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Abstract

Northern Uganda has been a scene of various armed resistances in the post-independence period. The most devastating struggle is the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) conflict which started when the ruling National Resistance Movement assumed power in 1986. At the peak of the LRA conflict, approximately two million people forcibly relocated to Internally Displaced Peoples (IDP) camps due to the increased LRA insurgency in the north, and in part because of the atrocities committed by Uganda Peoples Defence Force (UPDF). However, with peace, stability and relative calm slowly returning to the region, most IDPs have returned home although some are yet to return owing to various reasons. Nonetheless, embedded in the return process is the problem of repossession of the abandoned lands. Insecure access to land continues to be a major problem for many people due to the on-going contestations arising from competing tenure claims and land grabbing by local, national and international ‘investors’, the most pronounced case being the Amuru Sugar Works in Lakang.

This paper employs the political economy approach in order to understand the interactions of political and economic processes as well as power relations in Lakang-Amuru district. Before the imposition of colonial rule in Uganda, the land in question was utilised for communal hunting and grazing by the communities which inhabited Lakang and the adjacent areas. However, after 1911, the colonial government established a conservation sanctuary thereby displacing the original inhabitants of the land. The first post-colonial government inherited the colonial project through formal recognition of the nature reserve. This was subsequently revoked by the Idi Amin regime through various degazetting instruments. Degazettment paved way for the slow return of the people in 1973. The people were again displaced by the LRA conflict. After the cessation of hostilities, peace and stability returned to the north, and the displaced people too moved back to their land although many more are yet to return. However, the returnees are in a dilemma as part of the land has been acquired by the Madhvani Group of companies for sugarcane growing.

The chapter presents a brief history of the LRA conflict and its consequences, land grabbing in a global and Ugandan context. It examines the background of the Madhvani Group and thereafter explores the rooted history of the land in question, analyses the embedded complexities and actors involved in the acquisition of 40,000 hectares of ancestral/customary land in order to establish a sugarcane industry. It questions; what are the likely benefits of the project and at whose expense? What is at stake? At the same time it explores the implications of the dispossession on land rights, rural livelihoods, identity as well as belonging. Lastly, it discusses whether the cane industry is likely to bring the long awaited development to Northern Uganda.
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Introduction

Uganda’s economy is largely dependent on the agricultural sector. Agriculture and land-related resources contribute 43% to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP), provide 88% of on farm and off farm related employment, and constitute 85% of the total export earnings (Rugadya and Kamusime, 2010:13; Mabikke, 2011:1 and Candia et.al, 2011). This is an indication that land is one of the most important assets at national and local levels because it is the largest contributor to Uganda’s economy. Land is equally important to households since it forms the centre of livelihood and survival. During the colonial period, Uganda’s economy was benchmarked on export oriented cash crop production attributable to the need to finance the colonial government administration and desire to meet the industrial and consumer demands in Britain (Carswell,
2007). However, there has been a transformation from dependence on traditional export-oriented cash crops (coffee, cotton, tea and tobacco) which were introduced by the colonial government in the colonial period to what is known as ‘non-traditional cash crops’ (fish, flowers, forest resources and grain). The policies of post-colonial governments which were and still are geared towards diversification of the economy are the major reasons behind the modification.

Cognizant of the fact that over 88 percent of Ugandans live in the rural areas as small-scale farmers largely dependent on subsistence agriculture (Mwenda, 2007), land continues to form an important part in their survival. According to Rugadya and Kamusiime (2010), approximately 73% of the Uganda’s population is engaged in subsistence agriculture and even a majority of those who are not directly involved in it earn some form of income off farming. The Human Development Report (HDR) of 2007 indicates that crop production, livestock farming, including the extraction of water and forestry related resources employ about 73.3 % of Ugandans between the ages 14 - 64 (United National Development Programme, 2007). Therefore, it is important to have secure access to land. Although this ought to be the ideal situation, access to land continues to be a problem for many especially in the post-conflict area of northern Uganda. As such, the north which has lagged behind in the social and economic dimensions due to the protracted conflict and the encampment policy could remain peripheral because of insecure access to land for returnees. As recent statistics indicate; poverty in the north remains at 46% against the national poverty rate of 25%, the infant mortality rate stands at 200 compared to a national average of 137 per 1000 births, literacy rates are appalling and access to basic services is still poor (The Independent Publications Limited, 2011). At the same time, the average children enrolment rate continues to decline at primary, secondary and tertiary levels over the years thus exposing the divide between the north and other regions of Uganda.

That notwithstanding, the underlying reasons why the north could struggle to bridge the above discrepancy in socio-economic indicators with the rest of the county are the on-going insecurities in accessing the abandoned land, land wrangles and grabbing. Although over 80% of IDP have already returned home (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC); Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), 2010) problems of insecure access to land arising from competing tenure claims and land grabs continue to be a major challenge to the returnees. In addition, a significant number of people remain trapped in former IDP camps because of land related problems. The disappearance of natural land marks during the conflict as well as the perception that unoccupied land is ‘vacant’ and for that matter ‘free’ for occupation is among the causes of land conflicts in the north. Competing tenure claims emanated from the fact that over 93 % of the land is held under customary tenure in an area where traditional land governance institutions have broken down due to the over two decade conflict (Ker Kwaro Acholi, 2008:1; International Organisation for Migration et al., 2010:13), and land grabbing which stems from commercial and speculative interests.

**Methods of Data Collection**

The research was undertaken for a period of six months in Amuru district of northern Uganda. Gulu district was included in the study as well because Amuru was part of Gulu district before 2006, and all matters concerning land in Amuru district were at the time of the research (2012) handled in Gulu district. Besides, most of the informants, including district administrators working at the district headquarters live in Gulu district. Secondary data was also collected in the
process in order to lend credence to the primary information. The data was obtained from Entebbe, Jinja and Kampala as the government publishing house which was useful for historical literature is located in Entebbe, the Madhvani Group is based at Kakira which is in Jinja district and the ministry of Lands and Environment is located in Kampala.

The data for the study was collected through in-depth key informant interviews, semi-structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). Similarly, review of documents, including newspaper reports, budget speeches, government policy documents, instruments relating to gazetting and degazetting which were enacted during the colonial and the immediate post-independence periods was useful. These were important in understanding the political economy of land, who owned what resource, when and how in relation to the contested land in Lakang Amuru district. Regarding data analysis, the process is on-going. Although this is the case, the information was recorded, transcribed, sorted and synthesised through qualitative coding. The coding process was useful in distilling, handling and making comparisons of data obtained from different sources.

**Origin of the Lord’s Resistance Army Conflict**

The start of the conflict in northern Uganda is attributed to the colonial policies of divide and rule as well as indirect rule. Scholars have argued that colonialism created a divide between the communities from the north and the peoples of the south, and henceforth, the LRA conflict (Odoi-Tanga, 2009; Atkinson 2010 and Branch, 2007; and Gersony, 1997). However, it is beyond the purpose of this chapter to detail the colonial histories which led to the divisions between the north and the south. The LRA conflict started in 1986 when the ruling National Resistance Movement (NRM) government (National Resistance Army (NRA) at that time) under the command of Yoweri Kaguta Museveni took over power on 26th January 1986 after a five year guerrilla civil war which was largely centred in central Uganda-Luwero Triangle (Atkinson, 2010, Atkinson 2009, Human Rights Focus (HURIFO), 2002). The fighting forces at that time included on the one hand, a northern dominated Uganda National Liberation Army (UNLA) headed by Tito Okello Lutwa, and on the other hand a predominantly southern NRA force under Yoweri Museveni. After the defeat of the UNLA forces, the NRA soldiers crossed into northern Uganda to pursue the former government troops. As such, the remnants from all previous regimes, including the UNLA fighters, retreated deep in the villages of ‘Acholiland’, while others fled across the border into the Sudan (now the new state of Southern Sudan) to fight the NRM government (CSOPNU, 2004; Allen & Schomerus, 2006).

**Effects of the LRA conflict on northern Uganda.**

The LRA rebels and the Ugandan army committed gross human rights violations in the north, including indiscriminate killings, abduction, rape, forced encampment and maiming (Gersony, 1997; ARLPI, 2001 and Temmerman, 2001; HURIFO, 2002). The climax of the conflict came with the encampment of about two million people because of the Uganda Peoples Defence Forces (UPDF) Policy of forced removal of people from their homes to the ‘protected areas’ — IDP camps. At the start of encampment, the government of Uganda indicated that the people moved to IDP camps willingly, but later-on, a top military commander in the Uganda Peoples Defence Force (UPDF) admitted that encampment was a deliberate military strategy (Olara, 2009). The displaced communities lived and called the new places ‘home’ from 1986 to 2007 when the government allowed them to return home. As stability, relative calm and recovery
started to return in the north; people too started to gradually return to their homes to re-establish the shattered households and economically rebuild their lives. But embedded in the return processes were and still are a number of challenges which continue to hamper the success of return and reconstitution processes. Among the fundamental issues include land conflicts and land grabbing. The next section examines the meaning of land grabs, locates the origin of land grabbing and how it has taken hold in developing countries, including Uganda.

**The Land Grab Phenomenon in Perspective**

The term ‘land grab’ has become a catchword in the NGO world and the academia in the recent times. Land grabbing, GRAIN argues, involves large scale acquisition of farmland by states, transnational companies and multinational agencies in another country either through leases, concessions or outright purchase with the aim of producing basic foods for export to the parent country (GRAIN, 2011). Other scholars have gone further to conceptualise this phenomenon in the context of ‘(trans)national commercial land transactions’ implying that it is not only transnational corporations that are involved but national actors are also part of the equation (Borras and Franco, 2009). Irrespective of the differences in conceptualisation, the information reveals how the increase in land deals and acquisition of large tracts of land has immensely impacted communities, including distortion of livelihood systems of indigenous peoples, disorientation of nested local networks, and marginalisation of rural poor as well as accentuation of poverty. Acquisition of large swathes of land also violates the rights of indigenous peoples, ignore the social, economic and environmental impacts and do not adhere to the principle of informed consent (Oxfam, 2011).

