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VIII
This study was about the leadership crisis in Church of Uganda, Muhabura Diocese. Church of Uganda province has had its ups and downs through the years but the most disturbing of all have been problems of leadership in the dioceses. Christians have always expressed resentment to their bishops because of either their dictatorial leadership or non-performance in the interests of the Christians. In Muhabura diocese, the Christians strongly resented the decision of the H.O.B of C.O.U to have Rev Canon David Sebuhinja as the second Bishop of Muhabura diocese. The insistence of the H.O.B to have Rev Canon David Sebuhinja as bishop triggered off a conflict, which has disgraced the church of Christ, divided Christians, and for now three years the diocese has had no bishop.

The major purpose of the study was to establish whether the leadership crisis in church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese in spite of the standing biblical principles of church leadership and administration and attempt to find a way forward for the province of church of Uganda in general and Muhabura diocese in particular.

This study sought to identify the major principles upon which the ideal New Testament church was led. This was done by studying and analyzing selected scriptures in the bible related to church leadership and administration. Biblical principles related to appointment, duties, qualifications, established offices and Christ's work in governing the church were studied and analyzed. Christ is the head of the church and his headship is fulfilled through a plurality of elders leading his church on earth. And all these elders are of equal importance. Church leadership is servant hood rather than being masters of the members. It has been established that the two leadership offices in the church are "Elders and Deacons". The appointment to church leadership has both divine and human interventions (of, Acts 20:28, 14:23, 1:12-26, Acts 6). The qualifications of these offices are clearly stated in 1 Timothy 3:1-13, Titus 1:5-9, 1 Peter 5:1-3. The study has also analyzed available literature church leadership. Upon this background, the study has established the events unfolding in Muhabura diocese crisis and found out that the
problem has occurred because basically church of Uganda Muhabura diocese has abandoned the church leadership principles as laid in the bible.

The study involved administering questionnaires to Christians in Muhabura diocese C.O.U; who were randomly selected. The filled questionnaires were collected and carefully analyzed by the researcher. The researcher also conducted face-to-face interviews with the identified key informants listed in the appendices of this book. The data collected has been presented in a descriptive, qualitatively narrative form of events.

It is interesting to note that the factors that sparked off the crisis in Muhabura diocese like bishop Shalita's undue influence, bishop-elect's weaknesses, weaknesses of provincial leadership, spiritual bankruptcy of Christians, constitutional problems as well as political influences were prevalent and will continue to influence such crises in other dioceses of church of Uganda. This is because the church has adopted secular principles to run a divine institution; whose principles and guidelines as laid down in the bible have been either neglected or misused. Yet if followed would screen the wolves from the sheep, such that the church by practise of these principles would have only men filled with the Holy Spirit to lead the church. Unfortunately because of secularism and neglect of biblical principles of church leadership; the church's divine offices have been filled by secular individuals without prior sanctification or assumed of it, with a false hope that the sanctified office will sanctify the office bearer. This has led the divine offices to be held by men seeking self-gratification. The effects have been disastrous punctuated by conflicts.

The constitutions of the province of church of Uganda and Muhabura diocese should be amended to be in harmony with the biblical principles as well as the popular will of faithful Christians. This would be possible if the constitutions will aspire to present the will of the faithful men of God as well as defending what God desires his church to be. Once this is done, the Holy Spirit will dwell in his church freely and defend it from all evil forces that breed such conflict.

The book is composed of seven chapters. The first chapter is the general introduction and background to the study. It gives a brief history of the development of the church in
Uganda, with the accompanying leadership challenges. This chapter also has an outlay of the methodologies the researcher used in this particular study. The second chapter tries to explore the biblical principles of church leadership and administration employed by the ideal New Testament Church. The researcher tries to analyze particular biblical scriptures concerning church leadership and governance, upon which has been used to evaluate possible deviation from those principles by Church of Uganda.

The third chapter traces the origins of church's deviation from the ideal New Testament leadership principles. This is done using a historical approach. The chapter looks at the early church's leadership development to meet the challenges of the time but ends up in the opposite direction by adopting secular principles. The fourth chapter tries to trace the background of Muhabura Diocese, with the intention of finding out whether the historical, social, geographical, religious, and economic background has any stake in the prevailing leadership crisis in the diocese. The fifth chapter attempts to trace the origins and course of events unfolding in the Muhabura diocese crisis up to the time of carrying out this research. It is upon the analysis of these events that it was possible to establish whether what was taking place in Muhabura is a deviation from biblical principles. Chapter six attempts to analyze the causes of the crisis in Muhabura diocese. A bigger part of this chapter examines how the crisis is as (result of the church's deviation from God's inspired word. Other causes of this crisis are examined in this chapter. Chapter seven attempts to give the summaries, conclusions and recommendations to the crisis.

Therefore, this research is encompassing so many aspects of church leadership and administration, and attempts to offer solutions to one of the most challenging situations in church leadership. It is also revealing in a way that since the church is made up of both sinners and saints, conflicts are inevitable, and Christians should be ready to face them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Church Missionary Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.O.U</td>
<td>Church of Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.O.B</td>
<td>House of Bishops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.C</td>
<td>Electoral College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 COMING AND EXPANSION OF THE CHURCH OF UGANDA

The study is about the leadership crisis in Church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese. The Anglican Church of Uganda has experienced a number of leadership crises in most of its dioceses and this has involved "Men of God" conflicting with each other and at times with the "flock" they lead over administration and running of the dioceses. The church of Uganda is an independent province of the Anglican Community Worldwide, which subscribes to the Holy Scriptures. It is part of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church worshipping the one true God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Church is commissioned to carry out Christ’s Mission of preaching, teaching, healing and nurturing her people, so that they may have abundant life and build an evangelistic, loving, caring, worshipping, peaceful and just community'.

The origin of Christianity in Uganda is associated with the white missionaries from Europe; who might have come to Buganda as explorers. First to arrive were Speke and Grant in 1862. When Henry Morton Stanley followed in 1874, and settled at the Kabaka’s Palace; Kabaka (King) Muteesa displayed an interest in Christianity. Stanley therefore in his famous letter to the British Newspaper, the Daily Telegraph of 15th November 1875, asked for missionaries to come and evangelize Buganda. Anglican missionaries of the Church Missionary Society (CMS) arrived in 1877 and were followed by the Catholic White Fathers in 1879.

Among the CMS missionaries to arrive first in Uganda were Lt. Shergold Smith and Rev. C.T Wilson. On 18th March 1882, the first Seven Anglican converts were baptised. Their names are; Mackay Sembera, Firipo Mukasa, Edward Mukasa,

Yakobo Buzabalyawo, Yakobo Takirambudde, Princess Nalumansi Kalala, Princes Lakeri Namikka. Forty years back, Arab traders had also arrived and had brought with them their religion, Islam.'

The Kabaka of Buganda welcomed the two groups of Christians - Anglicans and Catholics. They both stayed near the Court. The two groups of Christians were unfriendly to each other. Thus from the beginning both misunderstood and opposed the teachings of the other. This led to uncompromising acute rivalry between the Roman Catholics and Protestants’. More so, each of the religious groups operating in Buganda tried to win the King of Buganda as their convert but he was clever a difficult to be influenced by anyone of them; as they were always unfriendly to one another. The Kabaka became less and less friendly to both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant missionary groups as their rivalry continued and culminated into war; the popular Wangereza Wafransa Wars in Uganda.

In 1884, Kabaka Muteesa died even before he became converted and was succeeded by his Son Mwanga, who became indifferent to all religious groups operating in his Kingdom.

By this time, a considerable number of young Buganda staying at the court got fascinated with the new religion of 'Love and Freedom’. They were later to become the Young Christians known as “Readers”, whom the erratic Mwanga turned against for transferring their allegiance to Christianity. Hatred for them increasingly grew day after day. He murdered nearly 200 readers, who were later known as the “Uganda Martyrs” in 1886.

The period between 1885 and 1886 was the most trying period for the Christian missions in Buganda. The very survival of the Christian Church in Buganda and in


Uganda was determined during this period. However, far from acting as a deterrent against conversion and baptism, it had the effect of increasing the numbers of people presenting themselves to the missions for instructions and baptism.

There were again religious wars between the Muslims, Protestants and Catholics in Buganda with the influence of the Kabaka at the time. However one can say with certainty that from 1892, the growth of the Church was assured. From Buganda, the Church expanded to all parts of Uganda - West, East, and North. The spread of Christianity into all the major areas of Western Uganda took nearly twenty years, and began in 1891, when Captain Lugard of the Imperial British East African Company moved from Mengo to Zaire on a military expedition.

Western Uganda and Zaire that formed part of the Church in Uganda were chiefly evangelized by Baganda missionaries. In the East, the Church mission society first preached in Busoga in 1891, which became a basis for the evangelization of the whole Eastern region. The CMS missionaries were helped by the Baganda missionaries in this part of Uganda. And by 1910 most parts of Eastern Uganda had become Christianized with a considerable number of converts.

The development of the Church in the North Uganda was strangely haphazard especially those parts which depended on the church Missionary Society”. Northern Uganda comprised of West Nile, Acholi, Lango and Karamoja. It took so long for the CMS missionaries to take root there; though the Verona Fathers of the Roman Catholic Church had made earlier attempts by September 1910. CMS missionaries first reached Karamoja in 1923 but real progress was seen in 1929 with Mr. Alfred Buxton of the Bible Church men's society, when he established a station there

9 Ibid., p.33
10 Ibid., p. 66
In Acholi and Lango, the Church took long to get there. It was through the efforts of their chiefs with the help of the Banyoro that in 1903, AB Llyod of the CMS at Hoima and AB Fisher went to Acholi and Lango respectively. In respect of the slow progress of Christianity in northern Uganda, Tuma observes that;

What is clear is that the CMS looked upon the north of Uganda as something of a backwater; but 1926 founded the diocese of Upper Nile in the north probably due to increase in Christian converts. However, by 1910 most parts of Uganda had been reached by the CMS and Church began effective consolidation’.

1.2 DEVELOPMENT OF CHURCH OF UGANDA

The CMS missionaries started with creation of the Native Anglican Church (N.AC) from which the diocese of Eastern Equatorial Africa was born in 1885 with Bishop Hanington as the first Anglican Bishop13. In 1897, the Diocese of Uganda was formed out of the diocese of Eastern Equatorial Africa. In 1926, the Diocese of upper Nile was created out of the Diocese of Uganda and in 1960 the Diocese of Uganda was further divided into the Dioceses of Namirembe, West Buganda, Ankole-Kigezi, Ruwenzori and Ruanda-Urundi”.

In 1961, the Diocese of Upper Nile was divided into the Dioceses of Mbale, Northern Uganda and Soroti. In this particular year, the province of the Church of Uganda - Ruanda - Urundi was inaugurated as an independent province within the Anglican Community with eight dioceses. Bishop Leslie Brown, who was then Bishop of Namirembe, became its first Archbishop. However, the name, “The province of the Church of Uganda, Ruanda-Urundi”, later changed to “The Church of Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi.” In 1966 the diocese of Ruanda-Burundi was divided into the dioceses of Burundi and Rwanda. In this particular year, the most Rev. Eric Sabiti was enthroned as the first Ugandan Archbishop”.

12 Ibid., p.59
14 Ibid., p.30
15 Ibid., p.30
In 1967 the diocese of Ankole-Kigezi was divided into the dioceses of Ankole and Kigezi whereas that of Northern Uganda was divided into Northern Uganda and Madi/West Nile.  

In 1972, the Diocese of Kampala was formed from Namirembe Diocese. The diocese of Boga-Zaire formed from Ruwenzori diocese. The diocese of Bunyoro Kitara formed from Ruwenzori diocese. The diocese of Busoga formed from Namirembe diocese where as Bukedi was formed from Mbale diocese. By 1972, the Church of Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi had a total of Sixteen (16) dioceses with fourteen (14) of them operating within the boundaries of Uganda. In 1974, the most Rev. Janani Luwum was enthroned Archbishop of the province of Church of Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and Boga-Zaire. In 1975, the diocese of Butare was formed from Rwanda diocese and the diocese of Bujumbura formed from Burundi Diocese. In 1976, the dioceses of Lango and Karamoja were formed from Soroti diocese. The diocese of Bukavu was formed from Boga-Zaire diocese where as West Ankole diocese was formed from Ankole diocese:

On 16th February 1977, the most Rev. Janani Luwum was murdered and the Most Rev. Silvanus Wani was enthroned as the Archbishop of the province of Church of Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and Boga-Zaire. In 1980, the Francophone province of Rwanda, Burundi and Boga-Zaire formed a full separated and independent province. This made Uganda therefore an independent and separate province too. On 29th January 1983, the most Rev. Yona Okoth was enthroned Archbishop of the province of the Church of Uganda; with eighteen (18) dioceses. These grew to twenty-four by 1995, at the time the most Rev. Livingstone Mpalanyi Nkoyoyo was enthroned as the Archbishop of the province of Church of Uganda replacing retired Yona Okoth. Presently the province of the Church of Uganda has a total number of thirty-one (31) dioceses.

16 Ibid., p.30
17 Ibid., p.30
18 Ibid., p.30
1.3 HISTORIC PROBLEM OF C.O.U LEADERSHIP

The Church in Uganda has had its ups and downs especially in 1970's when Uganda was under the tyrannic rule of President Idi Amin Dada. Amin’s reign to the Church in Uganda was a replica of Kabaka Mwanga's rule of Bug and a, which climaxed with the murder of the Young Courtiers in 1886 - the Uganda Martyrs. Amin's totalitarian, arbitrary, whimsical and anarchical leadership put the Church in Uganda at cross roads. As the Amin regime continued, the churches were forced into some form of opposition, partly due to Amin's apparent drive to Islamisation 19.

By 1976, the Archbishop of the Anglican Church of Uganda was at the forefront of denouncing the autocratic leadership of Amin; which earned him an official death sentence. Archbishop Luwum was murdered on 16th February 1977 by Amin/". This was a big blow to the leadership in the Church of Uganda. Nobody wished to become Archbishop in the footsteps of late Luwum.

The Anglican Church response to the death of Luwum was to elect Silvanus Wani a relative of Amin as the next Archbishop. By the time Wani came to retire, Amin had been overthrown and Obote had returned to power, where upon the Church elected a prominent Obote supporter, Yona Okoth to succeed Wani. Gifford notes that;

\[
\text{This pattern has manifested, according to one observer, a tendency to elect men who are not necessarily popular to the believers but simply because they were in the good books of the government in power at the time.} \]

The Church of Uganda therefore has not had an “anointed and shrewd leadership” with a vision to direct the Church according to the principles of the apostolic Church. Leadership has always been influenced by the political environment at the time. Archbishops have been elected not because of their ability and vision for the Church to cause development but for preservation of the Church of Uganda and to win favors from the politician of the day.

19 Paul Gifford, Op.cit., p.64
20 Ibid., p.65
The political influence in the C.O.U leadership has prevented it from playing any significant prophetic role. When Luwum was killed, Wani was elected for being in good terms with Amin; for just as the tide turned after the overthrow of Amin, leaving Wani as an anachronism, so Obote was removed only a few years after Okoth's election, making Okoth too an anachronism for almost a decade of Museveni's rule. He held on to some degree ignored by Museveni and not widely respected by Ugandans, who knew that his greatest qualification for the job was his close link with Obote.

Even in 1995, the succession to Archbishopric from Yona Okoth to Bishop Mpalanyi Nkoyoyo was said to be a strategy on the part of the Church of Uganda to win the favors of President Museveni, who desired the Archbishop to be a Muganda. Paul Gifford notes that;

According to one Bishop; the outgoing Archbishop Okoth was told by the government desperate to hold the Church together that the new Archbishop was to be the Bishop of Mukono. Okoth then dutifully canvassed for Mukono among other Bishops and Mukono was duly elected in 1995.

1.4 HISTORIC TRIBAL TENSIONS IN C.O.U LEADERSHIP

The creation and leadership of Church of Uganda with its dioceses, has always been punctuated by ethnic tendencies. Creation of a new diocese has been an attempt to please Anglican members of a tribal grouping. And henceforth ensuring that the Bishop of that diocese belongs to that tribe.

The most obvious problem is that between the Baganda and the other groups that make up Uganda. This has frequently led to a movement for the Baganda to form their own separate ecclesiastical province. In 1961, the Church constitution created the province of Church of Uganda. The Archbishop who was elected by the diocesan bishops was Erika-Sabiiti, the bishop of Ruwenzori in 1965. The Baganda protested

21 Ibid., p.65
22 Ibid., p.66
23 Ibid., p.85
his election claiming that the first African Archbishop must be a Muganda”. Gifford observes that;

They attempted to dislodge his occupation of office as he was denied entry into his official residence and instead relocated him into the Bishop of Namirembe “boy’s quarters”, a Muganda. This seemed very outrageous to the other non-Baganda Anglicans. This made Archbishop Sabiti's task extremely difficult as it was impracticable for him to be based outside Kampala, (Fort portal), yet the Baganda Anglicans became even more determined to retain the Cathedral (Namirembe)23.

In 1970, a draft Church constitution was in place and recommended that a new diocese of Kampala be formed out of Namirembe diocese to be the Archbishop's 'See' and his powers strengthened. The Baganda dioceses were very disappointed and openly talked of seceding from the ecclesiastical province though this did not materialize. They hated Archbishop Eric Sabiti, branded him pro-Obote; in his bid to stamp out federalism in Uganda. Gifford again takes note that;

On 31st January 1971, Eric Sabiti was even denied entry to Namirembe Cathedral by the Baganda Anglicans. They even denied him any official role in the ceremonies connected with the remains of Mutesa in April 197126.

The desire of the Baganda to secede and set up their own province has never disappeared, just as the non-Baganda Anglicans have persisted in their determination of keep the Baganda in the one nationwide province”. The Baganda think that they are more superior to other tribes and so all Church leadership roles in Uganda should be relegated to them.

There has been an impulse towards an ethnically homogeneous diocese, with a local man, of that tribe and area as Bishop. The adoption of the 1972 Church constitution

24 Ibid., p.78
26 Ibid., p.79
27 Ibid., p.79
in which the free transfer of Bishops from one locality to another was floated so that the episcopate should not be tied to a particular locality and ethnic group; Bishops should not be “tribal” but should represent the whole Church received wider spread opposition from the Baganda.

The creation of new dioceses has taken the same route. For example in 1984, the Bakonzo were given a separate diocese of South Rwenzori south on grounds of Toro domination in Rwenzori diocese. The formation of North Mbale diocese on 26th March 1992 was an attempt by the house of Bishops to stamp out longstanding rivalries between people of Buhugu in Bugisu Archdeaconry and the Bishop of Mbale diocese; they accused of autocracy and resentment. A similar situation existed with the creation of Sebei diocese in 1999, when prior the Archdeaconry of Sebei claimed administrative oppression from Mbale diocese and seceded from it until the House of Bishops granted them a diocese. Sebei has a tribal grouping of the Sabiny where as Mbale the Bagisu”. Gifford clearly states that;

Indeed since the 1960’s, the C.O.U has broken up into small dioceses, some of which have been created out of tribal and dialectical sentiments. The C.O.U claims that poor administration lies behind the split”.

However, the creation of new dioceses by C.O.U in an attempt to solve mal-administration is inadequate a solution as this seem to be an address of the symptoms rather than the cause of conflicts in Church of Uganda. This research therefore will seek to explore the causes of such leadership crisis that has rocked C.O.U and the impact of such crisis upon the Church. The research seeks to find out whether it is a deviation from the biblical principles of leadership that has yielded such crisis.

1.5 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

8 Ibid., p.80
Since the enthronement of the first Ugandan Archbishop in 1966 of the Church of Uganda, there has been resentment of Church leadership among Anglican Christians. Archbishop Eric Sabiti received resentment among the Baganda; which made his work extremely difficult. During the regimes of Dr. Obote and Amin Dadu, the Church of Uganda had no clearly appointed Archbishops as those in the position at the time volunteered to leadership because they would compromise with the politicians for preservation of the Church of Uganda. That is the church chose leaders who shared the same political ideologies with the presidents of the day. From 1980 to the present, Church of Uganda has witnessed a number of leadership crises in some of its dioceses; and this has always destabilized the whole province. These crises have involved the laity and clergy over running and administration of dioceses.

Succession wrangles to Bishopric have characterised the Church to-date. Confusion over leadership has engulfed the dioceses; and currently Muhabura diocese is experiencing leadership wrangles. Since the announcement of the second bishop of Muhabura by the house of bishops in September 2001, the Christians have expressed utmost resentment of the bishop elect and for almost three years the diocese has had no bishop. It is therefore of concern to everyone as to why such leadership crises have engulfed Church of Uganda in general and Muhabura diocese in particular at this material time. May it be a neglect of biblical principles of leadership and Church administration? The purpose of this study is to answer some of these questions. These crises have made the Church to lose credibility as an institution of spiritual enrichment and moral change.

1.6 HYPOTHESES

This research has been based on the following hypotheses.
a)

b) Leadership crisis in Church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese is a result of deviation from the Biblical principles of leadership and Church administration.

c) The Leadership crisis in Church of Uganda Muhabura diocese is fuelled by political and ethnic forces at the time as well as the spiritual decline among members of the Anglican Church both Laity and Clergy.

d) The leadership at the provincial level has a weak system of dealing with such crisis despite the past experiences it may have witnessed in the same manner.
1.7 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study covers a period of 24 years i.e. 1980-2004. The year 1980 is very important because it is when Church of Uganda became a fully independent province. This was after the Francophone province of Rwanda, Burundi and Boga-Zaire formed a separated and independent province; leaving Uganda to stand on its own as a province too.

The year 2004 is very important because the province of Church of Uganda is making 24 years of maturity since its acquisition of provincial status. Hence a period good enough for the researcher to compare a number of events that have been at play in the province. Although the study covers Church of Uganda, Muhabura Diocese has been used as the case study. Muhabura Diocese has been selected because it has experienced the most recent leadership crisis as regards elections to Bishopric and administration of the Diocese.

1.8 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research is to establish whether the leadership crisis in Church of Uganda, Muhabura Diocese is a result of deviation from the biblical principles of leadership and Church administration and to determine ways by which crises can be avoided.

1.8.1 Specific Objectives
The specific objectives of this research are;

i) To establish the biblical principles of Leadership and Church administration.

ii) To find out whether the leadership; Crisis in Church of Uganda (Muhabura Diocese) is a result of deviation from biblical principles of leadership and Church administration.

iii) Attempt to find ways in which to address leadership crises in future for the province of Church of Uganda in general and Muhabura diocese in particular.

1.9 LITERATURE REVIEW

There is no available information about leadership crisis in Church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese. The researcher has reviewed a number of books relating to church leadership and management and well as that relating to Church of Uganda. These include the following:

Tom Tuma (1978), in his book, 'A Century of Christianity in Uganda' 1877-1977, looks at the beginning of Christianity in Uganda, and Church expansion which was primarily done by the indigenous people themselves, He looks at the period of consolidation of C.O.U marked by several challenges and controversies, among which he cites the emergence of the revival movement and independent churches ". He, therefore, leaves out a lot more of the challenges that have faced C.O.U from 1977 onwards since his book's coverage ends 'in 1977. This study has taken into account that Church of Uganda has had such challenges and more notably the leadership crisis that has engulfed the Church to date evidenced by the Muhabura Diocese Crisis.

Tom Tuma looks at the Church when it had a very big geographical area as Church of Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and Boga-Zaire. However this research has focused particularly on the province of Church of Uganda since 1980.

John Baur (1994) is in agreement with Tom Tuma, in tracing the Church's presence in Uganda. He examines how Christianity spread in the whole of Africa but thorough exploration of his work is entirely on the Catholic Church. Very little attention is

\[\text{Tom Tuma, Op.cit, pp. 131 - 151.}\]
given to the Protestant Church and no mention at all is made on Church of Uganda; which form the basis of this Study. Baur examines the challenges of the Church based on the Catholic Church\(^{32}\), and no mention of the Anglican Church is seen of which Church of Uganda under study is part.

**Grace Lubaale (2001)** presents the challenges and prospects in the Anglican Church of Uganda in Busoga Diocese ". He explores the challenges to Church growth in Busoga diocese, among which he cites the Busoga crisis. This work forms a basis of my research since it singles out the Busoga crisis as one of the challenges to development in the diocese. However the book only looks at the crisis as a challenge to development but does not explore the causes of this crisis. This research on the other hand will focus on the Muhabura Diocese crisis, finding out the causes and the way forward for C.O.U in general and Muhabura diocese in particular.

**Tom Turna (1980)** looks at Church growth and expansion in Busoga with regard to African participation between 1891-1940\(^ {34}\). He extensively looks at the role of Basoga professionals in leading the Church in Busoga but does not labour to examine the challenges these leaders faced. Moreover this particular research is to be on the Muhabura Diocese, which is not of concern to Tuma. **Waruta (1995)** explores the challenges and promises for the African Church in the 21\(^{st}\) Century"; Several challenges facing the African Church are discussed and no specific emphasis is put on Church of Uganda; which is of great interest to this research. However, the challenges and promises to the Church presented in Waruta’s book has been a good basis of study about the leadership crisis in Church of Uganda;

---

As it is one of the contemporary challenges that has destabilized the Church, but never surface in
Waruta’s presentation.

Gifford (1992) confers with Tuma and Baur as regards the beginnings and spread of Christianity in
Uganda. He analyses Church state relations in Uganda and how they have impacted on each other
since colonial times up to the regime of president Museveni. This gave the researcher a basis of
examination the political role in the leadership crisis in Church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese.
He also looks at the crisis in Busoga Diocese of C.O.U and gives an in-depth analysis of the
happening between 1992-94. This research however has a focus on the Muhabura crisis that has
happened after the Busoga crisis, which Gifford attempts to analyse.

Kisambira (2000) chiefly examines the Busoga crisis, its causes and impact on Church of Uganda.
He has great coverage of the background of the Busoga crisis particularly the 1992 crisis and its
effects on C.O.U37. This work is very important and of interest to the researcher as it has been used
for reference purposes. However Kisambira's work focused on the Busoga Diocese crisis whereas
this research has a focus on the Muhabura Diocese crisis.

Berkley (1994) looks at transitional leadership and Church management and points out the most
effective ways of leading Christians on part of Church leaders. He however does not identify the
problems that such Church leaders meet like Christian's resistance, which is the focus of this
research. Berkley examines the "crisis and conflict" that occur in Church leadership”; but
specifically looks at how such crisis and conflict could be solved. He however ignores the causes of
such crisis and conflict in Church leadership, which is the central study of this research. Generally
Berkley concentrates on theories other than practical solutions to leadership problems in Churches,
which may be irrelevant to Church of Uganda case.

of Uganda (not yet published), Kampala, pp.16-19.
House, Michigan, p. 187.
Lewis (1996) points out the need for transformation of Church leaders who can effectively deal with the new wind blowing across the face of the Church\(^{39}\). He therefore points out new models of leadership. Churches should adopt to withstand the pressure of chaotic times. Whereas he agitates for transformational Church leadership to overcome leadership problems, he does not specifically look at any leadership crisis in any Church that may necessitate such models. He also does not identify the causes of such crisis but assumes that for present Church to work effectively there must be transformational leadership.

Lewis is in agreement with Berkley on the theories and strategies that Church ministers should employ for effective Church leadership\(^{40}\). However, these theories and strategies may not solve the crisis in Church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese since they apply to general leadership problems affecting any particular Church being affected by today's changing times, yet the leadership crisis in C.O.U seem to stem from historical times and its structures.

Lewis' work challenges the status quo and asks for a paradigm shift in thinking about leadership\(^{41}\). Indeed this has been a basis for the researcher to examine whether really the leadership crisis in C.O.U is a result of its unchanging leadership mode alongside the changing times in the Church.

**Domazio (1988)** examines the historical background of Church leadership. He also traces the origins of conflict right from the early centuries of the Church\(^{42}\). This book has been very important and has been widely quoted in this research and has given the basis of finding the causes of the leadership crisis in Church of Uganda. He however, does not look at the current changing situation in the Church, which may dictate some changes in Church leadership and thus cause conflict in Church administration rather than being the historical mistakes done at the early centuries of the Church.

\(^{39}\) Phillip Y. Lewis, (1996), *Transformational leadership: a new model for total church involvement*. Broadman and Holman publisher, Nashville, p.100

\(^{40}\) Ibid., pp. 103-197

\(^{41}\) Ibid., Op.cit., p. 2

Langley and Kiggins (1974), labour to examine the transition of Church leadership from the hands of the missionaries to the African Clergy and "laymen" in East Africa. They explain the important role played by "laymen" in Church leadership at all levels between 1869-1973\(^4\), but do not have information about the challenges that such leadership experienced after 1973, one such was crisis and conflict in Church administration. The authors dwelt much on the efforts and processes to Africanise the leadership of the Church by forming an African Clergy and later inclusion of laity leadership. They however do not examine how the working relations were between the African Clergy and laity leadership, which seem to have worsened after the White Missionaries left East Africa, resulting into a leadership crisis that is central to this research.

Pierson (1996) explores the spiritual human relations and promotional approach to Church leadership and administration". In this attempt, he examines the need for Church leaders in organising the Church members. He also brings out the qualities expected of a true Christian leader as well as the relationship between Church leaders and members. This work is very important to the researcher because it gives the elementary basics of Church leadership and administration that is not always the case; and this is what is central to this research. Pierson also looks at Church leadership and administration in the Seventh-Day Adventist Church; where in matters of Organisation, the administration recognizes that the authority of the Church rests in Church membership whereas this research will focus on the Anglican Church of Uganda where authority of the Church rests more in the Clergy than in Laity leadership.

Orr (1994) examines the need and character of leadership in a Christian organisation. He takes note that all leadership principles are universal and compatible with the Holy scripture." which provides a basic framework for this research.


\(^4\)Robert Pierson (1996), *So you want to be a leader*, The Ministerial Association General Conference of Seventh Day Adventists, Hagerstown, p.1

Roebert (1996) puts across the idea that a Church grows because its leaders receive anointing in the area of management and administration as a gift from God and uses it to glorify Christ. The book generally describes the pastoral administration of a Cell Church and the way it must be built around biblical leadership principles."

This work has been of relevance to the researcher because it provides elementary guidelines of how a Cell Church can be effectively managed though the scope of this particular research is far much wider than a Cell Church. Moreover Roebert writes with the experiences of the Hatfield Christian Church in South Africa yet this research will focus on the Anglican Church of Uganda (Muhabura Diocese) whose conditions and experiences may be quite different from those of Hatfield Church in South Africa.

Armerding (1992) acknowledges that today’s Church faces a crisis of leadership. Many whom God has called to be leaders are holding back because of anticipated opposition or a sense of inadequacy or the fear of burnout." Armerding however does not dig out what would be the possible circumstances leading to the leadership crisis in the Church, which is the core of this study. He gives profound discussion of the dynamics of biblical leadership, which gives a basis for the researcher to analyse whether the leadership crisis in C.O.U is a deviation from the above.

Barna (1997) is in conformity with Orr on the need and character of leadership in the Church; thus takes note of a Christian leader as someone who is called by God to lead; leads with and through Christ like character, and demonstrates the functional competencies that permit effective leadership to take place.” Barna however fails to take note of situations where effectiveness in Church leadership may be hampered by conflict and crisis in the Church. The work also looks at necessity of transition in Church leadership as a smooth process, which is not always the case. Confusion has always erupted in Churches as regards succession, which is characteristic of C. O. U.


4 George Barna,(1997), Leaders on leadership, Regal Books, California. p.25.
Tusiime (1990) provides basic information about Muhabura diocese, which is the researcher's case study. He gives the background history to the creation of the diocese highlighting the circumstances that led to the creation as well as the enthusiasm among the diocese Christians towards the development of the new diocese." Though Tusiime does not examine the leadership crisis, which has hit Muhabura Diocese; his work has been greatly used by the researcher in this study. This study has based on Tusiime's work to find out why the once enthusiastic Christians of Muhabura Diocese at its creation have been torn asunder by leadership crisis and conflict.

Kintu (1994) examines the longterm and immediate causes of the crisis in Busoga diocese. Among the long term causes he cites that there were already problems lingering at the creation of the diocese; this in addition to the archaic church constitution of church of Uganda made it difficult for the Diocese to move on without problems. He also takes note of the arrogance of Bishop Cyprian Bamwoze which was not in conformity with the character of any church's shepherd. 50 The Muhabura crisis is however a unique one because whereas in the Busoga saga the laity's revolt against the incumbent bishop was seriously condemned by provincial leadership, in Muhabura, the laity and the house of bishops seem to agree to a greater extent that there is a problem which needs urgent attention. In fact, the Muhabura laity's persistence with the revolt has so much been sanctioned by the provincial leadership.

The two crises are different in a way that whereas the Busoga crisis was a result of people's resentment towards their arrogant bishop and his maladministration, that of Muhabura stems from people's resentment of the obvious manipulation of the succession to the Diocesan see. Therefore, the underlying circumstances are very different and therefore the need to examine the crisis of Muhabura diocese.

1.10 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This research focusing on the leadership crisis in C.O.U with particular reference to the Muhabura Diocese Crisis has the following importance.

49 Bernard B. Tusiime, (1990), Background to creation of a new Diocese of Muhabura. Dissertation submitted for the Diploma in theology of Makerere University, pp.30-35.
j) The study will stimulate interest in the need for evaluation of Church leadership and administrative principles to find out whether they are in line with biblical principles of leadership and Church administration.

(ii) It will stimulate interest in Church of Uganda leadership in the need for stronger policies on retirement, election and succession of Clergy in the different offices of C. O. U.

(iii) Church of Uganda will evaluate its criteria regarding appointment/election of Bishops and other clergy in the different positions of Church leadership; elections of such people have always been preceded by conflicts depriving Church stability.

(iv) The study will stimulate interest in the need for the re-orientatation of its Bishops and clergy on leadership skills and administration through seminars and workshops.

1.11 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1.11.1 Research design

To obtain the relevant information for this study, the researcher used historical design, survey and sampling method. This aimed at finding the opinions, ideas and facts about the leadership Crisis In church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese, its causes, and way forward towards finding a solution to the problem. Similarly, the researcher used descriptive data since the problem under study is still in the offing. The study gathered large and detailed amounts of data for comparing the various information to assess the relationships between them. The survey involved a self-constructed and administered questionnaire, and face-to- face interviews as the data collection tools.

1.11.2 Study population

This included both the clergy and laity. Among the clergy were the outgoing archbishop and provincial secretary.
In Muhabura Diocese the researcher held interviews and discussions with Diocesan Officials including; the Retired Bishop, Bishop-elect, Dean of Cathedral, members of the electoral college, bishop's commissaries, Archdeacons, Members of the synod, retired and serving parish priests. Laity leadership of the diocese, as well as lay Christians were interviewed and others were served with questionnaires. The other staff at diocesan headquarters and local district administrators formed part of the study population. The Diocesan officials were selected because the problem under investigation has surrounded the roles they play in their different capacities in the diocese. These also participate in the selection of names for appointment as Bishop to the House of Bishops. The researcher was therefore able to interact with both the pro- bishop elect and anti-bishop elects Christians in Muhabura diocese.

1.11.3 Instruments of data collection

(i) Interviews
The researcher held discussions, conversations and interviews with the people who formed the study population. This was because the research aimed at getting information from conflicting factions in the diocese under study and therefore the need to get first hand and a balanced view of the informants. Also information needed involved events that have happened in the diocese under study and hence required narration by the informants; which could only be met under the interview instrument. The people who formed the study population were interviewed with an interview guide (appendix iii), and some of the interviews were tape-recorded.

(ii) Questionnaires
The researcher also used questionnaires as one of the data collection tools. This is because most of the targeted respondents were literate. Secondary, the area under study was large and therefore questionnaires could be sent to many places and people.

(iii) Document analysis
The researcher gathered documents in respect of church of Uganda leadership and administration as well as information regarding the proceedings of the crisis in Muhabura diocese since its beginnings. Such documents included; constitution of
C.O.U, and Muhabura diocese, synod meeting reports, Diocesan annual reports, Minutes of provincial assembly meetings, and other correspondences relating to the conflict in Muhabura diocese. The researcher used other books about church leadership and administration. These documents provided the more recent information concerning the leadership crisis in Muhabura diocese.

1.11.4 Data Analysis
The data collected was analysed using the qualitative approach. The responses of the respondents have been narrated, described and analysed. This has helped in checking on accuracy, consistency, and uniformity as well as differences in thoughts and opinions of the different respondents. The questionnaires were collected and analysed by clustering responses. The information recorded on tape recorders has been analysed by the researcher to come out with a balanced and comprehensive report. The researcher took the majority voice from the analysed responses.

1.12 PROBLEMS FACED
During the study, the researcher encountered four major problems. Firstly, the researcher had insufficient funds for this study. This could not allow him reach majority of Christians in the rural areas of Kisoro. Yet there was a problem of transport to some areas because of the mountainous nature of Kisoro district. Hiring a motorcycle to such areas was very costly and usually unaffordable.

Secondly, majority of the Christians in Muhabura speak only Rufumbira, the native language, which the researcher could neither speak nor understand. He therefore restricted himself to only the few who could understand English.

Thirdly, due to the sensitivity of the issue being researched, some people refused at all to give the necessary information. They claimed that they could not make comments on issues that were before the court of law. A major case in point was when almost all the photo studios in Kisoro declined to take the photographs the researcher needed around the cathedral of Seseme citing sensitivity of Muhabura issues. This was until
One clergyman had to convince a seemingly courageous photographer to take the photographs.

Lastly, the climatically conditions of Kisoro were not favourable to the researcher. The town was too cold and dusty, conditions that were being experienced by the researcher for the first time. He in most cases woke up late up in the morning and missed some early appointments.

1.15 DEFINITION OF TERMS

ARCHBISHOP:
Bishop of the highest rank; who heads and oversees the province of the church of Uganda. He heads all Bishops in the province of the church of Uganda.

ARCHDEACONARY:
An administrative unit in church of Uganda comprising of Parishes, churches geographically close to each other under an Archdeacon.

BISHOP:
He is the head of the church in the diocese of Church of Uganda. He heads all clergy in the diocese. He oversees all activities taking place in the diocese.

CATHEDRAL:
This is the main church of the diocese under the care of a Bishop and most of the important functions of the diocese take place here.

CHRISTIANS:
These are adherents of Jesus Christ. They believe in Jesus Christ as Lord and saviour of mankind. Specifically, it will refer to followers of Christ in the Anglican Church of Uganda.

CHURCH:
Refers to congregation of Christians organised in Christian worship, and especially those belonging to church of Uganda.
It will also refer to the buildings where people go for prayers/worship.

**CHURCH OF UGANDA:**

Shall refer to all Christians in Uganda belonging to the church, which originated from the Church of England.

**CLERGY:**

These include priests/ordained ministers in the Anglican Church of Uganda.

**DIOCESE:**

Administrative unit in church of Uganda headed by a Bishop as the overseer.

**HOUSE OF BISHOPS:**

This is a council of all Bishops in the province of Church of Uganda.

**LAITY**

Shall refer to un-ordained Christians in the Church of Uganda.

**PROTESTANT:**

Shall refer to a Christian who belongs to any of the denominations that originated from Martin Luther's break away from the Roman Catholic Church and formed the protestant faith to which Church of Uganda subscribes.

**PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLY:**

Shall refer to an independent body of Christians in Uganda who owe their identity to the historical and liturgical relationship to the Church of England; with an Archbishop as the overseer.

**SYNOD:**

This means the supreme council of the diocese.
CHAPTER TWO

BIBLICAL PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH LEADERSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION

2.1 General Introduction.

For several decades churches have wrestled with modifications to leadership and organisational structures. Many factors have precipitated the search for more effective arrangements. Some churches have made changes in order to establish and maintain more vibrant relations between lay leaders and professional pastoral staff and to avoid frequent pastoral turnover. In some churches, the elected representative council members have not been recognised by the congregation as the authoritative leaders in the church, whereas in other churches, leadership has been a struggle between the laity and clergy. While all these happen, it should be realised that God has given certain principles in his word by which his leadership and church are to function. Notably however, while the appropriateness of referring to these changes, as a "crisis of leadership" may be open to debate the present diversity of leadership models practised by the church today raises many important issues.

During the past two thousand years, the church has used various leadership models which have reflected different emphases and needs, and which have been the pragmatic amalgamation of contemporary cultural methods and specific biblical principles. It should be appreciated that these models have strengths as well as weaknesses, benefits and dangers. There's need not to isolate only the example of the New Testament church's leadership structures and declare these as normative for our day. This would prevent us from considering and assessing other organisational structures and leadership models used by the church.

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of all leadership models employed by the church should be consistent with Holy Scripture. They should therefore be evaluated in light

---

of the biblical principles of leadership and an understanding of the specific cultural context.

However, while certain leadership principles are evident in the church, the Bible does not prescribe a precise model of leadership, but rather reflects how the church has adapted and continues to adapt its organisational structures to meet changing needs.

Subsequent shifts in church leadership principles continue to reflect the adaptation of the church to new circumstances and cultures; while others are deliberate shift for man to cater for his selfish ends. It would be good for this shift in church leadership principles happening to date if they are consistent with the biblical teachings.

Therefore, in designing church leadership guidelines and administrative principles, the question ought to be, "What leadership structure will both be consistent with biblical principles and most effective in a specific situation"? It is apparent that some churches have ignored completely biblical principles of church leadership and designed those that are only consistent with their own situations for purposes of selfish convenience. Certainly this has been the mother of all the leadership crises witnessed in the churches all over the world. Sometimes there is a considerable gap between what people identify as their "biblical principles and what actually happens in a church" In order to prevent such dissonance, it is important to become as self-conscious as possible about the values and assumptions of the culture in which we live. Cultural and historical analysis alongside biblical study is an essential part of the process of identifying or designing a leadership structure that will genuinely reflect biblical leadership principles and the nature of what it means to be the church.

We should always remember that the church must be built on the biblical plan and not on man-made ideas of how it should be. For effective church leadership the church

2 Ibid., p.8

should establish strong biblical pattern of leadership. This strong biblical basis for an understanding of leadership will result into considerable church growth.

Because the church has designed certain leadership models and principles not in line with Holy Scripture but for the convenience of men; there are those who claim that there is no biblical pattern for the organisation and administration of the church. For example, Donald G. Miller states: "No particular structure of church life is divinely ordained."

Miller again writes that any form of life which the Holy Spirit can inhabit and to which he may impart the life of Christ must be accepted as valid for the church. As all forms of life adapt themselves to their environment, so does the life of Christ by his spirit in the church". Miller, however, makes an error because he does not understand that the New Testament form of organisation for the local church is based upon New Testament principles. It is that fundamental principle which provides for us the standard by which all organizations and leadership in the local church must be measured.

The local church is a corporeity, requiring governing, with an accompanying fulfilling of responsibilities. But the church is the Body of Christ and she is distinct and different from Israel. Accordingly her governing prescribed in the New Testament differs from that of Israel as noted in the Old Testament. If these differences are not understood there will be efforts to embody into the governing of the local church principles for both of these separate bodies, which may conflict with each other.

This chapter therefore will dwell on the New Testament since it is where we see the beginnings of the church as well as how it was led from its earliest times. The chapter will treat issues like how the church was governed, principles followed in choosing

---

6 Ibid., p.28
2.2 PRINCIPLES OF CHURCH LEADERSHIP IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

2.2.1 Introduction:
The New Testament provides clear instructions for governing the local church and for the responsibilities her members share. When these instructions are not understood or are not followed by her leaders and her members, she will experience disruptive problems.

Following these instructions may not eliminate problems completely, but will eliminate many of the roots that would otherwise sprout conflicts and dilemmas, and allow her members to resolve their differences with scriptural teachings and unify the body so that she may enjoy the blessings that come with spiritual maturity. The role of leaders and changing leadership patterns in the church should be guided by scripture if the church is to free itself from the shameful conflict between its members.

There is necessity for the church to explore how the New Testament church was led and governed, appointment of leaders; as well as resolving of differences if any existed in the New Testament church. It is of paramount importance to find out what was the relationship between the leaders and the rest of the people who made up the church of Jesus Christ. The smooth growth of the early church as well as its survival through the Roman persecution must have been dependant on the good structural leadership principles that the church followed. This chapter therefore shall explore the New Testament church leadership; its organisation and principles.

2.2.2 Jesus Christ is the Head of the church

The fundamental principle from which church leadership and organisation develop is; Jesus Christ being the Head of the church" The Headship of Christ over the church is less regarded by very many Christians and less implement this principle in the life of

\[Donald\ G.\ Miller,\ Op.cit.,\ p.2\]
2.2.3 The implications of the Headship of Christ for church leadership.
Miller takes note that there is nothing very controversial about the principle that Jesus Christ is the head of the church. But there surely is room for a great deal of discussion when it comes to the outworking of this principle. Hardly any Bible-believing church would dare deny that Jesus Christ is the head of the church, but all too few do anything to practice it.

Out of this great truth that Christ is the Head of the church, two foundational and fundamental operational principles for the church arise. These two principles dictate to a large degree a kind of church government which does not square with what is being done by most churches in the world, and Uganda in particular. The principles are

(i) Any form of church government which gives pre-eminence to men rather than to our Lord is unbiblical.
(ii) The Headship of Christ is best reflected in the rule of a plurality of leaders.

(a) Pre-Eminence of Christ in Church Government

Fundamental to the concept of Headship is that of pre-eminence of Christ (Col. 1:18). God’s purpose for Jesus Christ in being the head of the church is that he might have the pre-eminence.

Ibid., p.3

28
Any form of church government that tends deliberately or otherwise to place men in position of pre-eminence is contrary to God's purpose.

In Mathew 23:8-10, Jesus denounces the status-seeking scribes and Pharisees who loved prominence, they delighted in titles, which honoured them and the place of honour at public gatherings (cf. Mathew 23: 5-7). Pre-eminence in the church belongs solely to our Lord. He alone is Teacher, Father, and Leader. This is why Jesus forbids his disciples to take for themselves titles, which would exalt them over others.

The error in Mathew 23:8-10 was two fold:

- They wanted to elevate themselves over men, to be served, not serve.
- They wanted to claim that which belonged to Christ.

Never in the New Testament do we see any kind of hierarchical 'pecking order" where one Pastor or Reverend is the head or senior and others are assistants to him. There is only one chief shepherd (1 Peter 5:4), and even the great apostle Peter dares only call himself a 'fellow elder' (1 Peter 5:1).

The headship of Christ then prohibits the exalting of anyone but Christ himself, for his headship demands that he has the pre-eminence.

(b) Christ's Headship a rule of a Plurality of Elders

Leadership by one person tends to exalt one man over others, while Christ is to be exalted, for he is the head of the church. However, Christ's headship can best be reflected when the church is led by a plurality of elders.

We said previously that the headship of Christ over the church was to be seen in his work of giving the body, composed of many diverse members, unity and cohesion. He is the unifying force who binds the body together. Now, how does this work out in the practical administration and leadership of the church? We need to practice the leadership of Christ organisationally, if the world is to observe that Jesus Christ directs and guides and gives unexplainable unity to his
This is best accomplished by the church being led by a plurality of men, who in the New Testament of leaders avoids exalting men above men and giving them pre-eminence that belongs only to Christ. It is also necessary because no one has all the gifts necessary to lead the church. God has diversified his spiritual gifts, which necessitates plurality rule (cf. I Cor 12:27-30).

Most important is that plurality rule most clearly evidences the leadership of Christ over his church. When a group of elders meet to discern the Lord's guidance there is a great deal of more assurance of God's will when all come to a unanimous decision than when one man decides what is best. Indeed the headship of Christ is no more apparent than when a group of stubborn hard headed, but godly Christian men come together, all seeking God's guidance in a matter, and they all reach a harmonious decision."

In practice the New Testament church had Christ's headship with a plurality of leaders. For example in Acts 6, the church was faced with the problem of widows, who were being overlooked in the daily administration of food. The apostles came to a collective decision on this vital matter, and their decision found approval by the whole congregation. The Lord's headship was clearly recognised. In Acts 15, we see the most crucial decision, which the apostles and elders faced in the New Testament. Concerning circumcision of Gentiles; the decision was made by the group of apostles and elders. Notice especially verse 25 and the expression, "So we all agreed." That is how to best discern the leading of the head of the church, and that is how we can best demonstrate his headship in a very practical way - through leadership by a plurality of elders.

Another passage of scripture which underscores the necessity of leadership by a plurality of men is Mathew 18:20. This is a scripture to my knowledge that has never been clearly understood by most people.

For where two or three come together in my name, there am I with them.

