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This thesis has been composed by me and is based on my own research through historical records and an extensive review of existing literature, on the subject.
This thesis presents a theory of urban residential settlement for Kampala-Mengo between 1890 and 1968.

It has been shown in this work, that the historical events that saw the creation of Kampala in 1890, as an imperial town next to Mengo, an indigenous town, had a strong influence and mostly determined the eventual residential settlement patterns, until the dual city ceased to exist in 1968, when both municipalities were merged into one single urban agglomeration.

The hypothesis put forward in this study is that residential settlement location in Kampala-Mengo was based on racial and ethnic considerations, which were the result of (a) imperial urban administration policy, and (b) contrasting social-cultural characteristics within the African urban population itself.

After defining the operational terminology, the theory identifies three distinctive settlement areas, at the macro-level, for each of the three races (European, Asian and African) forming the population of Kampala-Mengo at the time. These areas have been identified, basically, as the highlands on the two central hills in the city centre for the Europeans; the lower slopes of the hill where the CBD was located for the Asians; and the surrounding valley settlements outside Kampala township boundaries, for the African migrants.

We have, at the macro-level, also identified the area surrounding the indigenous settlement at Mengo and extending towards the north, west and south as a settlement for the "host" tribal group (the Baganda), while the rest of the African migrants settled in the low-lying areas at
the boundaries between both townships and, at a later stage, in the east of Kampala.

At the micro-level, three categories of ethnicity have been defined, and according to these, ethnic clustering in various settlement areas has been shown to exist, at different levels. Generally, supporter settlements have been found to present tribal group and linguistic category clusters while public housing estates exhibited tribal, linguistic and nationality types of ethnic clustering.

It is suggested, in the concluding chapter, that while these initial patterns may be undergoing a process of transformation, the impact they had on the city's residential settlement structure is still evident and will continue to influence further developments for some time yet.
I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have, in one way or another, helped me during the preparation of this work.

My thanks go, first of all to both my supervisors, Mr. Philip H. Bowers and Mr. John B. Leornard whose constructive criticism and guidance have enabled me to bring this work up to the required standard. The discussions we held during consultations greatly helped me in explaining many of the ideas that I have presented in this thesis.

I am similarly, very grateful to Professor Anthony O'Connor, Professor David Parkin and Dr. David MacMaster, for their very valuable discussions and advice in the initial stages of my work.

I have also benefited greatly from the assistance offered by Professor Senteza Kajjubi, Dr. Anthony Lubega and Mr. David Ntwatwa while I was in Uganda collecting research material.

I am most grateful to my family, particularly to Henry and Betty who have borne the colossal financial burden of all my expenses throughout the duration of my stay at Edinburgh. This work would never have been produced without their strong determination to see it accomplished.

Lastly, I owe a very special thank you to Vida and Maja who have patiently waited for so long for me to come home and join them. It was always very comforting, in times of hardship and despair, to hear Vida's voice of encouragement, telling me to be strong and fight on.

Edinburgh
June, 1987
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF ILLUSTRATIONS</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLANATORY NOTES</td>
<td>xi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER 1 Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Origin and Growth of Kampala-Mengo</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The Imperial Experience</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kampala-Mengo’s General Urban Form</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Urban Ethnicity</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Urban Settlement Patterns</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 The Macro-Level</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 The Micro-Level</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Clustering Based on Religion</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Summary and Conclusions</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampala’s Population by Census Divisions - 1980</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Map of Uganda Showing Buganda, Kampala and Mengo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Kabanka's Palace and the Residences of the Most Senior Chiefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Central Hills of Kampala-Mengo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kampala Fort and Environments - 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kampala Township and Mengo Municipality 1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kampala Township and Mengo Municipality 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Great Kampala - A Summary of Changes in Urban Administrative Limits (1890 - 1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kampala Planning Scheme - 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Land Use Pattern - 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kampala's Major Hill and Valley Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Uganda's Linguistic Ethnic Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kampala Planning Scheme - 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Residential Settlement Patterns - 1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Population Density by Census Subdivisions - 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nsambya EARH Housing Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>House Categories on EARH Housing Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>African Residential Areas in Kampala East - The Planned Settlements, 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nakawa Housing Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Naguru Housing Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kibuli Hill - The Muslim Settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(viii)
CHART

A  Ethnic Categorisation for Kampala-Mengo  62
B  Kampala - Mengo´s Ethnic Residential Structures  79
C  An Example of a Typical Extended Family Household in a Supporter Settlement  174
D  Chain Migration in Nsambya EARH Housing Estate  199

Figure

1  Membership of Kampala´s Major Tribal Groups to Other Ethnic Categories  77

PHOTOGRAPHS

Railway Siding and EARH Housing  125
Kampala Road  125
Former Asian Housing  126
High Density Asian CBD Housing  126
Former European Housing  127
Former Asian Housing Estate  128
National Housing and Construction Corporation
High Income Flats  128
National Housing and Construction Corporation
Middle-Income Flats  129
Supporter Settlement on Slopes of Makerere Hill  129
Police Housing Estate at Nsambya  130
Nakawa Housing Estate  130
Private High-Income Housing at Muyenga  131
### LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Population Growth for Kampala-Mengo</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ethnic Composition of Africans in Kampala-Mengo (1959)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Ethnic Composition of Africans in Kampala-Mengo by Socio-Linguistic Group (1959)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Racial Composition of Kampala-Mengo (1911-1969)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Major Tribal Groups in Kisenyi (Heads of Household) in 1964 and 1954</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>East African Railways and Harbours - House Classes in Kampala (1965)</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Racial Distribution of EARH Employees (1949-1965) - East Africa</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>EARH Employees According to Race and Grade (East Africa) - 1965</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>EARH Employees at Kampala According to Race and Grade (1965)</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Nsambya EARH Estate-Housing Occupation According to Class and Race (1965)</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Percentage Distribution of African Employees of the EARH by Ethnic Origin in Kampala</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Household Heads According to Tribe and Income Category (Oct. 1962) Nakawa Estate</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Household Heads According to Tribe and Income Category (Oct. 1962) Naguru Estate</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Household Heads According to Tribe in Nakawa Estate (1962)</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>Household Heads According to Tribe in Naguru Estate (1962)</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Total Number of Household Heads According to Tribe both in Nakawa and Naguru Estates Added Together (1962)</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPLANATORY NOTES

I. PREFIXES

We have, throughout this work, used the correct grammatical prefixes that precede words in all Bantu languages. These, on the contrary, have been avoided in most cases by European writers, who have chosen to adopt the so-called "convention" of the International African Institute which uses only the stem of the word without differentiating between the peoples, the name of the District where they live, the plural, singular or language they speak.

Thus while such writers have used the stem GANDA to refer to all the above:

- BAGANDA - are the peoples (tribal group)
- BUGANDA - the territory (or country)
- LUGANDA - the language
- MUGANDA - a single member of the tribe

II. ASIAN

The term "Asian" as commonly used in East Africa refers to all immigrants from the Indian subcontinent. In Kampala these included, among others, Indians, Pakistanis, Goans and Sikhs.
III. KIBUGA

We have tried as much as possible to avoid using this term in preference for MENGU MUNICIPALITY, which it was. This has been mainly due to the desire to use uniform terminology throughout since the discussion is about Kampala-Mengo and not Kampala-Kibuga, which might have been confusing, had we used the word. The term does appear, though, on certain maps reproduced from other studies, and should be understood to stand for Mengo Municipality, in such cases.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study presents an analysis of the patterns of residential settlement that evolved in Kampala-Mengo between 1890 (when the imperial city was founded next to the indigenous town at Mengo), and 1968 when the twin city merged into one single administrative entity, thus bringing to an end an era of over seven decades of events that were so crucial in the moulding of the city fabric, particularly its residential settlement patterns.

The need to carry out this study has been prompted by the realization that none of the existing models of residential location applied to Kampala’s structure. This, in a way, is not even surprising since most of the models in existence have been developed in industrialized western societies and are, therefore, in the words of Ede (1981) "ethnocentric and of dubious relevance to the contemporary Third World". Nor are we aiming at producing a model that will, at a stroke, be able to explain residential settlement patterns of all Third World cities for, once again, we do realize that each individual city has its own unique characteristics depending upon its history, size, the diversity of its functions and the composition of its population.

We do hope, however, that our study will be useful in providing some kind of "analytical platform" to the study of similar cities, i.e. cities of imperial origin, as Kampala has been classified in this work.

Among the most important factors which will be taken into consideration in our attempt to construct a model of residential settlement in Kampala-Mengo, is that of the
auspices under which urbanization began and reached its major period of growth.

This study draws on the considerable research work done by urban geographers, historians and social anthropologists on the urbanization process of the dual city, Kampala-Mengo. Besides our own research work through historical records and population census material (which we must admit, was very hard to come by and at times also rather patchy) we are developing a theory of the city’s residential settlement patterns, relying heavily on secondary data, particularly from three commendable surveys carried out in different settlements by three different authors:

(i) Southall and Gutkind - Kisenyi settlement (1954)
(ii) Grillo - Nsambya EARH Housing Estate (1965)
(iii) Parkin - Naguru and Nakawa Housing Estates (1969)

Each one of these studies simply set out to investigate the nature and characteristics of the settlement they were studying. The results they got from each individual study presented one common theme: Ethnic Clustering in residential areas. While these studies have been adopted in this work because they each represent a typical settlement from a variety of residential settlement categories, the analysis is based on an extensive review of the historical and socio-economic processes in force throughout the period under investigation. Our work here is, thus, to try to put together individual structures that have been identified by different writers, into a general urban form. In order to develop a theory about the resultant residential structure, we need to examine the events and processes that, in combination, gave rise to the city’s present settlement patterns. The hypothesis for this study is, that Kampala’s residential settlement patterns present a considerable amount of ethnic clustering which has been the result of (i) imperial policy;
(ii) socio-cultural differences between the city’s African population.

Together with ethnic clustering we shall also identify clustering based on religion resulting mainly from semi-random political decisions helped by the city’s topography. It will be stated, therefore, that residential settlement patterns in Kampala-Mengo between 1890-1968 were a direct result of imperial segregational policies, ethnic affiliations and religious inclinations.

**Approach to Study**

The work has been divided into three main parts:

- (i) Historical review
- (ii) Racial, Ethnic and Religious clustering
- (iii) Conclusions

(i) **Historical Review**

It will be shown in this study, that historical events in Uganda played probably the most important role in the urbanisation process of the country’s capital city. Indeed as a city created by an imperial power next to a traditional African town one just cannot attempt any meaningful study of the city without first returning to its historical setting. Our approach is to treat urbanisation as a social process (Little, 1974) which enables us to take into account the historical base on which the city was founded, and secondly it allows us to concentrate on the processes and structures which have produced (and continue to influence) the particular settlement patterns that evolved in Kampala-Mengo.

Many scholars of African urbanisation have stressed the necessity to pay increasing attention to the historical
evolution of urban areas in the pre-colonial and colonial periods through the study of the relationship between imperial policy and urban development, and traditional and cultural factors that determine the behavioural patterns of the urban populations. We share the same view with Schwab (1970(a)), that the values and structures of traditional African societies will, for years to come, play a major part in African towns. Thus the study of Kampala-Mengo without the essential knowledge of the relationships between the indigenous town of Mengo and the imperial town of Kampala, or lack of understanding of the socio-traditional and socio-economic characteristics of the Baganda next to whose indigenous town the capital was built, may only lead to identifying urban form without being able to explain its causes. To this effect Gutkind had this advice to give:

"Thus to study a Yoruba town without any knowledge of Yoruba history and tradition is a useless exercise. Even if we were to ignore the part tradition still plays in the social life of the African urbanite, the more recent colonial history of the new African towns, such as Nairobi and Lusaka, must be taken fully into account if the structure and function of social organisation is to be documented in detail."

(Gutkind, 1974 p 29)

It is imperative, in this study therefore, that particular attention is given to the part tradition has played in the social life of Kampala’s population, particularly as regards the effect traditional values have had on people’s decisions while taking up urban residence.

There is a potential danger, however, when one refers to history in that the subject tends to be very wide and at times too detailed. We have made an effort here to be as
brief as possible only pointing out the most important and relevant events and facts.

(ii) Racial, Ethnic and Religious Clustering

The second part of the study, and the main body that presents the analysis of Kampala-Mengo’s residential settlement patterns has been divided into two major conceptual and methodological approaches; the Macro and Micro settlement patterns. At the Macro level, we discuss the relationship between imperial policy and urban development and how this affected the eventual settlement patterns.

We start the chapter by defining the term "ethnicity" itself and proceed by identifying the different racial and ethnic categories present in the urban area of Kampala-Mengo at the time.

We have identified, at the macro-level, three distinct areas of residential settlement; one for the Europeans, one for the Asians and another for the Africans. We have described these settlement patterns as a direct consequence of imperial urban development policies which resulted in clustering of the racial nature.

Within the African settlement, at the macro level, we have identified two distinctive (though not completely isolated) settlement areas: one for the "host" peoples and one for the migrant African population.

At the micro-level, it has been shown that choices for residential settlement for the Africans in Kampala-Mengo were principally determined by affinity to one or another of the various types of ethnic groups. At this level of analysis, we have defined four main categories of
ethnicity to either of which each individual urban resident claimed membership and was recognised by others in the group as "one of them".

The theory of ethnicity explains that in urban areas, people tend to reside, associate and work with their own "kind" in order to increase the predictability of their environment while minimizing the anxiety and stress that derive from uncertainty (Hanna and Hanna, 1971). When faced with situations of inter-ethnic interaction, urban residents are likely to form themselves into distinct clusters both for social reasons and economic advantages. Through the process of chain migration, we demonstrate how migrants were drawn to particular localities of the city where they had relatives or friends already established in the urban environment. We discuss the importance of such relatives and friends on whom a migrant has to depend heavily until he can find his own home, and in time, become another benefactor for his kinsmen.

We suggest in this study, that kinship and ethnicity are vital factors in determining the distribution of population in settlement areas. The process whereby people look for job opportunities for their relatives and fellow tribesmen, lodge the migrants, feed them and help them in times of crisis can only be explained in terms of ethnic and kinship systems. We argue here and explain that ethnic clusters in Kampala’s settlement patterns were a result of a process of chain migration and settlement in particular areas facilitated by a complex system of kinship and ethnic linkages.

(iii) **Conclusions**

The final part of the study presents the conclusions that will be drawn from the facts stated and analyses made
in both the first and second parts of the study.

A summary will be made about the final structure of the urban residential fabric stressing the concept of ethnicity as it affected settlement choices. It will be pointed out in this respect that the degree to which ethnic groups were spatially isolated was the result of social subordination in the form of discriminatory segregation, first by the imperial authority and then by the Baganda, a condition brought about, in the latter case, by cultural dissimilarities and a superior socio-economic structure.

Finally, an effort will be made in this final chapter, to discuss the new sources of power and sources of change which are expected to affect the urbanisation process in the future, and hence, the residential settlement patterns. What has been the magnitude and impact of political and socio-economic changes on the cultural-traditional values of the urban population? Which processes create, or slow down, the formation of socio-economic classes, and which processes maintain the presence of socio-cultural classes (if any) that may still be exercising social dominance over other traditional groups?

It is the hope and objective of this study, to be able to provide satisfactory answers to these questions in order to throw some light on the future trend of the city’s urbanization process. Short of this, the observations made and the theory suggested thereafter, would only present a fait accompli situation which Kampala, certainly, is not.
CHAPTER 2

THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF KAMPALA - MENGÖ

The urban agglomeration of what is today known as Kampala City is in many respects unusual and therefore demands a general description of the community, its environment and the historical factors which so greatly affected its form and growth. In this study, Kampala has been classified as an Imperial city the reasons for which will be explained later on in this chapter.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, Kampala was founded and developed as the commercial capital of Uganda, with Entebbe as the administrative capital. Situated, as it is, in close proximity to Lake Victoria (Port Bell) and Entebbe International Airport, Kampala's position was eminently suitable from all points of view.

Firstly, as a British protectorate Uganda was constrained by the axiom of financial self-sufficiency and the administration was obliged to generate revenue, and hence trade, as rapidly as possible with minimal claims upon the Imperial treasury (Ede, 1981). Incorporated into the capitalist world-economy, the Ugandan landscape at the dawn of the imperial era was highly differentiated with respect to those characteristics of relevance to administration and economic production (Wallerstein, 1979). Abundant regular rainfall and rich soils made the South-central Zone - particularly Buganda and Busoga - the most productive agricultural area. This zone was also more accessible to world markets as it was adjacent to Lake Victoria, which was linked by caravan routes to the port of Mombasa. Prior to 1930, access to Kampala from neighbouring territories was by road and water. Port Bell, situated some seven miles away, was the port used by
travellers from Kenya, Tanganyika and the coast. Steamers taking passengers and cargo still ply between the many ports located all around the lake.

Road transport of imported goods from the coast was primarily by head porterage and caravans. In 1930, it was decided to bridge the Nile at Jinja, so that Kampala was then connected to the direct railway line to Nairobi and the coast. The bridge also carried a road, thereby providing a second link with the coast (Apter, 1961).

More importantly still, Kampala was founded on Kampala Hill, just a mile or so away from the capital of the Kingdom of Buganda, Mengo. The significance of this juxtaposition, to the city’s growth and development and its effects on the general urban form of Kampala, will be the recurrent theme throughout this work. It will be established, in a later discussion, that the people of the South-central zone, particularly the Baganda, were organized into centralized, quasi-feudal political kingdoms, more amenable to the economical institution of indirect rule (practised in Uganda by the imperial administration) than were the societies of the North, which featured much more localized authority structures and which were largely acephalus and lineage-based (Southall, 1956). The quasi-feudal structure of the Baganda was, as will be discussed in detail in the following chapter, particularly convenient in enabling the imperial government to promote export production, with the introduction of cotton and tobacco in the first two decades of imperial rule.

It logically follows this brief introduction, therefore, that any serious effort to discuss the rise and growth of Kampala, should inevitably start with a historical insight into Mengo, the capital of the Baganda at the first
arrivals of the European explorers. For Kampala is located at the very heart of the Kingdom of Buganda, next to its ancient capital (see Map 1).

**MENGO**

Historical records report the first Arab traders to have made contacts with the capital in 1844 (Johnston, 1902). The explorer Speke was there in 1862, Stanley in 1875, as well as other explorers and adventurers. In 1877, British Protestants established a Christian mission at the Kabaka's (King's) court, followed by French Roman Catholics in 1879.

The corollary is that outside influences, including those with potentially urban implications were being gradually assimilated by the Kabaka, court and people, not forced upon them (Southal, 1967). We shall see that throughout these decades, the Kingdom of Buganda not only maintained its political autonomy but steadily increased its political and economic powers as well as its sphere of influence.

The population of this traditional capital has never been accurately established. It is, however, estimated that the palace enclosure itself accommodated about 3,000 persons and the so-called 'native town' which surrounded it at least 10,000 (Gutkind, 1962). Whilst small by present urban standards, it was an extraordinary concentration of people in the area with an orderly centralized political system, and certainly unique in East and Central Africa.

Despite the frequent movement of the Kabaka's palace from one hill to another around Kampala, the settlement had a very definite cultural and conceptual continuity, for it
MAP 1 - Map of Uganda Showing Buganda, Kampala, and Mengo
was quite rigidly structured and was probably reproduced in much of the same form at every transplanting (Merton, 1957). While no clear explanation has been put forward as to the changing location of the Kabaka’s palace, it has been suggested that sanitation and security against invasion could have been the main reasons. Another explanation, which we are more inclined to accept, derives credibility from its cultural approach by presuming that it was the established tradition that a new palace was always constructed in a completely new location with every succession of a new king. The practice was finally halted at Mengo, it may be further presumed, because of the arrival of the Europeans and their subsequent establishment of trading and religious institutions around the traditional settlement.

Inside the palace enclosure, there were the Kabaka’s own quarters, his council and audience hall, the guests’ reception room and the establishments of the Queen Mother and Queen Sister. Immediately surrounding the palace were the residences of the Katikiro (Prime Minister), the Muwanika (palace treasurer), ritual officials, steward and major chief of the palace (see Map 2). Each of these had a huge entourage of perhaps as many as a thousand people. The mass population of this proto-city was very fluctuating. Apart from the vast numbers of pages, servants and attendants, there were very large numbers of labourers constantly being brought in to build or repair houses, to maintain roads and fences and to carry out new constitutional tasks, such as damming and clearing the lake where the royal crocodiles were kept. There were those involved in bringing tribute and supplies of all kinds, augmented by the hundreds of porters in the trading caravans which were beginning to penetrate from the outside world. There were open markets under the authority of one of the Kabaka’s officials, at which the
MAP 2 - The Kabaka's Palace and the Residences of the most Senior Chiefs - 1912
crafts and produce of the country were exchanged or sold for cowrie currency (Gresford, 1926).

This unique urban development in the area, was essentially the product of political centralisation, transcending a customarily dispersed settlement pattern. It was a closely institutionalized community, quite distinct from the rest of the society of which it was a part, concentrating in itself the highest degree of cultural elaboration and role differentiation (Mamdani, 1977). It thus had a number of the cultural characteristics of a city.

Southall has stated (and different writers have agreed with him) that Menge was the only case outside West Africa in which a traditional settlement continued to exert a profound influence over the development of a large modern city. He attributes this influence over Kampala to Meko’s own inherent strength, which permitted it to assimilate some external influences without being overwhelmed by them and which in turn led to the siting of a modern city alongside it.

Before we discuss the relationship between Kampala and Menge, let us first establish the rise and growth of Kampala, itself.

KAMPALA

The beginning of the township can be said to date from 1890 when Captain Lugard, sent out by the British East African Company, pitched his camp on the little hill of Kampala (now known as Old Kampala – Map 3). Lugard had defied the King’s authority on arrival by establishing a fort on Kampala hill, which was next to Mengo but not settled, in preference to the more vulnerable site which
MAP 3 - The Central Hills of Kampala - Mengo
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Source: Miner, 1967
the king had indicated to him. Around the camp, Lugard built a stockade which was subsequently replaced by a substantial fort which was erected in 1891.

So the Kampala-Mengo duality which was to last until 1968, seventy-eight years later, was unwittingly inaugurated. In 1893 a Protectorate was declared by the British over Uganda and this marked the beginning of the end of autonomous sovereignty for Mengo and Buganda as a Kingdom, as will be discussed at a later stage.

Lugard’s Kampala Fort at once attracted other settlement near by to the North and East, therefore, in the direction away from Mengo Hill. This point is important to note right away because it will be seen, as we go on, that all further imperial urban development followed the north easterly and easterly direction, being surrounded in the North, West and South by a very extensive Mengo municipality (Map 3).

On the initial settlement at Kampala Fort, there were the few hundred Swahili who had come with him from the coast, plus Emin Pasha’s Sudanese soldiers who, with dependents, were rescued by Lugard from their marooned camp on Lake Albert. Then there was the camp of the Zanzibari Levy who had been engaged in trade contacts with the Baganda before the arrival of the Europeans (see Map 4). To these were subsequently added a force of Indian troops, and the Indian traders, on whom all the Europeans utterly depended for their material supplies from the outside world (Lugard, 1893). By the beginning of the twentieth century, a half dozen or so European commercial agencies (British, American, Italian, Greek) had been set up. From this small beginning, Kampala commenced its commercial activities and as soon as the Africans realised that the existence of the fort and the British offered new
1. Kampala Fort
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opportunities and gave them security, an African market was established at the northern boundary of the township.

Soon after the turn of the century it must have been realized by the imperial government that the space below Kampala Fort was inadequate to meet growing trade and they decided to start a new township on the more expansive hill named Nakasero, half a mile to the east, (Map 3). By 1905 practically the whole of government officials and staff and traders' shops had been moved to Nakasero. Traders were encouraged to set up business across the Nakivubo Valley on Crown land which was made available from 1903 onwards as freehold plots or on temporary occupation licences, or for leases for 99 years (Hoyle, 1952). By 1901, considerable development had taken place on the hill and the valley to the west and south.

From this time on, Nakasero became the centre of urban growth and is today the site of the central business district. Kampala hill came to be known as Old Kampala and Lugard's Fort became the site of a museum.

At first, the Indian bazaar occupied the lower slopes of Nakasero, near the swamp which separated it from Kampala Hill. European and Indian business premises mingled somewhat further up. Above this were government offices, the High Court and other public buildings, while the upper slopes received the spacious gardens and bungalows of British officials, each with adjacent quarters for African domestic servants. Near the top of the hill was the European Club, known, as Miner (1967) describes it, with "unwitting symbolism" as the Top Club. The one notable exception to European and Asian commercial dominance, on the hill, was the open market in the midst of the Indian bazaar. There, African cooks and servants of European and Asian families, and even some housewives, purchased their
supplies of local produce.

As was to be expected, soon Nakisero also became too crowded and more space was needed, though it must be pointed out, "crowded" at very low population density, by bungalows in spacious gardens. The next and obvious expansion for European and Indian residential space was Kololo hill to the North-east (Map 3). The first urban impact on Kololo had been the settlement there of the Sudanese soldiers' families after the fort on Old Kampala Hill was abandoned. When it appeared that Kololo would be required for European and Indian occupation, however, the Sudanese were moved out and settled at Naguru on the next hill to the east of Kololo. Kololo was rapidly covered with various types of new settlements during the 1930s. One large area was built up with official houses for Indians in government service; another area similarly for European officials, but with more spacious houses in large gardens. Maps 5, 6 and 7 show the growth of Kampala towards the east.

It has been shown above how the township spread in stages over the years. By 1929 Kampala had expanded so quickly and in many ways so unsatisfactorily, that the Government requested Mr. Mirams, a planning consultant and valuer, to go to Uganda to prepare a report and plan for the expansion of Kampala. Population data before 1948 is very scarce and most unreliable since earlier censuses had been carried out by the Administration without professional statistical planning and may, therefore, not be strictly comparable with the 1948 Census (Uganda, Statistical Abstract, 1969).

All the first five censuses, or population counts held in the years 1911, 1921, 1931, 1948 and 1959, had separate arrangements made for the African and non-African
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components of the population. For reasons that we could not find an explanation to in the records no administrative report was published with the 1921 Census Returns.

However, some indications of the growth of population may be found in the table below, if the earlier figures, before 1948 are treated with considerable reserve and also bearing in mind the fact that the township boundaries were constantly changing.

**TABLE I - POPULATION GROWTH FOR KAMPALA-MENGO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EUROPEAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>AFRICAN</th>
<th>TOTAL KAMPALA MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>MENGO MUNICIPALITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>2,126</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>32,441</td>
<td>35,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>9,150</td>
<td>11,905</td>
<td>22,694</td>
<td>34,337</td>
<td>57,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>24,052</td>
<td>46,731</td>
<td>52,659</td>
<td>107,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Uganda, Statistical Abstract, 1969)

As will be amply demonstrated later, the proportional representation of the African population in Kampala municipality was comparatively very small. All early urban development had, more or less, ignored their presence. Mr. Mirams plan for Kampala of 1930, was the first urban authority document to make any mention of the African population, although only in passing and very vaguely.
Mr. Mirams had been asked to advise government in regard to the general layout of Kampala with special reference to future expansion, the siting of public buildings, co-ordination of arrangements for the layout of roads, drains, sewers, electric light and power lines; the problem of native location, the best means of refuse disposal; the revision of the existing rules of the township generally, and the preparation of a Town Planning Ordinance.

Mirams's report covered, inter alia, the location of population composed of Europeans, Asians, "and Africans", land and land tenure, roads and traffic, government and private housing, the architectural control of buildings, the drainage of swamps, the siting of industries and the new railway station, proposals for open spaces and proposed legislation to ensure the carrying out of the development plan (Map 8). This was Kampala's first Master Plan and the initial planned development in the township was a direct result of the recommendations made by Mirams. His plan had been considered so good that an impressed Director of Town Planning commented that:

"Mr. Mirams was extremely far-sighted both in regard to his road network and zoning. Kampala has undoubtedly developed along the broad lines recommended by him.....His road proposals particularly were so sound that in 1954 the roads in Kampala are still able to cope with existing traffic conditions, although the problem of parking remains to be solved."

(Kendall, 1955 p 22)

As the city's Director of Town Planning, Kendall would have done better by realising that infrastructure capacities are, normally, not gauged for just twenty
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years. Given the opportunity that Mirams was, practically, planning on vacant land, his design, particularly of the road network, could have been much more "sound" than satisfying the demands of only twenty years. Not surprisingly, in 1971 the Kampala Structure Report saw the only possible solution to easing traffic congestion in the city centre, in constructing transit motorways, widening of city streets, where it would be possible and turning very narrow streets into one-way streets.

More details about Mirams's Plan will be discussed in Chapter 6. Meanwhile, another Master Plan was prepared and introduced in 1951 (Map 9). The planning area was divided into five residential zones according to size of plot, as well as identifying locations for commercial and industrial areas, and sites set aside for forests and open spaces, both private and public. Owing to the general topography of Kampala, the forests and open spaces were located in the valleys and low-lying areas, while the elevated sites on the slopes of various hills were zoned for residence. The tendency for the town to develop in an easterly direction was further evidenced in the reserving of the next hill to the east, Naguru (see Map 3) for African Housing. Both Naguru and Nakawa in Kampala East became the first planned locations for African urban settlement in Kampala. All subsequent plans and development policies took a more comprehensive approach after realizing that the Africans were also going to take part in the activities of the imperial capital.

The problem of how best to arrange the relationship of many people differing in race, language, culture and religion has always dominated the life and development of any urban agglomeration which harbours different races. Southall (1967) has observed that when all the lines of
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difference are superimposed, the cleavage is particularly deep and integration especially difficult. How difficult was this integration in Kampala, what were the relationships between the city’s plural societies, and what effect all this had on city form, particularly residential settlement patterns, is the task this study sets out to tackle and present.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN KAMPALA AND MENG0

The Kampala-Mengo duality inaugurated in 1890 saw the creation of a twin city, inextricably intertwined, essentially opposed, yet mutually overlapping (Gutkind, 1963). For the first fifteen years Kampala was an insignificant adjunct to the Baganda capital, but after that, Mengo became increasingly overshadowed by the cuckoo in the nest. Mengo increasingly feared encroachment by Kampala and officially regarded the latter as an unfortunate, forced but temporary, concession. Kampala, on the other hand, regarded Mengo as a backward child, often with the conviction that its separate existence should be terminated as quickly as possible.

And while the Baganda ideally saw the British as invited guests who could be told to go when they were not wanted anymore, the British saw themselves as having gone to Buganda to suppress slavery, trade, convert to Christianity, bring new order and civilization, and establish a sphere of influence.

Mengo and Kampala were further kept distinct by radically different systems of land tenure. All land in Buganda was the ultimate property of the Kabaka, as will be explained in the next few pages. The early missionaries settled, by grace of the Kabakas, on land granted voluntarily to them, as had been the British Settlement founded by Lugard.
regularized by a grant from the Kabaka, after Lugard refused to settle on the initial location offered him. But in the Land Agreement of 1900, the mission grants became part of the "Mailo"* land system of Buganda, while the British Settlement on Nakasero hill became part of the Crown land allocation, redefined as State land when Uganda became independent in 1962 (West, 1969). "Mailo" land approximated freehold land, normally tenable only by those legally defined as natives and subjects of the Kabaka. The mission lands were, therefore, something of an exception to this. Crown land, on the other hand, was mainly held in lease from the government except for a few early grants of freehold. The result was that, in general, non-Africans could not legally occupy land in Mengo, but only in Kampala. Conversely, occupation of land in Kampala by Africans (and here reference is made particularly to Baganda) was only acceptable in their capacity as servants to the Europeans and Asians, or on temporary settlements as migrants (Southall, 1967).

As urban development took place, land in Kampala became exceedingly valuable because of its increasing demand, and even when its occupation by Africans was no longer discouraged (from the late 40s), most rural-urban migrants could not afford it. The effect of this was the continued settlement pressures in Mengo municipality in favourable localities just over the Kampala municipal boundary.

* Mailo - The term derives its origin from the English word 'mile' used to mean one square mile of land and subsequently adopted to describe and differentiate this particular form of land tenure. Mailo and all other forms of land tenure are discussed in Chapter 3.
The Nature of Kampala

Before we go on to discuss the relationships between Kampala's heterogeneous population, let us first take a look at the city itself, as a whole, and try to see if it fits in with any of the established typologies.

Many studies have been attempted on the "African City", all aimed at understanding the nature and origins of cities in Africa. Towards this objective, authors (Breese, 1966; Little, 1974; Peil and Sada, 1984; Hance, 1970; Banton, 1960 etc.) have, at different times identified different categories of the "African City". It must be admitted that this has been no easy task, especially since the majority of those involved in the study of the African towns have been tempted again and again to regard African urbanization as (albeit somehow retarded) following the same process as that of urbanization in Western Europe. There are those, on the other hand, who feel that African urbanization may be taking a path in many ways dissimilar to that of the developed countries.

In one of the most recent and most notable publications on the subject, O'Connor (1983) has identified six different categories of the African City as, indigenous, Islamic, colonial, European, dual and hybrid. In his detailed analysis, he ends up categorizing cities like Kano in Nigeria and Khartoum in Sudan, into all but the European category. Kampala has been found to possess the characteristics of four of the groups, apart from Islamic and European. In short, almost no single city has been confined to a single category. Whether this should raise any doubts as to the validity of the categorizations is a matter of individual judgement. We are, rather, more concerned, in this study, with the Colonial City or to be
more precise the Imperial City, which Kampala was.

It is important to note that O’Connor categorizes Kampala as a "colonial city" and Nairobi as a "European" city although both were a creation of the British and at about the same time. Although we find his categorization of the two, into these two different groups, fairly unconvincing, there are indeed, differences between the two cities which justify different categorization. His categorization (O’Connor, 1983 pp 32-35) is unconvincing because it is based on insignificant characteristics.

True it is, that Nairobi, Lusaka and Harare, do not fall exactly into the same category as Accra, Khartoum and Kampala, albeit all six are colonial in origin. A more meaningful categorization of the two groups should be based on the fundamental distinction between colonialism and imperialism, two different notions which are often mistaken to mean the same thing. Horvarth (1969) has defined colonialism as referring to "that form of inter-group domination in which settlers in significant numbers migrate permanently to the colony from the colonizing power" while imperialism refers to "a form of inter-group domination wherein few, if any, permanent settlers from the imperial homeland migrate to the colony". We are, therefore, talking about "settler-cities" and "non-settler-cities".

