

1934

23034/11

KENYA

C0533/442

1934

23034/11

Land Commission.

Recommendation regarding the Mukogodo Numonyi Masai

Previous

Open file

see 54154/25

Kenya

297  
Room 509

18/3

CLOSED  
UNTIL

Subsequent

38005/5/35.

Reg. 10/10

Mr. [unclear] 26/10

Mr. [unclear] 26

Mr. [unclear] 27. 10

S. - Chatterley 1/11

Mr. J. [unclear] 6. 11

E. A. [unclear]

[unclear] 7/11

Mr. [unclear] 9/11

Mr. [unclear] 9. 11

R. 305

297 16/11

Mr. [unclear] 20/11

23034

Land.

Land Commission.

Mukogodo

Mumonyot Masai

Governor Bygones 496 (21. March)

14 October 1925

Refers to para 810 of the Land Commission Report & states that he is in agreement with the recom. that the Mukogodo area be detached from the Kikuyu Province, that the Mumonyot Masai be removed to the Masai Reserve subject to the improvement in the grazing conditions & provision of adequate veterinary control.

Para 810  
Land Ref.

The Governor is in complete agreement with the recommendation of the Land Commission that the Mukogodo area be detached from the Kikuyu Province.

It should be noted that the Commission used the term Mukogodo as meaning the area of Crown Land in the North Nyeri District at present occupied by three small sections of Bororo (Mukogodo, Ndigiri and Ilmaga) and the Mumonyot Masai.

See 4277/20

The Governor diverges from the Commission's recommendation in that he recommends that the Mumonyot be removed from the Mukogodo area and settled in the Masai Reserve proper. This would be in accordance with the policy approved in 1925. It is necessary to turn to the history of the Mumonyot. Sixty years ago the Il Aikiptak Section of the Masai were virtually exterminated by the Purko Section. Of the survivors some emigrated to North Kavirondo and Baringo, but a few, now known as the Mumonyot, remained in the Loldaika Hills in subjection to the Purko. In 1911, the Purko Masai were moved to the Southern Masai Reserve, but the Mumonyot preferred to remain behind, and as their numbers were insignificant at that time, their removal was overlooked. By 1925 the Mumonyot's presence in the Loldaika Hills had become most undesirable. They had been found to be constantly trespassing on occupied and

unoccupied

unoccupied land, spreading East Coast Fever by running their cattle over farms and damaging the grazing in the area by starting grass fires. In addition, they had become truculent and disobedient. It was decided, therefore, that they should be moved to the Southern Masai Reserve at Government expense, and the move was reported to have been successfully completed by September, 1925. Unfortunately, it was discovered some months afterwards that a number of the Mumonyot, who should have joined in the move, had failed to do so. It is this party that the Governor now recommends should be moved to the Masai Reserve. Their numbers have been increased by certain undesirables of Masai origin and their strength is estimated to-day to be 95 men, women and children, 2,147 cattle and 1,695 sheep and goats. They are unpopular with the Dorobo and they are said to have harboured stock thieves and other bad characters.

The Masai Chiefs are prepared to accommodate the Mumonyot in the Reserve with their kinsmen who were moved in 1925, provided no actual move is made until grazing conditions in the Masai Reserve improve. The Governor points out that the Mumonyot have no desire to be moved into the Masai Reserve as it is not their original habitat, <sup>at all</sup> and the fact that no strong case was put to the Commission in favour of their removal.

The fact that they are of pure Masai origin and that there is already a Reserve for the Masai, seems, in itself, to be a good argument in favour of their removal from the Dorobo. The Governor considers that, had the case for their removal been argued before the Commission,

3  
there seems no reason to think that a recommendation would not have been made accordingly.

Unless it is considered (undesirable to present the facts to Sir Morris Carter in a semi-official letter in the first instance, the Governor's proposals may be approved.

*C. E. ... 26/10/25*  
The deviation from the Carter recommendation is so slight, & so well justified, that it seems hardly necessary to refer to Sir Morris Carter.

? Oppose.

*J. A. ... 26/10*

The first three sets of people referred to are described in paragraph 309 of the Carter Commission's Report as "small sections of Dorobo inhabiting Crown land in the North Nyeri District". Figures are given of the strength of the whole of them, putting down 213 adults and 132 children, but it appears from this despatch that the figures given only refer to the fourth section, the Mumonyot Masai. We have no information as regards the actual strength of the others but in 1925 the Mukogodo were put down as 182 all told with 1126 head of cattle (see 31803/25).

