Geert Castryck

Disentangling the Colonial City: Spatial Separations and Entanglements inside Towns and across the Empire in Colonial Africa and Europe

It has been argued that the first places of genuine global integration, where people, capital, goods, and ideas from across the world came together, were colonial cities.[1] When looking more closely, it appears that the argument primarily targets port cities in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. In these places, more than in many European towns in early colonial times, people from different parts of the world lived, worked, and traded. Furthermore, exchange between unevenly developed economic zones took place and maritime and terrestrial worlds met. These connections and entanglements had a fundamental impact on the shape, significance, and even existence of these towns. "They were 'global pivots of change' [. . .], instrumental in creating the space in which today's capitalist world-economy operates [. . .] long before the phenomenon occurred in the metropolitan capitals".[2] Nevertheless, it was only a matter of time until the direct colonial and urban encounter would also apply to cities in Europe and beyond the coast. Colonial connections are still visible in cities today, either in the diversity of people walking the streets, in buildings or monuments marking colonial rule, or in a town's spatial layout and symbolic markers.

Although the term "colonial city" usually refers to cities in colonies,[3] the features that make a city colonial also apply to cities in the colonial metropole. Connections and entanglements between the colony and the metropole, a core corollary of colonialism, ipso facto shape both sides of the equation. Colonialism implicates the metropole not only as an emitter of colonial domination, but also as a constituent part of an asymmetrical power relation, which by definition is a reciprocal relation. Mobility of people in a colonial context included colonial settlers moving from metropole to colony, colonial subjects moving within and between colonies (e.g. in processes of labour migration or urbanization), as well

1 A.D. King, *Urbanism, Colonialism and the World-Economy: Cultural and Spatial Foundations of the World Urban System*, Abingdon: Routledge, 1991, pp. 6–7.

2 Ibid., 7.

3 See, e.g., H. Gründer and P. Johanek, *Kolonialstädte, Europäische Enklaven oder Schmelztiegel der Kulturen?*, Münster: LIT Verlag, 2001.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110643008-007

as migrants from the colonies to the metropoles. The predicate "colonial" should therefore not be confined to areas under colonial administration but can better be applied to those phenomena that characterize colonialism and that are the result of colonial relations, wherever they manifest themselves. In this understanding, Paris, Hamburg, and Oxford bear attributes of the colonial city in them as much as the port cities of Dakar, Mumbai, and Dar es Salaam, or as the inland cities of Lubumbashi, Kigoma, or Nairobi.

By reconstructing (re)constellations of local and global connections inside colonial cities, this chapter offers an essentially spatial analysis of how colonialism worked in towns. The chapter shows that the colonial city was characterized by a high concentration of connections, both in town and across the colonial world. The city, as a whole, was not connected, but different parts of town each had their relations in different directions. The colonial attempt to obtain control over cities, as shown in numerous projects of colonial urban planning and segregation, was thus at least in part a spatial project, locally disentangling and severing the manifold global connections in the colonial city.

Our approach took inspiration from the analytical category "portal of globalization", which provides a way to localize with precision where global connections and relations are produced, paying attention to the development of practices or institutions for dealing with global connectedness.[4] Some places are more vibrant in the production of global connectedness and in stimulating qualitative changes in the nature of global connectedness than others, but it is worthwhile to keep the eyes open in every place on earth to uncover possible pathbreaking ways of shaping globalization – or connectedness, which is the primary interest of this chapter. Locally available assets, such as a tradition of connectedness, creative or innovative actors, a diverse population interacting locally and globally, the physical presence of infrastructure of transportation or communication (or the local historical quality to attract such infrastructure), etc. are crucial in this regard, and they are not only at work in the big imperial metropoles or powerhouses of globalization. The category "portal of globalization" provides an analytical entry point to interpret globalization in a multicentred, heterogeneous, actor-oriented, space-sensitive, and historically contingent fashion while, at the

4 Cf. M. Middell and K. Naumann, "Global History and the Spatial Turn: From the Impact of Area Studies to the Study of Critical Junctures Of Globalization", *Journal of Global History* 5 (2010) 1, pp. 149–170; G. Castryck, "Introduction – From Railway Juncture to Portal of Globalization: Making Globalization Work in African and South Asian Railway Towns", *Comparativ* 25 (2015) 4, pp. 7–16; C. Baumann, A. Dietze and M. Maruschke, *Portals of Globalization in Africa, Asia, and Latin America*, Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 2017, especially "Portals of Globalization – An Introduction".

same time, acknowledging the thrust, with ups and downs, of intensifying and accelerating interactions and interdependencies on a global scale. Even though our concern is not so much globalization per se, we adopt this analytical entry point for our reconstruction and spatial interpretation of connections and separations within and between cities in a colonial context.

The empirical basis for this chapter lies in Berlin's Africa, that is to say the parts of Africa included in the free trade zone determined at the Berlin Congo Conference (1884/85) as well as the European (and North American) lands involved in this initially one-sided space-making imposition. After situating our approach in relation to the existing literature, we will make an analysis of colonial cities, empirically drawing on four East and Central African examples: Dar es Salaam, Kigoma, Bujumbura, and Lubumbashi. We gauge the colonial origin and role of these cities as well as the colonial imprint on these towns' spatial layout and relations. We then move on to ask the same questions about European colonial cities such as London, Paris, and Brussels.

Overall, we argue that colonial cities are marked by and mark manifold connections and entanglements as well as asymmetries and separations premised on the unequal power relations of colonialism, both within the metaphorical "city walls" and across the globe. Global connections are not a flat maze but a power relation of connections in different directions and with different magnitudes of force. Such connections typically are highly concentrated in cities – colonial cities when it comes to the era of the essentially asymmetric colonial spatial order we focus upon.

African Urban History

In African urban history, two narratives coexist and collide. One, empirically rather thin, assumes that, except for some coastal towns, cities hardly existed in pre-colonial Africa.[5] The other, painstakingly, piles up evidence that Africa has places that can be called towns since time immemorial.[6] A similar dissonance

5 For a balanced assessment of this view, see A. Jones, *Afrika bis 1850*, Frankfurt/Main: S. Fischer, 2016, pp. 170–171.