The most important factor which contributed to the difference in the character of these cities is the fact that in Accra, Khartoum and Kampala, there was no permanent settlement by Europeans, whereas in Nairobi, Harare and Lusaka, Europeans migrated and settled in big numbers. As a result, one finds that no single piece of land is the property of any European in Uganda, while the highlands surrounding Nairobi were more or less legal
If we are to accept Horvath's definition as valid, and if we insist on differentiating between cities of "colonial" origin, it is probably more useful, therefore, to classify Kampala as an Imperial City and Nairobi as a Colonial City.

Such categorization, however, immediately poses a problem as all writing on tropical Africa and its experience with the Europeans has been described in terms of colonialism and less as imperialism. This may pose problems of interpretation and we may be accused of self-contradiction in the application of existing theory. For our study relies heavily on the useful analysis of the city of Delhi conducted by King (1976) whereby he developed a theory of "colonial" urbanisation which perfectly applies to the situation in Kampala. For some unknown reason, King insists on classifying Delhi as "colonial" though not disagreeing with Horvarth's distinction which would, otherwise qualify the city as "imperial". In adopting King's theory, we may, therefore, assume that while he describes the "colonial" city, his theory, in effect, generally explains colonization, colonialism and imperialism. According to Marxist theorists, after all, imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism all express the varied character of the hegemony exercised by the capitalist west over the rest of the world (Fieldhouse, 1981). And one does not have to be a Marxist to agree with that. The theory outlined below on the characteristics of a "colonial" city, does perfectly apply to Kampala, the Imperial City.

**The Colonial City**

The colonial city was created by Europeans for their own purposes of administration and trade, playing a critical role in the process of colonial political domination and
in the extraction of profit by colonial business enterprise. They were built to serve the needs of expatriate metropolitan powers (Kay and Smout, 1977).

King (1976) goes further and defines "colonial urban development" as the juxtaposition in the environment of the colonial society, of urban forms of Africa and Europe, a unique type of social, physical and spatial organization. The main conditions comprised in this form of colonial development are threefold:

(a) The relationship between the colonial power and the indigenous society is one of dominance-dependence, where the ultimate source of social, economic and political power rests in the colonizing force.

(b) The contact takes place at different levels of economic, social, technological and political organization and development.

(c) It is a contact situation between two different cultures.

Though usually considered as primarily economic and administrative, the resulting structure has also significant social and cultural attributes. The underlying assumption in the framework we are adopting here, is that all urban phenomena which it seeks to comprehend are part of a colonial system, at the centre of which is the colonial power. Contact takes place in the colonial city space where the colonial power resides and conducts its administrative and commercial interests.

King (1976) has further identified several distinct but inter-related elements in urban settlements in colonial cities as follows:

(a) The indigenous settlement is that sector of the colonial city occupied by the indigenous population, and referred to, the colonial culture, as the native city, or the native quarter. This may be a traditional city ante-dating the coming of the colonial power or it may be an area of
indigenous settlement, arising after, and usually as a result of, the establishment of the colonial urban settlement.

(b) The colonial urban settlement is that sector of the colonial city occupied, modified and principally inhabited by the representatives of the colonizing society.

(c) A third element of particular importance in many colonial cities is the sector which accommodates migrants brought in by the colonial administration from other regions to provide labour for the growing urban area.

Colonial cities are heterogeneous, including colonizer and colonized peoples and often intermediary peoples as well. Many colonial powers found it convenient to import an additional labour force from non-European countries. In some colonies, the need for labour was commonly met by importing free workers from Asia, on contract to work for a specified time.

The colonial town, although built by Europeans to house Europeans, also had to accommodate all these other peoples. It represented the meeting place between the society, religion, economy, polity and technology of conquerers and the conquered (Horvarth, 1969). The initial contact of the indigenous people with the city was to work as unskilled labourers. There were sharp contrasts between functional and residential zones, the latter being sharply differentiated on racial basis. A dual character ensued as Europeans attempted to segregate themselves from the indigenous population and to emphasize class distinctions (Abu-Lughod, 1977).

The colonial city was thus an immensely complex structure which was reflected in the landscape in a wide variety of patterns. It reflected the ideas and ideals of the various European powers, as on a virtually clear site the latest ideas in urban design could be effected without the
constant need to consider the restrictions imposed by the inheritance from the past, nor the cost of acquiring the land (Christopher, 1984). Urban design, therefore, varied from the close urban settlements of French North Africa and Dutch Cape Town to the garden cities of the later colonial period. It was often in the towns and more especially in the public buildings that the particular national imprint of the colonial powers was to be seen. Some authors have gone as far as making debatable statements like:

"...they were designed to be replicas of towns in Europe. Some reflected European town planning ideas more clearly than many towns in Europe...." (O’Connor 1983, p35)

Space permitted members of colonial society to build on a more extensive scale and live in more generous style than was possible in the metropolis. Large single family bungalows, four rooms or more, built of brick or stone and stuccoed, with screened porches and hipped corrugated iron or tile roofs, were normally protected from direct access by gates and green hedges.

There was, also, in many towns an enforced open space to segregate African from European areas. Thus, the hospitals and clinics, schools and playing fields, churches and water supplies were not necessarily for or even available to African residents, especially those in the older towns (Mabogunje, 1968).

The spatial location of colonial towns also serves as an indication of the nature of the relationship between the conquerers and the conquered.

Since the colonial authorities were concerned with dominance in the interest of commerce, some villages, conveniently placed, grew into towns as they became administrative centres - places from which district
officers could tour and supervise the countryside. More important, the major cities which developed, and especially the capitals, were usually suitably located—next to an existing indigenous settlement or transportation route—or peripheral (e.g. Dar es Salaam or Lagos) because they faced outward toward the metropolitan power rather than inward to the nation they supposedly led (McNulty, 1976; Gann and Duignan, 1981; Wallerstein, 1966; Davidson, 1963; Schilling, 1979).

Colonial powers' town-planning preferences greatly affected urban layout. New towns were often laid out with wide, straight streets on a grid pattern. Banjul and Harare are good examples of this (Hance, 1970). Dar es Salaam, on the other hand, reflects a German preference for cross-cutting streets and traffic circles. While towns from the pre-colonial era tended to have narrow, winding streets, Bulawayo's streets were designed to be wide enough to turn a cart with sixteen oxen (de Blij, 1963). The central business district, with its European shops, banking facilities, and railway station, was the dominant focus of the town, rather than the chief's palace, mosque or market, in the indigenous town. There was an area of government offices separate from a "Government Residential Area" where the colonial officials lived. With the spread of wage employment and official pressure for spatial differentiation, the local population also gradually separated work from home, though commercial and artisanal activities continued to be located in residential areas.

Within this theoretical framework, we examine and explain the relationships between the different racial and ethnic groups in Kampala, and how these, in turn, affected the settlement patterns.
To be able to fully comprehend Kampala's urban form, we need to start by explaining the political, economic and social forces that operated during the imperial era, to bring about the resultant characteristic features. For the impact of imperial rule is still apparent in the internal spatial structure of Kampala.

Historians have observed that in order to establish itself and to extend its power, an imperial authority often required native allies, (Mamdani, 1977). When the British fought against the Ndebele in Southern Rhodesia, they employed some African auxiliaries, while in Kenya, they made an implicit pact with the Masai who assisted them in defeating the Kikuyu and other tribes (Ranger, 1981). In Uganda, British control depended upon the support and cooperation of the Baganda. We start by examining this relationship and its effects on the urbanization process.

**BRITISH-BAGANDA ALLIANCE**

British imperialism in Uganda was consolidated by the alliance with the Baganda aristocracy. The events which led to this, unusually, strong and friendly pact where the Baganda were virtually equal partners with the British, are reviewed here briefly.

John Hanning Speke, the first British explorer to reach Buganda had been very highly impressed by the social and political organization of Buganda. Above all, he was very moved by the friendly and impressive reception extended to him by the Kabaka and his people. Acting on the reports sent back by Speke, another Britain, Henry Morton Stanley...
was sent to Buganda reaching it at a time when the Kabaka and his kingdom were being threatened by an Egyptian invasion. This created an opportune moment for an alliance with the British to offer him protection, while the Kabaka agreed to British missionaries to visit his kingdom.

As far as the Kabaka was concerned he had invited the Europeans to his kingdom to assist him in his ambition for trade and territorial expansion, the Baganda ideally seeing the British as invited tutors, who could be bidden farewell when their job was done (Fallers, 1964). As it turned out some fifty years later, the invited tutors had long become the masters and in full control of all political events in the country.

Meanwhile, the Church Missionary Society sent a group of Protestant missionaries arriving in Buganda in 1878, followed by French Catholics in 1879. European missionaries were followed by merchants in the form of the Imperial British East Africa Company. Anticipating social disorder disrupting trade, the traders pushed for British formal undertakings of imperial acquisition.

While all this was going on, Arabs (Islam), Catholics and Protestants were ungracefully contending for the Kabaka’s favour. Soon afterwards the Kabaka found himself confronted with the worst religious conflicts which resulted in civil war. With British military assistance, the Protestants in Buganda defeated the Catholics in a battle at Mengo in 1892. This marked the beginning of a mutual relationship between British interests and Protestant leadership in Buganda (Apter, 1961). From then onwards, leadership in Buganda was to be dominated by Protestants, and through Buganda’s influence, consequent protestant domination throughout Uganda in general.
Thereafter Buganda was not only prepared to assist the British but often suggested what particular actions should be taken against her neighbours resisting British influence. By assisting the British, particularly in their conflicts with the Bunyoro Kingdom, Buganda maintained her institutions and also secured a favourable position from which she managed to impose her political and social institutions on the other people in Uganda. Buganda was soon to become a real sub-imperialist state within the protectorate of Uganda, and a classical case of British indirect rule.

The reward for their parts as collaborators, besides maintaining political and social power, was the greatest economic achievement by the Baganda embodied in the Buganda Agreement of 1900 which created a class of notables, a "landed gentry".

**THE BUGANDA AGREEMENT OF 1900**

British land policy throughout East Africa at the time was, that the natives were to be left in undisturbed possession of the lands they occupied, but the unoccupied and waste lands were to be at the disposal of the crown. In general, this was understood to mean that such unoccupied land would be handed over to non-native farmers and planters. Whilst this was more easily achieved in Kenya, the situation in Uganda was a bit more complicated.

Previous European visitors to Buganda had long discovered that all land in the Kingdom - occupied, unoccupied and waste - was tribal territory and the Crown could acquire land rights here only by specific grant from the Kabaka (Wrigley, 1964). Entebbe, where the imperial administrative headquarters were, had been acquired in this way.
While being careful not to disrupt the friendship and alliance with the Baganda, the newly appointed Sir Harry Johnston was, in 1900, determined to secure rights of ownership for the Crown over the "waste and uncultivated land in Buganda, land which the Baganda were not using then and were unlikely to use in the near future. Not only was Johnston's problem dividing the land between the Crown and the Baganda, but also "which" Baganda were to gain control of the land. The British had, once again, underestimated the complexity of customary land tenure.

Before the signing of the 1900 Agreement, the Baganda peasant (Bakopi) held land from a chief. Chiefs were hereditary (Bataka) or Kings' favourites (Batongole), who had been allotted land by the Kabaka which they held at his pleasure. The Chiefs who received or held land from the King in this way were responsible for collecting taxes for the King and for providing soldiers when required, and they themselves in turn received dues from their peasants in terms of work, food, beer, bark cloth and other commodities as well as military service.

The peasant, on his side, received a plot of land of an unspecified size, and on this land he built himself a house and grew his food, and here in time he would be buried. The house site and the land round it were known as his Kibanja, and the term Kibanja System is still sometimes applied to the much modified form of customary land tenure that now exists. As long as the peasant paid his dues, he could hold the land as long as he was still cultivating it; otherwise it was returned again to his chief.

Although this organisation was feudal in the sense that each military command had a territorial basis and that each chief had a following whose primary loyalty was to
him rather than the state, the commands were not, strictly speaking, fiefs. With the exception of the Bataka the only hereditary group of chiefs, (and these were relatively few), other chiefs had no kind of security of tenure on land even while they lived. It was a society in which there were strongly marked differentiations of wealth and status but at the same time something like equality of opportunity.

Having failed in his original intentions of dividing the land between the people of Buganda as a whole and the Protectorate Government, Johnston’s 1900 Agreement ended up granting the Kabaka and a number of the existing chiefs freehold over the estates they happened to be occupying. The chiefs ceased to be dependent on the King’s pleasure and obtained permanent security of holding, together with the quite new right to buy and sell land and to pass it on to their heirs. Their rights extended to enormous stretches of land from one square mile to eight or even more. Hence the popular Mailo land system of tenure, which only describes in corrupt Luganda that land was so extensive as to be measured in miles. The Chiefs, now commonly referred to as landowners, retained much of their old power, their rights to allocate land, their authority over their tenants, and their positions in the political councils of Buganda. When cotton was introduced at the beginning of the century, the peasants were made to pay a toll (Envujjo) on the cotton grown.

The 1900 Agreement, indeed, gave the Crown a small fraction of the usable land surface of Buganda. But probably the most important consequence of this unfortunate exercise was the creation of a permanent aristocracy. This, of course, was not without its advantages to the imperial government. As Mamdami (1977) explains, it was in the interest of the Baganda landlords
to maintain the imperial situation which had rewarded them with economic independence from the Kabaka, while this relationship was also exploited by the imperial power in spreading its rule over the more distant parts of Uganda through the Baganda Chiefs.

At the time of signing land was granted to about 1,000 chiefs. By the time the allotment was completed in 1909, over 3,700 title holders had been registered. By 1926, these had multiplied to some 10,000 primarily as a result of inheritance, sale or even fragmentation.

Control over land, the most important means of production, particularly in an agricultural economy like that of Uganda, allowed landlords control over the producers on the land, and thus over the agricultural surplus product, which in turn was the source of the State's revenue. Buganda was not only a very strong political power, but also a rapidly developing territory with a considerable amount of the nation's economic resources in the hands of a few landlords.

Before long, however, the imperial government sensed that things were going out of hand with landlords charging their tenants random taxes as they saw fit. As the amount appropriated from the tiller increased, so did the value of the land. Between 1912-1913, the Protectorate annual report noted a rise in the price of land from 4 shillings to over 30 shillings an acre (0.4 ha). The Government began to feel it necessary to take steps to safeguard the interests of the peasants, whose rights had not been defined by the 1900 Agreement. These steps culminated in the Busuulu and Envujjo Law of 1927 which put a limit on the land rent (Busuulu) and tribute on cash crops (Envujjo) the landlord could appropriate from his tenant, while guaranteeing the tenant complete and hereditary
security of tenure so long as he continued the effective use of the land. As a matter of fact, the claims of the landowner to dues in food and other commodities were commuted to a fixed land "rent" (10 shillings at the time) which was to be paid whatever the size of plot held.

While this new provision considerably reduced the income of the initial landlords, it had the negative effect of encouraging speculation, particularly in urban areas.

Meanwhile, the owner of some enormous estate allocated in 1909, had no power to exploit his land if it was densely populated with tenants by raising the "rent" which had remained fixed at 10 shillings, for example, for more than thirty years since the introduction of the Law in 1927, during which time the value of land must have obviously increased.

This situation, surely, was in direct contrast to the Land Rent Model, initially put forward by Von Thunen referring to rural land, which established that location rent is determined by transport cost savings, and the concentric zone model of urban land use (Richardson, 1977). Developed and adapted later to urban land use (Alonso, 1964; Wingo, 1961; Muth, 1969) the theory may be summarized as:

"urban land rents are determined by the value of the land's marginal productivity. And, as in agriculture, the land's productivity is determined by the characteristics of the land itself and by transportation costs to relevant markets."

(Mills, 1969 p233)

This Differential rent as Marx identified it in his works (Harvey, 1975) was reduced to a type of land rent that is,
probably, unknown in the Western world. While the Absolute rent existed and continued to be collected in the form of Busuulu, the fixed rent stipulated by the 1927 Law was not even a Monopoly rent since the landlords could not charge freely according to "the purchaser’s eagerness to buy and ability to pay".

Although the Busuul and Envujjo Law of 1927 may appear to have been principally, or even exclusively, envisaged for rural land use, its impact on the administration and use of urban land was equally, if not even more so, strongly manifested in Kampala-Mengo. To be more precise, since the Busuulu and Envujjo Law of 1927 was an off-shoot of the 1900 Mailo Land Agreement, its effects were to be experienced only where the Mailo land tenures existed, and therefore, only in Mengo municipality, since all land within Kampala municipality was Crown land. It was within Mengo municipality, too, that urban land was (where possible is, even up to today) still greatly put to farming purposes, albeit on a generally much smaller scale, with food crops being grown on almost every plot, in order to alleviate urban expenditure on food.

The 1927 Busuulu and Envujjo Law, thus, bears a lot of relevance even to urban land, the only difference being that the size of agricultural land in the rural areas was considerably greater than the fragmented plots in urban areas, together with the fact that urban land was put to a variety of uses other than farming.

Having established the relevance of the Busuulu and Envujjo Law on urban land use, we are particularly interested here in the effect the 1927 law, together with the Mailo land tenure system, had on the development of land particularly for residential settlement purposes in Mengo municipality.
The immediate effect of the 1927 Law on landowners was that, deprived of their revenue from the land and the agricultural products derived from it (monopoly and differential rents), they started looking on their land, not as a factor of production, but as a capital asset (Southall and Gutkind, 1957). By far the simplest and quickest way of making wealth from an estate was to sell, or preferably lease, part of it.

This state of affairs had, in its application to densely occupied urban areas the negative effect of very low return on mere ownership and a high return accruing to the developer. This, in turn, led to either one or the other of two situations. Firstly, those landowners fortunate enough to own areas of land near the town, which were unoccupied by tenants, simply held them vacant and unused until such time as they were in a position to undertake permanent development themselves. Yet Gutkind (1963) observes that while landowners expressed the desire to build houses for rent, if resources were available, rather than let others put up properties on their land, very few landowners did, in fact, get involved in the real construction of urban housing. Wrigley explains this by suggesting that the traditional relationship between landlord and his peasants had been transformed, in urban areas, into a relationship between developer and immigrant labour. A chief, in the eyes of his original tenants (who made sure that all their dues were delivered to him in time), the landlord was now required to change his role to entrepreneur "a chore both troublesome and unnecessary, and one moreover that was not in accordance with their traditional pattern of behaviour" (Wrigley, 1964 p 35).

Under these circumstances, Gutkind found that only a few landowners had any misgiving about leasing their land to
developers providing they paid a large premium and a good rent. These "large premiums" and "good rents" were, obviously illegal, but it is common knowledge, that in such cases, where rent has been restricted by law, landowners react by demanding a form of "key-money" or "entry money" from the incoming tenant (Richards, 1973). Such practices were commonplace in Kampala as will be shown at a later stage.

Large premiums and a good rent could, however, be afforded by only a few African urban migrants. The non-Africans, on the other hand, who could afford such substantial amounts as to satisfy the landowners were, very hard to come by, mostly due to fears related to the uncertainties involved in the administration of Mailo land by the Mengo Municipal Authority.

In the absence of such big offers, landowners resorted, in most cases, to the only possible alternative of leasing out small affordable plots to the migrant labour force, leading to the uncontrollable, haphazard fragmentation of land, so common in many developing cities.

But before we continue with this issue, it is most important to stress that it was generally observed (Southall and Gutkind, 1957; Gutkind, 1963; Wrigely, 1964) that most of the Mailo landowners preferred to lease rather than sell their land. This desire was most elaborately demonstrated at the time when the Protectorate government wanted to acquire land for the construction of the railway through Buganda to the Western Region of the country. Here, the landowners were quite prepared to lease whatever land was required but categorically objected to its being purchased.

Land in Buganda (and probably in many other places) is a
status symbol and parents always want their children to succeed to their land. Those who own land try as much as they can to pass it on, a process which also continually contributes to land fragmentation though not necessarily haphazardly, in this case. One landowner was quoted by Gutkind as saying "a landless man is not respected" (Gutkind, 1963 p198), a statement that should not be strictly literally interpreted, but carries a widely held opinion in Buganda. Landless people are not despised either.

With very few landlords willing to develop their urban land, and fewer still ready to sell it, property values in urban areas were highly inflated. Those who could develop Mailo land generated just about the highest rate of profit than any other form of investment in Uganda (Southall and Gutkind, 1957). Tenants of mailo plots in the town and near it, could also make very high profits in relation to their investment by building shops or lodging houses to rent. Gutkind established that a large number of customary tenants had constructed houses on their plots ostensibly for their "relatives", but in every case quite clearly for rental. Some of them had even rented rooms in their own houses. In most cases, therefore, the land developer was also the customary tenant or the plot holder.

Urban land within Mengo Municipality was, thus, largely developed by tenants, in a situation of rapid urbanization and lack of sufficient housing. Over the years the activities of landowners and tenants were determined more by changing economic conditions than traditional forms of relationship. The changes that took place indicated, on the one hand, the continued entrenched status of the Baganda landowners, and, on the other hand, the emergence of a new category of people, who in the face of changing economic conditions, modified the traditional relations
between landowners and tenants.

The "developer-tenants" were, in most cases, Baganda migrants to Kampala, whose resources were generally limited and as such could only afford to construct housing of very minimum standards for the unskilled urban workers they rented accommodation to. This usually resulted in overcrowding and slum conditions of which Kisenyi discussed in a later chapter was a typical settlement.

In conclusion to the mailo land tenure system, its evolution, it may be said, had the most important effect of putting land development within Mengo Municipality principally in the hands of the lowest level developer—the tenant himself, where settlement was, in most cases, unplanned and random. Secondly, speculative landowners could withhold land from development if they chose to, or even evict their tenants if the occasion granted better offers.

These and all other factors discussed above, led to inappropriate use of urban land, over concentration of population in dwellings in particular areas, and the development and growth of slum areas. But the most important consequence of the 1900 Land Agreement to urban development was summarised in the Structure Report of 1972 which stated:

"The land tenure system in the Kampala area is a complicated one, and it has had, and continues to have, considerable influence on the way the city has grown. This was because it was considerably easier to carry out planned development on land with certain types of ownership rather than on others, sometimes to the detriment of orderly growth of the city as a whole."

(Kampala Development Plan, 1972 p 114)
The land that was most difficult to carry out planned development on was, of course, the mailo land. The report identified three types of land tenure in Kampala at the time.

(a) **Freehold** - 7% of the total Kampala City area was freehold land occupied by the Church of Uganda at Namirembe, the Roman Catholic Missions at Rubaga and Nsambya, the Moslem Community at Kibuli, and it also included the central part of Kampala with long-standing commercial interests.

(b) **Public Land** - This is what was Crown Land at the signing of the 1900 Agreement, together with the acquired Mailo Land from the Kabaka and his chiefs when the mailo land tenure was "abolished" in 1969. Public Land is divided into:
   (i) Government land extending over 10% of the total area
   (ii) Kampala City Council making 30% of total, and
   (iii) Leasehold - 4% leased to private individuals and concerns.

(c) **Private Mailo** - Despite the abolition of Mailo Land Tenure in 1969, the Structure Report of 1972 still identified 50% of the total urban area as mailo land.

While Mailo land may be acquired by the government or planning authority, the Land Reform Decree of 1975 which specifically abolished land tenure greater than leasehold, therefore freeholds and mailo ownership, also failed to effectively wipe out private landownership, control and speculation on land. Originally granted in large units (square miles) land, particularly in Kampala, has been consistently subdivided. This fragmentation has been taking place in a haphazard fashion and has resulted in irregularly shaped plots, lacking satisfactory access, and very difficult to service.
Our study, concentrates, however, on the effects the Land Agreement of 1900 had on the residential settlement patterns that ensued, as will be discussed in the example of Kisenyi in Chapter 6.
TOPOGRAPHY

The city is built on, and among, a series of rounded and flat-topped hills and the surrounding country is green, every valley or depression containing a river or swamp. An inlet of Lake Victoria comes up to within a few miles of the city centre which has its own nearby harbour for lake steamers, Port Bell, (Map 10).

The city is composed of a number of "power centres" or centres of national dominance, situated on the hills. Settlement on the hills may be traced back to an old Buganda tradition.

The basic ecological unit throughout Buganda from ancient times has been the Mutala, which is a hill or area of high ground rounded by valleys. The Mitala (plural) were the usual basis for the political allocation of land. The Kabakas, we have seen, moved their palaces and capitals from hill to hill, while other hills were crowned with their eventual tombs and jawbone shrines (the most famous of these being Kasubi to the southwest of Makerere Hill).

When foreigners began to appear in numbers and for long periods, they were accommodated in the same way by the allocation of a separate hill to each faction, party, religion, race or other special interest group (Gutkind, 1967). The practice, given Kampala's topography of dozens of hills, continued under the British Protectorate, until all the hills within a convenient distance were accounted for. Growing concentration extended settlement down the slopes until, with the added incentive of health control, the swamps were drained and the intervening valley bottoms
also brought into use. But by this time the planning authorities had come to appreciate the value of maintaining something of this network of open spaces as a permanent amenity, as May proposed in his 1947 plan:

"The built up areas will surround the hilly outcrops in the shape of belts, while the valleys between will form the natural green lungs of the town."

(May, 1946 p10)

This type of city structure reminds one of the Garden City, which was one of the latest planning ideas in Europe. May's proposal here reflects what Christopher (see pg 35) observed about the freedom of European planners in the colonies, to try out these new ideas. Indeed Kampala has, with the orderly composition based on the principle of organic limitation (Howard, 1946), been often described as a garden city, despite the fact that it lacked controlled growth.

The open spaces in the valleys were put to use as parks, playing fields and main arterial roads. The major swamp in the centre of Kampala-Mengo was formed by the sluggish Nakivubo river. Rising below Wandegeya and Makerere and reinforced by steams running down from Namirembe, it became a wide expanse of waving papyrus grass between Mengo, Nakasero and Nsambya. As this was drained, it allowed some expansion of inter-hill settlement.

**MORPHOLOGY**

Kampala form shows a number of well defined urban zones which together comprise the internal structure of the city. These zones are not only distinctive in terms of urban land use but also with respect to the form and arrangement of their component parts.
The settlement of the hills meant, in the first place that many major institutions were dispersed in this way, rather than concentrated in an urban centre. In the second place, it meant that the personnel of these institutions tended to be concentrated around them, almost in sub-communities, rather than distributed about the town on the basis of diverse factors of choice as suggested by the trade-off theories of western cities. There was, rather, a distinct cellular structure, though not rigidly adhered to, more reminiscent of Harris and Ullman's (1945) multi-nuclei model. The initial functional dispersion also meant that many problems of urban density were slow to develop and, apart from the supporter settlements, present little technical difficulty even today.

Thus the power centres on the hill-tops were, the palace and administrative centre of Buganda kingdom on Mengo Hill and the first imperial fort on Kampala Hill. The imperial headquarters were later transferred to Nakasero Hill, on the summit and forward slopes of which are found government offices and residences, Parliament Buildings, the High Court, Radio Uganda, the National Theatre and the main shopping and entertainment centre of the city. The banks and hotels are also concentrated in this area, completing the features of a typical Central Business District.

Rubaga Hill is the site of the Roman Catholic (French) cathedral and Mission School and hospital, while Namirembe Hill has the Protestant cathedral, mission school and hospital. Similarly, Nsambya Hill possesses the Roman Catholic cathedral, mission school, and hospital of the Mill Hill Fathers. On Kibuli Hill, in the south of the city, is the Mosque, the main focus of Kampala's Moslem community. Kibuli has a Moslem school, though not a hospital like her sister hills.
Another recruit added to the regilious hills in the late 50s was the All-Africa Headquarters and Temple of the Baha’i faith. This one lies furthest outside Kampala (within Mengo Municipality) to the north. This hill still remains thinly populated in comparison to those mentioned above, mainly because the Baha’i faith was a very late comer to have any great impact on the African population and thus attract any extensive settlement of followers.

The government hospital, the largest in the country, is situated on Mulago Hill. Makerere Hill is the site of Makerere University campus. East of Nakasero Hill stretches the Kampala golf course which divides the high-class residential area of Kololo Hill from the rest of the city. Other high-income areas are found on hills east of the town, at Muyenga and Mbuya, and south on Busiga and Bunga Hills.

On the lower slopes of the hills and in the swamps and valleys between them are found the low-income residential areas, of which Katwe, Kisenyi, Kibuye, Kiswa, Wabigalo, Kivulu and Wandegeya, are typical.

Lower down the Nakivubo (towards the east) is the ever-widening expanse of railway yards with the main industrial area of sidings, go-downs, yards, warehouses, workshops, factories and depots, growing out in a general easterly direction. The line from Kampala to Port Bell on the shores of Lake Victoria 8 kilometres away, was an important economic focus which resulted in the growth of densely populated slums all along the railway.
CONCLUSION

It may be argued that Kampala's identity, its ecological meaning as well as its beauty and interest are provided by its hills (Southall, 1967). They are the most convenient units for any descriptive distinction of neighbourhoods and special local functions. Such distinct concentrations, of an ethnic, religious or economic sort are still significant, although to some extent both rich and poor, and persons of many tribes or nations can be found to live on every hill.

Urban contrasts are especially strong both within the city and its edges. While spontaneous functional differentiation did play a major role, these contrasts are, rather, more a consequence of racial, ethnic and social segregation together with the effects of conscious planning. Kampala rose out of dispersed functional concentrations, and grew by the addition of parts, rather than by internal transformation. This has resulted in an urban form whose distinctive functional zones have been only minimally altered in the city's urbanization process.

The geography of the city still reflects its character of power phenomenon (the palace at Mengo having been replaced by an army barracks after the abolition of the Kingdoms in 1966). The centres of power, the desirable residential areas and the shopping centres still continue to exist and develop in the same pattern on high ground. At Nakasero and Kololo, the former imperial settlement areas, planned high-class development continues in much the same way with lay-outs hardly differing, and contrasts resulting largely from different periods of development. This situation is contrasted by the low income areas which lie on the city's boundaries in the swampy, lower ground. It is here, in the valleys, that the greater part of the population
lives, still carrying out allotment farming, indulging in market trading, and living generally in slum-like conditions.

These contrasts in the residential settlement patterns will be the main subject of discussion in the rest of this study where it will be established that the historical, administrative and socio-economic factors that were in force in the early years of the city's creation, had such a strong impact as to continue influencing settlement patterns, for yet a long time.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Ethnicity, though frequently given false emphasis, remains the paramount problem of African social and political life. In spite of the vigorous nationalistic activities in many African countries since independence, there remains dynamic diversity of ethnic group cultures. This diversity of cultures has often been described in terms of tribalism, a narrow and frequently misused term. The confusion, in the use of the word, has often arisen from conceptual difficulties related to the categories of social strata or social groupings in everyday use which are many, overlapping and unclear. One can find such terms as race, nationality, citizenship, ethnic group, caste, estate and tribe used at different times to mean different things, sometimes substituting one for the other. It is true that there is a close relationship between some of them, and it is also accepted amongst social anthropologists that there are no standard definitions. It is, however, necessary to clarify in our study which terms are to be used, the relationship between one another and work out a suitable definition for each.

Pre-colonial Africa included many societies that were complex and hierarchical, as well as simple segmentary societies. Some of these states had 'estates' - that is, categories of people with hereditary status: nobles, commoners, artisans, slaves, etc. (e.g. Buganda), while others had categories of people with separate designations indicating presumed separate ancestry (e.g. Kano).

The establishment of colonial rule immediately imposed one
new categorisation of "nationality" while at the same time introducing the concept of "race". And although the indigenous categorisations were never completely destroyed, they were gradually modified as Southall has suitably explained, in his anthropological study of Uganda. Rejecting the use of the term "tribe" on the grounds that these groups "have been always taken to be clearly distinct local and cultural groups whose origins are so primeval that their identity is virtually impossible to modify", he states, rather, that most of these identities are of recent origin, anyway, "moulded and defined by the exigencies of the colonial situation" (Southall, 1975 p 265). He insists that the so-called tribes were either estates (and should be considered as such), or they were essentially segmentary, not unitary entities, with multiple identities at a number of different levels equally meaningful in different contexts.

But while Southall's observations tie in with our own life experience in these societies, we still feel that we need the term "tribe" to describe a certain category of ethnic group for which no other existing term (to our present knowledge) offers a better description. Southall, like many others who have, for similar or different reasons objected to the use of the term, has not been very helpful in this respect either, failing to suggest more appropriate alternative terminology.

Other authors, dealing with the subject, who have challenged the use of the word, albeit from a different perspective, include Mamdani who longs for the scientific context when the word used to characterise "those social formations that did not possess a state structure - the communal, classless societies, as, for example, the Germanic tribes" (Mamdani, 1973 p3). Today, however, he goes on, every single ethnic group in Africa is referred
to as a tribe regardless of the nature of its social
development. He wonders what it is that makes "2 million
Norwegians a people and just as many Baganda a tribe, or a
few hundred Icelanders a people and 14 million
Hausa-Fulanis a tribe". In a similar tone, Andreski
(1969) also wondered why 13 million Yorubas should be
called a tribe but the much less numerous Latvians a
nation.

There is always a danger in trying to universalize
explanations and definitions of social anthropological
phenomena. Such efforts are normally riddled with
political sentiments and subtle ethnocentrism. While
Mamdani and Andreski may, well indeed, have a valid point
in expressing their doubts about the use of the word in
that particular way, we feel that it is the "proper"
definition of the term, that matters most, rather than to
whom it is applied. Population alone, should not be the
major factor determining the use of social anthropological
terminology, and neither should race.

