

BOUNDARY ESTABLISHMENT AND ITS INFLUENCE ON PASTORAL RESOURCE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE POKOT AND KARAMOJONG SINCE 1902

BY

JACOB ADIPO OGALO

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY MASENO UNIVERSITY

P.O. BOX 333 MASENO

&

PROF. MILDRED NDEDA

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE,

JARAMOGI OGINGA ODINGA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

P.O. BOX 210 BONDO

ABSTRACT

International boundaries remain finite lines of divisions by which national geopolitical space is delineated and contained. This understanding is based on territoriality and sovereignty of each state denoting what is internal and external to the state. The thrust of this paper is that the establishment of the international boundary between Kenya and Uganda not only split or separated pastoral communities that hitherto lived together but has contributed in fueling cross border resource conflict between the Pokot and Karamojong. This is against the cardinal norm that boundary or border relations and interaction should help foster, promote and maintain peace and human coexistence. This paper posits that the study of cross-border pastoral conflict should be done in tandem with the functionality and contribution of the boundary to the phenomenon. It holds the position that the rapture of the vice is faceable through colonialism and Post colonial period and that the problem of rusting and banditry among these pastoralists remain unresolved due to the way in which the boundary was perceived and is now manned.

Key words: Boundary, Border, Pokot, Karamojong, conflict, colonial administrators.

Background to the Establishment of the Kenya – Uganda Boundary

In Africa, two broad types of boundaries were identified in the process of their creation. First, are the boundaries created between territorial holdings by different colonial powers. This is what Anene (1970) calls boundaries established by international agreements. Secondly, are those boundaries drawn between the territorial possessions of the same colonial power also known as unilateral boundaries. The Kenya – Uganda boundary establishment falls in this latter category. However, it is important to take cognizance of the fact that in both cases (whether unilateral or by international agreement), territories were carved out in spite of pre-existing social formations and patterns of community interactions.

Convenient boundaries were phenomena that accomplished the arrival of European colonialism in the continent. They are referred to as convenient boundaries for two reasons. First, such boundaries meant to help the Europeans preserve their balance of power and friendship among themselves. Kabwegyire (1974) calls them “bargain boundaries” between European imperial powers that had spheres of influence in Africa. Secondly, is what Mamdani, (1983) sees as boundaries used in the colonial tactic of divide and rule. This kind of boundary was used to arbitrarily divide the African communities by placing them in two different colonial territories. The Kenya – Uganda boundary is a case in point where the Samia, Teso, Pokot and Bagisu have all been separated by the boundaries establishment with a section placed in Kenya while the other is placed in the Republic of Uganda. Mamdani (1996) argues that the main purpose underlying the divide and rule tactic was to preserve the unity of the colonial rulers and disunity of the majority African subjects. Given the fact that the convenient boundaries did not take into account the interest of the affected communities prior to their creation, they have been reported to have had an enormous potential for inter-tribal conflicts (Butt, 1990).

The Process of Kenya – Uganda Boundary Establishment

Unlike many established unilateral boundaries, creation of the Kenya – Uganda boundary was expected to be less controversial. This derives from the fact that unilateral boundary creations involved officials from one imperial power. Conversely, the process of creation of this boundary went out of this cardinal norm. Instead, it was marred by confusion and differences by British officials in the two colonies who operated on two different ideological confines. The ideological differences were such that one group supported a merger of the colonies (Kenya and Uganda) while the other pushed for a boundary creation to separate them.

The point of departure were the changes to be brought about in East Africa Protectorate (Kenya) and Uganda which was made by the British officials some time towards the end of the 19th century. Subsequently, suggestions of a possible merger between the protectorates of Kenya and Uganda came up in London at the office of the Colonial Secretary (National Archives Entebbe, 1901). As a result, Sir Harry Johnston was made responsible for choosing a suitable administrative capital for the envisaged merger (Kwamusi, 1996). In his view, Johnston had come up with the idea that the new capital be known as “King Edward’s town” to be situated at Entebbe but later changed his mind to have it at Kipchoria near the present day Londiani Township (National Archives Entebbe 1901).

However, by 1901, the whole idea of having a merger between the two protectorates was already facing vehement opposition from those who favoured and voiced for a creation of a boundary to separate the two protectorates. The proponent of this school of thought was Sir Clement Hill the then superintendent of African protectorates administered by the British Foreign Office. His idea on boundary creation was anchored on the fact that prior to 1900, he had visited East Africa to inspect the administrative trends in the protectorates. His report to the Marquess of Lansdowne in May 1901 had two issues with the merger idea; first was that the merger was tantamount to creating one huge area, which would be impossible to be manned by one person. And second, was that Uganda’s infrastructure was inadequate to the extent that it was not going to provide a smooth link or coordination with the East Africa Protectorate (Ingham, 1957). In addition, Hill confirmed that the Uganda Railway was near completion and with a few territorial adjustments, would improve by making it easy to administer the Kenya protectorate. This drew support from Hugh (1961), who noted that,

“The transfer of the East Africa Protectorate headquarter from Mombasa to Nairobi, appeared to imply that Kisumu could be more effectively administered from Nairobi than across the Lake in Entebbe” P87.

