



7

Forced Resettlement, Rural Livelihoods and Wildlife Conservation along the Ugalla River in Tanzania¹

Eleanor Fisher

Introduction

In the twentieth century, the conservation of wildlife within protected areas in East Africa involved radical change in the relationship between people, land and natural resources. Population resettlement played a part in this change; areas of land now protected under wildlife and forestry laws were once populated and people were moved – forcibly or otherwise – by colonial and post-colonial authorities.² However, the links between population resettlement and the gazettement of protected areas for conservation purposes are complex and have led people to re-interpret and contest both resettlement and conservation goals in many different ways.

Understanding how experiences of population displacement and resettlement in the past are given expression in the present is critical if we are to appreciate fully the nature of people's connections to many protected areas in East Africa today. These connections include productive activities, but they encompass also the meanings people give to conservation and to their interactions with representatives of the state and conservation agencies.

This chapter takes a case from western Tanzania, near the Ugalla River, which is today enclosed within a protected area, Ugalla Game Reserve. It is based on archival sources and ethnographic fieldwork undertaken in Tanzania between 1992 and 1994.³ The discussion focuses on the transformation of Ugalla from a territory inhabited by people to a protected area conserved for wildlife. In this case, the human population was forcibly moved in the mid-1920s as a public health measure. This eviction can be seen as a ‘critical event’ that opened up the possibility for the territory to be used in new ways. Approximately thirty years after the human population was resettled, Ugalla was gazetted for the conservation of fauna and flora. In effect, the land was transformed from a tribal homeland into a state managed protected area, governed by conservation goals, policies, values and practices.

What makes this an interesting case is that, despite resettlement policies and conservation laws restricting access to the area, the original inhabitants and other rural people have never been totally excluded. Moreover, both colonial and post-colonial authorities have recognized that resource use in Ugalla is important to people’s livelihoods. Part of the reason people have managed to maintain a presence in the area is through the way tribal identity and resettlement history have been used as a means to negotiate access to Ugalla. For, after the human population was resettled, they continued to lay claim to their past area of habitation and, in so doing, maintained a presence within it in ways that generated different historical trajectories to those envisaged in the original resettlement plan.

One way these claims were consolidated was through use of Ugalla on a seasonal basis for productive activities such as hunting, fishing, honey hunting and beekeeping. Over time this led to the development and institutionalization of beekeeping and fishing as specialized livelihood activities permitted within Ugalla Game Reserve. In this respect, forced resettlement spawned the beginning of a contradiction between administrative objectives – those that drove both resettlement actions and later conservation planning – and local people’s need to make a livelihood and desire to have access to Ugalla on their own terms. Thus, in more recent years, the conservation of wildlife in a purportedly ‘natural’ area, has met with counter-tendencies that have generated a field of action in which it is possible to observe different interpretations of what constitutes the locality of Ugalla. These interpretations emerge in an on-going tension between state claims over Ugalla as a game reserve, and local people’s claims over Ugalla as a place where they wished to carry out productive activities.

Sleeping Sickness Resettlement from the Ugalla River: A Critical Event in the Life of the People

People living near the Ugalla River were forcibly resettled as the British colonial response to a sleeping sickness epidemic that erupted in western Tanganyika during the mid-1920s.⁴ It was held that by re-locating the population

into concentrated settlements away from the river, tsetse fly, a carrier of the sleeping sickness trypanosome, could be kept 'at bay' and people protected from the disease.

Resettlement took place in three consecutive stages corresponding to the dry seasons of 1925, 1926, and 1927. People were moved to seven areas known as resettlement 'concentrations' each situated approximately 50 to 80 kilometres from the river.⁵ It is estimated that a total of 9191 people were moved; although whether all came from near Ugalla River, and how accurate the process of enumeration was, is not known.⁶

Historical accounts by men who lived through the evacuation tell of a Doctari Makaleni (Dr Maclean) who came to tell them they had to move (Fisher, field diary 1993). They describe how huts were burnt, how people were afraid of the lorries that came to transport them, and of old people who refused to leave and who, left behind, were eaten by hyenas. After the move, people experienced a lot of hardship. One man described how:

when we moved the life was bad and we were not blessed. At this time there was sleeping sickness ... [in Ugalla] ... but even so there was a lot of food ... Even before we moved, when we came to sell beeswax people here would say 'no don't come' and we would reply, 'no we eat our ugali ... [staple food] ... of cassava and finger millet differently from you' ... [i.e. prefer our own customs] (Fisher, field diary 1993).

Some older people still refer to the resettlement area as a 'counterfeit country'. The move also generated political conflict, as previously independent chiefdoms were seemingly subordinated to others in the resettlement areas.

In the 1930s, as the sleeping sickness epidemic spread, resettlement concentrations became established in other parts of the region. Agents of modernization, expressed through Christian missions, education, health care, agricultural and veterinary extension work, all gravitated towards the spaces delimited by the resettlement schemes.⁷ The hopes of administrators are echoed in sentiments expressed by the Provincial Commissioner for Western Province: '[i]n their ignorance bush natives must realise the advantages of safe community life properly administered, must eventually out-weigh the joys of being left alone ...'⁸ This is not to say that there was no resistance to the new centralizing trajectories of colonial administrators. Once moved, some people simply ran away to live in the forest, as was the case on a number of occasions in Ugalla.⁹

As a window to assist us to examine the consequences of forced resettlement from Ugalla, we can conceive resettlement as a critical event that radically transformed the nature of people's presence in the locality. This is not to say that other events (e.g. warfare, long-distance trading, German colonization) did not have a significant impact on the local population. However, population resettlement was a situation in which individual and collective relationships to the locality were irrevocably changed in a very short period of time. The dramatic nature of this change fed into a process in which people had to encompass and internalize new experiences, social relationships,

livelihoods, memories of the past, and visions of the future (c.f. Long 1997). By viewing resettlement in this way, our attention is directed not only to the shock people experienced, but also to their responses to the event, including their capacity to rebuild their lives. It also enables us to examine how the act of resettling the population was an event that precipitated change in land use in Ugalla and necessitated specific, on-going, administrative actions on the part of the British colonial government.

Identifying People According to Productive Categories: the Rise of Administrative Problems

Once Ugalla had been depopulated, a potential for the area to be exploited in new ways had been created: past inhabitants began to generate different connections to the area, and new interests started to arise. As one old man described:

you know when someone leaves the place he has lived, he has his memories ... every year it was an obligation to return. People went by foot ... in two or three days you would arrive with nothing and make *kangara* ... [beer made with honey] and drink lots, eehh. In the resettlement area, people said 'you should not make *kangara* ... [due to attempts to control drunkenness and make people use staple crops 'sensibly'] (field diary 1993).

Despite people's desire to return to live in Ugalla, district and regional administrative officials would not permit this to happen and, to uphold the objectives of the resettlement policy, the administrative status of the area was changed. Because of the continued threat of sleeping sickness, the region surrounding the Ugalla River became categorized as a 'quarantine zone' on public health grounds. People were only permitted to enter the quarantine zone on terms established by administrative officials, namely as part of an accepted seasonal labour migration to work as 'fishermen'. Other categories of people were actively excluded from the area, they included 'hunters', 'settlers' and 'women'. Thus began an annual struggle between officials wishing to control people's presence in the area, and people who wanted to return to Ugalla each dry season.

