

TWO FRATERNAL TWINS: ETHNIC POLITICS IN KENYA AND TANZANIA

Name:	Nerissa Naarden
Student number:	1374664
E-mail:	Nerissanaarden@gmail.com
Date:	06/09/2016
Course:	Bachelor Project Comparative politics
Teacher:	Jan Erk
Word count:	7982

Tanzania and Kenya are both countries that are located in East-Africa. They both have been subjected to colonial rule in the past. Tanzania was subjected to German and British rule, and Kenya was only subjected to British rule. Tanzania is a country with roughly fifty million people and has various ethnic groups in the country (The World Bank, 2016). Kenya, who had a slightly smaller population of about forty-four million people, also has a lot of ethnic groups in the country (The World Bank, 2016). In Tanzania ethnic groups like the Maasai, the Arabs, Sikhs, Europeans, Indians, Chinese, Yao and Nyakyusa will be found. Some of the ethnic groups in Kenya are the Kikuyu, the Luo, the Kamba, the Luhya, the Kalenjin and the Maasai (Long & Gibson, 2015, p.836). Evidently both countries are rich with ethnic groups, but ethnicity itself does not play a role in Tanzanian politics, whereas in Kenya it does.

Why does Ethnicity play an important role in Kenyan politics, but not in Tanzanian politics? In Kenya there are parties based on ethnicity, but in Tanzania who has the same history before colonialism does not have parties based on ethnicity. Ethnicity is the awareness of group difference based on an idea of common descent and common culture (Abbink. 1991, p. 1). It is not important if that common descent or common culture actually exists. However, it is important that those various groups of people perceive it to be true and see themselves as different from the rest. The Islands, like Pemba and Zanzibar, will not be discussed here, because their history and politics would need their own analytical explanation. An explanation that would be too large to discuss here.

To examine why ethnicity plays a role in Kenyan politics, but not in Tanzanian politics requires a detailed look at the various groups that exist in both countries. First, the common ethnic history and general history of both countries will show that the countries share the same history. Second, there will be an examination of how the colonial powers ruled the countries differently. The first major change came with the colonization of the countries, which is also the first critical juncture that signified different paths for Tanzania and Kenya. The coming to existence of borders allowed for different policies to be followed. The second critical juncture was the different kind of policy the British colonial government upheld in Tanzania and Kenya. In Tanzania the colonial government supported local political movements of the African people, whereas in Kenya they were frequently discouraged. An important factor in the difference in government policy is the influence the Europeans had in both countries. In Tanzania they had far less impact on policy formation than in Kenya.

Common ethnic history

Before colonization by the Germans and/or the British ethnic groups already existed in Tanzania and in Kenya. Hatch (1972, pp. 23-39) looks at the migrating patterns of people in East-Africa before there were fixed borders. Over the centuries various people migrated and brought their languages and cultures into the area. The groups that crossed paths with each other influenced the languages of each other

(Hatch, 1972, p.34). This is particularly important, because it proves ethnic divisions in East-Africa were already there before it was influenced by other countries. Another important point that will become apparent when we study the Arab and Portuguese influences in East-Africa is that they mostly influenced the coastal region, whereas the mainland remained mainly untouched. First, a historic account will be given of how various groups have influenced each other. Then the Portuguese and Arabic influence, which were mostly commercial, will be shown through a historic timeline. The main point that will become apparent in the following paragraphs is that the (ethnic) history before the age of imperialism, that started around the 1880s, is mostly the same for Tanzania and Kenya.

First, they share the same language families. There are four language families present in the area: the Bantu, Nilotic, Cushitic, and Khoisan (Hatch, 1972, p.26). And all these language families influenced each other as the groups came into contact with one another. An example are the Plains Nilotes of which two groups spilt off: the Bari and the Teso-Maasai. From the Teso-Maasai three groups were formed which were the Lotuko, Karamojong-Teso and the Maasai (Maxon, 2009 p. 68). They all migrated away from their possible point of origin, Lake Turkana, to different areas (Maxon, 2009, p.68). Second, they also share the same geographical environment. East-Africa is/was largely a harsh environment with irregular rainfall (Hatch, 1972, p. 6). It has a few areas that are suited for agriculture, and these areas are also far apart from each other (Hatch, 1972, pp. 6-7). Due to these harsh conditions, people had to travel to find water. In effect, there were a lot of nomadic people. In addition, the rough environment made it hard for people of different areas to communicate with each other, because it was hard to travel across the dry and thorny lands (Hatch, 1972, p.7). In addition to the same language families and geographical surroundings, the countries also share the same history when it comes to outside influence. The Germans and the British were not the only cultures and people that influenced East-Africa. There has been a great deal of Arabic and Portuguese influence, sometimes more influence than others, from the 15th century (Hatch, 1972, pp. 34-35) until the 19th century (Hatch, 1972, p.56). But this influence was mostly secluded to the coastal region of East-Africa (Maxon, 2009, p.35).