In this paper, land grabbing will be used to mean the acquisition of large swathes of land either by local people, foreigners, or national and multi-national corporations. The processes related to land acquisition, the nature, extent and exact details of the land deals are most of the time never disclosed to the public and the communities to be affected by the development projects. Only those persons in positions of authority in recipient countries may have the privilege of understanding the nitty-gritty of the land deals. And in peculiar situations where the land deals are exposed, the details are oftentimes imprecise. This means that there is limited transparency, openness as regards to the embedded details and inadequate consultation is undertaken during the land acquisition processes.

Land grabs are attributed to various factors. First, the shortages in food supply amidst price increments especially in some of the major food importing countries caused the global food crisis from 2007 to 2008. These dynamics were caused by an upward spiral in demand for cereals and vegetable oils brought about by changes in consumption patterns in Europe and China. These pushed-up the prices of the essential commodities. Second, the global financial crisis compounded the problem (Cotula et al. 2009; World Bank, 2011). At the height of this problem, the prices of staple food crops reached a record high ever-since the 1970s thereby causing widespread riots in major world cities (Kugelman and Levenstein, 2009). Recent prediction indicates that 2013 could be a year of global food crisis owing to poor harvests arising from extreme weather patterns —Drought — not only in the United States of America, but Russia and Australia as well (Frum, 2012).

Third, the European Union (EU) Renewable Energy Directive (RED) and country-specific policies which oblige corporations to shift from the use of fossil fuels to agro-fuels (bio diesels)
have fuelled the land rush (Graham et al. 2009; Cotula, 2012). The promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and green energy technologies’ as an avenue to reducing fossil fuel dependence and the associated greenhouse gas emissions as well as carbon offsets have been high on the agenda in the western world. National and regional targets have been set in the EU of which all countries are meant to comply. Individual EU countries are expected to meet an obligatory “20 % share of energy from renewable sources in overall Community energy consumption by 2020 and a mandatory 10 % minimum target to be achieved by all Member States for the share of biofuels in transport petrol and diesel consumption by 2020” (Directive 2009/28/EC, 2009:2). These targets have encouraged the generation of energy from all available renewable sources. Since the needed energy is meant to come from renewable energy sources, this has been and will continue to be realized at a cost, i.e. food insecurity, reduction in the acreage of land available for food production and increased land grab/land deals.

These incidents reawakened and provided a new lens of looking at the broader agricultural sector which has been overlooked in many countries for many years. As indicated in a report by Oxfam (2011), the agricultural sector has for decades been neglected, but the emerging global dynamics have revealed its importance in the world economy thereby compelling countries to increase funding. Similarly, the world’s population which is projected to increase from seven to nine billion people will drive the demand for food even higher. As a stopgap measure and in order to ensure a steady supply of food, the countries which import high quantities of food have devised ways of securing large swaths of land in countries where land is not only assumed to be abundant but also said to be underutilized. The primary aim of land acquisitions was and still is to engage in extensive agriculture as an avenue to prevent the reoccurrence of the vulnerabilities pointed out earlier (World Bank, 2011).

The emerging data indicates that developing countries especially in Africa and Asia have been the most affected as regards the land grab phenomenon. It is estimated that over 227 million hectares of land, an area which is almost the size of Western Europe, have either been sold or leased to international investors and multinational companies, much of the said land being in Sub Saharan Africa (Oxfam, 2011 (a) and Oxfam 2011(b). Shepard and Anuradha (2009) argue that since the start of the 2008 food crisis period, 180 land deal agreements have been concluded and many more are under negotiation in different parts of the world. At the same time, the Land Matrix — an online database which documents large-scale land deals — estimates that over 987 land deals which amount to 57,368,608 hectares have been concluded since 2000. Over 70 percent of the total global land transactions which are either under negotiation or have already been accomplished target land on the African continent (World Bank, 2011). In the same vein, the International institute for Environment and Development (IIED) indicates that between 51 and 63 million hectares of land were acquired between 2008 and 2010 in Africa alone (IIED, 2012).

As indicated in the foregoing discussion, many countries on the African continent have been affected by the rush for fertile lands. The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), like many other African countries, negotiated large scale land deals which resulted in the sale and leasing of about 180, 000 hectares to foreign multinationals (IIED, 2012). Anecdotal reports also indicate that the president of DRC agreed to lease 10 million hectares of land to South Africa (Kugelman and Levenstein, 2009). The trend has been the same in Ethiopia where over 1.2 million hectares
have been leased and sold to Asian, Middle East and European investors mainly for cereal production and establishment of ranches between 2004 and 2009 (World Bank, 2012). According to the Oakland Institute (2011), Foreign Direct Investments (FDI) targeting specifically the land sector has been on the increase in Ethiopia. The FDI increased from US$ 125 million in 2000 up to US$545 million in 2004, and at present, FDI inflows in the Ethiopian agricultural sector are estimated to be at 32 percent (Oakland Institute, 2011). Despite the increase in the acreage of land acquired for cereal production and FDI, Ethiopia is one of the counties which continue to experience severe hunger, malnutrition and high dependence on food aid hand-outs. Equally, the government of Madagascar entered an agreement with a South Korean company (Daewoo) to lease 1.3 million hectares; half of the country’s arable land for 99 years (Kugelman and Levenstein, 2009). Although the reported deal did not materialize, the trend presents a clear picture of how the rush for farmland in the developing world is real.

**Land Grabbing in Uganda**

As the Government of Uganda (GoU) attempts to attract foreign investment, create employment and stimulate development through the import substitution strategy, investment in land has been envisaged as the plausible way to achieve these goals (National Association of Professional Environmentalists (NAPE) and Friends of the Earth International, 2012). To this end, various methods have been adopted; including provision of free land to both national and international investors as a means to encourage them invest in the country. In some cases, the government has directly and indirectly facilitated the investors to acquire land in the country. Through this approach, those who subscribe to the ruling NRM government and are close to the president get access to extensive lands for speculative reasons (land banking), meaning that they anticipate to re-sell the land at a higher price, establish vegetable plantations, cultivate grain, engage in coffee production as well as farming in different parts of the country (Oxfam, 2011). The implication of land deals on food insecurity, environmental degradation, poverty, culture and identity as well as poverty in the areas where the projects are implemented is unprecedented.

The Land Matrix database indicates that four large scale land deals amounting to 76,512 hectares were concluded in Uganda. In 1992, the government of Uganda signed an agreement with the Libyan government to allocate three large chunks of land, i.e. Bukaleba Beef Ranch (4,000 hectares), Aswa Ranch (46,000 hectares) and Maruzi Ranch (16, 376 hectares (Okello, 2006). Meanwhile, Egyptian government planned to establish grain farms on land totalling to 840,000 hectares (Kugelman and Levenstein, 2009) and Agri-SA holds about 170,000 hectares of arable land in Uganda (Mabikke, 2011). Similarly, the Ugandan government tried to allocate 7,100 hectares of land to the Sugar Corporation of Uganda Limited (SCOUL) to produce more sugar although the civil society resisted the allocation through massive demonstrations and appealing to donors to block the proposal (NAPE and Friends of the Earth International, 2012).

A recent report by Oxfam entitled ‘Land and Power’ unpacked the activities of multinational companies and exposed the roles of government departments as regards to dispossession of small holder subsistence communities in Uganda, Indonesia, Guatemala, Honduras and Southern Sudan (Oxfam, 2011). In the Ugandan case, the study findings indicated that Uganda National Forestry Authority (NFA) granted a licence to a UK-based New Forests Company Uganda Limited (NFC) to establish a timber plantation as part of the global initiative to fight climate change and greenhouse emissions (Matsiko, 2012). In the proposal, NFC promised to provide
jobs, build schools and health facilities in the areas of Luwunga and Namwasa. As such, the NFC was able to apply for carbon credits for carbon offsetting. However, the establishment came with numerous costs as over approximately 22,000 people (15,000 evicted from Luwunga kiboga district and 7,400 people evicted from Namwasa in Mubende district) lost their rights to land, livelihoods were disrupted, houses and households destroyed. Although the research was insightful, Oxfam and Uganda Land Alliance (ULA) came under attack by the president. Among other things, they were tasked to explain their anti-land campaign activities and compelled to publicly apologize or risk deregistration (Matsiko, 2012).

In a separate inquiry, the ‘Land, Life and Justice’ study synthesized the implications of the palm oil plantation on the environment, livelihoods and food sovereignty in Kalangala, central Uganda (NAPE and Friends of the Earth International, 2012). The palm oil project which was established in 1998 by the Government of Uganda with support from the United Nations International Fund for Agricultural Development and the World Bank aims at increasing the supply of cooking oil in the country. Despite the objective, the project has been criticized by the local people for various reasons. The project started amidst limited consultation of local people occupying the area. The emerging critical issue is that out-growers were compelled to sell their land to the company after failure to pay for fertilizers and other farm inputs which were supplied to them on credit. At the same time, small holder farmers have been displaced from ancestral lands, many have lost livelihoods and their land has been grabbed by the company. They have been denied access to former grazing grounds, water resources, building materials and large tracts of the forest on which they depended has been cleared to make way for new palm oil plantations.

Statistical data indicates that arable land in Uganda is estimated to be 33 percent out of a total of 241551 sq. km (NAPE and Friends of the Earth International, 2012; and (United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 2007). Although this is the case, Mabikke (2011) argues that land deals account for about five percent of the total agricultural land, while GRAIN (2011) indicates that the percentage of land under foreign land deals could be between 4 and 8 percent. These figures represent a small percentage of the total land deals because many land transactions go unreported especially in the rural parts of the country. The media has tried to issue reports on the impending or completed land grabs in the Uganda but the reports often target internationals corporations and individuals (Matsiko, 2012). The few reports alluding to involvement of local nationals do not unpack the complexities, embedded details and the target is particularly the elite in government (Nalugo, 2012). On this basis, many land deals are unreported thus not captured in the above data.

