



Colonial State and the Transformation of Inter-Ethnic Conflicts in Uasin Gishu County Up to 1963

Kiprono Chebii  

Ph.D. Student, The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya

Francis Muchoki

Senior Lecturer, The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya

Kennedy Moindi

Senior Lecturer, The Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya

Suggested Citation

Chebii, K, Muchoki, F. & Moindi, K. (2023). Colonial State and the Transformation of Inter-Ethnic Conflicts in Uasin Gishu County Up to 1963. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 1(4), 1151-1168.

DOI: [10.59324/ejtas.2023.1\(4\).107](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2023.1(4).107)

Abstract:

Inter-ethnic hostilities have persisted over a considerable duration on a worldwide scale, originating from socio-economic and political issues. Ethnic conflict has been extensively documented in several African countries throughout the continent, spanning from the pre-colonial era to the colonial period. The occurrence of this ethnic conflict can be attributed to the policies implemented by the colonial state. Hence, the principal aim of this research was to document and examine the extent of the colonial state's engagement in the endeavor of mitigating inter-ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu County, particularly during the era preceding 1963. The primary objective of

this study was to examine the impact of the colonial state on the development of inter-ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu County, specifically focusing on the period leading up to 1963. The research employed a historical methodology, incorporating primary and secondary data sources. The study incorporated a diverse range of primary data sources, such as annual reports, conclusions derived from appointed commissions, interviews conducted with key stakeholders, court judgments, and official government statistics. In addition, the study incorporated secondary materials. The sources encompassed a heterogeneous array of materials, including printed books, scholarly papers, and unpublished archival documents. The study was positioned within the existing body of literature by incorporating these sources. Land alienation and the subsequent establishment of settler farms coupled with setting up squiredom labour served to inadvertently lay the foundation for inter-ethnic friction. The study posits that the implementation of a holistic strategy that encompasses various actors from both the public and private domains is necessary to effectively tackle the root causes of disputes and avert their recurrence in subsequent instances. Simultaneously, it is imperative to enhance regulations to dissuade the political class from employing land issues as a tactic to incite ethnic differences and escalate tribal wars within the designated region. The output of this research is expected to have a positive impact on various stakeholders, such as historians, policymakers, political bodies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and religious institutions. The aforementioned findings have the potential to make a significant contribution to the promotion of peace and justice in Uasin Gishu and similar contexts.

Keywords: *Colonial State, Ethnic Conflicts, Uasin Gishu.*



Introduction

Globally, interactions between ethnic groups have historically been marked by instances of discord and tension due to socioeconomic and political factors. The aforementioned issue continues to pose a significant challenge not just to global peace, but also to peace at regional and national levels (Kemplin, 2021). Numerous instances can be observed globally wherein inter-ethnic conflicts have posed significant challenges to the maintenance of international peace and security. According to Piccotio (2012), the most lethal ethnic wars worldwide occurred in several regions, including the Balkans, Chechnya, Iraq, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Israel's West Bank and Gaza Strip, as well as Rwanda and Sudan, with a specific focus on the Darfur region. Consequently, the occurrence of ethnic conflicts has given rise to profound divisions that have materialized in several manifestations, including but not limited to ethnic animosities, wars between states, conflicts within states, and conflicts extending beyond state boundaries (Gurr, 2005).

In Kenya, the Northern frontier has been singled out because of the frequency of conflicts that have taken place between rival communities since pre-colonial times (Diba, 2015). The advent of the colonial period in the mid-1880 did not change the situation for the better. Instead, it escalated since the range and magnitude of these conflicts continued to escalate into different shapes and dimensions thus posing serious conflict challenges that have continued up to today (Emeka, 1999). Post-independence Kenya has not escaped the wave of conflict found in other parts of the continent. The most pronounced conflicts in the continent include fights over grazing fields, ownership of land, and politically instigated violence. The Kenya Human Rights Watch (2017) avers that, in Kenya, conflicts over land ownership have been witnessed in counties such as Uasin Gishu, Nakuru, Narok, and Trans-Nzoia. These conflicts have involved different communities such as the Kikuyu, Abaluhya, Gusii, Maasai, and Kalenjin communities. It is worth noting that,

the colonial state policies on land created landlessness, squatters, and more so, ethnic consciousness due to the establishment of native reserves for specific ethnic groups.

Furthermore, following the establishment of the colonial state in the mid-1880s, there was a notable increase in tensions and hostilities between Africans and the colonial authority. The implementation of the divide-and-rule policy was utilized as a means to effectively administer the African population and ensure their subjugation. Subsequently, the colonial powers employed the strategy of land alienation as well. The presence of colonial practices, including the colonial economy and labour exportation, resulted in tensions among the white highlands, with Uasin Gishu being one such example. The displacement of indigenous communities and the subsequent occupation of their territory by other communities can be attributed to the policies implemented by the colonial government. These policies aimed to support the colonial economy by providing labour to the settlers, but inadvertently resulted in the alienation of land that originally belonged to the indigenous communities. The aforementioned trajectory underscores the significance of possessing a unified and comprehensive historical narrative on the individuals responsible for instigating ethnic conflicts within the region. Hence, the primary objective of this study was to address the existing historical void, specifically on ethnic clashes in Uasin Gishu during the colonial period.

Objective

This study was guided by one objective namely: to discuss the colonial state in the transformation of inter-ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu County (1895-1963)

Research Question

What was the role of the colonial state in the transformation of inter-ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu County (1895-1963)?

Literature Review

Anderson and O'Dowd (1983) focused on the question of ethnicity in his essay 'Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism'. According to the author, nations gained imaginary communities as a result of the fateful collision of capitalism and technology. A nation is a socially constructed community imagined by individuals who identify with one another. As a result, imagined communities began to develop their nation-print languages, which each individual spoke. Anderson goes on to say that what makes a nation an imagined community is that even the tiniest nation will never know most of their fellow members or have even met yet, but they consider themselves a nation in their thoughts.

According to William (2001, p. 56), ethno-political conflicts exert a profound and enduring influence on the contemporary global landscape. According to Thomas Hobbes, human beings possess an inherent inclination toward self-interest. Drawing upon an earlier historical epoch, the author posits that the primary catalyst for discord in contemporary society lies in the inherent human inclination to fulfill their insatiable desires (Badawi, 2006). In this particular interpretation, wars may be traced back to past empires and kingdoms, and their current intensification transcends racial boundaries, encompassing individuals with shared ancestral origins. When individuals are unable to establish a mutually acceptable arrangement for coexistence in their pursuit of fulfilling their respective wants, conflicts often arise due to competition for finite resources. This ultimately results in both immediate and enduring conflicts. According to Tepfenhart (2013), the existence of resentment between different groups can frequently be attributed to historical events that have perpetuated animosity and apprehension among them. Ethnic communities are motivated by fear to organize and safeguard their interests against perceived threats that may jeopardize their means of sustenance.

According to Ajulu (2002, pp. 251-268), ethnicity is a hallmark of Sub-Saharan countries

whose populations are settled along tribal lines in the upcountry and even in urban areas where estates reflect ethnic consciousness. According to Arthur (2009, p.22), the foundation of colonial power in Africa in the late 1880s witnessed the creation of Western administrative institutions. These arrangements were designed to serve Western interests through a "divide and rule" tactic. He also expresses sadness that the practice resulted in ethnic groups fighting each other during and after the colonial period. This picture of ongoing ethnic hostilities has been attributed to a lack of national identity in the majority of African post-independence countries. Using Rwanda as an example, Billy (2012, p. 56) draws a direct link between the civil wars that occurred later in post-colonial Rwanda and the Belgian colonization of the nation from 1916 to 1962. He bemoans the fact that colonial officials split the two main communities (Hutu and Tutsi), fostering ethnic consciousness. Tutsi were favoured in all facets of human existence, to the detriment of Hutus. Belgian colonial rulers left an ethnically divided Rwanda at independence in 1962, which lasted until the mid-1990s, resulting in a civil war that lost over 800,000 lives. The case of Rwanda provides a foundation for arguing that if wars are not adequately managed, they can threaten the very stability of nations.