*Ibid. p. 6*
Most people would think that this is some kind of promise that Christ will be present with a group of Christians, no matter how few gather. Many small churches have consoled themselves with this passage, especially on prayer meeting nights, when literally two or three have come. But the context of this verse is not that of Christians to gather as a church for worship, or even of some less formal gathering of Christians. It is rather a coming together for the purpose of discipline. In verses 15-17 instructions are given as to how to deal with a brother who had sinned. In verse 18 reads.

\[
I \text{ tell you the truth, whatever you bind on earth will be} \\
\text{bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will} \\
\text{be loosed in heaven. (Mathew 18:18)}
\]

The 'binding' or 'loosing' refers to the judgement of those who have gathered over a matter of church discipline. And verse 20 promises of the Lord's presence when two or three come together; it is a gathering for judging a matter which may necessitate church discipline. Why does Christ not promise his special presence when only one comes to decide a matter of discipline? It is because the headship of Christ is best demonstrated when he convinces a plurality of men of his will.

Some people may reject this principle basis of plurality of elders in leadership basing on the Old Testament and singular leadership of Moses, David. But that was in the Old Testament before the church, and above all these Old Testament men were the "types of Christ", who is the Head.

Concerning this principle of the headship of Christ over his church, we therefore take note that there should be no any other head of the church, other than he whose headquarters are in heaven. Unfortunately, this principle receives only lip service in the church today and the failure to recognise it has led men to confer upon themselves different titles reflecting church headship and robbed it from Christ. The result has been conflicting interests and roles between men as they gamble to function in Jesus' divine office.
Therefore, leaders serve on behalf of Christ who is the head of the body, the church. Christ is recognized as the chief Pastor or shepherd (1 Peter 5:4, Heb 13:20), and he is ultimately the overseer of believers (1 Peter 2:2:5). The nature of church leadership is best seen in a leader's reflection of Christ's relationship with his church”.

2.2.4 THE CONCEPT OF 'BROTHERHOOD' IN CHURCH LEADERSHIP.
The concept of Brotherhood, if well understood and practised will enhance church leadership's rule of the plurality of elders. The church is a brotherhood, not a hierarchy. The hierarchy concepts, a "ruling body of clergy organised into orders or ranks each subordinate to the one above”11. Jesus told His disciples,

> You know that the rulers of the Gentiles Lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant. (Mathew 20:25-26).

He also warned them about the leaders of the Pharisees:

> Everything they do is done for men to see: They make their Phylacteries wide and the tassels on their garments long: they love the place of honour at banquets and the most important seats in the synagogues; they love to be greeted in the market places and to have men call them 'Rabbi'. But you are not to be called 'Rabbi', for you have only one master and you are all brothers. And do not call anyone on earth 'father', for you have one Father, and he is in heaven. Nor are you to be called 'teacher', for you have one Teacher, the Christ. The greatest among you will be your servant. For whoever exalts himself will be humbled and whoever humbles himself will be exalted. (Mathew 23:5-12).

10 Bruce J. Guenther, Op.cit., p.4
In summary, if we are all brothers and on the same level, no one should seek to lord over other brothers, wear special clerical clothing or give any impression that is part of a special church leadership group.

The brotherhood concept means that the disciples are brothers and sisters. We find many references to this in the New Testament.

- "Peter stood up among the believers and said, "Brothers ... " Acts 1: 15-16
- "Therefore, my brothers, you whom I love and long for, my joy and crown, that is how you should stand firm in the Lord, dear friends" (Philippians 4: 1).
- "Therefore, holy brothers, who share in the heavenly calling ... " Hebrews 3: 1.
- "To the holy and faithful brothers in Christ." (Colossians 1 :2)
- Peter wrote about 'love of the brothers', twice in his first epistle. (1 Peter 1:22, 3 :8)
- Peter also writes about "the brotherhood" ... your brothers throughout the world"
  1Peter 2: 17, 5:9
- The term brother should also apply to the leadership, as we see Paul did when he wrote, "Tychicus, he is a dear brother, a faithful/minister and fellow servant in the Lord" (Colossians 4:7)
- James wrote about, "my dear brothers" 1: 16,2: 1,5,3: 1.
- The term sister is not used as frequently as brother in the New Testament but it is used enough that we know it was a well-accepted term. Both Paul and James wrote about "the brother or sister" James 2: 15.

Paul commended to the church at Rome "Our sister Phoebe" Romans 16: 1

---

This brotherhood concept should be practical in all churches if harmony is to be achieved among believers.

An appropriate symbol of this brotherhood concept is the use of "preacher benches" instead of lofty chairs in churches and other places of worship. Too often the church's leaders like to sit up front in lofty, high-back, cushioned chairs with armrests, while the rest of the church sit on benches. This is hardly a good brotherhood practice, because it elevates some brothers above others, which eventually breeds questions especially from "bench seated believers".

This is a practice, which is very commonly associated with the churches that have a hierarchy and in the researcher's opinion this is not in line with the biblical pattern.

The brotherhood concept means there are no classifications within the church; there is no clergy and laity distinction with in the body of Christ. Only brothers and sisters exist within the church.

The terms laity and clergy are not New Testament concepts; their origin and use belongs to church history. G.W. Bromiley wrote in the article on 'Laity' in 'Evangelical Dictionary of 'Theology' that "from Laos (people), the laity ought strictly to denote whole people of God. Historically, however, it has come to be used of those who are not specifically ordained to the ministry (clergy). The distinction is particularly marked in the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches, with a strong emphasis on the fact that the duty of the laity is to be taught, to obey, and to make financial contributions." These two terms will be covered in a detailed way later in chapter three.

2.2.5 THE PRINCIPLE OF SERVANT LEADERSHIP

In the New Testament church, once leaders realised that the church is under Christ's headship and that they themselves were not higher than the rest but they existed as beloved brothers and sisters; with only different roles to play in the church; they had to observe another very important principle; that being a leader means servanthood. They were to serve rather than being Lords in the church.

Servant hood is one of the most unique characteristics of leadership to the New Testament church. The very essential part of true leadership is that 'a leader is one who serves'. A leader of God's people must have the inner attitudes and motivations, and the outer service, of a servant.

Any leader must first be a servant, and then on the basis of servant-hood, he is able to lead. The ministries of Jesus and his apostles were all founded on a servant's "people conscious" heart. According to Jesus, the greatest leaders were the most diligent servants. He then uses himself as a personal illustration.

For even the son of man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many. 
(Mark 10:42-45)

Jesus continually modeled this attitude with his small group to the point of washing their feet (John 13). This further enhances the principle of brotherhood we have previously looked at in a way that if all take each other as brothers and sisters, there will be no hindrance to serving one another i.e. being one's servant. Jesus told his ambitious position - seeking apostles that,

The greatest among you will be your servant” Mathew 23: 11.

To every church leader therefore, Jesus is the supreme example of servant hood. Today, however, some leaders would still repeat the selfish words of some of Jesus' disciples, who said;

"Master, do what we desire" and "Grant that we may sit on your right and left hand in your Kingdom"(Mathew 20:20-28)

Frank Domazio, Op.cit, p. 38
In summary, Christ the servant spoke very clearly on the centrality and necessity of servant leadership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership position</th>
<th>Required service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathew 20:28</td>
<td>&quot;The son of man&quot; did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew 23: 11, 12</td>
<td>&quot;The greatest among you will be your servant&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Whoever exalts himself&quot;</td>
<td>will be humbled&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "Humbles himself"   | will be exalted"
| Mark 10:43,44       | "Whoever wants to be great must be your servant"
| "Whoever wants to be first" | must be a slave of all"

Luke 22:26,27
"The greatest among you should be like the young's"
A Christian leader therefore is supposed to be a servant of the rest and should not at any time exalt himself above others. By the nature of the case, those who exact themselves to a position of authority over all have necessarily disqualified themselves from a position of service.

2.3 THE LEADERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH

2.3.1 Introduction
The New Testament offers us a variety of arrangements for church leadership. The New Testament contains many references to church organisation and from these we can understand God's will for the church today.

So far as leadership in the New Testament church is concerned, there are only two offices; that of "Elder and that of Deacons" who served as her leaders. There is no office of Pastor; there is the work of Pas to ring and the gift of Pas to ring, but there is no office as such". In the foregoing discussion, we shall be looking at these two offices and the persons who filled them.

2.3.2 Elders
In many ways, the term 'Elder' is a word from by-gone days; we live in a culture obsessed with youth. For many young in and out of the church today, this word in the context of church carries a "loaded meaning". For them it may conjure up an elderly man in a polyester suit, who gets to make all the rules. Or it may invoke someone who is on a Pedestal, high and lifted up in their ceremonious holiness, distant from the realities of daily living. These of course are
not appropriate caricatures of leaders in the church, but in many cases that is what have come to be.

The biggest problem is that Elders are not esteemed in our day. And yet they should be because the elder in the New Testament is the central character in the life of the body of Jesus. They are the real heroes, often unsung. They are the people that through God's provision keep the church on the right path. But in many churches, they are becoming a thing of the past. Many congregations have distanced themselves from the true Biblical concept of eldering, either by removing the position from their church structure or remaking it into a misrepresentation that it was never meant to be. But today in our fatherless generation, more than ever before do we need to rekindle this privilege and responsibility that the scriptures so highly esteem".

2.3.3 Who is an 'Elder'?

According to R. Mercurio, in his article found in the New Catholic Encyclopaedia, he says that; the name elder signifies an old man, but it also connotes a man of authority, no matter what his age. He adds that from the earliest days the elders held positions of honour and authority in Israel18

In ancient Israel, the term 'elder' was an imprecise way of referring to those who were recognised as the wise and natural leaders in the community because their authority and power were based on existing family/community relationships". These were people to whom respect was instinctively given because of their age and experience. With the development of synagogues as places of assembly, some of these elders were appointed to oversee the wellbeing of the local Jewish communities21.

Therefore, Elder is a Jewish synagogue term. Because many of the early Christians had a Jewish background or were proselytes, they were familiar with this term and therefore, it was unnecessary for the New Testament writers to define the term Elder. Christians knew the elders had teaching and ruling duties within the congregation.

There is even a passing reference to the Elders in Jerusalem in Acts 11:30; which suggests further that the terminology of 'Elders', familiar to Jewish Christians had been carried over from the synagogue to the New Testament church.

However, one needs to understand that the term Elder is a very flexible term in the New Testament. It is not as we might think of now as a governing board of individuals over a Congregation. If one looks to the New Testament for a detailed description of an Elder, you will not get it. But by reading the New Testament books as a whole, what emerges is a picture of one who oversees the church. In his book, biblical Eldership, Alexander Strauch gives a biblical description; that in biblical terminology elders shepherd, oversee, lead and care for the church".

Elders were part of the church from its very start. Luke mentions elders at Jerusalem (Acts 11:30; 15:2, 4, 6, 22; 21:18), that "they had appointed elders for them in each church" (Acts 14:23), and elders being in the Ephesians church (Acts 20:17). Thus elders existed throughout in the early church.

Elders in the New Testament were not professional leaders or elected delegates as we think of them today. They were not educated to be elders; there were no seminaries or theological colleges to train from; they learned in the school of day-to-day living. They were elders because they were good men. People around those saw in them something special and trusted them for their leadership. They did not contest for leadership positions, neither lobbied to be elected as leaders as it is the most common practice in our present church. Instead they led because they were leading, they were teachers because they taught well; they were true fathers because they innately protected their spiritual families.

According to Viola Frank, the elders were local men who were more spiritually advanced than the rest of the believers in the local assembly. Hence, the Greek word translated elder simply means a mature man. In addition, the elders were called

---

\textsuperscript{2} Strauch Alexander (1997). *Biblical Eldership*, Lewis and Roth publishers, New York, p.49
"Pastors" or "shepherds" for they were responsible for correcting, teaching, instructing, and guarding the flock from spiritual predators23.

2.3.4 Two words used for the office of Elder

In the New Testament there are two Greek words that are employed interchangeably for the office of elder. (Cf Acts 20: 17, 28; Titus 1: 5,7).

The first one is the Greek word "Presbuteros" from which we get the word presbytery or Presbyterian, is usually rendered "Elder". The second one is 'espiscopos', which is usually rendered 'Bishop' or 'overseer'.

Relationship between Elder and Bishop.

The word 'elder' emphasizes the maturity of the man, and the dignity of his office, while the term 'Bishop' or 'overseer' refers more to the function of this office24.

According to Frank Domazio, Elder which is 'Presbuteros' in Greek refers to a person advanced in life; of rank or position of responsibility either among the Gentiles or in the Jewish nation. In the church, the same word applies to those who are appointed to exercise spiritual oversight and care for a local church. Bishop is office of overseer ship; for the purpose of watching over and inspecting"25.

The elders were the mature brethren who were the servants/leaders in the local church. This term and the term bishop are synonymous and represent one office. JB Smith explained the relations between the bishop and elder terms by stating, "during the entire New Testament period they were recognized officials and representatives of the church. Elder was the official title, while bishop (Greek: overseer) was the function’”26.

We have also taken note before that the terms bishop/elder were used interchangeably by Luke when he wrote about Paul sending for the Ephesians elders to come to

---

23. Viola Frank (1997); Rethinking the Wineskill present Testimony ministry, Atlanta, p.58
25. Frank Domazio op.cit, p. 24
Miletus. Paul told these elders that" ... the Holy Spirit has made you overseers (take note of the footnote: bishops), be shepherds of the church of God" (Acts 20: 28), thus addressing this one group by both terms. We see this too in Paul's writing to Titus; ‘’appoint elders … since an overseer”, (Titus 1:5, 7), an overseer is therefore the Bishop.

13.5 Other Terms Related to Elder

(i) Priest:

The Old Testament priesthood was not carried over into the New Testament period (Hebrews 3:1; 4:14; 5:5; 7:10-23, v. 26; 8:1; 9:11; 10:21). The term priest is never applied to a church leader. The Law on which it was based was abolished (Hebrews 7:12, 18-22; 8:7-13). Under the new covenant there was only one priest, the High priest Jesus Christ. All members of the body of Christ can approach God through their High priest, Jesus Christ, without any man being in-between (Romans 5:2; Ephesians 2: 18

Peter did use the term priesthood, but he applied it to the whole body of believers and not just to a group of church leaders. He wrote, "You also, like living stones, are being built into a spiritual house to be a holy priesthood" (1 Peter 2:5), but "you are a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God" (Y.9). This application of the term to the whole body of believers follows the Old Testament concept of the people of Israel being God's own possession among all peoples, being a Kingdom of priests and a holy nation (cf Exodus 19:5, 6, Isaiah 61:6)28.

(ii) Pastor

Only once is the shepherd-sheep based term 'Pastor' used for the church's leadership. The only time that the word 'Pastor' occurs in the New Testament is when Paul used the term in Ephesians to describe the same function as elders:

It was he who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets,
some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers,

\[\text{Leland M. Hames, OP.Cit., p.5.}\]
χ)

to prepare God’s people for works of service, so that the body
of Christ may be built up. (Ephesians 4: 11, 12)

The structure of this sentence (" Some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists,
and some to be pastors and teachers") indicates the "Pastors and teachers" are one and the same
group". The Greek term translated Pastors is "Poimen", and is translated "shepherd" in the other
sixteen places it is used in the New Testament. The
Pastor - related verb "shepherd" and noun "flock" are used elsewhere. For example,
in Acts, 20:28, elders are encouraged in the "Pastoral" duties of overseeing and shepherding; In 1
Peter 5: 1-2; elders are commanded to "shepherd" the flock of God
that is in their charge, which is the role of a Pastor30.

Therefore, the terms elder and pastor are not two different roles or offices. Today we tend to separate
the two, but in the New Testament and the early church was not the case. The phrase "some to be
pastors and teachers", shows that Pastors are lumped into the same role as teachers. This suggests
that the chief role of the Pastor is to feed the flock through teaching, which, again is the primary role
of Elders (Titus 1 :9). The contemporary practice of using this term to signify the one pastor over a
church is not a biblical concept. As we have seen, there were always elders serving the local church.
Paul used pastors and elders to signify the same group.

Kelly James notes that the two words i.e. elders and overseer is synonymous. Most scholars now
acknowledge this congruency; and quotes IB Light foot that, "it is a fact now generally recognised
by theologians of all opinion, that the Language of the New Testament, the same officer in the church
is called indifferently 'bishop (overseer)' (episkopos) and 'Elder' or presbyter', 'Presbuteros'": Frank
Viola writes:

According to the New Testament, elders were overseers
and Pastors. The term elder refers to the character of

29 Ibid., p. 5
30 Ibid., p.5
bb)
the leader, the term overseer refers to his function, and
the term pastor refers to his gift32.

The reason we need to draw this out is because this framework contradicts most all churches and their notions of what a pastor and elder are. In our present churches they are distinct; however, biblically, they are identical. When thinking about the role of elder we need to look at it from this angle: elders are pastors, pastors are elders.

(iii) Minister

Today the term 'Minister' is also commonly used to describe church leaders. The Greek term was used in the early church, but its use was not limited to the local church leadership. The Greek terms translated minister, ministry, etc, in the New Testament were applied to apostles, prophets, evangelists, deacons, elders and teachers, and all members of the church. (Acts 1:17, 23; 6:4, 20:24; 21:19) Romans 11:13; 1 Cor 12:5, 11 Cor 3:6; 4:1; 6:3; Ephesians 3:7; 4:12; Col 1:7, 25; 4:7; 1 Timothy 4:6; 2 Tim 4:5)33

The word 'minister' has been applied to church leaders, whether the leaders are professionally ordained by man or spiritually ordained by God. Our applications of the word sometimes give no distinction between a true servant of God and a man, who falsely dons the same title. Today even if a man is not divinely called, even if he is neither willing nor able to serve God's people, he can be ordained and called a "minister".

The unfortunate attitude from the church's misuse of the term 'minister' is that only the one man called 'minister' is the servant of God. Instead, God calls each Christian to a particular ministry function.

This confusion over the definition of 'minister' has led to the idea that only an ordained minister is competent to do the spiritual work of the church. Thus the word 'minister' has been given an idea of professionalism that clashes with its true meaning.

The church's ministry is not the work of the Elders alone. All have a part in the ministry in Christ's church.

32 Viola Frank, Op cit., p. 58.
Although we have already discussed the principle that necessitates the plurality of elders, let us say that the uniform practice of the churches in the New Testament was to have a plurality of elders (Philippians 1:1, Titus 1:5; James 5:14). In 1 Timothy 3:2 singular is widely recognised as a "generic use", speaking of elders as a class.

The New Testament church had multiple leaders. The plural number of elders would ordinarily emerge from the membership of the assembly (Acts 14:23), although in a newly formed assembly it may require sometime to pass before the Lord fully equips and qualifies elders. There were many elders in each church. Acts 11:30, also suggests the existence of multiple leaders in the church rather than single church headship. Acts 15:2 further suggests that the New Testament church based on plurality of leaders. Paul and Barnabas together with other believers were appointed to go and meet elders the apostles about the dispute that had emerged - Gentile circumcision.

2.3.7 The Evidence of Plurality of elders in church

Only a quick look at the passages involved demonstrates that the apostles and other New Testament writers understood that each church had a plurality of godly men ruling. The reference is consistently in the plural ("elders" not "elder").

• Acts 11:30 speak of the elders of the Jerusalem church. Evidently James was not the only one.
• Acts 14:23 inform us that it was the customary practice of Paul and Barnabas in their missionary work to appoint elders (plural) in each church (singular).
• Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 22, and 23 all refer to the elders of the Jerusalem church.
• Acts 16:4 again speak of the elders of the Jerusalem church.
• In Acts 20:17 Paul sent for the elders of the church in Ephesus.

Philippians 1: Paul addresses the "bishops" of the church in Philippi.

In Thessalonians 5:12-13, Paul instructs the believers of the Thessalonians church in regard to their responsibilities to "those who labor among you and are over you in the Lord." The repeated reference is to "them" rather than "he".

1 Timothy 4:14 speaks of a body of elders laying their hands on Timothy.

In 1 Timothy 5:17, Paul again speaks of elders in the plural.

In Titus 1:5, Paul commands Titus to appoint elders in every city. Evidently this was a part of "setting in order the things that lack", the implication of this verse, then, is that if a church had only one elder, it would be "lacking" and not in keeping with the norm.

Hebrews 13:7, 17, and 24 all refer to a plurality of rulers in the church ("then" and "they").

In James 5:14, James prescribes for the one sick to summon to himself the elders of his church.

Finally, in 1 Peter 5:1, Peter addresses a plurality of elders as well.

In short, the New Testament writers never refer to the office as held by a single man. The terms "elder" and "bishop" as they refer to the church office of elder, appear in the singular only in passages which give instruction concerning the treatment of individual elders (1 Timothy 5:1, 19), or which list the qualifications which must be met by each individual elder (1 Timothy 3:1-2), or where individual elders write in reference to themselves individually (1 Peter 5:1; II John 1; III John 1). When referring to the office as such in relation to the church, it is always in the plural. This is the norm.

2.4 APPOINTMENT OF ELDERS AND OTHER CHURCH LEADERS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The major question in the minds of most Christians is, "How are elders appointed?" There are several passages that give us instruction and guidelines on this matter. Let us examine some of these below.

(i) Jesus' Example
Jesus left an example that all Christians should follow. In Hebrews 5:5, Christ did not take upon himself to become a high priest, but was appointed by God. If Christians follow this example, no one would seek to exalt himself for appointment to a holy office. It is by God's grace and calling that one qualifies for this servanthood Position. As Paul wrote, "I became a servant of this gospel by the gift of God's grace given to me through the working of his power" (Ephesians 3: 71) And to an elder, he wrote, "see to it that you complete the work you have received in the Lord" (Colossians 4: 17). By the fruits of a Christian in his/her previous ministry in the church and by these fruits the congregation should be able to realise Christ's servant among them, and therefore acknowledge him as its leader.

(ii) Christ's choice of the Twelve

It was by God's grace that the twelve apostles were picked on by Jesus. Just as Jesus himself, they did not need to exalt themselves to seek appointment, they did not lobby to become Jesus' apostles neither did they need to have any blood relationship with Jesus. It was simply by the grace of God that they became his apostles. It's surprising that Jesus did not choose key, prominent men to form part of his twelve. One of Christ's disciples occupied important positions in the synagogue, nor did any of them belong to the Leviticus priesthood. Rather, they were common laboring men, having no professional training, no academic degrees, and no source of inherited wealth. Most were raised in the poor part of the country. They were impulsive, temperamental, and easily offended. Jesus broke through the barriers that separated the clean and unclean, the obedient and sinful. He summoned the fisherman as well as the tax collector and zealot. Jesus saw hidden potential in them. He detected a teachable spirit, honesty, and willingness to learn. They possessed a hunger for God, a sincerity to look beyond the religious hypocrisy of their day, and they were looking for someone to lead them to salvation.

In calling the despised to himself, in sitting down to a meal with publicans, in initiating the restoration of a Samaritan woman, Jesus demonstrated that even these people were welcomed into the Kingdom of God.

Christ looked at the heart of those whom he appointed. Most of the leadership problems in the church can be solved if you are willing to develop the lay people
within the congregation. This will require that you open your heart to a broader spectrum of lay people in the church. Sometimes we fail to see emerging leadership because we are looking for the wrong things. We often look for those who mesh with our personality but pass over those who follow a different drummer. Samuel for example, misjudged the Lord's choice for the second king of Israel because he focussed on height and stature;

_Samuel saw Eliab and thought, "surely the Lord's anointed stands here before the Lord! But the Lord said to Samuel, 'Do not consider his appearance or his height, for I have rejected him. The Lord does not look at the things man looks at. Man looks at the outward appearance but the Lord looks at the heart (J Samuel 16:6-7)"

Jesse was just as surprised that his older children were not elected. He had not even considered inviting shepherd boy David to the ceremony. But even though David was a 'ruddy' young boy ... the Lord said,

_Rise and anoint him: he is the one (J Samuel 16: 11-12)._

God tends to use the "ruddy young boys" that are fully committed to him. Our tendency is to hang educational nooses around budding leaders. Yet the harvest is so plentiful and the laborers are so few that God would have us look at all leadership possibilities around us. In most churches there is tremendous potential and talent sitting idle in the paws, just waiting for leadership to employ the right methods to put them to use. In most churches however, it is a sad fact that about twenty percent of the people do eighty percent or more of the work. And the eighty percent of the people almost do the work of 'observing'.

(iii) The role of the Holy spirit.

In Acts 20:28; we are told that ultimately it is the Holy Spirit who appoints elders.

Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy spirit has made you overseers.

This is still the divine side of appointment of elders, which is not any different from what we have seen as regards God appointing Christ to priesthood and Christ's example of choosing the twelve.

(iv) Human side of appointment.

There were times in the early church where elders were appointed. Luke wrote that Paul and Barnabas on their missionary journey "appointed elders for them in each church" (Acts 14:23).

Paul also wrote to Titus to "appoint elders in every town, as I directed you" (Titus 1:5). Also, Paul tells the Thessalonians;

To respect those who work hard among you, who are over you in the Lord and who admonish you. Hold them in the highest regard in Love because of their work. (I Thessalonians 5: 12 - 13)

Again in I Corinthians 16: 15-18, we read,

You know that the household of Stephanas were the first converts in Achaia, and they have devoted themselves to the service of the Saints. I urge you, brothers, to submit to such as these and to everyone who joins in the work, and labours at it.

In these passages we are simply told to "recognise" those who are elders. We will know those who are elders because they will meet the qualifications of an elder and they will already be doing the work of an elder. This sounds rather mystical, but we
are able to discern that a man is an elder just as we recognise that an individual is gifted to teach or to recognise that the scriptures are the inspired word of God. Paul was an apostle and had a special commission and guidance from the Lord. Titus was a close companion of Paul and served as his assistant and personal representative. In the case involving Titus, they were together in Crete and when Paul left him there, he commissioned Titus to appoint elders in these newly emerging churches. Thus both of these New Testament examples of appointment of elders were carried out under direct apostolic authority. Steve Atkerson observes that the apostles merely established as elders those whom the Holy Spirit had already made overseers in the church. There is therefore no specific method of appointment of leaders. As we have noted before this silence of scripture is instructive, for it tells us that there is no one way to formally recognise elders. As we understand it, this recognition is that of the church at large. Once initial elders are recognised, these men will be sensitive to the Holy Spirit’s appointment of new elders by monitoring the congregation to see if others have emerged as elders.

It is also possible that a man is no longer functioning as an elder, for a variety of reasons; family needs, business pressures, or whatever. In such a case that individual should step down. If the elders had some kind of systematic review, it would more easily facilitate the recognition of new elders or a change in function of a former elder.

**(v)** **The example of appointment of Matthias to Replace Judas (Acts 1:12 - 26).**

The apostles and brethren, when they chose a twelfth apostle to replace Judas, left us an example the church can follow in choosing leaders. In the book of Acts, Luke explained how their choice was made. He first told how Peter stood up among the one hundred and twenty brethren, when it was time to select this new apostle. Since this address was delivered to the whole assembled company of some one hundred and twenty persons, indicates that the appointment was the public concern of the whole fellowship, not just a private affair for the Eleven\(^6\).

The selection was left to the group, and was not made by the apostles alone, nor was it a matter of a brother stepping forward who claimed to have an "inner" calling to take office. The selection was going to be by 'lot', but first they had to select those who would be in the lot. As far as we know, this is the last time the apostles use the time-honoured method of casting lots. It is not just a "Lucky dip" - the decision is made after much prayer". However, notice should be taken that the choice was not totally by Lot. It was not a matter of letting the Lot fall on anyone of the one hundred and twenty brethren.

Certain qualifications were laid down. The person to be selected must have accompanied the Apostles during the entire ministry of Jesus from the baptism of John to the ascension. Such a man would be equally equipped to perform the most essential function of an apostle; to be a witness of the resurrection.

The group then put forward two men whom they felt fulfilled the qualifications. Apparently they limited those going through the next process. If voting occurred, apparently not all who received scattered votes were accepted for the lot. We would think that to leave all who receive scattered votes would test the Lord by requiring him to choose from a group which was not carefully selected.

Having the two selected, earnest prayer was made that the Lord would indicate his will through the lot. Only then and under these restrictions was the lot cast. And the lot fell on Matthias. This also indicates that the apostles were calling upon the Holy Spirit for guidance in casting the lot. By making the final selection by the lot, it became the Lord's choice, and not the prerogative of the members.

Why was this practice so quickly abandoned? We have no further record in the New Testament of the choosing of leaders by lot. Perhaps this was because the Twelve were unique. They had been chosen, not by the congregation, but by Jesus during his ministry. Only in filling out the Twelve was it necessary to secure an

---

appointment directly from the ascended Lord, not mediated through any human being. Or perhaps after the spirit was given, his guidance made lots unnecessary, Leland Haines argues that today the lot is viewed by many as an Old Testament practice and
rejects it because the selection of Matthias by lot was made before the Holy spirit was given, and therefore thought it was a hasty and improper method of selection. But there are no grounds for this assertion. Jesus gave the disciples the Holy Spirit before Pentecost (John 20:19-22), and under the old covenant, men were moved and guided by the Holy Spirit too.

Since these disciples had just spent forty days with the risen Lord (at which time they may have received instructions on the use of the lot) and prayed for guidance, the Lord was involved in their actions. Others say that Matthias' selection has proven to be improper because he is not mentioned again in the New Testament. But there are no grounds for this assertion. Although he is not mentioned, neither are most of other apostles. There is positive evidence that his selection was proper; we find him numbered with the other eleven [for mention of the eleven apostles (cf Mathew 28: 16; Mark 16: 14; Luke 24:9, 33), to bring the total to twelve (Acts 1 :26; 2: 14; 6:2)]39. Besides the above reasons, there is not even the slightest hint in the New Testament that his selection was improper. Thus there are no grounds here for any objection to the Lot. Perhaps the only motive for rejection of the lot is that today many men want to have complete control over selection of church leadership.

The important points that in abandoning the lot, the church did not abandon the idea that its leaders must be chosen by Christ. Whether these leaders are marked out by vote, appointment, or some gift of the spirit, they are ultimately chosen by the Lord of the church. We need to reclaim in our day this awesome sense that the final appointment of church officers is made by Christ himself


The lot should be accepted as a God-given method of choosing qualified men for church leadership, and it will work satisfactorily if the example in Acts 1 is followed. If the church carefully and prayerfully selects the candidates, the Lord can use the lot to make his will known. If this is not done, the lot can become a testing of the Lord and may result in unqualified persons entering church leadership. A note of interest is that the Greek term for lot is 'Kleros, from which the English term clergy comes.

2.5 THE RECOGNITION OF ELDERS IN THE CHURCH
When the Biblical evidence is considered it is clear that elders are made by God and not by man (Acts 20:28). However, this does not exclude man from the process of the public recognition and calling of elders. Two distinct aspects are to be seen when considering the raising up and appointment of elders in a local church. Each aspect will be considered in some detail.

(a) The Holy Spirit's role in the making of elders
The first aspect concerns the Holy Spirit's role in the making of elders. This is primary and fundamental. It recognizes the fact that the Holy Spirit Himself raises up elders to oversee His flock. Paul said, be on guard for yourselves and for all the flock among which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers (Acts 20:28). The task then is not to create elders, or ultimately to elect them. It is to discern those whom the Holy Spirit has raised up within the congregation to lead the flock. He accomplishes His work by developing men and causing their emergence to be noticed in the context of the local assembly. This development will be noted in three areas.

(i) The Development and Manifestation of Christ-Like Character
The first is the development of Christ-Like character. The Scripture gives a crystal clear portrait so that the men the Holy Spirit has chosen can be identified. Their character begins to be marked by the qualities described in 1 Timothy 3: 1-7 and Titus 1:6-9.

(ii) The Evidence of Ministry Skills, Wisdom and Fruit
The second area where a man will emerge is in the area of ministry involvement. Evidence will be shown of skill in ministry, both in the handling of the Word of God and in the handling of people. His effectiveness and fruitfulness in the work of shepherding will be obvious to the congregation.

(iii) The Desire and Heart of the Man to Lead
Lastly is the matter of desire and spiritual drive. Paul says an elder must be a man who aspires to the office (I Timothy 3:1). The Holy Spirit will put a holy ambition within the person to oversee the flock. This ambition is out of a concern for God's name and the spiritual wellbeing for the flock, not self-exaltation.

(b) The Church's role in the making of Elders
The second phase in recognizing elders involves the process of public confirmation and ordination. It is in reality an acknowledgement of the work that the Holy Spirit has already accomplished. This official or public phase includes the following:

(i) The Elders recognise the need for leadership
The first step in the process is the elders recognize the need for leadership and present that need to the church. Elders have the responsibility to oversee the flock. As such they play the central and leading role in the process of raising up new elders."

(ii) The Congregation is taught the responsibilities of Elders and its role in the process.
Secondly, the congregation is taught what constitutes qualified leaders. The presence of godly character (1 Timothy 3: 1-7), the work of shepherding and the flock's confidence in each man must be clearly perceived. The members of the congregation are also taught their responsibility and role in the selection process. Ultimately, it is

40 Leland M. Haines, Op.cit, p.20

53
they who give consensus and confirmation of whom the Holy Spirit has raised up as elders”.

(iii) **The process is saturated with prayer**
Thirdly, there must be active involvement in prayer. Since a God-given confirmation of whom the Holy Spirit has raised up is essential, the entire process must be done in a context of prayer. The congregation is to be informed of their need to pray these men out. This is to help preserve a spirit of unity in the body. In addition, special days of church-wide prayer should be called to pray for the elders. This stresses the critical importance of the selection. The elders themselves must commit to prayer, recognizing the decision to the welfare of the flock. 42

(iv) **The Elders invite qualified nominees to serve the Flock as overseers**
Fourth, the elders will extend an invitation to men to serve the flock with them as fellow overseers. The invitation will be given to those whom they judge have met the specific qualifications for the office. After much discussion, prayer and consideration, and only after coming to unanimous agreement among themselves, the elders will extend the invitation and proceed toward the goal of public recognition (I Timothy 5:22).43

(v) **The prospective elder will be interviewed, examined and trained**
The fifth step is an interview and examination of the candidate in four key areas. First, the personal interview is made with the candidate and his wife. This is to answer any questions they have and to give them a clear picture of the responsibilities and duties that go with eldership. It is also done in consideration of the fact that an elder's wife will be called upon to make special sacrifices that many wives are not able or willing to make. The support and encouragement of the wife are absolutely essential. Second, a written doctrinal examination is given to the elder. An elder

41 Ibid., p.21
42 Ibid., p. 22
43 Ibid., p. 24
must be able to whole-heartedly support the doctrinal statement of the church. A clear unified voice must be heard from the elders in all areas. Third, the prospective elder is given a copy of the church’s elder's manual and a book that represents the church's philosophy of the church. He is required to meet for a number of weeks to go over the manual and discuss the book. Fourth, there is a meeting in which elders, Deacons and other recognized ministry leaders will meet, with an opportunity for questions. The prospective elder is asked to respond to any and all questions regarding his doctrinal position, his philosophy of ministry and his qualifications to serve as an elder. 44

(vi) The Congregation is informed of the candidates for eldership
The sixth step is the public announcement of the candidates for eldership. The congregation's role here is critical. The members alone can evaluate finally if they will follow the prospective elder. The sheep will know the true shepherd's voice (John 10:14). Each prospective elder is presented to the flock and the flock is asked to join prayerfully in consideration of this appointment, and express their support or reservations. Over a period of several weeks, they are given opportunity to show cause as to why any of these prospective elders should not be set apart to eldership. Any reservations should be communicated in writing or in person, not by means of an anonymous note. 45

(vii) Confirmation is given by congregational consensus
The seventh step is the consensus of the congregation. If the response of the congregation is positive with a consensus approaching total agreement, the elders will consider it a confirmation from the Holy Spirit and proceed to ordination. If a consensus of 80 - 90% is not evident, the candidate will be removed from consideration."

(viii) The public ordination is granted to serve the flock

44 Ibid., p.18
45 Ibid., p. 19
46 Ibid., p.25
The last step is to follow the Biblical pattern of ordination where the approved elder is set aside for ministry by the laying on of hands (I Timothy 5:22; Acts 6:6; 13:3). This is an act of identification and blessing. This public act confirms the appointment and invests a man with authority to serve as an elder. 49

2.6 QUALIFICATIONS OF ELDERs

The desire to be an elder is a very serious one because the Lord will judge them with a stricter standard. James wrote,

> Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly
> (James 3:1)

So brethren must seriously examine their motives when they consider this office. They and the church should carefully consider if they have the qualifications. The scriptures lay down extensive qualifications for the office of Elder. Concerning the qualifications of Elders, Viola Frank notes that;

> New Testament elders were kingdom seekers, not empire builders. They were ordinary Christians, not multi-talented, ultra versatile, superhuman, and iconized, celebrity-like performers. Their qualifications came not from professional schools or licenses, but from the spirit of God their training was not purely academic, formal and theological, but practical and functional, being cultivated within the context of church life itself and through mentoring relationships with other godly men. Thus they did not deem themselves qualified to lead by acquiring a blend of accounting, public speaking and amateur psychology skills, but by genuine growth”.

49 Ibid., p.27

We get to know the qualifications of Elders by looking at 1 Timothy 3:1-7, Titus 1:5-9 and 1 Peter 5:1-4.

a) **Qualifications in 1 Timothy 3:1-7**

This gives us a very detailed sketch of the person who is to serve as elder. Even though this list may seem exhaustive, it is not a complete entirety, but gives us an overview of the character qualities required of the position. Likewise, it is not a church manual" for leadership; it is simply the beginning of a formation of a new paradigm of servant leadership that Jesus Christ was implementing.

Along similar lines, some have taken the notion that this list is simply historical and is only meant for the Ephesians elders that Paul was attempting to address": This is however a fallacy; the list here though not comprehensive still holds weight when it comes to the present day office of elder.

Most importantly, these qualifications were about the man's character not his credentials; which in many ways is contrary to our current notion of how we select church leaders. Paul stated that:

> Here is a trustworthy saying: if anyone set his heart on being an overseer, he desires a noble task. 2 Now the overseer must be above reproach, the husband of but one wife, temperate, self-controlled, respectable, hospitable, able to teach,’ not given to drunkenness, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, not a lover of money. 4. He must manage his own family well and see that his children obey him with proper respect? (if anyone does not know how to manage his own family, how can he take care of God's church” He must not be a recent convert, or he may become conceited and fall under the same judgement as the devil. 7 He must also have a good reputation with outsiders, so that he will not fall into disgrace and into the devil's trap. (1 Timothy 3:1-7).

The following qualifications for elders/overseers are seen from the above passage.

• Must be above reproach
• Husband of one wife
• Temperate, self-controlled and respectable
• Hospitable
• Able to teach
• Not given to drunkenness
• Gentle
• Not quarrelsome
• Not a lover of money
• Must manage his own household
• Not a recent covert
• A good reputation

Let us look at some of these qualifications in detail below.

• **One Woman's Husband** (Greek: *Mias Gunaikas andras*)
This is easily the most controversial of the traits listed. The writing in the Greek is vague and can leave a laundry list of questions. Some of them would be:

1. Simply means that he cannot be a polygamist?
2. Does it mean he cannot remarry after the death of his wife?
3. Or does it imply that he may not be remarried after a divorce?

Many different churches hold different Views on these words, some holding to staunch view such as those in examples number two and three. But would they be correct?
First, all other qualifications that Paul lists are about one's current situation. For example, Paul is not saying that if one has not always been beyond reproach that he is not included. It is how the person behaves now, not in his pre-Christian life. Second, Paul could have phrased this differently if he wanted to exclude certain individuals from the responsibility. He could have plainly said; "An elder can only be married once"
way Paul could have expressed the idea ... is using a perfect participle of ginomai to say, "having been a husband of one wife "(gegonos mias gunaikos andra). This is, in fact, the force of requirement for widows in 1 Timothy 5:9, "having been the wife of one husband".

Because of this vagueness, it is best to error on the other side instead of excluding a multitude of individuals. Therefore, this part of the verse is referring to polygamy alone; an elder cannot have more than one wife. And therefore, beyond any controversy, why would this be a necessary trait, yet God is looking for faithful men? In their marriages, with their families, in their communities, God desires men to lead his church who will be there day in and day out. However he does not make celibacy a requirement.

• Hospitable (Greek: philoxenon)

Hospitality in the ancient world was a very important character quality and it had the same standard for one who desired to be an elder ". It was one of the most cherished virtues among the early Christians (Acts 16:15; Romans 12:13; Hebrews 13:2; 1 Peter 4:9, 3; John 5:10)54

There were no hotels or travellers' Inns as we know of them today. Travellers had to either stay with someone they know (sometimes with a letter of recommendation) or stay at an inn which often doubled as a brothel. The episkopos (elder) must be hospitable; a man who gladly and at all times welcomes into his house the servants of God. People who wish to lead others must also be welcoming of them even to the point of offering their own material lives. As G. W. Knight insists, "he who must teach others and take care of and exercise oversight over them must be open and loving to them".

• Skilled in Teaching (Greek: didaktikon)

As William Mounce says, "This is one of the more significant requirements of an overseer and sets them apart from the deacons. 56 Elders, simply stated, need to be good teachers if one is not familiar with the scriptures, cannot discern that which is false from true, cannot gently instruct others, one does not meet the requirements needed to fulfill this duty. Skillful in teaching is an important qualification in the context of pastorals, where much of the material has to do with faithful adherence to traditional teaching and opposition to heresy". Just as in the early church, false teaching abounds and to be an excellent elder one needs to be competent with the scriptures and be able to refute those who challenge him. This does not imply that the person needs to be a good speaker such as how "ministers" today are trained for the pulpit. Rather as Titus 1:9 says,

He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it.

A proficient elder needs to be theologically able and have the skills to see error and have the ability to expose it soundly. These are the characteristics of a competent teacher.

- **Manage his own household well** (Greek: *Kalos proistamenon*)

This is also key for a practiced elder. One's family is the 'proving ground' for effective leadership. An elder should command obedience from his children. Young children should obey their parents, in this case, especially their father, it does not imply that his family will be perfect, but in most cases a good father is a respected one. An elder should have children who revere him and his actions will either bear this out or not. His children should look up to him. He should love his wife sacrificially and not with selfishness.

55 Knight G. w. (1968); *The faithful sayings in the Pastoral Epistles*, Baker books, Dallas, p. 159
56 Mounce, William (2000); *Pastoral epistles*, Word publishing, Tyndale, p. 174
However, each one of you also must love his wife as he loves himself and the wife must respect her husband  
(Ephesians 5:33)

Their relationship should be intimate and commendable. Likewise, how can one manage to lead God's people (a church) well when he cannot manage small family of five or ten members. And moreover obedience and respect to a father will depend on how well he relates with his children and wife. Children who turn out to be people of good standing will have been influenced so by their parents.

• Not a recent convert:
This is the maturity implied in the term 'Elder' as we have already said earlier; though there is no specific age limit. Of course, we would expect a recent convert not to be well versed with all scriptures in such a short time that he can defend the gospel in face of false teachings. A convert elevated very rapidly to a prominent position in the church might easily become proud. His manner of performing his duties would then be at variance with what is demanded in a Christian leader. In a letter to the church of Ephesus, Paul could require some maturity in the faith since that church had been established 12 years previously”.

• Good reputation
Righteous living of believers will bring honour and respect from the non-believers. Therefore for a church to be respected as a holy institution especially by those outside it; should have leaders who command respect and honour from society. Of course such men gain their reputation out of righteous living as well as good relations with societal members. Paul insists that Christian leaders should maintain a good reputation with non-Christians.

b) Qualifications in Titus 1:5-9.

The qualifications in Titus are parallel to those of I Timothy 3: 1-7.

Paul wrote to Titus to:

5appoint elders in every town, as I directed you. 6An elder must be blameless, the husband of but one wife, a man whose children believe and are not open to the charge of being wild and disobedient. 7Since an overseer (bishop) is entrusted with God's work, he must be blameless - not overbearing, not quick-tempered, not pursuing dishonest gain. 8Rather he must be hospitable, one who loves what is good, who is self-controlled, upright, holy and disciplined. 9He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as there has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it.

These qualifications align with those in I Timothy and we shall not have any further emphasis on each of them, but a comment needs to be made on one of them.

• Believing children (Greek: Pistos).

In I Timothy 3:4-5, it is not explicitly required that the children of an elder should be Christians. The requirement is explicit here because Christianity was more recent in Crete and it could easily happen that only the parents would be converts, the children remaining outside the church. Paul wants to avoid such a situation. Children should not have irregular conduct and not insubordinate. And of course no believer who is faithful is expected of this. That is why there is insistence that children must be believers. Moreover if children remained outside the church; they would behave in a very disorderly manner just like the non-believing children and this would cost the church leader his reputation yet it is a necessary requirement (I Tim3:7).

c) Qualifications in 1Peter 5:1-3

Peter appeals to elders to "oversee" and "tend" the flock in doctrine and in discipline. Peter's expectations of elders are similar to those of I Timothy and Titus

59 Ibid., p. 360.
Peter writes;

*Be shepherds of God's flock that is under your care, serving as overseers - not because you must, but because you are willing, as God wants you to be; not greedy for money, but eager to serve; not lording it over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock.*

More fundamentally, Peter brings out the motivational qualifications of an elder i.e. "Willingness to serve" and "not greedy for money" and not for the power which the office affords. Church leaders should be willing to serve as willed by God and should not hold any personal motives for the service. In other words Peter encourages a willing heart of a leader for service and forbids those leaders who acquire leadership for their own benefit or to use their offices to satisfy their own ends.

• **Elder had older children**

As mentioned earlier, elders were mature brethren. The qualifications in 1 Timothy and Titus mention about "keeping his children submissive" and 'his children are believers'. Both statements show that the elder would have older children, which implies they would be at least in their later thirties. Some people may believe that elders can be younger since Paul wrote to Timothy that;

*Don't let anyone look down on you because you are young ... "*

*1 Timothy 4: 12*

But there are two things wrong with this view. First, Timothy was not an elder in a local church; he was a representative of Paul. Second in the New Testament times youth referred to those between 14 and 40\(^60\).

All those qualifications mentioned are essential and taking careful look at these qualifications of elders, they all focus on godliness and servant hood.

\(^{60}\) RC.H. Lenski (1946), *Interpretation of st. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus, and to Philemon*, Wartburg Press, Colombus, Ohio, p. 481
According to Joel Comiskey, "Character is what you are in the dark". Most of the requirements in the New Testament involve character. Virtues such as honesty, faithfulness, and good judgement, are synonymous with New Testament leadership. No amount of talent or giftedness can replace these characteristics. Bad character qualities will ultimately disqualify a person from leadership".

People take care of every incident, more especially with what happens with their leaders. They want to make sure that the actions of their leaders correspond with what they say. They want to make sure that the leader they are going to follow is credible and honest. Godly character refers to Christ's work in our actions, attitude, and daily Christian living. Good church leaders should remain so whether at home or the pulpit. Leaders should set an example for the believers in speech, in life, in love, in faith and in purity. If leaders did so, they will have a good time and even those who try criticize will be silenced by the good leader's actions.

### 2.7 THE WORK AND DUTIES OF ELDERS

The New Testament is quite specific concerning the work of elders. Thus provide direction, teaching, help the church to achieve consensus and to grow into maturity.

Elders are to teach (I Timothy 3:2; 5:17; I Peter 5:2; Acts 20:28); to guard (Acts 20:28-29; Titus 1:9-14); to oversee (I Peter 5:3; Hebrews 13:7, 17); to give counsel (Acts 21:23); to handle disputes (Acts 15:2 ff); to visit and pray for the sick (James 5:14); and to supervise the distribution of money (Acts 11:30), for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of the ministry (Ephesians 4:12).

Let us look at some of the above duties in detail.

- **Teaching and preaching**

An elder must be able to teach and be a defender of sound doctrine. He must hold firmly to the trustworthy message as it has been taught, so that he can encourage others by sound doctrine and refute those who oppose it (Titus 1:9)

---

Most elders are to be preachers and teachers. Apparently not all elders carried out these duties, because Paul wrote,

*The elders who direct the affairs of the church well are worthy of double honour especially those whose work is preaching and teaching* (1 Tim 5:17)

Tying "preaching and teaching" together suggests this work is done by the same individual. And as I have already mentioned earlier, Paul tied "Pastors and teachers" together in his epistle to the Ephesians church (Ephesians 4:11, 12), again indicating that these two are one and the same group.

The importance of teaching in the church is emphasised several times in the New Testament. Luke wrote that, "in the church at Antioch there were ..... teachers" (Acts 13:1); Paul wrote to Romans; We have different gifts, according to the grace given to us, let him use it ... if it is teaching, let him teach" (Romans 12:6,7); to the Corinthians, "And in the church God has appointed ... third teachers" (1 Cor 12:28); And to Timothy, Paul wrote "what you have heard from me before many witnesses entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also" (II Tim 2:2); they are to be "apt teachers" (Y. 24), and are to "preach the word, be urgent in season and out of season, convince, rebuke, and exhort, be unfailing in patience and in teaching.