6 D.M. Anderson and R. Rathbone (eds.), *Africa's Urban Past*, Oxford: James Currey, 2000; A. Burton (ed.), *The Urban Experience in Eastern Africa c. 1750–2000*, Nairobi: British Institute in Eastern Africa, 2002; S.J. Salm, and T. Falola (eds.), *African Urban Spaces in Historical Perspective*, Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005; B. Freund, *The African City: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007; C. Coquery-Vidrovitch, *The History of African Cities South of the Sahara: From the Origins to Colonization*, Princeton: Markus Wiener,

exists between narratives of colonialism as an overwhelming European imposition of absolute domination[7] versus African resilience,[8] long-lasting negotiations and compromises,[9] the colonizers' inescapable colonial situation,[10] and everyday tensions of empire.[11] The claim for either a strong or a weak colonialism, for either African cities or externally introduced urbanization, reflects different views on the position and integration of Africa in the world. Cities as places of concentration and connection allow us to escape these binaries and to reconstruct the complexity and diversity of colonial connectedness.

When looking at African colonial cities, it is not our main concern whether or not these places were urban before the colonial era, but what matters is how the past affects the colonial city: its location, connections, and significance. Likewise, it is spatially visible that different groups with agency as well as different directions and intensities of connectedness are at play in

2009; G. Myers, *African Cities: Alternative Visions Of Urban Theory And Practice*, London: Zed Books, 2011.

7 The narrative of overwhelming colonial almightiness is no longer prominent in state-of-the-art historiography but still is in circles propagating moral indignation and mobilizing for reparations. To give but one example of a book that caused an overly justified outcry against colonial abuse and atrocities, yet reduced Africans to passive victims, thereby completely reproducing the colonial bias that denied any agency to Africans, see A. Hochschild, *King Leopold's Ghost: A Story of Greed, Terror, and Heroism in Colonial Africa*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

8 A focus on resistance has been prominent in African history ever since the nation-building narratives of decolonization in the 1950s and 1960s, illustrated by the seminal article by T.O. Ranger, "Connexions between 'Primary Resistance' Movements and Modern Mass Nationalism In East and Central Africa", *Journal of African History* 9 (1968) 3, pp. 437–453 and 631–641. For a critique of this "connection" between primary resistance and modern nationalism, see C.M. Young, "Nationalism, Ethnicity, and Class in Africa: A Retrospective (Nationalisme, ethnicité et classe en Afrique: une rétrospective)", *Cahiers d'Études Africaines* 26 (1986) 103, pp. 421–495.

9 A critical yet sympathetic overview of the focus on the long and winding road of struggles, negotiations, and compromises in the making of African history can be found in the special issue of the *Journal of African Cultural Studies* in honour of Terence Ranger: J. Lonsdale, "Agency in Tight Corners: Narrative and Initiative in African History", *Journal of African Cultural Studies* 13 (2000), pp. 5–16. For a self-critical assessment of the tensions between the narrative of resistance and nationalism versus small-scale stories of the personal, social, and political initiatives of historical actors in the historiography on Africa's (colonial) past, see also T. Ranger, "The Invention of Tradition Revisited: The Case of Colonial Africa", in: T. Ranger and O. Vaughan (eds.): *Legitimacy and the State in Twentieth-Century Africa. Essays in honour of A.H.M. Kirk-Greene*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1993, pp. 62–111.

10 The idea stems from the article written in the late colonial period by G. Balandier, "La situation coloniale: approche théorique", *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* 11 (1951), pp. 44–79.

11 The wording is derived from F. Cooper and A.L. Stoler (eds.) *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

every colonial city, thus shaping the historically contingent spatial positions and layouts of these cities.

It should be noted that colonial cities have been researched before. Limiting this overview to African colonial cities, three strands of colonial urban history exist side by side. First of all, there is a wide range of literature on colonial urban planning.[12] Either focusing on the spatial layout of colonial cities, on policies of control and containment through spatial engineering, or on the role of individual actors, this approach explains both the colonial character and the particular shape of cities across the colonial world. Apart from being part of a colonial project, though, this approach pays little attention to a town's global connections – or, if at all, these connections are meant, and believed, to be controlled or curtailed.

Reflecting tendencies in African history in general, a second strand in colonial urban history substantiates that African city dwellers circumvented, undermined, and confronted colonial urban planning and control measures, turning colonial cities into spaces quite different from what the colonial administrations had envisaged.[13] Instead of spaces of control, many a colonial city became a space of contestation. Here as well, most of the existing research limits its focus to one city, or sometimes to the symbiosis between a few cities within one colonial realm.

A third strand, invoked in the opening sentence of this chapter, approaches colonial cities as pivots of global change, prominently highlighting global connections.[14] However, in this approach the micro level in town and the variations between different parts of town are often overlooked; put otherwise, the attention remains limited to selected sites of global connectedness that are understood as characterizing the town as a whole. They often also pay more attention to the long-distance connections than to the entanglements with the hinterland.

---

12 Cf. P.D. Curtin, "Medical Knowledge and Urban Planning in Tropical Africa", *The American Historical Review* 90 (1985) 3, pp. 594–613; G.A. Myers, *Verandahs of Power: Colonialism and Space in Urban Africa*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2003; L. Beeckmans, "Editing the African City: Reading Colonial Planning in Africa from a Comparative Perspective", *Planning Perspectives* 28 (2013) 4, pp. 615–627.

13 L. White, *The Comforts of Home: Prostitution in Colonial Nairobi*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990; P. Martin, *Leisure and Society in Colonial Brazzaville*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

14 See, e.g., N. Worden, "VOC Cape Town as an Indian Ocean Port", in: H.P. Ray and E.A. Alpers (eds.), *Cross Currents and Community Networks: The History of the Indian Ocean World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, pp. 142–162; K.R. Hall (ed.), *Secondary Cities and Urban Networking in the Indian Ocean Realm, c. 1400–1800*, Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008; R. Mukherjee (ed.), *Oceans Connect: Reflections on Water Worlds across Time and Space*, Delhi: Primus Books, 2013.