It was Clement Hill’s idea that prompted the transfer of Uganda’s Eastern Province to East Africa Protectorate that today covers the former provinces of Nyanza, and Western, as well as parts of Rift Valley (Ochieng, 1974). It is, however important to note that, Hill’s boundary creation idea had a few flaws. The first flaw was that it had the great potential for disrupting the social setting of African ethnic groups in the two protectorates. The second flaw was that it did not take into account the existence and use of natural boundaries which the indigenous people already recognized. Besides, going by Hill’s proposal, natural features like Mount Elgon, River Yala, Lake Rudolf and Elgeyo Escarpment would be fearlessly contested by the African communities that were going to lose them to the transferred territory.

Although Johnston’s proposed merger received support from C. W. Hobley the then Commissioner of the East African Protectorate, and Sir Charles Elliot, they were outrightly rejected by the Marquess of Lansdowne. This was despite the fact that Harry Johnston and Charles Elliot were the British officials on the ground in Kenya and Uganda respectively. Subsequently, the decision by Hill prevailed upon those of Hobley, Johnson, and Elliot as Hugh (1961) observes:

“The Marquess of Lansdowne preferred to act upon the advice of a foreign Office official Sir Clement Hill instead of the recommendations of experienced man Sir Harry Johnson, special Commissioner in Uganda, and in spite of views exposed by Sir Charles Elliot Commissioner of the East Africa Protectorate.” P39.

It was the rejection of the merger proposal and the acceptance of boundary adjustment by the transfer of Eastern Province of Uganda in 1902, Karasuk and Rudolf Province in 1926 that marked the evolutionary milestone in the establishment of the Kenya – Uganda boundary.

Boundary Transfers 1902 to 1926

Boundary development and function in Africa has always depicted two ideas, that is, boundary “delimitation” and boundary “demarcation”. In his words, Campell Mc Ewen (1969) indicates that, delimitation comprises the determination of a boundary by signing of a treaty or verbal agreement and demarcation as the actual laying down of a boundary on the ground marked by beacons or other similar physical means.

Going by the above definitions, all the colonial boundaries in Africa that confirmed the imperial force’s sphere of influence then constitute delimitation. This is because the treaties that were signed involved establishing the territorial limits of one European power or the other (Kwamusi, 1996). A case in point was the signing of the Helligoland treaty between the British and the Germans that further created the Uganda and Kenya protectorates as the British sphere of influence and Tanganyika as the German sphere of influence. As such,

the first ever international boundaries to be created in East Africa came as a result of the signing of two treaties between the British and Germans. First was the signing of the Anglo- German agreement of 1886 in which the German spheres recognized the line of demarcation from Vanga passing through Taita and the Chaga, skirting the northern base of mount Kilimanjaro and along to Lake Victoria at the points of latitudes 1° south (National Archives Entebbe 1926).

The second Anglo – German treaty signed in July 1890 provided for the proclamation of a British protectorate over Zanzibar and a ten mile coastal strip leading to the withdrawal of the German protectorate over the Sultanate of Witu and the coast upto Kismayu (Kenya National Archives 1908). In exchange, the British were to assist the Germans to secure possession of the Coast. The second British protectorate was declared in 1894 and this included Buganda kingdom, Bunyoro, Ankole and Busoga (National Archives Entebbe 1906). The third protectorate was the East Africa protectorate, which was established in July 1895 over the territory between Uganda and the East Coast. According to Ogot (1995), the exact boundary of the new protectorate was not only arbitrary but also vague. He points out that it followed the Anglo-German frontier of 1886 from Vanga in the south to the Uganda border, which at that time was Guasso Maasai River. From there it followed the Kedong' River and Laikipia escarpment up to the northern shores of Lake Turkana (Ogot, 1995). It is important to note that the border between East Africa protectorate and Ethiopia remained undefined just like the border between the British Somalis and Italian Somalis.

On its part, creation of the Kenya – Uganda boundary fell within the confines of boundary demarcation. Moments before the implementation of the boundary creation, the Uganda Protectorate underwent a few leadership changes. In a span of less than one year, Harry Johnston was replaced by Colonel Hayes Sadler. Before Sadler assumed office, Fredrick Jackson was entrusted with the responsibility of Acting Commissioner in Uganda (Kwamusi, 1996). At this point in time, Sir Charles Elliot was the Commissioner of East Africa Protectorate (KNA 1964). Sadler together with C.W. Hobley had the immediate task of working on a process of the boundary creation as the latter had been given the responsibility to define it. Subsequently, the instruction given to the acting commissioner confirms the earlier position about the colonial office adoption of Clement Hill's proposal. The instruction to Fredrick Jackson stated that: "In the opinion of His Majesty's Government, it is better that the boundary creation process be fast tracked to enable its implementation" (National Archives Entebbe, 1956).

As a follow up to this instruction, Fredrick Johnson, Charles Elliot, and C. W. Hobley met at Njoro in December 1901 and agreed that the boundary would have to take into account the ethnic divisions of the area. Their idea was informed by the consideration of ethnic population in northern Uganda to remain there while placing the 'Kavirondo' in the East Africa Protectorate (Melwa, 1991).

In spite of this noble idea meant to sort out ethnic divisions through the boundary, the Hobley team still had a problem with Hill's "natural boundaries" which interfered with many communities in the two protectorates. As if this was not the only problem, C. W. Hobley and F. J. Jackson could not agree on which side of the boundary Mt. Elgon should fall.

In their disagreement, Hobley was for the idea that it should be placed in the East Africa Protectorate while Jackson favoured that it remains in Uganda (National Archives Entebbe, 1969). According to Hobley, the

western and southern slopes of the mountain were “full of rather turbulent natives” who in his opinion “were in very low state of civilization,” and, for this reason alone, he took them to be akin to the Kavirondo of the East Africa Protectorate where he wished them to belong (Kwamusi, 1996). On his part, Jackson indicated that for effective administration, the mountain should fall on the Ugandan side.