When it comes to the urban situation, the confusion is
worse confounded, as far as the use of the terms race,
tribe, ethnic group and nationality, is concerned.
Southall suggests it would not matter so much if tribalism
and ethnicity were understood in their largely recent and
essentially colonial sense, but even so, many aspects of
urban behaviour are better understood when organizations
such as the Unions of the Ibo, (in Nigeria) and the Luo
(in Uganda) are not related as tribal associations to a
"falsely imagined primeval past, but as ethnic
associations to a relevant contemporary category of
phenomena to which the activities of Poles and Italians in
American cities, of Irish in Liverpool or Flemings and
Walloons in Brussels, obviously in various ways, belong
(Southall, 1975 p 266).
As Shorter (1974) rightly observed, ethnic groups in East Africa cannot be classified unidimensionally, or according to a single criterion; they can be grouped in a number of different ways according to which factor, or factors are selected. It might be thought that one is on surer ground when grouping the tribes on the basis of geography or history, yet even here there are pitfalls. Historical accidents have juxtaposed peoples of different cultures and origins, and have brought about far-reaching transformations in the cultures of tribes which share a common historical tradition. The boundaries of the present Sudan, certainly, enclose two of the most contrasting cultures one could find anywhere on the face of the earth, with the Arabs in the north and the Sudanics in the south. These same historical events have intercepted peoples of the same cultures and origins, and have produced various ethnic groups of the same ancestry and culture, living on either side of the borders of many different countries.

In order to define our urban ethnic categories, we must, against this background therefore, select factors which have validity for the contemporary social processes. Some of these factors may be historical, some geographical, some cultural. Each urban individual has an identity or set of identities deriving from his supposed ethnic origin or ancestry. These include not only "tribe", but also sub-divisions of tribes (clans - which we are not going to consider in our study), groupings of tribes (Social-linguistic groups), and nations. In Kampala (as in most big cities) there is also the wider category of race.

An ethnic or racial group entails, therefore, membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others as constituting a category distinguishable from other categories of the same order, and offers a medium for
communication and interaction. We shall, thus, use the concept of ethnicity in reference to all differentiations based on a sense of common ancestry and culture between individuals and groups, at a number of different levels. Of the diverse and complex traits that characterise such classifications, we shall consider skin pigmentation, national or geographic origins and linguistic characteristics, as the most decisive. Our definition of ethnicity is thus made up of four different hierarchical groupings in descending order, divided into the Racial Group and three Ethnic Groupings.

The chart below is a schematic presentation of the different categories of ethnicity in Kampala - Race, Linguistic Group, Nationality, and Tribe - as identified and defined in our study.

**CHART A - ETHNIC CATEGORISATION FOR KAMPALA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negroid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongoloid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINGUISTIC GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Bantu, Nilotes, Nilo-Hamites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and Sudanics)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan, Kenyan, Sudanese, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Baganda, Luo, Nubi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Acholi, etc, Baluhy etc, Nandi etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Starting with race, we shall classify the relevant groups according to the three basic human, physio-biological distinctions - Negroid, Caucasoid and Mongoloid. It is important to point out, at this stage that we are aware of the warnings that have been brought to our notice by some writers regarding the use of the term race:

"When one speaks of race, one somehow implies racial purity. However racial purity no longer exists, because there has been interbreeding on a tremendous scale over the centuries. Racial purity has thus been eliminated. Consequently, the term race is an anachronism."

(Adams, 1978 pp 253-269)

This statement has been quoted from an article entitled "The Coloureds of South Africa", which in itself, makes it much easier for us to understand the cruel condemnation of the term race as "anachronistic". True it is, indeed, that interbreeding has resulted in various subsequent racial categories which are neither Negroid, Caucasoid or Mongoloid, and thus "not pure". But the general consensus, so far, has been to fit them, albeit vaguely and subjectively, in one of the three primary classifications. We are sticking to the use of the term race in our study, anyhow, since the groups involved clearly belonged to either of the three basic categorisations.

At this level of ethnic classification, we thus identify three racial groups; Africans, Europeans and Asians. Race here refers to the biological aspect of group differences and some typical physical characteristics, e.g. colour of skin, colour of hair, etc.

From here onwards, further ethnic classification is
limited to the African racial group only, since the other two races were relatively too small in numbers, in Kampala, to justify any further groupings.

**SOCIO-LINGUISTIC GROUPS**

The classification of these groups is primarily one of language, culture and differences of social organisation and political system. Although in modern scientific usage, language is the basic test, these classifications also take into account traits of social organisation such as divine kinship and cattle cults, material culture or arts and crafts, and physical characteristics such as the colour of the skin and the shape of the nose and lips (Goldthorpe, 1962; Southall, 1956).

The ethnic groups identified at this level are: Bantu, Nilotics, Nilo-Hamites (half-hamites) and Sudanics.

**NATIONALITY**

This level simply allows us to classify settlers according to their country of origin. An ethnic group in this category is composed of different groups of people who have only one thing in common - country of birth. Ethnicity, here, indirectly implies a form of interaction between particular groups of people operating within a plural society. The most important component of this ethnic category, therefore, is national migration. The people of Uganda (Ugandans) and the people of Kenya (Kenyans) form no meaningful ethnic group in their own countries as long as there are no foreigners present. We may, therefore, identify Ugandans, Kenyans, Sudanese, etc. as ethnic groups if they live together in one single country as a result of migratory processes.
Amongst the nationalities present in Kampala were: Kenyans, Tanzanians, Rwandese (Banyarwanda) Urundians (Barundi), Zairians (Congolese) and the Sudanese.

TRIBE

We have explained in great length above the problems involved in the use of the term "tribe". We are therefore trying to define the term, in our study, in the simplest, and most straightforward, way possible defying all the racial and ethnocentric prejudices, commonly applied in literature.

The tribe is simply defined as a group of people of common descent, kinship, territory, culture, and most importantly, with a distinctive language. It is estimated that there were about forty different tribal groups in Kampala of which a few examples were: Baganda, Lango, Nubi, Baluhya, Bakonjo etc.

KAMPALA'S ETHNIC GROUPS

In a typical African town, the population of urban Africans is composed of the members of many ethnic groups from within the country plus citizens of several neighbouring countries. And while this study lays more emphasis on the effects of ethnicity on the settlement patterns of Kampala's African population, it should be remembered that Uganda was a British Protectorate from 1894 until 1962 during which time Europeans and Asians settled in the city in quite big numbers, thus bringing about the racial category of ethnicity identified above.

Uganda stands at the cross-roads of nearly all the main linguistic groups of Eastern Africa with the Bantu, Nilotes, Nilo-Hamites, and Sudanics all being represented.
(Map 11). Its geographical and historical position makes it relatively easy for its neighbours (Sudan in the North, Kenya in the East, Tanzania in the South, Rwanda in the Southwest, and Zaire in the West) to maintain close contacts with its inhabitants. As a typical example of historical events that have divided the tribe into two different national territories, the Basamia tribal group of Eastern Uganda extend over the border into Kenya. Similarly, the Bagishu, another tribe in Eastern Uganda sometimes refer to themselves and the Vugusu across the border into Kenya as one and the same people (La Fontaine, 1969).

On the Western front, a lot of intermarriage has been going on between the Bantu and Sudanic groups on either side of the border with Zaire. And most of the manual labourers on farms (especially in Buganda) are immigrants from Rwanda and Burundi. The Southern Sudanese tribes, on the other hand, had a lot in common with the tribal groups of Northern Uganda to whom most had migrated principally for political reasons.

The Uganda Protectorate Census of 1959 identified thirty-eight tribal groups resident in Kampala, together with a group of people who were classified as "unidentified" (Table II).

Table II, showing the Baganda as the dominant ethnic group in Kampala, demonstrates the truth in the observation that:

"While it is not unusual for a town to be dominated by one ethnic group, in whose natal land the town is located, and who may also dominate particular occupational categories, it is not unusual to find between ten and fifty different ethnic groups represented in most African towns."

(Gutkind 1974 p20)
MAP 11 - Uganda's Linguistic Ethnic Groups

Source: Goldthorpe, 1962
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### TABLE II - ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF AFRICANS IN KAMPALA-MENGO (1959)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Òengo Municipality</th>
<th>Kampala Municipality</th>
<th>Total Kampala-Mengo</th>
<th>% of African pop. in K'la-Mengo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>32,946</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>37,464</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batooro</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo (Kenya)</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>5,544</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyaruanda</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluhyia (Kenya)</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,481</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyankole</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahaya (Tanganyika)</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakiça</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi (Sudan)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basamia</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basoga</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugbara</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo (Zaire)</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langi</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madi</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagisiku</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alur</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonam</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badama</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barundi</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikwa</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikuyu (Kenya)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baygere</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyole</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuman</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aamibba</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bkonjo</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwe</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Group</td>
<td>Mengo Municipality</td>
<td>Kampala Municipality</td>
<td>Total Kampala</td>
<td>% of African pop. in K'la-Mengo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebei</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakenyi</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batwa</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamojong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labwor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lendu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52,659</td>
<td>24,052</td>
<td>76,711</td>
<td>99.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Uganda Protectorate General African Census 1959
Domination of a particular ethnic group (in this case the Baganda) and the relationship between ethnicity and occupation will be the subject for detailed discussion at a later stage. Our immediate requirement is the identification and classification of the ethnic groups, listed in the census below, into meaningful ethnic categories within the bounds of our definition of ethnicity.

At the highest level, Kampala's population may be categorised into the three broad racial groups: Africans, Europeans and Asians.

"Europeans" here is not strictly continental but is meant to include Americans and Australians who also appeared (in bigger or smaller numbers) during this period, in Kampala. In other words, we are applying the conventional jargon of using the word Europeans to represent all "whites", which, incidentally, does not depart from our basis of categorisation - physio-biological characteristics.

The Asian ethnic group, on the other hand, was mainly composed of immigrants from the Indian subcontinent, particularly Indians, Pakistanis and Goans.

At the second level of Ethnic Categorisation, we identify the major tribal groups, in the 1959 population census of Kampala-Mengo, representing each of our four socio-linguistic categories; Bantu, Nilotics, Nilo-Hamites and Sudanics (Table III).
### TABLE III - ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF AFRICANS IN KAMPALA-MENGO

**BY SOCIO-LINGUISTIC GROUP (1959)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Group</th>
<th>Mengo Municipality</th>
<th>Kampala Municipality</th>
<th>Total Kampala-Mengo</th>
<th>% Total African pop. in Kampala-Mengo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(i) Interlacustrine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>32,946</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>37,464</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td>3,486</td>
<td>2,346</td>
<td>5,832</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyaruanda</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyankole</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahaya</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basoga</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barundi</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>43,404</td>
<td>10,587</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>(ii) Non-Interlacustrine</strong> | | | | |
| Baluhyia          | 1,337              | 1,481                | 2,818               | 3.7                                  |
| Bakiga            | 1,172              | 810                  | 1,982               | 2.6                                  |
| Basamia           | 442                | 628                  | 1,070               | 1.4                                  |
| Bagishu           | 196                | 342                  | 538                 | 0.7                                  |
| Badama            | 87                 | 204                  | 291                 | 0.4                                  |
| Kikuyu            | 31                 | 164                  | 195                 | 0.3                                  |
| Bagwere           | 106                | 81                   | 187                 | 0.2                                  |
| Banydyde          | 89                 | 87                   | 176                 | 0.2                                  |
| Baamba            | 55                 | 6                    | 61                  | 0.08                                 |
| Bakonjo           | 41                 | 20                   | 61                  | 0.08                                 |
| Bagwe             | 34                 | 18                   | 52                  | 0.05                                 |
| Bakenyi           | 36                 | 3                    | 39                  | 0.05                                 |
| Batwa             | 33                 | 1                    | 34                  | 0.04                                 |
| <strong>TOTAL</strong>         | 3,659              | 3,845                | 7,504               | 9.8                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic Group</th>
<th>II Nilotics</th>
<th>III Nilo-Hamites</th>
<th>IV Sudanics</th>
<th>Total African pop. in Kampala-Mengo</th>
<th>% Total African pop. in Kampala-Mengo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mengo Municipality</td>
<td>Kampala Municipality</td>
<td>Total Kampala-Mengo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Interlacustrine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>5,544</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alur</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonam</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,040</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,105</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Nilo-Hamites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakwa</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runam</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebei</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoiong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labwor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>685</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,104</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,789</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.31</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Sudanics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>1,483</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugoara</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madi</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lendu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,637</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,227</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,864</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.01</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,659</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,052</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,711</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.92</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data extracted from Uganda Protectorate General African Census Report of 1959
I. **Bantu** - Most of East Africa is inhabited by the Bantu Group and these formed the majority of the African population in Kampala-Mengo. Racially, the Bantu ethnic group is a mixture of dark skinned Negroes - from dark brown to completely black - with broad noses and full lips; with Hamites of paler skin in colour and thinner noses and lips; all, however, have the characteristic tightly-curled black hair. More importantly, all speak languages closely similar to one another - the so-called Bantu languages - with common grammatical features and a large number of common words (Goldthorpe, 1962).

The most numerous tribes of Bantu in Kampala have been divided into two sub-categories:

(i) **The Interlacustrine Bantu:**

- Baganda
- Banyaruanda
- Batoro
- Bahaya
- Banyankole
- Barundi
- Banyoro
- Basoga

As the name suggests, these are the tribal groups of Bantu who lived between lakes, and the lakes referred to here being Victoria, Kyoga, Albert and Edward (see Map 11). The last three in this category, it should be noted, were immigrants from Ruanda, Tanzania and Burundi respectively, with the Barundi not particularly interlacustrine, as per definition. This common grouping is, however, convenient and useful for it is not based on geographical location but rather on the socio-political structures of their societies. All these groups lived in stratified societies with centralized political systems, ruled by kings or paramount chiefs, though to varying extents.
(ii) The Non-Interlacustrine Bantu:

Baluhya
Bakiga
Basamia
Bagishu
Bagwere
Badama

These were the Bantu groups who were traditionally without centralised government or a stratified structure. Their political organisation was on a very small scale, and depended on localised lineages.

It should be noted that the Baluhya, who formed the biggest population in Kampala-Mengo in this group, were immigrants from Kenya.

II. Nilotes - The second biggest linguistic group in Kampala was represented by the Nilotes. The Nilotic peoples, as the name implies, live in or near the Nile Valley and their centre is in Southern Sudan.

These groups are of generally tall and very black skinned peoples, sometimes heavy-featured, and often with characteristically protruding front teeth which make many of them easily recognisable, even in a mixed town population. The Nilotic languages are simple in structure and all very similar and according to Goldthorpe (1962), the highest degree of mutual understanding among East African Nilotes is between the Alur of North-Western Uganda and the Kenya Luo, who, though they are furthest apart, are closely related.
The most important Nilotes represented in Kampala were identified as:

Acholi
Lango
Alur
Jonam
Luo

These were described by Southall (1956) as tribal groups with localised segmentary lineage systems, mostly marked in the case of the Luo who had no traditional chiefs with specialized political power, and less so among the rest, who had the institution of chiefship developed only on a fairly small scale.

Once again we have, in this group, the Luo, a migrant group from Kenya, as the most numerous in Kampala-Mengo as the figures in Table III indicate.

III.  **Nilo-Hamites** - The Nilo-Hamites cover most of the North Eastern part of Uganda. These groups are moderately fair-skinned and are generally taller than the Bantu. The emphasis in the way of life of the Nilo-Hamitic peoples is on nomadic cattle-keeping. Their languages show a combination of Hamitic grammatical features, such as word-endings and word stems (Goldthorpe, 1962).

The most numerous representative group in Kampala-Mengo from this category were the Teso. Other tribes in this ethnic group; the Kumam, Kakwa, Karamojong and Suk were either minimally or barely represented, at all.

As nomadic peoples, their social organisation lacked any specialized political institutions. They lived in small groups of persons with the elders or family heads as the accepted leaders.
IV. The Sudanics - In terms of total population and total geographical area of settlement, the Sudanics were the least represented in Uganda. As the name may suggest, the Sudanic linguistic group consists mainly of tribal groups from Southern Sudan which extend all the way westwards towards West Africa. Like the Nilotics, these groups are generally tall, thin and very black skinned.

Their social organisation consisted of family clusters based on minimal lineage, with the head of the lineage acting as the head of the cluster.

The Sudanic languages were described as monosyllabic - most words in their simplest form consist of one syllable - and with no grammatical gender (Tucker, 1940).

In Kampala-Mengo, however, the presence of the Sudanic ethnic group was greatly boosted by the Nubi from South-central Sudan. Other tribal groups in this category were the Lugbara, Madi, Congo and Lendu.

After identifying the tribal groups in each socio-linguistic group, we may now perform a simple but very useful exercise to demonstrate how a single tribal group can be part of various ethnic groups at different levels (Figure I).

The Figure shows that each one of these individual tribes forms at least two other ethnic categories. Thus a Luo, for example, a man coming from a particular location in either Central or South Nyanza in Kenya or the Kenyan Islands of Lake Victoria, is also a Luo, a Nilotic, and therefore linked to Acholi, Alur and other Ugandan Nilotics. He is also a Kenyan and thus shares a common identity at the nationality level with a Muluhyia in Kampala. The Muluhyia, on the other hand, while sharing the nationality ethnic grouping with the Luo, is also a
FIGURE 1 — Membership of Kampala’s major tribal groups to other ethnic categories
Bantu and therefore identifiable with the Baganda in Kampala, but more importantly he is a non-Interlacustrine Bantu and thus very close to the non-Interlacustrine Basamia, just across the border.

Similarly, the Congo tribal group from the area surrounding the north-western border of Uganda, are also Congo, a Sudanic linguistic group hence in the same category with the Lugbara in Kampala. The Congo also do come from Zaire and therefore form an ethnic group with the Bakonjo and Baamba in Kampala, who are also Zairian tribal groups.

The importance of these various levels of ethnic categorisation not only lies in the fact that they could be easily identified in Kampala, but also, and particularly, in the effect they had on the settlement patterns in the city's residential areas.

Working within this conceptual framework we shall, at the macro-level, identify three, initially distinctive residential zones in Kampala namely: European, Asian and African. We shall, at this level, discuss too the relationships between the "host" ethnic group (Baganda) and the "migrant" groups both Ugandan and non-Ugandan. Finally, at the micro-level, we shall examine and establish the most important elements that characterise ethnic residential clusters in the city's settlement patterns.

Lastly, residential clustering based on religious affiliation will be presented in the example of Kibuli Hill Settlement which was the most typical of this type of residential concentration. This part of the study is dealt with separately in Chapter 7 following the discussion on ethnic residential clustering.
The chart below is a schematic presentation of Kampala's ethnic residential structures as will be discussed in the following chapters.

**CHART B – KAMPALA-MENGO’S ETHNIC RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES**

```
RACE
  ├── EUROPEANS
  │    └── HOSTS
  └── AFRICANS
        └── MIGRANTS
              ├── INDIGENOUS SETTLEMENT
              └── SUPPORTER (SQUATTER) SETTLEMENTS
                   └── PLANNED SETTLEMENT (HOUSING ESTATES)

NATIONAL/GEOGRAPHIC ORIGIN, LANGUAGE

BANTU, NILOTICS
  ─── NILO-HAMILITES, SUDANICS
KENYANS, TANZANIANS
  ─── ZAIRIANS, SUDANESE
  └── BAGANDA, ACHOLI, LUO NUBI, BALUHYA etc.

RELIGION

PROTESTANTS, CATHOLICS, MUSLIMS
```
6.1 **THE MACRO-LEVEL**

It was established in earlier chapters that Europeans were the first relatively permanent residents in many of what are now the towns of Black Africa. The buildings they constructed for trade and administration often were the nascent centres which slowly grew into towns. These centres and towns, in turn, attracted Africans from rural areas, neighbouring countries or even Asians and Arabs from their home countries or even intermediate points.

Kampala, an imperial creation itself, likewise attracted Africans from the surrounding areas, as well as Asians and a few Arabs, from more distant areas. Table IV shows population growth of the three main racial groups for Kampala-Mengo from 1911-1969.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>European</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>African</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34,567</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>35,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>36,354</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>38,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>38,600</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>42,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9,150</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>46,242</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>57,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>76,711</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>99,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>4,293</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>31,505</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>293,328</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>329,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE IV - RACIAL COMPOSITION OF KAMPALA-MENGO (1911-69)**

Source: Uganda Government Census Publications from 1911-1969
NOTE: (i) The Table above excludes figures for minority ethnic groups classified as Arabs and Others in the 1969 population census. Their total was recorded as 1,574.

(ii) Earlier figures of population censuses should be treated with considerable reserve as it is difficult to find out the precise areas to which the early data applies, and also due to the fact that the boundaries of these areas were constantly changing.

The figures in the table above show that while the African population of Kampala-Mengo increased through the years, their proportions relative to those of the Europeans and Asians were steadily decreasing up to the 1959 census. This simply suggests a relatively higher rate of population growth amongst the European and Asian groups which could be attributed to the arrival of more immigrants from abroad. The situation drastically changes however soon after independence (1962) as the 1969 census records indicate a sharp decline in percentage representation in both the European and Asian groups, notwithstanding population growth, in absolute terms, within these same groups.

The table reveals two other important facts. Firstly, in the period of 58 years (from 1911-1969), the European population of Kampala-Mengo had multiplied by more than twenty-nine times, that of the Asians by some forty-six times, while the Africans were only eight times more numerous.

Secondly, the figures implicitly suggest some kind of control over the process of migration to the city - consciously or otherwise. One would have, otherwise, expected a higher growth rate within the African
population, as a consequence of rural-urban migration.

With the population of European and Asians growing at a much higher rate than that of the Africans, and with the apparent administrative controls on immigration and settlement in the city, our next assignment is to investigate the spatial relationships between these three main racial groups in Kampala-Mengo.

Our brief review of the theory of imperialism in chapter one established that domination of a heterogeneous or plural society by one minority group, was the key characteristic of the imperial situation and was most obviously manifest within the city itself (Horvarth, 1969). Thus the major factor governing the structure and growth of the imperial city was the official and semi-official controls exerted over the development of the urban fabric.

According to Hirst (1974), this arose essentially from two mutually reinforcing considerations:

1. That building usually had to be commenced from scratch and it was therefore possible to plan the form of the city ab initio.

2. That there usually existed a desire on the part of the colonialists, who were in a position of enforcement, for residential separation from the colonised population, and this would often entail a cultural and racial separation.

The operation of these forces was particularly evident in Kampala’s residential structure, and other factors, for example the topography of the site and the presence of a third racial group (the Asians), only magnified their impact.
Kampala's imperial population was, as Table IV suggests, radically mixed and yet, our study will establish, spatially divided, particularly in terms of residential settlement patterns. The divisions, rooted in the societies' own history, were even further complicated by the policies adopted by the imperial administration. During this period, administrative policies structured race relations in the town and the population was, as a result, stratified into layers which were very largely determined by race. British imperial policy was designed to maintain separation between Europeans, Asians and Africans. Each racial group had its "quarter" in town, and this gave the urban community many of the characteristics of a caste structure (Langlands, 1975). The layers were further differentiated internally, and this was most important in the case of the African layer, which was divided into several complex patterns of fairly distinguishable ethnic clusters, showing varying abilities and inclinations in relation to the urban work situation.

Ethnic differences within the African groups, particularly in relation to residential settlement patterns will be the topic for detailed discussion in our study at the micro-level, in Section 6.2.

At the macro-level, Kampala's initial residential patterns clearly demonstrate its ethnic diversity. Urban settlement patterns at this stage may be said to have been the direct and sole, result of segregation based on race. At least until 1962, when Uganda achieved independence, non-Africans largely determined the patterns of residential development within the area then defined as Kampala Municipality. From an early period in the growth of Kampala (i.e. c.1915) when health requirements were stressed and particularly since 1930, a desire that the development of the town should be properly planned into
functional zones was advocated in order to prevent overcrowding and maintain satisfactory health conditions (Kendall, 1955). Conscious planning resulted in the marked functional differentiation of urban land use: several residential areas, an area for business and light industry, the central commercial area, public and open spaces of all kinds, plus an area for major public buildings, can easily be distinguished (see Map 9 pg 27).

Planning controls particularly those concerned with health regulations and building standards also effectively promoted racial separation of residential areas especially by excluding Africans from certain areas. Land use zoning and planning residential development along racial lines prevented the evolution of a smooth density surface and a markedly disjointed pattern arose to obscure any simple distance relationships, much in contrast to what the NUE (New Urban Economics) Models would support.

In his 1913 report on the town planning and housing policy in Kampala, Professor Simpson said:

"Owing to the wonderful development of the country, and the paucity of officers, there has been no time to prepare a well considered plan of the town, from a health point of view, into separate quarters for Europeans and Indians, divided by a neutral belt on which neither can encroach with buildings. On one side of the town a small area divides the European official quarters from the others, while Indian and European dwelling houses and shops are close to one another. More than this, the situation of many of these buildings is as far down the slope of the hill [Nakasero] in one direction as to be close to the swamp. The consequence of this is that
malarial fever and blackwater fever are prevalent in the blocks of houses on the lower slopes of the hill amongst Indians and Europeans, and malarial fever, which had been rare in the higher parts of the hill, has gradually travelled up as the intervening space has been decreased by houses being built on it."

(Quoted in Kendal, 1955 p18)

Hence, as far as the Europeans were concerned, residential separation from the Asians was urgent, necessary and inevitable. the 1919 Kampala Planning Scheme (see Map 12) wasted no time, therefore, in ensuring that Asian residences and trading areas were confined to the lower slopes of Nakasero and Kololo Hills, with European trading areas and a green belt separating them from the European residential areas on the higher slopes of both hills.

Acting along the same guidelines, Mirams, charged with the preparation of a development plan for Kampala in 1929 (which was effectively Kampala’s first Master Plan) suggested co-operative housing as the solution to the housing problem "as far as it affects the Asiatic" (Mirams, 1930 p72). He selected and designed sites for such housing on both sides of the Bombo Road, sites located towards the foot of Nakasero Hill, just above the steeper slopes of the commencement of the Nakivubo valley to the north.

It is not clear whether he was accused, or was it simply a feeling of guilt which compelled him into making the statement:
"There is no question of segregation or anything of the sort, for representatives of the Indian communities have been personally consulted and they generally appreciate any development which provides for community of living in suitable environment."

(Mirams, 1930 p72)

"Suitable environment", it would appear from the above, meant *residential separation* - if only this phrase suits Mirams better than the word *segregation*.

It was also stated in the same report that Municipal records showed a total of 518 buildings in the town, at the time, of which 252 were classified as "Private Residential and Business" and 142 as Government Residential. The report does not state clearly which properties were occupied by who, but it would be a fairly accurate assumption that the "Private Residential and Business" premises were mainly occupied by the Asians in the form of shops at the street level and residences upstairs, while the Government Residential were almost exclusively for the Europeans. In reference to these residences, Mirams pointed out:

"During the last 10 years the approximate average [sic!] increase in the number of European occupied properties was 11 per annum, and of properties occupied by Asiatic 15 - a total of 26. The increase of population over the same period being European 206 and Asiatic 1,185, representing an average of approximately 21 and 118 per annum, respectively. It will be, incidentally, noted that these figures give an average of less than two Europeans per house, and Asiatic eight."

(Mirams, 1930 p 73)
These observations serve as an indication of the differences in residential population densities within the European and Asian residential zones. The central commercial zone of the city, where most of the "Private Residential and Business" properties were located was certainly the most densely populated part of the town, as further reports will confirm.

Providing for the future Mirams suggested:
"Building sites in favourable positions and for various purposes will be more easily available and restrictions as to the class in one area, will be offset by provision for the class in another."

(Mirams, 1930 p83)

Notwithstanding the abolition of racial segregation in 1928, Mirams was still, in 1930, making recommendations for future development with "restrictions to class" as one of the major considerations and effective determinant of eventual urban form. "Restrictions to class", as we shall see later, were nothing other than "restrictions to race" as the categories of housing introduced were consciously designed to fit within the already existing residential zoning patterns. In other words, it may be said that in terms of residential settlement, race and class normally meant one and the same thing: Europeans, Asians and Africans, in that descending order.

Mirams's report went on:
"The plans provide for 12.78 miles of new roads being constructed in residential areas and 4.63 miles in commercial areas (i.e. between the Bombo-Jinja Road and Nakivubo, and also south of Nakivubo in the factory area).
The former gives a frontage to 368 acres of building land of no less than 17.86 miles in extent. This area is made up as follows:

Nakasero - 245.5 acres
Kololo - 93.8 acres
Old Kampala - 28.8 acres

(Mirams, p83)

In brackets immediately below this, the Town Planner confessed:

"No credit is taken for the area of at least 100 acres south of the Nakivubo [river] selected for working class houses."

So while the urban authority was not concerned with providing housing for the urban Africans, they were not prepared, either, to provide the necessary services within the areas earmarked for future development for working class settlement. In fact, to be more precise, in the city's first Master Plan, no particular consideration is given to housing and urban settlement for the Africans. We are only left to guess that the casual remark "sites for working-class housing are clearly defined as south of the railway and east of the Entebbe road," was probably, partly, meant to refer to sites for the Africans as well. It must be remembered, here, that the "working-class" was, in those days, mainly composed of Asian skilled and non-skilled labour working for the railways and similar government departments. It will be shown, in a later discussion on employer-provided housing, that some Asians did, indeed settle there, though in comparatively smaller numbers.

These sites for the working class were, of course, in the valley south of Nakasero Hill and on the lower northern slopes of Nsambya Hill, at the fringes of the then
municipality's southern boundary (see Map 8 pg 25).

The 1947 report on the Kampala Extension Scheme (May 1947) was the first to consider any kind of urban development aimed at the African population. It was stated in the report:

"The Kololo-Naguru scheme maintains the emphasis on new settlement areas for Europeans and Asians, but at the same time lays considerable stress on developing the organized civic life of the African so that 'he may graduate to full citizenship'". (underlining is ours)

(May, 1947 p2)

The first part of this statement clearly supports our assumption drawn from the figures in Table IV (pg 80), that there were some sort of policy controls on the settlement patterns and distribution of housing to Kampala's different racial groups. It is not surprising, therefore, that the growth rate in the populations of Europeans and Asians was proportionally much higher than that of the Africans since emphasis was still being maintained, in 1947, on new settlement areas for the two alien groups.

The second part of May's statement quoted above is, at its best, an indication of some faint realisation of the existence of the African in the urban environment, and at worst, a very ambiguous, esoteric compilation of English words.

Whatever qualifications were needed for the "graduation" it had taken the imperial government over sixty years to realise the need to plan for African urban settlement. On the direction of the Town and Country Planning Board, a
Planning Committee officially designated Naguru (in 1949), the hill to the east of Kololo (see Map 3) as allocated to African housing, while the majority of the available land on Kololo was reserved for government officials and Asian businessmen. Meanwhile, at Nakawa at a site separated from Naguru by the Kampala-Jinja highway construction of a housing estate for the African urban dwellers, had been commenced in 1948.

It should be remembered, nevertheless, that the dual organisation of the British and the Baganda, which set the early pattern for separate European and African development, was essentially a political and not a racial settlement. But having said that, it would be extremely naive to believe and completely rule out any racial segregation in urban settlement policy. Indeed racial segregation of all kinds was officially abolished, as late as 1923, which in itself proves its initial existence. And even after this official abolition, segregation between races continued to exist and be practised in other subtle ways, as for example by introducing planning zones and different housing standards for particular residential areas. Furthermore, even after accepting the relationship between the Europeans and Baganda as non-racial with respect to urban settlement policy, we certainly cannot claim the same relationship between the Europeans and the Asians, and the migrant Africans in Kampala. The Asians, as the reports discussed here have clearly shown, were undoubtedly segregated, while the African migrants had simply been completely ignored until very late in the imperial administration.

As a consequence of such policies, three distinctive categories of settlement can be clearly identified in Kampala’s early settlement patterns. At the macro-level these patterns are: (see Map 13)
1. The European settlement
2. The Asian settlement
3. The African settlement - (a) Housing Estates (b) Indigenous settlement (c) Supporter settlements

The European Settlement

The need for a higher, healthier, more spacious, less congested site, which had rapidly become apparent at the founding of Kampala on Old Kampala hill, had been satisfied by moving the British administrative headquarters to Nakasero Hill. Here there was ample room for development, a good supply of water from springs on the lower slopes of the hill, and favourable residential sites on the upper slopes.

Thus the imperial administrators laid out for themselves low density residential areas on the upper slopes of Nakasero Hill and later extended to Kololo Hill. Extensive areas were laid out on the lines of the garden suburbs of an upper class residential zone of a non-industrial English town, the only difference being in the house style and in the fact that land being free to the government, vast gardens were laid out for each premises. With their gardens, lawns, flowering shrubs and long driveways, they have been identified by some writers as "English" in concept and appearance, (Langlands, 1975), a description that, we feel, would not be stretched all across the English country. It must be admitted, though, that these residential zones did, in fact, bear some characteristics, as mentioned above, of certain residences in England, only showing an adaptation to tropical conditions in the size of the verandah and height of the ceiling.
Both Nakasero and Kololo represented planned high-class development on spacious lines. The lay-outs differed little and contrasts resulted largely from different periods of development. Characteristic of the well-wooded avenues of Nakasero are the comfortable old houses of the 30's, with large private gardens, corrugated iron roofs, spacious, cool airy rooms and verandah. In the post-war period, there developed, on Kololo Hill, blocks of flats for government officials and other houses built by commercial firms for their employees. These developments were sometimes interspersed by a few residences of the wealthy Asian business families, but the overall characteristic was that of a European residential zone.

The Asian Settlement

The 1919 Planning Scheme had restricted the Indian bazaar traders to the lower slopes of Old Kampala and Nakasero Hill, nearest to the malarial swamps. Asian settlement gradually spread from the city centre, where they lived above their premises, along Bombo Road towards the west, clustering at Kira Road, another area of very high Asian population density.

Although some wealthy Asian elite managed to penetrate the high class residential zones of Nakasero and Kololo, the central commercial zone, Old Kampala, and Kira Road were clearly identifiable as Asian residential areas. In marked contrast to most European towns where the central commercial area is generally one of low densities, this was by far, the zone of the highest population density in the town (see Map 14). Several factors encouraged this concentration of which three need particular mention. Firstly, the plots were very small, due to the original plan and subsequent division. The plots were very small, of course, in accordance with Mirams recommendations of
housing the Asians in "co-operative" residential zones. This, inevitably resulted in a large number of premises per acre. Secondly, the shops were largely Asian-owned and the upper stories had been given over to flats and tenements for the family and relations of the shopowner. Such families were often very large since the Asians are well reputed for living in close-ties with relatives. Thirdly and most importantly, however, Asians, (like all non-Africans) could not own land outside Kampala township boundaries as this was illegal in Uganda. Understandably they were also very reluctant to lease land outside the township, although they had the right to do so if they wished.