In the way administrators sought to control people's access to Ugalla, we see that after resettlement these rural people became categorized according to the forms of the productive resource use they engaged in. These categories are important because legitimacy was only accorded to certain types of productive activity, while other activities were banned. Thus, prior to the move, written descriptions of people living near the Ugalla River describe, for example, 'the Wagalla', 'native Africans', 'taxpayers' or 'sleeping sickness cases' (see Burton 1860; Reichard 1892; Cameron 1877; AWSID 1916; [RH.Mss 2551, 1919]; Maclean 1929a/b). However after resettlement, and in keeping with wider regional transformation, one can witness a change as people became referred to as 'fishermen', 'hunters', 'honey hunters' and 'agri-

culturists'. Each of these categories is linked to a productive activity, particularly those carried out by men. In effect, these economic categories fed into official perceptions of the problems confronting the administration of Ugalla, generating a perceived need for new administrative solutions.

Hand in hand with categorization of people according to productive activities, was the fact that people themselves were generating new associations with Ugalla, based on these forms of resource use. Productive categories of resource use were not simply imposed from outside; they also reflected long-term change in the nature of productive activities for the people concerned.

In the 1930s, development in the region was biased towards the promotion of agriculture, but it was recognized that this was not the only activity that men undertook (women are largely invisible in the referenced archival sources).

Agriculture is, and I hope it always will be, the main occupation of the natives ... [but] ... it is a fact that it does not occupy anything like all their time ... [the] ... slack season ... [lasts for] ... half the year ... during which time, in this Province probably 10,000 men spend their spare time every year in collecting honey and fishing.¹⁰

Despite notions of non-agricultural activities being 'spare time', permitting men to fish along the Ugalla River was recognized as important for those concerned.

One difficulty associated with fishing on the River was that men continued to catch sleeping sickness. As a consequence, a native authority ordinance was instituted that covered the area around the Ugalla River (Tabora District Book 1935).¹¹ It stated that fishermen proceeding to the Ugalla River were to go in large parties under a leader; any sick were to be sent at once to hospital; and the whole party was to proceed for medical examination at the end of the season.

In interview, the grandson of a man who acted as a fishing leader told how: 'one day, at the time we moved, we chose one person as a leader and he was a fisherman'. He proceeded to describe how:

it was yourself and your own nets, you said you were going to build a camp ... but to have a camp first you had to come and see the Chief ... each leader of every camp was given permission ... it was essential that you came to see the Chief to build in a certain place. He was the leader of all the river from Koga to Silongwe, he was the Chief of the area ... If a person had done something really wrong he was brought here to Siri and then chased from the riverside (Fisher, field diary 1994).

Although referred to as a 'chief' the leader was not one in an administrative sense but a skilled and respected fishing leader. A key point in this description is the fact that the fishing leader was not simply imposed by administrative officers, but held an existing and accepted role. This is important; not only do we have to understand how the colonial administration exercised its authority on the fishermen, but also how the fishermen kept and renegotiated their right to use the river and to be responsible for their own well-being.

The fact that a fishing ordinance was implemented is relevant because it reveals how attempts were made to control people's access to the area they had previously inhabited. In this sense, we can see the policy of resettlement, and subsequent actions to prevent people from catching sleeping sickness, acted as a means to discipline the local population.

Alongside fishermen, 'native hunters' were a problem for the administration of Ugalla. This was also due to the threat of sleeping sickness and the need to control people's presence near the river. However, 'the problem' of native hunting was treated very differently from that of fishing. Unlike fishing, it was illegal and led to direct confrontations with colonial administrators, many of whom were keen hunters. Ugalla River was the main sports hunting ground in the region, and native hunters were blamed for game being 'shot out'. As a result, attempts were made to register or confiscate their muskets and some men were taken to court.¹²

In addition to fishing and hunting, people tried to resettle in Ugalla as small groups returning on an ad hoc basis. Because of the continued threat of sleeping sickness, and also because new settlements represented failure for those charged with maintaining the resettlement policy, the colonial authorities kept forcibly re-evacuating settlers. For example, in 1938–9, a new rise in sleeping sickness cases was recognized and linked to fishing, honey hunting and 'a tendency to shift back into individual communities'. Some 48 'families' and 'fish-mongers' were reported to be residing at the river or in nearby bush (west Ugalla). All were forcibly removed because, in the view of the Provincial Commissioner, 'there would have been 480 by this time next year'.¹³

An interesting social aspect of the dynamic of colonial attempts to prevent people from returning to live in Ugalla was a prohibition on women going to the river. This was seen as an important means to stop seasonal settlements from becoming permanent (c.f. Mblinyi 1989 on Tanganyikan colonial policies restricting female migration).¹⁴ Indeed, successive representatives of both the colonial and post-colonial administrations have sought to exclude women from Ugalla because they were – and are – thought to generate problems; not only through the threat of establishing new settlements, but also as the cause of fighting and drunkenness within seasonal camps, thus upsetting what was – and is – considered to be social order (with implicit inferences to prostitution and lack of moral control).

From the limited texts available on Ugalla prior to the mid-1920s, and from oral historical accounts, it would appear that women did not hunt, fish or honey hunt.¹⁵ Nonetheless, they were living in villages in the area and undertook many different productive and reproductive activities. Absence of habitation and tasks associated with women after the 1920s, suggests a very different use of the space from that time, with dry season productive activities undertaken by men in Ugalla being separated from other tasks and aspects of daily life in villages in the region.

Whether people's sense of belonging to Ugalla was erased by resettlement and the administrative categorization of people (men) according to productive activity can be disputed. What is clear is that some people approached

the new situation through the reorganization of seasonal activities in such a way that a livelihood could be made in Ugalla and associations with the area maintained. This was to the exclusion of certain categories of people, which included women, children and the old or disabled, as well as others who did not carry out forest activities. In practice, fishing may not have been the only activity that men engaged in or even the main reason for going to the river. However, over time occupational activities did change and become more market oriented, with certain forms of production being institutionalized as key forms of resource use in Ugalla: for example, fishing and beekeeping – to the exclusion of others, such as agriculture and hunting.

To summarize, while the authorities recognized that they could not prevent people returning to the area outright, they sought to confine entry to ‘fishermen’ for a limited part of the year, asserting authority indirectly through a fishing leader, and by using the discipline of medical intervention on people’s bodies. In contrast, ‘native hunters’ had to have their weapons registered or were taken to court; women were excluded to prevent ‘unruly behaviour’ and permanent settlement, while re-settlers were forcibly evicted. At one level, the resettlement policy was unsuccessful because people could not be prevented from returning to the area or from catching sleeping sickness. However, there was a dramatic change in the nature of human occupation and in the use of resources that did enable greater government control over and organization of the population.

The Enclosure of Land for Conservation: Ugalla River Game Controlled Area

The changing status of Ugalla fed into a process of re-categorizing and re-evaluating the area by a variety of social actors who represented different interests. A bridge was built across the River, lumbering took place, and Ugalla drew the attention of colonial scientists anxious to carry out botanical, geological, entomological and zoological research (Phillips 1931; Jackson 1936; Milne 1936; Potts 1937; Glover 1939).¹⁶ In addition, it became part of a fashionable western hunting circuit for wealthy tourists seeking to shoot lion, greater kudu, black sable, roan and water fowl (Sayers 1930; Rodger 1954; Moffett 1958).¹⁷

The presence of these new social actors in Ugalla gradually brought about a change in the administration of the area. Whereas public health issues had been central to administration in the region through the 1920s and 1930s, from the 1940s a new administrative emphasis was placed on the need for rational forms of natural resource management and development planning (Iliffe 1979: 436).¹⁸ As part of this process, in the 1950s extensive areas of western Tanganyika (land from which people had been forcibly resettled due to sleeping sickness) were enclosed within forest reserves and game controlled areas. This included the region surrounding the Ugalla River and meant that people’s rights to use resources or to settle were severely restricted through new forestry and fauna preservation laws.