The differences between Jackson and Hobley provided Elliot, who favoured a merger, with an excuse to temporarily delay the boundary creation process. To solve this impasse, a two-man commission comprising Hobley and William Grant was appointed to delimit the boundary (Kwamusi, 1996). This commission was faced with two challenges. The first was the need to consider the ethnic differences of the people that would fall on either side of the boundary. The second was the advantages that could be derived from administering a given area regardless of ethnic considerations. Subsequently, ‘Kavirondo’ (Luo and Luyhia) fell on the East African Protectorate side while on the Uganda side were the Basoga and Bakedi.

It is important to recognize the fact that the administrative “position” was also considered by this two man commission. For instance, on Lake Victoria, Berkeley Bay, that was placed in Uganda inhabited by the ‘Kavirondo’ was placed in Uganda because they traded with Busoga and could therefore be administered from there. Similarly, the Babukusu were included in Kenya because they paid their tax at Mumias (Wafula, 2000).

In July 1902, the two-man commission completed its work. It was marked by the transfer of Uganda’s Eastern province to EAP. For the transfer of Karasuk to EAP, the process began from 1919. In his letter to the Secretary of State for Colonies in July that year, Edward Northey, the governor of Kenya raised serious concerns about the portion of the Kenya – Uganda border in the areas occupied by the Suk (Pokot), Turkana, and the Karamojong. The boundary, in his words was:

“Unsatisfactory because it cuts northern and southern Turkana into two and does not satisfactorily define the borders of the Turkana, Suk and Karamoja tribes...the boundary should, if possible leave the whole of any one of these tribes under one administration” (Kwamusi 1996).

It was later agreed between Governor Northey and Robert Coryndon, the Governor of Uganda, that the Turkana and Suk be placed under the administration of EAP. While leaving the whole of Karamoja in Uganda. According to Kwamusi (1996), there were two reasons given for this decision. First, it was argued that the EAP was more convenient in managing issues relating to the Turkana and Suk because for a long time it had been closely connected with them. Secondly, those areas of southern Turkana and Suk territories were in the vicinity of Trans-Nzoia, an area that was already under white settlement and controlled from Nairobi. In September 1919, the Secretary of State for Colonies gave a formal approval to the proposed boundary adjustments between the two protectorates and the two governors were to organize for the demarcation of the new boundary (National Archives Entebbe 1920). As a result of this in 1926, further territorial transfers from Uganda to Kenya were made involving Rudolf province and the Suk territory.

Even with this approval, it still emerged that the establishment of the boundary between East Africa Protectorate (EAP) and Uganda remained challenging especially the area north of Elgon. This was for the simple reason that the area was completely unknown to the Europeans. This position also emanates from the

fact that it is a rugged terrain, which makes its accessibility impossible. For instance, the very few explorers and colonial administrators who visited the area only managed to reach either Lake Rudolf or Turkwel River (Barber, 1968). Cases in point include explorers Von Hohnel who reached the eastern shores of Lake Rudolf in 1888 and Cavendish who made a rapid march down the western shores of Lake Rudolf in 1897 (KNA, 1901). On his part, Fredrick Jackson, the Commissioner of Uganda, had been to Turkwel River for the Imperial British East Africa Company in 1890 (National Archives Entebbe, 1900). It is important to note the fact that these people only skirted the fringes of the region while their knowledge of the entire territory remained vague and very limited.

It was against this backdrop that it became challenging to the British colonial officers in the EAP and Uganda regarding where and how exactly to draw the boundary in the northern region. A further confusion and complication emerged in 1902 when Major Macdonald extended his expedition in Uganda to Lake Rudolf. This elicited a furious reaction of infringement from Sir Arthur Hardinge the Commissioner of British East Africa (KNA FCP, 702/0 1901). As a way of getting a solution on where exactly the boundary separating the two colonies in the north was, Hardinge referred the problem to the Foreign Office in London. A reply from the Foreign Office indicated that although the upper or northern boundary had not been demarcated well, the territory was within the British sphere and Hardinge was to assume that Lake Rudolf was within his protectorate. The dispatch to Hardinge to this effect read,

“As time goes on and the Uganda Protectorate is more clearly defined it may be extended eastwards so as to comprise Lake Rudolf within administrative sphere, but for the present purpose... the district lies within your jurisdiction. It is proposed that you proceed with the administration of the country as soon as circumstances admit” (KNA FOCP 7077, 1898).

By the admission of the Foreign Office that the upper or northern boundary had not been demarcated well, this was a clear indication of the uncertainty that surrounded the establishment of the entire boundary. For instance, the decision to transfer parts of Eastern Uganda to EAP was based on Clement Hill's false assumption that Uganda's main commercial outlet would be down the Nile and upon his desire to place the railway under one administration. This transfer of territory challenged Johnston's policy of a union of the colonies in two ways. First, Johnstone had not seen that Uganda's natural outlet was via Mombasa and secondly, he had thrown the boundaries wide open to the north and east for future expansion and development. Like in the first transfer that involved taking the Eastern Province of Uganda to EAP, a two-man team of C.W. Hopley the sub-commissioner of EAP and W. Grant the sub-commissioner of Busoga was asked to make recommendations for the northern boundary. Again, the major challenge at that time was how to divide the already administered tribes on and around Mount Elgon (Kabwegyere, 1981). Besides, so little was known of the territory and the people north of the mountain that Jackson and Elliot were anxious to keep the northern boundary flexible and open for future modification or changes.

