The Consequences of Early Colonial Policies on East African Economic and Political Integration

The Consequences of Early Colonial Policies on the East African Economic and Political Integration

Matthew Lee Battani

A Thesis in the Field of International Relations

for the Master of Liberal Arts in Extension Studies

Harvard University

November 2020

Abstract

Twentieth-century economic integration in East Africa dates back to European initiates in the 1880s. Those policies culminated in the formation of the first East African Community (EAC I) in 1967 between Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania. The EAC was built on a foundation of integrative polices started by Britain and Germany, who began formal colonization in 1885 as a result of the General Act of the Berlin Conference during the Scramble for Africa. While early colonial polices did foster greater integration, they were limited in important ways. Early colonial integration was bi-lateral in nature and facilitated European monopolies. Early colonial policies did not foster broad economic integration between East Africa's neighbors or the wider world economy. Those policies only allowed East African nations to integrate vertically and exclusively with their colonial masters. Furthermore, distrust, conflicts, and war between Africans and Europeans greatly hampered bi-lateral integration efforts. Rivalries between European and Arab powers and geographic challenges further slowed integration in East Africa. This thesis concludes that the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 laid the foundation for greater regional integration in East Africa, but only within the boundaries set by Great Britain, which continued exclusionary and monopolistic policies intended to benefit their empire.

Dedication

To my many friends, neighbors and colleagues in Uganda who gave me a warm home for almost four years

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge the following people:

Harvard's Extension School Staff

Harvard's Library Staff

My academic advisor, Chuck Houston

My thesis co-director, Don Ostrowski

My research advisor and thesis co-director, Doug Bond

And the fabulous professors from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Harvard's Kennedy School that stimulated my academic growth throughout this process

Table of Contents

Chapter I

An Introduction to East African Integration

The twentieth century was arguably the most dramatic and consequential in all of human history. From the World Wars to the Cold War, from the arms race to men walking on the Earth's moon, it is unlikely that we could find a more impactful 100 years and decolonization during that century might be the single most impactful trend of the entire century. It began with European empires stretching across much of the known world, particularly in Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Their empires strived to "effectively occupy"[1] massive tracts of land. The century ended with Britain peacefully handing the small yet enormously prosperous colony of Hong Kong, back to China and with the once-vast European empires hanging on to only the vestiges of their former scale, controlling little more than a few remaining outposts as the new millennium began.

As these empires disintegrated, most of which took place during the 30 years after the conclusion of World War II, numerous movements took hold in attempts to unify, strengthen, and make relevant those former colonies in the face of their still powerful former colonial masters and the world's two emergent super powers the United States and the USSR. The Cold War was in full swing at the time and smaller nations all over the world struggled to maintain their national autonomy in a bi-polar world, which sought to enlist

[1] "General Act of the Berlin Conference on West Africa," February 26, 1885.

each and every corner of the globe in an existential struggle between the East and West. The leaders of these new nations, especially in Africa and the Arab world, recognized the need for unity and the potential benefits that could come from it, which spawned numerous unification efforts driven by Pan-Africanism and Pan-Arabism. However, in the years immediately after independence most of these movements lost steam and their proponents, once full of vision and determination, ended up settling for, at best, compromised unity, and, at worst, eventual disintegration of existing unity.

The movement to federate East Africa in the aftermath of Britain's exit is one such failure. Independence in East Africa began with Tanzania in 1961 and concluded with the lowering of the Union Jack in Nairobi, Kenya in December 1963. Upon independence, the people of the East Africa inherited, what was at the time, probably the most impressive level of economic integration seen anywhere in the world. They had a common currency, joint ownership over a vast array of common services and a fully functioning common market. What is more, they also enjoyed considerable political will from their newly elected leaders to develop a full political federation. The first East African Community was declared in 1967.

Why did this movement fail? East Africa in 2020 is far less integrated than in was upon independence in 1963. This thesis aims to focus on the consequences of early integrative colonial policies in East Africa and argues that while significant progress towards integration was made up to 1919, the foundation of that integration was weak, leaving East Africa with a shaky foundation on which to build greater integration.

Early colonial integration was weak for five main reasons. Firstly, when Europe arrived in East Africa they had no clear plan for how to engage with the region. European motivations for being in East Africa were incredibly diverse and often contradictory. Second, rivalries between European and regional powers, particularly the Sultanate of Zanzibar, were destructive, which slowed and even undid existing integration. Thirdly, Africans themselves were seen as enemies in the process. They were not engaged as equals of sovereign nations and therefore had very little input in the process. Fourthly, integration was forced upon the local African populations causing much resentment and over a dozen open rebellions, which further set back integration efforts. Finally, early colonial policies meant to integrate East Africa with Europe were exclusionary. Both Germany and Britain governed with protective measures in place preventing East African peoples from forming a broad network of partnerships. Their trade was restricted and potential sources of foreign capital were excluded. These policies, in effect, set up state-sponsored monopolies in East Africa, which further delayed the process towards broader integration.

African nationalism matured in the years immediately following World War II, which coincided with the decline of Britain as a colonial power. Britain became too weak to maintain and enforce the exclusionary policies in their empire. Free trade and broad economic integration were seen as ways to prevent another war and Britain began taking some steps towards broader, more open integration in East Africa. The saying went "where goods don't cross borders, armies will." This thinking took greater hold after the ravages of World War II. However, it was too late. The demand for independence had grown. Violent wars against colonization broke out in Algeria, Vietnam, and Kenya. African nations, beginning with Ghana in 1956, started earning their independence. The most meaningful steps toward East African economic and political integration took place just before independence and were thoroughly undone by the late 1970s. It was an acrimonious divorce that resulted in closed borders, unpaid debts, halted trade, and, eventually, open war between Uganda and Tanzania in 1978.

The collapse of the East African Community in the 1970s is also relevant today because for more than 20 years, efforts to restart the grand project have stalled. In the immediate aftermath of the collapse of the Soviet Union, Africa went through a significant realignment. The old bi-polar paradigm of East versus West came to an end. Both sides had allies and supporters on the African continent and once the Cold War ended, things began to shift. Notably, South Africa's Apartheid government quickly adjusted. The CODESA talks began, which resulted in a new constitution, majority rule and the election of Nelson Mandela. Simultaneously, the leaders in East Africa began meetings and agreed to finally federate East Africa, a dream that had been abandoned in 1964. However, as of 2020, East Africa is only marginally closer to federation than it was in 1993 when its leaders restarted the process. Examining the shortcomings of early colonial integration may inform contemporary efforts at rapprochement.

It is important to point out that the concept of East Africa began as a foreign one. Both Germany and Britain called their colonies in the region East Africa up to independence. The closest thing to a regional identity prior to colonization was the Swahili Coast, which was controlled by the Sultan of Oman. The Swahili Coast, however, did not include the interior, which makes up most of East Africa today. East Africa as a unified region was initially born when Germany signed the Treaty of Versailles at the end of World War I. The treaty ceded Tanganyika to Great Britain and unified the region. The original members of the East African Community were extensively integrated under the British East Africa High Commission. The four East African territories, Zanzibar, Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika, suffered the same colonial policies, fought against the same colonial master and, upon independence, inherited a sophisticated network of integrated services. The regional identity present today has its origins in British imperialism.

Theoretically, integration should be a good thing and should not fail. More trading partners means more markets for a country's goods. More financial partners means more availability of capital. More partners in a customs union means more clout in customs negotiations and more partners allowing free movement of labor means labor demands can be better met. Under the colonial system in which integration happened vertically between the colonizers and the colonized, taking more colonies meant better integration for the hegemon only, however. It was an exclusionary type of integration. For the subjected, some benefits might flow from being connected to the imperial power, but the benefits were not equal. Trade was directed vertically, not horizontally, so the only nation achieving broad integration was the colonizer who could integrate their economy widely across as many colonies as possible, negotiate and even dictate the rules through economic weight, political manipulation, or military might. The colonized, on the other hand, did not enjoy such broad integration. Instead, they tended to have only one main trading partner that could set the rules in their favor. In this way, decolonization completely changed the game. Instead of a few powerful nations enjoying broad economic integration, all nations could, at least in theory, pursue new economic partnerships in a more level playing field.

The framework used to examine integration in this thesis comes from *African International Relations* by Olatunde J. C. B. Ojo. This book identifies five levels of integration. Under this classification, the most basic integration includes erasing tariffs and quotas on trade, which makes it easier for goods to move across borders and link the economies. Linking the economies increases competition and therefore stimulates innovation. It also opens up new potential markets for businesses and producers while allowing for importation of a greater variety of commodities, components, and consumer goods at potentially lower prices. Optimizing trade in this way allows economies to be greater linked and enjoy greater benefits from more frequent and larger dealings.

The next level, in addition to tariff-free, quota-free trade, creates a full customs union in which tariffs outside the integrated bloc of nations would be regulated and uniform eliminating discriminatory tariffs on specific countries or regions and optimizes trade between the bloc itself and the outside world.[2] This optimizing of trade aims to make trade dealings with the member-nations easier and more straightforward by unifying any trade deals. It also aims to strengthen the bargaining clout of the bloc by making it a larger and therefore more relevant trade partner. By increasing size in this way, any potential trade deals become more consequential and potentially more attractive to outside nations and other customs unions. The advantage is gained by negotiating from a position of greater strength than individual nations could achieve unilaterally in bi-lateral negotiations.

[2] Olatunde J. C. B. Ojo, *African International Relations* (London: Longman, 1985).

Third level integration, in addition to free trade and a full customs union, includes a common market in which barriers to the free flow of capital and labor are removed inside the integrated community.[3] The removal of such barriers acts to further promote economic activity within the common market by allowing labor needs and capital needs to be met more freely. This type of promotion of economic activity can work better in theory than in actual practice. For example, a common market in which all member states have surplus labor and yet are deficient in available capital will still require the members to look outside the common market both to utilize their comparative advantage in labor and to compensate for their comparative disadvantage in available capital. This dynamic can actually weaken the common market, as there may be advantages in negotiating unilaterally over collectively. This is the reality of the current East African Community.

The fourth and fifth levels both include political integration. The fourth envisages optimized and harmonized economic policies and possibly even a common currency,[4] thus eliminating separate monetary policies and further optimizing trade by removing relative currency instability. The final level is full political integration in which member nations share governing structures, yet maintain some local autonomy and therefore are classified as federated[5]

---

[3] Ojo, *African International Relations*.

[4] Ojo, *African International Relations*.

[5] Phillip Kasaija, "Regional Integration: A Political Federation of the East African Countries?," *African Journal of International Affairs* 7, no. 1–2 (2004): 32, https://doi.org/10.4314/ajia.v7i1-2.57213.

and unify many, if not all, other laws and policies related to infrastructure, social policies, security and military, immigration, environmental policies, etc.

Integration in East Africa reached the fourth level. Efforts were made in 1964, immediately after Independence, to federate and achieve full integration. The Nairobi Declaration of 1963[6] laid out the motivations for this, however, the 1964 working group failed to come to establish a constitution. Less lofty goals were established under the 1965 Kampala Agreement[7] and the 1967 first EAC treaty.[8]

These agreements sought to maintain and build upon the integration inherited from British rule. There was a common market with free movement of labor and capital. There was a monetary union and a common currency. A customs union ensured free trade between the members and collective bargaining in trade negotiations with nations outside the Community. Additionally, there was a wide range of integrated services and some of these went beyond the level of some of the most integrated economies in the world today and achieved a level of integration virtually unheard of at the time. These included: East African Harbours and Railways, East African Post and Telecommunications, East African Airlines, a partially integrated electricity grid and power interdependence, and an East African Agricultural and Medical Service.

---

[6] Jomo Kenyatta, Julius K Nyerere, and Milton Obote, “Nairobi Declaration of Federation by the Governments of East Africa,” June 5, 1963.

[7] “Kenya, Tanganyika, and Uganda: Kampala Agreement on Redressing Trade Imbalance,” *International Legal Materials* 3, no. 6 (1964): 1106–15.

[8] East African Community, “Treaty of East African Cooperation” (Kampala, Uganda, November 29, 1967). November 29, 1967.

Beyond these formal structures of integration, these nations were important trading partners and their tourism industries were inextricably linked. This was particularly true of Tanzania and Kenya both of who had tourism industries that dwarfed that of Uganda's. Most of Tanzania's big-ticket tourist draws were in their north, near the border with Kenya. These include Mount Kilimanjaro, the Serengeti National Park and the Ngorongoro Crater and Conservation area. Additionally, Zanzibar, a popular island destination in Tanzania, was often accessed via Kenya as was Tanzania's largest city and port, Dar es Salaam. This extraordinary level of integration demanded cooperation between the neighbors not only because of the common services established under the East African High Commission, but also because of the extensive level of trade and interconnectedness that had been fostered and bore fruit under a British hegemony.

Surprisingly, or perhaps not, the same thinking that created the European Union was behind integration in East Africa as well. At the end of World War II, conventional wisdom aimed to integrate economies to prevent wars. It is in this period that we have the so-called "golden age" of economic integration in East Africa and "there was never the possibility that the three [East African] governments could go to war against each other, or could undermine each other...."[9]

An incredible amount of integration activity was seen during this golden age from 1946 to 1948. In 1946, East Africa Airlines was setup with

[9] M. Rwekaza, "'Political Cooperation', in Perspectives on Regional Integration and Cooperation in East Africa: Proceedings of the 1st Ministerial Seminar on East African Cooperation" (East African Community Secretariat, March 25, 1999), 89–91.

joint ownership between Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika with a small share going to Zanzibar. Construction on the Owen Falls Dam began in the Protectorate of Uganda aimed at supplying electricity to the Crown Colony of Kenya. In 1948, the Kenya and Uganda Railways and Harbours Corporation was reorganized to include Tanganyika and became the East African Railways and Harbours Corporation or EAR&H and was based in Tanganyika. Also in 1948, East African Post and Telecommunications began operations based in Kampala, Uganda and was operated throughout all four British territories. Also in that year, the East Africa High Commission was created which aimed at streamlining colonial administration by overseeing economic development. Combined with the existing customs and monetary union, this level of regional planning was unprecedented and as the EAHC guided implementation another trend began to gain steam.