• **Feed the flock of God**

In Acts 20:28, perhaps the most outstanding one would be to "feed the flock of God". Peter tells the elders the same thing in 1Peter 5; Feed the flock of God. This may involve counseling , talking to people one-on-one, guiding them, providing for them, visiting them etc.

• **Over seeing**

Elders have the responsibility of overseeing. This is the discipline or correction.

• **To lead**

Elders of course have the responsibility to lead. They are to lead both by precept and example (I Timothy 4:12; 1 Peter 5:3).
• Guard the flock
Elders are to guard their people from errors and sins and dangers of all kinds, both from within and without (Acts 20:28-31; Hebrews 13:7; I Timothy 4:16).

Paul writes to the Ephesians that the pastors-teachers are given "for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of the ministry, unto the edifying of the body of Christ" (Ephesians 4:12). The following can be identified from this scripture:

• Elders are to equip the saints for ministry
An elder as a shepherd (Pastor) is primarily responsible to equip the saints for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ. To equip is to get something ready for action, or outfitting it to handle tasks assigned (Mathew 4:21). Biblically, the ministry belongs to every believer. Christianity is not a spectator sport, but a battle where every believer is a soldier with a task to fulfill. The duty of shepherding, for which every elder is responsible, is to see that the flock is prepared for individual ministry.

Equipping also involves bringing believers to faithful and fruitful involvement in ministry that builds up the body of Christ (Ephesians 4:12, 16) God has placed the ministry in the hands of the people. The responsibility of elders is to see that it becomes a reality in the church. Without mutual ministry on every level, the church will not grow qualitatively or quantitatively as Christ desires it to (Ephesians 4:16).

• Equipping to personal maturity
Equipping involves, first of all, bringing believers to maturity in their character and walk with Christ. They are to grow in their comprehension of Christ, their communion with Christ and their character likeness to Christ. (Ephesians 4:13-15).

• Be an example to the Flock
An elder is also to be an example to the flock. The greatest equipping, discipling tool is modeling. Jesus appointed the twelve that they may be with him (Mark 3:14). The vital role of modeling a godly life marked by the right priorities, principles and practices cannot be over emphasized.

God has placed this vital role primarily in the hands of elders (I Timothy 4:12). Paul continually pointed to it in his life (II Timothy.
3:10; Thessalonians 1:6), as did Jesus (John 13: 13-15). Elders are to be involved in discipling and reproducing godly, Christ-like believers. The primary method is to exemplify Christ-likeness themselves.

### 2.8 RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FLOCK TOWARD THE ELDMERS

The scriptures make it clear that we have an obligation toward elders. Let us discuss some of them below:

(i) We are to obey and submit to them (Hebrews 13: 17)

Believers are encouraged to "obey" church leaders. Interestingly, the Greek behind 'obey' is not the regular Greek word for 'obey'. Instead, 'Peitho' is used which literally means "to persuade" or "to convince".

Thus Hebrews 13: 17 should be rendered "let yourselves be persuaded by". This same verse also instructs believers to 'submit' to the authority of their church leaders. As with 'obey', the common Greek word for 'submit' is not used. Instead, 'hupeiko' was chosen by the author, a word meaning 'to give in, to yield' after a fight. It was used of combatants". Thus God's flock is to be open to being "persuaded by" (peitho) its shepherds. In the course of on-going discussion and teaching the flock is to be "convinced by" (peitho) its leaders. Mindless slave-like obedience is not the relationship pictured in the New Testament between elders and the church.

Of course, there will be those times when some in the flock cannot be completely persuaded of something. When necessary to break the grid lock, the congregation is to "give in to, to yield to" (hupeiko) the wisdom of its leaders.

Much may be gleaned, from the way that New Testament writers made appeals directly to entire churches. They went to great lengths to influence ordinary 'rank and file' believers. The apostles did not simply bark orders and issue injunctions; instead, they treated other believers as equals and appealed directly to them as such. No doubt local church leaders led in much the same way.

(ii) We are to respect and love them (1 Thessalonians 5:12-3)

These verses reveal that leaders are to be respected, not because of automatically inferred authority of rank, but because of the value of their service. It is also significant that in 1 Thessalonians 5:13, Christians are commanded to especially "love" their elders - "hold them in highest regard in love because of their work". Jesus said, "you know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave". (Mathew 20:25-28)

(iii) We are to protect them from unfounded charges (I Timothy 5:19)

The Greek word used is 'Kategoria' translated 'Accusation'.

Do not entertain an accusation against an elder unless it is brought by two or three witnesses.

In other words, while the slander is inevitable it is to be rejected unless established. Elders - Pastors are to enjoy your protection and be given the benefit of doubt". Offering them protection against such unfounded charges is evidence of love towards them. Love will think the best of them until it is able to do so no longer. A minister has one solemn possession, his character. An accusation against him, therefore, is serious and must be witnessed before two or three persons or not at all. This would stop many rumours and save many of God's servants if heeded64.

(iv) We are to remember them and imitate them (Hebrews 13:7).

Hebrews 13:7 reflects the fact that the leadership style employed by church leaders is primarily one of direction by example, as already noted:
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Remember your leaders... consider the outcome of their way of life and imitate their faith.

Christians must remember their leaders because they live exemplary lives and we should work hard to live by their example both in faith and character.

(v) We are to remunerate them (I Timothy 5: 17-18).

The pastors of the church who rule; labour in the word; their work should not be taken lightly; instead should receive remuneration as indicated in verse 8. Men called of God would preach whether they are paid or not, but God ordained them to live by their ministry (I Cor 9:7-11)65.

The honour the elders ought to be given includes material support. Not only should they be given it, they should also be truly recognized as worthy of it66.

However, over emphasis on remuneration of church leaders and the insistence on it as a right has been the mother root of so many problems in the church.

(vi) We are to recognise them (I Thessalonians 5:12, I Corinthians. 16:15-18)

Here the recognition of elders in church is related to the work that they perform. And therefore Christians must appreciate the efforts of their leaders. This will be one way of encouraging them to work more.

(vii) We are to pray for them.

Finally, in light of their great value, should drive you to pray for your elders - Pastors (cf 1Thessalonians 5:25; 2 Thessalonians 3: 1). Their work is important, and they deal often with very personal life issues. They need as well as deserve your help in intercessory prayer. Pray that God will keep them faithful in this valuable service and use them to His glory.

The elders of the church need the prayers of the brothers and sisters, especially prayer when they face major trials. Peter, for instance "was kept in prison; but earnest prayer for him was made to God by the church ... he described to them how the Lord had
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brought him out of prison" (Acts 12:5, 17). Prayers at other times are needed too. As Paul requested, "you also must help us by prayer" (II Corinthians 1: 11); "Pray at all times ... making supplications ... for me, that utterance may be given to me in opening my mouth boldly to proclaim the mystery of the gospel. .. that I may declare it boldly, as I ought to speak" (Ephesians 6: 18-20); finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may speed on and triumph" (II Thessalonians 3: 1); "Brethren pray for us" (I Thessalonians 5:25); and "pray for us" (Hebrews 13: 18). Let us now take time to look at the second office of church leadership in the New Testament - Deacon.

2.9 DEACON
This is the second office of church leadership found in the New Testament church. The Deacons are the assistants to the elders (bishops) in the carrying out of their responsibilities. The interesting thing is that, unlike the eldership the New Testament seems not to record the institution of this office, nor to describe its functions, apart from the account in Acts 6 of the appointment of the seven (as they were known - see Acts 21:8)67
Before we turn to consider the data presented in Acts 6 just a few words about the origins of the term Deacon.

2.9.1 Meaning of "Deacon"
Our word 'Deacon' is the Anglicized version of the Greek word, 'diakonos'. The related verb, 'diakoneo', in classical Greek referred to 'waiting upon tables', then from this, to caring for household needs, and then, by extension, to serving others more generally". Basically, diakonos is a servant, and often a table - servant, or waiter. In the New Testament, the word - group is used in both the wider and narrower senses.
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The more general sense is common in the New Testament, whether for royal servants (Mathew 22: 13), or for a servant of God (I Thessalonians 3:2). In a single passage Paul describes Epaphras as a 'deacon' of Christ and himself as a 'deacon' of the gospel and of the church (Colossians 1:7, 23,25). Others exercise a diakonia towards Paul (Acts 29:22), the context showing that they are his assistants in evangelistic work". The deacons were to be assistants to those who preached the word. They were to see the distribution of material goods to those in need. Possibly we should think of the Deacon not as an officer of the community, but as an assistant to the bishop. Here also perhaps, since deacon means primarily one who serves at table, we should think of the deacon as assisting the bishop in performing the rite of the Eucharist." In a metaphorical sense, the word may be translated 'minister or servant' and is applied to the apostles as ministers of the new covenant (2 Corinthians 3:6); ministers of God (2 Corinthians 6:4); ministers of justice (2 Corinthians 11:15); of Christ (2 Corinthians 11:23).

The word therefore does not lose its connection with the supply of material needs and service. It is in this light that we are to see Christ's insistence that his coming was in order to minister (serve). He makes this clear in Mark 10:45, when he says that son of man did not come to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many.

Significantly this claim is set in Luke 22:26; in the context of 'table-service'. The Lord is the Deacon par excellence, the table waiter of his people. And as these passages show deaconship in this sense is a mark of his whole church.

In Philippians 1:1 'Deacon' appears as a distinct office, where Paul addresses his letter to all the Saints at Phillip with the bishops and deacons. Together with 1 Timothy 3, the word-group is used in its narrow sense, referring to the second of the New Testament offices.

In Acts 6, the word diakonos does not appear, it is not used to describe 'The seven'. This is why some deny any connection between Acts 6 and the office of the deaconate. However, the word-group is used in reference to the functions of the
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Seven in verse 1, the word translated 'daily service', (or ministration (KJV), or distribution (NIV), is *diakonia*, while in Y.2, the word translated 'to serve tables' is the infinitive of the verb *diakoneo*. 

From this we see that the word 'Deacon' does not appear in Acts 6, never the less the idea of serving in an official capacity is clearly present, thus providing a strong link to the passage in I Timothy 3 which spells out the qualifications, required of those who would serve in this capacity. And since it seems unlikely that God would reveal to us the requirements of deacons without telling us their job. We must see Acts 6 as recording the institution of the office of deaconate.

### 2.9.2 Appointment of the Seven Deacons: Acts 6

*Circumstances for establishment of office of Deacon.*

The church had grown and it became harder to maintain the warm, free fellowship that marked it at the beginning. So there was needed to make an advance in Organisation of the New Testament church. At a very early stage, the church attracted Hellenistic Jews i.e. Greek-speaking Jews from outside Palestine; as well as Aramaic speaking Palestine born Jews. Before long a rift arose between these Grecian and the Hebrews.

The Hellenists complained that the widows in their group were being neglected in the daily distribution of food. A common pool had been established in which the property of the wealthier members had been placed; and daily distribution was made to those who were needy, among whom widows would naturally figure prominently.

Since the wealthy of the Christian community had sold their goods to provide for the poor, some Greek speaking Jews felt their poor and widows were being neglected in favour of the more traditional Hebrew speaking Jews.

The apostles called all the disciples together and asked them to seek out seven men; who would be relegated with the duty of serving in the daily distribution. This was to

---

Ensure that the apostles could have enough time to concentrate on the ministry to which they were called, that is; prayer and to the ministry of the word.

Before appointment, the apostles laid down the qualifications for this new office. They were asked to seek out men of good reputation, full of the spirit and of wisdom. Note that even for such practical duties in the church, spiritual endowment is required as well as good reputation and general wisdom.

The suggestion of the apostles was readily accepted by the whole church of Jerusalem. The whole congregation participated in the election of the seven deacons. There is no mention of the use of lots. The seven included; Stephen, Phillip, Procorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas.

The apostles inducted them into their office by prayer and the laying on of hands. The seven were selected by the rank and file; the imposition of apostolic hands confirmed this selection, commissioned the seven for their special work, and expressed the apostles' fellowship with them in the matter”. Indeed the laying on of hands is too common in Acts to be seen as special milestone here, and the careers of Stephen and Philip show that the seven were not confined to table service”. This account of the appointment by the Jerusalem church of seven approved men to supervise the administration of the widows' fund is commonly taken as the formal institution of the office of Deacon.

2.9.3 Significance of Deacons' appointment for the present church.
Firstly, expressing disappointment or complaining over a matter concerning the church is okay. We should not look at brethren's raising such issues as holding ill feelings about others; rather the church must have honest expressions to solve problems.

Secondly the apostles collectively listened to the complaint. The problem was not relegated to one or a few to resolve. This again reminds the present church of the importance of plurality leadership and responsibility.

Thirdly, the apostles did not assume to be above the disciples. In fact they are addressed as "brothers". Nor did the apostles assume an authoritarian role; they only asked the disciples to choose the men they wished as long as they met the specified requirements. The apostles did not dictate leaders over the disciples. The present church therefore should involve all the church members as much as they can if not absolutely when it comes to the time of selecting church leaders.

Fourthly, the major significance lies, not in the institution of an order in the ministerial hierarchy, but as the first example of that delegation of administrative and social responsibilities to those of appropriate character and gifts, which was to become typical of the Gentile churches and the recognition of such duties as part of the ministry of Christ. Furthermore, many church leaders today are not free to devote themselves to the two prime aspects of their ministry; prayer and preaching. Members of the local assembly must assume positions of responsibility in order to free the pastor to do the job for which he has been called.

The decision of the apostles was approved by the congregation. They did not contest the decision of the twelve because apparently the congregation, all of them was made to be involved in the process of choosing of the deacons. It is notable that all seven of the men chosen bear Greek names. Possibly the Hebrews, in the generosity that should mark Christians in a dispute; saw to it that all seven were Hellenists. One was even a 'proselyte' - a Gentile who had become a Jew, this was Nicolas form Antioch. The church should continue with this generosity. For example it would be kind of a church member to withdraw his intentions for church leadership if his position to church leadership will divide up the church.

Leaving aside improvable theories which see the seven as but the Hellenistic counter - part of the Twelve, we may, note first, that the seven are never called 'Deacons', and secondly, that while the cognate words are used they apply equally to the diakonia of the word exercised by the Twelve (V.4) and to that of the tables (whether for meals or money) exercised by the seven (verse 2)?3. More over the work done later by Stephen and Philip was more like the work of the Apostles than like the work of deacons in

most modern churches. It is probably better to think of the seven as being a unique
group, like the Twelve, and not a permanent order in the church”.

Ecclesiastical usage institutionalized and narrowed the New Testament conception of 'Deacon'.
Early non-canonical literature recognises a class of deacons without specifying their functions.
Later literature shows the deacons undertaking functions such as attending to the sick, which
must have been part of Christian *diakonia* in apostolic times; but their duties in the Eucharist at
table service at the communal meal : and personal relationship with the monarchical bishop,
become increasingly prominent. The occasional limitation of the deaconate to seven is probably
due to deliberate archaizing75.

2.9.4 Qualifications for Deacons

As we look at the New Testament requirements for Deacons, there are two points to note;
Firstly, while this office is ordained by God, and certain qualifications are laid down, we will
discover that these are no different from the qualities required of every believer. This should
remind us of the general principle that the Lord sets apart those in his church who are to occupy
office by graciously giving them a heightened measure of the various gifts and fruit of the spirit.
The church does not create the office bearer when she elects him to office; she recognised that
the Lord himself has equipped this man to exercise that office.

Secondly is that the qualifications laid down for office bearers are qualities permanently
belonging to the office. They are therefore not only 'conditions of entry' to the office, but are
qualities, which the office bearer must continue to cultivate in prayerful dependence upon the
spirit of Christ. When a person ceases to display the qualities belonging to his office, unless he
repents, he will have to be removed from it. If not, the name of Christ is dishonoured, and the
church discouraged from pursuing those holy traits, which should be exemplified in her leaders.

Two passages in the New Testament bear directly upon the qualifications for serving as a deacon: they are 1 Timothy 3:8-13 and Acts 6:1-6. The qualifications in I Timothy 3: 8-13 for Deacons are not any different from those required of Elders as spelt out in I Timothy 3: 1-7. It can be seen at once that there is very little difference between the two lists; and in fact the qualities in both of them are very similar to those which would normally have been looked for in the holder of any responsible office in society. In other words what we are being given is not a picture of the specific offices of bishop and deacon with the duties and resources required of these ministers, but a fairly conventional account of what the men ought to be like who are entrusted with any responsible office whatever in the church. These qualities, though applicable in many walks of life, are mentioned here to show how men ought to conduct themselves in God's household”. Note that V8 employs 'likewise', indicating that these qualifications augment the ones above for Elders and the one above augment these for Deacons. The following are the qualifications in I Timothy.

i) Dignity:

The deacon must be a man worthy of respect. He does not aspire to office in order to gain respect, he is appointed to office because he already commands respect in the church. His upright and orderly life, a product of self-discipline, gives him a serious and dignified demeanor. Sometimes we confuse dignity with distance, but Christian dignity is a warm, attractive quality flowing from love.

ii) Sincerity (NIV):

He is not double-tongued (KN), but straightforward, open and honest. You can depend on his word: he says what he means, and means what he says. He should not be the kind of person, who says different things to different people for purposes of suitting the occasion.

iii) Not indulging in much wine.
If he drinks wine, he does so with moderation. He should have good temperance. The biblical testimony is consistently against the use of strong drink. No one mastered by drugs whether alcohol or other kinds can serve Christ effectively in office. The practical application of this principle in modern society is total abstinence.

iv) Not pursuing dishonest gain:

Deacons might be particularly subject to this temptation because they had charge of the distribution of alms". Unlike Judas Iscariot, the disciples' treasurer, who likes so many after him, could not keep his hand out of the till. Those charged with handling the church's money must be free of the love of it. This temptation is there even to the godliest deacon, but it should not be tolerated at all as it is the root of all other evils.

v) Have faith with a clear conscience.

To be a deacon, a man must be grounded in the faith. Belief is the basis of behaviour. His profession of the Christian faith is not paralyzed by a guilty conscience. His behaviour must conform to his belief so that his conscience is pure. He is no hypocrite, subscribing to the confession with mental reservations. He holds unequivocally to Christ, and to the gospel, and his sins are washed away through a daily dependence upon the Lord and his work of redemption.

vi) Found blameless.

A contender to this office should first be proved by his belief and behaviour. Before anyone is admitted to the diaconate, he must prove himself worthy in the eyes of all.


For that case, he should be one, good time and not newly converted. A new convert cannot be grounded and must not be trust into prominence”.

Paul tells Timothy,

Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands. (1 Timothy 5:22)

The deacon is a man who has proved his worth in the life of the church, and whose spirituality and maturity are evident to all. He is beyond reproach.

vii) Godly wife

Every man should be striving to develop these qualities of spiritual maturity, but so should the women. Whether they are already the wives of deacons or only prospectively so, the women too should be people of dignity, with their tongues, appetites and passions under control. No man can successfully fulfil the requirements of spiritual office if he is being undermined by his wife. The two are one, so they must be one in godliness too.

viii) One Wife's husband

This quality is exactly the same as that attached to the bishop already looked at before. He should have one wife and be faithful in the marriage bond.

ix) Manage his household well.

A Deacon must be a good manager of his own household. His children do not 'run riot' - as with the bishop, he keeps his children under control with all dignity. And the apostle adds significantly;

If anyone does not significantly; manage his own family, how can he take care of God's church? (1 Timothy 3:5)
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(X) Excellent standing and respect from the church.

The man whose conduct is in keeping with his office of deacon gains great respect in the church. Indeed, some have seen that the "excellent standing" mentioned in this verse (v.13) refers to a faithful deacon's being elevated to the office of elder. Christ's church, for the qualifications are, with one main exception, the same. And, as faith is strengthened by living according to God's norms, a faithful deacon is also promised great assurance of salvation. Possibly Paul has in mind the promotion of deacons to the higher rank of bishop-presbyters; but more likely that deacons who are competent and zealous will win the gratitude and respect of the community.

(xi) Good reputation (Acts 6:3)
The idea here is not any different from that held about bishops as discussed under the qualifications for elders in I Timothy 3:7.

(xii) Full of the spirit and wisdom. (Acts 6:3)
This requirement suggests that the role of deacons was to be more than simply waiting on tables. They were to get involved in other church work. Like preaching and defending the Christian faith. This is so clear because Stephen, one of the seven is seen doing the work of the twelve (the apostles). According to Guthrie while they were appointed on this occasion as almoners, the ministry of those of their number of whom we have any further account was not restricted to this form of service". Indeed the present work of deacons in modern churches where they exist is not any different from that of the bishops/elders hence the necessity of wisdom and filled with the spirit is so crucial if the deacons and such church ministers are to carry out church work more effectively.

Among the qualifications for deacons, there is no mention of teaching abilities as expected of elders (1 Tim 3:2). But when faced with a challenge, they, as all

Christians could make a strong defense of the faith. Luke wrote in Acts about Stephen, one of the seven, who when confronted said;

"Brothers and fathers listen to me", and went on to preach a powerful sermon (Acts 7:1-53) when persecution scattered the Jerusalem church, those who were scattered went about preaching the word". Philip, one of the seven went to Samaria and "proclaimed to them Christ" (Acts 8:4-8). "They believed Philip as he preached good news about the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ" (V12) and "Philip opened his mouth, and beginning with this scripture he told him the good news of Jesus" (V35). He baptized both Simon and the Ethiopian Eunuch. (V13 and38).

2.9.5 The Deacon's work:

What exactly did the seven Deans do? A superficial reading would suggest that they become literally table waiters, garcons (Acts 6:2). However, we have already seen that what the deacons were administering was not the menu but the money. So why the expression' to serve tables'?

The word table was used in Greek to refer not only to the meal table, but to the table of the money-changer, or the banker. For instance, in Luke 19:23, in the Parable of the money, the noble man enquires of his unfaithful slave, "Why did you not put the money in the bank?" What he says is literally, "why did you not give my money upon a table?" In Acts 6, then, the seven were charged not merely with distributing food and drink, but being in charge of the common purse; they managed the financial affairs of the church, with special concern for the poor.

Such a responsibility requires important spiritual qualities; we have already seen that the apostles directed the people to choose out seven men of good reputation full of the spirit and of wisdom, and then they ordain them (i.e. set them apart to this office) by prayer and the laying on hands (Y.6). These qualities parallel and summarize those spelled out in 1 Timothy 3. We are all exhorted to go on being filled with the spirit"
(Ephesians 5:18). but men qualified to be deacons are those in whom this is outwardly obvious. As the context in Ephesians 5 shows, being spirit-filled refers not so much to the emotions as to the will: you show that you are spirit-filled by being subject to the Lordship of Christ in every area of life - in the church, the family, your employment etc. Wisdom, on the other hand is the ability to translate godly principles into practical action so as to achieve spiritually profitable goals. How necessary this is when it comes to administering the funds of Christ's church.

It is not too hard to see the Parallels with 1Timothy 3. We may summarize that the deacons' work is to assist Christ's under shepherds by taking from them the burden of managing the church's material resources. In particular, in this office, the church continues to express God's concern for those in need, particularly among his own people.

2.9.6 The necessity for the Deaconate:

Is the deaconate necessary in every church, so that a church is not properly constituted if it lacks deacons?

In Acts 6, the seven were not ordained until they became necessary. In Titus 1, Paul commands Titus to appoint elders in every city, but, makes no reference to deacons. Of interests also is Acts 11:29-30, which records that the relief offering entrusted to Barnabas and Saul was sent to the elders in Jerusalem and not the seven. No doubt the elders may have passed the gift on to the seven, but we are not told that they did.

The office of Deacon is not essential to the being of the church, but it may become necessary for her well-being, when so adjudged by the elders. This happens when the task of financial management becomes too onerous for the elders, and distracts from their ministry of the word and prayer. In 1Timothy 3, the qualifications for the deaconate are very similar to those for the eldership, with the exception that the latter are to be 'apt to teach'. Even though this happens so, we have already seen that two of the seven Deacons; Stephen and Philip did effectively the work that was being done by the elders (apostles). Clearly, then, the deacon's role was an assistant to the elder. That is why in many churches today deacons are required to subscribe the confession just as elders do.
CONCLUSION

It is interesting to note that today's church leadership has its foundation in the scriptures. God has put in place measures along which his church should be led. We recognise that the church's leaders come from the congregation. And any member who is spirit-filled or gifted to lead appears in the congregation and the rest of the members will dully recognise him as their leader basing on his Christ-like character. Church leaders provide direction and not rulership to the congregation. They are servants of the church rather than her masters.

We recognise that the New Testament church had two categories of leaders - Elders and Deacons. Elders occupied a superior position than the Deacons. Deacons were assistants to the Elders. Church leadership was effective because God provided a number of gifted elders for the church who worked whole heartedly to solving church conflicts if they arose. The qualifications for church leadership were clearly spelt out in the bible and these are seen to sum up a true life character of any Christian. Perhaps there was no visible disagreements between the leaders and those who were led because the duties and obligations of each of them where clearly spelt out. And each of these groups tried as much as they could to live to the expectations. Strictness in appointment of leaders was clear to ensure that the church got leaders who would move it to spiritual fulfillment.

It is true that God is the source of leadership but he uses human beings to identify those who can lead His people. It is therefore clear that in choosing church leaders the Holy Spirit is at work and when she's followed by the people concerned with choice of church leaders; the best leaders are elected. When the church's superior leaders became very busy as there were many activities in the early church; Deacons were appointed to help in Jesus' ministry.

We have surveyed the biblical teaching about the origin, qualifications and functions of deaconate, and have found that it is an important spiritual office in the church of Christ. The deacon serves to assist the elder by administering the church's material property, and in this office expresses God's concern for the needy. We see that while the deaconate is an auxiliary office, it is nonetheless of great importance to the wellbeing of the church and her ministry.
Though the church has gone through many changes and perhaps the conditions in which today’s church is in may be different from those of the New Testament church, it is only fruitful for the current church to adhere to the church leadership principles as laid in the bible. Modification of such principles for purposes of suiting the changing times will certainly bring about church transformation. But when such modifications are made to suit the present times regardless of the written word, conflicts are bound to occur. The genesis of leadership conflicts in church due to modifications of leadership to suit the times through the centuries and has spilled over to the present church is the concern of the next chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE ROOT CAUSES OF CHURCH LEADERSHIP CRISSES:

3.1 INTRODUCTION:

Conflicts in church leadership are not a new phenomenon to today's church. Once the church deviated from the biblical principles of church governance as seen above, conflicts emerged in the church. The church was brought to Africa and Uganda in particular with those conflicts embedded in them. Moreover Christianity was planted in Uganda on divisive grounds, with divided missionaries, competing for converts. The missionaries created a very big gap between themselves and those who received the message. The recipients were called lay Christians; to distinguish them from those who preached and brought the Word. Christians came to believe that the clergy were a special class of Christian hierarchy than them, the lay Christians.

3.2 WHERE THE CONFLICT BEGAN - RELIGIOUS HIERARCHIES:

What produced such anti-biblical ministry concepts as the separation of clergy and laity? We have to go back to the early church to find the roots of today’s conflict over leadership roles.

The early church was organized in a way that let all members of each congregation play an active role in the church’s life. Within her membership, the early church had a variety of people with different spiritual gifts that were profitable to the entire local body of believers. The two main areas of gift-function were those Christians who guided and labored in the word of God, and those who participated in the various congregational ministries of 1 Corinthians 12:4-11 and Romans 12:3-8. These portions of scripture enumerated the various congregational ministries in the church. Though
these verses do not provide the complete list of ministries; they give us a good idea of the diversity of the gifted congregational ministries."

Many members of the early church operated in these different ministries of the spirit, but they did not necessarily have names or titles. The early church apparently considered the actual work of ministry to be more important than an office. Prophesying to the edification of the church or showing mercy to the weak members of the congregation must have produced more true growth than the creation of titled positions for every ministry function.

Today unfortunately the church has lost much of the spontaneous God-given power of the Holy Spirit in her daily walk. She depends more on the strength and power that goes with a titled position, rather than experiencing the obvious power of the God's spirit, who needs no long introductions or apologies for his work. The work was more important than the rank, and the early church put her emphasis on the function of the saints of God, rather than on their official position.

When it was necessary to create a position, the early church chose out from among her members those who already manifested the wisdom, character and anointing of the Lord upon their lives. One such example was the selection of deacons in Acts 6:3, as already looked at before. In this way, the early apostles underscored the principle that it is the man who sanctifies the office, not the office that sanctifies the man. As the church grew however, men with ungodly character were appointed to spiritual offices, coming with selfish motives, which resulted into misuse of these offices. There developed conflict between those Christians who wanted a reversion to the previous scriptural appointment of men to spiritual offices with those who already held the offices and were personally benefiting from them. The church today would do well to choose out from among her members those who are already functioning in the area of their calling; of course considering the biblical principle that members of the church exist as fellow brethren and sisters and are equal in importance. When the church does not do this, as it has always neglected,

she may be "laying hands on empty heads", and expecting "the dove that has no wings to fly".

3.3 CHURCH LEADERSHIP DURING THE TIME OF THE "CHURCH FATHERS":

The writing of the church fathers was clear on the subject of ruling and governing in the church. They held firmly to the biblical principles as looked at initially. Thus, they held that the ability to function was always founded upon present service and ability, rather than mere rank or position. The early church fathers did not desire to "fill position" in the church just for its own sake. Today, the church needs to restore this same attitude and appoint men with "heartfelt devotedness" to the church rather than those who see church leadership positions as a chance of gaining honour, respect, distinction and prestige in society. Such men have destabilized the church, fuelled conflict as they work to preserve their status quo rather than pave way for advancement of church and its objectives.

Changes in church leadership in the first three centuries:

Within the first three centuries, the early church experienced a drastic change in its governmental structure. This was to have lasting dangerous effects on its leadership. The church has never yet entirely retrieved herself from its dregs.

The first century church as already seen had basically two offices: Bishops (elders, pastors, overseers or shepherds) and Deacons. Oversight of each local congregation was totally in the hands of the local church elderships, while deacons ministered to the practical needs of the people.
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However, the heart of a deacon (a servant) was required in each bishop, just as we have already noted that the qualities expected of bishop/elders were the same as those of deacon. Polycarp of Smyrna (who wrote c.1.lco-117) held that the first duty of the bishops was compassion and mercy, visiting all those with infirmities. 84

In the second century, a third office began to emerge in the church. This was a group of local elders; whose office was created in addition to the deacons and bishops (the local pastors). In this structure, unfortunately, the group of local leaders had total power over the one man in the bishop's office. This did have an advantage, however, the bishop was taken or elevated to the position of "senior pastor" who still remained the one man and received the mantle of leadership, and his other elders recognized this, but he could not use this position to domineer his fellow elders."

It was James, the bishop/pastor of the local church at Jerusalem who rose up and applied the Old Testament to the issue of circumcising Gentiles during the Apostolic Conference in Acts 15. In practical terms, James was the one man who "steered the bus", but he consulted with his fellow team leaders on how to reach their goal. This shows how the biblical principle of leadership plurality was highly used though on the other hand illustrates how God appoints one man among the local church elders to be "first among equals" not to dominate, but to receive a specific mantle of anointed direction. This is what is typical with church of Uganda's leadership structure; where the Archbishop occupies a position of “first among equals” though he does not dominate the diocesan bishops.

By the third century, however, the office of the bishop or senior elder in the local congregation was taken to an extreme. Bishops of various local churches began to exercise total authority over local elders and deacons. There was a clear development of a special class of Christians who led the church; with a boss at the top and his juniors. The majority of Christians were completely left out of leadership and there would be ministry functions in the church were greatly suppressed. These were looked at as lay. The distinction of church members between laity and clergy and how it has breeded church conflict will be looked at in the next sub topic.
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However, this domination by one man did not only suppress the functions of "lay Christians" but resulted in spiritually suppressing the functions of the deacons in the serving of the local church. Gradually certain bishops received extended power over many other local congregations. And finally the office of the local bishop was taken to an un biblical extreme in its authority over many elders and their local churches. Almost total power resided with the bishop, and not with the local elders as it was originally. With this office magnified, surrounded with a lot of power, authority and influence, it was to become a centre of conflict in church as regards to who was to occupy it. Men began fighting for this office and continue to fight for it. Because of such a development and church of Uganda not being exceptional, has had several conflicts in its leadership over this particular office. The Muhabura diocese crisis under study is a fight over this magnified office.

3.4 REASONS FOR MAGNIFICATION OF THE OFFICE OF THE LOCAL BISHOP:

The church deviated from the original biblical office of bishop/elders and transformed it into something more than what the office was intended for. This was because of the following reasons (adapted from "Frank Domazio, The making of a Leader, p.15).

- The church believed that she could accomplish a greater unity against divisive heresies if she exalted certain strong teachers.
- The church felt that she could more easily stem the tide of immorality and intellectualism by giving more power to one man.
- The church began to use one man from each local assembly to represent them to the bishops of other local assemblies, which gradually led to the exaltation of this one man over the other local elders as the "episcopes par excellence"
- The church began to desire to financially support certain local bishops so that they could give all of their time to ministering to the people, which began to politically separate certain men who desired position and prestige.
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The church began to desire local bishops to perform most of the work of the ministry, because they had the most education, which led to a governmental corps of mostly bishops overseeing education, doctrine, marriages, baptisms, the communion table, the elders, the deacons and even church property and monies.

The church began to look mainly to the bishop's office for all major teaching, and thus the local elders were considered only "teachers" while the bishop was considered as the joint apostle/prophet.

The church therefore developed a hierarchical leadership structure, which was contrary to the biblical form of church governance. The lay Christians were completely discriminated from church management. They were pushed to the receiving end. There developed a monarchical episcopacy. The culmination of this move to give supreme authority to the bishops is illustrated in the way that Ignatius of Antioch referred to the bishop;

_We ought to regard the bishop as the Lord Himself._

Jerome, commenting on Titus 1:5, remarks that the supremacy of a single bishop arose by custom rather than by the Lords' actual appointment", as a means of preventing schisms in the church. It seems most probable that monarchical episcopacy appeared in the local congregations when some gifted individual acquired a permanent chairmanship of the board of presbyter-bishops.

The elders came to be seen or elevated to the status of the ruling body, while the bishops, deacons were the liturgical leaders and administrators employed by them. Others have seen the origins of the later episcopate in the position held by Paul's lieutenants, Timothy and Titus; but these men are never called bishops and we meet them in letters of recall, which make no clear provision for the appointment of successors.
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Consequently, the church fell away from the New Testament pattern. Now bishops were considered as apostles, prophets and evangelists, local elders became pastors and teachers, deacons mainly served the bishops and elders; congregational members were simply "not in the ministry of the Lord". This has continued to breed conflict as congregations have re-awakened and demand for full participation in the leadership and ministry of the church. No wonder congregations in Uganda have on a number of occasions questioned and challenged the candidature of certain bishops imposed on them by the elevated elders - board of elders. This has been particular with Muhabura diocese of Church of Uganda, which will be treated in the next chapters.

3.5 CLERGY - LAITY DISTINCTIONS IN CHURCH:

3.5.1 Introduction:

Tragically, today over emphasis an academic degree has contributed to the pride, hypocrisy and spiritual lifelessness in many of the church's leaders. As we have seen in the bible in the previous chapter, God emphasizes development of his leaders in character, wisdom and piety. God does not put any premium on ignorance but that does not mean that he puts his priority on academic training. Why has so much of the church twisted God's biblical standards into a total opposite of their original image? One reason is the change in our understanding of true biblical leadership. The introduction of the terms "clergy" and "laity" have contributed to this misunderstanding. They have made distinctions among Christians, into the "superior" and "lesser" Christians, which has caused conflicts between the two groups of Christians. Let us look at these leadership concepts. We will examine the definition, background and influence of these two words on church leadership, and more especially how they have been misused to alienate the two groups of Christians from each other.

3.5.2 Definitions and Background of the terms:

In their application to the church of Jesus Christ, the terms "clergy" and "laity" contains seeds of both truth and falsehood. It is true that the New Testament presents
Two general distinctions of ministry. But in doing so, the New Testament never uses the words "clergy" and "laity", or their root meanings.

English word "Clergy" is related to the Greek word "Cleros". It means "a lot or inheritance" for example in 1 Peter 5:3 the elders are exhorted not to Lord it over "the lots" (Greek: ton clerón), which refers to the entire flock of God's people. Nowhere in the New Testament is any form of "cleros" used to designate a separate class of ordained" leaders. Instead, it refers to the "inheritance" (Greek: Cleron) laid up for all the saints (Colossians 1: 12; Acts 26: 18). The saints as a collective whole are conceived of in the New Testament as God's "inheritance". We have utterly perverted and turned upside down the New Testament teaching by using the term "clergy" to refer to a special elite group of church leaders.89 The New Testament presents all Christians as ministers in the sense that all have definite ministries to perform in the body of Christ. The New Testament does designate two different general functions in the church, which are; governmental and congregational. However, this general distinction is never made in-an attitude of complete superiority of one over the other, as has been the general understanding of clergy being superior to laity.

The relationship between the governmental and congregational ministries is similar to the biblical relationship of husband to his wife. The husband and wife are equal as persons, but do differ in their specific function or role." Similarly, the governmental and the congregational ministries in the body are equal as persons, but different and unique in the functions that they perform. The terms "Clergy" and "Laity" are misleading because they have come to suggest unbiblical distinctions between Christians in the church. These terms have created a lot of undesired attitudes attached to them and those who hold them.

89 Zens Jon, The Clergy/Laity distinction: Help or a hindrance to the body of Christ? w.w.w.searching together.com/articles/zens/clergy laity/htm / (24, 04.2004)
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Today we generally understand the word "Clergy" to apply to the group of ordained persons in a religion, as distinguished from the word "Laity", or common people. According to Frank Domazio.

*It is interesting, however, to note the source of distinction. The word "Clergy" derives from an Old English word meaning "clerk", which is derived from the ecclesiastical Latin word, "Clericus", which means, "priest". Thus the concept of clergy is historically equivalent to the concept of a pristhood".*

On the cultural background of the word "clerk", the Oxford English Dictionary states thus;

*The original sense (of a clerk) was a man in a religious order... as the scholarship of the Middle Ages was practically limited to the clergy and these performed all the writing, notarial and secretarial work of the time; the name "clerk" came to be equivalent to "scholar" and specially applicable to a notary, secretary, recorder, accountant or penman. The last (i.e. penman) has come to be the ordinary sense, all the others being archaic, historical, formal or contextual.*

The Middle Ages concept of "Clergy as scholars" has carried over to the religious thinking of our day. This association has made people think that Clergy are scholars, and in order to be a member of the clergy, one must be a scholar. But as already seen before under biblical principles of church leadership, the New Testament does not put scholarship before the condition of sainthood or having a shepherd's heart as necessary qualifications for those in the ministry.
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Some important examples from the New Testament will verify this. Even Paul, favorite example of those who support scholarly emphases in the church, because of his, training under the scholar Gamaliel; puts greater emphasis on shepherding, Character and preaching the cross of Jesus Christ than on scholarship in his epistles. It is interesting to note that Paul, a trained and noted scholar of his day, was sent primarily to the Gentiles, an ignorant and unlearned people. On the other hand, Peter, the ignorant, unlearned fisherman, was sent to the Jewish people, the theologians of

Today the church has managed to think that scholars are the best-prepared ministers, and that the best preparation for the ministry is an academic one. Such an over-emphasis has helped to cause several problems. Many take pride in their position as ministers. A theological vocabulary has developed, which is totally inaccessible to the average person. An intellectualism has developed which renders many unable to meet the practical needs of the people of God, and which has even led many to deny the divine authority of Jesus Christ and his word."

3.5.3 PROFESSIONAL CLERGY SYSTEM

Another major cause of the church's unbiblical division between "Clergy" and "Laity" is the professional status the church accords to clergy. The Clergy have been elevated to the status of "professional Christians". The clergy system has fallen into the temptation of professionalism since the middle Ages.

As we have already seen, the concept of "clergy" is equivalent to the concept of a separate priesthood. The word "clergy" is derived form a Latin word, which is a variant of the word "Clerk". This word in turn, comes from the ecclesiastical Latin word "Clericus", which means priest. Both by shared Linguistic background and tradition. Clergy and priesthood are equated.

And since priesthood was considered a "profession" by virtue of the taking of vows to a particular religious order in the middle ages, clergy became a profession. Particularly during the Middle Ages but also throughout church history, the men who
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took the vows of a religious order were called priests; after their training and 'ordination. These vows began to be understood as constituting the making of a profession" for God. The man who wanted to make serious "profession of Christ" became a "priest". Thus priesthood became a profession. Those who made professions of Christ in religious orders made certain vows or commitments to God and to their particular religious groups. In this sense, the members of the religious societies became professionals. All this was done in the name of their underlying religious profession to Jesus Christ.

Those considered to be in the clergy, therefore, were looked upon as "professionals." Those who received a theological and "professional" education were considered to be part of the clergy, or at least, well prepared for a particular denominational ordination.

**Laity:**

This English word is derived ultimately from the Greek "Laos" which means people". In profane Greek "Laos" designated the mass as distinguished from the leaders or rulers of the people, a usage also found in the Septuagint (Isaiah 24:2). But elsewhere for example Exodus 19:4-7; Deuteronomy 7:6-12, "Laos" connotes the election of Israel from among the nations of God's chosen people and special possession.94

This latter is the New Testament emphasis:

"You however, are a chosen race... You who in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God"

*(J Peter 2:9-10). Hence all Christians are "chosen", "predestined", called by a special choice (Ephesians*

---


All in the body of Christ, whether "saints, bishops or deacons" (Philippians 1: 1), are the "people" ("Laos") of God. "People of God" is a title of honour bestowed upon all who believe in Jesus Christ (2 Corinthians 6: 16; 1 Peter 2:9-10).

Egan W. J. states in his article in the New Catholic Encyclopedia that:

Laikos, from which lay, layman and laity are more immediately derived, is not found in the Septuagint or New Testament. 96

3.5.3 Later development of the term "Laity"

Throughout the apostolic period, all Christians were "brethrens". There was no distinction between Laity and Clergy. It was until the third century that these two terms began to be used to designate certain groups of Christians in the church.

"Laity" was generally defined as a body of people outside a particular profession, and most often referred to those not in the clergy. But we have already seen that the clergy were equated to priests and the two were the same priesthood was taken as the only profession at this time.

The word "Lay" still affects our thoughts about the "laity", though it is less commonly used in this context today. Frank Domazio notes:

Lay means uninstructed and unlearned. In the Coverdale translation of the Bible, translated Acts 4: 13 this way: "They saw the boldness of Peter and John and marveled for they were sure they were unlearned and lay people. 67 95 Ibid, p.328
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Is not interesting that the Jewish leaders considered Peter and John, two of the greatest ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ, to be merely "lay" people! Has not the church held this same attitude throughout her history, toward ministers of the simple gospel of Jesus Christ?

_The word "lay" also had the Connotation of "unholy". Thus, in 1609, the Duay Bible translated 1 Samuel 21:4 in this way: "I have no lay breads at hand, but only holy breads._

Whether we like it or not, through the years, the church has considered lay people as uneducated and unholy compared to the Clergy. The terms "Lay brother" and "lay deacon" exemplify this misunderstanding about true ministry. Lay brother" is a man who has taken the habit of a religious order, but is employed mostly in manual labour and is exempt from the studies or choir-duties required of the other members. "Lay deacon" is a man in deacon's orders who devotes only part of his time to religious ministrations while following a secular employment. Thus the term "lay people" implies those who worked in manual labour, who seldom do religious studies, and work for the Lord on a strictly part-time basis. This concept has its roots in Greek Philosophy, which considered man's spirit holy, but his body evil.

_The word 'laity' is also directly related to the Late Latin word 'Laicus', which is a different form of the word 'lake'. One of the main senses of 'lake' is play, sport, fun, glee, tricks and "goings-on". The church has created a striking contrast in using the word 'laity' to refer to those who are involved with the less important or "playful" things of life, while using the word 'clergy' to refer to those who are involved in the more important or "spiritual things of life"._

Has this not been the church's prevalent attitude?
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It is even more interesting to note that the word "lake" is an old form of the word "lac'' meaning a defect, failing, moral delinquency, fault, offense, absence of something, or the condition of being censored. When the word "lac" referred to a limb of the body, it meant a crippled limb; when it referred to a geographical district, It meant a destitute area. The church has also held the attitude that the common, lay people have so many faults and moral weaknesses that what they have to say need only be censored. The attitude has existed that the Laity are crippled limb of the body of Christ, who live their life in a spiritually destitute district. Though many churches are attempting to escape this thinking, it still under lies the attitudes in many churches.

It is in light of the above distinction between the "Laity" and Clergy that raised the status of the clergy over the laity; that leadership conflicts have been inevitable. As the clergy suppresses the laity in major decisions of the church, the laity are trying to regain their equal rights with the clergy in church policies. On many occasions in church of Uganda, the laity have come up to oppose certain decisions taken by clergy. The major leadership roles have been relegated to the clergy. The New Testament emphasizes the importance of all Christians finding and functioning in their different ministries. It is a mistaken concept that a number of church models of government have been used, some of which have deviated from what they truly functioned in the apostolic church.

3.6 MODELS OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT

Church government refers to the structures used by a church or denomination to organise its work or activities. Since examples of church government in the New Testament are meagre and often localized, we should not expect a uniform pattern of church government in scripture.

Traditionally, there have been three main models of church government, these are:

- Episcopal model
- Presbyterian model
- Congregational model
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One of the main reasons for the diversity in church government is the fact that the Bible does not offer a single, definitive structure or model for church government. Among the things it does cover are: the offices of apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor and teacher; the role of bishops and deacons and the role of elders. It also offers a set of criteria by which we can measure leaders' qualifications and character. We might also look to early church history for examples of church government, but these should not be taken as ideals. Each model has its good and bad points.

However, each type of church government can work effectively if Jesus is acknowledged by all to be the head of his church (Colossians 1: 18). Conversely, no type of church government will ever be workable if the leadership and congregation do not affirm Jesus as the head.

3.6.1. EPISCOPAL MODEL OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT

The Episcopal model of church government is centralized in structure and hierarchical in ministry. This pattern finds its biblical model in Paul's appeal to apostolic authority and the orderly appointment of formal leaders in the churches.

The word "episcopal" is derived from the Greek word 'episkopos' (overseer). It denotes a system of church government in which a bishop possesses the chief ecclesiastical authority. Emphasis is given to the office to which leaders are appointed or elected. Basically, a bishop or archbishop, oversees the churches, appoints pastors, sets policy, and guides the vision of the local congregations. As we have already noted in the previous chapter; the early churches had always a plurality of men over one local church. And these were called elders. This Pattern was maintained without any difference for perhaps the first 200 or 300 years. 101

Later developments show that people had preference for one of the elders to take precedence and be the "president". This elder eventually became known with the title

bishop”. The rest of the elders were taken to be under him. This is what led to the formation of the episcopal form of government - where one man has authority over a number of churches. The supreme power of the church is vested in a distinct and 'superior order of church officers called Bishops. The biblical basis for this model is the Jerusalem model of leadership, and the leadership of the apostles especially Peter, John, and James. 102

This model of church government continues to be used by Anglicans and so is what is practiced in church of Uganda. The model has been successful in helping groups maintain a consistent expression of faith over a long period of time, but it has also been vulnerable to the excesses of corrupt individuals; which has always bred conflict in church.

This model has also made the "lay" Christians to act as observers in most of the church activities and policies. They have been left on the recipient end and this type of church government also can leave little freedom for the local pastor or congregation to be led by the Holy Spirit.

3.6.2 PRESBYTERIAN MODEL OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT

This is where; the church is governed by Presbyters (elders), usually elected by the people of a congregation or a group of congregations.

From the Greek "Presbuteros" for elder, means the local church is governed by a small group of elders (overseers), who are responsible for all decisions related to the functioning of the church. All decisions regarding church policy are placed in the hands of selected group of elders called "the presbytery". 103

Traditionally, this model of church government came out of the reformation of Martin Luther. The Presbyterian and Reformed churches use it. This model provides a plurality of men who rule over a plurality of churches. 104
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The presbytery rules over the local pastor who in turn rules over the congregation. Sometimes this can place the God-appointed leader, the pastor, under the authority of those he is supposed to lead. These people who constitute the presbytery are teaching and ruling elders, all possessing equal powers, without any superiority among them either in office or in order.

For biblical support, this model points to the plurality of ministers in the New Testament (1 Corinthians 12:28), and the use of the word "elder" in the bible. This concept of church government is traced back to the Old Testament synagogue, which was governed, by a group of elders. Because the New Testament church used the same form of organisation, John Calvin considered their example to be the proper form of church government. The Presbyterian system often leaves a considerable distance between lay people in local congregations and those who make decisions.