The only space they thus had for manoeuvre was what was granted to them by the imperial urban authorities, and this led to their being concentrated in those particular areas mentioned above.

It is important to stress, at this point, that this clustering in the central areas of the city was, contrary to Western Urban Economics Models, not a result of socio-economic considerations, but a sole consequence of restrictions based on race. Asians were wealthy enough to have qualified for residence in the first grade residential zones like Nakasero, but were simply not allowed the opportunity, until very late, (Chapter 8). Likewise they could have taken out land leases outside the city boundaries if they were not made to feel very unwelcome by the Baganda who controlled the periphery. Asians could have, indeed, bought land for permanent settlement, after all, most of them were Ugandan citizens, but the law forbade such actions.

To sum up this racial concentration of the Asians in Kampala we have, on the one hand, Europeans giving
themselves as much space, and trying to distance themselves from the Asians, as possible, while concentrating the latter in very densely populated commercial zones. On Makasero Hill itself, the Indian bazaar, as we mentioned earlier, was on the lower slopes of the hill near the swamp. And although European and Indian business premises mingled somewhat farther up, the best commercial sites along the Kampala Road were reserved for European commercial enterprise. Above these were the government offices and other public buildings forming a buffer zone between the Asian residences below and the spacious bungalows of the British officials on the upper slopes.

On the other hand, was the government policy prohibiting landownership by non-Africans, which was designed, as we saw, to avoid confrontation with the Baganda.

This clustering in the Asian settlement patterns continued to increase in density within the municipal boundaries until the Asians were expelled from the country in 1972.

The African Settlement

The inevitable consequence of the imperial urban settlement policy pursued in Uganda was best summed up by The Uganda Relationships Commission (1961) in its report:

"The African population has been treated for local government purposes as belonging to the district councils outside rather than to the towns. Land has been laid out mostly with non-Africans in view and the Africans have formed a largely unregulated fringe just inside or outside the town boundaries."

(see Map 13)
Thus the major factor governing the structure and growth of Kampala were the official and semi-official controls, discussed in the previous chapter, exerted over the development of the urban fabric. Together with the Mailo land system of privately owned land in the city, these factors conditioned and constrained the growth and development of Kampala to an extent that "normal" residential development, in the sense that individuals—particularly Africans—freedom to exercise their locational preferences for urban residence, was severely limited.

In this situation immigrants to the town had to depend heavily upon the already existing African population around the town. As rural-urban immigration gathered pace, more and more Africans joined their friends and relatives settling mainly in the areas extending from Mengo towards Kampala's boundary.

Population figures from the 1948 and 1959 censuses come out in support of these observations made by the Commission above by revealing that 74.3% and 68.6% of the African population in Kampala-Mengo in 1948 and 1959 respectively, were living outside the imperial capital's boundaries.*

*By 1969 at the time of the next census, the Kibuga (Mengo Municipality) had been completely incorporated into Greater Kampala and as such there were no more separate population figures for Mengo Municipality.
TABLE V - POPULATION DISTRIBUTION OF AFRICANS IN KAMPALA-MENGO (1948; 1959)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total K’ala-Mengo</th>
<th>K’ala M’ity</th>
<th>Mengo M’ity</th>
<th>% of Total in Mengo</th>
<th>Total Urban Population</th>
<th>% of Total in Mengo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>46,242</td>
<td>11,905</td>
<td>34,337</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>57,031</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>76,711</td>
<td>24,052</td>
<td>52,659</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>107,079</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


And of the 57,031 total urban population of Kampala-Mengo in 1948, 60.2% was living outside Kampala’s boundaries while by 1959, the African population living in Kampala municipality had gradually increased, dropping the total urban percentage in Mengo Municipality to 49.2%. This increase in the African urban population within Kampala Municipal boundary was, obviously, in response to the authority’s realisation of the need to accommodate Africans and plan for their settlement in the city. But even within the African urban population itself, there were major ethnic differentiations resulting in the concentration and eventual identification of particular ethnic groups in particular residential localities around the city. Broadly, the African residential settlement patterns can be divided into three main categories:

(a) The indigenous settlement
(b) The "supporter" settlements
   (defined on page 147)
(c) The "planned" settlements
   (Housing Estates)
Within each one of these settlements, specific types of housing may be also identified some of which were typical and synonymous to their respective category. It is therefore necessary that we start off our investigation into Kampala's settlement patterns with a brief analysis of the housing market, particularly, the supply side of it. This will be very useful in helping us to understand why and where housing was available and why particular locations tended to attract certain ethnic groups more than others and in the process leading to ethnic clustering in residential settlements.

A typical example of a residential locality from each of the three settlement categories, will be presented and discussed in detail, showing the proportions and relationships between different ethnic groups, resident on the settlement.

**Housing**

The distinction between the spacious residential areas, discussed in the previous chapter, which were almost entirely European and the commercial area which was predominantly Indian, was striking. Even more striking was the fact that few deliberate provisions had been made for accommodating Africans in towns until after the Second World War.

Up until this time the imperial masters held the view that:

"the town was not a suitable habitat for a permanent African society."

*(East African Royal Commission Report, 1953-55, p 200)*
The report went on to explain that towns were not intended for the African population and that the Africans were only "temporary inhabitants while they worked as unskilled labourers.

Thus the African in Kampala-Mengo was limited to the areas outside Kampala's boundaries.

In his article on the social structure of African Urban populations, Southall, (1956) established that of the 20,000 unskilled labourers employed in Kampala in firms with five or more employees, just over a tenth lived within the town's municipal boundary. Those living within the municipal boundary were, of course, mainly domestic servants, and those resident in the quarters provided by the East African Railways, the Uganda Police and the housing estates of Kampala East.

Three-fifths of the 30,000 unskilled labourers, Southall found out, lived in the belt immediately surrounding the municipality, an area which he defined as two and a half miles (4 Km) from the centre of the municipality. The rest of the unskilled group were found to live beyond the two and a half mile limit, though very few went beyond four miles (6.4 Km) from the centre.

The better paid workers, of whom the clerks made up the largest group, lived mainly further out than the two and a half mile zone, for those who normally commuted on bicycles, and from as far as twelve miles (19 Km) away on motor cycles or by car. Southall made no mention at all of any use of public transportation, and it may therefore be assumed, as indeed it is most likely, that there was no reliable means of public transportation at the time for the daily commuters.
Thus, generally speaking, the Africans who lived outside the city boundary mostly looked for accommodation as near as possible to the city centre in order to minimize the distance to place of work since most of them could not afford even a bicycle.

The imperial policy of non-integration, coupled with the rigid application of unrealistic building rules totally unsuited to the needs of the community and the economic capacity of the country, were some of the most important factors that paved the way for uncontrolled peri-urban development. A high proportion of the working population occupied the low-income areas, in cheap - often dilapidated - housing. Since neither the government nor the urban authorities were particularly concerned with housing the African, a proliferation, of very low quality dwellings erected by private landowners, and in most cases by the migrants themselves, soon followed in order to cater for the masses that were flocking to the areas just outside Kampala municipal boundary.

In order to understand fully the housing situation in Kampala-Mengo, it is necessary, first of all, to present a brief review of the theory of the operation of housing markets. These theories, probably needless to say, have been developed in industrialised Western countries, and as many such theories, may bear very little relevance to the Ugandan situation (or that of most developing countries). Nevertheless a comparative analysis with the situation in Uganda, enables us to explain and understand better how the housing market operated in Kampala-Mengo and where it failed to meet the demand and keep up with the pressures of a rapidly growing urban population.
The Operation of Housing Markets

Each society must have some mechanism for allocating housing to its population, i.e. distribution of housing to social groups and households at given locations. Housing is allocated either through the private market, on a competition basis in terms of the values people attach to housing and their ability to pay, or through the public sector, where governments, housing officials or some community group, distribute housing according to individual and collective needs (Bourne, 1981).

Bourne defines the market for housing as "a set of institutions and procedures" for bringing together housing supply and demand (buyers and sellers, renters and landlords, buildings and consumers) for purposes of exchange resources, the resources being housing services. The mechanism of allocation, as defined above, is price.

This and all similar neo-classical approaches to housing focus on equilibrium conditions, housing choices, and social harmony. In a freely operating market, it is claimed excess demand is met by a rise in prices which gradually restore equality between demand and supply. It has been observed, however, that due to its special characteristics, housing does not operate like other market goods, which makes it almost impossible for market forces alone to provide an adequate stock or indeed its fair distribution. A free market is simply unable to provide decent housing to those with low incomes, while in extreme cases even the middle-income family is increasingly finding it harder and harder to shelter themselves (Lansley, 1979; Drakakis-Smith, 1981).

Some of the imperfections which characterise housing include (Solomon, 1974):
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(a) Housing is a highly heterogeneous good, differing in age, size, amenities and location. The fact that houses are geographically fixed means that identical houses in different areas are not likely to be substitutes since the housing market is usually determined by the closeness of substitutes. It is thus possible for a situation of excess demand to exist in one area alongside another in a state of excess supply.

(b) Housing is a durable form of investment requiring a substantial outlay to create it but paying off little per year. Housing purchase involves high transaction costs and the inevitable involvement of advertising agents, survey fees, legal fees and moving costs. It generates no foreign exchange and competes for funds, and land, with industry and agriculture, and may sometimes even be inflationary.

(c) The building process of houses depends upon a long complex chain of activities, which results in an inelastic supply of housing. In a freely operating market excess demand should be met by a rise in prices which would gradually restore equality between demand and supply. Generally, this is not the case in the housing market, as will be shown in the next pages.

Housing Demand

Housing demand can be split into two parts: the demand for additional dwellings and the demand for the replacement of existing houses. The demand for dwellings
to increase the housing stock is usually in response to an increase in the number of households, caused by demographic factors such as: migration, income movements, size of family, stage in family life cycle, and employment opportunities. The demand for replacement houses, on the other hand, can be even more erratic for houses as we mentioned before, have long lives and partly because the length of life can easily be varied, by careful repairs and maintenance and structural alterations (Lansley, 1979).

Housing demand has been defined as the accommodation that people are "able" and "willing" to pay for (Needleman, 1965). Susan Charles calls it "the flow of buyers and would-be tenants who are currently searching for houses (Charles, 1977). A third definition says housing demand "is what people really want and demand socially, economically and culturally" (Abrams, 1964).

Effective housing demand relates primarily to an ability to pay for the commodities offered has simply been used as a justification for directing government housing programmes towards the middle-income groups in order to avoid rental deficits. This practice might well reduce excess demand but does not consider social need. Those not able and willing to pay for housing because of the fact that they cannot afford it are assumed, by the definition, not to be searching for any.

A much more acceptable definition of housing demand, and certainly more relevant to the Ugandan case, would be that one of Abrams who, not only, takes into account economic and social aspects, but also cultural considerations, as these will be shown to have played a major role in the demand for housing in Kampala-Mengo. Strictly speaking, "housing demand" may, here, be defined as "housing need",
which would be defined as a normative concept of a shortfall from some desired level of consumption of housing services. This definition considers needs in terms of numbers and sizes of dwellings required, needs in terms of living habits and housing preferences, and indeed needs in terms of the socio-economic status and rent paying ability of the population.

In general, needs are expressed objectively by reference to standards, as indeed was done in Kampala-Mengo, as will be discussed later on. Estimates can also be expressed subjectively in terms of the needs felt by the users. But in the prevailing economic conditions in Uganda, the only subjectivity that counted was that of purchasing power, and this was not subjectivity at all, but rather the dictatorship of market laws.

Those without the good fortune to belong to the classes of the population who have purchasing power, cannot, therefore, rely on market laws in their demand for housing.

Housing Supply

Housing supply is the flow of houses whose owners are currently looking for buyers or tenants (Charles, 1977). Once a house is bought or let, it ceases to be part of supply, but remains part of the stock. Supply consists of houses being resold principally by owner-occupier and newly built or converted houses being sold by building developers. Ability to buy or rent creates two separate, though not independent markets within housing.

(i) The rented market, where demand arises from households who opt to purchase their housing services by renting houses. Supply in this market is through both public and private
The house purchase market, where demand arises from households wishing to purchase their own house for owner-occupation and landlords, both public and private, wishing to buy housing in order to enter the rented market. Supply in this market is through the building industry and secondhand dwellings.

The supply of housing in Kampala-Mengo and its effect on the patterns of residential settlement will be discussed in detail at a later stage. Before that we need to introduce another part of the housing market which is of great relevance to our study of Kampala-Mengo.

**Housing Finance**

As was stated before, housing is a very expensive asset and as such, money is usually borrowed in order to purchase it. Therefore, apart from the rented and purchase markets, housing has a third market for the finance of house purchase - or in the case of Uganda, the finance of house construction as well, since the majority of the population construct their own houses.

In the developed countries where a mortgage system exists, the house is built first and paid for in instalments out of earnings. The four main financing agencies for private houses are: building societies, local authorities, insurance companies and banks.

The key to housing finance, according to Stafford (1978), is savings. Building societies, he states, can only lend out what they receive in the form of savings. The main task facing building societies, therefore, is to attract investors and retain sufficient savings to be able
to grant mortgages. And to be able to get a loan from a bank or insurance company, the borrower, normally, has to have some kind of collateral to secure the loan. At this point, it is probably best to point out, before we go on with this discussion, that to the present day, there is only one building society in Uganda whose resources are very limited and, hence, whose contribution to the housing financing market is very small. The reasons for the inadequacy of the building societies in Uganda may be found in the reluctance of many people to deposit their money in the banks or building societies (simply because they feel they can look after their own money), but a still better explanation is the sheer incapability of the majority to save any money at all.

The United Nations Department of Economics and Social Affairs (ST/ESA/50) made the following useful classification showing the wide range of income groups in developing countries.

I. **High-income**: the minority at the top of the income pyramid who require no assistance in the purchase or rental of housing.

II. **Middle income**: the somewhat larger group, still in the minority, however, who require some form of assistance, such as easier mortgage loans, reasonable interest rates and help in land acquisition but need no subsidies if this assistance is given.

This group has some ability to pay and some knowledge of the ways in which housing finance works. Indirect forms of government assistance to the group might include the promotion and development of savings and loan systems and co-operatives and the provision of incentives to encourage families to participate and save in these systems.
III. Low-income: households employed on a more or less regular basis but at low levels of income. These households require substantial assistance, although not necessarily in the form of deep subsidies per family.

IV. Very low-income: the majority of households in the poorer developing countries. They include slum and squatter residents. With heads of household unemployed or underemployed, such families usually hardly manage to live. Families in this category, to the extent that they are given housing at all, normally require substantial government subsidies. Assistance might also take the form of technical advice for self-help housing built on land serviced by only the most basic utilities.

The above categorisation shows that the majority of the urban populations in developing countries need substantial assistance to be able to shelter themselves. It also demonstrates that the majority of the population in poor developing countries just have no "extra" to put aside in banks or building societies.

The poor housing finance, or indeed the absence of mortgage systems is, thus, a direct reflection of the saving powers of the majority of the people in Uganda. Some could not save because they were outside the monetary economy, (subsistence farmers, for example), some because of the distrust in the banking system, but the great urban majority could not save simply because they barely had the means to subsist.

It is not, however, the ability to save that mattered most to potential house-buyers or builders, although it
affected their chances of securing mortgages or loans. It was rather, the capability of one to construct 80% of his dwelling (through whatever means available to him) before a loan could be approved by the building society. Similarly, one had to have some other tenable property in order to secure a loan from a bank or insurance company, all of which further excluded the majority of the urban population from active involvement in the housing market.

The greater part of the urban population was, under such circumstances, totally dependent on the provision of housing by those who could afford to construct it, both in the private and public sectors.

Housing Provision

Although the provision of houses can be broadly divided into the public and private sectors, in practice they are inter-related in a number of ways (Merrett, 1977). For instance, the construction of houses in both sectors utilises the same contractors and the private sector depends upon the public sector for its roads, services, refuse collection and often its maintenance. An increase in public sector rents, for example, would increase the demand for owner-occupied and private houses to rent, while an increase in supply of public dwellings might reduce demand in the private sector. Related to this aspect was the over-subsidized government housing for top civil servants, whose effect on the rest of the housing market in Kampala-Mengo will be discussed later.

In developed countries, the fundamental difference between the public and private sector, Merrett observes, is that the builder or developer is a businessman, whose main aim is to make a profit by selling to individual purchasers in a free market. It is very important that he knows what
type of houses sell best. The public housing sector, on the other hand normally provides cheaper housing which, in many cases, requires heavy government subsidies.

The Ugandan situation, as we have seen, slightly differs, particularly as far as the provision of housing, in the private sector, is concerned. We have already described the state of affairs in the low-income residential areas where most of the development and construction of housing was undertaken by the migrant-tenants themselves. They were the builders (normally with the assistance of friends and neighbours), the owners, and the landlords (if they had room for rented accommodation).

Higher up the economic ladder, most of the middle-income housing was constructed by local labourers and craftsmen while very few families in the highest-income category, hired building contractors to construct their house.

Generally, the construction of a house was a long lasting endeavour approached, in most cases, on a piecemeal basis, as resources permitted. We have got the experience of seeing houses built up to the roofing stage and collapsing from there after years of aggressive weather acting on the bare concrete blocks, for the owner just could not find the finances to complete his house.

However, whether constructed by owner or building contractor, housing in the private sector had, almost always, one thing in common. It was always constructed for a particular person, either the owner, or prospective tenant. The role of builder or developer as entrepreneur was, more or less, non-existent. the reasons for this, we may recall, were to be found in the reluctance, or unwillingness, of mailo landowners to sell their land. Even on Crown land within the boundaries of Kampala
municipality the practice of constructing houses for purchase was impeded by lack of buyers since most of those who could afford it were being housed by the government or other employer, anyway, in heavily subsidized housing.

Put together, all these factors point out the major role played by the individual in providing his own accommodation, while developers and building contractors were left with no real motivation to undertake massive housing construction. The result was, inevitably, an insufficient housing stock.

Against this background, we may now go on to examine the concrete roles played by both the public and private sectors in the provision of urban housing in Kampala-Mengo.

The Public Sector

Provision of urban housing by the public sector may be further divided between several main groups which in Kampala, included the Government, Parastatal Bodies, and the Municipal Authority.

The role played by the public sector in the provision of housing before independence, has been discussed at length and may be summed up as satisfactory for the European population, fair for the Asians and minimal for the Africans.

Although the construction of housing for the African urban population had been started in 1948 at Nakawa in Kampala East, real concern for low-income urban housing was first expressed in the 1947 Development Plan for Uganda (Worthington, 1947).
In an effort to cut down on housing costs, houses were built also with cheaper materials as stabilized earth, mud and wattle, hollow tile, etc., to produce a house that could be rented to low-income families. Still, the cost of roofing materials and doors and windows helped to keep much of this housing above the reach of the urban poor. This led the housing department to revise and modify its designs and standards and in 1955 a procedure, permitting less substantial houses in selected parts of towns, was adopted (Uganda, 1959).

Three grades of rules were identified:

**Grade I** - The normal standard of urban building with long lasting materials and all the necessary utilities.

**Grade II** - Small houses (no larger than 93m$^2$) with mud walls but a durable, non-inflammable roof. Pit latrine and probably water from standpipe.

**Grade III** - Temporary erection of still simpler houses with thatch roofs. No minimum size specified.

The Town Planner would prepare layout plans and the Director of African Housing would either undertake direct control of the different schemes or assist with advice, and on occasion, finance initial services.

The obvious and inevitable consequence of the grading policy was the creation - or continuation - or residential categories with quiet salubrious areas such as Kololo and Nakasero (the Grade I areas on one end, and a bustling urban community such as Katwe (the Grade III area) at the other end of the city.
A survey into housing in 1957 by the African Housing Department revealed that in Kampala-Mengo:

(a) one African in three lived in African built and owned housing on the fringe of Kampala, mostly mud huts with thatch or metal roofs, sited haphazardly mainly in slum areas,

(b) one in three lived in housing provided, usually free of rent by employers and varying greatly in quality, from neat police quarters, to old neglected labour lines,

(c) one in five lived some distance from the city centre in rural surroundings,

(d) only one in ten was housed in estates built and run by government as a social service.

After independence, however, as one would expect, the housing situation did change in that Africans (and Asians) were then able to move into the Grade I housing which had, hitherto, been mainly constructed for European occupation. But apart from the construction of a few more housing units in the years that followed, that was just about the only major change that took place. With the terms "European Quarters", "Asian Quarters", and "African Quarters" having been changed to "Senior Quarters", "Junior Quarters" and "Housing Estates", respectively, the pre-independence racial character immediately emerged into one of class (economic status) segregation.

Understandably too, more emphasis continued to be laid on the construction and provision of heavily subsidized housing for the middle and high income groups, whose services were desperately required. It must not be forgotten either, that it is these very income groups, who could afford the rents charged (albeit they were considerably subsidized anyway), in contrast to the low-income earners most of whom found it very difficult to
pay the rents for their supposedly "low-income" housing units, provided by the public sector.

But even then, not every high or middle-income civil servant, would be guaranteed government accommodation. The government-owned houses were allocated to officers who fulfilled certain criteria. Firstly, applicants were classified not on the basis of actual need, but on the basis of whether they were entitled or eligible (Nkutu, 1968). While all expatriates recruited by the Government were entitled to housing, Ugandans were only eligible and that, on condition that they were in, or above, a certain salary scale, and scored a sufficient number of points, depending on marital status and number of children. Priority, in allocation of government housing, was therefore, given to the expatriates, (which was fair enough) while little effort was made by the government to increase (probably with the help of the private sector) the public housing stock.

Of the parastatal bodies, the Uganda Electricity Board had, by 1966, abandoned building houses even for its staff, the richer Lint and Coffee Marketing Boards were still providing their top employees with heavily subsidized housing, though hardly constructing any new units, and the Uganda Development Corporation was mainly involved in building high cost housing intended for either wealthy foreigners and commercial enterprises, or for executives of the Corporation and its subsidiaries (Machyo, 1968).
Meanwhile, the National Housing Corporation* had been created in 1964 and charged, as the government's main housing agency, with the responsibility of construction low, middle and high income housing units for sale and rent in all important urban areas of the country. By 1984, the corporation could claim success only to a total of 2930 housing units all over the country.

Of these, Kampala's share was:

- 94 Low-income housing units
- 1697 Middle-income housing units
- 534 High-income housing units

**TOTAL:** 2325

(Source: NH & CC records, 1985)

85% of this total was "pool housing". That is, used by civil servants and parastatal bodies' employees, with only 15% of the stock rented to the general public.

The government's attitude and effort towards the provision of urban housing may be summed up by quoting the Third Five Year Development Plan 1971-76 which, while estimating 3,000-4,000 new units every year for the high- and middle-income groups, simply stated that "...the lowest income groups will continue to be housed predominantly in owner-built and rented quarters in those urban and peri-urban areas where rigid building regulations do not apply, or apply only nominally".

* The National Housing Corporation was renamed in 1974 to the National Housing and Construction Corporation.
Nor were the planned middle- and high-income market units realised. In fact, according to a senior employee of the NH & CC, all construction of any kind almost came to a total halt in 1975, and has never really taken off again as of 1987.

The Private Sector

With public housing accounting for only 15% of the housing stock and 85% being provided through private initiative, it was also observed, in the Third Five Year Development Plan 1971-76, that some of the private housing construction had been undertaken by private enterprises for the housing of their staff, but the bulk represented self-help efforts by middle and upper-income people, mostly in the peri-urban areas, where sites and building costs were much lower than in the city centre. It was also noted that while most of this housing had been constructed for owner-occupation, there were a considerable number of house-owners who preferred to reside in government or company subsidized housing, while renting out their own houses for additional income, a practice which is not uncommon in many developing countries.

And yet it must be noted, too, that this was mostly Grade I housing which very few Africans could afford to rent and was, thus, let out mostly to Europeans and Asians. This was later confirmed in the report made by the Ministry of Housing that most Africans who, "hire accommodation in the private sector will mainly be found in what are described as Grade II housing areas, which are not only overcrowded, but with very high rents as well".
It will be discovered, later on, when we discuss in detail a typical settlement of Grade II housing, that this housing was, in fact, more expensive than it had been intended to be when the different zoning regulations were laid out. As a result, it was, in most cases, also rented out to civil servants with not-so-low-incomes. It is, therefore, incorrect to state, as the Ministry of Housing did above, that most Africans who hired accommodation in the private sector did so in the Grade II housing areas.

As for the provision of true low-income housing in Kampala, Nkutu (the then Minister for Urban Development) stated:

"Since before independence non-Ugandan private developers have shelved their building plans due to imagined insecurity under African Government. Even today, when there is a "building boom" the private developers seem to be more interested in shops and offices than in housing. Nor does he really intend to build for the African......The private African landlord who builds a high cost house around Kampala is not keen to let it to an African from fear that the property would not be cared for properly. So they look for a foreigner. The small African landlord builds rows of rooms on the periphery of the town, mainly in the slum or quasi-slum areas, but the volume of output is far less than would meet the demand."

(Nkutu, 1968 p7)
Apart from the "imagined insecurity" under an African government* there is a better explanation as to why private investors were reluctant to construct housing for low-income dwellers - African investor included. From the perspective of real estate investors and developers, the rent-paying ability of poor families simply does not promise a rate of return sufficient to justify large expenditures on upkeep and services, not to mention major renovations and improvements. Rent defaults and other debilitating social factors compound the economic uncertainties and offer no incentive to attract investors. The only alternative left for the low-income family, therefore, is settlement in deteriorated and overcrowded dwellings. Such localities could be identified almost all along the initial boundary between Kampala and Mengo.

SUMMARY

Our discussion on housing in Kampala-Mengo has revealed several "irregularities" in comparison to Western theories of the "normal" operation of housing markets. While there is clear evidence that we cannot talk of a housing market in Kampala-Mengo the same way it is supposed to operate in Western industrialized cities, i.e. through the normal market equilibrium forces, it is less clear whether there is, indeed, one single housing market to which there is access available to everybody.

* Incidentally, when the Asians were expelled from Uganda in 1972, (and these were the major private investors) all their property was confiscated and allocated to Africans without any compensation to the previous owners. - Their "imagined" fears had turned out to be a real nightmare.
These are questions to which satisfactory explanations are yet to be found for there, still, is a lot of conflicting evidence and ideas on these matters. There are those who argue that low-income housing cannot be provided by market processes in developing countries (e.g. Drakakis-Smith, 1981) simply because the urban poor cannot compete in the housing market. Similarly, Lansley (1980) believes that the distribution of market-expressed preferences depends upon the existing distribution of income. He argues that a free market would be unable to provide housing of a socially acceptable level to those with low incomes because they have insufficient voting power in the market.

Muench (1978), on the other hand, bitterly disputes such assertions and wonders who actually defines "better housing" (probably represented by the phrase "socially acceptable" in Lansley's case), since he believes that "people choose the housing they have, however bad it is" (Muench 1978, p141).

Muench came to the conclusion that there existed a housing market within the low-income group when presenting the results of his survey on housing in Kampala. It was stated:

"Perhaps the most important observation to be made from the summary results is that there is indeed a low-income housing market, with a full three-quarters of the population in the survey area paying market rents.....there is a widespread disbelief among developmentalists, even those concerned with housing economics, that low-income housing can be provided by market processes in developing countries."

(Muench, 1978 p140)

Muench's conclusion is unconvincing for several reasons.
Firstly, the survey area from which the results were drawn included many settlements of the Grade II housing category (e.g. places like Kiswa, Kitali, Naguru, etc.) These so-called low-income housing areas, as we have already warned, are not really occupied by the lowest income households, as will be seen later on in this Chapter. The result obtained from such a biased sample, where emphasis was particularly laid on Grade II housing areas, cannot reflect the true situation of the operation of the housing market in the lowest income groups. Muench’s shortcoming is that he failed (or conveniently neglected) to recognize the existence of yet another lower income group resident in Grade III areas (slums and squatters), the group of urban dwellers that Drakakis-Smith and Lansley believe cannot afford market rents.

Other experts in the field insist, however, that lack of economic power alone does not lead to market failure. The argument, here, is that the market always regulates itself to the needs, demands and capabilities of the consumers, at the time. This discussion is, certainly, beyond the scope of our study and we feel it is best left to those in a better position to give more credible explanations.

We may, however, point out the main factors that so markedly affected the operation of the housing market in Kampala-Mengo.

1. The imperial policy on housing for the Africans which was segregative and slow in reacting to the housing demands of the migrant African population.
2. The rigid and unsensible mailo land policy which discouraged a more reliable and steady supply of housing.
3. Excessive subsidies offered in government and company housing particularly for the middle- and high-income earners which had the consequence of discouraging those with such privileges from constructing their own houses. This, in turn, had a slackening effect on the building contractors, resulting in the overall shortage of housing.

4. The general economic situation of the country with more than 80% of the urban population unable to finance or secure loans for suitable housing.

These factors, together with a few other not so obvious limitations (e.g. the fear of foreign investors to lose their property should things go wrong, or the socio-cultural conflicts between the African ethnic groups themselves) led to a situation where people’s choices when searching for housing were, in the majority of cases very different from the attributes that households consider in Western cities when they are looking for accommodation. Aspects such as quality of housing, size of housing unit, condition of dwelling, quality or environment and accessibility are of utmost importance and constitute a vital characteristic of the housing market. These considerations determine house prices and, as such, play a major role in the choices people make, in developed countries, when looking for accommodation.

It is common knowledge, on the other hand, that the only "choice" that low income families have when searching for urban accommodation is accessibility. The nearer to the city centre (or place of work) the better, for they cannot afford to spend much on transport. Yet "accessibility", when closely looked at, is a consideration that is already tied to existing low-income settlement areas. While a
higher income family can choose between a location ten kilometres from the city centre, or another one, fifty kilometres away, the only choice the low income earner has, as far as accessibility is concerned, is between slum A or squatter settlement B. We are going to establish in our study that, indeed, even accessibility is of secondary importance to the urban low-income dweller, particularly the migrant. It will be shown that people's choices of residential location in Kampala-Mengo were primarily based on and determined by, the existence of ethnic or tribal relations in a particular locality, other than considerations of nearness to place of work, or even rent.

Summing up our discussion on the house supply for the Africans in Kampala, we may identify four major types of housing provision each pertaining to one of our categories of settlement patterns listed before.

I. **Private Housing in the Indigenous Settlement**
This was mainly owner-occupied housing in and around the original settlement at Mengo. All this housing was constructed on individual private initiative and normally occupied a tiny fraction of the vast mailo land, where they were located. The majority of the population in this settlement was made up of indigenous (host) Baganda.

II. **Private Housing (rented and owner-occupied) in Supporter Settlements**
This was housing constructed for the consumption of the lowest-income urban dwellers migrating from rural areas to the city. Most of the residents in these settlement were tenants as most of the landlords were wealthy indigenous Baganda living somewhere in the vicinity in more spacious and better housing. There were characteristic ethnic
clusters identifiable to, and within, particular supporter settlements. Kisenyi will be discussed in detail as a typical example of this settlement.

III. Public Housing (rented and sometimes heavily subsidised) in Housing Estates - Planned Settlements

We have established that most of the housing provided by the government was the so-called "Pool-housing", heavily subsidized and available only to the top civil servants and executives of parastatal bodies. Since most of this housing was occupied by Europeans and Asians (even long after independence) we shall be more interested, within this group, with the rented lower-income housing units in the housing estates. These were the settlements of migrant groups in skilled and unskilled employment, with a more steady income than that one of those in the Supporter Settlements. The location of these settlements, as part of a zoning policy, in the process of city growth, resulted in the concentration of certain ethnic groups in these areas, who formed the strongest challenge (population wise) to the dominance of the Baganda tribal group, on the other side of the city. Here Naguru and Nakawa form the focus of our investigation into residential ethnic clustering.

IV. Free Employer-Provided Housing in Housing Estates (and Labour Lines, Servants’ Quarters, etc.)

Although this category (similar to the one above) includes some housing constructed by private companies for the consumption of their top executives, we shall concentrate, rather, on the Housing Estates where housing was provided by
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employers "free of charge" for their middle and "low income" employees.

Despite the fact that Nsambya also belongs to the category of Planned Settlements (Housing Estates) it will provide a very useful example of residential ethnic segregation as a consequence of ethnically biased employment policy, coupled with the process of chain migration.

THE INDIGENOUS SETTLEMENT

We have already explained why this study categorises Kampala as an imperial city. This classification is closely related to the fact that the new town was sited on land occupied by a particular indigenous tribal group, the Baganda, and as such the European imperialists were not free to use the surrounding land as they chose. This situation was not, however, unique as Dar es Salaam was similarly sited on Zaramo land, and many other examples could be quoted from across the continent, particularly from West Africa. In contrast, Nairobi was sited on unoccupied land, though land claimed by the Kikuyu tribe.

While the indigenous settlement was, strictly speaking Mengo Hill and its immediate surrounding related settlements, our discussion of the indigenous peoples includes the Baganda tribal group as a whole. For the advantages enjoyed in the urban environment were not limited only to the "real" indigenes (landowning families) who were, obviously in a class of their own, at least initially, but the fact that one was a Muganda, certainly, made life in town much easier for him than most other migrants, as this study explains.

Other authors have described such "indigenous" tribes in other conceptual terms depending on the nature of their
studies. For Mazrui (1978) it was satisfactory to call the Baganda the "heartland tribe", defining the term as "a community located relatively near the capital city, large numerically, politically active and historically important".

The history, size and political importance of Buganda has been already discussed in detail in the first chapter. This chapter goes a little further and presents the most important socio-economic factors that prevailed in the indigenous settlement at Mengo and as a result of which the Baganda, as a tribal group, enjoyed special status in the city as a whole.

Hanna and Hanna (1971), on the other hand went further than Mazrui and completed the dichotomy by identifying indigenes and strangers in some African cities. The indigenes were described, normally, as the "Africans in or coming from surrounding areas of the city", with the strangers were defined as "those who migrated to the city from more distant areas".