Soldiers returning from World War II began to clamor for more rights and freedoms. They had seen and learned much from their war experienced and their efforts changed calculations in Whitehall in regard to much of her overseas empire. Along with developments in Algeria and Vietnam, grand plans to integrate overseas empires ground to a halt. In 1952, the Mau Mau rebellion started in Kenya. The rebellion did not halt integration entirely, but it did consume and distract the British from some integration efforts. The rebellion also greatly dampened British enthusiasm for her colonial projects as a huge amount of resources had to be diverted to the Kikuyu highlands both to stop the Mau Mau and to placate a very upset and extremely vocal expatriate community running Kenya's cash crop agriculture in and around Nairobi.

Accomplishments of the EAHC were remarkable. Upon independence, the EAHC had established a common currency, customs union, and joint ownership of infrastructure and even centralized taxation as well as a host of other regional bodies and services. The integration went even further. In 1948 a common market had been established under the quasi-federated system of the High Commission. It was the EAHC in which regular and direct coordination became the norm and the structure was simple. It was comprised mainly of the three territorial governors and a Secretariat staffed by "technocrats with a region-wide outlook and expertise, coordinated the common services"[10] who met regularly in Nairobi to carry out the business of the Commission's wide ranging mandate.

Upon independence, the EAHC gave way to the East Africa Common Services Organization, which sought to coordinate the budding federation. Spirits were high and the hope for greater integration was alive and well. The trio of new African leaders, Nyerere, Obote and Kenyatta, declared, "the value of working together has been adequately demonstrated in the E.A.C.S.O. and in the Common Market but the scope for further joint action remains wide."[11] It appears, however, that the goals of the three African leaders were different. Integration had already reached its zenith and what these leaders likely had yet to realize is that the next 15 years would see a slow and steady disentanglement of their economies that would culminate in a terribly costly war between Uganda and Tanzania and a disastrous five-year border closing between Kenya and Tanzania.

---

[10] Kasaija, "Regional Integration," 25.

[11] Kenyatta, Nyerere, and Obote, "Nairobi Declaration of Federation by the Governments of East Africa."

This thesis examines integration in the early colonial period. That examination ends with the creation of British East Africa in 1919, which laid the foundation for all East African integration under British rule. An explanation of integration and disintegration beyond 1919 would require further scholarship.

Chapter II

The Groundwork for European Integration

European interaction with East Africa has come in two distinctly different waves. The early wave was led by Portugal and started at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Portugal was searching for an all-water route to India and unintentionally found East Africa along the way. This began a wave of Portuguese interaction mainly involved trade in highly valuable goods like slaves, ivory and gold and did not involve extensive construction of settlements, deep penetration into the hinterlands, direct governance or large infrastructure projects.[12] It also did not leave a lasting linguistic or religious impact. The later wave, led by Britain, started in the 1840s and included all those things.

Arrival on the Coast

The first wave began with Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama's seminal voyage to India (1497-99). Da Gama extended a route pioneered by Bartolomeu Diaz who, a decade previous, had become the first European to sail from Portugal to the Indian Ocean around the southern tip of Africa. Da Gama's voyage is recognized as a major milestone in sea faring, exploration

[12] D. Wadada Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa* (Zed ;--USdistributor, LHill, 1981), 6, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015004965524.

and European imperialism.[13] He opened the door on a hundred years of Portuguese domination of sea traffic around the Cape of Good Hope between the Indian and Atlantic Oceans. Portugal would go on to hold colonies in Asia and Africa up until the late twentieth century. In fact, Portugal was both the first European colonial power in Africa and the last to leave, only giving up their colonies of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau in 1975. Macau, Portugal's last colony in Asia was only transferred to China in 1999. When the Suez Canal was completed in 1869 connecting the Red Sea to the Mediterranean, the importance of the cape route diminished, though Portuguese domination of Indian Ocean trade had already subsided in favor of other European powers notably the French, Dutch, Danish and British.

Da Gama's voyage marks the beginning of a new era in world history because it opened the Indian Ocean to Europeans, and Europeans would go on to colonize nearly every land it touches. The first in East Africa, Mombasa and Malindi, saw Da Gama's arrival in 1499. This was followed by a series of very rapid changes. Kilwa, located in southern Tanzania, fell under Portuguese control in 1502. Up to that point, Kilwa had been the most powerful kingdom along the coast and had subjects up the Zambezi River and south in Mozambique.[14] Further north in 1503, Zanzibar was brought into the Portuguese Empire. By 1509, Portugal had established domination of the

---

[13] Vasco Da Gama, *The First Voyage* (London: Ernest George Ravenstein, 1898). xi.

[14] Da Gama, *The First Voyage*, 32.

entire coast of East Africa[15] supplanting the Omanis who had operated the trade between the Swahili Coast and the Arabian Peninsula for centuries.

Portugal's arrival as the first European power marked a shift in the existing trade, which had previously linked East Africa with the Arabian Peninsula. That early trade is known to have included iron, gold, ceramics, ivory, palm oil, rhinoceros horn, tortoise shell, pepper, cinnamon, frankincense, and slaves.[16] It is remarkable how much of that trade is considered illicit today, yet such trafficking continues and has grown to include other clandestine items such as lion bones and pangolin shells. Humans continue to be trafficked in high numbers as well.[17] After Portugal's arrival, East African trade with India increased. They traded slaves in exchange for a variety of goods for the home market, most notably textiles.[18] Portugal's direct trade with India was focused on pepper and cinnamon and East Africa, at least at first, was merely used as a means to access Indian spices. Estuaries along the East African coast were their source of fresh water, while harbors provided shelter, provisions and places to make repairs. Later, as trading vessels advanced technologically, reliance on East African ports diminished and instead were tapped directly for gold, slaves and ivory as trading destinations rather than as mere stopovers.

---

[15] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 6.

[16] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 5.

[17] "Recalling Africa's Harrowing Tale of Its First Slavers – The Arabs," *New African*, March 27, 2018, https://newafricanmagazine.com/ 16616/.

[18] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 7.

Portugal's main focus was to "seize the whole trade of the Indian Ocean and of the distant Spice Islands."[19] This first wave of Europeans was vastly different than the second because it lacked the resources for settlements, and facilitated nothing more than trading outposts for the plundering of high-value commodities. Early naval dominance positioned the Portuguese to capture significant wealth from this "outpost-style" colonization,[20] which integrated trading settlements with Portugal, but did not integrate those outposts with each other. Later colonization aimed at both vertical integration with Europe, mostly Britain, and horizontal integration between the colonies themselves. In the twentieth century in East Africa, the development of a customs union, currency board and eventually the East African High Commission are the strongest examples of both vertical and horizontal integration.

When the Portuguese first arrived on the East African coast they encountered numerous groups of Bantu speakers, the largest of which spoke Swahili, a Bantu language with heavy use of Arabic vocabulary. These peoples originated in what is today Nigeria, Congo, and Cameroon and moved east across Africa beginning in the 2nd millennium BCE displacing and mixing with the previous inhabitants. Along the coast of East Africa, Bantus mixed with Arab and Persian traders, a mixture credited with forming the Swahili Coast

---

[19] Kenneth Ingham, *A History of East Africa*, 3d ed. (London: Longmans, 1965), 6.

[20] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 5.

by the 6th century CE.[21] Portugal, having had hundreds of years of dealings with Arabic speaking Moors, had familiarity with Arabic. In fact, Da Gama's crew on his first voyage around Africa had Arabic speaking sailors, which facilitated immediate communication with the local people.[22] This immediate communication with the local people had not been the case in southern Africa as neither the European languages, nor Arabic had taken hold in the populations there. These areas include modern-day Namibia, South Africa and Mozambique and it was this section of Da Gama's voyage around southern Africa that communication with local inhabitants was the most difficult. Due to the presence of Arabic, the availability of harbors and fresh water estuaries, and the availability of good timber with which repairs could be made, East Africa, therefore, captured Portugal's immediate interest. Furthermore, rumors about the existence of Christian settlements in the region peaked their interest further. Those rumors turned out to be false, possibly mistaking East Africa with Ethiopia.[23]

By the 1690s, raiding parties from Oman forced Portugal further south into Mozambique and forever ended Portugal's domination of East Africa.[24] From Mozambique, Portugal continued trading with Indian markets. With the Omanis in control once again, East African trade diverted back to the Arabian

[21] Anthony J. Hughes, *East Africa: The Search for Unity; Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, and Zanzibar*, Penguin African Library, AP11 (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), 11.

[22] Da Gama, *The First Voyage,* 34.

[23] Da Gama, *The First Voyage,* 36.

[24] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa,* 6.

Peninsula and away from India and Europe until the next wave of Europeans arrived over 150 years later. This key development is largely responsible for the cultural, linguistic and economic divergence between East Africa and Mozambique.

Virtually all interaction between Europeans and East Africans prior to the twentieth century was in Arabic or Swahili. This advantaged early explorers and traders from the Iberian Peninsula because of their long dealings with the Arabic speaking Moors. In fact, texts from early explorers indicate that they believed all the local inhabitants to be Moors differentiating White Moors (Arabs) from Moors (Arabic or Swahili speaking black Africans).[25] European sailors in those days often spoke at least some Arabic, so they could communicate with local inhabitants along the coast of Tanzania and Kenya because of the Arabic influence in the region. Further south, this was not the case and communication with local inhabitants was more difficult.

As for the region as a whole, Arabic was not the lingua franca, which fact inhibited Portuguese traders somewhat from making inroads beyond the Swahili Coast. Inland, a wide variety of Bantu languages were spoken with strong Swahili influences particularly along trade routes. It was not until the arrival of the British that non-Arabic speaking Europeans penetrated inland.[26]

In summary, Portugal's integration with East Africa only directly affected the coast in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They communicated in Swahili or Arabic and traded in a wide variety of goods,

---

[25] Da Gama, *The First Voyage*, 34.

[26] Hughes, *East Africa*, 23.

which initially focused on spices, but evolved to include other high-value commodities. Even though Portugal did not penetrate inland, integration was taking place. Economic, cultural and linguistic influences followed the trading routes deep into Tanganyika, Kenya and into Uganda as well. Those influences were at least partly driven by Portuguese presence on the coast but the main driver of integration in East Africa at that time was Arab trade. Later European explorers such as Livingstone, Speke, Burton, and Stanley would need to rely on this Arab "footprint" when laying the foundation for deeper European integration with East Africa.[27]

Geography Slows European Exploration

Europeans saw Africa very differently in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Much of the Earth's second largest continent remained blank on their maps, which inspired mystery and wonder at the possibilities, as well as fear and trepidation at what challenges may lie in the interior. Africa's secrets had yet to reveal themselves and tempted European imperialists with potential successes.

> Golden expectations of the wealth to be won somewhere in the teeming heart of Africa had been conjured up by reports of the first explorers; and the interest taken in the second phase of exploration, which opened in 1874, was quite as much commercial interest as scientific, philanthropic or political. A little more light and Africa might be found possessing more riches than the East.[28]

[27] Ingham, *A History of East Africa.*

[28] Reginald Coupland, *The Exploitation of East Africa, 1856-1890: The Slave Trade and the Scramble* (London: Faber and Faber, 1939), 15.

Up to the mid-nineteenth century, efforts to explore had largely followed coastlines. In East Africa, Arab traders and Africans themselves brought exportable commodities like gold, slaves and ivory to the coast. From there, European ships moved those goods to markets throughout the Indian and Atlantic oceans.

Maintaining a competitive fleet across two oceans was extremely costly, and prior to the late nineteenth century, no European power had sufficient resources to explore Africa's interior. Coastal exploration was made possible at first by the sail and later enhanced by the steamship, which shorten trip durations, increased cargo capacity and extended navigation beyond wind-dependent routes to include against-current and upriver voyages.

Initial exploration of Africa's interior followed mighty rivers, primarily the Nile, Congo, and Zambezi. These three magnificent rivers demarcate some of Africa's most important geographic boundaries. The world's longest river, the Nile, flows north through the Sahara into the Mediterranean draining everything from the Rwenzori Mountains in western Uganda to Lake Victoria in the heart of East Africa. Africa's second longest river and most voluminous, the Congo, drains a massive area in central Africa into the Atlantic Ocean. Its basin extends from the Central African Republic in the north to western Tanzania in the east and even includes parts of Zambia in the south. Where the Congo's enormous basin stops, the Zambezi's drains seven southern African countries towards the Indian Ocean through Mozambique. After coastal exploration, it was these three principle rivers, along with many secondary rivers and tributaries that provided Europeans a path into Africa's interior.

The rivers, however, were problematic. Their navigability proved enormously challenging. The rapids and cataracts of Africa's primary rivers prevented safe and reliable shipment of goods characteristic of rivers like the Mississippi in North America or Yangtze in Asia. This difficulty did not stop explorers, missionaries and traders from trying to follow and use those rivers. These explorers were met, however, with largely insurmountable geographic challenges that prevented large-scale trade, infrastructure projects and regional integration. These challenges did not dissuade early explorers or their European financial backers, but instead tended to raise the stakes and intensify the desire to unlock Africa's potential. Coupled with the fact that several European powers, notably Britain and especially Germany, were particularly capital rich during the late nineteenth century and that public fervor for colonial glory was growing, conditions were ripe for deeper penetration into previously uncharted territories. European ambition, curiosity and the availability of capital combined to trigger the first big European push into East Africa's interior. It would, however, need to skip a step. Where development on other continents took place along rivers, in Africa and particularly in East Africa, railways would need to be built before large-scale projects became feasible.