The absence of settlements or agricultural activities near the Ugalla River projected an image of the area as uninhabited. This representation provided extra cultural and social value for outsiders to whom it appeared a ‘natural landscape’. Its flora and fauna could be valued according to scientific (and sporting) standards, as against the economic motives of entrepreneurs or the livelihood interests of rural people. This contributed to Ugalla being gazetted as a conservation area in which wildlife were controlled and protected. The first part of Ugalla to be gazetted was a small portion in the east, the result of entomological experiments on tsetse fly, not for wildlife preservation per se.¹⁹ This new status of Ugalla as a conservation area was achieved largely thanks to the earlier history of population resettlement.

In the new policies on natural resource management and development planning, we see the perpetuation of administrative attempts to keep people out of Ugalla, albeit for conservation rather than sleeping sickness prevention purposes. At the same time, however, administrators familiar with the area recognized that the exclusion of rural people was impossible to administer and, importantly, that Ugalla played a significant role in their livelihoods.

The status of activities such as fishing in Ugalla was influenced by wider change as forms of seasonal production were given increased emphasis within regional development. In the 1940s and 1950s, the colonial government was actively trying to promote the beeswax and fishing ‘industries’ (Rodger 1954). Indeed, for the first time reference was made to ‘beekeeping’ in administrative documents, with the term ‘honey hunters’ transformed to the more progressive category of ‘beekeepers’. This was in keeping with Ugalla River having become one of the main locations for extension work by the newly created Beekeeping Section (Smith 1994).²⁰

In 1952, D.K. Thomas, the Game Ranger for the Western Range, promoted the need for a game controlled area in the Wala–Ugalla River area in order to control the hunting and lumbering that was taking place, and to provide a breeding sanctuary for the types of animals that inhabit *Brachystegia* woodland (Thomas 1961).²¹ Thomas did not point to native hunters as the main culprits of game destruction; instead, extensive ‘illegal and unsporting hunting’ by resident British, Arabs and Greeks and by foreign tourists was held to blame, while Greek entrepreneurs were held responsible for lumbering.

Support for ‘native rights’ in the proposed protected area was voiced by a number of colonial officials. For example, in promoting the need to conserve Ugalla, the Provincial Commissioner argued that ‘[the GCA would not] ... affect the interests of Africans, as it is all fly country and the only inhabitants are fishermen’.²² But the Game Ranger was strong in his advocacy of the interests of these fishermen: ‘it is however essential that Africans be allowed to continue their fishing activities in the proposed controlled area’.²³ Similar support was given for beekeepers by the District Commissioner for Mpanda and the Beeswax Officer in Tabora.²⁴ From these accounts, one gains an impression that this reflects an administrative awareness that fishing and beekeeping were entrenched in Ugalla and that they could not be prevented, and were important productive activities. Furthermore, recognition was given to

the value of local knowledge as fishermen were seen as a potential source of information concerning what was taking place in the area (e.g. poaching). Indeed against the context of the enclosure of vast areas of land from which people had been forcibly resettled, as forest reserves, native rights to forest produce became a political issue in the 1950s (Rodger 1954: 46–47).

In the event, once its boundaries had been agreed, the Ugalla River Game Controlled Area was gazetted in 1954.²⁵ Three classes of resource user were permitted to use the area on licence: ‘beekeepers’, ‘fishermen’, and ‘sports-hunters’ (i.e. international trophy hunters).²⁶ Sports-hunting in particular was felt to provide ‘justification for the formation of these areas’.²⁷ Nevertheless, the way the interests of African people were taken into account by civil servants responsible for gazetting Ugalla River Game Controlled Area reveals that the conservation process was nothing as simple as a clear-cut exclusion of local interests. Within the colonial administration there were different views and the goal of conservation had to be negotiated vis-à-vis recognition of the importance of the beekeeping and fishing ‘industries’ for the region and for the livelihoods of the people concerned. Thus, we can see how contradictions between visions of the future of the locality held by rural people on the one hand, and an external conservation vision on the other, were becoming embedded in the way Ugalla was transformed into a protected area.

People’s Return to Ugalla: A Bid to Resettle the Land

Once Tanganyika received its Independence from Britain in 1961, new social actors emerged. They included African bureaucrats in local government, refugee fishermen and women from Burundi, Zaire and Malawi, sports-hunting Tanzanian citizens and Burundian ivory traders. In the case of Ugalla, local leaders articulated their claims through a language of African rights and ‘tradition’. They argued that Ugalla had been forcibly taken by the colonial government, and that it was part of their traditional homeland, being the place they had originated from, closely associated with their tribal identity (*‘Ugalla’* meaning place/territory of the Galla). Their claims went beyond the demand to make a livelihood; they argued that they wished to return to live there, in effect challenging Ugalla’s status as a conservation area.

We can trace claims to resettle Ugalla back to the 1940s. In 1994, when I interviewed a man, *Mtemi* (Chief) Nsokoro Mvula, who had been a chief until the 1960s, he said that he had first sought to mobilize people to return when his father, a chief from Ugalla, had died. He said that it was necessary to bury his father in Ugalla, and they would have to offer libations (*tambiko*) to him each year. Also, he himself no longer wanted to be subordinate to the host chief in the resettlement area. *Mtemi* Mvula’s account is confirmed by archival documentation. In 1948, the District Commissioner agreed that *Mtemi* Mvula and his supporters could move to settle in the far western portion of Ugalla; subsequently he drove the Chief there in his motor vehicle. *Mtemi* Mvula represented this as a victory, but the agreement was in keeping

with a perceived need for new resettlement concentrations due to labour demands in the Lupa Gold Mines and along the Mpanda Line Railway.²⁸

This background to issues of identity and claims to the territory is significant for an understanding of how, during the 1960s, a group of people managed to position themselves as those with ‘true’ rights over the territory of Ugalla. The manner in which they located Ugalla at the centre of local culture and politics was a strong counter-narrative to expert representations of Ugalla as a ‘natural’ environment for wildlife conservation. Here we see that the resettlement history was in no way forgotten and became an important means for people to legitimate claims to the area. For example, a communiqué from the Executive Officer for Tabora District Council – for the first time in Kiswahili not English – to his counterpart in Mpanda, reveals local people’s use of the idiom of ‘tradition’ and resettlement history in supporting their claim. The administrative document is headed ‘the Wagalla to return to their traditional homeland’.²⁹ It goes on to state that the leaders, David Yongolo and Abdurahaman Kaponta, claimed rights as ‘chiefs’ to move to Ugalla with their people, arguing that it used to be their country, that if they moved they would be near traditional fishing and honey-hunting grounds, and also that their present agricultural land was infertile.

At this time, African officials in local government voiced support for people trying to return to Ugalla, causing immediate concern within the Game Department (still dominated by Europeans). As Game Department officials realized, local political alliances were emerging and it appeared that the Tabora District Council had the power to let these people in. ‘There seems to be a certain faction ... who are keen to re-settle the area comprising the Ugalla River Controlled Area ... As we are all aware, this is one of the show pieces of this part of the world, and any settlement would in fact be disastrous. I wonder if we could possibly make this into a Native Authority National Park?’³⁰ The language of these administrative documents underlines a tension between the British civil servants still in senior positions in the Game Department and African members of the District Council who represented the case of people from the area.