According to Udamaga (2016), the consolidation of the Northern and Southern protectorates in Nigeria by the British was undertaken with the primary objective of advancing the interests of the colonial rulers. According to Nnoli (1978), the occurrence of inter-ethnic conflicts can be attributed to the actions of individuals in positions of power who perpetuate discriminatory practices based on ethnic identity. The author references the case of the Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groups in Rwanda. The Hutu, constituting the larger portion of the population, perceived the Tutsi minority as the tribe favored by the state. The aforementioned impression gave rise to the hostility that subsequently evolved into the Rwandan genocide of 1994. The examined literature presents a compelling argument for the necessity of doing an analysis of inter-ethnic conflicts within cosmopolitan

settings, such as Uasin Gishu County, to ascertain the underlying causes, consequences, and potential resolutions.

Nyukuri (1997 p.80) observes that inter-ethnic struggles in Kenya have their genesis in the legacy of colonialism. Drawing from historical perspectives, Kiprono (2017) also argues that the exit of settler farmers from the former white highlands in Uasin Gishu County in the early 1960s saw the independence government, under the founding father Jomo Kenyatta, adopt the policy of willing buyers willing seller in redistributing the land left by the departing Europeans. The native communities anticipated that the land would be reverted to them; however, this did not happen. The “willing buyer, willing seller” policy resulted in an influx of many ethnic groups into the former white highlands leading to ethnic animosity. These ethnic tensions would later be used as a political tool to incite “locals” against perceived “outsiders” into violence. “The problem of ethnicity emerged during the colonial period and it has been progressively accentuated since independence with the emergence of ethnic origin as a factor in national politics” (Oyugi, 2002, p. 6). “Much of the discontent revolves around how the founding president dealt with land formerly appropriated by white settlers from local communities” (International Crisis Group, 2017).

TJRC (2013) argues that the failure of the colonial and post-colonial governments to deal with landlessness and land-related issues forced communities to use violence as a self-help mechanism. What comes out is that political expedience has been advanced to ignite ethnic conflict under the pretext of historical injustices. As much as these studies offer a snapshot of the issue of ethnic conflict in general, they do not specifically discuss the historical dynamics and evolution of inter-ethnic conflict in Uasin Gishu County; thus, the proposed study seeks to answer these questions through a historical examination on inter-ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya, up to 1963.

Methodology

This study was carried out in Uasin Gishu County. The County is located in the former Rift Valley Province's center section. The Case investigation Design was used for this investigation. This was driven by the study's intention to conduct an in-depth examination of the problem under inquiry, namely ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu County. Simultaneously, case studies were favored because they allowed the researcher to focus on the broad field of conflict specifically ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu County during the colonial period. The researcher visited the Kenya National Archives (KNA) in Nairobi and the Nakuru Regional Archives to obtain historical materials for the study. Documents like intelligence reports, Provincial, District, and Department of Native Affairs Reports were analyzed by the KNA to learn more about ethnic violence. Similarly, among the records sought at the archives were Human Rights records and Presidential Commissions of Inquiry Reports on inter-ethnic conflict issues. Furthermore, the KNA provided useful secondary material in the form of books, periodicals, newspapers, and various other official papers about Uasin Gishu, such as yearly, quarterly, and monthly reports. Finally, intelligence reports and diaries left behind by European settlers and administrators were studied to identify the historical foundations of inter-ethnic strife before independence. Archival data was used to confirm, validate, and supplement other data sources. This historical study emphasized the importance of archive work.

In this study, qualitative data analysis approaches were employed to make connections between the study topic and theory. In particular, secondary material content data was analyzed for relevance, strength, and weakness concerning the study topics. An inter-ethnic conflict critical qualitative analysis was constructed. The collection and identification of emergent themes and sub-themes related to the study objectives were part of the data analysis for this study. Data acquired using the two research instruments (interview guide and document analysis guide) was analyzed qualitatively in systematic themes

utilizing descriptive narratives and verbatim forms. Data gathered through interviews was analyzed and written up as a tale. This is because, during the interviews, the participants tell their experiences and points of view in the form of a story. To provide a complete account, data from archives and documentary sources were analyzed. Simultaneously, the analysis followed chronological trends.

Results and Discussion

The White Settler Farms and Land Alienation as the Foundation of Frosty Inter-Ethnic Relations in Uasin Gishu

The British colonialists initiated purposeful actions intended to legally justify the purchase of land from Africans. The East African Order in Council was passed in 1901, granting the commissioner of the protectorate the authority to acquire all public land in whichever manner he saw fit. According to Tarus (1994), this action resulted in the famous aphorism that Crown Land refers to all land owned by the British Crown. As a result, vast tracts of land were excavated in Uasin Gishu and given to whites, who created large-scale plantations and dairy farms. The Crown Lands Ordinance was approved by the Colonial administration in 1902. This legislation again allowed the commissioner authority to sell up to 1,000 acres of Crown Land in freehold to anyone, or to issue 99-year leases that were increased to 999-year leases in 1915. As a result, Africans became tenants at the whim of the crown. According to Zwanberg (1975), this meant that they could be kicked off their land at the government's discretion. This was due to Africans' refusal to recognize their rights to land ownership. Africans' land rights were limited to occupation and grazing but not ownership (Mbithi & Barnes, 1975).

By 1930, the Native Land Trust Ordinance proclaimed that 'African reserves belong to Africans forever'. The Carter Commission established the limits of the white highlands, including Uasin Gishu, in 1934. By 1939, 2,027 settlers had received 6,543,360 acres of very arable land. This equated to around 2,534 acres

per settler (Tarus, 1994). The Afrikaner settlers in Uasin Gishu could find an alternative colony identical to their home (Sorrenson, 1975). The Grogan Concession, for example, accumulated nearly 328 square miles of forest area in adjacent Keiyo for timber and left only 72 miles for grazing (Tarus, 1994). This conclusion is supported by Ochien'g and Maxon (1992), who claim that Afrikaans-speaking South Africans were the first white settlers to arrive in Uasin Gishu around 1900 and that by 1914, the area was completely settled. They engaged in large-scale agriculture and were reliant on African labourers, primarily the Kikuyu, Kalenjin, Maasai, and Abaluhya. According to one important informant, white settler farmers in Uasin Gishu sought labourers from several ethnic groups to meet their labour needs (O.I, Samuel Kanyi). A noteworthy development that resulted from the seizure of African land was the establishment of a squatter system in Uasin Gishu, which necessitated the lodging of thousands of squatters in European farms. The majority of squatters in the Kenyan colony were founded by the Kalenjin and Kikuyu populations. They were joined by Abaluhya, who had arrived in Uasin Gishu and Trans Nzoia as farm labourers and squatters (Kanogo, 1987). According to Ochieng and Maxon (1992), this was a vivid representation of the natural process of land alienation sanctioned by the colonial authority because it helped to provide African labour to European and government activities. Coffee plantations, wheat farms, tea plantations, and dairy farms were also created by the settlers.