Land in post-conflict northern Uganda has also been targeted for acquisition by Ugandans on an individual basis or in association with foreign partners from Zimbabwe, South Africa, Canada, and Denmark. Local leaders, Members of Parliament, military and police personnel as well as the business community have been singled out as interested parties in land deals in the north. The same land has of recent been targeted by local multinational corporations the notable case being Amuru Sugar works Limited owned by the Madhvani Group. A lot of controversy surrounds the land in Lakang Amuru district where the Amuru Sugar Works is to be established to the extent that critics have questioned whether this phenomenon could be categorised under ‘land grab’. The subsequent section presents the details relating to the proposal forwarded by the Madhvani group in relation to the land in Lakang Amuru district where Amuru Sugar Works Limited is to be established.
Amuru Sugar Works Limited

The proposal to establish “the sugarcane industry [in Amuru district] by the Madhvani Group of companies under Amuru Sugar Limited started in 2006 as an initiative by President Yoweri Musevini to develop conflict affected northern Uganda”\(^1\). The company which was preferred to propel the initiative was the Madhvani Group, an Indian company with a long history and experience in sugar production in Uganda since the colonial period. The Madhvani Group started operations in Uganda as early as 1914. It opened up the Kakira cotton ginnery in 1921 before investing in the sugar business in 1922. It went on to establish Kakira sugar Works Limited in Jinja in 1924\(^2\). The Madhvani Group is presently the largest private sector business in Uganda with various enterprises, including agriculture and processing, sugarcane, tea and floriculture, packaging, commercial property development, hotel and tourism as well as construction. The current turnover to the Madhvani Group in Uganda is in excess of US$ 100 million, with assets valued at US$ 200 million\(^3\). At the moment, the Madhvani Group is in the process of expanding the sugar business to northern Uganda through the establishment of the proposed Amuru Sugar Works Limited.

The initial reports indicated that the proposed Amuru Sugar Works Limited is a joint venture between the GoU and the Madhvani Group whereby the GoU will hold a 40 percent share in the project at the initial stage on behalf of the public and the people of Amuru, while Madhvani Group will hold 60 percent (Madhvani, 2012; Rugadya and Kamusiime, 2010). The joint venture agreement spells out that the government is to contribute 40 percent and Madhvani Group 60 percent in order to raise US$ 30 million needed to kick-start the project. However, in what was described by some commentators as a ‘win-win’ proposal which was announced during the recent visit to the area in a bid to secure the land for the project, President Museveni indicated that the Madhvani group will own 50 percent shares and government will hold the remaining 50 percent (Masembe, 2012).

As regards to the land, Madhvani (2012) argues that after examining the various options in the country, Amuru district (Lakang) was considered suitable because it was ‘totally free of inhabitants in an extremely isolated area with no infrastructure such as water, electricity and proper roads’. “They [Madhvani group] … surveyed the area when people were still in IDP camps. They started their tour from West Nile, and from their findings, West Nile was relatively dry and … not favourable for sugarcane growing. Thereafter, they moved to Adjumani district … but the area was largely forested, so the project would meet a lot of encumbrances, because of

---

\(^1\) In-depth interview with OKia Santo, former chairman Area Land committee Amru Town Council, 8th 02 2012.

\(^2\) See The Monitor newspaper article entitled “Madhvani’s land acquisition in Busoga” is available at [http://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/ugandaat50/Madhvani+s+land+acquisition+in+Busoga/](http://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/ugandaat50/Madhvani+s+land+acquisition+in+Busoga/11370466/1410908/-/fcedgo/-/index.html). The Monitor Newspaper article entitled “Between a rock and a distant, unknown place: Origin of the Madhvani empire” provides more information on the establishment of sugar industry in Uganda. Online [http://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/ugandaat50/Between+a+rock+distant++unknown+place+origin+of+Madvanip11370466/1410098/-/14e6tfw/-/index.html](http://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/ugandaat50/Between+a+rock+distant++unknown+place+origin+of+Madvanip11370466/1410098/-/14e6tfw/-/index.html)

\(^3\) More details about the Madhvani group can be accessed from their brochure available at [http://www.madhvanifoundation.com/downloads/mgbrochure-08.pdf](http://www.madhvanifoundation.com/downloads/mgbrochure-08.pdf)
too many forests. They finally moved to Amuru. The area was found favourable; the soil type was suitable for sugarcane growing.\(^4\)

The project entails acquisition of 40,000 hectares of land in perpetuity and at zero cost, implicitly the people of Lakang are meant to give away the land for development of the sugar industry. Half of the land, 20,000 hectares, will be used to establish a central business district (nucleus estate) of the factory that will entirely be under the management of the Madhvani Group and the remaining land will be leased to the communities to grow sugarcane under the out-grower scheme. At the same time, the Madhvani Group will acquire a title deed to the land in question (40,000 hectares) in a quest to secure additional funding of about US$50 million from the African Development Bank (Rugadya and Kamusiime, 2010). The government through Amuru District land Board has allocated 10,000 hectares of land to the Madhvani Group and the remaining 30,000 hectares are yet to be given out.

However, with such intentions as articulated in the accounts by the proprietors of the Amuru Sugar Works Limited, the project has encountered resistance and raised various arguments not only in Amuru but in the entire northern region. The informants indicated that they are interested in the supporting development initiatives in their area but the major concern is the unwillingness on the side of government to be transparent by providing clear and precise information regarding to the type of investments, process of land acquisition, actors involved and tangible benefits from the projects to the people. Additionally, the unwavering support of the project by the president, the ‘politically connected individuals and the elite within government has brought to question the ‘genuinity’ of Amuru Sugar Works Limited (Masembe, 2012).

The president argues that the already established sugar factories in Uganda (Kakira, SCOUL and Kinyara) save the country approximately US$ 232 million in import substitution (Museveni, 2012). Therefore, the addition of Amuru Sugar Works Limited to the production chain with an estimated output capacity of 70,000 tonnes of sugar, the country is likely to bring in over 52 million dollars, which is about 120 billion Uganda shillings per year. Uganda consumes over 3000 tons of sugar per annum, in case this amount is imported, the country will spend over 300 million dollars to import sugar (Masembe, 2012). In 2007, the Madhvani Group together with President Museveni went to Amuru to convince the communities to support the project (Banfield, 2009), and over the years, the president has held public rallies in Amuru district and been involved in discussions with community leaders in a bid to have the project succeed (Masembe, 2012; Rugadya and Kamusiime, 2010).

It is against this background that some commenters, including senior district officials in northern Uganda continue to question the intentions and integrity of the Project. As indicated in the following excerpts: “In Amuru, things [land] tend to be politicized; I do not know what interest is in that area\(^5\), and another wondered; “… people offered land in other areas of northern Uganda but Madhvani is interested in that particular area, why?\(^6\). To some, “Madhvani … [is] being used as a front; there … [are] other forces behind Madhvani. But what we really know, what really propelled all this is the discovery of oil\(^7\). “Madhvani is a cover, when the land is acquired, he will be removed from the land after a short time in order to extract minerals that are

---

\(^4\) In-depth interview with OKia Santo, former chairman Area Land committee Amru Town Council, 8\(^{th}\) 02 2012.

\(^5\) In-depth interview with a senior district official in Amuru District, 08\(^{th}\) 02 2012.

\(^6\) In-depth interview with a senior government official in Gulu district, 02\(^{nd}\)/03/2012.

\(^7\) In-depth interview with a land owner in Amuru 10\(^{th}\) 01 2012.
under the land”\textsuperscript{8}. After the discovery of oil in the Albertine region, reports of land grabbing have been on the increase, and because of this, some local people believe that the motive of land acquisition is speculative.

The study established that government never followed the procedures related to land acquisition as indicated in the constitution of the Republic of Uganda. Chapter 15, article 237, Clause 1 of the constitution of the Republic of Uganda states that: Land in Uganda belongs to the citizens and shall vest in them in accordance with the land tenure systems provided for in the constitution …”, i.e. customary, freehold, Mailo and leasehold (Government of Uganda, 1995). This implied that people have rights to hold and utilise land in a customary manner and dispose of the land in question as deemed appropriate, including outright sale, lease or give out the land as a gift. Chapter four article 16 clause 1 states: “Every person has a right to own property either individually or in association with others”. Clause 2 indicates: “No person shall be compulsorily deprived of property or any interest in or right over property”. Under any circumstance that individual land is compulsorily acquired for public use, the 1998 Land Act requires that “prompt payment of fair and adequate compensation, prior to the taking of possession or acquisition of the property” is made (Government of Uganda, 1995).

While referring to the process of land acquisition for the project, Professor Ogenga Latigo, the former Member of Parliament for Agago county and Leader of Opposition in the 8\textsuperscript{th} Parliament indicated that “Government mishandled the Amuru case\textsuperscript{9}”, while others informants argued: “The idea is not bad but the approach of establishing the sugarcane factory [was wrong, and besides the project] is imposed on the people, the project should be started when the people have returned to their land. The priority should be to give chance to the locals to resettle before establishment of the sugarcane factory.”\textsuperscript{10} “You cannot bring a project and you expect the local people to receive your project when you just come and throw it on them, they have to be ready, what are the benefits, what are they going to do in terms of corporate social responsibility. We in these positions need to ensure that much of the interests of the local people are catered for. You cannot ignore them, it cannot happen\textsuperscript{11}”. The subsequent section presents the location of the study area where Amuru Sugar Works is to be established.

