



NORWEGIAN
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE CHALLENGE OF AFRICAN CHRISTIANITY TO HUMAN RIGHTS

Exploring the response of the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda to Human Rights

Julius Izza Tabi

Supervisor

Professor Gunnar Harald Heiene



*This Master's Thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the MA degree at*

MF Norwegian School of Theology, 2017, Spring

AVH5035: Master's Thesis (60 ECTS)

Master in Religion, Society and Global Issues

38 276 words

Dedication

I dedicate this study to the Church in Africa, particularly the Anglican Church of Uganda.

Acknowledgments

I am humbled and grateful for an opportunity to take a Master program in Religion, Society and Global Issues at the Norwegian School of theology (Det Teologiske Menighetsfakultet). I extend a grateful appreciation to the administration of MF and Uganda Christian University for a collaboration that has resulted in this opportunity. In a special way, I acknowledge the following; Rev. Canon Dr. Alfred Olwa the dean of Bishop Tucker School of Divinity and Theology who has always kept encouraging me through my program. The Rev. Canon Professor Christopher Byaruhanga the dean of the School of Postgraduate and Research at Uganda Christian University and the Rev. Dr. Andrew David Omona for recommending my application to MF. The retired bishop of Ma'di and West Nile Diocese, Rt. Rev. Dr. Joel Samson Obetia who supported my journey to Oslo greatly. God bless all of you.

I acknowledge my dear wife Oliver Driciru Tabi for releasing me to come to Oslo when we were expecting our son in barely two months. You have shouldered many responsibilities singly at a time when you needed me most. May God bless and reward you richly. I also acknowledge my son Samuel Ushindi Tabi, you were born in my absence due to my study, you missed my love throughout the time of my study. I promise you my time and love, and to raise you to an upright man into the academic world. Special thanks to my parents Severino Soyi Izza and Catherine Asianzo who kept their parental love and care to my family all the time. My father-in-law and mother-in-law late Vicky Okuonzi Lei (RIP) and Irene Owuzu respectively for watching over my family in my absence.

I thank Professor Gunnar Harald Heiene for his invaluable support in supervising every single process in writing this thesis. And the administration of the Anglican Church of Uganda, Diocese of Kampala and all my interviewees for the open doors for my fieldwork. Above all, I thank God Almighty for grace, wisdom and good health all through my study.

Julius Izza Tabi,

Spring, May 2017

Abstract

The Human rights doctrine is one of the fast-growing concepts of the 20th century that has become embedded in democracy, legal systems and is key in driving the value system in many communities today. Proclaimed as the UDHR in 1948 by the UN General Assembly and simplified in specific rights in various international covenants, human rights have largely appealed to all people across political, cultural and religious divide. Despite its wide acceptance, the human rights doctrine is not fully welcomed in some cases hence being challenged by some cultures, regions and religions. This research has sought to study how the response of the Diocese of Kampala (Anglican) to Human Rights challenges the human rights project.

This social research employed a qualitative interview method of data collection and an inductive approach of data interpretation. The research has shown that there is an ambivalence to the human rights doctrine in the Diocese of Kampala based on cultural and religious accounts. That the African Christians in the Diocese are discontent with some of the clauses in the human rights doctrine that are regarded to have no place in their cultural and religious values. Such human rights in question includes; the right to abortion, homosexual practice and or the LGBTI rights, restraining coercive discipline of children, early sex education among others. A strong value is placed on cultural and religious values than to human rights.

In this study, the researcher concludes that the worldview of an African Christian is fully informed by her cultural and religious convictions. Hence for a concept like human rights to take ground, it must not put religion in a cage. Rather religious values should be cherished and religions should be engaged in both the construction and implementation of human rights.

Julius Izza Tabi.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Abbreviations/acronyms.....	ix
1.0. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY.....	1
1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. Personal motivation.....	1
1.3. Presentation of the topic and statement of the problem.....	2
1.4. Main and sub-research questions.....	5
1.4.1. Main question.....	5
1.4.2. Sub-questions.....	5
1.5. Aims or objectives of the study.....	5
1.6. Methodology.....	6
1.7. Literature analysis.....	6
1.8. Outline of the thesis.....	10
1.9. Summary.....	11
2.0. GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA, THE CHURCH OF UGANDA, AND THE DIOCESE OF KAMPALA.....	13
2.1. Introduction.....	13
2.2. Background of the Republic of Uganda.....	13
2.2.1. Pre-colonial Uganda.....	13
2.2.2. Colonial Uganda.....	14
2.2.3. Post-colonial Uganda.....	17
2.3. History of the Church of Uganda and Diocese of Kampala.....	19
2.3.1. Missionary work in Uganda.....	19
2.3.2. History of the Church of Uganda and Diocese of Kampala.....	20

2.4.	The state of human rights in Uganda.....	21
2.5.	Conclusion.....	23
3.0.	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY.....	24
3.1.	Introduction.....	24
3.2.	Defining and tracing the origin of human rights.....	24
3.3.	Why human rights.....	26
3.4.	International declarations and covenants.....	27
3.5.	African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Right.....	29
3.6.	Religious roots of human rights.....	30
3.7.	Christianity and human rights debate.....	33
3.8.	Human rights debate in early Protestantism.....	33
3.9.	Human rights debate in modern Protestantism.....	36
3.10.	Human rights and Anglicanism.....	39
3.11.	The struggle for orthodoxy in the Anglican Church.....	43
3.12.	Human rights and the Anglican Church in Africa.....	44
3.13.	Human rights and the Anglican Church of Uganda.....	46
4.0.	RESEARCH METHOD.....	47
4.1.	Introduction.....	47
4.2.	Research design.....	47
4.3.	Case study.....	48
4.4.	Qualitative interview.....	49
4.5.	Presentation of interviewees.....	50
4.6.	Data recording, storage and transcription.....	51
4.7.	Data analysis and interpretation.....	51
4.8.	Research challenges and limitation.....	53
4.9.	Research criteria – reliability and validity.....	54
4.10.	Research ethics.....	55
5.0.	DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION.....	57
5.1.	Introduction.....	57
5.2.	Theoretical understanding of human rights.....	57

5.2.1. Defining human rights.....	57
5.2.2. Scope of human rights (the unborn and the dead).....	58
5.2.3. Universality of human rights.....	58
5.3. African values versus human rights.....	60
5.4. Human rights versus Christian values.....	67
5.4.1. Sex education to juveniles.....	71
5.4.2. Homosexuality.....	71
5.4.3. Human sexuality.....	74
5.4.4. The right of intersex people.....	76
5.4.5. The right to abortion.....	76
5.4.6. Punishment of children.....	76
5.5. Challenges to human rights.....	77
5.5.1. God and his word alone should be the standard of human regulation.....	77
5.5.2. Natural law admired.....	78
5.5.3. Contextualization of human rights.....	78
5.5.4. Translate human rights into African local languages.....	78
5.5.5. Embrace religious values.....	78
5.6. Summary.....	79
6.0. DISCUSSION.....	80
6.1. Introduction.....	80
6.2. Theoretical understanding of human rights.....	80
6.2.1. What is human rights?.....	80
6.2.2. Who is entitled to human rights?.....	84
6.2.3. Are human rights universal?.....	85
6.3. Do African values and human rights match?.....	87
6.3.1. Human rights are not African values.....	87
6.3.2. Some human rights are good and right things.....	90
6.3.3. Human rights are being wrongly perceived by some Africans.....	91
6.3.4. Esteem African societal values than human rights.....	91
6.4. Human rights versus Christian values.....	93
6.4.1. Human rights related well with Christian values.....	93

6.4.2. Human rights must be inspired with biblical values.....	94
6.4.3. Human rights are not compatible with Christian values.....	96
6.5. Challenges to human rights.....	97
6.5.1. Rejection of human rights that conflict with Christian values.....	98
6.5.2. God’s word alone, not human rights should be the moral standard.....	99
6.5.3. Rejection of universality of human rights.....	100
6.5.4. Challenge to the church.....	101
6.6. Summary.....	103
7.0. GENERAL CONCLUSION.....	104
7.1. Summary of the previous chapters.....	104
7.2. Research findings in response to the research questions.....	106
7.3. Limitations and future research suggestions.....	108
REFERENCES.....	109
APPENDICES.....	117
Appendix #1.....	117
Appendix #2.....	119

Abbreviations/Acronyms

ACC – Anglican Consultative Council

ACHPR – African Charter of Human and People’s Right

ACSA – Anglican Church of Southern Africa

AHRC – Australian Human Rights Commission

AU – African Union

CCPR – Convention of Civil and Political Rights

CEDAW – Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

CMS – Church Missionary Society

COU – Church of Uganda

CRC – Convention on Rights of the Child

CRMRP – Convention on the Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons

CRPD – Convention on Rights of People with Disability

ECHR – European Center for Human Rights

GAFCON – Global Anglican Future Conference

IBEACo – Imperial British East African Company

ICC – International Criminal Court

ICESR – International Convention on Economic and Social Rights

IRCU – Inter Religious Council of Uganda

LGBTI – Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex

LRA/M – Lord’s Resistance Army/Movement

MF – Menighetsfakultet

OAU – Organisation of African Union

RSGI – Religion, Society and Global Issues

TEC – The Episcopal Church

UDHR – Universal Declaration of Human Rights

UHCR – Uganda Human Rights Commission

UJCC – Uganda Joint Christian Council

UK – United Kingdom

UNICEF – United Nations Children Fund

UN – United Nations

UPC – Uganda People’s Congress

UPDF – Uganda People’s Defense Force

UPF – Uganda Police Force

Acronyms of Bible books

1 Cor – 1 Corinthians

Eph – Ephesians

Gen – Genesis

Jer – Jeremiah

Lev – Leviticus

Matt – Matthew

Ps – Psalms

Rom – Romans

1.0. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction

This chapter is dedicated to outline the general overview of the study. I will begin by writing a personal motivation for this thesis in the theme of African Christianity and Human Rights. This will be followed by the presentation of the topic which will lead to the main research question and the sub questions; and the objectives of the study. Subsequently, I will describe the methods I have used to answer the questions raised in the study and a presentation of the literature I have used in the theoretical framework will follow. And conclude by outlining the structure of the thesis.

1.2. Personal motivation

Initially a Master in Religion, Society and Global Issues (RSGI) at Det Teologiske Menighetsfakultet (MF) wasn't my dream as my admission reads Master in Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity. Prior to the start of my program, I was informed that the school won't start the program I was admitted for and asked to opt for RSGI. As an African Christian, very skeptical of the liberal Western Christian views on some subjects like Human Rights, I was worried of being swayed by such liberal Western Christian views. One of my academic mentors wondered whether by taking a Master program in RSGI my faith is safe. He asked these questions in a personal mail to me; "Are you moving on to make secular ethics your core domain? Is your Christian faith safe if you are given two more years there [in Oslo]? Who is winning? Your sponsor or your diocese?" This kind of skepticism expressed in my worry and my academic mentor's questions is not only peculiar to me and him, it is true of many African Christians.

However, I have discovered that the human rights talk is an issue the Church in Africa cannot ignore and if anything, the Church in Africa should strive to have an in-depth study into the subject to have a good intellectual approach to it. I believe for the Church in Africa to make a good and constructive critique of the secular human rights doctrine, it must first seek to study human rights even in its very secular context. I therefore decided to take a course in Religion and Human Rights and eventually developed a thought in writing my thesis in this subject, particularly

wanting to seek for the “silent” questions the Church in Africa is asking in their discontent in some aspects of human rights.

1.3. Presentation of the topic and statement of the problem

This master thesis project sought to study the response of the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda to human rights looking at the Church’s challenge to human rights in the context of African Christianity. In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations (UN) adopted and proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Since then several conventions on human rights have been held and several human rights documents signed at national, regional and international levels. However, human rights have been welcomed by a mixed feeling at different cultures, regions and religions with some cultures and religious traditions making a whole approval of it while others are ambivalent about it.

Whereas many Protestant Churches in the West have largely welcomed and made approval of these requirements in the Human Rights doctrine, majority of their counterparts in Africa are not willing to wholly accept the concept or at least certain aspects of Human Rights. For example, the Anglican Church on which this study has been centered is suffering disunity and a threat of breakage of its Global Communion due to disagreements on some aspects of Human Rights that has been largely accepted by the West while Africa, which hosts many practicing Anglicans are not willing to accept some of these aspects of Human Rights, raising some challenges to human rights.

In Uganda, particularly, not only the Anglican church, but majority Christian denominations in the country ambivalently approaches Human Rights and this is largely true across Christianity in the African continent. In 2008, the Anglican Church in the Global South boycotted the Lambeth Conference – bishops’ meeting and opted for an alternative conference in Jerusalem – the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON). The conference’s declaration described itself a spiritual movement which seeks to “preserve and promote the truth and power of the gospel of salvation in Jesus Christ” (GAFCON, 2008a). Although it was not explicitly expressed against

what the conference preserves the gospel, homosexuality looked the “conference’s presenting issue” (Sadgrove et al, 2010, p. 199). Key in the organisation of GAFCON 2008 was the then primate of the Anglican Church of Uganda, the Archbishop Henry Luke Orombi. In their 2016 communiqué, there is a plan for GAFCON 2018 (GAFCON, 2016).

Previously in 1998, the Global Anglican bishops’ meeting (Lambeth Conference) recognized people with different sexual orientation but didn’t accept homosexual practice being scriptural, only accepting marriage and sexual relation between persons of the opposite sex: “in view of the teaching of Scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage.” (Anglican Communion, 1998). Despite this resolution, The Episcopal Church (TEC), went ahead to ordain homosexual bishops and accept marriage between persons of the same sex contrary to this resolution. Thus, “to date, the most divisive debates between provinces [of the Anglican Communion] have centered on trends within TEC and elsewhere towards the widened acceptance of homosexual relationships.” (Sadgrove et al, 2010, p. 195).

The Church of Uganda is one of the provinces that has openly rejected homosexual relationships, taking position on the resolution 1.10 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference. When the government of Uganda attempted to enact a law against homosexuality known as *The Anti-Homosexuality Act 2014* which seeks to criminalize homosexuality, the church in Uganda, including the Church of Uganda welcomed the bill. Taking a lesser radical position compared to the government’s, the Church asked the government to remove death penalty for aggravated homosexual acts, and remove the clause that asks the public to report persons thought to be homosexuals. However, the Archbishop in his message about the bill, strongly reiterates the position of 1998 Lambeth Conference that; “homosexual practice is incompatible with Scripture,” and the conference (Anglican Church) “cannot advise the legitimizing or blessing of same sex unions nor ordaining those involved in same gender unions.” (Ntagali, 2014).

Earlier last year 2016, the Archbishop of the Church of Uganda, requested for prayers for the Anglican Communion regarding some of the issues in the communion one of which is the acceptance of same-sex marriage by The Episcopal Church (TEC). Part of his communication reads:

“The Episcopal Church in America (TEC) elected as Bishop a divorced father of two living in a same-sex relationship. Not only was this a direct violation of the Bible, but it violated Resolution 1.10 of Lambeth 1998 which rejected “homosexual practice as incompatible with Scripture...and [the conference] cannot advise the legitimizing or blessing of same sex unions nor ordaining those involved in same gender unions.” (Ntagali, 2016).

This statement comes after the primates of the Anglican Communion’s meeting early 2016 where they resolved the action of TEC in admitting gay marriage was against the church’s teaching. The primates unanimously resolved: “Recent developments in The Episcopal Church with respect to a change in their Canon on marriage represent a fundamental departure from the faith and teaching held by the majority of our Provinces on the doctrine of marriage.” And the primates feared that “Possible developments in other Provinces could further exacerbate this situation” (Anglican Communion, 2016). The meeting designed a kind of discipline for the action of TEC not to represent the Global Anglican Communion on matters of faith and not to be elected in any standing committee. This was put in a strong statement:

However, given the seriousness of these matters we formally acknowledge this distance by requiring that for a period of three years The Episcopal Church no longer represent us on ecumenical and interfaith bodies, should not be appointed or elected to an internal standing committee and that while participating in the internal bodies of the Anglican Communion, they will not take part in decision making on any issues pertaining to doctrine or polity (Anglican Communion, 2016).

However soon after this meeting and agreement by the primates, TEC scoffed at the resolution and went ahead to declare their participation in the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) meeting held in April 2016 in Lusaka, Zambia. The Archbishop of Canterbury remained silent on implementing the resolution [discipline] above so the Church of Uganda and other provinces in Africa decided to boycott the meeting because TEC was not bared from attending it.

It therefore seems that the Church in Africa – here the Church of Uganda is failing to find a justification for some of these aspects of Human Rights here expressed in resisting the right to same sex marriage. Put in other words, the church in Africa appears to question the compatibility of several aspects of the Human Rights with African Christian morals and Christian orthodoxy. The problem this study will look at is: In what ways is the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda challenging the human rights doctrine? This question will be answered in looking at the response of the Diocese of Kampala to Human Rights. This study is important because it will be able to provide a theoretical understanding of human rights by the Church of Uganda – Diocese of Kampala, showing conflict between human rights and religion and suggest how these conflicts can be approached.

1.4. Main Research question and sub questions

1.4.1. Main Question

In what ways is the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda challenging the human rights doctrine?

1.4.2 Sub research questions

- What is the theoretical understanding of the Diocese of Kampala on human rights?
- How has the Diocese of Kampala responded to human rights in general and the controversial homosexual rights?
- How is the response of the Diocese of Kampala to human rights a challenge to the human rights doctrine?

1.5. Aim/Objective of the study

The objective of this study is to;

1. Explore the theoretical perspective of the Anglican Church of Uganda, Diocese of Kampala on human rights.
2. Examine the response of the Anglican Church of Uganda, Diocese of Kampala to human rights general and the controversial homosexuality rights.
3. Find how the Anglican Church of Uganda is challenging the human rights doctrine.

1.6. Methodology

This thesis which is a social research because its topic is “relevant to the social scientific field” (Bryman, 2012, p. 4). Although a social research can employ both qualitative and quantitative research strategies, I have used the former strategy since the research attempts to explore the theoretical perspective of the Anglican Church of Uganda on human rights. Thus, I use an inductive theory approach where theory is an outcome of this research.

In addition, the study is based on a case study; “case study research is concerned with the complexity and particular nature of the case in question” (Bryman, 2012, p. 66). Here, a single community of the Anglican Church of Uganda, Diocese of Kampala is the case of the study. The case has been singled out among several other options of Dioceses within the Anglican Church of Uganda; and the latter has been singled out from the various Christian denominations. A research design based on case study can be a critical case, extreme or unique case, revelatory case, longitudinal case or representative case.

The latter applies to this study. Bryman also calls the representative case study as exemplifying case because a chosen case “exemplifies a broader category of which it is a member” (Bryman, 2012, p. 70). Thus, in this study, the response of the Diocese of Kampala to human rights exemplifies the response of the Province of the Anglican Church of Uganda to which the Diocese is a member. I have used qualitative interview to collect the empirical data for this thesis. There will be an in-depth discussion on the methodology of the research in Chapter 4.

1.7. Literature analysis

Here I will briefly mention the theoretical materials I have used in this thesis, mentioning their titles and authors. This thesis will make use of several literatures, however, in the main topic which is discussed in chapter three, I will make use of the second edition of Michael Haas' *International Human Rights: A Comprehensive Introduction* to introduce the subject. Haas, a onetime Noble Peace Prize nominee gives a very comprehensive philosophical, historical and contemporary basis for human rights which I will use to write on the origins and justification for human rights. However, I find an on-spot definition of human rights in *Does Human Rights Need God?* a book edited by Elizabeth M. Bucar and Barbra Barnett. The duo in their introduction to the book titled; "The why of human rights" have given a pleasing definition of human rights. The introductory chapter of the duo also will in addition to Haas' volume be used to highlight "why" human rights.

Although human rights ideas did not start with the United Nations' (UN) Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the declaration became the realization of the human rights idea. Therefore, I will use the document of the UDHR which is readily available at UN's website to flesh-up the introduction of the subject on human rights. This will lead to various declarations and conventions that has been held and signed since the 1948 UDHR. Such declarations and/or conventions include; the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (CCPR), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC), the Convention of the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) among others. I will use these documents to discuss the various declarations and international conventions on human rights.

Since the focus of my thesis is on the African continent, I will just mention the commitments of the European Center for Human Rights (ECHR) and their related conventions but I will discuss the African Charter on Human and People's Rights (ACHPR) in detail. This human rights document (ACHPR) was adopted first in 1981 but it only came to force in 1986 by African states who are members of the African Union (AU) which was then the Organisation of African Union (OAU). I will use this

document and other documents by the African Commission on Human and People's Rights (ACHPR) to discuss human rights in the African context to which Uganda is a party.

My topic is on African Christianity and human rights, therefore before I discuss human rights issues from the African Christian perspective, I will first consider Christianity and human rights in general. To this effect, *Christ and Human Rights: The Transformative engagement* by George Newlands will set the pace and *Christianity and Human Rights: An Introduction* which is a collection of essays written by various scholars and edited by John Witte, Jr and Frank, S. Alexander will be helpful too. I will use the foreword by a South African Anglican bishop Tutu Desmond and a chapter by Nicholas P. Wolterstorff on "Modern Protestant developments in human rights" to discuss human rights from a Protestant perspective. More so, Esther D. Reed's *The Ethics of Human Rights: Contested Doctrinal and Moral Issues* will bring to play the question of rights from a Christian perspective. This volume will help me discuss the various schools of thoughts on human rights from the Protestant circle.

There is also a sharp contrast between a Western (liberal) Protestant views on human rights and conservative views outside the West. Although this thesis is not on the Orthodox church, to demonstrate this sharp difference, I will use the chapter by Max L. Stackhouse and Vigen Guroian titled; *Why Human Rights Need God: A Christian Perspective* and *Human Rights in a Secular Society: An Orthodox Christian Perspective*. These chapters are found in *Does Human Rights Need God?* in Bucar and Barnett (ed). Also, I will involve *Christianity and Human Rights: Issues and Influences* by Adeney S. Frances and Sharma Arvind (eds) to discuss the influences of Christianity on human rights; and, look at issues raised by the same. Before I discuss human rights and the Global Anglican Communion, I will look at the response of the Lutheran Communion on human rights from *Faith and Human Rights: Voices from the Lutheran Communion* by Peters N. Prove. This should give a definite manner of how another Christian denomination has responded to human rights to that of the Anglican Communion.

The Global Anglican Communion is in tensions and facing a possible break between the West and the Global South majorly due to the gay rights. The *Church of England – Charity Law and Human Rights: A Comparative Perspectives on Law and Justice* by O’Halloran Kerry analyses how the Church of England – the mother of the Global Anglican Communion is being faced with the challenge of operating in a human rights environment. His volume helps me discuss the response of the Church of England to human rights and relate it to the Global Anglican Communion. The point of contention on the Gay rights traces back to the Lambeth Conference of 1998 resolution 1.10. I therefore, using this resolution will show how and why there is a contention of gay rights within the Anglican Communion.

The Anglican Church in Africa and other provinces in the Latin America, the North America and Asia is struggling to restore orthodoxy within the Communion. This is because they see their majority counterparts in the West are abandoning biblical orthodoxy in preference to a secular human rights doctrine. Out of this is born the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON), an alternative conference to the Lambeth Conference by the former. I will use documents of GAFCON to discuss this struggle for orthodoxy with the Global Anglican Communion. Also, I find the analysis of GAFCON by Joana D. Sadgrove et al. *Constructing the boundaries of Anglican Orthodoxy: An analysis of the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON)* an important document to use here. The Anglican Church of Uganda is not only an active member of GAFCON but played a very key role in its formation.

This therefore brings me to discuss human rights and the church in Africa and I will majorly dwell on the Anglican Church of Uganda also called the Church of Uganda (CoU) though I will refer to Christianity in other African countries. The Church of Uganda lacks a full human rights document; human rights talks are found in regular news published on her website. The most recent is the August 2016 “Resolutions of the 23rd Provincial Assembly of the Church of Uganda” which has certain resolutions related to some aspects human rights. I will use such documents from the Church’s website to discuss human rights issues and the CoU. The Church of Uganda Diocese of Kampala has the cathedra of the Primate of the CoU, so the Archbishop of the

Church of Uganda is the bishop of the Diocese. Therefore, any document that pertains the Church of Uganda is true of the Diocese of Kampala.