3.6.3 CONGREGATIONAL MODEL OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT

The congregational mode of government calls for government by the entire membership of the church. It means that the body of believers constituting the local church (the congregation) govern themselves through some form of democratic process. This model highlights the autonomy of the local church, free of external controls or a centralised government. Leaders are chosen by the membership. Co-operation with other congregations is voluntary. The biblical precedence for this model is the self-governing churches established by Paul.

The congregational model of church government emerged as a reaction against both the Queen of England's (Elizabeth I) desire to enforce uniformity within the church of England and those Puritans who wanted to see the national church reorganized on Presbyterian rather than Episcopalian lines.

105 Ibid., p.20
107 Ibid., p.24
These new separatists (later known as Congregationalists) were influenced by Robert Bravne, who had in 1582, published his Congregationalist principles. He rejected the concept of the state church in favour of the "gathered church" principle, that is the idea that the church should consist only of those who have responded to the call of Christ and who have covenanted together to live as his disciples. 108 As a result the local church should be independent and not subject to bishops. Authority and power, including the right to ordain, is not vested in elders, but is placed in the hands of the whole church. 109

This model of government gained popularism in America, where some Congregationalists fled the wrath of Queen Elizabeth I. It therefore came to be known as an American invention that appeals to our sense of democracy. 110
The congregation votes on matters of church policy, how to spend money, and hiring a pastor. Problems can occur when the Pastor is not allowed to lead under the direction of the Holy Spirit and sometimes becomes nothing more than a hireling.

In congregational churches, each person gets one vote; however long the period you have stayed in the church. It has the fallacy of having a person who is saved yesterday, absolutely new in the faith, have one equal vote in matters of the church with somebody who have walked with God for fifty years. Such a person can even be voted for a leadership post in the church yet one of the prequalification for eldership in the New Testament church was that one should not be a new convert.

As an expression of their freedom from the bondage of tradition, Congregationalists have set themselves against credal tests for church membership. This tolerance has sometimes been strength but it has also left many Congregationalists vulnerable to different theological variations. Although it is the most "democratic" - some call it Christocentric - form of church government, it has also facilitated considerable schism and divisiveness.
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CONCLUSION

It is therefore, clear that the conflicts in today's church over leadership is not a new phenomenon neither should it be something that Christians should be afraid of rather once a leadership problem does occur, Christians should earnestly and soberly design solutions for it. In the early centuries of the church, these church leadership positions became clearly demarcated stipulating that there are some leaders who are more superior to others. This meant that there are some church leaders who were to have more powers than others. This brought about subordination in church leadership; and a bureaucratic system, which has been developed creating leadership problems for the church. In such developments taking place in the church, the laity were clearly left out in major decision making. Their role in the church was to take on what the clergy had agreed upon. The clergy/church leaders no longer existed as servants of the church and its members but her master. Church leaders therefore became more dignified members of the Christian church. With such dignity attached to church leadership positions; Christians began struggling to see themselves in such positions. The trend has never stopped and perhaps will continue to exist; and this has swept through the entire church. Church of Uganda has not been an exception. In Muhabura diocese, Christians are fighting for such dignified offices because the importance attached to such office is now secular in that church leaders are more of masters than servants of the church. Because through the centuries the clergy have been dignified over the laity, the lay Christians are always behind them even in times they may be wrong. And we shall find this apparent in chapter five of this study.

The church in its attempt to effectively have strong institutions and consolidate them for furthering spiritual growth has used various models in administration.

All these different forms or models of church government have been, and still are, warmly contended for among professing Christians. But though men/women entertain various views of this subject, it is still conducive evidence that God has not appointed some particular and definite form of church government, nor yet that the said form is not clearly revealed to us in the scriptures. To admit this however, is to concede the infidel claim at once that God has instituted and revealed nothing to us in the bible. For what subject can be named about which fallible men do not differ in their opinions? None, not one.
Attempt to follow strictly one model of church government has been disastrous for several churches as some sections of members of the church have seen themselves to be having little powers in the church as well as raising several complaints of others overshadowing their ministries. And this has been apparent in church of Uganda where conflicts in leadership have come as a result of struggle between Christians who favour congregational authority and those who favour Episcopalian authority as we shall see in chapter five of this study. For effective church leadership however, churches should endeavour to strike a balance between those three models of government. This is what will bring harmony in church leadership and allow each member of the church to exercise his/her ministry without another overshadowing his/her interests in the church.
CHAPTER FOUR

BACKGROUND OF MUHABURA DIOCESE

4.1 GEOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

Muhabura diocese covers the entire Kisoro district. It is one of the 31 dioceses of the province of the church of Uganda. The diocese is located in the extreme southwestern part of Uganda. It borders with the Democratic republic of Congo (DRC) to the West and Rwanda to the South.

To the East of the diocese is Chuya bamboo forest that borders with Rubanda County (in Kabale district). To the North is the Bwindi impenetrable forest National park, a gorilla sanctuary; which borders with Kinkizi County in Kanungu district. Gahinga and Sabyinyo Mountains have been turned into national parks for these rare mountain Gorillas since 1992.

The diocese covers a land area of 700 sq. kilometres with a population of about 250,000 people. The area is densely populated with over 301 people per sq. kilometre. The diocese/district is a mountainous region with the flat areas interspersed among volcanic hills and lakes. The diocese is remote and has its headquarters in Kisoro town, a distance of approximately 510 kilometres from Kampala city. Due to volcanicity, the longest middle part of the area lacks water as it is largely covered with volcanic rocks. In view of this, water is a real problem to the people in this area.

Within this restricted area, there are astonishing varieties of geographical and geological phenomena. The whole area varies in altitude from about 6000 feet above sea level around Lake Mutanda to over 13000 feet in the extinct Birunga volcanoes

1Christian community service department, Diocese of Muhabura five-year development plan, 1990, p. 2
2Ibid., p. 2
3Church of Uganda, Diocese of Muhubura, and five-year development plan III, 2001, p. 1.
Bordering DRC and Rwanda, commonly known as Mufumbira Mountains. The highest of these is Muhabura; where the diocese derives its name; rises to 13500 feet.

Three sub counties of Nyabibusize, Chahi, and Nyakabande are relatively flat where as the other three subcounties of Busanza, Bukimbiri and Nyabwishenge are hilly. In hilly areas, communication is a real problem. Flat areas have volcanic soils and are productive except that the population density is high. The hilly areas are not very productive.

As already seen, the whole area has varied geological structures with volcanic rocks covering most of the water less open area, some of the cone-shaped hills in the area have craters with Volcanicity making part of its hill-side fertile soils. The waterless low-lying areas below Mufumbira mountains comprises open pasture land stretching from Nyakabande to Bunagana interspersed by its beautiful lakes of Muhehe and Mutanda to the north, Kayumbu and Chahefi to the south bordering Rwanda. Both Agriculture and extensive pastoralism have been practised in this region."

The area has two major rainy seasons in a year - March to May and September to December with heaviest rainfall during April and November. The remaining months are usually moderately dry and at times windy and dusty especially between July and August. The rainy seasons mark the time of planting crops and dry seasons harvest time. The whole diocese today is intensively cultivated and due to lack of water over the open stretch of land, there is little opportunity for cattle keeping on a large scale."

4.2 ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

The entire diocese is more than 90% rural. The economy is largely based on subsistence farming. For a long time, Bahutu have largely been involved in cultivation, while the Batutsi have been cattle keepers and the Batwa depended heavily on hunting. However with the present population increase and economic

4 Ibid., p. 6
5 Ibid., p.6
6 Christian service department, Diocese of Muhabura, Five year development plan 1990, p. 3.
7 Church of Uganda, Diocese of Muhabura, Five year development plan III 2001, p. 4
Changes, cattle keeping and hunting have diminished to the extent that all the three ethnic groups are concentrating on cultivation to earn a living.

The main food crops grown are sorghum, beans, peas, sweet and Irish potatoes, bananas, wheat, millet, maize and vegetables especially cabbages and tomatoes. Cash crop growing has been done on a small scale in the hilly eastern and northern parts of the area. The cash crops include coffee and tobacco; wheat on the other hand is grown on the high areas of Bihunge hills to the east along the Chuya forest and on the slopes of Mount Muhubura and Mugahinga.

There are limited numbers of animals being kept, mainly cattle, goats and sheep. On average, a homestead has about five goats or sheep and very few cows scattered here the forests of Chuya and Mugahinga provide bamboo material for building and making of granaries, baskets and sieves. On the other hand, the forest of yabwishenye provides timber for shutters and furniture and the surplus are usually sold in Kabale town and some is exported to the neighbouring Rwanda. Pottery has also been remarkable in the diocese especially around Cyibumba in Nyakabande and Gihuranda in Busanza where there is good clay. Brick making is now on the increase in the area due to high demand for the same in Kisoro town.

Before Amin's regime, in the sixties and early 70s, mining companies operated in the area, providing employment to the people. Wolfram mines existed at Kirwa, Mutolere and Bahati; tin at Birunga, alluvial gold in Nyabwishenye, and limestone quarries usually known as "chalk" in Busanza. Since Amin chased the Indian business community out of Uganda in 1972, all the mines fell into disuse and the mining industry in the area has collapsed. However, the known resources in the diocese include: Lakes Mutanda, Muhehe, Chahafi and Kayumbu; Bwindi forest; Bwindi and Mugahinga game reserves the home of mountain gorillas; as well as the mineral deposits mentioned above.

8Ibid., p. 54.
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4.3 KISORO TOWN

This is the biggest town in the district/diocese. Kisoro town is the administrative centre of the whole diocese. District administrative offices and diocesan headquarters are situated in this town. Most of the marketing transactions between peasants and traders are done here. However the commercial activities are just increasing but exchange is mainly of excess foodstuffs to Kabale and Rwanda markets.

4.4 INFRASTRUCTURE

Muhabura diocese is a mountainous diocese with extremely poor road network. Most of the roads are seasonal with the exception of Kisoro - Kabale, Kisoro - Chanika/Rwanda road, and Kisoro – Bunagana/DRC road; which are murram roads in fairly good state. The rest of the roads become impassable when it rains especially in the swampy areas where temporary/simple bridges tend to be swept away.

The diocese has Bafumbira people with 3 ethnic tribes; these are Bahutu, Batutsi and Batwa. Bahutu are the majority forming almost 3/4 of the diocese population. They are also historically known as cultivators. The Batwa are the minority and were known as hunters while the Batutsi were known as cattle keepers. All these people's past way of life has changed drastically in response to economic changes in the country. It is now difficult to identify any of the ethnic groups by their way of life except the marginalized Batwa who seem not to have changed much. The Batwa are despised and have no land rights, they are common beggars in Kisoro town.

Bafumbira are sometimes called Banyarwanda (Rwandese) due to the language they speak that is much similar to Runyarwanda - the language of the Rwandese. The oldest Bafumbira would prefer to identify themselves as Rwandese because it was the colonialists who transferred Kisoro district from Rwanda territory to Uganda. They

12 Ibid. p.5 13 Ibid., p. 3.
However affirm to be Bafumbira because they do not want to be mistaken and miss take part in Uganda national cake sharing".

There are eight clans found among Bafumbira, a case repeated elsewhere in Kigezi among Bakiga and Bahororo. They live side-by-side intermixed as clanic villages and unevenly spread throughout the whole area. Every clan has a totem, which unites several sub-clans as sharing one ancestry. Inspite of these strong ties among the people of the same clans, these clans do not live in isolation. Furthermore apart from have a feeling of oneness. The eight clans are Bazigaba, Bagahe, Bagesera, Basigi, Bagiri, Bagara, Barihira, and Bangura".

4.6 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

(a) Bafumbira Traditional beliefs
From time immemorial, Bafumbira had a supreme God who was known by different names like Imaana, Nyagasami and Rurema. All these names refer to God's attributes of creating, providing and presence. Besides worshipping the Supreme Being and creator; the Bafumbira venerated the "Imandwa", "Biheko" and 'Nyabingi'; the venerated divinities of the land. These divinities had their King known as Ryanombe. Therefore, before and even after the advent of Christianity in Bufumbira, the people adhered to their traditional beliefs".

This traditional religion permeated the Bafumbira thorough that when Christianity was preached, African traditional religion was a janus. Some people regarded Christian rituals as merely a European version of their own traditional religious ceremonies and therefore, saw no reason to abandon their own traditional rituals in order to embrace those of Europeans. This traditional religion was a big force against the spread of the gospel in Bufumbira.
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(b) Coming of Christianity to Bufumbira.

First missionaries arrived in this area in 1912. In this year Rev. H. B. Lewin, the rural dean of Ankole with Rev. Grace who was the Headmaster of Mbarara High School, both CMS members, made a reconnaissance survey of their mission field in Kigezi. They talked to local chiefs in the area, preached to them and persuaded them to allow church teachers to be posted in their areas.

At the time was Nyindo who ruled Bufumbira from his court at Mabungo in Nyarusiza Sub-county. Nyindo was however under the supervision of a Muslim Muganda a British colonial agent whose name was AbdullaNamunye. This supervision was greatly resented by Nyindo who could not imagine himself, a representative of 'Mwami' of Rwanda being supervised by a despised person.

The CMS missionaries in company of a Munyankole lay reader, Yoweri Buningwine and Ntamwete their interpreter in Bufumbira talked to the Bufumbira chief, Nyindo, convincing him to accept the posting of teachers to his area. The teachers could teach the chief and his subjects- 'Gusoma'-the art of reading and writing as well as the gospel truth. On finding out that Buningwine, a Muhima and Ntamwete, a Mututsi: were his kinsmen; Nyindo readily accepted the offer and suggested that Buningwine should be sent to Bufumbira as the first teacher; a request which was not granted. This was because Buningwine was the only Munyankole lay reader who was to be in charge of the college of church teachers at Mbarara. Lewin however promised someone else as soon as he returned to Mbarara.

In 1913, Zakariya Balaba, a Muganda catechist was posted to Bufumbira as the first Anglican missionary church teacher in Bufumbira. He resided at Kisoro and his main achievement was getting a site for the Anglican Church in Bufumbira at Seseme, which later became the centre for missionary work in the whole area.

---
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After the First World War in 1919, Rev. H.B. Lewin, the Rural Dean of Mbarara again posted other Banyankole evangelists to Bufumbira area. Among these was Eriya Magusyo, the first actual church teacher at Seseme responsible for Bufumbira County.

The introduction of the Anglican Church in Bufumbira was difficult because the natives could not differentiate the Anglican Christianity brought by these Banyankole from their English colonialism. The Bafumbiria were also reluctant to get converted in fear of the reprisals of the divinities, which could not be happy with the conversion. Further more, ‘Gusoma’, which was done in Luganda and Swahili, made the new religion more foreign. Christianity was viewed as the belief that intended to draw them away from their God. So though the chiefs co-operated, they did so out of fear; they were not in for the new religion whole-heartedly.

In 1921, the C.M.S Rwanda mission sent missionaries to Kigezi. This was to be a turning point in mission work in Kigezi including Bufumbira. The two missionaries were Doctor Sharp and Stanley Smith who arrived in 1921.

The missionary activity in Bufumbira was greatly motivated by the need of the C.M. S foreigners to learn Banyarwanda traditions and language, because Sharp and Stanley had their eyes fixed beyond the borders of Uganda, into Rwanda; where their hopes lay for their future missionary field. Hence the first missionary activities of Rwanda were directed towards Bufumbira as a springboard to Rwanda”.

On 24th September 1922, the first 27 Bafumbira converts were baptised by Bishop J.J. Willis of the Diocese of Uganda; at Seseme, after a six months vigorous catechism and reading course. Worship was at first non-Liturgical and informal as there were no vernacular Liturgical books - these were not available in Kinyarwanda, the language of Bufumbira. New Testament Bible was first translated into Kinyarwanda in 1931. The books were however few and only the leader could possess one while the rest followed by listening and repeating.
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By 1930, the C.M. S had established itself firmly at Rugarama and was controlling all the Anglican Church in the district from Kabale. By 1934, the missionaries had erected a church building of stone at Seseme Hill and a two-roomed rest house. This lent to the site of Seseme the status of the centre of Anglican Church work in Bufumbira, which has remained so up to this day.

In 1935, there was a mission to Bufumbira - a team of nine men and two women from Rwanda and two from Kampala arrived in Kabale and moved to Kisoro. Preaching began on 22\textsuperscript{nd} September 1935 at Seseme and ended on 30\textsuperscript{th} of the same month. As a result, there was a marked spiritual renewal and general progress in all spheres of the church life in the years 1935 - 1945 and by 1944, 1000 Bafumbira had been baptised at Seseme church\textsuperscript{27}.

By 1961, Bufumbira had two parishes of Seseme and Iryaruvumba. Seseme had become a rural Deanery. In 1967, Kigezi diocese was created from Ankole-Kigezi with the Rt. Rev. R. Lyth as its Bishop. It was not until 1974 that Bufumbira got its first Archdeacon, Rev. Canon K. Rwamfizi. During the period 1934 - 1974, there were two key church workers who served the church at Seseme. These were the Late Rev. Z. Rwenduru and Rev. A. Gihanga”.

(c) **Formation of Muhabura diocese**

Historically the Diocese of Muhabura, which is under study, was part of Kigezi diocese, which is 50 miles away from Muhabura diocese. This new diocese was inaugurated on 14th of January 1990 with Rt. Rev. Shalita as its first Bishop and Rev. Canon Wilson Baganizi as its first Diocesan Administrator whereas the Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja worked as diocesan youth worker. The diocese has three Archdeaconries of Kabindi, Iryaruvumba and Gisorora. It has 37 parishes and 130 congregational churches with 90,000 adherents”.

\textsuperscript{26} Christian service department Diocese of Muhabura, Op.cit., p. 5.

\textsuperscript{27} Bernard Tusiime, Op.cit., p. 14


\textsuperscript{29} Cranium Mugisha (2004), Impact of leadership wrangles in Muhabura Diocese, (B.A Thesis, Uganda Christian University, Mukono, p. 1.)
The diocese of Muhabura was created due to a number long standing circumstances. These included the following among others; firstly, the distance from Kabale to Kisoro was too long for the clergy to move to the then diocesan offices 10 Kabale. Secondly, there exist cultural differences between the Bafumbira in Kisoro and Bakiga in Kigezi. The language of communication during worship was Rukiga which was hardly understood by the Bafumbira in Kisoro. Thirdly, Kisoro was economically viable with enough resources to enable it run a diocese on its own. It could maintain the bishop and cater for its clergy sufficiently. Lastly, Kisoro had enough educated and experienced clergy who could run the diocese as well as providing it with good leadership. For instance, there was Rev. Dr Baganizi, Rev. Canon Shalita, the late Rev. canon Dr Rutiba etc. all of which were the very instrumental persons in former Ankole-Kigezi diocese. These in addition to other influential lay people in Kisoro like Dr Philemon Mateke were convincing to make Muhabura diocese a separated and independent diocese.

The first bishop of Muhabura diocese, the Rev. Ernest Shalita worked for 12 years and retired on the 31st December 2001 as required by the provincial constitution, which stipulates that a bishop should retire at the age of 65 years of age. It is however said that during his election as bishop, a good number of clergy did not want him as the bishop though they managed to resolve the matter amicably. It is also said that many of the people wanted the Rev. Canon Wilson Baganizi, others Rev Barham while others wanted the Rev. Ernest Shalita, the retired bishop. The election and announcement of Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja as the second bishop of Muhabura diocese generated resentment among Christians, which eventually led to violence and resistance. The diocese has found itself in a leadership crisis since the official announcement of the bishop-elect by the House of Bishops on 5th September 2001.

This research seeks to find out the causes of this leadership crisis 10 Muhabura dioceses and the way forward for the diocese; which all will be the concern of the next three chapters of this book.
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CONCLUSION

Muhabura diocese is isolated geographically from other dioceses in that what goes on there is not easily influenced by other dioceses. Its proximity to Rwanda; allows cordial relationship between the Bafumbira Christians and those in Rwanda. It is perhaps due to this proximity that when the conflict occurred in Muhabura, Muhabura top clergymen ran to Rwanda to present their case instead of allowing church of Uganda to solve the case. Due to poor transport, transfer of information is hard. Newspapers are received in the area as late as 5.00 p.m. This means, therefore, that Christians were liable to misinformation by a few on decisions of provincial leadership; which probably had a big bearing on the crisis. Indeed those Christians in the remote parts of Muhabura diocese behaved the way they did during the conflict perhaps due to unrealistic rumours about what was going on in the diocese. Because of its poverty, the diocese attracted a number of donors and many diocesan projects were well funded by donor agencies. The diocese had accumulated a lot of wealth and many Christians were benefiting from them. They would, therefore, be very concerned with the new leadership of the diocese because the success of the new leadership would have a big bearing on their standards of living. It is also true that they would be concerned to see that they get a good bishop who would safeguard what had been achieved. Christians are so poor that they are liable to exploitation by self-seekers. Due to poverty Christians would blindly accept gifts and support such people with ill-intensions and hence broaden the conflict in the diocese. It is no wonder that some Christians accused each other of supporting particular candidates for material benefits. Due to the two dominant tribes in the area, moreover, with the historical long standing rivalries between them, any small issue in the area can easily divide them up hence leading to quarrels. The sensitivity on tribal inclinations is therefore important to assess whether it has any influence in the ongoing leadership conflict in Muhabura diocese. Therefore, the history, geography, economy and ethnicity of the area some how has had a bearing on the conflict in the diocese.

The formation of Muhabura diocese was good but the Christians were not nurtured in what it meant to be an independent diocese. It seems that the Christians in the diocese
Misconceived the implications of attaining a diocese. They thought it meant total independence to decide what they wished and even though they consulted, their decisions would be paramount. Christians in Muhabura even for 10 years existence as an independent diocese had not conceptualised the role of provincial leadership. Perhaps it is due to this that the conflict was inevitable as analysed in the next two chapters. Certainly we shall be seeing these issues at play in the next chapters.
ORIGINS AND COURSE OF THE MUHABURA DIOCESE CRISIS

5.1 Introduction
The conflict in the diocese of Muhabura was triggered off by the election of Reverend Canon Sebuhinja but had been simmering for some time. This had to do with the succession to Bishop Shalita; who was due for retirement having reached the mandatory age of retirement of bishops of church of Uganda.

According to C. o. U. Constitution, every bishop retires on attaining 65 years of age. The Rt. Rev Shalita became 65 years old at the end of 2001; and duly informed the Archbishop well in time. The crisis in Muhabura diocese stems from the succession dispute to bishopric office, which was to be filled on Bishop Shalita's retirement. Some Christians were in favor of Rev Dr. Baganizi where as others were in support of Rev Canon Sebuhinja. It is this struggle for the highest leadership post in the diocese that has disfigured the whole province of church of Uganda and sharply divided Christians in Muhabura diocese.

5.2 CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT PROPOSALS
It is alleged that bishop Shalita well before his retirement wished the Reverend Canon Sebuhinja to succeed him as bishop. But was afraid of Rev Dr. Baganizi who was a favorite of the majority of Christians in the diocese of Muhabura. Bishop Shalita therefore did all that he could to see that he blocks the Christians' choice in his favor. He therefore proposed three amendments in the constitution to the provincial assembly; which were duly rejected by the provincial assembly.

It was pointed out that through the diocesan council; Bishop Shalita proposed an amendment of the constitution of the province to reduce the retirement age of bishops

1 Provincial constitution of the church of the province of Uganda, p.18.
2 Jackson Sabiti (Rev), Diocesan education Secretary, Diocesan offices, Interviewed on 7th.06. 2004.
from 65 to 60. This idea was rejected at the province. It was alleged that this proposal was intended to block Rev Dr. Baganizi, who had already clocked 60 years of age and would hence have no chance of becoming bishop of Muhabura.

Bishop Shalita again proposed to the assembly that the retirement age for bishops be increased from the age of 65 to 70 years. It was alleged that the proposal was an intention of making himself to stay in office of bishop for more years as he paves way for Rev Canon Sebuhinja to succeed him. Dr. Philemon Mateke, Chairman house of laity, Muhabura diocese and a member of the provincial assembly expressed sadness when commenting on bishop Shalita's proposals;

\[\text{When almost the whole assembly was about to adopt this proposal, bishop Shalita hurriedly said that the proposal of amendment was meant for Muhabura Diocese and not the whole province, yet the members of the whole assembly thought that it would apply to the whole province; we rejected it.}\]

Bishop Shalita also proposed to the diocesan synod that article 9 (d) concerning the powers of the Archbishop in the diocese to be amended; it reads thus;

\[\text{To visit officially any diocese of the province, whether at the invitation of the Bishop or of his own initiative provided that reasonable notice is given.}\]

Rev Emmanuel Mfitumukiza said that the bishop intimidated them saying that if the Archbishop is given such unlimited powers over the bishop(s), meant that the diocesan bishop should have such unlimited powers over all Christians in the diocese; deciding to do whatever he willed and thought was right to him.

Rev E. Mfitumukiza argued that the bishop Shalita's intention was to block the Archbishop and other people outside the diocese from knowing what was taking place

3Philemon Mateke, Chairman of laity, Kisoro District offices, interviewed on 11.06. 2004.
5Emmanuel Mfitumukiza (Rev), Secretary Planning, Muhabura Diocesan offices, interviewed on 9.06 2004.
In the diocese. Bishop Shalita would manipulate everything in the diocese including determining who would succeed him without any interference from the Archbishop. His sharp intimidation to the synod that since the Article was giving unlimited powers to the Archbishop over the bishops meant that the bishops got unlimited powers over the Christians was in an attempt to suppress any kind of resistance that would come from the Christians in Muhabura, by publicly asserting his supremacy over everybody in the diocese”.

Despite these constitutional amendment proposals that irked many of the Christians in Muhabura, they were extremely happy and satisfied with the work and developments that were initiated by Bishop Shalita. Bishop Shalita who majority of Christians described as a humble, man of God and hard working person, were qualities that he exhibited but changed towards the end of his term of office; Canon Muruta, a long serving priest in the diocese said;

_But when Bishop Shalita was retiring, some people say he was becoming dictatorial. He was confident that he would get no opposition._

**5.3 THE DEBATE ON SUCCESSION TO DIOCESAN SEE**

Rev Jackson Sabiiti contended that the crisis had its origins three years before the retirement of the first then bishop of Muhabura diocese. There was a debate among Christians as to who would succeed the retiring Bishop Shalita.

_When the debate about the succession of Muhabura diocese see started, Christians started exchanging views about who would take over after bishop Shalita. The talk of the town, the talk of the streets and every where a Christian would meet another one the only name was Rev Dr. Baganizi"._
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The Christians were however watching the activities of the Bishop Shalita, who had apparently expressed interest in someone they did not like; this was Rev Canon sebuhinja. People would ask Bishop Shalita about who would succeed him as next bishop of Muhabura. Canon Muruta said that when the question was raised to Bishop Shalita, he would respond that all pastors are potential candidates for this office. People however warned bishop Shalita against selecting Rev Canon Sebuhinja, his close associate.

In 1997, the Christians were already warming up to select the next bishop. They however learnt that bishop Shalita was planning to impose someone upon them to be his successor. They protested publicly in the letter they wrote and circulated in Kisoro town and all the parishes of the diocese;

*Three years before retirement of the then first bishop, the Christians wrote an anonymous letter, circulated in Kisoro town saying that there was a plot by the then bishop to plant a successor who was not in their interest.*

They called upon the leadership of the diocese to leave them alone and they choose a bishop of their choice. They castigated the then bishop against interfering with the succession to the see and trying to impose upon them a person they did not like.

According to Rev Jackson Sabiti, the then bishop was outraged by the anonymous letter and instead of taking seriously the contents of the letter, he went to church the following Sunday and condemned those Christians who were spreading malicious propaganda. He in turn castigated them for lack of discipline and moral laxity that was making them raise issues that were defamatory and disrespectful to the bishop. This hurted the Christians the more.

The question of succession to the diocesan see that was raised by Christians to the then retiring bishop was in an attempt to ensure that they get someone who was the kind of person to further the developments of the diocese that had been initiated by bishop Shalita. It was not that they were calling upon the guidance of the then bishop
to point at someone he thought was good for the diocese. The debate on succession to the see was raised in an attempt to express dissatisfaction/disagreement with the choice that bishop Shalita was imposing upon the Christians. In so doing the Christians thought that perhaps bishop Shalita would stop his Sebuhinja project and listen to the voices of the people. But alas, this was a fiasco and instead bishop Shalita intensified his campaigns for Rev canon Sebuhinja as his successor on retirement.

5.4 BISHOP SHALITA'S CAMPAIGNS FOR REV CANON SEBUHINJA

When Dr. Baganizi left Muhabura diocese for another appointment at the provincial headquarters, Bishop Shalita began campaigning indirectly for Rev Canon Sebuhinja. It was alleged that Dr. Baganizi left Muhabura diocese because he was facing silent persecution from the then Bishop. That his development projects that he initiated and ran in the diocese were a threat to bishop Shalita; who feared that the Christians would attribute nothing to him as development. Dr. Baganizi therefore left in a way Christians did not understand.

*When he left Christians almost demonstrated as they all cried. Christians wished that a party be made for his departure from a place he left in love and might, but he left in silence! The diocesan administration played a low profile about his departure.*

It is alleged that immediately Dr. Baganizi left, Bishop Shalita started his campaigns in the whole diocese in favor of Rev Canon Sebuhinja. The bishop tried to mobilize the Christians to gather momes for the impending consecration of the next bishop but Christians refused to donate money before the candidate of their choice was declared. Of course though not officially known people had already seen indicators that Rev Canon Sebuhinja was the bishop's favorite as successor. Despite the Christians resistance to donate money for consecration, bishop Shalita forced his way.

9 Jackson Sabiti (Rev), interviewed on 07.06.2004.
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Bishop Shalita had passed a ruling in all churches of the diocese that there should be no conferences, workshops, fellowships, seminars; to be held before collecting money for the consecration and enthronement of the person whom the house of bishops would elect as bishop of Muhabura diocese. It is alleged that every Christian was to pay five thousand shillings (5000) for this function. Christians were not happy with bishop's Shalita's undue influence to the succession of the see.

It is claimed that soon after; bishop Shalita went public and declared that it was Rev Canon Sebulinja to succeed him as bishop of Muhabura diocese. Dr. Philemon Mateke said that when bishop Shalita went to Iryaruvumba, he asked them;

Do you know who will succeed me? Christians said no; he replied; Sebuhinja stand up that is the one.

The senior church Warden, St. Andrews cathedral Seseme, Wilson Munyangabo told the researcher that when he approached the retiring bishop to advise him on what the Christians thought of his undue influence in the succession question to the office of the diocesan bishop, he is reportedly to have harshly replied;

The one I will choose will be bishop’?

Bishop Shalita is alleged to have said everywhere he went for visits in the diocese that "whoever is not my choice whether he gets 100% votes will not be the next bishop, whether you Christians give money or not, it is my candidate that will be consecrated bishop ..,13 These utterances put Christians to negative sentiments to bishop Shalita. When Bishop Shalita started his tour in all churches to bid farewell to Christians this was the sole message that he carried. Whenever Christians could ask him to be impartial in this issue, he could even refuse their food and refreshments organized for him”.

11Augustine Ntibarikure, interviewed on 12.06.2004.
12 Wilson Munyangabo, church warden, Kisoro High School, interviewed on 8.06.2004
13 Augustine Ntibarikure, interviewed on 12.06.2004
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Indeed long before the real nominations and electoral process of the bishop elect of Muhabura diocese, the retiring bishop had worked much to disorganize the diocese. with due respect to their bishop, who had served them well for 12 years, pioneered the inauguration of the diocese; championed developments in the diocese, the Christians vehemently resented his influence over the succession question to the diocesan see. Even with less than 3 years to retirement, they wished, their former diocesan secretary the Rev Dr. Baganizi to be the next bishop,

5. **REV DR. BAGANIZI "THE CHRISTIANS' CHOICE".**

Rev Dr. Baganizi had been diocesan secretary in Kigezi diocese and retained the same position for six years in the new Muhabura diocese. All Christians the researcher talked to including those who preferred Rev Canon Sebuhinja to be the next bishop described Rev Dr. Baganizi as a very developmental

During his period as diocesan secretary in Kigezi diocese, was among the key players who fought for the creation and inauguration of Muhabura diocese. It was reported that Dr. Baganizi was at the forefront in organizing the enthronement and consecration of the new Muhabura diocese and its first bishop. In fact some people expected him to be their first bishop.

He then became diocesan secretary of Muhabura where he initiated so many developments. It is believed that all the fulfilled and unfulfilled developments in the diocese were plans of his time. Rev Dr. Baganizi had worked for the diocese when in its infant stages and the Christians could easily see what he initiated. Though he left the diocese, his nostalgia was still high among Muhabura Christians and no wonder when there was need for election of the next bishop; the Christians' choice was Rev Dr. Baganizi;

*He is a developmental man; all these buildings that you see were built by Rev Dr. Baganizi.*

\[15\] Wilson Munyangabo, interviewed on 8.06.2004.
Despite of his advanced age for the office, still Christians wanted him to be bishop. Christians wanted someone who would uphold and maintain bishop Shalita's initiatives.

Rev David Byigero commented;

We need someone who is development oriented, one who can continue with development initiatives of bishop Shalita; that can only be Dr. Baganizi because we have so far seen him work well as our diocesan secretary’?

5.1 Why Muhabura Christians like Rev Dr. Baganizi

Among the reasons that the Christians identified for Dr. Baganizi as their choice as bishop included the following.

(i) All the constructions at the diocesan offices were planned for and built by diocesan secretary. He constructed the bishop's house, guesthouse and diocesan offices as well as Rutaka health center in Iryaruvumba.

(ii) He is a kind person to the sick, to the needy and all those persons who needed his attention. Christians needed to have him in their home. "Whenever he could meet a person irrespective of age, sex or creed, Dr. Baganizi was bound to stop and greet him or her", one Christian commented.

(iii) He is visionary and hardworking with an independent mind. Bishop Shalita asserted that;

Dr. Baganizi is hardworking and a good administrator who has worked in different positions’?

16 David Byigero (Rev), chaplain, Rwaramba S.S.S, interviewed on 10.06.2004.
(iv) He is very influential with many contacts in and outside Uganda. He would be able to convince many donors to finance the diocese's development projects.

(v) He has had wide experience in church leadership. He even served as provincial secretary of church of Uganda during the time of Archbishop Wani.

(vi) His wife has good qualities of a pastor's wife. The wife served very well as a mothers' Union worker before they transferred to the provincial headquarters. Christians wanted her back to be patron of the activities of women in the diocese. Rev David Byigero described Mrs. Baganizi as very decent and elite.

(vii) Christians said that Dr. Baganizi is a pastor. During his time at the diocese, he would make pastoral visits and socialize with Christians. Christians wanted a person like him who was "down to the people". He and his wife are well coming to all Christians. His home welcomes all Christians. Both were described as social people. Mrs. Baganizi was described as a wife who is well organized and one who fears God. The Christians knew them well since they had tasted their experience when the two worked in Muhabura diocese. As a manifestation of Rev Dr. Baganizi's capability as bishop and the Christians' desperate need to have him as bishop, the synod through their electoral college had him unanimously voted as the only nominee candidate to the House of Bishops.

As a matter of fact, during the researcher's survey in Muhabura diocese, it was always rare him to find a lay Christian in favor of the bishop elect. Majority of those the researcher met wished Dr. Baganizi to become their next bishop.

Rev Dr. Baganizi is thought to be a very intelligent, highly educated, and innovative person who cannot be used as a stooge. No wonder he retired from the diocese prematurely because he could not stand to be used by bishop Shalita for his selfish ends; one Christian who asked for anonymity reported.
Augustine Ntibarikure commented that Bishop Shalita had really done a lot, he was the first bishop and he actually delivered and so someone to succeed him must be a man of integrity. Christians needed Baganizi to be bishop, because is the kind of person that the people thought would sustain the diocese's developments. In their general meeting held at Seseme cathedral on 8th September 2001, the Christians resolved that:

_Muhabura diocese Christians are in favor of a developmental person who through their assessment so far is Dr. Wilson Baganizi._

As already noted that the retiring Bishop Shalita was campaigning for another candidate swapped the wishes of the majority of Christians in the diocese. The bishop Shalita even continued the more to manipulate the Electoral College as well as the house of bishops in his favour. So the more he intensified his campaigns for Rev Sebuhinja, the more the Christians openly disagreed with him. No wonder it became worse when the retiring bishop openly showed support for the bishop elect to disappoint the Christians the more.

5.6 THE NOMINATION PROCESS BY ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The election of the bishop in Muhabura started with the diocesan synod, which constituted the Electoral College, with representation from each parish and the bishop's nominees. The functions of the synod include appointment of the diocesan board membership and constituting the Electoral College. It is the electoral college which nominates the candidates for the house of bishops to choose from." Therefore the people who make the Electoral College come from the synod. They are deemed to have true representation of the synod members.

18 _Resolutions of general meeting of Christians at Seseme cathedral on 8th /September 12001._

19 _A baseline survey report of the peace, human rights and conflict manageme the Human rights and peace center, Makerere University October 2002, p.66._
In accordance with the constitutions of the Church of Uganda and the diocese of Muhabura, the Electoral College consisted of six (6) members with a presiding Diocesan chancellor who is appointed by the bishop. The Electoral College had three (3) clergy nominated by the house of clergy and three (3) laity nominated by house of laity, one being a lady.

In accordance with the constitution of Muhabura diocese, the diocesan chancellor is appointed by the bishop to preside over the Electoral College and can be assigned to carry out other duties by the bishop." In affirmation to the above, bishop Shalita noted that the outgoing bishop is out of system and has no influence."

The diocesan chancellor was honorable Sam Bitangaro, as chairman of Electoral College. Other members included; Canon Bitunguramye, Dr. Philemon Mateke, Rev canon Eridad Mature, Rev canon Sebuhinja, Rev canon Esau Muruta and Mrs. Aida

The Electoral College sat on the 11th August 2001. The provincial secretary sent guidelines for the nominations, which throughout the meeting remained with the diocesan chancellor. Canon Muruta claimed that the guidelines were not read to them.

Members raised certain issues concerning procedures before actual nominations. For example, one member asked why it was not possible for each of them to be availed with a copy of the guidelines; another one inquired whether if any of the members on EC was nominated for bishop; was to stay, deliberate and vote. Consequently some members wondered how such a proposed candidate and at the same time a member of the Electoral College will be discussed when he is present. These and others were the pertinent issues, which were raised but were not properly solved nor addressed.

21 Ernest Shalita (Rt Rev), interviewed on 8.06.2004.
22 Esau Muruta (Rt. Rev), interviewed on 7.06.2004.
During the nominations, six names were short listed as follows: Rev Dr. Canon Baganizi, Rev Canon Sebuhinja, Rev Canon Sam Mfitumukiza, Rev Ephraim Mbabaabazi, Rev Mbishishi and Rev Munyambaraga.P. The Electoral College finally came down with three names; actually the first three in the above order.

When voting took place, all the six members voted for Rev Canon Dr. Baganizi. He therefore got six votes including that of Rev Canon Sebuhinja. Everybody wished him to be the next bishop of Muhabura diocese."

However, the provincial constitutional requirement is that two nominations should be presented to the House of Bishops. So the Electoral College had to nominate another person to "accompany" Rev Canon Dr. Baganizi. Little did they anticipate that the House of bishops would come out with quite different resolution?

The Electoral College members voted the second time between the two candidates that was Rev Canon Sebuhinja and Rev Canon Sam Mfitumukiza. The results were that Rev Canon Sebuhinja got three votes, all from the three clergy present including his own vote. Rev canon Sam Mfitumukiza got two (2) votes from laity. One member of the laity did not vote the second time, because he only wanted Rev Canon Dr. Baganizi.25

The Electoral College finally sent the names of Rev Canon Dr. Baganizi and Rev Canon Sebuhinja to the House of Bishops for appointment of the bishop of the diocese. Following the nomination exercise, expectations were high that Dr. Baganizi was to become bishop."

However, people expressed fear for sending Rev Canon Sebuhinja's name to the House of bishops because they claimed the retiring bishop Shalita had been conversing for him among other bishops. Christians remained confident and expectant and with high hope in favor of Dr. Baganizi. They consoled themselves that since Dr. Baganizi had been voted unanimously by the Electoral College, the House of bishops


24 Esau Muruta, interviewed on 7.06.2004.

25 Ibid.

would take due consideration of that and confirm their choice since the electoral college was a representation of the synod. The Christians also assumed that since Canon Dr. Baganizi had been working at Namirembe for quite a long period; he would stand a better chance. He was thought to be familiar with the house of bishops and they knew him well and personally, than it was for Rev Canon Sebuhinja. All these assumptions turned out wrong!

One Christian lamented that the nomination exercise was hurriedly done and hazardous. Christians needed to know who had been recommended to the house of Bishops;

>Candidates were not mentioned in churches for people to give their comments as an established normal procedure in Muhabura diocese, Gakuru lamented.

5.7 HOUSE OF BISHOPS ELECTS REV CANON DAVID SEBUHINJA

The Archbishop summoned the house of bishops. It sat on 5th September 2001 at Lweza. Rev canon David Sebuhinja was elected as bishop elect of the diocese of Muhabura by secret ballot.

The diocesan Chancellor had submitted their curriculum vitae as well as their spiritual Testimonies. These were sealed together with the Electoral College’s report on its ongoing work and these envelopes were sealed and submitted to the Archbishop. Bishop Shalita claimed that he was completely out of the system, as the constitutions of both the church of Uganda and Muhabura do not stipulate any role of retiring bishop in the electoral process, thus;

>I was unaware of the candidates, I also met the candidates’ names in the House of Bishops, the report was read and we voted, Rev Canon Sebuhinja was elected”

Most likely because the diocese was having the succession issue for the first time, they lacked the experience. They under estimated the role and decisions of the House of Bishops. The practice however by the House of Bishops is that anyone of the two candidates can be bishop. The house of bishops has the mandate, reserves the right to select one of the candidates as bishop elect for a vacant diocese. Of special interest to note is that the House of Bishops knew little about Rev Canon David Sebuhinja. The bishops had however interacted with Rev Dr. Canon Baganizi often. He has worked as a church commissioner for several years and was a one-time provincial secretary in the 1970s. Surprisingly he was not the bishops’ favorite. The House of Bishops chose someone they knew little about.

From the interview the researcher had with the former Archbishop of C. O. U, the most Rt. Rev Dr. Living stone Nkoyoyo on 1st July 2004; the person who chaired the house of bishops, it is apparent that bishop Shalita manipulated the house of bishops in favor of Rev canon Sebuhinja, a view he constantly denies. Nkoyoyo said;

Well for me I was not with the bishops all the time. I could not know what was taking place, but Shalita had the opportunity to interact with his fellow bishops and do "Kakuyege" (campaign ) among them for someone he thought would succeed him .

Dr. Philemon Mateke believed however, that it was only Rev canon Sebuhinja's spiritual testimony that was presented. He added that the Dr. Baganizi was not told to present his spiritual testimony and it lacked at the time of the sitting of the House of Bishops thus;

After nominating these people, Shalita met Sebuhinja and told him to write down his spiritual testimony. I am told Sebuhinja got a lot of votes from the bishops. This is what they told me when I met the Archbishop, Dean of province and provincial secretary".

However, as to why the House of bishops preferred Rev Canon Sebuhinja to Rev Dr. Canon Baganizi remains unknown. The Rt. Rev Shalita declined to comment

11 Philemon Mateke, interviewed on 11.06.2004.
On this saying that he could have overstretched. The former Archbishop, who also was the chairman of the House Bishops, said;

_I personally had one vote; people would have thought that I liked Dr. Baganizi because he was my staff member. But I think Dr. Baganizi being familiar with the bishops could have also worked as a disadvantage to him ... the bishops possibly "knew him inside and out._

He continued to say that the bishops "knew him so well". Indeed the former Archbishop's statements on this matter coupled with bishop Shalita's apparent campaigns among fellow bishops for his favorite candidate was enough to qualify the candidature of the Rev canon David Sebuhinja. Moreover, all bishops slept in the same place before the elections. The uniqueness of Rev Canon David Sebuhinja's candidature among the bishops arose out of his unchallenged spiritual testimony as opposed to his competitor. It is alleged that apart from Rev canon David Sebuhinja meeting the constitutional qualifications for this office, his spiritual life was more convincing to the house of bishops. His educational qualifications were sufficient for the office. He was above 45 years of age as demanded by the constitution of church of Uganda. He had served the church for quite a long time and at the time of elections; he was diocesan secretary of Muhabura diocese.

When asked about the suitability of Rev Canon Sebuhinja as his successor, bishop Shalita did not hesitate to shower a lot of praises for his candidate. He described him as a long serving priest, who has served the church for more than 34 years. He became a missionary among the Bakonzo and at one time ran a parish single handedly in Rwenzori diocese. He became principal at Bishop Barham theological college in Kabale. Rev Canon Sebuhinja worked as diocesan youth worker and then diocesan secretary of Muhabura diocese; whereupon he was elected by the House of Bishops as bishop elect of Muhabura diocese." Bishop Shalita commended Rev Canon David Sebuhinja's spiritual life; and said thus;

29 Ernest Shalita, interviewed on 08.06.2004.
He insisted that because the bishop elect's spiritual life is not doubtable even the Archbishop Nkoyoyo said that for the 14 months into the crisis nothing wrong had been found about bishop elect. He continued to describe the bishop elect as a man of integrity, a good pastor, with a stable family; whose wife has excelled as a mothers union worker. These characteristic features were vehemently refuted by many of the respondents the researcher talked to in Muhabura.

Whatever the case, it is very possible that since the rest of the bishops knew little about Rev Canon Sebuhinjja, they relied on the bishop Shalita for information to make a well-informed decision. The above description of Rev Canon David Sebuhinjja to the rest of the bishops would have been very convincing. Moreover, the Rev Dr. canon Baganizi had nobody to Kakuyege (campaign) for him among the bishops. The house of bishops set 28th April 2002 as date for his consecration and enthronement in the diocese of Muhabura.

5.8 THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS REJECTS REV CANON DR. WILSON BAGANIZI

The more experienced and longer serving Dr. Baganizi was rejected by the House of Bishops. The most Rt. Rev Nkoyoyo Livingstone suggests that it could have been because the House of Bishops "knew him well". He claimed that knowing someone well-meant knowing ones strengths and weakness. The little known Rev canon Sebuhinjja was instead favored. Could it be that the house of Bishops was not aware of the weaknesses of the Rev canon Sebuhinjja? Regardless of the results, some respondents the researcher talked to especially those who were in support of the pro- House of Bishops decision claimed that the rejection of Dr. Baganizi by the House of Bishops stems from his doubtable spirituality. On this issue Retired Rev Ezra Bigaruka commented;

30 Ernest Shalita (Rt. Rev), interviewed on 8.06.2004.
To be honest, Dr. Baganizi has the good qualities of an administrator but lacks qualities of a spiritual leader.

Dr. Baganizi has served at the provincial headquarters for so many years and many of those bishops know him. He has shown his ability in administration in all these years since ordination but has never preached in church beyond five times". It is apparent that Dr. Baganizi was not well with the House of Bishops. He had nurtured many of the bishops and these were the people to give him the mandate as bishop elect of Muhabura. If they could not second him, then there must have been a problem. It is alleged that the Archbishop Silvanus Wani period discredited the Dr. Baganizi a great deal; when he served as the provincial secretary. This was a time when the state under the dictatorial leadership of President Idi Amin Dada persecuted the church. It is alleged that when Archbishop Luwum was murdered, Dr. Baganizi took the chance of grabbing a lot from the province.

At such a very sensitive time for the church, Dr. Baganizi as provincial secretary was out to exploit the situation. It is alleged that there was church property, which were plundered, by him and his close friends. That he misused church vehicles and some were turned into his personal property. That those he could not afford to keep at his home were kept at his friends' homes especially canon Bitunguramye.