According to Chasang (2011), what occurred following the European settlement of the Uasin Gishu plateau was competition for grass by native groups. The colonial administration used this to subjugate the natives and assimilate them into the colonial settler economy. Indeed, by 1926, 840 locals had been enlisted as squatters in both Uasin Gishu and Elgeyo Marakwet (KNA/DC/UG/2/1). This happened following the expulsion of the Keiyo and other Kalenjin to make way for white colonization. Douglas was a European pioneer who collected a large amount of land in Uasin Gishu (Groen, 1974). In 1922, he acquired property near Chepkorio, forcing

many locals to flee to make space for settler activity. W.F. Van Breda and his brothers were another European pioneers who arrived in Uasin Gishu in 1904. In doing so, he implied that he is interested in Uasin Gishu because he has 'been told by private individuals and government officials of the amazing Uasin Gishu Plateau'. (Groen, 1974). Each of the three brothers, who arrived in Uasin Gishu from South Africa in February 1903, got 10,000 acres of land. Their territory reached up to the salt-licking Sergoit rock. Following then, more settlers began to arrive in the Uasin Gishu plateau. Major Arnold, for example, was fascinated by stories of the plateau. This prompted him to return to South Africa with his family in 1902. In 1905, he was joined by John de' Waal, who purchased land from Van Bredas. In Uasin Gishu, he established a large-scale farming enterprise. The South Africans were the largest single group to relocate to Uasin Gishu. This was led by Jan Van Rensburg, a well-known farmer from South Africa's Transvaal District.

This choice to acquire native land with complete contempt for their land rights not only disenfranchised them but also laid the groundwork for frigid inter-ethnic relations in the region, as will be proved later. Despite this, many people supported the move, as reported in the East African Daily on the presence of Afrikaners in Uasin Gishu, claiming that it would reinforce the area's defenses and so free up this territory for farming:

The Afrikaners (in Uasin Gishu) are not a disturbing factor in contact with the natives, but a controlling factor. Their arrival in Uasin Gishu marks a promising epoch in the history of the land' (Groen, 1974).

To indicate their opposition to this decision, Van De Waal was murdered during some conflicts in 1911. The Uasin Gishu Farmers Association was moved by this. The government dispatched a punitive expedition against the locals in the Keiyo and Marakwet areas in 1911. This gesture indicates how enraged the Africans were by the action of forcibly stealing their land.

Migrant Labour on Settler Farms and Its Effect on Inter-Ethnic Relations

Land alienation amounted to the establishment of migrant African labourers, mainly in Uasin Gishu, as well as the creation of squiredom. The loss of grazing land was the initial shock for the indigenous peoples. As a result, they were forced to provide labour to European farms. By 1920, the DC of Uasin Gishu stated that 700 to 800 indigenous had gone to work on European farms. As time progressed, the figures continued to rise. Simultaneously, European settlers brought in labour from other locations, mainly non-Kalenjin speakers, to work in their fields. "The sub-contractors who built the Uasin Gishu railway considered them (Non-Kalenjin) quite satisfactory, the heaviest task of breaking metal for ballast was done properly by the Kavirondo" (KNA/DC/UG/3/2).

During the 1950s, the colonial administration not only facilitated the migration of labourers from central Kenya to Uasin Gishu for employment on settler farms, but also facilitated the migration of individuals from Kavirondo, including the Abaluhya, and Luo communities. The colonial authorities posited that these populations, in contrast to the Kalenjin, had a proclivity towards an agrarian sedentary way of life, which consequently fostered a strong work ethic, notably in the realm of cultivation (Kipkalya, 2020). As a result, during the 1950s, there was a significant increase in the population of the Kikuyu community in Uasin Gishu and other areas of the divide, which caused dissatisfaction among the Kalenjin group. This prompted them to initiate protests to persuade the Europeans to revoke their decision to admit immigrants whom they perceived as unfamiliar individuals. As a consequence of the perceived animosity expressed by the Nandi community, the Uasin Gishu District Commissioner, Mr. P.H Burton, decided to prohibit the entry of the Kikuyu population into the Uasin Gishu region (Kipkalya, 2020).

Mr. Symes-Thompson, his successor, however, continued with the importation of migrant populations such as the Kikuyu, Abaluhya, and Luo into Uasin Gishu. He contended that

migrant labourers were critical to the agricultural success of settler farms. As a result, an increasing number of settler farms began to see the influx of migrant labourers. To justify this, C.D. Cullen, a settler located in Kipkabus, fired all Nandi labourers and hired Kikuyu, Abaluhya, and Luo migrant labourers, accusing them of complacency. He rationalized his actions by claiming that whereas a single Kikuyu labourer could weed ten lines per day, five Kalenjin could only weed two and a half lines per day. KNS DC/TAMB/2/9/11 Liaison Committee. In the 1930s, some Nandi were replacing Keiyo squatters on the plateau's eastern side. This was after the settlers began favoring the Nandi over the Keiyo, maybe as part of their divide-and-rule strategy. As a result, the Keiyo perceived the Nandi to have encroached on their masters' farms. As a result, there was friction between the Nandi and the Keiyo, and accusations of livestock rustling were leveled on both sides (Kipkalya, 2020). As a result, the DC stepped in, fearing that a physical clash between the two communities would harm the interests of the settlers in Uasin Gishu.

According to the Uasin Gishu District Annual Report (KNA/PC/RVP2/8/1), the subject of whether the future of the Uasin Gishu plateau resided in the hands of the English or the Dutch became of interest and conjecture in 1913. Such discussions were held without regard for the native African people, which had been consigned to reserves at this point. According to Githumo (1981), the introduction of colonialism in Kenya, which began in the late second half of the nineteenth century, brought about numerous changes in the concept of land ownership, property rights, techniques of land acquisition, and community control. Rather than community rights, Europeans introduced the concept of individual claims to land through ownership and use. From 1901, formal governmental laws governing land ownership and delivery were developed, including the concepts of leasehold and freehold.

According to Zeleza (1992), settler and cooperative production constituted the mainstay of the colonial economy, requiring a large supply of labour. For settlers and corporate interests,

this meant forcible takeover of land, animals, and other indigenous means of production. According to Berman and Lonsdale (1992), the Crown Land Ordinance of 1902 empowered the commissioner of the protectorate to distribute land to European immigrants and establish reserves for ethnic groups to expedite the alienation of land for settlement. According to Tanui (2018), the Nandi were the first colonial reserve to be established in Kenya due to their resistance to colonial rule. This effectively resulted in the loss of the Nandi grazing area (Kaptich) to European settlers in the Trans Nzoia and Uasin Gishu plateaus. According to one significant informant:

Colonial authorities demarcated the boundaries of Uasin Gishu's flat terrain as white highlands exclusive to the whites alone. Mlango to the west, Burnt Forest to the south, Elgeyo border to the east, and Moi's Bridge north as the boundaries. The Nandi and the Elgeyo would not cross the set boundaries into Uasin Gishu. The only Africans who were found in Uasin Gishu were labourers working for the white farms (O.I, Samuel Kanyi).

According to Leo (1984), the forced displacement of the Nandi in the territories resulted in the availability of 3200 square kilometers of land for European immigrants. This had an emotional and economic impact on the Nandi territorial entities (Bororiosiek). The Nandi resisted vehemently but were eventually beaten and incorporated within the allotted reserves. As a penalty for resistance, the Europeans confiscated almost 16,000 head of cattle and 36,000 minor stocks. According to Lagat (1995), the persistent Nandi resistance resulted in the loss of people, animals, and land. Their native region in the southern Uasin Gishu plateau was opened to European colonization, depriving their animals of grazing places and salt licks. They were assigned to marginal regions with limited yearly rainfall, making them unsuitable for cattle raising and crop cultivation.