The interviews which I have conducted will form an empirical material that I will use in my discussions.

1.8. Outline of the Thesis

The main research question this study seeks to answer is; In what ways is the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda challenging the Human Rights doctrine? The chronological flow of the materials in answering this question runs as follows.

In chapter two, I present a general background of the Republic of Uganda; and that of the Province of Anglican Church of Uganda and Diocese of Kampala. I will look at the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial Uganda. The state of human rights in Uganda. In this chapter, I will also discuss the history of the Anglican Church of Uganda which is a product of the missionary work of the Church Missionary Society (CMS). This should help my readers to understand the context of the case this study is built on.

Chapter three will look at the theoretical framework of the main subject (human rights) of this study. I will start by explaining what human rights is and trace the origins of human rights using (Haas, 2014) and (Bucar and Barnett ed, 2005) also looking at “why” human rights. I also will present the various international conventions on human rights starting with the UDHR. Since my focus is on religion and human rights, I will then look at the religious roots of human rights, with a concentration on Christianity. Then I will turn my attention to Christianity and human rights, discussing various schools of thoughts on the subject in modern Protestant writings. And finally look at the Anglican Church and human rights, starting with the Global Anglican Communion and narrow to the Anglican Church of Uganda.

In chapter four, the methodology of the study is discussed thorough a description of the methodology used in the study. The chapter describes the research strategy and

design, the methods used in data collection, and how the collected data has been stored, transcribed, analyzed and interpreted. In this chapter, the researcher also presents the reliability and validity of this study. And, this chapter ends with a presentation of some of the challenges the researcher has faced during the study and some ethical issues in social research which he has considered.

And chapter five is that of the data presentation and analysis where the researcher gives a detailed presentation of the empirical material gathered through qualitative interviews. The interviews were transcribed and presented in this chapter in themes that has been generated through coding. Here four major themes are found; the theoretical understanding of human rights, human rights and African values, human rights and Christian values, and the challenges to human rights. The data presented in these themes brings out the views of the respondents on the topic which is often made by extensive quoting of the interviewees.

Chapter six is the second last chapter in which the researcher has done a discussion on the data presented in the last chapter (five), this has been done in an interaction with the theoretical material in chapter three and other relevant literatures. The discussion is limited to the four themes which have been identified through coding as presented in chapter five.

The last chapter (seven) is a general conclusion to the study. This chapter begins by giving a recap on the previous chapters, responds to the research questions and makes some recommendations. The researcher then identifies some possible areas of study.

1.9. Summary

This chapter has given a blue print of this study. It started by stating my personal motivation in the theme of Christianity and human rights in Africa, and then rolled to briefly offered a presentation of the topic, the research questions, aims and objectives. It also has cited the methodology of this study, outlined the main literature that has fleshed this study and then outlined the structure of the study. The next chapter presents a general background to the republic of Uganda and the

history of Christianity in Uganda especially the Anglican Church of Uganda and the Diocese of Kampala.

2.0. GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA, THE CHURCH OF UGANDA, AND THE DIOCESE OF KAMPALA

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter, I will present a background to the Republic of Uganda, a state in which the Anglican Church of Uganda, Diocese of Kampala is to be found. Here, I will look at the precolonial, colonial and postcolonial Uganda. I will also discuss a background to the Church of Uganda in general and Kampala Diocese in specific. Here I will write on the history of the Anglican Church of Uganda (COU) which is a daughter church of the Church of England planted by the Church Missionary Society (CMS). It is important that I also briefly discuss the state of human rights in Uganda today. This chapter gives an understanding of the context of the case this study is built on.

2.2. Background of the Republic of Uganda

Many people have known Uganda for one of her famous leaders, president Idi Amin Dada, the third president (1971-1979) of the Republic of Uganda – a former British protectorate. The 54 years old sovereign state of Uganda lies in the Eastern Africa bordered by Kenya from the East, Tanzania in the South, Rwanda in the South West, Democratic Republic of Congo in the West and the youngest nation of the world, South Sudan in the North. Historically, the country got her name from Buganda one of the most powerful pre-colonial kingdoms in the Eastern and Southern Africa. The kingdom of Buganda was one of the many kingdoms and chiefdoms in what is now known Uganda. Cedrick Pulford in his *Two Kingdoms of Uganda: Snakes and Ladders in the Scramble for Africa* discusses the history of the country looking at the struggle between the two kingdoms of Buganda and Bunyoro. He recalls Churchill the former British prime minister and Henry Morton Stanley a British explorer's reference to the country as the "Pearl of Africa" (Pulford, 2011, p. 1).

2.2.1. Precolonial Uganda

Like many African countries, the present nation-state of Uganda was a land occupied by various kingdoms and chiefdoms each operating independently. Uganda was a land belonging to the independent kingdoms of Buganda, Bunyoro, Banyakole,

Bugishu, Busoga, Toro, and many other chiefdoms. The first foreigners with interest in Uganda were the Arab traders and later the European/British explorers in the 19th century. "Arab traders in search of slaves and ivory arrive [in Uganda] in the 1840s, soon followed by two British explorers. Speke is here in 1862. Stanley follows in 1875" (History World, 2016). Uganda was not popular or not much known to Europe until 1875.

Pulford asserts that Uganda was publicized to Europe – especially to Britain in 1875 by Stanley who telegraphed about the urgent need for missionary work in Uganda. To him, Stanley's "trumpet call for evangelists brought a rapid response from the Church Missionary Society [CMS] in London" (Pulford, 2011, p. 2) with the first CMS missionaries arriving in the country in 1877. Two years later in 1879, French Roman Catholic missionaries also arrived in Buganda for the evangelization of the land. The arrival of the missionaries in Uganda together with the explorers and later the administrators under the auspices of the Imperial British East African Company (IBEACo) initiated the need for their protection, which gradually led the country into becoming a British protectorate.

2.2.2. Colonial Uganda

Uganda would have been a territory of the Germany after the king of Buganda signed an agreement accepting his kingdom to become a Germany protectorate had it not been overturned by an agreement between the British prime minister Lord Salisbury and Berlin. "In December 1890 Lugard arrived in Uganda (Buganda) as the first British administrator. However, he was merely a representative of the Imperial British East Africa Company" (Were & Wilson, 1972, p. 180). This meant Buganda was now habited by four people groups, the native people of the kingdom, the CMS missionaries of the Anglican Church, the French Roman Catholic missionaries and now the British administrator.

The kingdom of Buganda, and the British and French Missionaries, and the IBEACo each occupying a hill making up Kampala fought against each other leading to loss of lives and destruction of properties in 1892. Captain Frederick Lugard of IBEACo with the might of his machine gun prevailed and "In 1894 the British government

declares a protectorate over Buganda. Two years later British control is extended to cover the western kingdoms of Ankole, Toro and Bunyoro – to form, together with Buganda, the Uganda Protectorate” (History Today, 2016).

The influence of the kings and chiefs of the Kingdom of Buganda was very powerful that the IBEACo show it necessary to exercise control through them resulting into the signing of the 1900 Buganda Agreement. The agreement show the Kabaka (King of Buganda) and the chiefs renounce their due to the Queen as seen in one of the terms of the agreement; “The Kabaka and Chiefs of Uganda hereby agree henceforth to renounce in favor of Her Majesty the Queen any claims to tribute they may have had on the adjoining provinces of the Uganda Protectorate” (Kituo Cha Katiba, 2016).

Through this agreement and series of other agreements with the other kingdoms, Uganda became a British protectorate until 1962, October 9 when the indigenous people took over the administration of Uganda. However, the 1900 Buganda agreement which increased Buganda’s counties from 10 to 20, thus eating up part of Bunyoro, “later became a source of great hostility between Buganda and Bunyoro as the latter tried to recover her ‘lost counties.’” (Were & and Wilson, 1972, p. 187). The colonial history of the country is full of conflicts either between the religious groups or the various kingdoms. Were and Wilson’s assertion implies that the British administrators never took a neutral position in these conflicts, they instigated conflicts against the kingdom of Bunyoro to reduce her powers as it was a challenge to them.

Likewise, as “the Catholics and Protestants were furiously cutting each other’s throats in the service of the same Christ” (ibid, p. 183), Lugard of IBEACo supported the latter against the former. Until 1926, the Uganda protectorate’s boundaries weren’t complete, the North West of Uganda which now is also called West Nile belonged to Congo state under the Belgians until 1909 and later transferred to the British administration in Sudan. “Three years [1914] later West Nile was given to Uganda in exchange for the territory to the north and east” (ibid, p. 189). The final boundary of Uganda was drawn in 1926, Were and Wilson writes;

“The final adjustments were not made until 1926 when Turkana district, which had proved impossible to control from Entebbe, was ceded to Kenya. Entebbe became Uganda’s administrative headquarters and Kampala, near the Buganda capital, rapidly grew into the country’s commercial center” (ibid, p. 189).

For the desire to make Uganda self-sustaining, the British administrators sought to introduce cash crops for export. Were and Wilson assert that various cash crops like coffee, sugar, rubber, tea, wheat, cotton etc. were introduced but “all of these proved unsuitable for small scale production with exception of cotton” (ibid, p. 223). The political environment started to change in the mid twentieth century. By late 1950s and early 1960s there was a wave of Pan Africanism that sought for Africa’s independence. So, an agenda for drawing a constitution leading to the country’s independence was tabled. Were and Wilson summarized the events that led to the drawing of a constitution and election of a General Assembly in these words;

In September 1961, a constitutional conference began in London. Representatives of the leading political groups in the Protectorate were present – including representatives of the Kabaka’s Government. Compromise was eventually reached. There was to be an elected National Assembly, on which all parts of Uganda would be represented. The leader of the Government would be called Prime Minister and he would be executive head of the Nation, though advised by ministers and answerable to the National Assembly (Were & Wilson, 1972, p. 293).

By March 1, 1962 Uganda attained self-government with Ben Kiwanuka becoming its first Prime Minister and by April the Uganda People’s Congress (UPC) party won an election under the leadership of Dr. Milton Obote. “It was, thus, Dr. Obote who was the Prime Minister when Uganda was granted full independence on October 9, 1962” (Were & Wilson, 1972, p. 294). Thus, opening a post-colonial era.

2.2.3. Post-colonial Uganda

It is now over fifty years that Uganda became a Sovereign state, the country celebrated a Golden Jubilee of her independence in 2012. The country experienced an unstable political leadership since independence, Milton Obote, the first Prime Minister who negotiated the terms of the independence with the British later became an executive president of the state in 1966. Five years later,

In 1971, when Obote is abroad, his regime is toppled in a coup led by Idi Amin. Obote settles just over the border from Uganda in neighboring Tanzania, where he maintains a small army of Ugandan exiles under the command of Tito Okello (History World, 2016).

Despite her Christian heritage after a long period of British rule and establishment of Christian missions, Idi Amin Managed to register Uganda as a Muslim state in 1974, three years into his presidency. Ali Mazrui, a renowned African scholar notes;

At the Islamic Summit Conference held in Lahore, Pakistan, in February 1974, Uganda was admitted as a Muslim state. According to the 1959 census, little more than 5 per cent of the population was Muslim ... But whether Muslims in Uganda constituted 5 per cent or 10 per cent of the population, they were clearly heavily outnumbered by Christians in the country. What then was Uganda doing at the conference of Islamic states in Lahore? (Mazrui, 1977, p. 21).

Obote's manipulation of the constitution and Amin's registration of Uganda as Muslim state shows how individual presidents of Uganda have been driving the state in a direction they so wished. This did not only end by Amin's regime, it continues in the 30 years' reign by the current president Yoweri K. Museveni. Museveni who took over the state by a military revolution in 1986 nearly brought the state from anarchy to the rule of law. "There are improvements in education, health and transport. International approval brings a willingness to invest and to lend. The nation, emerging from two decades of appalling chaos, is suddenly almost a model for Africa" (History World, 2016).

However, constant manipulation of the constitution to the extent of removing presidential term limits makes Museveni no different from Obote and Amin. Although the president – Museveni has distanced himself from lifting presidential age limit¹, fears are that he is using some politicians to move a motion to remove presidential age limit to enable him rule as long as he wishes.

The post-colonial Uganda is also a polarized state between political ideologies, and even to a larger degree along religious and tribal lines. There has been series of civil wars majorly along tribal lines with some being attributed to religious ideologies. The most prominent is the Lord's Resistance Army and or Movement (LRA or LRM) which saw the country in a two-decade political turmoil. LRA has been labelled as a terrorist group and many of her leaders have been issued indictment by International Criminal Court (ICC) with only a one, Dominic Ongwen currently answering charges before the ICC.

Demographically, Uganda's population stands at 34,856,813 million (Uganda Bureau of Statistics, 2014, p. 6). Though the World Population Review (WPR) puts the current population at 39,234,256 and states that "The inhabitants of Uganda are mainly Roman Catholic, who make up 47.9% of the total population. Anglican [alias Church of Uganda], Muslim and Pentecostal believers represent 35.9%, 12.1% and 4.5% of the total population respectively." (World Population Review, 2016). This means about 88% of Uganda's people are Christians whose voices are very influential.

Kefa M. Otiso describes Uganda's political landscape having been influenced greatly by conservative Protestant Christianity. He also Identifies that Ugandans are religious in every way, he writes "there is no hardly any separation between the sacred and secular in its everyday life" (Otiso, 2012, p. 1315). Although the Anglican

¹ Soon after the February 2016 election which has seen president Yoweri K. Museveni sworn in for a fifth-elective term, debates have sparked over the lifting of presidential age limit. Currently, the constitution allows one to offer himself for the presidency until one is 75 years old. Museveni who will be over this age limit by the next elections in 2021 wouldn't be eligible by then. Critics say that the age limit debates are fueled by him to ensure his life presidency. However, the president has distanced himself from the age limit debates as reported by a leading daily newspaper, the New Vision. See here http://www.newvision.co.ug/new_vision/news/1301589/museveni-respect-75-age-limit

and other Protestant population is lower to that of Roman Catholics, as noted above by Otiso, the country's political scene and even human rights debates, is largely influenced by conservative Protestantism – or at least by a conservative Christian worldview.

2.3. History of the Church of Uganda and Diocese of Kampala

The Church of Uganda alias the Anglican Church of Uganda is one of the main denominations in Uganda. In this section, I will briefly discuss missionary work in Uganda which birthed Christianity in Uganda and the give an account of the said Church of Uganda and the Diocese of Kampala.

2.3.1. Missionary work in Uganda

Christianity in Uganda is no more than 140 years old. Early missionary work in Uganda is attributed to a telegraph which Henry Stanley, a British explorer send to the UK in 1875 emphasizing the need for missionary work in Uganda. Stanley could be said to have initiated and started the Christianization of Buganda. In his April 14, 1875 telegraph, Stanley claims he had converted King Mutesa of Buganda to Christianity and that his initial work could be complemented by the arrival of missionaries in Buganda.

The Telegraph quotes Stanley's text, "I have undermined Islam so much here, that Mtesa has determined henceforth to observe the Christian Sabbath. . . and he has further caused the 10 Commandments of Moses to be written on a board for his daily perusal" (The Telegraph, 26/12/2005). Stanley continues, "If it were only followed by the arrival of a Christian mission here, the conversion of Mtesa and his Court to Christianity, would, I think, be complete."

Stanley's message was warmly welcomed by the Church Missionary Society (CMS), "Three days after the publication of the letter £5000 was offered to CMS to organise a mission to Uganda. The Society's established work at Frere Town gave them added incentive to accept the offer and preparations began" (CMS, 2016). And "In 1876 a party of eight men was sent out. They were beset with illness and only two, the Rev C T Wilson and Lt Shergold Smith, reached Uganda in June 1877" reports CMS. "In

February 1879, they were followed by Roman Catholic missionaries, the White Fathers, who came as part of a carefully planned advance into East Africa” (Were & Wilson, 1972, p. 158).

Were and Wilson assert that early missionary work in Uganda was both a triumph and an unhappy toil. They write that, “Mutesa refused to allow either the British Protestants or the French Roman Catholics to go away from his capital and their work was therefore confined to the members of the court and other Buganda who lived nearby.” This meant their influence was localized and they would not reach as far as they could wish and owing to their religious differences in Europe, the two missionary groups often conflicted in the courts of the king. However, it was a triumph because “so many of the leading men in the country [Buganda] became Christians” (Were & Wilson, 1972, p. 158). Nevertheless, the missionaries later expanded their work to the whole of Uganda and thus Uganda was Christianized.

2.3.2. History of the Church of Uganda and Diocese of Kampala

With the coming of the CMS in 1877, on her website, the Church of Uganda refers to this year of the presence of Anglicanism in the country as her origin. After the death of King Mutesa of Buganda who generally offered a bed of roses for the Christian missionaries in his kingdom, his son who succeeded him became hostile to Christianity. “In 1885 James Hannington, sent out as the first bishop of Eastern Equatorial Africa, was murdered in Busoga. Years of religious wars and political unrest followed and the Christians were scattered” (CMS, 2016).

Between 1885 and 1886 several converts were murdered by the king, the apex of which was June 3, 1886 when twenty-six Christians were murdered at Namugongo with majority having been burnt, some dismembered while others were speared, beheaded or castrated. This day is very commemorative to the Church of Uganda and Christianity in general, it is an annual holiday celebrated as the Uganda Martyrs day. In total, 45 converts, 23 Anglicans and 22 Roman Catholic Christians were murdered by the king majority being the king’s pages who angered the king by devoting their allegiance to their new-found king (Jesus) than Mwanga himself.

Years later, in 1977 during the reign of president Idi Amin, the Church of Uganda suffered another tragedy in which her Archbishop Janani Luwum was murdered by Amin. Janani joined the list of Anglican saints, he is recognized as a martyr by the Church of England and the Anglican Communion, his statue stands at Westminster Abby in London where a memorial service was held for him on March 30, 1977. Janani Luwum was the Archbishop of Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and Boga-Zaire.

The Diocese of Kampala is one of the thirty-six dioceses in the Province of the Church of Uganda. Although the headquarters of the Church of Uganda is at Namirembe hill in Kampala, the Archbishop's seat is not at Namirembe Cathedral. Until 1972, Namirembe Cathedral has been the See for the Church of Uganda. However, the All Saints Cathedral Kampala at Nakasero which started as a chaplaincy for a European Colonial hospital in Nakasero was later in 1972 "elevated to a Pro-Cathedral and later to a Cathedral for the Archbishop of the Church of Uganda. The Cathedral is currently the seat of the Bishop of Diocese of Kampala who is also the Archbishop of the Church of Uganda" (All Saints Cathedral Kampala, 2016). Unlike majority of the other dioceses of the COU whose jurisdictions are limited to ethnic groups, the Diocese of Kampala is Metropolitan, bringing together people from all ethnic groups of Uganda.

2.4. The state of human rights in Uganda

Uganda is a constitutional state, article 1 (1) of her constitution declares "All power belongs to the people who shall exercise their sovereignty in accordance with this Constitution" (Parliament of the republic of Uganda, 2016). This implies that Uganda is a country which has a high regard to the people and their constitutional and civic rights. Furthermore, article 20 (1) of the said constitution speaks highly of the inherency of the rights of the people of Uganda; "Fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual are inherent and not granted by the State." These rights are to be "respected, upheld and promoted by all organs and agencies of Government and by all persons" 20 (2). The pace set by these statements in the constitution sees Uganda, a member of the United Nations (UN) commit herself to uphold the rights of all peoples of Uganda.

However, human rights reports by both the state human rights body – the Uganda Human Rights Commission (UHRC) which is responsible for the monitoring and promotion of human rights, and other local and international human rights bodies faults Uganda in her commitment to human rights. The 2015/2016 report of Amnesty International (AI) on the state of human rights in Uganda rates police brutality and restrictions of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly top human rights abuse by state organs. AI has summarized their report in these way;

Police brutality and restrictions of the right to freedom of peaceful assembly increased. Attacks against activists, journalists and other media workers continued with impunity. Opposition politicians seeking to participate in the national elections scheduled for early 2016 were arrested and detained, along with their supporters (Amnesty International, 2016).

Other human rights abuses in the report of AI includes, an increase in attacks on persons with LGBTI orientation, violence against women and girls, and repeated anonymous breaks into the offices of organisations defending human rights. The *Anti Homosexuality Bill 2014* to which the president appended his signature but was later challenged in court and annulled has been a concern to the international community. The bill if not annulled criminalizes homosexuality. However, to date, the penal code condemns sexual relation between persons of the same sex.

The 18th Annual Report 2015 of the UHRC equally shows the state of human rights in Uganda is very wanting. UHRC received 4,227 complaints in 2015 compared to 3,904 in 2014, an increase by 8.27%. On the sad note, government security agencies were top respondents in the complaints received. Uganda Police Force (UPF) and Uganda People’s Defense Forces (UPDF) were top first and third respondents respectively. UHRC reports;

Uganda Police Force remained the top respondent in 2015, with 385 (50.65%) out of 760 respondents, followed by private individuals with 182 (23.94%) and the Uganda People Defence Forces with 97 (12.76%). Uganda Police Force, private individuals, Uganda People’s Defence Forces, local

governments and the Uganda Prisons Services have remained the top five respondents for the last six years (UHRC, 2016, p. xxi)

Although this trend is very alarming, the UHRC is hopeful that there is a “progress towards achieving human rights protection by various actors. This is demonstrated by a full and partial progress made towards compliance with several recommendations.” According to UHRC, “In 2015, the Government compliance with UHRC recommendations improved, and this is commendable” (UHRC, 2016, p. 244). UHCR is a government statutory body, article 54 of the constitution gazettes it as an independent body “and shall not, in the performance of its duties, be subject to the direction or control of any person or authority.” Although UHRC’s independence is subject to debate, the progress it has noted towards the achievement of human rights in the country raises hopes that Uganda is moving towards her commitments regarding human rights.

2.5. Conclusion

When looked at with the lens of human rights, the political and religious history of Uganda is tainted. A careful examination of the current political system in the country yet presents a lot of human rights issues. Religious men and women appear more united than in the past. An ecumenical Christian organization, the Uganda Joint Christian Council (UJCC) helps bring Christian denominations together whereas an interfaith organisation, the Inter Religious Council of Uganda (IRCU) brings together people of all faith. The Church of Uganda remains a very influential Christian denomination in Uganda. Therefore, any study of the relationship between human rights and Christianity taking the Church of Uganda as a case is of great significance.

3.0. THEORETICAL FRAME WORK OF THE STUDY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical frame work for my topic in Christianity and human rights, particularly in the African and or Ugandan context. This chapter is very significant as it is a means of “developing an argument” on the research topic in addition to helping the researcher “demonstrate that [he] is able to engage in scholarly review based on [his] reading and understanding of the work of others in the same field” (Bryman, 2012, p. 98). I will start by an introduction to human rights, thus defining human rights and tracing its origin as well as pointing out the importance of human rights. I will also discuss some of the international human rights conventions since 1948. However, much of this chapter will underscore human rights talk within the Christian tradition, looking at various schools of thoughts within the tradition, especially among modern Protestant writings. Special focus will also be laid on human rights talk in the Global Anglican communion and subsequently to the Anglican Church of Uganda, the case on which this study centers.

3.2. Defining and tracing the origin of human rights

The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), which is a thirty-articled document adopted by the United Nations General Assembly specified and mentioned human rights worth protecting but has never defined human rights. Thus, to date; “there is no precise meaning of the term ‘human rights’” (Haas, 2014, p. 2). The lack of consensus in defining human rights alone creates ambiguities in understanding human rights. However, many attempts have been made to define human rights as I sample few below.

The Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) describes human rights as “rights and freedoms contained in specific international instruments² that are

² The Australian Human Rights Commission recognises that human rights are contained in the following international instruments;

1. International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
2. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)
3. Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC)
4. Declaration of the Rights of the Child (DRC)

scheduled to, or declared under, the AHRC Act” (AHRC, 2009). This human rights body underscores human rights as “rights and freedoms” referring to the specific rights as contained in international human rights documents/instruments. On his part in the *The Changing face of Human Rights and Religion; A Personal Reflection* Clemens Nathan sees two important aspects of human rights as “liberty and equity.” He writes that human rights is a product of European political thought whose aim is to “have the greatest degree of individual liberty and equity while maintaining these rights for all” (Nathan, 2009, p. 36). Meanwhile, Bucar and Barnett precisely define human rights as “bundles of claims each person has simply because of his or her humanness” (Bucar and Barnett eds, 2005, p. 3).