Well before receiving the reports from Hopley and Grant, Commissioners F.J. Jackson of Uganda and C. Eliot of EAP had agreed on a gentleman's arrangement that an arbitrary line should be drawn north from Elgon with the peoples to the West falling to Uganda and those to the East to British East Africa (National Archives Entebbe file no.A/233, June 1930). They were prepared to recognize this arbitrary arrangement on two

grounds. One, they knew little of the northern peoples and two, in the event of a problem, it would still fall in their administrative ambit for a solution.

It is however important to note that this boundary arrangement was never recognized because Hobley and Grant came up with another recommendation. The new recommendation by this technical team was that the boundary should follow river Suam from its source on Elgon to its junction with River Turkwel and then follow the Turkwel to the mouth of Lake Rudolf (National Archives Entebbe, 1901). In as much as Commissioner Eliot was hesitant about this recommendation by noting that not much was known of the ethnic divisions along the Turkwel, the recommendation by the technical team was accepted by the Foreign Office. With this as the new boundary position, then it cut away part of north eastern Uganda and divided the Suk and Turkana between the two protectorates but left the Karamojong in Uganda. It is this kind of arrangement that has created a persistent source of trouble on how to share the natural resources around the current border.

On 14th March 1927, the office of the Chief Secretary of the government of Uganda provided a detailed description of the recognized boundary between Kenya and Uganda. The description gave three parts as follows;

“(1) Boundary from 1° south latitude, through lake Victoria to the North of Sio River. (2) Boundary from the Sio river to the summit of Mount Elgon..... (3) Boundary from the summit of Mt. Elgon to Mt. Zulia, on the boundary of the Anglo-Egyptians Sudan” (National Archives Entebbe 1926).

From this boundary description, it is important to point out that it was the second and third proportions, which cut across the ethnic territories of the Pokot and Karamojong.

Role of the Established Boundary to Pokot and Karamojong Conflict in the Colonial Period

The establishment and operationalization of the Kenya – Uganda boundary had a far-reaching effect on the indigenous people that lived along it. Since it involved the definition of new areas to be occupied by each community in terms of geographical demarcation, it constituted a barrier to such communities. This was particularly true between the Pokot and Karamojong since 1926. The major problem that accompanied the boundary establishment was the fact that in the process of its establishment, none of the indigenous people was involved. Besides, there was no civic education given to the people when it became operational. To the British officials in the two protectorates, the main purpose of the boundary was not only to ensure effective British administration of their respective areas, but also to control what they called “the people’s primitive way of life” as Barber (1968) puts it:

“The British officials wanted a clear boundary which could be identified easily both on the map and on the ground, and to keep the tribes and their livestock firmly behind the line” p64.

To the communities in reference (Pokot and Karamojong), such a boundary was incomprehensible. This was due to the fact that they wanted to operate on their traditional boundaries that had no diverse impact on their pastoralist mode of life. Given the fact that the new boundary cut across the grazing lands of the pastoral

groups, it seriously affected the Pokot and Karamojong not only in terms of animal pasture and water but also the free movement of animals and humans. All this was against the backdrop that prior to the boundary creation, the Pokot and Karamojong mutually exploited the existing common resources in their geographical region. The newly created boundary therefore, drew a wedge between the nomadic people whose livelihood depended very much on moving across the vast plains in the region without any boundary obstruction (Onyango 2010).

Therefore, the establishment and function of the boundary marked a radical shift in the Pokot and Karamojong way of life. For instance, they now belonged to different political entities and were expected to come to terms with that. The new political order was in relation to their movements and trading requirements. For instance, it was already clear that these pastoralists had close social-economic ties that saw them move and transact their activities with less restriction. This was confirmed by one British administrator, who observed,

“The pastoral tribe of Kenya and Uganda on either side of this boundary are closely related ...and often carried their socio-economic activities together”(National Archives Entebbe, 1964)

The observation here is that, since pastoral groups are never self-reliant, they always maintained some reciprocal and mutually supporting relations with their neighbours. However, given the demands of boundary operations, it was now a requirement that all people should stay within such boundary limits and in case of any movement or interaction across it, such persons were to seek permission from their respective authorities. It is important to note that the border movement restriction was only on paper because, by 1926, the entire boundary did not have a physical barrier hence the pastoral communities could cross it freely. This was against the colonial border policy that stated,

“Every person, Kenyan or Ugandan, Pokot or Karamojong must have valid permission issued by the appropriate and competent authority of one’s respective country. All must report their arrival or departure with the same authorities” (KNA, 1928).

The Pokot and Karamojong, who were in contact with the colonial authorities on either side of the border, interpreted this kind of restriction as a denial of their fundamental right to freely relate with their neighbours. Consequently, most of them rejected the requirements of the created boundary. In their view, they only accepted and operated on their traditional boundaries marked by natural and geographical terrains. This explains the frequent and discrete manner in which they continued with their cultural activities.