One long serving retired clergyman who preferred anonymity said that there was a 505 estate car that Dr. Baganizi stole from the province and kept it at canon Bitunguramye's home for more than two years; which had been reserved for Rev. canon Shalita, who had gone to USA for further studies. Rev Shalita is reported to have driven the vehicle back to the province and decided to use it in his capacity as provincial treasurer. It was also alleged that when Rev. Baganizi was going to USA for further studies, he hid a pick up stout vehicle for the province at his home, so that he could use it when he comes back. It is alleged that this vehicle was later kept at canon Bitunguramye's

31 Ezra Bigaruka (Rev), interviewed on 9.06.2004
home. The said vehicle had been used for commercial purposes in the areas of central Buganda. While Dr. Baganizi was away, it is alleged that canon Bitunguramye used to drive these vehicles to keep them in good condition. No wonder canon Bitunguramye fights had to make Rev. Baganizi bishop of Muhabura diocese. One respondent wondered how such a "man of God" who took advantage of the then political crisis in the country to enrich himself could serve as bishop of a diocese. Rev. Ezra Bigaruka was even more disappointed with this particular scenario, thus;

*Imagine at a time of political crisis when bishops are being hunted like snakes; the provincial secretary who is the "Archbishop" now in a situation of grabbing property of the province ... at such a critical moment ... it really sounds absurd*,

Some Christians alleged that Rev. Dr. Baganizi still took advantage of the political crisis and misused finances of the province for personal ends. It was alleged that he built a very magnificent house in Kisoro, which at that material time was quite exotic and not expected of a person of his caliber. It was further alleged that in 1977, Archbishop Wani went to Kisoro to purposely see the exotic house of Rev. Dr. Baganizi that was widely known throughout the province. Everybody knew the existence of the said house because its tiles were imported from Nairobi. It was alleged that he used church money and vehicles to construct the house.

Some Christians alleged that the house of Bishops could have rejected Rev. Dr. Baganizi because he is said to have children born out of wedlock even when he is a clergyman. It could have been to the above widely known allegations about the Rev. Dr. Baganizi, that Rev. Victor Kalimwabo, an ardent supporter of the bishop elect had this to say;

*Those standing firm in defense of the church say that it is the morally corrupt Christians who would want a

32* Ezra Bigaruka, interviewed on 09.06.2004.

33* Ezra Bigaruka (Rev), interviewed on 09.06.2004
Bishop who is like them and who could be expected to sympathize with their moral weaknesses”,

It is also possible that Rev. Dr. Baganizi was not favored by the House of Bishops despite his experience because he was already in 60s years of age and had remained with less than three years to retire. The House of bishops could have wanted to avoid having a short-term serving bishop; which could make them repeat the same sensitive, expensive and tedious exercise of choosing another bishop for Muhabura. If that was the case; by the time Rev. Dr Baganizi would be consecrated, he would be organizing for his retirement. This could be ridiculous to the province of the church of Uganda.

When asked about the suitability of Rev. Dr. Baganizi for the office of bishop of Muhabura, bishop Shalita described him as a hard working administrator, who has worked in different positions; "but he is approaching retirement.

One respondent claimed that because of the alleged moral weaknesses of Rev. Dr. Baganizi, some bishops asserted that it was an advantage to Rev. canon Sebuhinja, his name to be sent alongside that of Rev. Dr. Baganizi’ candidature. It was imagined that if Rev canon Sebuhinja's name had been taken with somebody else's name other than Rev. Dr. Baganizi; Rev. canon Sebuhinja would not have been elected by the house of bishops. But his name was sent with someone who was highly doubted spiritually by The house of bishops."

5.9 REACTION OF MUHABURACHRISTIANS

The election of Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja as bishop elect of Muhabura diocese was received with mixed feelings in Kisoro. It divided up Christians in the diocese. Some were in support of the bishop elect whereas others opposed the results from the House of Bishops. Those Christians who supported the bishop elect were referred to as "pro House of bishops", because they accepted the decision of the House of bishops to have Rev Canon David Ssebuhinja as their bishop elect. They however also referred

34 Victor Kalimwabo (Rev), Parish Priest, Kisoro town, interviewed on 11.06, 2004.
35 Ernest Shalita, interviewed on 08.06.2004.
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To themselves as "Faithful"; because they did not oppose their elders and did not want C.O.U constitution as well as that of Muhabura diocese breached.

The Christians who were opposed to Rev Canon Sebuhinja as bishop elect were referred to as "ant-house of bishops" or simply referred to as "those on opposition". But because also the central figure of conflict was Rev Canon Sebuhinja; those in his favor could be called "Pro-Sebuhinja"; and those on opposition: "Anti-Sebuhinja".
The pro-Sebuhinja Christians were led by the Retiring Bishop Shalita, whereas the anti Sebuhinja group was led by chairman house of laity, Dr. Philemon Mateke. As already noted, majority of Christians in the diocese and some members of the Electoral College had a strong feeling that Rev Dr Baganizi would be elected bishop because he was voted 100% in the Electoral College. Electoral College members thought that the house of bishops would respect their choice.

On 16th September 2001, Dr Philemon Mateke stormed the house of bishops at Lweza, attacking them for failure to elect a bishop that the people wanted. He asked the bishops why they could have skipped Dr Baganizi, the Christian's choice." Rt. Rev. Shalita expressed surprise at Dr Philemon Mateke's conduct, thus;

I could not imagine a person of his caliber to react like an unlearned man. The house of bishops told him that his duty was to nominate not to elect. 38

The chairman, house of laity is reported to have expressed his defiance to the house of the bishops and insisted that they had not made the right decision; he is alleged to have assured them that violence would erupt if they do not change their decision that; "He was going to turn Muhabura into another Busoga.

On 8th September 2001, a general meeting of Christians of Muhabura diocese was held at St. Andrews Cathedral Seseme where up on they resolved to reject the appointment of bishop elect and expressed their will for a developmental person, who through their assessment was Dr. Wilson Baganizi. They also expressed their

37 Ernest Shalita, interviewed on 08.06.2004.
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Disappointment upon the Rt. Rev. Shalita's involvement and manipulation of the electoral process of the next bishop. They vowed not to allow Rev. canon Sebuhinja as bishop of Muhabura diocese, but suggested that he could be consecrated elsewhere and becomes a 'bishop of the bishops'. In addition, a letter of protest was written to the Archbishop on this date. The move which began at St. Andrews Cathedral Seseme was preached in the entire diocese. The pro-house of bishops Christians did not mind about the move of the opposition. A letter was written by clergy from this group on 21h September 2001 expressing gratitude to the house of bishops and congratulating the bishop elect over his appointment". Meanwhile acts of violence were beginning to surface among Christians of Muhabura.

With confusion looming high and dividing further the Christians, some members of the synod including chairman laity wrote to Bishop Shalita requesting for an emergency synod meeting to allegedly resolve to reject the bishop elect. Dr Philemon Mateke wrote to the bishop Shalita on 16th October 2001 requesting for a meeting. Several synod members followed this with other written requests to the bishop to have an emergency synod meeting.

In response, Bishop Shalita neglected the pleas for a meeting and in his letter to Dr. Philemon Mateke, chairman house laity stated;

_The issue of the bishop elect is now at the level of the House of Bishops because at my level the constitutional procedures to discuss them were constitutionally exhausted at the synod level through the Electoral College"

Bishop Shalita could not use this opportunity to explain to the Christians where they were erring and possibly guide them and counsel them towards the right direction. The Christians even became more furious than ever before. They realized there was to be neither resolution nor reconciliation through the bishop Shalita, their chief shepherd. Violence and unplanned meetings took shape, which greatly determined the

39 Ernest Shalita, interviewed on 08.06.2004.
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next course of action for the crisis. The synod meeting however failed to take place until after
the bishop officially retired. Some Christians did not want to hear anything concerning the
bishop elect. They had now developed much hatred for him. It had even become difficult for the
bishop elect to attend church services at the Cathedral. He was mocked and humiliated on
several occasions. However, much as they disliked bishop Shalita; they still maintained the
outward respect for him. In the cathedral, Christians wanted the bishop elect to attend as a
common Christian. Whenever his name was mentioned, heckles, insults and words of disgrace
would be clearly heard from the congregation. The same reaction had now spread to other
churches in the diocese. The cathedral was now taken over by those on the opposition. At first
Bishop Shalita and the pro-house of bishop’s decision thought that the bishop elect was not liked
only at the cathedral but this was a lie. The Christians in the villages disliked him the more. Rev.
Canon Sebuhinja even refused to attend church services when the Archbishop visited, claiming
that he would be humiliated. He claimed that the cathedral rejected him. But why couldn’t he go
and pray from other churches? Why couldn’t he go and pray from his mother church at Kabindi.
Precisely he feared to be humiliated.

During bishop Mutebi’s visitations to Muhabura diocese, representing the Archbishop to perform
pastoral services, the Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja moved with him. He however was humiliated
all through. For example, when canon Sebuhinja went with him to Iryaruvumba Archdeaconry
for confirmation; in the service of Holy Communion, canon Sebuhinja helped in administering
the sacrament but Christians refused to drink from his cup. In the Archdeaconry of Gisorora,
canon Sebuhinja never went there, he could have been humiliated more.” In the sub center at
Gitovu, canon Sebuhinja was refused to greet Christians by many voices shouting, Agende!
Agende! (Let him go!).

On Friday 1 “November 2002 at Kabindi Archdeaconry where both Sebuhinja and Shalita come
from, Sebuhinja forced himself in the service against the advice by

41 Bishop Shalita’s, letter to chairman House of laity, 29th October 2001.
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Canon Muruta who had earlier informed him of the Archdeaconry staff’s resolution not to allow Sebuhinja in the service. Definitely, he attended casually but was humiliated, when nobody recognized him officially.

On Sunday 3rd November 2002, in St. Andrew’s cathedral Seseme, Sebuhinja who had already put on his clerical robes ready to enter the procession was ordered to undress and later walked casually in the service without being noticed.”

Christians were very violent when it came to priests who were pro-Sebuhinja. Such priests were chased away from their parishes. They however continued to do their work from their personal homes. Those who were transferred to the parishes that were anti-Sebuhinja stalwarts did not even get a chance to administer any sacrament in those parishes or even hold church services. For example the priest at Muramba parish was beaten up and imprisoned for some days due to his pro-Sebuhinja beliefs. At the cathedral it was even worse, open rebellion though non-violent was seen in the cathedral choir. The Dean of the cathedral was surprised by their conduct since it was his first time to work in the cathedral; on the first Sunday of October 2002; "the choir refused to sing ... they said that they did not want the bishop elect to be their bishop.

Muhabura was now insecure. The Christians vowed to cause bloodshed if the house of bishops went ahead to consecrate the bishop elect. Christians planned to roll the volcanic stones and block the way from Kampala such that no bishop would have chance of reaching the cathedral and if they traveled on foot, they would be killed". If the consecration went on, Christians vowed to make Muhabura a replica of the Kanungu incident. Bishop Shalita was bent on having the bishop elect enthroned. He was however afraid of the insecurity. He wrote to the state asking for soldiers to assist during the consecration. On several occasions, policemen with guns attended services with Christians. How long would this take? Would Muhabura diocese be the only one for

45 Ibid.
46 Ibid. 47Ibid.
48 Gideon Kwizera (Rev Canon), Cathedral Dean, Cathedral vestry, interviewed on 11 062004.
49 Living Stone Nkoyoyo, (Most Rev), Retired Archbishop, Bweyogerere Leisure Park, interviewed on I 072004
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the bishop to have bodyguards. It was good enough to postpone the consecration, something worse would have happened as Augustine noted;

For the Archbishop not to consecrate the very bishop elect, I think was God's guidance as this would have caused a Christian genocide ever known. People were ready to die for the cause.

Indeed on 19th January 2003 when the consecration failed, many Christians throughout the diocese—celebrated victory over chaos and scuffle that was anticipated during Sebuhinja's consecration. Shalita and his 13-member team were not happy with the cancellation.

Counter accusations of instigating violence were heard from both sides. It was alleged that since the cancellation of the consecration and enthronement of bishop elect, five homes of the opposition were attacked including one old revival woman called Mary Nyiramanzi of 78 years of age hailing from bishop Shalita's home village. It was alleged that bishop Shalita and the bishop elect would spend many hours in the diocesan offices with a few sympathizers hatching out plans to continue Sebuhinja's war to office. They however, between 20th and 23rd January 2003 also appealed for calm from their supporters and urged them to plan for consecration in April 2003.

The Christians did not want to hear anything about Shalita's-Sebuhinja project. Many were irritated to see them in the cathedral. On the so" December 2001 Christians attempted to block bishop Shalita from leading service in the cathedral. The bishop and some other clergy were locked in the vestry such that they could not lead the service; the cathedral had become unsafe and the bishop wrote to the RDC of Kisoro district thus;
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On 30th December 2001 a good number of clergy and I were locked in the vestry and we were redeemed by the Rev. Jenny Green who broke the lock and let us OUT.54

During the service, there was the worst disturbance and violence and bishop Shalita was prevented from preaching. There was scare, confusion, and worship lost its Meaning

On Palm Sunday of February 24th 2002, there was again confusion at the cathedral as the opposition group blocked entry to the cathedral. They did not want Bishop Shalita to have Christians in the cathedral. The situation became worse. The police failed to calm the situation. The RDC intervened but people could not listen to his pleas. The army was called which ruthlessly cooled the situation.

On 9th December 2002, some Christians started stoning Rev. Canon Sebuhinja's office. They did not want him even to continue as their diocesan secretary. They wanted him out of office. They claimed that he was using this office to champion his cause, by having power to organize meetings and mobilize for support from some Christians and other sympathizers. The RDC had to intervene and advised them to take the matter to court.

On 18th December 2002, the diocesan offices were set ablaze. It is clear that they targeted Rev. Canon Sebuhinja's office because the researcher physically saw that it was the most damaged by the blaze. Fortunately nothing was burnt apart from the door.

On 3rd February 2002, there was a plot to harm the bishop Shalita. He claimed that the pro-Mateke group put needles in the bishop's seat in the cathedral. This was a shock to the entire country and the outside world. He further praised God for protecting him from the piercing needles;
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Amazingly I sat in that chair without feeling anything but later towards the end of the service, I felt scratches at the back, only to realize they are needles.

This should have thrown the whole congregation into confusion during the service, but bishop Shalita kept quiet, left the chair and sat among the congregation. He however mentioned to the congregation at the end of the service, about the attempted murder by the opposition. Bishop Shalita claimed that to harm the bishop and the bishop elect would give the opposition opportunity to elect a bishop of their choice.

Of course this was unchristian; this is the least thing that even pagans would do! Though the Christians attempted to do away with the bishop Shalita, who was allegedly imposing on them his successor; any further attempt to harm the bishop Shalita would possibly be disastrous to many; indeed in his letter "Fears of bloodshed" to the RDC, he stated;

\[
\text{with needles one person would be injured but if a bomb is planted in the throne and blasts, many people in the congregation may loose their lives}
\]

Some Christians were very determined not to compromise with the bishop elect. But it seemed that the Christians had become more furious with bishop Shalita, who by all costs wanted the bishop elect consecrated. No wonder they did all that they could to either intimidate bishop Shalita or actually injure him so that he could abandon the Sebuhinja project.

In "Fears of bloodshed" bishop Shalita noted that some individuals like Christopher Ndabarinze, an Army veteran remarked that at the consecration of the bishop elect, someone would be killed in the cathedral. He also noted that John Bahinda remarked that the use of needles was just a beginning of something bigger than the needles planted into the bishop's throne. He also noted that he had heard a rumor that Dr. Mateke was organizing youths for the purposes of deploying them in all the churches
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In the diocese on Sunday 17th February. That the deployment was intended to disturb worshipers and to do acts of vandalism and terrorism.

At this time, the people had developed more hatred for bishop Shalita than even the rejected bishop elect. For they believed the actions and insistence of the bishop elect were Bishop Shalita's innovations. On 20th December 2002, bishop Shalita and his wife were ambushed near their residence. Their car was heavily stoned and aimed at the bishop. The car was badly damaged but Shalita and his wife were not hurt.

On 25th December 2002, bishop Shalita's magnificent rental building in Kisoro was set ablaze. One part of the building was destroyed, but failed to destroy it completely. It was reported that some clergymen were part of this group in destroying bishop Shalita's building. He has however managed to repair the house with help from overseas.

Violence had become a common occurrence where more than one Christian converged. The Archbishop visited them in a problem familiarization tour and to bring reconciliation between the two groups. They fought in the cathedral in front of the Archbishop. The Archbishop feared that he could be the next target of attack.

5.10 HOUSE OF BISHOPS' RESPONSE TO MUHABURA CONFLICT

The Archbishop and House of bishops at first down played the conflict in Muhabura. No much attention was given to it. They thought that it was a simple disagreement, which soon would cool even before consecration; of the bishop elect. But this was a miscalculation of the events in Muhabura.

However, much they received negative correspondences from the Christians against consecration and enthronement of the bishop elect, the Archbishop maintained that the said ceremony would take place on 28th April 2002 at St. Andrews cathedral Seseme. He and the house of bishops were determined to hold the function and install the bishop elect. They maintained that there was no error that was made during the electoral process and that the house bishops were not going to change its decision.
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5.10.1 Provincial chancellor's report to Archbishop

On 24th January 2002, the Archbishop sought advice from the provincial chancellor who replied on 13th February 2002. He advised that the outgoing bishop of Muhabura should retire since he had reached his mandatory retirement even before this date. Yet he was seen to be at the center of the conflict. He noted that there was no error made in the election of Rev. canon David Sebuhinja. He however advised the house of bishops not to downplay the seriousness of the conflict and not to rush to consecrate and enthrone the next bishop of Muhabura. He suggested that time should be allowed for reconciliation and reflection on errors possibly made. "He also advised that as an accepted common practice, the Archbishop should take over Muhabura diocese as caretaker bishop.

5.10.2 Provincial secretary's response

In his press release on the situation in Muhabura diocese dated 18th February 2002, he vehemently condemned the unbecoming behavior of Christians. He assured the Christians that the correct procedure and requirements for the nominations and election as provided in the diocesan and provincial constitutions and canons were duly followed. He advised Christians in church of Uganda to respect obey and observe both the diocesan and provincial canons and constitutions. He also stated thus;

*We have since the announcement of the decision of the house of Bishops regarding the election of Rt. Rev. David Sebuhinja received several representations, some in support of the decision and others in opposition to the decision. We have carefully listened, read several memoranda, visited Christians in Muhabura diocese and reviewed both positions. We have read several correspondences from the group that is opposed to the election of the Bishop elect. We have followed comments from the public*
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in the media and radio programmes. Nowhere is it alleged that the correct procedure in the nomination and election was not followed. 61

The provincial leadership and the pro-Sebuhinja group did not see how realistic those on opposition were. They thought that since every procedure was followed and nowhere was the law breached, they had all the right to neglect the views of those on opposition. But with time they were to succumb into listening.

5.10.3 The provincial conflict resolution team

The Archbishop appointed a conflict resolution team headed by the Rt. Rev Dr. George Sinabulya, to go on a fact-finding mission in Muhabura. The team did its work between 16th and 19th of December 2001. The team met and talked with the major stakeholders in the conflict. These included; chairman house of laity; Dr. Philemon Mateke; chairman clergy and bishop elect; Rev. canon David Sebuhinja, bishop Shalita, members of the synod, house of laity and clergy, and political leaders in the district.

The team's report, which is now popularly known as "the Sinabulya report" identified that the church of Uganda should take seriously the conflict in Muhabura, that they should listen and evaluate carefully what people of Muhabura were saying.

The report also noted that the crisis had so much divided the Christians in Muhabura and that there was need for mediation and conflict resolution between the two opposing groups of people. The team observed that the nomination of the candidates for election of a bishop in Muhabura seems to have been handled without the necessary confidentiality. It became common knowledge of who got how many votes and who voted for whom even before the names were sent to the House of Bishops. The report highlights how the bishop elect issues in Muhabura diocese had been largely politicized and there was need for a neutral ground to solve the conflict. It also noted that it was very difficult to consecrate the bishop elect of Muhabura because of the prevailing conditions.
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The report recommended that the key stakeholders in the conflict together with the key players should be flexible in finding a solution to the conflict. It advised that people's original positions should be abandoned and rather looks for appropriate solutions for the way forward. This meant that those who had got stuck with the radical view that solution would only be consecration of bishop elect were to evaluate their position. The anti-house of bishops was also to drop their radical wish for Rev. Dr. Baganizi to be bishop of Muhabura diocese.

The report recommended that bishop Shalita should be helped to get out of Muhabura crisis. Considering the good work done by bishop Shalita as bishop of Muhabura plus other key responsibilities at the province, everything should be done to get him out of the controversy so that he retires at a positive note where the diocese and indeed the province shall continue to consult and use him. As a process of conflict resolution, a caretaker bishop was to be appointed so that the retiring bishop Shalita hands over to him. There was to be a task force to work together with caretaker bishop to initiate a conflict resolution process.

It is very true that the findings of the Rt. Rev. Dr. George Sinabulya's team greatly opened and influenced the provincial leadership towards the Muhabura conflict. The report made the Archbishop and the House of bishops to realize that the rejection of their bishop elect was not a project of the minority but of the biggest percentage of Muhabura Christians indeed they realized that the crisis had caused much tension among Christians than they thought. For it seems they had been convinced by their fellow bishop- of Muhabura, that it was a few Christians bringing confusion in the diocese. No wonder before this conflict resolution team was set up, the House of bishops never took the protests seriously and had decided at all cost to consecrate the bishop elect. The House of bishops is said to have expressed shock and surprise at the findings of the provincial conflict resolution team's report. One respondent told me that they (R.O.B) realized had been insisting on their decision basing on lies. It was reported that bishop Shalita is said to have got furious when this report was being read to the House of Bishops, and rubbished its findings as well as recommendations. Dr.
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Philemon Mateke noted that; when the Rt. Rev Sinabulya had begun reading his report in the House of bishops, Shalita stood up and said rubbish."

Whatever the case, much of the findings and recommendations of this report were taken seriously by the House of Bishops. Much of what the Archbishop did later to diffuse the conflict in Muhabura was either directly or indirectly based on the “Sinabulya report”

5.10.4 Archbishop becomes caretaker Bishop of Muhabura

In due consideration of the provincial chancellor's advice and observations and recommendations of the Sinabulya report, the House of bishops decided that the Archbishop becomes caretaker bishop of the turbulent Muhabura diocese. This meant also that bishop Shalita was to hand over leadership of the diocese. This function of the Archbishop was in conformity with the provincial constitution of church of Uganda and provincial canons; that is canon 1:3:8; which states;

\[
\text{In the event of a vacancy in a diocese as a result of death or illness or other in capacity of this diocesan bishop or where a diocesan bishop does not hand over the office, upon attaining the age of 65 years, the Archbishop shall take over the seat until a new bishop is elected, Consecrated and enthroned.} \] 65

And article 9(a) of the provincial constitution gives the Archbishop Powers to exercise general pastoral care leadership, supervision and discipline over the whole province in accordance with this constitution and provincial canons.

On the 29th march 2002 in a message to the diocese, Archbishop Livingstone Nkoyoyo declared that he was to take over the diocese as caretaker bishop. He also postponed the enthronement and consecration of the Rev. canon David Sebuhinja. On 8th April 2002, the Archbishop wrote to bishop Shalita asking him to hand over the
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dioce to him. This ceremony took place on the 17th April 2002 at Seseme, where up on the Archbishop was represented by the Dean of the province, the Rt. Rev Dr Nicodernus Okille. The pro-Sebuhinja group including the retiring bishop Shalita was not happy with the Archbishop's actions. Bishop Shalita declared that he was in fact still bishop of Muhabura because he had not yet handed over the diocese to the people who gave it to him, that is the House of Bishops and more so the Muhabura diocese congregation. He expressed unhappiness at the Archbishop's action to ask him to go out of office and retire even before he would hand over the diocese to the bishop elect at the consecration ceremony that had been scheduled for 28th April 2002. Bishop Shalita further declared;

> Officially and in reality I am still bishop of Muhabura because I have not handed over the office ... though I am not doing office work, even when a new bishop is consecrated I will have to go and hand over the diocese to him".

5.10.5 Archbishop's visit to Muhabura diocese

On 17th May 2002, the Archbishop himself visited the diocese to carry out pastoral duties in his capacity as bishop of Muhabura diocese; he was also to make a follow up of the activities of the team of commissaries he had instituted to rule on his behalf. Above all he wished to see for himself the situation on ground following the various reports he had received from his envoys; notably Sinabulya report, Rt. Rev Okille's team at hand over ceremony and many others. He was also interested in facilitating the reconciliation process among the conflicting parties. The Christians were very optimistic at the Archbishop's visit and in him they expected a solution for their problem. Chairman, House of laity, reflected this in a speech and in part it read;

> Your grace, different delegations have been frequenting your office with different views concerning the center of the conflict. Now that you are on the ground you will assess the truth of the matter as you interact with these Christians. We
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hope that through your interaction with them a solution will be arrived at to end the conflict in this diocese”,

Indeed the Archbishop's visit to Muhabura, unfolded the darkness behind the conflict. He must have come to believe that the crisis was not merely a conflict between chairman house of laity and retired bishop Shalita. He realized that many Christians in the diocese disliked the bishop elect.

5.10.6 Re-affirmation of Rev Canon David Sebuhinja

In a meeting of the House of bishops on the 13th November 2002, the election of Rev Canon Sebuhinja as bishop elect of the diocese of Muhabura was re-affirmed. Another date was set for this particular ceremony. This was to be on the 19th January 2003. However, the reactions of the Christians in Muhabura were scaring to any intending bishop to go there. A decision was therefore reached that while the date for the ceremony remained the same; the venue was to be St. Paul's provincial cathedral at Namirembe Hill, in Kampala. The House of Bishops also agreed that Rev Canon Sebuhinja continues working as Diocesan secretary till consecration and enthronement takes place.

5.10.7 Appointment of Bishop's commissaries.

For effective administration, the Archbishop appointed a six-member team of commissaries to help him in running and administration of the diocese. These were people who were to work on his behalf. This team of commissaries was inaugurated on the same day the Rt. Rev Dr Nicodemus Okille; provincial Dean represented the Archbishop at Bishop Shalita's hand over of the diocese on 12th April 2002. Three members were in support of the House of Bishops decision while the other three were against Rev Canon Sebuhinja as bishop elect.

The members were;
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The Rev Victor Kalimwabo
Mrs. Joan Bahizi
Mr. Benon Ndemeye
Rev canon Baker Habimana
Mr. David W. S. Munyangabo
Mrs. Theodore Iragabo

The first three were pro-Sebuhinja while the last three were anti Sebuhinja. The group's chairmanship was to alternate between Rev Victor Kalimwabo and Rev Canon Baker Habimana. Their work was to initiate reconciliation, which apparently never materialized. They used to fight each other. They in fact worsened the situation instead of working for reconciliation. These bishop's commissaries never succeeded because they did not possess the powers of Archbishop.

Archbishop sacked them all. Archbishop then appointed the second group of bishop's commissaries. He appointed three (3) Archdeacons and sub Dean of the cathedral. This was in November 2002. The three Archdeacons were;

- Rev canon Esau Muruta
- Rev canon Erastus Gapfuyekubaho
- Rev canon Eldad Mature, and
- Rev Gideon Kwizera (sub dean of cathedral).

Rev canon Muruta, who even confessed that he is the one who nominated Rev Canon David Sebuhinja's candidature in the Electoral College, and even wrote or signed letters congratulating the Archbishop and House of Bishops as well as the bishop elect had by this time defected to the opposition.

There was still a problem with this second group of bishop's commissaries. Rev Muruta and Rev Kwizera were on the opposition where as the other two were pro-house of bishops. Archbishop asked Rev Canon Muruta, who is now on the opposition to be chairperson of these commissaries.
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In the first meeting, they failed to agree as regards the committee's secretary. Whereas the pro-Sebuhinja clergy wanted a secretary to be from among them since chairperson was anti-Sebuhinja, canon Muruta wanted Rev Kwizera to be secretary. This committee also failed to work. It accomplished totally nothing. The pro-Sebuhinja clergy accused the chairman of the bishop's commissaries of impersonation and taking diocesan decisions single handedly without consulting them.

They further accused elderly canon Muruta of calling and chairing illegal council meetings designed to destroy the church by passing ill-fated resolutions to close the diocesan bank accounts and diocesan offices; as well as conspiring with the Archbishop to pass wild resolutions. They alleged that canon Muruta was collaborating with the "position hungry" Rev Baker Habimana, and the "money-hungry" Rev Gideon Kwizera to sustain the conflict in Muhabura diocese to serve their personal interests at the expense of the integrity of the church.

The Archbishop apparently was not amused by the conduct of the canon Mature and Erastus. In addition they were part of the group that sued the Archbishop in the High court of Uganda, over alleged failure to perform his constitutional duties, thus failure to consecrate their bishop elect. Archbishop therefore appointed the third group of the bishop's commissaries; this was in April 2003. He sacked canon Mature and Erastus but retained canon Muruta and Rev Kwizera; the sub-dean. The sacked commissaries were replaced with people from the opposition side. The committee now consisted of the following persons:

- Rev canon Esau Muruta.
- Rev Gideon Kwizera.
- Mr. David Kanyaruzu.
- Mrs. Hope Luzaza.

The pro-Sebuhinja Christians were very disappointed with the Archbishop. They claimed the Archbishop was allying with the opposition. Bishop Shalita was more disappointed than ever before;
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It showed us that the "faithfuls" were no longer a matter to the Archbishop... the diocesan leadership is now in the hands of the opposition.

The pro-Sebuhinja group was even more disappointed to learn that the Archbishop who is also a caretaker bishop of Muhabura diocese had asked Rev Canon Muruta to delay his retirement for the next two years. They accused the Archbishop and canon Muruta of bleaching the constitutions of both Muhabura diocese and the province. Bishop Shalita said that canon Muruta was working illegally because he should have retired in 2003 because he turned 65 years at that time. He further claimed that Christians do not honor him (Muruta) because of the above.

The Archbishop was simply tired and disgusted with working with the so-called "faithful’s". They were very uncompromising yet they were a minority. He, therefore, thought of working with those who were respectful and whom Christians could listen to. He was interested in working with those who had a positive attitude to reconciliation. The accusations that the pro-Sebuhinja brought against the Archbishop left him dismayed. He above all did not want to impose upon people a bishop they did not like. He therefore sidelined them;

Indeed in his response to canon Muruta's letter asking for retirement from clerical work, he stated that canon Muruta should not retire at that material time when the church was in this crisis; that the church needed the help of an old clergy like Muruta. He therefore requested him to stay for more two years. By the time of the visit to the diocese to carry out this research, the bishop's commissaries were working as a team and though they are all from the opposition, they seemed persons who can compromise small issues for conflict resolution to take place in Muhabura.

5.10.8 Rev Canon David Sebuhinja no longer Diocesan Secretary.
The Archbishop desperate to strike reconciliation between the two conflicting parties tried all the possible alternatives to achieve this goal. Well aware that majority
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detested the candidature of the bishop elect; who also doubled as the diocesan secretary; he asked him to leave this office. Canon Sebuhinja was no longer diocesan secretary. This off course pleased very much the anti-Sebuhinja group. But the pro Sebuhinja group did not take it as a serious loss. In fact they thought that the bishop elect would now be on full board to fight for his new position without compromising as a diocesan secretary.

It is apparent as already noted that the Archbishop is now interested in working with the majority and those who had a positive attitude to reconciliation process rather than the radical views of enthronement and consecration.

The Archbishop however was tactical in doing this. He slowly sidelined the Rev canon Sebuhinja as diocesan secretary from the major activities and decision making of the diocese, as his involvement would stir up more conflict and reconciliation made more difficult.
Indeed the removal of the bishop elect from this office of diocesan secretary was a good move considering the trend of events; though the House of Bishops had agreed that he continues working as diocesan secretary.

Reconciliation would have been even harder if the most hated man-the bishop elect was the one organizing the reconciliation meetings as well as being secretary to such meetings. But still the opposition would have definitely shunned such meetings.

The bishop elect was told to shun the electoral process of the new synod members; in preparation for the next synod meeting. The fact was that there was need for fresh synod elections as the old synod together with its committees had by this time (November 2002) expired. Rev Gideon Kwizera, the Dean of cathedral was to be the chief returning officer in these elections. The bishop's commissaries were to help him accomplish this task. The Archbishop later asked canon Sebutinja to leave office as diocesan secretary so that he paves way for reconciliation. He was replaced by Rev Gideon Kwizera.

Later the office of diocesan secretary was occupied by Rev Canon Baker Habimana who by the time of carrying out this research was holding the same office.

Unlike the Busoga diocese crisis, where the opposition forcefully took over the diocese and were heavily condemned by the provincial leadership; in Muhabura it was different.
The opposition here took over the diocese with the full backing of the provincial leadership. In fact the Archbishop did so much to see that all the diocesan offices, which matter a lot, were occupied by people on the opposition. The pro-Sebuhinja group was completely sidelined. The reason for this was that the anti-Sebuhinja group had a positive attitude towards reconciliation. Much as they did not want the bishop elect, they were willing to work with any other person or group of people other than bishop elect and bishop Shalita, to forge a way forward for the diocese. At this time they were not even interested in Rev Dr. Baganizi but a neutral candidate to diffuse the crisis.

On the other hand, the pro-Sebuhinja group, who proved more abusive to the Archbishop through the letters the researcher read and were as well uncompromising and clearly stated to the Archbishop that enthronement and consecration of the bishop elect would be the only solution to the conflict, vehemently remarked that reconciliation can only be through the bishop elect. To the Archbishop siding with those on opposition moreover who were apparently the majority was more advantageous to the reconciliation process.

5.10.9 DR. BAGANIZI'S RESPONSE TO THE CRISIS

Rev. Canon Dr. Wilson Baganizi who described the situation as unfortunate to Christ's church does not feel cheated but insists that there should be transparency and consistence in all kinds of leadership including church leadership.

\[ I \text{ do not think I was cheated but once you are elected, you thank God that you have been elevated. Personally} \\
I \text{was called to be a priest; such roles are additional responsibilities.} \]

The crisis in Muhabura diocese could have been averted and can still be avoided in other dioceses of C.O.U elsewhere if certain things happened. Firstly, majority of Christians are not informed and very few participate in church councils. There is lack of clear policy and participation in policy issues of the church by majority of
Christians including the clergy. For example, majority of Christians including some bishops do not know the contents of the C.O.U constitution. Some clergy including bishops do not have a copy.” In such a situation Christians are bound to react in ignorance, and conflicts become inevitable. Therefore when policies and decisions are made by the few in the church; majority fail to understand them and feel not bound by them.

The provincial leadership did not make enough ground work in Muhabura diocese before the electoral process. Education was necessary bearing in mind that the diocese was to experience the issue of succession for the first time. Indeed the laity do not know what takes place in the church. For example, someone from the provincial headquarters was necessary to go to the ground in Muhabura and explain to the diocese what was expected of them in the electoral process. It is no wonder that the laity were astonished to learn that the candidate of their choice as reflected in their EC was not elected by the HO.B.

The chancellors both at the provincial and diocesan levels would have prior explained to the EC that their role was to nominate as provided in the constitution. The chancellors would have even gone to the whole synod and explained since the synod is the one which elects the EC. There is lack of democracy in C.O.U. The bishops and other clergy have usurped the would be powers of the laity. It is true that the Bishops/clergy provide leadership to the church, but the lay people should be allowed to express their leadership positions in the church. They should actually be allowed to make decisions. This, however, is possible when they nominate one for pastoral training and ordination. But once a priest is ordained, he is given powers to lead but he also usurps powers of the lay Christians. In Muhabura diocese, the House of bishops failed to take the laity representatives seriously even before the announcement of the bishop elect at Lweza. In fact, the crisis could have been stopped at H O.B but Bishops think that they are very authoritative and that they should not be challenged. This was clear when Muhabura Christians asked Dr.
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Philemon Mateke and Eddie Kwizera to talk to the H.O.B at Lweza but they were ignored.

In Dr. Baganizi’s view, the people who were going to have the bishop should have been listened to. There should have been some kind of special relationship and understanding between those who nominated and those who elected. And before the announcement, the HOB needed to be satisfied that everything was okay. Although it would have been difficult for the H.O.B to reverse the decision; what they did not know was that there was going to arise a serious crisis in the church. It is clear that H.O.Bs did not weigh the outcome of their decision. The bishops would have sat and discussed the complaints of the laity immediately but they were instead rubbed.

Likewise in a democratic institution based on brotherhood, H.O.B would have explained to the Christians why the voice of the Electoral College was not taken seriously. Instead H. O.B wished to maintain the unpopular mystery, full of hypocrisy surrounding the election of a bishop. It is high time that election of Bishops in C.O.U became clear to the local Christians;

Indeed election of bishops is only a mystery in C.o. U; and why must it be a mystery?

The researcher thinks that it is also important that the outgoing bishop should seriously be kept outside the electoral process of his successor. May be the incumbent bishop should first retire or the church should come up with stringent measures to deter his undue influence in the electoral process. Considering the course of events of the crisis in Muhabura diocese, Dr. Baganizi declared withdrawal of his candidature to the Muhabura diocesan See by 2002. He has since been as silent as a ‘corpse’ with the hope that the crisis would subside. But alas his utmost silence could not deter those in his favour to pursue the issue further. The pro-Baganizi Christians were now determined to forestall the consecration and enthronement of the bishop-elect now that there were no hopes of having Dr. Baganizi, bishop of Muhabura.

75 Wilson Baganizi, interviewed on 25.05.2005
76 Wilson Baganizi, interviewed on 25.05.2005
77 Wilson Baganizi, interviewed on 25.05.2005
5.11 DIOCESAN SYNOD CONVENTION

This was the first sitting of the 4th diocesan synod, which took place between 21st and 29th of November 2002, in St. Andrew's cathedral Seseme. The heavily attended synod meeting was convened and chaired by the Archbishop who was also bishop of Muhabura diocese. He inaugurated this new diocesan synod and deliberations went on with particular emphasis on the bishop elect issues and generally the conflict in the diocese but also reminded the members of the house of bishops’ decision to consecrate the bishop elect on 19th January 2003. In his charge he stated that for the last 14 months since Rev canon David Sebuhinja was elected as bishop of Bishops to replace the Rt. Rev Shalita, the Christians had been consecrated and enthroned as bishop yet there was nothing wrong posted against him;

The synod members were irked and disappointed with the decision of the House of Bishops; where upon they too re-affirmed their position on rejection of the bishop elect. They upheld the reasons that they had raised in the previous synod (3rd synod) for rejection of the bishop elect. They all appealed to the House of Bishops to review the consultation meetings of the committees they had appointed to look at the Muhabura conflict including Rt. Rev Sekkadde, Rt. Rev Sinabulya, Rt. Rev Mutebi and others.

The debate became very hot between the pro-Sebuhinja and anti-Sebuhinja synod members whereby there was physical fight between the members in front of the Archbishop; the synod chairman.

We have all these months waited and tried to find out as to why canon Sebuhinja was allegedly refused and up to now there hasn’t been true accusation nor false allegation that has been filed against him’’
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The debate surrounded as to whether the bishop elect should be consecrated on the 19th of January 2003 or not. A decision was taken in the meeting that members should vote by lining up to resolve this issue. In the process of voting, some members of the synod about 49 of them walked out. These were the pro-bishop elect. 107 members voted against the consecration of the bishop elect where as 11 members absconded from voting.

The Archbishop never interpreted the results of the voting but pledged that he would report back to the House of Bishops. 80 The Archbishop had now realized that it was impossible for the consecration to take place. Majority did not want the bishop elect. In addition they were very violent. How could the consecration and enthronement of the Bishop elect be possible?

Much as the House of Bishops had earlier reached a decision to consecrate the bishop elect on the 19th January 2003; the bishops did not know the magnitude of the problem/conflict on ground. The Archbishop had witnessed it all by himself. With agreement or disagreement of the House of Bishops; it was impossible for him to stand and test the fire of Muhabura Christians.

The pro-Sebuhinja synod members, dissatisfied with the outcomes of the synod meeting wrote a scorning letter to the Archbishop on 3rd December 2002; which the researcher saw. They accused the Archbishop of conspiring with the opposition group to defy the decision of the House of Bishops. They said that he was instigating the Christians and allying with politicians to sabotage the consecration.

In part of their letter stated thus;

...where as it is generally believed that the self-styled politicians who are avowedly opposed to the Bishop-elect canon David Sebuhinja would by now have subsided into acceptance; the Archbishop’s defiant schemes have been rekindling the outrage of the politicians to wage war against
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the House of Bishops. This behavior at the caliber of an Archbishop is deeply deplorable.

The pro-Sebuhinja Christians were not happy with convening this particular synod meeting. They indicated their disapproval in a letter dated 23rd November 2002 to the Archbishop.

The pro-Sebuhinja synod members wished the Archbishop during the synod meeting to constantly remind and re-affirm to the synod only the program for consecration and enthronement said to be in next January. They did not expect him to entertain any discussion as regards the rejection of the bishop elect. But this was wrong and unrealistic assumption of the so-called faithful’s. How could they expect the Archbishop to dictate on what should be discussed and what should not be discussed?

Moreover in a synod meeting; how could it have been possible for the Archbishop to rule against the majority of the synod members?

They further accused the Archbishop of enticing the anti-decision of the House of Bishops to speak out their negative feelings about the Bishop elect's consecration and enthronement scheduled for next January. They claimed that this helped the opposition group to recover their morale and fighting power basing on the Archbishop's sermon to the synod (Jonah 1:12).

Such scorning and abusive correspondences to the Archbishop made him develop negative feelings for the pro-Sebuhinja group. More and more he kept on leaning towards the opposition group. Well, the pro-sebuhinja were the minority and following the seemingly unrealistic established church institutions through whom the bishop elect had passed through; their uncompromising character and scorn for the provincial leadership deprived them of any little sympathies they would derive. Day by day they were losing grip of the objective.

5: 12 ARCHBISHOPS POSTPONES CONSECRATION

In a press release dated 14th January 2003, the House of Bishops suspended the consecration and enthronement of Bishop elect of Muhabura diocese, in part of the

*In view of the conflict and disunity prevailing in the diocese of Muhabura, the House of Bishops meeting this 141h day of January 2003 resolves to defer indefinitely the consecration and enthronement of Bishop. Elect, Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja*,

Therefore the ceremony could not take place on the 19th January 2003 as had been agreed upon earlier. This was not only surprising but also disappointing to the bishop elect, bishop Shalita and all those Christians behind them.

According to Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja, the Archbishop had developed a negative attitude towards him personally and he did not want him to become Bishop. He claimed that the postponement of the ceremony was also surprising to many members of the House of the Bishops. Postponing the consecration was the Archbishop's own making and not the consensus of the House of Bishops.

The bishop elect in discontentment narrated that a few days to consecration; the Archbishop invited all bishops to Kampala reportedly to travel to Muhabura for the ceremony. But the Archbishop had received a joint report from Rev. Kaiso of UJCC, the Diocesan secretary of Kampala diocese and Mr. Mungat. He claimed that the report was advising the Archbishop not to consecrate Rev Canon Sebuhinja; citing unfavorable circumstances prevailing for the ceremony. The bishop elect further claimed that when the Archbishop addressed the House of Bishops; the bishops were unhappy about the decision but the consecration all the same was postponed indefinitely.

This was frustrating especially to the pro-Sebuhinja group. They had spent a lot of money preparing for the consecration and booking hotels. In fact by December 2002, just one month to the ceremony; eleven million of Ugandan money had been
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Collected; in addition to three cows, six goats, numerous chickens and comfortable accommodation for the visitors.

On the other hand, this was victory to the anti Sebuhinja group. The opposition group had a thanks giving service on the 19th of January 2003, thanking the Archbishop for deferring the consecration. They now realized that the province had accepted the voice of the Christians, which they wanted the House of Bishops to be taken as the voice of God.

5:13 ACTIVITIES OF NEW DIOCESAN COUNCIL

With the inauguration of the 4th synod of the diocese, came with new members of the diocesan council. Majority on this diocesan council were members of anti-sebuhinja. This ignited resentment from the pro-sebuhinja members on the council and was determined to oppose, scold and reject any decision that was not in their favor. Even in this very council disagreements were very common.

The pro-sebuhinja click refused to recognize this new diocesan council and repeatedly called it an illegal council.

On 7th April 2003, the Archbishop convened the diocesan council in which he sacked the two Archdeacons; Canon Mature and Erastus from the Bishop's commissary and replaced them with people from the opposition. These were Mr. David Kanyaruzu and Mrs. Hope Luzaza. This council was chaired by Canon Muruta. Rev. Canon Esau Muruta remained the chairman of the Bishop's commissaries. The sacked pro-sebuhinja Archdeacons who were pro-sebuhinja diehards were very disappointed. By this time there was no room to discuss the extent of how the Archbishop favored the opposition group.

Now that the Bishop's commissaries can reach a decision without disagreements and majority of the diocesan council members are anti-sebuhinja, they began hatching plans of how they can completely neutralize the activities and influence of pro-sebuhinja people in the diocese.

5.13.1 Diocesan Council Resolutions

Under the chairmanship of Rev. Canon Esau Muruta; the head of the Bishop's commissaries; the diocesan Council put in place new diocesan boards and communities. It was the Archbishop who directed this to happen. The council had also resolved to close the diocesan offices but the Archbishop restrained them."

The council had also resolved to direct parishes to stop taking quotas to the then diocesan treasurer who was a pro-sebuhinja stalwart. Of course this was disastrous to the diocese. The pro-sebuhinja sacked bishop's commissaries were angered more and protested to the Archbishop over the activities of the canon Muruta as well as refuting the legality of the present diocesan council. The pro-sebuhinja members shunned many of these council meetings and they denied being party to most of the resolutions. They claimed that the diocesan council was illegal and its chairman was using this illegal council to escalate the conflict in the diocese.

On 11th August 2003, 57 Christians wrote to Rev. Canon Esau Muruta, declaring him an illegal chairman of fake diocesan council meetings. They disassociated themselves from those meetings. It is clear that by this time, the diocesan council meetings were being attended by only members of the opposition.

In November 2003, the Archbishop sent the retired bishop Wilson Mutebi to carry out pastoral duties in Muhabura diocese. Among which he was to baptize, confirm Christians and chair diocese council meetings. The representative pastoral duties of Bishop Mutebi were irksome to the pro-sebuhinja click.

5.13.2 Rev. Gideon Kwizera is made "Canon".

They accused bishop Mutebi of causing more trouble in Muhabura and acting contrary to the constitution. They claimed that it was illegal for bishop Mutebi to have made Rev. Gideon Kwizera a canon. In part of their protest letter they stated that retired bishop Wilson Mutebi went to the extreme of making Rev. Gideon Kwizera a
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Canon in St. Andrews Cathedral. In their view, bishop Mutebi had neither a Cathedral nor Episcopal staff in Muhabura and so it was not proper for him to make someone a canon he had never and would never work with. They felt this was scandalous to the church of Uganda. They claimed that they were always offended by instigators of trouble like Bishop Mutebi who wanted to ignite confusion to allow them keep on coming in Muhabura for their selfish ends.

To Rev. canon Gideon Kwizera, the complaints of the pro-sebuhinja group are baseless. He did not lobby or campaign to be made a canon. He insisted that the correct procedures were followed when he was made canon. He claimed that it was he Archbishop who has also bishop of Muhabura, who for his long service and dedication to the church saw it fit that he became a canon.

5.13.3. Archbishop extends Rev Canon Esau Muruta's retirement

It was also during the pastoral duties of Bishop Mutebi, that canon Muruta was requested by the Archbishop to delay his retirement by more two years though he was to retire by 31st December 2003. The Archbishop should have realized that canon Muruta was doing a lot of good work to recover the diocese from the conflict. The fact was that canon Muruta is a much-respected experienced clergyman in Muhabura and majority of Christians both lay and clergy like him. Secondly much as he had joined the opposition; he was not an extremist and therefore thought to be someone who could help initiate reconciliation among the divided Christians of Muhabura. This was received with resentment from the pro-sebuhinja group. They accused Archbishop and Bishop Mutebi of acting outside the legal framework of church of Uganda, in their protest letters, the pro-sebuhinja clergy stated;

_They have undermined the church constitution by giving Rev Canon Esau Muruta more years to continue serving after his December 31.2003 retirement. They have terminated the services of an active pastor. Rev. Arthur Niyonsaba of 40_
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years of age but Muruta of over 65 years of age is to continue serving.

But just as we have already stated, the Archbishop was now interested in working with those who had a positive attitude towards the reconciliation process and canon Muruta was not negative about it either.

5.13.4. Diocesan staff transfers.

In the diocesan council meeting which took place on 15th November 2003, and chaired by the Archbishop's delegate; the retired Bishop Wilson Mutebi, there was a reshuffle in the diocesan staff. Bishop Shalita who was not satisfied with the staff transfers attributed the unfair transfers to Dr. Mateke's influence. He alleged that Bishop Mutebi transferred staff of Muhabura diocese on the advice of Dr. Philemon Mateke.⁹⁰

5.13.5 Reasons for transfers of diocesan staff

The intention of the transfers was to help the clergy who had been chased away from their parishes to get other parishes where they would conduct their businesses." The clergy who had expressed their support for the Bishop elect were chased and sometimes beaten up by their Christians. These had run away from the parishes and were at their homes idle.