In simple terms one could look at human rights as claims to human liberty and equity, rights and freedoms which are possessed “from birth by all persons regardless of race, color, creed, gender, and the like” (Haas, 2014, p. 2). Although this definition stands challenged by those who ascribe rights to the unborn, it stands accepted by current human rights stipulations in which rights are only limited to those already born.

It is easier to consider human rights having its genesis in the 1948 UDHR. However, human rights ideas and philosophies are much older than the UDHR, though it is evident that modern human rights talk has lasted for close to seventy years. In his thought, Nathan Clemens argues that human rights is the product of the seventeenth and eighteenth century European Enlightenment following the three decades of religious war in Europe. To him, although the 1648 Peace of Westphalia marks the longing for human rights, it was until the mid-twentieth century after the second World War, precisely the UDHR that has brought modern human rights talk on board.

-
5. Declaration of the Rights of Disabled Persons (DRDP)
 6. Declaration of the Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons (DRMRP)
 7. Declaration on the Elimination of All forms of Intolerance and Discrimination Based on Religion of Belief.

In addition to the above, the AHRC regards the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESR) and any other instruments the Commission considers relevant.

The two World Wars were marked by bloody, indiscriminate killings which “gave birth to the modern human rights era in which individuals have increasingly been regarded as subjects of the international legal order” (Evans, 2007, p. 1). The UDHR is thus a means to avert any such a bloody phenomenon as stipulated in the preamble, “Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world” (United Nations, 1948). The ultimate hope for the declaration of the human rights being the recognition of the inherent human dignity that is expected to result in “freedom, justice and peace in the world.” In short, modern human rights era has been marked by the adoption of the UDHR by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 1948.

3.3. Why human rights?

It is already explicitly expressed above in tracing the origin of human rights that the primary goal for it is the protection of humanity, the respect for human dignity. That the sanctity of human life ought to be respected and protected regardless of one’s race, religion, culture, language, color etc. “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights” is the proclamation of the dignity of the human life in the first article of the 1948 UDHR. Thus, humanity is not to be subjected to oppression, discrimination, extrajudicial killings and have freedom to life. Human rights is an instrument to ensure the sanctity of life is protected, that mankind “born free” must live free in equity and equality to one another.

Mankind is to act humanely to each other, thus human rights help to “inspire action to diminish man’s inhumanity to man, to discourage the torture, genocide and other manifest evils which remain ... [an] endemic feature of human society” (Newlands, 2006, p. 4). Writing from a Christian perspective with emphasis on Christology and human rights, George Newlands in his *Christ and Human Rights: The transformative engagement* urges human rights being vital in “understanding humanity before God, to righteousness and justice.” Emphasizing the importance of human rights as a Christian, Newlands looks at human rights as;

Human ability to enjoy certain basic capacities which are constitutive of human living – the ability to enjoy, survive and to enjoy reasonable health and freedom of action, to express one’s views without hindrance, to associate with other people without arbitrary constraints and without fear of torture or detention (Newlands, 2006, p. 4).

What is to constitute the basic or fundamental rights has continued to be disputed, however; there is a “widespread agreement that there is a set of rights owed to us as human beings” (Bucar & Barnett, 2005, p.1).

3.4. International human rights declarations and covenants

Since the UN’s Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, there has been series of other international human rights conventions in which covenants have been signed in the struggle to promoting human rights. The UDHR being the genesis of all the other conventions. This initial human rights instrument was “drafted by representatives with different legal and cultural backgrounds from all regions of the world” and it’s “Declaration was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December 1948” (United Nations, 2016a).

There are three generations of rights as classified by many human rights scholars. Michael Haas in his *International Human Rights: A Comprehensive Introduction* and Ven der J. A Ven in his *Human Rights or Human Rule* all attest to this. Ven’s three generation human rights account is that, “the first generation of civic liberties, political and judicial rights; the second generation of economic, social and cultural rights; and the third generation of collective rights.” He then further describes the third generation – collective rights to include “the rights to development, a healthy environment, peace, co-ownership of the common heritage of humankind, and the right to communicate.” (Ven, 2010, p. 4). Similarly, Haas referring to Karel Vasak’s work in *The International Dimensions of Human Rights* (1982) puts human rights in three generations:

- (1) Civil and political rights constitute the first generation, which focus on issues of liberty.
- (2) Economic, social and cultural rights are the second

generation, with a concern on equality. (3) The third generation, he argues, is concerned with a wide range of issues, including the rights to development, a healthy environment, group self-determination, and peace.

Haas' classification³ of human rights spells out implicitly some of the international conventions of human rights. These are the respective international conventions on human rights. Following the UDHR is the 1967 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) which deals with "rights relating to the relationship between people and government" (Haas, 2014, p. 115). There are twenty-seven articles or rights conferred in the ICCPR.

Ten years later, another international convention whose focus was the economic, social and cultural aspect of humanity was convoked. The convention known as the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) whose draft was approved in 1966 commenced in 1976. This covenant deals with "substantive rights" pertaining economy, and the social and cultural rights of humanity.

On 18 December 1979, another convention called the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. The convention addresses the issue of gender disparity between men and women, a means to eliminate any form of discrimination against women. As a fruit of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women (UNCSW), the convention "is rooted in the goals of the United Nations: to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity, and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women" (United Nations, 2016b).

³ A good detailed description of human rights generation can be found in table 1.1 (Human rights generations) in Haas, Michael. (2014). *International Human Rights: A Comprehensive Introduction*. London, U.K: Routledge. (p. 6). Haas puts various human rights in their chronological order of centuries in which they have been affirmed or covenanted.

Other conventions include; the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The convention also known as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) looks at the “aspects of a child’s life and set out the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights that all children everywhere are entitled to.” The convention equally “explains how adults and governments must work together to make sure all children can enjoy all their rights” (UNICEF UK, 2016). The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability (CRPD) and the Convention on Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons (CRMRP) are some other prominent international conventions on human rights. All these conventions and others not mentioned here seek to protect the “dignity and worth of the human person” as affirmed in the UDHR.

3.5. The African Charter on Human and Peoples’ right

The African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Right (ACHPR) was set up in 1987 and a protocol to the Charter was reached ten years later in 1998 but the protocol was effected on January 25, 2005. The Charter is “is an international human rights instrument that is intended to promote and protect human rights and basic freedoms in the African continent” (ACHPR, 2005). The ACHPR also called the Banjul Charter in article 2 reiterates the rights and freedom of the individual as stipulated in the UDHR. The article states;

Every individual shall be entitled to the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms recognized and guaranteed in the present Charter without distinction of any kind such as race, ethnic group, colour, sex, language, religion, political or any other opinion, national and social origin, fortune, birth or any status (ACHPR, 2005).

The Charter has a well laid document stipulating peoples’ rights and duties. However, unlike their sister rights body in the European Union (EU) with an operational European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), ACHPR only has the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Right without a court. The commission only helps interprets the Charter and guide member states in the matters of human rights.

Although the commission is seeing some progress in their work, it remains very distant to being an influential rights body in the continent since human rights issues are dealt with by national courts and rarely by regional courts.

3.6. Religious origins of human rights

There is no consensus on the religious roots of human rights. Some scholars find philosophical basis for human rights in the various world religions as others vehemently deny it. Michael Haas belongs to the former, he ably demonstrates how individual duties, prohibitions and responsibilities have been “reinterpreted in modern terms and shown to have laid a foundation for the development of human rights” (Haas, 2014, p. 15). His view suggests that the attempts to find religious roots of human rights is but only a “modern reinterpretation” of the teachings in the various religious traditions. Starting from Hinduism to Islam as the probable oldest and newest major world religions respectively, Haas attributes various characters as human rights advocates⁴ in these religious traditions. Attention is directed here to origins of human rights in the Christian tradition.

In his view, Haas outlines Jesus of Nazareth, St. Paul of Tarsus, Thomas Aquinas, Bartolome de las Casas and Martin Luther are some of the prominent human rights advocates in the Christian tradition. Born and ministered during the time of Roman oppression of the Jews, Haas believes that Jesus of Nazareth advocated for Romans not to be “dislodged by terrorism or superior force but rather by converting them to a new way of thinking in which all are treated with compassion and equality.” He further writes of Jesus;

Jesus, similarly, criticized the pursuit of wealth and was able to convince a lynch mob not to stone to death a woman accused of adultery. Christian theology developed in part from Jesus’s attack on Jewish religious authorities for doctrinal intolerance and indifference to human suffering.

⁴ In table 2.1 Human rights advocates in major religions, Haas lists several characters as advocates of human rights in these religions. For example, Haas includes Krishna Chaitanya and Mahatma Gandhi as advocates for legal equality and self-determination, nonviolence and equality respectively in Hinduism. His list of human rights advocates in various religious traditions can be found in Haas, Michael (2014). *International Human Rights: A Comprehensive introduction*. New York: Routledge, p. 16.

He thereby demanded the rights of assembly and free speech to articulate unapproved views (Haas, 2014, p. 19).

Responding to claims within human rights communities that human rights doesn't have and do not need any religious grounding, Stackhouse objects such views. To him, the claim that, "diverse versions of 'the standard secularist account' find adequate grounding in secular conceptions of human dignity" is void. His argument in contrast is that "the foundations of human rights claims are essentially theological." (Stackhouse, 2005, p. 26). Stackhouse further argues that although Judaism or Christianity cannot claim support for all human rights, it is undeniably true that "what passes as 'secular', 'Western' principles of basic human rights developed nowhere else but out of key strands of the biblically rooted religions" (p. 33). He suggests the following as a grounding of human rights from the Christian tradition;

An exploration of the sources of human rights, however, yields three central areas of contribution: (1) relating first principles and concrete circumstances, (2) accenting the regard for the individual, and (3) recognizing the need for the social embodiment of human rights, particularly in the institution of the church (ibid, p. 33).

Jan-Olav Henriksen a Lutheran theologian distances the historical formation of human rights on Christian ethics but he reinterprets the Christian tradition to develop a human rights theology. He writes "it would be historically incorrect to say that the human rights tradition is derived from Christian ethics, this tradition can [only] be interpreted in the light of Christian ethics. ..." And that in doing this, "one should be careful not to regard human rights as the true expression of Christian teaching" (Henriksen, 2006, p. 78).

His view is no different from that of the Church of Norway (Den Norske Kirke). In her document *Set the oppressed free* which has been adopted by the 2014 synod, the church recognizes that though not explicitly found in the Bible, reading the "Bible through the lens of human dignity and human rights, we will find many examples

that can motivate us, as a Christian community, to be involved in human rights efforts” (Den Norske Kirke, 2014 p. 5). The Church of Norway in her 2014 synod holds that all human beings have been created equal in the image of God “and the inherent, equal dignity of all human beings is the basis for the radical message of equality found in Christianity.” Affirming that “Universal human rights protect human beings against abuse and oppression. In light of Christian faith, human rights are expressions of the inviolability and equality of human beings” (Den Norske Kirke, 2014 p. 104).

Equally, Esther Reeds in *The Ethics of Human Rights: Contested Doctrinal and Moral Issues* argues for a Christian embrace of human rights as a way of expressing love of God and neighbor but she sees subjective rights being purely a legal instrument. “Epistemologically, the meaning of “right” is found in God and is thus prior to subjective rights. The meaning of “right” rests in God and as revealed preeminently in Christ” writes Reed, she continues “Subjective rights – whether expressed as natural rights or human rights – are context bound and contingent moral and/or legal instruments” (Reeds, 2007, p. 3). Reeds belongs to a school of thought which believes that God doesn’t communicate his message to humanity in the language of rights but only as recorded in the Holy Scripture.

On the contrary, Vigen Guroian from an Orthodox perspective refutes any origin of human rights in the Christian tradition. In his critique of the human rights and Modern Western faith, Guroian writes that “Human rights thinking is alien to Orthodoxy” he rather argues that “the notion that a normative human nature is concretely manifested in every human individual who comes into existence is central to Orthodox anthropology and theology.” (Guroian, 2005, p. 42). To him, the Western thought of human rights which appear to make humanity independent of God is a flaw and it “contradict Orthodoxy’s insistence upon the theonomous nature of humanity revealed by the divine Word’s incarnate existence” (p. 43).

The ambiguities in the religious origins of human rights probably set the pace for ambivalence. It seems clear that human right has never been mentioned in any religious scripture including the Holy Bible, a sacred text of Christianity. Neither is

human right a primary focus of the traditional Christian scripture and ministry. Although there is a convincing modern reinterpretation of the Christian tradition to ground human rights, care should be taken in considering these reinterpretations thus, either not looking at human rights as an expression of the Christian faith or taking human rights in its entirety as the Christian mission.

3.7. Christianity and the human rights debate

The different views on the origins of human rights in the Christian tradition as expressed above by various scholars reveal the greater human rights debate in Christianity. We have already seen how some scholars passionately defend human rights having adequate origin in the Christian tradition while others distancing human rights from the same. Debates on human rights among Christians centers majorly on the philosophical rooting of the rights doctrine in the Holy Scripture and practices of the Christian faith. Other interests in the debate include what rights and the 'why' of the human rights bringing into play what Jacques Maritain foresaw few years after the UDHR in his comment on the human rights debates; "We agree on these rights, providing we are not asked why. With the 'why,' the dispute begins" (Maritain quoted in Bucar and Barnett, 2005, pp. 1-2).

3.8. Human rights debate in early Protestantism

John Witte asserts that the Protestant Reformation saw many who disagreed with the Roman Catholic Church, denounce canon laws and Papal ecclesiastical authority opting for freedom of the individual Christian. They valued an accountable relationship between the family, church and state; seeing the trio "stand equal before God and are called to discharge distinctively godly functions in the community." To them, the "family, church and state are thus organised as public and transparent institutions, accessible and accountable to each other and to their members" (Witte, 2010, p. 30).

Distinct Modern Protestant Developments in human rights has been discussed extensively by Nicolas Wolterstorff. Wolterstorff argues that the idea of human rights is not an Enlightenment outcome rather a result of Catholic and later Protestant

thinkers. Wolterstorff believes that the Enlightenment thinkers Hobbes and Lockers only inherited these views from their forbears. He writes;

The idea [of human rights] was given birth six centuries earlier by medieval Christian thinkers, and that it continued to be used through the centuries by Catholic writers and, once Protestantism arose, by Protestant writers as well. Hobbes and Lockers inherited the idea from their Christian forebears (Wolterstorff, in Witte & Alexander, 2010, p. 155).

Wolterstorff classifies Protestant arguments for or against human rights in five categories; the agapist rejection of human rights, the rejection of natural human rights as lamentable modern invention, rights talk: useful but dispensable, human rights as indispensable but not fundamental, and human rights talk as indispensable and fundamental.

The first category – the agapist rejection of human rights by a twentieth century Swedish Lutheran Bishop, Anders Nygren in *Agape and Eros* (1930s) rejects the idea of human rights and preaches the agape love. Anders argues that the agapic love doesn't only supplement justice but supersedes it. Thus, in the practice of the agapic love, "we are not to love the neighbor agapically *in addition to* treating her as justice requires; we are to love her *instead of* treating her as justice requires" (p. 157). If agapist love supersedes justice, then it equally supersedes human rights, hence there is no need for rights talk.

The rejection of natural human rights as a lamentable modern invention is the second category. Here, it is seen that "justice has nothing to do with natural rights. The idea of natural rights is lamentable invention of the individualistic political philosophers of the enlightenment" (p. 159). Leo Strauss the man behind this view argues that the Enlightenment did a lamentable thing by "the fundamental change from an orientation by natural duties to an orientation by natural rights," saying that "the language of rights is for each of us asserting his claims, his entitlements, his rights, each against the other" (Strauss, quoted in Witte & Alexander, 2010, p. 159). Joan Lockwood O'Donovan argues in support of this view, sees no compatibility between

human rights talk and Christian theology. To her, “right is primitive endowment of power with which the subject first engages in society, not an enhancement which accrues to the subject from an ordered and politically formed society” (O’Donovan quoted in Witte & Alexander, 2010, p. 161).

The third category argues that human rights talk is useful but dispensable. Thus, human rights talk is not always necessary and has no monopoly because “one could make the same point with other concepts” (p. 161). Emil Brunner’s *Justice and the Social Order* defends this view. Before human rights talk is a principle of justice Brunner describes as *suum cuique* “the rendering to each man of his due ... who or whatever renders to every man his due, that person or thing is just” the due which Brunner equates to human rights talk is not to be established by the human lawgiver but rather from the “primal order [God],” (Brunner, quoted in Witte & Alexander, 2010, pp. 161-162). He castigates human rights that gives individual autonomy saying it is God’s will that human beings should be dependent of each other.

Fourthly, there is a school of thought that sees human rights as indispensable but not fundamental. This view argues that “more fundamental rights are duties; rights are grounded in duties” (p. 165), thus they prefer obligations over rights. Nonetheless, they “sense that talk about human rights is getting at something of deep importance” but they “at the same time, feel uneasy with giving natural rights a fundamental place in the moral order” (p. 165). As seen in the United Church Pronouncement on Human Rights, here, “fundamental human right is the right to be responsible to God” and “human rights and human duties are two sides of the coin” (p. 166). So, human rights are a means of fulfilling human duties before God, they are indispensable but not fundamental.

Last is the school advanced by Wolterstorff, that human rights are indispensable and fundamental. To him, a right is “a legitimate claim to do good or being treated a certain way by one’s fellows – or in the limiting case, by oneself ... rights are what respect for worth requires” (p. 169). Basing on the redemptive love of God on all who bear the *imago Dei*, Wolterstorff concludes that “a worth-bestowing relation to God” to even the most impaired should be sought. It is on the account of the worth of

everyone “being honored by God that grounds natural rights” as indispensable and fundamental (p. 170).

3.9. Human rights debate in modern Protestantism

Like we have already explored above, although human rights have become largely acceptable within the twenty-first century Protestant denominations, it continues to be a matter of dispute. There has never been a unanimous view on the human rights talk in modern Protestantism and perhaps this will continue for some time. Here, we shall look at the various arguments in the human rights talk among modern Protestantism. I will begin by looking at the views of a Nobel Peace Prize winner, an African Anglican Bishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa. He is one out of few African bishops who have wholly endorsed the human rights doctrine.

The retired Anglican Archbishop Desmond Tutu of the Church of Southern Africa (ACSA) couldn't be spoken less of his active activism against discrimination since the apartheid and post-apartheid regime. Tutu is a 1984 receiver of the Nobel Peace Prize, 1986 Albert Schweitzer Prize for Humanitarianism, 1987 Pacem in Terris Awards, 1999 Sydney Peace Prize, 2007 Gandhi Peace Prize, and 2009 Presidential Medal of Freedom. The Anglican bishop believes to be human is to be free. His article *The first word: to be human is to be free* (2010) emphasises that “the Bible makes some quite staggering assertions about human rights which came to the foundations of the culture of basic human rights” (Tutu, in Witte & Alexander, 2010, p. 1). Tutu believes humans as a pinnacle of divine creation are inviolable and are not just to be respected but revered. Referring to Gen. 1-2, he writes;

Human life (as all life) is a gift from the gracious and ever-generous Creator of all. It is therefore inviolable. We must therefore have a deep reverence for the sanctity of human life. That is why homicide is universally condemned. ... we should not just respect such a person but that we should have a deep reverence for that person (p. 2).

In his account, archbishop Tutu believes the Bible is a wealth of resource in support of human rights and that persons of faith stand out in a better position to defend

human rights. Tutu sees the Bible as a revolutionary document that has powerfully aided the fight against apartheid in South Africa, he puts this in an astonishing statement that while the European missionaries had the Bible and the natives, had the land; "They said 'Let us pray,' and we dutifully shut our eyes. When we opened them, why, they now had the land and we had the Bible" (p. 1). However, the Bible turned out to be a dynamite to fight against the injustices of those who had given it; "those who may have wanted to exploit us and to subject us to injustice and oppression should really have not given us the Bible, because that placed a dynamite under their nefarious schemes" (p. 1). Tutu therefore draws his strength in support of human rights from the Bible.

The freedom of choice is a fundamental right given by God of which no human being is to be rid of, believes Tutu. To him, the freedom even extends to either embracing or rejecting the love of God, therefore to be 'human is to be free.' In his view, Tutu writes that even God himself will not intervene in the choices one makes whether right or wrong; "God may not intervene to nullify this incredible gift [freedom to choose] in order to stop us from making wrong choices" (p. 4). No human being has the moral authority to stop another from making choices, in fact; "God, who alone has the perfect right to be a totalitarian, has such a profound reverence for our freedom that He had much rather we went to hell than compel us to go to heaven" (p. 4). And, to be a person of faith is to promote justice, "in the face of injustice it is to disobey God not to stand up in opposition to that injustice and that oppression" (p. 3) writes Tutu. Tutu endorses human rights in its fullness including the controversial Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transsexual and Intersexual (LGBTI)⁵ rights and the right to assisted death⁶.

On her part, Esther Reed sees a lacking theology and ethics in as far as engagement with human rights is concerned among the present-day Protestants. Seeking to

⁵ Despite controversies surrounding same sex marriage in the Anglican church, archbishop Desmond Tutu supported the lesbian marriage of his daughter the Rev. Mpho Tutu to her lesbian Dutch professor Marceline Furth which took place on December 30, 2015. Refer to <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-36462240> for more reading

⁶ A recent BBC report quoted archbishop Desmond Tutu saying he may consider assisted death, "I hope I am treated with compassion and allowed to pass on to the next phase of life's journey in the manner of my choice," <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-37587290>

address this impasse, Reed in *The Ethics of human rights: Contested doctrinal and moral issues* has developed some helpful working assumptions for Christianity and human rights which I discuss here as her contribution to the modern Protestant debate on the subject. First, Reed proposes that a Christian understanding of rights is to be found in the objective righteousness of God revealed in Christ. That, “the meaning of ‘rights’ can be understood only with reference to the objective righteousness of God as revealed preeminently in Christ” arguing that “subjective or natural rights may be recognised as a means of expressing that every person is a creature of God and beloved by God” (p. 40).

Secondly, Reed sees a parallel line between the evangelical command to love neighbour and the human rights talk, though the former is never to be expressed in the language of the latter. This amounts to the fact that; “A Christian ethic of rights does not appeal to a mythic natural state ... where all persons were equal and free to pursue life, health, liberty, and possessions, as their right” she explains. Neither does it mean a “Christian ethic of human rights originate in positive law of a nation-state” but rather, “human rights legislation belongs to the human law and secular vocation of the state as God’s servant for good until Christ comes again (Rom. 13:4)” (p. 40). In this respect, Reeds explains that;

True human freedom is not neutrality, indeterminacy, indefinite self-possibility, a zone of non-interference by others, being one’s own judge of good and evil in refusal of God’s word, and so forth, but a way of describing creatureliness within limits set by divine grace. The meaning of true freedom before God is different from the exercise of those freedoms that secularist human rights instruments seek to protect (p. 41).

With this parallel view of the Christian ethic of rights to the secularist view of the same, Reed calls for a dialogue between the two. She however emphasises that these fundamental differences shouldn’t make a Christian ethic of rights to denounce or resist the rights claims championed by the secularist theorists.

Further, Reed's argument refuses "any analogy that threatens the qualitative difference between liberal-individualist notions of rights and confession of God's saving righteousness" (p. 41). Subjective rights don't compare to righteousness of God in any sense, admitting any analogy between the two "compromises divine transcendence or the truth that every perfection that belongs to creatures is given by grace and perceived in faith" even though both occurs "under divine lordship and his provision" (p. 42) Reed argues.

Finally, Reed advances the need for a stronger theological argument in defense of fundamental human rights other than the secularist arguments. To her, faith communities and in this case Christianity "has a role to play alongside, and as an alternative to, secularist theories of human rights rooted in global liberal or utilitarian theorizing." Seeing how secular nation-states involved in the inception of human rights equally remain wanting when it comes to the observance of human rights, "theology remains 'tragically too important'" (p. 42) in addressing human flourishing.

3.10. Human rights and Anglicanism

Richard Hooker was an Anglican thinker in its formative years and has arguments concerning the theology of divine law and human law. Hooker would easily endorse the human rights doctrine as he believes Christians have the responsibility to obey civil governors in all things temporal. His view discussed by Reed is the give to Caesar what belongs to Caesar and to God what is God's attitude. Reed comments of his argument; "Obedience in temporal matters is owed to civil governors and obedience in spiritual matters is owed to ecclesiastical governors" (p. 45) and that "the grace of God can be mediated through human authorities and ... the church has a duty to bear witness to this" (p. 49). However temporal (human) laws whether by the church or the state must be godly, measuring up to the Ten Commandments.