While indigenes suitably describes the original local tribes, we find the word stranger an improper and almost offensive descriptive term of the Africans that subsequently moved to the towns. "Stranger", in our opinion, has the connotation of "unknown" or "new" and this is where the term appears to lay emphasis. And this is, also, precisely why this term is inaccurate since newcomers to the town, who may be known (to some people) or unknown do not always stay new and unknown. In other words, the state that someone, who moves to a city from a distant area, is a "stranger", is only temporary as he normally quickly acquires friends and new relationships and gets assimilated in the urban way of life. He, however, will, almost always, remain a migrant to the
city, someone who moved from another distant region to settle - permanently or temporarily - in the city.

Parkin's (1969a) classification between Hosts and Migrants in Kampala, therefore, offers a more suitable distinction between the Baganda at Mengo and all the other migrants who settled in Kampala-Mengo.

The Baganda are, here, called the hosts in Kampala not because they specifically invited others to come to the town, but because it was their customs and institutions which dominated the African population of the city. The hosts figuratively owned Kampala-Mengo, while the migrants moved into it. While this distinction lays emphasis on cultural superiority of the Baganda, it is also invariably flavoured with historical, political and economic overtones. The discussion that follows gives an insight into the most important of these factors, that characterised the indigenous peoples at Mengo - the Baganda.

The Indigenous Society

As a kingdom ruled by the Kabaka, Buganda stratification also featured a strong hierarchy that provided for more mobility among its leaders, than did most of her contemporary societies (for example the Hausa in Nigeria). The reason for this unrigid structure may be found in the fact that the population of the kingdom had been almost totally homogeneous. This fact has been stressed in explaining Buganda's political success and dominance over her neighbouring kingdoms of which Bunyoro was the most powerful and most significant. Bitter rivalry between the ruling class in the Kingdom of Ankole, for example, which was a caste of its own, and the rest of the "commoners", considerably weakened the military capabilities of the
Kingdom (Mair, 1977).

Politically, the structure was, as we have mentioned, in the main one of an army containing a numerous class of organisers and commanders whose business was leadership in times of war and who enjoyed a political, social and economic status markedly above the common. These positions of leadership, were not hereditary and the Kabaka could choose or dismiss any chief any time, if he saw fit (Fallers, 1964).

Their social and political organisation apart, the primary reason, or at any rate the essential precondition, of the degree of economic success achieved by the Baganda was that they lived in an environment which was exceptionally favourable. The rainfall is fairly high - in Mengo its annual mean ranges from 1100 mm to 1400 mm - and, what is much more important, it is extremely reliable and well distributed through the year. Agriculture was thus a much more rewarding process than in most other parts of East Africa. It was, indeed, a fundamentally different kind of agriculture that was practised here. The main source of food was not an annual, soil-exhausting crop of maize or millet but a banana plant (Matooke) which, once mature, yielded fruit all the year round and went on yielding it from year to year (Gresford, 1926).

The consequences of this secure and stable form of agriculture were the unusual permanence of Baganda settlements and the possibility for them to achieve high standards of living, by devoting a large part of their resources to other activities. Although they devised no fundamentally new techniques or forms of production, they were more fully and more elegantly clad (in bark-cloth or antelope skins) than any of their neighbours; they lived in larger, better-built and cleaner houses (Wrigley, 1964).
Buganda is also known to have traded with Zanzibar—in slaves, ivory and hides—long before the arrival of the British colonisers. But although trade with Zanzibar did not alter the nature of Buganda’s economy (which still remained subsistence agriculture low-level manufacturing) it did introduce important changes in the technique of production, which gave rise to new forms of specialization and consequently to profound alterations in the structure of society (Powesland, 1954). Thus there arose in Buganda a class of highly skilled professional craftsmen. By the 1880s the Kabaka and the great chiefs had in their service carpenters who could make doors and bedsteads on the Arab patterns, potters who could imitate the cups and water-jugs of Zanzibar, and smiths capable of repairing guns. As such skills were very scarce, their owners attained high standing and a considerable measure of political influence in society.

A more dramatic change in the economy of Buganda was to come with the introduction of the cotton and tobacco as cash crops for export. In the first two decades of colonial rule, commodity production for export, encouraged by state taxation (in order to get the Africans involved in the global economy) was limited to the South of Uganda and particularly concentrated in Buganda. The north and other parts of the country were thus turned into "labour-supply areas", to use Amin’s terminology (Amin, 1976), in order to encourage migration to the city where they would have to pay taxes. Another reason for the deliberate creation of labour reserves was the fact that there was a genuine need for extra labour in the newly acquired mode of production. Buganda’s advantage over the other areas was that it already offered a mode of production that enhanced prospects for a transition to capitalist production (Mandami, 1977).
A report made by one colonial official mentioned that "a considerably number of people from Toro, Bunyoro and Ankole find their way down to Entebbe and Kampala in search of work and they would of course, relieve the strain upon the people of Buganda" (Powesland, 1973 p 20). Thus saw the beginnings of labour migration to Buganda and into the royal capital at Mengo. Initially finding their way into Buganda as a means of escape from feud, famine and oppression (by overzealous Belgian colonisers the Banyaruanda and Barundi (from Ruanda and Burundi respectively) also soon discovered the high standards of living that they could acquire from living with the Baganda. The trickle of immigrants turned into a flow, and soon the Banyarunda became the bulk of the agricultural labourers in Buganda.

These subsequent colonial economic transformations only served to strengthen the position of Mengo which, as we have seen, was a unique urban development in the country, essentially the product of political centralisation, transcending a customarily dispersed settlement pattern.

This unique position of the indigenous settlement of the Baganda prompted Parkin to make the statement:

".....there is a hierarchy of some Kampala localities according to residential status. Strictly speaking there are two of them, one of the Baganda and people who associate with them, and another for the non-Baganda migrants. The Baganda one is not well defined physically but operates outside the city for the most part. The non-Baganda being in suburbs [at the city boundaries] and continuing with Kampala East."

(Parkin, 1969 p5)
Parkin would, however, appear to have slightly over-expressed the dichotomy here, especially so since he admits, himself, that the Baganda area was not clearly defined, physically. The use of the phrases "the Baganda and people who associate with them" as against the "non-Baganda migrants" may also be confusing at this stage since "people who associate with the Baganda" can be understood to be (and are) "non-Baganda" anyway.

Nor is Parkin necessarily wrong in his observations. Issues of urban ethnicity in Africa are very complex and need to be approached with a comprehensive knowledge of all the factors at hand. It is, therefore, necessary that we examine the relationship between the indigenes and migrants in Menge.

**Indigenes versus Migrants**

The superior status of Buganda, over the rest of the country, at the time of colonisation, rendered them the obvious media for the expansion of British imperialism over the whole region. The Baganda, as we saw in Chapter two, became the collaborators with the colonial powers and in return they were tremendously privileged during the colonial period with considerable autonomy under their King. As the agents of indirect rule and the group with the greatest exposure to Europeans, the Baganda had had greater opportunities for formal education than the other peoples of Uganda. Between 1922 and 1953 over 50% of the students entering Makerere College, Uganda’s most advanced educational institution, were Baganda, and they, as a result, held three-quarters of the top civil service jobs available to Africans at the time (Young, 1966).

The status of the Baganda, therefore, resulted in an
ethnic division of labour in Uganda, or to put it more correctly, an ethnic occupational bias towards the Baganda, since they performed the more prestigious functions of the coloured polity (e.g. providing most of the administrators for British rule assigned to different parts of the country). The region became the best educated, the best developed economically, the best integrated through a network of communications, and the most influential. As Kampala evolved into the capital city, Buganda developed into the capital region with Mengo, its indigenous town, as the administrative headquarters of the region.

Thus, the fact that Buganda was the heartland area and had most contact with Europeans, the preferential treatment accorded the Baganda within the colonial education system, the disproportionate access to government jobs that followed their higher level of education, the desire of the Baganda for modernizing norms and the emergence of commercial activity in Buganda, all contributed to a structural imbalance that manifests itself politically as Buganda versus The Others. Just as the Baganda developed a sense of being apart from the rest, so did Uganda’s other peoples, particularly the northern tribal groups, come to resent the Baganda.

The Baganda, naturally regarded their own status as being somewhat higher than that of all other Africans who migrated into their territory. Occupation of land within the boundaries of Kampala Municipality was, for very long, frowned upon by the Baganda and was left, almost entirely, to immigrants. Those Baganda who worked in Kampala commonly commuted to their places of work from their individual plots in Mengo or any other suburbs in the municipality.
The Baganda did, nevertheless, recognize a closer affinity with the other Bantu groups (particularly the Batoro, Banyoro, Banyankole, Bahaya and Banyaruanda) than with any of the rest. These are the tribes that were listed under the Interlacustrine Bantu ethnic group. They had similar languages and customs and would pick up Luganda with comparative ease*. The Bantu migrants felt it relatively easy at the interpersonal level to graft themselves on to Baganda society while in Kampala. It was also advantageous, in most instances, as it helped one secure his position in the city, just as it was prestigious to identify oneself with the Baganda society. The Bantu migrants thus lived, on the whole, where the Baganda lived, and were, like the Baganda, less numerous in the government housing estates that developed in the late forties and through the 50s. The majority of them, however, had no kinship lines (or permanent interest) to enable them to be assimilated anywhere else but at the bottom of the Baganda system. They settled in various localities in Mengo Municipality, but would always be distinguished from the Baganda by their lower standard of living in dress and food and their lower education and inferior occupations.

The non-Bantu groups, on the other hand, understandably resented the superior attitude of the Bantu displayed towards them, especially by the Baganda. And while some Bantu groups could pass as Baganda, when the occasion was convenient, the physical appearance of the Nilotic Luo, Acholi, Lango and Alur, or that of the Nilo-Hamitic Teso,

* Comparisons may be drawn here between European languages, in that French may be said to be similar to Italian, or Czech to Russian, as languages of the same linguistic group, i.e. Latin and Slavic, respectively.
or that of the Sudanic Madi and Lugbara, was so different, that they could never deny their non-Baganda background. This conflict of attitudes of ethnic differences was, inevitably, manifest in the spatial differentiation in residential settlement patterns, resulting in ethnic clusters in different localities of the city. Politically, the relationship between the non-Bantu and the Baganda was, simply put, very antagonistic and potentially explosive. In fact it did explode soon after Uganda achieved independence, but this is a subject beyond the scope of our study here. This information, however, gives a hint as to how much a role ethnicity played in Uganda’s history and the urban development process.

Although specific national interests could be acute at times, and job competition would even induce hostility between them, in other respects there was a strong affinity in language, culture and general social framework between the Nilotic Luo of Kenya and their closest ethnic relatives, the Nilotic Acholi, Lango and Alur of northern Uganda, as was discussed earlier on. These exhibited similar cultural and linguistic characteristics, like the Bantu did between their tribal groups. Coming from societies which did not have kings or recognisable rulers, were barely educated and lagged behind in terms of economic and cultural development, the northern ethnic groups felt as uneasy as the Kenyan Luo, Baluhya and Kikuyu about being "foreigners" in Kampala. The Acholi, Lango, Alur, Luo, Nubi, Basamia, Baluhya and Kikuyu, consequently found themselves concentrated in the housing estates of Kampala East, the Police Barracks at Nsambya and Naguru, the East African Railways and Harbours housing estate at Nsambya, the Army barracks at Mbuya, and in unplanned settlements along the railway line to Port-Bell and on the northern slopes of Kibuli Hill.
Kenyan immigrants were particularly numerous along the railway line from Kampala to Port Bell as this was the side of Kampala they reached first after crossing the Lake from Kenya. Here, slum-like areas grew up and a ribbon of African petty shops, bars, tea houses, hovels and renting rooms run on towards the port on Lake Victoria (Hutton, 1965). Temporary occupation of crown land suited them better than Mailo land in Mengo where they felt they were unwelcome, and few of them were sufficiently committed to Kampala-Mengo, anyway, to make them willing to involve themselves in the machinations of Baganda society. A Luo migrant in Kampala was once quoted by Jellicoe in one of her writings and the quoted statement has been re-quoted over and over again by several other authors on the subject of migrants in Kampala. The Luo was quoted as saying:

"Urban life does not draw relatives apart, it draws them together. In our country brothers quarrel over land and property; but in the towns there is none to quarrel over and they come to each other for protection."

(Marguerite Jellicoe, 1968 p 7 - Quoted by Little, 1974)

As far as a Luo migrant in Kampala is concerned, he could not have made a more accurate statement. Our worry is, nevertheless, that this claim might have been misinterpreted by some authors who seem to quote it in order to demonstrate urban unity among urban dwellers in African cities. This statement is valid if, and only when, it is viewed in the context of a migrant to a city, who has no real or potential claim to any piece of urban land. For while most disputes in Kampala were not over boundaries (as these were validated by the Mailo land system and the 1927 Law), quarrels over inheritance were commonplace among prospective candidates. Squabbles over land-ownership can, and we know them to have, drawn
relatives apart, contrary to what the Luo quotation above may suggest to some people. In line with our theory of ethnic clustering in urban residential areas, immigrants long settled in a town become the centre for in-coming fellow tribesmen or countrymen, the relationship that the Luo quotation above was intended to describe.

The attitude of the Baganda to the immigrants was one of toleration supported by a clear recognition that in the job market, they would work for less and take on menial tasks shunned by the Baganda. As Mair (1965) revealed in her study of the Baganda, most of the traditional occupations of the men (such as bark-cloth making) had fallen into disuse, and instead men were now "earners of money" to provide the household with clothes and the new "necessities of life" which European contact had created. Cotton, and later coffee, had become the major occupation. One would hardly find a home in Mengo which did not have at least one coffee tree in the back or front garden. These gardens were, however, generally large and required hired labour. Wage-labour, drawn almost entirely from alien tribes, had thus become a normal feature of Baganda life. The worker, dependent on a wage income had, therefore, become a necessity, though alien to the precolonial, precapitalist economy of Buganda. In accepting this new condition, the Baganda had apparently transformed their historical superiority into the idea that skilled labour was the sphere of the Baganda and unskilled work that of other tribes. To this effect Elkan made the following observation:

"The Kampala labour force consists, broadly, of two distinct strata: of Ganda (Baganda) and of immigrants. Ganda hold most of the better paid jobs although they figure also amongst the unskilled, whilst the immigrants are mostly, but not all, unskilled."

(Elkan, 1960 p 103)
Imprecise as it is, this observation presents the occupational situation in Kampala at the time, as best as it prevailed. Our study of the housing estates of Kampala East will, indeed, reveal a considerable number of unskilled Baganda residing in the area.

While the wealthy land-owning indigenes lived on their extensive estates in high grade African dwellings in Mengo and its surroundings, the majority of Baganda migrants lived in the immediate surroundings of Kampala within Mengo Municipality on plots that were progressively being subdivided, up to a point where they were at times less than 1000 sq. metres.

The better paid Baganda workers, of whom the clerks made up the largest group, lived mainly further out, sometimes up to 20 kilometres from the city centre, where they acquired a plot on Mailo land and normally combined urban employment with limited agricultural activities to supplement their incomes and minimize expenditure on food. Those migrant Baganda who, without hereditary advantages on Mailo land, did through education and ability achieve high incomes, were almost always able to secure a residential plot within three to five kilometres of the city centre, on which, besides their own housing they sometimes constructed cheaper accommodation for renting for lower income urban workers. This situation prompted Mamdani to comment:

"Whereas the salaried Muganda was still likely to own land and derive at least nominal tribute from his tenants, his non-Muganda counterpart was a civil servant whose only
source of income was the salary he received from the State."

(Mamdami, 1977 p 134)

A similar observation in relation to the advantageous situation of the migrant Baganda was made by Elkan that among Kampala-Mengo’s immigrants:

"....many Ganda are more fortunately placed. They live on smallholdings on the outskirts of the town and from there they commute daily to their work. Their smallholdings provide them with shelter and usually with some of their food, whilst the immigrants have to rent expensive accommodation and buy all their food from shops or markets."

(Elkan, 1960 p 45)

And while there was no law forbidding non-Baganda immigrants from acquiring either Mailo land or customary holdings from the Baganda, very few of them did. One reason could be that most non-Baganda immigrants had their own permanent homes in the rural areas and probably did not feel sufficiently settled in Kampala to invest their savings in land which would form too strong a tie in preventing them from returning to their tribal homes. Another, and probably even more possible explanation was the fact that landownership in Buganda was strongly associated with tradition and inheritance. Hence there was a considerable feeling against a non-Muganda migrant becoming a landowner in his own right. This state of affairs was summed up by Richards:

"Ganda who are alarmed at the speed at which immigrants are invading their country are apt to comfort themselves by the thought that these men are merely tenants and not permanent landowners."

(Richards, 1973 p 133)
In fact the Lukiko (Buganda parliament) had passed a resolution in 1951 to change the Land Law to read "the landlord will not be permitted to sell land to anyone who is not a Muganda" instead of "to one who is not of the Protectorate". This amendment was not, needless to say, approved by the imperial government.

Under these circumstances, many immigrants, particularly the non-Bantu (including the non-interlacustine Bantu) tribal groups, preferred to live away from Mengo territory. It was with them that accommodation provided by the Government or by employers was particularly popular, as the examples of Nsambya Housing Estate and the Kampala East Housing Estates will show. Such accommodation provided migrants with an opportunity to work and live outside the main jurisdiction of Baganda society.

This state of affairs led to the eventual concentration of the Baganda and their "related" interlacustrine tribal groups, in the suburbs of Mengo municipality, leaving most of the other migrants to Kampala-Mengo to form clusters just inside or over the Kampala border into Mengo municipality and on crown land in Kampala East. The resultant residential settlement pattern at the macro-level is what Parkin identified (and everybody else recognised) as one settlement area for the Baganda and another for the non-Baganda.
6.2 **THE MICRO-LEVEL**

I. **THE SUPPORTER SETTLEMENTS**

With Kampala and Mengo divided yet so close together, it was inevitable that immediate space between them, particularly on the Mengo side, should be subject to particularly intense pressures from both. All along the boundary between the two there sprang up alternating pockets of dense, low-income residential settlements and of small commerce. These were "natural" settlements in the sense of unplanned - the net outcome of countless decisions in response to ecological, economic, social and political forces which no coherent authority was controlling in a co-ordinated manner. These interstitial areas were the slopes and valleys rather than the hilltops. The most important such settlements that sprang up around the boundaries included Kisenyi, Wandegeya, Wabigalo, Kivulu, Mulago and Nsambya (see Map 10, p 52).

Similar locations of densely populated areas within Mengo Municipality included Katwe (the very first African off-spring of Kampala), Kibuye, Nakulabye, Najjanankumbi, Bwaise, Natete, Kamwokya and Kawempe.

In these settlements, particularly the ones surrounding Kampala Municipality, housing was mainly of the lowest category, officially described as Grade III housing of "temporary erection of simple houses with no minimum size specified". This was housing belonging to Africans, sometimes inhabited by the owners, but mostly by tenants who paid rents to the owners. Some were also shared by both owners and tenants at the same time.

These houses came into being solely as a result of African
private initiative induced by the need to accommodate the masses of African migrants in search of jobs in the city. The subsequent settlements in these areas, were the inevitable consequence of a policy of urban development whereby the African migrant had been ignored and left to fend for his own accommodation.

Here houses, built from mud and wattle with old tin roofs (and sometimes corrugated iron roofs), stood at all angles from one another and facing which ever direction the owner chose. Settlement was as unplanned as it was uncontrolled. Garbage disposal, sewage and drainage were in most cases dealt with at each individual household’s discretion, and were, inevitably, a menace to public health.

Such places have been described in literature as "shanty towns", "peri-urban slums", "septic fringes", and so on, terms which are, in our opinion, sometimes too cruel and unappreciative of the positive role played by these settlements in the big cities almost all over the world.

One may detect a trace of prejudice in the unnecessary attempt to justify the use of the word "slum", by establishing a false semantic relationship between the word and the name of the place in the following example: "Even the name of the densely populated Kampala area called Kisenyi reinforces its local image as a "slum" for in Luganda Kisenyi means a swamp margin, the low flat which lies between the hill and the edge of the papyrus mat."

(Halpenny, 1975 p 277).

It is true, indeed, that in Luganda, the word Kisenyi means, a swamp and it is very likely that the area called
Kisenyi in Kampala got that name just because it lies in a swamp between Mengo and Nakasero Hills. It is also important to note that any swampy area is called Kisenyi and there are probably thousands of Bisenyi (plural in Luganda) all over the country.

And while there is no doubt that Kisenyi has all the characteristics to qualify it as a "slum", we simply fail to see the relevance in meaning between the traditional name of the area and the descriptive term used by Halpenny. The name alone does not make Kisenyi any worse a slum than Kivulu or Katwe which, incidentally, also happen to lie in swampy areas but are not called Kisenyi.

This may well seem a trivial point to argue about, but it represents a typical example of how much emphasis and attention is paid to the physical characteristics of these settlements while the basic "skeleton"; the functional relationships within and with respect to the surrounding areas; and the positive role played by them is sometimes completely ignored. In their frequently appalling conditions, settlements like Kisenyi are, certainly unacceptable to those who can afford better accommodation somewhere else. They are always condemned in the worst possible terms and in some cities the final verdict has been demolition - a measure which, incidentally, has not yet been proved to be very effective in achieving its desired aims.

Nor do we intend to idealize or maintain situations which are clearly very squalid by preaching such doctrines as that the poor are happy in their poverty. Such is the policy of complacent urban authorities who either do not know how to deal with the problem or are simply not concerned. The result of such policies is, of course, further deterioration of living conditions in these
settlements as more and more migrants find their way into the city.

It is not for us here to suggest panacea as to how to deal with the problem of such settlements, but we feel it is very important to recognize the positive functions performed by the so-called "squatters", "shanty-towns", "peri-urban slums" or "septic fringes". Drastic measures taken in certain cities where squatters have been evicted or slums cleared, have been met with failure simply because these are cosmetic policies aimed at removing "filthy" neighbourhoods (sometimes shameful and embarrassing in the eyes of politicians) without making any effort to provide alternative planned accommodation for those evicted.

Our study, on the other hand, refers to these lowest of the low-income urban residential areas as supporter settlements, and not because there is any need or desire to add to the already long list of such confusing and sometimes mis-used terminology, but because we realise the supportive role played by Kisenyi and similar settlements in every big city. Support to the general urbanisation process is, precisely, what Kisenyi offered, not only to its own residents but to the city as a whole. A statement made by Southall and Gutkind, came closest to describing, in one sentence, the precise importance of Kisenyi as a supporter settlement:

"Many African visitors to Kampala frequent Kisenyi for the varied facilities which it offers"

(Southall & Gutkind, 1953 p27)

Maintaining an important life-line, we may add to the statement above, that services were also "exported" from Kisenyi into Kampala municipality in terms of commercial products and human labour.
The importance of Kisenyi as a supporter settlement, and all the others in this category, may be summarised in the following points as offering:

(a) support to new immigrants in providing housing and sometimes employment,

(b) support to the urban employment sector as sources of unskilled and skilled labour,

(c) support to the urban economy and development by providing locally made cheap products for urban (and rural) consumption,

(d) support to the urban population in the provision of an infinite range of public services (usually very cheaply) e.g. restaurants, laundries, tailoring, beer bars, repairs of all kinds, etc.,

(e) support for social and traditional activities through cultural and community organisations,

(f) support and maintenance of ethnic linkages in the urban spatial structure,

Our discussion in this category of urban settlement thus lays more emphasis on the functions, spatial form and the human relationships within such a settlement, other than on physical appearance.

Kisenyi - As a Typical Example of a Supporter Settlement

Lying between Mengo, Old Kampala and Nakasero, Kisenyi was one of the most densely settled areas with an extremely heterogeneous population. This was the part of Mengo nearest the central part of Kampala Municipality and thus lay between the foci of potential concentration, the capital of Buganda on the one side and the commercial capital of the protectorate on the other (Map 10, p. 52).
The settlement, 32.4ha in area, was found to be occupied at a density of approximately 90 persons per hectare in 1956 (Southall and Gutkind, 1957). A later survey of the same area in 1964 recorded an increase in density to approximately 150 persons per hectare (UN TAO/Uganda/I, 1964). The total population of the area increased from 2,914 in 1954 to 4,847 in 1964, and more than doubled on that figure in only five years to the 1969 population of 11,000.

The Land Settlement Agreement of 1900 had given most of the land in Kisenyi to the Kabaka and the rest to one senior prince and four senior chiefs. In subsequent years, however, much land fragmentation occurred as the number of Mailo owners increased from the original size in 1900 to 59 by 1952 (Gutkind, 1963), most of the landlords being wealthy and possessing a number of estates in various parts of Buganda. In their survey, Southall and Gutkind also discovered that a number of Nouveaux riches had pushed their way in, mainly on land inherited and disposed of by younger members of the royal family. A third and almost entirely different group of property owners were those who actually owned the houses and other buildings in the area.

While the first two groups of owners were land holders with secure documentary title deeds, the latter were simply customary tenants who erected buildings on rented land either for their own use or for renting to others.

The practice of a landowner granting small temporary residential plots to immigrants from rural areas to the city. With low-income urban workers searching for accommodation which was not provided by the urban authority, the private landlord soon discovered an opportunity of deriving some income from their idle masses.
of land around the Kampala Municipal boundary.

Notwithstanding the Busuulu and Envujjo Law of 1927, which introduced a fixed rent on land, both the actual size of the plot and the rent charged remained a matter of informal agreement between the landowner and the tenant. Furthermore, landowners could also raise the rent if they wished, and evict those tenants from the land who would not pay the required rents. Here, Southall and Gutkind explain, landlords would simply take advantage of the fact that their tenants were, in the most, unclear as to the distinction between economic and political power. In a situation of conflict between legal provisions and economic realities, most tenants were simply afraid to take action against their powerful landlords. The idea that an aggrieved tenant of no importance would successfully sue an influential landlord, was generally ridiculed, and more so, if the tenant was a non-Muganda. In fact, Southall and Gutkind did observe that far from fearing prosecution, landlords were, themselves prosecuting customary tenants whom they were trying to evict, or whose rent they were endeavouring to raise. Some landlords, it was discovered, being smarter than their tenants, would avoid allowing tenants permanency of customary tenure by refusing to give their tenants a Busuulu (land rent) ticket, particularly those tenants who might have been unaware of its importance. Without proof that the tenant had fulfilled his obligations, i.e. paid his dues, he could not claim the protection of the 1927 Law in case his landlord wanted to evict him.

It is also important to point out (though it probably is obvious) that most tenants could not afford the legal costs involved, especially when most of the odds were against them, and stood the chance to lose, anyway. Nor should the fact that, most of the judges in the Buganda
courts, were themselves landlords, or relatives of such who would, most often than not, pass their verdicts in favour of their colleagues, be ignored.

Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that despite all this apparent illegal power of the landowner, it was the tenant who profited more (per unit square metre of space) if only he played his cards right. Through informal verbal arrangements, all the tenant needed to do was to pay the required land rent and cram as many lodgers on his customary holding as he could, becoming a "landlord" himself, in the process.

To this effect Southall and Gutkind discovered that the character of some customary tenancies tended gradually to approximate to that of the new type of plot. Firstly, the landowner would acquire the tenant's "permission" to cut the original holding into smaller portions for allocation to other applicants. On the other hand, the customary tenant would require permission from the landlord if he wanted to extend his building for renting purposes or if he wanted to construct himself a more permanent house. For these developments to be approved he, of course, had to pay a higher rent to the landlord.

The authors came to the conclusion that a form of residential lease was growing up, as a result of these developments, in densely occupied areas. Based on informal and purely verbal agreements between landlord and tenant, such leases lacked any kind of legal definition or documentary ratification and could, thus, be retracted by the landlords at their will.

On the tiny plots available "tenant-landlords" crowded the maximum number of people into the smallest possible dwellings. As a supporter settlement, Kisenyi offered
residence for low-income people in proximity to employment in the city. A 1964 survey conducted by a United Nations team of planners, found 40% of the working force employed in Kampala city, while some 42% were employed in Kisenyi itself, and the rest elsewhere. The same survey also established the existence of 486 structures used for residential purposes, with a total of 1,569 households, in 1964. Comparison with the 1954 survey by Southall and Gutkind revealed a decline in the number of single-person households from 30% to 19% in 1964, while there was a significant increase over the period in four- to six-person households. In 1954, only 16% of the households were occupied with more than two persons per room, while the figure rose to 28% in 1964.

A high population mobility was also recorded in 1954 with only 20% of the taxpayers having payed their income tax while resident in Kisenyi for two consecutive years. Southall and Gutkind did admit, however that this somewhat exaggerated the situation since it was possible, for those who had more than one residence or those who came to Kisenyi early in the year, to have paid tax elsewhere and thus not appear on the tax register at the time of their survey, notwithstanding residence in Kisenyi.

When basing their observations about population mobility in Kisenyi on tax registers alone, the authors rendered their findings slightly inaccurate for two main reasons. Firstly, in Uganda, low income earners, particularly those in self-employment, have never been very keen on paying income tax and try to avoid it as long as they can. The practise of rounding up low-income residential areas at dawn or of setting up early morning road "ambushes", in order to trap tax evaders is still very much in force in the country, as the alternative to paying taxes (prison) is the only constant reminder and threat to those who
refuse to pay. With Kisenyi's population made up of the low- and lowest-income earners, the majority of whom would rather not pay any tax if only they could get away with it, it certainly was most inappropriate to draw conclusions about the populations' mobility based solely on the tax register.

Apart from this not-so-obvious irregularity of the low-income settlement's population, the authors simply chose to ignore a more obvious fact that female heads of household were not required by law to pay any taxes, though a considerable number of them were engaged in occupations similar to, or the same as, those of their male counterparts. This proportion of the settlement's population (23%) would, therefore, not appear on the parish's tax register even if they were permanent residents in the area. Lack of consideration of these two aspects thus renders the author's observations about population mobility based on tax registers less than conclusive.

There still remains a theoretical possibility, however, that at the time of their survey, population mobility between different supporter settlements in the city was much higher than a decade later when the migrant population had considerably grown and population densities in these areas very much risen. Indeed the 1964 UN Survey found the percentages of those who had lived in Kisenyi for longer periods to have greatly increased. Despite the fact that Kisenyi's location always rendered it likely to have a high percentage of turnover in its residents, the survey established a nucleus of families for whom Kisenyi was a permanent home with consequent long residence. 86% of all residents interviewed at the time indicated no plans to move away from Kisenyi.
But what are the reasons that made people go to live in Kisenyi, in the first place? What leads to ethnic clustering in a settlement such as Kisenyi, how much mobility is there between different residential localities and what factors influence people's choices while looking for accommodation?

In order to find satisfactory answers to these questions it is necessary, first of all, to examine the operations of the intricate social networks of kinship, tribalism and ethnicity. For it is through the existence and operations of these systems that communication is maintained between the urban immigrant and his rural home, which leads to eventual ethnic clustering in residential areas via the process of chain migration.

**Dynamics of Ethnic Clustering Through Residential Choice**

It is generally accepted that urban ethnicity is essentially to do with the process of social change resulting from large scale immigration. As an inherent element of the processes of industrialisation, urbanization and development in general, immigration of rural peoples of varying origins and characteristics into towns, and of free settlers and refugees between regions and nations has normally resulted into the formation of ethnic clusters in urban areas (Charsley, 1974).

In Kisenyi (and all similar settlements) most townsmen's ties and identities were closest with an ethnic group that included, almost always, people from the same area of origin. According to the theory that puts chain migration as the main cause of ethnic clustering, what may become a chain of immigration in a foreign land, where he then "makes good" (Price, 1960). As a success, he recruits others of his family and friends, mainly like himself,
young often single, men to come to join him. These, the theory goes on, when happily settled will in turn, do likewise, resulting in migrants from the same place of origin settling in a particular area of the land they have migrated to. While Price's observations were derived from his studies of European immigrants to Australian cities, the theory is widely recognised and lays a satisfactory basis for the discussion of chain migrations to all big cities of the world.

Price did, however, go further and state that chain migration eventually grows to considerable dimensions and results in the appearance abroad of village, district or regional communities very reminiscent of those in Europe*. Not infrequently, he goes on, later migrants enter the same occupation as their hosts so that migrants from the same village or district are often concentrated both in the same place abroad and in the same occupation.

While there is evidence of the latter situation to have happened in Kampala-Mengo (as will be demonstrated by the example of the settlement at Nsambya), there is no evidence to suggest that there were any exclusive settlements of the tribal or ethnic nature that would confidently be identified as "urban villages".

Our study sets out to establish, rather, that through the process of chain migration, facilitated by the existence and operation of kinship and ethnic relations, ethnic

* It is important to remember that Price was, here, particularly referring to Greek, Dalmatian and Yugoslav immigrants to Sydney, Western Australia, and Canberra, respectively.
clusters can, at the micro-level, be easily identified, albeit sometimes obscured by the presence of a variety of other less numerous tribal groups in the particular residential localities of Kampala-Mengo.

Our aim, before we present some of the typical residential settlement areas, is to try, within the next few pages, to explain the consequent ethnic clustering by finding answers as to why, for example, the "second", "third" and many other subsequent immigrants following our pioneer, should necessarily live or choose to live with him or in the same neighbourhood and not any other Kampala-Mengo residential locality. Indeed the question may arise here whether immigrants had a choice of residential location, and if so what were the major factors that determined these choices.

Our discussion on housing for the Africans in Kampala did reveal that the choices that the immigrants had as to residential location were very limited if not minimal. This section sets out to explain the factors that determined these choices and so influenced the residential structure of the city. Emphasis is, here, layed on those "intermediary" factors involved in the process of chain migration which directly lead to ethnic clustering and which are so vital in the urbanization process of the African migrant to a city. When basing our explanations of ethnic clustering on the theory of chain migration developed in Western societies, it is necessary to identify the similarities and differences in the processes involved.

There is, probably, no doubt that the common denominator, in the case of European "subsequent" immigrants to Australia and their African counterparts in Kampala, was a fairly efficient system of communication between home area
and new settlement (though the level might have differed). It may be argued, on the other hand, that the Australian immigrants were, more often than not, officially invited by their "sponsors" (as Price calls them), while most of the migrants to Kampala-Mengo would just join a relative or friend, as a "right", granted them by the socio-traditional system. Ethnic clustering in Kampala-Mengo was more of the "kinship-tribal" nature while that in the case of Australian cities was more of the "Nationality" type. In both cases, however, the overall difference lies in the magnitude and thus importance attached to the phenomenon of urban ethnicity. Ethnic differences and therefore ethnic clustering, can be found in almost all plural societies of the capitals of the Western world. But in marked contrast to the situation in Western cities, where the major dimension of social differentiation and residential segregation is the socio-economic attributes of the inhabitants, ethnicity was, for long, the principal axis of segregation in most non-western (particularly, former colonial) cities and left a marked effect on their residential settlement structure.