It was decades before those railways could be planned and built. In the meantime, transportation and communication continued to move by foot. Beasts of burden were impractical because they had to be shipped to East Africa and were hard to keep alive once there. This placed the "weight" of exploration, mission work, and commercial ventures squarely on the backs of African porters, who, since the early days of the ivory and slave trades, had been making the journey from the interior to the coast along narrow, singletrack footpaths.[29] After railways were completed, porters were replaced in some areas, but were still heavily relied upon to move goods to and from the new rail stations. After World War II, when road networks were put in place, trucks further replaced porters. Today, porters continue to work in vast rural areas that lack roads, though motorbikes (*boda bodas*) are widely used and can reach most areas using footpaths, reducing the need for African porters to almost zero.

In summary, the vast distances, lack of navigable rivers, reliance on human porters and unfamiliarity with local languages slowed European integration with East Africa's interior. Demand for the construction of railways and roads would eventually lead to grand construction projects. That demand started with the search for fresh converts.

Missionaries Drag Europe Inland

In the interior of East Africa, initial exploration mainly sought to find suitable mission locations from which to spread the Christian faith. Before long, those missions began to include commercial interests that ventured far inland away from the familiar coastal ports setup in the preceding centuries by traders and slavers. Broadly speaking, when the "Age of Exploration" ended in the seventeenth century, much of Africa remained unmapped, so religious and later commercial explorers had little to go on besides the existing Arab trade routes. Civil administrators soon followed their religious

[29] John Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, African Studies Series 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 44–46, http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebookbatch.ACLS_batch:MIU01000000000000004916746.

and commercial counterparts to oversee and, where necessary, ensure their success.

In East Africa, Christian missionaries preceded civil administrators by about three decades. Without their activities, the interior of East Africa might never have fallen under European sway.[30] Once there, missionaries were successful in attracting their kith and kin, usually in the form of traders, into the interior with them. These traders quickly organized and evolved into chartered companies. These "companies" were later responsible for governance and even had their own militaries. Before the end of the nineteenth century, the chartered companies in the region failed and gave way to formal civil administration directed from either London or Berlin. In this way, Europe first tiptoed and later stumbled into the interior as formal colonization was declared to rescue the failing companies and protect the investments they represented.

The arrival of these two waves of Europeans, Portuguese and British, has some significant similarities. Neither planned to settle or even stay in East Africa. Portugal used East Africa to reach India for trade. By the nineteenth century, when the British explored further into the interior, they were searching for converts. They did not intend on staying, investing, or colonizing the territory and similarly to Portugal's dominating presence on the coast, Britain's much larger impact on East Africa was unplanned, unintentional, and opportunistic. They arrived with no plan for economic integration. By the

[30] Hughes, *East Africa*, 23.

time the British had a clear plan after World War II, East Africans were demanding they leave.[31]

Probably the most famous of the early missionaries was also the first, David Livingstone.[32] From 1841-1873 Livingstone worked on the continent and traveled into Africa's interior. His journeys, disappearance, writings and especially his death in search of the source of the Nile in 1873 captured attention in Britain and Europe as a whole. He added significantly to European geographic knowledge of southern Africa, particularly of the Zambezi River. From 1852 to 1856, he became the first European to travel overland across southern Africa from Luanda (Angola) to Quelimane (Mozambique).[33] Upon his arrival at Nyasa (Lake Malawi), he discovered a well-established Arab slave trade, an activity he grew to despise. His later anti-slavery writings highlighted the evils of the Indian Ocean Arab slave trade and inspired a generation of explorers, abolitionists and commercialists who followed him. Britain eventually colonized most of the area he explored with the exception of territories previously claimed by Portugal (Angola and Mozambique) and Germany, which held Tanganyika, Rwanda and Burundi as German East Africa until after World War I at which time Britain took control of Tanganyika while Belgium took Rwanda and Burundi as League of Nations Mandates from the dissolving German empire.

---

31 Kenyatta, Nyerere, and Obote, "Nairobi Declaration of Federation."

32 Hughes, *East Africa*, 23.

33 Stephanie Barczewski, *David Livingstone* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 118, http://yale.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.12987/yale/9780300180060.001.0001/upso-9780300180060-chapter-4.

Livingstone's three C's of Christianity, commerce and civilization provided justification for British activities ranging from mission work to trade to full colonization. Public response to his writings is credited with creating a fervor that partly led to the "scramble for Africa". His 1857 book, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa*, sold 70,000 copies.[34] As a missionary, however, he converted no one. As an explorer, he lacked a signature "discovery", which he was in search of upon his death. His greatest lasting impact was probably igniting British interest in the region, which led to colonization.[35] This history has been re-assessed in recent years and has been kind to Livingstone the man, but has somewhat dismantled the imperial narrative constructed after his death. Livingstone, because of his failings as a missionary and shortcomings as an explorer was the perfect imperial hero for those in need of justifying territorial aggression. His suffering and eventual death could be spun into a tail of piety and self-sacrifice, and his widely read anti-slavery writings could be cited as justification for wide-ranging anti-slavery activities which often doubled as colonial ventures.[36] In any case, David Livingstone ignited interest the region. His disappearance prompted a heavily publicized rescue mission lead by the Welsh-American explorer Henry Morton Stanley.

[34] Barczewski, *David Livingstone*, 120.

[35] Barczewski, *David Livingstone*, 129.

[36] Barczewski, *David Livingstone*, 115.

If Livingstone is most remembered for igniting interest in Africa, Stanley is probably most remembered for clarifying it.[37] In 1875-76, he circumnavigated Lake Victoria definitively establishing it as a source of the Nile, confirming John Hanning Speke's 1862 assertion.[38] His exploration of the Congo River Basin erased the last African terra incognita on European maps. He linked the Luabala River with the Congo River, demarcating the key watersheds of both the Nile and Congo River basins.[39] His accomplishments as an African explorer stand second-to-none. His work, like Livingstone before him, paved the way for wide-ranging penetrative activities by Europeans deep into the heart of the continent.[40]

Stanley's varied career represents Europe's early intentions for Africa pretty well. He led rescue missions, built roads and trading posts, negotiated treaties with numerous chiefdoms, mapped previously uncharted rivers and mountains, aided Leopold in hiding his intention to annex the Congo for Belgium, warred with Arab slave traders, angled for leverage over other European and Arab powers and outmaneuvered De Brazza for the Congo. He contributed greatly to European knowledge of the continent while simultaneously fueling imperial rivalries and his work, particularly in the

---

[37] James L. Newman, *Imperial Footprints: Henry Morton Stanley's African Journeys* (Dulles: Potomac Books, 2004), 335.

[38] Henry M. Stanley, *In Darkest Africa: Or, The Quest, Rescue and Retreat of Emin, Governor of Equatoria* (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, 1890), 291.

[39] Stanley, *In Darkest Africa*, 255.

[40] Newman, *Imperial Footprints*, 219.

Congo, is cited as a top cause of the scramble for Africa.[41] The "scramble" resulted in the colonization of most of the continent within two decades of his arrival. Like Livingstone before him, he could not have predicted the impact of his work. Stanley let his curiosity lead him from adventure to adventure without a coherent plan or clear focus.[42] At times he was cruel to Africans while at other times, he came to their rescue.[43] What is abundantly clear, however, is that like his European backers, his aims were far-reaching, opportunistic, and muddled.[44] While building roads and trading posts along the Congo River, his plans were thwarted by both King Leopold who was bent on annexation, and by his European staff who squabbled over petty issues of rank, resources and creature comforts.[45] During this time in East Africa and in Africa as a whole, European activities were extremely varied and unfocused. Rivals sought to press their comparative advantages in Africa and each was different. There were a few ventures that sought to link and integrate Africa's economies, but many projects failed or gave way to other agendas. The shape of European integration was not yet formed. Rivalries and competing interests divided territories and often contradicted each other.

The inland activities by the early explorers and missionaries like Stanley and Livingstone did not lay a solid foundation from which to build

---

[41] Newman, *Imperial Footprints,* 149.

[42] Hughes, *East Africa*, 24.

[43] Stanley, *In Darkest Africa*, 1–3.

[44] Stanley, *In Darkest Africa*, 1.

[45] Newman, *Imperial Footprints,* 149.

economic integration. This had several causes. Firstly, European activities were unplanned and largely incoherent. The intrepid leaders at the time were driven by glory and adventure. While they tried to establish administrative posts, missions and new trading centers, those efforts were undermined by their wanderlust and by intense European rivalries. Secondly, East Africa's vast territories and challenging geography made integration all the more difficult. It would take more than just a few adventurous men to overcome those challenges. The region now known as East Africa had yet to be envisioned and would remain fractured and incoherent. Attempts to settle the brewing rivalries and bring clarity to these activities such as the Berlin Conference of 1884-85, the Anglo-German Agreement of 1886 and the Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty of 1890 only temporarily alleviated rivalries, which later became full-blown at the outset of World War I. Britain eventually gained control of the entire region and laid a foundation for integration. However, before Britain could fully operate in the region, they needed to gain control of its trade. They found one type of trade particular problematic, the slave trade.

Chapter III

Europeans Capture East African Trade

East Africa has been the center of a slave trade that probably began around the 6th century, peaked in the nineteenth century,[46] and continues to this day.[47] No mention of this practice can be made without acknowledging its impact on East Africa and on the continent as a whole.

> So invasive was the practice of slavery into the economic, political, demographic, cultural, social and religious life of Africa and persisted for so many centuries, that while its effects varied both geographically and temporally in intensity, slavery out-distances in scale and scope any single or combination of disasters — natural or man-made, which descended upon the continent.[48]

No study of modern Africa can be complete without considering the impacts of slavery.

The Slave Trade in East Africa

Africa has bled slaves from the north, east and west for centuries. First slaves were taken from the north and across the Sahara to markets around the Mediterranean and Middle East. Later slaves were taken from the east to Arabia and India and lastly slaves were taken from the west and sailed across the Atlantic after the European discovery of the Americas. While Africa was

---

[46] Paul E. Lovejoy, *Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 10.

[47] "Recalling Africa's Harrowing Tale."

[48] "Recalling Africa's Harrowing Tale."

not the only continent from which slaves were taken, the African slave trade has been the most prolific and long lasting[49]. This has had a number of driving factors, which have evolved over time.[50] In East Africa it likely began after Arab traders gained control of the coast.[51] Millions of African Bantu slaves were captured and sold throughout the Middle East and Indian Ocean. Some were marched across the desert while others hauled away on ships. If they survived capture and the journey, which millions did not, they were put to work on clove or sugar plantations, as domestic servants, miners, concubines, porters, soldiers, sailors or pearl divers. Much disputed numbers put the total from East Africa around nine million slaves between the 6th and twentieth centuries.[52] Slaves of East African origin were sold mostly to Arabs but some were sold to Europeans as well. The difference in which they were sold to had a huge impact on their fate as the slave trade differed greatly by region. Slaves in the Arab world were mostly women. Any progeny were born free. The European slave trade, on the other hand, mostly dealt in men and progeny inherited their slave status. This practice perpetuated slavery in North America for generations even after the Atlantic slave trade ended. Because of

[49] "Recalling Africa's Harrowing Tale."

[50] J. D. Fage, *A History of Africa*, The History of Human Society (London: Hutchinson, 1978), 327.

[51] Lovejoy, *Transformations in Slavery*, 10.

[52] Moritz Behrendt, "Tidiane N'Diaye's 'The Veiled Genocide': Selective Theses on the Arab Slave Trade – Qantara.De," Qantara.de – Dialogue with the Islamic World, accessed February 13, 2020, https://en.qantara.de/content/tidiane-ndiayes-the-veiled-genocide-selective-theses-on-the-arab-slave-trade.

these practices, it is difficult to find the descendants of slaves in the Arab world as they assimilated quickly into the local population,[53] while the descendants of the slave trade in the Americas have remained distinct.

Continent wide, around 25 million black African slaves have been sold from the continent in the last 1500 years.[54] This number is only an estimate and other estimates put the total number much higher. Documentary evidence needed to establish scope is lacking as records were rarely kept.

There was great interest in Europe in the late nineteenth century in the evils of the Arab slave trade in East Africa. Both Livingstone and Stanley wrote widely on the topic. Their descriptions of the brutality make the reading hard to stomach. In Europe, their writings and the evils they exposed were used as justification for European colonization, which was also very brutal. The challenge to historians of this particular issue is that the primary sources on the Arab slave trade came mostly from British explorers and missionaries who saw the Arabs as rivals.[55] In some cases, their accounts were exaggerated, while it is also known that they either destroyed or failed to include accounts of their own brutality against the local people. When Christopher Palmer Rigby arrived in Zanzibar in 1858, he relayed a report that slavery had

---

[53] "Recalling Africa's Harrowing Tale."

[54] Deutsche Welle (www.dw.com), "East Africa's Forgotten Slave Trade | DW | 22.08.2019," DW.COM, accessed February 13, 2020, https://www.dw.com/en/east-africas-forgotten-slave-trade/a-50126759.