The Carter Commission recommended that the whole lot should be detached from the Kikuyu Province and put into the Northern Frontier Province

for

May A

4577/25  
Camp

for purposes of administration as they have no particular affinity with the Kikuyu but have with other people. What the Governor recommends is that the Mukogodo area should be detached from the Kikuyu Province and put into the Northern Frontier District as recommended, but as the Mumonyot Masai were gathering to themselves a lot of undesirable and ex-squatters they should be transplanted bodily into the Masai Reserve. The Masai are willing to take them, or rather are not prepared to object, but the Mumonyot themselves want to stay where they are. The Governor says that they are unpopular and squabble with the Dorobo while they encourage the Samburu and harbour stock thieves and bad characters. I wonder how far it is the case that the Mumonyot Masai do not want to migrate to the Masai Reserve but it seems to me to be one of those instances in which we must be guided by local opinion. After all, it is only because they managed to escape notice that they were included in the last removal of Masai in 1925. At that time the then Governor said that the decision to move the Mumonyot was a natural outcome of the removal of the main body of the Masai in 1912 and that any move of the Samburu, Mukogodo or Wandorobo at present associated with them will have as its object their settlement in areas reserved for them. (See 57087/24). It follows that the action now proposed is simply the completion of what should have been done in 1925. I think we may approve. Mr. Prosser says,

It is a small deviation from the recommendations of the Carter Commission and that Commission had not got the whole of the facts before it. They did not make any particular recommendation about the Mumonyot but lumped them in with the Mukogodo and the rest, proposing that they be allotted to the Northern Frontier Province. If the special circumstances had been brought to their notice I have little doubt that they would have advised reunion with the main Masai.

J. H. R.

31.10.34.

Sir J. Maffey.

You have, I think, a copy of the Land Commission's Report. The area in question seems to be part of the left-hand portion left uncoloured on the general diagram which accompanied the Report.

The position will be clear to you from Mr. Grossmith's minute. In his evidence (not sent on) Mr. Lindsay recommended that the three Dorobo sections should be considered separately. On the strength of the Mumonyot's desire (naturally, if they have a little Alsatia of their own) to remain undisturbed, the Commission decided to treat the four sections as a whole although there is no affinity between the Dorobo and the Masai. We now know that the Dorobo do not get on with these Mumonyot, who seem to be a real source of trouble generally.

In view of the fact that the main body of the Mumonyot have already been moved into the general Masai Reserve and that those who remained behind did so without any intention on the part of the Govt., I

entirely

entirely agree that they should be moved.  
Having regard to all the discussion on native  
land matters since 1925, there is no reason  
for regarding them as having a right to remain  
because of non-disturbance during the past nine  
years.

I approve

W.C.S.

8/16/34

*[Signature]*

6.11.34

This seems right; but as it is  
a variation of the Report, it would be  
reasonable to propose that the  
Council should be asked to refer the  
two Commissioners who are to report.  
I have no doubt they will agree; a  
further point will be a working point  
if the Council's action is delayed.

*[Signature]*

9/11

(Lord Plymouth  
has seen)  
Edw  
9/11

*[Signature]*  
20/11/34

2 To Kenya, 1955 (Amended)

13 NOV 1934  
1934

C.O.

Mr. Grossmith.

Mr. *Frederick*

Mr.

Mr. Parkinson.

Sir G. Tomlinson.

Sir C. Bottomley.

Sir J. Shuckburgh

Permt. U.S. of S.

Parly. U.S. of S.

Secretary of State.

*Answered by No. 1 on 38005/15/35*

*2*

Dawning Street,

14 November, 1934.

Sir,

C.D.  
R 12 NOV  
D *IX*

*(1)*

I have etc. to acknowledge

the receipt of your despatch No. 496

of the 4th of October regarding the

recommendations contained in

paragraph 810 of the Kenya Land

Commission Report concerning the

Mukogodo, ~~the~~ Ndigeri, ~~the~~ Ilimwesi

and the Mumonyot Masai.