Of Hooker's arguments on divine law and human law, Reed summarises his arguments in these three points;

First, human law exists within divine providence despite the effects of sin, and struggles both with and against the consequences of the Adamic fall. Second, knowledge of God's law was bestowed innately at the creation of humankind but does not survive in our experience as universally held system of beliefs or practices. Third, the witness of the church must be to God's revelation, but this does not, indeed should not, denigrate moral reasoning about the quality of human laws. Human reasoning is still capable of identifying some of the worst effects of sin and of framing laws that curtail the worst excesses of our post-fall state and point toward how humans ought to behave toward one another (p. 62).

In his 2012 lecture titled *Human Rights and Religious Faiths* at the Ecumenical Center Geneva, William Rowans, a hundred and fourth archbishop of Canterbury calls for new ways of thinking about human rights and religious faiths, particularly Christianity. Rowans acknowledges that, the 1948 UDHR "is unquestionably a landmark in the history of moral consciousness, one of the factors that has consistently given hope and purpose to political life throughout the globe" (Williams, 2012, 28.02). This acknowledgement is a vivid support for human rights by the then Primate of All of the Church of England, also "head" of the Global Anglican Communion. Saying that human rights offers ways of identifying injustices and energizes religious minorities (which in some places are Christians) from oppression.

The primate's understanding is that rights shouldn't be taken as individual rights but rather what has been mutually recognized between saying that "rights are a crucial way of working out what it is for people to belong together in a society" and the rights "language gets difficult only when it is divorced from that awareness of belonging and reciprocity." He hopes that any helpful language of rights should help individuals identify with the other. Williams therefore sees a problem in law making attempts to code universal claims. He writes;

Law, I believe, is not a comprehensive code that will define and enforce a set of universal claims; it is the way in which we codify what we think, at

any given point, mutual recognition requires from us. It will therefore shift its focus from time to time and it cannot avoid choices about priorities. To seek for legal recognition of any particular liberty as a 'human right' is not to try and construct a universal and exhaustive code but to challenge a society that apparently refuses full civic recognition to some of its members.

To Williams, moral universalism is key in religious creeds, denying this fact creates a gap between religion and the human rights discourse. He contends the presupposition in the UDHR that human beings have status simply because they are members of humanity. To him, this "takes for granted that there are some things that remain true about the nature or character of human beings whatever particular circumstances prevail and whatever any specific political settlement may claim." And, being created in the image of God as affirmed in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures means that human beings are responsible for reflecting the "love, fidelity, and justice of God."

Much as there is a place to focus on individual rights, Williams argues that a global grounding of human dignity should be sought, that which looks beyond the individual's or a society's understanding. To recognize the dignity of another is to see that they have a "standing before God, which is, of its nature, invulnerable to the success or failure of any other relationship or any situation in the contingent world." Human rights should be rooted in understanding the sacred, "It is essential that, in an age that is often simultaneously sentimental, utilitarian and impatient, we do not allow the language of rights to wander too far from its roots in an acknowledgement of the sacred," Williams concludes.

Kerry O'Halloran in *The Church of England – Charity Law and Human Rights* observes that the Church of England, which is the mother of the Global Anglican Communion is struggling in the face of human rights. He writes, "The Church of England is undoubtedly in a difficult position ... [being] exposed to effects of law reform relating to ... human rights [having] a direct bearing on its core religious beliefs" (O'Halloran, 2014, p. xv). The pressing human rights issues facing the church

include; “gay marriages, same gender parents, together with female and gay clergy, and many other indicators of break with tradition, are relentlessly requiring [the Church] to make further adjustments and compromises” (p. xvi).

The official position of the Anglican Church regarding homosexuality is that it is a perversion and sinful. “It is condemned in the Scripture as sinful regardless of the context and there are several references in both the Old Testament and the New Testaments to a homosexual lifestyle being expressly forbidden” and “the Church together with the wider Anglican Communion seemed to take a firm Scriptural stand in defense of traditional Protestant values” (ibid, p. 203). Lev. 18:22; 20:13, Rom. 1:16-32 and 1 Cor. 6:9 are some of the Scriptures referred to in condemning homosexuality.

The 1998 Lambeth Conference (Global Anglican bishops’ meeting) resolution 1.10 on *Human Sexuality* firmly rejects same sex marriage defining marriage between a man and woman; “in view of the teaching of Scripture, upholds faithfulness in marriage between a man and a woman in lifelong union, and believes that abstinence is right for those who are not called to marriage” (Anglican Communion, 1998a). The bishops agreed that the conference “cannot advise the legitimizing or blessing of same sex unions nor ordaining those involved in same gender unions.” This resolution implies to be an Anglican is to affirm this position and those “North American dioceses that have chosen to take an opposing stand on these issues can no longer be Anglicans and should be expelled” (ibid, pp. 212-213) writes O’Halloran.

However, in resolution 1.10, the 1998 Lambeth Conference unanimously affirmed and adopted the UDHR urging her members to comply “with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the nations in which our various member Churches are located, and all others over whom we may exercise any influence” (Anglican Communion, 1998b). Generally, the Anglican Church, the Anglican COU inclusive, is positive to human rights especially the UDHR, except in few aspects like that of human sexuality where it is at per with the human rights doctrine. To date, the 1998 Lambeth Conference resolution remains the official position of the Global Anglican Communion of human sexuality even though some provinces, notably The

Episcopal Church (TEC) of America seem to be defying this resolution. The full endorsement of human rights is gaining strength in TEC and the Anglican Church in Canada as well as other Dioceses in the West which has resulted to a struggle for orthodoxy in the Global Anglican Communion with a stronger voice from the Global South.

3.11. The struggle for orthodoxy in the Anglican Communion

A faction of Anglican Provinces isn't content with the way some secular views are permeating the Communion and distorting the "Truth" of the Gospel. These Provinces started a movement called the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON) with the view of restoring orthodoxy in the Communion. One of the issues which disturbs these Provinces is the acceptance of same sex marriage by other provinces contrary to the 1998 resolution 1.10 of the Lambeth Conference which categorically spelt that it is unscriptural to have persons of same sex contract marriage. This is how the movement which started in 2008 describes itself: "The GAFCON movement is a global family of authentic Anglicans standing together to retain and restore the Bible to the heart of the Anglican Communion." The conference's mission is to "guard the unchanging, transforming Gospel of Jesus Christ and to proclaim Him to the world" (GAFCON, 2008a).

GAFCON isn't opposed to human rights per se, it is rather concerned with certain aspects of human rights that they see is very inconsistent with Christian morals and contravenes scriptures. The election and consecration of an openly gay bishop in TEC in 2003 is the precursor for GAFCON, they see this as a moral compromise of biblical values as expressed in this statement explaining why the movement started;

The GAFCON journey began in 2008 when moral compromise, doctrinal error and the collapse of biblical witness in parts of the Anglican communion had reached such a level that the leaders of the majority of the world's Anglicans felt it was necessary to take a united stand for truth (GAFCON, 2008b).

The reinterpretation of marriage to suite same sex marriage is a breach of God's design of marriage, as argued by John Ssenyonyi a Ugandan clergy, "There is No Change to God's design. What God intended for marriage at creation is still in force" (Ssenyonyi, 07.01.2009). The Anglican Provinces subscribing to GAFCON are opposed to accepting same sex marriage as a universal human right. The context to the GAFCON Jerusalem Declaration castigates the actions which "promotes a variety of sexual preferences and immoral behavior as a universal human right" and resolution 8 reads "we acknowledge God's creation of humankind as male and female and the unchangeable standard of Christian marriage between one man and one woman as the proper place for sexual intimacy and the basis of the family" (GAFCON, 2008a).

3.12. Human rights and the Anglican church in Africa

The human rights debate among African churches isn't well documented even though there is a lot of skepticism to human rights or at least to some aspects of it. I have already made references to Desmond Tutu, an African Anglican bishop and his support for human rights. In his arguments, he advocates for the freedom of every individual, the right to choose without interference. Being a moral agent is to have the freedom to choose, and, "moral approbation and disapproval have no meaning where there is no freedom to choose between various options" (Tutu, in Witte & Alexander, 2010, p. 4). Such right to choose includes those which might seemingly be condemned by religious doctrines.

However, Tutu's voice isn't supported by the Anglican Church of Southern Africa (ACSA), a province which he once headed as an archbishop. In their 2013 provincial synod, ACSA reaffirmed their commitment to the understanding of the resolution 1.10 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference. The synod affirmed that; "God calls us to love and minister to all people, regardless of their sexual orientation, while at the same time upholding God's standards of holiness" (ACSA, 2013), God's standards being marriage is a reserve for one man and one woman. ACSA held a debate on human sexuality in the year 2016, debating two proposals; to have licence for clergy who

identify as LGBTI and a prayer for the blessing of those wanting same sex marriage. The motion which was to be passed by a simple majority of the synod could not pass.

Archbishop Thabo Makgoba of ACSA in his communication on October 1, 2016 expressed pain over the failure of the proposals. "I was deeply pained by the outcome of the debate. I was glad I wear glasses or the Synod would have seen the tears. I wanted to be anywhere but in the Synod hall - I wished I was at home quietly in Makgoba's Kloof" (Makgoba, 10.01.2016). The archbishop's expression of disappointment at the failure of the proposals shows his solidarity to the LGBTI community. A statement in his communication addressed those with LGBTI orientation with a strong voice in support of the LGBTI rights. He writes to the LGBTI community;

You are loved by God and all baptized, believing and faithful persons, regardless of sexual orientation, are full members of the Body of Christ. We recognize that many of you are baptized and confirmed members of the Church and are seeking the pastoral care, moral direction of the Church, and Gods transforming power for the living of your lives and the ordering of your relationships. We urge you to stick with us to play your full part in the deliberations to come.

On the contrary, Makgoba's view isn't welcomed by other primates in Africa, most churches in Africa are "vigorously opposed to same-sex unions in any form" taking a traditional view point of the Scriptures. GAFCON with majority membership from the African Anglicans is opposed to the rights of the LGBTI. Archbishop Nicolas Okoh of the Church of Nigeria doesn't agree with Makgoba, saying in Africa, marriage is a union between a man and a woman. That homosexuality is a taboo. Quoting Stephen Noll, a former Vice Chancellor of Uganda Christian University founded by the COU, Okoh writes;

The difference in the challenges to marriage in Africa and the West cannot be more strikingly portrayed than by the fact that in the same year the British parliament legalized same-sex marriage, its former colonies,

Nigeria and Uganda, passed stronger laws against homosexuality and same-sex marriage (Noll, quoted in Okoh, 24.12.2014).

The Anglican Church of Uganda an active member of GAFCON holds no different view from that by GAFCON and other sister Anglican Provinces in Africa.

3.13. Human rights and the Anglican Church of Uganda

The Anglican Church of Uganda (COU), is one province among others strongly opposed to acknowledging the LGBTI rights saying it is unscriptural and goes against the morals of the church. COU takes the 1998 Lambeth Conference resolution 1.10 to every letter. Stanley Ntagali, the archbishop of the COU compares the situation in the Anglican Communion in which everyone is at liberty to do as he wishes as being recognized in the human rights talk to the time of Judges in the Bible in which “Everyone did what was right in their own eyes” (Ntagali, 16.01.2016).

The recent move in the COU against the LGBTI rights is the 23rd Provincial Assembly held in 2016 that has maintained marriage to a man and a woman. The Assembly denounced sexual education in secondary schools that promote homosexuality calling upon the “government to ensure that all sexuality education materials promote the Biblical values of abstinence before marriage, and faithfulness in lifelong marriage between one man and one woman” (COU, 26.08.2016). The Assembly further decried that abortion shouldn’t be legalized as a choice which a woman can make anytime at ease, saying it kills life instead of protecting life; “Abortion which is done by one’s choice is against Gods will and the Bible considers it to be murder. Any life has the right to continue and no one has the mandate to destroy it.” This act by the COU in blocking the choice to abortion would be regarded as putting a burden on women in the human rights doctrine.

Like the Global Anglican Communion (GAC) or GAFCON, the Anglican Church of Uganda isn’t entirely opposed to human rights but is careful in recognizing these rights, measuring them against biblical standards. Thus, the Bible stands highly esteemed by the Church than human rights. Human rights is read through the lens of the Bible other than the Bible being read through the lens of human rights.

4.0. RESEARCH METHOD

4.1. Introduction

My practice of the Christian faith as an African Anglican Christian and clergy has made me experience and witness scepticism to human rights by many African Christians. This research has sought to explore the scepticism; hence the main research question is: In what ways is the Anglican Church of Uganda challenging the human rights doctrine? In this chapter, I expand the methodology for this research which I briefly mentioned in chapter 1.6. Here, I will discuss the research strategy, design, sampling method, the interviews, data recording and storage, and identify some of the challenges and limitations of the research and other methodological interests.

4.2. Research design

The empirical data I have collected in exploring the ways in which the Anglican Church of Uganda challenges the human rights doctrine provides a view point for the theoretical discussions in chapter 3.0. This research is very significant in the fields of social sciences hence can be termed as a social research (Bryman, 2012, p. 4). Whereas it is possible to employ both quantitative and qualitative strategies in a social research, I have found the latter more applicable to this study. Berg and Lune uses the term qualitative research to refer to one which seeks “the meanings, concepts, definitions, characteristics, metaphors, symbols, and description of things” (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 3).

In exploring the ways in which the Anglican Church of Uganda challenges the human rights doctrine, I intend to come up with a theoretical perspective of the Church on human rights. As such an inductive theory in which “theory is an outcome of research” (Bryman, 2012, p. 26) is the approach I have employed as opposed to deductive approach. In other words, I will use the empirical material fleshed by the theoretical framework to induct the theoretical understanding of the human rights doctrine of the Anglican Church of Uganda. In an inductive study as this, it is important to note how “it uses a grounded theory approach to analysis of

data and to generation of theory;" and it is "a strategy of linking data and theory ... associated with qualitative research" (Bryman, 2012, p. 27).

4.3. Case study

Additionally, out of the several dioceses in the Anglican Church of Uganda, I have taken the Diocese of Kampala as the case in my study. Bryman describes a case study research as one which is "concerned with the complexity and particular nature of the case in question" (Bryman, 2012, p. 66). A case study is concerned with and "provide a deep understanding of phenomenon, events, people, or organisations" (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 328). The response of the Anglican Church of Uganda, Diocese of Kampala to human rights is the phenomenon which I sought to understand. Berg and Lune asserts that a proper study of a case should be able to provide an understanding about similar individuals, groups, and events in what they termed as generalizability (p. 341).

The Diocese of Kampala of the Anglican Church of Uganda was a better choice for my case in this study because it is a Metropolitan Diocese whose leadership and membership is made up of all peoples of Uganda. Besides, the Diocese of Kampala though it is not the headquarters for the province of the Church of Uganda, has the cathedra of the Archbishop of the Province who at the same time is the bishop of the Diocese of Kampala. This suggests the possibility for generalizability. I will therefore attempt to zoom out my findings of the response of the Diocese of Kampala to human rights to reflect the response of the Anglican Church of Uganda at large.

The principle of generalizability is like that of representation as discussed by Bryman. He equally argues that case study can be a critical case, extreme or unique case, revelatory case, longitudinal case or a representative case. The latter which Bryman also calls the exemplifying case applies to my study because "it exemplifies a broader category of which it is a member" (Bryman, 2012, p. 70). In other words, the response of the Diocese of Kampala to human rights is used to exemplify the broader response of the province of the Anglican Church of Uganda to human rights. The empirical material for this study has been collected through qualitative interviews.

4.4. Qualitative interviewing

Qualitative interviewing, a method of data collection takes two forms; a semi-structured and an unstructured interview. The former which Berg and Lune also call semi-standardized interview involves the use of predetermined questions on special topics has been my choice for this study. “These questions are typically asked of each interviewee in a systematic and consistent order, but the interviewers are allowed freedom to digress ... to probe far beyond the answers to their prepared standardized questions” explains Berg and Lune (p. 112).

There isn't readily available research and literature on the theoretical perspective of the Anglican Church of Uganda on human rights. Conducting such a qualitative interview therefore stands a better method for gathering empirical material for the study. The three sub research questions formed key topics on the subject upon which semi-structured interview questions were framed.

Whereas majority of the interviewees were interviewed in a face-to-face interview sessions, this was not possible with one. This is because the respondent was very busy to fix time for a face-to-face interview. However, the researcher had to be flexible to use a Web based interview method in which a Facebook messenger chat was the medium for the interview. Berg and Lune describe such computer based conversations which provides a “real-time chat rooms, instant messenger protocols, and real-time threaded communications” as *synchronous* (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 133). Like in face-to-face interview, Berg and Lune argues that this method allows the interviewer to ask probing questions and to them, “it seems prudent to include this and other technological data-collecting strategies in the arsenal of lines of action for conducting qualitative research” (ibid, p. 134).

The interview questions were semi structured, thus open ended questions whose response was dependent on the respondent. Open ended questions give room for informants to “answer in their own terms. They are not forced to answer in the same terms as those foisted on them by the response choices” (Bryman, 2012, p. 247) and allows the exploration of new ideas. Since my intention is to explore the response of

the Church of Uganda to human rights, open ended questions served the purpose well since the respondents discussed the topic in a manner “in which the researcher has limited knowledge” (ibid, p. 247). Despite the advantages offered by open ended questions, the interview sessions usually take longer than is the case for closed questions. Transcription and coding of interviews are also time-consuming and are among the challenges I had faced.

4.5. Presentation of the interviewees

The sampling of the respondents was purposive; thus, the respondents were sampled to meet the goals of the research. Per Bryman “The goal of purposive sampling is to sample cases/participants in a strategic way, so that those sampled are relevant to the research questions that are being posed” (p. 418). The respondents were from various professional backgrounds including theologians, social workers, teachers, lawyers and people from other professions, and some are university students. This ensured that all the respondents are not unaware of human rights, but that they at least have some knowledge on the subject.

In total, 10 respondents were interviewed, each interview session was unique, guided by the interview guide, the individual interviews generally lasted for about 45-60 minutes each. The respondents especially the clergy were interviewed in their offices which provided a quiet and free environment for the interview sessions. This category of interviewees often welcomed me as a brother clergy and often prayed for God’s guidance before the interview sessions started. They were warm and open in the discussions. The other interviewees apart from the clergy were equally interviewed in serene environments that allowed them to freely discuss their views on the topic uninterruptedly.

Out of the ten interviews I conducted, five respondents were clergy (pastors) which I selected from across the various archdeaconries in the Diocese while the other five respondents were lay persons. Due to sensitive nature of the topic, the identity of the individuals will be concealed in the presentation of the data. I have chosen to identify the clergy in the presentation as clergy A, B, C, D, and E. Similarly, the four lay

persons are not equally mentioned by their names, they are rather identified as 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 respectively. In short, a reference to Clergy A means clergy respondent A where else Lay 1 refers to lay respondent 1 etc.

4.6. Data recording, storage and transcription

The interviews were recorded using an audio recorder, the researcher also took some notes during the interviews as well. The recorded interviews were stored in both the audio recorder and backup by storing in an external hard disc and on all my personal computers. This is to ensure that the data is not lost. The recorded interviews were later transcribed into scripts which provided the main data for this study, though I often referred to the notes I made.

4.7. Data analysis and interpretation

Interpreting qualitative data is usually uneasy, many reference books have got “host of competing approaches rather than what appears to be a settled consensus” (Silverman, 2011, p. 57), thus there is no clearly agreed approach to data analysis. Silverman outlines three approaches to qualitative data analysis, these are; content analysis, grounded theory and narrative analysis. “Content analysis involves establishing categories and then counting the number of instances when those categories are used in a particular item of text, for instance a newspaper report” (Silverman, 2011, p. 64) whereas narrative analysis deals with narrative data. The appropriate approach for my qualitative data is grounded theory.

According to Charmaz and Bryant, grounded theory is

A method of qualitative inquiry in which researchers develop inductive theoretical analyses from their collected data and subsequently gather further data to check these analyses. The purpose of grounded theory is theory construction, rather than description or application of existing theories. (Charmaz and Bryant in Silverman, 2011, p. 67).

On the other hand, Creswell who calls grounded theory as ‘inductive data analysis’ describes it as a theory in which “qualitative researchers build their patterns, categories, and themes from bottom up, by organising the data into increasingly

more abstract units of information.” He further explains that “this inductive process illustrates working back and forth between the themes and database until the researchers have established a comprehensive set of themes.” (Creswell, 2009, p. 175). Both Silverman and Creswell’s description of grounded theory involves the organisation of the data into themes and or categories in order to arrive at a theory through a process called coding.

Grounded theory method of data analysis involves coding of the data in which the interview materials are treated in codes (categories) which eventually leads to the induction of a theory. Thus, I have coded my data through memo writing in which I have carefully highlighted relevant words, lines and sentences and give them labels. These labels help to link up related data, describe abstracts and concepts. As noted by Silverman, such labels also referred to as ‘*in vivo* coding’ can emerge from using specific words that the interviewees use, as well as modifying, somewhat, these phrases.

The grounded theory or inductive method of data analysis, an approach which I have adopted for this study takes the following steps as described by Creswell. First organise and prepare the data for analysis, this involves the transcription of the interviews and fieldwork notes. The second task is to carefully read through all the data to get a general sense of the data. While reading through the data, ask, “what general ideas are participants saying? What is the tone of the ideas? What is the impression of the overall depth, credibility, and use of the information?” (Creswell, 2009, p. 185). Then the next task is to begin a detailed analysis of the data through coding, Rossman and Rallis refers to coding as, “the process of organising the material into chunks or segments of text before bringing meaning to information” (Rossman & Rallis, 1998, in Creswell, p. 186).

During the coding, Creswell advises that the researcher should generate a description of the setting or people as well as categories or themes for the analysis. Here, between five to seven themes or categories could be generated. “These themes are the ones that appear as major findings in qualitative studies and are often used to create headings in sections of studies. They should display multiple perspectives from

individuals and be supported by diverse quotations and specific evidence” (Creswell, 2009, p. 189). Last but not least, the researcher should find a way of how the categories or themes can be presented in a qualitative narrative. This according to Creswell might be the “discussion that mentions a chronology of events, the detailed discussion of several themes (complete with subthemes, specific illustrations, multiple perspectives from individuals and quotations) or discussion with interconnecting themes.”

Finally, the researcher interprets or makes a meaning of the data by critically seeking out the lessons learnt. According to Creswell, “the lessons could be the researcher’s personal interpretation, couched in the understanding that the inquirer brings to the study from her or his own culture, history, and experiences.” He also suggests that the lessons learnt “could also be a meaning derived from a comparison of the findings with information gleaned from the literature or theories.” (Creswell, 2009, p. 189). The combination of Silverman’s and Creswell’s approaches to the analysis of a qualitative data (grounded theory or inductive data analysis) has proved helpful in helping me analyse and interpret my data.

4.8. Research challenges and limitations

Any social research hardly goes by without challenges. I had equally met some few challenges which I ought to mention here. The Diocese of Kampala being an urban Diocese has very busy priests engaged in several ministry activities. As such, there were few clergy whom I had intended to interview but I failed to schedule interview with such because they were often taken up. I also failed to conduct interviews with both the bishop (also the archbishop of the COU) and assistant bishop of the Diocese. However, I obtained a lot of materials presenting the archbishop’s views from the website of the COU. Again, there were two cases when I schedule interview time with the interviewees but I had to wait for over two hours since the priests had to attend to other emergent cases which required counselling of their parishioners. There was one case where the clergy and I had to reschedule the interview for another day.

More so, my topic on human rights especially at one point having discussion on homosexuality was met with skepticism by some of my interviewees. This was partly because I happen to be coming from a European theological institution. Some in Africa see European institutions being theologically liberal. One clergy repeatedly inquired why I study in a liberal theological college and why the topic on human rights. Knowing forehand that this challenge would arise, I mostly dressed in my clerical collar during the interviews to give an impression that I am a fellow clergy. In addition, I had to introduce myself very well as a clergy from the Church of Uganda, this I hope reduced skepticism towards my fieldwork.