\textbf{Study Area, Location and Characteristics}

The area of Lakang is found in the newly created Amuru district. The district of Amuru which was created in 2006 is bordered by River Nile to the West; the district of Adjumani to the North, in the East is Gulu district and Nwoya district to the South. Lakang is a relatively flat plain with a few undulating landscapes interspersed by thickets and forested areas. The study informants indicated that the land in Lakang is fertile possibly because the over twenty year LRA conflict gave the land chance to regenerate.

Politically, Amuru district is under a two tier system of governance. On the one hand is the formal government structure, while on the other hand is the traditional/cultural establishment. Administratively, Amuru district is divided into four sub-counties. Each of the four sub counties

\textsuperscript{8} Interview with Uma-Owiny Dwewamoi Paul Vincent, 08\textsuperscript{th} 05 2012.
\textsuperscript{9} Interview with Professor Ogenga Latigo county, former member of Parliament for Agago and leader of opposition in the 8\textsuperscript{th} parliament, 17/03/2012.
\textsuperscript{10} Focus Group Discussion, Rwodi of Parabong, Toro, Boro and Pagak, 26\textsuperscript{th}/04/2012.
\textsuperscript{11} In-depth interview with a senior district official in Amuru District, 08\textsuperscript{th} 02 2012.
is governed by a sub-county chairperson. Below the sub-counties are Parishes which are administered by Parish chiefs. At the bottom of the ladder are villages that are governed by a council of nine people headed by a village chairperson. The traditional administrative structure operates side by side with the formal government establishment. In Amuru district, there are five chiefdoms which are administered by a Rwot, loosely translated as chiefdom chief/clan head. The chiefdoms include Parabong, Toro, Pagak, Boro and Lamogi. The clans or chiefdoms are divided into sub-clans that are represented by one traditional leader (locally known as Rwot — Rwodi for plural) to the council of the chiefdom chief (Paramount chief).

MAP OF AMURU DISTRICT SHOWING THE STUDY AREA

Source: Author’s modification from UNOCHA (April 2009).

The historical context of Lakang
The area of Lakang which is found in present-day Amuru district has since the period before colonialism been inhabited by various semi-autonomous decentralised but also hierarchically organised polities. Historical literature indicates that the River-Lake Nilotic Luo speaking peoples who migrated southwards from the Bahr-el-Ghazal provinces of the Sudan towards the end of the 15th century to parts of north western Uganda were among the first people to settle in
this area (Karugire, 1980 and Atkinson, 1994; Odhiambo et al, 1978, and Shipton, 2009; Were and Wilson, 1977). The similarities in language, songs, dances and all traditional activities performed in Acholiland with those of the Shilluk peoples of the Sudan is an indication that these communities were one entity, argues Uma-Owiny (2012). As the different groups migrated into Uganda, they not only absorbed but were also absorbed thus the emergence of a common dialect (Luo) which subsequently dominated the area. Although this was the case, the different groups settled in “small centralised states” which evidenced similarities in structure and style of governance (Odhiambo et al, 1978; 33).

While in Uganda, these peoples first settled at Pubungu, near present-day Pachwach, before dispersing to various directions (Were and Wilson, 1977). One group moved to the West Nile area, integrating with the Sudanic Madi thus the emergence of the Alur sub-group of the Luo. The second group continued further down into central Uganda especially to parts of Bunyoro. While others went eastwards from where they crossed into the western part of Kenya to form the Luo of Kenya, and the fourth category stayed in northern Uganda (Karugire, 1980; Odhiambo. et al, 1978; and Shipton, 2009). The latter group, according to Were and Wilson (1977), expanded into present-day Acholi, Lango and Alur areas. For this paper, the focus is on the sub-groups which remained in northern Uganda and specifically the groups that settled along river Nile because these later-on gave rise to the peoples who occupied Lakang and the adjacent areas.

Although it is beyond the intention of this paper to examine the causes of the migration and settlement patterns that ensued thereafter, what seems to be certain though is that the “groups that remained settled very close to river Nile about 100 years ago”12. Since the Luo speaking groups were of different backgrounds and identities, they as a result settled and consequently established distinctive decentralised chiefdoms/clans in an area that stretched for several kilometres from river Nile (Uganda Wildlife Authority Monitoring Unit, 1998). Owing to their preference in settling along the banks of river Nile and other bodies, Odhiambo et al, (1978) refer to them as River-Lake Nilotes. Settlement along river Nile was conditioned by the presence of the river on which many depended for transport and food (fish). Among the communities which settled in the area (now distinctive chiefdoms in Amuru and Nwoya districts) include; Pabit, Ariya, Patira, Tebiro, Alero, Payira, Bwobo, Parabong, Toro, Boro, Pagak and Lamogi, Pabbo (Uma-Owiny, 2012:4).

It is important to state that the latter six chiefdoms (Parabong, Toro, Boro, Pagak, Pabbo and Lamogi) are the focus of this paper because these people lay a collective claim to the land in Lakang. The settlement pattern at the time was that each polity occupied a particular hill in a cluster-like pattern due to “social factors, and security problems”13 that emanated mainly from wild animals which threatened the communities. The centralised isolated pattern of settlement set much of the land free for other activities, including farming, although subsistence agriculture too was practiced within the vicinities of the homestead. Thus, other than utilising some of the land for settlement and subsistence agriculture, the largest piece of the land was set aside for communal hunting and grazing, harvesting of honey and other wild fruits as well as medicines. The main livelihood sources for the communities in the area were hunting of wild game and grazing of animals. As such, hunting and grazing areas were owned and accessed in a communal

12 In-depth interview with Chief of Pagak, 10th/05/ 2012
13 Focus Group Discussion with the Rwodi of Parabong, Toro, Boro and Pagak, 26th/04/2012.
manner without any chiefdom claiming exclusive rights to the land. As one Rwot\textsuperscript{14} puts it, “All the clans utilized the land. It was strictly for hunting [and] no … clan claimed ownership of it. We all recognized that this [land] was for the benefit of all clans surrounding that area. That is how we utilised the land anyway”\textsuperscript{15}.

**Establishment of a wildlife reserve in the colonial period**

The initiatives to establish a wildlife sanctuary by the British colonial government started in 1911 when the Luo sub-groups which settled in and around the areas of Lakang were forcefully evicted from their customary and ancestral lands. The reasons for the displacement were threefold. One, the colonial government claimed that the area was infested with tsetse flies and small pox, and for his reason, the people who occupied the area were forcefully relocated to other areas that were deemed free not only from such diseases but also flies that caused the diseases. Secondly, the colonial policy of administration at that time emphasized and aimed at bringing people closer to each other for administrative purposes, i.e. easy administration, reduction of administrative costs and implementation of the forced labour program. And thirdly, the practice of eviction was part of the divide and rule policies which were employed by the colonial government to contain the Lamogi rebellion of 1911. The rebellion ensued from the refusal by the people from the Lamogi clan to participate in any government works specifically grading of roads (Uma-Owiny, 2012).

The Rwodi recounted that: “In 1911, people were forced off their ancestral lands by the British colonialists and confined in camps in near Gulu town. The colonialists claimed that the land was infested with tsetse flies … that cause sleeping sickness. The area was not fit for human occupation”\textsuperscript{16}. In the writing entitled “History Repeats Itself”, Uma-Owiny writes about how the communities were taken to camps in 1911: “Sleeping sickness disease which was transmitted by tsetse flies was killing Acholi in big numbers, including domestic animals like cows, goats [and] sheep” Uma-Owiny, 2012:37). He went on to indicate: “The disease had no cure at that time. When it starts on a person it means death or madness before death. The white men … [told the local] people that the flies came far away from Busoga, they flew along the river Nile, that is why they … reached …Acholiland” (Uma-Owiny, 2012:51).

The language of persuasion was used to convince the reluctant people to heed to the instruction from the colonial administration even when the intention and motives were not clear. Recognising that most parts of East Africa were already identified for their conservation potential by the early explorers, including Winston Churchill, some informants indicated that sleeping sickness could have been a proxy. In the writing entitled My African Journey, Winston Churchill describes how the landscapes of East Africa were crowded with wild animals. The plains were thus mirrored and interpreted through a conservation lens — “zoological gardens” (Churchill, 1909). It is on this basis that some informants doubted the presence of tsetse flies in Lakang and the other areas. In a Focus Group Discussion, the Rwodi from Amuru district argued that “…sometimes the colonialists used a persuading language, that you know, there is sleeping

\textsuperscript{14} Rwot means head of the clan/chiefdom. Rwot is one and Rwodi is plural.

\textsuperscript{15} In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10\textsuperscript{th} /05/2012.

\textsuperscript{16} Focus Group Discussion, Rwodi of Parabong, Toro, Boro and Pagak, 26\textsuperscript{th} /04/2012. The Senior Land Management officer of Amuru district reiterated the same statement when she argued that “People lived on the land for a long time even before the colonialists came to Uganda, the people left the area of Lakang in 1911 because of tsetse flies” (08\textsuperscript{th} 02 2012). Detailed discussions on land in Acholiland can be found in Amuru Sugar Works Investment by Madhvani Group Response 2: Stakeholders Briefing KKA/01/04/001.
sickness in this area which is caused by a fly, in case you remain here you will die”17. Whether the communities were persuaded or not, the colonial government dispossessed the people of their land, an incident which marked the beginning of land grabbing in northern Uganda with the intention of establishing a nature reserve. The consequences of this land grab are examined in the later sections of the paper.

Thereafter, internally displaced People’s (IDP) camps were established for the displaced people. “The evicted people”, one informant indicates, “were taken to Gulu, the exact area where Pace stadium was constructed”18. According to Uma-Owiny (2012), the displaced sub-clans were disturbed because of forced encampment under the excuse of avoiding areas which harboured tssetse flies that transmitted sleeping sickness. The people were thus forced to vacate the land.