Two groups attempted to return to Ugalla in the early 1960s: one of 547 people from Mpanda (Uruwira resettlement concentration) under the leadership of Kaponta, and the other of 500 people from Tabora under the leadership of Yongolo. They went to Ugalla accompanied by a game officer, tsetse officer, agricultural officer, and local government officer. Kaponta chose the site of Kasekela outside the southern boundary of the GCA, and Yongolo a site called Igombe outside the northern boundary (the only portions of Ugalla GCA not also gazetted as forest reserve where settlement was prohibited). In both areas, the administrative officers demarcated a line beyond which settlement and agriculture could not take place.

Local versions of events recorded during my fieldwork gave a different representation of what took place. Apparently, *Mtemi* Ngugula Yongolo tried to force everyone to settle at Igombe, his ‘hereditary chiefdom’, by tying a rope across the road to prevent people from going further. Both archival administrative documents and oral historical accounts refer to a line of

demarcation representing a boundary. For administrators accompanying people to the area, this line was to stop them degrading resources in the game reserve. For the Chief, the line was to consolidate a settlement and therefore to provide political meaning to his office. Here we have two different meanings given to the action that took place; further meanings arose from the people's own understanding of the attempt to resettle the area that generated conflict with both main parties.

When *Mtemi* Yongolo and a group of people finally settled at Igombe they found they had become accustomed to welfare provisions in the resettlement area and that wild animals ate their crops and were dangerous. Thus, they did not have the ability to cope with the new situation that confronted them. Present popular narratives convey the perception that once settled they realized Ugalla was no longer good for people, emphasis being given to the power of animals. Apparently, the wife of Yongolo died when in the new settlement. Because she was a Muslim, they went to seek immediate assistance of a ritual leader for the funeral. When they returned they found that hyenas (this may allude to a transmogrified form taken by witches) had taken her body and pulled it to pieces. The interpretation of this event is used to convey an image of the reclaimed land having been 'only good for animals'.

The bid to resettle the land provoked an immediate response from the Game Department. In 1965, the administration elevated the status of Ugalla River from a 'game controlled area' to a 'game reserve'. This category of protected area prevented people from living within the boundaries (Government Notice 281 & 282, June 1965).

The change in status of Ugalla to a game reserve had the consequence of once again making beekeeping and fishing a highly visible 'problem' for the administration. Because productive activities were not permitted in a game reserve, people's right to keep bees and to fish was called into question. It was eventually decided that fishermen could continue to use the reserve because a special exception had been made for them to fish in the Ugalla River when the area was gazetted in 1954. However, because beekeeping and honey-hunting activities had been on a much smaller scale and carried out by fishermen and hunters in the 1940s and early 1950s, no precedent had been made for beekeepers in the prior legislation. A legal misrepresentation of local history was used against the beekeepers: 'their claim that they have got permanent camps along the river is not justified. The area, to a distance of 30–40 miles on each side of the river was cleared of permanent habitation in 1950 (sic.) as an anti-sleeping sickness measure ... anyone found in the reserve will be prosecuted'.³¹ Eventually, in 1967, officials at the Beekeeping Section in Tabora gained special permission for '*bona fide*' beekeepers to keep their beehives in Ugalla.³²

In the actions of people seeking to return to Ugalla, we see that the resettlement history comes full circle. Faced with direct experience of living in the area, people were confronted with the hardship this could entail and with the daily reality of land given over to wildlife. In this respect, the area's status as a game reserve devoid of settlement became consolidated through these

events, as did acceptance that beekeeping and fishing were key activities that could occur in the area. This situation has continued up until the present day, when beekeeping, fishing and tourist (i.e. non-resident) sports-hunting are the main legitimate activities that take place in Ugalla Game Reserve, with settlement and other forms of productive resource use being banned, although they may take place illegally.

Beekeeping and Fishing in Present Day Ugalla Game Reserve

Along a track that runs the length of the Ugalla River from east to west, and in the forest away from the river are beekeeping and fishing camps. These camps consist of a shelter, which is typically made of poles thatched with grass or palm fronds, and places to dry fish or to process raw honeycomb. To the outside eye, the camps appear impermanent, for the shelters become dilapidated during the rains when the men have returned to their villages. However, each camp bears the name of a village area that existed prior to resettlement in the 1920s, and many of the people who work in these camps are first, second, third, or even fourth generation descendants from sleeping sickness evacuees. These lines of descent can be traced through the many relationships of kinship and affinity that exist between men who work in the reserve (see Fisher 1997b). (Some women do go to the river but very few; numbers are difficult to estimate, but maybe 20 women as compared to 300–500 men in a given season.)

Each seasonal camp has a boundary, which is not marked but is part of the local knowledge people hold about the area. Government officials do not know these boundaries, but the camps have recognized leaders who will mediate if and when disputes arise. Such knowledge of the environs of camps in Ugalla is extensive, albeit localized. Although some people may work in the area for a short period, others build up this knowledge over many years, being part of their family history, their memories, their skills, and their working relationships. People also have an intimate knowledge of the movements and activities of others – game officials, tourist hunters, poachers, and so on – in the Reserve, which emerges in claims and counter-claims concerning who is carrying out illegal activities and who has a right to work in the area.

As occupations, beekeeping and fishing are very different in character and organization; nonetheless, their development has been closely linked. As one man described:

once a fisherman meant all, like one person, because a fisherman he was a Galla, and a honey-hunter he was a Galla, and a hunter likewise. Now a honey hunter fished and for bees he looked for honey in the forest, in the trees ... and he hunted as well. These three things they went together (Fisher, field diary 1993).

This is an example where resettlement has spawned the re-working of collective identity, which is given fresh meaning in the present day.

Another man described how:

Beekeeping is of recent times ... in the past there was a sea of fish, but we went on as fishermen and in the end people became beekeepers ... this is why we say that fish gave birth to bees The people who were moved ... [due to sleeping sickness] ... they went to Kasontwa to find trees and honey hunt and to get two or three buckets of honey and that was all. This honey was eaten and the price was very low, three shillings for a whole bucket ... [The beekeeping co-operative] ... it was like an injection, you brought twenty buckets with you and one of your companions would see and say I will bring forty buckets, and someone else would take sixty ... The hives became many because of the money, it was food (income), it became a proper market (Fisher, field diary 1993).

Today, some men manage to combine beekeeping and fishing, but many channel their resources into one activity. Beekeeping is primarily carried out by people from the region; very few immigrants keep bees unless they marry into a beekeeping family or are close to a successful beekeeper. There are many reasons for this, including a fear of bees and the fact that it takes many years to gain skills, labour and beehives to be successful on an annual basis.

Beehives are a substantial form of private property, from which, in a good year, a significant income can be gained. For beekeepers working in Ugalla, individual rights are held over the trees the beehives are placed in. These rights can exist for a man's working life and pass between generations. Given that a successful beekeeper can own several hundred beehives, and that there will be a group of beekeepers working in each camp, many of whom will be related, intricate relationships grow up between people, trees and the land contained within Ugalla Game Reserve. These relationships are played out through men's experience of working and living together in close proximity through a season and often over many years.