Although I hoped to have face-to-face interviews with all my respondents, there was one whom I failed to meet physically, as such, I had to flexibly use an internet aided interview. I interviewed this interviewee using Facebook Messenger, a phone application that enables encrypted instant phone messaging. With this medium, the researcher misses all the nuances of a face-to-face interaction.

The transcription of the interviews was not that easier than I thought it would be. On average, my interviews lasted for 45 minutes each. There was one which went close to an hour and about 10 pages of a transcript was produced out of this interview. I had to spent several days transcribing one interview. Despite these and other minor challenges, my fieldwork was successful.

4.9. Research criteria - reliability and validity

A good social research should have some criteria by which it can be evaluated. The two criteria which I have engaged in my study is to ensure that it is reliable and valid. "Reliability is concerned with the question whether the results of a study are repeatable" whereas "validity is concerned with the integrity of the conclusions that are generated from a piece of research (Bryman, 2012, p. 46, 47). *Internal validity* has been ensured in this study by employing a check between the observations by the researcher of the empirical material and the theories that have fleshed this study and vice versa.

Since this is a case study, it ought to confirm to *external validity* which refers to “the degree to which findings can be generalized across social setting” (Bryman, 2012, p. 390). Although external validity is a problem to “qualitative researchers because of their tendency to employ case studies and small samples” (ibid, p. 390), for it to be valid, it should not only apply to the case that has been examined, the findings should be able to apply to a similar social setting. This study will attempt to apply the findings based on the Anglican Diocese of Kampala – a case of the study to the entire Province of the Anglican Church of Uganda.

The discussions of the empirical finding and the theoretical framework eventually will lead to conclusions of the researcher, all these must be reliable. In other words, there must be a consistency to ensure that a research is repeatable. *Internal reliability* isn't applicable to this study since it is an individual's work. Internal reliability, as argued by Bryman is like *inter-observer consistency* and this works best when a study is carried by a team of researchers. Similarly, it is difficult to maintain *external reliability* in a social research because “it is impossible to ‘freeze’ a social setting and the circumstances of an initial study to make it replicable” (Bryman, 2012, p. 390). Despite the changing social settings, my findings on the response of the Church of Uganda to human rights should be repeatable with a somewhat similar result within a period when the social setting remains the same.

This is because I have tried as much as possible to seek to “satisfy the criterion of using low-inference descriptors, thus, the researcher should; tape record all interactions, carefully transcript these tapes and present long extracts of data in the research report” (Silverman, 2011, p. 365). More so, I avoided the reconstruction of the responses of the interviewees, this according to Seale would compromise the views of the respondents. So, I was keen in

Recording observations in terms that are as concrete as possible, including verbatim accounts of what people say, for example, rather researchers' reconstructions of general sense of what a person said, which would allow researchers' personal perspectives to influence the reporting' (Seale, in Silverman, 2011, p. 361).

4.10. Research ethics

According to Bryman, ethical principles a social researcher should bear in mind includes; making sure the research does no harm to the participants, having a participant's consent, non-invasion of the respondent's privacy and keeping research free from deception (Bryman, 2012, p. 135). I adhered to these principles. Before going out for the fieldwork, I obtained an introduction letter from MF Norwegian School of Theology (this letter has been included in the appendix pages) which I used to introduce myself to the Diocesan Secretary who in turn gave me a go ahead to meet the persons of my interest.

In addition, I had to introduce myself and my topic well to all the respondents. I got the consent of every respondents and made them aware that the interviews will be recorded just to help me make a reference to as I may not effectively make note of everything. I also assured them that this interview will be strictly used for this study and by no means be used for any other purposes. Furthermore, although none of the informants asked to be kept anonymous, I have decided to keep their identity secret in the data presentation and analysis. This is in line with Silverman's argument that "such protection is required even when, ... we are not dealing with matters that seem, on the face of things, to be particularly delicate or intimate" (Silverman, 2011, p. 94) and it ensures a "mutual trust between researcher and people studied" (ibid, p. 97). This research has been designed in a manner that it doesn't cause any harm to the participants. All the ethical principles of a social research have been considered in this study.

5.0. DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

5.1. Introduction

This chapter organizes the data which I have gathered through qualitative interviews and presents it into themes which were arrived at through coding of the data. The major themes presented here are; Theoretical understanding of human rights, human rights and the African values, Christianity and human rights and some challenges to human rights. I begin by the theoretical understanding of human rights.

5.2. Theoretical understanding of human rights

This section is an analysis of the theoretical understanding of the respondents of human rights. The definition of human rights, scope of human rights and universality of human rights respectively are discussed by the respondents.

5.2.1. Defining of human rights

Respondents have got somewhat similar views on the understanding of human rights. Human rights are “privileges or rights that are deserved by anyone, rights that rightly belong to people” (Lay 1). And Lay 3, a ‘Christian lawyer’ says; “Human rights are God given privileges that are given to every human being by virtue of being human. They are unalienable” (Lay 3).

Lay 4 comments that; “Human rights is a way to speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. It is a way of giving privilege for one to receive justice that is due to himself” (Lay 4). Human rights are “things an individual is entitled to as a human being” (Lay 5). And Lay 2 defines human right as, “precepts human beings make or agree to use as a precaution in a series of sound decision made in a society and trying to balance it with laws and constitutional reforms.”

Meanwhile Clergy A says, human right is the “right to live as a person, freedom to move and to ... stand and express myself in certain situations as I feel it should happen” and “when I see some of the things going wrong in my community, in my nation, I have the right to speak and say this is not right, this is wrong” (Clergy A).

Human rights are “privileges every human being has to live a dignified life, to be respected by all” (Clergy C). Similarly, Clergy E says human rights is “giving freedom and dignity that human beings deserve. Honouring human beings as human beings” (Clergy E).

In other words, Clergy B explains human right as “the right to receive services [which are due to them]” (Clergy B). Relatedly, another clergy refers to human rights as “what everybody is entitled to as long as he is human, no matter the race, no matter the colour, no matter the religion, even if you are educated or not as long you have life” (Clergy D).

5.2.2. Scope of human rights (the unborn and the dead)

Clergy D argues that human rights should equally be extended to the unborn and the dead. To him the unborn has right to the womb and in case of still birth, they deserve a decent burial. Human rights should apply “even to the unborn, as long as life has started. That’s why culturally even a prematurely born baby deserves a decent burial in my culture, and they also have a right to the womb” (Clergy D). He adds that, “from my cultural perspective, life begins from conception, once conception has taken place, life starts until you die.”

Concerning the dead, he says, “even the dead ones have their rights, they have the right to a decent burial, and the right not to disturb their peace while in the grave” (Clergy D). Backing his argument with the Ugandan laws concerning the dead he says, “that’s why it is criminal to disturb them because they have that right [the right to peace while in the grave]” (Clergy D).

5.2.3. Universality of human rights

Some respondents think human rights cannot be universal while others believe it can be. Lay 1 reasons that the different cultures of the different peoples of the world cannot permit the universality of human rights. “People all over the world have different cultures, because of cultural differences attaining the same human rights might be difficult” (Lay 1). She illustrates her view by saying, “imagine if we are all

told to dress like the Arabs what would the Americans do? So, the cultural shock cannot allow us to have same human rights.”

Lay 2 has a dual view. To him, human rights can be universal but there should a global submission to the authority of the Bible. “If all the authority in the globe would understand and use the bible in their constitution, accept godly principles in constitutional amendment and eradicate reforms that compromise Christian cores”, then human rights can be universal argues Lay 2. He however says that human rights “can’t vent as universal when it is imposed on a certain society with the intent to deprive a targeted group... so if human rights are not geared towards mediocre, it doesn’t matter in which part of the world that we live in, it is the same.”

In a similar view, Lay 4 partly agrees with the universality of human rights if it is not imposed on others. He argues;

I agree with universal rights but not to force some which we don’t like. Only if they would make Africans to choose what they think is good for them. Because what is good for Europeans may not be good for us. That’s why it is said one man’s meat is another’s poison. Much of these rights come from Europe and America, and what is good for them may not be good for Africa (Lay 4).

According to Lay 5, human rights can be universal because “despite belonging to different races, languages, and cultures, we belong to one human race, descended from Adam and Eve” (Lay 5). Alluding to the Christian scriptures that in Christ there is no Jew, Greek, Barbarian etc. Lay 5 believes that humanity can be guided by a universal moral standard – human rights.

Clergy D thinks that human rights shouldn’t be universal, they should rather be culture context. He explains,

So that if you know in Africa, marriage is between a man and a woman, it should be written that in Africa it is like this, in Asia this is the position, in Japan, this is the position. So, human rights must ensure

that all communities have their cultures captured so that they know that when you are talking about Africa, this is their stand (Clergy D).

He further reasons that human rights in its current form is good for the West, “this current one (human rights) at most is good for the west, if it is to be universal, it should be re-written... human rights is a wide issue but it is never universal at its best.”

Like clergy D, clergy B also disregards universality of human rights. “I don’t believe in universal human rights because all cultures are different. You know, all cultures have their norm” (Clergy B).

5.3. African values versus human rights

There is a mixed view from the respondents on the relationship between African values and human rights, with others saying human rights are compatible with African values while others saying it is not. Still, some think it is partly compatible and partly incompatible. For instance, Lay 1 says that some human rights are compatible with human rights while others are not.

For example, choice of a marriage partner in our African setting, a man cannot marry a man and woman cannot marry a woman. It’s an abomination but I hear human rights activists saying it’s okay because it’s a human right to make choice of a marriage partner [including the choice of a same sex partner]” (Lay 1).

Upon a further inquiry into the human rights which are compatible with African values, Lay 1 denies compatibility of African values with human rights, she remarks, “Our African values are not really compatible with some of the human rights and I would choose African values over human rights.”

On his part, Lay 2 believes human rights are not necessarily Western values and disagrees that they are incompatible with African values. He comments; “the idea that human rights are Western culture is wrong and a misguidance if Africans use the bible to resent what they see in such rights which they are subscribed to.” He

therefore suggests that any resentment towards human rights must be its falling short of biblical values even if they come as though Western values; "So if Western values are to be rejected, it should be compared to the mind of God which is the Bible."

Lay 2 further decries that no culture stands pure, referring to the scriptures, he says "for all have sinned and have fallen short of the glory of God." To him, since all have sinned, all cultures including that of Africa and individuals are corrupted hence any human effort to correct this shortfall must begin with repentance and acknowledgement of God.

If we sin, we repent and change, this gives sense of humor, accountability, responsibility and protection which is lacking in Africa. This must be corrected, and the societal values [upheld] and never reprisal of individuals. Africa should have a place for accepting, accounting, perceiving which should start with God or Allah (Lay 2).

He stresses the importance of beginning accountability and perception with God by saying; "absolutely, we have to begin with God and end with Him" asking African leaders to be servants of the people like the men of the bible such as David, Zedekiah, Joseph, Nehemiah etc.

Per Lay 4, certain human rights are compatible with African values while others are not. He argues with examples;

Others are good, for example human rights that are geared towards justice. For example, recently I see the police putting flyers in public vehicles that police bond is free, those are good things, people need to know such rights. The negative ones are like you tell me not to punish my own child for doing wrong, and for example a man wanting to marry a man and they want them to be wedded in the church, that even is very abominable in our African culture despite the Christian values we have now appreciated (Lay 4).

Additionally, Lay 4 largely sees human rights as values coming from the other side (the West) to spoil African children.

Even before Africans embraced Christian values they had their values to bring up people in the right way. The community had their way of life, they had their justices through their dos and don'ts. But now because of the human rights that have come from the other side of the world, every time people say it is my right. Now young girls can walk naked, but you go and tell them, they will reply it is their right. They say it is my right, if I want to put on a pant and walk around. That is the negative impact human rights has brought us, spoiling our children. Now children are falling apart from their families and communities (Lay 4).

He summarily says; "Certain human rights are good and are right things. Some of the human rights are good, but we Africans perceive it in the wrong way as such we use it to do what is wrong." He continues; "But some of them are not well, they don't fit with us" (Lay 4).

Lay 3 sees a relationship between human rights and African values, she says; "Many of our African cultures don't advocate for unfair treatment. But rather treatment with dignity" (Lay 3). She however adds that;

Though I know some of our cultural practices are discriminatory especially against women and thus conflicting with basic principles of human rights. Especially harmful practices like early marriages, female genital mutilation, widow inheritance etc. But that's not to say they're clustered (Lay 3).

Likewise, Lay 5 reasons that human rights can be compatible to African values. "African culture is very protective of life. You cannot just at will kill somebody. It is prohibited. This is the greatest human right ever, the right to life." He adds that "there is a kind respect accorded to every human being in Africa" which is the main goal of human rights.

On her part, clergy A highly esteems African values, she says, "You see some African values are very important, they are good, there are some of them which are really very good" (clergy A). However, she also acknowledges that some African practices aren't to be admired, saying that such should be dropped; "there are some of them [African values] which are not good, but the good ones we must encourage, the bad ones we have to leave." In her appreciation of African values, she cites the respect African women gives to their husbands which is being lost due to human right teachings through women emancipation. She laments,

Women are being trained or being taught to respect their husbands, to love them and to stay with them and that's what we are. But when you find this human right come and tell women, if the man has done this or that to you, pack your luggage and go. That you have the right to leave him, when you have money, the man cannot rule you, your money can help you (Clergy A).

She condemns the manner of advocacy by some women's right activists. Quoting one of them having said that "it is your right as a woman, when a man beats you pack your things and leave the man." She further condemns the right to work for women which makes some women work several miles away from their family which usually results into infidelity and breakage of marriages. Clergy A strongly sees that the advancement of women's right in Africa as something foreign and dangerous to marriages. She comments, "All these is because of these rights they have brought for us here in Africa which is now spoiling many marriages."

On the contrary, clergy B condemns the egocentric life of many Africans, saying it is a cause for some of Africa's problems. He urges Africans to leave egocentrism and work towards human rights, "the biggest problem in Africa is people are self-centered, everybody wants to do things for their own satisfaction. People do not see that other people need their support and yet Africans need to work towards human rights" (Clergy B). He continues saying,

We need to further and take away that kind of self-centered kind of life and then we [show] care, you know it is all about care for one another. That is why sometimes the Western World look at us the so needy people and they come for our rescue yet even within us here we could do something only if we take away self-centeredness... we need to maintain and sustain the right of other people.

Despite this tough condemnation of the self-centered life of many Africans, clergy B recognizes and appreciates the communal living in Africa which some people claim is a stumbling block to the advancement of human rights in Africa. He says, "the communal style of living in Africa is very good because there is that attachment in your heart for somebody and following that the lining of the relatives and the dependents are always kept" (Clergy B).

Recalling a statement reflecting the communal living in Africa by John S. Mbiti, "I am because we are, and since we are I am" clergy C equally appreciates the communal living in Africa. He says, "in Africa, an individual finds a meaning in the community and the community will not be without the individual" (Clergy C).

He argues that human rights have often sought to protect the individual's right without considering the communal values which have been upheld for years in Africa. "How can you promote a right of an individual which contradicts the values of the community in which the individual dwells?" asks clergy C. Meanwhile lay 1 is convinced that societal roles cater for the individuals in the society. According to her, at most; "societal roles [values and norms] cover the reasonable individual rights." She goes on to say, "I also believe all rights should lead to the good of the society. If individual rights are only benefiting an individual and hurting the community I wouldn't approve such rights" (Lay 1).

Clergy B attributes the clash between human rights and the Ubuntu (communal) life in Africa to the approach used in introducing human rights to African communities. He cites the communal discipline of children in Africa where any member of the community can discipline a child found doing wrong. Quoting a common saying

that “In Africa it takes the whole village to raise a child,” clergy B condemns the human rights doctrine which bars people from disciplining children by canning. He says that canning as a way of discipline was acceptable in African communities

But when the issue of the abuse of the right of the children or the children’s rights came over, some people perceive it in the wrong way, that if you touch [cane] this child, they will arrest you and people started leaving their children to grow like that [without enforcing discipline on them] (Clergy B).

He however acknowledges that some parents torture their children instead of canning for discipline. “Of course, there are some people who beat their children terribly and you find there are scares all over and children die you know, a lot of depression in the life of these children which is very bad” comments clergy B.

Further, clergy B also sees that sometimes-human rights enforcers tend to suppress communities by forcing certain rights on people instead of helping people appreciate and embrace it. He emphasizes, “the problem is not human rights but the approach, because if you make me to understand very well what you want me to do other than suppressing me so that you lift one side, this person will fail to understand for good” (Clergy B). He is optimistic that “there are ways of making this work well”, only if the approach of bringing human rights to the African people is revisited.

Additionally, there is also an indication that human rights are seen to be Western way of life and not a universal norm. In his condemnation of human rights in protecting children from being canned, clergy B attributes the non-canning culture to the Western World. He attributes the widespread indiscipline in young people in Africa today to laws that bars parents to discipline children through canning by saying; “and therefore in this generation, people have gone astray. Now I could call this departure from the African way of life and now they are living the Western way of life of which the two are not matching” (Clergy B).

According to clergy D, human rights to some extent is compatible to African culture because;

One, humans or people are protected by their culture because the culture prescribes dos and don'ts, that means it is protecting the right to your existence, the right to your gender or who you are. Number two, culture also protects the human life, ... And then three, culture also helps us to know how to protect each other, and respect each other such that we don't go beyond what culture has prescribed. In a way, our African culture prescribes respect each person deserves... so the issue of human rights in African cultures are not written but prescribed in our cultural norms, practices and values (Clergy D).

And viewed in another lens, there are some human rights which don't share a page with African values says clergy D.

For example, people have been talking about human rights violation, if my culture says homosexuality is not permissible and is punishable by death or by whatever action and the West looks at that as a human right violation, that contradicts our values (Clergy D).

Clergy E at first condemns African cultures in the favor of human rights. "I don't see them [human rights and Africa values] walking together because in Africa, African values, their culture sometimes violates the rights of other people" says Clergy E. he gives an example, "in my culture, women as being regarded as lesser being... some of the cultures neglect some people like women, because many times, their views are not taken" laments Clergy E.

He further says that; "On the other hand, human rights fit African values because those are rights that are general to everybody since it gives equal treatment to everyone in the community" (Clergy E). He concludes by saying that, "I don't see the bad part of human rights in relation to African culture."

Clergy E wasn't aware that the international human rights bodies are advocating for gay marriages, after making it known to him he then condemns human rights by saying that;

Spiritually, I have problems, and culturally, it violates, that is where I see that part of human right violating African culture, otherwise in Africa, a man and a man cannot marry. I don't support that then, I thought it was a problem of America only.

He continues; "spiritually, it is against the will of God who created man and woman. Then culturally, it violates moral values, because morals are very important part of our society. Accepting such things brings moral degeneration" (Clergy E).

5.4. Human rights versus Christian values

Speaking about human rights and Christian teachings, values and norms; some of the interviewees seem ignorant about the relationship between the two. For instance, one commented, "Am not sure there is a relationship between the two [human rights and Christianity] but what am sure is they both have a common goal of living in harmony and peace" (Lay 1). Lay 3 says that "The 10 commandments are the bedrock of human rights."

Lay 2 sees no problem with Christians to accept human rights only if the human rights are not in violation of the bible. He emphasizes;

The bible is always very clear, encouraging Christians to submit to authority, but when human rights are in violation of these [biblical] principles for example, legalize abortion, gay marriage, animals-humans sex [bestiality] etc. ... are never to be seen as church value and must never be condoned (Lay 2).

"Christian values would best illuminate human rights only if it was utilized, unfortunately; majority human rights making persons distance themselves from religious values including Christianity" comments Lay 5.

However, clergy B believes human rights and Christian ethics, teachings and morals are in some cases incompatible. He looks at the bible and not human rights as the manual book for Christians. Clergy B reasons that,

The bible is our [Christians] manual in our lives the way we have manuals for machines [like] the computers, it tells you to connect this point to that point and it works. The same thing is with the bible, for me I call the bible our manual.”

Clergy A has no different view in seeing the bible as a Christian’s manual like clergy B does. She maintains that Christians are to “depend on the scripture, what the scripture tells me is what I do.” In her view, embracing human rights at the expense of the scripture is rejecting the authority of God the creator. She explains, “But [it is terrible] if I am out of the scripture and I now embrace human rights fully and don’t even respect the authority of the bible, the authority of the creator” (Clergy A).

She emphatically says that human rights shouldn’t be exercised independently of God because “when you are out of God, you are out of scene, you are completely out, and your leader is the devil if you don’t follow the authority of the bible.” She firmly reiterates by saying that, “so when human rights speak of things which do not agree with the scripture, I will not agree with it.”

Clergy B believes that the problem with mankind which has created room for the emergence of human rights is man’s evasion from God. Quoting Ephesians 6:1-3 which reads,

Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. “Honor your father and mother” – which is the first commandment with a promise – “so that it may go well with you and that you may enjoy long life on the earth (Ephesians 6:1-3, NIV).

He argues that if the commands of the bible are followed to every letter, there would be no room for the abuse of the rights of anyone. Per him, if such biblical commands are adhered to, then “there is no way I [parents] cannot keep you [children], care for you, watch you, and support you, so there will be no human rights issue because all have been taken care of in the bible” (Clergy B). He continues to emphasize that by introducing more rights, we are creating more problems;

In Christianity, we have the basis. The only biggest problem is now people do not follow God's command. People deviate, people are separated [from God], people are apart from God's word, that's where the biggest problem is. So, in Christian life I feel if everybody, if a child of God could depend on God, there will be no abuse. You know, ... the more we create issues [human rights], the more problematic it becomes. When you remain obedient to the scriptures, there will be no room for human rights because the bible is sufficient.

Equally, according to Clergy C "the value attached to life in the Bible – man being made in the image of God presupposes that Christianity promotes life." To him, commands like, "you shall not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not covet your neighbor's wife or property, you shall not steal are human rights in biblical language" (Clergy C).

Clergy E sees a thin agreement between human rights and Christian values. "The bible and human rights can agree to a lesser extent but not to a greater extent because human rights are human thoughts to see what is right from human perspective" comments Clergy E. He says that what man sees right may not be right in the eyes of God;

Sometimes in human rights, humans in their thinking may see something as right but it isn't from the view of God and that is where I see human rights does not to a greater extent walk with the bible. If we listed down all the human rights they have come up with and compare it with biblical views, we will find that much of it doesn't agree (Clergy E).

For clergy D, Jesus' principle of 'do to others what you would them do to you' brings human rights into play in the Christian faith.

For Christians, Jesus has summarized it all, do to others what you would them do to you. That means that is what Jesus is saying is human rights, because if you do to a person what you would them do

to you, [you observe human dignity]. But if that good I do to others is not good to me, then it contradicts our being as people who should have one thought, one mind (Clergy D).

The bible and culture but not human rights should influence Christian practices believes Clergy D. "To me, number one, the bible is the word of God which we should use. Number two, cultures must be in but filtered and then our practices must be influenced by these two" (Clergy D). His emphasizes contends that human rights must address the issue of faith and culture;

The human rights thing is made by humanists, who don't want provisions for an idea of God because they don't have an idea of God. They are brought up in the idea that there is no God, that is why they didn't want to include it [God] in the human rights thing. If human rights is going to be human rights, it must address the issue of faith and culture so that you don't brush off somebody because our values are due to our culture (Clergy D).

Lay 3 admits that the human rights – Christian values conflicts, as a lawyer she comments;

Well the confines of human rights maybe wide to include normally that clash with Christian principles such as the rights and liberties related to sexual orientation or reproductive health. This has overtime proved a challenge for many Christians practicing human rights (Lay 3).

And Lay 4 sees human rights and Christian values in conflict; "they are conflicting because the human rights promote what is not right with biblical values" (Lay 4). He goes on to say; "For me what I will agree with are those things which fit our African values and the biblical teachings, but anything contrary to that, I cannot accept."

Without doubt, the respondents see some human rights in contradiction to the scriptures and they unanimously suggest that such rights ought to be rejected by Christians. Such rights which contradict with the bible includes, homosexual

relationships, the right to the choice of one's sex and gender, the right to sex education to juveniles, freedom of assembly which might cause disharmony among others. Here is how they reacted to these rights;

5.4.1. Sex education to juveniles

One is bitter about the program of sex education being engineered by UNICEF for students in primary schools saying it contravenes the scriptures and may expose the children to risky sexual behaviors. According to him it is only "the work of parents to uplift their children to understand this [sexual education] but when you bring it as a program to schools... for us we say it is another way of increasing Sexually Transmitted Diseases" (Clergy B). He argues that,

Once a child begins to learn on sexuality at that [early] age, by the time they reach the age of fifteen they are very active, they are sensitive, they want to know what is it all about. Then the issues of child abuse, early pregnancy increases in girls, there is also HIV increase because that kind of understanding is already there in their lives. Which to me, these activists are wrong in that context.