“Under this exercise nobody was allowed to carry with him any sick person who was suffering from sleeping sickness disease. You had to remove the sick person from the hut and lace him outside on the compound. Any sick domestic animals were not allowed to be taken. Nobody had to blow Bila (animal horn) or make any sound which could be heard at a far distance. Pick your belonging knowing very well that you will not return to the homestead anymore”, writes Uma-Owiny (2012:65).

Those who tried to carry the animals and sick people were penalised. However, after “a period of the six months, our people were not used to the kind of camp conditions. They [thus] started to demand for the return to their lands”19. Despite their longing to return to their ancestral and customary land, the return process did not materialise.

Although tssetse flies were later-on contained, the communities that previously settled in Lakang were not allowed to move back to their ancestral and customary lands until 1936, implying that the communities lived in encampment for twenty five years — from 1911 to 1936. In the meantime, Lakang and other areas which were communally owned by the people of Lamogi, Pagak, Boro, Parabong, Pabbo and Pagak were converted into a game reserve. To the south of Lakang, Murchison Falls National Park was established in 1936, the same year when Gulu district was created. And to the north lay East Madi Game Reserve. The newly established game reserve covered areas of Lakang, Kinene, Apaa, Anaka and Lamogi, territories where the people were forcefully evicted in 1911.

At the start, the areas that were part of the game reserve were called ‘Wangalaya’, a name that was coined based on large metallic saucepan like structures which were locally referred to as ‘Galaya’. The ‘Galayas’ were hanged on big trees indicating the boundary between the game reserve and the communities. Henceforth, the evicted communities were not meant to move closer, cross or settle beyond the point where the ‘Galayas’ lay. The fortress nature of conservation that was employed with metallic plates (Galayas) as boundary markers defined the dividing line between human settlement and the conservation area beyond which the communities were not supposed to settle. The Galaya’s consistently reminded the communities of the boundary of the park. The game reserve was later called Kilak Controlled Hunting Area in 1936.

17 Focus Group Discussion, Rwodi of Parabong, Toro, Boro and Pagak, 26th/04/2012.
18 In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom 10th /05/2012.
19 In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10th /05/2012.
While the original inhabitants of Lakang were forcefully evicted, their land was in turn converted into conservation area to promote sport hunting as part of the broader tourism project. As such, sport hunting permits which gave exclusive rights to foreign tourists and a few privileged local to hunt game in the reserve were issued to licenced gun holders. As Ogenga Latigo argues:

“Part of tourism during the colonial days was getting animal trophies. Someone could not shoot animals in the [national] park. [He therefore went to] such areas which had a reasonable population of various animals for trophy hunting. When you killed a big Buffalo, they would decorate the head of the animal into a trophy for the hunter. Tourists used to come, get the trophies prepared and thereafter send them to Europe”20.

The local communities that previously hunted in this area in a communal manner were however restricted from accessing the hunting ground. Although this was the case, some few individuals could sneak into the protected area in search of game. That was the case because: “The area formed our communal ground; so we shared it with the licensed land owners. That was the status of the land”21.

Meanwhile, over the years, the communities which were displaced longed to return to their land. However, every time they needed to move closer to home, they were required to obtain permission from the colonial authorities. But, as the agitation to return ‘home’ increased, the communities were allowed to move back to the former lands in a phased manner. The return process was gradual in such a way that “every few years the communities through their leaders would request that they be allowed to move a little further … but every time they would need permission from the colonial authorities”22, implying a move back to the former customary and communal lands. The people were therefore allowed to move closer to ‘home’ but cautioned not to go beyond the ‘Galayas’. The metallic structures were an indication of the boundary between the game reserve and the communities. In the first wave of return, “the returnees were allowed to move to Keyo which is about 12 miles north-west of Gulu town. Despite this, the communities were not [able to reach their land]. The status quo remained for all those years until independence in 1962”23.

As the period drew closer to independence, another project of establishing a migratory sanctuary with the view of protecting the wildlife population specifically elephants that strayed north of Murchison Falls National Park was conceived by the colonialist government. There were also considerable numbers of Buffalo, Uganda Kob, Haartebeest, Black Rhino, Reed Buck and Water Buck which required protection (Uganda Wildlife Authority, October 1998). The area was thus converted into a nature reserve. The conversion of the area into a game reserve disregarded the communities that were displaced from this area in 1911 even though they held legitimate claims to their ancestral and customary land. When the communities left the area because of tsetse flies, their land was converted into a game reserve. To implement the idea, The Game (Preservation

20 In-depth interview with Professor Ogenga latigo member of Parliament and leader of Opposition in the 8th Parliament, 17th/03/2012. The Rwot of Pagak also indicated the “colonial government used to give [hunting] permits to licensed gun holders to go and hunt game” In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10th /05/2012.
21 In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10th /05/2012.
22 In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10th /05/2012.
23 In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10th /05/2012.
and Control) Ordinance No. 14 of 1959 was issued. The ordinance gazetted a migratory corridor of approximately 15 kilometres as a migratory Sanctuary for elephants. This was called “Aswa/Lorim Game Reserve”\textsuperscript{24}. The proclamation also defined the boundaries and the areas that were included in Aswa/Lorim Game Reserve thereby bringing the number of conservation areas to two, i.e, Kilak Controlled Hunting Area and Aswa/Lorim Game Reserve. The local communities were not allowed to hunt game in both conservation sanctuaries except the licenced gun holder. Although it was illegal for the communities to access the area, some few individuals would illegally hunt game in the conservancy.

\textbf{Milton Obote Government 1962 to 1971}

After attainment of independence Uganda’s in 1962, the post-colonial government reinforced the earlier plans of the colonial government. In 1963, The Game (preservation and Control) Act which contained The Game (Kilak Hunting Area) Order was enacted by the Uganda Game Department. The Order contained Legal Notice (L.N.) 364 of 1963 that was thereafter amended by Statutory Instrument (S.I.) 17 of 1964\textsuperscript{25}. These regulations officially gazetted the former game reserve to Kilak Controlled Hunting Area thereby compelling the communities that were slowly returning to their customary and ancestral lands to retreat to other parts of northern Uganda. The order further stipulated the types and numbers of animals that may and could not be hunted by licenced gun holders in a calendar year. It also specified the fees payable to Acholi District Administration by licensed sport hunters and mapped out the area where hunting was to take place. There was more of continuity rather than change in that the new developments materialised the initial objective of the colonial government—establishment of a conservation area. The status quo remained until Idi Amin assumed office as head of state in 1971.

\textbf{The Idi Amin Regime 1971 -1979}

During the early years in office, Idi Amin proposed radical changes in land ownership in order to win the hearts of the masses, paramilitary troops and reward a handful of tribesmen, the Kakwa and Nubians. Through the radical-populist land reform policies, President Idi Amin who assumed power through a coup-d'état on 25\textsuperscript{th} January 1971 revoked Statutory Instrument 17 of 1964\textsuperscript{26} which was enacted by President Milton Obote. In this regard, on the 30\textsuperscript{th} day of March 1972, Idi Amin under the military government issued what was known as “The Game (preservation and Control) Abolition of Game Reserves) instrument, 1972 No. 54 which abolished the Katagati Game Reserve and Aswa/Lorim Game Reserve.

On the same day (30\textsuperscript{th} march 1972) Statutory Instrument 1972 No. 55 was also issued. Statutory Instrument 1972 number 55 specifically decreed that: “The Game (Kilak Hunting Area) order is hereby revoked”\textsuperscript{27}, implying that from then on Kilak Hunting area was in principle degazetted (Kilak Hunting Area Revocation Order, 1972). The degazettment orders of Kilak Hunting Area and Aswa/Lorim Game Reserve paved way for the return of some displaced communities to their ancestral lands and allowed people to practice the previous livelihood systems that were centred on communal hunting and grazing. On the contrary, the degazettment process simultaneously gave chance to the opportunistic individuals, ministers, the elite in the military and tribesmen in

\textsuperscript{24} See The Game (Preservation and Control) Ordinance Number 14 of 1959 in the appendices.
\textsuperscript{25} See The Game (Preservation and Control) Act in the appendices.
\textsuperscript{26} See attachment of The Game (Kilak Hunting Area) (Revocation) Order 1972.
\textsuperscript{27} For more details, refer to the Statutory Instrument 1972 No55 in the appendices.
the Idi Amin government to acquire large tracts of ‘vacant’ and ‘free’ land in Lakang. There was no consideration that the land was a collective property previously under communal tenure.

Oral sources indicate that some people who were dispossessed of the land were not given the chance to repossess their lost lands. The 1975 land reform decree which proclaimed that all land in Uganda is public and thereafter vested it in the state on behalf of the people of Uganda served to facilitate dispossession. This was mainly because the political elite and Idi Amin’s henchmen inappropriately acquired land in the country, including the former grazing and hunting lands to establish commercial farms and agricultural estates at the expense of the local communities. And because of this, some informants argued that degazettement of the game reserves to give way for return and settlement was an excuse by the political elite who had already identified the land. The degazettement process was only a ‘polite’ way to obtain access to the land rather than outright land grab. Large tracts of land were acquired in the present-day districts of Amuru and Nwoya (Gulu district at the time) by South Sudanic speaking groups from the west Nile area from where Idi Amin came. As one informant put it:

“At that time, there were some knowledgeable people who were aware of the presence of the vast land that was unoccupied, and in particular those from west Nile were interested in the land, people like Onegi Obel, then Governor of Bank of Uganda, Omar and Hassan were among the first beneficiaries. They arranged for the whole of that area to be degazetted to give way for commercial farming. That is how those individuals were able to get land without consulting the local people”28.