Having discussed, in detail, the socio-political and urban administrative policies that directly led to the characteristic racial residential settlement patterns at the macro-level, we may now identify ethnic and kinship relationships as the major factor that influenced people's choices of residential location at the micro-level, thus resulting in ethnic clusters in different residential settlements.

Ethnic and Kinship Relationships

The general pattern of the migration of rural Africans to towns has been for well-worn paths to lead newcomers to
urban areas settled by the original migrants from their home localities, so that thereafter, later migrants tread the same route towards those towns or parts of towns where relatives or tribesmen may be found who will support them until they are independent. A typical example of such chain migration in Kampala-Mengo, is presented on Page 199 in the example of Nsambya Housing Estate.

When a migrant arrives in a town or city in search of employment for the first time, the most urgent and fundamental decision to make is where to live. Researchers in this field (Shorter, 1974; Grillo, 1973; Southall, 1964; Leslie, 1963; Caldwell, 1969; Marris, 1966; Kilson, 1974; Shack, 1973) have established that, indeed, in most cases, the migrant leaves his home to travel to the city, with at least some rough knowledge of where to go in the city. He has to go to some place where he knows someone, or where he feels he will be most welcome. The migrant newcomer has to find somebody in town to take care of him, that is, receive, house, and feed him. He cannot pay until he gets a job and some money. So he must find someone who feels sufficient sense of moral obligation to help him for nothing. This means either a relative or a man from home.

In his discussion of urban ethnicity in Africa Schildkrout contends:

"After migrating, they apply their traditional concepts of kinship to a new situation and use these to structure part of their urban experience - to justify claims upon members of their own ethnic community and to express certain tensions between their own ethnic community and others."

(Schildkrout, 1975 p 246)
A survey on rural-urban migration conducted in Ghana estimated that:

"Over half the potential migrants in the rural areas expected to stay with relatives or fellow villagers. If to these are added those joining their nuclear families, mostly wives going to husbands and children going to parents, the proportion exceeds two thirds."

(Caldwell, 1969 p 128)

The same report continued on the next page that:

"If migrants do not know any specific person in town, they often seek out the most important persons among their own ethnic group, frequently a kind of elective chief of the specified immigrant community. It is usually one of his tasks to provide, personally, the necessary initial accommodation or to suggest someone who can do so. The system is made easier by the tendency for the various ethnic groups to settle in clusters."

(Caldwell, 1969 p 129)

Although it may appear insignificant, the last sentence of the report quoted above distorts the very argument that we are trying to put forward. Despite the fact that it does not invalidate the main observations of the report, in general, the statement that "The system [kinship] is made easier by the tendency for the various ethnic groups to settle in clusters" is essentially incorrect for it presents the cause and effect in reverse order. It is, rather, because of the existence and operation of the ethnic and kinship systems that leads to ethnic clustering, and not the other way round. In other words, ethnic clustering is the product of the operation of kinship and
ethnic relationships. It is the realization of the major role played by kinship and ethnic connections in the rural-urban migration process that compels us to change Caldwell's last sentence to read as:

"The tendency for the various ethnic groups to settle in clusters is made easier by the system [of kinship and ethnicity]."

But how does the system of ethnicity and kinship operate?

An "established" urban worker is expected to share the benefits of his employment with those from his home area (kin, friends, tribesmen) and the extent to which he does so reflects on his standing in both the urban and rural communities. To start with, there must exist a way of communication between the urban migrant and his rural area, and the reasons for the maintenance of strong ties between the urban and rural dwellers are both economic and social. Firstly, despite the fact that incomes are generally higher in urban areas than they are in rural areas, urban minimum wages are below the minimum requirements to support a family in the city. This, coupled with lack of adequate housing leaves the men with no other choice other than to leave their wives and children behind. But the reason why even long term dwellers of high incomes and secure positions continue to have contacts and interests in their rural areas is the fact that the majority of contemporary urbanites in Africa were born in rural areas.

The links between the urban and rural areas are maintained through frequent visiting and through continuous transmissions of money and goods, these being, in the main, manufactured products from the towns and food from the rural areas. Even where migrant workers spend their whole working lives in towns, they maintain in absentia the most detailed interest and long-range participation in
home tribal affairs through writing letters, and passing news constantly among themselves. Irrespective of the length of the period away from their place of origin most urban migrants always recognize the fact that their birthplace still offers the only viable family home, especially for security in old age.

These links with place of origin continue for many years, even in the case of permanent settlers. On the subject of immigrants to Buganda, Richards stated that "men who have been 20 to 30 years in Buganda are still returning to visit their friends or to send their children to see their homeland" (Richards, 1973 p 185). As a matter of fact, it may be said that most of the first-generation immigrants regard their rural areas as "home" and as such continue to have connections with them as long as they live. But probably the most important aspect that demonstrates the importance of the urban-rural ties, is the fact that many settled urban dwellers still have their family burial grounds in the rural areas where even their "urban" children are buried. This cultural aspect of the kinship bond between urban and rural is likely to continue for a very long time through the present and immediate future urbanites, with rural ancestry.

Through this network of kinship and ethnic connections, help is ensured in difficulties, and it operates to pass on news about job opportunities and assists in securing employment and accommodation. The urban dweller has a moral obligation to receive and accommodate an immigrant from "home", (be it a relative, friend or just a neighbour from the same village) while he gets established in the urban environment. Once wage employment is found and the migrant is able to support himself, he would normally try, again with the aid of the already "settled" immigrants, to find his own accommodation. Since the great majority of
immigrants are unskilled, and often initially, in casual employment, the residential location decision would be greatly constrained and considerations such as size of dwelling, quality of housing and quality of environment are, simply, peripheral. The aspects that matter most are, in most cases, rent or price of dwelling and nearness, both to place of work and, to relatives (if any) and newly established friends. But cost of housing and nearness to place of work are both functions of the availability of housing on the market, which, we have already established, to have been very scarce in Kampala. And with such a limited supply of housing, as was the case in Kampala, even those preferences may not always be met. The new residential location is likely, therefore, to be near to the initial place since it will be acquired with the help of the host migrants. Simmons shares the same opinion:

"Short-distance moves are likely to predominate in urban areas, especially if the new residence is obtained through the same kinship and ethnic assistance that provided the initial accommodation."

(Simmons, 1968 p 123)

If this behavioural pattern of searching for and selecting a residence is dependent upon the decisions made by earlier migrants from the same place of origin, then migrants from the same rural areas are likely to become associated with particular urban neighbourhoods. Lack of adequate housing plays an important role in the encouragement and sustaining of short-distance moves once a migrant arrives in a particular locality. In such a situation, the migrant, if he moves at all from his initial residential location, is likely to move to the residence of another friend or relative in the same neighbourhood. Ethnic clustering in residential areas is at its greatest, when migrants do not even move out to settle on their own but share densely
populated dwellings, or put up temporary extensions to the initial dwelling, where space is available for such construction.

The network of social contacts developed prior to moving to town and maintained by the sending back of information concerning urban life will, therefore, tend to sustain an on-going operation whereby successful migrants help new migrants to find jobs and residence, of which they are more likely to provide the latter themselves or find it within their own neighbourhoods. Through the operation of these kinship and ethnic links Kampala's current residential patterns may still reflect to a large extent the initial residential location of dependence upon pre-migration social contacts.

SETTLEMENT IN KISENYI

In the 1964 UN Survey, asked about reasons for moving to Kisenyi, in the first place, 59% of the respondents answered that they came seeking for jobs, while 27% found housing in Kisenyi at rents they could afford, and 14% had come because of family ties. The 14% were interpreted as relatives who moved to Kisenyi to join their families in residence, though not necessarily for employment purposes. These would include children and wives joining their parents or husbands respectively.

It is logical to expect a large percentage of migrants in an urban settlement to have come looking for jobs, as it is, similarly, logical and obvious that most of them would try to find the cheapest accommodation possible. But what the 59%, who came looking for jobs, and the 27%, who found cheap accommodation in Kisenyi, did not reveal (as the researchers were apparently not interested in that information) is how they happened to end up in Kisenyi,
and not Kivulu or any other similar settlement where they would, as well, have found employment and, correspondingly, cheap housing.

With our theory of ethnic clustering in mind and with the operations of kinship and ethnic systems well in force in Kampala's settlement areas, we feel confident to suggest that a considerable majority of the 59% and 27% must have come to Kisenyi to join or seek assistance from a relative or acquaintance from their rural area. Our claim may be further substantiated by a survey conducted on the process of rural-urban migration in Dar es Salaam which concluded that:

"It would be difficult to find a single African who arrived in Dar es Salaam knowing not a soul...Almost every African who decides to come to Dar es Salaam came to a known address, where lives a known relation; this relation will meet him, take him in and feed him and help him to seek a job, for months if necessary, until he considers himself able to launch out and take a room of his own."

(Leslie, 1963 p 32)

Kampala is no different to Dar es Salaam, in this respect, whereby Leslie's observations are reminiscent of Caldwell's report, on the same subject, for Ghana (page 162).

In his article about the distribution of immigrants in Buganda, Richards states:

".....In this way travellers who come without the certainty of a particular job have yet the knowledge of a particular house from which they will be able to seek a job or a piece of land. The distribution of immigrant
labour.....is effected through a network of kinship ties which runs across Buganda from end to end."

(Richards, 1973 p 76)

As for Kisenyi settlement, Southall and Gutkind had this observation to make:
"Kisenyi gives many African immigrants their first taste of Kampala life. It acts as a rendezvous to which new arrivals come in search of relatives or friends."

(Southall and Gutkind, 1957 p 25)

While Southall and Gutkind found almost forty different tribes to be represented in Kisenyi in 1954, the 1964 Survey counted some thirty, of which we have shown only those with more than 1% of the total population in the area (Table VI). In both instances the first five tribes are the same, and in the same order of intensity, with the Baganda accounting for the largest representation, through to the Banyaruanda, in fifth place, both in 1954 and 1964. The Somali, in sixth place, in 1964, were listed in 1954, within the "Other" group, defined by the authors as small tribes represented by less than 10 persons each.
### TABLE VI - Major Tribal Groups in Kisenyi
(Heads of Household) in 1964 and 1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>1964 Percentage</th>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>1954 Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahaya</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>Bahaya</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyarwanda</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Banyarwanda</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluhya</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Kikuyu</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakamba</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adapted from:–
1954 - Townsmen in The Making Southall & Gutkind (1957)
1964 - Recommendations for Urban Development in Kampala-Mengo UN TAO/UGANDA/1 (1964)

Although the percentages shown in Table VI do not clearly prove our hypothesis of ethnic clustering, they do show the obvious domination of the Baganda in the area, together with their fellow interlacustrine neighbours, with the Nilotic Luo, surprisingly, present in very high
proportions, (this being an interlacustrine dominated settlement). The high proportion of Luo in Kisenyi could be attributed to the presence of occupations in Kisenyi, such as cobbling, carpentry and chicken selling which, according to local convention, were characteristically identifiable with the Luo. With the highest percentage representation after the Baganda, it may be said that the Luo did certainly form an ethnic cluster in the area where most other tribal groups hardly made up a single percentage of the population. The slight fall in the proportion of the Luo in Kisenyi by the 1964 survey has not been explained anywhere but we feel that this may be attributed to the later developments in Kampala East where the Luo influence was even greater and could have attracted inter-migrations between different settlements. The Housing Estates and settlements of Kampala East will be subject to detailed discussion in a later section.

Similarly the fall in population of the Batoro from 7.7% in 1954 to 6.9% in 1964 may also be explained by the growth of another supporter settlement at Mulago in the early sixties, which, because of its occupational nature, attracted many unskilled Batoro to their characteristic occupation as domestic servants to the medical staff at Mulago Hospital and the University staff at Makerere. Here, once again, it was popularly believed that unskilled Batoro were generally employed as domestic servants.

And while the Bahaya formed just 7.7% of the total population of the settlement in 1954, their proportion had risen to 12.2% by 1964. The authors of the 1954 survey remarked that:

"The Haya [Bahaya] of Kisenyi seem out of all proportion to their numbers elsewhere in Greater Kampala, and this can only be attributed to the attractions of the charcoal trade for men and of prostitution for women."

(Southall and Gutkind, 1957 p27)
Indeed it was general knowledge in Kampala, and usually assumed that every Muhaya (singular) either lived in Kisenyi, or at Kwaziba (near Nakawa) with the unfortunate attribute of prostitution, in the case of women. They continued to increase in numbers in the locality and it may be a perfectly fair assumption, once again, that Parkin (in the case of the Bahaya) also had Kisenyi in mind when he stated:

"I personally know of Toro, Ankole, Haya [Bahaya] Luo and Lugbara areas of this type [of ethnic concentration] almost all in Mengo Municipality."

(Parkin, 1969 p 286)

Kisenyi is also considered to be the only locality with a recognisable concentration of Somalis from Somalia. These specialise in the trading business and run most of the restaurants and tea and coffee bars.

It is vital we make the observation that the explanations put forward, by Southall and Gutkind, for the Luo and Bahaya clusters in Kisenyi, together with our own explanation for the Batoro cluster at Mulago, may tend to suggest another dimension to the process of residential ethnic clustering, namely, occupation. This could, indeed, have been the case (as it certainly was at Nsambya Railway Housing Estate) but our argument is, that it was through the operations of ethnic and kinship ties that even clusters related to occupation were able to be formed. They were, still ethnic clusters, entry into which required the initial assistance of a relative or friend particularly in the case of first time migrants who had come straight from Toro or Kisumu (for the Luo, in the latter case).
Answers to a question in the questionnaire of 1951 revealed that nearly all the Baganda in the area had relatives resident in Kisenyi, as did the Luo, Bahaya and Banyarwanda. It was found that the Batoro had few relatives in the area, while other minority ethnic groups had a relative or acquaintance from the home area. The survey of 1964 had this similar result to report:

"Some 46% of the households in Kisenyi contain individuals not members of the immediate family. In these households, among the outsiders, 71% are relatives, and the others are non-related but usually members of the same tribe and often engaged in the same occupation.

(UN TAO/UGANDA/I, 1964 p 93)

It is not possible to gather from the presented results of the survey who the researchers defined as the "immediate" family, as this could make a big difference in the results obtained. For, in the language of the Europeans (who were, most likely, responsible for the designing and conducting of the survey) immediate family probably does not go beyond a husband, his wife, and their children. In the African sense, on the other hand, immediate family may extend to include, both parents of husband and wife and their brothers and sisters, to extreme extended family cases where even nephews and nieces are considered part of the immediate family. The family shown in the chart on page 174 was, in the eyes of many Africans, composed of members of "immediate" relationship.

It is not uncommon, nevertheless, in places like Kisenyi to find non-relatives, sometimes three or four men, sharing the same room, contributing equal shares of the rent, yet each one cooking separately for himself. Such co-tenants have, almost always, one thing in common - they
are members of the same ethnic group, either of the same tribe or, at least, of the same nationality. More usually, however, such groups consist of "brothers" of convenience or as Southall and Gutkind called them, "classificatory brothers" — being "brothers" by common place of origin. Such households may be found in all tribal groups in the urban settlements though the Kisenyi survey of 1954 established their existence most frequently among the Luo and the non-Bantu generally. This is, in itself, self-explanatory since these particular tribal groups formed the minority in the area, in terms of the wider linguistic categorisation of ethnicity. Other instances of ethnic concentration occur whereby brothers and sisters, or other close relatives live in adjacent rooms or houses, eat together, but yet each pay their rent independently.

A more typical example of a large Baganda family living in Kisenyi may be presented in the example, studied by Southall and Gutkind, of a woman who had been living in the settlement, on a customary land holding, for 20 years. She had three mud houses on this plot, mainly occupied by her family, with a few rooms rented to lodgers. Two of her daughters were living with her in the same household together with a grandson and three granddaughters. An elder sister of the houseowner had joined the household after a broken marriage somewhere else. The household head's son was renting another room elsewhere in Kisenyi and working as a painter while the third daughter got married to a son-in-law who also had a customary holding in Kisenyi with four houses on it.
In order to explain ethnic clustering in residential settlement areas in Kampala-Mengo, we have attempted, first, to present some theoretical background as to the processes that lead to the concentration of ethnic groups in urban areas. We have, with the help of Price's theory of chain migration, established that ethnic clustering in urban areas is essentially a process of social change resulting from large-scale migration into the city. Here, we have not attempted to explain, nor are we really concerned with, the reasons that lead to migration. Most relevant to our discussion is the dynamics of urban residential clustering, paying particular attention to the
nature and systems of communication between the urban and rural areas, right through to the actual process of settlement and assimilation.

It has been established that the great majority of migrants to urban areas leave their homes with at least some rough knowledge of where or whom to go to on arrival in the city. Communication between the urban and rural areas, it has been suggested, is maintained through frequent visiting and continuous exchanges of money, goods and news. These activities can be maintained for very long periods (in the case of long-term migrants or even permanent migrants) only because of the existence and operation of kinship and ethnic ties.

In a supporter settlement like Kisenyi, ethnic and kinship relations play a major role in the decisions of potential rural-urban migrants as regards residential settlement. And while occupation might, at first sight, appear to be the cause of ethnic residential clustering, it is still through the operations of kinship and ethnic linkages that clustering, even of the employment nature, is brought about. This situation, as we indicated, will be suitably demonstrated by the example of the Nsambya Housing Estate.

The behavioural pattern, we concluded, of searching for and selecting a place of residence by a new migrant is dependent on decisions made by earlier migrants from the same origin, a process which eventually leads to ethnic residential clustering.

Despite the lack of sufficient statistical data to provide some scientific evidence in support of our hypothesis, we have been able to show that the Baganda formed (probably not surprisingly) the majority of residents in Kisenyi supporter settlement. Based on our own long-term
observations and experiences as a permanent resident in Kampala-Mengo, we have also tried to point out the generally known and accepted notions that within the settlement, there were "recognisable" clusters of the Bahaya, Luo and Somali. These impressions have been echoed by other scholars (Southall and Gutkind, 1957; Parkin, 1969; Grillo, 1965; Langlands, 1975; Muench, 1978; Temple, 1969) who have, while carrying out their different surveys in Kampala-Mengo made the same observations.

It is important to stress, however, that while these clusters are recognised (or felt) in terms of proportional representation, they are not, spatially, clearly distinct, apart from the case of the Bahaya, where the "prostitutes quarters" were concentrated in a particular part of the settlement. A "Luo area" was, also loosely identified.

There is, also, another type of clustering at a higher level. We may be reminded that our conceptual framework of ethnicity defined three different categories of ethnic membership in Kampala-Mengo. Another look at Table VI (page 169) reveals a 62% representation of the interlacustrine Bantu ethnic group (Baganda, Bahaya, Batoro, Banyarwanda, Banyoro and Bakamba), as against 38% of the rest, both in 1954 and 1964. While this constant ratio may be purely coincidental between those years, what is more important, is to notice that the interlacustrine Bantu formed a linguistic ethnic cluster in the area. This, as we explained earlier on, should not be surprising since the settlement lay at the foothill of Mengo Hill, and was thus, the closest supporter settlement at the boundary between Mengo and Kampala Municipalities, rendering it the most easily accessible by the Baganda and their "associates".
Indeed it may be a fair speculation, to suggest that the percentage representation of the Interlacustrine Bantu might have been even greater than the figures presented in Table V show, for two reasons. First of all, the minority tribal groups listed as "Other" certainly did include many interlacustrine tribes (if in fact not the majority). Secondly, since the percentages represent household heads, there is a fair chance that the interlacustrine Bantu households accommodated more persons on the average, than did the rest. The reason for this assumption is simply that most of the customary plot holders (our "tenant-landlords") were Baganda and were, as such, more likely to accommodate more relatives and lead an extended-family type of life (example on page 174) than the Luo, Lango or Teso who were in most cases single men who had left their families at home.

The interlacustrine Bantu ethnic cluster at Kisenyi formed only part (although certainly the biggest of the concentration that led to the overall linguistic cluster of the group in Menge municipality, as discussed at the macro level in Section 6.1. Other similar settlements included Katwe, which was more or less an "only Baganda" settlement, as was Nakulabye, in the West of Kampala which, once again, were heterogenised by dispersions of smaller interlacustrine Bantu tribal groups.

This pattern will be seen to have been reversed in settlements on crown land in Kampala East.

II. THE PLANNED SETTLEMENT

Free Employer-Provided Housing

Before the low-income housing developments of Kampala East took place in the late 1940s, the only governmental
efforts to provide housing for their low-income labour force consisted of employer-provided housing by the police, railways, army, Ministry of Works and some educational and medical institutions. This was the kind of housing that went automatically with a job and not because of the willingness or kindness of the employers, but because this enabled them to frequently transfer employees, whenever they saw fit, as it was desirable and necessary to have on-site residents in some of the medical and educational institutions.

The police were housed on an estate at Nsambya and later at Naguru where the training school was located. The Special Branch also had its headquarters and residences at Naguru. The army had two barracks, one at Mbuya on crown land in Kampala East and a later location at Makindye, south of the City in Mengo Municipality. The Ministry of Works housing for their low-income employees consisted mainly of temporary iron or wooden constructions and mobile houses which were erected wherever construction work (e.g. roads, building, telecommunications) was going on. The Railways, probably the biggest single parastatal body employer, housed its employees on their estate at Nsambya, next to the police barracks. This railway housing estate will be the subject of detailed examination from this category of housing and residential settlement.

It is necessary to point out that the institutional housing at Makerere and Mulago Hills was not, of the low-income type. Makerere, established as the country’s first higher educational institute was an academic enclave of Europeans, as was Mulago Hill, where the country’s main hospital was located. The Africans resident on and around these areas were either housed as house servants to the Europeans, in the small quarters in the back-yard, or had to look for their own housing in nearby supporter
settlements such as Wandegeya, Kivulu and Kamwokya.

This category of housing does include the accommodation of servants mentioned above where domestic employees (in most instances with their families) resided within the compounds of their employer's house.

Finally, free-employer-provided housing also included company houses or "labour lines" built by some employers for their workers, and presumably the corners in godowns and spaces under shop counters in which some men appeared to spend their nights. This kind of accommodation was most common with the non-Ugandan immigrants in Kampala, particularly the Luo from Kenya and the Nubi from Sudan (Elkan, 1960).

The most important characteristic of this type of housing was that those who were entitled to share in it did so "free of charge", at least initially. Sometime later, rents were to be introduced, however, although assisted with very heavy subsidies from employers.

While Elkan (1960) estimated the total number of Africans working in Kampala, who were housed in the free employed-provided housing to have been about 10%, our study finds this percentage too high and unreal. The reason for expressing doubts about this figure is simply that the police, the army and the railways, the only employers who provided free housing to the Africans at any substantial level, just could not make up 10% of the total urban African population. Secondly, if we are to accept various research reports which have stated that 85% of the city's African population had to fend for its own accommodation, and if we add to that the approximately 12% that was housed in the newly constructed housing estates of Kampala East (discussed later on in this Chapter) then
the only more realistic estimate for those in free employer-provided housing evaporates to a mere 3%.

Nsambya East African Railways and Harbours* Housing Estate - As a Typical Example of Free Employer-Provided Housing on a Planned Settlement

The Railway Housing Estate, as it is more commonly known in Uganda, was the first large-scale housing estate built by the EARH for its Kampala employees in the 1930s on the southern edge of the city (see Map 15 and 16).

In his survey of urbanisation in Kampala, Mulumba (1974) found the estate to be the most densely populated residential area of the city with over 50,000 persons per square kilometre (500 per hectare). Although initially designed for the use of Asians in the low- and middle-income groups of the company, the estate was slowly "invaded" by Africans in the lower income groups. Eventually, after independence, the dwellings on the estate were no longer free of charge, but rented out to the employees although still at very heavily subsidised rents.

Like all similar designs of low-income African and Asian housing the estate presented a monotonous linear layout of dwellings with no obvious consideration to the use of open space. EARH housing was normally divided into seven classes and allocated according to scale of employment, although the estate at Nsambya contained no units in Classes 1 and 2 (see Table VII). Classes 5, 6 and 7 were

* The East Africa Railways and Harbours was an inter-territorial body operating extensive goods and passenger rail, road, and lake traffic in Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika. It was established in 1949 after the amalgamation of the Kenya Uganda Railways and Harbours and the Tanganyika Railways and Posts Services.
MAP 15 - Nsambya EARH Housing Estate

Source: Adapted from Mulumba 1974

MAP 16 - House Categories on EARH Housing Estate

Source: Adapted from Grillo, 1969
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>House Class</th>
<th>Rooms</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superscale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Usually large bungalows in own grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kitchen, shower, storeroom, toilet (larger than 4 below)</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kitchen, shower, storeroom, toilet [larger rooms than 5(ii) below]</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division II</td>
<td>5(ii)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kitchen, shower, storeroom, toilet, verandah. courtyard</td>
<td>&quot;Asian&quot; style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kitchen, shower, storeroom</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III</td>
<td>6(ii)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kitchen, shower, verandah</td>
<td>&quot;Asian&quot; style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kitchen, shower</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The &quot;Landies&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EARR Annual Report 1964
further divided into different housing sub-classes according to the amenities available. Class 7(i) units, each consisting of a single 3 x 3 m² room with a window at the rear and with the overhang of the roof forming a small veranda at the front, were known as "Landies", a term which came to be applied to the whole estate. Intended for bachelor residents at the construction of the estate, the landies were built with prefabricated concrete, roofed with iron, and arranged in barrack-like lines of ten or twenty units in a row, with five units sharing a kitchen shelter and forty units a latrine block. As the labour force increased on the estate many of the single room units housed whole families, with only a curtain dividing the "living" room from the "bedroom" (Grillo, 1965).

Class 7 (ii) units arranged in blocks of four were more spacious, with the kitchen serving virtually as the second room. Even in the higher class quarters, Grillo observed that kitchens and storerooms often served as extra sleeping space. From Class 6 upwards amenities and size of dwellings increased with each class, with a maximum of 4 rooms, as the biggest house at Nsambya.

EARH figures for 1965 show that approximately 1,700 workers were stationed at Kampala, less than half of them living at Nsambya Estate. Altogether, the EARH owned some 850 housing units in the city, out of which Class 1 and Class 2 houses were very few, and none at Nsambya as already mentioned. Senior officials eligible for Class 1 and 2 housing rented, for the most part, bungalows in the residential suburbs of Kololo and Nakasero.

Without going into the details of the grading system of EARH employees, it is important to point out who (since housing was allocated according to employment status) qualified for, and occupied, what type of accommodation on
the estate. This, apparently innocent and common socio-economic criterion is soon discovered to conceal more complex factors of race and ethnicity, the moment we take a closer look at the structure of the workforce.

The EARH Annual Reports 1949-1968, show a total East African workforce of over 40,000 employees by 1965 whom we have broken down according to race in Table VIII. The figures in the table show considerable fluctuations in the total employed, falling sharply during the late fifties and sixties, the reasons for which are beyond the scope of our study. In his survey of the EARH entitled "The Tribal Factor in a Trade Union" Grillo observed that:

"In the past, posts above Group B Division III were largely occupied by Europeans and Asians. Since 1962, however, there has been a vast increase in the number of Africans in higher grades....."

(Grillo, 1969 p 171)

Although we are not able to explain the general decline in the total number of employees as shown in Table VIII, one established fact is, nevertheless, that many Europeans left East Africa in the early sixties as each EARH member country achieved its independence, thus, the increase in the number of Africans in higher grades observed by Grillo. These changes in the employment policy of the EARH, obviously had a direct influence on the allocation of housing as more and more Africans rose to higher grades in the employment structure.

The EARH Report for the whole of East Africa also prepared Table IX showing the racial structure of the workforce according to grade as of April 1965.
**TABLE VIII - Racial Distribution of EARH Employees**
1949 - 1965 (East Africa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>41,789</td>
<td>56,295</td>
<td>43,952</td>
<td>41,619</td>
<td>39,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>5,580</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>2,259</td>
<td>2,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,065</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,691</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,587</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,902</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by the author from EARH Reports (1949 - 1968)

**TABLE IX - EARH Employees According to Race and Grade (East Africa) (April 1965)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>African</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superscale</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group A</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B(Exec.)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division I</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>2,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>702</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from EARH Report 1965
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Of the 41,902 total workforce in 1965, the EARH-Uganda District constituted 4,736 or 11%. At Kampala, the headquarters of the Uganda District, there were stationed a total of 1662 employees and Table X shows the composition of staff according to race and salary scale. Unfortunately, this table does not break up the non-African racial group into our standard European and Asian categories but we may gather from Table IX for the whole of East Africa, that about 92% of all European employees were within Group B Division I and above, while the Asians were mainly employed within the various divisions of Group B, below the Executive Grade. Although a higher percentage of Africans in Kampala was employed in the superscale and Group A Grades than was the case for the whole of East Africa (23.3%), we may still assume that all Europeans in Kampala were employed beyond Group B Executive Grade, and as such would not occupy housing at Nsambya Estate where there were no Class 1 and 2 housing units. And since the racial classification "Non-African" in Table X obviously indicates the presence of Europeans in the workforce at Kampala, our assumption is further proved correct by EARH records in which Table XI shows the housing units at the estate being occupied only by Africans and Asians.

Table XI reveals that all Asian employees on the estate were housed in Classes 3, 4 and 5(ii) and none below that. They were particularly concentrated in Class 5(ii) where they occupied 33 of the 76 housing units in this class, while the Africans were mainly housed in classes 5(i), 6 and 7 housing. It is rather unfortunate that we do not have any statistics from earlier years when the estate was predominantly an Asian settlement, to facilitate a comparative analysis as to how much clustering (of the racial kind) there might have been before, in the area. The only hint we have as to the pre-independence racial
distribution on the Estate may be gathered from the statement:

"By 1965, there were more Africans than Asians in this area, and indeed one young railw~man who had actually been born and brought up at Nsambya once remarked that for him the most significant sign of the advent of independence, was the fact of Africans living in "Asian houses".

(Grillo, 1973 p 34)

**TABLE X - EARH Employees at Kampala According to Race and Grade (1965).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Non-African</th>
<th>African</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superscale</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EARH Reports
TABLE XI - Nsambya EARH Estate Housing Occupation According to Class and Race (1965)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Asians</th>
<th>Africans</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (ii)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (i)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: EARH Reports

As this discussion is about the African settlements, it is the Africans at Nsambya that we are going to concentrate on from the period after independence.

Amongst the African residents on the estate, Grillo (1965) found a highly heterogeneous community, not without its usual internal divisions. Apart from working for the same employer, each individual had allegiances determined by factors outside the railway framework. More precisely, each person belonged to a particular ethnic group, and these were found to number twenty-seven, altogether.

The EARH enumeration of African Employees in 1965 produced the percentages which we have presented in Table XII showing a varied representation of almost all the major Ugandan ethnic groups and immigrant employees from all the six neighbouring countries. Two general features are immediately noticeable from this Table. Firstly, the
percentage of the Kenyan ethnic group in the workforce of the EARH in Kampala was almost as big as that of all the Ugandan ethnic groups employed by the organisation. Likewise, the Kenyans also formed the majority of residents on the housing estate at Nsambya.

Secondly, within the Ugandan ethnic group, only second to the Baganda, on top of the Table with 11.7%, the Basamia formed the second numerous ethnic group of employees. This point becomes very important as soon as we remind ourselves of two other points discussed earlier on. Firstly, it was shown that the Basamia live both in Uganda and across the border in Kenya. It was also established that they have a lot in common with the Bulahya, a Kenyan tribal group, with whom they share the non-interlacustrine linguistic category.

We may also remember that the Baganda civil servants and company employees of not too low an income (and certainly EARH employees were not amongst the least paid) preferred to commute from outer suburbs rather than reside in such "low class" housing.

If we, therefore, take these two points into consideration and closely associate the Basamia with the Kenyan employees, we then have a basis from which to explain Kenyan dominance on the housing estate as well.
### TABLE XII - Percentage Distribution of African Employees of the EAH by Ethnic Origin in Kampala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>% of Total African Labour Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basamia</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyankole</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basoga</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugbara</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madi</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakiga</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagisu</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamoja</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UGANDANS</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyans</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzanians</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda/Burundi</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Adapted from Table 19, p 37; Grillo 1973

**NOTE:** These percentages are drawn from a total of 1,284 employees, excluding 305 workers whose place of birth was not recorded in the returns.
Although the published statistics do not tell us much about the tribal composition of the non-Ugandan ethnic groups, some brief information is available showing the Luo to have made up 60% and the Baluhya 36%, (Grillo, 1973 p 37) of the total Kenyan population on the estate. It will be shown, in the next chapter, that the Luo and Bulahya also constituted the majority of the Kenyan residents in the Housing Estates of Kampala East, where a Kenyan residential cluster was also very noticeable.

Explaining the concentration and dominance of Kenyans in the EARH workforce, Grillo observes:

"Ethnically the Kenya Luhya (Baluhya) are closely related to the peoples from Uganda’s Bukedi District - the Samia [Basamia] and Gwe [Bagwere] who frequently identify themselves with the Luhya."

(Grillo, 1973 p 39)

Ethnicity at Nsambya Housing Estate may be explained at two different levels of categorisation, albeit, they do not oppose each other, but just compliment one another. At a lower level, we have the Baluhya, from Kenya, closely related to the Basamia and Bagwere, from Uganda, as members of the non-interlacustrine linguistic group. At the higher level, however, we have the Luo and Bulahya forming, as Kenyan immigrants in Kampala, a nationality ethnic grouping. In this foreign environment, both the Luo and Bulahya are registered as Kenyans and are normally identified by the majority of the locals as Kenyans and not Luo or Bulahya. And while each one of the two tribal groups was present in big numbers, a combined front made them, politically, stronger in a situation where they dominated the home nationals. They did not feel "alone" as Luo or Bulahya, but it suited them and was sometimes advantageous to pass as Kenyans. The political advantages
(and disadvantages) this nationality front posed will be discussed in the case of the Kenyan Unions in the Housing Estates of Kampala East.