This chapter makes a plea to overcome this pars pro toto view on the globally connected colonial city. Some scholars have already undertaken similar efforts, either by explicitly focusing on one neighbourhood and its connections[15] or by being precise in localizing connections on neighbourhood, street, or house level. The latter has so far primarily been done for European or metropolitan colonial cities.[16] In this chapter, we want to draw upon this meticulous localization of connections, on the one hand, and combine it with the older research strand that reconstructed colonial urban planning, on the other hand.

We call for a spatial reading of the colonial city as a space where connections in different directions coexist and interact, each having their spaces in town, which together shape the colonial city. The spatial shape of the colonial city, thus, lies at the same time in the layout and separations in town, in the variety of spatial connections in different parts of town, and in the interactions – or lack thereof – between these different parts. We argue that it is these connections and interactions, both across the colonial world and in town, both facilitated and confined by colonialism, that make a city colonial.

Colonial Cities in Berlin's Africa

In this section, we introduce Dar es Salaam, Kigoma, Bujumbura, and Lubumbashi as well as London, Paris, and Brussels as colonial cities, each in a different way positioned, connected and internally structured within a colonial spatial order.

15 Cf. L. Bigon, "'Garden City' in the Tropics? French Dakar in Comparative Perspective", *Journal of Historical Geography* 38 (2012) (1), pp. 35–44; S. Baller, "Urban Football Performances: Playing for the Neighbourhood in Senegal, 1950s–2000s", *Africa* 84 (2014) (1), pp. 17–35; L. Beeckmans and L. Bigon, "The Making of the Central Markets of Dakar and Kinshasa: From Colonial Origins to the Post-colonial Period", *Urban History* 43 (2016) (3), pp. 412–434; N. Carrier, *Little Mogadishu: Eastleigh, Nairobi's Global Somali Hub*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

16 M. Matera, *Black London: The Imperial Metropolis and Decolonization in the Twentieth Century*, Berkley: University of California Press, 2015; M. Goebel, *Anti-Imperial Metropolis: Interwar Paris and the Seeds of Third World Nationalism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. For a meticulous reconstruction of the affiliations of owners or tenants on the level of cadastral parcels in colonial Elisabethville (today Lubumbashi), see S. Boonen and J. Lagae, "A City Constructed by 'des gens d'ailleurs': Urban Development and Migration Policies in Colonial Lubumbashi, 1910–1930", *Comparativ* 25 (2015) (4), pp. 52–70.

Dar es Salaam, the Colonial Capital on the Indian Ocean Shore

Dar es Salaam became a colonial city under German colonial rule. However, it was the sultan of Zanzibar who decided to build Dar es Salaam in the 1860s as a refuge from the hectic life in the bustling town of Zanzibar.[17] When the town was founded, there were already several thriving towns on the East African coast, which was then part of the realm of the sultan. Dar es Salaam (literally "Haven of Peace") was intended to be quiet and relaxed, and, at least from that point of view, the history of the town turned out a failure. Cities change and perform different functions over time. It is important to notice that the town was founded as part of a regional spatial order in East Africa, centred around Zanzibar and connected to the Indian Ocean world and as such to the world economy at large.

In the wake of European colonization, Dar es Salaam became the colonial capital of German East Africa in 1891. At first sight, it may seem to be a rupture to change a site of relaxation into an administrative centre, but this is only partly true. What the German colonial rulers actually did was remove their operations from Bagamoyo, one of the bustling towns on the coast, where the old order was too strong and too hostile for the European colonizers.[18] Dar es Salaam was still to some extent the "Haven of Peace" for the ruling elite, as it had been in the sultan's times, yet now for a new elite with a new imperial and metropolitan reference. The direction and the magnitude of force of the town's connections changed, but the old function as safe and quiet haven lived on as well.

When looking at the inhabitants of the town, a similar instance of simultaneous continuity and change can be seen. The town grew from an estimated 3,000 inhabitants at the end of the 1880s to roughly 13,000 a decade later.[19] This population consisted of only a handful of Germans and primarily three broadly defined other groups, each embedding their own connections: people from the surrounding coastal areas who were attracted by the opportunities to make a living in town, people from the East and Central

17 This section contains a cursory historical and spatial sketch of Dar es Salaam. For more thorough information, see J.R. Brennan and A. Burton, "Introduction", in: J.R. Brennan, A. Burton and Y. Lawi (eds.): *Dar es Salaam: Histories from an Emerging African Metropolis*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki Na Nyota Publishers, 2007, pp. 1–75.

18 For an analysis of anti-colonial resistance in Bagamoyo around 1890, see J. Glassman, *Feasts and Riot: Revelry, Rebellion, and Popular Consciousness on the Swahili Coast, 1856–1888*, Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1995.

19 Brennan and Burton, "Introduction", p. 26.

African interior, and people from across the Indian Ocean. The composition of the population tells us something about the entanglement of pre-existing spaces of connection. Indians had played a role in the Zanzibari trade system of the nineteenth century, but the rise of Indian inhabitants in Dar es Salaam from 100 in 1891 to 2,600 in 1913 and 8,800 in 1938 (of a total urban population of 33,500, i.e. more than a quarter) took place in the context of the Indian Ocean world, by then incorporated into a British imperial order. People of the East and Central African interior had already travelled to and from the coast and settled on the coast, either as slaves or caravan porters, within the context of the nineteenth-century trade system centred on Zanzibar, and they continued to do so in the colonial era. The coastal people, previously concentrated in other coastal towns, had taken part in the Zanzibari trade system as well. Considered together, we notice that the German retreat to the sultan of Zanzibar's resort led to a colonial town inhabited by people connected in different ways across East and Central Africa and the Indian Ocean world. For these people, Dar es Salaam was a different town, with different functions, directions, and references, than for the German and later British colonial rulers – or for the later Tanzanian national rulers for that matter.[20]