Fishing is somewhat different in that there are many in-comers and it is easier for officials to intervene at camps in accessible riverside locations. Also, people can fish for a season, working as labourers to generate an income, without necessarily returning the following year. Nonetheless, many men are from families who have fished on the Ugalla River for decades, being descended from sleeping sickness evacuees, who may retain lively memories of life in a resettlement concentration. Other fishermen are refugees (some are fisherwomen), who live in nearby refugee camps, and who originated from neighbouring African countries; still others are immigrants from elsewhere in Tanzania.

In the interactions and disputes that arise between long-established fishermen and beekeepers and the more recent in-comers, tribal identity and the history of resettlement emerge in claims over the right to work in the area. Those who are long established allege that they have a 'true' right to fish or keep bees in Ugalla based on ties to the locality and from being of Galla origin. People also use the resettlement history to locate themselves within the genesis of Ugalla as a game reserve for conservation purposes. Indeed, past relations with representatives of the colonial administration are evoked in

claims based on the argument that permission to fish soon after resettlement was an endorsement of special status and rights.

Claims over rights emerge when people feel that use of the reserve or the specific camps and sections of the river is threatened. For example, when refugees first started to fish at the river, it provoked 'Wagalla' fishermen to try to exclude them from access to the river. These refugees had very different and highly productive fishing skills and they alleged that existing fishermen were backward and used magic for fishing. This magic was seen as unacceptable to refugees who described themselves as modern, and likened existing fishing practices to hoe cultivation while they, the refugees, were used to using ploughs (Fisher, field diary 1994). In turn, existing fishermen alleged that they used the river in a traditional way that did not lead to over fishing and where traditional fishing leaders could control the activities that took place.

Despite periodic disputes between different groups of resource users, the manner in which beekeeping and fishing are institutionalized in Ugalla Game Reserve demonstrates the success with which people have managed to build up seasonal productive activities. This should not imply an absence of conflict between local people and the wildlife authorities, far from it. Periodic allegations are made by representatives of the state or international agencies that beekeepers or fishermen are being environmentally destructive, degrading the woodland, threatening wildlife, or over-fishing. Typically, short-term attempts to control or exclude people are made through burning camps, new permit systems, and restrictions on resource use. In actual fact, the legal status of fishing and beekeeping remains ambiguous.

The capacity of rural inhabitants – both long-standing inhabitants and newcomers – to carry out seasonal forms of productive activity in Ugalla is largely due to the success of local forms of organization in encompassing change. These forms of organization have roots in the way seasonal productive activities have historically developed as skills exclusive to certain groups of people (c.f. Abrahams 1967a; Roberts 1970; Unomah 1973; Cory n.d. [Mss.EA]). In more recent times (post-1950s), this organization has enabled people to establish formal co-operatives, which help them to market produce and to represent themselves as different collectivities who have livelihood interests in the Reserve. Local development associated with beekeeping and fishing from Ugalla is no mean feat, particularly if one considers that dried fish is marketed throughout the region and that honey and beeswax are sold to Europe through the fair trade market (Fisher 1997a, 2000).

In the way that people make their livelihoods in Ugalla, it can be said that the ex-resettlement area has been reconstructed in social terms. This is manifest through local knowledge, the existence of private property, recognized use rights to land and natural resources, and people's daily experience of living and working in Ugalla Game Reserve.

The fact that there is no permanent settlement or agriculture, and that the forest has regenerated over past settlement sites, has favoured a view of the area as 'natural' with conservation value. This provides an image, values and scientific justification for conservation policies. Ironically, lack of settlement,

together with what is considered to be good quality woodland and water, also make the area particularly attractive to beekeepers and fishermen. In the case of both conservation and local livelihood activities, resettlement policies have generated unintended consequences in the present day. In the process of using the area for livelihood purposes, people's experiences of resettlement, their tribal associations to the territory, and long-term interaction with representatives of the state, have become reworked and been given different meanings over time. This has enabled them to maintain a claim to the area, despite restrictions on resource use.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined how forced resettlement from Ugalla in western Tanzania in the 1920s acted as a critical event, which generated a very different historical path for the area and people than might have been the case had the human population remained undisturbed. People were originally resettled as a public health measure; nonetheless, lack of human habitation coupled with regeneration of the forest and an increase in wildlife, opened up the possibility for wildlife conservation as a new form of land utilization. After Ugalla was gazetted as a protected area, conservation and restricted forms of local resource use, beekeeping and fishing, became closely linked. Thus, there was never a simple exclusion of all local livelihood activities, and certain groups of people have maintained access to natural resources, even though the nature of the human activities and of people's presence in the area has radically changed over time.

In viewing forced resettlement as a critical event, we have seen how tradition has reflexively been used to generate counter-tendencies to dominant forms of land use and administration in order for people to make claims, to maintain associations to their purported homeland, and to gain access to valued natural resources. This particular resettlement was, and continues to be, a social process that did not simply finish when people were moved away from their land. People developed different connections to the area. These led to the establishment of beekeeping and fishing as the two legitimate forms of local resource use in the area.³³

Analysis of resettlement over a long time perspective has provided a window which has enabled us to see how different actors situate themselves in relation to one another and how they respond to the critical event and its outcomes. It may be the case that no single group controls these outcomes; and, as a consequence, people continue to negotiate access and rights to the place and its natural resources. These processes of negotiation may or may not generate conflict at a given time. The consequences of resettlement in Ugalla have cut across history in complex and discontinuous relationships, linking environment, people and politics in ways that are not typically captured by technical experts seeking to resettle people or to conserve the environment. It is to this social character of resettlement schemes, and the linkages between

conservation and resettlement in a part of East Africa, which this chapter has tried to call attention.

Notes

1 I would like to extend my thanks to Alberto Arce and John Fisher for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of the text.

2 The term ‘displacement’ is used to refer to the removal of people from an area of land, while ‘resettlement’ refers to the planned relocation of people to another area.

3 A more detailed account appears in Fisher, E. (1997) ‘What Future for the *Shamba la Bibi?* Livelihoods and Local Resource Use in a Tanzanian Game Reserve’. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Hull, UK. Archival sources are the Tanzania National Archives (TNA), colonial administrative files held by the Wildlife Division of the Ministry of Tourism, Natural Resources and Environment in Dar es Salaam (WD), and colonial records kept in Rhodes House at Oxford University (RH), East Africana Section, Dar es Salaam University Library (EA).

4 For details of the Tabora-Ufipa epidemic see Maclean 1927a/b, 1929a/b, 1930 a/b/c; Swynnerton 1923–4; Fairbairn 1948.

5 ‘Resettlement concentration’ is the term used in archival literature from this period. The idea was that habitations should be concentrated together within a single area in order to ‘push back’ the bush and therefore eliminate the presence of carriers of the sleeping sickness trypanosome, game and tsetse fly.

6 A comment in the Annual Report for Tabora sub-District (1926) suggests that the authorities did not themselves know how many people were moved: ‘decided to evacuate the whole of affected area ... [Ugalla River] ... 3,000 – 5,000 removed – estimate at probably half’ (TNA.mss.1733/9 969).

7 TNA.mss.21711, 21709, 11307, 11515, 21710, 21712, 31731.

8 Bagshawe, Provincial Commissioner, Western Province Annual Report, 1932 RH.mss.Afr.s.3059.

9 RH.mss.Afr.s.3059.

10 Bagshawe, Report on Native Affairs for the Western Province, 1935 (page not given). RH.Mss.Afr.s.279–306.

11 Bagshawe Personal Diary 9.10.34, RH.mss.Afr.s.279–306, Vol XVII; for a romanticized account see Carnochan and Adamson (1935, 1937).