But while the Bulahya were happy to identify themselves with the Luo in Kampala, both as Kenyan immigrants, there was also the established ethnic relationship between the Bulahya and the Basamia of Uganda. The relationship may have been as genuine (similar culture and language), as it could have been just convenient (support in times of political crisis) but it was a very important one in explaining ethnic clustering at Nsambya.

With the Baluhya in the middle and the Luo on one side, strong socio-linguistic affiliation to the Baluhya, drew the Basamia into the "Kenyan" ethnic grouping, on the other side. Although we have already stated that the Basamia tribe did indeed live both in Uganda and Kenya, we are not making any attempt at categorising Ugandan Basamia as Kenyans, for they simply were not. We are, nevertheless, trying to explain the intricate relationships, that led to a double-faced "linguistic-nationalistic" ethnic concentration at Nsambya, by establishing the real socio-political factors that affected it.

Without much statistical data to enable us to demonstrate the domination of the Kenyan ethnic group at Nsambya Housing Estate, we may only sum up what Tables XI and XII tell us about the proportional representation of the main ethnic groups, in employment with the EARH. Of the total 1284 enumerated employees:

- the Kenyans made up 41.2% = 529
- Baganda 11.7% = 150
- Basamia 7.6% = 96
- Banyamkole 5.5% = 70
- etc.
While the Baganda mostly preferred to commute from outlying areas of the city, Grillo observed a similar attitude to that of the Baganda by the Banyankole. He stated:

"A number of people actually preferred to find their own accommodation, in particular those from Ankole District [Banyankole] who lived in an ethnic cluster on nearby Kibuli Hill."

(Grillo, 1973 p 33)

The Banyankole, as an interlacustrine tribal group, could live in areas dominated by the Baganda more easily than did the Kenyan tribal groups, or even the non-interlacustrine Basamia. With this lack of desire to reside on the Nsambya Housing Estate, displayed by both the Baganda and Banyankole, the Kenyans and Basamia were left in a far superior position to seek and share the limited accommodation available for the Africans on the estate. It is not surprising, therefore, that the settlement was popularly referred to as a "Kenyan enclave" and the EARH generally considered a pro-Kenyan orientated organisation.

Whether deliberately, or not, the EARH's employment of more Kenyans than any other Ugandan tribal group had the direct consequence of creating an ethnic cluster on the estate at Nsambya.

The Kenyans in Kampala

It will be argued that Kenyan dominance in employment with EARH and, therefore, dominance on the housing estate, was a result of the chain migration of Luo and Bulahya into Kampala from their home areas around the eastern shores of Lake Victoria.
Historical evidence as to why the Luo, particularly, migrated in such big numbers to Kampala, is hard to come by. It may be suggested, however, that the first arrivals of the two tribal groups in any significant numbers were with the extension of the Kenya-Uganda Railway from Kisumi into Uganda finally reaching Kampala in 1931 (Richards, 1973). Together with imported labour from the Indian sub-continent, the Kenyans were initially recruited to work on the construction of the railway line as unskilled labourers, gradually improving their skills into artisans. As Parkin observed, "Ever since the extension in 1901 of the railway in Kenya from Mombasa and Nairobi to the Luo capital of Kisumi, the Luo have spread far and wide as artisans, clerks and unskilled workers to towns throughout East Africa." (Parkin, 1969(a) p 186). Of the Bulahya, he remarks that they, for a long time, did not regard themselves, nor interact, as a single cohesive ethnic group although they exhibited similar migratory processes.

It has been a widely held opinion in Uganda's history, that with alternative economic outlets in lucrative agricultural activities, the Baganda, initially, did not care to work in the city and had left it to be run by the Luo. This view has been harshly condemned by Parkin (1969(b)) - for one - as "crudely inaccurate" in its details and having ignored the parts played by such important and large groups as the Acholi and Bulahya. Parkin, unfortunately, does not explain the implied inaccuracies in detail, probably because it would be rather difficult to refute the facts.

First of all, it is a fact that despite their immigrant status, the Luo dominated Kampala City through the 50s only to be challenged by the Baganda immediately before and after independence. According to government statistical records of 1965, the Luo, alone, constituted
11.5 per cent of the total 27,878 workforce in 1961. As residents in Kampala City they were nearly as numerous as the Baganda constituting 14.3% of the city's African population as against 18.8% of the Baganda. (The Baganda were, of course, dominant in their capital Mengo, as we saw.)

With the Batoro in third place constituting only 9.8%, and the Acholi and Baluhya at 6.2% and 6.1% in fourth and fifth place, respectively, the situation was clearly one of dominance by the Baganda on the one hand, and the Luo on the other. It is also true, however, as Parkin suggests, that notwithstanding the third place of the Batoro, the Acholi and Baluhya were both politically and economically more active.

The more important fact we want to state here, before we go on to discuss the Luo in Kampala, however, is that the Baganda did actually try to stay out of Kampala - the imperial city - as long as they could. The reasons for this lack of interest particularly in settlement and to a lesser extent in the economic activities in the city have been discussed in detail in Chapter 3. Economic self-sufficiency and, above all, pride and traditional allegiance to the King and their Kingdom were the main reasons that made the Baganda turn their backs on the imperial capital, thus, leaving the opportunity to anybody who would grab it. As it happened, the Luo did, aided by the construction of the Kenya-Uganda railway.

For many Luo, their careers began with residence in the Namuwongo slum on the northern slopes of Kibuli Hill, popularly known as Kisumu Kidogo (Little Kisumu) indicating the concentration of the tribal group in the area (Elkan, 1960). Here they would lodge with the 'brother' or friend, getting a job, again with the help of
a relative or friend, and finally moving to their own rented room or house, either on the same settlement, another suburb, or preferably on a housing estate. With their job opportunities ranging from the most to the least skilled, the Luo were, probably, also the most mobile in terms of residential settlement. They mostly migrated to Kampala, with the intention of earning bridewealth and return although many never found their way back home (Hutton, 1973).

In a supporter settlement like Kisumi Kidogo, the residential turnover of a majority of Luo, their coming and going helps advertise the urban system to friends intending to follow in their steps. Almost all workers have a complex network of extra-town ties which links them socially and economically with their homes and continues to place them in special relationships with their home people. The townsman not only provides accommodation, he also helps the visitor to find a room of his own, a process which leads, as we say in Kisenyi, to the formation of ethnic clusters in multi-occupied dwellings and local neighbourhoods.

Residential clustering of the Kenyans at Nsambya was, as we have stated, the inevitable consequence of an ethnically biased EARH workforce structure. Recruitment into the organisation, at the lowest levels, often depended on the work-seeker gaining inside information and support from someone who could speak for him with the relevant officials, whenever a job was on offer (Grillo, 1965). Those who worked in a particular section would know when vacancies occurred and would then pass on the information to their friends and relatives searching for jobs.

Grillo (1973) attempted a very useful exercise to identify
the extent to which chain migration had affected the composition of EARH labour force. Each respondent was asked to name any "relatives" employed at the EARH at Kampala. Grillo was the first to warn us, however, about the incompleteness of his survey for the specified broad categories of patrician, matrician, and wife's relatives (he offers no explanation for this choice) excluded several important relatives such as sister's husbands and children. He also admits that while he knew it to be the case with several respondents, his questions referred only to current employment and the results failed to pick up instances where fathers or elder brothers had formerly been employed with the EARH. Friends and neighbours from back home, were another important group of the ethnic system that were left out. Yet his findings still indicate very high percentages of relations at the EARH depot in Kampala. Considering that his results represent a considerable underestimation of the links between the labour force by a network of kinship and ethnic ties, a more comprehensive survey would, probably, have produced more than the 40% Kenyan and 24% Ugandan percentages of employees with relatives in EARH.

The part played by recruiting policy itself in generating such ethnic concentrations of the Kenyans in EARH workforce is unclear, and, at this stage, of less importance. Under normal circumstances, the recruiting officer should be concerned only that an applicant is suitably qualified for the job he is seeking. Grillo's argument that employers favour people from areas or ethnic groups already well represented in the section is hard to accept particularly in the case of domination by an immigrant tribal group, for that would be ethnic segregation against the local tribal groups - an
unthinkable practice. For similar reasons, neither would we accept nepotism as the possible cause of Kenyan domination in the EARH workforce and settlement are at Nsambya. Nor are we dismissing all kinds of malpractices in employment policies of different employers. It would be most naive to state that nepotism or tribalism was never practised in employment procedures in Kampala. What we are arguing against is, rather, that such would have not been a deliberate official policy of the EARH. Lack of interest from the host tribe (only 11.7% Baganda of total workforce) and her "sister" interlacustrine tribal groups, left the employers with no choice but to continue to recruit the available Luo, who in turn were only too happy to increase their influence and domination, assisted by their fellow Kenyans the Baluhya, through the operations of kinship and ethnic ties.

A typical example of chain migration to Nsambya Housing Estate may be presented from Grillo's survey of the labour force in 1973. He detected a cycle of migration to Nsambya which had been sparked off some 40 years before by the arrival of a Luo migrant by the name Hamisi, from Rusinga Island near the Kenyan shores of Lake Victoria. After hearing of his successful employment in Kampala, Opion and Onyango, from the same Rusinga area, set off with their wives to join Hamisi. On arrival Hamisi found them jobs in the then Kenya Uganda Railways and Harbours Service, and also found them accommodation at Nsambya. These were soon joined by various relatives including Martin, Maria and Marcus, all of whom married Businga people who also came to Kampala and stayed with them. Over the years, Marcus, Martin, John O. and Francis all got employment with the EARH. Grillo found that apart from the deceased Hamisi, and Opion who had retired back to his rural area, all those mentioned in Chart D were still living at Nsambya in 1965.
He also discovered that besides those listed in the Figure above, many other Rusinga people had, at one time or another, called on this core group providing them with housing and assisting in finding jobs, though many of these had since moved on to other localities in Kampala.

Among the migrants from a particular area, there are often a few, like Opio in Grillo’s example, who are more willing or more successful than others in placing their relatives and friends in accommodation or employment. They therefore build up reputations as urban gatekeepers or perhaps patrons. As Caldwell observed in Ghana (see page 162) Opio, and those like him, become the "elective chief" and play a major role in the establishing and maintenance of ethnic clusters in residential settlements.
SUMMARY

The East African Railways and Harbours housing estate at Nsambya presents yet another type of Settlement, typical of the free employer-provided housing in Kampala-Mengo.

As in Kisenyi, it has been suggested here, also, that the process of chain migration was principally responsible for the resultant ethnic cluster in the area, assisted by the operation of kinship and tribal linkages.

At the highest level of ethnic categorisation, we have identified a nationality cluster of the Kenyans in the area, only strengthened by the Basamia of Eastern Uganda who had closer affinity to the Kenyan Baluhya, than any other Ugandan tribal group employed and resident on the estate. Being the last tribal homelands that the railway from Mombasa to Kampala traversed before entering Uganda, the Luo and Baluhya somehow managed to continue working on the construction of the line, all the way to Kampala. And due to the initial reluctance of the host tribal group (the Baganda) to get actively involved in the operations of the company, we have indicated that this, then gave the Kenyans (together with the Basamia who they most likely picked on entering Ugandan territory) the opportunity to consolidate their role as the least skilled employees of the EARH. Once this position was attained, subsequent recruitments to the company were, particularly at the lower levels, mostly determined by those already in employment passing on information about new vacancies to their relatives and friends from their places of origin.

Evidence of the existence and persistence of these active urban-rural networks at Nsambya may be found in Grillo’s statement that:
"...the Nsambya sample produced only one respondent who had no land, never visited his home, never sent gifts, had not built himself a house, kept his wife in town and whose parents were dead."

(Grillo, 1973 p 61)

The fact that his parents were dead could, in fact be the reason why he had no more contacts with his original home, though this debate is of no real significance to our study.

At the lower level of ethnic categorisation, however, the Luo, as a tribal group undoubtedly dominated the East African Railways and Harbours employment structure and consequently its African housing estate at Nsambya forming, therefore, a Luo tribal cluster on the settlement.

III. THE PLANNED SETTLEMENTS - THE HOUSING ESTATES OF KAMPALA EAST

Until 1948, the only effort made by the imperial urban administration to house the Africans was within the category of free employer-provided housing discussed in the last chapter.

The introduction of public housing estates was the result of eventual government recognition that something ought to be done in the way of accommodation for the masses of rural-urban migrants to the city who were steadily increasing in search for jobs and expected better livelihood. The first housing estates, all constructed in Kampala East at Nakawa, Naguru, Kitali and Kiswa (see Map 10 Page 52) had been intended for the low-income families while the later developments in the North East at Kira
Road and Kamwokya, and in the South East at Bugoloobi and Butabika were meant for higher-income families. In all, there were a total of 1697 housing units in the Public Housing Estates of Kampala by 1971, the time when all housing construction practically came to a halt (Uganda National Housing Policy, 1984). Most of the estates consisted of quite small houses, usually with not more than three rooms, built of permanent materials in Grade II housing areas.

Construction of the first housing estate started in Nakawa in 1948 and was followed a year later by the Naguru Estate. With 867 rented units, all but 5 consisting of a single habitable room, Nakawa Housing Estate catered especially for the majority of unskilled and very temporary immigrant ethnic groups, while Naguru, with 683 units of which 238 were one-roomed, plus 80 bedspaces in hostels, catered for the more skilled, better educated, and higher paid.

Few as they may seem to be, the contribution made by these housing units was not insignificant at the time. The 1948 National Population census gives the African population of Kampala-Mengo as 46,242 out of which Parkin (1969(a)), enumerated a total of 5240 living in these two estates, immediately after their construction was completed. These two estates alone, thus, catered for approximately 12% of Kampala's African population.

Nakawa and Naguru were also the last "low-income" rental estates to be built in Kampala. In 1954, a home ownership scheme was started at Ntinda by the African Housing Department (the authority charged with African housing by the imperial government) whose limited funds got exausted after constructing only 150 houses. The intention here was to encourage Africans to buy or build their
own permanent houses with a basic capital of 20 per cent of the value of the house. By 1963, all the 150 houses had been sold (mainly to government parastatal bodies and private companies) and the remaining service land was laid out in larger plots and leased for middle-income housing.

Further attempts were made at Ntinda in 1957 to facilitate housing by providing site and services, followed by two similar efforts in 1959, one at Kitali and the other at Kiswa. Here the allocatees of plots were permitted to build using mud and wattle, to allow for low-income families to be able to construct their own houses. By 1968, a total of 86 houses had been built on the site and service plots at Ntinda, and 70 houses at Kitali. At Kiswa, however, over 200 houses had been built already by 1963 when Kitali had only 37 and Ntinda only 26. Kiswa's location within walking distance of a major employment centre in the Industrial Area (Map 17) made it a more suitable and attractive locality to the industrial employees. Kiswa (like Naguru and Nakawa) was commonly referred to by its own residents as "Upper" and "Lower" Kiswa. Upper Kiswa consisted of plots of land sold by the City Council for the construction of houses using more permanent, but cheap, local materials like clay and timber. The residents of Upper Kiswa were mainly unskilled or semi-skilled, and there was also a highly mobile proportion of men of skilled artisan and clerical status. The latter frequently expressed their distaste of residence in Kiswa and some attempted to move to Nakawa or Naguru whenever they could (Parkin, 1969(a)).

In Lower Kiswa, the houses were normally constructed of less permanent materials (mainly mud and wattle), were less substantial and the rooms were much cheaper to rent. In terms of housing demand, Kiswa competed with the supporter settlements at Namuwongo and Wabigalo on the
Kiswa was the last of the serious efforts of direct
government involvement in low-income housing in Kampala.
Subsequent mass housing developments undertaken by the
newly formed National Housing Corporation (see footnote on
Page 116) at Kira Road, Kamwokya, Butabika and Bugolobi
were, visibly, aimed at the city's high-income population.

In his extensive survey of the Housing Estates of Kampala
East, which concentrated mainly on Nakawa, Parkin
(1969(a)) established that many Nakawa and Naguru
residents had moved from Kiswa some rising through the
hierarchy of Kiswa, Lower and Upper Nakawa and finally
Naguru. He also discovered that many Kenyans (Luo and
Baluhya) had moved to Nakawa and Naguru from some other
supporter settlements, particularly Namuwongo (Kisumu
Kidogo) on Kibuli Hill. The upward movement, it may be
argued was, most likely, facilitated by the securing of
better housing by those new immigrants to the city who had
taken up cheaper available housing on arrival although
they could afford the rents at Naguru or Nakawa. It must
be pointed out too that most of the houses at Kiswa were
occupied by tenants who could, whenever their economic
situation allowed, move out into better housing, and the
ultimate housing available to most of these immigrants was
at Naguru. This filtering, as it is commonly known,
should not be exaggerated, however. For while many
aspired to and could probably afford the rents at Nakawa
or even Naguru, it was a one-way, dead-end, street where
once at Naguru, very few tenants left the estate to create
room for others from the bottom of the hierarchy. Apart
from a few civil servants, who might have been, possibly,
temporarily housed at Nsambya while awaiting more
appropriate housing, or those who qualified for better
housing through promotion, the next category of housing
within this group of Housing Estates were the heavily subsidised high-income units unavailable and out of the reach of most of the tenants at Naguru and Nakawa.

Nakawa and Naguru housing estates, as we have already mentioned, accommodated between them almost 12% of the city's African population, and were, thus, the two most important and largest public housing establishments. With reference to Parkin's survey and with the application of data from, both, the National Housing and Construction Corporation and the National Housing Policy, we shall try to establish the "ethnic factor" and ethnic concentration of particular tribal groups in the planned settlements of Kampala East.

**NAGURU AND NAKAWA - As Examples of Public Estate Housing on a Planned Settlement**

Nakawa and Naguru are roughly divided by the main Kampala to Jinja road (Map 17) with Naguru slightly set back from this road. Nakawa occupied an area of about 32.4 Ha, while Naguru is much larger with an area of about 86.2 Ha. Both estates were planned on a rectangular grid, each divided into about 30 groups of from 10 to over 60 houses. Most of the houses were arranged in on-facing squares while a few were placed in two facing lines with a narrow road between them (Maps 18 and 19). With no clearly defined semi-private and private areas, Nakawa had courtyards, though, which contained service and utility blocks serving about 20 dwellings. Naguru, on the other hand, as a higher income estate had greater amenities (street lighting, a fair number of water taps, and daily collection of garbage), had a community and social centre, and a church. While in some parts of Naguru detached houses with private gardens and hedges between them made it less easy for neighbours to intermingle, houses at
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MAP 18 - Naguru Housing Estate

Source: Mulumba, 1974
Nakawa were very closely grouped together, enforcing interaction between neighbours. This enforced neighbourly relationship in a settlement of a highly heterogeneous population will be discussed in more detailed at a later stage in this chapter.

Nakawa Estate also had a number of what were known as "bedspaces", that is, one single room and a kitchen, in cheaper four terraced houses. More expensive houses, in Naguru particularly, were semi-detached. In the bedspaces at Nakawa, families with bigger children would draw a curtain across the room separating the parents from the children. Sometimes, it was necessary for a member, or two, of the family to sleep in the kitchen.

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION IN NAKAWA AND NAGURU ESTATES

The ethnic composition of the population in both estates was thoroughly examined and suitably presented, by Parkin, in Tables of Tribe/Income Category (Tables XIII and XIV). From these tables we have drawn up Tables XV and XVI showing the numbers of household heads according to tribe in both Nakawa and Naguru Housing Estates.

In Nakawa, the Luo with 183 household heads constituted almost a quarter of the total number of heads of household, as they also did in Naguru with 146 heads. With the Acholi in second place at Nakawa and the Baganda in second place at Naguru, we find the Baluhya constituting about 10% of the household heads, in third place, on both estates. It is very important to remind ourselves throughout this survey that both, the Luo in first place on both estates, and the Baluhya, in third place on both estates, were ethnic groups migrating from Kenya. We shall, therefore at a later stage, group them together as Kenyans - representing, together with other smaller Kenyan ethnic groups (e.g. Kikuyu) a "Nationality
### TABLE XIII - NAKAWA ESTATE

Household Heads According to Tribe and Income Category (including occupants of bedspaces) (Oct. 1962)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>% of Total Household Heads</th>
<th>Very Low Income</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
<th>Middle Income</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Actual No. of Household Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100 125 150 175</td>
<td>200 300 400</td>
<td>500 600 700 &gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>21.99</td>
<td>1 29 33 20 25</td>
<td>50 15 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>9 30 23 9 8</td>
<td>17 9 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluhyia</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>4 18 14 14 9</td>
<td>14 4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugbara</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>9 18 15 6 1</td>
<td>13 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakiga</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>3 36 3 5 4</td>
<td>6 3</td>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basamia</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>2 8 5 5 11</td>
<td>6 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 6</td>
<td>11 5 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2 5 3 3 3</td>
<td>15 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro)</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1 7 4 4 1</td>
<td>9 4 2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13) 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basora )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyarwanda</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3 6 6 5 5</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1 3 3 3 3</td>
<td>10 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madi</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2 5 6 4 3</td>
<td>3 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1 3 6 4 1</td>
<td>6 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>- 2 1 3 2</td>
<td>8 6 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>- 4 1 2 1</td>
<td>1 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>2 10 5 4 5</td>
<td>14 3 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>99.76</td>
<td>41 186 131 95</td>
<td>86 187</td>
<td>61 10 6 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL IN %</td>
<td>4.98 22.60 15.92 11.54</td>
<td>10.45 22.72 7.41</td>
<td>1.21 0.73</td>
<td>0.24 0.12 2.07</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribe</td>
<td>% of Total Household Heads</td>
<td>Monthly Income Ranges - Shillings</td>
<td>Actual No. of Household Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Very low Income</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Middle Income</td>
<td>High Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of Total</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>22.64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluhya</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basamia</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugbara</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL IN %</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>24.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE XIV NAGURU ESTATE
Household Heads According to Tribe and Income Category (as at October 1962)
HOUSEHOLD HEADS ACCORDING TO TRIBE, IN NAKAWA AND NAGURU ESTATES (1962)

**TABLE XV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Actual No. of Household Heads</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>22.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluhya</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugbara</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakiga</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basamia</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyarwanda</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonam</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyankole</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basoga</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>823</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE XVI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Actual No. of Household Heads</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>22.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>19.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluhya</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basamia</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basoga</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugbara</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>645</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.01</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Tables prepared by Parkin from Government Statistics of Enumeration of Employees in 1962
It is also important to note, that while the Baganda came seventh at Nakawa with only 4.37%, they constituted almost one-fifth of the household heads at Naguru in second place after the Luo.

The Lugbara, Bakiga, Banyaruanda and Madi were mostly unskilled labourers, as we mentioned before, and most of them lived, therefore, at Nakawa. Apart from the Lubgara, who made up 7.9% of the household heads at Nakawa and only 2.02% at Naguru, the Bakiga, Banyaruanda, Madi, Banyancole and Jonam do not appear in any significant numbers at the higher-income Naguru Housing Estate. This indicates a concentration of families and members of these particular ethnic groups at Nakawa, while the Acholi represented another concentration at Nakawa with almost three times as many as at Naguru.

Another ethnic group that deserves special attention here is the Nubi – a Sudanese migrant group. With only 3.16% of household heads at Nakawa, the Nubi were twice as numerous at Naguru with 7.59% indicating a recognisable presence in a locality which was, otherwise dominated by the Kenyans, followed by the Baganda and the Nilotic linguistic group.

Once again, like in the case of the EARH housing estate at Nsambya, we have got both Kenyan tribal groups, the Luo and Baluhya in a commanding lead, albeit there is, this time, a surprisingly big proportion of the Baganda on the estate at Naguru. More surprising still is when we note that Southall and Gutkind (1957) estimated about 330 Baganda, 60.7% of the total at the time, to have occupied the bedspaces at Nakawa in 1955 compared to only 125 Luo.
These figures would appear to contradict our recurrent theory that the Baganda always stayed in areas under the jurisdiction of Mengo Municipality, and preferred to live in their own homes in the suburbs of the city, other than in the low standard housing within Kampala Municipality. Maintaining our theory, we probably need to point out the obvious that not every Muganda was born in Mengo or the surrounding rural areas, and as such not every Muganda had a home or his own piece of land in Kampala-Mengo and its suburbs. Apart from being a Muganda, and would therefore, much more easily find accommodation in Mengo than other migrants, any Muganda who had no relatives in the city who could accommodate him on arrival, had to look for housing just like any other migrant. And nor was every Muganda able to buy a plot of land and build his own house.

As there were many Baganda migrants who lived in supporter settlements like Kisenyi and Kivulu, so were there those who found accommodation in housing estates like Nakawa and Naguru. Southall and Gutkind explained this presence of the Baganda in such large numbers in bedspaces by pointing out that these were the most unskilled and transient group who came to Kampala from the more distant parts of Buganda. They were the uneducated and consequently low paid Baganda whose position approximated most closely to that of unskilled migrants of other tribes in Kampala.

In sharp contrast to the 1955 situation, Table XV shows the proportion of the Baganda in Nakawa to have dropped to a mere 4.37% by 1962. The reasons for this drastic change are mostly a matter of postulation since no research was conducted to establish the real causes. After acquiring some skills and earning some capital, it may be presumed that a Muganda migrant is in a better position to look for housing or even a plot of land in the suburbs. As a member of the local tribe a Muganda migrant is more likely
to have a higher mobility than other fellow migrants for he would be more easily accepted by his landlord tribesmen.

Furthermore, the possibility of rising through the residential hierarchies of the housing estates were not limited only to the Luo. Some Baganda may also be presumed to have moved from Nakawa to Naguru as their economic status improved over the years.

There is no real evidence to support this supposition, however, and a more likely explanation for the 20% Baganda population of the total number of household heads at Naguru in 1962 may be that these had come straight to the estate.

These, it may be seen from Table XIV, were mostly middle- and a few high-income earners who were, most probably, skilled and professional civil servants and industrial employees, who had been allocated housing on the estate.

With 11.17% of the total number of household heads for both Naguru and Nakawa, as compared to 22.41%, twice as many, Luo, it may still be said that the proportion of the Baganda on the housing estates was rather low, considering, as Parkin also pointed out, that the Baganda were the local tribe and the proportions of local tribes in housing estates in other African cities was much higher.

The main tribal group, the Luo, are not only followed by another Kenyan group, the Baluhya with a very high proportion, but do also share other ethnic linkages with the Acholi of Uganda who are numerous on both estates, particularly at Nakawa. As we explained in the example of Nsambya, the Luo and Baluhya are both Kenyan immigrants in
Kampala and are both faced with similar difficulties in becoming incorporated into the local society. The Baluhya and Basamia are also more closely linked ethnically than they are to the other Bantu (interlacustrine) groups on the estates. The Luo are Nilotics and therefore very closely linked to the Acholi, Lango and Jonam residents on the estate.

While there undoubtedly is a dominance of the Luo, Baganda, Baluhya and Acholi tribal groups as percentage totals on both estates, regrouping of tribal groups in Table XVII reveals the extent of ethnic clustering both, of the Nationality kind and of the Linguistic type.

With 32.4% of the total number of household heads, the Luo and Baluhya formed a very strong and recognisable ethnic concentration of Kenyans in the area leading to the popular identification of the estates with the city's Kenyan immigrants, particularly the more skilled and high-status.

Both the Luo and Baluhya tribal groups in the estates at Nakawa and Naguru had their own political Unions in association with the home political parties of the time KANU and KADU respectively. In Kampala, however, the Baluhya were willing to go along with the Luo as one strong force against the rival Baganda and their related interlacustrine Bantu tribal groups. Always politically more active than their Ugandan hosts (because of a more vigorous fight for independence in Kenya than was experienced in Uganda) the Kenyans directed their leadership and organizational skills into trade unionism with the result that membership in newly created unions increased six-fold throughout Uganda between 1958 and 1961 (Scott, 1966). The political power achieved by the Kenyans as leaders of some of the most important Trade
TABLE XVII

Total Number of Household Heads According to Tribe both in Nakawa and Naguru Estates Added Together (1962)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe</th>
<th>Actual No. of Household Heads</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luo</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>22.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baganda</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baluhya</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acholi</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lugbara</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nubi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basamia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakiga</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lango</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teso</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batoro</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyarwanda</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyoro</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basoga</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madi</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonam</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyankole</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>99.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unions was soon to lead to uncertainty about their future in Uganda, as Ugandan nationals anxious to get their jobs started voicing their grievances against the "excessive" numbers of Kenyans in Uganda. While the number of jobs in the Kampala African labour force declined from over 36,000 in 1957 to under 28,000 in 1961, the proportion of Kenyans in employment went up while that of the Baganda went down (Parkin, 1969(a)). The number of Kenyan workers increased from 10% in 1956 to 17.9% in 1961, as that of the Baganda fell from 42% to 31.5% during the same period.

Shortly before independence, at a time when the Baganda had launched a final effort to free the country from the imperialists, resentment of the Kenyan hold over jobs and trade unions was widely expressed, and was followed by constant attacks by government officials soon after independence. Despite the mildly hostile attitude towards them, the number of Kenyan workers in Kampala did not decrease in any significant way until the late 60s, notwithstanding the return of most of the Kikuyu after Kenya achieved independence in 1963.

The reasons for the Kenyans' persistence and political success in a foreign environment may be found in two explanations. Firstly, we already mentioned the apathy and reluctance of the Baganda to get involved in the imperial administration of the city and its economic machinery, until very late in the fifties when they stepped up the struggle against imperialism. The initial absence of the Baganda from the scene gave the Kenyans a lot of time to build a strong political base, though not an economic one. Another reason for such strong Kenyan influence may be found in the second type of ethnic clustering in Kampala East, which may not have been as obvious as the Kenyan Nationality cluster on the estates.
Going back to Table XVII, we have attempted to regroup the household heads at both estates according to their respective linguistic categories. We must explain, once again, that we are exceptionally side-stepping our classifications in order to make a more meaningful ethnic grouping by putting the non-interlacustrine Basamia and Baluhya together with the Nilotic Luo, Acholi, Lango and Jonam. Explaining the sense of fraternity between the Baluhya and Basamia, Parkin noted the significance of a Muluhya who had acquired a job by passing as a Ugandan Musamia, while some Luo posed as Acholi in similar situations. This tripartite relationship with the Baluhya as the middle link was repeated at the housing estates of Kampala East as it was at Nsambya.

The regrouping exercise, thus, gives us the following proportions: **Nilotics:** Luo + Acholi + Lango + Jonam + (Baluhya + Basamia) = 755 (51.4%)

**Sudanics:** Lugbara + Madi + Nubi = 177 (12.0%)

**Nilo-Hamites:** Teso = 39 (2.7%)

**Bantu:** Baganda + Bakiga + Batoro + Banyarwanda + Basoga + Banyoro + Banyankole = 352 (24%)

The results of the computations above immediately reveal that there were more than twice as many "Nilotics" as there were Bantu in the two estates. The sense of "foreignness" was shared alike by Kenyans and the other linguistically related tribal groups.

As migrants in Kampala, the sense of foreignness was,
indeed, shared alike by all tribal groups who culturally differed from the "sophisticated" interlacustrine tribal groups. The conventional wisdom in Kampala was, that Kampala East was for the non-Bantu (including the non-interlacustrine) immigrants while Menge and her suburbs was for the Baganda and her related tribal groups.

This state of affairs is the situation that Parkin described as "two significant hierarchies in residential localities; one of the Baganda and people who associated with them, and another for the non-Baganda migrants", quoted earlier on in our study.

The crude cultural difference between the Baganda and her "allies" and the rest of the migrants on the estates, was manifested in the case of Nakawa by conducting Tenants' Association General Meetings in Swahili with translations into English, rather than use Luganda, although almost everyone who stayed in Kampala for more than six months could very well understand Luganda. At Naguru though, because of the large proportion of the Baganda, the meetings were held in English and translated into both Swahili and Luganda. The language most commonly used in the estates was, Swahili, a foreign language, but the most acceptable compromise. The northern tribal groups in particular (the Nilotics, Sudanics and Nilo-Hamites) often pretended not to understand Luganda and would refuse to speak it, unless they had to, or when it was advantageous (chatting up women, for example).

The common feeling of being foreigners in an environment that was culturally, economically and politically dominated by the Baganda, encouraged the rest of the immigrants in Kampala East to unite behind the Kenyans in building up political power through the organisation of trade unions. With such a strong base and support particularly from the
co-Nilotic Acholi and Lango, the Kenyans were able to keep their hold on jobs in Kampala for quite some time before their numbers started steadily decreasing in the late 1960s, due to increasing political pressure.

Parkin made an elaborate study tracing the movements of some residents on the estates and the evidence gathered would clearly support chain migration as the process that led to ethnic clustering in the areas, as was the case in Kisenyi and Nsambya.

Officially, according to the Estates Management rules, houses were supposed to be allocated in order, off the waiting list, as they became vacant. No one, the rules stipulated, had the choice as to who his neighbours would be. This regulation was, obviously intended to disperse the various tribes all over the estates and avoid tribal clusters. It is, probably obvious that this bona fide regulation was rather naive and did not succeed much in its aims. Firstly, even if there were no other means of residents tricking the management into choosing their own neighbours, random allocation alone, particularly in the more numerous ethnic groups on the estates, had a fair chance of creating unintended clusters. If a Luo was next on the waiting list and the next vacant house was next to a house occupied by a Luo, there should be no reason why the applicant would not get the house.

Secondly, we stated at the beginning that the houses, themselves, were graded and territorially separated from the others. The rents were correspondingly different in the different house categories, and this must have led to economic status segregation. Economic status, on the other hand, was closely related to tribe as may be gathered from Tables XIII and XIV. There is a fair chance, therefore, that the Luo and Baganda could form a cluster in one
locality of the estate at Naguru while the poorer Madi and Jonam formed their own clusters in cheaper housing at Nakawa. For these latter two tribal groups, indeed, Naguru seems to have been either "out of bounds" or economically unattainable. While we have tried, with our scanty evidence, to suggest that many Luo and Baganda moved from Nakawa and got better housing in Naguru, there are certain tribal groups whose level of economic advancement was already considerably limited by just belonging to those tribes. Urban sociologists have explained what they call "Aspirational Disjunction" by identifying two levels of analyses. Hanna and Hanna (1977) argue that while the primary barrier to aspirational fulfilment is the lack of financial capital, the second barrier and, probably, more critical, is the unequal distribution of wealth. They observe that inequality in Africa had racial overtones originating from colonial times, which have been, since independence, replaced by a few "elite" and privileged tribal groups. Indeed, it may be argued that the Baganda managed to force their way into Naguru simply because of their elite status, both as indigenes as well as being economically powerful.

