

Occasional Paper No. 8

**REPORT**  
OF A  
**FAUNAL SURVEY IN EASTERN AND**  
**GENERAL AFRICA**

January to April, 1947

BY  
**CAPTAIN KEITH GALDWELL**

*Lates Game Warden, Uganda, and Senior Assistant Game Warden, Kenya*

PP-1-38

Issued by the  
**Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of the Empire**

1948

Price 16s. 6d.

On my homeward trip I again left my safari at Dodoma and trained to Dar-es-Salaam, where I stayed some days with His Excellency, Sir William Battershill. On reaching Nairobi at the end of March I refitted and motored via Kisumu to Uganda, thence through Kampala and Kabale to Rutchuru and the Ruindi Plains, where my accident took place, and my safari came to an end.

The total distance covered was over 7,000 miles by car and lorry, and 1,400 miles by rail. Through the entire safari I made a special effort to contact everyone likely to give me information of value. The whole of the journey was made under a certain amount of difficulty, as heavy rain was encountered on every day except two.

## DETAILED REPORTS

### (a) KENYA

Game conditions in Kenya are undoubtedly far better than in any of the other Territories that I visited. Here, and here only, is public opinion really vocal, and public opinion is determined to preserve as much game as is justifiable having regard to economic conditions.

There has been, through the war years, a great reduction of game, amounting almost to extermination, on private land throughout the Colony. The great demand for and high prices fetched by game meat, needless to say, brought about the supply, but since it has always been recognized that game on private land belongs to the owner or occupier, such game would probably not, in any case, have been kept permanently.

Elsewhere in the Colony there has been some diminution, but the amount generally speaking has not been great. In the parts of the Southern Masai Reserve that I visited game is, on the whole, very plentiful. In fact some control has since been necessary to keep the large herds off the best of the Masai grazing.

Killing of meat for profit had started on Crown Land, and although sale of such meat is illegal, control is almost impossible. The schedule of game that might be killed was until recently generous on a Full Licence, i.e. ten or even twenty of some animals might be shot. Normally nobody used to shoot up to these numbers, although considerable quantities of Zebra were shot for Lion bait.

The high price of meat made all game worth killing, and parties with lorries used to go down, all with Full Licences,

and proceed to do their best to fill and overfill their schedules. The meat was immediately converted to biltong, and it was impossible for anyone to tell how many animals had gone to fill a lorry load of sun-dried meat.

The Game Department acted quickly and cut every schedule to the bone, three being the maximum number of any of the larger animals allowed on a Full Licence. A bridge control at the entry to the Masai shooting ground was then established, and a copy of the new schedules, for which they had to sign, was given to everyone going in. This considerably annoyed the meat hunters, many of whom announced that they were going back, since from their point of view it was not worth while keeping a safari going to kill the small amount of game now permitted.

A threat to Elephants carrying large tusks also arose on account of the enhanced value of ivory. This was met by a sharp increase in the price of Elephant Licences, so that the expense of a safari plus the cost of a licence more nearly approximated to the cash return. Naturally such action aroused the indignation of the money-making fraternity, many of whom had been in the habit of taking along their mothers, daughters, and sisters to act as dummy licence holders.

The great threat to game in Kenya, as elsewhere, is development. The cry is for land and yet more land, and every effort is made to make better use of land now in occupation. In many cases there is a clamour to get rid of game without any certainty that any good will be attained thereby.

A distant, but what may be in the end, a serious threat to the best of the Elephant country is in prospect, since a surveying party is now working in the Middle Tana area. This country is practically uninhabited and is the home of what are probably the biggest Elephants in Africa. The suggestion is that, after the survey, up to two million acres might be brought under irrigation. This may or may not be feasible; if it is, presumably it will be undertaken for the purpose of food production. The difficulties that will then arise will be considerable and a heavy campaign of shooting against Elephant and other game will have to be undertaken over a very large area.

Fly in Kenya is not nearly as serious as in other territories. For one thing there are no *G. morsitans*, *G. longipennis* and *swynnertoni* being the common fly. Admittedly the fly area has increased to a certain extent in the Masai country during the last twenty years, but there is some reason to think that such increase has probably been brought about by trade lorries

carrying the fly from place to place. In any case since *G. morsitans* is not involved the game destruction policy is not likely to be advocated.