The Portuguese influence started at the end of the 15th century. Hatch (1972, p. 40) states they saw commercial interests in the East-African coast and wanted to disrupt the stronghold that the Arabs had on trade between Asia and Europe. According to Hatch (1972, p.40), they initially got a hold on the area, because people from different tribes in East-Africa would not work together. Some chose to align themselves with the Portuguese like the King of Mombasa, others tried to resist attacks and influence from the Portuguese like the Kilwa (Hatch, 1972, pp. 41-42). Eventually, the Portuguese established their authority, but only along the coastal cities (Hatch, 1972, p.42).

In the meantime, in the country itself there were new migration patterns of the people. In this period most groups travelled to the areas that they were to inhabit at the end of the 19th century (Maxon, 2009, p.93). Groups continued to influence each other and pushed each other out of a certain area or incorporated the new tribe into their own (Maxon, 2009, pp. 93-108). In the area where currently Kenya is the tribes did not have a centralized political system, but it did not mean that the tribes did not have a

way to create unity (Maxon, 2009, pp .93-94). An example of this are the Maasai. They were a group that in the middle of the 17th century gained more power and expanded further (Maxon, 2009, p.95). The Maasai did not have centralized control, but had a system that provided control and leadership through age sets (Maxon, 2009, p.95). Elders of the group had the administration and decision making power in their hands (Maxon, 2009, p.95). In Tanzania there was more centralized political control in tribes. This arguably happened according to Maxon (2009, p.102), because of the long distance trade, but also because of the turmoil in the area due to the murdering, plundering and assimilation of people by the Ngoni tribe (Maxon, 2009, p.109). He furthermore argues that it was a driving force for rulers to increase their powers and for the emergence of larger and more complex political units (Maxon, 2009, p.102). In return it caused people to seek safety under kings who had the power and the wealth to provide security (Maxon, 2009, pp. 105-110).

At the end of the seventeenth century the Portuguese were frequently challenged. All the fighting had resulted in a rapid decline of the population along the coast, but it was repopulated in the following centuries (Hatch, 1972, p.44). The fire in the Portuguese did not die down and they did more to protect their 'stronghold', for example by creating Fort Jesus (Hatch, 1972, p.44). Eventually there were new revolts, which shows that their power was not secure, but they established control again (Hatch, 1972, p.45). The first real challenge came from the Dutch, British, Persians and Oman. The latter two overthrew, with the assistance of the African states, the Portuguese power in East-Africa (Hatch, 1972, p.45).

The Portuguese history, the leadership in tribes and the migrating patterns that have been discussed are significant for three reasons. The first reason is that it shows that the Portuguese influence did not extend beyond the coast, and in effect they could not establish centralized control. The second reason is that the tribes themselves sometimes established centralized control within their tribe or a more loose kind of control within their tribe. However, all the separate tribes were not united into one tribe. The control of chiefs or other types of leaders did not extend beyond their own tribe. The final reason is that it shows that the background of the countries is largely the same. A point that will become more apparent in the following paragraphs.

In the seventeenth century the Portuguese dominance ended. The 18th century had Omani influence, but not as extensive. It is argued by Hatch (1972, p.47) that it was a result of that the people of East-Africa did not want to lose their independence and that domestic Omani rule itself was frequently in dispute. One of those disputes was between the Mazrui and the Busadi who fought internally over Oman and the Independence of Mombasa (Hatch, 1972, p.47). Another dispute was where in 1806 Sayyid Said gained control over Oman and built his empire. He defeated the Mazrui family and he established an alliance with Britain (Hatch, 1972, p.51).

After much struggle Said reached its goal in 1835-1837: The Mazruis were expelled from Mombasa (Hatch, 1972, p.53). Around the 1820's Said had to cooperate with the British in abolishing

slave trade so he would not lose his power (Hatch, 1972, p.55). If he could not put an end to it, he at least had to stop the trade between Christian countries and Omani subjects (Hatch, 1972, p.55). Said his laws and centralized control were effective and East-Africa entered the international trading community with their trade ports (Hatch, 1972, pp 55-57). The penetration into the mainland resulted in small Arabic commercial centers where the locals and traders could come to terms with each other (Hatch, 1972, p.59). Due to increases in trade a new political system and social structure had to be made in trade areas and along trade routes: Ntemi system of chieftainship (Hatch, 1972, p.60). It entailed that larger social units were created with stronger political structures to provide order and laws in and for the slave trade (Hatch, 1972, p.60). They held political, social and religious power (Maxon, 2009, p.77). Moreover, the chief was seen as the link between the people of the group and their ancestors (Maxon, 2009, p.77). But this was a system that was only present in the region where currently Tanzania is (Maxon, 2009, p.77).

Of all the European countries there, Britain had the most influence and when Said died in 1856 this increased (Hatch, 1972, p.63). His successor, his son Majid, relied even more so on British support (Hatch, 1972, p.63). However, not only the British were looking at East-Africa. Other European countries were more and more attracted to East-Africa and according to Hatch (1972, p.64) it was due to the trade, strategic considerations, and the information missionaries gathered. In the 1870's more Europeans came under different roles and were allowed to be there as long as they did not interfere with the commercial matters or politics. However, they did not stay out of their business for long. An age of European imperialism was about to start (Hatch, 1972, p.67) and the first critical juncture was about to happen.