And finally, it is really impossible to believe that house allocation was always conducted in the fairest way and according to management rules, and that no foul play ever took place. The rich and powerful always find ways and means of achieving most of what they want. The author remembers visiting a relative (Muganda) at Naguru in the mid-sixties, who, boastfully, repeatedly narrated his story, to every visitor, of how he made sure that an Acholi neighbour was moved to another part of the estate, presumably a more "Nilotic" area. Similarly, Parkin reports of one Lango who confided that he deliberately caused the eviction of his former neighbour because he wanted a fellow-tribesman who was already high on the
waiting list to live next door to him.

Through such methods, together with bribery and nepotism ethnic clustering had, but to come up. We still have vivid memories of "tribal zones" on the estates, with the Baganda zone particularly distinct at Naguru.

**SUMMARY**

The developments in Kampala East towards the end of the forties marked the first initiative, on the part of the imperial government, to provide public housing for the urban Africans.

Similar to the situation at the EARH housing estate at Nsambya, both Kenyan tribal groups, the Luo and Baluhya were, once again, dominant at Naguru and Nakawa Housing Estates. We have here, therefore, ethnic clustering of the Nationality type. Again like the settlement at Nsambya, Naguru and Nakawa were popularly known in Kampala as "Kenyan" residential areas. And with their Trade Unions being operated from there, Kampala East was generally also known as the Kenyan "political headquarters".

At a lower level of ethnicity, we have seen that the Nilotics (Luo, Acholi, Lango, Jonam - supported, by the Baluhya and Basamia) far outnumbered the rest, thus, presenting a linguistic group cluster in the settlements.

And once again like at Nsambya EARH estate, the Luo dominated both housing estates forming, at the lowest categorisation of ethnicity, a concentration of the Luo tribal group in Kampala East. The Baluhya and Acholi did, also, form tribal group clusters at Nakawa while the Baganda and Baluhya presented similar clusters at Naguru.
The distinction between the Baganda settlement areas, (together with other interlacustrine tribal groups), and the rest of the African migrants, has been finally completed by the regrouping exercise on page 216 which shows a mere 24% representation by the former as against 76% by the rest. These percentages, compared with the 62% interlacustrine Bantu household head representation in Kisenyi (page 176) as against 38% for the others, provide further evidence to the distinction between settlements in Mengo Municipality and those in Kampala East. And it must be remembered here, that we suggested a few good reasons to suspect that the interlacustrine Bantu percentage is much lower than it might have been had population figures been available of the total number of residents in Kisenyi.

An even better distinction, between the "western Baganda settlement" and the settlement areas in Kampala East, for the rest of the migrants, could have been shown were such statistics available for the population living beyond supporter settlements in Mengo Municipality.

Here, too, it has been suggested that ethnic clustering was brought about by chain migrations, facilitated by the operations of the ethnic and kinship system, although the extent to which these factors affected settlement in the area, might have been less than in other residential areas particularly in the supporter settlements. Even more importantly, the sense of foreignness shared by most migrants to a city dominated by a powerful host tribal group, has been established as the major reason that led to the distinction in settlement patterns that many other writers have observed and frequently mentioned in their work.
CHAPTER 7

CLUSTERING BASED ON RELIGION

Apart from race, linguistic group, nationality and tribe, another source of residential clustering in Kampala was religion. Not only did religion leave a distinctive mark on the city's residential settlement structure, but it did also have a profound effect on the country's politics. The extent to which the importance of religion in Uganda may be applied was appropriately summed up in the statement that:

"At various times in Uganda's history, religious divisions have been extensions of other cleavages. At other times, religious distinctions have cut across or even redirected lines of social strain."

(Mittelman, 1975 p 69)

Religious loyalties united peoples of different (or separated those of the same) racial, tribal or geographical origin. At the time of the nation's first General Elections in 1961, the contest for government was mainly between two political parties, or rather, between two rival religious groups, Catholics and Protestants. The Democratic Party was popularly known as "The Pope's Religion" while the Uganda People's Congress was loosely referred to as the "United Protestants of Canterbury". It was the alliance promptly made between the Kabaka's less strong political party (King Only), and the Uganda People's Congress that finally did the trick and stopped the Democratic Party from winning the elections. For once, the Baganda found themselves deeply divided along religious lines. The threat of a Catholic central government broke down all the tribal barriers between the, otherwise, rival Baganda and Lango, for the leader of Uganda Peoples Congress was from the Lango tribe.
Spatially, however, religious residential clustering was the result of an initial random, but conscious, distribution of the country’s main religious groups in settlement areas facilitated by the city’s topographic characteristics. As we saw in the chapters on the city’s origin, when the first European missionaries arrived in Kampala, each group was allocated a hilltop by the Kabaka; Namirembe going to the Church of England group; Rubaga to the French Catholic White Fathers, and Nsambya to the British Catholic Mill Hill Fathers. Kibuli Hill became the Islamic centre in the city after it had been allocated to the Kabaka’s uncle who was the leader of the Muslims in Buganda.

All these religious institutions maintained and consolidated their activities on their corresponding settlements, eventually becoming some of the most important historical monuments and most noticeable landmarks of the city’s form. Besides the cathedrals and mosque, each one of these hills also had a Primary and Secondary School attached to the respective religious institution, as did all the "Christian hills" – Namirembe, Nsambya and Rubaga – have their own hospitals. While these hospitals were private and therefore unaffordable by the majority of the respective followers (who could seek free medical treatment in public clinics or the country’s major hospital at Mulago anyway) the Churches together with their schools attracted and encouraged settlement of followers all around the slopes of the hills.

Although we could not put our hands on any available empirical figures to support our claims, it can, none the less, be stated with a considerable amount of confidence that; Namirembe Hill and its immediate surroundings are settled almost exclusively by Anglican
Protestants; that Rubaga Hill and most of Nsambya Hill are predominantly occupied by Catholics; and most characteristic of all is Kibuli Hill as a Muslim settlement area. It is, indeed, Kibuli Hill, that our detailed micro study of ethnicity based on religious affiliation, is going to concentrate on.

Kibuli Hill

Kibuli Hill is located about 3 Km to the south of the city centre. Immediately below the mosque on the crest of the hill are situated three schools: Kibuli Primary School, Kibuli Secondary School, and Kibuli Teacher Training College. With the exception of the Teacher Training College, which is not strictly Muslim in nature, both the primary and secondary schools were created to educate children in the Muslim faith with a curriculum containing, among other things, subjects like Arabic and, of course, the teachings of the Koran. Being the only African Muslim schools in Kampala, at the time, (there were a few Asian Muslim Schools within the municipal boundaries) the primary and secondary schools at Kibuli were listed, in 1964, among the "overcrowded" and the Ministry of Education figures reported a 96% Muslim population in both. Although the majority of the students in both schools were residents of Kibuli Hill, many other Muslim parents sent their children to Kibuli, from wherever they happened to be living in Kampala’s suburbs.

The Secondary School and Teacher Training College were largely staffed by Europeans and a few Asians who, except for their contacts with those few students at school, led a life completely apart from the community surrounding them. The low hedges and wire fences which separated their spacious well-cared-for houses, from the mud structures of their neighbours on the eastern side of the
hill were a clear indication of where one world stopped and another one began. The southern middle slopes of the hill were, however, mainly occupied by spacious modern bungalows of well-to-do Moslems of social significance. Further down the hill towards the papyrus swamp that separates Kibuli Hill and the Nsambya Police Barracks, were concentrations of low-income settlers made up entirely of an African population engaged in various commercial activities in the supporter settlements around the slopes of the hill.

The total population of Kibuli Hill was listed at 1,026 in 1948, rose to 3,676 in 1959 and was reported as 12,180 in the 1969 National Census, giving very high annual growth rates of 12.8% from 1948 to 1959 and 13.2% from 1959 to 1969.

Although the period of rapid growth had only encompassed the past twenty years, the history of the community extended back to 1900 - seventy years at the time - when the site was given as a land grant to Prince Mbogo, leader of the Baganda Muslim community. His son controlled almost all of the village land and the absence of major land fragmentation may be attributed to the fact that there have been only three chiefs in the history of the community.

Originally cut off from both Kampala and the rest of the Baganda in Mengo by swamps (Kibuli Hill was also the furthest, of all the "Religious Hills", from Mengo) Kibuli was for long very much like a traditional village in social structure and appearance. Today a few of Mbogo’s actual followers and many of their children and grandchildren still live scattered throughout Kibuli. Over 20% of Kibuli’s present adult Baganda population were born there (Solzbacher, 1968).
The density of population within the Kibuli area varies considerably. The areas of greatest density are those nearest the Industrial area on the Eastern Slopes of the hill. According to Solzbacher, houses are, here, as close as two or four feet apart. This is the area inhabited mostly by migrants from outside Buganda and Uganda. Yet other portions of Kibuli, particularly on the southern side of Mbogo Road (see Map 19) still look like a Buganda village. In this area, the layout is typical of a rural setting under the invasion of the unguided hand of urbanization. The homes are surrounded by fairly large gardens of food crops and coffee trees. There is no proper coordination of the buildings and the service routes that feed them. Land properties are privately owned in irregular unstandardized shapes and sizes (Mulumba, 1974).

One interesting feature emerges as soon as one looks at the Land and Surveys maps of Kibuli and compares them with the housing dispersion that developed in the area through to the late 60s. One observes even more dense populations in the areas which were already densely populated in the past, with small clusters of dense housing spreading out haphazardly in all directions of the neighbourhood.

In spite of the tremendous tribal heterogeneity* of Kibuli's population, the area is best known to everyone in Uganda as the Muslim settlement symbolised, as we have

---

* Solzbacher claims there were "over eighty tribes from eleven countries" represented in Kibuli at the time of his research in 1968. We feel there might be a slight exaggeration here since we have already listed barely 40 different tribes resident in Kampala-Mengo by the 1969 population census. This unjustifiably over-inflated figure goes well beyond all reasonable estimates even if the population listed as "Others" in the census, was to be included.
Source: Mulumba, 1974

MAP 19 - KIBULI HILL - The Muslim Settlement
seen, by the presence of Uganda's principal African mosque at the top of the hill. In his survey of the area, Solzbacher (1968) discovered that the largest portion of the population born and living in Kibuli was Muslim. It was observed that the Baganda Muslims as well as other Muslims when moving from rural areas to Kampala, often moved to Kibuli. Solzbacher observed that this migration and settlement at Kibuli,

"...occurs even in cases where they could afford to live in better sections of town."

Here, the pulling force is principally the attraction of living with fellow Muslims in an Islamic environment, though we should not discuss ethnic linkages, altogether, which were always attached to these processes. As elsewhere in the city, migrants to Kibuli were no exception to the rules of migration. They came to Kibuli originally because they had relatives or friends from their rural home living in the area. These relatives and friends were, however, Muslims since the area had been settled by Muslims since 1900, soon after the founding of the city. Initially staying with these acquaintances while looking for work, they were most likely to find a room of their own in the area with which they were familiar. Before a room became vacant anywhere, other tenants often found a friend of relative to move in. In this way the cycle of migration and residential concentration of the Muslim population at Kibuli was encouraged and maintained.

Another reason that makes Kibuli an outstanding example of religious ethnic clustering, in contrast to her sister Missionary Hills, is the very fact that there existed, in the area, many distinct small ethnic enclaves of the tribal nature. Within Kibuli itself, Solzbacher's study revealed particular tribes concentrating in specific areas
on the hill giving rise to the development of ethnic
neighbourhoods. He found one neighbourhood comprised
completely of the members of one tribe from Northern
Uganda; Namuwongo neighbourhood was popularly known as
"Little Kisumi" because of its Luo dense population; Wabigalo was clearly identifiable with the Nubi from
Sudan; while the Baganda were mainly concentrated on the
southern side of the hill, as we have already stated.

On the contrary, while Namirembe and Rubaga are basically
Protestant and Catholic settlements respectively, they are
also typically Baganda settlement areas with no
recognisable migrant ethnic neighbourhoods.

Notwithstanding this great tribal variety, however, it was
established that many of the residents of Kibuli speak of
their settlement as a village quite apart from the city,
which they were physically part of. And not only did the
residents of Kibuli consider themselves separate from the
rest of the city's population, but so did the rest treat
the Muslims as almost a "tribe" of its own. It was not
uncommon to hear a Muganda saying of another Muganda
"well, he is a Muslim, isn't he?" if the occasion called
for such a comment. Such a statement would normally be
made in order to explain some "strange" behaviour or
sometimes even to disassociate oneself from someone.
There are countries after all, where one finds "Muslims"
listed as a separate "tribe" in national censuses.

It may be argued that the Muslim faith puts stronger
emphasis on human relationships than does the Christian
faith. Muslims tend to accept stronger commitments and
loyalty to each other, than the Christians do. In an area
inhabited by so any different tribal groups, Solzbacher
observed a community functioning with remarkably little
overt social strain. The crime rate was surprisingly,
under circumstances of poverty and squalor, one of the lowest in Kampala City as a whole. This, he explained "was due not only to lack of violations of penal codes, but also to the presence of the self regulatory mechanisms that characterise a viable, integrated community" (Solzbacher, 1968 p 48).

All this may be underlined by the respect and strict observance of the code of conduct of the Muslim faith. All the different tribal groups resident on Kibuli Hill were bonded by a common religious affiliation which (particularly in the Muslim religion), appeared to cut across all tribal and national boundaries to create a solid unit of a religious residential cluster on the hill.

Institutional arrangement of the religious nature, thus governed the entire range of group behaviour on Kibuli and her sister hills. Religions of various forms and kinds have had a strong influence on the people of Uganda so much that it has been an important factor in the settlement patterns that have evolved. In the main, religion is expected to make a positive contribution to urban development by promoting the high moral standards as we have seen in the case of Kibuli, so fundamental to the social and economic well-being of urban populations.
CHAPTER 8

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It has been shown that Kampala-Mengo cannot be studied and understood without a detailed description of the historical factors, the community, and its environment. For it is these, together with the political and socio-economic factors, at a later stage, that were the major factors that determined the form and spatial structure of the city as it may be perceived today.

Most important in the growth of Kampala-Mengo, was the joint confrontation of totally different cultures, embodying at the same time the impact of post-imperial on pre-imperial forms of urbanism.

In order to facilitate and legitimize the new imperial administration, it has been established that, collaboration was sought, and achieved, by the British from the Baganda, who, in return, enjoyed privileged status throughout the imperial era. The existence of a traditionally highly organised society at Mengo, on the other hand, was the main reason why there was never any significant settlement by Europeans in Kampala-Mengo, thus leading to our categorisation of Kampala as an Imperial and not Colonial City.

The 1900 Land Agreement (Mailo land) and the 1927 Busuulu and Envujjo Law, another political bargain between the Baganda and the Protectorate Administration, have been shown to have had great impact on the residential settlement patterns that evolved throughout the growth of the city.

The resulting urban structure, with its multiple nuclei
revolving around the centre on Nakasero Hill, the traditional indigenous focus at Mengo, several separate church and missionary settlements on the surrounding hill tops, racially segregated residential areas, and valley settlements for the African migrants around the boundary of Kampala township, all reflect a general pattern of urbanization that grew from the initial imperial set up.

The initial structure of the urban system was established with imperial objectives in mind, and subsequent growth has been more of an elaboration of this pattern than a transformation.

At the macro-level of Kampala-Mengo's settlement patterns, we have identified three distinct residential settlement areas; one for the Europeans, one for the Asians and one for the Africans.

Among the political and urban administrative policies that laid the basis for Kampala's residential structure, zoning based on race came out as the most important cause of residential clustering in the initial stages of the urbanisation process. In a more subtle way, later on in the city's development process, racial segregation was cleverly substituted by the grading of residential areas, according to type of housing construction and materials used. While this action would appear to have led to socio-economic segregation in lieu of residential racial segregation, the effect on settlement patterns remained, more or less, unchanged. In a situation of imperial domination, there was a close relationship between race, social status, income and thus residential location. In terms of social status and income, the order was Europeans, Asians and Africans. It followed, therefore, that the different residential locations based on housing standards continued to be occupied in that same descending order.
The question may arise here, however, whether all the Europeans were receiving a higher income than all the Asians or Africans. Similarly, were all the Asians receiving higher incomes than all the Africans. For if that were to be the case, then racial segregation in residential settlement, at this level, could satisfactorily, though not necessarily justifiably, be explained in terms of socio-economic attributes. Alternatively, if the answers to the questions above are negative, then one would have expected a certain amount of infiltration into high class residential areas by Asians and Africans of high socio-economic status.

The answer to both questions is, probably predictably, no. A lot of Asians in Uganda were much more wealthy than Europeans since the former were principally involved in trading professions while the latter were mainly civil servants. Several Baganda Chiefs were similarly of very high status and with incomes well beyond those of some of the Asians and Europeans. The socio-economic status of the three racial groups was described by Southall in the observation that:

"There are, in fact, wide status differences within each racial group. The real incomes of wealthy Baganda aristocrats are well above those of the lower economic levels of both the European and Asian groups. Some of them occupy important positions in Government bodies and state sponsored corporations, as well as in both the Baganda provincial Government and the central political system of the Protectorate. The more successful members of the Asian group are far more wealthy than the high status Europeans as a whole, whether the latter are in government or in business."

(Southall, 1956 p 324)
And yet we have seen that very few Asians (not to mention any Baganda) had managed to find their way into the European enclave at Nakasero by the 1950s. European and Asian residential areas still remained distinctively separate. The wealthy Baganda, on the other hand, whether high status chiefs or highly educated government employees, remained, and found pride, in residing on their own, sometimes extensive estates in their own houses in various parts of Mengo Municipality. The low-income African population was, simply, not catered for by the imperial urban authority until late in the 1940s. Up to this time, low-income Africans were accommodated in the township boundary only as domestic servants.

The underlying factor which led to racial clustering in the city’s settlement areas was the conscious imperial urban development policy which saw residential segregation as a desirable planning objective.

When the need to plan for the settlement of Africans in Kampala-Mengo was finally realised, two major factors determined the chosen locations in Kampala East. First there was the desire to keep residential areas for the Africans as far away from the city centre as was possible. This would, not only, ensure spatial segregation but also reserve the low density housing areas of Nakasero and Kololo.

Secondly, the impossibility of building public housing on the western side of Kampala, because of the private ownership of land in Mengo, necessitated the location of African settlements (and subsequent growth of the city) in the east, with the construction of the first government housing estates at Nakawa and Naguru.

Europeans and Asians did not leave Uganda overnight after
independence in 1962. The situation as regards residential settlement did, needless to say, change slowly with the gradual departure of some Europeans, particularly those who were involved with the imperial administration. African and Asian politicians moved in to occupy the former imperial administrator's residences at Kololo and Nakasero, as did top company executives. While this marked the end of racial segregation in residential settlement, it started off a process of socio-economic segregation in the settlement of the Africans, through the policies of a Ugandan dominated administration. We shall discuss more of this in the next few pages.

At the Micro-level, we have identified three main ethnic categories:

(i) Linguistic group
(ii) Nationality group
(iii) Tribal group

Ethnic clustering in residential areas (and in employment in some cases) has been shown to be a result of particular groups of people sharing certain common interests and affiliation, collecting together and living in particular localities of the city. Concentrations of pockets of tribal groups were found to be a common feature of supporter settlements, in the example of Kisenyi, as they were also present, albeit to a lesser extent in the housing estates of Kampala East. The examples of Nsambya, Naguru and Nakawa housing estates have presented ethnic clustering of the nationality nature where the Kenyans formed clusters in considerable numbers. Linguistic group ethnicity has been established in Kisenyi where the interlacustrine Bantu far outnumber the other groups while the Nilotic group in the housing estates of Kampala East dominate the rest. It has been stated that almost every urban dweller pays allegiance to each one of the three
categories of ethnicity at different times and under different circumstances. Furthermore, it has been shown that some urban dwellers can find membership to all three categories at one time, convenient and advantageous. Thus we saw that a Luo at Naguru feels safe among fellow Luo who make-up the majority of the estate, as a tribal group. The same Luo, an immigrant from Kenya, does share the same country of origin with the Muluhya migrant at Naguru who also comes from Kenya. They are both of the same nationality. This combination formed the nationality ethnic cluster at Nsambya, as we saw. The Luo man at Naguru, once again, is a Nilotic as is an Acholi. As members of the same linguistic group, they find it suitable to live together in the same area and thus producing, over time, another cluster of the linguistic nature.

Other characteristic ethnic residential clusters of the tribal nature that have been generally recognised by Kampala-Mengo’s residents (and identified by foreign visitors and researchers) include: Kisumu Kidogo (Little Kisumu), at Namuwongo for the Luo; Kwaziba settlement, another Bahaya cluster near Nakawa; Kitoro, a concentration of Batoro at Mulago; the Congolese (Zairian) cluster at Bulange; the Nubi area at Kisugu and similar smaller clusters scattered mainly within the various supporter settlements around the city.

A particular type of tribal (and linguistic) clustering needs to be briefly mentioned here.

It was mentioned in the text that in the category of free-employer provided housing, were the Police barracks at Nsamba (next to the EARH estate), the Police training college at Naguru, and the Uganda Army barracks at Mbuya. In all the three cases, these were, certainly Acholi and
Lango dominated institutions and thus the settlements were clusters of the Acholi at the tribal level (for these formed the majority) and the Nilotics, at the linguistic level. Different theories have been put forward as to the reasons for the dominance of the Nilotics (the northern tribal groups) in the police forces and the army. Most common of these explanations has been the suggestion by some writers (Mazrui, 1978; Fallers, 1964; Mittelman, 1975) that the taller northern tribes were physically stronger than the shorter and softer southern Bantu tribal groups. The northerners, according to this theory are a "martial" people while the southerners were supposed to be (because of their diet of less calorific value) comparatively of weak physique.

Despite the validity of some of the physiognomical distinctions, the theory miserably crumbles as soon as one refers back to empirical and historical evidence, for it was the Baganda and Banyoro (southern Bantu groups) who were the strongest military powers in the area before the arrival of Europeans.

Mamdani (1977) suggests, on the other hand, that it were the requirements of the British imperial administration, a minimum of 5 feet 8 inches, that eliminated the shorter southern peoples. This may well be true but still, in our opinion, an unsatisfactory explanation.

Linguistic, Nationality and Tribal ethnic clusters may be identified in many different localities all over the city reflecting a multi-nucleated residential character. But the most important, in terms of causal-effect, of all ethnic clusters, was the very clear distinction between the Baganda residential settlement areas (together with the other interlacustrine Bantu) and the rest of the urban population. Of the total area of Kampala-Mengo, the
initial pattern was, very much like; the north, west and south is for Baganda, and only the east, with a portion of the north east, is for the rest. The basis to the ethnic clusters within the African residential areas, that followed, may be thus found in the domination of the interlacustrine Bantu over the rest. Although the domination of the Baganda was also of an economic nature, it was rather the socio-cultural domination which mattered most. The manner in which immigrant tribes could be assimilated into Buganda society depended on variability of their socio-political systems. The very complex system of land tenure of the Baganda together with their favoured relationship with the imperial powers, made most of the immigrants (particularly the non-Bantu) feel unwelcome into Mengo territory.

Nor do we pretend to know the precise reason for the dominance of the Nilotic linguistic groups in employment and settlement in these institutions. Our own guess may be twofold. On the one hand, it is possible that the southern Bantu tribes simply did not want to join the army or police and work and live in such close contact (as particularly happens in such barracks) with the people they felt culturally (and otherwise) superior to. In fact being a member of one of the southern Bantu groups, it is well known to us that working in the police or army was generally despised and frowned upon among these groups - and it still is, to a certain degree.

Alternatively, it may be suggested that the imperial powers purposely avoided recruiting the southern tribes (here we have the Baganda particularly in mind) in the police and army so that they could more easily fight against them, should the occasion arise. With the historical rivalry between the north and south well in existence, the British only exploited the situation by
recruiting the more-than-willing northern tribes who were anxious to free themselves of political and military southern domination.

Careful not to get too far with the ideological set-up of the national institutions of security, we are trying to explain here, how ethnic clustering came about in these particular settlements. While it was still possible for a particular policeman or soldier to assist his brother or friend to join the forces, we also believe that these clusters were more a consequence of recruitment policy than any other factors.

In a situation where the Africans had already been spatially segregated by the imperial urban policies, their choices of urban residential location were restricted to intermediate areas between the two municipalities and depended on the availability of rented accommodation, the possibility of erecting their own housing, or compelled, at a later stage by lack of choice, to live in accommodation provided by employers or government. The patterns that evolved simply reflected the political and socio-economic relationship between the indigenous people, as a tribe, and the rest of the migrant tribal groups.

In the patterning of residential areas in Kampala, it might be suggested that the concept of ethnicity stresses the importance of group status and culture in determining the urbanite's place of residence. The degree to which the non-interlacustrine Bantu tribal groups were spatially segregated was the result of social subordination engendered by cultural dissimilarities and socio-economic superiority by the Baganda and their allies.

Lastly, the topography of Kampala provided a convenient landscape for implementing planned residential development
and functional zoning. The several flat hills offered different nuclei for residential development as did the valleys in between after being drained. Characteristic of the city’s structure, are the centres of power and educational and religious institutions scattered on all surrounding hill tops, of which religious clusters were the most noticeable.

Existing research material provides little systematic information as to what concrete changes have taken place in Kampala’s residential settlement patterns since the radical political changes of the early 70s. Our own intentions to carry out field research in Kampala were thwarted by the then precarious political situation in the country.

Judging from the observed trend of events, however, it is expected that urban neighbourhoods will become more ethnically mixed, and the original characteristic concentrations of particular ethnic groups in specific areas will become more and more blurred. For while the first-generation immigrants may regard their places of origin as "home", and as such maintain the chain migration through ethnic linkages, their children born in Kampala, and thereon, will be much more likely to consider themselves as real "urbanites". The movement towards a modern, monetary economy has, already, changed many people’s attitudes to the institutions of kinship and ethnicity, so much that some of the "educated" urban dwellers fight hard (among urban friends) to pretend that they have no social or kinship connections with "villagers". Indeed to the urban youth, it is fashionable and posh to be "urban" and embarrassing to be a rural migrant. Many rural immigrants in Kampala’s schools often claim wrong birthplaces around the city’s surroundings.
But while all these political and socio-economic forces have acted over the years on Kampala's population, it may still be said that the original ethnic settlement patterns had a profound impact on the city's general residential structure which may be traced up to today.

As Southall (1967) remarked, the study of Kampala-Mengo is particularly interesting because it contains within itself most of the major elements combined at different strengths, which are found in African cities of quite varied type, such as older, more traditional West African cities and the newer, European-dominated cities of East and Central Africa. It combined both racial and ethnic segregation, and political dominance of a particular African tribe - here parallels could be drawn with the Ibos in Nigeria and the Kikuyu in Kenya. It included traditional and modern roles, local African residents of long standing and high status, as well as thousands of temporary migrant labourers of many ethnic backgrounds.

This combination of various elements, which may be found in several other African cities, gives Kampala the structural richness that may elevate it to the state of a model for the comparative analysis of similar cities.

CONCLUSION

Urban ethnicity continues to play an important role in people's choices of residential location. Despite the socio-economic and political changes that have taken place since European colonisation (and subsequent independence) ethnic group membership still considerably influences the perspectives and practices of the residents of Kampala City. Few people will deliberately settle in areas where conveniences are few and life is going to be difficult - although as we have stated, the choices are very limited.
Unable to speak the language, ignorant of the customs of the host tribal group, and rarely possessing more than a minimal amount of money, a migrant naturally seeks a locality where customs are more familiar and the cost of living fairly cheap.

It is certainly true that new immigrants attach themselves to their fellow-tribesmen or kinsmen already in the town which leads to groups of immigrants identifying themselves with particular localities of the urban area. This practice of joining "their own kind" enables the migrants to exploit to the full any tribal rights they may have for help, whether kinship obligations or duties to age mates.

Analytically it is very difficult to separate general obligations to fellow ethnics from the more specific obligations derived from kinship, friendship, and neighbourhood in the rural areas where they come from. Their significance for inter- and intra-ethnic relations derives from the way in which the exercise of the obligations is interpreted and the extent to which, as a result, ethnic clusters are created or maintained in the urban areas.

The imposition of imperialism over Uganda meant that another set of political institutions was superimposed on the traditional arrangements. While the new set was in many ways distinct from the old in the sense that Africans, even in the later years, had only very limited participation in the political system, the new institutional arrangement did affect the traditional system. In the first place constraints were imposed through the 1900 Land Agreement which made the Baganda chiefs less dependent on the Kabaka for their welfare, albeit, this did not undermine their loyalty to him and the Kingdom. The landed gentry thus created together with
the introduction of a cash-crop economy saw the departure from pre-colonial subsistence farming to post-colonial capitalism. And the movement towards the modern monetary economy led to the creation of the working class, driven out of their rural areas by the legal requirement to pay cash taxes.

Migration to Kampala has accelerated still further since the country achieved its independence from Britain. In the euphoria that followed immediately after independence, politicians promised economic prosperity to everyone in the country, which only encouraged more potential migrants to head to towns and share the wealth of their newly born country. As Abrams observed when commenting on urbanisation in developing countries:

"Changes in political patterns have been sudden and revolutionary as well. Often the new state would be trestled on a constitution glowing with lofty language but with no precedent for applying it to a specific set of facts. "Freedom", "social security", dedication to the "public welfare" are all promised before there is the experience, tradition, purchasing power, or industry to bring them into bud."

(Abrams, 1964 p 48)

While Abrams could be accused of ethnocentrism (for he appears to be blaming the new governments for the economic dependence which they inherited from their former colonial masters), his first sentence above, could not have described the situation in Uganda any better. After failing to deliver much of the promised goods (particularly in terms of economic prosperity) a really drastic measure was taken by a new government which expelled all the Asian population from the country in
1972, in order to "put the economy in the hands of Ugandans". The immediate effect of this move (we shall not discuss the political and economic ramifications) was the completion of a process of "residential decolonisation" which had started with the approach of independence.

Residential clustering based upon racial segregation had finally been totally replaced by clustering based upon other factors, especially wealth and education. At the macro level, the pattern had, henceforth, changed from three distinct racially separate zones to a classification between high income and low income residential areas. The grading of buildings into three grades with the style of housing and density of housing varying accordingly has ensured the preservation of a characteristic imperial urban morphology of the rich living at the top of the hill and the poor at the bottom. As the racial character of this stratification gradually disappeared, a social class stratification rapidly took over. The clusters that emerged in the former European and Asian residential areas were, thus, politicians and top civil servants in Nakasero and Kololo, company executives at Nuyenga Bugoloobi and Mbuya and African traders and businessmen in the central areas formerly occupied by Asians.

According to theory (Hanna and Hanna, 1971; Gutkind, 1974) segregation by income group should lead to a lessening of other relationships based upon ethnic group membership and an increase in those based upon other qualifications. Judging from our own experience in Kampala, this assertion would hold fairly true within the educated and high-income categories, where non-ethnic clustering is more common. As an immigrant rises up the economic ladder, he becomes less dependent upon kinship and ethnic ties for social and economic security and tends to move away socially and
spatially. His choices for residential location then become wider and considerations of market equilibrium forces become more applicable if, and where, they operate. The upper and middle class may, thus, free itself of ethnic clustering in favour of social class clustering.

Unfortunately, as Southall (1959) points out, not all urban dwellers are consciously engaged in a struggle for status. The lower their skill and consequently their income, the more loosely they are attached to the urban economy, since they are always striving to survive in the urban environment. This makes them less interested in the urban community and maintains the strong ties with their rural areas of origin. Although some of these migrants never go back to their rural homes and become permanent urbanites, they are passive figures in the political structure and active participants in the lower reaches of the economic scale, with much of their kinship and tribal allegiances very much alive. Unable to participate fully in the modern commercial-industrial economy, this group of urban dwellers (which, as we have seen forms the majority of Kampala’s population) are still dependent on the existence and operations of the kinship and ethnic systems.

The scarcity of urban housing in a city with an annual growth rate of 2.5%, coupled with the structure of a land market that is still burdened with customary landholding practices which impede land transactions, all contribute to the maintenance of ethnicity in low-income residential areas. Residential mobility within these groups has, therefore, continued to be slowed by these factors. The most general statement that can be made is that in the new urban situation, the scope of kinship rights and duties has narrowed and probably become more uncertain and the body of kin included in them become more reduced. Simple
lack of living space in densely populated dwellings, financial difficulties associated with the present economic recession, on top of the already minimal incomes, are some of the major forces that are working towards weakening the kinship and ethnic system. Already living space, housing costs and cost of living in the urban area, are reducing the extended family system to conjugal and nuclear units.

Government policies too, have at times, been rigorously implemented to remove elements of traditional institutions "that are not conducive to development". One such measure was the abolition of traditional Kingdoms which was followed a few years later by the total destruction of the indigenous settlement at Mengo. While the Kabaka's palace was turned into an army barracks, and the Buganda parliament building turned into battalion administrative headquarters the trading centre was gradually turned into residential quarters for soldiers, thus leaving no trace of any "notorious" Buganda-sub-imperial headquarters. Yet Buganda's importance, influence and dominance continue to affect over-all development, through their still superior position in education and the economy.

Without going away from the point we were trying to make, we may also add to the list of forces in operation today, the observation that most of the modern social and economic institutions simply operate in opposite directions to traditional, social systems. While tradition bowed in respect to a man who fathered many children (in most cases with several wives) modern society despises polygamy and the rearing of many children presents, particularly in urban areas, a heavy economic burden.
APPENDIX - Kampala's Population by Census Divisions - 1980

Data from Population Census Report 1980

KAWEMPE DIVISION
82,885

RUBAGA DIVISION
103,746

NAKAWA DIVISION
81,913

CENTRAL KAMPALA DIVISION
76,655

MAKINDYE DIVISION
113,304

TOTAL POPULATION
458,503

Total Land Area
150 Sq Km
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