Therefore, immediately after Rudolf Province was transferred to British East Africa and the boundary functions became clear, the Pokot and Karamojong relations worsened. In the process of its creation, the colonial governments used the geographical and natural features of two rivers, Turkwell and Kanyangareng, to separate the two communities. However, instead of separating the two communities, the two rivers drew them together. For instance, the River Turkwell after leaving Elgon flows through and cuts across two mountains Chemerongit to the north west and Suk Hills to the south east. Just before it cuts the mountains, the Turkwell is joined from the West by a major tributary, the Kanyangareng, which, in its course, flows around the western edges of the Chemerongit Hills. It was at the river valley that the Pokot and Karamojong conflict became

frequent after 1926. The conflicts would mainly arise due to the boundary perception more particular now that it determined which side of the colony the natural resources of rivers and hills fell. In this case, the conflict was both due to boundary issues and natural resource claims. This also arose from the fact that the boundary demarcation was perceived differently both by the colonial government and the people. To the colonial officials, the boundary was supposed to be easily identifiable both on the map and on the ground. Purposely, the latter was to help prevent inter-tribal conflict by keeping the pastoralists and their livestock firmly behind the line. The pastoralists, however, did not understand, let alone recognize, the functions of the established boundary. When the boundary became operational to deny them a chance to cross and use water and grazing land on either side, then it totally became incomprehensible. This prompted frequent conflicts between the communities and the government officials. For instance, the British attitude towards the Karamojong was aimed at secluding them from the Pokot, Turkana as well as other ethnic groups in east and north Uganda. This was confirmed by the 1926 transfer of Rudolf Province from Uganda to Kenya and fixing of district boundaries in eastern Uganda (Kiwauka 1968). The former marked the final establishment of the Kenya and Uganda international boundary. By the position of this boundary, it cut across grazing land and water points, which adversely affected the Karamojong and Pokot.

The transfer of part of eastern Uganda territory to Kenya affected the Karamojong in two ways. First, the areas of Chemerongit and Kanyangareng River, which they hitherto used for pasture and water, became no go zones for them. Secondly, the international boundary demarcation meant that they could not raid their Pokot and Turkana neighbours for animals as before. However, what annoyed them was the fact that the transferred territory was meant to compensate their bitter rivals, the Pokot, who had themselves lost large tracts of land to the white settlers in Kitale (KNA, 1962). On their part, the boundary restriction denied the Pokot a chance to graze on the Pene Plains, which were their alternative grazing lands during droughts. Similarly, they could not raid their neighbours the Karamojong during times of replenishment or for bride wealth demands.

Consequently, the two tribes engaged in territorial claims that defied the colonial boundaries. A case in point was in 1929 when the Karamojong made a second claim that Rivers Turkwell and Kanyangareng belonged to them because, in the past, they hunted, watered and grazed their animals there yet the boundary now placed the rivers on the Pokot side. As for the Pokot, they blamed the existence of the boundary on the account that it denied them a chance to graze at Mount Kadam in Karamoja area which was previously their drought reserve grazing area.

According to Markakis (1993), it was the inability of these two tribes to comprehend the functions of the boundary that led to their persistent conflicts. However, Ocan (1994) differs with Markakis (1993) when he notes that it was not their inability to comprehend the boundary function but their devious acts about the boundary that constantly led to conflicts. This misconception of the function of the boundary was further compounded by the fact that both the Pokot and Karamojong were quick to blame the colonial officers from both sides of the boundary of favouring their enemies. This was more pronounced during and after cattle rustling activities. In essence, the international boundary that separated the Pokot and Karamojong had far reaching effects on these pastoralists. For instance, it was in their tradition to raid and counter-raid each other for animals. Practically, these fell outside the legal demands of the boundary operations, which required that anybody crossing it had to report to the authorities on both sides and declare their intentions. As such, each community was expected to carry out its activities within the boundary jurisdiction unless permitted by the

colonial government officials. Subsequently, raids and counter-raids across the boundary were tantamount to abusing the boundary regulations. More importantly, the raiders who were caught or fell in the trap of the colonial government officials who kept vigil along the boundary had their animals confiscated and were arraigned in court at either Kacheliba, Kapenguria, or in Karamoja (Dietz, 1987).

This boundary restriction also meant that cultural activities such as bride wealth payment, ritual activities and the ability for one to replenish their stock especially from across the boundary was on the decline. In addition, an oral account from a government official corroborated that the boundary restriction increased intra-community raids and conflicts as some of the communities and clans turned on each other for their much needed animals. For instance, Onyango (2010) observed that in the years after 1930, intra-community raids between the Pian, Jie, Tepeth, Matheniko and Bokora was on the increase. Similarly, Yurco (2011) maintained the same argument but with reference to the Turkana, Pokot and Samburu. The same line of thought has been espoused by Mkutu (2003), Satya (2004), and Vries (2007). In their argument, they hold the opinion that the boundary establishment squeezed the Pokot since much of their land in Kitale was alienated for settler farming. A case in point is the fact that these people's traditional dry season and drought reserve areas were adversely affected by the new boundary demarcation as these fell on either side which caused scarcity. For instance, an elder's oral source indicates that the area around Mount Kadam and River Kilim in Karamoja was, their drought reserve point before the boundary establishment. On their part, the Karamojong point to the Turkwell and Kanyangareng rivers with similar claims.

The establishment and operationalization of the boundary implied that the system of resource use and ownership also changed. For instance, by the East Africa Order in Council, Karasuk was transferred from Uganda to Kenya in 1926. This transfer of territory marked the beginning of resource scarcity and claims by the pastoral groups. The transfer adversely affected the Karamojong clan of Pian, Matheniko and Bokora who lost their grazing land and water points in Chemerongit and Kanyangareng rivers that were transferred to Kenya in order to provide land for the Pokot in Karasuk (Onyango, 2010). This was after they were displaced from Trans-Nzoia and Kitale by the white settlers (Barber, 1968). Consequently, the two communities had, from the time of the boundary establishment, fiercely contested the scarce resources in the areas around Turkwell and Kanyangareng.