Dr. Lewis, the Tsetse Research Officer in Kenya, is not, in any case at the moment, an advocate of game destruction. Should he become convinced as a result of further research that game should go in certain areas he would, I am sure, put forward such a policy clearly, resolutely, and forcibly, but would always be anxious to work in the closest co-operation with the Game Department.

*National Parks.*—Kenya has already established one National Park of about 40 square miles, which is held and managed by a Board of Trustees. This area, the nearest point of which is only about 4 miles from Nairobi, contains a vast number of animals. The following list includes the more important of them :—

## ORDER PRIMATES

Sykes Monkey (*Cercopithecus mitis kolbi*)  
 Baboon (*Papio doguera*)  
 Grey Monkey (*Cercopithecus aethiops pygerythrus*)

## ORDER CARNIVORA

Ratel or Honey Badger (*Mellivora capensis*)  
 Clawless Otter (*Aonyx capensis hindei*)  
 Hunting Dog (*Lycan pictus lupinus*)  
 Bat-eared Fox (*Otocyon megalotis virgatus*)  
 Jackal (*Thos aureus*)  
 Aard-wolf (*Proteles cristatus termes*)  
 Spotted Hyæna (*Crocuta crocuta*)  
 Striped Hyæna (*Hyæna hyæna dubbah*)  
 Cheetah (*Acinonyx jubatus*)  
 Caracal (*Caracal caracal nubicus*)  
 Wild Cat (*Felis lybica*)  
 Serval (*Felis serval hindei*)  
 Lion (*Felis leo*)  
 Leopard (*Felis pardus*)

## ORDER TUBULIDENTATA

Antbear or Aard-vark (*Orycteropus afer*)

## ORDER RODENTIA

Spring Hare (*Pedetes sp.*)  
 Porcupine (*Hystrix galeata*)

## ORDER HYRACOIDEA

Tree Hyrax (*Dendrohyrax arboreus*)  
 Rock Hyrax (*Procavia sp.*)

## ORDER ARTIODACTYLA

Hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*)  
 Wart Hog (*Phacochoerus athiopicus*)  
 Giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*)  
 Coke's Hartbeest (*Alcelaphus buselaphus cokii*)  
 White-bearded Gnu (*Connochates taurinus albojubatus*)  
 Harvey's Duiker (*Cephalophus harveyi harveyi*)  
 Klipspringer (*Oreotragus oreotragus*)  
 Suni (*Nesotragus moschatus*)  
 Steinbuck (*Raphicerus campestris*)  
 Dik-dik (*Rhynchotragus kirkii*)  
 Waterbuck (*Kobus defassa subsp.*)  
 Bohor Reedbuck (*Redunca redunca*)  
 Chanler's Reedbuck (*Redunca fulvorifula chanleri*)  
 Impala (*Æpyceros melampus rendilis*)  
 Thomson's Gazelle (*Gazella thomsonii thomsonii*)  
 Grant's Gazelle (*Gazella granti roosevelti*)  
 East African Eland (*Taurotragus oryx pattersonianus*)  
 Bushbuck (*Tragelaphus scriptus subsp.*)

## ORDER PERISSODACTYLA

East African Zebra (*Equus burchellii bohmi*)

## REPTILES

African Crocodile (*Crocodilus niloticus*)

## OCCASIONAL VISITORS

Buffalo (*Synceus caffer subsp.*) and Rhinoceros (*Diceros bicornis bicornis*)

The whole Park is very well looked after by the Park Warden. Tracks, which are well sign-posted, lead in all directions and are easily passable in dry weather. The Park is most popular and a large number of cars are to be seen cruising around most evenings from 4 o'clock to 6.30. Lion, which can be seen almost daily within twenty minutes' drive from the heart of Nairobi, are the chief attraction.