This not only is observable if we look at the spatial functions and hierarchical position (positionality) of the town in relation to a global colonial spatial order in the making, but also is manifested in the spatialization processes inside the town. In the course of the colonial period, urban planning measures implemented a spatial separation of the population groups mentioned above. As mentioned before, research on colonial urban planning has primarily researched colonial motivations and legitimations for segregation measures, on the one hand, and the failures of urban regulation in the face of popular resistance or resilience, on the other hand. From a local perspective, there is a wealth of rigorous historical research on "regulation and its failures in colonial Dar es Salaam". This chapter does not add much to the analysis of the local politics of "administering urbanization" and the motivations, strategies, practices, and policies regarding issues like land use, housing, and

20 There are, of course, also differences and tensions amongst the population groups just mentioned. See J. R. Brennan, "Between Segregation and Gentrification: Africans, Indians, and the Struggle for Housing in Dar es Salaam, 1920–1950", in: J.R. Brennan, A. Burton and Y. Lawi (eds.): *Dar es Salaam: Histories from an Emerging African Metropolis*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki Na Nyota Publishers, 2007, pp. 118–135. For identity strategies and tensions in nearby Zanzibar, see L. Fair, *Pastimes and Politics: Culture, Community, and Identity in Post-abolition Urban Zanzibar, 1890–1945*, Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001.

policing in town.[21] Our main concerns, though, are the connections and separations in town and how they relate to connections over longer distances and attempted colonial control.

The setting for our argument is the well-known spatial organization of the centre of Dar es Salaam, consisting of an area of Indian residence in the commercial part of town, the neighbourhood of Kariakoo (and numerous later extensions of the city) meant for African inhabitants, the Mnazi Mmoja Grounds separating these zones, and an area of European residence, still most resembling the lush and green atmosphere of the sultan's "Haven of Peace". This has been interpreted as a separation of population groups – and rightly so. Yet, we can also read the spatializations inside the town as a local separation of areas with different connections – across the Indian Ocean, with the interior, and with the European metropole, respectively. These different areas of operation and connection were spatially separated in town but also entangled in the form of exchanges between people from different neighbourhoods. Mobility and exchanges within Dar es Salaam were at the same time movements and connections between different spatial frames of reference.

Hence, colonial policies of controlling and containing groups of people – or trying to do so – was as much a matter of controlling space as of controlling people. By separating groups of people in town, also their manifold connections could be disentangled and – to some extent – controlled or contained. Nevertheless, Indians, coastal people, and people stemming from the interior – which is, admittedly, an arbitrary category, gradually overlapping and merging with coastal people – made a living and made their town, drawing on their respective vested connections, while concurrently making use of the infrastructures and opportunities provided by colonialism. For sure, there were also Europeans making a living in town and likewise contributing to the urban environment and its connections and separations. In short, there were multiple Dar es Salaams, each with its distinct connectivity, not only consecutively but also simultaneously.

21 Cf. J.R. Brennan, A. Burton and Y. Lawi (eds.), *Dar es Salaam: Histories from an Emerging African Metropolis*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki Na Nyota Publishers, 2007. Part 1 of this volume is entitled "Administering urbanization".

Kigoma-Ujiji and Bujumbura, Colonial Cities at Lake Tanganyika

We now move some 1,200 kilometres inland, symbolically taking the train the German colonial government – or the African workforce – had built at the beginning of the twentieth century, and incidentally following the same trajectory of the nineteenth-century, Zanzibar-centred caravan route. Kigoma and Bujumbura are two towns on Lake Tanganyika, which have also been created as colonial towns by the German colonizers, but which are morever much more than just towns made by the colonizer.

Bujumbura is now the capital city of Burundi and lies at the north-eastern tip of the lake. It had been a regional market in pre-colonial times, a militarily strategic place under German rule, and capital of the Belgian-led mandate territory of Ruanda-Urundi. The urban area of Kigoma-Ujiji lies some 200 kilometres more to the south, in the present-day state of Tanzania. Ujiji was important in late pre-colonial times; German rulers chose nearby Kigoma as the endpoint of the railroad linking East and Central Africa with the Indian Ocean, and after a short Belgian interlude, Kigoma-Ujiji became part of the British-governed Tanganyika Territory.

When considering the urban planning of Kigoma-Ujiji, we observe the typical three-tier division of colonial towns in East Africa, which we also encountered in Dar es Salaam. The old urban centre of Ujiji serves as an African settlement, including a few inhabitants of Arab origin, perpetuating connections with east Congo and the East African area dating from the pre-colonial period. Remarkably, in colonial times Ujiji was predominantly inhabited by people with connections around and across Lake Tanganyika and not so much by people stemming from the immediate surrounding rural area of Buha. By then, these Ha people had become an important part of the urban population as well.[22] A tiny European residential strip in Kigoma, close to the port and the railway station, lies 7 kilometres to the north-west of Ujiji. Different from many colonial urban planning projects, but somehow comparable to the move from Bagamoyo to Dar es Salaam mentioned before, the Europeans moved away from the "old" centre of the

22 Cf. G. Castryck, "Bordering the Lake: Transcending Spatial Orders in Kigoma-Ujiji", *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 52, 1 (2019). Ujiji, of course, has its own more sophisticated internal spatial organization, which we do not reconstruct in this chapter for lack of place. See S. Hino, "Neighborhood Groups in African Urban Society: Social Relations and Consciousness of Swahili People of Ujiji, a Small Town of Tanzania, East Africa", *Kyoto University African Studies* 6 (1971), pp. 1–30.

urban area, creating a "new" centre – which had already been the site of an important regional market in pre-colonial times – for the purpose of colonial rule and trade. The important Indian presence in town, complemented with a few Arab and Greek entrepreneurs,[23] was located adjacent to the European strip. Furthermore, a neighbourhood called Mwanga, where the African personnel of European and Indian employers lived, is situated between Kigoma and Ujiji. Over the years, the space between Kigoma and Ujiji has gradually urbanized as well, turning Kigoma-Ujiji into a contiguous urban area. A racial and socioeconomic reading of this spatial organization can be found in colonial sources.[24] This urban planning reflected attempted colonial control through the separation of population groups and coincidingly served economic needs of all groups concerned – albeit under unequal conditions. Yet, we can also read this spatially, calling attention to the connections these different parts of town had, both over short and long distances. Thus, colonial urban planning was not only about separating people but also about locally disconnecting manifold global connections.