What becomes apparent when we look at the history of ethnic groups in East-Africa is that ethnic divisions in society already existed before colonization. Spear (2003, p.24) confirms this when looking at the coast of East-Africa and Zanzibar. He finds that ethnic concepts and politics existed before colonial rule arrived in the region (Spear, 2009, p.24). Another important point to be stressed is that before colonization the influence of other countries, notably the Portuguese and the Arabs, was mostly on the coastal region. The groups in the mainland itself continued to influence each other like they have always done. They came across one another due to migration and influenced each other by taken over parts of each other's culture and language. Even though there were some differences between Tanzania and Kenya regarding the organizations of clans and tribes, the general pattern of the countries still remained the same. Separate clans were not able to unite in both countries, but some of them did establish a form of leadership within their clans. Still, some forms of leadership within the tribes were stronger than others. And in both countries the clans had different reactions to the Portuguese and the Arabs. Most of them, however, did not want to be dominated again.

A change by colonization

Tanzania and Kenya were dominated again, but it did not just end with commercial influence that was mostly secluded to the coast. For the first time they broke with their history and they were subjected under political, social and economic control by Great-Britain and/or Germany. The reason why this is an important changing moment is because the areas were officially divided into countries with a fixed set of people. The countries and their colonial governments could uphold different kind of policies. Furthermore, the people could rise up against a common enemy or for a common goal like with the Maji Maji revolt in German territory.

There was almost no European influence except commercial influence until the 19th century (Hatch, 1972, p.68). Slave trade attracted the Europeans, but slave trade itself was mostly done by the African themselves (Hatch, 1972, p.69). When it was banned, other commodities had to be found like ivory (Hatch, 1972, p.69). According to Hatch (1972, p.69), Britain wanted control to ensure free trade, but they did not want to expand their empire, so they left most of the power with the people. Other countries, however, were the complete opposite. Britain joined the other countries, but did it to protect its commercial wealth according to Hatch (1972, p.72).

In the 1880s and the 1890s the Europeans divided the country without consulting the Africans (Hatch, 1972, p.72). The Germans had an interest in Tanzania and got the country. The Germans tried to consolidate their power and the British did the same, only Gladstone who was the prime minister of Britain at the time put a halt to it, because he did not see the value of the area (Maxon, 2009, p.132). Carl Peters, from the Gesellschaft für Deutsche Kolonisation, made German protectorate places in Africa, and it is argued by Hatch (1972, p.74) that they did that because they wanted to annex the territory before their rivals could do so. The Europeans negotiated a sphere of influence above the sultans head (Hatch, 1972, p.75). Great-Britain and Germany kept being at odds, but they reached another agreement (Hatch, 1972, p.75).

Some chiefs in Tanzania signed documents that would give their land to the Europeans, but the African people did not let their land be taken without resistance and there were uprisings (Hatch, 1972, p.76). The government took the German company to consolidate/strengthen their positions, but people kept resisting (Hatch, 1972, pp. 76-77). But not everybody was against the German influence (Hatch, 1972, p.77). Each African community decided for themselves which policy they were going to follow based on what would facilitate their interests more (Hatch, 1972, p.77). The German administration was depersonalized and strict (Hatch, 1972, p.78). It was a result of not enough administrators and not enough revenue to control the area, which lead to unqualified local administrators who got administrative authority by the Germans (Hatch, 1972, p.78). Each sign of resentment by the local people was readily suppressed (Hatch, 1972, p.78). They frequently overreacted and used harsh measures of physical punishment (Maxon, 2009, p.171). They expected the people to make money for

their own government with the production of cash crops, and that increased the tension which led to the Maji Maji revolt (Hatch, 1972, p.79). The people were done with the brutality that was inflicted on them. The revolt failed according to Hatch (1972, pp. 79-80) mostly because of two reasons: they did not have enough military might and there were still tribal loyalties even though they tried to create an appeal that was above the tribes. The Germans learned from it and tried to expose their own mismanagement (Maxon, 2009, p.174).

The British conquest of Kenya was a gradual one. An important event, the building of the Uganda railway, shaped the protectorate in the earlier days of colonization (Maxon, 2009, p.159). It arguably broadened the scope of the British control and allowed for a more systematic conquest (Maxon, 2009, p.160). The railroad itself made it easier for the British colonial authorities to reach the mainland by being able to move troops inland (Maxon, 2009, p.160). Before the railroad was built the British authorities had made almost no effort to exert influence and expand their control over the land (Maxon, 2009, p.160). And even if they tried to expand their control it went slowly by the hands of the previous administrators of the Imperial British East Africa company (Maxon, 2009, p.161). The resistance that came from the people before 1900, before the railroad was built, was put down by using rifles in a strategic matter and using divide and conquer policies (Maxon, 2009, p.162). An example of this was John Ainsworth, a civil servant, who selectively used rifles and his alliance with the Kamba to extend his rule over Machakos that was in the South of Kenya (Maxon, 2009, pp. 161-162). After the railway was built the British expansion accelerated. By the end of the decade the Kikuyu, the Meru and the Embu in the North had been subjected to British control (Maxon, 2009, p.162). In the West they again made use of divide and conquer policies to gain control over the Wanga and the Luo (Maxon, 2009, p.162). The African people resisted British control, some more successful than others, but they all succumbed eventually.