According to Barber (1968), the two tribes (Pokot and Karamojong) base their claims to the disputed territory on different criteria. For the Karamojong, the area was in their possession from before, while for the Pokot, their argument is informed by "what had been rather than what was" in claim. The years after the establishment of the boundary soon saw every group begin to claim not only their demarcated territories but even went on to claim areas that were hither to not theirs as a way of cushioning themselves from what Carter (1996) calls resource scarcity.

The Pokot and Karamojong disagreements can therefore be traced to their fierce fights promoted by scarcity territorial claims in December 1928 (National Archives Entebbe, 1928). In this fight, the oral account indicates that when the Suk had exhausted their scale grazing land near Mount Kadam, Apolodar, and Erimot their leader asked for grazing land from the Karamojong near river Kilim. When this request was turned down, the Pokot forced their way into Karamojong territory because they failed to understand why their neighbours were marginalizing them yet in the eve of colonialism they mutually shared these resources. In the process, one

Karamojong person was killed. In addition, fifteen donkeys and herds of cattle were stolen Barber (1968). In response, the Karamojong launched a series of counter attacks, which drove the Pokot back to Turkwell. Social cubism tenets of scarcity and marginalization come out handy at this point in the sence that through the colonial activity of boundary operations, resources became an evenly distributed between two communities which led to them being scarce. With the communities restricted to their respective countries, they therefore became strangers whenever they crossed over to the others territory and by extension marginalized in the use of such resources.

However, it was the growing intensity of cross-border raids between the Pokot and Karamojong areas compelled the District Commissioner of Karamoja, Ashton Warner, to write to commissioner Hayes Sadler expressing grave concern about what he referred to as the “constant raids going on across the boundary” (National Archives Entebbe, 1920). Expressing desperation at a situation that could go out of hand, Werner said,

“Altogether, unless we put a police post there or East Africa protectorate can keep their people in from raids, which would certainly be difficult, I don’t quite see what we can do” (National Archives Entebbe No. A 32/10).

Owing to the attitude within the British colonial circles that these pastoral groups were primitive and barbaric, they thought the raids and counter-raids across the boundary as activities that would soon end. However, chances of sealing the inter-ethnic conflict across the boundary were becoming difficult for the British. Saddler himself concurred when he said that, the establishment of law, order or effective control over “The people of this wild border was no easy matter” (KNA, 1929). Given the fact that the two ethnic groups did not live in amity, it compelled the colonial authority to try and provide ‘protection’ to each ethnic group along the entire boundaries.

Other than the Pokot and Karamojong, this protection was extended to the Turkana, Samburu, Teso, Samia, and Sabiny (Sebei) (Barber, 1968). In 1930 and 40’s the colonial administration in Kenya and Uganda tried several attempts at achieving peace and harmony but with very little success. The chance to find a lasting solution remained elusive because the colonial authorities lacked a viable alternative to cattle raiding, as they were not so keen on livestock development. Instead, they were pre-occupied with white settler activities (Kwamusi, 1996).

Consequently, throughout the era of the boundary operations, the Northern Frontier District of Kenya and Karamojong in Uganda remained “closed districts”. This, in many ways, went along to interfere with the extent to which their ties with other communities could be promoted. However, it is important to note that the boundary operations did not stop the people’s movements neither did it stop the cattle raids. Eventually, the idea of using the boundary to contain the people was self defeating.

More importantly, the impact of the boundary demarcation has been felt more on the Pokot side than the Karamoja area. This is given the fact that the pastoralists use their natural environment to their advantage and survival. In what is emerging as a direct result of the boundary restriction, the Pokot side has, in the past, experienced a lot of land degradation arising from the over-stretched piece of land grazed by many herds. To

their effect, Vries (2007) confirmed that these areas are now prone to extensive soil erosion, which can be confirmed by the deep gullies observable from the southern highlands. The elders also confirmed this position by stating that the area is set for its worst ecological times given the high level of soil erosion during the rainy season.

In Uganda, especially after the transfer of some of her territories to EAP, the British administrators were opposed to the European settlers citing the fact that their demands were untenable. A case in point was when they put a lot of pressure on the colonial government for the provision of social services to equal the demands given to their counter-parts in Kenya. Meeting the white settler's demands in Uganda was likely to tremendously increase the cost of administration in the colony. In contrast, their population was much smaller and was relatively far apart as compared to the Kenyan case. However, their idea still caught the attention of the colonial officials given the fact that they were the export producers while Africans were relegated to the position of internal or consumer producers.

Just like in Kenya, the colonial policies in Uganda after the transfer of territories appeared to favour the economically productive areas with the unproductive ones like Karamoja and west Pokot neglected. For, instance throughout the colonial period, the Kenya-Uganda boundary remained substantially un-demarcated (Mc Ewen, 1969). This contradicted the case where some parts, especially the former Eastern Province of Uganda, had been marked while there were considerably big portions of it at Karasuk and Rudolf that remained unmarked. However, it is important to note that even where there were signs of demarcation, the alignments were not reliable enough to provide it with a precise demarcation (Kwamusi, 1996). Despite the fact that the boundary was poorly demarcated, it remained a political and legal phenomenon. Therefore, its demarcation and functions fitted well within the legal and political confines of a boundary. This remains so because boundaries are understood to be 'imaginary lines' that mark the limits of legal, political, and administrative power of a state or administrative area (Melwa, 1991). It is such boundary demarcations that cover both intra- territorial as well as international boundaries.