12 Tabora sub-District Annual Report, 1926, TNA.mss.1733/20 (105); Bagshawe Papers, diary 1932–3/1934–5, RH.mss.Afr.s.279–360.

13 Bagshawe Diary 9.1.36; see also 4.9.33; 20.9.33; 16.11.35; 9.1.36; 5.11.36; 27.6.36, RH.mss.Afr.s.279–306. Annual Report for Western Province, 1934, RH.Mss.Afr.s.3059.

14 Maclean, Abstracts from Tanganyika Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.622; TNA.19931; Appendix D, TNA.1733/9 (69); TNA.21712.

15 Cameron, 1877; Bohm 1888; Reichard 1890; Blohm 1931, 1933 a/b; Tabora Provincial and District Books. See also Shorter 1968; Abrahams 1967b.

16 Western Province Annual Report, 1936, RH.mss.Afr.s.3059; Gillman 1933 (64), RH.mss.Afr.s.1175; Burt 1936, RH.Mss.Afr.s.1263 (1/2); Potts 1925–1952, RH.Mss.1259.

17 Tabora sub-District Annual Report, 1926, TNA.mss.1733/20 (105); WD.mss.ugr letters 21.9.54/7.10.54/25.7.55/11.10.55.

18 TNA.mss.23892 (Volumes 1 and 2).

19 Tabora District Book (microfiche: R.H. n.d.). Also, TNA.mss.19931 vol. 1 and Government Notice 213, updated in the Wildlife Ordinance of 1940.

20 WD.mss.ugr. Letter from G.H. Swynnerton, Game Warden, Arusha, to the Honourable Member for Agriculture and Natural Resources, DSM, 2.4.53.

21 WD.mss.ugr. Letter from D.K. Thomas to the Game Warden in Arusha, 16.8.52 (also replies 9.11.53/ 16.9.52/ 17.9.52/ 26.9.52).

22 Letter from the Provincial Commissioner, Western Province, to the Game Warden, Arusha, 19.3.53.

23 WD.mss.ugr. Letter from D.K. Thomas, the Game Ranger of Tabora Range, to the Game Warden, Arusha, 2.10.52.

24 WD.mss.ugr. Letter from the District Commissioner, Mpanda to the Provincial Commissioner, Western Province, 3.12.53. WD.mss.ugr. Letter with minutes of a District Commissioner's Conference, Tabora, 28.1.54.

25 Government Notice No. 83, formalized in the 1958 Fauna Conservation Ordinance, 7th Schedule, No. 48. WD.mss.ugr. Letters from the Provincial Commissioner of Western Province to the District Commissioner, Mpanda, 14.7.53 and 22.7.53.

26 WD.mss.ugr: minutes of a District Commissioner's Conference, Provincial Commissioner of Western Province to the Game Warden, Arusha, 28.1.54.

27 WD.mss.ugr Letter from D.K. Thomas, Tabora Game Ranger to the Game Warden, Arusha, 31.6.54.

28 TNA.Mss.10599.

29 WD.mss.ugr. Letter from the Executive Officer, Tabora District Council to the Executive Officer, Mpanda District Council, 20.11.62. Also, letter from the Executive Officer, Mpanda District Council to the Executive Officer, Tabora District Council, 28.2.63.

30 WD.mss.ugr. Acting Chief Game Warden to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Wildlife, 1.6.64.

31 WD.mss.ugr. A.G. Juyawatu, the Game Warden to Mr Ntenga, the Senior Field Officer of the Beekeeping Section, Tabora, 29.12.64; Report from Mr Ntenga, the Senior Field Officer, Beekeeping Section, Tabora to the Principle Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Wildlife; Ntenga, personal communications during 1993 and 1994; WD.mss.ugr. Letter from J.N. Kundaeli, the Principle Game Warden to the Regional Game Warden, 19.4.66.

32 WD.mss.ugr. Statement of the 18.8.66 by the Game Warden, Tabora.

33 Nonetheless, resettlement events which took place more than seventy-five years ago have not been forgotten. Even today, certain groups of people contest control over resources and the meanings associated with the place, using past linkages as the basis of their claims.

References

- Abrahams, R. G. 1967a. 'The Peoples of Greater Unyamwezi, Tanzania'. In D. Forde (gen.ed.) *Ethnographic Survey of Africa*. London: International African Institute.
- 1967b. *The Political Organisation of Unyamwezi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- AWSID (Admiralty War Staff Intelligence Division). 1916. *A Handbook of German East Africa*. London: Her Majesty's Government.
- Bennett, N.R. (editor). 1970 [1895]. *Stanley's Dispatches to the New York Herald 1871–1872, 1874–1877*. Boston, USA: Boston University Press.
- Blohm, W. 1931. *Die Nyamwezi, Land und Wirtschaft*. Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co. M.B.H.
- 1933a. *Die Nyamwezi: Gesellschaft und Weltbild*. Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter and Co.
- 1933b. *Die Nyamwezi: Texte (Berichte und Mitteilungen in der Sprache der Eingeborenen)*. Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter & Co.
- Bohm, R. 1881–1883 *Bericht Aus Kakoma. Mitt Eilungen der Afrikanischen Gessellschaft en Deutschland*. 3: 2–16.
- Burton, R. 1860. *The Lake Regions of Central Africa*. 1st edition, Vols. 1 & 2. London: n.d.
- Cameron, V.L. 1877. *Across Africa*. Volumes 1 & 2. Virtue & Co. Ltd (n.d.)
- Carnochan, F.G., and Adamson, H.C. 1935. *The Empire of the Snakes*. London: Hutchinson & Co. Ltd.
- 1937. *Out of Africa*. London: Cassell & Company Ltd.