[55] Behrendt, "Tidiane N'Diaye's 'The Veiled Genocide.'"

depopulated the Swahili Coast so extensively that one had to walk 18 days inland to find any settlements.[56]

While interesting as a topic, this thesis's argument is not dependent on which groups were most responsible for the slave trade, where those slaves ended up, or how they were treated. It is important to note that Europeans and Arabs competed for control in East Africa dating back to the time of Da Gama. Foreign activities in East Africa, whether Arab or European, varied greatly over the centuries. By the late nineteenth century, Britain was asserting itself in East Africa like never before. They sought to end the slave trade because it no longer suited their economic aims. In addition, slavery was seen more and more in Britain, as the nineteenth century progressed, as a moral issue. Free-trade imperialism depended on eliminating the slave trade,[57] which had caused widespread population stagnation.[58]

> In 1600, the black African population was some 50 million — about 30% of the combined population of the New World, Europe, Middle East and North Africa. By 1800, the population had fallen to 20% of the total. In 1900, at the end of the slave trade, Africa's population had fallen yet further to just over 10% of the total.[59]

With population failing to keep pace, Africa lacked the necessary labor to increase production. East Africa's trade in slaves, ivory and gold was largely extractive and not productive. In combination with the spread of firearms

---

[56] Christopher Palmer Rigby, "General Rigby, Zanzibar and the Slave Trade," *Near East and India* 45, no. 1273 (1935): 462.

[57] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 8.

[58] "Recalling Africa's Harrowing Tale."

[59] "Recalling Africa's Harrowing Tale."

across the continent in the nineteenth century, which moved inland along side the ivory and slave frontiers, these extractive trades laid a poor foundation upon which industrial societies could integrate. Britain, and later Germany, represented a new type of economic power and they would both go to great lengths to shape and mold East Africa's economies into their imperial designs.

Free Trade Imperialism

European empires, since their inception, exploited colonies for economic gain. In previous centuries the focus had been on extractable and tradable resources such as gold, silver, guano, slaves and ivory. By the time Britain and Germany were able and prepared for an all out assault into East Africa's vast interior, the nature of their economies had changed. By the late nineteenth century, colonies were meant to provide natural resources to be processed in factories back home with the finished goods then sold in markets throughout the empire and to markets around the world. For this to work, trade needed to be free and optimized as far as possible.

> According to this doctrine, countries which had a comparative advantage in the production of particular goods could exchange them in a free market with others which had a similar advantage in other goods, and in this way the wealth of all civilized nations ... would grow to unequalled heights.[60]

Industrialization had created a unique dynamic thus far unprecedented in human history. Through mechanization, human efforts ballooned their capacity to process raw materials creating both surplus labor as well as vastly increased demand for materials to process. Products previously unattainable

---

[60] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 8.

by the masses were now becoming affordable at sometimes astonishingly cheap prices, which further boosted the desire for more goods. This demand for materials added new fuel to the fire and propelled exploration into a new phase. East Africa had long exported from her interior gold, ivory and slaves, but now, East Africa would get a fresh look by industrial powers who would scour the vast region for opportunities to apply their new methods of production. Populations of elephants and people had somewhat collapsed and their remaining populations only represented small trading opportunities antithetical to industrialization, so the new imperial powers searched East Africa for resources to exploit that could be applied to their comparative advantages and therefore grow wealth.

Over time, mainly through British efforts, previous forms of trade would move from legitimate to "illicit".[61] This shift has been called "free trade imperialism"[62] and the basic tenants were very different to the "mercantilist imperialism" that came before.[63] Britain, due to the developments of the Industrial Revolution, wanted to shift trade towards their comparative advantage, namely production.[64] This meant a shift away from the previous non-production and extractive types of trade. In order to do this, Britain first needed to gain an upper hand against their rivals. In East Africa, their primary

---

[61] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 5.

[62] Bernard Semmel, *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism: Classical Political Economy the Empire of Free Trade and Imperialism 1750–1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 2.

[63] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 7.

[64] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 6.

rivals in the late nineteenth century were the French, Dutch and Sultanate of Oman, each of whom still relied heavily on trade in goods derived from extraction rather than production.[65] The British accomplished this by first forcing the Sultan into an alliance and requiring that they stop all trade with the French and Dutch. Once this was accomplished and Britain had control of trade in the western half of the Indian Ocean, they could then move to crush forms of trade where they held no comparative advantage.

The rise of Germany and their sudden interest in East Africa caught the British off guard, but did not hamper these plans as Germany too aimed to engage in free trade imperialism based on production. Slavery had greatly diminished East Africa's productive capacity and therefore was viewed negatively by many adherents of this new form of capitalism.[66]

Britain Restrains the East African Slave Trade

East Africa was probably the only part of the world where slavery became markedly more common throughout the nineteenth century.[67] In East Africa especially, the Arab slave trade on the Indian Ocean persisted well after it had been banned in Europe and North America. However, under British control and an overall change in the nature of trade, plus an increased need for labor internally, the slave trade was declining by the 1880s.[68] According to

---

[65] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 6.

[66] "General Act of the Berlin Conference on West Africa, 26 February 1885."

[67] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 72.

[68] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 50.

Nabudere, “From the 1840’s onwards it became Britain’s policy to eliminate the slave trade, and later slavery itself, as the precondition of its free trade capitalism.”[69]

Free trade imperialism took colonization deeper than mercantilist systems before it as production required more oversight and more direct involvement than extraction. Production is inherently more complex. Consequently, the British and Germans eventually sought a more hands on approach to governing than either the Portuguese or Omanis before them. This was done partly to satisfy missionaries crusading against the slave trade, but also to alter trade away extraction and towards production. It was not enough to simply supplant rival powers. Direct involvement was needed to channel Africa’s productive capacity towards British and German needs. Coffee and tobacco were identified as early opportunities.[70] This list soon grew to include many other items like cotton and sisal. The General Act of the Berlin Conference required that colonial powers stop the slave trade and to do that, they needed to maintain thorough presence through their territories.

Agreements to curb the slave trade in the Indian Ocean between Britain and the Omanis date back to the 1820s. However, these agreements were not always enforced. As Britain strengthened their hand in the region, they were able to exert more pressure and by 1873, slave trading was banned in all markets under Omani control.[71] However, enforcement was another matter

---

[69] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 8.

[70] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 12.

[71] “Sir Bartle Frere and the Zanzibar Slave-Trade,” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter London* 18, no. 4 (January 1873): 102.

and the trade continued until 1896 Anglo-Zanzibar war fully subjugated the sultan.[72] Once Britain and Germany were fully in control of the region, the trade disappeared almost entirely.[73]

Rivalries Ignite the Scramble for Africa

The scramble for Africa had a sudden and dramatic impact on the continent. Before the scramble, only about 10% of Africa had been formally colonized. However, in the roughly 30 years prior to the outbreak of World War I in 1914, that number increased to 90%. In 1880, indigenous Africans controlled most of the continent. In most cases they were not subordinate to foreign powers, but were rather partners in trade.[74] The continent was comprised of about a dozen sizeable African kingdoms and countless smaller chiefdoms. Foreign presence at that time was restricted to small areas, mostly on the coast. Tippu Tip, an Arab slave trader who operated out of Zanzibar, controlled sizeable inland territory from where he could trade and raid for slaves.[75] Portugal, since the sixteenth century, had controlled trading outposts up and down the coasts of modern day Angola and Mozambique. Britain, since the Napoleonic wars, had controlled the Cape Colony, when it seized the territory from the Dutch when French aggression exposed Dutch weaknesses.

---

72 Ingham, *A History of East Africa*.

73 Welle (www.dw.com), “East Africa’s Forgotten Slave Trade | DW | 22.08.2019.”

74 Melvin Bragg, “The Berlin Conference,” Audio, *In Our Time* (London: BBC Radio 4, October 31, 2013).

75 Stanley, *In Darkest Africa*, 49.

The remainder of the continent, however, remained free of European control, though British influence on the West African palm oil trade was growing and France was linking their presence in Senegal with outposts around the Sahel and up to Algeria.[76] By 1914, however, Africa was almost entirely under European control as France, Britain, Germany, Belgium, Italy and Spain all occupied large tracts of land. Only Ethiopia and Liberia remained under indigenous control at the outbreak of the Great War.

The causes of the scramble for Africa are varied. Broadly speaking, the scramble was caused by the growing economic might of, and rivalries between, major European powers. This was fueled in large part by industrialization. Germany was on the rise and the Ottoman Empire was crippled, creating a power vacuum that exposed North Africa to European takeover. Algeria and later Morocco fell under French control while Italy took modern day Libya and Britain invaded Egypt. France and Britain had been maneuvering in West Africa for decades and with the arrival of Belgium as an aspiring imperial power, competition began to intensify.[77]

In the background to all this was the growing unpopularity of the slave trade. Stanley and Livingstone had exposed the evils of that trade and it was in this spirit that the Berlin Conference of 1884-85 was called. While purporting to focus on sovereignty issues in West Africa and humanitarian efforts to stem slavery, the conference actually divvied up the entire continent for the major

[76] Bragg, “The Berlin Conference.”

[77] Bragg, “The Berlin Conference.”

European powers.[78] The result was horrific. Under Leopold, nearly ten million Congolese died within just a few years. Within days of the end of the conference, German declared East Africa a colony.[79] This triggered a rivalry with Britain over East African territory, which was settled relatively peacefully in bi-lateral agreements. East Africa's modern borders were decided in agreements between the two powers in 1886 and 1890, but the rivalry was not finally settled, in East Africa at least, until after World War I. The Great War caused widespread famine and death in East Africa as well as massive destruction of the existing infrastructure and plantation system put in place in German East Africa, which is where most of the fighting took place.[80]

Key events in the lead up to the scramble itself were the de Brazza-Makoko Treaty in 1880, the British seizure of the Suez Canal in 1882, Bismarck's decision to pursue colonies for Germany in 1884, and the Principle of Effectivity put in place by the Berlin Conference of 1884-85.[81]

In 1880, Pierre Savorgnan de Brazza, an Italian-French explorer attempted to wrest control of the Congo for France by signing a treaty with Chief Makoko. Stanley, who was acting as an agent for King Leopold of

---

[78] James Heartfield, *The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1838–1956: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 298-299, http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190491673.001.0001/acprof-9780190491673.

[79] Bragg, "The Berlin Conference."

[80] Michael Pesek, "Making Sense of the First World War in Africa," *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1–11.

[81] Bragg, "The Berlin Conference."

Belgium in the Congo, immediately disputed the treaty's legitimacy[82] and hurried his efforts to claim Congo for the Belgian king.[83]

Then, in 1882, Britain seized control of the Suez Canal, which had been, up to that point, jointly administered by France and Britain. This caused a blow to French prestige. France had suffered lost revenue with the decline of the slave trade and had not industrialized as quickly as Britain or Germany. They had suffered a catastrophic defeat in the 1871 Franco-Prussian war. Stanley eventually outmaneuvered their agent, de Brazza, in Congo for Belgium. However, their presence in North Africa, the Sahel and West Africa remained strong. They wished to challenge Britain for Sudan and angled for a west-east axis across the continent, which directly contradicted Britain's north-south plan.

Germany was late to the colonial game. In 1881, their chancellor Otto von Bismarck publically disavowed any colonial endeavors.[84] Just ten years prior, Germany had been unified as a result of the Treaty of Frankfurt at the end of the Franco-Prussian War. Since the end of the Napoleonic Wars, Europe had maintained a balance of power put in place by the 1815 Congress of Vienna. Following the defeat of France and the unification of Germany in 1871, that balance of power became unstable. The result was an intensification of European rivalries. In East Africa, that began with the arrival of Carl Peters.

---

[82] Heartfield, *The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society*, 303.

[83] Newman, *Imperial Footprints*, 149.

[84] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 14.

Carl Peters is probably the most famous German colonist. He is also probably the most notorious. His energy and ambition in East Africa matched that of the early British trailblazers, as did his impact on events there. His example was used by Germany to promote and justify German territorial aggression in the twentieth century similarly to how Livingstone's example was used by the British in the nineteenth century.

Germany's interest in East Africa can be precisely traced. It started when Peters, a recent graduate of Humboldt University in Berlin, briefly moved to the U.K. where his well-connected uncle introduced him to London society. There, he became acquainted with British ideas of imperialism and colonization. After a brief stay in London, he returned to Berlin and created a pressure group, the Society for German Colonization, aimed at gaining overseas territories, which evolved into the Deutsch Ostafrikanische Gesellschaft (German East Africa Company) or DOAG.[85] This company, along with the Imperial British East Africa Company, was responsible for administration throughout all of British and German East Africa up until colonization. These two chartered companies oversaw the entire region of the first East African Community. It was the first time the block that would become the EAC in 1967 was put under the control of so few hands and it set the precedent for that eventual integration.

Peter's energy and enthusiasm for expanding the German Empire in East Africa would inspire German expansionism elsewhere and also in the next century with the rise of the Third Reich. His example was championed by

---

[85] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa,* 14.

the Nazi's who wished to raise Germany from the ashes of World War I and once again challenge her European rivals for supremacy of the continent and beyond.

Peters spent the early 1880s in Tanganyika and Uganda signing treaties of protection with African leaders in exchange for their submission to German will.[86] Back in Berlin, Peters, along with significant public pressure for colonial projects, was successful in convincing Bismarck to reverse his position and agree to take colonies. Bismarck then called enthusiastically for a conference to be held in Berlin amongst the major European powers to resolve the many troubling issues surrounding the African continent.[87] The conference had twelve nations in attendance. The only non-European nation represented was the United States. No Africans attended the conference and only two participants had ever been to the continent.[88] The resulting General Act of the Berlin Conference was declared in February 1885.

The Principle of Effectivity

The result of the Berlin Conference was to divide the continent up amongst Europe's powers. Those powers, however, could not maintain colonies in name only. They needed to effectively occupy and administer their

[86] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 20.

[87] Bragg, "The Berlin Conference."