It was also alleged that the people who were in the offices were related to Sebuhinja and bishop Shalita and were therefore their supporters. These did not want anything to happen in the diocese other than consecrating the bishop elect; which was by this time impossible, so to pave way for reconciliation these staff transfers were necessary?

⁹⁰ Ernest Shalita, Interviewed on 08.06.2004.
⁹¹ Gideon Kwizera, interviewed on 11.06.2004.
⁹² Gakuru, Laity, Kisoro Town, interviewed on id 11.06.2004
Also due to bishop Mutebi’s prior observations and recommendations about the conflict in Muhabura; the transfers were in partial implementation of the

Diocesan staff who had served for long in certain offices who were related to bishop shalita and bishop elect were duly transferred to other offices. Some of the diocesan staff including the parish priests of pro-sebuhinja was transferred to parishes which were strong pro-Baganizi. This was in a bid for the natural law to work. It was assumed that these would be forced or humbled for submission to the majority view of Christians in those parishes. Of course such priests who were strong pro-sebuhinja hard-liners were always chased away by the Christians."

5.13.6 Execution of staff transfers

Notably of those who were transferred included the following:

Rev. canon Gideon Kwizera was removed from office of Diocesan secretary and made dean of Cathedral. Note that before the transfers, he was also sub dean of the Cathedral.

Rev. Canon Baker Habimana was promoted from child sponsorship program officer to Diocesan secretary.

A whole education secretary of the diocese was transferred to Kabindi parish as assistant parish pastor. Rev. Jackson Sabiti, who had been pastor at Kabindi parish, was made diocesan Education secretary and acting Archdeacon of Gisorora Archdeaconry. Rev. Ephraim Mbabazi, who had been diocesan development and planning officer, was replaced by Rev. Emmanuel Mfitumukiza.

Some other diocesan staff were demoted, some were taken to small village parishes and others completely laid off. The diocesan treasurer, Mrs. Joan Bahizi was made diocesan auditor and her previous post was to be advertised.

5.13.7. Reaction to staff transfers

93 Gakuru, Ibid.
Many of the transferred diocesan staff especially those who were pro-Sebuhinja refused to comply with the staff board resolutions. They looked at their transfers as victimization for their pro-house of bishops' decision views.

On 17th November 2003, just two days after the staff board resolution on staff transfers, the pro-sebuhinja transferred clergy and lay workers of the diocese wrote to the Archbishop protesting the staff transfers. They said that the diocesan council that resolved on the transfers was illegal and a composition of Dr. Philemon Mateke's opposition group. They decried the actions of the council for demoting, dropping and transferring 18 diocesan staff who support the decision of the House of the Bishops." They vowed not to honor "retired Bishop Mutebi and Mateke's reshuffle" of the diocesan staff. They wondered how retired Bishop Mutebi, who does not understand the problems of Muhabura diocese, would reshuffle staff.

They complained of victimization for being in support of the bishop elect. They said the transfers and demotions had demoralized some of the senior staff, and were unrealistic. For example a senior Archdeacon and commissary Erastus Gapfuyekubaho had been demoted from the office of the Archdeacon and posted to a young village parish of Maregamo." The clergy who refused to move said that they could not be transferred by politicians and someone who is not their diocesan bishop. And moreover the transfers were taking immediate effect yet they had not been informed before the transfers. Bishop Mutebi had no idea of where the transferred clergy were going. He did not know the geography of Muhabura diocese; for example, they transferred one lame clergy to the most volcanic mountainous area; where it could have been very difficult for him to carry out his pastoral duties"

The staff refused the transfers. Those working at the diocesan offices refused to hand over offices to the newly appointed staff. They locked their offices and remained in their homes. According to the report on staff transfers made by Rev. Emmanuel Mfitumukiza, planning and development; the transfers were a fiasco. People refused
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move from their current positions of work. Therefore even those who were willing
to move could not move.” Mrs. Joan Bahizi is said to have been removed from
Jury office and given a post that was non-existent in diocesan structure. There was
Such office of auditor.99

On 14th January 2004, the Archbishop ordered that all diocesan clergy and lay staff
must respect and obey the decisions made by the diocesan synod, council and staff
board. He told them that the decisions of the meetings chaired by Bishop Mutebi were
binding.

In response to the Archbishop's plea, the rebellious staff in defiance of the diocesan
council decisions and authority of the Archbishop, who also is bishop of Muhabura,
wrote a scorning letter assuring him that they were not ready to move even an inch
from their current places of work. They even accused the Archbishop of working
outside the law. 100

5.14 Archbishop is sued in High Court of Uganda

(i) Who sued the Archbishop?

In May 2003, some members from the pro-Sebuhinja click sued the Archbishop of the
province of church of Uganda in the High Court of Uganda.

These lay Christians were:

Emmanuel Ziraguma, of 40 years old, resident of Kisoro town and prays at St.
Andrews Cathedral Seseme.

Paul Manjari, of 83 years old from Bunagana church of Uganda.

Charles Mbarusha, of 33 years old, from Kasoru church of Uganda in Kabindi
Archdeaconry.

(ii) Accusations against the Archbishop.

They accused the Archbishop of the following:

98 Emmanuel Mfitumukiza, Report on staff transfers, Muhabura
diocesan offices, Kisoro, 15.11.2003.
99 Ernest Shalita, Interviewed on 08.06.2004
JO<Memoranda by pro-Sebuhinja transferred clergy, dated 19.01.2004
➢ Failure to exercise his powers under the church of Uganda constitution to consecrate and enthrone Rev. canon David Sebuhinja, who was duly nominated and elected as the bishop elect of Muhabura diocese.

➢ Wrongfully taking over the diocese of Muhabura as caretaker bishop and there upon taking decisions which had caused a lot of confusion and divided the laity of the diocese resulting in a crisis that had paralyzed the activities of the diocese. They said that the Archbishop had neglected his constitutional duty of consecrating the bishop elect with no genuine reason, and that he had taken over the diocese illegally.

These three lay members wanted court to force the Archbishop to consecrate Rev. canon David Sebuhinja, the bishop elect. They also wanted court to order him move out of the diocese of Muhabura.

(iii) Court ruling.

Much as the Archbishop cited confusion and insecurity in Kisoro as the great problems that have delayed him to consecrate and enthrone the bishop elect; and that he had taken over the diocese in accordance with the provisions of C.O.U provincial constitution; it did not sound appealing to the judges. The court ruled that the Archbishop had failed to consecrate and enthrone the bishop elect. Court ruled that the claimed insecurity was no big deal to have affected the ceremony. Court therefore ordered the Archbishop to immediately organize for the consecration and enthronement of Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja. The Archbishop therefore lost in court.

(iv) Reconciliation process.

Court gave the two parties one-month to settle their differences out of court as they prepare for the consecration and enthronement of the bishop elect.

Archbishop's lawyer asked for reconciliation to take place. It was agreed that 10 people; taking 5 from pro-Sebuhinja and 5 from anti-Sebuhinja together with the
Archbishop and the two lawyers for both sides meet at Lweza to chat out for reconciliation and the way forward.

Pro-Sebuhinja sent their five representatives to Lweza on the agreed day but the anti-Sebuhinja group declined. None of its members appeared at Lweza. Archbishop himself came to Lweza. He however was angry and rebuked the Christians for taking him to court. The Christians are believed to have run away. They even refused to have a cup tea with the Archbishop.

The Archbishop by this time was fed up with the issues of Muhabura. He had developed reluctance over Muhabura issues. The Muhabura Christians had scolded him many times, openly abused him through their correspondences, and physically fought each other in front of him. He had lost interest in them; he indeed wanted to get relief from this problem. No wonder on many occasions, concerning Muhabura conflict, he was just delegating.

(v) Archbishop reacts to court ruling.

Archbishop Nkoyoyo did not oppose the court ruling but declined to implement its orders. Apparently he was outraged with his flock for being sued in court. He is said to have produced three actions in connection to the court ruling.

Firstly he openly said that he would not personally consecrate the bishop elect of Muhabura diocese, Rev. canon David Sebuhinja. He advised that court in association with his lawyers could go and preside over this ceremony. That the magistrate would go and install the bishop elect protected by state security.

He also said that despite the court ruling, the consecration was not possible. He said the Muhabura Christians were prepared to kill. They were prepared to cause bloodshed. He likened Muhabura Christians to the Hutu like tendencies of the Rwandese; who spearheaded the 1994 genocide; he thus clearly stated;
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When I went to Muhabura I was nearly beaten up. Those people behave like the Hutus did in 1994 and I am not ready to experience the same.... it may require over 5000 soldiers to oversee the exercise. 104

Lastly, in less than five months to his retirement, the Archbishop made an appeal to the court of appeal of Uganda at Kampala. He wished that the court of appeal reverses and nullifies the high court ruling. His memorandum and record of appeal was received in the court of appeal of Uganda on the 23rd of January 2004. By the time of compiling this report, the case was still in the court of appeal of Uganda.

But one wonders why the Archbishop filed for an appeal in the court of appeal of Uganda. Was he not taking the conflict to higher heights? The Archbishop could have taken the matter to the church tribunals.

The question remains; can the civil court solve the problem? Possibly it can offer possible alternative solutions but it is shameful for a civil court to direct church Issues.

5.15 REASONS FOR ARCHBISHOP'S REFUSAL TO CONSECRATE AND ENTHRONED BISHOP ELECT

The Archbishop expressed utmost determination to consecrate and enthrone the Rev. canon David Sebuhinja as Bishop of Muhabura. This determination waned as more and more days passed along with many disappointing events taking shape in Muhabura.

So much was said and heard and most of it was fabricatory information about Archbishop Nkoyoyo. The Archbishop was disappointed with such information coming from the bishop elect, retired bishop Shalita, and their supporters; defaming the office of the Archbishop and his individual personality. He openly told the bishop elect thus;

With all these lies, you are spreading about me; I have lost the morale to come to Muhabura ... I will never consecrate
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and enthrone you as bishop of Muhabura diocese. I thought I was dealing with people of the spint.""

The following are the reasons that made the Archbishop develop a negative attitude towards installing the bishop elect.

(i) **Insecurity in Muhabura.**
The Christians in Muhabura had become violent. They threatened to cause bloodshed if the Archbishop dared to install the bishop elect. The Christians had vowed to kill any bishop who would attempt to travel to Muhabura for this particular ceremony. The Archbishop therefore said that he did not have a military force to provide him with security.

(ii) **The negative reports that the Archbishop was receiving about the consecration and enthronement of the bishop elect.**
For example the Sinabulya report did not recommend at all the consecration and enthronement of bishop elects but rather recommended that a caretaker bishop should be appointed for Muhabura diocese. The same report also observed that it would be very difficult to consecrate and enthrone canon Sebuhinja under the prevailing conflict. The provincial chancellor's report advised the House of Bishop's not to down play the seriousness of the conflict and not to rush to consecrate and enthrone the next Bishop of Muhabura. The observation of the Rt. Rev Wilson Mutebi, who was in Muhabura to represent the Archbishop on several occasions at the peak of the conflict, was negative about consecration and enthronement of bishop elect. Of course we should not downplay the fact that God speaks through people.

(iii) **Over whelming opposition to the bishop elect.**
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At first the Archbishop and the House of Bishops had been convinced by the retiring bishop Shalita that the Muhabura problem was just between Dr. Philemon Mateke and the bishop elect. Shalita had claimed that the rest of Christians were happy with the bishop elect. This was to be proved wrong. In a memorandum from the Christians of the Muhabura diocese dated 30th January 2002; more than one thousand Christians signed on it.

During Bishop Mutebi’s pastoral services in the diocese, he moved with the bishop elect, who received scorn and resentment whenever they moved in the churches. During the synod meeting on the 28th November, 2002, convened and chaired by the Archbishop himself, in response to a motion that there should be voting to decide whether the consecration was possible; more than two thirds (2/3) of the synod voted against the consecration of the bishop elect. To this effect the Archbishop was over whelmed, refused to make a comment on the results of the voting and just said that he was going to duly report to the house of bishops 108.

(iv) Failure of the reconciliation process.

A part from the prevailing insecurity in Muhabura; the Archbishop claimed that he cannot consecrate and enthrone the bishop elect, when there was divisive and conflicting parties in the diocese. He wanted the conflicting groups of Christians to reconcile with one another so that they can receive the new bishop when as one person. The more they waited for the two parties to reconcile, the more the divisions increased. The commissaries he put in place failed to initiate the necessary reconciliation.

The commissaries themselves never worked as one. They instead filed accusations against each other. Worse of all was the pro-Sebuhinja extremists including the bishop elect himself, who argued that reconciliation can only take place when the bishop elect has been installed. They extremely believed that it was only through the consecrated bishop that reconciliation would be possible.
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(v) **Archbishop was grieved over being taken to court.**

To the Archbishop, being sued in the high court of Uganda meant that he was the one blocking the consecration. They perhaps wanted the court to force the Archbishop to consecrate the bishop elect. And perhaps wished him be imprisoned for breaching the constitution of the church of Uganda and Muhabura Diocese.

In fact it became very obvious, that the bishop elect and bishop Shalita were the key brains behind the court case. They provided the court costs including hiring lawyers. "How could you expect me to consecrate and enthrone someone who has taken me to court? Let the magistrate go and preside over the ceremony. Bishop Shalita and the bishop elect organized people who were not even known to me to sue me in the high court of Uganda.

(vi) **Sebuhinja's decline on a number of offers.**

The bishop elect issues had divided up people in Kisoro including those who did not belong to the Anglican Church of Uganda. The most and only lasting solution to the conflict would have been the bishop elects to step down; but he vehemently refused. So much was offered to him such that he goes out of conflict but he refused. For example; he was asked to be consecrated at Namirembe rather than in Muhabura, which was insecure, but he refused.

The Archbishop in liaison with the bishop of Namirembe, Rt. Rev Ssekadde, asked him to be taken to Namugongo and he works in the theological college but refused. Again Rev. Barham, a white, desperate to bring the conflict to an end in Muhabura; offered to take Rev. canon David Sebuhinja to England together with his wife and all children. Rev. Barham had secured finances and wanted the Rev. canon Sebuhinja to go for master’s degree studies but he refused. It is clear Rev. Canon Sebuhinja wanted to be bishop at all costs. But to Archbishop Nkoyoyo, he did not want to impose on Christians a bishop they did not want.

Bishop elect's indecision on several matters.

Indeed the Archbishop should have realized in the bishop elect what the Christians were alleging against him. He is a man who cannot decide for himself. The Archbishop feared to have a bishop who could not take stern decisions on behalf of Christians of a diocese should a very serious issue arise. The Archbishop could not imagine someone who as bishop elect did not have an independent mind.

For example, when Archbishop asked the bishop elect to be appointed a worker at Namgongo; he said that he needed some days to consult first. He probably went to consult bishop Shalita who told him to decline the offer. When Rev. Barham offered the bishop elect a scholarship to study in England; he requested to be given some time to seek consultations. In the end he refused the offer. When told that he would be consecrated at Namirembe, it is alleged that on consulting bishop Shalita; he declined to be consecrated at Namirembe.

False allegations against Archbishop Nkoyoyo.

Bishop Shalita and the bishop elect spread unrealistic rumors to the world intended to tarnish the personality of the Archbishop. The two traveled to the Anglican province of Rwanda and talked to some bishops there who were very friendly to Ugandan Archbishop. They alleged to the Rwandese bishops that Archbishop Nkoyoyo was the biggest block to bishop elect's consecration and enthronement in Muhabura diocese. They further alleged that Archbishop Nkoyoyo had defied the decision of the House of Bishops and that the decision not to consecrate Rev. canon Sebuhinja was personal and not the view of the House of Bishops. They also alleged that he had allied with the politicians to block the bishop elect. Worst of all was the allegation that Archbishop Nkoyoyo had been bribed by chairman house of laity and LC (v) chairman Kisoro district, a sum of 4.5 million Uganda shillings. The bribe was allegedly to convince the Archbishop not to
Consecrate the bishop elect. The two Rwandese bishops brought wholesomely the allegations of bishop Shalita and bishop elect to Archbishop Nkoyoyo and his wife. This irked the Archbishop most. It was after all these that the Archbishop openly told the bishop elect that he would never consecrate and enthrone him.

What was even more discouraging was that the two alleged that the 4.5 million Uganda money was to be shared among four (4) rich people, including Mungat and the Archbishop.

(ix) Archbishop lost morale for Muhabura case.

The Archbishop became demoralized. He felt some elements were cheapening him. By this time, he did not want to get involved in Muhabura conflict. Because of the above allegations; the Archbishop got a very bad impression of Rev. canon Sebuhinja. He could not think, he could be endowed with the Holy Spirit to pray for the bishop elect. The conflict had become so monotonous to the Archbishop that he proposed to the House of Bishops to appoint two other bishops to handle Muhabura issues. These were Bishop Kyamugambi and Bishop Onono Onweng. The Archbishop now could know what was happening in Muhabura through the two House of Bishops’ delegates, newspapers and or rumours if he wanted to know any way.

The unchristian conduct of the pro-Sebuhinja click, the bishop elect himself were discouraging to the Archbishop. They made the Archbishop’s heart harden more than ever before. The pro-sebuhinja clergy were abusive to the church’s chief shepherd. The lay members who supported the bishop elect were not different either. They threatened to kill the Archbishop if he dared go to Muhabura. The Archbishop told me that they would ring
mobile phone and threaten to kill him and warn him against meddling in Muhabura affairs. They would ring accusing him of refusal to consecrate the bishop elect. This coupled with the bishop elect's unchristian conduct of spreading unrealistic, personality defaming information about the Archbishop were enough to turn the Archbishop negative towards the consecration process. This even became worse when the pro-sebuhinja group would write correspondences to the Archbishop, abusing him and accusing him for several allegations. The researcher saw many of these abusive correspondences. Archbishop Nkoyoyo was surprised to see that even the patron of the diocesan mother's Union and wife of contending diocesan bishop Mrs. Marion Sebuhinja was a signatory to such letters abusing the Archbishop. Archbishop Nkoyoyo retired without consecrating bishop elect of Muhabura; yet during his term of office, he had successfully consecrated and enthroned 25 bishops of church of Uganda. 

Well, will Rev. Canon David sebuhinja be bishop of Muhabura diocese? Can it be possible for the new Archbishop to consecrate and enthrone him? We cannot hold any assumptions but put everything in God's hands as Rev. Jackson sabiti says; "Iam waiting to see Rev. Canon Sebuhinja consecrated may be a miracle can happen!"

5.16 INvolvement of the state in Muhabura conflict

Unlike in Busoga; where the major stakeholders were not actively inclined to politics and state activities, the case in Kisoro was different. The major players in Muhabura crisis are also influential prominent politicians in the district and the country. Because of their active political participation, it was always hard to disassociate them from their political grounds when it came to church affairs.

For example, the Diocesan Chancellor of Muhabura, who presided over the electoral college; which nominated the Rev. canon David Sebuhinja was honorable Sam Bitangaro. He is a member of parliament and a minister in the movement government.

when the crisis came to its peak, he decided to resign from his post. It could have been to avoid any possible shame to the government, that possibly the government wished Rev. canon David Sebuhinja to be bishop. He completely pulled out of the diocesan affairs and could not even go to testify in court when the Archbishop was sued in the high court.

Dr. Philemon Mateke, chairman house of laity Muhabura diocese doubles as the district local council five chairman. He is a very influential man in the district. He commands a lot of respect and is seen as the lord and Governor of the Bafumbira.

Bishop Shalita claimed that when Dr. Mateke confronted the Bishops at Lweza, he went there in his capacity as district local council chairman. He further claimed that as district local council chairman; he organized a rally at the Cathedral on 26th September 2001 and launched a campaign to reject the bishop elect.

Archbishop Nkoyoyo feared to consecrate the bishop elect due to prevailing insecurity in Muhabura. He expressed fears that Dr. Philemon Mateke as chairman of the Bafumbira had the capacity to organize his people and they roll the volcanic stones at Kanaba to block the Archbishop from reaching Sesemi. Whatever the case; Dr. Philemon Mateke never got involved in the crisis in his capacity as district local council chairman but because of his influential position, the Bafumbira including those who were not Anglicans could always rally behind him for anything they thought was of concern to their chairman. It was therefore difficult to distinguish his influence in church as chairman house of laity and district local council chairman.

Another most important government official who was central to the conflict was canon Bitunguramye. He was also a member of the Electoral College which nominated the Rev. canon David Sebuhinja to the House of Bishops. He also doubles as district movement chairman, Kisoro. His involvement in Muhabura conflict put the movement government at risk. People claimed that the movement government did not wish the Rev. Canon Sebuhinja to be bishop. This is because canon Bitunguramye was one of the key persons on the anti-Sebuhinja group.

113 Ernest Shalita, interviewed on 8.06.2004.
RDC’S Involvement

At the peak of the Crisis was Mr. Robert Nambafu as the Resident District Commissioner of Kisoro. He was key in this conflict. The RDC got involved in this crisis in his official capacity and as a member of the Anglican Church. When the Bishop Shalita wrote to him seeking for security because of the prevailing violence, he expressed impartiality throughout the crisis. He always deployed police whenever there was violence. On several occasions he would go and talk to the violent Christians in order to calm them. When things became worse he did not hesitate to call in the Army.

The new RDC of Kisoro, Mr. David Mutabunga Masereka, expressed a lot of concern to see the conflict resolved but added that as district security committee had made it categorically clear that they would be impartial, but if things went beyond, they would not hesitate to criminalize any person of all levels and status. He clearly warned all the warring factions against any forms of violence.

When violence erupted at Muramba parish in Kabindi Archdeaconry, the RDC sent police to calm the situation. It arrested the priest and lay reader who were at the center of the controversy and both were produced in court. The people however blamed the police for interfering in church affairs and harassing the people."

The RDC was highly blamed for harassing those on the opposition and being used by Bishop Shalita to intervene into something he did not know well. On several occasions, the RDC deployed police in the Cathedral during church services. Christians could attend church services in the Cathedral together with gun wielding policemen. This was to neutralize any possible violent activities that had become common during such services. They however accused principal judge-Justice Ntagoba of personally interfering with the court ruling involving the Archbishop with some three members of Muhabura.
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diocese. He is believed to have influenced the decisions of the high court. He was pro-sebuhinja and had vowed to preside over this case himself.

Principal Judge Ntagoba, who is born in Kisoro, was alleged to have allied with Bishop Shalita and the Bishop elect to witch hunt members of the opposition. A case in point were the allegations of defamation, Ntagoba and Shalita brought against Augustine Ntibarikure, an anti-Sebuhinja stalwart, was dragged to court where upon the magistrate dismissed the case due to lack of sufficient evidence.

Once a Christian becomes an active politician and gets a role to play in the state, it becomes hard to distinguish his roles as politician and Christian when it comes to participating in church activities. What was clear was that the state did not whatsoever have any hidden interests in Muhabura conflict. The police, the RDC were doing their work in response to the obvious violence and insecurity that was brought by the conflicting parties. The police and RDC had to do their role of maintaining law and order without partiality. The major stake holders in this crisis like Kisoro district local council chairman, Kisoro district movement chairman, Kisoro town Mayor, principal judge-justice Ntagoba; got involved in the crisis as active Christians in the diocese but at the same time as members who people turn to whenever they needed guidance, their activities were not therefore sanctioned by the government. What is also very clear is that C. O.U. has maintained its cordial relationship with the state.

The state did not wish to take active participation in the conflict. Its major concern was the violence and death threats, which came with the conflict. On 20th February 2002, the inspector General of police wrote to his grace the Archbishop of the province of church of Uganda urging him to quickly diffuse the crisis in an amicable manner. The police boss was of the view that the House of Bishops pursued the matter to an amicable solution. He however stated that the police would definitely take action against anybody who engaged in any criminal activity.

On February 6th 2002, Bishop Shalita had written to the RDC of Kisoro about such death threats and violence in the church. He indeed appealed to state to provide him
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Security. The state's response was to take soldiers and policemen to church to ensure security during church services.

With security personnel available whenever they were necessary, Bishop Shalita was not happy with the Archbishop's claim that failure to consecrate was caused by the prevailing insecurity. To Bishop Shalita, the state would have provided the necessary security if it was necessary for the Archbishop to consecrate and enthrone the bishop elect. 120

5.17 EFFORTS OF ARCHBISHOP OROMBI

The most Rev. Henry Luke Orombi has inherited one of the greatest challenges facing church of Uganda. This is the succession dispute to the see of Muhabura. His predecessor, retired archbishop Nkoyoyo, left office when some Christians in Muhabura were accusing him of partiality while solving the crisis and therefore siding with the opposition, a group that was opposed to decision of the House of Bishops.

However, the Muhabura Christians; both pro-sebuhinja and anti-sebuhinja are very optimistic with the new Archbishop's steps towards diffusing the prevailing conflicts among them. The crisis in Muhabura diocese is so delicate that he needs the necessary wisdom from God to solve it, as the bishop elects states;

*The Archbishop has to be very careful in handling this crisis since he has just inherited the problem. He has to pray for guidance from God.* 121

Since Archbishop Orombi came to office, he has been steadily looking at this problem. So far he has taken two initiatives in diffusing the crisis. And these have been convening clergy and spouses retreat in Muhabura and putting in place a Confidential review committee on recent staff board transfers.

(I)Clergy and spouses retreat.

This retreat took place between the 12th and 15th of May 2002 at sesemse girls secondary school near the cathedral.
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Through this retreat, the Archbishop had sincere hope that they would be able to come together and as one would pour their hearts to the lord and shall be able to diffuse and antagonize the schemes of the enemy and triumph over his strong holds. He hoped to bring antagonistic clergy together so that they can be able to recognize and forge for a way forward of the diocese.

During the retreat, the Archbishop called for reconciliation to take place among the divided clergy. He preached a message of unity and repentance. He called upon the clergy to forget their differences and work for the mission to which they were called.

The clergymen are said to have realized their mistakes especially about the ongoing crisis as many if not all of them have actively got involved. During the retreat; they acknowledged their sins and asked for forgiveness from God. Those who had taken the Archbishop to court in association with some lay Christians accepted this mistake and prayed for forgiveness too.

100 Archbishop also met the retired clergy and their spouses on Saturday 15\textsuperscript{th} May 2004. This was probably because the retired clergy have also been key participants in this crisis. Many of them have been part of the different clicks of Christians writing and signing correspondences to the Archbishop. Above all, they were also familiar with not only the problem at hand but know the in and out of the diocese.

\textbf{Visitations.}

The Archbishop visited the families of retired Bishop Shalita and bishop elect, Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja. At the bishop-elect’s home, the Archbishop was full of compassion and empathy for the family because of the trying period they were undergoing. He prayed for them and was hopeful that the crisis would be solved and peace would prevail again in Muhabura.

\textbf{Results of the retreat.}

\textsuperscript{122}Archbishop Orombi’s letter to Muhabura clergy, 14.04.2004

\textsuperscript{123}Jackson Sabiti, interviewed on 07.06.2004.

\textsuperscript{124}Ibid.
As already noted before that the clergy realized their mistake and prayed for forgiveness. They henceforth repented of their sins committed during their involvement in the crisis. They also asked the Archbishop to send back the two names that brought controversies in the diocese that is Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja and Rev. Dr. Wilson Baganizi. They asked the House of Bishops to give them another chance to nominate fresh names, so that the diocese could have a bishop. 126

However, retired Bishop Shalita is said to have reacted negatively towards the so-called repentance of the clergy especially those who participated in suing the Archbishop to court. Bishop Shalita is said to have rebuked the clergy and wondered what wrong they had done which needed them to repent. He is believed to have said the following words to the pro-sebuhinja clergy who went to update him on the proceedings of the retreat;

*You have repented ... repented for what? Even if it is dying you.*

The retired Bishop is believed to have castigated the same clergy over their association with the Muruta clergy who are demanding for fresh nominations to the House of Bishops, as though there was anything wrong with the bishop elect, and if the constitution and provincial canons had not been followed during the nomination and election of the Rev. canon David Sebuhinja.

**(iv) Confidential Review Committee.**

During the Archbishop's visit to the diocese, the affected clergy complained bitterly about the staff transfers that had been done by Bishop Wilson Mutebi when he represented Archbishop Nkoyoyo on a number of pastoral visits in the diocese. The Archbishop Orombi expressed concern and wished to understand the problems of those pastors affected by the transfers. He instituted a transfer review committee, chaired by Rev. Jenny Green, a white missionary working with the diocese.
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The crisis in Muhabura diocese is a big challenge not only to the Anglican church of Uganda but also the Anglican Communion worldwide. Following the course of events in the diocese, it becomes clear that there is something wrong going on in the church. It surprises everybody to see that the once united Christians of Muhabura are disunited. They have expressed utmost hatred for their bishop elect; witch hunted the retired bishop whereas the clergy as well as laity are divided up.

The crisis in Muhabura is revealing in that its seeds had been sown in the early days of the creation of the diocese. It is also revealing in that there is an apparent struggle in the church between the clergy and laity over making of major decisions in the church; and on especially regarding who should have more say on election of leaders. The Christians have been divided up between those in support of the bishop elect - Rev. canon David Sebuhinja, and Rev. canon Dr. Baganizi; a nominee rejected by the house of bishops.

Each of these groups has particular interests they want preserved in the church, and, therefore, feels that their candidate would be the best bishop to safeguard such interests.

The nomination process had a lot of external influences and thus was so overt that it opened the eyes of even those who were not aware of church procedures. The two candidates nominated to the house of bishops could not become bishop at the same time and one of the two; Rev Canon David Sebuhinja won the favour of the house of bishops. To the majority of Muhabura Christians, this was a surprise and they therefore expressed resentment to the house of bishops; an indication of either ignorance of the procedures of church leadership or sheer defiance to the leadership of the province of C.O.U. Violence has rocked the diocese, which has indeed exposed the spiritual bankruptcy of the Christians, and now the crisis does not seem to subside.

Neither is there any indications that the bishop elect would be consecrated and enthroned because much has been destroyed, the Archbishop sued in court, yet the Christians have utterly rejected provincial leadership. The cause of this particular scenario is the concern of the next chapter.
CHAPTER SIX

CAUSES OF MUHABURA DIOCESE CRISIS

INTRODUCTION

The crisis in Muhabura diocese has been revealing in so many areas. Though the crisis was ignited by the election of Rev Canon David Sebutinja as bishop elect of Muhabura, there were largely other circumstances which brought about this crisis. Include deviation from biblical principles of church leadership, political influences, Bishop Shalita's influences, declining spirituality, weak provincial leadership, nepotism, among others. We shall have detailed treatment of these causes.

6.2 Deviation from biblical principles of church leadership and administration

(i) Failure to recognise Christ's headship.

In chapter two, we said that the first but less implemented principle in church leadership is Jesus Christ being the head of the church. Unfortunately in C.O.U and Muhabura diocese in particular, this principle was found to be less practised if not completely ignored. The leaders in Muhabura diocese failed to recognise this principle that is why they found themselves in problems. Bishop Shalita for example bad exerted a lot of influence over the diocese that he thought the end of the diocese was in himself. He thought he was the overall head and whatever he would do, Christians would just listen to him. He thought that because of this extended personal influence, he had the ability to run the diocese the way he liked including deciding who would be his successor. No wonder he could not think of any possible opposition from the Christians.' Bishop Shalita had been running the diocese like a family business. He ignored the fact that the church's headship is Christ and anything that the human church leaders have to do must do so in consultation with the church head who should give approval of any intended scheme.
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Bishop Shalita could have followed this principle that he was leading a diocese; but there was a boss above him, who cannot be manipulated neither can he allow his church to be manipulated. Muhabura diocese leaders’ influence in running the diocese showed that they had neglected Christ. They ignored the fact that they were representatives of Christ, who chose them to lead the people on his behalf. Ninety percent of the respondents blamed bishop Shalita for running the diocese as if it was a personal property. Bishop Shalita's undisputed influence over the Electoral College is an indication that members were deemed to make decisions in the interests of the retiring bishop rather than using their free will to nominate people with good suited characters. Bishop Shalita's undue influence in the Muhabura schism without allowing reconciliation to take place allowed Christians to get divided up further. And on the other hand, the chairman of laity held and spoke with such authority that when he took a decision to reject the bishop elect, without allowing room for negotiations initially amounted to running a diocese like one's own household. Once you recognise that Christ is the head of the church, you lead by and through him and you are bound not to have any problem. The biggest problem of Muhabura and perhaps similar to other dioceses in church of Uganda is that they are being run like secular organisations; where executive officers lord it over themselves and make decisions depending on what they think: will benefit themselves and the organization.

In Muhabura, the crisis emerged because the leadership in place was giving pre-eminence to men rather than Christ, the head of the church. The clergy in the diocese and the laity were divided over personalities. One group wished the Rev. Canon Sebuhinja to be bishop whereas others wanted Canon Dr. Baganizi. The crisis in the diocese deepened because the Christians had given human predominance in the church rather than Christ. They were debating who of the two should take the place of pre-eminence in the church. No wonder in Mathew 23:8-10, Jesus denounces the religious leaders of the time, who had brought confusion in society because they exalted themselves rather than God. The bishop elect of Muhabura's conduct was explicit that he was seeking for pre-eminence rather than of Christ. He vowed not to compromise with anything apart from being consecrated and enthroned as bishop of Muhabura. When asked about how the crisis in Muhabura could be ended, he replied that there was need for a
neutral person to mediate the reconciliation between the conflicting parties; and that person needed to be himself because he had suffered a lot because of the crisis” To the bishop elect, reconciliation and conflict mediation can only be by him regardless of the considerations of the head of the church, Christ.

The pro-sebuhinja clergy saw no leadership in Muhabura without the consecration and enthronement of the bishop elect, the anti-Sebuhinja group saw no leadership without the removal of the bishop elect. All this gives us a clear impression that Christians had ignored at all the principle that they needed to put Christ above all in order to design a clean and transparent leadership in the diocese. Rather they were, giving pre-eminence to men. If the Christians in Muhabura in particular and C.O.U in general realised that the church is headed by Christ, they would not need to fight over men to determine who to lead them.

But because, Christians are seeking to exalt others or themselves above Christ, the head: they are seeking for titles as well as putting on clothes of distinction from the flock. Rev Mfitumukiza Emmanuel in due consideration of this advised the bishop elect that, he needed to seek salvation first from the head of the church but not seeking salvation from the purple shirt which bishops put on'.

The leadership identified in Muhabura diocese was that which glorifies men rather once they put predominance of men and neglected Christ as the head of fighting was inevitable to determine which one was best suited for leadership.

(iii) Undermining plurality leadership.

The crisis in Muhabura and other similar conflicts in C.O.U have taken place because the leadership is vested in only one person, the bishop rather than in a number of leaders as it used to be in the New Testament church. Much as there seems to be other leaders in the diocese rather than the bishop, real power and decision making is vested in the bishop. The other leaders are seen to take decisions from the bishop rather than participating in decision-making as it was in the New Testament church.
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With particular reference to Muhabura diocese, overall leadership was in the hands of the Bishop Shalita, who was exalted over any other leader in the diocese. Because he was the diocesan exalted leader, his voice in the House of Bishops sounded great. The bishops had to acknowledge his decision. Because there was no plurality rule or it was undermined in Muhabura, some Christians who had specific gifts in leadership were sidelined or eliminated by those who wanted to exalt themselves in the diocese. Of course when opportunity arose, Christians had to oppose this exaltation of one man that had turned into dictatorship.

Once there is no plurality rule, the bishop was elevated and those who could lead were ignored. A case in point was Rev Canon Sam Mfitumukiza who had worn very many souls to Christ in Muhabura but had been harassed and chased away by bishop Shalita.

It was alleged that when the Muhabura Electoral College met for nominations; the bishop had sent with Rev Canon Sebuhinja a list of names to be nominated for bishop to the House of Bishops". In the Electoral College, plurality rule was undermined.

This group of elders with equality would have in agreement discerned the Lord's guidance and selected a person who was acceptable to all.

In case the elders on the Electoral College had agreed during the nominations, the Muhabura Christians would have sincerely approved their decision just like it happened in Acts 6 when the congregation approved the decision of the elders.

When there was resentment of the Christians towards the bishop elect in Muhabura, there was no meeting of the diocesan leadership to take decision on behalf of the Christians but rather the then leadership was divided up. Bishop Shalita was on the extreme end just as Dr. Philemon Mateke was in the opposite extreme end. Yet in Mathew 18:20 there is emphasis on plurality of leaders coming together to solve a problem that has emerged. Once the leaders come together, God would be in their midst and would be given guidance in solving the problem. This was not the case in Muhabura, the leaders of the diocese did not come together to find a solution to the problem. In fact Bishop Shalita was so much against a synod meeting being convened to solve the crisis". With reference to Mathew 18: 18, the synod meeting
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Would have reached a decision which the Muhabura Christians would have followed without dividing themselves into opposing clicks. This is because God would have bound or loosed their decision.

(ii) Changed roles of Bishop

The New Testament roles of bishop have been neglected, Bishops were to provide direction, teaching, and counsel, handle disputes, visit and pray for the sick, oversee, guard the flock among others. These are no longer the roles of a bishop. The bishop is now a mistakenly magnified job that he is seen to mediate between the church and politicians; he is seen to solicit for donations and ensure that the diocesan projects are implemented and supervised well. These changed roles greatly influenced the Muhabura crisis. It was alleged that Bishop Shalita was key in this crisis because he wished to protect such projects he had initiated and would continue to benefit from.

This office is so important that it is now associated with power and riches. No wonder the Christians in Muhabura were fighting each other to see that the person who occupies the office would be of benefit to them personally. Christians in Muhabura were not looking for someone who would attend to their spiritual needs but rather their social and physical needs. This is simply because the bishop's roles are no longer spiritual only but the social and physical responsibilities carry much more weight.

(iv) Magnification of office of Bishop

The New Testament bishop was a person whose office was instituted by God to attend to the needs of the local Christians. A bishop was one of the many elders in the church of which they shared equality.

This magnification of the office of bishop suppresses the functions of 'lay Christians' as well as any other leader in the church.

This was so particular with Muhabura diocese. Because this position is of paramount importance and its functions are no longer the biblical ones but rather taken as an authoritative office in terms of spiritual and ecclesiastical significance. This mistaken identity of the office has resulted into dictatorship of the bishop over the Christians. A bishop is always feared whose decisions must be binding to all Christians. It was
alleged that Bishop Shalita was very much feared by not only the lay Christians but also the clergy. The clergy feared to say anything in meetings that was contradictory to the bishop's views. It is this mistaken magnified identity of the office of bishop that Bishop Shalita during his farewell visits to the parishes assured Christians that it would be his choice to determine who would be bishop to succeed him.

The crisis in Muhabura was obviously a conflict to tear down this kind of scenario. The chairman house of laity suggested that they needed to tear down this kind of system where the bishop is supreme. The bishop should be made to be accountable to the Christians in the diocese”.

(v) Under looking the congregation

In the New Testament church as already seen the congregation was always consulted in every decision that was made by the elders. In C. O.U and Muhabura in particular, the lay Christians were ignored when they resented the bishop elect. The laity are regarded to be those who should be at the receiving end contrary to New Testament teaching. House of Bishops chose someone whom majority of Muhabura Christians did not like. House of Bishops at first ignored the pleas of the Muhabura Christians against consecration and enthronement of the bishop elect. The Muhabura Christians did not approve the decision of the House of Bishops, as was always the case with the New Testament church. They instead rose up to contest the decision of the House of Bishops. The crisis would not have deepened had the House of Bishops listened to the plight of Christians.

(vi) Religious hierarchies

The hierarchical kind of leadership in C.O.U and found in Muhabura diocese was not prescribed anywhere in the New Testament. It was found out that this leadership breeds competition for church positions; which was the case with Muhabura diocese.

The biggest problem with Muhabura was the struggle for the highest office in the diocese. In C.O.U more importance is put on the position that one holds than the work he does. People struggle to get titled positions in church than evaluating their
performance in such positions. This hierarchical leadership elevates certain Christians above others yet the New Testament church practiced brotherhood, where all Christians were brothers and sisters; and all were equal in importance. We have already noted that it is this vying for the highly positioned posts in C.O.U, which are non-biblical that has caused this crisis. And when C.O.U continues with such leadership structures that exalt men over others, conflicts and crises will not leave the

(vii) Clergy - Laity distinctions

The Muhabura crisis was caused by the elevation of the clergy over the laity. C.O.U in general and Muhabura diocese in particular; the clergy have precedence to the laity. This has always been a source of conflict between the two groups of Christians. These distinctions as already seen are unbiblical; and their elevation only perpetuates

In the Muhabura case for instance; whereas the laity are involved in nominating the candidates for bishop, it is the House of bishops who have the final decision as to who should become bishop. In this way the lay Christian's role is put at the elementary stage. These are not seen to be competent enough to choose a bishop of their choice.

The clergy have major hand in diocesan decision. No wonder the Muhabura Christian lay community rose up to contest the upper hand of their retiring bishop in choosing the next bishop. It should have been under this same circumstance that the House of Bishops could believe Bishop Shalita much more than the chairman house of laity, Muhabura diocese. The House of Bishops did not take the laity seriously when they came up to oppose their decision. They are alleged to have told the chairman house of laity that they cannot reverse the decision to consecrate the bishop elect because the only role of the laity was to nominate but not to decide who to become bishop”. It is this non-biblical marginalization of the laity by the clergy that the crisis in Muhabura deepened. The laity were struggling to show the House of Bishops that they were also a big force to reckon with in the church.
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Moreover in the New Testament as already seen the laity would be the ones to approve the decisions of the elders who in the Ugandan case the elders would be the Bouse of Bishops.

(vii) Ignores Holy Spirit intervention.

As already seen in chapter two of this study, the New Testament church depended on the Holy Spirit for major decisions in the church. The leaders consulted the Holy Spirit in major decision-making. They always prayed to call upon the Holy Spirit's intervention. In situations where the Holy Spirit has been involved, we do not expect any problems to come as seen in the biblical examples in chapter two.

In Muhabura case, Christians ignored the Holy Spirit. During the nominations; it was alleged that members came with names already written on papers, whom they wished to be nominated to the House of Bishops for possible election to the office of bishop.

It was alleged that there were campaigns for certain candidates prior to the nominations day. It was found out that the retiring bishop did much to canvass for support from fellow bishops in favour of Rev Canon Sebuhinja. All these human efforts forbid the Holy Spirit from intervening in such appointment of bishops. There is totally no meditation to the Lord by those involved so that the Holy Spirit can reveal to them the kind of person fit for the leadership position. After all through prior canvassing and campaigns, people had already fixed their minds on particular candidates; how then could the Holy Spirit get involved? The disagreements during the nominations of candidates as seen in chapter five is a clear manifestation that the Holy Spirit was far away from those who nominated but rather came to the E. C with dictated names to be endorsed.

The conflict that emerged after the decision of the House of bishops to appoint Rev. Sebuhinja as bishop elect is a clear manifestation that there was no guidance of the bishops by the Holy Spirit. According to Archbishop Nkoyoyo, the Holy Spirit has never left the church” but his role has always been neglected. Once you do something that is against the wish of the Holy Spirit, such conflicts are likely to occur.
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(ix) **Appointment of leaders is more secular than spiritual.**

As already noted in chapter two, in the New Testament church, there was consensus on appointment of elders. Everybody was equally involved. It was always those who had manifested spiritual qualities and those who had witnessed the Lord; who were considered spiritual and therefore fit for spiritual office. In C.O.U today and more specifically Muhabura diocese; there has been a tendency to appoint men who are secular to divine offices with the false hope that the divine office will sanctify them.

The offices of the church are therefore filled with men of the flesh. These are people in spiritual offices but will quarrel, insult, fight and find their way out whatever, the circumstances. This is what the case with Muhabura was. There is no utmost respect attached to appointment of leaders in C.O.U, as it was the case with Muhabura. It is something that looked trivial and one that can be manipulated to the benefit of a few.

(x) **Biblical qualities for church office no longer hold.**

In chapter two, we looked at the qualifications for bishops in the New Testament church. Among them were hospitality, managing one’s household well as well as having a spiritual wife among others. These were not of importance in appointing the second bishop in Muhabura.

For example 95% of the respondents consented that Rev. Canon Sebuhinja could not become their bishop because his wife was intolerable, rude and not fit to be a mother’s union patron. Others cited the inhospitable conduct of the bishop elect. These and others were raised but the House of Bishops did not take them seriously. It is a wonder as to what were their measures for choosing the bishop of Muhabura! The close relationships of the bishop-elect to the outgoing bishop seem to be the most fundamental quality to becoming bishop in C.O.U dioceses including Muhabura. It was reported that few bishops knew the bishop elect of Muhabura but voted for him because the Muhabura out-going bishop was his close associate and wished him to become his successor.

Though not documented anywhere it is clear that in most cases courtesy is accorded to the outgoing bishop by fellow bishops to indicate to them the kind of person he would wish to succeed him. It is under such circumstances that personal rather than
realistic judgment is made between the nominees. Moreover other bishops would regard the outgoing bishop to be well informed about his flock from which the choice is to be made. This can be supported by the evidence, which Archbishop Nkoyoyo revealed to the researcher, that before voting, bishops slept in the same place and that Bishop Shalita had the opportunity to canvass for support for his candidate from fellow bishops. It is also clear that from the qualities that the people liked about Dr. Baganizi, the most strong one was that he was a good administrator; basing on their prior experience with him as Diocesan secretary. Whereas it is true that a church leader needs to be a good administrator, it is worthless if his spiritual life is doubted.

Christians are interested in a church leader who will transform them and the Diocese economically regardless of his spiritual life. If we are to take the accusations against Dr. Baganizi as seen in chapter five, then we can conclude that Christians take spiritual qualities for church leadership to be secondary.

(xi) In appropriate model of church government.

C.O.U employs the episcopal model of church government. This is what is practiced in all its dioceses including Muhabura. This model has been vulnerable to the excesses of corrupt individuals as already noted in chapter three. C.O.U has bishops at the top leadership and these are enshrined in the House of Bishops; which has powers over the major decisions in the church. With the Muhabura experience; it was found out that such a leadership model was vulnerable to manipulation by a few individuals for their own benefit. For example over 90% of the respondents said that Bishop Shalita manipulated the House of bishops into voting Rev Canon Sebuhinja.

This manipulation of the House of Bishops by the then bishop of Muhabura which led to the election of Muhabura's resented bishop elect is what sparked off the crisis in the diocese. This model used by C.O.U was in my view the biggest problem that precipitated the Muhabura crisis. The Muhabura lay Christians were almost acting as observers in the selection of candidates. The selection of the bishop elect was relegated only to a few people who did not present the views of the lay Christians of Muhabura. For instance only six Christians participated in the nomination process yet the diocese has over 100,000 Anglicans; the bishop elect was elected by less than 40 bishops; majority of
Whom had no knowledge of the Rev Canon Sebuhinja. It is therefore of no doubt that the lay Christians vehemently contested the decision of the House of Bishops. Yet this model is nowhere given as the ultimate model for church leadership. The model has led the C.O.U to completely neglect the role of Uganda Christians in choosing their bishops. It is also evident that choosing of the bishop is vested in the hands of a few people and the role of the Holy Spirit was evidently not there.

(xii) Neglected responsibility of the flock to the elders.

In chapter two, we said that the flock has an obligation to obey and submit to the elders; respect and love them; protect them from unfounded charges and to pray for them. This will certainly create harmony between the flock and the shepherds. The Muhabura diocese crisis shows a direct contradiction of this biblical teaching. With due consideration to the interviews conducted among Muhabura Christians, it was found out that they had little regard for their leaders. They were not willing to compromise with the retiring Bishop Shalita and the Archbishop. Muhabura Christians threatened to kill the Archbishop of C.O.U if he dared consecrate the bishop elect. A number of attacks were made on Bishop Shalita. Many of the parish priests were beaten up for supporting the bishop elect. Others were chased from their parishes. A number of unfounded accusations were brought against the Archbishop and Bishop Shalita as well as the Bishop elect. For instance the Archbishop Nkoyoyo was accused of receiving 4.5 million shillings from the opposition group”. Bishop Shalita was accused of bribing fellow bishops to allegedly vote for Canon Sebuhinja. Dr. Baganizi was accused of theft and having children out of wed lock. Rev Canon Sebuhinja was accused of incompetence.

These accusations were an indication that the Christians had no respect for their leaders. They proved non-submissive to Bishop Shalita, their chief shepherd, when on many occasions they refused him from preaching. The clergy in Muhabura especially the pro-bishop elect were abusive to the Archbishop through the various correspondences that were sent to his office. All these were an indication that the
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Christians had no love for their leaders. How then could they pray for the Archbishop, bishop elect, retiring Bishop Shalita when they had developed hatred for them to that magnitude?