2. I am impressed with the *strength of the case made out* arguments advanced for the

separation of the Mumonyot Masai from

the three sections of the Dorobo in

the Mukogodo area, and their removal

to the Masai Reserve. *consider,* however,

*And as* the proposals deviate from the

recommendation of the Land Commission

it would, in my opinion, be

reasonable and proper that Mr. R.W.

**DRAFT.**

**KENYA.**

**NO. 953**

**GOVERNOR.**

**FURTHER ACTION.**

Hemsted and Captain F.O'Brien Wilson,  
*who are still*  
the two Commissioners in Kenya, should  
be consulted.

3. If it can be ascertained that  
the two Commissioners have no objection  
to the proposals you may assume that  
they have my approval. You will no  
doubt keep me informed of any developments.

I have, etc.

(Sgd) P. CUNLIFFE-LISTER

AIR MAIL

KENYA  
No. 496.



GOVERNMENT HOUSE  
NAIROBI  
KENYA

RECEIVED  
12 OCT 1934  
C. O. REGY

4th OCTOBER, 1934.

Sir,

Enclosed (2)

3246/33.

43740/25.

43770/25.

I have the honour to refer to the recommendations made in paragraph 810 of the Kenya Land Commission report concerning the Mukogodo, Ndigiri, Ilimwesi and the Mumonyot Masai.

2. With the recommendation that the Mukogodo area be detached from the Kikuyu Province I am in complete agreement. By a recent administrative arrangement, of which you are aware, this area and the Samburu country have been transferred to the control of the Provincial Commissioner, Rift Valley Province, and I have received from him a strong recommendation that the Mumonyot Masai should no longer be permitted to remain in this area but should be moved to join their kinamen in the Masai Reserve. This recommendation was also made to me by the Officer in Charge, Northern Frontier District, in his comments on the Commission's proposal.

3. It will be seen from correspondence ending with Mr. Amery's despatch No. 991 of the 3rd October, 1925, that this section of the Il-Aikipiak Masai was moved to the Masai Reserve in that year. The removal was not in fact as complete as was believed when Kenya despatch No. 1096 of the 2nd September, 1925, was written and it was discovered some months after the move took place that some of the Mumonyot who should have joined in the move had failed to do so. Subsequently their numbers were increased by undesirable Masai from the Masai Reserve proper and by discharged Masai squatters entering the area from Rumuruti and North Nyeri farms, who, owing to the Veterinary Restrictions, were unable to obtain permits to return to the Masai Reserve or who filtered into the area without permission and who could not be moved owing to Veterinary restrictions. The total



total numbers are estimated to be 395 men, women and children; 2174 head of cattle and 1695 sheep and goats. These figures are erroneously given in Section 809 of the Commission's Report as the totals in respect of the whole of the four groups referred to as Mukogodo. It appears that in drafting the Report the Mumonyot figures given on page 1573 of the Evidence (Vol.II) were taken to be the totals of the whole table.

4. Evidence was taken from the Mumonyot Masai and is reproduced on page 1572 of Volume II of the Printed Evidence. The people through their representative asked to be allowed to remain where they are and no strong case was put to the Commission in favour of their removal. The point was, however, raised by Mr. Lindsay in his memorandum (vide page 1581) and it is known that Mr. Horne, the Provincial Commissioner, had for some time favoured their removal to the Masai Reserve.

5. These people are unpopular with the Dorobo with whom they quarrel regarding water and the latter have frequently urged their removal. They have also encouraged Samburu to enter this part of the country and have harboured stock thieves and other bad characters. There is a certain amount of coming and going between them and the Masai Reserve and Masai on farms and illegal inter-movement of stock is difficult to detect though it is known to occur.

6. Had the case for their removal been argued before the Commission there seems no reason to think that a recommendation would not have been made accordingly, particularly in view of the fact that their presence in the area was due to their avoidance of a previously approved policy. In 1925 those Mumonyot who were moved were placed amongst the Kekonyukie in the Kedong Valley and the Masai Chiefs have recently been consulted in regard to accommodating the balance.

They...

they raise no objection to the proposal provided that no actual move is made until grazing conditions in the Sabal Reserve (which are at present low) improve.

7. Subject to this condition and to the provision of adequate veterinary control during the move, I trust that this modification in the Commission's recommendation will be approved.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

J. H. ...  
...