[88] Bragg, "The Berlin Conference."

territories or risk losing them to competing powers.[89] This involved more than just planting a flag or signing a treaty with a local chief. It required that the colonial power actually be present, govern and work to end the slave trade.[90] This principle rapidly increased European exploitive and divisive activities in Africa. It was meant to stop the slave trade and to pave the way for "legitimate" trade favored by European industrial powers and was effective in doing so. This satisfied the abolitionists and opened the door for commercialists.

The Berlin conference and subsequent agreements between Britain and Germany in 1886 and 1890 defined each powers sphere of influence. European presence increased and stemmed the slave trade. The new colonial powers soon began projects aimed at developing and integrating the local economies with their own. These projects met stiff resistance from indigenous peoples as more than a dozen large rebellions broke out. Hundreds of thousands died in the resulting chaos. However, effective control of East Africa and its regional trade was eventually established and this enabled Germany and Britain to put concrete measures in place for meaningful economic integration.

The 1880s laid the foundation for greater East Africa integration. That integration was, however, only vertical and bi-lateral, as both Germany and

[89] "General Act of the Berlin Conference on West Africa, 26 February 1885."

[90] "General Act of the Berlin Conference on West Africa, 26 February 1885."

Britain established effective monopolies in their colonies, preventing those colonies from integration outside their respective empires.

Chapter IV

Integration before World War I

The first attempts to turn East African lands into productive and profitable trading colonies that could be integrated politically and economically into Europe came in the form of chartered companies.

The DOAG and the IBEAC

Britain and Germany had hoped granting charters to enterprising companies might speed the establishment of effective administration, in accordance with the 1885 General Act, and generate profits too. Germany quickly established the DOAG and transferred all existing treaties between Germany and East African chiefs, pioneered by Carl Peters, under the authority of the company.[91]

Britain, who had abandoned the idea of the chartered company in 1857 with the dissolution of the British East India company, returned to the idea[92] presumably due to resources already being stretched thin and their preoccupation with other colonies. In theory, the chartered company was a brilliant idea. If done properly, it would generate revenue for the crown without requiring any government resources. Companies granted charters were given monopolies on profits in exchange for providing security and

[91] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 90.

[92] Bragg, "The Berlin Conference."

administration warranted by treaties and the General Act. There was no distinction between government and business. In practice, however, these companies were a disaster for East Africa. Both needed to be saved from bankruptcy and were guilty of terrible abuses against the local populations. The companies suffered constant rebellion and sabotage, failed in raising the necessary capital for their grand schemes and grew unpopular with the local people. Before long, Berlin and London stepped in. Industry and their financial backers placed immense pressure on their governments to save the failing investments.[93] Both companies effectively lost their charters before the turn of the century, although the DOAG continued to operate in a limited role under government supervision until 1919.

Currency Reform

Prior to the arrival of the colonial powers, no single currency was in general use. Areas used different currencies such as cowrie shells, special beads or maize cobs, but these did not have fixed values outside of their immediate regions.[94] Bartering remained common as salt and iron hoes produced inland were traded for food and grain. Grain was traded for slaves who were transported to the coast and traded for guns.[95] A "bewildering variety" of currencies were in use, which included Australian dollars and Indian Rupees among others; however, most African chiefs refused to accept

---

[93] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 15.

[94] Roland Oliver, *History of East Africa* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 153.

[95] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 67.

these foreign currencies and rather preferred their local ones.[96] As these were not fixed in value, nor were they pegged, this made trade slow and incredibly unpredictable. Among the myriad of tasks required to integrate the East African economies, currency reform was only one. Germany circulated their own currency in German East Africa beginning in 1890. Britain introduced separate currencies in each colony and a common currency in Kenya and Uganda in 1905.

Getting the chiefs and headmen to accept the currency changes to optimize trade would prove incredibly difficult and faced stiff local resistance. After World War I, Tanganyika was added to the newly minted East African Shilling. A major milestone was reached in 1935 when Zanzibar was added to the East African currency board, which put the entire region of the EAC on a single currency for the first time. This was, however, undone upon independence 30 years later. Today, the current EAC members each have separate currencies. A single common currency was planned after the reiteration of the EAC in 2000. Progress is proving very difficult once again and two hard deadlines have been missed. The project has not been abandoned, however, and the new deadline is 2024. It remains to be seen whether East Africa will be unified under a single currency once again.

German East Africa

Germany's colonization of East Africa happened very quickly and ended just as quickly. After Bismarck's decision to take colonies for Germany in 1884, German East Africa was declared a colony within days of the end of

[96] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 68.

the Berlin Conference in February of 1885. This colony included the modern-day countries of Tanzania (minus Zanzibar), Rwanda and Burundi. Germany lost possession of this colony and their other six colonies after signing the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. Before losing East Africa, however, Germany had built two rail lines, an extensive network of large-scale plantations, setup lucrative mining operations, established banks, introduced a new currency, and encouraged the settlement of over 5000 Germans. They had also crushed over a dozen large rebellions and were responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of the local inhabitants.

Iliffe argues that Germany colonized East Africa for a few reasons. They thought it would be useful in a fight against Britain, they wished to obtain some "unknown benefits" and that they had been persuaded to by Carl Peters.[97] Nabudere adds to these explanations by showing that German trade with Zanzibar had increased in the 1870s and 1880s to the point that it actually surpassed British trade there.[98] Germany began to see itself as the regional hegemon and colonized East Africa to protect their growing trade interests.[99] While Bismarck's precise thinking is unknown,[100] German activities in the colony suggest Nabudere has the more complete argument. German colonial planning showed a focus on trade right from the beginning. Their forces in the colony were designed to subdue local resistance, not fight

---

[97] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 88–91.

[98] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 20.

[99] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 20.

[100] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 91.

the British. At the outset of World War I, Germany was not prepared to fight in East Africa, nor was it prepared to fight in any of its colonies as Bismarck remained focused on Europe and Germany's colonies either capitulated quickly, or fought a protracted non-confrontational war with Britain by ceding all strategic points in order to avoid being overwhelmed by superior British forces with any direct confrontation.

In the years after 1885, Germany moved quickly to modernize the economy in their East African colony. They sought to end the slave trade by diverting traffic to Dar es Salaam instead of Bagomoyo. They introduced the German Rupee and used shipping to divert traffic away from Zanzibar, which was still under British Control. Once the British completed the Uganda Express from Mombasa to Kisumu, they began work on their own central rail line from Dar es Salaam to Tabora.[101] They also built roads, a floating dock at Dar and added light vessels capable of river travel.[102] All this was successful in cementing Germany's effective occupation and they soon began annual detailed studies of East Africa's potential commodities by examining native flora and fauna. They quickly introduced cotton and sisal to reduce German dependence on American and Mexican exports and they began to encourage white settlement in the colony as part of an overall plan to boost production. Sisal, coffee and cotton enterprises, after overcoming initial setbacks, were

[101] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 22.

[102] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 21.

paying dividends by the outbreak of war and roughly 5000 Europeans had settled in the German colony by 1912.[103]

According to Nabudere,

> The integration of East Africa into German imperialism was entirely effected by the monopoly activities of the D.O.A.G. This monopoly made a fortune out of compensation paid to it by the German imperial state for its so-called 'losses' incurred in the colonization of the territory for German imperialism. During the colonial period it prospered as production expanded, gaining new land concessions and controlling large plantations, a wide trading network and the only two banks in the territory. Its control of the banks meant that the entire mortgage business of the territory passed through its hands.[104]

While trade in Germany's East Africa colony grew in both imports, exports and in variety of goods in both directions, the colony's trading partners eventually shrank to one. Integration was, therefore, not horizontal in German East Africa. The colony itself was only integrated with Germany and the D.O.A.G had a monopoly on all major aspects of that colony. They profited over seven million marks in the final eight years before the outbreak of war.[105] Their colonial planning was paying off as import/exports increased from 36.2 to 81.7 million marks in only six years from 1906-1912 with the greatest increases in 1910, 1911 and 1912.[106]

The German approach was paying dividends and her rivals noticed. The British governor of Kenya noted that the Germans had devoted themselves to

---

[103] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 23.

[104] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 24.

[105] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 25.

[106] Oliver, *History of East Africa*, 153.

the ‘methodical development of the colony with systematic thoroughness… to the determination to establish a colonial empire at any price’.[107]

Rivalry between the two powers continued to stymie integration. “Some Britons feared that their new rivals might establish colonies with protective tariffs. Some Germans feared that the British might exclude their rivals by converting commercial predominance into formal empire.” Despite his belief in free trade, Bismarck gave in to political pressure and introduced protective tariffs in 1879. Such protectionist measures prevented any meaningful economic integration in East Africa other than with the colonial powers. This integration was exclusionary and eventually shrank in significance with the decline of European powers after World War II.

British East Africa

Progress on integration in British East Africa had similarities and differences to German East Africa. Two main differences stand out: less capital investment and greater numbers of white settlers, especially in Kenya around Nairobi.

Kenya

Kenya’s process towards colonization more closely followed with that of German East Africa’s than it did Uganda’s. The first step was to relegate the sultanate, then lease the coast. British and German influence in the region had been growing since the 1870s in the form of increased trade through Zanzibar.

[107] Charles Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate* (London: EArnold, 1905), 256, http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.FIG:004724889.

Both Germany and Britain claimed the coast and both leased it from the sultan. The issue was temporarily settled with two agreements, first the Anglo-German Agreement of 1886, which settled disputes in the mainland of East Africa[108] and second in 1890, with the more comprehensive Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty. Both parties recognized that East Africa must be shared between them.[109] The treaty of 1890 established the modern-day border between Kenya and Tanzania.

Primary sources suggest that British interest in Kenya was mainly driven by their intense interest in the interior kingdoms of modern-day Uganda[110] and to control the headwaters of the Nile.[111] They needed Kenya as a corridor of transport and communication with the interior African kingdoms. The result was initial disinterest in Kenya's vast territory between the coast and Lake Victoria. However, interest in Uganda waned in favor of the fertile Kenyan highlands first mentioned in British reports by Lugard in 1890[112] and then made prominent by Lord Delemere in 1897.[113] Interest in these fertile highlands would go on to play an absolutely crucial role in

---

[108] *Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar* (London, 1920), 47, http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106011039275.

[109] "Heliogland-Zanzibar Treaty" (Berlin, July 1, 1890). June 1, 1890.

[110] John Gray and Carl Peters, "Anglo-German Relations in Uganda, 1890–1892," *The Journal of African History* 1, no. 2 (1960): 281–297, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021853700001857.

[111] Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate,* 208.

[112] Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate,* 28.

[113] Robert B. Edgerton, *Mau Mau: An African Crucible* (New York; London: Free Press; Collier Macmillan, 1989), 1–18.

governance of all of British East Africa. These highlands attracted the largest number of white settlers anywhere in the region. These settlers rapidly occupied Kikuyu highlands and began coffee growing by exploiting cheap Kikuyu labor. The situation changed more dramatically than anyone probably could have envisioned. The Uganda Express was planned and built to export agricultural products from the Great Lakes to Mombasa. By 1905, however, the protectorate’s capital was moved from Mombasa on the coast to Nairobi, which had only been founded six years earlier by the colonial authorities as a railway depot. This represented the growing importance of agriculture in the Kenyan highlands and the growing influence of white settlers there. Rebellions amongst the local population broke out immediately and persisted into the 1950s. These rebellions were crushed by a combination of divide and conquer tactics among Kenya’s tribes, mercenaries from abroad and superior British firepower.

Governance in British East Africa after 1905, therefore, favored Kenya over Uganda. Kenya was the only East African colony allowed some measure of industrialization during the colonial period. Kenya’s infrastructure became better developed. Uganda and Tanganyika were meant to supply Kenya, who had become a proxy of British rule through its large white settler population. While outside the scope of this thesis, this settler population would go on to play a crucial role in the unequal development of these three countries, which became a sore point upon independence. Kenya remains the largest and most developed economy in the region and this is almost certainly due to British policies that favored Kenya over her neighbors from 1905 until independence in the early 1960s.

In 2012, the Nairobi to Kisumu section of the Uganda Express stopped services that had begun in 1901. It has not been replaced. A modern, standard gauge railway, built by the Chinese, has been added next to the original line, but only to Nairobi, cutting off Uganda and Lake Victoria once again from rail transport to the coast. None of the early explorers envisioned this outcome. The center of gravity shifted suddenly to Nairobi in 1905 and what started as a mere depot in 1899 has been the economic and industrial center of gravity in East Africa ever since.

Britain also held on to Kenya the longest, only granting independence in December of 1963 after significant pressure was exerted by Kenya's newly independent neighbors, Uganda and Tanzania.[114] The presence of a large European population in the highlands and British policies favoring that population fomented distrust of the British amongst East Africa's African and Asian populations. This distrust continued up to independence as Kenya's neighbors feared being controlled by their powerful neighbor and its influential and very loud European population.[115] Unequal development of the colonies, which was instigated by the settler movement had sowed the seeds of distrust and created a major impediment to later economic and political integration in East Africa.

[114] Kenyatta, Nyerere, and Obote, "Nairobi Declaration of Federation."

[115] Kenyatta, Nyerere, and Obote, "Nairobi Declaration of Federation."

Uganda

Uganda, like its neighbors, was conquered by force. Unlike Tanganyika and Kenya, however, Uganda had been relatively isolated throughout the previous centuries. Uganda had not been heavily affected by the slave or the ivory trades due to their relative distance to the Indian Ocean. By the mid-nineteenth century, however, the ivory frontier had expanded and trade with the kingdom of Buganda on the north shores of Lake Victoria began. Soon explorers such as Speke, Burton, Lugard and Stanley found the kingdom, which, for the most part, had been relatively untouched by the outside world.