The administrative structure at the time was the division of the protectorate into provinces and districts which were led by chiefs and sub-chiefs (Maxon, 2009, p.163). The British did not have a lot of their own men on the ground, so the Africans themselves were the administration under supervision of the British (Maxon, 2009, p.163). Unlike in Tanzania, in Kenya there were no real kingdoms or chiefs and those that were present were loosely organized like the age sets of the Maasai. Nevertheless there were chiefs appointed (Maxon, 2009, p.163). They were the communication lines between the people and their colonizers and that was most of their power (Maxon, 2009, p.163). Even though Britain had a system in place of indirect rule, the appointed chiefs had little to say about the policy that was employed (Maxon, 2009, p.163). Indirect rule entailed that the new institutions were built on the African institutions so that they could develop their own country with the help of the British administration; the Africans were responsible for their own development (Latham, 1934, pp. 423-424). This system was practiced wherever possible (Crowder, 1964, p.199). Even in Kenya where there were weak or no local leaders to begin with, they enforced and created this system.

The European settlers gained a lot of influence on the Kenyan colonial administration. When the railway was complete it had to start making a profit and this was facilitated by the administration by encouraging European farmers to settle there and start exporting products (Maxon, 2009, p.164). Sir Charles Elliot was the driving force behind the project and believed the area needed a white settler community to make a profit, because he deemed the African population not capable of being productive enough (Maxon, 2009, p.164). Land that was not inhabited by the Africans, public land, was taken and given to European farmers under the Crown Lands Ordinance of 1902 (Maxon, 2009, p.164). This led to displacement and other negative effect of and for some African groups and their land (Maxon, 2009, p.164). Like the Kikuyu who were divided by those who owned land and not, and the Maasai who made several agreements about the land they were settled upon and eventually lost their grazing grounds to the European settlers (Maxon, 2009, pp. 164-165). The white settler community in Kenya did not just want the land, but they also wanted exclusive ownership. This was realized by the Elgin Pledge when the secretary of state for the colonies, Lord, Eldgin, sanctioned that the land, the White Highlands, between Kiu in the east and Fort Ternan in the West would be exclusively for Europeans (Maxon, 2009, p.165).

European agriculture did not prosper until 1914 and before 1914 the African agriculture was more profitable than the Europeans (Maxon, 2009, pp. 165-167). The lack of prosperity was according to the Europeans the lack of African labor, and they pressured the colonial administration to forcefully make the Africans take jobs on the European plantations (Maxon, 2009, p.166). When the European agriculture finally started to prosper after 1914 it was according to Maxon (2009, p.167) partially a result of the restrictions that were posed on African agriculture by the colonial government under the pressure of the settlers. The ability of the European settlers to influence the colonial government did not end with agriculture. Even though they were not profitable, they could ask or demand changes. One of those changes was influence in the administration of Kenya by the establishment of a legislative council where they dominated even though they were a minority (Maxon, 2009, p.168).

What we can conclude is that for the first time in their history, Tanzania and Kenya, were subjected under foreign rule. In itself it does not seem that significant, but it is a break with their previous history. A break that is important, because it unified the countries for the first time. The African people might not have been happy about the control the British and the Germans had, but for the first time they were a country with set borders. Those borders made it possible for different kind of policy to exist between the two East-African countries, and the borders made it possible for people to rise together for a goal that was important for their country or their people.

A difference in policy

The next critical juncture in the history of the countries was the difference in British policy after WWI. Kenya was assigned to the British administration by the League of Nations, but was treated differently. Which becomes apparent when we look at how much influence the white settler community (the British) had in determining policy. In Kenya the Europeans had considerable influence before the world war, and this started to increase for a while. In Tanzania they were also a dominating force, but the main difference between the two countries is that the governors and administration in Kenya frequently supported the claims of the European settlers, whilst in Tanzania the governors supported the African movements. This difference in their support led to the rise of nationalistic movements in Tanzania like the Tanganyika African Association. While the lack of support from the government and the policy they uphold in Kenya made the formation of national movements hard. This will be shown by history where it becomes apparent that political movements in Kenya were mostly formed by interests that were significant for a specific group. Like the Kikuyu who mostly defended their own interests of landownership. The effects of this become apparent when we look at party formations leading up to independence: the Tanzanians had a national party, whereas in Kenya the people were divided between the KANU and the KADU. The difficulty of forming political movements in Kenya is also shown by the disapproval by the administration when it came to the Kikuyu Central Association, and the banning of political associations for a period of time.