- Clyde, D.F. 1962. *History of the Medical Services in Tanganyika*. Dar es Salaam: Government Press.
- Comaroff, J., and Comaroff, J.L. 1992. *Ethnography and the Historical Imagination*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Cunnison, I. 1951. *History of the Luapula: An Essay on the Historical Notions of a Central African Tribe*. Cape Town, London, New York: Oxford University Press, the Rhodes Livingstone Institute.
- Fairbairn, H. 1942. 'The Agricultural Problems Posed by Sleeping Sickness Settlements'. *The East African Agricultural Journal*, 9: 20–32.
- 1944. *Sleeping Sickness in Tanganyika*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.
- 1948 'Sleeping Sickness in Tanganyika Territory'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 45: 1–17.
- Fisher, E. 1997a. 'Beekeepers in the Global "Fair Trade" Market'. *The International Journal of Sociology of Agriculture and Food*, 6: 109–60.
- 1997b. 'What Future for the Shamba la Bibi? Livelihoods and Local Resource Use in a Tanzanian Game Reserve'. Unpublished PhD thesis: University of Hull, UK.
- 2000. 'Forest Livelihoods: Beekeeping as Men's Work in Western Tanzania'. In C. Creighton and C.K. Omari (eds). *Gender, Family and Work in Tanzania*, pp. 138–76. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Fisher, E., and Arce, A. 2000. 'The Spectacle of Modernity: Blood, Microscopes and Mirrors in Colonial Tanganyika'. In A. Arce and N. Long (eds). *Anthropology, Development and Modernities: Exploring Discourses, Counter-tendencies and Violence*, pp. 74–99. London & New York: Routledge.
- Glover, P. E. 1939. 'A Preliminary Report on the Comparative Ages of some Important East African Trees in Relation to their Habitats'. *South African Journal of Science*, 36: 316–27.
- Hatchell, G.W. 1949. 'An Early Sleeping Sickness Settlement'. *Tanzania Notes and Records*, 27: 60–64.
- 1956. 'Resettlement in Areas Reclaimed from Tsetse Fly'. *Tanzania Notes and Records*, 53: 243–446.
- Heelas, P., Lash, S. and Morris, P. 1996. *Detraditionalization: Critical Reflections on Authority and Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Iliffe, J. 1979. *A Modern History of Tanganyika*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jackson, C. H. N. 1936. 'Some New Methods in the Study of *Glossina morsitans*'. *Proceedings of the Zoological Society, London* 1936: 15–20.
- Long, N. 1997. 'Agency and Constraint, Perceptions and Practices. A Theoretical Position'. In H. de Haan and N. Long (eds). *Images and Realities of Rural Life: Wageningen Perspectives on Rural Transformations*, pp. 1–20. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Maclean, G. 1927a. 'Tanganyika Territory Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for 1925'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 24: 563.
- 1927b. 'Tanganyika Territory Medical and Sanitary Report for 1926'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 24: 954–6.
- 1929a. 'The Relationship between Economic Development and Rhodesian Sleeping Sickness in Tanganyika Territory'. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Sleeping Sickness*, 23: 37–46.
- 1929b. 'Tanganyika Territory Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for 1927'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 29: 695–6.
- 1930a. 'Sleeping Sickness Measures in Tanganyika Territory'. *Kenya and East African Medical Journal*, 3: 120–26.

- 1930b. 'Tanganyika Territory Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for 1928'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 27: 809.
- 1930c. 'Tanganyika Territory Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for 1929'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 26: 696.
- 1931. 'Tanganyika Territory Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for 1930'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 27: 809.
- 1932. 'Tanganyika Territory Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for 1931'. *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*, 28: 342.
- 1933. *Memorandum on Sleeping Sickness Measures*. Pamphlet no. 8. Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania: Tanganyika Territory Medical Department, Government Printer.
- Mblinyi, M. 1989. 'Women's Resistance in "Customary" Marriage: Tanzania's Run-away Wives'. In A. Zegeye and S. Ishemo (eds). *Forced Labour and Migration: Patterns of Movement within Africa*, pp. 61–72. London: Hans Zell Publishers.
- McCracken, J. 1987. 'Colonialism, Capitalism and the Ecological Crisis'. In D. Anderson and R. Grove (eds). *Conservation in Africa: People, Policy and Practices*, pp. 63–78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milne, G. 1936. 'Report on a Soil Reconnaissance Journey in Parts of Tanga, Central, Eastern, Lake and Western Provinces of Tanganyika Territory'. Dar es Salaam: Unpublished, N.
- Moffett, J.P. 1939–1940. 'A Strategic Retreat from Tsetse Fly: Uyowa and Bugomba Concentrations 1937'. *Tanzania Notes and Records*, 7–10: 2–5.
- 1958. *Handbook of Tanganyika*. Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania: Government Printer.
- PAWM. 1992. Planning for Priority Game Reserves: Status Reports for Mkomadzi, Maswa, Ugalla, Rungwa-Kizigo and Uwanda, Planning and Assessment for Wildlife Management, Department of Wildlife, Ministry of Tourism, Natural Resources and Environment. Unpublished, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania.
- 1994. Ugalla Game Reserve Management Plan, Planning and Assessment for Wildlife Management, Wildlife Division, Ministry of Tourism, Natural Resources and Environment. Unpublished, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania.
- Phillips, J. 1931. 'A Sketch of the Floral Regions of Tanganyika Territory'. *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Africa*, XIX: 59–70.
- Potts, W. H. 1937. 'The Distribution of Tsetse Flies in Tanganyika Territory'. *Bulletin of Entomological Research*, 43: 365–74.
- Ranger, T. O. 1969. 'The Movement of Ideas 1850–1939'. In I.N. Kimambo and A.J. Temu (eds). *A History of Tanzania*, pp. 161–88. Nairobi, Kenya: Heinemann, Educational Books.
- Ranger, T. 1983. 'The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa'. In E. Hobsbawm and T. Ranger (eds). *The Invention of Tradition*, pp. 211–62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reichard, P. 1890. 'Meine Erwerbung des Landes Uganda'. *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung*, 7: 77–9.
- 1892. *Deutsch Ostafrika: das Land und seine Bewohner*. Leipzig: publisher not documented.
- Roberts, A. D. 1968. 'The Nyamwezi'. In A. Roberts (ed.). *Tanzania before 1900*, pp. 117–53. Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania: East Africa Publishing House for the Historical Association of Tanzania.
- 1970 'Nyamwezi Trade'. In R. Gray and D. Birmingham (eds). *Pre-Colonial African Trade: Essays on Trade in Central and East Africa before 1888*, pp. 39–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Rodger, B. 1954. Unyamwezi Development Report. Dar Es Salaam: Unpublished.
- Rodgers, W. A. 1980. Wildlife and Natural Resource Conservation Planning. Department of Zoology, University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania (unpublished): Unpublished Report for Tabora Rural Integrated Development Programme (UK Overseas Development Administration).
- 1982 'An Ecological Survey of Ugalla Game Reserve'. *Tanzania Notes and Records*, 36: 1.
- Rodgers, W. A., and Nicholson, B.D. 1973. 'National Projects – Wildlife Development and Management Priorities in Tanzania'. Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania: Mimeo Report, Game Division.
- Sayers, G. F. 1930. *The Handbook of Tanganyika*. London, UK: MacMillan and Co. Ltd.
- Shorter, A. 1972. *The Kimbu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, F. G. 1994. *Three Cells of Honey Comb*. Western Australia (Nedlands): Private Publication.
- Swynnerton, C.F.M. 1923–4. The Relationship of some East Africa Tsetse Flies to the Flora and Fauna'. *Transactions of the Royal Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, 17, 128–41.
- Thomas, D. K. 1961. 'The Ugalla Game Controlled Area'. *Tanganyika Notes and Records*, 57: 227–30.
- Unomah, A. C. 1973. 'Economic Expansion and Political Change in Unyanyembe, c. 1840–1900'. Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

Archival References

Tanzania National Archives, Dar Es Salaam (TNA)

2551. Report of the District Political Officer, Tabora to the Secretary of the Administration, Dar Es Salaam, 1919.
- 42398/2. Annual Veterinary Report for Tanganyika Territory, 1920.
- 42398/2. Unyamwezi Development Report, by Rodger, J.T.R.C., 1954.
31351. Compulsory Resettlement of Africans: General, n.d.
11825. vol.1. Swynnerton, C.F.M. n.d.
- 7538, vol.2. The Game Experiment, Shinyanga, Jackson, 11.5.46.
21261. Tanganyika Territory Legislative Council, the Sleeping Sickness Problem in the Western and Lake Provinces, and in Relation to Uganda, 1933.
11307. Sleeping Sickness: General Principles of Treatment, Quarantines, 1927–1933.
11515. Sleeping Sickness Outbreak Western Province, Volumes 1, 2, 3, 1927–1932.
21709. Sleeping Sickness Concentration Committee: Minutes of Meetings.
21710. Sleeping Sickness Concentrations: Medical Arrangements Concerning, n.d.
21711. Sleeping Sickness Concentrations: Educational Arrangements Concerning, n.d.
21712. Sleeping Sickness Concentrations: Economic and Development Concerning, n.d.
31731. Resettlement as a Preventative Measure Against Sleeping Sickness.
10599. General Correspondence on Sleeping Sickness, n.d. Volumes 1 & 2.
40876. Tsetse Operations in Western Province, n.d.
- 11551 Game Reserves Volumes 1 and 2.
- 19931 Volume One, Game Reserves in Connection with Tsetse Research and Anti-Sleeping Sickness Measures.
- 10599 Labour Arrangements.
- 1733/4 (52), Annual Report for Tabora District, 1925.