Upon the subjugation of the Nandi community in around 1905, the colonial administration proceeded to establish demarcations based on ethnic affiliations. Consequently, legislation was

enacted to prohibit indigenous individuals from inhabiting any designated reserve area that did not correspond to their specific ethnic group (Ochieng & Maxon, 1992). According to colonial documents, it is evident that the Uasin Gishu area was partitioned into two distinct sections: the settled area encompassing European farms, and the native district of Elgeyo, which was incorporated in 1913. The District was subdivided into five distinct sections, namely Soy, Nandi Border, Trans Nzoia, Sergoit, and Elgeyo (PC/RVP2/8/1). The implementation of this measure was undertaken by the colonial authority to facilitate governance and enhance tax-collecting efficiency. According to the annual report of 1913, the District Commissioner of Uasin Gishu District made an indication.

Matters of interest, records of native cases and 'Ma-shauri', rules, maps account of customs, records of taxation, etc. are all being collected into a book kept for this purpose at Eldoret" (PC/RVP. 2/8/3).

The introduction of Native Reserves weakened the traditional framework of land access. Individual families, rather than clans or kinships, arose as a key means of securing land in the reserves, for example. The reserve limits prevented individuals from getting land rights elsewhere and created pressure on the land, which traditional customary tenure patterns had addressed through out-migration whenever there was a lack of land or any sort of disturbance (Bruce & Adholla, 1994). The removal of the Nandi from the Uasin Gishu plateau by the British caused discontent in the established reserves. As a result, during the early years of colonial authority, some chose to relocate to other locations such as Mount Elgon, Tugen, and Kipsigis (O.I, Akui Kwambai). Furthermore, land alienations occurred following the First World War (1914-1918). Mr. Hemsted C.S, the then District Commissioner (hereinafter DC) of Uasin Gishu District, justified the alienation of 180 square kilometers of land by claiming that the Nandi ethnic group was not beneficially 'occupied' (KNA/DC/NDI/1/2).

The process of land alienation had a significant impact on the Nandi reserves, exacerbating the issue of land scarcity. This situation was advantageous for European settlers, as the indigenous population, who had been displaced and turned into squatters, was readily available as a source of labour in Uasin Gishu, Trans Nzoia, and Kericho Districts. According to Ellis (1976), the Nandi community in the 1920s developed a sense of hostility against the state due to a combination of factors. These factors included an exacerbated land shortage, a significant rise in taxation that had tripled between 1909 and 1920, and a change in tax collection dates. Moreover, the apprehension surrounding the dissemination of Rinderpest prompted the implementation of livestock quarantine measures within the Nandi reserves during the years 1921-1923. The African reserves witnessed the implementation of stringent quarantine regulations, prompting the Nandi community to express their opposition to the colonial authorities through passive means, such as withholding tax payments and labour contributions.

According to Moyse-Bartlett (2012), there was a steady buildup of animosity and dissatisfaction toward the government from 1920 to 1923. This tension reached its peak when the Nandi community made preparations for a customary ritual called *Sagetab eito*, commonly referred to as the sacrifice of the ox. This ritual held great historical significance as it symbolized the transfer of leadership from one generation to the next within the community. The *Sagetab eito* ritual is a traditional event that historically showcased a demonstration of military might, wherein all Nandi males would assemble at a designated location to observe the symbolic transfer of power. The aforementioned ceremony was conventionally succeeded by a surge in livestock raids, as the officially acknowledged age set of warriors endeavored to demonstrate their superiority over the prior generation of warriors. Upon receiving reports, colonial government managers held the belief that the Nandi Orkoiyot intended to exploit the ceremonial *Sagetab eito* of 1923 as a pretense to amass armed forces for a significant insurrection. Consequently, the authorization to conduct the

event was rescinded, resulting in its cancellation. According to Moyse-Bartlett (2012), it is suggested that on October 16, 1923, a few days before the planned Sagetab eito, the *Orkoijot* Barsiran Arap Manyei, who was the son of Koitalel Samoei, along with four other elders, were apprehended and then relocated to Meru until the year 1961. The strategic decision was made to destabilize the established hierarchy within the Nandi community, so undermining their cohesive political structure. According to Paul Kisang (O.I), the authorization to conduct the symbolic ritual, which signifies the transition of authority from one age set to the next, was rescinded. Consequently, the event did not occur, and as of the present day, it has yet to transpire.

According to Tanui (2018), land alienation caused the Nandi to live in squalor on the reserves, and the only way out was to work on colonial white settler farms, which were originally their grazing areas. As previously stated, the Nandi lost vast swaths of fertile land in Uasin Gishu to Europeans. This loss had a significant impact on their economy since it redirected their attention away from activities like subsistence cultivation, livestock herding, and cattle raids and forced them to work as squatters on colonial farms. Squatters first appeared in Uasin Gishu in 1910, when a large number of Nandi people relocated to neighboring white farms to work as farmhands. According to Margrate Kiptoo (O.I), the Nandi signed a labour agreement with their thumbprint in blue ink on paper. This was dubbed *keteben bulu* (thumbprint). The relationship benefited both parties since it provided labour for white settler farms and grass for Nandi livestock. However, due to the continuous low pricing of cereals on the global market in the 1930s, European settlers moved their attention from cultivating cereals to livestock husbandry. This made life more difficult for the Nandi squatters in Uasin Gishu and other regions.

The archival documents originating from the East Africa Royal Commission in 1953 provide evidence that the settler community in Kenya actively advocated for the enactment of laws that conferred authority onto local governing bodies

and district councils to restrict the presence of squatters and their livestock on settler farms. By 1934, livestock, totaling over 12,000, had been relocated from the established regions. The activities resulted in a temporary increase in congestion within the reserves due to the settlers encountering a significant lack of labour. Consequently, they were compelled to reverse their decision and let the re-entry of the squatters (KNA/PC/RV/2/8//10). Upon the renewal of their contracts, the squatters were granted permission to return to their premises. However, a restriction was imposed on the maximum amount of livestock they were permitted to maintain, limiting it to a total of 10 heads of cattle. The primary objective behind this initiative was to effectively tackle the labour scarcity prevalent across the district, particularly in some areas (KNA/PC/RVP.2/7/10). Within the district, the interrelations among individuals of African descent residing in the reserves were generally amicable. However, the harmonious dynamics were frequently marred by incidents of stock theft, which consequently strained the ethnic connections. The aforementioned information is documented in the yearly report of 1935, as recorded by the Uasin Gishu District Commissioner at that time.

Relations between members of the Nandi and Elgeyo people are somewhat strained and friction is apt to arise quickly in isolated cases when members of one community or the other come as unbidden guests to ceremonials or dances held on the farms. Such an event took place on Bethell's Farm, Moiben, in September. Following hue and cry, over two hundred armed Elgeyo turned out to follow stock alleged to have been stolen by Nandi squatters from Elgeyo squatters (KNA/PC/RVP.2/8/12).

The Nandi and Elgeyo ethnic groups clashed on occasion in Uasin Gishu, particularly from November to March. This was a time of plentiful harvests and widespread stock theft. In the 1941 annual report, the then-DC, Uasin Gishu District, stated:

‘Although there has been little local political disturbance among any section of the community and less friction between the Nandi

and Elgeyo residing on colonial farms, in the district, it must be remembered however that the silly season starts in the hot weather of January and February and the Nandi show some signs of their perennial stock thieving propensities as Inter-tribal stock theft take prominence in the dry months of the year' (KNA/PC/RVP.2/8/16).