Like in Kigoma-Ujiji, urban planning and segregation was also applied to Bujumbura. Here as well, we witness a separation of neighbourhoods and people during the colonial period, which again is not only spatialization or segregation within this town, but is also in relation to the spaces surrounding this town and regarding long-distance spatial connections. The situation of today is in fact the spatial layout created in the 1930s and undoing the situation in which all non-Europeans (including some Greek merchants) inhabited one neighbourhood in the heart of town, between the colonial administrative centre and the lake.

23 Obviously, Greeks are also Europeans. Yet, occasionally dubbed "second rate whites", they occupied an intermediary position between the colonizer and the colonized, both socially and spatially. The three-tier structure"European"-"Asian"-"African", in fact, hid a much more complex stratification, having hierarchies amongst Europeans, between Indians and Arabs, and amongst Africans as well. For a historical situation of the label "second rate whites", see Boonen and Lagae, "A City Constructed", pp. 60–64.

24 Tanzania National Archives (TNA), Tanganyika Territory – District Officer's Reports, Kigoma District, Annual Report 1931, p. 25; TNA, 63. Western Province (Regional Office Tabora), File T.2/41, Kigoma Township – General, 1921–1950; TNA, Native Affairs General – Tanganyika Secretariat, File 41622, Minor Settlements – Western Province, 1951. Also see D.E. McHenry, Jr., "Reorganization: an Administrative History of Kigoma District", *Tanzania Notes and Records* 84 (1980) 85, pp. 65–76; S. Hino, "Social stratification of a Swahili town", *Kyoto University African Studies* 2 (1968), pp. 51–74; S. McCurdy, "Transforming Associations: Fertility, Therapy, and the Manyema Diaspora in Urban Kigoma, Tanzania, c. 1850–1993", PhD dissertation, Columbia University, 2000.

The spatial reorganization of Bujumbura was both necessary, because of the growth of the urban population, and politically welcome in order to contain and control different population groups. We can distinguish five areas in town, and all five are destined for people who differed from the surrounding Burundian population in one way or another: permanent Swahili residents, Asian settlers, (the workplace for) colonial administrators, Europeans (mainly Belgians and Greeks), and temporary Congolese staff. Towards the end of the colonial period, the number of Burundians moving to town, and thereby not or no longer integrating in the Swahili community, rapidly increased.[25]

We now move on to a reconstruction of how different groups of people appropriated these towns in different ways and with different connections. Based on archival and field research in both towns, we particularly demonstrate the connections of the Indian and Swahili communities in Bujumbura and Kigoma-Ujiji. Although Indians were already active in the Zanzibar-centred East and Central African caravan system of the nineteenth century, the connections of the Indian communities of colonial Kigoma and Bujumbura relied on the spatial framework and infrastructures of European colonialism in general and of the British Empire in particular. Notwithstanding, the direction and intensity of their connections differed significantly from those of European imperial connectedness.

In 1931, the Indian community in Kigoma consisted of almost 400 people, and in Bujumbura approximately 80. By 1955, the number in Kigoma had risen to more than a 1,000 Asians (most of them Indians) and in Bujumbura to almost 700 Indians. Also of importance is the change in gender and age balance. In 1931, both in Bujumbura and in Kigoma, there were only half as many women than men, and even fewer children. After the Second World War, there were more Indian children than adults in Bujumbura, and females made up 45 per cent of the Indians in Kigoma.[26] Furthermore, by the end of the 1930s the population lists contain a growing number of elderly widowed mothers who came over from India or the East African coast to spend their old age with their children at Lake Tanganyika. By 1946, at least 8 Indian widows of between 54 and 61 years lived with their children in Bujumbura. There are also examples

25 Cf. G. Castryck, "Moslims in Usumbura (1897–1962): Sociale geschiedenis van de islamitische gemeenschappen van Usumbura in de koloniale tijd", PhD dissertation, Universiteit Gent, 2006, pp. 83–90 and 118–159.

26 TNA, Tanganyika Territory – District Officer's Reports, Kigoma District, Annual Report 1931 & 1935; Castryck, "Moslims in Usumbura", pp. 123–126.

of a sick father who came to live with his son, or a 70-year-old man who came over to live with his younger brother.

These data indicate that the Indians were increasingly intent on remaining in the area and on building their lives there. Indians in Bujumbura and Kigoma developed their professional and family lives locally but kept long-distance relations alive. In broad strokes, these connections took place within the realm of the British Empire, and at the same time they crossed the borders of the empire, as can be seen in the intensive business relations between Kigoma and Bujumbura as well as reaching into the Belgian Congo. In fact, many Indian traders in Bujumbura operated from Kigoma-Ujiji. They maintained long-distance connections with places of origin, short-distance connections between both urban centres and with surrounding markets, and on top of that relations with other communities within both towns.[27]

The British Empire, or colonialism in general, provided the historical, political, and spatial order within which these Indian communities deployed their agency, but in so doing they also went beyond and bended this order. The multilevel connections spread across the globe, had decisive Kigoma-Bujumbura and Indian Ocean-Lake Tanganyika axes, and radiated outwards to include markets in the region and neighbourhoods inside town. Nevertheless, the precise loci of connection were not the colonial cities as a whole but only specific quarters and even particular businesses and families inside these town quarters.

For the second example, the focus is on a group of people who were the backbone of urbanization in the region. I call them "Swahili", based on the language, religious, and cultural identity these people acquired parallel to their process of urbanization.[28] At least until the 1930s, both Bujumbura and Kigoma-Ujiji were primarily Swahili towns. Swahili newcomers in the emerging urban centres along Lake Tanganyika partly stemmed from the surrounding area, but a significant part also came from the eastern part of the present-day Democratic Republic of Congo.[29] They started arriving before European colonialism, as part of a historical

27 Cf. Castryck, "Moslims in Usumbura", pp. 163–182.

28 Cf. P. Gooding, "Slavery, 'Respectability,' and being 'Freeborn' on the Shores of Nineteenth-century Lake Tanganyika", *Slavery & Abolition* 40, 1 (2019), pp. 147–167; G. Castryck, "Living Islam in Colonial Bujumbura: The Historical Trans-locality of Muslim Life between East and Central Africa", *History in Africa* 46 (2019). Henceforth, Swahili without quotation marks.