The Buganda Kingdom was one of the most advanced and organized in all of Africa. Britain and later France quickly sent missionaries and both were successful in converting large numbers of Bugandans, including some with high positions in the court of the Kabaka. A complicated power struggle ensued almost immediately between Muslim traders based out of Zanzibar, Protestant missionaries from Britain, Catholic missionaries from France and local converts from both sides. Karl Peters had also established occupation and claimed the territory for Germany.

Two events in 1890 settled the matter in favor of Britain. Frederick Lugard defeated the Muslim and Catholic forces[116] and Britain reached an agreement with Germany resulting in the Heligoland-Zanzibar Treaty. The treaty ceded Buganda and Zanzibar to Britain in exchange for British withdraw from Heligoland near the German coast in the North Sea. The treaty also contained other provisions regarding the Kenyan and Tanganyikan

[116] *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* (E. C. Barton, 1894), 330–39.

coasts, ceding those to Britain and Germany respectively.[117] The native Buganda kingdom, which once had a troop strength of over 100,000[118] was greatly weakened by years of disease, divisions caused by outside forces, conversions and intermittent warfare. It fell under the sway of the Imperial British East Africa Company shortly thereafter.

The IBEAC was a short-lived venture, however. They ran up debts subduing their rivals and failed to raise sufficient capital to begin the grand Uganda Railway project. By 1894, they had signed over their rights back to the Crown and ceded a large area of eastern Uganda to the East African Protectorate, which was beginning to take the shape of modern-day Kenya. The activity of the Church Missionary Society in Buganda was also a key factor leading to the declaration of Uganda as a British Protectorate.[119] The CMS had been working hand in hand with business interests in Uganda and encouraged formal colonization to ensure their protection and success.

Under British control and with the Uganda Railway project now underway, cash crops were encouraged, especially cotton and later coffee. Exports rose and the population rebounded. Cotton farming expanded outside of Buganda to include parts Busoga, Teso, Toro and Bunyoro lands. Coffee farming, which began in the Elgon region, expanded to Busoga and as far away as Kigezi in the deep southwest. Cooperatives were discouraged, however, and British and Asian traders were given favor. Cotton ginning was

---

[117] "Heliogland-Zanzibar Treaty."

[118] Stanley, *In Darkest Africa*, 404.

[119] "M. De Brazza's Treaty with Congo Chiefs," *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 2, no. 11 (November 1882): 270–71.

restricted and Africans were required to sell their crops through foreign brokers. Uganda was being integrated bilaterally into the British Empire and not horizontally in the region. The country weathered price fluctuations of cash crops pretty well and avoided famines by reverting to subsistence farming when commodity prices fell and then returning to cash crop production when prices rebounded.

The introduction of cotton to Uganda was meant to serve a variety of purposes. Firstly, fluctuations in American cotton prices were hurting British production and supplying cotton from within the empire, it was thought, would mitigate any instability. Also, cotton growing would help a myriad of other interests and integrate Uganda further with Britain. Cotton would require bailers, ginners and transportation in the form of steam ships on Lake Victoria and then rail transport to the coast.[120] The introduction of cotton to the Ugandan economy was therefore meant to help "iron and steel interests, the banks, the merchants and other small British businesses".[121] Uganda was restricted any cotton industry of its own to protect the British textile industry from competition.

Britain moved before their German rivals in establishing a major railway in East Africa. The Buganda kingdom was more organized and hierarchical than any other society in the region. Because of this, it was thought, it would be easier to organize and extract wealth for the Crown from such a society. This was, at least in part, a motivation for the construction of

[120] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 40.

[121] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 40.

one of the largest and most expensive colonial projects in British history, the Uganda Railway. The "Lunatic Express" or Iron Snake, as the Kikuku would call it ran over 1000km from Mombasa to Kisumu on the shores of Lake Victoria. From there, steam ships on Victoria, the earth's second largest lake, could export wealth from Buganda and deliver goods as well as troops to ensure British domination of Africa's Great Lakes region. Planning for the railway began in 1894 and construction took place from 1896 to 1901.

The entire Great Lakes region of Africa could be better integrated into the British Empire by connecting a railway to Lake Victoria.[122] The interior held resources no longer available at the coast. Slavery had not decimated the interior kingdoms of Buganda, Bunyoro, Ankole, Toro or the Acholi peoples and therefore greater productivity could be possible. Also, those kingdoms were hierarchical and well organized with peasant labor serving their kings. This too must have made the region particularly attractive. Furthermore, the ivory trade had not yet decimated elephant populations in the interior. Uganda's land-locked geography and distance to the coast necessitated huge up-front investment from the British. This led the British to declare Kenya a protectorate as well to ensure they maintained access to Uganda.[123] Since independence, however, Uganda's geography has been a major impediment to broader integration and distrust between Uganda and Kenya has further isolated the medium-sized country. Its main access to the coast is through

---

[122] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 39.

[123] Hughes, *East Africa*, 94.

Kenya and Kenya has squeezed that connection to a single two-lane highway plagued with terrible traffic, massive potholes and lengthy border delays.

In summary, European rivalries continued to stymie East Africa's integration with the global economy. The Berlin Conference and subsequent German and British conquest of Tanganyika, Rwanda, Burundi, Zanzibar, Uganda and Kenya laid key elements that would be needed for later integration such as currency reform and infrastructure. However, those reforms were only used to benefit the colonial powers under monopolistic principles. The free trade ideals that were used to justify aggression and to end the slave trade became secondary to European protectionism and monopolies that setup barriers to wider integration. In these years, however, several key developments took place. In 1900, a common customs collection center was established for Kenya and Uganda, which grew to include Tanganyika after World War I. In 1902, a common court of appeals was also setup to serve the two colonies jointly. These provided some precedent for later, much broader integration.

Chapter V

Resistance and War in East Africa

Colonization across Africa has hardly been uniform and cannot be easily categorized. West Africa was low-lying, hot, malaria-filled and difficult for European settlers. This part of Africa saw a style of colonization similar to previous centuries sometimes called "empire of outposts".[124] It involved trade in high value commodities, small trading posts, indirect rule, and trade in slaves. Southern Africa, with its low latitudes, temperate climate and familiar seasons proved most attractive to European settlers. Their crops and livestock thrived; so southern African colonies contained large numbers of European settlers, confiscation of lands and direct rule by Europeans.

Methods and Style of Colonization in East Africa

East Africa was similarly attractive to settlers, not because of its latitude, but because of its elevation. Large parts of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania lie higher than 4000' giving the region cooler temperatures that stave off many tropical diseases. Coupled with fertile soils and plentiful rainfall across much of Africa's Great Lakes region, East Africa attracted large numbers of white settlers in the early twentieth century. At the time of decolonization in the 1960s, over 100,000 whites in East Africa, mostly in Kenya, called themselves Africans. The presence of these settlers greatly

---

[124] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 7.

affected the process of colonization, later integration and eventually complicated the move to independence. The “settler problem, for many years wrongly diagnosed as the native problem, had its origins in geography”.[125] Across Africa, decolonization was more prolonged and violent in colonies with larger settler populations. Colonies with settler communities also suffered larger, more violent African resistance to foreign rule than colonies with indirect rule and few foreign settlers.

When Britain and Germany arrived in East Africa, their tactic, unlike the Portuguese in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, was to first ally with the Sultan of Oman and gradually strengthened their hand, eventually relegating him to nothing more than a ceremonial leader.[126] The sultan was eliminated completely from East Africa when he was overthrown in Zanzibar barely a month after Britain’s exit in 1963. Whereas Omani raiders in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries pushed the Portuguese further south into Mozambique, the British and Germans worked with the Omanis and made use of their political clout in the region. Slowly overtime, however, as European trade revenues in the region grew, the Omanis were weakened, ceding more and more control to the European rivals.

The early years of European rule in East Africa was not over cohesive colonial territory, but rather small outposts, like islands, spread out in vast

---

[125] Hughes, *East Africa*, 13.

[126] Felix Ocen, “How Ugandan Led Revolution That Ended Arabs Reign over Zanzibar,” Daily Monitor, accessed January 15, 2020, https://www.monitor.co.ug/Magazines/PeoplePower/How-Ugandan-led-revolution-that-ended-Arabs-reign-over-Zanzibar/689844-5415576-cappocz/index.html.

areas.[127] The imperial powers had moved into strategic areas to control trade and establish large-scale farming. In many areas, especially in the hinterlands of Tanganyika and Uganda, white settlement was never established and local authority was largely maintained albeit with temporary disturbances. Subsistence farmers were hardly affected by the arrival of foreign powers that only controlled small areas of land and monopolized trade and finance irrelevant to their culture and livelihood.

African Resistance to European Rule

Colonization throughout East Africa, like Africa as a whole, was by no means uniform and therefore resistance to foreign incursions was also not uniform. Previous to the arrival of European powers, East Africa had no national or regional identity. Individual kingdoms and fiefdoms were distinct and separate. The struggle against colonization laid the building blocks for today's regional identity upon which current integration efforts are built. Each nation struggled against a foreign colonial power. Each nation gained independence roughly at the same time, and sometimes even aided each other in that struggle.[128] The lack of unified identity and cooperation allowed the East Africa to be conquered by Europe. However, once East Africans united with the common purpose of independence from Europe, decolonization was only a matter of time.

---

[127] Michael Pesek, "Colonial Conquest and the Struggle for the Presence of the Colonial State in German East Africa, 1885-1903," *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 161–82.

[128] Godfrey Mwakikagile, *Nyerere and Africa: End of an Era* (New Africa Press, 2007), 128.

In the early days, however, before these regions were connected by infrastructure or a common purpose, it took weeks, if not months for communication between colonial offices to reach destinations at the periphery. In German East Africa in particular, most of the territory was far from any colonial outpost. These peripheral outposts had little impact on African life or power structures because they lacked both the necessary staff and resources to affect any real colonial agenda.[129] This was largely the case until after World War I. The situation along the Swahili Coast and the near interior, however, felt a heavy foreign presence. There, the sowing of cash crops, the collecting of high taxes, and forced labor were the hallmarks of that presence.

The costal region saw the most ferocious resistance to foreign rule, but as the European powers pushed further inland, so moved local resistance. The most notorious stories accompany the history of the Maji Maji Rebellion, which raged from 1905-1907. Dozens of other rebellions to foreign rule took place prior to World War I. In fact, such rebellions did not stop until after decolonization. The Hehe, in southern Tanganyika, were systematically attacked and eventually defeated in conflicts with German forces and their askaris from 1891-1898. The Nandi resisted British rule in Kenya in numerous rebellions raging from 1890-1906 and the Kabaka of Bunyoro fought against British rule in Uganda from 1894 to 1899. In 1898, he fought with Kabaka Mwanga II of Buganda, combining the military strength of the two previous

[129] Michael Pesek, "The Lonely Imperialist. Richard Kandt and the Making of Colonial Politics at the Very Periphery of the Empire," *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1–18.

African rivals. However, the British defeated their combined forces and both kings were captured in 1899. Today this is seen as the last serious stand made in Uganda against the "yoke of colonialism".[130] Another large rebellion broke out in Buganda in 1949. Three years later in Kenya, the Mau Mau Rebellion ravaged the Kikuyu highlands for four years and resulted in the internment of over 1.6 million Kikuyu's in British concentration camps and the death of approximately 200,000 Kenyans.[131]

These rebellions made integration next to impossible. The issuing of new currency, the construction of trading centers and the construction of the Uganda Express all suffered attacks and setbacks due to the animosity between Europeans and Africans. In many cases, it is not an exaggeration to call the two sides enemies incapable of any meaningful integration. East Africa first had to be subdued to be integrated into Europe and the long history of rebellions in East Africa show that was dream was never fully realized.

Rebellions aside, the colonial projects were incredibly ambitious given the size of the territory and the geographic challenges. Germany turned East Africa into state endeavor[132] and their goals were lofty. They planned to conquer the local population, impose an imperial state, engineer the local economy, conscript the local population to be put to colonial use and

---

130 "The Betrayal and Capture of Mwanga and Kabalega," *Daily Monitor*, April 4, 2012, https://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/ugandaat50/1370466-1379638-14dfxax/index.html.

131 Caroline Elkins, *Imperial Reckoning: The Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya*, 1st edition (London: Holt Paperbacks, 2005), 354–68.

132 Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 162.

construct the required infrastructure as well. Violence and terror were used to subdue the local population and meet these aims.[133] German gunships bombarded coastal towns and German-hired mercenaries plundered. The first colonial government under Hermann Wissmann was accused of running a "military dictatorship" that did not prevent war crimes committed by German solders against the local population. Anyone suspected of insurgency was executed without any court hearings.[134] This early brutality did not encourage the local population to trust German intentions and such conflicts continued through Germany's relatively short rule in East Africa. Germany's war against the Hehe state in southern Tanganyika lasted over eight years. Germany met fierce resistance and ultimately had to use scorched earth policies to prevail. Over 100,000 Africans are thought to have lost their lives in that war. Less than ten years later, when the Maji Maji rebellion broke out, Germany employed similar tactics resulting in the deaths of over 200,000 Africans.[135] Numerous smaller rebellions broke out during Germany's rule in which the local population paid a heavy price both for accepting and especially for resisting German will.

German rule in East Africa was characterized by shortages of sources and personnel. At the outset of World War I, fewer than 800 German officials operated in the colony and messages took months to reach outposts, as they had to be carried by porters across footpaths significant distances. German

[133] Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 161–82.

[134] Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 162.