I attended by invitation a meeting of the Trustees of the National Parks, and also had an interview with Colonel Marchant, Chief Native Commissioner of Kenya. From the latter I realized the great difficulties that the Park Trustees are having to contend with in their negotiations for the proposed main Park in the Voi Area. The Chief Native Commissioner stated that he needed every inch of land for land-hungry natives; that he was now reduced to "groping about in deserts" (his expression) to get more land. He furthermore stated that he would not agree to any bit of land which might possibly be of some use, some day, to some native, being earmarked for a National Park. The weight carried by his views is considerable, and makes agreement difficult. Since my interview with Colonel

Marchant, he has been appointed Chief Labour Officer for the Ground Nut Scheme and has left Kenya.

One of the reasons for the popularity of the Kenya Game Department is its readiness to assist in control of game and destruction of vermin in European or Native Areas. The Department has a Warden, four Assistant Game Wardens, and six Control Officers, who are kept fully occupied.

Usually the amount of killing necessary is not great, but I admit I was shocked at the destruction of Rhinoceros, which has lately been necessary in the Wakamba Country. Owing to overstocking and subsequent severe erosion, the Wakamba tribe are seriously short of grazing. It was suggested that they should move into an unoccupied area of dense bush country in their reserve, but they demurred to accepting it on account of the Rhinoceros therein.

The Game Department agreed to do their best to get rid of the latter, and sent up Mr. J. A. Hunter—one of the Control Staff—to do so. He found it quite impossible to drive them off and accordingly had to shoot them. During the short time of twelve months he killed over 1,000 Rhinoceros and cleared the area completely.

I must admit that had anyone told me that that number of Rhinoceros existed in such a small area I would never have credited it. The only comforting thing is that only a small proportion of the Rhinoceros bush has been cleared (about 400,000 acres), and there is reason to hope that most of the rest of it is equally heavily stocked. This means that the Rhinoceros population is much greater than we had believed and is some consolation for the slaughter.

Elephant control is at present carried out on a minor scale compared with Tanganyika and Uganda (150 Elephant against 1,500 and 2,000 in the latter Territories), but there is no doubt it will have to be more rigorously pursued in future. The Elephant population is definitely rising and it will be necessary in the immediate future to kill at least sufficient of these beasts to offset the annual increase.

The most disquieting thing about the Kenya Game situation is the early retirement of Captain Ritchie. The "Veteran Game Warden"—*vide* the English Press—has borne the heat and burden of the day for twenty-five years; to him is due the credit for the healthy outlook towards game one meets everywhere in the Colony. His personal popularity, his immense range of friends in all walks of life, coupled with a brilliant brain, scientific attainments, and a polished pen, have combined

to give him unique influence. No one will, I fear, be able to fill his shoes. For the moment I only know of one candidate who might be suitable to try them on, and it is not certain if and when he will be able to do so.

#### (b) TANGANYIKA

It is very noticeable that in Tanganyika Territory the attitude toward game, with a few exceptions, is the exact opposite to that found in Kenya. A succession of Administrations, whose attitude to game questions was that of Gallico, induced a general anti-game mentality and accordingly the Game Department has, until recently, been flouted and ignored. Unfortunately Game Preservation is a subject upon which everyone thinks himself qualified to pontificate, and as a result proclamations are issued and policy regarding game is formulated, sometimes without the Game Department being consulted.

In Tanganyika Territory as in Kenya, the high price of ivory caused a sharp increase in the number of Elephant licences (1,500 per cent by comparison with 1938). The Game Warden requested (alas! without success) that the price of licences be raised as had been done in Kenya. The matter went to the Finance Committee and a number of important folk who knew little about Game Preservation, had their say, "Revenue would suffer"—"The price of Elephant licences should be lowered, not raised."

Every experienced Game Department Officer knows that the only way to reduce an excessive Elephant population, protect crops, and increase revenue is by organized Elephant control. The issue of cheap licences which allow Tom, Dick, and Harry to roam all over the countryside and scatter the Elephant herds far and wide only makes confusion worse confounded, as was proved in Uganda in 1922.

The Headquarters are, and have been for some years, at Iyamungu, 15 miles from Moshi and 50 miles from Arusha. This is far enough from everything, but when I add that Headquarters itself is 6 miles up a side road, which, during the rains, can only be covered on foot, the situation becomes fantastic. Can one imagine an earnest inquirer motoring 50 miles and then walking 6 miles, up to his knees in mud, to have a talk to the Game Warden? What chance has the latter to cultivate the personal contacts which are so essential to induce a rational outlook on Game Preservation?