Consequently, the Kenya- Uganda boundary provided both countries with the new status as international states. Given the ignorance with which the Pokot and Karamojong had over the boundary, they kept crossing it at will. By 1926, the careless cross-border movement had caught the attention of the British officials who hoped to put it to an end. For instance in 1930, the Upe and Kenyan Pokot launched a complaint to the colonial officials about the boundary that had split and put them in two different political units.

Their complaint was that they are one ethnic group having the same cultural and economic activities and that the boundary denied them the chance to interact as a people. In their complaint, their leaders did not understand why they had been split into two and more importantly, they could not comprehend why they were not allowed to cross over to be with their relatives and cousins on either side. The impact of the boundary on these people, including the Karamojong, was in the frequent manner in which they abused the boundary demands as they fulfilled either their social, economic, or political interests.

In as much as the boundary was negatively perceived by both the Pokot and the Karamojong because it curtailed their hitherto operations, it also had some positive results to the local people. For instance, it was observed that between 1902 and 1907, a protozoan parasite known as trypanosomes responsible for causing

sleeping sickness in human beings and nagana in livestock was thriving at the shores of Lake Rudolf and the river banks of Suam, Turkwel, and Kanganyareng (Entebbe Archives 1908). Being the inhabitants of these places, the Pokot, Karamojong, and Turkana were seriously affected by this new animal and human disease. Other than the existence of trypanosomiasis, the other infectious diseases that had been reported were dysentery and small pox. However, the point to note is that sleeping sickness and Nagana was recorded as being the most fatal and dreadful in this area at this time. Consequently, the immediate response of the colonial governments in Kenya and Uganda was to try and confine as much as possible the outbreak of sleeping sickness and nagana to the affected areas and to ensure they do not spread across the boundary.

As an immediate measure, the colonial officials in Uganda enacted the Uganda customs consolidation ordinance of 1904 in which the movement of livestock between Uganda and her neighbouring countries without special permission was prohibited (National Archives Entebbe file No A10/ 1). On the Kenyan side, a livestock quarantine policy was strictly put to use with both the people and livestock restricted not to cross the boundary. In addition, the two colonial governments carried out anti-sleeping sickness and nagana education of the people. Unfortunately, it became impossible to educate the Pokot and Karamojong on this problem on two accounts. The first account was that it was not possible to access the terrain in Karamojong and more particularly the Kenya Pokot side. The second was on the ground that these people had little, if any trust, in the colonial official whom they regarded as intruders and brutal. It therefore compelled the colonial officials, together with their officers from the department of livestock and agriculture, to wait for the people and their livestock at the water points to educate them on the effects of nagana as well as persuade them to allow for the vaccination of their animals.

According to oral sources, the local people only respected the impact of confining them behind lines after they realized that they were losing their animals to the wrath of Nagana. Initially, it occurred to the Pokot and the Karamojong that the government was always confinement happy and its policies were not necessarily to their benefit. Besides, they had looked at the colonial government's policy of burning and clearing the bushes as a way of destroying their range land and not as an aspect of eradicating the tsetse flies. Despite the fact that the governments put these measures to curb the spread of both sleeping sickness and nagana, some of the Pokot and Karamojong still defied the orders and moved their animals across the boundary but this time under cover of darkness. The animal restriction movement was compounded when rinderpest outbreak was reported in Uganda in 1914 and in Kenya in 1923 (National Archives Entebbe, file no A46 269). In as much as the arbitrariness of the boundary was already beginning to influence the effectiveness with which anti-epidemic measures were being implemented, it emerged that if it were not for the existence of the boundary and its operations, the toll on both animals and humans would have been overwhelming between the Pokot and Karamojong during the epidemic years.

This paper analyzed the process of the establishment of the Kenya-Uganda international boundary. The historical analysis was done by taking into account the broad types and classification of boundaries. It was noted that the established boundary, though unilateral, caused a lot of confusion and division within the British colonial circles in London where some officials advocated for a merger of the two colonies while others favoured a boundary separation. It was the latter that finally took precedence.

A clear observation during this time was that the colonial officials were not keen on the impact of that the established boundary on the Pokot and Karamojong. The boundary operations therefore had little or no regard to the relations between the Pokot and Karamojong of Uganda before colonialism. This was reflected by colonial officials' ignorance about the local people, the geographical features in place, and how natural resources were shared by the people. The boundary therefore not only split the people but also their natural resources by placing them on either Kenya or Uganda. This aggravated how the people related and shared their natural resources thereafter. Consequently, this sub-theme observes that these two communities' relationship was henceforth marked by a lot of tension and incessant raids and counter raids.