6.3. ACUSSATIONS AGAINST THE BISHOP

Over 90% of the respondents blamed Bishop Shalita for the leadership crisis in Muhabura diocese. Much as he was accredited to the enormous developments in the diocese, the respondents claimed that towards the end of his leadership, he turned against the people he was leading in a bid to impose upon them his successor. Among the accusations against the Bishop included the following:

(i) Selfish constitutional amendments

Bishop Shalita was accused of proposing amendments to the Muhabura diocese constitution to enable him stay in power longer than the constitutional prescribed period. It was alleged that the proposed constitutional amendments were in an attempt to block Dr. Baganizi from becoming bishop of Muhabura."

He first proposed that the retirement age of Muhabura bishop be reduced from 65 to 60 years; such that Rev Dr. Baganizi who was already 60 years of age would have no chance of becoming bishop. When this failed, Bishop Shalita was allegedly to have proposed that the retirement age be increased from 65 to 70 years of age. Many respondents believed that this was in an attempt to make himself stay in leadership for more years since he was about to reach the mandatory retirement age of C.O.U bishops. The Christians who were already tired of his leadership were dissatisfied with these proposals. When these failed he began designing ways of how his influence could be felt in the diocese even after he would have left the office of bishop.

(ii) Dictatorial personality

Ibid.

12 Emmanuel Mfitumukiza, Interviewed on 09.06.2004

13 Ibid.

Bishop Shalita was accused of being a dictator during his long term of office in Muhabura. He is
a man who would find his way out. He would come to meetings when he has already made decisions. 14 Rev David Bigyero stated that the Bishop Shalita shouted him down in a parents' meeting at Rwaramba church of Uganda secondary school when Rev David Bigyero as head teacher attempted to read to the parents a budget speech of the school. Majority of the diocesan clergy were already tired of him even before he retired. He sidelined clergy who did not confer with his views. It was not a surprise that Muhabura Christians were resistant to any bishop elect who had inclinations towards bishop Shalita. Christians thought that the Bishop Shalita's dictatorial legacy would be continued through the bishop elect who was his very close associate. His dictatorial leadership was clearly demonstrated when it came to the succession question to the see of Muhabura. Bishop Shalita is said to have repeatedly said;

*Whoever is not my choice whether he gets 100% votes, will not be the next Bishop; whether you Christians give money or not it is my candidate that will be consecrated Bishop.* 15

This was bad to dictate a spiritual leader on the Christians. In politics it is possible taking the example of President Idd Amin, whether Ugandans liked him or not, he had to be their President for nine years. But religion does not take this trend. It was therefore the attempt by Christians to resent the dictatorial leadership of Bishop Shalita that conflict was inevitable in Muhabura. Canon Muruta consented that when Shalita was about to retire very many Christians complained of his dictatorship.

The senior churchwarden of the Cathedral lamented that the clergy used to fear the Bishop Shalita because he was autocratic. He even made those who did not compromise with his views to retire early before their mandatory age, because he ruled with an iron hand. Rev Obedi Byibesho was forced to retire before reaching 65 years of age; Rev. Bigirabagabo was forced to retire in the same way as well as Rev. Bigirimana

14 David Bigyero, interviewed on 11.06.2004.
15 Augustine Ntibarikure, interviewed on 11.06.2004
Some Christians alleged that Bishop Shalita had misused a lot of the diocesan finances for personal use. Donations from outside friends were taken as though it was his own. He distributed the donations as if he had bought them using personal money. One incident of such donated give away happened when the researcher was in Kisoro. Even when he is retired he had kept some church donations at his home and had mobilized the orphans from all over the diocese, who walked on foot from far distances to come to his personal home and be given clothing; with invitation of the press to give the ceremony a public image. This became an issue of contention between the bishop and the anti-sebuhinja group who claimed that such church donations needed to be kept and distributed at diocesan premises and with knowledge of the diocesan officers. Drama ensued when Bishop Shalita had rang the bishop elect and former diocesan treasurer, Mrs Joan Bahizi as well as compassion co-ordinator Mr. Bahizi to go at his home and grace the function. The opposition mobilized local council officials to go and stop the function. Donations for the diocese had been turned into personal donations. He was regarded as a thief by the chairman of laity,

*Shalita is a thief, is a robber, he wants to rob the diocese, he has constructed a magnificent house here in Kisoro using our money*.

It was alleged that Bishop Shalita had constructed that rented house using church money. No wonder when the crisis became violent, Christians went to destroy this house.

It was alleged that Bishop Shalita needed Rev Canon Sebuhinja a weak leader to succeed him because he would continue to have access to the diocesan finances especially the donations. One Christian alleged that the donors did not know the bishop elect, so Shalita would continue to have the necessary influence over the donors and possibly how to distribute it in the diocese. It was further alleged that the

16 *Wilson Munyangabo, interviewed on 08.06.2004*

17 *Philemon Mateke, interviewed on 11.06.2004.*
Muhabura diocese financial institution had been turned into a personal property of Bishop Shalita\(^{18}\).

Bishop Shalita was only interested in draining the diocese rather than contributing to it. For example the Sunday collection book indicated that retired Bishop Shalita had only given 2000/= the whole year yet he would attend the services every Sunday. He would be on stewardship committee but would not tithe or give offertories as an example*.

(iii) **Neglected developing some areas.**

It was alleged that Bishop Shalita was discriminative. Some areas within the diocese were not catered for in terms of development. The projects designed to develop the diocese were taken first to his home area, then other areas would get second consideration.

Being an administrator and in charge of development, he neglected some areas within the diocese like Busanza in Iryaruvumba Archdeaconry. He allocated developmental projects and charitable organisations like Compassion International to his home area. Bishop Shalita was quoted saying when asked as to why he neglected Busanza;

\[\text{I need to develop Rwaramba first where I come from, Gisorora and Seseme where I became head teacher,}\
\[\text{Kabindi where I studied from, Busanza for what, can we even have somebody there to run the project?}”\]

Because of this, besides its geographical location in the diocese, Busanza has remained the poorest area and this explains why most of the Protestant Christians in the area are shifting to Roman Catholic Church. Moreover the nostalgia of Rev. Dr. Baganizi was still high among the Christians in the inaccessible Rutaka area; where

\(18\) Jackson Sabiti, interviewed on 6.06.2004

\(19\) Gakum, interviewed on 11.06.2004

\(20\) Ibid.
he had constructed a health centre under very hard circumstances. Christians in Muhabura had a
feeling that they had been neglected for long and needed someone who would bring economic
salvation to their areas. They were tired of being
neglected a great deal.
However, these seem to be isolated cases of disgruntlement about Bishop Shalita's economic
achievements. Christians in Muhabura including those who opposed him were happy for his
developments. It was evident that his dictatorial tendencies that he had exhibited were now
intolerable, and they did not need any bishop elect who had any links to Bishop Shalita.

(iv) Nepotism

Bishop Shalita was accused of perpetuating clanism in the diocese”. Many of the senior diocesan
staff were either his relatives, coming from the same village or very great friends. It is this
particular scenario that the Christians around the cathedral were very bitter about. They claimed
that the people who have power over the cathedral are not locals but coming from very far. The
main problem is that church leaders are not born in Kisoro town and the local people where the
cathedral is located are opposed to the immigrants.
Bishop Shalita comes from the same village with the Rev. Canon Sebuhinja; whom he wanted to
become his successor. They both come from Rwaramba church of Uganda; in Kabindi
Archdeaconry. Bishop Shalita had even appointed Rev. Sebuhinja as Muhabura diocesan
secretary.
Rev Ephraim Mbabazi who was working, as the planning and development officer of the diocese
was a blood brother to Bishop Shalita. Mr Solomon Kanna Rugyero, in charge of the credit and
savings organisation formally called Muhabura financial institution is a brother to Bishop
Shalita.
In addition Mrs. Marion Sebuhinja, wife to the diocesan secretary was mothers' union worker.
Mr. Peter Bahizi, who was said to be a grade II primary school teacher was a given a
job that was an equivalent of a masters' degree candidate. He was in charge of

21 Ibid.
22 David Bigyero, interviewed on 10.06.2004.
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compassion project in the diocese. This was alleged to be because of his great friendship to Bishop Shalita, Mrs Joan Bahizi, wife to compassion boss was diocesan treasurer; whose qualifications for the job were highly doubted by many respondents.

One respondent told the researcher that the said diocesan treasurer had dropped out of a u.c.c. but found her way into the diocese when she and her husband came to the diocese pretending to be born again Christians. It was alleged that Mutabazi, who was her junior, had better qualifications than the duly appointed diocesan treasurer”.

Bishop Shalita was running the diocese like a family business. It was alleged that there was a plot to make Bishop Shalita's son Bishop of Muhabura on Rev. Canon Sebuhinja's successful retirement after serving in the same capacity”. None of the staff in Shalita's office at this time were from the east of the diocese; all were from his home place.

During the nomination exercise, two of the seven who constituted the Electoral College were his relatives and were under Bishop Shalita's influence. Bishop Shalita had appointed Mr. Sam Bitangaro as diocesan chancellor, whose relatedness to Mrs. Marion Sebuhinja was well known. Mrs Sebuhinja is an auntie to the diocesan Chancellor. It was alleged that Mr. Sam Bitangaro could have favoured the husband of his auntie hence being elected by the House of bishops”.

Pastors and other workers appointed and posted in the offices were close relatives of Canon Sebuhinja and bishop Shalita. Pastors who would be transferred to good parishes were related and friendly to Canon Sebuhinja and bishop Shalita. Promotion during their regime was not done on merit. A case in point was Rev Bisaho who was promoted to become Rev Canon Bisaho in Buhozi Parish of Iryaruvumba Archdeaconry, simply because he had prepared a good meal for the bishop. Those who occupied offices were people with no qualifications to occupy them. The idea of capability was really neglected and the spiritual stand of these people was not considered at all.

Bishop Shalita and his diocesan secretary neglected those who were qualified enough. Those who needed to go for further studies were denied a chance to do so. A few

24 Enunmanuel Mfitumukiza, interviewed on 09.06.2004
25 Philemon Mateke, interviewed on 11.06.2004
26 Jackson Sabiti, interviewed on 07.06.2004
who had been sent to go and study theology and finally made priests had not gone there as a call from God but with hope of getting money from the church. Bishop Shalita used to have people with low educational levels as if the diocese of Muhabura had no educated Christians. A case in point was when he appointed Mr. Peter Bahizi, a primary six leaver and grade II teacher as his principal advisor; and representative of Muhabura diocese to Barham University council".

Bishop Shalita was very resistant to anybody who proposed to go for further training. He only gave chance to his own brother, Rev Ephraim Mbabazi to study at Uganda Christian University, Mukono. It was alleged that the diocese had been given two vacancies to fill in the university but Bishop Shalita refused to send the second student to the dismay of everybody". It is not a surprise that these people who were close to bishop Shalita and Rev Sebuhinja have been key in fighting for the bishop elect.

(v) **Bishop's influence over electoral process.**

95% of the respondents said that Bishop Shalita had great influence on the electoral process even before nominations took place.

He campaigned for Rev. Canon Sebuhinja two years before his retirement. He could visit churches in the diocese popularizing the Rev Canon Sebuhinja's ability to succeed him as bishop. Among the reasons that were put forward for rejecting the bishop elect, they stated that;

*There was persistent campaign for his successor by the then Bishop of Muhabura, the Rt. Rev. E. Shalita was in practice and in canon law, wrong and unfortunate. It is very evident that even after his retirement, he has continued to deliberately lobby other Bishops mainly from the west'*
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28 Wilson Munyangabo, interviewed on 08.06.2004
29 Gakure, interviewed on 11.06.2004
From the start, he had told Christians that it was his candidate who would be consecrated bishop of Muhabura. Bishop Shalita had appointed Mr. Sam Bitangaro, a son to Mrs. Marion Sebuhinja, who would develop sympathies for his Aunt's husband to be nominated and eventually elected. It was further alleged that Bishop Shalita gave a list of possible candidates to Rev Canon Sebuhinja, which he would just read in the Electoral College during the nomination exercise. It is alleged that Bishop Shalita had cautioned his clergy on the Electoral College against seconding certain names whom he did not like''. It was alleged that after the nominations, Bishop Shalita hurriedly advised Rev Canon Sebuhinja to write down his spiritual testimony to be taken to the house of bishops where as the Rev Dr. Baganizi did not. This is what made him to have an upper hand over Dr. Baganizi.

It was further said that bishop Shalita canvassed for support from fellow bishops to vote for Rev Sebuhinja, whereas Dr. Baganizi had none to do the same for him. From the interview the researcher had with Archbishop Nkoyoyo, it became very evident that Bishop Shalita campaigned greatly for his candidate. It was because of these widely spread allegations that the chairman house of laity, Muhabura said that perhaps Shalita had bribed the rest of the bishops'''. Bishop Shalita has been key in battling with Christians' resentment to bishop elect. He has openly been negative for any possible reconciliation or withdrawal of the bishop - elect's candidature. It is also true that the bishops knew little about Rev Canon Sebuhinja, they depended on bishop Shalita's information. The too little knowledge about Rev Sebuhinja or the misinformation of bishop Shalita about Rev Sebuhinja should have influenced a lot in the election of the bishop elect''.

(viii) Bishop needed a weak successor.

It was alleged that bishop Shalita wanted someone weak to succeed him so that he could continue to have undue influence in the diocese. He had achieved a lot from the diocese, which he needed to protect. Bishop Shalita wanted to continue having influence over the Donors and donations that were increasingly coming in to the
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Diocese. He wanted to continue having a grip over the diocesan projects; for instance child sponsorship scheme, compassion international, Muhabura financial institution and others". With a close friend and a weak leader, bishop Shalita would continue moving to foreign countries to liase for aid for the diocese of which he would have personal advantage. It is Bishop Shalita who is known to the donors. The new bishop would need Bishop Shalita's help not only to be introduced to the outside world but also be introduced to the donors. This would enable Bishop Shalita continue enjoy full rights, and privileges as before.

It was alleged that with a weak leader, Shalita would have access to diocesan property especially the vehicles for personal use. It was further reported that Bishop Shalita had written a number of books; which would get popular market through the diocese as he moves abroad".

6.4 WEAKNESSES OF BISHOP - ELECT

Rev Canon David Sebuhinja met all the constitutional requirements to become bishop of Muhabura, but to the Christians he was not qualified enough to be their bishop. They would rather accommodate him as a number two administrator but not the top most leader in the diocese. 98% of the respondents acknowledged that the bishop elect was a weak leader, who could take the diocese nowhere. However, much as they knew the bishop elect as a weak leader, they liked him as a humble and introverted person. The bishop - elect was said to be weak in the following areas:

(i) Brutal wife

96% of the respondents said that Rev Canon Sebuhinja had been rejected as bishop of Muhabura because they could not stand his wife whom they described as not only rude but also brutal. They claimed that Mrs Marion Sebuhinja was not fit to be a wife of a bishop because of her poor character, which was described to be unspiritual.
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All words describing a poor charactered wife were piled on Mrs. Marion Sebuhinja but perhaps because they hated her a lot and the bishop elect - her husband. At their home however, the researcher was received with utmost hospitality to the surprise of very many Muhabura Christians. Some Christians had warned the researcher that the wife would not allow him in their home. It was said that she has the opposite character of her husband.

*Sebuhinja’s wife is rude, arrogant, does not respect anybody and she is the decision maker at home*”.

It was alleged that while she was working as mothers’ union worker in the diocese; many of the diocesan decisions and policies were made by her and not the diocesan secretary who was her husband. Through the husband, many diocesan staff were intimidated, harassed and victimised over trivial issues. Sebuhinja was and is always in the armpits of his wife. It was further alleged that the bishop-elect would have pulled out his candidature but fears to disappoint his wife, who is hopeful of being referred to as wife of bishop and mother’s union patron”. Christians vehemently rejected him not because he was all that a bad person but feared that the wife would fail him as bishop of Muhabura.

In the popular Sinabulya report, the Christians complained about the bishop elect’s wife, that she is forceful and abuses people in public. Archbishop Nkoyoyo was also very unhappy about Mrs Marion Sebuhinja’s conduct;

*I could not consecrate Canon Sebuhinja because can you imagine his wife was part of those who used to call or write to me abusing me and threatening my life 40.*

Indeed many of such abusive correspondences to the Archbishop and similar ones of rebelliousness nature and full of disrespect were seen and read by the researcher carried Mrs Marion Sebuhinja’s signature and name.
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At one time when there were constituent Assembly elections, Marion Sebuhinja is alleged to have ridiculously abused Dr. Philemon Mateke, one of the candidates at a polling station where she was in charge. Dr. Philemon Mateke was competing with Mr. Sam Bitangaro, a nephew to Marion Sebuhinja. She is believed to have told Mateke; "not to be silly" a statement that was insulting to a former minister and an area member of parliament", Marion Sebuhinja is said to have become even worse during the crisis. Whenever she could meet widows who did not want Sebuhinja to become bishop, she could tell them insulting statements like;

\[ \text{You woman I understand you also don't want my husband to become a bishop, can you call your husband to become one?} \]

This kind of confrontation from a woman who had been a mothers' union worker was unbearable, so Christians vowed never to have Canon David Sebuhinja as their next bishop42.

(ii) Has no independent mind.
The bishop elect was alleged to be someone who cannot make decisions. Decisions wait either his wife or bishop Shalita. 97% of the respondents said that the bishop elect cannot make decisions, yet they were tired of the bishop Shalita and could not compromise with Marion Sebuhinja. The bishop elect was thought to be optical and not visionary. During his time as chairman house of clergy and diocesan secretary, he was a complete failure because he could not make decisions. His wife dictated decisions on who should be transferred.

He is believed to have absolutely failed as cathedral dean and chairman clergy. He feared the bishop so much that he could not present the problems of the clergy to the bishop. He was a yes man to the bishop. It was alleged that one time a clergy who

41 Wilson Munyangabo, interviewed on 08.06.2004
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had a sick child needed a vehicle to take the child to hospital, the diocesan secretary is reportedly to have replied that they needed to wait for the bishop who had gone abroad for tour. He is not a good administrator. He cannot decide for himself. He waits too long to decide on a problem.

(iii) He is not a pastor.
When he was dean of cathedral at Seseme, he could not visit Christians, he was too far from the sick and wounded. He is not a pastoral pastor". He is a man who is introverted and not interested in his Christians. He is a man for years and year’s doesn’t care or visits his Christians, whether in times of peace or problems.
In the different capacities he had served in the diocese, he could not listen to the demands and advice from Christians. He could only prioritise bishop Shalita's interest.

(iv) Poor administrator
The bishop elect was alleged to be someone not interested in development. During his term as diocesan secretary, he never initiated any development project. He is a man who wants to work with persons ignorant of what they are doing so that he manipulates them for his selfish ends. The Christians would rather have no bishop other than Rev. Canon Sebuginja.

One respondent said that the bishop elect was anti-social. This is measured when he was in office as diocesan secretary. He could mistreat pastors. It was alleged that because he was not a social person, he rarely receives visitors in his home; and has never had any house helper in his lifetime.

The bishop elect was accused of voting for someone else, indicating that he himself is aware of his incapability to serve as diocesan bishop. While meeting the Sinabulya team, the laity complained that the bishop elect has no spiritual testimony in word and
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practice and does not love missions. He is also believed not to keep secrets. He revealed who voted for who in the Electoral College including himself that he had voted for Canon Dr. Baganzi. The bishop elect was further accused of not being a good shepherd; the he could not even visit wardens”.

The bishop-elect was however not in line with his critics. He said that he had worked in the church for 37 years but nothing negative had been brought against him before. He claimed that if he was weak, Dr. Mateke would have brought out this during the Electoral College nominations; in his words, he stated,

*Christians had seen my performance, character and secondly both diocesan and provincial constitutions had been followed, there was therefore no sufficient reason to reject me as their bishop”.*

Marion Sebuhinja argued that the failure to consecrate the bishop elect basing on people’s allegations that the bishop elect was weak is unrealistic because it is rare for one to be liked by everybody; there would be those who oppose, even Jesus was opposed by some people.

### 6.5 SPIRITUAL BANKRUPTCY OF CHRISTIANS

Following the course of the crisis, it was evident that there was declining spirituality among Muhabura Christians. Though only 20% of the respondents admitted that the crisis was due to declining spirituality, there was enough evidence to show that many of the Christians minded little about their spiritual life. I found out that much as majority of Christians in the diocese stood up to oppose bishop Shalita and bishop elect in a bid of what they claimed was to safeguard the church; they did so to protect the church as an institution of social refugee rather than of spiritual enrichment.

Among the reasons they put across for refusing the bishop elect none pointed at his inability to preach the gospel; rather they strongly put that he was a weak decision

---
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maker and not developmental oriented. This means therefore that majority of these Christians were attached to the church and fought much to protect it because of mainly the physical fruits which would come along with a good bishop.

The bishop elect however could not agree with this view stating that the diocese had done a lot in the previous years to uplift the spiritual life of Christians and that evangelism has been key in the diocese with missions every year, and that people still heavily attended church services.

During the study visit in Kisoro, the researcher realised that Mubaura diocese's Christians are more of nominal than committed Christians. They are Christians who can change with changing circumstances. For instance many Christians had developed hatred for the bishop-elect's home instead of advising and counselling them during that difficult time, as Marion Sebuhinja states;

All people have drifted away from us, they no longer love us, the problem here is that many Christians are Christians by name and for the sake of going to church, yet early church Christians were committed and prayerful”.

Nominalism has been the greatest problem in Mubaura diocese and C.O.U in general. Christians seemed to be concerned with what going on in the diocese was because some hated the bishop-elect personally, whereas some who do not attend church at all had been told that the bishop-elect is a bad man. No-wonder as Marion Sebuhinja stated, that it is surprising that when you go around the diocese, even those who do not know the bishop elect say that they do not want him as bishop “.

Generally there is spiritual decadence among Mubaura Christians both laity and clergy. Some people highly doubted Dr. Philemon Mateke's spirituality. In fact the chairman, house of laity has not been a good practising Christian. He was allegedly elected chairman of laity because of his popularity among the locals. He was also the people's favourite because he has a lot of money and would be supportive of church projects. During the days when Dr Mateke was a minister, he contributed much in
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Building the cathedral and so Christians rewarded him as their chairman; otherwise his spiritual commitment is doubtable. It was also alleged that Dr. Mateke was the one organising lumpens he would buy alcohol to cause violence and terrorism in the cathedral and other churches in the diocese.

Rev Ezra Bigaruka regretfully lamented Bishop Shalita's mistake of taking seriously Dr. Mateke's spiritual presence as he says;

_There was something wrong that Bishop Shalita did. Mateke when he became minister, he married another wife and Shalita knew this as a bishop. But Mateke went around deceiving people that he is saved including resorting to monogamy, but this was for political reasons. Shalita brought him close and was given a high chair nearest to the altar which allowed him to take his foot deep in church matters_,

Dr. Mateke was therefore believed to have actively got involved in church and specifically the crisis not that he was so much concerned with the church's spiritual concerns but to please his voters.

Materialism has swept away they would be faithful in the diocese. The crisis was a struggle for material benefits. It was alleged that Bishop Shalita had become so much materialistic that much of church property had been turned into his own. Shalita's adamancy to plant his successor was to protect material gifts and donations from outside as well as having a grip on compassion and Muhabura financial institutions.

It was further alleged that in preparation for his retirement, he had used a lot of diocesan donations to construct many buildings and buy a fleet of vehicles for personal - commercial purposes in Kampala".
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The bishop-elect whom many people described as a poor man despite having worked as diocesan secretary for long, but with not even a simple vehicle; was seen as struggling to become bishop as way of getting access to finances and diocesan wealth. It is no wonder that the bishop elect was not willing to compromise on any other terms rather than being consecrated and enthroned as bishop. Otherwise if he was spiritual enough and so much concerned with the spiritual stake of his diocese, why couldn't he withdraw his candidature to pave way for reconciliation? Indeed as already said in chapter five, the bishop elect said that there could be no reconciliation without a bishop and that bishop should be him because he had been much hurt.

The Christians in the crisis were so concerned with church's property and finances rather than anything else; the church offertories became an area of contention between the pro-bishop elect and anti-bishop elect Christians. Dr. Philemon Mateke is allegedly to have said to the Archbishop in May 2002 that he had requested Christians not give "quota" anymore until Rev Canon Sebuhinja left the office of diocesan secretary.

Rev Canon Esau Muruta, chairman bishop's commissaries and also on the opposition side is reportedly to have written to all parishes in the diocese instructing parish priests not to submit "quota money" to the then diocesan treasurer. When the Archbishop rejected his decision, canon Muruta again wrote to the parish priests on 7th April 2003 instructing them to pay 100, 000/= with immediate effect to his self-appointed treasurer. Because of the heated struggle as to who should have control over diocesan bank accounts led to their closure. All diocesan bank accounts except that of compassion project were frozen. Struggle was between chairman bishop's commissaries and Rev Canon Baker Habimana, on one hand, and the pro-bishop elect diocesan staff, on the other hand. The issue was that canon Muruta and Rev Canon Baker Habimana; now that they had been appointed by the Archbishop as top most leadership wanted to change diocesan bank signatories in their favour whereas the pro-bishop elect staff opposed it because they held the statusquo incumbency to the same accounts.

Canon Muruta and other anti-bishop elect staff were accused of plotting to close the diocesan accounts, in a protest letter to the Archbishop which in part stated;
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He chaired illegal council meetings designed to destroy the church by passing ill-fated resolutions to close the Diocesan Bank Accounts and Diocesan offices”.

Sensing that they were losing control over diocesan finances especially the fattened bank accounts the two pro-bishop elect bishop’s commissaries, diocesan treasurer, Education Secretary and the diocesan planning and development officer wrote to the Diocesan bankers and general public on 17th December 2003, warning them against any possible impersonation of diocesan secretary by Canon Baker Habimana. In part of the letter they slated;

We therefore write to inform all Christians, all our partners, our Banks, and the general public that whoever deals with Baker as the diocesan secretary does so at his/her own risk.61

What should be noted is that at this time the struggle in the diocese was not about the bishop-elect but who should have an upper hand over diocesan funds. Christians struggled for employment in the diocese. Some Christians supported particular candidates because in them they could be able to get jobs. In fact Archbishop Nkoyoyo said that some diocesan staff had to reject and abuse him because they could not go against their boss to be (the bishop elect), who would give them jobs”. Both clergy and laity compromised their spiritual stand for struggle for offices. Christians struggled not that they wanted to see a growing spiritual diocese but to realise good offices when they win at the end. The Rev Canon Mature and Erastus Gapfuyekubaho accused some fellow clergy of fighting for positions. They stated;
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For instance, the self-interest of Baker Habimana, Gideon Kwizera and Muruta the chairman, seeking to close the diocesan offices with the ill intention of taking over certain positions soon afterwards is evidently the common talk along the streets of Kisoro pertaining to the deliberations of their meetings”:

The crisis was indeed a struggle for positions of material influence in the diocese. Much as the Archbishop had asked Rev Canon Baker Habimana to act as diocesan secretary in the place of Rev Canon Sebuhinja; the Rev Canon Jackson Sabiiti Kazinda and others wrote to the general public on 17.12.2003, claiming that Canon Baker Habimana was impersonating the diocesan secretary of Muhabura in part of the letter it stated:

Let us take this opportunity to inform you all that the duly appointed Diocesan Secretary is Rev Canon Jackson Kazinda Sabiiti. He is the one with genuine appointment letter and as such whoever has anything to do with the diocese he is the right person to contact”.

The crisis as a struggle for jobs became so clear when there were Diocesan staff transfers. Those who held juicy offices refused to transfer, retained office keys, yet could not report to the offices. It was also very evident that a good number of clergy, who drifted to the opposition, saw it as moving to successful levels and could be rewarded with either good parishes or better jobs at the diocese. Indeed a few clergy who were on opposition and have gained good offices at the diocese during the reshuffle were seen working hard to fail the consecration and enthronement of the bishop elect.

Muhabura diocese had become more secular than Kisoro district society itself where it belonged. Those key players in the crisis seemed to have forgotten their faith and

Christ who had died for their lives. They were struggling to maintain individuals in leadership at the expense of others. It was alleged that Joan Bahizi, the diocesan treasurer had become more money hungry than the tax tenderers. She was arrogant and rude especially to parish priests who failed to submit reasonable amounts of church collections. She could abuse them and even spit at them, rebuking them for their incompetence as parish priests". The Christians' complaints about Marion Sebuhinja's arrogance, rudeness and abusive character are not in line at all with the spirituality required of an elder's wife as already seen in chapter two of this book.

Taking the Archbishop to court was a sign of spiritual bankruptcy. It meant that the Christians had no hope in church tribunals and instead preferred secular courts to solve spiritual affairs. It was reported that Shalita and the bishop-elect mobilized the 83-year-old Manjari Paul along with two pure nominal occasional Christians Ziraguma Emmanuel and Mbarusha Charles to sue the Archbishop to court. It was further alleged that Ziraguma Emmanuel last went to church when he was getting married some fourteen years ago. He abused office when he worked in the bank and lost his job. Christians saw his activities as a way of securing a job when Canon Sebuhinja becomes the bishop, he could work in treasury". Mbarusha Charles whose true Protestant affiliation was doubtable by some Christians rallied with others to sue the Archbishop. He is believed to be more devoted to the Roman Catholic Church than Muhabura diocese. He is allegedly believed to know little about the Anglican Church and how it is run, and thought to have attended church only during his baptism. Christians highly thought these three were stage managed by bishop Shalita and the bishop elect to champion the court charges against the Archbishop. Otherwise they are highly doubted to have that initiative and money to pursue that case, let alone their inexperience in church affairs. No-wonder one Christian equated Mbarusha and Ziraguma to the two scoundrels who were organised by the pagan Queen Jezebel to testify against the faithful Naboth, for rightfully refusing to sell off his vineyard to the most sinful Israelite King - Ahab (1Kings 21); Augustine added:
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My father in law, Manjari Paul, has been a churchman for long. At his age of 80, because there was no other person to accuse the Archbishop, was organised together with two young boys below the age of 40 years, and who attended church only at their baptism to accuse the Archbishop for failure to consecrate the bishop elect.

Another person behind the court case was Christopher Dufitumukiza whose spirituality was highly doubted. He had also abused office when working in the bank and was chased. He also perhaps wanted a job. Nevertheless he is a man who is married with five children but he has never been married in church officially. His children have never been baptised and he does not attend church services at all. How could such a person also sue the Archbishop, where could he get the moral and spiritual authority to sue the Archbishop. It indeed became so shameful to learn that the bishop elect and Bishop Shalita were using force to gain this position of leadership in the diocese. It is no surprise that one Christian commented that today people are occupying spiritual offices not as a calling from God but they call themselves to these divine offices at all costs”.

The immature conduct of the Christians in Muhabura leaves a lot to be desired. It is explicit that many of the clergy are pastors by training and having attained theological qualifications but not by calling. Bishop Shalita said that there were clergy among the lumpens who tried to destroy his commercial building in Kisoro. Violence, terrorism and threatening people's lives were very common. Attempt to harm Bishop Shalita and his wife near their home is a very unfortunate occurrence not thought of Christ's followers. The attempt to harm bishop Shalita by putting needles in the bishop's seat in the Cathedral was a shock to the entire country and the outside world. Organised violence to block others from worshipping in the diocese and particularly at the cathedral is no doubt a sign of spiritual immaturity. On 9th and 18th December 2002,
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Rev Sebuhinja's office was stoned and diocesan offices were set ablaze starting with Rev Sebuhinja's office respectively is an indication of no spiritual concern at all for Christ's church. The Christians' attempt to lock bishop Shalita and some clergy in the cathedral vestry to deter them from conducting church services might have perhaps suggested disgust for God's spiritual word". At Muramba Parish church, there was physical fighting between a priest and lay reader which led to police intervention and consequently the two were shamefully imprisoned for causing violence": It was reported that most of the people who engaged in such violent activities were under the influence of alcohol. Most of these were scoundrels whom Dr. Mateke has trained during his political career to cause violence whenever it was necessary. Many of those who participated in such violent activities are not churchgoers. Many do not pray at all.

Fighting and hatred punctuated the crisis. One popular incident is when fighting erupted during the synod meeting that was convened and presided over by the Archbishop himself. They almost beat him up. Clergy of different camps could not meet and greet each other. One incident happened during the study in Kisoro. A pro- Sebuhinja priest, whom the researcher had just met and chatted with for more than two hours, met him afterwards in a restaurant with an anti-Sebuhinja priest but refused to greet us despite repeated interest we showed to greet him. It was no mistake for the researcher to realise that Muhabura diocese was in such problems because its spiritual offices were filled by very secular people dressed in priestly garments.

6.6 POLITICAL INFLUENCES
The baseline survey report conducted by the Human rights and peace centre, Makerere University (2002) noted that divisive political culture had crept into C.O.U Conflicts in the church over the election of Rev Canon Sebuhinja in Muhabura diocese were attributable to divisive politics. Anti-Tutsi and Movement sentiments against multi-parties were identifiable as playing a role in the conflict in Muhabura.
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Although Sebuhinja was said to be more inclined to the movement, his opponents were using the movement and multi-party divide to ostracise and isolate Sebuhinja by portraying him as a multi-partist. For instance there was a serious allegation that Bishop Shalita and Rev Sebuhinja were clan destining to put up strong opposition against Canon Bitunguramye who was the incumbent movement chairman for Kisoro district. It was alleged that the two clergymen organised meetings with other Kisoro residents to buy votes such that they can out-compete Canon Bitunguramye in the forthcoming movement elections. Shalita and Sebuhinja had contributed 600,000/= and 400,000/= respectively.

These allegations were highly refuted by very many Christians. Augustine Ntibarikure said that all those were a cover of what was impossible for the two clergymen to take such a deep foot in politics at a time when almost nobody wanted to hear about them here in Muhabura. He argued that Shalita had never contributed any money beyond 100,000/= to build a church, and had never heard of any church fundraising where Sebuhinja had contributed any figure beyond 20,000/=; so it was not true that they could organise such money for political activities”. Ntibarikure suggested that perhaps the money was collected for support of those who would be sent to Kampala to convince the House of bishops. However Canon Bitunguramye's nomination as chairman movement was rejected by Bishop Shalita because Bitunguramye was against Sebuhinja. Bishop Shalita highly believes that the crisis in Muhabura has gone to deeper levels because of influences of politicians. The initiators of the conflict were politicians. Dr. Philemon Mateke, the local council V chairman of Kisoro has been a minister in the regimes of both Obote and Museveni; Canon John Wilson Bitunguramye was once general secretary of former Kigezi region, has been Kisoro district chairman for sometime and now district movement chairman. Shalita suggested that these politicians had been trusted by the church because politicians as people are seen as
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those who can give vision to the church; and the church needs such respectable men in society.

The local politics in Kisoro had further taken the crisis to greater heights. Political hatred that had been buried was rejuvenated to play a role in the religious conflict in Muhabura. Mateke and Shalita deferred greatly concerning Kisoro politics, much as the church would bring them together. For instance Shalita never supported Mateke during L.c. V elections and instead supported Milton Bazanye. This annoyed Mateke a great deal.

The long historical political drama in Uganda between the two dominant political parties, one representing the Anglicans and the other the Catholics was seen at play in the Muhabura conflict. During the L.C. V elections, still it was alleged that the Catholics who are predominantly members of DP supported Milton Bazanye against Mateke. During the crisis the same Catholics in Kisoro have offered great support to Sebuhinja. The Catholics wanted Sebuhinja, a weak leader so that along with Bazanye they would manipulate and dominate the politics of Kisoro. It was also said that all former presidential candidate Besigy supporters were in support of Sebuhinja; which was more annoying to the movement stalwarts in the district. It was further alleged that Canon Bitunguramye became very disappointed and increased his activities further to block Sebuhinja from becoming bishop of Muhabura.

As already noted that the Anti- Tutsi and movement sentiments have been smuggled in this crisis; All Tutsis supported Bazanye in the LC V elections have duly supported Sebuhinja. It was highly believed that this was a plot to weaken Mateke politically ". Because of the political influences in the crisis, even non-Anglicans have been actively participating in the conflict. It was alleged that the biggest percentage of money collected for consecration and enthronement preparations for Sebuhinja were from Catholics and non Anglican Tutsis.  
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The crisis carried a lot of political overtones. It was highly politicised. The Sinabulya report observed that the conflict emerged at an active political period and could be used to divide people further if not handled well". The Bishop elect issues in Muhabura diocese were largely politicised by the opposing parties in the conflict. Many correspondences were copied to state and civic leaders like RDC and security organs". Dr. Mateke on the other hand complained that Bishop Shalita over-used police, the district security officer and politicians in the issue to intimidate dissatisfied people. The baseline survey report suggests that this happens with C. O. U because the Anglican Church since colonial times has had cordial and close working relations with most governments in Uganda. As such the church has greatly been influenced by politics". It is therefore not a surprise that high-ranking government politicians who are not even Anglicans like Hon Nsaba Buturo took keen interest in this crisis.

According to Bishop Shalita, it is the politicians who have divided up Christians in the diocese for selfish motives. Politicians have taken advantage of the material poverty of clergymen to divide up the diocese. Whereas it is also true that these priests are persons of influence in their societies and so can mobilise and influence their followers to give support to "cooperating political candidates". Shalita was convinced that some clergy in Muhabura knew the truth but were following Mateke because he had bribed them". It was alleged that a case in point was Canon Muruta who even suggested Sebuhinja's name in the Electoral College and from the beginning of the crisis was stuck on the decision of the house of Bishops was later swayed by politicians possibly because of simple material gains.

The inability of the church to maintain its clergy in good economic and financial standing has escalated the crisis as it has enabled politicians to use them as political capital. The clergy have been misled by the politicians because these could give them financial assistance and other smaller materials. It was alleged that Mateke for instance was paying school fees for one of the clergy's sons and has ensured that some
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of the clergy acquire district tenders. He has also put pastors on district committees such that they can campaign for him as well87.
Some clergy went on opposition because they could not afford to lose the support they were getting from the politicians. But Marion Sebuhinja was of the view that it is just sheer materialism of some pastors because those pastors who were on Mateke's side were not necessarily the poorest of all.

Rev Jackson Sabiti and Canon Muruta, expressed disappointment to learn that there were allegations that pastors on opposition had been bribed by politicians; Canon Muruta said that;

For me as a member of the EC, was supposed to be neutral but when I assessed the support of the bishop-elect then I decided to change my mind and thought that he would withdraw. This was after one year. I assure you there has been no financial support from the politicians”.

The alliance with politicians for maternal gain is a false allegation brought against the pastors by Shalita and his supporters. It could even be the reverse. This is because the bishop-elect and Shalita had bigger politicians on their side, moreover from the central government; whose incomes are much higher than those on the opposition”. What is clear is that there were counter accusations by both camps of using politicians to make their cause known.

The baseline survey report noted that political influences in Muhabura were further complicated by personality problems characterised by the over bearing character of certain individuals using their financial and educational clout. These individuals have entrenched themselves becoming more or less patrons of the church. They use the church to promote their political career and are the main players in the church
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conflicts”. Personality cults, complacence and tolerance of entrenched interests in the C.O.U around which some individuals and families have become so influential to the extent that they can decide who should be bishop was very evident in Muhabura92.

Some powerful individuals in the diocese created the politics of localism and exploiting it to their advantage. These personalities are relatively wealthy, well-educated and are politically very powerful and well connected. They hold a lot of sway on the population. The diocese has been depending on them while they have also been pursuing their political interests through the church; which guarantees them a political base and cover. They exploit the well-organised structures of the church.

It was perhaps against the above feeling that Marion Sebuhinja argued that Christians in Muhabura are just influenced by a few elites; who have taken advantage of their little learning. Bigaruka further noted that these few elites mix with the locals freely and are bountiful thus have won hearts of many Bafumbira. Therefore even when they preach something wrong, people will always follow them as though they are right.

6.7 WEAKNESSES OF PROVINCIAL LEADERSHIP

C.O.U provincial leadership has always exhibited weaknesses in dealing with conflicts in its dioceses. The leadership has always been incapacitated by either archaic church structure or personal weaknesses of certain officers as well as weaknesses of the system used to diffuse such crises. Provincial leadership failed to solve the Busoga crisis until the Bishop Kyomya was enthroned, the west Buganda diocese crisis was a hard rock for the province; the conflict in North Mbale diocese was not an easy one; and now the Muhabura crisis has totally exposed the inability of the provincial leadership to effectively handle the leadership crises in its dioceses. The leadership at the province has been limited by the following to deal with the crisis in Muhabura.
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(i) **Constitutional problems.**

In the election of Rev Sebuhinja, no article in the provincial and Muhabura diocesan constitutions was bleached, but the Christians rejected the decision of the House of Bishops. The people rejected the bishop elect regardless of the constitutions of the province and the diocese. There were however detected loopholes where the two constitutions were both silent regarding the E.C and contributed a lot to the crisis.

For instance the diocesan constitution states, in article 9(d) that;

*The election of any Bishop of the diocese shall be an electoral college elected by the diocesan synod at its ordinary session. The membership of Electoral College shall be three clergy nominated by the House of clergy and three laity nominated by the House of laity one being a lady. The terms of membership shall be the same as those of the synod*.\

The biggest weakness of this article is that it is silent about what happens in case one of the clergy on the Electoral College is nominated by the members. Does he remain a full Electoral College member and also participate in the voting? Or else should they be legible for nominations to the House of Bishops when they are members of the Electoral College?

Realistically it could be very unfair for a nominated candidate to have been part of the Electoral College which nominated him. Suspicions of possible connivance would not be ruled out. There is also obvious facial intimidation from the nominee to the rest of the members. It is also unfair because the nominee on the Electoral College has the advantage of voting for himself to the disadvantage of a competing counterpart absent.

This is what mostly flared up Muhabura Christians. Canon Sebuhinja was part of the Electoral College and voted for himself which consequently led to his becoming bishop-elect. The provincial leadership found itself tied up because though it
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ethically and practically sounded unrealistic, the constitutions were silent about it and therefore everything right was followed during the electoral process. The Christians however were not willing to compromise on this.

Another point of interest is in the provincial constitution, article 13(a) as regards the appointment of Bishops. According to this article the synod of the diocese has the duty of making representations of two nominations to the House of Bishop for possible consideration and election of a bishop of a diocese. The House of Bishops in this article reserves the right to choose any of the two nominations regardless of the anticipated wishes of the synod.

This idea of resting final powers, in the House of Bishops for appointment of a bishop has problems. With the case of Muhabura, the House of Bishops because they choose regardless the hopes of the synod, decided to elect Sebuhinja who was least favourite of the synod as indicated by nomination results in the electoral college where he got 3 votes whereas Dr. Baganizi got 6 votes. This system further down plays the importance of the synod in the electoral process of a diocesan bishop. It marginalizes not only the role of the synod but also ignores the views of the synod as a true representation of all Christians in the diocese.

This authority rested in the House of Bishops makes those who are not bishops seem less intelligent and incompetent in determining a capable bishop. In reference to Acts 6 as already seen in chapter two; the whole group was involved in choosing their leaders and the only role played by the apostles was to pray and ordain them. Why should our bishops today want to assume more powers than the apostles?

Article 13(a) further perpetuates the unbiblical distinction and notion between clergy and laity; which has developed through history as already seen in chapter three in this study, where the status of the clergy has been raised over the laity; in this case who are the majority in the diocese. It is no surprise that Christians rose up against the decision of the House of Bishops. According to this article, a Diocesan Bishop is elected by the House of Bishops from names of two people nominated by the Diocesan synod of that diocese for which he is being appointed and elected. The greater weakness of that system is that it makes
translation of Bishops very difficult. Had this not been the case Sebuhinja would have been consecrated and immediately translated to another diocese other than Muhabura. Archbishop Nkoyoyo noted that had Sebuhinja been consecrated at Namirembe as suggested he would have been taken to NorthMbale diocese where the bishop had resigned due to problems of personal integrity. But one wonders whether the Christians there would have accepted Sebuhinja since it was not their diocesan synod which had nominated him as the constitution stipulates and having already publicly rejected by his own people in Muhabura.

In due consideration to the above, article 13(a) of the provincial constitution enhances the problem of localism; where there is assured guarantee that local man of the area must become bishop. The article makes it hard for an Acholi to have become bishop in Muhabura. Yet it is widely accepted that most leaders are less respected and honoured among the people they are born. Perhaps if this was not so, someone from any other part of Uganda, possibly without known weaknesses to Muhabura Christians could have been bishop without any resentment.

The constitutional silence on what happens in a situation where the laity contest the choice of the House of Bishops; left the provincial leadership in a dilemma. There is only consideration of dissatisfaction of House of bishops on the nominated candidates where upon in 13(a) states in part that the Archbishop with the House of Bishops shall consider any representations so made and if they think fit refer the matter back to the synod for further consideration. The constitution of the province needs to be updated in such a way that both the leaders of the clergy and lay Christians at the grass roots have equal say in running the church as it used to be in the New Testament.

Another constitutional problem in C.O.U concerns the power and authority of the Archbishop over the dioceses. Much as article 9(a) of the provincial constitution states that; among the functions of the Archbishop is,

\[
\text{To have and to exercise general pastoral care, leadership, supervision and discipline over the whole}
\]

province in accordance with this constitution and any canons made here under;"

The exaggerated powers and authority accorded to the diocesan bishops by the same constitution leaves the Archbishop with a mere status of the first among equals (bishops). This has always made the Archbishop incapable in intervening in conflicts in particular dioceses. This has in addition made Christians in Uganda to accord more respect to their diocesan bishop than the Archbishop. The case in Muhabura is self-explanatory. A good number of clergy and laity ridiculed the Archbishop, openly abused him and eventually took him to the high court of Uganda accusing him of illegally taking over the diocese.

Indeed at the peak of it all, the crisis In Muhabura exhibited that there was a constitutional crisis in C.O.U, which needed to be addressed. However such constitutional limitations have been there but not all the conflicts in C.O.U dioceses have arisen because of the inadequacies in the constitution. There are weaknesses that the House of bishops and the person of the Archbishop have always been accused of.

(ii) Over emphasis on constitutional procedures
The provincial church leadership at first under estimated the problem when it started. It came in belatedly. They thought that since they had followed all the constitutional procedures, the conflict would soon come to an end. This over reliance on the Law by the provincial leadership was interpreted by the Christians as insensitivity to their cause. The Christians therefore had enough time to mobilise themselves for possible defiance of the House of bishops. In an attempt to respond to the conflict, the Archbishop sought the counsel of the provincial chancellor whether there was any breach of law. In reference to the memoranda of the Christians to the Archbishop, the chancellor noted that;
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... in apparent ignorance of the constitutional mandate, role and discretion of the House of Bishops in the election of a Bishop call upon the House of Bishops to uphold the views of the people as expressed in the votes of the electoral college and not to impose on the diocese someone whom the people know has no capacity to deliver.”

He further stated that there was no mistake that was made in the election of Sebuhinja. This seems to have made the Archbishop more adamant than ever concerning the Christians’ pleas. The people did not want to hear of the constitution whose unrealistic procedures were robbing them of their authority over their own church.

In a press release dated 18.02.2002, the provincial secretary stated that nowhere was it alleged that the correct procedure in the nomination and election was not followed. The province wasted valuable time and opportunity they would have used to calm the Christians and possibly bring a quick end to the crisis but rather arrogantly or ignorantly expected all Muhabura Christians majority of whom are illiterates to know the constitutional procedures and then succumb.

Besides, over emphasis on the constitution and legal frame work of the church robbed the churchmen the wisdom to turn to the bible and evaluate the people's wishes in due consideration of the New Testament principles of church leadership. One wonders why the province at first ignored the voices of the people yet congregations were much involved in decision-making and apostles listened to their problems keenly once they were raised. In Acts 6 as already noted had the apostles have relaxed or reluctantly approached the stated problem there would have been already a New Testament- Muhabura scenario. Bishop Shalita, the chief shepherd refused to listen to people's sentiments about the bishop-elect citing exhaustion of all constitutional procedures which in any case had inadequacies that had caused confusion in the diocese, how then could the Christians be advised to review the church's constitutional procedures?

(iii) House of Bishop's over reliance on incumbent bishop.