I agree that "plans have been drawn up" and are "under the consideration of the Town Planning Committee" for the construction of suitable premises for the Game Department in Arusha. I feel it is very wrong that the Department should ever have been dumped at Lyamungu in the first place, for it means that it is perforce completely out of touch with all elements of the community.

The atmosphere regarding game is reflected in the way cases of breach of the Game Laws are treated. Whilst camped on safari with Captain Moore in the Masai Country, not far from the Kenya border we heard two shots and went out in my car to reconnoitre. We eventually found a lorry and although it tried to bolt, we soon overhauled it. In the back was a newly shot Thomson's Gazelle. The driver admitted he had no licence, but said it was only the second time he had poached on those particular plains!

Breaches of the Game Laws are always very hard to detect, and the only way of stopping illegal killing is by infliction of such heavy fines that the poacher says to himself, "I don't suppose I shall be caught, but if I am, £50 or £100 fine is not much fun—I won't try it." (We got this principle fairly well established, after a battle, in Kenya many years ago.) The idea has not yet penetrated to Tanganyika Territory. In the case to which I am referring the offender was fined Sh. 40/-, i.e. far less than it would have cost him if he had taken out a licence and shot legally. Breaches of the Game Laws by natives are more or less ignored.

The general shortage of game (other than Elephant) in most of Tanganyika is most noticeable to anyone passing through the Territory, and was admitted by all with whom I discussed the question. The shortage, I have little doubt, is very largely due to killing by natives, but I will refer to this later.

Besides the killing by natives, a certain amount of game has been needlessly destroyed in furtherance of experimental agricultural activities. To give an instance, several thousand acres of Masai land South of Arusha were selected for a wheat growing scheme. The first essential was to "kill off the game". This was done and 2,000-3,000 head of game were slaughtered. A large amount of money was spent, but the wheat crop, I am informed, worked out at half a bushel an acre. The scheme was abandoned and the only abiding result was that the game had been killed.

The staff of the Tanganyika Territory Game Department is far below requirements; moreover the Game Rangers (and

many of the native staff), instead of doing their work as rangers, are employed on Game Control. I entirely agree that control is needed, but the Game Department Ranger Staff are not the people who should normally be employed to carry it out. The present arrangement is unfair to everyone. I think that there is little doubt that Tanganyika could employ half a dozen Control Officers who would not cost the Treasury anything. They would in fact pay for the Game Department as well as themselves, and even show a profit since the Elephant herds in the coast areas need considerable reduction.

How much game control will be needed to assist the Ground Nut Scheme is uncertain, but I am inclined to think that game will fall back before the intensive cultivation and clearing which is taking place. In any event I hope that the Game Department will take over such control and it will be carried out systematically on expert lines and not left to the whims of the Ground Nut folk. I met one of these in the train on my way to Shinyanga. He said he had been out on a survey near Mwapwa and saw a lot of animals, "Wot looked like donkeys with straight 'orns" (oryx?), but "we mowed 'em down from the jeep: 'ave to get rid of them"—I doubt if he actually did much "mowing", but I hope that control will not be attempted by the unco-ordinated efforts of untrained individuals. Finally I recommend that no relaxation of the Game Laws be allowed by special exemption or tacit permission. Once disregard of the law is allowed to start there is no stopping it.

A new Game Ordinance was passed some seven years ago, and I think it is unfortunate that an effort was not made to bring it more into line with Kenya and Uganda Legislation. It has, I fear, a number of deficiencies, loop-holes, and at least two unfortunate provisions.