The Uganda Land Commission that was in charge of administering all land in Uganda was literally used by military personnel and government elite to acquire land in various parts of the country including Amuru. “Whoever wanted to acquire land in this area was meant to apply to the Uganda Land Commission through Gulu district. [After the LRD of] … 1975 leases were granted [on the land] for a period of five years”29. At the same time, other key informants asserted: “During Idi Amin’s time, it [land grad] was worse. When Hassan acquired land [in Lakang], five people were killed in the process”30. “[Those who were killed] tried to resist the expropriation of land by Idi Amin’s military men, government officials and West Nilers as they established the commercial farms”31. Records indicate that during the reign of Idi Amin, the Uganda Land Commission issued titles on the contested communal hunting and grazing land; 22 in Amuru, 50 in the Purongo and 20 in Koch Goma during the same period. The land that was either surveyed or titled was about 23,838 hectares (Rugadya and Kamusiime, 2010). Although this was the case, some of the local communities returned to the former ancestral and customary lands as a slight window of normalcy and stability returned to the Acholiland after the fall of the Idi Amin regime.

Idi Amin also directly rewarded the political henchmen and foreign allies with tracts of land in this area after degazettment. An estimated 20,000 hectares of the degazetted land was given to

28 In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10th /05/2012.
29 In-depth interview with OKia Santo, former chairman Area Land committee Amru Town Council, 8th 02 2012.
30 FGD with key informants from Gulu and Amuru, 07th 03 2012.
31 In-depth interview with the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, 10th /05/2012.
his friends from Saudi Arabia for the development of a large cattle ranch (Akena, 2010). As such, much of the land that was owned in a communal and customary manner for the purposes of hunting and grazing became individualised more so by the elite in government. Although the displaced communities still had the longing to return to the original ancestral lands where they were forcefully evicted in 1911 by the colonial government, this dream did not materialise. Despite this, those who were able to return continued to access parts of the former grazing and hunting grounds in a communal manner except the grabbed sections.

In 1975, Idi Amin declared the Land Reform Decree (LRD) which ordered that all land in Uganda shall be public land to be administered by the Uganda Land Commission in accordance with the Public Lands Act, 1969 (MISR- Wisconsin-Madison, 1988). The decree virtually invalidated all the previous land tenure regimes including customary, declared all land in Uganda public, held by the state in trust for the people of Uganda and administered by the Uganda Land Commission. Since all land in the country was made public, any persons that intended to hold land under customary arrangements were meant to seek permission from the controlling authority — the Uganda Land Commission. The decree virtually deprived Ugandans of ownership of land.

Although the Land Reform Decree remained largely on paper due to limitations in implementation, it disoriented the land holding mechanisms in the country. For this reason, some commentators have gone on to argue that the LRD was used to foster patronage as land was rewarded the close allies to the president-Idi Amin (Kisamba Mugerwa, 1991). A few persons that managed to return to the area accessed the communal hunting and grazing lands up to the time when the Lord’s Resistance Army conflict broke out in 1986. At the time of resettlement after more than two decades of the LRA conflict, the former hunting and grazing ground is a subject of competing tenure claims as five categories of people claim ownership of the same land. First are the clans that lay a claim to the land based on ancestry and customary grounds. Second is the Uganda wildlife Authority on the basis that the area is a game reserve. The third category comprises of persons that got the land during Idi Amin’s regime. Fourth are various individuals, politicians, members of parliament and local chiefs, who got access to the land after the LRA war. Fifth is Madhvani who was allocated 10,000 hectares (30,000 more in the waiting) by Amuru District Land Board. The next section examines the anticipated benefits from Amuru Sugar Works Limited.

**Anticipated Benefits from Amuru Sugar Works Limited**

The Madhvani Group argues that the establishment of the sugarcane industry in Lakang Amuru district is to provide various positive externalities in the ‘extremely remote area’, including various developments within 5-100 kilometers around the nucleus estate. In the first instance, the proposal indicates that a road linking Amuru district to the regional town, Gulu, will be established in addition to a 200 km road network within and around the estate. At present, 22 Megawatts (MW) of renewable energy is generated at the parent industry in Kakira Jinja district of which 12-13 MW is supplied to the national power grid on a 24 hour basis (Madhvani, 2012). A similar model will be established in Amuru district whereby the energy which is to be

---

32 Find a detailed discussion on land in Acholiiland can be found in Amuru Sugar Works Investment by Madhvani Group Response 2: Stakeholders Briefing KKA/01/04/001.
33 Refer to the Appendix for the Land Reform Decree of 1975.
generated from the bagasse will supply the main factory, the satellite towns and trading centers that will emerge within and around the estate.

Owing to the fact that the main factory in Jinja has transformed the production line from the use of fossil fuels to production based on renewable bio-mass fuel, it has greatly benefited from carbon emission reduction credits from the World Bank, the Global Environment Fund (US$ 3.3 million) and a loan of US$ 8.6 million from the East African Development bank. The Madhvani Group hopes to emulate a similar model in Amuru whereby 10 MW of renewable energy will be generated from the bagasse at the start of the project, with the anticipation of producing more energy over the years. The carbon emission reduction credit financing schemes have become a major driver of large scale land acquisitions by multinational companies in the developing countries.

A water treatment plant and reservoir will be constructed, mechanical workshops, fuel stations, administrative infrastructure and other amenities will be provided in Lakang. At the same time, five villages to house staff in the nucleus estate, hospitals, educational and recreational facilities are to be provided to the workers and their children (Banfield, 2009). The communities involved in the out grower scheme are to benefit from the agricultural extension services, equipment for clearing, ploughing and a development fund would be used to support out-growers (Ibid, 2009). However, agricultural projects in Uganda that have lately employed the approach of distributing seeds and extending agricultural inputs to the communities end-up grabbing peoples land because of failure to pay for the services rendered. In Kalangala, small holder farmers were compelled to sell their lands to a palm oil company (BIDCO) because of failure to pay for fertilizers and other inputs received (NAPE and Friends of the Earth International, 2012).

At the moment, the Madhvani Group employs over 7,000 people at the parent factory in Kakira, about 100,000 people are indirectly supported through various livelihoods projects and over 10,000 people in the East African region directly employed by the industry. In Amuru, it is anticipate that the development of a cane industry is likely to provide direct employment to 7,000 -8,000 individuals as sugarcane cutters, mechanics and transporters. An additional 7000 people will benefit from the out growers scheme as well as small-scale business enterprises which are likely to emerge in the estates thus improving the livelihoods as well as providing alternative sources of income to communities (Madhvani, 2012).

Although the cane industry is anticipated to bring positive changes and development in Lakang as argued by the proprietors, pro-government politicians, business community and a section of community members, voices of discontentment in the communities exist. Their concerns relate to tangible benefits which are to accrue from the sugarcane industry. The communities indicate that since they are undergoing resettlement and reconstitution, they can hardly be meaningful layers in the out-growers scheme. Besides, considering that general re-establishment after conflict is a slow, gradual and phased process, the communities need time to effectively position themselves in the social, economic and political realms of the country before being able to effectively participate in the industry. Without this, the business community as well as politicians

---

34 Details about the Madhvani group can be accessed from their brochure available at http://www.madhvanifoundation.com/downloads/mgbrochure-08.pdf
35 Details about the Madhvani group can be accessed from their brochure available at http://www.madhvanifoundation.com/downloads/mgbrochure-08.pdf
from Gulu district and other areas of Uganda are likely to seize the opportunities in the industry as opposed to the people of Lakang. The emerging middle class could be from other regions of the country but not the people of Lakang because having been in IDP camps for a long time. More than two generation of young people hardly attained proper education due to encampment, and because of this, such persons may not have the required technical skills, education and the financial base to favourably compete with those from other regions. At best, they are likely to become cane cutters and casual labourers in the sugarcane industry. Asked about the benefits which are likely to accrue from Amuru Sugar Works Limited and whether the people of Lakang will gain, one informant noted:

“No, the factory will not bring any benefit to the common man; the factory will do nothing to us. It is not easy to grow sugarcane, when they want to buy it [sugarcane] from you they dictate their own price; that is tedious work. He [Madhvani] can employ our people, but cannot pay the wages which could adequately sustain someone’s family. Indirectly we shall benefit, but directly not. The general infrastructure established will be used for the whole community. A few individuals are likely to benefit from the sugarcane establishment.”

Before analysing what is at stake, it is important to provide a description of the setup of the Kakira sugar industry in Jinja where the Madhvani Group is currently based. This could validate the argument in the excerpt above. It could also be useful in understanding the reservations of the people. At the parent industry in Kakira Jinja, the Madhvani Group is virtually independent of the surrounding environment. They almost have nothing in common with the workers and the township where the industry is located. The only space of interaction with the community members are the house servants. The Madhvani Group is self-sufficient in enclosures of the nucleated estate as each of the families live in a high wall enclosure from where they ride horses and play polo. They have a private airstrip, water system and power supply. Within the establishment, there are banks, private hospitals as well as schools from where the workers receive soft loans, subsidised treatment and children of labourers attend school respectively. They have their own security, shops, and grow vegetables which they supply amongst themselves within the nucleated estate. In essence, the Madhvani family does not have any contact with the local people around the factory and Jinja district other than the limited apace where out growers offload the sugarcane.

Against this backdrop, the underlying questions are, how will the local communities of Amuru penetrate this closed nature of establishment in the nucleated estate in order to become major players? In reality, this could be a difficult to attain dream for the local people of Lakang Amuru district based on the enclavatic nature of establishment and business. It remains to be seen how the economic trickle-downs which are anticipated will translate into tangible economic benefits for the local people in order to stimulate development in northern Uganda. No doubt those small scale enterprises are likely to sprout outside the nucleated estate and employment for cane cutters will be provided but how will this transcend into socio-economic development and reduction in household poverty? There is a high likelihood that the local peasants could remain marginal. At Kakira, the workers earn about US$ 80 per month but much of it is taken up in form of food
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rations even before the month-end. Owing to the fact that the cane cutters do not earn enough, they are compelled to sigh off their salary as advance before the end of the month so as to sustain their families. The workers are constantly in debts, and for that reason, they are held at ransom year after year.