European colonial farmers in Uasin Gishu ran into problems with their livestock, particularly along the Moiben and Elgeyo borders. The Nandi and Elgeyo raided their fields on occasion to steal livestock. According to one Provincial Commissioner's report, "the Elgeyo native showed little trouble except for some occasions when they aided another ethnic group in stock theft" (KNA/PC/RVP.2/8/2). Squatters, stock, and stock theft were the most common Native Affairs issues in the Uasin Gishu district. The coffee farmers wanted squatters to have livestock to make manure, while the stock farmers preferred squatters without livestock, as he believes the squatters' animals transmit diseases. It is still impossible to get all segments of the community to agree on this troublesome issue (KNA/PC/RVP.2/7/7). As a result, the Kapchepkendi clan of Nandi, who were infamous stock thieves, were barred from leaving their reserves for two months in 1933 (KNA/PC/RVP.2/7/7).

By 1934, the protectorate's 30,000 white settlers controlled around one-third of the arable land. This was made feasible through land alienation. Every ethnic group in the protectorate lost land, while some groups lost more than others. The district councils of Uasin Gishu and Trans Nzoia were mandated in 1939 to limit squatter livestock, control the number of squatters, and increase the number of working days to 270 per year. This relocation was designed to minimize the number of herds and accessible land for squatters. In effect, the squatters in Uasin Gishu and Trans Nzoia did not fulfill the new contracts and instead protested by relocating the settler farms to the reserves in large numbers. This resulted in traffic congestion and confrontations, which increased the demand for land (Youe, 2002). The trend was mirrored throughout Kenya; for example, the Mau Mau revolt in

central Kenya and the Pokot region was fueled in part by a rejection of harsh colonial regulations.

The colonial administration found it necessary to apprehend individuals affiliated with the African nationalist movement due to their increasing engagement in acts of violence. In response to this issue, the colonial government devised a land reform initiative well recognized as the Swynnerton Plan. Mwangi (1981) posited that the objective of the Plan was to alleviate overcrowding in African reserves by implementing a shift from communal to individual land ownership. This strategic move was anticipated to enhance agricultural productivity and promote the conservation of environmental resources within the primary African native reserves located in Central, Rift Valley, and Nyanza Provinces. According to Kanyinga (2000), the execution of the Plan led to a rise in inequality in the distribution of land. This was primarily because colonial chiefs, affluent individuals, and supporters of the colonial government were able to acquire larger portions of land, while other members of the community experienced significant losses in the land during the adjudication process. The aforementioned situation gave rise to conflicts about land ownership since disagreements over pre-reform boundaries became a prominent issue that influenced the broader struggle for national independence during the 1950s. The actions taken by the colonial authority in managing land affairs in the greater Rift Valley Region, including the Nandi community in Uasin Gishu, resulted in the emergence of conflict and animosity among the many ethnic groups residing in the area.

The problem of land emerged as a pivotal concern throughout the decolonization period, as nationalist movements voiced the grievances of their respective ethnic constituencies. Uasin Gishu was among the regions where this matter held significant importance. The fate of the white highlands posed a challenge to the smooth process of transition, as the white farmers harbored concerns about potential challenges to their status from the new black majority administration. According to Leys (1975), the

declaration made in 1961 on the attainment of Kenya's independence through the establishment of a majority black-led government caused distress among white landowners. Nevertheless, a strategic approach was formulated by moderate European individuals, namely Michael Blundell, Wilfred Havelock, and Bruce Mackenzie, inside the framework of the New Kenya Group Party (NKGPP) to protect the interests of European farmers in Europe. The Party implemented a policy aimed at promoting a multiracial society in Kenya by eliminating racial restrictions on land ownership in the white highlands (KNA/RVP/DC/UG/1/2). During this period, there was a gradual increase in the prevalence of ethnic animosity among Africans. It is noteworthy to observe that the implementation of severe colonial measures had sown the seeds of ethnic strife. At the onset of British colonial control in Kenya, a strategic approach was implemented whereby African communities were administered in a segregated manner. This measure aimed to deter a collective uprising against colonial authority by the diverse ethnic factions. The establishment of boundaries by the British administration in Kenya served to delineate distinct ethnic groupings, while also designating each Kenyan community as an independent entity. This was accomplished through the implementation of a tribal reserve system, which held significant importance within the framework of colonial governance.

Transformation of Inter-ethnic Relations in Uasin Gishu in the Period Leading To Independence

The influx of Europeans to Kenya was a direct consequence of the Second World War. According to Yoshida (1971), European individuals arrived with their own altered perspectives and methodologies about the concept of squiredom. These perspectives had a significant impact on the procurement of labour, leading to the subsequent increase in the importation of labour and the subsequent proliferation of immigrants from various communities in Uasin Gishu. They acquired substantial parcels of land with support from the government. The establishment of the European

Agricultural Settlement Board was facilitated through government funding, aiming to assist newly arrived farming immigrants. Simultaneously, a significant number of individuals with sufficient cash chose to independently migrate for agricultural purposes. Clayton and Savage (1974) posit that a contentious debate arose within the colonial state on the appropriate course of action for the conversion of squatting practices, as well as the allocation of responsibility for overseeing said conversion.

The perspective of the Labour Department is most effectively demonstrated through the 1946 study titled "A Discussion of the Problem of the Squatter," authored by Mr. Wyn Harris, the Acting Commissioner of Labour. In this scholarly article, Mr. Harris examines the concept of transforming squatters into migrant labourers as a response to the issue of overpopulation in the reserves. However, he also criticizes the settler notion of converting squatters into "cottage labourers," a situation in which labourers reside on a farm with limited land and no livestock, relying heavily on a cash wage for sustenance. The Commissioner deemed this proposition to be unreasonable because the earnings in question would not be adequate to sustain the squatter family. The author suggested that the implementation of social security would result in excessive costs, while also limiting the ability of resident labourers to extricate themselves from an unfavorable contractual agreement. Fundamentally, the proposition put up by the local District Councils failed to provide adequate protection for the African population. Wyn Harris aimed to use a gradual approach, enabling labourers to expand their agricultural activities and attain a certain level of land tenure security.

"We are trying to produce a stabilized labourers residing with his family on the farm, who regard his labour as his main means of livelihood, but whose efficiency, and, indeed, the general economy of the country makes it impossible to pay the wage we know to be necessary for this reasonable standard of living. He must, therefore, be allowed some interest in the land on which he works. That land also must be, for

the most part, his security in old age and disability. We have, therefore, got to give him some security of tenure and at the same time guard against his abuse of that security. We must pay him the highest cash wage we can afford and land must carry the balance. On the land side, the question boils down to tenure and control". KNA/DC/UG/1/1/ Uasin Gishu District Report 1939- 1940.

According to Lonsdale (1980), the most expedient approach was to maintain the practice of importing immigrants from different regions of the country. This was because these individuals did not hold squatter stock and, as a result, would be able to benefit from the rights granted to squatters. In pursuit of this objective, Wyn Harris criticized the policy implemented by the District Council, which aimed to decrease the number of squatter stock and land, without a concomitant increase in pay provided to individuals involved in this sector. The apprehension expressed by European farmers regarding the discontinuation of Nandi squatter labour and its substitution with migrant labour was justified. In 1949, the Uasin Gishu District Commissioner saw a significant increase in the level of indebtedness among plateau farmers, primarily attributed to the acquisition of machinery. A significant number of farmers were operating within tight profit margins.