CONCLUSION

This paper has also found out that though controversial, the establishment of the International boundary between Kenya and Uganda had far reaching impact on the Pokot and Karamojong relationship and whose legal implications, by omission or commission they disregarded. It emerged from this paper that these people only recognized, accepted and operated on their traditional boundaries of frontier of contact or frontier of separation that were legitimized by their elders. More to this was the fact that their leadership, were never involved in the process of this boundary establishment. As such, they had little if any regard for it as they went on with their pastoral way of life. Their impression of the boundary was that it was the colonial government's mechanism of confining and denying them the chance to relate as before. By implication, the boundary policy demanded that all people crossing it had to get official permit to do so from government officials manning it and at designated points. It also emerged from this study that the boundary was not only poorly demarcated but also patrolled with lean security officials armed with inferior and out dated weaponry. Given the above situation the study found that the confusion which marked the boundary operations on one hand and the peoples need to continue with their traditional mode of life on the other was one of the root causes of the poor relationship and conflict between the Pokot and Karamojong from 1902.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the boundary operations, it was noted that this did not go down well with the Pokot and Karamojong since their leadership were not consulted during its establishment. This then marked the discreet manner in which they abused its policies while they crossed it with their cattle. To curb this, it is this paper's recommendation that the Kenyan and Ugandan governments should introduce an electronic method of identifying their cattle. This should involve the use of micro computer chips with an electronic code number for each animal to help track down heads. This should be done through incisions on either the animal's neck or ear. The advantage of this method is that it will help in tracking the movement of stolen cattle within and across national borders. Through a tracker machine along the specific crossing point, which should be linked to the main machine in the headquarters either in Nairobi or Kampala, it should be able to reveal the place of animal movements and to which direction. In case their movements will be very fast and towards a particular direction, that will be proof enough that those are rustlers driving the cattle from their initial locations. Likewise, this paper found out that the Kenya and Uganda security officials at the border possess inferior weapons as compared to those being used by bandits and rustlers. In order to counter this problem, the paper recommends that the two governments should spend more money in arming their security forces beyond the traditional G3 rifles for them to march the arsenal of the cattle rustlers who usually have more sophisticated weapons such as AK 47.

They may also consider buying Boing Scan Eagle helicopter surveillance to monitor the boundary. The primary function of this helicopter will be to spy on the rustlers through reconnaissance, surveillance, and hitting targets. Its other advantage is that it has a day and night camera and thermal imager. It has been used to try and locate school girls kidnapped by Boko Haram in Nigeria and to spy on Al - Queda and A-Shabaab in Djibouti with the latter case proving successful.

REFERENCE

- Anene, J.C. (1970). *The International Boundaries of Nigeria 1885 – 1960: The framework of an Emergent African Nation*: London. Longman.
- Barber, J. (1968). *Imperial Frontier: A Study of Relations Between the British and the Pastoral Tribes of North Eastern Uganda*, Nairobi: East African Publishing House.
- Butt, P.L. (1990): “Colonial Boundaries and Modern African Countries”, in Jackson Hudman (ed), *World Geography issues for Today*, New York: Wiley Publishers
- Dietz, T E. (1987). The struggle to govern the Commons. *Science* 302:1907-1912. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science1091015>
- Hugh, F. (1961): *An African Economy: A study of the Economic Development of The Nyanza Province of Kenya 1903 – 1953*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Kabwegyere, T.B. (1974): *The Politics of State Framework: The Nature and Effect of Colonialism in Uganda*, Nairobi: EALB.
- Kenya National Archives (1964): Political Records. Notes on customers and Believers of the Pastoralists. File No. K. NA 3/2/2.
- Kenya National Archives. (1901) *File NZA/17/17. Political Records on Boundary Activities*.
- Kiwanuka, M. S. M (1968) “Uganda Under the British”, in B.A Ogot (ed) *Zamani; A survey of east African History*. Nairobi, East African Publishing House.
- Kwamusi, G. (1996). A history of border relations between the people of Uganda and Kenya. The case of the Abasamia of the two countries. M. A Thesis, Makerere University department of History, Kampala.
- Mamdani, M. (1983). “Karamoja; colonial roots of famine in north east Uganda” *review of African political economy* 48, 176 – 192.
- Markakis, J. (Ed.) (1993). *Conflict and Decline of Pastoralism in the Horn of Africa*, London: Macmillan.
- Melwa, C.M. (1991): “A comparative study of Trans-border Interactions along the U.S and Mexico and Zambia – Zaire Borders” *A Paper of the Institute of Human Relations, Lifami Series: Zambia*.

- Mkutu, K. (2003). "Pastoral Conflict and Small Arms and Security in the Great Lakes Region and Horn of Africa *Safe world*.
- National Archives Entebbe (1901). Administration of boundaries between British East African and Uganda. File no A46/871
- National Archives Entebbe (1926) correspondence from the colonial office file no A/1/11 on border activities.
- National Archives Entebbe (1930) correspondence file no A34/18 on border operations
- Ocan, C. (1994). "Pastoral Conflict in North Eastern Uganda: The Karamojong Case", *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 34/35
- Ogot, B.A. & Ochieng', W.R. (Eds) (1995). "*Kenya: The Making of a Nation*, Maseno. Desk top
- Onyango, E.O (2010). Pastoralists in violent defiance of the state. The case of the Karamajong in north eastern Uganda. un published PhD Thesis, Burgem.
- Satya, A.C. (2004). "Understanding Inter-pastoralists Conflict in Uganda. The Cattle Raiding Phenomenon of Kapchorawn Distort" M.A. Thesis, Central for Peace Stadium Austria. Salih, J. (1992). *Ethnicity and the state in Eastern Africa*, Nordiska: Uppsala. Retrieved on February 18th 2011 from <http://www.nemaug.org/DSOER/KAPCHORWA.pdf>KAPCHORWA
- Vries, K. (2007). "Identity Strategies of the Agro-Pastoral Pokot: Analyzing ethnicity and Clanship within a spatial frown Work" Paper Presented at *CODESRIA* Conference Dakar. Senegal.
- Wafula, P. (2000): "A History of Border Relations between the Bagisu of Kenya and Uganda." A Paper presented at *CODESRIA Conference*, Darker.