**What is at stake?**

**Livelihood sources**
The acquisition of land by the Madhvani Group in Amuru district raised mixed reactions in Lakang, and aroused broader questions as regards to large scale land acquisition in post-conflict northern Uganda. The capitalistic system and monetised economy which has emerged after the conflict could completely change the local political economy and social organisation of northern Uganda, including Lakang. The communities of Lakang argue that the alienation of 40,000 hectares of hunting and grazing to the Madhvani Group is to bring to an end the livelihoods sources on which they depend for game, wild fruits, honey and root tubers. The consequences of which is food insecurity, nutritional deficiency and increase in poverty levels. The loss of livelihoods has implications on gender as well. The men have to devise new means of providing for the households because the hunting and grazing grounds are to be taken up by the new land use. Cognizant of the fact that a new capitalistic middle class comprising of mostly outsiders could emerge because the local communities may not have the capability to competitively participate in the sugarcane industry, local resistances are likely to arise. The sugarcane industry could therefore ignite resource based local struggles and agitation for inclusion. As it will be discussed later, already, Organised Youth Groups have taken advantage of the breakdown in the informal and formal land governance structures to control access to the former grazing and hunting areas.

Equally, the women who shoulder much of the burden at household level, the triple responsibility of caring, nursing and providing for the families, are to bear an extra burden of devising new means of feeding the households. The streams in Lakang have from the colonial period been a rich source of a variety of fish. However, since the land will become private property, the women are likely to find difficulties in accessing the resources. They could probably be regarded as trespassers on private land thus risking victimisation and harassment. This could culminate into rape or imprisonment. Social cohesion and community kinship relations which emerged from women working together in fishing groups will also be lost as well. Asked what is likely to be lost through the alienation of land to the sugarcane industry, a key informant indicated: “The women made an overnight expedition for the fishing trip; the women had their own fishing groups, they fished from river Achwa, Ome and Apaa, the factory will stop this”.

**Land rights**
The proposal by the Madhvani Group indicates that 40,000 hectares of land will be acquired in perpetuity and at no cost. Thereafter, a land title will be secured over the whole piece of land of which part will be leased to the original communities that previously utilised the land for grazing and hunting. Once the land is leased to the community, they will establish out-grower schemes. The land will thus be given to the Madhvani Group at the expense of communities claim to hold
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formal customary rights over the land. Although customary tenure is formally recognised in the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, the communities will not receive any form of compensation for the losses incurred.

As a response, the communities with assistance from the members of parliament have sought for legal redress in Gulu High Court but they lost the case on grounds that the land in question does not fall under customary tenure. The ruling gave the Madhvani Group the right to continue with the investment, an issue which the communities oppose. They appealed the ruling of the High Court but the case is yet to be heard. A critical analysis of the course of events indicates that government appears to sanction the grabbing of land by investors and there is little that the affected people can do to prevent land grabbing. While examining the processes to acquisition of land by foreign investors in Uganda, Lunyiigo (2007:7) argued; “investment is all the rage; the investor, especially foreign investor, is king in Uganda today, and Government bends over backwards to accommodate their wildest schemes. Where the investor calls the [people’s rights] environment and conservation in general can go to hell”. The sanctioning of dispossession is an indication that the government of Uganda seems to only value the ‘purported’ creation of employment, increment of the revenue base of the country and import substitution rather than the human rights, livelihoods, identity as well as survival of the displaced communities.

**Educational resource**

The contested land in Lakang is an educational and cultural resource from where the young generation is taught specific gender roles. The girls are taught by the mothers to care for their families through fishing expeditions. The boys too are taught hunting skills by the fathers. In relation to hunting expeditions, the norm was that one male person in the community, normally a great fighter and/or adventurer, took the responsibility to organise and bless the hunt. For this reason, during the hunting sessions the courageous boys are identified and subsequently nurtured to assume new responsibilities of organising communal as well as blessing the hunts in case of death or ‘retirement’ of the in-charge. The chiefs, women and youths argue that establishment of the sugarcane industry is to put the pristine cultural practices to a sudden end. They too attribute the disintegration of the culture of the Acholi as a people to the LRA conflict, and in part to grabbing of lands of cultural importance from where specific information would be conveyed to the young people.

The communal hunts contributed to social cohesion and togetherness in Lakang and indeed the whole of northern Uganda. The nested community cohesive attribute kept the community together under one ‘whole’ with reciprocal relationships. This arrangement was however disrupted by displacement in 1911 when the colonial government created nature sanctuaries, the LRA conflict in the 1990’s and continues to be obstructed by contemporary conflicts over land and land grabbing. Although this is the case, some members of the community argue that hunting and grazing continues to be a useful social practice to those who have started to organised village hunting sessions. Recognising that the communities have been divided for over two decades through encampment, the social practice of hunting and grazing as a community could rejuvenate the spirit of togetherness within the communities. This, in some ways, could provide answers to the contemporary land questions in post-conflict northern Uganda.
Cultural heritage

“Our land is part of our culture, we are now suffering because this war destroyed the culture; our greatest strength was our culture”. The contentious land is of cultural significance to the communities of Lakang and the Acholi as a people. To the ‘outsiders, an outside in this case means a person who comes from outside of the northern region, the land in Lakang is looked at in the context of investment. However, the communities indicate that there exist particular spots where sacrificial ceremonies were and continue to be conducted for specific reasons. Whenever the male members of the community went to hunt, they would seek for protection from the ancestors, ask for guidance, and luck as well as blessings in order to get a bounty with ease. Communication with the ancestors was mandatory before the hunt started. In the same vein, whenever the men returned with big animals, traditional ceremonies were performed to thank the gods and praise the ancestors for the blessings. These sacred identity markers are to be completely destroyed through the establishment of the sugarcane industry. The loss of pristine areas of significant cultural importance could prevent the continuation of traditional customary practices on the side of the local communities. Such a loss could disorient the distinct cultural heritage of the area and the identity of the people.

Identity, belonging and spirituality

The land under contention has important fixed marks — spiritual areas and burial grounds — which the communities consider sacred. Notwithstanding the fact the colonial government forced the people off the land to which they claim to owe their identity and the LRA conflict separated the communities from the land for over twenty years, the people in Lakang argue that there are special identity markers which give them a strong sense of belonging to the land. In Uganda, like most parts of Africa and the world, family burial grounds are sacred spaces which are believed link the living and the dead. According to Li (2001), there is always a special bond with the places where one was born and grew up, to the tress and graves of the ancestors and it is always memorable to live close to the kin. Many people believe in the presence of the ancestors in their homes which in turn defines their identity as a people and belonging to the land. Shipton (2009) argues that the Luo as a people, to which the study population belong, have a special connection to the land of their fore fathers. Burial of the dead at specific sites on the landscape, Shipton (2009:14) argues; provide permanent identity markers which are important for “personal, familial and political identities and allegiances”. The Luo people “look upon graves and the homestead sites for their forebears as their anchors-in time, in space, and in culture and society”. The any attempt to distort this emotional connection is oftentimes subject to violence for the reason that it “challenges the attachments of rural-dwelling people to their kin, to ancestral land, and through ancestors to divinity” (Shipton, 2009: xi).

The same understanding holds for the people in Lakang who argue that land connects them to the ancestors who are always present to provide as well as intervene in their daily routine, for instance, during communal hunting. Although the sugarcane industry could provide alternative livelihoods, the irreplaceable scared features seem to hold more value to the communities. As indicated in a key informant interview: “My great grand fathers were buried in those hills around; you find cultural sites, graves and the like. We all know the hills that were occupied by particular clans and places where our ancestors lived. And all these attempts to get back there are
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aimed at reclaiming our ancestral land\textsuperscript{39}. The implicit idea is that establishment of the sugarcane industry is to permanently disconnect the communities from the valued cultural lands thereby interfering with peoples identity and sense of belonging.

\textbf{Community cohesion and kinship relations}

The interests of the Madhvani Group in Lakang ignited chiefdom wrangles and class struggles over the land whereby every clan is at the moment interested in delineating its own portion of the land from the collective communal hunting and grazing ground. The respective clans intend to subsequently allocate the parcelled out portions to clan members for the establishment of permanent settlements as this is viewed as a plausible means of attaining a secure tenure. The gradual transition from communal to a more ‘individualised’ tenure regime signals a disintegration of the communal reciprocal attributes which previously characterised the ‘Acholi society’. The individualised form of land ownership was not more pronounced before the LRA conflict but this new dynamic emerged from the practice of renting land around and within the vicinities of the IDP camps. From then on, the communities appreciated the embedded value of land and subsequently realised that land can be sold to make quick money. The land market and value of land gradually increased. Thus, the Madhvani case has therefore served to reinforce the individualisation of land ownership. The consequences of this new dynamic are disintegration of kinship relations, distortion of the spirit of togetherness and social cohesion among and between the peoples of Amuru district.

As the different categories of people in Lakang attempt to repossess the former hunting and grazing grounds, territorialisation ensued. A new category comprised of youths, whom for lack of a better word I will refer to as ‘Organised Youth Group’, emerged within the communities which live around the contested area. The emergence and formation of the ‘Organised Youth Group’, or in the words of the Rwot of Pagak chiefdom, “Strong Men”, is an attempt to control the natural resource — hunting and grazing ground. The youth in part intend to safeguard the former hunting and grazing grounds and to a certain extent benefit from the land through extralegal land sales for individual benefit. At the moment, the ‘Strong Men’ who emerged within the Toro clan because it settled nearest to the land in Lakang usurped the powers of the cultural leaders by controlling access to the land. Everyone who intends to access the land, including the traditional leaders has to secure permission from the ‘Strong Men or Organised Youth Group’. These have heavily benefited from the sale of land to prospective investors, businessmen and land grabbers in the area of Lakang. This has resulted in the collapse of the traditional/cultural land governance system. The situation could have severe implications not only to the security in the area but also the culture and identity of the communities in northern Uganda.