In WWI East-Africa was one of the fronts they fought on (Hatch, 1972, p.82). The war taught the African people some lessons in warfare and the might of the European countries in fighting against each other (Hatch, 1972, p.83). After the war the economy was destroyed: plantations were abandoned and products were seized by the British (Hatch, 1972, p.83). The League of Nations assigned the territories to countries and the British took over the newly named Tanganyika (Hatch, 1972, p.83). First the impression came that it would follow Kenya its model and that it would become a part of white-settled East-Africa (Hatch, 1972, p.85). The policy of divide and rule had set in (Hatch, 1972, pp. 85-86). However, the British colonial government saw Tanganyika in a different light as the white settlers did and the colonial government treated the country different than Kenya. For example, Governor Byatt did not favor the European settlers as much like it did happen in Kenya (Maxon, 2009, p.187). With the Devonshire declaration made in 1923 they stated that every controversial issue that arose should take the African interests into account more than other interests (Hatch, 1972, p.86). As a reaction, the white settlers wanted a council to be set up that had to be consulted before legislation was promulgated (Hatch, 1972, p.87). The council was dominated by the Europeans like they expected (Hatch, 1972, p.87). At the same time British policy became more clearly defined with the installment of a dual mandate and indirect rule under the Governor Sir Donald Cameron, who came into power in 1925 (Hatch, 1972, p.87). A dual mandate meant that the colonies should develop in a way that it benefitted the interests of

the indigenous inhabitants as well as it would develop in the world interests (Hatch, 1972, p.87). Indirect rule was the system where in each area an African leader would get judicial, executive and financial powers that were backed by the British colonial government (Maxon, 2009, p.189). They were there to maintain law and order, a good infrastructure, and to keep an eye on who and what lived in the area (Hatch, 1972, p.88). They had to have the help of local people, because the area was too big (Hatch, 1972, p.88). The local leaders were selected by quid pro quo, which led to unqualified people who were molded by the British colonial government themselves (Hatch, 1972, p.90).

In 1929 Cameron participated in the formation of the Tanganyika African Association (TAA), which would lead to independence (Hatch, 1972, p.90). He supported the formation of the TAA, because he found it beneficial to have a place where the local people could discuss ideas (Hatch, 1972, p.90). It was not the first organization with a national character. In 1922 the Tanganyika Territory African Civil Service Association was set up with more an elitist character (Hatch, 1972, p.91). They believed that education was the key to get a better status in society (Hatch, 1972, p.91). Members from the Tanganyika Territory African Civil Service Association were from different tribes which was the start of a national consciousness, and some of those members also formed the TAA (Hatch, 1972, p.91). Cameron opposed the plans for a Closer Union that arose in the late 1920s (Maxon, 2009, p.190). He did not want the white domination in Kenya to happen in Tanzania (Hatch, 1972, p.91). There was an important conference in 1933, which was a year before Cameron left. He wanted no Closer Union between African territories, because Kenya and its dominate European settlers would sabotage Tanganyika (Hatch, 1972, p.93). In 1930 there was a joint selection committee that wanted to hear evidence from all the subjects (Hatch, 1972, p.93). The three delegates, Martin Kayamba, Chief Makwaia and Francis Lwamgira were a unity even though they were from very different backgrounds (Hatch, 1972, p. 94). They did not want any scheme that would allow Kenyan white settlers to penetrate their society (Hatch, 1972, p. 94). In effect, Governor Cameron encouraged the local tribal communities (Hatch, 1972, p.91). Klemens Kiiza was an example of this. He had support and opened the path for Africans to political issues by forming the Bukoba Bahaya Union, which was formed by the Bahaya to become the first tribal organization (Hatch, 1972, p.92). But it was the exception rather than the rule since most tribes resisted efforts to establish an administrative authority above them (Hatch, 1972, pp. 92-93).

World War II had less of an impact on Tanganyika than World War I, because it was not being fought on their territory (Hatch, 1972, p.96). But money from the African states was put in the war chest and the boys in the army came back with new experiences (Hatch, 1972, p.96). Those experiences have according to Hatch (1972, p.96) led to independence movements. Politically the locals had more freedom. In 1940 the bettering of Africans became their mandate, there were movements for all of them (Hatch, 1972, pp. 97-98). The TAA kept on growing. Political awareness grew and the U.N. wanted the country to become independent and Britain were to facilitate it (Hatch, 1972, p.102). The war led to a demand of resources from the country, but it did not only lead to economic development, it led also to

discontent (Hatch, 1972, p.102). Plans that were made often resulted in failures (Hatch, 1972, p. 102). Investment and attention was weak just like the administration, because the administration focused on Kenya and Uganda (Hatch, 1972, p.102). An important example of Failure was the groundnut scheme where the British government tried to overcome the world shortage of fats by investing 86,4 million dollars of which 60 million was lost due to poor planning (Hatch, 1972, p.103). Negatively, the costs of living went up, and positively local representation went up and the Africans were led into the central government (Hatch, 1972, p.103). The new government system led to more opportunities for Africans to exercise their influence (Hatch, 1972, p.104). The African Association wanted better representation and the U.N. supported them (Hatch, 1972, p.104). A report recommended some measures like the election, but it caused controversy (Hatch, 1972, p.104). The discussion opened up even more when the new Governor Edward Twinning had set up a constitutional committee and in 1951 it came with a report that wanted experts to look at the issue of elections (Hatch, 1972, p.105). Another important element was that the country generally had a racial harmony and that it was important to preserve that (Hatch, 1972, p.105). A method to do so were multiracial councils that would replace the existing ones, but this also had some opposition (Hatch, 1972, p.105). But the Europeans and the Africans in the council accepted it as a temporary solution (Hatch, 1972, p.105). In 1954 the Governor made his decision on constitutional reform and when it was amended later that year it entailed that the legislature would contain 61 members, of which 30 were unofficial members appointed by the government, ten of each race, and the government would continue to have a majority of thirty-one official members (Hatch, 1972, p.105).