The bishops knew little, if not, some bishops knew nothing at all about Sebuhinja. Shalita himself claimed that he had no knowledge of the nominated candidates and also found the names in the House of bishops. Shalita has utterly expressed ignorance of the nominations before he reached the house of bishops. He was quoted in the New vision saying that Sebuhinja and Rev canon Wilson Baganizi were his friends but their names were only revealed to him in the House of Bishops during voting”. Now if Shalita himself from Kisoro and one who appointed the chancellor to preside over the nominations; let alone his well-known close relationship with the chancellor of the diocese and a shepherd of the diocese; who is expected to know all his sheep had no knowledge of the nominated candidates; how could you expect other bishops to have had prior information about the candidates before the voting day? This is contrasted with their full knowledge of Dr. Baganizi whom they had closely worked with for long. Archbishop Nkoyoyo argued that could be this full knowledge of the bishops about Baganizi contributed a lot to undermine his successful candidature. But how could they choose someone whom was the least favourite of the synod and secondly one they had little knowledge about? Dr. Philemon Mateke said that the policy though silent has been that the outgoing bishop has much say in the house of bishops concerning his successor”.

Indeed one's successful candidature to the position of bishop does not depend on his familiarity with members of the House of bishops but rather how close he is to the retiring bishop. The retiring shepherd has an upper hand even when a new Archbishop is to be elected. They rely on him because he is considered to be on the ground. Therefore, it is not how much the HOB's know the candidate but how close you are of the outgoing bishop.

The House of Bishops therefore allows to be influenced by the outgoing bishop because he is thought to know his Christians better. The house of Bishops voted basing on the unbalanced information about the candidates. One wonders why they
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could not have referred the nominations back for further scrutiny. The biggest weakness though, is that since the nominations are only introduced to the house of Bishops on the voting day, they are left with no time to use other avenues other than the incumbent bishop to find out the spiritual, social, domestic and other such qualities of a person to be a bishop. The House of Bishops is therefore liable to misinformation.

(iv) Weaknesses of Archbishop

It is not a secret that the Archbishop did not handle this crisis with the necessary impartiality. He leaned too much on the opposition: which gave them the confidence to launch stronger opposition to the bishop-elect.

The Archbishop is alleged to have postponed and or refused to consecrate and enthrone the bishop-elect against the wishes and decisions of the House of Bishops. It is alleged that the bishops were disappointed to learn that the Archbishop had postponed the ceremony indefinately'. He is also alleged to have incited further opposition during the synod meeting he chaired on 28th November 2002, when he constantly allowed Christians to express negative sentiments against the bishop elect. After the court ruling, the Archbishop was very negative about bishop-elect and his supporters; which denied possible progress to reconciliation The longer period of time between election and consecration enabled the opposition to mobilize further. It was further worsened when consecration was postponed with the hope that all Christians should be reconciled first. This gave a false impression to the opposition that the Archbishop was on their side. The Archbishop failed to give a genuine reason for refusal to consecrate the bishop elect. The Archbishop claimed that Kisoro was insecure but the government had never declared Kisoro insecure. Moreover Kitgum has been insecure for long but the Archbishop went to consecrate a bishop there. In addition if the Archbishop had the will to consecrate, the state should have arranged the necessary security to guard the function.
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The Archbishop put it plainly to the researcher that he feared to die because the Bafumbira Anglicans vowed to kill him if he dared travel to Muhabura for consecration. It is also true that the Archbishop lost the will and good attitude to the Muhabura case because he found out he was dealing with people of the flesh. He had been abused and almost beaten. He completely became negative and asked the House of Bishops to assign other bishops the Muhabura reconciliation plan.

The provincial leadership failed to acknowledge what was wrong with Sebuhinja, which gave him much force to demand for his installation. None of the members of the House of Bishops went to Kisoro to see what was on ground but only insisted that consecration would go on since all constitutional procedures were exhausted. The biggest weakness of which the Archbishop could definitely have no absolute control was that when he took over Muhabura diocese as caretaker bishop, he was running it from Kampala, yet at the same time was in charge of Kampala diocese and North Mbale diocese let alone being Archbishop of the province. This gave opportunity to the members of the opposition whom he had entrusted to help him in the diocese to make decisions and policies that were disastrous to the entire reconciliation process. For instance they resolved that all diocesan work must stop closure of diocesan offices, staff transfers that were based on grudges as well as freezing of diocesan Bank accounts.

It was also unnecessary for the Archbishop to appeal against the judgment of the High court in the court of appeal of Uganda. After all decisions of the high court magistrate were practically impossible and had not set the period in which the Archbishop was to do this, yet the Archbishop could not be forced to install the bishop-elect. Appealing to the court of appeal was an indication that the Archbishop had more confidence in secular courts to solve such church issues.

But whatever the case the Archbishop did all that they could to reconcile the two parties and to him a bishop who was not acceptable to Christians would fail to nurture Spiritual growth among them. Moreover to the Archbishop, at that stage, reconciliation was more necessary than a bishop in Muhabura. It was also for the same case that he became desperate and resorted to dealing more with the opposition because they were interested in reconciliation.
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6.8 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CLERGY AND LAITY

The established relationship between laity and clergy is not in line with biblical principles of church leadership. There is superiority of clergy over laity. This has continued with a lot of suspicion on the side of the laity; who are struggling to rekindle their biblical glory. The ordination of clergy has created a false thinking that they are the only ones legible for such spiritual offices because of their theological training. This is the very reason why no lay Christian has opportunity to become bishop as though the Holy Spirit is not upon them. The biggest weakness is that the laity have been left isolated from taking up such church roles and if so relegated to perform lesser functions; for instance just nominating but not electing a bishop. The Sinabulya committee to the Muhabura crisis reported that it was the laity who were struggling to get a bishop of their choice. The Muhabura crisis was a clear indication that the laity were struggling for this equality with the clergy (house of bishops) over who should be their bishop. It is no surprise that Mateke, chairman of laity went to the House of Bishops to contest Sebuhinja's candidature, he was told that he had no stake in electing a bishop; that his only role was to nominate. He vowed to mobilize Muhabura lay Christians to oppose what he called marginalisation of the voice of the laity. The Laity who further came up to oppose the House of Bishops decision were referred to as 'rebels'. This annoyed the Muhabura laity who vowed to show the House of Bishops that they have equal stake in church authority. Less than 10% admitted that the crisis was due to the poor relationship between the clergy and laity but rather suggested that could be the conflict over roles and authority in church between the two groups. This problem however could not have been stronger in bringing about the Muhabura crisis, but possibly a fight of personal grudges among the key players in the crisis fuelled the crisis the more.

6.9 PERSONAL GRUDGES

Some respondents claimed that since all the constitutional procedures had been exhausted in the electoral process that brought Sebuhinja to that position and those
opposed to him are very much aware of that; they are just using it as a cover to fight personal wars with some people who had grieved them for a longer time before. Most of the key personalities opposed to Shalita and the bishop elect have been working closely with the diocese. Some of whom have been personal great friends with bishop Shalita since their youthful days. For instance Canon Bitunguramye had been Shalita's friend since 1950; and it was Shalita who made Bitunguramye Canon; which to many Christians was out of amended provincial Canons. Bitunguramye is said to have become cross with Shalita when Shalita as bishop with great influence and longtime friend could not support his candidature as district movement chairman.

It was alleged also that Bitunguramye became bitter because Shalita had sidelined him in favour of new friends. It was also alleged that Bishop Shalita was intimidated by Dr. Baganizi's good relationship with Muhabura Christians as well as his economic progress that he interpreted as Baganizi's moral and spiritual weakness.

During his working period in Muhabura, Dr. Baganizi was the Christian's favourite because of his ready concerns for the needy and sick. Shalita was not happy with this and worked a lot to chase him from the diocese. Shalita is believed to have alleged that Baganizi was growing rich because he had stolen a lot from the church. It is also true that Shalita and Mateke had been friends since the inauguration of the diocese. But Mateke became unhappy with Shalita because Shalita never supported him during the LC (V) campaigns".

**CONCLUSION**

All those factors as discussed worked in connection to deepen the crisis in Muhabura. But after fundamentally a close scrutiny of the events of the crisis, one concludes that largely the leadership principles and structures of the church of Uganda which are not in line with New Testament teaching is the major cause of the crisis, and if not checked will continue to perpetuate similar crises in other dioceses in C.O.U. The effects of this crisis have been disastrous, shameful but also revealing of the loopholes in C.O.U leadership.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 SUMMARIES AND CONCLUSIONS

According to the research findings, it was found out that the crisis in church of Uganda, Muhabura diocese, stems from neglect to uphold the biblical principles of church leadership and administration. All the other causes and events identified in the crisis are an indication that the church has drifted away from the New Testament church principles of leadership. For example, people fight for the office of Bishop because it has been magnified and distorted from what it was meant to be as indicated in the New Testament. It is now an office of "Lordship", accompanied with having riches, influence and fame.

Because of drifting away from the New Testament church the church today no longer value the spiritual qualities of those meant to be her leaders. The qualifications of eldership as seen in 1 Timothy, Titus and 1 Peter are not considered at all. If these qualifications were critically put into consideration, the church today would be able to get leaders who are the people's aspiration. It has become clear that to become bishop in C.O.U today, you need to be at good terms with the outgoing bishop; who seems to hold much say on who would succeed him. Because of considering such self-centered qualities for leadership in the church we have refused to allow the Holy Spirit to work among us, to give us guidance on who would be the most right leaders for our church.

Notably also, the church has changed upside down the biblical expectations of church leaders. In the bible, it is those who were filled with the Holy Spirit and who manifested the "God-like characters" that congregation saw it fit to appoint them as their church leaders. In other words, they had to receive sanctification before assuming divine office. The biggest problem in C.O.U today is that some of the people who occupy its divine offices are the most secular, with the notion that the office will sanctify them. In the end such people have moved on with their human moral laxity in those offices and have done things that are not expected of a person holding such a divine office. The thinking that once someone has been ordained has received the Holy Spirit and therefore fit to lead God's flock is unrealistic and has
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been the mother of all evils in C.O.U. It has laid hands on people who have never changed their hearts completely to Christ and therefore will do anything to use those offices for self-gratification. No wonder many C.O.U leaders are not always willing to quit.

Therefore, the provincial leadership is weak and always unable to deal with crises in the dioceses because it does not govern the church in conformity with biblical principles. The Muhabura diocesan laity vigorously came up to express resentment at the election of their second bishop because they wish to have an equal stake with clergy as it was in the New Testament when it came to appointment of leaders.

However, disregarding church leaders by abusing them, scolding them, attacking them verbally or physically, is a real neglect of the lay Christians' responsibilities towards their leaders as expected them in the bible. Once C.O.U membership, both laity and clergy take keen interest to evaluate their church against the principles that guided that of the New Testament, the conflicts and crises witnessed would be no more. And in case they come up, will be dealt with consistently and in dire agreement of all members as it was with the early church’s problem of circumcision of gentiles and that of Hellenistic Jews.

7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS
Church of Uganda has suffered so much with these leadership crises in some of its dioceses. The Muhabura diocese crisis has been a shame to the entire C.O.U. The diocese has had no shepherd for now three years and the Christians have been divided up by the crisis. Certainly this crisis must come to an end and all Christians in Muhabura and others elsewhere are praying for this turbulent diocese to stabilize. In light of the crisis in Muhabura diocese, the way forward should involve the following.

The two nominees to the House of Bishops should be thrown back. Neither Rev Canon Sebuhinja nor Rev Dr. Baganizi should be favoured. There is need for selection of a person who will be neutral to both the conflicting groups in Muhabura. Much as every procedure was followed in the nomination and election of Rev Canon Sebuhinja; the House of Bishops needs to be an institution that takes into account the
Feelings of Muhabura Christians. Hard lining on consecration of bishop-elect will not only perpetuate the crisis but also divide up the church of Christ further.

Muhabura Christians; both clergy and laity should realise that the church belongs to Christ. They all belong to the church of Christ; developing faith in personalities is unbiblical and will only help to heighten the divisive leadership which is prevalent in the diocese. The Christians need to rekindle the lost biblical leadership, which was without division, and conflicts. Muhabura Christians should not fight for leadership roles in the diocese but rather should live a good spiritual life to be noticed by the Holy Spirit. Muhabura Christians need to realise that it is the Holy Spirit that chooses church leaders. This will be so when the Holy Spirit endowes one or several members of the church with unique gifts/qualities for leadership, and these will become evident to the congregation, who will notice such a gifted individual. In this sense he will be called upon to serve the church. In light of this, those vying for church leadership should note that the Holy Spirit cannot dwell in a sinful body hence the need to sanctify self in preparation to receive the unique gifts.

There's necessity for constitutional changes such that the House of bishops just confirms the Electoral College’s nomination. Another possibility would be an amendment of the constitution such that the Electoral College nominates one candidate to the House of bishops; and the House of bishops duly appoints the nominated candidate as bishop. To avoid the likely inconsistencies, the house of bishops should organize several retreats with members of the Electoral College before the nomination and electoral process. This should be to equip the EC members with information on what kind of person should be selected. This will also involve feeding them with the word of God on church leadership. Another amendment of C.O.U constitution should involve the stipulation of the required number of members on the Electoral College. This is to ensure uniformity for all dioceses. This was a big problem in Muhabura diocese as Christians were divided up over the legal number of members required to constitute the Electoral College. Those on the opposition claimed that the required number was twelve (12) whereas six (6) members constituted the Electoral College that nominated the candidates. The constitution of C. O. U should further be amended to give the Archbishop more powers over the dioceses and the diocesan bishops. He should have executive powers to dismiss, suspend undisciplined clergy pending
sitting of a church tribunal. There has been a very big problem with the legality of the Archbishop taking up turbulent dioceses because the constitution just gives the Archbishop powers to exercise general pastoral leadership in the province. The Archbishop's powers should be increased such that he is not just the first among the diocesan bishops (equals).

C.O.U provincial leadership should develop mechanisms of dealing with such leadership - succession disputes should they arise in any diocese. It should develop a system of free transfer of bishops such that bishops are not local but can be transferred to any see by the Archbishop. This will solve the problem of inherent localism and tribalism that has an apparent manifestation in the choosing of bishops. However, for this free transfer of bishops to work outside their home diocese, it should be done in consultation with the diocesan synods.

The ministry of reconciliation should be the starting point for a breakthrough in Muhabura diocese, due to the divisions, hatred and enmity had been generated among the clergy and laity. A Diocesan convention should therefore be planned in order to bring all Christians together. This will help in equipping them spiritually and enable the Holy Spirit to work among them; such that they can drop the hatred and personal resentments that have grown in them. With this diocesan convention, all Christians will be brought on board. Actually the way forward for Muhabura calls upon an all-inclusive approach that will involve everybody in the process of reconciliation. Dropping anybody along the way will weaken the church and the ministry of reconciliation.

Christians in Muhabura should have the necessary flexibility in opinions if the crisis is to come to an end. All key stakeholders in the conflict and all key players in finding the solution to the conflict should not stick to their original positions but be free to evaluate the situation and look for appropriate solutions to the end of the conflict. The pro-sebuhinja group should stop thinking that the end of the conflict lies in consecrating the bishop-elect. The anti-sebuhinja group should as well stop thinking that Rev Dr. Baganizi is the only able developmental person who can run Muhabura diocese.
Education of both the laity and clergy should be availed concerning the running and administration of the church. People of different offices in the service of the church should be trained and exposed to their duties, responsibilities, rights and constitutional provisions to avoid acting in ignorance. They should be taught the different roles and importance of the various church offices and those such offices need to be respected. This should be done in Muhabura and all other dioceses of the province of C.G.D. Vital documents, literature and other public information concerning the church should be availed at different levels of the church administration. This will help reduce on the suspicion from church members. Information regarding election of a diocesan bishop should be known by every church member and the procedure at every level made publicly if the church continues to involve the lay Christians in choosing of bishops.

There should be utmost transparency in election of a bishop and every process should be monitored to fight suspicious tendencies. When only members at any level have been satisfied, then procedure should be taken to the next level. This process should be monitored from the beginning to the end with proper documentation at every stage. This helps to solve and or resolve problems or conflicts as they arise before it is either late or too late.

Church tribunals should be made functional such that whenever there are conflicts among a congregation; the tribunals have the capacity to reconcile them rather than going to the civil courts whose rulings are a great embarrassment to the church of Christ.

Conditions of service for all church of Uganda employees at all levels should be written. Also a code of conduct for all church of Uganda members and employees, both laity and clergy including bishops should be put in place. This code of conduct should specify penalties for offenders. A committee for code of conduct and conditions of service should be set up in all dioceses. This committee should comprise of an equal number of clergy and laity. The committee should have powers to discipline members of the Anglican church of Uganda. In this respect, pastors in Muhabura diocese who played role in suing the Archbishop in the High court of
Uganda as well as disgracing him through verbal and written abuses should be disciplined.

There should be legal provision within both provincial and Diocesan constitutions to enable the church leadership enforce its decisions upon all, especially those of their members who seem reluctant to obey, without having to resort to state organs such as the police and law courts. However, there should be courts of appeal both at the Diocesan and provincial level to check against victimisation and to ensure justice for all.

Jobs that require specific skills in the diocese should be advertised in the public media so that qualified technical practicing Christians can fill them. The most fundamental of all those positions is that of Diocesan Accountant/Auditor. This should not be given to anybody but a Christian who has proved his/her ability in accounting. To completely eliminate the problem of nepotism and clanism in the diocese, an independent company should always be hired to recruit such staff of the diocese except for posts that require one to be a priest like parish pastors. This independent compay under the guidance of the church will eliminate the upper hand of the diocesan bishop; who are found of manipulating and or ignoring the diocesan appointment committees when they wish to recruit their relatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>PLACE OF INTERVIEW</th>
<th>DATE OF INTERVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mpalanyi Nkoyoyo Livingstone</td>
<td>Retired Archbishop of church of Uganda/Bishop of Muhabura Diocese</td>
<td>Bweyogere Leisure park</td>
<td>01.07.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shalita Ernest (Rt Rev)</td>
<td>Retired Bishop of Muhabura Diocese</td>
<td>Kisoro town near St. Andrews Cathedral</td>
<td>08.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sebuhinja David (Rev Canon)</td>
<td>Bishop - elect of Muhabura Diocese</td>
<td>Kisoro town</td>
<td>12.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Baganizi Wilson (Rev canon Dr)</td>
<td>Church commisioner (C.O.U)</td>
<td>Centenary publishing house offices</td>
<td>25.05.2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Muruta Esau (Rev Canon)</td>
<td>Chairman of Bishop's commissaries, Archdeacon of Kabindi Archdeaconry</td>
<td>Diocesan offices of Muhabura</td>
<td>07.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mateke Philemon (Dr)</td>
<td>Chairman of Laity Muhabura diocese, Chairman LC (V) Kisoro district</td>
<td>Kisoro district Administration offices</td>
<td>11.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mfitumukiza Emmanuel (Rev)</td>
<td>Muhabura Diocesan planning and development officer</td>
<td>Diocesan offices of Muhabura</td>
<td>09.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sabiiti Jackson</td>
<td>Education Secretary Muhabura, Archdeacon Gisorora</td>
<td>Diocesan offices of Muhabura</td>
<td>07.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kwizera Gideon (Rev Canon)</td>
<td>Dean, St Andrews Cathedral Seseme</td>
<td>St Andrews Cathedral Vestry</td>
<td>11.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Marion Sebuhinja (Mrs)</td>
<td>Children Ministry worker, formerly mother's union</td>
<td>Kisoro town</td>
<td>09.06.2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Byigero David (Rev)</td>
<td>Chaplain Rwaramba S.S., formerly Headmaster of Rwaramba S.S.</td>
<td>Rwaramba S.S Chaplaincy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ntibarikure Augustine</td>
<td>Kisoro district sports officer, member of St Andrews Cathedral</td>
<td>Kisoro district Education offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Kambabazi Sarah Muruta</td>
<td>Lay Christian of Muhabura diocese, Daughter to Rev Canon Esau Muruta, Professional Teacher at concerted college school, Ntinda</td>
<td>Concerted College school Ntinda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bigaruka Ezra (Rev)</td>
<td>Retired clergy of Muhabura diocese</td>
<td>Kisoro Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kalimwabo Victor (Rev)</td>
<td>Formerly Diocesan Information officer, Pastor in charge of Nyakabingo Parish</td>
<td>Kisoro Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Masereka David Mutabunga</td>
<td>Member of Anglican Church of Uganda, RDC, Kisoro district</td>
<td>Kisoro district administration offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sebazunga J. W. (Rev)</td>
<td>Retired clergy of Muhabura diocese</td>
<td>Muhabura Diocesan Headquarters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Munyangabo Wilson</td>
<td>Senior church warden, St Andrews Cathedral Seseme</td>
<td>Kisoro High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lubaale Grace</td>
<td>C.O.U Stalwart, son of a priest and student of Religious Studies</td>
<td>Kyambogo University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kazinda Jackson Sabiti (Rev Canon)</td>
<td>Formerly Division education secretary, Pastor, Kabindi Parish</td>
<td>Muhabura Diocesan offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kanna Solomon Rugera</td>
<td>Lay member, coordinator of Muhabura micro-finance institution</td>
<td>Muhabura micro-finance institution offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mugisha Cranmer (Rev)</td>
<td>Clergy of Muhabura diocese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Harerimana</td>
<td>Kisoro district council speaker, lay member</td>
<td>Kisoro Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ndikumwami Godfrey (Rev)</td>
<td>Student at Uganda Christian University, Mukono</td>
<td>Rwaramba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Byibesho Sam</td>
<td>Town Mayor Kisoro, member St. Andrews Cathedral, Seseme</td>
<td>Kisoro Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

The bearer of this letter is a student of Kyambogo University pursuing a Diploma/Degree course.

He/She is conducting a research, which is part of the requirements for the fulfillment of the award.

You are therefore requested to assist him/her with data collection.

Yours sincerely,

Dr. Peter Wasswa Mpagi
H.O.D. RELIGIOUS STUDIES

c.c. Academic Registrar
APPENDIX (II): QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE ADMINISTERED

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CHRISTIANS IN MUHABURA DIOCESE

This questionnaire seeks to find information on the causes of the crisis in Muhabura Diocese. You are kindly requested to complete the questionnaire by providing the appropriate information. The information you will provide will be treated as confidential and strictly used for the purpose of this study.

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

1. Name...........................................................................................................(Optional)

2. Age..........................................................3. Sex.............................................

4. Position in the church (tick appropriately)
   □ Member
   □ Church leader (specify)
   □ Priest
   □ Retired church leader (specify)

5. Church..........................................................Parish..........................Archdeaconry...........................................

6. How long have you been in this church?..........................................................

7. How long have you served in this church..........................................................

8. When were you (a) baptized.................................................................(b) Ordained..........................

9. Have you got any promotion since you joined servant hood? □ YES □ NO
   If yes specify........................................................................................................

PART B:
(PUT A TICK ON EITHER "YES" OR "NO")

1. Do you participate in choosing of church leaders? □ YES □ NO

2. Was Rev. Canon Sebuhinja best suited to be Bishop of Muhabura Diocese?
   □ YES □ NO

3. Does Rev. Baganizi have the best qualities for Bishop in Muhabura Diocese?
   □ YES □ NO
4. Do you agree with the current procedures of appointment of Bishops in C.O.U?
YES ☐ NO ☐

5. Is it true that political influences and intrigues have destabilised church leadership in your diocese?
☐ YES ☐ NO

6. Is the working relationship between your clergy and laity leaders good?
☐ YES ☐ NO

7. Is it true that ethnic/tribal differences have brought confusion in the running of your diocese?
☐ YES ☐ NO

8. The provincial leadership of C.O.U is too weak to effectively deal with the leadership wrangles in its dioceses
☐ YES ☐ NO

9. Do you think the crisis in Muhabura Diocese stems from the declining spirituality of Christians?
☐ YES ☐ NO

10. Should the lay Christians be given full authority to elect a Bishop of their choice?
☐ YES ☐ NO

11. Were the Christians in this diocese right to contest the consecration of Rev. canon Sebuhinja?
☐ YES ☐ NO

12. Have you taken any side in this crisis?
☐ YES ☐ NO

13. In your view, were the supporters of Rev. canon Sebuhinja right to sue the Archbishop for refusing to consecrate him into office?
☐ YES ☐ NO

14. Do you agree that the Muhabura diocese crisis is a conflict between the laity and clergy?
☐ YES ☐ NO

15. Is it true that the laity is marginalized in major decision making of the diocese?
☐ YES ☐ NO

16. In your opinion was the Archbishop just insensitive to the demands of the Christians in Muhabura Diocese?
☐ YES ☐ NO

17. Would you blame the Muhabura Diocese laity leadership for deepening the crisis in the diocese?
☐ YES ☐ NO
18. Did the Archbishop do the right thing to call off Rev. canon Sebuhinja’s consecration?  
☐ YES  ☐ NO

19. Do you think resignation of the Chairman Laity would help to stop the conflict in Muhabura Diocese?  
☐ YES  ☐ NO

20. Do you think if Rev. canon Sebuhinja had publicly withdrawn his candidature, the crisis would have been avoided?  
☐ YES  ☐ NO

21. Is it true that the crisis is perpetuated by simply personal grudges among some church leaders in the Diocese?  
☐ YES  ☐ NO

(TICK WHERE APPROPRIATE)

22. Regardless of the C.O.U constitution, who do you think should have the final vote for appointment of a Bishop?  
(a) House of Bishops  
(b) Diocesan synod  
(c) Laity  
(d) Archbishop

23. What do you think is the most outstanding cause for the leadership wrangles in Muhabura diocese.  
(a) Not following the Bible  
(b) Political influences  
(c) Ethnic/tribal differences  
(d) Weak provincial leadership  
(e) Spiritual bankruptcy of Christians  
(f) Conflicting roles of laity leaders and clergy  
(g) Poor relationship between clergy and laity

SECTION: C
(Please fill in the spaces provided)

24. List the causes of wrangles in Muhabura diocese

(i) ........................................................................................................

(ii) ........................................................................................................

(iii) ........................................................................................................

(iv) ........................................................................................................
25. Has tribalism featured in this crisis? NO or YES
   If yes how?

26. Why are the politicians involved in church wrangles?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
   (iv)
   (v)

27. (a) In your opinion is Christian spirituality on the decline in Kisoro?
   (b) If yes why?

28. What reasons do Christians give for refusing Rev. Canon Sebuhinja as their bishop?
   (i)
   (ii)
   (iii)
   (iv)
   (v)

29. (a) Whom can you blame for the leadership crisis in your diocese?
   (b) Briefly state the reasons for your answer

30. Why do some Christians want Rev. Baganizi to be bishop?
   (i)
   (ii)
31. In your opinion, why was Rev. Canon Sebuhinja elected as bishop?
(i) .................................................................................................................................
(ii) .................................................................................................................................
(iii) .................................................................................................................................
(iv) .................................................................................................................................
(v) .................................................................................................................................

32. Why did the Archbishop later on refuse to consecrate his elected candidate?
(i) .................................................................................................................................
(ii) .................................................................................................................................
(iii) .................................................................................................................................
(iv) .................................................................................................................................
(v) .................................................................................................................................

33. List three problems faced by Christians in Muhabura diocese
   (i) .................................................................................................................................
   (ii) .................................................................................................................................
   (iii) .................................................................................................................................

34. Mention five things you have not liked about this crisis
   (i) .................................................................................................................................
   (ii) .................................................................................................................................
   (iii) .................................................................................................................................
   iv) ..................................................................................................................................
35. What do you expect to change in the diocese after the crisis?

(i) ............................................................................................................................

(ii) ............................................................................................................................

(iii) ...........................................................................................................................

(iv) ............................................................................................................................

(v) ............................................................................................................................

36. What do you think should be done to solve the crisis?

(i) ............................................................................................................................

(ii) ............................................................................................................................

(iii) ............................................................................................................................

(iv) ............................................................................................................................

(v) ............................................................................................................................

Thank you for your kind response
APPENDIX (III): INTERVIEW GUIDE

1) Do you think the crisis in Muhabura diocese has occurred because the church does not follow what the bible teachers about leadership.

2) How have the politicians greatly influenced the events of the crisis in Muhabura diocese?

3) What do you say about the ethnic/tribal differences between Christians of Muhabura as the major cause of the crisis?

4) Why does the provincial leadership of C.O.U seem weak to deal effectively with such leadership crisis in its dioceses and especially Muhabura?

5) What is your comment on the declining spiritually among members of the Anglican church as one of the causes of the crisis in Muhabura?

6) In your opinion, why is the relationship between the clergy and laity leadership so poor in the church that it always breeds conflict?

7) What should be done in a situation where the laity contest the appointment of a certain Bishop by the House of Bishops?

8) Suggest any possible recommendations to the church to avoid any other such crisis in future.
APPENDIX IV

LETTERS OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DIOCESE OF MUHABURA AND CHURCH OF UGANDA PROVINCE HEADQUARTERS ON MUHABURA CRISIS DOIOCESE OF MUHABURA
P.O. BOX 22, KISORO.

December 3, 2002
To:
The Archbishop,
Church of Uganda (Anglican)
The Dean of the Province
Church of Uganda (Anglican)
All the Diocesan Bishops
Church of Uganda (Anglican)
Your Grace/Lordships,

RE: APPEAL TO KEEP UP THE CONSECRATION AND ENTHRONEMENT PROGRAMME FOR THE DIOCESE OF MUHABURA ON 19TH JANUARY 2003 AND SHUN SCHEMES DESIGNED TO DERRY THE DECISION OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

Introduction: We, the undersigned synod members alarmed by the gross abuse of our church policy and constitutional order hereby make this written appeal for defence of our Church.

The Matter at issue:

Your Grace/Lordships, the election of the Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja to be the next Bishop of the diocese of Muhabura succeeding the Retired Bishop Ernest M. Shalita was duly done. To this effect, the Provincial Chancellor made an appropriate report to the Archbishop on which the Provincial Secretary based the Press Release dated is" February 2002 about the situation in Muhabura Diocese and said, "We have, since the announcement of the Decision of the House of Bishops regarding the election of Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja, received several representations, some in support of the decision and others in opposition to the decision. We have carefully
listened, read several memoranda, visited Christians in Muhabura Diocese and reviewed both positions. We have read several correspondences from the group the public in the media and radio programmes. Nowhere is it alleged that the correct procedure in the nomination and election was not followed". (Paragraph five)

During his inauguration of the new synod in Muhabura Diocese on 28th November 2002, the Archbishop said in his unsigned charge “The crisis in Muhabura has lasted at most 14 months since Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja was elected as Bishop by the House of Bishops to replace our brother, the Rt. Rev. Ernest Shalita. We have all these months waited and tried to find out as to why Canon Sebuhinja was allegedly refused and up to now haven’t been true accusations or false allegation that has been filed against him. "In this respect, the recent concluded House of Bishops re-affirmed their decision and only waiting to come on 19th January 2003 to consecrate and enthrone the Bishop- Elect". (Paragraph 6-8).

The Problem:
The Most Rev. Dr. Livingstone Mpalanyi-Nkoyoyo who is currently care-taking the Diocese of Muhabura, has been observed as conspiring with the opposition group to defy the decision of the House of Bishops. The hurried nature of the election of a new synod before consecration and the abrupt inauguration of the new synod on 28th November 2002 gave opportunity to people suspected of unconstitutional memberships to buy their way into the synod such as Dr. P. Matoke and the likes of Mateke. A motion was tabled seeking for inquiry into the above-mentioned suspicion concerning wrong memberships. Surprisingly, the synod chairman, Archbishop Nkoyoyo, ignored the motion. Now, which way Church of Uganda (Anglican) if would be defenders of the Faith and Order are the ones aiding the forces of evil to derail and take over the Church? Whereas, it is generally believed that the self-styled politicians who are avowedly opposed to the Bishop-Elect Canon David Sebunja would by now have subsided into acceptance, the Archbishop's defiant schemes have been rekindling the outrage of the politicians to wage war against the House of Bishops. This behaviour at the caliber of an Archbishop is deeply deplorable. Instead of re-affirming the programme for consecration and enthronement on 19th January 2003, the Synod chairman - Archbishop Mpalanyi-Nkoyoyo kept enticing the anti-decision of the House of Bishops to speak out their negative feelings about Canon Sebuhinja's consecration and enthronement on 19th January 2003. This helped the opposition group to recover their morale and fighting power basing on the sermon (Jonah in Muhabura was thrown deep into the sea, there would be on calm.

One member asked the Chairman seeking to know as to why the synod had been plunged into deliberating on a matter which had been constitutionally concluded on by the previous synod. The Chairman gave no answer.
Another member asked to know as to when the House of Bishops might have referred the matter back to the Diocese for a repeat. Again the synod chairman, Archbishop Mpalyani-Nkoyoyo ignored the question and kept pointing to the anti-decision of the House of Bishops to speak out their mind. When the synod Chairman, Archbishop Mpalyani-Nkoyoyo, embarked upon the extremity of conducting voting, more than sixty of us disassociated ourselves by moving outside as we had earlier indicated in our previous communication dated 23rd November 2002. Some others who also support the decision of the House of Bishops remained inside and observed that some on lookers of the opposition kind mingled themselves into the line when the Chairman directed the opposition group to line up for counting. The 107 opposition members counted included non-synod members! What a mess! The Chairman became happy, waved to them and promised to take the results to the House of Bishops.

**Gratitude & Support:**

Your Grace/Lordships, we greatly appreciate your November 14, 2002 re-affirmation of the very choice you made on September 5, 2001 concerning the Bishop-Elect, Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja and the release of you programme for consecrating and enthroning him on 19th January 2003. We are eagerly waiting to receiving you on 18th- 20th January 2003 to come and carry on your programme in Kisoro including that of consecrating and enthroning the Bishop Elect Canon David Sebuhinja on 19th January 2003 and leave the rest to him. He is capable of spearheading the desired reconciliation as the Archbishop often says that the people of Muhabura themselves have the will for their conflict resolution.

**Request:**

For the time being until the planned consecration/enthronement weekend, please our Fathers in God - allow us to concentrate on the preparations. We are pausing this request because we have heard the opposition group leaders boast that another synod subsidiary meeting is soon to take place. It is unfortunate because whenever we hear the opposition group leaders spreading what ought to be a rumour, it eventually turns out to be their prior programme with the Archbishop. We want to make it clear to you that any other forum organized by the Archbishop or his representatives, apart from consecration; we shall not be a party to it. This is because such a forum will have ceased to be Constitutional organ of the Church but a malicious meeting of Mateke his opposition group and the Archbishop. Our request therefore and appeal to our Diocesan Lordship together with our beloved Retired Fathers - none of you should accept being sent to the Diocese of Muhabura for any mission before the planned consecration date is" - zo" January 2003. Thank you very much.

**For information Your Grace Lordships:**

So far we have enough of what we need for the consecration necessities, Four million collected during November 2002 in addition to the seven million Ug. Shillings.
collected during 2001; three cows, six goats, numerous chicken and comfortable accommodation for our visitors.

Yours faithfully,

The Undersigned members of the Synod.

c.c. The Provincial Secretary
    The Provincial Chancellor
    the Retired Bishops
All Diocesan Clergy and Lay staff,  
Diocese of Muhabura  

Dear Rev./Canon /Mr./Mrs.  

**RE: DECISIONS OF THE DIOCESAN COUNCIL/BOARDS**  
I have received information that some of the staff are not respecting the decisions made by the Diocesan Synod, Council and staff Board. I would like to remind you that as staff, you are expected to respect the decisions made by the Diocesan decision and policy-making bodies, i.e. Synod, Diocesan Council, Staff Board and other Boards/Committees.  

It should be noted that all decisions that were made by the above mentioned Bodies which were chaired by my representative The Rt. Rev. Wilson Mutebi on 13th - 15th November, 2003, were/are binding.  
I urge you to work together as a team in order to build the Diocese and enhance God's work among the Christians in the Diocese of Muhabura. Without this teamwork, it may make reconciliation and unity very difficult and bring disharmony in the Diocese.  

Lastly, all the Clergy and other Diocesan workers who were transferred and appointed should move to their new locations with no further delay. Anyone who may have a problem or complaint should take it to the Diocesan Secretary, Rev. Canon W. Baker Habimana.  
May God bless you in your Ministry?  

Yours sincerely  
The Rt. Rev. Dr. Lingstone Mpalanyi - Nkoyoyo  

**ARCHBISHOP BISHOP MUHABURA DIOCESE**  

**c.c.** The Provincial Secretary  
**c.c.** The Diocesan Secretary  
**c.c.** The Diocesan Chancellor
DIOCESE OF MUHABURA,
P.O. BOX 22, KISORO
17th December 2003

All Clergy Diocese of Muhabura
All Christians and the General Public

RE: REV. CANON BAKER HABJMANA IMPERSONATING THE DIOCESAN SECRETARY - DIOCESE OF MUHABURA

We the undersigned Bishop's Commissaries and the Diocesan Administration of the Diocese of Muhabura wish to inform all Christians and the general public that the above-mentioned Rev. Canon Baker Habimana is impersonating the Diocesan Secretary of the Diocese of Muhabura. This followed the High Court ruling of 3rd November 2003 which ruled out those who had taken over the diocese illegally. Consequently, Boards/Committees which they had put in place were rendered null and void together with the appointments of they made.

Actually Canon Baker Habimana's illegal appointment came even after the ruling of the High Court of Uganda; in which case all his actions under the title of Diocesan Secretary tantamount to contempt of the ruling of the High Court of Uganda. We therefore write to inform all Christians, all our Partners, our Banks, and the general public that whoever deals with Baker as the Diocesan Secretary, does so at his/her own risk.

Let us take this opportunity to inform you all that the duly appointed Diocesan Secretary is Rev. Canon Jackson Kazinda Sabiiti. He is the one with genuine appointment letter and as such whoever has anything to do with the Diocese, he is the right person to contact.

By copy of this letter, we inform the said Rev. Canon Baker Habimana that if he continues impersonating the Diocesan Secretary of the Diocese of Muhabura, we are in touch with our lawyers and we are ready to sue him in the High Court of Uganda for his multiple offences.

Yours sincerely,
The Most Rev. Livingstone Mpality Nkoyoyo,
Archbishop of the Church of Uganda,
P.O. Box 14123, KAMPALA

Your Grace,

RE: DECISIONS OF THE DIOCESAN COUNCILBOARDS
Greetings to you in Jesus' Name. This is to acknowledge the receipt of a letter dated 14th January 2004 endorsed by you. We feel that, that letter was designed by a group of people who do not know your title since they addressed you as the Rt. Reverend instead of the Most Reverend. We the undersigned Diocesan Clergy and Lay staff of the Diocese of Muhabura do want to assure you that we will stick to being loyal to the Church's hierarchical and constitutional order as we have always been. We the clergy who first underwent the Oath of Canonical obedience of before exercising the ministry, pledged to pay true and canonical obedience in ONLY those things which are lawful and honest. This is why we fully support the Decision of the House of Bishops and the Church Constitution in relation to the nomination and election of our Bishop-Elect Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja.

However, to our wonder and dismay, you as an Archbishop and the leader of the whole Anglican Church of Uganda has not been law abiding. For instance, you have not respected the decision of Muhabura Synod, the House of Bishop's decision in regard to the election of the Bishop-Elect Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja. You have not honoured the ruling of the High Court of Uganda which was made on 3rd November 2003 and disqualifies you from being the Bishop of Muhabura Diocese. You have given Rev. Canon E. Muruta more years of service when he IS presumed to have retired on 31st December 2003.

Your Grace, our resistance to the transfers, demotions and dismissals should not be taken as disloyalty. We have instead seen them as victimization because of our support to the decision of the House of Bishops on the election of the Bishop-Elect Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja.
We feel that your continuous dealings with the opposition only, will never bring unity and reconciliation in our Diocese, instead it will perpetuate further conflicts and disharmony. Therefore, be informed once again as earlier communicated to you in our letter of 17th November 2003 that none of us is ready to move not even an inch from his/her current place of work.

We further bring to your attention that none of us will take his/her complaints to Rev. canon Baker Habimana as you have indicated in your letter because he is not our Diocesan Secretary.

Finally, now that you are retiring, we beg you to leave Muhabura issue in God's hands and will.

We wish you a happy retirement.

Yours,

Names and Signatures attached.

c.c. The Dean of the Province
   All Diocesan Bishops
   The Provincial Chancellor
   The Provincial Secretary
   Babigumira & Co. Advocates
   The Resident District Commissioner - Kisoro
   The District Security Officer - Kisoro
   The District Police Commander - Kisoro
   Rev. Canon Baker Habimana
DIOCESE OF MUHABURA
P.O. BOX 22, KISORO

17th November 2003
The Archbishop of the Province of the Church of Uganda (Anglican)
The Diocesan Bishops of the Province of the Church of Uganda (Anglican)

RE: CLERGY CONCERN IN MUHABURA DIOCESE-WHICH WAY CHURCH OF UGANDA?

We greet Your Grace and the Lordships in the Love and Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.
Your Grace, your delegate retired Bishop Wilson Mutebi has chaired Dr. P. Mateke's opposition group branded "Diocesan council". In their so-called Diocesan council, which sat on 15th November 2003 "with immediate effect", they demoted, dropped and transferred 18 Diocesan staff who support the Decision of the House of Bishops. Is this how the Christian Church should work?

The Retired Bishop Wilson Mutebi does not understand the problems of the Diocese of Muhabura. Moreover, he made the reshuffles illegally. Retire Bishop Mutebi has gone to the extreme of making Rev. Gideon Kwizeria Canon in St. Andrews Cathedral. In our view, as clergy, Bishop Mutebi has neither a cathedral nor Episcopal staff in the Diocese of Muhabura. How then dores he make any clergy a Canon who he has never and will never work with? We feel this is a scandal in the Church of Uganda. We are always offended by instigators of trouble like Retired Bishop Mutebi who want to ignite confusion to allow them keep on coming in Muhabura diocese for their selfish ends.

They have undermined the Church Constitution by giving Rev. Canon Esau Muruta more years to continue serving after his December 31, 2003 retirement. They have terminated the services of an active pastor Rev. Arthur Niyonsaba of 40 years of age, but Muruta of over 65 years of age is to continue serving.

They have demoralized some of the senior staff and penalized them for their support of the decision of the House of Bishops. A case in point: - Senior Archdeacon and Commissary Erastus Gapfuyekubaho has been demoted from the office of the Archdeacon a posted to a young village parish (Maregamo). At this material time, do we need transfer or consecration and enthronement?

We are still fully convinced that the Holy Spirit of the almighty God guided you when you elected Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja - Bishop Elect. Once again we pledge unwavering support to the decision of the House of Bishops.
In our view as clergy, we feel that this is not the time to surrender the Church of Christ to secular politicians like Dr. Mateke.

Lastly, we the undersigned clergy are not and will never be ready to serve under Mateke's rule of the Church. For that matter, therefore, we are not going to honour Retired Bishop Mutebi and Mateke's reshuffle of the Diocesan Staff.

Yours faithfully,

Names and Signatures attached.

C.C. The Provincial Secretary

The Provincial Chancellor
The Archbishop/Bishop,
Church of Uganda/Diocese of Muhabura

Your Grace,

RE: GROSS LEADERSHIP MISCONDUCT

Greetings in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Your Grace, after maximum patience, the undersigned part of your Commissary have seen it necessary to communicate to you about various anomalies committed by Rev. Canon Esau Muruta mis-using his capacity as our Commissary Chairman.

1. Since our appointment as your commissary in Muhabura Diocese, we have never sat in a meeting together.
2. Our Chairman, Canon Esau Muruta invites Diocesan council meetings without our knowledge.
3. He chairs illegal council meetings designed to destroy the Church by passing ill-fated resolutions to close the Diocesan Bank Accounts and Diocesan Offices.
4. He issues letters and circulars signed by himself as Chairman without giving copies to his fellow commissary members.
5. He ventures on travels to Kampala to hold meetings with the Archbishop seeking endorsement of certain wild resolutions without the knowledge of his fellow commissary members.
6. He tries to convene Diocesan Council meetings without the Constitutional procedure of using the Diocesan Secretary, and also screens certain council members from attendance and comes out with divisive resolutions to escalate the conflict rather than heal the wounds. For instance, the self-interest of Baker Habimana, Gideon K wizera and Muruta the Chairman seeking to close the Diocesan offices with the ill intention of taking over certain positions soon afterwards is evidently the common talk along the streets of Kisoro pertaining to the deliberations of their meetings.
7. Rev. Canon Esau Muruta meddles in the affairs of other Archdeaconries to the extent of conducting sacraments in those Archdeaconries thus usurping the parish pastors and the area Archdeaconry. For instance, on 13th April 2003, Canon Esau Muruta authorized Canon Baker Habimana to conduct a baptism service in Matinza C.O.U Parish sidelining the area Archdeacon and Parish pastor.
8. On 2nd January 2003, Canon Muruta assumed the Chairmanship of the Diocesan Council which he had called without our knowledge and out of it he, himself as Chairman, Esau Muruta, signed and issued to the 37 parishes of the Diocese a circular halting "QUOT A MONEY" and ordering the Parish pastors not to take quota money to the Diocesan office, by so doing, Canon Esau Muruta has failed Muhabura Diocesan quota from reaching the Province.
Thus, Muruta who is retiring after December 2003 has been demonstrating his level of understanding of the Church.

9. After halting the official quota, Muruta himself issued another circular to the parishes demanding the quota money to be paid to another office not known by the Diocesan Administration. For instance, on 7th April 2003 he (Muruta) ordered the Parish pastors each to pay Ug. Shillings 100,000= (One hundred thousand) with immediate effect to his self-appointed treasurer.

10. Canon Muruta has been collaborating with the position-hungry Rev. Baker Habimana and the money-hungry Rev. Gideon Kwizera to sustain the conflict in Muhabura Diocese to serve their personal interests at the expense of the integrity of the Church.

May the Lord Almighty save His Church starting with the Diocese of Muhabura!

Yours sincerely,

1. .................................
   Rev. Canon Eldad Mature
   Bishop's Commissary and Archdeacon,
   Iryaruvumba Archdeaconry.

2. .................................
   Rev. Canon Erastus Gapfuyekubaho
   Bishop's Commissary and Archdeacon,
   Gisorora Archdeaconry.

c.c. All Bishops,
   Church of Uganda
   " Provincial Secretary,
   Church of Uganda
   " The Provincial Chancellor,
   Church of Uganda
   " The Diocesan Secretary,
   Diocese of Muhabura.
   " The Diocesan Treasurer,
   Diocese of Muhabura.
   " Rev. Canon Esau Muruta/Chairman Bishop's Commissaries.
RESOLUTIONS:

a) That the Christians of Muhabura Diocese are in favour of a developmental person who, through their assessment so far, is Dr. Wilson Baganizi.

b) That since the Diocese, through its Electoral College of 6 members, expressed its will through an election in which Dr. Wilson Baganizi polled 6 out of 6 votes in which case the obvious truth is that even Canon David Sebuhinja voted for the former, then the work of the House of Bishops had been simplified.

c) That the House of Bishops should not compromise the integrity of the Diocese Electoral College, by imposing on the Diocese someone whom the people know has no capacity to deliver.

d) The church that is embodied in the human hearts are not building and that if anything those hearts of Muhabura Diocese that want a shepherd, have been led by the Holy Spirit to identify the kind of shepherd they need.

e) That should the Archbishop see any need for seeking the opinion of the House of Laity and Clergy of the Diocese, they are at his disposal.

f) The Electoral College was presented a list of Candidates; meaning that they didn't choose freely on their own.

g) Bishop Shalita decampaigned some legible candidates e.g. Rev. Dr. Zac Niringiye. Bishop Shalita long before the Electoral College sat had vowed that even if the candidate of the Electoral College could get 100% would not go through in the House of Bishops. He emphasised this in most of his Pastoral visits.

h) Bishop Shalita started campaigning for Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja about three years ago. For instance, he attempted to change the Church of Uganda Constitution two times and unfortunately the Provincial Assembly refuted his motions.

i) Ever since Dr. Canon Wilson Baganizi left the Diocese, there has hardly been any new plan developed under the leadership of both of them e.g. Faith House, Rutaka Health Centre, Karungu Church land, which is still bare and Vocational training centre.

j) Bishop Shalita has been a Dictator, e.g. in his meetings people do not freely deliberate; one wonders why he would not consider the majority vote during the election of next Bishop by Electoral College; he has always forced his ideas to be supported even when they are not constructive e.g. when people failed to pay
money for the consecration of the new Bishop because they didn’t want his candidate.

1) Mrs Marion Sebuhinja - wife of the Bishop elect is arrogant, yet she is Diocesan Mothers Union Worker. For instance, she abuses people (Christians).

m) Bishop Shalita and Rev. Canon David Sebuhinja have personalised the Diocese by employing their relatives’ e.g. they both come from the same Parish (Rwaramba). Also a complex of shops was built for Bishop Shalita as a retirement package which is questionable by Christians.

n) They have used one man - by the names of Mr. Peter Balizi, to perpetuate their ambitions in the whole Diocese. For instance, he is the only one who moved the motion to dissolve this meeting but he was refuted.

0) That a radio announcement be made as to the above resolutions.

1) The Christians seriously resolved that the decision taken by the House of Bishops be reversed