5.4.2. Homosexuality

Lay 3 sees the practice of homosexuality morally wrong from her Christian perspective, she says; "we must stick to the moral question but however be careful not to impose this on others. I often pray for God's grace not to judge clients based on their orientation. But do what is humanly possible to help them while counselling them" (Lay 3).

"From the word go, God's intent for sex and marriage is that it should be practiced between opposite sex. That is why he created them male and female" states Lay 5.

"Until now, I cannot imagine a man going in for a man, a woman going in for a woman; even animals hardly do that" he adds.

Furthermore, clergy B sees gay (homosexual) marriages as one right which though is being promoted by rights bodies, it contravenes the Christian scriptures. "Gay

marriage is totally against the word of God. They say it is their right to choose which sex they should have [marry]. And then a man can marry a man, and yet biblically it is wrong” decries clergy B.

Referring to Genesis chapter two, he advances that when Adam was lonely, God created him an opposite sex helper. “God says it is not right for a man to be alone, and let me create for him a helper suitable for him ok! And that is where God created a woman, he never created a man.” He adds that “the issue of Gay marriage, gay rights, that’s not a right, that’s not a human right, that’s an abuse of human right instead which I strongly oppose and I strongly condemn it.”

Clergy B prides in the Archbishop of the Church of Uganda, Stanley Ntagali’s protest during primates meeting in 2016 in London when he walked out of the meeting room because those who supported homosexuality were entertained in the meeting. Clergy B says, “And he [the archbishop] made a history, he walked out of the meeting and he said, we as Africans, we as Ugandans, we cannot be part of this.” As Kampala Diocese, “we have a very strong position against the gay, the lesbian, and all these... we don’t support it, we preach against it” (Clergy B).

Similarly, Lay 1 refers to Homosexuality “a sin, an abomination.” She defends her argument by saying;

When God created man in the beginning he said he was beautiful but alone. Given the work he had given him, he said I will make him a helper and he took the man’s rib and made a woman. He could have created another man but made a woman. It was by no accident that he created a woman, he is the master planner, he knew a woman would help a man fulfil the work he has given him of multiplying and subduing the earth (Lay 1).

Referring to Leviticus 18, Lay 2 agrees that homosexuality is an unlawful sexual orientation. He says, “Lev. 18 explains in detail about unlawful sexual orientation, including incest, animals-humans sex, same sex, etc.” He says, “if Christians are silent, the world gets misleading information consumed. So, Christians must do

selfless preaching of God's word" to correct the unbiblical views being promoted. He stresses that "the church must not backstage and be shunned by the worldly laws and rights which can harm them deeply."

"God punished the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah for that cause (homosexuality)" believes Lay 4. He stresses that; "Now, if the creator didn't mean that way, then what use is that one there? The major reason for creation of sex is procreation, so how can a man and a man procreate?" asked Lay 4. He attributes these practices to the devil's creation; "That's why I say, some of these things are being brought by the devil, he wants to spoil people's relationship with God" (Lay 4).

Clergy A speaking on the position of the Diocese, says, Kampala Diocese "does not accept [homosexuality], even the Province of the Church of Uganda don't accept, even me personally I don't accept." She expressed her disappointment at the 1988 Lambeth Conference which attempted to pass homosexuality while rejecting the ordination of women. "I got disappointed, ... they were discussing homosexuality and ordination of women, to pass homosexuality and leave [out] ordination of women." She was however happy that the latter was passed and homosexuality dropped.

Clergy E speaks of his view on homosexuality;

Our diocese (Kampala Diocese) allows any man or woman to marry a woman or man respectively of their choice. But they shouldn't choose to marry same sex. Should there be people who choose otherwise and they want the church to do as they wish, then they also violate the rights of the church. If such come to me, I will guide them on the intention of God for men and women, I will not violate their right but set them free but not compromise what the bible says which is what the church stands on (Clergy E).

Similarly, Clergy D says, "Our (Diocese of Kampala) position is, number one it is evil, number two, it contradicts God's plan for humanity. And number three, it is not human. And because the bible says it is evil, we call it evil." He adds; "that is why

our weddings are for men who are male and for women who are female, anything less than that, we reject” (Clergy D).

5.4.3. Human sexuality

Lay 2 defined human sexuality as “being either male or female” and says that to be male or female, “its God who predetermines it.” She has an unkind word for those who prefer a different sex from that given by nature (God); “it is madness of the highest order, unfortunately some don’t believe in God but they should understand that there is the highest authority, God who is supreme.” She continues to argue that, “if you have both [male and female] hormones, then one must be stronger than the other meaning that by the time you have male physical appearance then the male hormones dominate your body so you are a male period.”

Clergy A has a similar view saying that;

You don’t decide [your sex and gender], you are a born as a man, you found yourself as a man, I am born a woman, I have not decided. I have not decided of my height, I have not decided of my colour, I cannot not decide the family I come from, the tribe I come from I cannot decide. I found myself in that tribe, I found myself in that colour, I found myself a woman, those things you cannot reverse them (Clergy A).

Clergy B holds no different view from Clergy A and Lay 1, he says, “On this issue of gender, no one will ever decide his gender.” He argues that neither individuals nor parents can determine sex and gender. He confesses that;

I have seen many people who have gone for surgery, they want to change themselves to be a man or a woman that is impossible. They try, but they work against God’s will (Clergy B).

He goes on to even condemn parents who have a special preference to one sex,

There are also people in marriage who say they need a baby boy or girl, they fight for it, they struggle for it, but it is not your own making. I

think it is in Proverbs where they tell us that men go sleep and they don't know the result, it is God who decides this to be, that to be (Clergy B).

Clergy B refutes the actions of "people who think they can change (sex), and then people who think they can make."

"I don't agree with those who want to change their gender" this is "because you don't know why God made you that way, he created you well. Why do you want to go the other way?" (Lay 4). Again, he gives an example; "There was a man in Kampala who had three daughters and wondered who will inherit his wealth because he had no son. So, he had to make one of the daughters take a male gender in order to become the heir." Lay 4 condemns this act.

In the same way, Clergy E says one's sex is God's creation not man's. "I think what makes a man or woman is first the design God has for men and women, that can easily tell this is a man and this is a woman. And, their behaviors are different." He maintains that sex must be expressed in marriage and between opposite sexes; "Culturally, sex is honored in marriage, that's why fornicators and adulterers are punished. That is the same view of the bible. And this is where both cultures and bible allows sex only in marriage, and must be strictly between a man and woman" Clergy E argues.

On the expression of human sexuality, Clergy D believes that "sex is not merely for pleasure, it is to produce results. In Africa sex is for procreation, sex is for enjoyment, sex is for pleasure. So, the church looks at sex as a good thing so long as it is correctly directed." He condemns using sex for enslavement, weapon of war and for transaction "some use sex for business which actually is not acceptable, sex has been used for enslavement which is wrong, sex has been used as punishment for example in guerilla war, but all these are wrong" (Clergy D).

5.4.4. The right of the intersex

Those born with both sexes have the right to choose one sex, says Lay 4. He illustrates his argument with an example;

Intersex persons have a right to choose, because something happened in one of the church a couple was wedded. But after some time, the man kept coming back to the minister, he realized that his wife was hermaphrodite (an intersex) with two sexes. In that case, I would advise such to choose a single sex and live by it and if possible have it [surgically] corrected than trying to live the two sexes and causing such a problem (Lay 4).

5.4.5. The right to abortion

Clergy D strongly condemns a woman's right to abortion. "A woman does not have the right to abort because the child has the right to live in the womb. Terminating such will deny them life, yet they could become president, legislature, priests etc." (Clergy D). He adds that; "usually a human being is known after he has grown up. But that's not fair, supposed you were aborted will you come for research here?" asked clergy D. "That's why Job says you saw me from my conception" (Clergy D). Arguing that God knows one right from conception not after birth.

5.4.6. Punishment of children

Punishing children for discipline purpose is right, argues Lay 4. "The children's right, yes, if you talk about children's right to education, to medical care, those are good. But to protect children from being disciplined, to not cane children isn't right. Because I am who I am because I was canned" explains Lay 4. Adding that; "in Africa we believe in disciplining children, the bible even says spare the rod, spoil the child."

Punishing a child including the use of lashes of the cane is acceptable argues Clergy D. He condemns children's right "where they say the child has the right to do anything and you shouldn't discipline [by canes]. So when such rights of this nature

came here, it has made the children complacent and you cannot now correct a child” laments Clergy D. “In our culture, discipline is very key” (Clergy D).

5.5. Challenge to human rights

The respondents in various ways put forth some specific challenges to human rights as below;

5.5.1. God and his word alone should be the standard for human regulation

Lay 1 challenges human rights to consider the Bible as a manual for human living. She explains;

I would also challenge them in this way, if an inventor invents something and you the user fails to use it, the best thing to do is to go back to the instruction manual. We have one called the Bible. If apple made an iPhone and you fail to use it, you don’t go to anyone else, you check its instruction manual (Lay 1).

“Where does mankind end without being directed by God’s word?” asked clergy C. “If mankind is to frame up an excellent human right, it must first consider God’s word which is light and lamp to our being” adds Clergy C. “Man is lost without God, man is at a mess without regarding God’s word” Clergy C concludes.

While Lay 2 equally recommends that “the Bible to be what will be a final standard” to all leaders including those dealing with the framing of human rights. “It’s not that some of these rights are wrong, but are disoriented with the word of God” adds Lay 2. He claims that “the bible has by far been the real words of God our creator and He [God] honors his words, if used as yard stick for formula in curving out human rights” (Lay 2) God’s word is honored. “We must begin with God and end with God” Lay 2 concludes.

Clergy E maintains that whereas it is good that rights should be protected, it shouldn’t conflict with God’s word. “I would stand openly and say that rights of people should be protected, but biblically, there are some behaviors that the bible doesn’t accept” such we shouldn’t promote, argues Clergy E.

“Go back to creation, start from creation. How God created things, how God made people, to multiply” argues Clergy A. “Now these issues we are talking about, a man should marry a man, where does that come from?” she asked.

5.5.2. Natural law admired

Lay 2 believes “setting up naturally acceptable rules” as opposed to positive laws in human rights would be more beneficial. While clergy D observes that “anything that is true in natural law is Christian.”

5.5.3. Contextualize human rights

Clergy B asks for human rights to be contextualized. “Selling the idea to others should make a nation first buy the idea and allow every individual nation to come with specific policies in context” suggests Clergy B. Similarly, Clergy D argues for the contextualization of human rights. “Contextualize human rights according to the people, there are rights which are not good for Africa but are good for the West. Such should not be imposed” (Clergy D). In saying that different peoples have different cultures, both Lay 1 and Clergy B argue against universal human rights, they desire human rights be put in cultural context.

5.5.4. Translate human rights into African local languages

Clergy D wondered why human rights continue to remain in English and not translated into individual local languages in Africa. He would like to know “why the human rights cannot be translated into our local languages so that human rights reach to grassroots” (Clergy D). This according to him will help the local people understand the human rights doctrine very well to make informed decisions on these matters.

5.5.5. Embrace religious values in human rights

The various respondents would like human rights to embrace religious values. Clergy D comments; “Human rights will only be good if our religious values are firmly enshrined, that is what defines us in Africa” (Clergy D). Lay 2 suggests that every human legislation including human rights must “begin with God and end with

him" (Lay 2). To him, a valid human rights doctrine must not exclude God and religion.

5.6. Summary

In this chapter, the qualitative interview data has been analyzed and presented in the major themes of; theoretical understanding of human rights, human rights versus African values, human rights versus Christian values and some challenges the respondents pose to human rights. The next chapter will discuss these themes bringing it in an interaction with the human rights debate in existing literature especially with human rights debates discussed in chapter 3.0.

6.0. DISCUSSION

6.1. Introduction

Chapter five (5) is a full presentation of the data which was collected by qualitative interview. The data had been coded and presented in three major themes; theoretical understanding of human rights, human rights and African values, and human rights and Christian values.

In this chapter (six), I will discuss the findings of the data presented in chapter five in relation to the theories which I had earlier discussed in chapter 4.0 and other relevant literatures. Similarly, I will use the three major themes of; the theoretical understanding of human rights, human rights and African values, and human rights and Christian values the way they have emerged in chapter 5.0 in the discussion.

6.2. Theoretical understanding of human rights

The acceptance or rejection of any concept will largely depend on the manner it has been understood. Although a clear understanding of a concept such as human rights does not guarantee its acceptance, in an environment where there is a skepticism to the doctrine of human rights it is very important to discover how such understand the concept. As such the first part of this discussion relates the understanding of human rights by the interviewees to the way in which human rights have been understood universally. I begin by the definition of human rights.

6.2.1. What is human rights?

Since the birth of human rights in 1948, “there is no precise meaning of the term ‘human rights’” (Haas, 2014, p. 2). There could be as many definitions of human rights as those who have attempted to define it. Key words that have risen from the definitions of the respondents in referring to human rights includes; privileges, entitlements, freedom, justice, dignity, and humanness. Like the Australian Human Rights Commission (ACHR), Clergy A and E emphasizes ‘freedom’ in referring to human rights.

For example, Clergy A mentions that human rights is “freedom to move and to... stand and express myself in certain situations as I feel it should” (Clergy A). Clergy A’s mention of freedom of expression is in line with article 19 of the UDHR; “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers” (UDHR, 1948). Freedom is an essential element of human rights. The first sentence of the preamble to the UDHR highly regards human freedom very important in achieving equity and equality; “Whereas recognition of ... the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom” (UDHR, 1948). The strides that have been made in the advancement of human rights would have been null had human freedom not been recognized.

Like any other right, ones’ freedom isn’t given him by state authorities neither human rights promoting bodies; freedom is inherent and not granted to one by another. Clergy E’s reference to human rights as “giving freedom ... that human beings deserve” is thus paramount. Every human being has been innately endowed with this freedom. States and other authorities only have the mandate to protect and provide an atmosphere for one to express his freedom. Put in biblical terms, one’s freedom is divinely endowed by his creator. Archbishop Tutu passionately observes that to be human is to be free to choose. “The Bible points to the fact that human persons are endowed with freedom to choose. This freedom is constitutive of what it means to be a person – one who has freedom to choose between alternative options, and to choose freely” (Tutu, in Witt and Alexander, 2010, p. 3).

However, AHRC thinks freedom must be limited to those contained in international instruments of human rights. Human rights are “rights and freedoms contained in specific international instruments” (AHRC, 2009). The limits and extent of one’s freedom should hence be guided by these instruments such that one doesn’t express his freedom in a manner that will hurt another or at least outside the legal frameworks of human rights. Whereas this is a plain political truth in the rights language, persons who are conservatively driven by collective morals informed by

either religious beliefs or cultural norms will have a preference to their religious or cultural convictions other than international instruments regarding human freedom.

Consistently, Lay 1, Lay 3, and Clergy C all refer to human rights as privileges that one deserves for being human. Human rights are “privileges ... that are deserved by anyone” (Lay 1), “Human rights are God given privileges that are given to every human being by the virtue of being human (Lay 3). And, human rights are “privileges every human being has to live a dignified life” (Clergy C). All the affirmations made in the 30 article UDHR are privileges that a human being is entitled to. Lay 4 alludes justice in referring to human rights saying human rights “is a way for one to receive justice that is due to himself” (Lay 4). The human rights doctrine will be a total failure if it is robbed of the vital element of justice. Human rights seek to deliver justice to humanity as stated in the UDHR, “the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world” (UDHR, 1948).

Lay 3 makes a reference to God being the giver of the privileges that human rights seek to promote. She argues that God is the creator of humanity and hence these privileges are being endowed by God the creator. Her view that rights are endowed by God isn't far from the view of the founding fathers of the US. In July 4, 1776, the unanimous declaration of the thirteen United States of America equally recognizes the ‘truth’ “that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and pursuit of Happiness” (National Archives, 2017). The UDHR declares that “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood” (UDHR, 1948) acknowledging rights have been endowed but withholds the endower.

Series of theses and arguments regarding the inclusion of God in the human rights doctrine have been laid down. Volumes like *Does Human Rights Need God* and *Does God Need Human Rights* among others have risen because of such arguments. To a religious man like Tutu, human rights cannot be spoken of independent of God because “human life (as all life) is a gift from the gracious and ever-generous Creator

of all” (Tutu, in Witte and Alexander, 2010, p. 2) and this per Tutu is the reason for the inviolability of the human life. “We must therefore have a deep reverence for the sanctity of human life” argues Tutu. Bucar and Barnett asks, “How does God enter into it (human rights)?” (Bucar and Barnett, 2005, p. 3). Although Bucar and Barnett seem to suggest that human rights are human declarations by saying that the claims in human rights “are contained in international declarations and agreements” and not in religious sacred texts, they insist that “the rationale for human rights cannot be adequately analyzed without addressing religious perspectives” (ibid. p. 3). One such religious perspective in Christianity is that God is the creator and probably the endower of these claims or privileges quoted in the human rights instruments.

Martin Palous acknowledges the relationship between humans and the transcendent (God) in stating that “The relation of a person to the transcendent pole beyond his own activities cannot be separated from his relationship to himself, to his own existence in the human world” (Palous, in Bucar and Barnett, 2005, p. 246). He further states that “the bond between man and God is essentially anthropomorphic.” From this perspective, Palous thus underscores that in some sense,

Human rights need God in order to be declared ‘inalienable’; to gain status of a principle that transcends the field of current *Realpolitik* and existing rule of man; to help form a government that accepts the finiteness of human existence or nature and institutionalizes human freedom (ibid, p. 246].

In other words, if human rights are looked at to be purely human invention without any divine attribution, then it falls short of inalienability. It was Peng-chun Chang of China, a member of the draft committee of the UDHR who vehemently advocated for the removal of God in the human rights doctrine. Chang “insisted, in the name of universalism, on the removal of all allusions to nature and God from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights” (United Nations, 2017).

6.2.2. Who is entitled to human rights?

The UDHR clearly accrues the privileges it champions to mankind after birth. This is explicitly implied in article 1; “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood” (UDHR, 1948). However, to some people it is unfair to limit these rights to one in the periods between birth and death. Clergy D argues that both the unborn and the dead are entitled to some sorts of rights. He reasons that life starts from conception and not from birth hence the unborn should equally be protected by certain rights. He argues that the unborn are entitled to life and to the womb their dwelling place. He states that human rights should be applied “even to the unborn, as long as life has started... a prematurely born baby deserves a decent burial in my culture, and they also have a right to the womb” (Clergy D).

This view probably will not be a sweet music in the ears of many human rights activists for two reasons; first, human rights has largely been limited to life that has been born; and second, the right to retain a fetus in the womb is a woman’s right and not the fetus’. As in the view of Haas, human rights are liberties and freedoms which are only possessed “from birth by all persons regardless of race, color, creed, gender, and the like” (Haas, 2014, p. 2). On the other hand, giving a right to the unborn especially right to life and the womb will mean a woman’s liberty to terminate a pregnancy as is being promoted by many human rights advocates will be infringed. Pro-life arguments which draws a big following among many American evangelical Christians and even so in Uganda would like the unborn equally protected.

For example, the Archbishop of the Church of Uganda in his Easter message did not let down his word against abortion. The archbishop refers to abortion as violence against the unborn and warn the government from legalizing abortion. The primate warns; “Some in the government and their NGO-allies would like to legislate violence by legalizing the killing of babies through abortion. A country that legalizes abortion and does not advocate for the lives of the voiceless will be subject to God’s judgment” (Ntagali, 2017). Calling abortion murder, the archbishop continues his campaign against abortion; “I urge our MPs to resist the sweet persuasion of some in

our government and other international voices and to stand up for life! Life for our mothers and life for the unborn. Say “No” to abortion. Abortion is murder.” Such a view will obviously like to see human rights protecting the unborn. They are opposed by pro-choice activists who think a woman has the legal mandate to terminate pregnancy at any stage at her will.

6.2.3. Are human rights universal?

The universality of human rights is a subject that in theory is easily taken than in practice in the view of Clergy D. His reference to human rights as “what everybody is entitled to as long as he is a human, no matter the race, no matter the colour, no matter the religion...” implies human rights are universal. Clergy D seems to have a problem with the current human rights being promoted which in his view is more of Western values than universal human rights. “This current one (human rights) at most is good for the West, if it is to be universal, it should be rewritten...” (Clergy D). Both Clergy B and D, and Lay 1 thinks cultural plurality cannot allow human rights to be universal. Clergy B expresses it this way; “I don’t believe in universal human rights because cultures are different, all cultures have their norm” (Clergy B).

Clergy B, D and Lay 1 looks aggrieved because Western culture which comes in the names of human rights appears to be eroding their highly esteemed African values. Although human rights have been largely welcomed in the West, the closeness between human rights and the Western culture is a subject the deserves attention. Is the human rights project merely an exportation of Western values to the non-Western cultures? The 1948 declaration of human rights makes human rights assume supremacy over all cultures including the Western culture. The UN General Assembly, Proclaimed the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations” (UDHR, 1948) without exception of any culture. The last article of the same (UDHR) affirms that “Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person...” (Article 30, UDHR). This means that in the mind of the United Nations, human rights do not represent any single culture and are to be accepted and promoted by all peoples.

Where else human rights have been regarded as universal, without doubt, it has a Western root and to date, the West have much share in influencing human rights than the rest of the world. Nathan Clemens (2009) carries the view that human rights is a product of European political thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth century after the 30 years of religious war in the continent which ended in the signing of the Peace of Westphalia. Attempts have been made to trace the philosophical roots of human rights in several other cultures and religions, nevertheless, it is impossible to divorce the origins of human rights from the European Enlightenment. Further, the rights doctrines have first been explicitly expressed in legal documents of Western states. In tracing sources of rights, Haas (2014) identifies the 1776 American Declaration of Independence, the 1789 French National Assembly's Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. These are early documents which explicitly speaks of rights and are typically from the West. These perhaps makes one easily admit that the human rights doctrine is being driven by the Western worldview.

What worldview then should drive human rights? In speaking about the relevance of human rights, Henriksen argues that human rights should not be driven by a worldview or religion. He writes; "these instruments [human rights] may be used to eliminate injustices arising from determining social or political issues from the perspective of a particular religion or worldview" (Henriksen, in Prove & Smetters, 2006, p. 80). However, Lay 2 believes that for human rights to be universal, it must be inspired by the authority of the Bible, believing that "if all the authority in the globe would understand and use the bible in their constitution, accept godly principles in constitutional amendment and eradicate reforms that compromise Christian cores" (Lay 2), it then produces better human rights.

Putting the authority of the bible above human rights as suggested by Lay 2 would mean that human rights must be driven by one worldview or by worldviews that are inspired by the bible namely; Judaism and Christianity. Newlands' view that "religious discourse of different sorts will have to be understood, assessed and taken in the [formulation and] practical implementation of human rights" (Newlands, 2006, p. 173) rather looks more appealing than exalting one worldview over the others in

driving the human rights doctrine. It is also very dangerous for human rights bodies to thrash religious views because “those who share religious beliefs will have a significant role of facilitating both conversation about, and nature of, the appropriate enforcement of rights” (ibid, p. 173).

6.3. Do African values and human rights match?

The breaking of national and regional boundaries by the forces of globalization has brought many cultures together than ever. Cultures with different worldviews now should harmoniously live together as such there may be need for a universal moral standard. Just like Christ has brought people of various cultures together into the household of God, Lay 5 believes “despite belonging to different races, languages, and cultures, we belong to one human race, descended from Adam and Eve... humanity can be guided by a universal moral standard – human rights” (Lay 5). Per his view, human rights can provide a moral standard for all cultures – the African culture inclusive. Some respondents distance African values from human rights while others think African values can match with human rights.