29 Castryck, "Bordering the Lake".

order connected to the caravan trade with the coast.[30] This order enabled spatial connections and mobility and included the ability to have local influence, either based on relations within local political contexts or based on references to the epicentre of the caravan trade system on the Indian Ocean coast.

It is precisely this reference to the east or to the coast that made Swahili the dominant culture for people who in fact came from the west but did so within and drawing upon a locally embedded and translocally connected historical order that provided the framework and the spatial connections for settlement. Moreover, these spatial connections remained operational and relevant as well as even further developed long after that transient order had been overtaken by European colonialism. Family relations, religious learning, mobility for professional reasons, exchange of political ideas, the travelling of fashion and music styles, as well as imaginary, symbolic, and ritual connections with places of origin or cultural reference continued to flourish between and within Swahili cities. Swahili cities dating back to the Zanzibari period remained "familiar" places, and lines of communication between these cities remained open, partly making use of the connections and mobility enabled by the colonial order that had supplanted the preceding one.

Despite the pulling apart of connections, which were oriented differently, in the urban layout of colonial cities, interactions in town continued. Swahili, Arab, Indian, Congolese, Burundian, Rwandan, and Ha people interacted significantly, thus again tying together multidirectional connections, which the colonial authorities attempted to prevent, limit, or control. These cities not only existed parallel to and circumvented colonialism, they also bore the clear imprint of colonialism in their spatial layout. In both urban areas being examined, the Swahili connections were actively removed from the heart of town, either by moving the Swahili out of the original city centre, as was the case in Bujumbura, or by moving the heart of the city itself, leaving the Swahili behind in a part of town (Ujiji), which gradually became marginalized in comparison to Kigoma. Connections in different directions and with different magnitude of force thus were pulled apart inside colonial towns, making colonialism a project of disconnection as much as of connection.

30 Cf. S.J. Rockel, *Carriers of Culture: Labor on the Road in Nineteenth-century East Africa*, Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2006; B. Brown, "Ujiji: the History of a Lakeside Town, c. 1800–1914", PhD dissertation, Boston University, 1973, pp. 1–271

Lubumbashi, the Capital of Minerals, Mining and Merchants

Highlighting, in a succinct manner, the economic capital of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Lubumbashi (in colonial times Elisabethville), we can similarly depict a globally connected town, which is both locally segregated and intertwined. Different from the previous examples, this city did not build on pre-colonial urbanization but on rich mineral deposits in the area.[31] The so-called geological scandal of Katanga, which is extremely rich in mineral resources, attracted European colonial powers and led to an Anglo-Belgian exploitation of the region, including the founding of the city of Elisabethville, named after the then Belgian queen, but run by the company Union Minière du Haut Katanga (UMHK). Founded as part of a mining enterprise, the conception of this town was different from the colonial cities primarily functioning in a territorial-administrative logic. The spatial layout of the city was and stil is oriented towards the mines. In town, the typical separation between European residential areas and quarters for African workers, separated by a neutral zone, formed the basis of the urban grid. However, when having a closer look, a large part of the urban population was neither part of the European colonizers nor of the African workforce. Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Jewish, and Indian merchants, petty traders, and shopkeepers formed a middle ground – both socioeconomically and spatially – between the European and African neighbourhoods. Breaking up the separations in town, they also brought in their own long-distance connections of commercial and family networks. Boonen and Lagae show how housing politics were used to enforce the separation of population groups, which only met with mixed success. In this economically conceived colonial city, unforeseen urban areas were carved out through the daily practices of connecting and exchanging.[32]

A Greek, Jewish, and Indian part of town emerged from the connecting practices in town while also drawing on connections with their respective networks stretching across Central and Southern Africa and beyond. Connections

31 For our spatial depiction of Lubumbashi, we primarily draw on the spatial analysis by Boonen and Lagae, "A City Constructed". Also see S. Boonen, "Une ville construite par des 'gens d'ailleurs': Développements urbains à Élisabethville, Congo belge (actuellement Lubumbashi, RDC)", PhD dissertation, Universiteit Gent, 2019.

32 Also see S. Boonen and J. Lagae, "Scenes from a Changing Colonial 'Far West': Picturing the Early Urban Landscape and Colonial Society of Cosmopolitan Lubumbashi, 1910–1931", *Stichproben* 15 (2015) 28, pp. 11–54; J. Lagae, S. Boonen and S. Lanckriet, "Navigating 'Off Radar': The Heritage of Liminal Spaces in the City Center of Colonial/Postcolonial Lubumbashi, DR Congo", in: R. Lee et al. (eds.), *Things Don't Really Exist Until You Give Them a Name: Unpacking Urban Heritage*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki Na Nyota Publishers, 2017, pp. 86–93.

in colonial towns were clearly not limited to colonial connections in the narrow sense, and the colonial city was only viable because of in-town and long-distance connections, bypassing, undermining, and, paradoxically, also facilitating colonial policies and colonialism as such. Without these intermediaries, the sterile fully segregated model of the colonial city would have been a complete failure. Colonialism was premised on its own dysfunctionality in order to function, yet it also provided the arena for all kinds of differently connected – both locally and globally – groups of people.

The paradox of colonial urban planning and segregation lies in the fact that the colonial city is characterized by the dysfunctionality of its urban planning or by the only partial and diminishing efficacy of segregation. The colonial character lies in the asymmetries and obstacles to connectedness as much as it lies in the inevitability of these connections, which make productive use of colonial infrastructures and imperial spaces of mobility and interaction. Indians, in particular, were as much hindered as they were facilitated by the British Empire. The same goes, mutatis mutandis, for other population groups, which explains the scattered spatial layout as well as the both separated and interrelated spatial connections of cities in East and Central Africa. Thus, the different strands in the literature come together. The African agency to circumvent urban segregation measures, notwithstanding the real effect of the spatial grid and attempted control, complemented a variety of idiosyncratic and resilient global connections in different neighbourhoods, which, despite spatial segregation, led to patterns of interaction in town, and are the constituent elements of the colonial city.