- 1733/9 (69), Annual Report for Tabora District, 1926.
1733/20 (105), Tabora sub-District Annual Report, 1926.
1733/-(5). Tabora District Annual Report 1921.
21475. Annual Report for Western Province, 1932.
Maclean, G., 1929: 122; Appendix D, Report on Sleeping Sickness, Tabora District Annual Report, 1926, TNA.Mss.1733/9 (69).
Letter from Hatchell, District Officer Ufipa to the Provincial Commissioner, Mwanza 27.8.29. in 11771 Volume 2.
TNA Mss.4283982 Administrative Arrangements.

Tanzania Wildlife Department Archives for Ugalla Game Reserve (WD)

- Letter from the Director of Veterinary Services to the Honourable Member for Agriculture and Natural Resources, 19.7.1949.
Letter from the Director of Veterinary Services to the Honourable Member for Agriculture and Natural Resources, 19.7.49 (TNA.Mss.11234).
Letter from the Provincial Commissioner, Western Province to the Game Warden, Arusha, 16.9.52.
Letter from D.K. Thomas, the Game Ranger of Tabora Range to the Game Warden, Arusha, 2.10.52.
Letter from the Director of Veterinary Services to the Game Warden, Tenguru, 31.10.52.
Letter from D.K. Thomas to the Game Warden in Arusha, 16.8.52 (also 16.8.52/ 16.9.52/ 17.9.52/ 26.9.52/9.11.53).
Letter from the Acting Director of Veterinary Services to the Game Warden, Tenguru, 5.1.53.
Letter from D.K. Thomas, the Game Ranger for Tabora Range to the Game Warden, Arusha, 30.1.53.
Letter from the Provincial Commissioner, Western Province to the Game Warden, Arusha, 19.3.53.
Letter from G.H. Swynnerton, Game Warden, Arusha, to the Provincial Commissioner, Tabora, 2.4.53.
Letter from G.H. Swynnerton, Game Warden, Arusha, to the Honourable Member for Agriculture and Natural Resources, DSM, 2.4.53.
Letter from the Honourable Member for Agriculture and Natural Resources to the Game Warden, Arusha, 4.5.53.
Letter from the District Commissioner, Mpanda to the Provincial Commissioner, Western Province, 3.12.53.
Letter with minutes of a District Commissioners Conference at which the Game Ranger, Tabora was invited to attend, Provincial Commissioner of Western Province to the Game Warden, Arusha, 28.1.54.
Letter from D.K. Thomas, Tabora Game Ranger to the Game Warden, 31.6.54.
Letter from the Provincial Commissioner of Western Province to the District Commissioner of Mpanda, 14.7.53.
Letter from the Provincial Officer to Member for Local Government (n.d.(1960s) TNA Mss.4283982).
Ker & Downey Safaris Ltd. Letters 21.9.54; 7.10.54; 25.7.55; 11.10.55.
Letter from the Executive Officer, Tabora District Council to the Executive Officer, Mpanda District Council, 20.11.62.

- Letter from the Executive Officer, Mpanda District Council to the Executive Officer, Tabora District Council, 28.2.63.
- Letter from the Executive Officer, Tabora District Council to the Executive Officer, Mpanda District Council, 20.11.62.
- Letter from the Executive Officer, Mpanda District Council to the Executive Officer, Tabora District Council, 28.2.63.
- Acting Chief Game Warden to the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Wildlife, 1.6.64.
- Letter from A.G. Juyawatu, the Game Warden to Mr Ntenga, the Senior Field Officer of the Beekeeping Section, Tabora, 29.12.64
- Report from Mr Ntenga, the Senior Field Officer, Beekeeping Section, Tabora to the Principle Secretary for the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Wildlife, n.d. (also personal communications to Fisher during 1993 and 1994).
- Letter from J.N. Kundaeli, the Principle Game Warden to the Regional Game Warden, 19.4.66.
- Statement of the 18.8.66 by the Game Warden, Tabora.

East Africana Section, University Library, Dar Es Salaam (EA)

- Cory, H. n.d. The Initiation and Organisation of some of the Sukuma Nyamwezi Secret Societies, Mss.105.

Rhodes House, Queen Elizabeth House, Oxford (RH)

- Bagshawe, F. J. E., 1932–1933 Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.279–360. Volume XIX, November 10th 1932 to December 6th 1933.
- 1934–1935 Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.279–306. Volume XVI October 9th 1934 to December 31st 1935.
- 1936a Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.279–306. Volume XVII January 1st 1936 to July 22nd 1936.
- 1936b Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.279–306. Volume XVIII July 23rd 1936 to December 31st 1936.
- 1937a Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.279–306. Volume XIX January 1st 1937 to August 21st 1937.
- 1937b Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.279–306. Volume XX August 22nd 1937 to December 31st 1937.
- Annual Provincial Reports for the Western Province, 1932, 1934, 1936, Mss.Afr.s.3059.
- Report on Native Affairs for the Western Province, 1935. Mss.Afr.s.3059.
- Photographs, Urambo Sleeping Sickness Concentration 1936 and Uyowa and Bugoma Concentrations 1937. Mss.Afr.s.3059.
- Burt, B. 1936 An Enumeration of the Principal Vegetation Types, Unpublished 1932–1936, Mss.Afr.s.1263(1/2).
- Gillman, C., 1923–1925 Private Diary (64), RH.Mss.Afr.s.1175. Volume VII February 15th 1923 to June 28th. 20.2.34, 1.3.34, 1.4.34. Also 24–25.5.34, and Gillman's notes and views on a Tabora Reclamation (Tsetse) Conference, 1937, RH.Mss.Afr.s.1175, Vols. VII, X, XI, XII, XIV.
- 1933a Geographical Notes on Tanganyika Territory, RH.Mss.Afr.s.1175. Volume XI, Notes on a Rapid Transverse, August 7th and 8th 1933.
- 1933–1936b Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.1175. Volume XII, April 30th to June 10th 1936.

- 1937–1940 Private Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.1175. Volume XIV, February 1st 1937 to November 30th 1940.
- 1933 1175 Volume XX
- Hutchins, E. E. Morogoro District, Vol.1, Part A, Sheets 25–26, August 1931, film no.MF15.
- Johnstone, J. R. (administrator in western Tanzania) 1933–1940 Bits and Pieces, or, Seven Years in the Western Province of Tanganyika Territory.
- Longland, F. 1927 Tabora Provincial Book, Reel No. 19 & Tabora District Book, Reel No. 20.
- Maclean, G. 1926–61a Abstracts from Tanganyika Diary, RH.Mss.Afr.s.622.
- Potts, W. H. 1925–1952 Tsetse Research in Tanganyika Territory, RH.Mss.1259.
- Swynnerton, C.F.M. RH.Mss.Afr.s.1897. Tsetse Research in Tanganyika 1919–1938.