The examples of governors that supported local movements and movements like the TAA illustrate the difference in policy between Kenya and Tanzania. Governor Cameron supported the movement of the TAA for example, because he found it beneficial to have a place where the local people could discuss issues. Cameron also opposed the Closer Union, because he did not want white domination to happen in Tanzania like it did in Kenya. The differences between the countries will become more clear after the Kenyan history of that period will be discussed.

After the first world war Kenya had suffered considerable damage and became the focus of the British colonial power (Maxon, 2009, p. 200). This entailed that the British colonial government invested in Kenya more than they did in Tanzania. The damage in Kenya was not due to the fighting on the land, but due to the recruitment of African men that were used as porters in the Carrier Corps for the British army (Maxon, 2009, p.201). A lot of men died and in the homeland the lack of men resulted in the inadequate cultivation and famine among the people (Maxon, 2009, p. 201).

The European settlers gained more political and economic control during and after the war (Maxon, 2009, p.201). One of the measures that put them ahead was the Crown Lands Ordinance of 1915 where all land was classified as crown land, even African reserves (Maxon, 2009, p.202). Another was the Native Registration Ordinance that was implemented in 1919 (Maxon, 2009, 202). It entailed

that every African had to have identification papers called the *kipande* which was a result of the demand of the European settlers to obtain more African labor (Maxon, 2009, p.202). They also gained more political control by having the ability to elect their members in the Legislative council by 1920 (Maxon, 2009, p.203). Both the Asians and the Africans suffered from the measures taken that benefited and strengthened the dominance of the European settlers (Maxon, 2009, pp. 203-204). The Europeans were headed to become a governing minority, but Asian and African protest put a halt to this (Maxon, 2009, pp. 203-204). This is a prime example of how the European settler community was favored over the Africans (and the Asians) in Kenya by the colonial government. This is a big difference with Tanzania where the dominance of the European settlers was held in check by governors like Cameron.

The African population started to become politically active when they were fed up with the dominance of the European settlers in the political and the economic arena, and their weakening positions due to all the measures that have been taken against them (Maxon, 2009, p.207). The most prominent groups in this protest were the mission educated and the chiefs, who sometimes worked together to achieve their goals and sometimes competed with each other for dominance in local politics (Maxon, 2009, p.207). An example of this is the protest of Harry Thuku. He was educated by the Christian mission and underwent (political) experiences that made him launch his political career (Maxon, 2009, p.207). He was against the abuse of the colonial government and the role that chiefs played as spokesmen for the Kikuyu unhappiness (Maxon, 2009, p.207). Eventually he was arrested for calling upon the African people to take action, which the government saw as civil disobedience (Maxon, 2009, p.208). His supporters and sympathizers demanded for his release, but during this protest a number of them got injured by the firing of the police that guarded the jail (Maxon, 2009, p.208).

In 1924 another organization was founded by the educated Kikuyu under the Kikuyu Central Association (KCA), but the administration saw the KCA as irresponsible (Maxon, 2009, p.210). The organization itself had increasing support among the mission educated men in Kikuyu country and Nairobi (Maxon, 2009, p.210). Under this association Johnstone Kamau, who is better known as Jomo Kenyatta, became the representation of the association and pressed his claims about the land distribution in London, but was largely ignored (Maxon, 2009, p.211). From 1928 the association put their weight behind the traditional values and practices, like female circumcision, that were seen as wrong by the missionaries (Maxon, 2009, p.211). This resulted in Kikuyu people choosing to leave their mission churches with the support of the KCA and the rise of new independent churches and schools by 1930 (Maxon, 2009, p.211). The KCA continued to attract support due to the issue of female circumcision, but it was not a mass movement (Maxon, 2009, p.215). For the Kikuyu and the KCA the main issue remained land, and with the appointment of the Kenya land Commission in 1932 there was hope for the settlement of the issue (Maxon, 2009, p.215). However, the commission disregarded a lot of their claims and gave little compensation (Maxon, 2009, p.215). Moreover, land segregation in favor of the Europeans was firmly secured by the commission by providing more security in the Highlands (Maxon, 2009, p.215). These are examples of how the Europeans were systematically privileged over the

Africans and how African political groups in Kenya were not mass movements, but were movements that supported the interests of an ethnic group. In Tanzania mass movements were created like the TAA and efforts of the European settlers to gain more dominance were averted by the governors. An example of this is the previously mentioned plan for a Closer Union that was shot down by governor Cameron. Also, unlike in Kenya, the formation of local groups where matters could be discussed among the Africans were supported by the governor of Tanzania. Groups in Kenya, like the KCA, were almost immediately seen as irresponsible by the Kenyan administration.