European Colonial Cities

We push our argument one step further by applying the same logic to European cities during the colonial period. As colonialism was not only contradictory per se but also worked because of and premised on its inherent contradictions, it is worthwhile to consider this insight in relation to the metropolitan capitals, asking what the place of Paris, London, or Brussels had in this colonial constellation, which worked despite, not because of, its principles of divided worlds on local and global scales. For lack of space, we did not include cities that were not the seat of an imperial capital (e.g. Hamburg, Oxford, Marseilles, etc.), although we could, without any doubt, apply the analysis to these cities as well. We could also extend the argument to the present day, as colonialism has been decisive in producing both enabling and

inhibiting asymmetries, which characterize the global constellation of connections and separations within and between cities until today.

For this section, we limit ourselves to three former colonial metropoles in Europe, which we only briefly touch upon in order to make our point that understanding the colonial city should include how the colonial city is also at work in the European colonial metropoles. We primarily draw on the empirical work of Marc Matera on London and Michael Goebel on Paris as well as on own observations of Brussels, which together underpin our overall argument.[33] In these European colonial towns, similar mechanisms as in Africa were at play. The obvious connection of the colony to the metropole produced unanticipated connections in the metropole, in turn having an impact on the colonies and on colonialism and making the metropolitan city a colonial city as well, being shaped by and dependent upon colonial connections.

Even though in the conceived political order of imperial rule the metropolitan capital is the place where decisions over the colonial world are taken, in reality this conception inevitably shapes the metropole as well. Not only is there a direction and magnitude of force from the decision-making centre to the colonial world, the colonial world also manifests itself in the metropole, bringing and making connections in town as well as redefining these cities as colonial cities – not unlike Dar es Salaam, Kigoma, Bujumbura, or Lubumbashi. This means that colonial imperialism manifests itself in metropolitan spaces in two ways: first, the sites of colonial rule and the self-glorification of imperial posturing in the form of monuments[34] (which we will not discuss in this chapter); and, second, the activities and connections made by and between migrants from across the colonial world.

For interwar Paris, Goebel reconstructs connections between African (especially North African), East Asian, and Latin American migrants and traces the spread and development of anti-imperial, nationalistic, communist, and eventually also fascist ideas within both the Parisian local and transcolonial networks of these migrants. His analysis of the networking and political awakening of students is particularly relevant for our argument. Whereas the French imperial government hoped to instil Francophilia by attracting an intellectual elite to French universities, an unanticipated side effect was the circulation and maturing of anti-imperial ideas. He highlights the importance of networks of relatives or acquaintances, who welcomed newcomers, and even

33 Matera, *Black London*; Goebel, *Anti-Imperial Metropolis*.

34 Cf. D. Cannadine, *Ornamentalism: How the British saw their Empire*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

more importantly the very dense space where most of them lived and were active. Paris not as a whole but in and around the Quartier latin, and within that neighbourhood the rue Cujas in particular, was at the heart of the globally connected and increasingly anti-imperial student activity. Goebel pays special attention to national student associations from China, Latin America, Vietnam, and North Africa and to how they politically and organizationally inspired each other. Many of the protagonists would become intellectual and political leaders of decolonization and national liberation in their countries of origin (e.g. Ho Chi Minh, Léopold Senghor, Habib Bourguiba, and Deng Xiaoping). He narrows his focus even further by stressing the high concentration of exchange in the house numbers 16 to 20 at rue Cujas, being home to several cheap hotels housing students from all over – what would later be called – the Third World, including French colonies like Vietnam, Congo, and Algeria (although strictly speaking, the latter was not a colony according to the French).[35] The rare interaction with labour migrants, especially from Algeria, indicates that the anti-imperial student networks were an elite affair, despite socialist leanings in many student associations. The Algerian workers stood not only socially apart from the studying elite-in-the-making, but also spatially, living in the Parisian banlieues instead of the Quartier latin.[36]

Locating precisely where a decisive concentration of global connectedness was produced, including paying attention to specific actors and associations, is a fine example of the "portals of globalization" approach introduced at the beginning of this chapter. It should be noted that in this case it was not the French imperial rulers that turned Paris into a "portal of globalization" but rather students from the colonized or otherwise globally peripheral world, who made a specific and relatively small part of Paris into an anti-imperial portal, deeply imbued with colonial connections.

Matera undertakes a similar analysis of imperial London. He particularly reconstructs the networks of people of African descent, including people from West and East African British colonies as well as Afro-Caribbean and African American migrants. Tracing people back to the exact addresses where they lived, with whom they lived or whom they met, and where they could take a shower provides a very precise picture of the social geography and topography of "Black Londoners" in the interwar period. Here as well, the imperial capital was the site where anti-imperial, socialist, and pan-African ideas could develop, and here as well a plethora of later African and Caribbean political

35 Goebel, *Anti-Imperial Metropolis*, p. 116.
36 Ibid., p. 145.

leaders came to fruition in the imperial capital (e.g. Jomo Kenyatta, Kwame Nkrumah, and George Padmore). Just like Goebel, Matera localizes the sites where intercolonial connections are concentrated, and identifies Camden Town and the area around Soho and Russell Square as the centre of Black London.[37] Within the imperial metropole, the colonial city – the city based on colonial connections, separations, asymmetries, and contestations – is not everywhere, but it is prominent and relevant in specific spaces within the imperial metropole.

Acknowledging that the metropolitan city is in itself also a colonial city shaped by colonialism and influences from the colonies turns the metropole into an anti-colonial city as well, both ipso facto by thwarting the spatial divide upon which colonialism is premised and because of the anti-imperial networks, organizations, and ideas colonial subjects developed in the metropole. The separations that characterize colonialism were both overcome by intense entanglements between metropolitan spaces, the colonized world, and beyond as well as reproduced in the heart of the metropolitan (capital) cities.