\textbf{Conclusion}

One of the major reasons advanced while accounting for the genesis of the LRA conflict is the under/uneven development which ensued from the demarcation of northern Uganda as a labour reserve during the colonial period by the colonial government (Odoi-Tanga, 1999; Atkinson 2010 and Branch, 2007; and Gersony, 1997). The colonial construction of northern communities as ‘inferior’, ‘martial’ and ‘warlike’ by the British colonialists determined their employment on
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tea, coffee, cotton and sugarcane plantations, including Kakira Sugar Works Limited which is owned by the Madhvani Group. The people from the north were also employed in the army and police. This caused the competition between the communities in the north and the peoples of the south. It should be emphasized that many people from northern Uganda not only continue to work for the Madhvani Group in Kakira Sugar Works Limited due to the colonial inaccurate perceptions, but for the most part constitute the largest workforce in the industry in Jinja. These mainly work as casual labourers, sugarcane cutters, gardeners, house helpers and cleaners. Some of the casual labourers whom I engaged in an informal interview session in Kakira indicated that although they wish to return to the north, they cannot afford because of meagre income. They cannot save enough to afford a trip ‘home’.

Against this background, I believe that the establishment of the Sugarcane industry in Lakang, Amuru district may not be the answer to post-conflict challenges which the north is grappling with. The industry may not stimulate development as envisaged by the president but could instead siphon the remaining resources out of northern Uganda. Certainly, there will be a boost in the economy of northern Uganda but the contribution is likely to minimally benefit the small holder farmers. Notwithstanding the fact that some community members will have the opportunity to have some income, the ‘masked’ benefits as postulated by the Madhvani Group may not translate into tangible trickle down effects which could deliver the communities of Lakang and indeed northern Uganda from the point of marginalisation to taking a centre stage in the development of the country. In the first instance, the land is to be taken away and for this reason, the possibilities of engaging in a rewarding out-grower scheme for the local communities without land are shattered. The ensuing isolation of local communities is to in turn concentrate wealth and power in the business community, politicians, political elite and land owners who are able to engage in the out-grower ventures. These categories of people will most likely come from the south thus widening the development divide. As such, Amuru Sugar Works Limited could serve to reinforce and entrench the colonial stereotype which led to the delineation of the north as a source of labour and army recruits. Through the establishment of the industry in the north, a region which has continued to be a supplier of manual labourers to Kakira Sugar Works Limited over the years, it will more or less subjugate the northern region even further since the land on which the people depend for subsistence will be under sugarcane cultivation.

The deprivation of local people to ancestral and customary land on which they depended for food, medicine and sustenance of culture as well as identity means sinking the communities into dependence on supply of labour to the sugarcane industry. The communities cannot invest because the land on which investment can be undertaken is taken away. A key informant posed a question: “How will my uncle who lives locally in Lakang ever be a participant in the out growers scheme? He hasn’t got the skills, education; this [venture] is completely out of his league 40”. For such a person there could be no other alternative other than to offer cheap labour based on terms and conditions set by the Madhvani Group as there will be no land to cultivate and alternative source of livelihood. This means further draining of a socially, economically and politically disenfranchised community.

To appreciate the above argument, a further reference to the nature of business at the parent industry at Kakira could be useful. By way of example, the categories of people engaged in the out-grower business at the parent factory in Jinja are the affluent, for instance the Members of
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Parliament, business community, wealthy landlords, many of whom particularly come from outside Jinja district where the factory is located. They have the resources and financial capability to invest in the sugar business venture and land on which to grow the sugarcane. The probable openings for the locals from the area are opportunities to work as sugarcane cutters (for the men), domestic house workers in the houses of Madhvani Group (to the women), and casual labourers in the industry. Aware that such work comes with least pay, the people who live within and around the factory have to a large extent not benefited from the sugar industry. As such, the postulations by the Madhvani Group could be questionable on such grounds.

The people of Amuru have for long been detached from the land which forms much of their identity as well as livelihood foundations, from 1911 due to tsetse flies, in the 1960’s because of colonial mistakes that saw the reaffirmation of conservation sanctuaries and during the 1990’s as a result of the LRA conflict. There has not been time for the displaced people to return to their ancestral land implying that repossession of land is essential. Although the government of Uganda through Amuru District Land Board allocated the land, the good will of customary right holders who subscribe and owe their identity to the grazing as well as hunting grounds ought to have taken propriety. Under customary tenure in Acholi, separate chunks of land can be set aside for communal hunting and grazing but this does not mean they are ‘free’ or ‘unoccupied’. From the outsider’s perspective, the land could be free because it is unoccupied but it is principally under a recognised land use, i.e. hunting and grazing. The allocation of the land in Lakang to the Madhvani Group could be equated to giving away the cultural rights and disorientation of the identity of local communities. This scenario is likely to create a landless community or a new set of land grab related IDPs in northern Uganda. Rather than giving away the pristine resources one which the people depend, the probable plausible possibility for the people of Lakang and indeed the whole of northern Uganda as well as the government could be to revitalise and harness the unique communal tenure system which has effectively worked outside of the capitalistic system for centuries. This could give the returning communities another window of opportunity and hope as they reconstitute the shattered livelihood systems and households after years of encampment.
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Legal Notice No. 217 of 1959.

THE GAME (PRESERVATION AND CONTROL) ORDINANCE, 1959.

(No. 14 of 1959).

DECLARATION OF GAME RESERVE.

NOTICE.

(Under section 39 of the Ordinance).

Aswa/Lolim Game Reserve.

IN EXERCISE of the powers conferred upon me by section 39 of the above-mentioned Ordinance, I hereby declare that the area specified in the Schedule of this Notice shall be a Game Reserve to be known as the Aswa/Lolim Game Reserve.

C. H. HARTWELL,
Chief Secretary.

ENTEBBE,
7TH SEPTEMBER, 1959.
(N.R.C. 2#).

SCHEDULE.

The area comprised within the following boundaries:

Commencing at the point on the Murchison Falls National Park boundary where the Anaka–Pakwach road crosses the hill Opokopung approximately 11½ miles from Pakwach; thence in a northerly direction to the summit of the most westerly hill of the Lolim group; thence to the source of the River Kulunyang; thence following the thalweg of the said river to its junction with the River Aswa; thence in a northerly direction to the hill Ladwong on the Aswa escarpment; thence in an easterly direction following a line of cairns and "Reserve" notices approximately one mile north of the River Aswa to a point on the eastern bank of the River Dengdenga (Jansohachu) marked by a cairn; thence in a southerly direction following a line of cairns or "Reserve" notices on the eastern bank of the River Dengdenga to the River Aswa; thence in a southerly direction following a line of cairns along a series of ridges to the River Laminaye; thence following the eastern bank of the said river to its headwaters; thence in a southerly direction following a line of cairns or "Reserve" notices to a point on the Murchison Falls National Park boundary on the Anaka–Pakwach road approximately 19 miles from Anaka; thence following the said boundary in a westerly direction to the point of commencement.
Appendix B: The Game (Preservation and Control) Act

THE GAME (PRESERVATION AND CONTROL) ACT.


The Game (Kilak Hunting Area) Order.

(Sections 71 and 72 of the Act).

1. (1) This Order may be cited as the Game (Kilak Hunting Area) Order.

(2) This Order shall apply to the area specified in the First Schedule to this Order.

2. The hunting of any species of scheduled animals specified in the Second Schedule to this Order is hereby prohibited.

3. In respect of any species of scheduled animals specified in the first column of the Third Schedule to this Order the number of each of such species which may be hunted in any one calendar year shall be the number respectively set out in the second column of such Schedule.

4. It is hereby prescribed that on the issue of a permit to hunt any species of the scheduled animals specified in the Third Schedule to this Order there shall be paid to the Acholi District Administration the basic fee as specified in that Schedule and, in addition, the fee respectively specified in respect of each of such species in the third, fourth and fifth columns of that Schedule.

5. It is hereby declared that a request has been received in writing from the Acholi District Administration to prescribe the fees specified in the fifth column of the Third Schedule to this Order in respect of permits issued to bona fide residents of the Acholi District.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

The area comprised within the following boundaries—

Commencing at the point where the Madi–Acholi District boundary meets the Albert Nile River; thence following the Madi–Acholi District boundary to the source of the Ceri River; thence following a straight line running in a southerly direction to a point marked with a cairn on the north bank of the Orme River in the Winciere Forest Reserve; thence
Appendix C: The Game (preservation and control) (Abolition of Game Reserves) instrument 1972, and the Game (Kilak Hunting Area (Revocation Order) 1972.

**STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS.**

**1972 No. 54.**

The Game (Preservation And Control) (Abolition Of Game Reserves) Instrument, 1972.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon the Minister by section 39 of the Game (Preservation and Control) Act, this Instrument is hereby made this 30th day of March, 1972.

1. The Kilagati Game Reserve and the Aswa/Lolim Game Reserve specified in the Sixth Schedule to the Act are hereby abolished.

2. This Instrument may be cited as the Game (Preservation and Control) (Abolition of Game Reserves) Instrument, 1972.

W. B. BANAGE,
Minister of Animal Resources.

Date of publication: 7th April, 1972.

**STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS.**

**1972 No. 55.**

The Game (Kilak Hunting Area) (Revocation) Order, 1972.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon the Minister by sections 71 and 72 of the Game (Preservation and Control) Act, this Order is hereby made this 30th day of March, 1972.

1. The Game (Kilak Hunting Area) Order is hereby revoked.

2. This Order may be cited as the Game (Kilak Hunting Area) (Revocation) Order, 1972.

W. B. BANAGE,
Minister of Animal Resources.

Date of publication: 7th April, 1972.