During a convened assembly, a group consisting of 44 agricultural workers expressed their support for a petition aimed at dissolving the Nandi squatter labour system, while approximately 24 individuals expressed opposition to the aforementioned petition. The Uasin Gishu District witnessed a significant divergence of opinions among settlers on the eradication of Nandi squatter stock. One faction, namely the Turbo-Kipkarren Farmers Association, expressed support for the implementation of the councils' removal ordinance. The division of two wards, namely Soy-Hoey's Bridge Farmers Association and Sergoit Moiben ward, exhibited a clear bias toward the preservation of resident labourers who possessed livestock. However, the stance of the fourth ward, the Southern Uasin Gishu Farmers Association, remained uncertain. The

agricultural practitioners mostly depended on local workers for their labour needs, making it improbable for them to secure an adequate workforce in the absence of resident labourers from the Nandi region who also possessed livestock. The Annual Report of 1949 indicates that the newly arrived settlers in Southern Uasin Gishu encountered challenges in acquiring the necessary workforce for their development initiatives.

The primary argument provided by individuals who objected to the "elimination order" was that resident labourer constituted a well-established and dependable workforce. The political dimension of the matter was a formidable tool wielded by fervent proponents of the 'Elimination order'. The individuals held the belief that revoking or modifying the order would signify a political triumph for the Nandi squatters, as well as serve as a strategy to remove the Europeans from the White Highlands. According to historical records, Jomo Kenyatta, the President of the Kenya African Union (K.A.U), delivered a speech at Uasin Gishu in 1949. During this address, he conveyed to the Nandi community that the Uasin Gishu region rightfully belonged to them and would be restored to their ownership. Nevertheless, the settlers expressed their intention to establish Uasin Gishu as an area suitable for the livestock sector, emphasizing the need for a "clean" environment. This raised the question of whether it was possible to maintain a "clean" farm while allowing African-owned cattle to be there. Nevertheless, Kipkalya (2020) argued that these assertions were merely political, as Kenyatta failed to honor this commitment after assuming office. Conversely, he facilitated the gradual influx of individuals from diverse communities into the district.

From the perspective of the Nandi squatters, the fact that certain areas of their reserve were recently alienated, as well as the elimination order, created the impression that, while their stock was being forcibly removed from European farms, the Europeans were pouring stock onto their farms while preferring immigrants over them. Many Nandi resident labourers were born in Uasin Gishu and had no

other home, thus they would be welcomed back to the reserve with open arms. In January 1949, Eldoret's veterinary officer, Mr. P.T. Preston, remarked that "the return of squatter-owned stock to the reserves and the development of the livestock industry in the Uasin Gishu without the return of the squatter stock to the reserve appear to be incompatible." The Nandi reserve is currently overcrowded and should not be forced to accept another animal (Mbithi & Barnes 1975).

According to Mr. Preston, a state of impasse is observed when there is a rigorous and ongoing restriction on the amount of squatter stock allowed on farms. He also proposed that any excess stock should be auctioned rather than returned to the reserve. In 1949, the Uasin Gishu District Council enacted an amending order to its resident labour laws, in direct response to the administration's overtures. This amendment included an extension of the grace period for stock elimination, which was prolonged to three years. The purpose of this was explicitly to engage with the government over the issue. In 1949, a collective organization known as the Nandi, Elgeyo, and Kipsigis Union was established by the Uasin Gishu squatters. The primary concern of the squatters' destocking was the depletion of their stock, with a particular impact on these ethnic groups. The decline in the number of resident labourers' cattle has resulted in increasing interaction between the Nandi resident labourers in Uasin Gishu and the Nandi reserve. However, a significant number of resident labourers had been residing on the farms for an extended duration, resulting in their unfavorable reception by tribal authorities when attempting to bring their livestock into the reserve, which already faced severe limitations in available grazing grounds. As a result, a significant number of former resident labourers were compelled to migrate to Tanzania and Uganda to locate suitable grazing lands for their livestock. The individuals sought the counsel of the previous Nandi Orkoiyot, Barserion Arap Manyei, to obtain a resolution for their predicament (KNA/DC/UG/1/1/ Uasin Gishu District Report 1941).

The aforementioned report records that Barserion communicated to them about a substantial expanse of unoccupied and fertile terrain situated on the Laikipia Plateau. Consequently, a sequence of covert excursions was arranged to explore this aforementioned "promised land". In February 1951, the Orkoiyot, a prominent leader, mobilized a substantial assembly of Nandi individuals who had previously been displaced from their land, along with their domesticated animals, to migrate toward the Laikipia Plateau. Individuals who chose to stay in Uasin Gishu were required to adhere to the directives of the local council, although a significant number of them opted to relocate to empty agricultural lands within the district. Illegitimate possession of a substantial quantity of Nandi squatter stock was observed inside several forest regions of the district, including a notable concentration in the Tindiret forest. In October, it was reported that the removal of squatter stock from the Lessos area had proved challenging due to the dense forest cover in the region. The Nandi squatters residing in this region, particularly the Kapchepkendi Bororiet, demonstrated acceptance towards the decrease of their surplus livestock and actively sought ways to avoid detection (LNC, Uasin Gishu, 1941).

In December 1950, the new Uasin Gishu district council decree for the steady decrease of resident worker stock on farms, with the goal of ultimate removal by the end of 1954, became law. This infuriated a certain segment of the farming community. The decline in the stock of resident labourers was causing a serious labour shortage. A well-attended conference of farmers in the Soy area in May 1950 passed a resolution calling for the retention of "Key-men-" and fair treatment for all farmers. Key men included long-serving Nandi squatters and those who had served as headmen in European farms. A meeting of the District Council was conducted on March 19th, 1951, in response to the rising feeling among a proportion of farmers in particular wards that provision must be made for the retention of "key men" by enabling them to keep an agreed quantity of cattle. The following resolutions were passed at this meeting: First, the council

decided that a maximum of 40 head of resident labourers' cattle might be retained on any term in Uasin Gishu until the end of the council order of 1950. Second, by the end of 1954, the council will take measures to allow cottage labourers to keep a specific quantity of cattle subject to requirements to be determined. There was also substantial disagreement, particularly among wheat growers in the district's center, who favored the retention of a considerably larger number of local labourers than requested by the Uasin Gishu District Council (LNC, Uasin Gishu, 1949).

In August 1950 the District councils were given full responsibility for executing anti-squatting legislation. The District Commissioners were given an additional title of officers-in charge of squatter stock reduction from the beginning of 1951 to oversee operations, while the Labour Department was to remove the squatter stock. Up until the middle of 1952 reduction of Nandi, squatter stock was proceeding more or less according to the council orders, but the reduction deteriorated from the middle of 1952 (Annual Report, 1950).

The reason stated was that the six Labour Inspectors working at the Uasin Gishu District Council in 1949 had been reduced to one, and the surviving one was also in charge of the Trans-Nzoia District. The workforce shortage was caused in part by the State of Emergency established in 1952. By June 1953, the District Commissioner of Uasin Gishu District reported that they were rapidly losing all headway won in reducing squatter stock that had been secured in 1950. Quarantines had stopped the movement of squatter animals, and the Resident Labour Inspectors had been transferred elsewhere since they would do nothing in the face of quarantine. Mr. R.E. Wainwright, Provincial Commissioner of Rift Valley Province, stated:

"Since then, with the quarantine restrictions and lack of resident labour inspectors, it can be said that the district is right back to its position in 1949 worse since the Nandi had lost further respect for the government intentions and laws' (PC Rift Valley, 1950).