[135] Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 163.

presence in some of these areas was so light that it had to be repeatedly re-established through violence.[136] The story of Germany's colonial rule in East Africa is one of chaos and while Germany did build roads and two rail lines, that period is not characterized by any coherent colonial policy. Instead, much of their time and resources were spent simply trying to subdue the local population and maintain presence throughout the whole of their vast territory as required by the Berlin Conference. They frequently resorted to extreme tactics, often trying to impress the local population with "magical" European technology.[137] When that didn't work, they resorted to intimidation and violence, and African leaders were often singled out and humiliated in front of their subjects to achieve maximum effect.[138] These tactics were employed because of the low number of German officials and staff present in East Africa and the more extreme the display of power, it was hoped, would have a larger and more lasting impact on the local population that may not encounter another such display for years. All told, German East Africa was more than 380,000 square miles, so even the most impressive military displays or punitive expeditions of Germany's tiny presence in the colony had little chance of transforming the economy. Instead, their destructive efforts to subdue the country killed hundreds of thousands of local people with the resulting disease and famine due to their harsh policies. Therefore, it was not possible for any meaningful integration to take place under German authority.

[136] Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 165.

[137] Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 165.

[138] Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 167.

"In German East Africa, were not, as in the well-known words of Clausewitz, the extension of politics by other means, but politics itself became an extension of colonial wars."[139] Even though some significant infrastructure was completed, the necessary stability was not present. "The colonial state that imposed this order might have had the military strength to weaken or destroy the social order of African societies, but it did not have the power and resources to transform them according to its will."[140]

The Great War in East Africa

World War I in East Africa was, by no means, a large theater by comparison to events Europe, but it "outshined" any other military engagements the region had seen before.[141] The colonial powers were unprepared for war in their East African colonies, which contained little strategic importance, and therefore saw only minor military build-up.[142] Forces deployed to East Africa were not designed or equipped to wage war with European rivals. Rather, they were designed and intended to subdue the local population and enforce the colonial order. The overwhelming majority of

---

139 Pesek, "Colonial Conquest," 166.

140 Michael Pesek, "The Colonial Order Upside Down? British and Germans in East African Prisoner-of-War Camps during World War I," *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 26.

141 Pesek, "Making Sense of the First World War in Africa," 1.

142 Ross Anderson, "World War I in East Africa 1916-1918" (Glasgow, University of Glasgow, 2001), 21–40, https://www.academia.edu/17269264/World_War_I_in_East_Africa_1916-1918.

those involved in the war effort were local Africans and casualties amongst the local populations were also much higher than European casualties.

Germany, a latecomer to the colonial game, only possessed seven colonies at the outbreak of the war (Togo, Cameroon, German Southwest Africa (Namibia), German East Africa (Tanganyika, Rwanda, and Burundi), and Qingdao). In most cases, German forces were less prepared for war than their more-established European rivals and their colonial forces were quickly overwhelmed and surrendered. In East Africa, however, this was not the case. In East Africa, without help from home, outnumbered and outgunned German forces fought a protracted guerilla style war aimed at aiding the main campaign in Europe by distracting as many British forces as possible.[143] Led by General Lettow-Forbeck, German forces in East Africa held out for over four years and only surrendered after receiving word that the war in Europe had ended. While British forces in East Africa managed to capture all the major areas of strategic importance such as roads, railways, and ports, they were never able to defeat Lettow-Forbeck's forces in a decisive battle and were therefore forced to continue to invest troops and equipment to protect and occupy key areas separated by vast distances.

In their efforts to eviscerate the elusive German forces, the British used upwards of 750,000 African askaris (guards) and porters. Some estimates put that number over one million, which supported a peak force of 58,000 British troops.[144] Belgian forces used upwards of 250,000 African porters, while the

---

[143] Michael Pesek, "The War of Legs: Transport and Infrastructure in the East African Campaign of World War I," *Transfers* 5, no. 2 (n.d.): 105.

[144] Anderson, "World War I in East Africa 1916-1918," 1.

Germans, who fought a very different style war in East Africa used only an estimated 46,000 to support their 15,000 troops. All told it is estimated that 100,000-300,000 African porters and askaris died from famine, disease, or exhaustion during the four plus year campaign.[145] A very small number of those deaths are attributed to actual battle injuries. There are numerous reports of askaris and porters being summarily executed for refusal to work or poor work performance. In addition, war crimes committed by European troops against defenseless African civilians were not uncommon either.[146] Raids, reminiscent of the centuries long Arab Indian Ocean slave trade, were conducted to capture sufficient numbers of porters required by the long supply lines which were stretched thin from the very beginning of the campaign.[147]

In German and British East Africa, the colonial social order, in some limited ways, was temporarily turned "upside down" by the events of World War I.[148] Civilian and military personnel of European origin were captured and interned on both sides of the border established by the 1886 Anglo-German Agreement. Up to that point, a clear colonial order had been put in place and strictly observed. Physical work was left up to Africans while "brain-

---

[145] Pesek, "The War of Legs," 113.

[146] Michael Pesek, "German and Allied War Crimes in the East African Campaign, 1914-18," *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1–20.

[147] Pesek, "Making Sense of the First World War in Africa," 3.

[148] Pesek, "The Colonial Order Upside Down?" 41.

work" was to be performed by Europeans.[149] During the war, captured Europeans were forced to perform manual duties, such as sowing and knitting military uniforms and making nails. This was wholly uncustomary, as even the poorest European in East Africa "possessed" at least one or two African servants at the time. The POWs were guarded, and according to some reports, humiliated by African guards (askaris). This was also unprecedented at the time, as whites in East Africa had probably never been put under the authority of any black African before. Furthermore, those imprisoned Europeans were required to clean the pit latrines used by both the prisoners and the askaris, which, at the time, must have been almost unimaginable.[150]

However, after World War I and the departure of Germany, the colonial order was re-established. There was no "Wilsonian moment".[151] African nationalism would not gain traction until after World War II. After World War I, masters were simply exchanged under the new League of Nations. Germany's colonial possessions became mandates and went to her rivals. In China, Japan took Qingdao, Britain took Tanganyika, Belgium took Rwanda and Burundi (formerly part of German East Africa), Namibia (German Southwest Africa) fell to South Africa, while Germany's west African possessions of Togo and Cameroon were divided between France and Britain. The re-establishment of the colonial order, to most Africans, must have looked like more of the same.

---

[149] Pesek, "The Colonial Order Upside Down?" 31.

[150] Pesek, "The Colonial Order Upside Down?" 31–32.

[151] Pesek, "Making Sense of the First World War in Africa," 1.

Besides turning the social order temporarily upside down, World War I had a devastating effect on the colonies themselves, especially Tanganyika where most of the fighting took place. Infrastructure was destroyed. Missions and plantations were evacuated. Christian missions had been particularly decimated as Germany had helped to import, from their Ottoman allies, a jihad against the British from Asia Minor to East Africa.[152] Due to the number of askaris that were recruited and trained along the Swahili Coast, a disproportionate number of them were Muslim. By one estimate Islam grew rapidly, up to 25%, from a previous 3% of the population, in the East Africa due to these events.[153] Europeans had been killed and those remaining were left to defend European supremacy in Africa.[154]

The high number of casualties among the local East African population was due to the way both sides fought the war.[155] Porters were ruthlessly exploited for the movement of supplies where lack of roads and mechanized vehicles increased their demand. Furthermore, both German and Allied forces acted as though they were fighting in enemy territory, given their distrust of the local population.[156] The post-war, post-German colonial order in East Africa would be based on the same exploitation of local Africans as the pre-

---

[152] Michael Pesek, "Jihad Made in Germany. German Propaganda in East Africa during the First World War, 1914-18," *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 2.

[153] Pesek, "Making Sense of the First World War in Africa," 7.

[154] Pesek, "The Colonial Order Upside Down?," 41.

[155] Pesek, "German and Allied War Crimes," 15.

[156] Pesek, "German and Allied War Crimes," 15.

war order had been. International law at that time did not specify their legal status and they were neither treated as citizens of their colonial power, nor as citizens of a sovereign nation.[157] The colonies tended to be a place for conservatives and nationalists.[158] This made it difficult for liberals, non-evangelicals, or progressives to operate. The foreign offices tended, instead, to promote racist, exploitive, imperialistic policies, which only exacerbated the suffering and exploitation of the local population.

It is important to note that Uganda prospered during the war years by selling agricultural products. The war itself did not reach Uganda as fighting was mostly restricted to the border between British and German territory (the modern day border between Kenya and Tanzania). British and German forces conscripted thousands of porters and askaris from Kenya and Tanganyika, but not from Uganda. Furthermore, the destruction of infrastructure, plantations, famine and disease did not reach Uganda. In fact, Uganda's population was rebounding during the war years from the ravages of diseases introduced by the missionaries and traders of the 1890s and the sleeping sickness outbreak of 1900.[159]

World War I's greatest impact in East Africa, however, was arguably bringing Tanganyika under British influence where it joined Zanzibar, Uganda and Kenya, the founding members of the first EAC. This paved the way for unprecedented integration and cooperation between the future East African

---

[157] Pesek, "German and Allied War Crimes," 15.

[158] Pesek, "The Lonely Imperialist," 1–18.

[159] David Ernest Apter, *The Political Kingdom in Uganda: A Study of Bureaucratic Nationalism* (London: Frank Cass, 1997), 36–40.

neighbors. It was in the immediate years after the war in which the groundwork for the Community was established. In 1921 the East African Currency Board was created and instituted a common currency, the first East African Shilling in Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika. In 1922, Tanganyika joined the "union" between Uganda and Kenya that had been established five years earlier dropping all duties on imported goods between these three territories. In 1927, a full customs union was established with uniform tariffs collected jointly on all imported goods from outside these territories. The final significant integration event of the interwar years took place in 1935 when Zanzibar joined in the monetary union by adopting the East African Shilling. The Great Depression, followed by the outbreak of World War II put colonial projects, integration, and development efforts on the back burner until the "golden age" of integration in the post-World War II years.

In summary, integration between colonization to the end of World War I was greatly hampered by conflicts between Africans and Europeans. Distrust between the groups prevented meaningful integration from taking place. Neither Germany, nor Britain was actually strong enough to impose a coherent economic order in East Africa. They were, however, sufficiently strong to disrupt traditional power structures and from this, East Africa is still recovering.

Chapter VI

Conclusion

Prior to the arrival of Europeans, integration in East Africa took place along Arab trade routes. Those routes ran on human power and tens of thousands of trips were made each year carrying tusks, cloth, beads, and other items.[160] While precise numbers are not known, the volume of traffic from the interior to the coast was quite large. This early trade goes back millennia and integrated eastern Africa with economies throughout the Middle East, Indian Ocean, and Mediterranean.

Europeans arrived at the close of the fifteenth century and initially only integrated with the coast. The second round of European integration in eastern Africa started in the mid-nineteenth century. They began by following the existing trade network that linked much of the interior to the Swahili Coast, but soon found those networks to be insufficient. Fueled by industrialization, religious zeal, available capital, and public fervor for colonial glory, they pushed deeper into eastern Africa to previously isolated kingdoms. They setup missions, began massive infrastructure projects, and created outposts to capture the existing trade.

European efforts in eastern Africa from the 1840s to 1870s were, like the motivations driving them, scattered and unfocused. Some tried to subjugate the Africans while others sought to defend them. Missionaries

[160] Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, 44–46.

aimed at converts while commercial interests searched for exportable goods. European powers competed with each other and with Arabs over who would control strategic areas. These divided efforts pitted Africans, Arabs, and Europeans against one another and facilitated little, if any, meaningful integration. The issue came to a head in the 1880s. There was growing public demand for colonial glory, especially in Britain and Germany. Even Portugal's long-standing colonies lacked clear borders. Exploration and trade missions were conducted in secret. Henry Morton Stanley charted the last terra incognita in Africa on European maps in 1877.[161] Intrepid Europeans such as de Brazza and Peters were scattered throughout the continent rushing to sign treaties with African chiefs.

In response to the chaos, Germany's Otto von Bismarck called for a conference to be held in Berlin among the European powers to settle the many questions surrounding European incursions into Africa. That conference only temporarily quieted destructive European rivalries. Its most significant consequence was the carving up of Africa for European powers. While nominally supporting free trade, the reality was quite the opposite as Germany and Britain used exclusionary and protective measures in their resulting East African empires.

The situation changed dramatically with the settler movement to the Kenyan highlands in the first decade of the twentieth century. Kenya became the "center of the periphery" and received the lion's share of development

[161] "Berlin Conference of 1884-85 - New World Encyclopedia," accessed August 7, 2019, https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Berlin_Conference_of_1884-85.

during the colonial period. This sowed seeds of distrust that has been hard to root out.

Early colonial policies slowed integration in East Africa in two main ways. First, the colonial powers thought of the Africans as adversaries. Britain and Germany had the to power to disrupt existing power structures, but were insufficiently powerful to replace them with suitable, long-lasting replacements. The resulting chaos continues to impact Africa today. One can only guess what may have happened had African leaders been approached as sovereign equals. Next, protective colonial policies set up exclusionary and bi-lateral integration at the expense of wider regional or global integration. Potential partners in trade and sources of capital were excluded to prevent competition in favor of state-sponsored monopolies. This exclusion began with the DOAG and the IBEAC and was later spun into dozens of separate monopolistic enterprises. These exclusionary policies caused resentment and unequal development particularly in Kenya.

Another example is demonstrated by what happened to German East Africa after World War I. Britain acquired Tanganyika after Germany signed the Treaty of Versailles. Up to that point, Germany had been more active in their East African colony than Britain. They were not stretched as thin as the British. They invested more heavily in the colony. Germany's GDP had actually surpassed Britain's but it was unable to invest as broadly because it held fewer colonies. While Britain had colonized roughly ten million square miles and held dozens of colonies around the world, Germany held only seven colonies for a total of roughly one million square miles. Imperial policies of both nations restricted investment in each other's colonies. These policies restricted the free flow of capital in East Africa. The monopolistic international system was slowing East Africa's potential for integration.