6.3.1. Human rights are not African values

In tracing the philosophical basis of human rights from different cultures, not many human rights scholars have followed up the philosophical foundation of human rights from the African culture(s). Haas (2014) for example, traces the philosophical basis of human rights in Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Judaism, Christianity and Islam but makes no reference to African Traditional Religion. He makes a good note on how the philosophies of Socrates (469 – 399 BCE), Aristotle (384 – 322 BCE), Marcus Tullius Cicero (140 – 43 BCE) and other ancient thinkers have contributed to the modern human rights doctrine. He goes on to mention Hugo Grotius, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Thomas Jefferson, Voltaire, Rousseau, James Madison, Immanuel Kant etc. as men in the recent past whose philosophies have highly inspired the modern human rights doctrine. All these are foreign to Africa. Hasn't there been any philosophies rooted in the African culture(s) that has inspired the modern human rights doctrine? If the African culture had been silent (unutilized) in contribution to the human rights doctrine, how then shall we convince the strong

views of Lay 4, Clergy A and Clergy D, and many other Africans who think that human rights are not African values?

The respective statements from these respondents implying that human rights are foreign to Africa are; "...but now because of the human rights that have come from the other side of the world, every time people say it is my right" (Lay 4). While complaining on the dangers of human rights to African families Clergy A said, "... all these is because of these rights they have brought for us here in Africa which is now spoiling many marriages" (Clergy A). Commenting on disciplining of children, Clergy D states; "so when such rights of this nature came here [in Africa], it has made the children complacent and you cannot now correct a child" (Clergy D). These statements audibly drum that human rights are foreign to Africa, that human rights are not African values.

To what extent does the view that human rights are not African values hold water? This view is largely inconsistent with the values of the African culture(s). African philosophy provides a rich heritage as far as human dignity, a core value which human rights seek to protect is concerned. The Ubuntu way of life in the African culture is "one of African approaches of understanding the humanity as a process of building cohesion and humanness when it comes to building peace in our daily life" (Manda, 14.03.2009). Referring to the Zulu saying "'*Umuntu Ngumuntu Ngabantu*', which means that a person is a person through other persons. We affirm our humanity when we acknowledge that of others," Manda re-echoes Mbiti's "I am because we are, and since we are, I am" (Mbiti, 1969, p. 224) an African philosophy of solidarity in which every African recognizes the humanity in the other.

The concept of the respect of human dignity does not but begins with the recognition of the dignity of the other. Nussbaum Barbra highly speaks of Ubuntu in regarding human dignity:

Ubuntu is the capacity in African culture to express compassion, reciprocity, dignity, harmony, and humanity in the interests of building and maintaining community. Ubuntu calls on us to believe and feel

that: Your pain is my pain, my wealth is your wealth, and your salvation is my salvation. In essence, Ubuntu, an Nguni word from South Africa, addresses our interconnectedness, our common humanity, and the responsibility to each other that flows from our connection (Nussbaum, quoted in Manda, 14.03.2009).

Without doubt, the human rights concept of human dignity, and human responsibility to each other is not foreign to Africa, it is the very heart of Ubuntu – the African way of life. This view is partly welcomed by some respondents who do not view human rights as foreign to Africa. For example, Lay 2 opposes it by saying that “the idea that human rights are Western culture is wrong and misguidance” (Lay 2). And Lay 3 sees the respect to human dignity – an important value promoted by human rights in African cultures. See comments; “many of our African cultures do not advocate for unfair treatment. But rather treatment with dignity” (Lay 3), thus implying that the concept of human rights is not foreign to Africa. Similarly Lay 5 says; “African culture is very protective of life. You cannot just at will kill somebody. It is prohibited. This is the greatest human right ever, the right to life” (Lay 5).

Despite its regard for human dignity, the Ubuntu deviates from the Western culture in that it is neither a dogmatic legal system nor is it rigidly ideal as noted by Villa-Vicencio;

The african notion of *ubuntu* is a deeply human, profoundly moral, and passionately compassionate philosophy. It knows neither the dogmatism of the Western legal systems nor the rigidity of many human rights idealists. Its aim is healing, restoration, and reconciliation rather than retribution, revenge, and exclusion (Villa-Vicencio, in Bucar and Barnett, 2005, p. 241).

Furthermore, like many other cultures, the African culture is as much capable of abusing human rights as it can illuminate human rights. In the Ubuntu way of life, love and hate are sides of the same coin, justice and injustice feast at the same table, friendship and enmity coexist. Mbiti notes this paradox by saying;

With this tightly knit corporate society where personal relationships are so intense and so wide, one finds the most paradoxical areas of African life. This corporate type of life makes every member of the community dangerously naked in the sight of other members. It is paradoxically the center of love and hatred, of friendship and enmity, of trust and suspicion, of joy and sorrow, of generous tenderness and bitter jealousies. It is paradoxically the heart of security and insecurity, of building and destroying the individual and the community. Everybody knows everybody else: a person cannot be individualistic, but only corporate. (Mbiti, 1969, p. 209).

The respondents' views on human rights and the African culture can further be put in three sub-themes; human rights are good and right thing, human rights are being miss-perceived by Africans, and societal values other than human rights should be esteemed.

6.3.2. Some human rights are good and right things

The importance of human rights in a democratic and globalized society can but not be under looked. There is yet a continued political, cultural, ideological and religious conflicts throughout the world which if not contained can yield a similar result of dehumanization of man by man as it was during the two world wars and several other genocides in the recent past. As such, Newlands stresses that "human rights matter because they can inspire action to diminish man's inhumanity to man, to discourage the torture, genocide and other manifest evils which remain a continuing and endemic feature of human society" (Newlands, 2006, p. 4). This is a similar affirmation of Lay 4 who said that "certain human rights are good." Although he is not being too general of the entire human rights doctrine, he at least appreciates some clauses of human rights. Lay 4 admires human rights in a way it seeks justice to the oppressed, and the fact that access to education and health to children is being considered a right.

6.3.3. Human rights are being wrongly perceived in Africa

The perception of a subject at hand either delivers its reception or betrays it for rejection regardless of its value. Similarly, it is important that if the human rights project is to make good strides, the manner of its perception by a community plays a vital role. It has been observed by some respondents that human rights have been negatively perceived by some Africans, as such some misuse it which further creates resentment to it by some. In his part appreciation of human rights, Lay 4 observes; “some human rights are good, but we Africans perceive it in the wrong way as such we use it to do what is wrong.” He claims that some young ladies walk near naked saying that it is their right. “Now young girls can walk naked but you go and tell them, they will reply it is my right. They say it is my right, if I want to put on a pant and walk around” (Lay 4).

Clergy B attributes the negative perception of human rights on the approach of introducing human rights in a community. He laments, “but when the issue of human rights came in, the approach was not good” he then gives an example; “for example, beating a child is a way of training a child. When you cane a child, a child will know this is not right thing and at the end of it, the child will be pruned and do the right thing, the child will grow upright” (Clergy B). He wishes that it would be good to teach people of the values of human right other than simply beginning to enforce these values without the people on whom it is being enforced appreciating them.

6.3.4. Esteem African societal values than human rights

The traditional African society embraced values that builds and satisfies the society rather than that which is only pleasurable to the individual. There is a high appreciation of the *Ubuntu* among the respondents than the individualistic culture in human rights which seeks to promote an individual’s values at the expense of the societal values. Lay 1 is convinced that in *Ubuntu*, “societal [values] cover the reasonable individual rights.” She further argues that “all rights should lead to the good of the society. If individual rights are only benefitting an individual and

hurting the community, I wouldn't approve such rights" (Lay 1). Once again, Ubuntu, as referred to by Nussbaum;

Is the capacity in African culture to express compassion, reciprocity, dignity, harmony, and humanity in the interests of building and maintaining community. Ubuntu calls on us to believe and feel that: Your pain is my pain, my wealth is your wealth, and your salvation is my salvation... [ubuntu] addresses our interconnectedness, our common humanity, and the responsibility to each other that flows from our connection (Nussbaum, quoted in Manda, 14.03.2009).

The interest of the spirit of brotherhood in *Ubuntu* as noted by Nussbaum is 'building and maintaining community' and a community that is held together with common values. Promoting an individual's right without regard to societal values can thus be blasphemous to many traditionally conservative Africans. Hence Clergy C's question, "How can you promote a right of an individual which contradicts the values of the community in which the individual dwells?" needs attention. Newlands' argument to inculcate a wider cultural framework in the human rights projects might seem satisfactory to Clergy C's question,

If it [human rights] is to be implemented effectively, it will have to be related to wider cultural frameworks. For some people, this means being embedded in a secular culture, without all traditional divisiveness of religious commitment. For others in many parts of the world, it will mean engagement with religion as an integral part of culture (Newlands, 2006, p. 5).

To many Africans, human rights must be embedded in the *Ubuntu*, here represented in the views of Lay 1, Clergy C, and Clergy B. They seem to be bleeding at heart because individual rights as promoted by human rights is corroding the *Ubuntu* values. If not addressed, such will continue in their resentment to human rights which eventually may affect the effective implementation of human rights.

6.4. Human rights versus Christian values

Christian scholars have reacted differently in accommodating human rights in the Christian tradition. Some do argue that human rights have much been inspired by the Christian scriptures and values. Before presenting his view that human rights are indispensable and fundamental, Wolterstorff discussed four major Protestant views that welcome human rights differently. Some outrightly reject it while others see it indispensable but not fundamental. Similarly, there are three views arising from the respondents in relation to human rights and the Christian tradition; human rights are consistent with Christian values; human rights must be informed by Christian virtues and human rights are incompatible with Christian teachings.

6.4.1. Human rights relate well with Christian teachings

Max Stackhouse a Western Christian scholar argues that “human rights ideas [have been] formulated historically by the Christian biblically based tradition” (Stackhouse, in Bucar and Barnett, 2005, p. 26). Stackhouse argues that if we are to be intellectually honest, we must recognize “the fact that what passes as “secular,” “Western” principles of basic human rights developed nowhere else but out of key strands of biblically rooted religions” (ibid, p. 33). Haas views Jesus of Nazareth, the founder of Christianity a human rights advocate. Such argument therefore find it very hard to divorce the human rights project from the Christian tradition. Likewise, Clergy D sees Jesus’ teachings consistent with the human rights doctrine. He points to the Golden rule set by Jesus “do to others what you would them do to you” a way of respecting and honoring the dignity of the other. Anyone who honors his humanness will seek to be treated humanely, by the Golden rule, such is expected to treat others humanely too.

Relatedly, Lay 3 acknowledges that “the ten commandments are the bedrock of human rights.” These views from the respondents largely welcomes human rights as values which Christians can embrace since they in a way are consistent with scriptures. Peter Prove, a Lutheran scholar goes deeper in his arguments for Christian basis of human rights. He reasons that the *imago Dei* theology that all are created in the image of God provides a basis for Christians to embrace the promotion

of human rights. He further argues that “the very birth, ministry, and death of Jesus Christ is itself the most powerful demonstration of the inherent value that God, through God’s love, invests in humankind” (Prove, in Prove and Smetters, 2006, p. 10).

If human rights have a place in the Christian tradition as such, then the church should promote and defend human rights, argues David Pfrimmer. Pointing to the fact that all have been created in the image of God as a theological foundation for human rights, Pfrimmer argues that “the churches’ work to promote and defend human rights must be seen in the larger context of a ministry of reconciliation where social justice is promoted when our collective relationships falter or fail, as they inevitably will” (Pfrimmer, in Prove and Smetters, 2006, p. 67). Where else these scholars like Pfrimmer, Stackhouse, Haas and others may see human rights presenting values consistent with and having been powered by the teachings of Christianity, some respondents argue that human rights are detached from Christian values and pray for human rights to be inspired by biblical values.

6.4.2. Human rights must be inspired by biblical values

Much as Lay 5 believes human rights could form a universal moral standard, he advocates for Christian values to inspire human rights. “Christian values would best illuminate human rights if it was utilized, unfortunately; majority human rights making [bodies] distance themselves from [Christian values]” (Lay 5). Lay 5’s argument that Christian values could best illuminate human rights clearly shows that he believes in the human rights doctrine, he only longs to see it brightened by biblical values. Newlands would however disagree with Lay 5 that human rights have not been inspired by Christian values. He argues that right from the conception and birth of human rights, “... church voices have played a central role in the genesis of the 1948 UN Charter” (Newlands, 2006, p. 3).

To Lay 5, the church voices which Newlands claims have been central in the genesis of human rights look invisible. It however may be of interest to know whether the church voices that Newlands claims have played a vital role in the birth of the UDHR

were biblically centered voices or simply voices of Christian humanists. And if there has been a central voice of the church in the genesis of the UDHR, does church voices continue to play a central role or is being recognized in the series of human rights conventions after 1948 where many current controversial clauses of human rights have been generated? Broadly, this is similar to John Witte's advocacy for the consideration of religious views and values in the human rights doctrine. Witte notes that;

Religion is an ineradicable condition of human lives and human communities. Religion invariably provide many of the sources and "scales of values" by which many persons and communities govern themselves. Religion inevitably help to define the meanings and measures of shame and regret, restraint and respect, responsibility and restitution... Religions must thus be seen as indispensable allies in the modern struggle for human rights. To exclude them from the struggle is impossible, indeed catastrophic. To include them, by enlisting their unique resources and protecting their unique rights, is vital to enhancing the regime of human rights and to easing some of the worst paradoxes that currently exist (Witte, in Witte and Alexander, 2010, p. 12).

Witte further argues that the repression of religion in the public sphere and governance, including in the academia will not yield much and may not be sustainable because;

Religion will invariably figure in legal and political life – however forcefully the community might seek to repress or deny its value and validity, however cogently the academy might logically bracket it from political and legal calculus. Religion must be dealt with, because [in Africa] it exists – perennially, profoundly, pervasively – in every community. It must be drawn into a constructive alliance with a regime of law, democracy and human rights (ibid, p. 42)

However, some of the respondents see the relegation of church voice in the human rights doctrine, hence argue that human rights are not compatible with biblical/Christian values.

6.4.3. Human rights are incompatible with Christian teachings

There is an eloquent view from the respondents that human rights are incompatible with Christian teachings as such, one clergy respondent says he prefers the bible as his manual than human rights. “The bible is our [Christian] manual in our lives” (Clergy B), Clergy A similarly affirms that Christians should “depend on the scripture” and do what the scripture tells them in preference to human rights especially if human rights promote values inconsistent with the scripture. Clergy A states, “so when human rights speak of things which do not agree with the scripture, I will not agree with it” (Clergy A). A close examination of the 1948 UDHR will show values which are hardly incompatible with Christian values. A lot of debates regarding the human rights doctrine in the Christian tradition surrounds the right to abortion, the LGBTI rights among others even though some Christians are generally dissatisfied of the entire human rights project.

Clergy B views that man’s disobedience to God created a room for the emergence of human rights. Had man remained obedient to God and his word, there would have been no abuse of each other, hence no need for human rights. His view looks consistent with Vigen Guroian’s who argues that since disobedience to God resulted in the fall of man, only obedience to God alone will restore man to God and restore human relationships where each other can be treated with respect. Guroian writes;

Perhaps if we were more obedient to him whom we call Lord, our eyes might return to the kingdom of God, where they belong. And I imagine that if we did that, Christian ethics might better comprehend what is most valuable and worth defending in the modern human rights doctrine – for I am no enemy of human rights – and we might stand a better chance of protecting and improving the lives of our brothers and sisters all over this earth (Guroian, p. 309).

Hence, obedience to God and his word alone is enough because scripture is sufficient argues Clergy C.

More so, human rights have been regarded as human thoughts which is fallible. Clergy E sees this as a reason for the incompatibility between human rights and Christian teachings. He believes that human rights formulated by human beings often may not present views that are necessarily right in God's sight. He is convinced that "If we listed down all the human rights [human beings] have come up with and compare it with biblical views, we will find that much of it doesn't agree" (Clergy E). Clergy E's extreme view correlates with that of Clergy D who says that human rights are ideas of atheist humanists who have no regard for God and hence cannot make biblically compatible rules for human living.

Indeed, human rights is a human view and largely a secular ideology. This has been acknowledged by Reed who however argues that it is not a reason enough for Christian ethics to denounce the human rights doctrine. Reed believes that "the meaning of 'rights' can be understood only with reference to the objective righteousness of God as revealed preeminently in Christ" (Reed, 2007, p. 40). Reed draws a line between the true freedom before God and freedom enshrined in the human rights doctrine. She, unlike Clergies D and E argues that "human rights legislation belongs to human law and secular vocation of the state as God's servant for good until Christ comes again (Rom. 13:4)" (ibid, p. 40). If human rights are merely human thoughts and more so a project of atheist humanists as claimed by Clergy E and D, should Christians withdraw from the human rights project? Being light and salt of the world (Matt. 5:16), Reed is right in observing that Christians have "a role to play alongside, and as an alternative to, secularist theories of human rights rooted in global liberal or utilitarian theorizing" (ibid, p. 42).

6.5. Challenges to human rights

The discontent of many African Christians on some human rights that conflict with Christian values were evidently expressed. Such include; homosexuality and or the LGBTI rights, sex education, abortion, discipline by canning, and abortion among

others. The strong voice against these identified rights presents nothing but the rejection of human rights that are seen to conflict with Christian values. Other challenges to human rights presented in the views of the respondents include; revering the word of God alone but not human rights, following human rights that are true to natural law, putting human rights in context, translation of human rights into the local African languages, stop Western aggressiveness to Africa in the names of human rights. I discuss few of these challenges below notwithstanding the importance of the other challenges I haven't discussed;

6.5.1. Rejection of human rights that conflict with Christian values

African Christians in the Anglican Church of Uganda, Kampala Diocese appear unbent towards political correctness in that there is an outright rejection of human rights that are seen to conflict with Christian values. One such right pertains homosexuality and or the LGBTI rights. During the 2014 legislation against homosexuality in Uganda, majority of the Christians stood in firm support to the *Homosexuality Act 2014*. In Jinja a town East of Kampala, the *Independent* an online magazine has covered an anti-gay protest with the protestors carrying a placard⁷ reading "Homosexuality is as ugly as the Devil. Wicked!" (Independent, 14.03.2014). The message in the placard speaks volumes on how homosexuality is being perceived among Ugandan Christians. These rights (LGBTI) are seen inconsistent with the Christian Scriptures and values, and they are not to be condoned.

Globally, the LGBTI rights has been championed by Norway when it presented a joint statement of 54 UN member states and 18 members of the Human Rights Council on December 1, 2006 in Geneva. There was no single African state among the 54 member states⁸ who produced the joint statement read by Strømme the then Ambassador and permanent representative of Norway to the United Nations. The missing of African states on this list communicates a lot on the general attitude of not

⁷ This is the placard whose image I have placed at the front page of this document, it has been accessed from the *Independent's* web page <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/how-uganda-was-seduced-by-anti-gay-conservative-evangelicals-9193593.html>

⁸ A list of the 54 UN member states that made a joint statement in 2006 proposing the protection of people with the LGBTI orientation can be found here <http://arc-international.net/global-advocacy/sogi-statements/2006-joint-statement/>

only African Christians but Africa in general towards the LGBTI rights. To date, only 96 UN member states have signed the General Assembly on LGBTI rights against 98 who either oppose or have remained silent regarding the LGBTI rights. Therefore, there is no resolution of the UN that has passed the LGBTI rights although the UN is very protective of the gay rights.

This implies that the LGBTI debate is not only being rejected by African Christians. In the Anglican Church, only TEC and some Dioceses in the Anglican Church of Canada have fully embraced the LGBTI. The Church of England, also the mother to the Global Anglican Communion continues to remain in dilemma though it generally has taken a non-discriminatory stand towards the LGBTI community. The binding document to the rejection of the LGBTI rights in the Anglican Communion traces back to the resolution 1.10 of the 1998 Lambeth conference which concluded that homosexual practice is not scriptural. The primate of the Anglican Church of Uganda has never let down his words against homosexual practice, consistently calling it an ungodly practice.

Lay 2 alluded to Leviticus 18 referring to homosexual practice as unlawful; here the Levitical laws condemns a man to have sexual relation with fellow man. "Do not have sexual relations with a man as one does with a woman; that is detestable" (Lev. 18:22). While Lay 4 argues that it is for the very practice of homosexual relations that earned Sodom and Gomorrah eternal damnation. The debate on human sexuality, same sex relations and other related issues concerning the LGBTI rights rarely receives a welcome among African Christians, rejecting it on both cultural and religious basis. And, another view of the respondents which also presents a challenge to human rights is that in matters where human rights are seen to conflict with Christian values and God's word, a preference is made to the latter than the former.

6.5.2. God's word alone, not human rights is the standard

In rejecting human rights that conflict with Christian values and or the word of God, African Christians present a challenge of preferring the scriptures to human rights. The human rights project as declared in the UDHR is "a common standard of

achievement for all peoples and all nations” (UDHR, 1948). However, the view of the respondents shows that some African Christians look unready to sacrifice their highly valued Christian values for human rights. For example, clergy A in her discontent to homosexual practices says; “It is right from creation, go back to creation, start from creation. How God created things, how he made people to multiply. Now these issues we are talking about, a man should marry a man, where does it come?” (Clergy A). It is clear in views like these that the authority of the Christian scripture is preferred to the human rights doctrine. Elsewhere, clergy E thinks it is not worth taking human rights which is man’s creation above the scriptures since human beings are fallible.

The challenge posed by the preference of God’s word to human rights when the two conflict is not to be taken lightly. For Christianity in Africa, especially in Uganda continues to be a strong force in influencing the polity. As noted by Kefa M. Otiso, Conservative Protestantism greatly influences the political landscape of Uganda, and in a country like Uganda where less than one percent of the populace is non-religious, “there is no hardly any separation between the sacred and secular in its everyday life” (Otiso, 2012, p. 1315). This means that the human rights that are seen to conflict with Christian values will not only register rejection at the level of religion but also in legislation. This has been evidenced in Uganda by the passing of the annulled Homosexuality Act 2014 which grossly condemns any homosexual practice. Although international pressures are often used to eliminate such challenges, it often brings a burden on such a religious society and as such, international communities (especially the West) are as seen to be very aggressive and repressive in the names of human rights promotion.

6.5.3. Rejection of universality of human rights

It is also audible that the views of some of the respondents’ state that human rights cannot be universal and if human rights are to be universal it should be re-written since human rights in its present form is not universal. There are two views embedded here; one that completely rejects human rights being universal, this view argues that human rights at its best can only be culture context. While the other view

agrees that human rights can be universal but in its current form, human rights are more of a Western culture than a universal moral standard. Clergy B belongs to the former; he says that human rights cannot be universal “because all cultures are different.” This view is also shared by Lay 1. While clergy D holds both views but largely believes that human rights cannot be universal. He says, “This current one [human rights] at most is good for the West, if it is to be universal, then it should be re-written” (Clergy D).

On the contrary, there seem to be some agreement on the universality of human rights. Like lay 5 who argues that mankind belongs to the same race – humanity, a basis for universal human rights. Peter Prove (2006) roots the universal basis of human rights on the Christian doctrine of the *imago Dei*, that all human beings regardless of ethnicity, race and religion are created in the image of God. Pointing out that although “not all terminology of human rights is not to be found in the biblical texts” (Prove, in Prove and Smetters, 2006, p. 9), human rights ideas rest on the fact that humankind is created in the image of God. The retired archbishop, a Nobel Peace Prize Winner, Tutu of the Anglican Church in the Southern Africa equally shares this view. He campaigned against the discriminatory apartheid regime, calling on all mankind to be treated equally regardless of race, language, color and sex. However, the isolated view that human rights cannot be universal is a big challenge in that such always look at human rights as an exportation of Western culture to the rest, in this case Africa. This therefore raises the need to reconsider a wider philosophical grounding for human rights from the African culture and inclusiveness of wider cultural perspectives in the human rights doctrine.

6.5.4. Challenge to the church

The respondents did also present a couple of challenges to the church; to promote human rights that doesn't conflict with Christian values, and to take a lead in the human rights project. Lay 1 expresses her challenge to the church; “Rights that don't contradict biblical principles, yes the church can promote them.” However, noting that; “The church should stand on what the bible says, not compromising in anyway” (Lay 1). Meanwhile clergy B notes,

The church needs to take the lead in human rights. Many times, we want other people to take lead and remain either to criticize them or correct them. I think the church needs to go ahead and talk about the right of the individual, the rights of human beings. The church needs to go ahead and not wait for anyone to bring issues then begin to oppose, because if the church leads, the world will see and begin to listen. So, I am calling upon the church, who are the follower of Jesus Christ, who are the light of the world to go ahead and lead in advocating. You know we are the voice of the voiceless (Clergy B).

