination, they appear indebted to the west for providing a political and economic
framework through which their country can prosper.

The evidence suggests that a true and pure ‘racial identity’ is becoming increasingly
impossible in a globalised world, and in retaliation of this lost cultural and national identity
Uganda has mobilised its ‘race’ in order to prevent a repeat of colonialism in the modern
form of westernisation. Yet Uganda accepts western neoliberal ideology to become independent, financially viable and economically prosperous which in turn may give them the autonomy to develop a sense of unified nationalism. Yet this national unity is often sacrificed through racial economic inequalities in order to achieve it, ethnic discrimination of the Karamojong demonstrates this. There is a dependence while at the same time a rejection of white superiority, Uganda accepts its dependence on international investment through the expatriate population, but challenges its potential connotations of racialization that they cause. In reaction, by creating supposedly ‘African laws’, a nostalgic longing for tribal identity and a reversal of colonial symbols such as road signs and buildings, they attempt to make the expatriate seem the ‘foreigner’ but not the dominator. In this way post colonialism is very different from post racism, it is not the eradication of ‘race’ but rather a revitalisation of it, resisting the stigmatisation associated with it to develop a ‘race’ which is celebrated for its difference.

Conclusion

From the evidence it is clear that the British colonial rule has had a lasting impact on the racialization in Uganda. Through imperialist tactics of ‘divide and rule’, the British exaggerated already existing geographical divides to foster power and coerce servitude. This impact had particularly damaging effects upon the unity of the country, creating a strong north, south divide and giving particular superiority to the region of Buganda. The heavy influence of European settlement and financial encouragement for education and the service sector within the area brought increased development, which neglected the other kingdoms, the results of which are still prevalent today. The inequality in development caused severe imbalances in employment, especially in the type of employment, and created a racial hierarchy within the country, with the majority population, native Ugandan’s, at the lowest of the hierarchical pyramid, Asians second and the European as superior.

While this was hoped to diffuse after independence, the polarity in hierarchy between Ugandan’s and Asians, especially in the trade and economy, could not be overcome. With the assistance of political and media propaganda declaring Asians as corrupt and untrustworthy, the Asian expulsion in 1972 was widely welcomed at the time. This racial discrimination, although dispersed in recent years, has recently seen a revival, with renewed hostilities towards Asians proprietors of the sugar trade. As this paper discussed, rising violence towards the Asian population can be blamed on several environments, including national and local, where Asians failed to integrate into Ugandan society and were vilified in the press. Not only does inequality exist between Asians and Ugandan’s, but the legacy of colonial rule also has resonance with the expatriate population within the country, who create inequalities between the rural and the urban. While the majority of the population live in rural areas, they are also the areas that receive the least funding, yet agriculture is the biggest employer of the Ugandan people despite its input to the Ugandan community decreasing. This lack of investment in rural areas is suggested in this paper a symptom of neoliberal racism, where the predominately white population residing in urban areas benefit from increased development and financial investment due to their superiority of ‘race’, but concealed under the rhetoric of meritocracy and national capitalist development.

Finally this paper discusses the implications of decolonisation and the impact post-colonialism has on the concept of racialization in Uganda. What is argued is that there is a complex and juxtaposing relationship between desires to create a nationalistic ‘African’ identity, one which digresses from the racialisation of colonial rule, but one which accepts a dependence on westernised development for the benefit of national improvement. While trying to mobilize their ‘race’, Ugandan’s find themselves replicating the ideology which they seek to reject, by creating a strong ‘African race’ they distinguish themselves as different, separate and apart from the ‘other’. Yet in a globalised world, where boundaries are fluid and the movement of people much easier, this attempt to construct a sense of national identity becomes much harder. As the evidence suggests, in a post-colonial nation, the influence of
other cultures seems inevitable and in reaction these ideologies become internalised as their own. This paper shows that the residuals of colonial rule still harbour deep complications in the racialization of the Ugandan people. While arguable reaching a modern era of post-colonialism, developing countries now face a new form of domination through neoliberal westernisation. In retaliation to the potential eradication of national identity that westernisation threatens, Uganda seeks to mobilise its ‘race’ to form distinct divisions from others, whether Asian or European. While identities become increasingly fluid and are becoming more often the result of interactions with each other, we see the complexities of racialization in Uganda. There is the desire to use racialization as a tool of liberation, but also the need to eradicate its inevitable subjugation.
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