In December 1952, the Uasin Gishu District Council order of 1951 (under the Resident Native Labourers Ordinance) was approved. It provided for the retention of 40 cattle heads by squatters on a farm subject to numerous conditions: The first requirement was for adequate grazing and land development; all cattle to be kept within a ring fence; all cattle to be dipped regularly; no individual resident labourer to have more than five head of cattle; and finally, no bulls to be kept by resident labourers, with the onus being on the employer to provide suitable bulls.

The Nandi residents took advantage of the European labour inspectors' shortage. As a result, the number of Nandi resident labourers in excess and illegal stock in the Uasin Gishu district increased significantly. The new council order was enforced by the Labour Department in the District in May 1954, and huge numbers of excess squatter stock were relocated to the Nandi reserve. This spurred a huge movement of Nandi squatters to other reserves, following in the footsteps of their forefathers, who had gone to Pokot, Maasai, and Elgon-Maasai reserves in 1944. Others traveled to Uganda and Tanganyika. Many of the squatters also relocated to forest areas where the district council provided minimal oversight (Sorenson, 1966).

Members of the Uasin Gishu District Council who favored the ultimate abolition of squatter stock were bolstered in 1954 by a council member, Mr. Rex Kirk, and his "let's face it" committee. These "let's face it" committee members concluded that the only viable approach for sustainable livestock production in Uasin Gishu was the entire elimination of Nandi squatter stock. The Agricultural Production Board had advised them that unless Foot and Mouth Disease, spread by squatter stock, was controlled in the district, rehabilitation loans offered to farmers to purchase stock to establish sound mixed farming as opposed to monoculture, which had previously been so widely practiced in Uasin Gishu, would be reduced (Annual Report, 1954).

In July 1954, a farmer's meeting in Turbo Club sought the elimination of Nandi squatter stock

in the area. The Kipkabus Farmers Association followed suit, calling for the abolition of all squatter stock. Many of the surviving Nandi squatters relocated out of Uasin Gishu this year to other regions where ex-Nandi squatters had gone. Those who chose to stay on their farms saw their livestock auctioned in huge numbers by Uasin Gishu District Council authorities. Chief Arap Titi, a Nandi councilor, stated in 1954, "The return of squatter stock to the reserve had been talked about for many years but little even seemed to happen after all this discussion, that was the first year that stock seemed to be returning in any number" (Annual Report, 1954).

However, due to the impact of the Swynnerton plan, the option of squatters returning to the reserve was closed off from 1954 forward. This initiative dubbed the "Plan to Intensify the Development of African Agriculture in Kenya," was revolutionary in the lives of Kenyans, including the Nandi. The strategy substantially altered the Nandi people's land tenure practices. The 'Akwo' and 'Kaptich' Lands among the Nandi were previously communally owned. The land thus belonged to the 'Bororiet' members collectively rather than individually. However, with the privatization of land among the Nandi in the reserve following the plan's implementation, the Nandi squatters in Uasin Gishu became landless. The plan barred them from entering the Nandi reserve because the land was no longer part of the tribal land unit but had become individual property (Kitching, 1980).

According to Kipkalya (2020), this turn of events impacted inter-ethnic relations among Uasin Gishu's ethnic groups, both migrants and indigenous. The transition from communal to individual ownership deprived the natives of their sense of connection and commitment to their ancestral land. At the same time, migrant communities granted them the right to possess land outside of their home. Most of them, Kikuyu who had been evicted from their property in central Kenya by settlers, yearned for a chance to proudly own land. As a result, an opportunity offered itself at the perfect time.

However, because the native Nandi and Kalenjin populations had been bullied into accepting this agreement, they still held out hope that one day all of their lands would be returned to them. That explains why their politicians, including Daniel Moi, were at the front of Majimboism. They advocated for regionalism, also known as Majimbo, together with other like-minded leaders. This strategy advocated for the separation of the country into regions based on ethnic supremacy in those areas. This meant that those who lived in a region that was not largely composed of the community from which they came had to relocate to their respective regions. This approach was taken by lawmakers in the Lancaster House Conference, and regionalism was included as one of the clauses of the independence constitution. It was, however, disbanded as soon as the country gained independence in 1963.

Conclusion

This study aimed to illustrate the role of colonial architecture in the emergence of inter-ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu throughout colonization. The historical account reveals the strategic actions undertaken by European settlers in Uasin Gishu, which involved the land acquisition and the promotion of migrant labour, resulting in the displacement of the Nandi community from their ancestral territories. The aforementioned displacement resulted in significant resentment and marginalization, culminating in a time of heightened social unrest following the attainment of independence. The study's findings indicate that inter-ethnic conflicts in Uasin Gishu possess a historical dimension and have persisted due to a lack of comprehensive historical analysis.

Recommendation

The study suggests that to effectively address the problem of inter-ethnic conflicts, it is important to have a thorough understanding of their historical roots. The resolution should involve altering the discourse surrounding individuals

who perceive themselves as the authentic inhabitants of the region, so addressing the issue of 'outsiders'. Hence, it is advisable to undertake the instruction and awareness-raising of individuals regarding the shortcomings of the colonial administration in fostering harmonious interactions as a remedy for fostering an impartial, logical, and comprehensive comprehension of inter-ethnic tensions in Uasin Gishu.

References

- Ajulu, R. (2002). Politicized Ethnicity, Competitive Politics and Conflict in Kenya: A Historical Perspective. *African Studies*, 61(2), 251-268.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0002018022000032947>
- Anderson, J. & O'Dowd, L. (1983). Borders, border regimes and territoriality: Contradictory meanings, changing significance. *Regional Studies*, Cambridge, 3(7), 593-604.
- Arthur, T. M. (2009). *The Causes and Dynamics of Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College.
- Badawi. A (2006) *The Ethnic Security Dilemma*. Evidence from Malaysia. Yasof Institute
- Berman, B., & Lonsdale, J. (1992). *Unhappy Valley Conflict in Kenya and Africa*. Nairobi: Heinemann Kenya.
- Billy, B. (2012). *Rwandan Inter-Ethnic Conflict: A Historical Look at Root Cause*. Austria: European Peace University.
- Bruce, J. W., & Adholla, M. (1994). *Searching for Land Tenure Security in Africa*. Dubuque: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Co.
- Chesan'g, C (2011). *Effects of PEV on Ethnic Relations*. UON
- Clayton, A., & Savage D. (1974). *Government and Labour in Kenya. 1985-1963*. London
- Diba, I.Y. (2015). *Inter-Ethnic Conflict between the Gabra and Dassanetch Communities of Marsabit County* (MA Thesis). Kenyatta University, Nairobi.
- Ellis, D. (1976). The Nandi protest of 1923 in the context of African resistance to colonial rule in Kenya. *The Journal of African History*, 17(4), 555-575.
- Githumo, M. (1981). *Land and Nationalism: The Impact of Land Expropriation and Land Grievances upon the Rise and Development of Nationalist Movements in Kenya, 1885-1939*. Washington DC: University Press of America.
- Groen, G. (1974). *The Afrikaners in Kenya. 1903-1969*. Ph.D. Thesis: Michigan
- Gurr, R. (2005). *Minorities at Risk: Global View of Ethnic Conflicts*. US Institute of Peace
- Hobley. (1910) *A History of Pre-colonial Kenyan Societies*.
- International Crisis Group (2017). *Kenya's Rift Valley: Old Wounds, Devolution's New Anxieties*. Brussels, Belgium. African Report no 28. ICG.
- Kanogo, T. (1987). *Squatters and the Roots of Mau Mau*. Nairobi: Heinemann.
- Kanyinga, K. (2000). *Re-Distribution from Above: The Politics of Land Rights and Squatting in Coastal Kenya*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrika Institute.
- Kenya Human Rights Watch. (2017). *Divide and Rule. State Sponsored Violence in Kenya*. Retrieved from <https://www.hrw.org/report/1993/11/01/divide-and-rule-state-sponsored-ethnic-violence-kenya>
- Keplin, R. (2021) Ethnic Conflict in the World. *International Encyclopedia Studies*.
- Kipkalya, D. (2020) *Land, Politics and History of Ethnic Tension in Rift Valley*. Nairobi: The Elephant
- Kiprono, C. (2017). Uasin Gishu Governor Race Lays Bare Tensions in Rift Valley. *Daily Nation*. Retrieved from <https://www.nation.co.ke/oped/opinion/chesang-uasin-gishu-governor-race-lays-bare-tensions-rift-valley/440808-3995562-jinfo17/index.html>
- Kitching, G. (1980). *Class and Economic Change in Kenya: the Making of an African Petite Bourgeoisie 1909-1970*. London: Yale University Press.