With this view, Clergy B shares Robert A. Seiple's view that "Christianity and human rights provide for, and demand, an underlying foundation that speaks to timeless importance of an importance of human dignity and human rights" (Seiple, in Witte and Alexander, 2010, p. 321). Tutu prides in their lead as the church against the apartheid policy; "I can testify that our own struggle for justice, peace, and equity would have floundered badly had we not been inspired by our Christian faith and assured of the ultimate victory of goodness and truth" (Tutu, in Witte and Alexander, 2010, p. 7). Similarly, Tutu does not only assert that Christians should lead the struggle in human rights but himself and the church in South Africa took a lead to fight against the injustices of the apartheid policy.

Den Norsk Kirken in *Set the oppressed free* affirms her support for the human rights project and is an example of a church that endeavors to lead the struggle in the promotion of human rights regardless of the conflicts with the scriptures. It remains uncertain whether a conservative church like the Anglican Church of Uganda to which clergy B who argues that the church must take a lead in the promotion of human rights belongs is willing to take a lead in the promotion of human rights in its current form where certain rights are seen to conflict with some of her core values and teachings. It will either take the church to compromise and reinterpret some of her core teachings in the light of human rights or compromise and willingness from human rights to absorb some of the values of the church which challenges human rights to bring the two in the same working arena.

6.6. Summary

This chapter has discussed the views of the respondents presented in the last chapter (5.0) in an interaction with the theoretical framework of this thesis. The chapter has been discussed in four main themes; the theoretical understanding of human rights, human rights and African values, human rights and Christianity in the context of Africa, and the challenges of African Christianity to human rights. These themes have been generated from the data presented in the last chapter. In the next chapter, I will make a general conclusion to the thesis as I respond to the main and sub-questions of the study.

7.0. GENERAL CONCLUSION

This research— *The Challenge of African Christianity to Human Rights: Exploring the Response of the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda to Human Rights*, has explored the ambivalence of African Christians to Human Rights. Taking the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda as the case for the study. The study is segmented in seven chapters, below is a recap of the previous six chapters.

7.1. Summary of the previous chapters

The first chapter is a general introduction to the study where the researcher presented his motivation for the study and the topic. A brief reference of the main literatures that has informed the theoretical framework of the study was also presented. The chapter ended with an outline of each chapter of the study.

In chapter two, a general background to the Republic of Uganda, the Anglican COU and the Diocese of Kampala has been discussed. This chapter provided a threefold background of Uganda; the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial Uganda. Here, the modern Uganda is found to have been a colonial creation where several independent kingdoms and chiefdoms have been put under one territory with its headquarters in Buganda kingdom. The name Uganda is basically derived from Buganda - one of the powerful kingdoms that together with other kingdoms and chiefdoms constitute Uganda.

A religious history of Christianity in Uganda and particularly Protestantism and or the Anglican Church was also drawn. It has been seen in this chapter that both the religious and political history of Uganda is wanting in the eyes of the human rights doctrine. It is also seen that although Uganda is a signatory to all the main international conventions on human rights, the state of human rights in the country remains very appalling. Of a great interest to this study in chapter two is an observation by Kefa that Uganda's political landscape is being influenced by a Conservative Protestantism, hence the COU which takes majority of Uganda's Protestant Christians is very influential in the human rights debate in the country.

The theoretical background of this study has been discussed in chapter three. In this chapter the meaning, origin, and the why of human rights has been presented. The theoretical background also took notice of the major international conventions and declarations on human rights. Since this study is in the African context, a section of this chapter covered the African Charter on Human and People's Right also known as the Banjul Charter. Here, it was discovered that although ACHPR has a good paper work, it stands far from achieving her full potential for lack of a human rights court run by ACHPR. A focus was then turned to religion and human rights by first looking at the religious roots of human rights and then Christianity and the human rights debate.

A specific interest has been laid on human rights debate in both early and modern Protestantism. It has been found out that the various strands of Protestantism and individual scholars approaches human rights uniquely. Here, it has been seen that the Anglican Communion suffers disunity and a threat of division because of human rights. The Anglican COU takes a conservative view, out rightly rejecting any rights claim that conflicts with biblical values; one such a right being the LGBT rights.

Chapter four presented the methodology of the research and chapter five is a full presentation of the data (interviews). The data which was collected by a qualitative interview in August 2016 has been transcribed and analyzed. It came out clearly from the data presentation that the human rights doctrine is being welcomed ambivalently in the Diocese of Kampala. The respondents who are African Christians seldom view the human rights doctrine independent of their cultural values. The data reveals an unwillingness among the respondents to compromise their Christian values in context of the African culture in favor of human rights.

In chapter six, the researcher makes a discussion of the main themes of data presented in chapter five. This discussion is a full interaction of the respondents' views, the relevant debates on human rights and Protestantism found in chapter three (theoretical background) and the researcher's views. The discussion also seeks to address the main and sub-research questions raised in chapter 1.4. The main research question being: In what ways is the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican

Church of Uganda challenging the human rights doctrine? The main research question has been served by three other sub-research questions. The following are some of the research findings in response to the research questions.

7.2. Research findings in response to the research questions

The first research question sought to explore the theoretical understanding of human rights. In Chapter 5.2, it is seen that there is a good understanding of human rights by the respondents, and that the Christians in the Diocese of Kampala present their first challenge in their understanding of the human rights doctrine. The universality and scope of human rights is being questioned. With a few voices giving their consent to the universality of human rights, there is a strong voice from the findings against the universality of human rights. However, culture and not the Christian faith is the reason for the rejection of the universality of human rights.

It looked evident that the African Christians treasure their Africanism and often feel betrayed by human rights which is often seen as a replica of the Western culture. There is a perception that Africans are being forced to drop their culture to embrace another culture in disguise of human rights. They therefore advocate for human rights that is culture context or else a reconsideration of the current human rights documents to inculcate all cultures if it is to be universal. Whereas it may be a rather difficult job to draft culturally contextual human rights, the equality and fairness to all promoted in the human rights project should address the superiority of the Western culture in the human rights doctrine.

There is also a question of the scope of human rights; thus, whether human rights should be limited to a period between birth and death. The research reveals a preference for human rights to protect the unborn and even to some extent be accorded to the dead. The two parts of this argument draws inspiration from both cultural and religious convictions of the African Christian in the Diocese of Kampala. The African culture as well as the Christian tradition highly esteems the unborn. In view of the former (African culture) the community is made up of three categories; the unborn, the living and the living dead. In the Christian scripture, references like in Jer. 1:4-5 and Ps. 139:13-16 reveals that God is the creator of the fetus (the unborn),

and that he knows an individual before birth and often predetermines one's mission long before birth. The combination of these two views on the unborn informs the African Christian's high regard for the unborn. As such, many African Christians as reflected in the research are pro-life (against abortion). These views challenge the pro-choice stand of the human rights doctrine that gives a woman liberty to abortion. Regarding the second research question which sought to find out the response of the Christians in the Diocese of Kampala on human rights which conflicts with biblical values, a full view has been presented in chapter 5.4. The research found out that the ambivalence to human rights by African Christians in the Anglican Diocese of Kampala is also seen in their resentment to homosexuality and other human rights which conflict with biblical values. The member states of the UN have not yet unanimously agreed on gay rights despite it being popular in the West and the UN seeks to protect and promote the rights of the LGBTI on the basis on non-discrimination. Resentment to the gay rights comes from majority conservative Christians across the globe and this is true in the COU Diocese of Kampala. Homosexual relations are considered acts against nature – against the sexual order created by God.

The research also reveals that the African Christians in the Anglican Diocese of Kampala esteem sexual relations between two married individuals of the opposite sex. Besides, one's sex and gender are not a matter of choice, they are created by God and changing one's sex or gender is equally seen to be against God's order of creation. The research also found that in the Global Anglican Communion, homosexuality is rejected in the resolution 1.10 of the 1998 Lambeth Conference. Hence any sexual orientation that the Christians in the Diocese of Kampala consider against God's intended order of human sexuality are rejected regardless of such having the approval by the human rights doctrine.

On a positive note, the research has found out an appreciation of human rights which do not conflict with biblical values by African Christians in the Diocese of Kampala. Although human rights that conflict with biblical values are being rejected and seen to be evil, there is a nod given to human rights that don't conflict with biblical values.

And it is not a mere appreciation but also an approval that the church can promote such rights. This means that the human rights doctrine is not totally rejected, demonized and thrashed. The research also reveals the church's high esteem of the Christian scripture, that human rights are subjected to the authority of the bible.

In a nutshell, the response of the Anglican Church of Uganda to human rights as presented in the views of the Diocese of Kampala clearly demonstrates that African Christians seek for the inclusion of their voices and values in the human rights doctrine. This challenge by the Christians in the Diocese isn't a lone challenge, John Witte's argument presented here in chapter 6.4.2 that religious views should be considered in the construction of the human rights doctrine is in support of this challenge. For human rights to dialogue with Christianity (religions) in the construction of human rights might eliminate some of the conflicting issues in the human rights doctrine. Therefore, the findings of this research demonstrate that in a post-secular age it is important that religion shouldn't be put in a cage in the construction of human rights.

7.3. Limitations and future research suggestions

This research, which has intended to study the Challenge of African Christianity to Human Rights in the response of the Diocese of Kampala to human rights in general has been too broad. There have also been very limited volumes on human rights and the church in Uganda at the disposal of the researcher as such, much of the theoretical information in this study is from none African sources. The shortage of available resource on human rights and Christianity in Uganda presents an area of research which needs to be explored. Although this research did not focus much on the values enshrined in the African culture(s), the researcher has found that a research detailing how the *ubuntu* culture in Africa can power the human rights doctrine will be prudent.

References

- Berg, L. Bruce & Lune, Howard. (2012). *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences*. Upper Saddle River (New Jersey): Pearson.
- Bucar, M. Elizabeth and Barnett, Barbra (2005). *Does Human Rights Need God?* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Brunner, Emil. (1945). *Justice and the Social Order*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press.
- Bryman, Alan. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Charmaz, K. and Bryant, A. (2011) 'Grounded theory in ethnography'. In Atkinson, P. et al. (eds), *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage, pp. 291-309.
- Creswell, C. John. (2009) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage.
- Desmond M. Tutu. (2010). *The first word: to be human is to be free* in Witte, John Jr. & Alexander, S. Frank eds. (2010). *Christianity and Human Rights: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, D. Malcolm. (2007). *Does God believe in Human Rights? A Reflection*. In Raphael, Walden; Stephens, Alan & Ghanae, Nazila. (2007). *Does God Believe in Human Rights? Essays on Religion and Human Rights*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Haas, Michael. (2014). *International Human Rights: A Comprehensive Introduction*. London, U.K: Routledge.
- Henriksen, Jan-Olav (2006). "Developing a human rights theology" in Prove, N. Peter and Smetters, Luke. (2006). *Faith and Human Rights: Voices from the Lutheran Communion*. Documentation No. 51. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Lutheran University Press.
- Maritain, Jacques. (1951). *Man and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Mbiti, John. S. (1969). *African Religions and Philosophy*. Nairobi, Kenya: East African Educational Publishers.
- Nathan, N. Clemens. (2009). *The Changing face of Human Rights and Religion; A Personal Reflection*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Newlands, George. (2006). *Christ and Human Rights: The transformative engagement*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate.
- O'Donovan, Joan Lockwood. (1996). *The Desire of the Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Halloran, Kerry. (2014). *The Church of England – Charity Law and Human Rights*. London: Springer.
- Reed, D. Esther. (2007). *The Ethics of Human Rights: Contested Doctrinal and Moral Issues*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.
- Rossman, G., & Rallis, S. F. (1998). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Seiple, A. Robert (2010), in Witte, John. Jr. and Alexander, S. Frank eds. (2010). *Christianity and Human Rights: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverman, David. (2011). *Interpreting Qualitative Data: A Guide to the Principles of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Stackhouse, L. Max (2005). *Why Human Rights Needs God: A Christian Perspective*. In Bucar, M. Elizabeth and Barnett, Barbra (2005). *Does Human Rights Need God?* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Strauss, Leo. (1953). *Natural Right and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vasak, Karel (ed) (1982). *The International Dimensions of Human Rights*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Villa-Vicencio. (2005). *God, the Devil, and Human Rights*, in Bucar, M. Elizabeth and Barnett, Barbra (2005). *Does Human Rights Need God?* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Ven, J. A. ven der. (2010). *Human Rights or Religious Rules?* Leiden, Boston: Brill.

Were, S. Gideon & Wilson, A. Derek. (1972). *East Africa through a Thousand Years. A.D. 1000 to the present day*. London, UK: Evans.

Wolterstorff, P. Nicolas. (2010). *Modern Protestant Developments in human rights in*

Witte, John. Jr. and Alexander, S. Frank eds. (2010). *Christianity and Human Rights: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Internet sources

ACHPR, (2005a). *Human and People's Right* retrieved from <http://www.achpr.org/instruments/achpr/> on November 3, 2016.

ACSA, (2013). *Agendum 21 – Human Sexuality* retrieved from <http://anglicanchurch.org.za.winhost.wa.co.za/oid/downloads/Agendum%2021%20Human%20Sexuality.pdf> on November 2, 2016.

AHRC, (2009). *Defining Human Rights*. Retrieved from <https://www.humanrights.gov.au/human-rights-explained-fact-sheet-1-defining-human-rights> on October 18, 2016.

All Saints Cathedral Kampala (2016). *A brief history of All Saints Cathedral* retrieved from <http://allsaintskampala.org/about/> on November 22, 2016.

Amnesty International, (2016). *Uganda 2015/2016* retrieved from <https://www.amnesty.org/en/countries/africa/uganda/report-uganda/> on November 21, 2016.

Anglican Communion (1998a) *Human Sexuality*. Retrieved on October 31, 2016 from <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/resources/document-library/lambeth->

conference/1998/section-i-called-to-full-humanity/section-i10-human-sexuality?author=Lambeth+Conference&year=1998

_____ (1998b) *Affirmation and Adoption of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved on October 31, 2016 from <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/resources/document-library/lambeth-conference/1998/section-i-called-to-full-humanity/section-i1-affirmation-and-adoption-of-the-united-nations-universal-declaration-of-human-rights?author=Lambeth+Conference&year=1998>

_____ (2016). *Statements from the Primates Meeting*. Retrieved from http://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/206038/Primates_Meeting_2016_State_ment.pdf on 26 May, 2016.

BBC, (2016, October 7). Archbishop Desmond Tutu 'Wants Right to Assisted Death.' *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-37587290>

_____, (2016, June 9). Mpho Tutu: Choosing between the church and gay marriage. *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-36462240> on October 31, 2016.

CMS, (2016). *Church Missionary Society archive* retrieved from http://www.ampltd.co.uk/digital_guides/church_missionary_society_archive_general/editorial%20introduction%20by%20rosemary%20keen.aspx on November 21, 2016.

COU, (2016, August 26). *Resolutions of the 23rd Provincial Assembly of the Church of Uganda* retrieved from <http://churchofuganda.org/news/resolutions-of-the-23rd-provincial-assembly-of-church-of-uganda> on November 2, 2016.

Den Norske Kirke, (2014). *Set The Oppressed Free: The Church of Norway and Human Rights* retrieved from https://kirken.no/globalassets/kirken.no/global/2014/dokumenter/menneskerettigheter_innmat_eng_korr2c.pdf on November 3, 2016.

GAFCON, (2008a). *The Complete Jerusalem Statement* retrieved from <http://gafcon.org/resources/jerusalem-statement/> on November 1, 2016.

_____, (2008b). *About* retrieved from <http://gafcon.org/about/> on November 1, 2016.

_____, (2016). *Nairobi Communique 2016*. Retrieved from <http://gafcon.org/2016/04/22/nairobi-communique-2016/> on 26 May, 2016.

Guroian, Vigen. *Human Rights and Christian Ethics: An Orthodox Critique*. In *The annual of the Society of Christian Ethics*, pp. 301-309.

History World, (2016) *History of Uganda* retrieved from <http://www.historyworld.net/wrldhis/PlainTextHistories.asp?historyid=ad22> on November 4, 2016.

Independent (14.03.2014). *How Uganda has been seduced by anti-gay conservative evangelicals* retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/africa/how-uganda-was-seduced-by-anti-gay-conservative-evangelicals-9193593.html> on Aprin 20, 2017.

Kituo Cha Katiba, (2016) *The Buganda Agreement 1900* retrieved from <http://www.kituoachatiba.org/sites/default/files/legal-resources/The%20Buganda%20Agreement%201900.pdf> on November 4, 2016.

Makgoba, Thabo. (2016, October 01). *The Anglican Church of Southern Africa's debate on human sexuality* retrieved from <http://anglicanchurch.org.za.winhost.wa.co.za/view.asp?ItemID=744&tname=tblComponent1&oname=News&pg=front> on November 2, 2016.

Manda, David Suze. (14.03.2009). *Ubuntu Philosophy as an African Philosophy for peace*. Retrieved from <http://www.africafiles.org/article.asp?ID=20359> on March 15, 2017.03.16.

Mazrui, A. Ali. (1977). Religious Strangers in Uganda: From Emin Pasha to Idi Amin. *African Affairs*. 76 (302) 21-38 retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/722011>

National Archives (2017). Declaration of Independence: A Transcription. Retrieved from <https://www.archives.gov/founding-docs/declaration-transcript> on March 10, 2017.

Ntagali, Stanley. (2017). *Archbishop Stanley Ntagali's 2017 Easter message* retrieved from <http://churchofuganda.org/news/archbishop-stanley-ntagalis-2017-easter-message> on April 17, 2017.

_____. (2016, January 16). *Hundreds Show Support for Archbishop Stanley Ntagali's Stand in Canterbury* retrieved from <http://churchofuganda.org/info/hundreds-show-support-for-archbishop-stanley-ntagalis-stand-in-canterbury> on November 2, 2016.

_____. (2016). *Archbishop's Lenten Appeal to Pray for Uganda and The Anglican Communion*. Retrieved from <http://churchofuganda.org/news/archbishops-lenten-appeal-to-pray-for-uganda-and-the-anglican-communion> on 26 May, 2016.

_____. (2014). *Archbishop Stanley Ntagali Comments on Uganda's Anti-Homosexuality Bill, the Church of England's "Pilling Report," and the Open Letter from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York*. Retrieved from <http://churchofuganda.org/news/archbishop-stanley-ntagali-comments-on-ugandas-anti-homosexuality-bill-the-church-of-englands-pilling-report-and-the-open-letter-from-the-archbishops-of-canterbur> on 26 May, 2016.

NUSSBAUM, BARBARA (2003): "Ubuntu: Reflections of a South African on Our Common Humanity", in *Reflections*, the Society for Organizational Learning and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Vol.4, n^o4, pp 21-26.

Okoh, D. Nicolas (2014, December 24). *The Complementarity of man and woman in the African Christian Context* retrieved from <https://www.gafcon.org/resources/the-complementarity-of-man-and-woman-in-the-african-christian-context> on November 2, 2016.

Otiso, M. Kefa. (2012). *Uganda*. In Juergensmeyer, Mark and Clarke, W. Roof. *Encyclopedia of Global Religions*. Los Angeles: Sage. Retrieved from <http://proxy.via.mf.no:2087/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxLYmtfXzQ3NDM0OF9fQU41?sid=eab8e4fc-0347-446a-9f28-59f31a65c402@sessionmgr107&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1>

Parliament of the Republic of Uganda (2016). *The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995*. Retrieved from http://www.parliament.go.ug/images/stories/constitution/Constitution_of_Uganda_1995.pdf on November 21, 2016.

Sadgrove, Joana et al. (2010). *Constructing the boundaries of Anglican Orthodoxy: An Analysis of the Global Anglican Future Conference (GAFCON)*. In *Religion*, 40 (3). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.religion.2010.02.006>

Ssenyonyi, John. (2009, January 07). *The Gift of Marriage: Biblical Foundations*. Retrieved from <http://gafcon.org/resources/the-gift-of-marriage-biblical-foundations/> on November 1, 2016.

The Anti-Homosexuality Act 2014 retrieved from <http://wp.patheos.com.s3.amazonaws.com/blogs/warrenthrockmorton/files/2014/02/Anti-Homosexuality-Act-2014.pdf> on 26 may, 2016.

The Telegraph, (2005). *How the king was converted by Stanley*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/uganda/1506321/How-the-king-was-converted-by-Stanley.html> on November 21, 2016.

Williams, Rowan. *Human Rights and Religious Faith*. The Archbishop of Canterbury Ecumenical Centre, Geneva - 28 February 2012 retrieved from <http://rowanwilliams.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/2370/human-rights-and-religious-faith#sthash.81RP3yar.dpuf> on October 29, 2016.

Uganda Bureau of Statistics (2014). *National Population and Housing Census 2014*. Retrieved from

<http://www.ubos.org/onlinefiles/uploads/ubos/NPHC/NPHC%202014%20PROVISIONAL%20RESULTS%20REPORT.pdf> on 26 May, 2016.

UHRC, (2016). *18th Annual Report 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.uhrc.ug/> on November 21, 2016.

United Nations (2017). *Drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved from <http://research.un.org/en/undhr/draftingcommittee> on April 4, 2017.

United Nations (2016a). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html> on October 20, 2016.

_____ (2016b). *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/text/econvention.htm> on October 20, 2016.

_____ (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/index.html> retrieved on October 18, 2016.

United Nations Children Fund, United Kingdom (2016). *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Retrieved from <http://unicef.org.uk/UNICEFs-Work/UN-Convention/> on October 20, 2016.

World Population Review. *Uganda Population 2016*. Retrieved from <http://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/uganda-population/> on 26 May, 2016.

Appendices

Appendix #1: Interview guide

The Challenge of African Christianity to Human Rights: Exploring the response of the Diocese of Kampala in the Anglican Church of Uganda to Human Rights

General information about the interviewee

1. What is your role in Kampala Diocese?
2. How long have you been part of Kampala Diocese and in your role in the diocese?

Theoretical understanding of human rights

3. You probably have heard about human rights; from which sources do you regularly hear about human rights?
4. Have you had any teaching on human rights, if yes, who organized it? Have you ever participated in any activity regarding human rights organized by the church? Explain.
5. What is your own understanding of human rights?
6. What is your view about the compatibility of human rights and African values?
7. In your view, what is the relationship between the Christian teaching and morals to human right?

Response to homosexual rights

8. Are there aspects of human rights that you think contradict the bible and Christian teachings, if yes, mention those?
9. How do these aspects you mentioned contradict with the bible and Christian teaching?
10. What is your understanding of human sexuality in respect to homosexuality?
11. What is the Church of Uganda – Kampala Diocese’s response to homosexuality?

12. Do you agree with the church's (Kampala Diocese's) stand on homosexuality?
Why and why not?

General response and challenge to human rights

13. Does Kampala Diocese have programs that promote human rights which doesn't contradict her message of faith?
14. In general, would you think the church should proactively involve in promoting human rights? Why and why not?
15. What challenge do you put forth to human rights in regard to homosexuality and other controversial aspects of human rights?
16. Do you see a future where the church and human rights walk together, explain?

**Appendix #2: Confirmation letter from MF Norwegian School of Theology
To whom it may concern**



NORWEGIAN
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

CONFIRMATION

We hereby confirm that Julius Izza Tabi, born 13.02.1982, is a student at MF Norwegian School of Theology. He is enrolled as a full-time student in the two-year master program Religion, Society and Global Issues since fall semester 2015. The second year of the program (fall 2016 and spring 2017) the students write a master's thesis (60 ECTS). In this connection the student is going to Uganda on a field work in August.

Oslo, 24.06.2016

For MF Norwegian School of Theology

Berit Widerøe Hillestad

Berit Widerøe Hillestad

Adviser, Department of Religion and Society



MF Norwegian School of Theology is a specialized university institution, founded in 1907. MF is accredited by The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education (NOKUT) and has the right to award Postgraduate degrees and Doctoral degrees in Theology and Christian Religion. The EU-code for MF is «OSLO40».

ADDRESS

P.O. Box 5144 Majorstuen
NO-0302 Oslo

VISITING ADDRESS

Gydas vei 4, Majorstuen
Oslo

PHONE

+47 22 59 05 00

FAX

+47 22 59 05 05

E-MAIL

post@mf.no

BANK ACCOUNT

6038 05 58583

ORG.NR.

NO 970011994 MVA

www.mf.no