Under German rule in German East Africa, import/exports had reached 81 millions marks by 1912. However, under British control from 1919 onwards, the colony stagnated.[162] There was little trust in the international system in the 1920s and Britain was busy repaying war debts to the United States. East Africa was utilized in the gathering of funds to repay that debt.

Worry about further changes in territories made potential investors nervous. Consequently, after World War I, import/export numbers from Tanganyika fell to 1890s numbers and did not recover for decades. Free trade was meant to be allowed to League of Nations members throughout mandated territories. However, monopolistic tendencies prevailed, further delaying capital inflow and international trade.[163] For example, Japan, a League of Nations member and ally of Britain in World War I, was prevented from trading in East Africa, even though such trade was legal under international agreements.[164]

Depression and World War II years followed the stagnant 1920s and it was only in the 1950s that East African nations began to multilateralize their exports. It was not until after the cataclysmic events of World War II that the exclusionary and monopolistic policies began to change and at that point, it was too late. The war made Great Britain a second rate world power. Forces in

---

[162] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 26–27.

[163] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 34.

[164] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 27.

Britain, however, sought to keep her colonies "remaining sources of cheap raw materials and consumers of surplus, overpriced or redundant manufactured goods".[165] The fortunes of East Africa and Britain remained closely linked even after independence.

By the 1950s, African nationalism had reached maturity and events in Algeria, Vietnam, and Kenya shook imperial holds on colonies, stretched budgets and patience thin and turned public opinion against colonization. Meaningful integration barely got off the ground before it was undone. It is no surprise, then, that all European aspects of integration put in place in nearly 80 years of European rule in East Africa were undone within 15 years of independence. This thesis has better explained why early integration was flawed. It began unintentionally and was haphazard, incomplete, limited, exclusionary, bi-lateral, and exploitive in nature. It favored Kenya over Uganda and Tanzania, which created problems for the newly independent countries.[166] Kenya had been the only nation allowed any measure of industrialization and, upon independence, regional trade heavily favored the former crown colony at the expense of Kenya's East African neighbors.

Today, even though the dream of fuller East African integration has been rekindled and the apparatus are in place for forward progress, the years are marked with missed deadlines, broken promises, and little action. The words of Ronald Segal in September 1963 seem as relevant today as they were when he wrote them.

---

[165] Nabudere, *Imperialism in East Africa*, 34.

[166] "Kenya, Tanganyika, and Uganda."

> If it [federation] is not tried, or if it is tried and fails, Africa may yet be reduced to a hopelessness of small, poor, endlessly squabbling entities, with the great powers of East and West intervening, manipulating parties and peoples, to the menace of Africa and themselves alike. If it succeeds, a peaceful aspiration and growth may come to a vast area of Africa, adding much to the riches and the security of the whole world.[167]

The second East African Community, created in 2000, can certainly trace its origins back to the first EAC (1967-1977), but it is a very different organization. The first Community was forged mainly out of necessary. The entire territory of the EAC I had been integrated under a foreign hegemony with a common currency and joint ownership of region-wide air, rail, and postal services. Governing structures had also been integrated. Slowly, as each young nation asserted its independence and unique direction, the Community was whittled down to a nub and then dissolved entirely in 1977. That process, for better or for worse, undid essentially all colonial integration. After a period of conflict, the end of the Cold War and Apartheid paved the way for talks of a new EAC to be started from scratch. While the first Community had been comprised entirely of former British colonies, the second Community has broken out of that mold by admitting Rwanda and Burundi who had been German and then Belgian colonies. They have further broken the mold of the first EAC by admitting South Sudan, who, while formerly a British colony, was never admitted to the integrated structures of British East Africa.

The EAC II, therefore, unlike its predecessor, was not built upon a colonial foundation and is much more diverse than the original. Most, but not all of the current EAC is English speaking. No particular tribe or alliance of

[167] Hughes, *East Africa*, 11.

tribes dominates the second EAC. It is a new organization forged by African leaders two generations distant from independence. This is not to say the EAC II is not influenced by Europe, but this time, the primary drivers are native rather than foreign.

The first EAC failed because it was built on a poor foundation dating back to the pre-colonial and early colonial period. By the time coherent and comprehensive integration efforts began after World War II, it was already too late. The early efforts to link these economies were for the purposes of exploitation by the British and German empires. The Uganda Railway was not built to integrate Uganda and Kenya. Rather, it was built to bring wealth from the Buganda Kingdom on the northern shores of Lake Victoria to the Indian Ocean and then to Great Britain for processing and redistribution. The customs and monetary unions created in the early part of the twentieth century were not intended to integrate African economies with each other, but to integrate those economies better into the empire. The investments made in agriculture and industry in Kenya did not benefit, in any way, Africans in Uganda or Tanzania. The same could be said for the investments in ports, post and telecommunications prior to World War II.

The early foundation for East African integration was driven by mostly exploitive aims and therefore failed in the long run. East African countries had their economies integrated with Great Britain but not to each other. Once Great Britain left, the impetus to integrate changed. The leaders in East Africa had to plan their own direction, and while there have been some symbolic successes along the way, the process has remained mired with few tangible integrative achievements. Still, the opening of a headquarters in Arusha, the lofty goals established by the EAC II and the functioning organs of the new

Community that facilitate dialogue between member nations should not be ignored. There is a road map for integration and trust can be built. Cooperation is the best way forward.

British hegemony carried sufficient power to put some integrative measures in place. However, that integration stopped as soon as they left. The resulting power vacuum led to a long period of instability, which East Africa is only recovering from now.

Frequently, contemporary sources discussing the second EAC evoke the first in their analysis. They should do so carefully because the two iterations of this economic and political community could hardly be different. The British had integrated their East African colonies in numerous ways that were hard to untangle upon independence. This necessitated the creation of the EAC I. It took the new nations almost 15 years to completely untangle. It was an acrimonious divorce that resulted in closed borders and war by the late 1970s.

The second EAC is attempting to trend in the opposite direction, that is, to integrate from disintegration. The progress has been slow, but let us not forget that it took the British nearly 80 years to achieve their version of East Africa. African governments, since the end of the Cold War, have pursued a vision of integration that matches and surpasses what they inherited from their colonial masters. The EAC II is barely 20 years old and without a regional hegemon to press the issue and set the terms, integration may be even slower this time around. The fact that the EAC II now has six members, twice the membership of the original, may complicate and delay matters even further. This time around, it will be very important that economic integration be designed to benefit all those involved, rather than just the powerful.

Ultimately what doomed the European integration project in East Africa was that it was largely exploitive and had no clear plan or focus. This facilitated wide-ranging projects like mission work, agricultural settlements including tens of thousands of white settlers, infrastructure projects meant to support those settlements, trade and administrative projects. Many of these projects attracted those seeking to exploit resources and/or local labor. Exploitation caused resentment, distrust, rebellion and violence. Exclusionary and monopolistic policies prevented wider integration. Leaders today should be mindful of these lessons when planning greater integration across the region, because without inclusive and careful planning, new integration efforts are likely to cause fresh resentments between peoples.

Bibliography

Anderson, Ross. “World War I in East Africa 1916-1918.” University of Glasgow, 2001. https://www.academia.edu/17269264/World_War_I_in_East_Africa_1916-1918.

Apter, David Ernest. *The Political Kingdom in Uganda: A Study of Bureaucratic Nationalism*. London: Frank Cass, 1997.

Barczewski, Stephanie. *David Livingstone*. Yale University Press, 2016. http://yale.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.12987/yale/9780300180060.001.0001/upso-9780300180060-chapter-4.

Behrendt, Moritz. “Tidiane N’Diaye’s ‘The Veiled Genocide’: Selective Theses on the Arab Slave Trade - Qantara.De.” Qantara.de - Dialogue with the Islamic World. Accessed February 13, 2020. https://en.qantara.de/content/tidiane-ndiayes-the-veiled-genocide-selective-theses-on-the-arab-slave-trade.

“Berlin Conference of 1884-85 - New World Encyclopedia.” Accessed August 7, 2019. https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Berlin_Conference_of_1884-85.

“The Betrayal and Capture of Mwanga and Kabalega.” *Daily Monitor*. April 4, 2012. https://www.monitor.co.ug/SpecialReports/ugandaat50/1370466-1379638-14dfxax/index.html.

Bragg, Melvin. “The Berlin Conference.” Audio. *In Our Time*. London: BBC Radio 4, October 31, 2013.

Coupland, Reginald. *The Exploitation of East Africa, 1856-1890: The Slave Trade and the Scramble.* London: Faber and Faber, 1939.

Da Gama, Vasco. *The First Voyage*. London: Ernest George Ravenstein, 1898.

East African Community. “Treaty of East African Cooperation.” Kampala, Uganda, November 29, 1967.

Edgerton, Robert B. *Mau Mau: An African Crucible*. New York : London: Free Press; Collier Macmillan, 1989.

Eliot, Charles. *The East Africa Protectorate*. London: EArnold, 1905. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.FIG:004724889.

Elkins, Caroline. *Imperial Reckoning: The Untold Story of Britain's Gulag in Kenya*. 1st edition. London: Holt Paperbacks, 2005.

Fage, J. D. *A History of Africa*. The History of Human Society. London: Hutchinson, 1978.

"General Act of the Berlin Conference on West Africa, 26 February 1885," February 26, 1885.

Gray, John, and Carl Peters. "Anglo-German Relations in Uganda, 1890–1892." *The Journal of African History* 1, no. 2 (1960): 281–297. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021853700001857.

Heartfield, James. *The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, 1838–1956: A History*. Oxford University Press, 2017. http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190491673.001.0001/acprof-9780190491673.

"Heliogland-Zanzibar Treaty." Berlin, July 1, 1890.

Hughes, Anthony J. *East Africa: The Search for Unity; Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, and Zanzibar*. Penguin African Library, AP11. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

Iliffe, John. *A Modern History of Tanganyika*. African Studies Series 25. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebookbatch.ACLS_batch:MIU01000000000000004916746.

Ingham, Kenneth. *A History of East Africa*. 3rd ed. London: Longmans, 1965.

Kasaija, Phillip. "Regional Integration: A Political Federation of the East African Countries?" *African Journal of International Affairs* 7, no. 1–2 (2004): 21–34. https://doi.org/10.4314/ajia.v7i1-2.57213.

"Kenya, Tanganyika, and Uganda: Kampala Agreement on Redressing Trade Imbalance." *International Legal Materials* 3, no. 6 (1964): 1106–15.

Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar. London, 1920. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106011039275.

Kenyatta, Jomo, Julius K Nyerere, and Milton Obote. "Nairobi Declaration of Federation by the Governments of East Africa," June 5, 1963.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review. E.C. Barton, 1894.

Lovejoy, Paul E. *Transformations in Slavery: A History of Slavery in Africa*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

"M. De Brazza's Treaty with Congo Chiefs." *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 2, no. 11 (November 1882): 270–71.

Mwakikagile, Godfrey. *Nyerere and Africa: End of an Era*. New Africa Press, 2007.

Nabudere, D. Wadada. *Imperialism in East Africa*. Zed ;--USdistributor, LHill, 1981. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015004965524.

Newman, James L. *Imperial Footprints: Henry Morton Stanley's African Journeys*. Dulles: Potomac Books Inc, 2004.

Ocen, Felix. "How Ugandan Led Revolution That Ended Arabs Reign over Zanzibar." Daily Monitor. Accessed January 15, 2020. https://www.monitor.co.ug/Magazines/PeoplePower/How-Ugandan-led-revolution-that-ended-Arabs-reign-over-Zanzibar/689844-5415576-cappocz/index.html.

Ojo, Olatunde J. C. B. *African International Relations*. London ; New York: Longman, 1985.

Oliver, Roland Anthony. *History of East Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Pesek, Michael. "Colonial Conquest and the Struggle for the Presence of the Colonial State in German East Africa, 1885-1903." *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 161–82.

———. "German and Allied War Crimes in the East African Campaign, 1914-18." *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1–20.

———. "Jihad Made in Germany. German Propaganda in East Africa during the First World War, 1914-18." *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1–18.

———. "Making Sense of the First World War in Africa." *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1–11.

———. "The Colonial Order Upside Down? British and Germans in East African Prisoner-of-War Camps During World War I." *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 23–41.

———. “The Lonely Imperialist. Richard Kandt and the Making of Colonial Politics at the Very Periphery of the Empire.” *Academia.Edu*, n.d., 1–18.

———. “The War of Legs: Transport and Infrastructure in the East African Campaign of World War I.” *Transfers* 5, no. 2 (n.d.): 102–20.

“Recalling Africa’s Harrowing Tale of Its First Slavers – The Arabs.” *New African*, March 27, 2018. https://newafricanmagazine.com/16616/.

Rigby, Christopher Palmer. “General Rigby, Zanzibar and the Slave Trade.” *Near East and India* 45, no. 1273 (1935): 462.

Rwekaza, M. “‘Political Cooperation’, in Perspectives on Regional Integration and Cooperation in East Africa: Proceedings of the 1st Ministerial Seminar on East African Cooperation.” East African Community Secretariat, March 25, 1999.

Semmel, Bernard. *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism: Classical Political Economy the Empire of Free Trade and Imperialism 1750–1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

“Sir Bartle Frere and the Zanzibar Slave-Trade.” *The Anti-Slavery Reporter; London* 18, no. 4 (January 1873): 102.

Stanley, Henry M. *In Darkest Africa: Or, The Quest, Rescue and Retreat of Emin, Governor of Equatoria*. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, limited, 1890.

Welle (www.dw.com), Deutsche. “East Africa’s Forgotten Slave Trade | DW | 22.08.2019.” DW.COM. Accessed February 13, 2020. https://www.dw.com/en/east-africas-forgotten-slave-trade/a-50126759.