- Lagat, A. B., (1995). *The Historical Process of the Nandi Movement into Uasin Gishu District of the Kenya Highlands: 1906-1963* (MA Thesis). University of Nairobi.
- Leys, C. (1975). *Under Development in Kenya: The Political Economy of Neo-colonialism*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Mbithi, P., & Barnes, C. (1975). *Spontaneous Settlement in Kenya*. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.
- Mwangi, N. E. (2011). *Church's Approaches to Peace Building and Reconciliation in Inter-Ethnic Conflict Areas in Kenya: A Case Study of Laikipia West District* (MA Thesis). Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Nnoli, O. (1978). *Inter-ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension.
- Nyukuri, B. K. (1997). *The Impact of Past and Potential Inter-Ethnic Conflict on Kenya's Stability and Development*. A paper prepared for the USAID Conference on Conflict Resolution in the Greater Horn of Africa. June 1997.
- Ochieng, W. R., & Maxon, R. (1992). *An Economic History of Kenya*. Nairobi: East African Publishers.
- Oyugi, W. O. (2002). Conflict in Kenya: A Periodic Phenomenon. Retrieved from <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/CAFRAD/UNPAN008267.pdf>
- Picciotto, R. (2010). 'Conflict Prevention and Development Co-Operation in Africa: An Introduction'. *Conflict, Security & Development Journal*, 10(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14678800903553787>
- Sorrenson. M (1975) *State, Ethnicity and Governance in Kenya*. Jostor.
- Sorrenson, M.P. (1966). *The Origins of European Settlement in Kenya*. OUP: London
- Tanui, P. J. (2018). A gender analysis of the influence of colonial policies on access to land and agricultural technology among the Nandi in Kenya, 1895-1954. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(9), 2017-229.
- Tarus. I. (1994). *The Keiyo during the Early Colonial Period, 1902-1939*. UON: Thesis
- Tepfenhart, M. (2013). The Causes of Ethnic Conflicts. *Comparative Civilizations Review*, 68, Article 8.
- TJRC. (2013). *Report of the Truth, Justice, and Reconciliation Commission*. Nairobi, Kenya: TJRC.
- Wandiba, V. (1985). *History of inter-Ethnic Conflicts in Bungoma*. Sociology Today
- Watson, D. (2008). Rethinking intercommunity violence in Africa. Retrieved from <https://www.wider.unu.edu/sites/default/files/Events/PDF/Slides/devconfmay2022-dan-watson.pdf>
- Yoshida, M. (1971). The protected development of European Agriculture in Kenya. *Journal of Rural Development*, 2(2), 76-102.
- Youe, C. (2002). Black Squatter on White Farms: Segregation and Agrarian Change in Kenya, South Africa and Rhodesia, 1902-1963. *International History Review*, 24(3), 558-602. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2002.9640974>
- Zezeza, T. (1992). The Colonial Labour System in Kenya. In W. R. Ochieng' & R. Maxon (Eds.), *An Economic History of Kenya*. Nairobi: East Africa Educational Publishers.
- Zwanberg. R.M.A. (1971) *Colonial Capitalism and Labour in Kenya (1919-1939)*. San Francisco, CA, U.S.A.:Bolerium Books Inc.
- Zwanenberg, R.M.A. & King, A. (1975) *An Economic History of Kenya and Uganda, 1800-1970*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Appendix 1

List of Key Informants

Akui Kwambai (Arap Kenyatta), 84. Interview by the researcher at Marura, 10th September 2020.

Chepkonga Kibor, 77. Interview by the researcher at Chebarus/Ilula farm, 28th July 2020.

Florence Njeri, 52. Interview by the researcher at Burnt Forest, 12th February 2021.

Fr. Mathew Too, 42. Interview by the researcher at Burnt Forest Catholic Church on 11th February 2021.

Kiptoo Margrate, 73. Interview by the researcher at Marura, 10th September 2020.

Koech Charles, 49. Interview by the researcher at Koibatek, 12th February 2021.

Michael Cheruiyot, 74. Interview by the researcher at Jerusalem estate near Eldoret airstrip, 13th July 2020.

Mzee Kibiwott, 69. Interview by the researcher at Chebarus, 14th July 2020.

Mzee Kimani, 78. Interview by the researcher at Burnt Forest, 19th February 2021.

Mzee Malakwen, 67. Interview by the researcher at Turbo, 8th July 2020.

Mzee Tom Shibiriti, 74. Interview by the researcher at Munyaka, 7th September 2020.

Pastor Francis Kulavi, 70. Interview by the researcher at Tugen Estate, 12th September 2020.

Paul Kisang, 44. Interview by the researcher at Munyaka, 29th July 2020.

Pius Kimayo, 58. Interview by the researcher at Rolian, Burnt Forest area, 12th February 2021.

Samuel Kanyi, 73. Interview by the researcher at Munyaka, 10th July 2020.

Archival Sources

KNA/PC/RVP/AA/13/1/8/3. Annual Report 1960.

KNA/PC/RV/2/8/10. Uasin Gishu Annual Report 1936

KNA/PC/RVP2/8/1. Uasin Gishu District Annual Reports 1913-1914.

KNA/PC/RVP2/8/3. Uasin Gishu District Annual Reports 1916-1917.

KNA/PC/RVP2/8/3. Uasin Gishu District Annual Reports 1916-1917.

KNA/DC/ND1/10/5. Nandi Confidential Report 1950.

KNA/DC/UG/1/2. Uasin Gishu District Annual Report, 1961.

KNA/BN/81/46 Settlement in Rift Valley Region.

KNA/RVP/AA/13/1/8/3 Vol. XI. Annual Report 1962.

KNA/RVP/DC/UG/1/2. Legislative Council Debates 1962.

KNA/RVP/DC/UG/1/2. Minutes of Kenya Constitutional Conference Records of the Fourth meeting 16th February 1962.

KNA/DC/UG/1/2. Blundell papers, Michael Blundell, memorandum to Rt. Hon. Baron Colyton, May 1st, 1962.

KNA, Native Affairs Annual Development Report, 1925

KNA/DC/UG/1/1/ Uasin Gishu District Report 1918-1919

KNA/DC/UG/2/1/1933

KNSDC/TAMB/2/9/11 Liaison Committee