The European settler community wanted a majority government that would lead to self-government and by 1925 this was linked to the idea of a Closer Union of the three African territories (Maxon, 2009, p.211). Their ideas were supported by governors like Edward Grigg, who was the Governor of Kenya at that time. But the ideas were not easily realized due to opposition by the Asians in Kenya, and the countries Uganda and Tanzania (Maxon, 2009, p.211). In Tanzania the plans for a Closer Union were opposed by their governor, Cameron, like previously mentioned. The Devonshire Declaration held, and the idea for a Closer Union was furthermore shutdown by the coming to power of a Labor government in Great Britain (Maxon, 2009, p.212). The policy changed and a responsible government was seen as a goal for future Kenya and that the Africans had to be represented (Maxon, 2009, p. 212). Furthermore, the new policy insisted that the trusteeship responsibilities would solely rest with the British government (Maxon, 2009, p.212).

After WWII, Kenya was the main interest of the British due to its strategic location and the large investments that were made by the British themselves (Maxon, 2009, p.246). The issue of land was still on the agenda for the Kikuyu, and the African farmers still were at a disadvantage compared to the European farmers (Maxon, 2009, p.247). However, Maxon (2009, p.247) argues that the war brought something new to the table: the return of African soldiers came with new experiences, experiences that made them want more advancement in the political, economic and social sphere. Sir Phillip Michel, who became the governor in 1944, saw the need for African advancement and did it in the framework of multiracialism which meant that the African settlers should share political control with the Europeans (Maxon, 2009, p.247).

There was a rising discontent after the war among the African people, because even though there was a plan of African advancement there was little effort to incorporate the educated African into the government or the economy (Maxon, 2009, p.248). There was discontent at the elite, the petty bourgeoisie and the rural areas for various reasons, but the main reason for all of them was that they were still victims of the policy (Maxon, 2009, pp. 248-249). For example, the Kikuyu were still taken of their land and the Kikuyu farmers still could not grow certain crops (Maxon, 2009, p.249). Some of the movements that arose from this discontent were radical even though they did not necessarily started out as radical (Maxon, 2009, p.250). The Kenya African Union (KAU) was the way the Africans (mostly of Kikuyu descent) could air their grievances (Maxon, 2009, p.250). They started as an organization that

was peaceful and wanted to gain access to the government, the elimination of the color bar (racial segregation) and an adequate solution to their land problem (Maxon, 2009, p.250). However, they ended as a split organization with a violent and radical side, and a more moderate side which Jomo Kenyatta belonged to (Maxon, 2009, p. 250). The radical side got violent and the British government and the European settlers got worried and banned the “Mau Mau Association” in 1950 which was a term that was used to refer to anti-European activity (Maxon, 2009, p.252). The members of the organization, including Kenyatta, were pushed to speak against the Mau Mau, but in the case of Kenyatta he denounced it too late and was seen as one of the perpetrators (Maxon, 2009, p.252). The situation escalated quickly and by the end of October 1952 an emergency situation was declared paired with the arrest of prominent KAU leaders like Kenyatta (Maxon, 2009, p.252). It was the start of the Mau Mau rebellion, which started successful for the rebels, but it practically ended in 1956 with the capture of Dedan Kimathi (Maxon, 2009, p.253). A huge negative effect of this was the ban of colony-wide political associations for the years to come, but a positive one was the change in policy which entailed that the government would not support settler dominance in Kenya anymore, because it led to obvious problems (Maxon, 2009, p.253). Plans like the program of economic reforms were made, but it did not bring any satisfaction to the Africans (Maxon, 2009, pp. 254-255). The banning of any colony-wide political organization resulted in tribalism and sectionalism according to Maxon (2009, p.255). His claims are supported by Mueller (2014, p.336) who states that the ban on countrywide political associations cemented ethnic pluralism till even after independence. A new constitution was made which resulted in some advances for the African people like the popular election of Africans to the Legislative council, but there was no universal suffrage since voters had to qualify by educational levels and property ownership (Maxon, 2009, p.255). After the first vote, the African members boycotted the existing constitution by not participating in the executive (Maxon, 2009, p.256). There was no political unity among the Europeans, and some saw the need for change (Maxon, 2009, p.256). A constitutional conference was held in London at the Lancaster House in 1960 that would facilitate this change that was still in the line of multiracialism (Maxon, 2009, p.257).

In contrast with Tanzania, the Africans in Kenya were still more disadvantaged. Superficial policy changes were made that brought no real advantages for the African community in Kenya, which resulted in uprisings like the Mau Mau revolt. Without this revolt, it could be argued that, the European settlers would still dominate the political and public arena of Kenya. However, the biggest difference between Kenya and Tanzania becomes apparent here: colonial government policy in Kenya favored the European settlers and Africans were retained to politically organize themselves, whereas in Tanzania the European settlers were not favored in policy and plans were made to facilitate the organization of Africans. An example of this facilitation was the support of the TAA and the active opposition of the governor of Tanzania to the Closer Union.