Section 28 lays down that any native may hunt, without a licence, to supply himself and his dependents with food, any animal allowed on a "Minor Licence". The one restriction is that "arms of precision" may not be used. It should be noted that—

- (i) Since no licence is required there is and can be no control of any sort over the hunters.
- (ii) Hunting may take place anywhere in the Territory except in reserves and closed districts.
- (iii) There is no restriction regarding numbers or sex of the animals that may be killed. The varieties of animals that may be killed by natives are as follows:—

*Unlimited.*

|                           |                       |
|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| Buffalo                   | Impala                |
| Hippopotamus              | Grant's Gazelle       |
| Roan Antelope             | Thomson's Gazelle     |
| Eland                     | Puku                  |
| Wildebeests               | Reedbuck, Common      |
| Zebra                     | Reedbuck, Bohor       |
| Hartebeests (two species) | Duiker (four species) |
| Waterbuck                 | Pygmy Antelope        |
| Bushbuck                  | Dik Dik               |

Animals for which a special licence is required, e.g. Elephant, Rhino, and Giraffe, may not be shot and a few rarities such as Abbots Duiker and Sitatunga are also exempt (theoretically) from being hunted.

It is laid down, as stated above, that arms of precision may not be used, so the native hunter is limited to a muzzle loader, but let no one imagine that this reduces the rate of slaughter. After all, the early hunters used nothing else but muzzle loaders, and were reasonably successful. Admittedly the natives are not such good shots as Harris, Gordon Cumming, and Baker, but this only means that a far greater percentage of game gets away wounded to die a lingering death.

The prohibition against shooting rarities is, I fear, farcical. How is the native, who only knows that he may go forth and shoot without a licence, to distinguish between Abbots Duiker and, say, Harvey's or the Red Duiker. I don't suppose he has ever heard the name of either and, to use a colloquialism, "he couldn't care less." Animals like Giraffe are not exempt either, but no doubt the native has a fair idea that he is sinning in shooting them, though he is not deterred on that account. During February the carcasses of seven Giraffe were found scattered between the Chisama and Ruaha Rivers. All had died of wounds and were full of slug holes. In no case had even the tails been taken, proof positive that the hunters never found them.

It may be argued that the native is only allowed under the Ordinance to kill for food, and that if he is found killing more than he needs he commits an offence. I did not hear of any prosecution taking place on this count, but I imagine that a good defence would be that he intended to dry the meat for future use or, as he does not live on meat alone, he is therefore fully entitled to barter or sell his meat to buy other food "for himself and his dependents".

I was told on all sides that more and more natives are taking up hunting as a means of livelihood and are doing so well out of it that they find it pays them to go far afield, even by motor-bus, to the best hunting grounds. Herein lies the danger.

I am the first to admit that game in certain areas is anything but an asset; in fact, if only the muzzle loading folk would confine their attentions to such places all would be well. In actual fact the real killers don't waste their energies in districts where game is scarce and wild. They go off and take up residence in a fly area, by preference one that is not administered, and make an excellent living shooting game and drying the meat. The result of their activities is that game is killed in the very places where it does no damage, and in addition is sometimes driven out of its proper habitat to invade cultivation.

I tried to get an estimate of the number of muzzle loaders in use. There are believed to be 17,000 in the Western Province, and the police have records of about 30,000 being registered, but no one with whom I discussed the matter thinks that this even approximates to the true figure. I was given 40,000 to 45,000 as the probable number, but for the purpose of argument will accept the lower figure. Assuming that 10,000 of these guns (a large proportion) are only for show, this leaves 30,000 in use.

I asked a number of people how many head of game a year were killed, in their opinion, by an average native hunter. The answers varied greatly, but the lowest of all was "one head every two months". By this computation it would appear that 180,000 head of game are annually bagged by more or less legal methods, and this takes no account of game that is wounded and dies a lingering death, nor game killed by illegal methods, such as the popular poisoned arrow.

Southern Rhodesia has published the figures of game killed in the Tsetse Campaign, 1922-1945. They came, if I remember correctly, to 320,000 head. Game lovers throughout the world were shocked at this slaughter, and it has been the subject of much debate and correspondence. There is every reason to think that a far bigger total is achieved by the native hunters of Tanganyika in two years.

The figures I have given may, and will no doubt be challenged. They are incapable of accurate proof, but the fact remains that the amount of game destruction that is taking place, largely in places where game is doing no harm, explains the immense decrease in wild life in the past few years. Opinion was unanimous that, with the exception of Buffalo and Elephant, game was disappearing rapidly.

One often heard it said, "Oh, the native hunter always used to hunt game and he never exterminated it; why should he be stopped now?" The answer is that, in the past, hunting tribes always exterminated the game in their own areas, but did not