Turning to Brussels, the city from where colonial Lubumbashi (then Elisabethville), Bujumbura (then Usumbura), and for a short period of time Kigoma (1916–1921, under military occupation) were colonially governed, we see extremely little presence of colonial subjects until the very end of the colonial period, when the World Exposition in Brussels in 1958 provided an occasion for Congolese to meet in Brussels, with a noted concentration in the Centre d'Accueil du Personnel Africain in Tervuren.[38] Nevertheless, the city was the focal point of anti-imperialism when the League Against Imperialism held its inauguration conference in Brussels in 1927, having a tremendous impact on the students in Paris rather than in Brussels itself.[39] Brussels only became a colonial city after the colonial period, having its main Congolese neighbourhood, Matonge, almost in the backyard of the royal palace, practically stared at by an equestrian statue of King Leopold II, the notorious founding father of Belgian colonialism. Until today – or increasingly in recent times – colonial space in Belgium, and in Brussels in particular, has been a contentious issue, reflected in red paint ("blood") attacks on royal statues and in campaigns to dedicate a street or square or to erect a statue in honour of Congo's first – and assassinated – prime minister, Patrice Lumumba. Brussels is today more a (post-) colonial city than it was during the colonial period.

37 Matera, *Black London*, pp. 6–11.

38 Z.A. Etambala, *De teloorgang van een modelkolonie, Belgisch Congo 1958–1960*, Leuven: Acco, 2008.

39 Goebel, *Anti-Imperial Metropolis*, pp. 136–137.

The spatial layout of African cities shows a continuity with the colonial period, although the population groups inhabiting the respective quarters in town have changed, now reflecting socioeconomic (class) rather than colonial (race) differences. Colonialism left its traces in the street grids but not so much in the people living in the city. In European colonial cities, the opposite is true. In Paris, the Quartier latin no longer has the status it used to have in colonial times. In London, Notting Hill and Brixton rather than Camden Town and Soho are the quarters with a high concentration of people of African descent. And in Brussels, the Congolese quarter of Matonge, remarkably situated between the centre of Belgian political life and Brussels' European district, only came into being from the very end of the colonial period onwards. The spatial logic changed, but the people of African descent or from the former colonies are more present than ever. In short, the colonial city left its spatial imprint on African towns, but it is in the former colonial metropole that the colonial city lives on.

Conclusion

To sum up, focusing on colonial cities in Africa and Europe we saw how the interplay of local and global as well as of connection and disconnection underpins the spatial relations both between and within cities in colonial Africa and Europe. On a more conceptual level, this empirically illustrated attempt to make sense of how urban, colonial, and global relate to each other in colonial cities can also be explained as an analytical exercise organized around the categories "spatial format", "spatial order", and "portal of globalization". "Spatial formats" are widely shared and firmly established abstractions or imaginations of space, which structure spatial practices and perceptions thereof.[40] The common understanding of particular types of spaces as "cities", for instance, presupposes a set of characteristics that are considered to be applicable to all "urban" spaces and that underpin the behaviour of actors in these cities, thus shaping the city after that common understanding. This common understanding – which is both an abstraction of observed, experienced, or perceived realities as well as a strong reference that informs action and shapes the city after its own image – is a spatial format. The spatial format "city" is not a tangible

40 Cf. U. Engel, *Regionalismen*, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018, pp. 3–5; M. Middell, "Raumformate – Überlegungen zu einer unvollständigen Liste historischer Phänomene" (preliminary notes).

place but an abstraction that allows us to group places as different as Brussels, Kigoma, and Dar es Salaam under one umbrella. This is more than just performativity of language or semantics, as the common use of the term "colonial city" for cities in the colonies demonstrates. Signified like this, the labelling is used to distinguish between cities, to ungroup cities like London and Dar es Salaam, based on whether or not they are in areas under colonial administration. Notwithstanding, we demonstrated in this chapter that there is no qualitative difference in spatial practices and connections depending on whether or not a city is situated in the colonies or in the metropole. Colonial city, therefore, is not a spatial format but merely draws our attention to the positionality or the hierarchical position of a given city within a spatial order, to the fundamental asymmetric agenda of colonialism as such.

Spatial order, then, refers to the constellation of spatial formats at a particular time in history. The difference between colonial Lubumbashi, Bujumbura, and Paris is not so much a qualitative difference on the level of the spatial format "city", but instead a different positionality in the constellation of several spatial formats, of which city, territorial state, and empire are probably the most relevant ones in our analysis. In other words, a colonial city is a city within a colonial spatial order. The fact that the colonial city is a category of asymmetric power relations makes it imperative to include cities in the imperial metropole in an analysis of the colonial city. Otherwise, if historians would adopt the strict separation between colonial cities in parts of the world under colonial administration, on the one hand, and colonial cities in parts of the world exercising colonial domination, on the other, they would heedlessly reproduce the essentially asymmetric power relations within the colonial spatial order. The colonial "denial of coevalness"[41] can be the object or outcome of study but must never be an unconsidered premise leading to a research design that reproduces the colonial separations. The differences between the cities under scrutiny are, without a doubt, undeniable, but they are differences of degree, differences of power, differences of positionality within a colonial spatial order; they are not categorical differences between types of cities.

At the cross section or urban spatial format, colonial spatial order, and "portal of globalization", we narrated how relations between and within urban spaces epitomize the colonial city. The historical specificities of colonial cities, asymmetric perspectives on them, and the relations between and within them make differently qualified cities into similarly functioning building blocks within a colonial

41 Cf. J. Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology makes its Object*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

spatial order. Colonial cities have the combination of urbanness and coloniality, of concentration and separation, of connectedness and disconnection, and of interaction and entanglement between all of these factors in common. The spatial format "city" informed the spatial practices of urbanites as much as the colonial spatial order underpinned the connections and their asymmetries on local and global levels. Yet, the concrete and idiosyncratic processes of spatialization within and between colonial cities lays bare the complicated dynamics of connection and disconnection, of flow and control, and of local interactions and global entanglements that make the global condition as well as the colonial order tangible and relevant.

Colonial cities marked entanglement and separation, which is a crucial factor of colonialism, and they did so in a highly concentrated way, spatially reproducing the colonial entanglements and separations within the areas of each of these towns. These cities continue to do so until today. The colonial period may be over, but the colonial city, as one way to make sense of urban spatializations until the present day, is not.