National parties could be formed again and two parties came into being: the Kenya African National Union (KANU) that was comprised of the Kikuyu and the Luo, and the Kenyan African

Democratic Union (KADU) which protected the smaller ethnic groups (Maxon, 2009, p.257). This shows a divide between ethnic lines during the upcoming elections. However, the parties had the same issue which was the release of Kenyatta (Maxon, 2009, p.257). The KADU formed a government with the promise that Kenyatta would be released in the future (Maxon, 2009, p.257). When Kenyatta was released in 1961 he tried to unite the two parties, but after that failed he became the president of the KANU (Maxon, 2009, p.258). The KANU and the KADU had different plans about the future of Kenya, and in effect its constitution (Maxon, 2009, p.258). After the elections of May 1963 KANU came out as the winner and was called to form a government that would lead Kenya to independence (Maxon, 2009, p.259). By the end of colonial rule in 1963 (Maxon, 2009, p.259) ethnic politics were set in stone.

Conclusion

All in all, government colonial policy determined the direction of the two countries. The encouragement of national movements in Tanzania led to a national party, whereas the discouragement of national movements led to ethnic politics in Kenya. National movements were encouraged in Tanzania due to the support of the Governor. An example of this is the support of governor Cameron for the formation of the TAA. In Kenya it was discouraged due to marking the KCA as irresponsible and banning the formation of political associations after the Mau Mau revolt by the colonial government. The history of Kenya and Tanzania have a lot of overlap. Up until colonization their history is practically the same. Ethnic divisions already existed in their societies due to migration. There was not much influence on the mainland and even the coastal regions, who were subjected by the Portuguese and the Arabs, had only commercial influence. This all changed when the European countries, Germany and Great-Britain, started to colonize the countries and exert their power in the social, political and economic sphere. For the first time they were under total control (even though this happened gradually). The borders made it possible for different kind of policy to come into being for the two nations, and it also made it possible for the African people to unite against a common enemy or fight for a common goal that was important for the people in their country.

The next and final critical juncture in explaining why ethnic politics are salient in Kenya and not in Tanzania happened after WWI. The British took over Tanzania, but maintained a different kind of policy. In the case of Kenya it resulted in sectional movements. One reason was that national associations were not encouraged and for a period even banned in Kenya. Another reason for those sectional movements is that they were only appealing to certain groups in the community. Like the issue of landownership: it was only significant for groups that lost their land like the Kikuyu. So those kind of movements usually were comprised of mostly Kikuyu. It is also shown by the movements leading up to independence. In Kenya different parties arose and they mostly represented certain ethnic groups: KANU was comprised of the Kikuyu and the Luo, and the KADU protected the smaller ethnic groups.

In Tanzania the colonial policy resulted in national movements. They were encouraged by the colonial government and (most of the) governors of the country, and the African interest were seen as paramount there by the colonial government. Even though the Devonshire Declaration – which made African interests paramount- also applied to Kenya, the European community there was too influential and did not want the African people to gain more power since it would be detrimental for their own power. It took longer in Kenya than in Tanzania for the African people to become more influential. In Tanzania national movements like the TAA were encouraged by the governor, and there was also no large influence on colonial government policy from the European settler community that could influence the colonial government in favoring them, which did happen in Kenya. This point should be stressed here: the Europeans in Kenya were favored in policy-making and were dominant, whereas in Tanzania this was not the case. More research is of course required. (Colonial) Government policy cannot be the only reason why ethnic politics are salient in Kenya and not in Tanzania, but it does provide one of the explanations for this phenomenon.

Literature

- Abbink, J. (1991). The Deconstruction of 'tribe': Ethnicity and Politics in Southwestern Ethiopia, *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 24, pp. 1-21.
- Crowder, M. (1964). Indirect Rule: French and British Style, *Africa: Journal of the international African Institute*, 34(3), pp. 197-205.
- Hatch, J. (1972). *Tanzania: A Profile*. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Latham, G.C. (1934). Indirect Rule and Education in East Africa, *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute*, 7(4), pp. 423-430.
- Long, J.D. & Gibson, C.C. (2015). Evaluating the Roles of Ethnicity and Performance in African Elections: Evidence from an Exit Poll in Kenya, *Political Research Quarterly*, 68(4), pp. 830-842.
- Malipula, M. (2014). Depoliticised ethnicity in Tanzania: a structural and historical narrative, *Afrika Focus*, 27(2), pp. 49-70.
- Maxon, R. (2009). *East Africa: An Introductory History*. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press.
- Mueller, S.D. (2014). The resilience of the past: government and opposition in Kenya, *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 48(2), pp.333-352.
- Spear, T. (2003). Neo-Traditionalism And The Limits Of Invention In British Colonial Africa, *The Journal of African History*, 44(1), pp. 3-27).
- Worldbank. (2016, 05 15). *Data*. Retrieved from World bank:
<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL>