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Abstract

This study attempts to describe and analyse the effects of a political boundary on the geographical landscape in part of West Africa. Initially pre-colonial conditions are considered — especially the political situation and pattern of indigenous political groupings.

Secondly, the boundary is described in relation to the factors which influenced its conception and ultimate creation and this is followed by a description of the line finally delimited to separate the two colonies of Dahomey and Nigeria.

The major section of the thesis deals with the various effects of the boundary. By forming the edge of the state the boundary acted to some degree as a negative influence in the landscape and a "frontier zone" developed in relation to different state functions. Within the frontier zone the boundary had a positive local influence on some aspects of communications, population movement and rural economies producing what has been termed a "border landscape". Population movement and trade were considered on a larger scale in both legal and illegal aspects while an attempt at measuring the restrictive influence of the boundary was made by applying the interactance hypothesis to movement of traffic on relevant boundary routes. A further aspect of the boundary effects deals with the boundary separating two colonial...
At each side a colonial situation imposed from outside influenced, in different ways and to a varying degree, every sphere of the economic, social, political and religious life of the indigenous population. Along the boundary, where the two colonial systems met, an apparent and measurable division developed in the geographical landscape.
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For this study it is important to define and distinguish such terms as "boundary" and "frontier". There is a distinction between the two but very often they are used as synonyms to avoid undue repetition.

A political boundary is a linear division giving a distinct limit to the state. To Ratzel (1), the boundary was the skin of the living state but he maintained that the boundary was an abstraction and that it was the border area which was the reality. "Der Grenzraum ist das Wirkliche, die Grenzlinie die Abstraktion davon". Or, as Ancel (2) later stated, the boundary is a line within a border-land.

A frontier, on the other hand, may be considered as a zone. Whether it be the political division between two states, or the division between settled and uninhabited areas within one state, the term frontier usually refers to a strip of land with width.

Other languages, apart from English, distinguish between boundary and frontier. In French "la limite" and "la Frontière" are used while in Italian there is "il confine" and "la frontiera".
Nevertheless writers have not consistently adhered to such a distinction. Lord Curzon, (3) for example, in his Romanes lecture used frontier and boundary as interchangeable terms. So, too, did Boggs (4) in his book on international boundaries. The translation of Adami's book (5) gives "frontier" for "confine" and Goblet, (6) like many French writers, uses "frontier" exclusively.

This dichotomy of meaning is however acknowledged the British Association Geographical Glossary Committee in 1951 (7) gave similar meanings for both terms.

A more recent application of the term "frontier" has been to the transition zone which stretches inward from the boundary and merges imperceptibly with the state core. Such a definition has been suggested in the works of Weigert, Pearcy, and Kristoff (8) but nevertheless it still refers to a zone with width rather than a specific line.

Throughout this dissertation the term "boundary" will refer to a specific line and "frontier" to a zone. The term "border" will also be used. Mainly as a synonym to avoid repetition it will generally refer to the political division (i.e., boundary) between Dahomey and Nigeria. Prescott (9) uses the term in connection with his "border landscape" and such a meaning is used in Chapter 6 of this study when the possibility of a border zone having developed is considered in relation to Dahomey and Nigeria.
Other terms of reference which need defining more specifically for this study are those of allocation, delimitation, and demarcation. "Allocation" refers to the political decision on the distribution of territory and it will be seen that much of Africa was allocated by and to various European powers at the Berlin Conference in 1884-5. "Delimitation" refers to the selection and defining of a specific boundary site. Concerning the boundary in question it will be seen that rivers, roads, and mathematical lines were used in the process of delimitation. After a boundary has been delimited the process of demarcation endeavours to construct the boundary in the landscape by a series of boundary posts, or perhaps in some cases a barbed-wire fence. Demarcation, however, does not automatically follow delimitation immediately. Along parts of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary this process was not commenced until 75 years after the boundary had been allocated.
INTRODUCTION

This study attempts to analyse the geographical effects of the political boundary between the Republics of Dahomey and Nigeria (See Fig 1). It may be expedient to explain initially why such a topic was chosen, why this particular boundary was considered, and lastly, why a detailed study of the boundary effects was made.

The political geography of Africa today is dominated by a study of the colonial period and the gaining of independence by the majority of the constituent states in the last decade. The retrospective appraisal of the colonial period as a whole is beginning.(1) The pros and cons of colonialism, however, are not the subject of this treatise, but the fact emerging from such a study is that the most permanent remnant of European rule in Africa is the political units, i.e., the boundaries.(2) In a decade at the end of the last century most of Africa was partitioned among several European powers, completely changing the political map of the continent. The new pattern, in almost all cases, remained unchanged(3) throughout the colonial period, and formed the basis of the recently independent states. Thus a consideration of African boundaries today offers the study of a relatively permanent and static feature in the geographical landscape in a continent of rapid change.

Apart from the restrictive factor of the actual mechanics of geographical research, the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary was chosen mainly because it divided two states which had experienced differing colonial
systems. By studying a boundary separating a state with a French colonial background from one of British colonial traditions it has been possible to use that boundary to mirror the contrasts between the two empires and the way in which each system affected the inhabitant and landscape on either side. Moreover, the study of the political boundary provides a base for considering the relations between Dahomey and Nigeria both in the colonial period and after independence. As Wright has indicated, "the problem of boundaries brings geography into close contact with international law, international economics, international organisation and international politics".

Although the stress is on one particular boundary, an attempt at the same time has been made to relate this study to boundaries as a whole and also to see how the characteristics and problems of such a localized study can be related to the political geography of West Africa in general.

The emphasis of the thesis has been placed on the effects of the boundary on the adjacent geographical landscape. This is partly because so far no comprehensive study of the effects of a single boundary in Africa is known to have been made. In Appendix I a brief review is made of boundary studies dealing with Nigeria and Dahomey, and it is seen that an analytical study of this nature has not been attempted. Initially, a study has been made of the pre-colonial conditions in the area through which the boundary was drawn. This section concentrates on the political situation and pattern of indigenous political groupings, and this, at a later stage, facilitates
a comparison between the colonial boundary and the pattern of indigenous frontiers it replaced

Secondly, the boundary is described in relation to the factors which influenced its conception and actual creation. It will be seen that a boundary had to be drawn in this part of West Africa as a legal limit and division between developing British and French empires. The origin and subsequent creation of the boundary was, however, influenced by factors in Europe as much as by more localized conditions in West Africa. Such considerations will be followed by a description of the salient features of the boundary finally delimited between the two colonies.

The third and major part of the thesis deals with the effect of the new boundary on the geographical landscape and on subsequent geographical developments on either side. In general the effects of the boundary will be viewed from two distinct aspects. Initially it will be seen how the various functions of the boundary have had a distinct influence on the surrounding landscape. Secondly with the boundary acting as the legal limit of two states, it is possible to see how, in seemingly one piece of territory, development of the geographical landscape on either side followed distinctly different paths. In the former respect, it will be seen how the boundary, by forming the edge of the state, has had a negative influence and a frontier zone has developed in relation to various state functions. At the same time, and within this distinct frontier zone, a boundary landscape has developed in relation to communications and population.
movements, to local economies and social patterns. All these are positive features in the geographical landscape and were created by, or considerably modified by, the superimposition of a colonial boundary.

The second aspect of the boundary effects deals with the boundary separating two colonial systems. The boundary in question, like those of almost all Africa, was a product of the colonial period. On each side of the new boundary developed what has been termed the "colonial situation."(6) A completely new state of affairs was imposed from outside and which influenced, to a varying extent, every sphere of the economic, social, political and religious life of the indigenous population. With the colonies of Dahomey and Nigeria the colonial situation was imposed from two differing sources and had differing characteristics. Thus, along the boundary where two differing colonial systems met, it may be expected that a readily apparent division would develop in the geographical landscape.
PART ONE

THE CREATION OF THE BOUNDARY
CHAPTER ONE

THE CREATION OF THE BOUNDARY

In the second half of the nineteenth century most of Africa was sub-divided between several European powers notably Britain, France, Portugal, Belgium and Germany. Within fifteen or so years after the Berlin Conference of 1884-85, most of the continent had been allocated and partitioned by a network of some 29,000 miles of boundaries. The boundary in question was only one of a series to be created simultaneously in this period. Before it can be described in detail, however, it is initially necessary to determine why a boundary had to be drawn in this particular part of Africa. The answer lies partly in the history and pattern of trading in the area and partly in political rivalry between the European powers.

In the years preceding the partition, slave-trading had virtually stopped in this part of West Africa and its place had been taken by trade in such products as palm-oil, palm-kernels, groundnuts, cotton, ivory and timber. Increasing numbers of traders and trading companies were attracted from Europe to the west coast of Africa. According to Boahen, more than ten companies from Britain were trading along the west coast, as well as eight from France. There was
considerable rivalry between these trading companies and some attempted to create their own zones of influence. It was these trading areas that in some places became taken over politically as protectorates and colonies (4). The European trading companies and individuals constantly appealed to their home governments to establish and maintain peace within their trading areas (5). This was usually answered by diplomatic caution from Paris or London, though eventually peace was maintained by annexing the area concerned. As a result, Lagos and Porto Novo were annexed in the 1860's. These were the two European footholds around which colonies were to develop, and between which the present boundary was to be drawn (6).

As in much of Africa, the basis for territorial claims made by the European governments was based on treaties made with native chiefs. Both Britain and France built up their "spheres of influence" by adding one treaty area to another, as one by one the mosaic of existing political units associated themselves with one or the other of the powers. Where the French group came into contact with that of the British a boundary had to be drawn and, in theory, the single boundary between the two colonies should have replaced and coincided with a common frontier between the two groups of existing political units. Such a development did not take place everywhere in Africa, but in this case, as Anene states, "at no other Nigerian boundary zone did the political relations established by European powers with native 'states' play as decisive a role in effectively determining the location of the international boundary" (7).
By building up spheres of influence and by making separate treaties with individual groups, the British and French were making some attempt at preserving the existing pattern. It was not their intention to split tribes and from the British there was a positive attempt, in this part of Africa at least, to maintain and even encourage any unity that existed at that time. This is evident from the correspondence between the British Governor in Lagos and the Colonial Office in London. A couple of years before any boundary between the British and French spheres was agreed upon in the area, Governor Moloney stressed that with reference to the Colony of Lagos as a whole, "it should be the policy to promote Yoruba unity (and indeed a sort of fiscal union among the tribes themselves composing Yoruba, which can only be effected by this Government), with its natural capital and outlet, Lagos. We should aim here at getting under our protection, as in the Gold Coast, all the countries composing the Yoruba race, but if it should be brought about, any question of protection or preference to any foreign power should come from themselves. Yoriba or Yoruba, properly called one of the great vernaculars of Africa, is the language of the eastern half of the Slave Coast, embraced between (and to their eastward), the kingdoms of Dahomey, Porto Novo and Katanu on the west, Atlantic on the south, Niger on the north and east. Yoruba represents racial and linguistic unity, the bulwark against the barbarous and devastating Dahomey on the west, the Mohammedan aggression from the north, its
confederation under the enlightenment of this government should prove of future benefit to the country and to this colony. 

Political interest in this part of the coast by Britain and France had initially been centred on Lagos and Porto Novo. In 1861 Lagos had been taken over by the British and two years later Porto Novo had become a French protectorate. This was followed by a series of treaties along the coastal area. In 1864 the King of Dahomey ceded "la plage de Kotonou" to France, and in 1868 "le Territoire de Kotonou". This was counterbalanced by British agreements with a cluster of small political groupings close by Addo, Pockra, Oke Odan became British protectorates and Badagri was ceded to the Colony of Lagos. The French protectorate over Porto Novo collapsed and for some time there were attempts by Britain to bring this latter town into the British sphere. This was not achieved, though treaties were made with small political units around Porto Novo.

In 1888 Britain made treaties with Oyo and Ketu to the north and the following year a boundary was created to divide the two spheres of interest. Initially an astronomical line was chosen and the two powers decided on the meridian which cut the mouth of the Adjarra creek, and which stretched from the sea to 9° north.

By 1894 the French had created a protectorate over Dahomey and both Britain and France had reached a similar distance inland with their treaty-made acquisitions. For a decade after the first stretch
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of the boundary had been defined, there was an attempt by the two powers to move behind each others protectorate in order to restrict the development of their opponent's hinterland. In essence, the problems which arose developed because up to the ninth parallel the boundary was more or less meant to follow an existing frontier. Around the ninth parallel, however, the north-south line approached Borgu and the problem was to which side of this unit should the boundary go. As in the areas to the south the treaty method of acquisition was to be used, but in the end the area was split in half by the two powers. In 1885 and 1890 Goldie, on behalf of the Royal Niger Company, had made a treaty with the King of Bussa and claimed all Borgu for the British as he believed all Borgu to be under Bussa. In July 1891 the British Government announced a protectorate over all Borgu. The French Government were advised of the move and at first France accepted the position.

The attitude of the French, however, changed somewhat after a successful war with Dahomey in 1894. With Dahomey under her control, France expounded the "hinterland" theory, and demanded the right of communication with Say on the Middle Niger. At first Britain was prepared to agree to such a proposal, but while the negotiations were in the process of taking place France demanded access to the Niger below Bussa and the Bussa rapids. Such a demand was refused by Britain on the grounds that Bussa was the capital of all Borgu with whom Britain had a treaty, and that the emirate could not be split. To this the French reply was one of doubt as regards the unity of Borgu and of the chief of Bussa being the most senior chief of Borgu. The French argued that the chief of Nikkî in reality had authority
over Bussa. Goldie's western frontier was thus challenged and this resulted in the "scramble for Nikki", when Lugard for Britain and Daceour for the French raced to obtain a treaty with the Nikki king in 1898. Lugard won the race but France responded with the idea of effective occupation as the only way to determine control of the area. As a result both powers established army posts in the areas of Borgu which they then occupied and for a few months war appeared imminent. Later in 1898, however, Britain and France agreed upon the present line and France was kept from the navigable section of the Niger. Thus, with the northern section of the boundary, although in the beginning the colonial powers attempted to keep the existing human groupings intact, such considerations were in the later stages ignored as a result of colonial rivalry.

The boundary as a whole, when finally delimited between the French and British, appears to split various existing political and human groups. This is evident from the map showing the development of the acquisition by treaty (See Fig. 2) and also by maps showing ethnic distribution (See Fig. 8). Despite an initial attempt by both powers to take control of the region unit by unit, the boundary appears to divide such areas as Ketu, part of the Oyo Empire as well as Borgu. Thus, before any attempt can be made to evaluate the effect of the boundary on the geographical landscape, it is imperative to consider the existing state of affairs in the political groups prior to the establishment of the boundary.
PART TWO

THE BOUNDARY IN RELATION TO PRE-COLONIAL CONDITIONS
In Chapter 1 it was shown how the boundary had been created to separate developing zones of British and French influence. These zones of influence had initially been built-up by making treaties with existing indigenous political units or by delimiting a boundary between two areas of effective occupation. The results of this partition created the first and most controversial of boundary effects—the splitting to a varying extent of existing tribes and ethnic groups.

In dealing with the partition of Africa it has been the common outcry among writers that the boundaries of the continent (not only between Dahomey and Nigeria) are "artificial" and take little heed of the existing "nations" and tribes. Green and Seidman, for example, write that "the political frontiers of the modern states of Africa were largely drawn by the imperial powers in the nineteenth-century scramble for Africa, without reference to geographical, ethnic, or sociological realities." However, as Hargreaves rightly states, "the partition of Africa is one of those historical processes which
have been more discussed than studied \(^{(2)}\) For Africa as a whole the boundaries might be described in general terms as "arbitrary and artificial" today and there are few places where a state boundary does coincide with what may be considered as tribal limits. In writing on West Africa, Ojo, a Nigerian Yoruba, states that "those who decided the present political boundaries did not take into proper account the irregular spread of ethnic groups. It was easier to make boundaries cut through territories of related peoples than to consider what were truly homogeneous culture areas. So today the boundaries do not coincide with the limits of ethnic groups \(^{(3)}\)"

From the other side of the boundary in question a Dahomean writer, Mondjannagni, describes the numerical unbalance between the Yoruba, divided by the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary "le contraste numérique entre le groupe ethnique Yoruba du Nigéria et celui du Dahomey, tous deux à l'origine formant un seul et même groupe, mais séparé en deux par une frontière absurde \(^{(4)}\)"

Such criticisms stimulate several lines of enquiry. Initially one must determine exactly what existing groups of population were split by the colonial boundary. Terms of reference vary from writer to writer and have ranged from "nation" to "tribe" and "ethnic group". Each of these terms, however, has a distinctly different meaning. Secondly it might be asked whether the splitting associated with the late nineteenth-century partition was something new to this part of Africa and thirdly whether such splitting could have been avoided by the colonial boundary makers.
These three questions may be considered initially in relation to Africa as a whole. This must nevertheless be followed by applying each to the region under consideration and to the conditions existing there towards the end of the nineteenth century. This will be of value in several ways. As the two colonial powers attempted to build up their spheres of influence by taking over the existing political units, a study of the latter as regards distribution and relative importance might serve to explain the general location and orientation of the boundary. Secondly, the conditions to be found within the individual political unit and its relationship with neighbouring territories might explain why several units were apparently split. Lastly, the varying conditions in the pre-colonial set-up might help to explain differential development on either side of the boundary after partition.

Regarding the first consideration, which deals with the actual character of the existing human groupings, it will be seen in the following discussion that no one term can be applied successfully to all groups in the region. The three major groups in the boundary area are the Yoruba and pre-colonial Dahomey in the south, and Borgu in the north. The character of each group has varied considerably over the last few centuries. Yoruba is essentially a language covering a large area of West Africa with a common culture, yet this area was not unified politically in the second half of the nineteenth century. Today the Yoruba are often referred to as a tribe, yet at the time of partition each individual sub-unit (e.g., the Egba, Egbado, Ibadan)
considered themselves as a separate tribe, and treaties with each tribal leader were made accordingly. Borgu developed from several ethnic groups yet may have had loose political unity in the nineteenth century. Pre-colonial Dahomey has been referred to as a tribe and might even be considered as a pre-colonial nation, yet its political jurisdiction at times extended over non-Fon peoples.

Taking West Africa as a whole it can be seen that an externally imposed boundary cutting human groupings was not new and was not specifically associated with the colonial partition. A study of nineteenth century history in West Africa shows that in some areas the character of indigenous empires was changing towards one of supra-national or multi-tribal units. The empires of both El Hadj Omar Tall and Samoury Toure, for example, both spread over a variety of peoples and were divided into territorial administrative districts which in places did not correspond to the tribal units.

As to the question relating to the possibility of fitting colonial boundaries on to existing frontiers, Anene, writing on Nigerian boundaries, states that no boundary could have been ethnically satisfactory. This was because the indigenous state systems at the end of the nineteenth century were already out of tune with ethnic distributions. Some writers, however, do believe that this could have been achieved and that the boundaries could have been fitted to existing political units. The answer is not so simple and several factors have to be considered. The state, for instance, has defined limits and a fixed area, but this was never so with the tribe - a
human group which suffers from "fuzziness at the edges" (7) and which on the whole was the political unit existing at the time of partition. As Ojo states "the Yoruba-speaking peoples, like any other group of people, are mobile, constantly spreading out from, or moving into a particular area, so that the boundary is always changing" (8). Such a concept is extremely important in this study, as Mondjannagni points out "première idée à retenir il n'y a jamais eu de frontières lineaires entre ces divers royaumes, il s'agissait surtout de zones d'influence" (9). The tribe is a human group rather than a geographical unit. It has a sense of community and may have a centre of authority, but it need not have a fixed territorial limit. The relative flexibility of the pre-colonial units is indicated to some extent by the various maps showing the tribal distributions during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries - though variations in distribution from map to map may also reflect the lack of knowledge of this area at the times the maps were drawn. Some maps give no specific boundary to a particular tribe while others, which do attempt to give such a line, vary considerably in its location. This is illustrated by Figs 3, 4, 7, and 8 which show the tribal distributions at different times during the past three centuries. Although inadequate contemporary knowledge of tribal distribution would lead to some cartographical mistakes, the maps will show some changes in the tribal distribution over a period of time.

In pre-colonial times the concept of boundaries in Africa instead of being specific demarcatory lines was thus one of frontiers...
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or marches which were rarely static and were, moreover, characterized by width. Such frontiers were not confined to pre-colonial Africa, but are common with tribal groupings throughout the world. In Northern Australia Hart and Billing have described the boundaries of the Tiwi as a "traditional zone - perhaps of several miles - where the change from trees to open savannah becomes noticeable, with the territories thus fusing into one another rather than being separated by sharp lines." (10) The classical empires (11) of West Africa, moreover, had more than one centre of power with allegiance and control conceived in terms of people rather than land. As Bolanle Awe states, "they were not homogeneous entities nor did they have any well defined boundaries, they incorporated within their borders various ethnic groups of people at various stages of development and civilizations." (12) In a nomadic society it was the distribution of the community which determined the areal extent of the state, not the territorial limit. One human group or tribe might migrate as well as intermingle and intermarry with a neighbour and there could probably be no absolute linear division between the two. This is sometimes difficult to conceive when some maps of tribal distribution delimit each tribe with a precise boundary as that of Murdock (13) for example. Such a situation is extremely misleading and tends to give an impression of a tribe being equally distributed over a given and defined piece of territory, and gives no suggestion of the intermingling and flexibility of these human groupings. A comparison between Fig 5 and Fig 6 demonstrates the problem. Fig 5 is taken.
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from Murdock and covers an area of West Africa between Ghana and Nigeria. Within Dahomey less than one dozen tribes are shown and each appears to occupy a distinct and separate area. Fig 6 on the other hand shows the distribution of 46 tribes within Dahomey. This map was constructed from data in the 1960 census of that country and clearly demonstrates how a tribe, though perhaps concentrating in a certain area, is not a distinct unit occupying a single and separate area. Most of the tribes on the census map, though tending to concentrate in one particular region of the country, appear to fade one into the next without any distinct boundary. This is particularly apparent in north-west Dahomey in the vicinity of Natitingou and Jougou where the Bariba settlements become intermingled with those of the Betammaribe, Ife Pila Pila, and Betyabe. Other tribes not concentrated in one particular area are sometimes found scattered. In the case of Dahomey the best example is probably the Peul or Fulani who are found widely scattered north of 9° north.

Thus it is important that these factors of frontier zones of constant intermixture and movement should be considered when the boundary is studied relative to the political and human pattern existing in this part of West Africa at the time of partition. By understanding such a movement, and by examining more closely the exact pattern when the boundary was drawn, it may be possible to clarify some of the problems which appear today.
TRIBAL DISTRIBUTION IN DAHOMEY
1960 CENSUS
CHAPTER THREE

EXISTING CONDITIONS SOUTH OF 9° NORTH THE YORUBA-DAHOMEY FRONTIER

In considering the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary in its southern section it is necessary to discuss the "Yoruba question". Ethnological maps of the area often show this boundary as cutting the Yoruba-speaking area in two and one of the best generalized examples can be seen in Crowder's book "The Story of Nigeria".(1) (See Fig. 7) Writers have claimed moreover, that the border in this section was drawn regardless of the indigenous population, its ethnological groupings or political divisions. Thus, this apparent problem of splitting tribes appears to be the most obvious effect of the boundary and it must be considered in more detail. Whatever the outcome of such a study, whether the boundary is seen to split ethnic groups or not, the tribal distribution on either side of the boundary would undoubtedly influence considerably the subsequent effectiveness of the boundary.

Figure 8 (after D. Forde)(2) shows the distribution of the Yoruba-speaking peoples in this part of West Africa at a recent date (1951). It can be seen that the Yoruba themselves are sub-divided into a variety
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of tribal units. A central core area of what Forde terms "Yoruba proper" is partially encircled by a network of related tribes. It can be seen that most of the tribal groups form one large compact unit, while to the west there are a few isolated Yoruba-speaking groups. The large single-area unit of Yoruba-speaking tribes is found almost entirely within the political boundaries of present-day Nigeria - except for a few groups to the south-west (the Ketu, Ahori, Nago, Awori, and Egbado) which do appear to be split by the boundary. The isolated groups to the west of the Yoruba proper stretch across Dahomey, Toyo, and even into Ghana.

As the map indicates, the Yoruba proper are found entirely within Nigeria, as are most of the other Yoruba-speaking groups. What must be considered, therefore, is firstly the groups which lie spatially independent from the main tribal bloc to the west and secondly the tribes to the south-west which do appear to be divided by the boundary.

Those groups which are entirely outside the Nigerian state, comprise the Tshabe, Dassa, Itsha and Ana. All these groups claim an origin from the Egba, Oyo or Ife peoples in Nigeria. Forde states that Savé (populated by the Tshabe) appears to have been the only Yoruba-speaking kingdom of any importance in central Dahomey, the other Yoruba groups there being scattered. Nevertheless, Forde continues, "it is certain that all the groups were (i.e. in pre-colonial times), independent of the main Yoruba bloc". In fact, at no time does there appear to have been any single political authority effectively controlling all the Yoruba, it was never considered as one unit and at
best can be considered as a confederation. As Morton-Williams\(^{(5)}\) indicates, "the territory of the early empire was not incorporated into a centrally administered unitary state, but consisted of a large number of internally autonomous kingdoms whose rulers were said to have derived their crowns from Oyo and were the vassals of the Alafin\(^{(6)}\). In 1868 Africanus Horton in referring to Yorubaland mentioned that "from want of a more specific name and from the whole of the tribes being once subjected to the king of the Yoruba, the Church Missionary Society has designated it the "Yoruba country", but as most of the tribes, such as the Egbas and Egbados, have objected to their being called Yorubas, and as there is no national name by which all the tribes speaking the same language, but differently governed is known, I have employed the name which is given to the whole nation at Sierra Leone - viz. the Akus\(^{(7)}\).

Moreover, as Blobaku has indicated,\(^{(8)}\) it is only recently that the Egba Ijesha, Ijebu, Ekiti or even Ife have begun to call themselves "Yoruba" as such a term was reserved for the Oyo peoples.

As we have seen, this extension of the word "Yoruba" to cover all peoples speaking a similar language was to some extent brought about by the Anglican Mission. A written language was developed which is now considered standard Yoruba, and which was based on Oyo speech, and in effect, the Anglican missionaries attempted to provide a linguistic unity to some degree over an area of differing political groupings and variety of dialects.
For administrative purposes the pre-colonial Yoruba empire was sub-divided into Metropolitan Oyo, or Oyo proper, and Provincial Oyo. The latter included the Ibarapa, Egba, Egbado, Owu, Ijebu, Awori, Popo and Dahomey. The latter, Fon-speaking group, was at one time included equally with the other Yoruba-speaking groups. Whereas in Metropolitan Oyo the authority of the Alaafin or king was direct, in the provinces the administration was largely indirect. The power and degree of independence of the provincial rulers often varied inversely with the power of the Alaafin and directly with the distance from the central capital at Old Oyo. For a period before the nineteenth century most of the Yoruba chiefdoms (apart from the Ekiti, the Ijebu, and perhaps Ife) appear to have acknowledged the ritual supremacy of the Alaafin of Oyo and only perhaps a very vague political suzerainty. Even this, however, was no longer the case in the decade leading up to colonial partition in the area and by that time individual groups were quite independent from Oyo. Thus one cannot begin to consider a unified Yoruba Empire as being split by the colonial boundary. If anything, one must consider each individual sub-group and its relation to the boundary.

In the south-west of the major Yoruba-speaking area Forde's map does show groups which are today split by the international boundary. The Ketu, Egbado, Ahori, and Nago are found in both Nigeria and Dahomey. Closer examination of the historical facts, however, demonstrates that this apparent splitting has not always been the result...
of a single stroke of "the thick blue pencil" of colonial partition. The boundary, in some cases, has merely fossilized conditions as they existed here in the late nineteenth century, while in other cases the present-day distribution of population does not correspond exactly to that of pre-boundary times. In general this area which the Ketu, Egbado, Ahori and Nago now occupy does appear to have been a frontier zone between the two pre-colonial power blocs of Dahomey and Oyo and later between Dahomey and Egba. Apart from perhaps the case of the Ketu kingdom, the boundary has merely replaced with a line an indigenous and characteristic tribal frontier in a region of considerable ethnic mixing and which was already in the process of developing at the time of colonial partition. To understand this process it is necessary to consider the historical development of both Dahomey and Yorubaland up to the time of the Anglo-French partition.

Originally Dahomey and the Yoruba may have had a common origin. Dahomey was one of the Aja states whose leaders had migrated from Allada and prior to this from Tado and probably earlier still from Ketu. Nevertheless from the late seventeenth century onwards the history of the then Dahomey and Oyo (a section of the Yoruba-speaking peoples) was one of growing apart. For two hundred years there was intermittent warfare between the two and the frontier zone which developed between them appears to have provided the site for the colonial boundary in the late nineteenth century.
Before the beginning of the eighteenth century Dahomey was merely one of the Aja group of city-states whose capital was at Allada. The Aja people had moved into the Allada area and founded a settlement about 1575. It was from this centre that sections of the Aja migrated over a considerable period to establish Grand Popo, Whydah, Jakin, Dahomey and Porto Novo, at various intervals and for various reasons. Under Do-Aklin a group settled at Abomey on the Abomey plateau some 60 miles from the sea. Do-Aklin's successor seized power from the local rulers in about 1620 and successive leaders were able to conquer areas to the south and southeast of Abomey. Thus by the beginning of the eighteenth century Dahomey was firmly established as a small inland kingdom with sovereignty over some forty towns and villages. Dahomey still belonged to the Aja states and recognized Allada as their "father-kingdom." Allada, however, was situated just a little to the north of the slave route from Oyo (the centre of the Yoruba Empire) to the coast. Oyo had begun to participate in the coastal slave trade with the Europeans sometime in the middle of the seventeenth century using Ouidah (a Gun or Popo port in the Allada kingdom) as its coastal outlet. As Fig. 9 indicates it is in the Ouidah area that the forest belt reaches the coast and, moreover, there is no broad inland lagoon to cross before reaching the sea. The break in the forest belt here provides a gently undulating grassland routeway all the way from Old Oyo to Ouidah and the Oyo cavalry would be able to escort the slave caravans along virtually the whole journey. In 1724, however,
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Dahomey centred on Abomey conquered the Allada kingdom and simultaneously blocked the slave route from Oyo and took control of the Allada group of states. These latter were tributary to Oyo and this resulted in Oyo attacking and defeating Dahomey in 1726. The following year Dahomey conquered Ouidah and this resulted in three separate invasions by Oyo in 1728, 1729 and 1730. By the end of these wars, Agaja, the Dahomean king, had agreed to his territory being a tributary of Oyo and also to a new state, Porto Novo, being carved from his domain. For the rest of the eighteenth century the Aja group of states then remained part of the Oyo Empire (Fig. 10). There were attempts at gaining independence, as for example during Tegbesu's reign (between 1738-1748), but this resulted in heavy punishment and Dahomey thus continued to pay tribute to Oyo for the remainder of the eighteenth century.

The subsequent development of a breakdown in Oyo-Dahomey relations may be ascribed to two major factors. From the Oyo point of view, there was little approval to the expansion of Dahomey within the empire and secondly the conquest of Allada meant the destruction of the very principle on which the Oyo Empire had been based. Such a move could possibly have spread to Oyo territory and tributary states might have attempted to overthrow Oyo. Secondly, there was the problem of Dahomey's economy. Dahomey depended on the slave trade and thus in turn was dependent on the external factors of supply and demand. From the middle of the eighteenth century conditions were unfavourable. Oyo,
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the largest supplier of slaves, was by then exporting via Porto Novo, its newly created tributary kingdom. Moreover, wars in Europe during the second half of the eighteenth century restricted the numbers of ships to be used in the trade and the heaviest blow of all came when the British Government abolished the slave trade in 1807. Thus, from the 1750's for at least a century Dahomey suffered from an economic depression, and this resulted in both internal unrest and a desire for independence from Oyo. In 1797 Agonglo, the Dahomey king, was murdered and an abortive attempt made to change the dynasty. Economic conditions, however, did not improve under Agonglo's son, Adanozan, and in 1818 he was overthrown by Gezo, with the backing of da Souza, (the richest Portuguese mulatto slave trader in Ouidah) and a large section of the populace who demanded political independence and economic improvement. To achieve this latter goal would entail finding new raiding grounds in order to continue the slave trade - the then basis of the economy. Areas to the west and north of Dahomey provided little attraction, having been extensively raided in the previous century, while to the north-east lay Oyo. Only to the east, in Egbado and Egbaland was there any hope of aiding the economy, and the political situation in these two areas, as well as in the rest of Yorubaland, made both this and the possibility of declaring independence feasible.

The collapse of the Oyo Empire

During this period, in the first decades of the nineteenth century, the Oyo Empire was in the process of degeneration and
collapse. There were several factors involved including internal economic, military and political developments as well as outside influence in the form of the Fulani attacks from the north. Probably the major factor over a considerable period was the steady movement of the centre of gravity in the Empire from north to south. According to Johnson, "light and civilization with the Yorubas came from the north with which they have always retained connection through the Arabs and Fulanis. The centre of life and activity of large populations and industry was therefore in the interior while the coastal tribes were scanty in number, ignorant and degraded." Such a statement is largely true and at that time the most populous towns as well as the capital were found in the north. From the eighteenth century onwards, however, Yorubaland became more and more orientated towards the south with the increasing trade between coastal peoples and the Europeans, with the arrival of missionaries and the spread of western education from coastal centres. As in later times the peoples of the south became increasingly restive to northern control and it is significant that between 1775 and 1780 the Egba state in the south rebelled against the central rulers in Oyo.

A second factor in the decline of the Empire was due to a weakening of the military strength of Oyo itself. This is illustrated by the failure to defeat the Egba during the 1780 rebellion, the defeat by the Bariba in 1783 and by the Nupe in 1791. These latter groups asserted their independence and made the military situation worse by cutting off supplies for the Oyo cavalry. Thus by the end of
the century Oyo was militarily weak and the situation was gravely aggravated by the breakdown of central government after the death of the Oyo leader, Abiodun, in 1789. Abiodun's successor, Aole, did not observe the traditional constitution when he gave orders for the army to attack another Yoruba town. This resulted in both army and chiefs refusing to obey him and in 1796 he was forced to commit suicide in the traditional way. Aole was succeeded by two leaders within one year to be followed by an interregnum from 1797 to 1819. Central authority collapsed and this resulted in the various Oyo chiefs being able to carve out kingdoms for themselves.

Throughout this period, economic factors also played an important role in the disintegration of the Empire. Up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, Oyo's trade had been both to the north and south. With the north there had been trade in horses, milk, kola nuts, rock-salt and livestock while the south had provided the main market for slaves. After the Nupe had become independent, however, and with the Fulani wars, the traditional trade with the north had been dislocated. To the south, too, trade declined with a considerable reduction in slave trading due to attacks on Porto Novo (the main outlet) by Dahomey in 1803 and 1805 and also by the abolition of the slave trade by Britain in 1807.

Disintegration was further accentuated in the second decade of the nineteenth century by external attack. This was, however, initially due to internal pressure when one of the northern chiefs attempted to carve a kingdom for himself during the long interregnum.
Afonja, the leader in Ilorin, appealed for help from the Fulani who used the opportunity to extend their own empire. They took over Ilorin and used it as a base to attack other areas in Yorubaland. In 1837 they attacked Katunga (Old Oyo), the then Yoruba capital. The Oyo were defeated and the capital had to be moved a hundred miles to the south to the present-day Oyo.

Thus, by the mid-nineteenth century, after a period of economic decline, a collapse of central authority, a weakened army, and outside attack, the Oyo Empire had become a series of semi-independent city-states, and minor kingdoms. Being among the furthest from the seat of central authority Dahomey was one of the first to slip from the "Oyo Yoke".

**Dahomey independent from Oyo: the development of a pre-colonial frontier**

In the 1820's, much of Yorubaland had been occupied in civil war resulting from various provincial leaders attempting to assert their independence and aggrandize themselves at the expense of others. The first of these wars was between Owu and Ife between 1821 and 1825. It was refugees from these wars who founded both Ibadan and Abeokuta in 1829 and 1830 respectively. Both towns quickly developed into well-organized independent city-states, and the latter became a bitter rival of Dahomey.

With the attention of Oyo confined to the civil war it was relatively easy for Adandoze (the Dahomey king, 1797-1818) to stop paying the annual tribute and in 1821, after actually defeating Oyo,
his son (Gezo, 1818-1858) declared independence

Dahomey's economic problems remained however, and attention was drawn first to Mahi country to the north of Abomey and then to the newly independent Egba state to the east. Between Dahomey and the Egba, the Egbado occupied most of the area in which Dahomey contemplated expansion. The desire to control Egbadoland, however, was mutually shared between Dahomey and the Egba. In the case of the Egba, it was essential to control and use Egbadoland as a march-land if their newly created state was to remain safe. Moreover, Egbado country stretched to the coast and control of the area would mean an assured supply corridor for European arms which were most readily available on the coast.

Thus the area occupied by the Egbado (and now occupied to some extent by the international boundary) was desired by states to the east and west for both political and economic reasons. For most of the nineteenth century this area was the scene of attack and counter-attack. Initially, hostilities were directed against the Egbado themselves, but this was later followed by Dahomey and the Egba attacking each other as Egbadoland developed into a frontier zone between the two.

In the mid-1830's, the Dahomean army attacked Refurefu, an apparently large Egbado settlement. The town was completely destroyed and the inhabitants who were not murdered were taken back to Dahomey as slaves. In 1842 the Egba conquered Otta and besieged Ado, another
Egbado town Two years later, Gezo, the Dahomey leader, decided to relieve Ado on the pretext that it belonged to Ijase-Ipe (the Porto-Novo kingdom) which by then was subject to Dahomey. The Egba defeated Dahomey and captured items of their royal insignia. From then on Dahomey's attention was fixed on Abeokuta, the Egba capital, on the pretext of recovering the royal emblems. In 1851 Gezo led the first attack on Abeokuta and Dahomey was again defeated. In 1864 Gezo's son, Gelele attacked again but was once more defeated.

Dahomey's objective in gaining new land was not confined solely to the Egbado and Egba. Seventeen years after the attack on Abeokuta, in 1881, Dahomey attacked the Oke-Odan region destroying seven settlements near Iseyin—Iwere, Aiyetoro, Oke-Ile, Ilajì, Atasa, Obanisuwa and Ijio (See Fig 11). In 1883 Gelele attacked Ketu twice and again in 1886 he besieged the town until it surrendered. In 1890 Dahomey attacked Porto Novo and were defeated by combined forces of the French and the Porto Novo. This was followed by an attack on Itiibo (an Egba town). This settlement of 5,000 was destroyed as well as Musunse and Ikereku Olodi. The Dahomeans then marched on to Oke-Ogun territory and destroyed Iberekodo, Aiyete, Tapa, Idofin, Pako and Idere. The population of each settlement was estimated as between one and three thousand. The people of Eruwa and Lanlate, on hearing of the destruction of these settlements, deserted their own towns. Two years later the French put an end to Dahomey's military strength and political independence in 1892.

The general situation in the frontier zone between Dahomey and the Egba is exemplified by a report on the area by Faulkner in 1879.
DAHOMEY AND EGBA RAIDS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY:
THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FRONTIER
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In an area some twenty miles south-east of Ketu, various villages, which ten years later would find themselves divided by an international boundary, lay in ruins, though not entirely depopulated. He saw Mota, Ijowun, Isala Tobolo and Binyan, which had been destroyed by the Dahomeans. Of Ijowun he says, "I was told by the few people who are left there that they are in constant dread all the year round. For three months they are in dread of the Dahomeans, and the rest of the year from the Egbas or Abeokuta people, several times the place has been destroyed both by Dahomeans and Egbas, but those who have escaped have come together again." 

The major consequence of the Dahomean and Egba raids was depopulation of the present boundary area, initially from widespread killing and secondly, of numerically more importance, due to large scale migrations into neighbouring towns for protection. Abeokuta and Iseyin were the main centres for refugees. When Iberekodo was destroyed at least 3,000 refugees were estimated to have fled to Abeokuta. These refugees, in addition to those from other Egba and Oke-Odan settlements, constituted large problems in the towns. In 1890 Abeokuta had more than 8,000 refugees. Iseyin had similar problems with refugees from Aiyete, Tapa and other towns destroyed in the same year. It appears that the majority of the refugees in the towns settled there permanently. Today the Iberekodo quarter in Abeokuta is largely populated by the descendents of refugees from Iberekodo, Igbo-Ora and other settlements in Oke-Odan. Large areas were depopulated and several towns have lain in ruins ever since.
Some attempts at resettlement were successful in such towns as Eruwa and Lanlate but other centres have never regained their former size or importance. In some cases people from several towns amalgamated to form one new settlement as, for example, Igbo-Ora which was reformed with people from the former Igbo-Ora, Iberekodo, Pako, Idofin and other towns.

This frontier zone between Dahomey and the Egba is described by Burton as being depopulated in his book on Abeokuta and the Cameroon Mountain. "According to T.B. Freeman a war has lasted nearly a century between the kings of Dahomey and of Great Benin. The lands lying between the two rivals had suffered greatly, and even in the present day, the line of country between Badagry and Abeokuta, which is 100 miles long, does not contain more than 500 souls." (13) Thus by the time of colonial partition the present-day boundary region was in many areas uninhabited. By placing a line of demarcation through this area the colonial powers were to a large extent replacing a frontier zone with a specific boundary line. Such a state of affairs is excellently illustrated by the map drawn by Father Borghero in 1865 (See Fig 12 After Boghero (14)). In this map, the missionary has given the approximate positions of towns and other settlements existing at that time as well as the probable limits of the existing "native states." Territory belonging to Dahomey, Porto Novo, the Egba and the Egbado is shown in the region relevant to this study. North of Porto Novo, however, the present-day boundary traverses an area which appears to have been devoid of any tribal unit. North of the probable limits of Porto Novo, and between those of Dahomey
THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY IN RELATION TO THE SLAVE COAST AFTER BOGHERO, 1865.
and the Egba, Borghero shows a "no-man's land" of up to 30 miles wide stretching north into the interior. Within this are less than half a dozen settlements marked. Twenty years later, when the boundary was delimited, conditions regarding the distribution of population or tribal units would not have changed to any great extent. Such an area would therefore seem to have been clearly the most suitable for any new political boundary in this region.

The Nago, Ahori and Egbado

Although historical research has shown a frontier zone to have existed south of Ketu at the time of delimitation, present-day maps, such as that of Forde, show the boundary splitting areas inhabited by the Nago, Ahori and Egbado. It appears as if the actual location of these people has changed to some extent since the end of the last century and that, at the time of delimitation, tribal distribution was considerably different from that of today.

As will be noted later, the Anglo-French Boundary Commission in 1889 used the existing tribal frontier (except probably in the case of the Ketu) which was, to a large extent, an area largely devoid of population. It must be remembered, moreover, that the boundary was at first only delimited and not demarcated. In the new colonies which were being created, the French, Germans and the English were "effecting important changes at the political and cultural centres where contact with the catalysts of European rule was closer, but on the periphery,"
writes Newbury, "rule was vague" (16) Often, among the indigenous population, little was known of the existence or the position, and even less the function, of the newly created boundary. The initial function of the boundary was as a tariff barrier but for some time "the Customs Service was more or less a farce," (17) and had very little effect. In one area technically within Nigeria, eight villages were paying head tax to the French. As late as 1912, 23 years after the boundary had been established, Partridge found that in Nigerian border villages British currency was unknown, "while French centimes were used everywhere" (18).

Thus by the turn of the century and even as late as the 1920's, the area in which this southern section of the boundary was located was relatively lightly populated and the boundary had little function in reality. Peaceful for the first time in several centuries the area was attractive and suitable for settlement and there is evidence to suggest that some population movement took place towards the border area from both sides of the boundary.

In 1897, some eight years after the boundary had been delimited, one Abassı was given the title of Seriki at Oke-Odan, and became paramount chief of the Egbado. His capital, Aiyetoro, was established less than 20 miles from the boundary, between Meko and Abeokuta, and immigrants were encouraged to move into the area from such towns as Egoa, Igolo, Sawampa, (see Map 13) Thus began the apparent movement west of peoples into the borderland and settlement took place actually across the boundary, though after it had been delimited. In the Ethnographic Survey of Africa, (19) Forde, when dealing with the
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Yoruba-speaking peoples of south-west Nigeria, describes the settlements near the international boundary as having been founded by mixed refugee groups subjected to raids from the Egba and Dahomey. Such villages as Idiroko, Ipokia, Ifonyin, Ado, and Igbesse (all within approximately 25 miles of the boundary) had developed from a mixture of Egbadó, Egun, Ahorí and Dahomey Yoruba.

Further evidence of the Egbadó and other people moving towards the newly created boundary is suggested by pre-colonial reports of tribal distribution. Instead of the present-day distribution of several peoples inhabiting the boundary area between the Fon (pre-colonial Dahomey) and the Egba, old descriptions tend to suggest what appears on Borghero's map of 1865. There, the Egbadó are shown to inhabit a small area around Otta between the Egba and the coast between Egbaland and Dahomey no tribal group is shown, save the Porto Novo kingdom on the coast.

Horton, in 1868, when describing the various tribes of the Yorubas, stated that the Egbadós "formed a belt of country on the banks of the lagoon in the forest of Ketu, on the border of Dahomey". Anene, too, describes the Egbadó as being situated between the Egba and the coast. In his book on "The Egba and their neighbours", Biobaku quotes a report by E P Cotton, who gave the term "Egba" to mean "wanderers towards the forest", and "Egbado" as "wanderers towards the river, (i.e. coastal lagoon)". Ellis, in his description of the Yoruba-speaking peoples written after the boundary had been delimited, described the Egbadó as "one of several small states, or
rather independent townships, consisting of a town and a few outlying villages" (23) The principal ones included Egbado, Oke-Odan, Ado, Awori and Igbessa, and all of these lay to the south of the Egba

Prior to the colonial period the Ohori (24) apparently inhabited an area in present-day Dahomey adjacent to the boundary. Since the establishment of the boundary, however, they have migrated to some extent into Nigeria. There is not much written evidence of this migration, but it is occasionally mentioned in contemporary District Reports. As early as 1890, for example, it was being noticed that there was "considerable immigration into the district owing to the panic created in the surrounding countries by the hostilities proceeding between the French and the Dahomeans" (25) Moreover, in 1914, when the Ohori had risen up against the French government in Dahomey, all the men who had settled across the boundary in Nigeria were called to arms and returned to Dahomey (26) By the early 1920's, however, figures suggest that the Ohori were found in approximately equal numbers on either side of the boundary. In 1921 the Nigerian census gave 16,000 for the number of Ohori in Nigeria and Forde estimated 15,000 for those in Dahomey (27)

Ketu

The Ketu people did not move into the boundary area after the line had been delimited and demarcated, but the kingdom is today divided by the boundary. The town of Ketu is an ancient settlement. According to oral tradition, Adetoutou is the forty-ninth and present ruler of Ketu, and Parrinder (28) indicates that the thirty-eighth
king's reign commenced about 1748. Thus Ketu has a history of several hundred years at least.

The question therefore arises as to the background to the apparent splitting of the Ketu kingdom as it is only with some knowledge of the pre-boundary conditions that one can attempt to measure the effect of the present political division.

In the nineteenth century, the Ketu kingdom appears to have been in the centre of the Dahomey-Egba frontier zone. The Ketu people were peaceable and they relied on their town fortifications rather than on a large army for defence. As Parrinder points out, the Ketu tried to maintain peace with both Egba and Dahomey, and in some respects acted as a buffer between the two. However, in the nineteenth century, divisions developed within Ketu and spread throughout the kingdom. By the latter part of the century it "fell between the two stools" of Dahomey and Egba. The kingdom was split and the town destroyed. The colonial boundary fossilized the situation and when the town was resettled, the colonial boundary had already been decided upon.

Being situated within a frontier zone between two stronger powers, Ketu to some extent aided its own destruction by attempting to remain neutral. Apart from being periodically attacked by both sides, there appears to have been disruptive factions at work within the kingdom for and against neutrality. One group, dominated by the farmers, desired unity with the Yoruba to the east. Another faction, largely comprising the traders and Muslims, preferred to maintain neutrality,
and trade with both sides. To the traders, a neutral market was important, as considerable exchange took place at times between Dahomey and the Egba. Moreover, Ketu market was used as a site for ransom and exchange of prisoners-of-war from both sides. Neutrality on the other hand meant that the kingdom was cut off from the sea, and thus cut off from a source of firearms. Ketu was militarily weak throughout most of its history and attacks from either Dahomey or the Yoruba were common. The first recorded Dahomean attack on Ketu was in 1760. It was about this time that Meko began to develop as a rival to Ketu. This latter settlement was first established as a Ketu farm, but by the end of Ande's reign (1760-80), Meko had developed into a town of some size and importance. A rift between Ketu and Meko began when the chief of the latter town demanded authorization from the Alaketu to wear a crown. The request was refused, and relations between the two declined.

In 1789, Dahomey attacked Ketu again, and by the turn of the century, during Ajibolu's reign, the Ketu kingdom suffered from an attempted secession by various villages within the kingdom.

In 1858 the Dahomey raided in the vicinity of Meko, and Ekpo some three miles south of Ketu. Two years later, in 1860, Idaninyi, in the north-east of the Ketu kingdom, was attacked. Dahomey then concentrated her attacks further south but trouble within the Ketu kingdom added to the Meko-Ketu split. In 1867 civil war raged between two rival Ketu societies and ended in the Alaketu actually seeking asylum in Meko. The king never returned to the capital. A new leader
was elected in Ketu and for sixteen years the two major towns in the kingdom had Ketu kings. Both, however, were killed in 1883 when Dahomey attacked first Meko and then Ketu.

In 1868 the Egba began attacking the eastern section of the Ketu kingdom. They decided to destroy Meko as they believed this town had acted as spies for the Dahomeans against the Egbas. As Meko had broken off relations with Ketu, help was sought from Oyo.

Meko was used by the Ibadans as a base against the Egbas in 1878 and from there they raided the Ketu farmlands. Five years later Dahomey attacked villages in the south of Ketu and then sacked Meko itself. The following wet season Ketu was again attacked by Dahomey and in 1886 the town was besieged and finally destroyed. The Dahomey king forbade its reoccupation.

Three years later the colonial boundary was agreed upon. The line delimited followed the vague frontier between Meko and Ketu. Whether one considers that Ketu has therefore been split by the boundary really depends on whether the traditional Ketu is considered or whether one considers the political conditions existing at that time. As Anene points out, "the principal vassal town, Meko, had unequivocally thrown off the paramountcy of the Alaketu of Ketu." (29)

Thus it appears that the boundary imposed from outside merely recognised the political situation existing at that time. It is true, nevertheless, that Meko and Ketu have the same history and belong to the same culture. Politically, however, the two factions were mirroring the events taking place in the rest of the Yoruba-speaking
Empire  Politically it was a period of fragmentation and city-states were appearing elsewhere  Whether or not Meko and Ketu, given the opportunity, would have reunited, is a matter of speculation  The colonial boundary did not take into consideration any possible future developments but fossilized the existing state of affairs

In regarding the boundary between the sea and 9° north as a whole it has been shown how the colonial boundary-makers cannot be accused of disregarding existing political conditions  The initial location of the boundary depended on treaties made with several small political units near the coast  The subsequent development of the boundary north was then influenced by the existence of the frontier zone which had developed between Dahomey and its Yoruba-speaking neighbours  Only the Ketu kingdom was situated within this frontier, and, as we have seen, at the time of partition this kingdom was already split  To the south of Ketu the frontier zone became settled by a variety of peoples from the inter-tribal wars, and such migrations continued into this relatively empty area after the boundary had been delimited
CHAPTER FOUR

EXISTING CONDITIONS NORTH OF 9° NORTH BORGU

North of 9°N the northern section of the boundary appears to split a large area generally referred to as Borgu. The question which arises (as with Ketu to the south) is whether or not Borgu was a single political unit at the time of partition. To the boundary-makers, and with many subsequent writers, Borgu has always been considered one. Lugard(1) described Borgu as being roughly oval in shape, approximately 400 miles from east to west, and 300 miles north to south. The area had several common characteristics. The leaders of various parts of Borgu have a similar history and although there are many legends as to the origins of Borgu, these latter all seem to agree on Kisra as the founder. As in legends of the Yoruba migration, Kisra is supposed to have originated from Mecca - being driven out for not accepting the Moslem faith. Kisra and his followers are supposed to have crossed Africa until eventually the River Niger was reached. This was crossed at Illo. Minor chiefs, perhaps the younger brothers of Kisra, founded the towns of Illo and Nikki, while Kisra himself became established at Bussa which became the capital of the region.
Borgu did have other common unifying characteristics. In some respects the region may be compared to Ketu in the frontier zone between Oyo/Egba and Dahomey. As Lugard states, "Borgu was a riverine, pagan area which escaped conquest and conversion by the Fulani, it was a "buffer" state between the Moslem north and the pagan south." (2)

The reasons for Borgu's independence and escape from Fulani attack and conversion to the Moslem faith are not obvious. The region is not mountainous and the forest, though thick in places, would prove to be no substantial barrier. Moreover Borgu did not have a large population. Perham and Bull (3) estimate that the area today (1962) has a population of about a quarter of a million (of which 35,000 are found in Nigeria) and thus prior to the boundary delimitation numbers would most probably be considerably less. In 1904, Lugard estimated the Nigerian section of Borgu to have a population of 25,300 (4) while Wallace (5) suggested 27,300 two years later. Factors which have been suggested as having aided Borgu's independence, however, have included the then formidable witchcraft of the inhabitants, skill in the manufacture of poisoned arrows, and lastly their readiness to attack at night - which Lugard found unusual in Africa.

Borgu, nevertheless, despite it being an area independent of the Fulani when the colonial powers arrived, cannot be considered as a single and unified political unit (6). In attempting to throw light on the problem, however, one is aggravated by the lack of information as prior to 1894 the few travellers who had attempted to penetrate the
interior of Borgu did not return (7) Secondly, much of the research on Borgu during the present century has been applied to that section found in either Dahomey or Nigeria rather than the area as a whole

Despite a tradition of common origin and despite the inhabitants of Borgu being referred to generally as Borgawa by the Hausa, or Bariba by the Yoruba, the inhabitants are, in fact, split linguistically. One section speaks Boko or Bussawa, of Mande origin, while the majority speak Gur, a Voltaic language. Ethnographically Borgu contains a considerable variety of tribal groups, including the Zana, Boko, Bokoberu, Bisagwe, Kamberi and Laru. The Zana, Boko and Bokoberu peoples are aborigines of the Borgu area, while the Laru and Kamberi accompanied the people of Kisra (the Bisagwe) on their migration from the east. The Bisagwe it appears, took control over the whole area and leadership over a heterogeneous collection of tribal groups. In time the ruling group plus the other tribes developed into two major groups—the Bussawa and the Borgawa. This latter group is generally found in the western, Dahomean half of Borgu and has developed from the Zana (natives of the Nikki area), Boko and Bokoberu plus the Bisagwe. On arrival of the Kisra migration the former three groups became the peasantry of the Bisagwe. In time the ruling group abandoned their own language in favour of Zana, Boko or Bokoberu, depending on the language spoken in the particular area under their control (8)

The Bussawa, as the name implies, are found further east around Bussa in Nigeria. This term is applied to the peoples who have
developed from fusion between the indigenous Boko, the Bisagwe followers of Kisra, and the Laru and Kamberi who followed him. As with the Borgawa, the indigenous groups formed the peasant classes and the Bisagwe gradually abandoned their language. Thus by the end of the nineteenth century, though largely unknown to the boundary-makers, Borgu had developed two separate human groupings, which roughly correspond to the later colonial divisions.

Economically and politically too the region was to some extent divided. As Kisra, the leader of the Bisagwe aristocracy of Borgu, had founded Bussa this town was considered the capital of Borgu. By the nineteenth century, however, Nikkī had outstripped this settlement in size and had acquired a greater territory than any of the other towns in Borgu. Duff, for example, writes that although "Sarkin Bussa and Sarkin Nikkī have been regarded as blood relations from a religious point of view, if such it can be called, Sarkin Bussa was the more important. From a material point of view, however, Nikkī was held to be the leader since the chiefs of Nikkī were in a much stronger position both as regards size of territory and numbers of followers." Anene further points out that from the three original centres of Bussa, Illo and Nikkī it was in fact from the latter town that most of the colonizing took place in what is now called Borgu. Most of the settlements in southern Borgu such as Kalama, Banara, Yashikera, Okuta and Ilesha, for example, were founded by Nikkī. Thus the situation was extremely complicated and confused. Conditions within Borgu changed rapidly during the nineteenth century.
and the various travellers and observers from Europe would certainly perceive considerably different circumstances. During the Fulani incursions to the south in the early part of the nineteenth century, Borgu had a military alliance with the Oyo Yoruba. Though contingents came from Bussa and Kailama, the Borgu army was under the king of Nikki. In the Eleduwe war of about 1830, the kings of Nikki, Kailama and Wawa were killed. Kitoro, the Bussa leader, however, had sent a deputy to the war and afterwards considered himself overlord of all Borgu. Prior to the European intervention in Borgu, the evidence suggests that during periods of war Borgu was united while immediately after any external attack alliances appear to have lapsed and the region would split into a handful of rival states. This is clearly illustrated by the civil war following the death of Kitoro. Claimants to the Bussa throne fought while Wawa, Nikki and Kailama lent support to the various candidates. Such a situation not only widened the gap between the various political centres in Borgu but to the external observer would give the impression of Bussa being the capital with factions from the rest of the country fighting for it. Bussa's importance would be further enhanced by its position both on the Niger and on the edge of Borgu. Though several explorers such as Clapperton and the Lander brothers had visited the area, no one had penetrated the interior prior to Lugard's expedition in 1894. Moreover, Bussa could be reached by river and also controlled trade routes between the Fulani states and Dahomey. Thus, to the external European observer, Borgu at the end of the nineteenth century might have appeared to be a group of political units controlled by Bussa.
In reality, however, the region was divided into at least two separate spheres of influence under Bussa and Nikki. Bussa appears to have controlled Wawa and Kalama while Nikki encompassed such settlements as Yashikera, Ilesha and Okuta. Considering the latter three, Nikki received military aid and tribute from them and the rulers from these settlements annually visited Nikki in order to celebrate the "Gani" feasts. Moreover, the throne of Nikki was a centre of attraction to the rulers of Yashikera, Ilesha and Okuta as the rulers of these places were Nikki princes and therefore candidates for the Nikki throne.

The two-fold division of Borgu, however, was not known by the boundary-makers. The area was considered as one unit but was ultimately split by colonial rivalry and may therefore be criticised as an example of the "divide and rule" school. The pre-colonial division, however, in ethnographic linguistic and economic spheres may help to explain any subsequent differences which might have appeared in the post-partition period.
PART THREE

THE DELIMITATION OF THE BOUNDARY
CHAPTER FIVE

DELIMITATION, DEMARCATION, AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE BOUNDARY

The southern section of the boundary between the coast and $9^\circ$ north was initially agreed upon in principle in 1889, $^{(1)}$ and in 1895-6 $^{(2)}$ a delimitation survey was carried out. In the first agreement, the boundary was defined as the meridian which intersected the Ajarra Creek - at approximately $2^\circ 43'$ west.

In 1898 $^{(3)}$ it was decided that the boundary should be continued from the ninth parallel in a northerly direction to the west of several named villages to reach the Niger 10 miles north of Gero. When the boundary along this section was delimited in 1900, $^{(4)}$ it was modified considerably. This was done on the one hand to facilitate delimitation, and on the other to fit in more with local conditions.

One of the first objectives of the boundary commissions, $^{(5)}$ was to see what natural boundaries could be used rather than follow the initial agreement verbatim. The nature of the land also affected the final boundary. Because of thick bush, or because there were not enough commanding high points, the then usual methods of surveying - triangulation and chaining out - were not employed. Therefore, where a natural line, such as a river, could not be followed, the boundary
commissioners decided to take astronomical readings for villages in the vicinity of the boundary and to traverse the paths which interconnected the villages at each side of it. The boundary would then be drawn around existing villages at a radius varying according to the size of each settlement. This would take into account the farm land used by each village. Existing roads were also taken into consideration by the boundary commissioners and the boundary was usually drawn parallel and at some distance from the path as a straight line may have cut the routeway in several places. As the report of the Boundary Commission specifically stated, it would have been "undesirable that a main trade route should be cut in more than one point by the international frontier" (6). Thus the following quotation appears as a typical section of the delimitation report of this boundary: Along the northern section "the frontier shall run parallel with the Silla-Guri road, and at a distance of 1 kilom from the centre of the village of Guri, thence along the circumference of a circle westward, of 4 kilom radius, and with the centre of Guri as centre, to a point 1 kilom from the Guri-Yashikira road, measured at right angles to and on the west side of the road" (7).

The final boundary delimited stretches 435 miles from the Gulf of Benin to the Niger 200 miles in the southern section and 235 miles in the north. Following its course from south to north the boundary first crosses a narrow sand-spit and coastal lagoon along the 2°43'E meridian until it reaches the mouth of the Ajarra Creek. The sand-spit,
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[Map showing the delimited boundary between Dahomey and Nigeria with annotations and scale.]
five miles wide at the boundary, and the lagoon\(^{(8)}\) form the characteristic coastline along this part of West Africa.

North of the lagoon the boundary is drawn along the thalweg of the River Ajarra, which flows sluggishly from a low flat plateau\(^{(9)}\). The boundary follows the Ajarra and its tributary for approximately 17 miles and passes the Idiroko crossing point on the major east-west routeway which follows the plateau. Thence across the plateau to the Pobé region the boundary follows pathways which existed at the time of delimitation as well as short sections of small tributaries of the Yewa river system. Forty miles or so from the coast, the boundary descends into a low depression which stretches across the whole of Dahomey and into Nigeria. This region, called the Lama Marsh in Dahomey\(^{(10)}\), lies mostly below 100 feet. Soils are black and fertile but underlying rocks are impermeable and drainage is poor. Consequently large areas of the depression are completely flooded during the rainy season and remain marshy throughout the year. Down the slope of the depression the boundary follows two converging tributaries of the Yewa but across the marsh the line parallels a north-south footpath. Even today, north-south movement in this area of the boundary is extremely difficult and almost impossible during the rains. The area between Pobé and Ketu is only scantily populated. In the Ketu area, in the vicinity of the boundary, land rises again to above 500 feet and a second plateau region is reached. The water table here is low, wells are deep and settlements - such as Meko, Ketu and Abomey - are nucleated. The boundary in this region was again adapted to the
pattern of local routes until it reached the confluence of the Ogbo and the Okpara. The land continues to rise and for 85 miles the boundary was to follow the thalweg of the latter river as far as 9° north. On delimitation, however, the boundary was taken along this river for a further five miles before turning to the east. For over 150 miles the boundary was then constructed almost entirely in relation to the existing pattern of routes and settlements. For long sections the boundary runs to the west of a north-south route-way making semicircles round the villages existing at the time of delimitation. From the Okpara the land continues to rise steadily until twenty or so miles south of Nikki the highest point along the whole boundary is reached at approximately 1700 feet. Here the general east-west watershed is crossed dividing those rivers which flow directly to the sea from those which flow north and east to the Niger. The boundary for some distance cuts the headquarters of several east-flowing tributaries and follows a north-south zone of settlements and footpaths. Thence the undulating terrain falls gently towards the Niger through an area largely lacking in settlement. The boundary here has been constructed as a straight line until the Niger is reached.

Although the boundary commissioners did attempt to provide a well-delimited boundary, the actual demarcation was not given excessive consideration. The use of the Okpara and other streams did provide an obvious boundary for local inhabitants, but technical difficulties must have arisen when the political division was drawn parallel and at some distance away from existing roads. In 1906 boundary posts were
erected along the boundary. These were numbered cement-posts, square in section, and with a pointed top and spaced at intervals of up to two miles. Many of these posts soon disappeared or were badly worn after being used by local farmers to sharpen cutlasses. During fieldwork very few of the original posts were discovered though the precise location of some was known in areas where a road crossed the boundary. (See Plate VII showing a boundary post in Ilara village.) Moreover, many of the original tracks referred to by the Boundary Commission have long ago disappeared making it even more difficult to locate the site of the boundary with any accuracy. Whether this provides any problem today, however, is discussed in later chapters.

In order to compare the boundary in question with those of West Africa as a whole it is important to construct some framework of classification for comparison. Many attempts have been made to classify boundaries ranging from the widespread use of a "natural and artificial" classification to the more comprehensive lists of Fawcett or Boggs. That drawn up by Barbour, however, is perhaps the most applicable to Africa and is quoted below:

A Astronomical line, i.e. parallel or meridian

M Mathematical line, i.e. straight line, arc of circle, line equidistant from a named line, etc

Mr Mathematical line defined by reference to relief

Mh Mathematical line defined by reference to features of human occupation

cont'd
R  Relief feature
Rf  Foot of mountain chain
Rl  Edge of lake or lagoon
Rs  Stream or river, usually the centre line
Rw  Watershed

I  One of the above which is also an inter-tribal boundary

For the whole continent the relative proportions of the three initial types were found to be very approximately as follows:
- Astronomical lines, 44%
- Mathematical lines, 30%
- Relief features, 26%

The astronomical and other mathematical lines were found predominantly in thinly populated areas while those defined in relation to features of human occupation were generally found in areas that were both settled and known when the boundaries were drawn up. Such an observation could generally be applied to the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary. In this case less than 1% of the boundary was defined as an astronomical line while 27% was drawn in relation to relief features and 72% was in the form of mathematical lines. The latter group comprises 16% simple mathematical lines (in this case straight lines drawn between two points) and 56% mathematical lines defined by reference to features of occupation. Those parts of the boundary drawn in relation to relief in all cases follow the median line of rivers and this occurs in six places. Thus, it appears, that with the boundary under discussion considerably more attention has been paid to the existing human pattern than with the
boundaries of the continent as a whole
PART FOUR

THE GEOGRAPHICAL EFFECTS OF THE BOUNDARY
CHAPTER SIX

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FRONTIER ZONE AND BORDER LANDSCAPE

In most of the world today the political boundary as a demarcated linear feature of the landscape is a concept which, to a considerable extent, developed in Europe and which was later imposed on large areas of the globe by Europeans. A few boundaries (as opposed to frontiers) have existed in various parts of the world for millennia, but the pattern today is largely of European creation. What must be stressed, moreover, is that the actual present-day state boundaries of Europe are often not much older than their African counterparts. In Europe, however, the boundary, to a large degree, was the culmination of a long period of state development, whereas the political divisions of Africa were largely created within several decades towards the end of the last century.

Considering Europe in general, the development of the state largely preceded the boundary. Each state grew around a nucleus or core area which had considerable advantages over surrounding districts. Thus, medieval France developed from the Paris basin and England from that of the Thames. The core area of each state was usually agriculturally richer than neighbouring areas, was more productive
and supported a larger population. At the centre a capital city developed from which a network of communications radiated. Each core area expanded into a surrounding no-man's land or frontier which separated one developing state from its neighbour. As states became stronger their rulers were able to extend control into the peripheral frontier by such methods as intermarriage or outright conquest. Such a process could continue until the interests of one state confronted those of another and through the intervening frontier a boundary was often drawn. Consequently the outer rim of European states often represents the most recently acquired part of the state. In the vicinity of the boundary various characteristics of the former frontier might remain—physical barriers to movement, a decrease in population density or a boundary population having a different outlook to those in the interior of the state.

The present-day boundaries of Africa, however, have not developed from a long historical process as in some parts of Europe. In this case the boundaries have usually preceded the state, they did not evolve, but were superimposed. Thus in evaluating the effect of the African boundary one must consider two different sets of factors. On the one hand there is the mosaic of indigenous states and tribal units with their own core areas and frontier zones, while on the other hand there is the colonial complex of a capital and boundary. These latter two aspects in Europe often represent the initial and the last stages in state development. In Africa, however, the intervening stages of a developing central core-area and surrounding frontier.
zone were absent for the newly created state-unit as a whole

The development and character of the new state depended on the character of both indigenous and colonial factors. The relationship and the extent to which the indigenous factor was taken into consideration varied from one colonial power to another and a comparison relevant to Dahomey and Nigeria is given in Chapter 14. At this stage, however, it is necessary to determine to what extent a core area with its surrounding frontier has developed for the state as a whole during the past eighty years.

Though it is easy to understand what is meant by the state core area, it is relatively difficult to define this exactly. According to Whittlesey (2) "it is the portion of the state that supports the densest and most extended population and has the closest mesh of transportation lines; it is more richly endowed than the rest of the state." With such a definition, the core areas of England or France are readily apparent. With regard to Dahomey or Nigeria, however, a single core area is not as yet so obvious. In Dahomey, the core area is in the south-east around the capital Porto Novo, though, in fact, most of the communications network and the economy is orientated towards nearby Cotonou. In Nigeria, three major core areas are recognizable, corresponding to the three federal states of the colonial period. Ibadan and Enugu are certainly situated at the centre of the regional transport network, while in the north there appears to be considerable competition between Kaduna, the colonial capital of the
Northern Region, and Kano the economic centre. As regards Nigeria as a whole it is difficult to discern one major core area orientated on Lagos. Nevertheless such a development has been taking place as the interior of the state as a whole has been criss-crossed with roads and railways leaving a frontier zone on the edge. Such a tendency can be seen in Fig. 16 which shows the pattern of major roads and railways and a shaded area of land which is completely surrounded by lines of transportation within each respective state. The shaded areas and more especially the areas in black illustrate the developing state and indicate how, as yet, it is neither one unit nor coterminal with the political limits within which it is growing. Instead a frontier zone is seen between various core areas and between the states themselves. In both states the communication networks are most dense in the south with minor concentrations of routes in the north. In Nigeria especially the empty "middle belt" is readily apparent. Also conspicuous is the lack of routes near the fringe of each state - although this is not quite true along the Niger-Nigerian boundary. Elsewhere, however, roads approach the political division but rarely cross it. Such a situation is particularly conspicuous near the Cameroon border as well as the boundary under consideration.

The Development of a Frontier Zone

In the context of this thesis the term "frontier zone" will be used to describe an area at the periphery of the state unit adjacent to the boundary, and which has certain characteristics derived
primarily from forming the edge of the state. Although the boundary line between the states of Dahomey and Nigeria, as well as in most of Africa, may have been drawn on the map and even to some extent demarcated on the ground with a string of boundary markers or customs posts along it, the lines are merely indicating the legal limits of the two states. The de facto state, with its complex of communications, settlements and utilized land, is not in some cases co-terminous with its legal limits and in reality the boundaries to a great extent tend to form a frontier marchland. This is especially the case in much of Africa and other developing areas where the state, as a defined piece of territory, is a relatively new concept and where urbanization, roads and other communication media, are often of recent introduction. Economically and socially, except in a few areas, the boundary does not function as a fixed determinable line. Instead, the economic-social function of one state today fades gently into that of its neighbour. In describing the similarities between states and economic landscapes, Losch acknowledges this situation: "The influence of centres always grows less toward the periphery. The capitals and their immediate surroundings differ more sharply from each other than do the border regions."(3) It is the difference between the two states and their economy, social organization and administration which creates a division rather than a single political line. As Newbury states when describing the three colonies of Togo, Dahomey and Yorubaland in the early twentieth century, the boundaries were "less important as rigid dividing lines than the economic and administrative links.
forged between the three colonial capitals and their respective protectorates. Though somewhat vague at the perimeter the colonies slowly emerged as a district unit by "ever-strengthening threads which linked political and social diversity, binding the markets of the interior to the coast. Around the threads of interior trade, woven by engineers and road builders the colonies crystallized," from the centre outwards. Roads were built like the spokes of a wheel to concentrate trade and traffic to the colonial centre. Even today these former colonies are still crystallizing and are developing to fill and utilize the area they were given. Settlement patterns resemble a series of wheels with the essential characteristics of hubs, spokes and rims. Settlements represent the hub from which transportation routes radiate like spokes. These spokes, terminating more or less abruptly, give a rim-like character to the pattern. The sharpness in which the outer rim is defined, however, varies considerably. In the area under consideration the evidence of settlement decreases gradually with distance from the state centre and the marginal line in reality is rendered indistinct. Thus, in this and in other parts of Africa, the legal boundary line to a large extent is a technical abstraction lying in a de facto empty area or frontier zone as one state fades into the next.

The presence of a frontier zone in the geographical landscape of this part of West Africa is probably most easily seen in the pattern of communications and more specifically in the road network. Even on a small scale map it is evident that the boundary area is
lacking in communication facilities — especially in an east-west direction. Along the whole length of the 435-mile boundary, only in one place does a tarred road link Dahomey and Nigeria. This is the International Highway which runs along the coast between Lagos and Accra and crosses the boundary at Idrako. Two other roads do cross the boundary between Yashikera and Niki, and between Meko and Ketu. Both of these roads are unTarred and the latter route is passable only during the dry season except for heavy lorries.

In general the roads tend to parallel the boundary line and this is usually done at some distance. Fig. 17 shows the tarred and all-season roads built in the two colonies after the boundary was delimited. A frontier zone with regard to roads is remarkably clear and the roadless zone within Nigeria is considerably wider than on the Dahomean side of the boundary. The distance between the north-south major road in Nigeria and the boundary is up to 40 miles for considerable distances and such a width of land without roads largely reflects the size of the country. Such a zone could not occur in such width in a country like Dahomey — whose width is little more than 80 miles for much of its length. Thus, it is possible that this frontier zone, at least as regards the road network, may partly result from the size of the state as well as the level of economic development and population density within that state.

An attempt has been made to measure statistically the characteristics of the landscape in the vicinity of the boundary and to do so an area 50 miles wide has been considered on either side.
THE NETWORK OF MAJOR ROADS IN RELATION TO THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY
In order to take random samples and to analyse the frontier zone on a statistical basis a cartographical grid has been constructed with north-south lines parallel to the boundary at five mile intervals while latitudinal parallels ten minutes apart are used for the east-west lines. This gives a grid of 32 roughly rectangular areas on either side of the boundary (See Fig. 18).

Initially the crude pattern of roads has been shown by recording whether either or both of the all-season and dry-season roads occur in any cell of the grid. The results can be seen in Fig. 19. Of a total of 640 cells approximately one third (206) contain an all-season road. In both Dahomey and Nigeria the number of cells containing this type of road decreases as a whole towards the boundary. From zone 10 on the Nigerian side, "all-season" cells decrease steadily towards the boundary (though not evenly) from 20 to 6 per zone over the 50 miles. In Dahomey the decrease is not so striking. Although the range is only 7, the highest number of cells (14) is in zone 7 (i.e. 30-35 miles from the boundary) while the lowest number is in zone 1.

Secondly, an attempt has been made to determine whether a frontier zone exists in relation to population density and growth. Unfortunately as the Dahomean census was based on sample studies, it has only been possible to consider the Nigerian side of the boundary. The system of ten parallel zones is again used with figures from both the 1951 and 1961 census. At present over two million people inhabit the area within 50 miles of the boundary. The density of this
STATISTICAL GRID FOR AREAS WITHIN FIFTY MILES OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY
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population, however, is by no means equal

Apart from zone 1 (where the boundary tends to have a positive influence and which will be discussed under the border landscape section) population distribution and density illustrates, in one aspect, how the state functions decline towards the boundary.

With regards to total population numbers it can be seen how in the interior of the state (zones 8, 9, and 10 for example) 35 miles and more from the border, totals exceeded 400,000 persons per zone in 1963. A similar situation existed in 1951 when each of these zones had populations greater than 100,000 compared with an average of less than 70,000 for the seven zones near the boundary. At both dates the largest number of people was found in zone 10 - the furthest from the boundary.

Moving towards the boundary, or at least to within a few miles of it, numbers fluctuate somewhat but at the same time decrease considerably. Such a trend is strikingly apparent when population figures are computed for zones ten miles wide. Commencing 50 miles from the boundary the five population totals (1963 figures) for the ten-mile zones drop rapidly as the boundary is reached: 875,101, 579,141, 217,254, 210,982, 203,207. The figures for 1951 also show a similar uninterrupted decrease towards the interior (See Figs 20 and 21).

Similarly with settlement sizes a frontier zone is apparent.
Forty or 50 miles from the boundary, settlements today have an average size of approximately 3,000 persons whereas near the boundary the number is well below 1,000. Within 15 miles of the boundary no settlement exceeds 10,000 whereas 35 miles or so into the interior several settlements exceed 50,000 and two have more than 100,000 inhabitants.

In both Figs 20 and 21, the number of settlements have been graded according to size. A comparison of the 1951 and 1963 figures proves instructive as regards the present-day trend in the development of the frontier zone. In 1951, villages with less than 100 persons were found only in zones 1 to 4, i.e. within 20 miles of the boundary. In the same year the largest number of villages within all zones was found in the 100 to 499 population category. By 1963, however, the pattern had changed considerably. By that time the cluster of small villages (i.e. less than 100 persons) near the boundary (28 in 1951) had gone. Four settlements of this size did exist but all were newly established and scattered apparently at random within the ten zones. Near the border the settlements as a whole had grown so that within 30 miles of the boundary the largest group of villages per zone was in the 500-999 person category. More than 30 miles from the boundary, however, the largest group of settlements per zone remained in the 100-499 class. In other words, in the interior a considerable number of new villages had been established in the inter-census period, whereas near the boundary the existing settlements merely increased in size without the corresponding increase in the number of settlements.
### DISTRIBUTION OF ROADS WITHIN FIFTY MILES OF THE DAHOMEY - NIGERIA BOUNDARY

#### Fig. 19

| Either or Both | R | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 |
| **DAHOMEY**   |   | 1 | 1 |   | R |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **NIGERIA**   |   | 1 | 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **DRY-SEASON ROADS** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| **ALL-SEASON ROADS** |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

* Dry-season roads

All-season roads.
## Population Distribution on the Nigeri Side of the Dahomey-Nigeria Boundary, 1931

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total population per five mile zone</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77,4</td>
<td>48,879</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>71,522</td>
<td>63,222</td>
<td>82,872</td>
<td>62,292</td>
<td>119,075</td>
<td>149,409</td>
<td>181,023</td>
<td>923,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total population per ten mile zone  | 126,321 | 139,612 | 110 | 181,367 | 330,432 | 923,842 |

| Number of settlements              | 105 | 79 | 60 | 78 | 99 | 125 | 73 | 88 | 104 | 121 | 932 |

| Average size of settlements        | 741 | 613 | 1134 | 916 | 638 | 662 | 853 | 1353 | 1436 | 1496 | 991 |

### Settlements Grouped by Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-499</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1999</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-4999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-9999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000-199999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000-499999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50000-999999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100000+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percents given to nearest whole number)

**Total population per five mile zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mile Zone</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% Increase since 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120,486</td>
<td>+54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>82,721</td>
<td>+60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>92,792</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>118,190</td>
<td>+69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>97,778</td>
<td>+55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>119,476</td>
<td>+152%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>157,568</td>
<td>+56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>421,573</td>
<td>+170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>404,892</td>
<td>+160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>470,209</td>
<td>+126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,085,685</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total population per ten mile zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mile Zone</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% Change since 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>203,027</td>
<td>+54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>210,982</td>
<td>+69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>217,254</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>579,141</td>
<td>+65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>97,778</td>
<td>+55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>119,476</td>
<td>+44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>157,568</td>
<td>+152%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>421,573</td>
<td>+254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>404,892</td>
<td>+170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>470,209</td>
<td>+160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,085,685</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of settlements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mile Zone</th>
<th>Total Settlements</th>
<th>% Change since 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>+37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>+35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>+62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>+88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>+57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>+219%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>+165%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1326</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average size of settlements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mile Zone</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% Change since 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>+13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>+26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>+36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>+152%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>+254%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2935</td>
<td>+170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1572</td>
<td>+160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>595</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Settlements grouped by size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-499</td>
<td>7 8</td>
<td>17 24</td>
<td>7 14</td>
<td>22 22</td>
<td>20 19</td>
<td>19 26</td>
<td>34 40</td>
<td>42 46</td>
<td>29 34</td>
<td>44 40</td>
<td>241 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>44 48</td>
<td>26 37</td>
<td>29 38</td>
<td>45 38</td>
<td>22 21</td>
<td>31 20</td>
<td>24 22</td>
<td>24 22</td>
<td>24 22</td>
<td>24 22</td>
<td>24 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1999</td>
<td>21 23</td>
<td>20 28</td>
<td>15 24</td>
<td>28 29</td>
<td>15 18</td>
<td>17 24</td>
<td>13 15</td>
<td>12 13</td>
<td>13 15</td>
<td>8  7</td>
<td>162 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2999</td>
<td>13 14</td>
<td>2  3</td>
<td>4  6</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>6  7</td>
<td>7 10</td>
<td>9 11</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>3  3</td>
<td>6  5</td>
<td>53  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-4999</td>
<td>5  5</td>
<td>2  3</td>
<td>3  9</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>4  5</td>
<td>2  3</td>
<td>4  5</td>
<td>6  7</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>3  3</td>
<td>31  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000-9999</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>3  4</td>
<td>3  9</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>3  3</td>
<td>5  6</td>
<td>6  5</td>
<td>24  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000-1999</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20000-4999</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>5  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50000-9999</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>2  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100000-</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>1  1</td>
<td>2  2</td>
<td>2  1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages given to nearest whole numbers)

1. "Number of settlements" refers to actual number of settlements mentioned in Census.
2. Totals in "Settlements grouped by size are generally smaller than above as settlements were sometimes grouped together for the 1963 census enumeration."
Such a thesis is enhanced by comparing the percentage increases of total population in boundary areas with zones further in the interior of the state. Within 30 miles of the boundary population per zone averaged only a 54% increase, whereas in zones 7 to 10 the average increase exceeded 180%. Thus, although the boundary areas as a whole may not be decreasing in population, the rates of increase are not as great as in the state interior and this may suggest a migration from the largely rural frontier to the more economically developed and urbanized interior. The zone with this relatively slow increase is found within 30 miles of the boundary. The width of this zone, however, appears to be decreasing. In both 1951 and 1963 zones 8 to 10 had population numbers distinctly greater than the seven zones near the boundary. At both population enumerations, zone 10, the furthest from the border, had the largest population. This zone did not, however, have the largest rate of increase in the intervening 12 years. The increase (at 160%) was relatively high but in zone 9 it was 171% and in zone 8 over 250%. Thus in these zones of relatively high population there has been a tendency for the highest growth to be in areas towards the fringes of the state the frontier zone becoming smaller as the ecumene extends.

Though decreasing in width the frontier zone is still an important feature of the landscape. It is a relatively underdeveloped area with a slower rate of population growth than interior areas. The average size of settlements decreases towards the boundary and within ten miles of the line only two settlements have more than 5,000
inhabitants. This rural characteristic has a retarding effect on the economy of the area despite a physical environment similar to more developed areas nearer the interior of the state.

An interesting example of the problems arising in this rural frontier is seen in the field of education. Recent research by the International Labour Organization suggests that in areas such as the frontier zone, where settlements are small and large centres are lacking, education is less effective than in more urbanized areas. The figures illustrating this (see Fig. 22) were calculated from samples in Ibadan, Ife, Otta and Ilara, the latter two settlements being 30 and 20 miles from the boundary respectively.

As the statistics indicate, in the Western Region of Nigeria an average of only 42% of school children completed their primary-school course. In Ibadan, the largest town in the region, 80% completed the course compared with approximately 50% in rural towns such as Otta and Ilara. In small villages (with populations of less than 700 persons) only 15% of the pupils completed their primary education - and this occurred despite primary education being free throughout the region. Thus, in an area such as the frontier zone under discussion, where settlements are generally small and which decrease in size towards the boundary, levels of literacy and education must be considerably lower than in more interior districts.

The frontier zone, so evident in settlement and communications, can also be detected in a more economic sphere in the form of market
### Percentage of Primary School Children not completing Primary Course in Western Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages with population</th>
<th>0 - 700</th>
<th>84.9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>700 - 1000</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 - 2000</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 - 5000</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All West</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(From the Interim Report on Education in a Rural Area of Western Nigeria, I L O, March 1967)*
prices From figures supplied by the Department of Statistics, Ibadan, a local survey was made of market prices for certain locally-grown products in 1966. During that year, prices for given amounts of produce were noted fortnightly at some 25 markets in Western Nigeria. From the average annual figures, maps showing the areal variation in price were constructed. In all maps (see Fig 23) it can be seen how the highest prices are, to a large extent, found in densely populated areas or along major routeways linking such areas. Thus the pattern for most crops shows high prices being paid in the vicinity of Lagos, along the routeway northwards through Abeokuta and Ibadan, and along the route which stretches through Otta towards Dahomey. With all crops considered, prices appear to decrease towards the international boundary and especially in areas away from major roads. In boundary areas between the Meko-Abeokuta road to the north and the international route to the south the price drop is conspicuous up to a shilling per gallon for palm oil and even more per gadabu of maize 

In all, the frontier area is relatively retarded economically and is to a large extent overlooked in development plans. The Economic Commission for Africa is encouraging regional co-operation and such a trend may help to develop boundary areas in the future. So far, however, they appear to have been neglected. New industry, for example, has rarely been sited near a boundary. When a new fibre-bag factory was opened at Badagry, only 15 miles from the boundary, and well within the frontier zone under discussion, considerable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Price Unit per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yams</td>
<td>Shillings per cattie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>Shillings per gadabu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Oil</td>
<td>Pence per gallon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Pence per roboto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>Shillings per basket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collected 1966

For explanation of measures see map notes

- Main road
- Dahomey Nigeria boundary
interest was aroused in its deliberate location "in an area far from the main centres of development" (9)

Thus, on either side of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary is a relative empty zone in relation to communications, population and various economic factors. This zone is not restricted to the boundary under consideration but can be seen in various forms and to a varying degree of development in many parts of Africa (10).

The Border Landscape

It has been shown that once the boundary was drawn between the two colonies and their area determined, it was possible for each state to develop in an attempt to utilize the whole of that area. Development has taken place from the economic and political centres of each state and the function of each state declines from each centre towards the periphery. Thus the boundary is now in a zone where one state merges in some aspects with its neighbour and a frontier, or relatively empty marchland, has developed.

Within this relatively empty zone, however, the boundary has had some positive effects on the geographical landscape. Lapradelle describes this as "le voisinage" (11) while "border landscape" (12) is given as the equivalent by Prescott. Both terms are expressions describing the way in which a boundary has influenced the geographical landscape in some positive form on either side. Prescott discusses four aspects of the subject. Initially he considers the boundary as an element in the cultural landscape, the construction of buildings,
defences, and systems of communications required for the efficient functioning of the boundary. Secondly there is the aspect of boundary landscape which deals with the variations of landscape and land use on either side of the boundary due to two adjacent but different political and economical systems. Thirdly the boundary may have an effect on boundary peoples and lastly on policies of the two adjacent states. This positive effect of the boundary can often be seen in the field in the form of an increase in population and communications density in the immediate vicinity of the boundary and the width of this zone of influence varies with the importance and effectiveness of the boundary.

It has been seen that those roads built and maintained by the government of each state decreased, in general, towards the boundary, and on only two occasions crossed into the neighbouring state. This is not the case, however, with roads and bush-tracks which have not necessarily been built by the state. Fig 19, for example, shows the distribution of cells containing seasonal routes. These are rough tracks which are normally passable by four-wheeled transport only during the dry-season. In both Nigeria and Dahomey there is a tendency for this type of routeway to increase as the boundary is approached. The highest number of cells containing seasonal tracks is found in zone 1 in Nigeria and in zone 2 in Dahomey.

With footpaths, in Nigeria at least, the increase towards the boundary is even more pronounced. Fig 24 indicates the length in
miles of footpaths within the 32 cells of each five-mile zone. It can be seen that the highest and lowest mileages are found in zones 1 and 10 respectively. With 456 miles, zone 1 has a total mileage more than 100 miles greater than the second highest total.

Similarly, with first and second-class roads, despite a general decrease towards the edge of the state, there is a sharp increase in zone 1 within five miles of the boundary. This feature is largely explained by roads following the boundary as they converge on a particular crossing point (See Figs 24–26). Moreover, when the boundary was delimited it often followed existing routeways which later became surfaced in some cases. This latter factor to some extent explains the sudden increase of villages in the vicinity of the boundary (See Fig. 27). In 1951, for example, zone 1 had the largest number of villages within 25 miles of the boundary. A considerable number of settlements, however, existed in pre-colonial times, and after the boundary had been demarcated along existing routeways, found themselves to a large extent within Nigeria. In the Boundary Commissioner’s Report of 1900, for example, of nearly 30 villages mentioned in relation to the boundary north of 9° north, two-thirds were placed in the Nigerian side. Thus there is not such a corresponding increase in settlement numbers in the immediate vicinity of the boundary within Dahomey.

In considering the frontier zone and the border landscape together (in respect of population totals for each zone) a general
### Fig. 24

**DISTRIBUTION OF TRACKS AND FOOTPATHS ON THE NIGERIAN SIDE OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>*18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | 456 | 291 | 277 | 329 | 283 | 330 | 309 | 344 | 333 | 242 | 3194 |

*Figures in miles per cell calculated from 1:500,000 map of Nigeria, 1960*
**Fig. 25**

**DISTRIBUTION OF FIRST AND SECOND CLASS ROADS ON THE NIGERIAN SIDE OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in miles per cell, calculated from the 1:500,000 map of Nigeria, 1960.
TOTAL DISTRIBUTION OF ALL ROADS AND TRACKS ON THE NIGERIAN SIDE OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>626</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in miles per cell calculated from the 1:500,000 map of Nigeria, 1960.
### DISTRIBUTION OF SETTLEMENTS ON EACH SIDE OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY

![Fig. 27](image-url)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAHOMEY</th>
<th>NIGERIA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Computed from 1:500,000 maps of Dahomey (1961) and Nigeria (1960)

R = Rise in settlement numbers in zones adjacent to boundary)
decrease in settlement numbers towards the border is shown, except in the immediate vicinity of the boundary where there is a sudden increase. Although such a trend appears quite clear from the zone totals, such a distribution may have occurred by chance. For a more accurate picture, it is necessary to consider the 32 individual zones which run east-west from the boundary towards the interior of each state. (See Fig. 27.) With regard to the total it was seen that in Nigeria, and within a certain distance of the boundary, settlement numbers suddenly increased in the last five miles or so. In other words, moving from zone 10 to zone 1, settlement numbers fluctuated apparently at random then decreased consistently through the frontier zone until a few miles within the boundary, when numbers rose again. On the Dahomean side of the boundary, settlement numbers again fluctuated at random in the interior, decreased and rose again. Within five miles of the boundary, however, settlement numbers dropped again. To some extent this may be explained by the way the boundary was delimited when most of the villages along the border were placed at the Nigerian side. In considering the two zones on the Dahomean side and the one zone in the Nigerian it is seen that the average of the three (55 settlements) is still considerably above adjacent zones on either side.

To measure the presence of the border landscape within the frontier zone each east-west zone has been underlined where it corresponds with the pattern achieved by the totals. (Fig. 27) On the Nigerian side of the boundary zones are underlined where settlement totals show a drop or a drop followed by a rise whilst in Dahomey,
underlined figures indicate either a drop followed by a rise, or, as in the totals, a drop followed by a rise and a drop. An interesting and distinct pattern emerges, and if the individual east-west zone repeats the pattern of the total, the letter "R" has been placed at the appropriate point along the boundary. In Nigeria numbers decrease towards the boundary in every one of the east-west zones and at the other side of the boundary the same occurs in all but one of the 30 zones. The drop in settlements may take place suddenly over ten miles or may occur gradually over the 50-mile band of country studied. On average, however, this frontier zone is considerably wider within Nigeria, where it is approximately 30 to 35 miles wide. Such a zone could not occur in such a small state as Dahomey and there settlements begin on average a steady decrease in numbers 25 miles from the boundary. On each side of the boundary half of the east-west zones show a rise in settlement numbers in the vicinity of the boundary. These zones are found predominantly in the south and - as will be shown in Chapter 12 - this concentration on both sides is to some extent related to smuggling and legal cross-boundary trading. Along the northern section the increase in settlement numbers near the boundary is more related to the results of delimitation when villages along certain stretches of trade routes were placed collectively on one side or the other.

A study of the settlement distribution based on the 1,500,000 map provided similar results. On both sides of the boundary a frontier zone existed and within which a border landscape had developed as a positive effect of the boundary.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE EFFECT OF THE BOUNDARY ON SETTLEMENT

In Chapters 5 and 6 various effects of the boundary on settlement have already been indicated. In Chapter 5 it was shown how the existing pattern of settlement was very much taken into account by the boundary-makers, and when the boundary was actually delimited the position of each existing settlement would appear to have been carefully considered. After partition it was shown in Chapter 6 how the boundary functioned as both a positive and negative force in the geographical landscape. As a negative factor it was seen how a frontier zone had developed with regard to population distribution, settlements became fewer and smaller towards the edge of the state. As the result of a positive force a border landscape had developed where settlement numbers, if not population numbers, tended to increase in the immediate vicinity of the boundary. The most apparent factor in increasing the number of settlements near the boundary is probably the establishment of customs posts and other centres of control (police, health, quarantine) on routeways between Dahomey and Nigeria and on either side of the boundary. Customs posts were not necessarily constructed in existing settlements. On the Dahomean side of the
boundary the first customs post was created in 1901 at Igolo on the main Porto Novo - Lagos road, about 30 miles from Porto Novo. Also in the Porto Novo area is the Dja customs post. In 1906 a post was established at Adjarr to but this was later moved to Merdjonou. The post at Bloblo was established in 1923, that at Pobé in 1932, Ponton in 1936, Modogan in 1938, Nkki in 1939, Savé in 1942, Djabatta and Irikongy in 1944 and finally Semeplan in 1947. On the Nigerian side of the boundary customs posts were established at Idioko, Meko, Ijoun, Ifonyintedo, Ijoffin, Idopetu, Ohumbe, Chikanda, and the Hulk Sentinel near Badagry. (See Fig 28)

Other factors affecting settlement development on either side of the boundary include smuggling and the differing administrations on either side. It will be shown later in the thesis how smuggling may account for a considerable number of settlements, while others have been established as a result of post-partition migration - itself a partial result of differing colonial policies on either side of the boundary.

The Igolo-Idioko Crossing Point

The establishment of the boundary did not stop at merely producing a string of customs and immigration posts. Some of these posts have developed into settlements of considerable size. Idioko today (on the major cross-boundary route), for example is a settlement of some 3,500 people, and has developed around a control post "under the iroko tree" Of the total population there are probably 250 or more officials working at the customs post as customs officers, police, immigration officers. These people with their families provide
CUSTOMS POSTS ALONG THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY
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a relatively rich market in comparison with surrounding districts, which, with the passing travellers (at a rate of 2,000 per week),\(^{(3)}\) has proved attractive to petty traders.

It is rare with the political divisions of Africa to find the customs posts actually situated on the boundary line.\(^{(4)}\) Among several reasons for this is the fact that when the customs posts were established at the turn of the century the precise position of the boundary was very often not known. As a result centres of customs control were often built in pairs, one on each side of the boundary and at some distance apart. The Dahomey-Nigeria boundary is no exception. The present customs post at Idiroko is situated on the Nigerian side of the boundary while the Dahomey post is situated a short distance away in Igolo. It should prove interesting to see what occurs when the raison d'etre of these two small settlements is removed when a new combined customs centre is opened. With sleeping accommodation provided for in the plans of the new customs house the income of the sleeping mat vendors, for example, will be sharply reduced. The new Nigeria-Ghana highway which crosses the boundary here will avoid Idiroko completely (See Fig. 29). There will be no reason for international traffic to enter the settlement. Petty traders will also be largely redundant in their present site. If they move, and this is likely, to the new customs post from both Idiroko and Igolo a completely new Nigeria/Dahomey settlement may develop while the former settlements will most probably decline into mere dormitory centres for boundary officials.

Since the establishment of the boundary between Dahomey and
THE IGOLO-IDIROKO CROSSING POINT
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Nigeria virtually all cross-boundary movement has been funneled through this route which leaves Nigeria at Idiroko. In pre-colonial times a small hamlet did exist on the present site as Idiroko is mentioned in the Boundary Commissioners Report of 1896. However, with the establishment of a customs post there at the beginning of this century, the settlement has developed into a village of considerable size and with a function depending almost entirely on the international boundary and its working. Today, although the village has a population approaching 3,500, only a small percentage was born in the village. Probably up to half of the population are directly involved or dependent on the various functions of the boundary - working in the customs, immigration or police force. This explains why the village has a large and temporary immigrant population as the customs and immigration officers come from all parts of Nigeria. In 1967 the population of Idiroko increased even more with the influx of troops into the settlement. After the declaration of independence by the then Eastern Region of Nigeria had been announced and later recognized by several African states the function of the village became increasingly one of a defensive boundary post. Soldiers guarded the limits of Nigerian territory and controlled all traffic crossing the boundary.

The extent to which the boundary influences the function of the village can be adequately seen in Plates I and II. In both photographs all buildings utilized by the customs authorities, immigration officials and the police are indicated in red. In the centre
of Plate I the two customs buildings can be seen at each side of the central square through which the international traffic must pass. The remaining buildings shown in red are, on the whole, quarters for customs or immigration officials. Buildings in blue (Plate I) show shops and refreshment bars which largely cater for the through traffic. Buildings uncoloured largely belong to the indigenous inhabitants of the village. The majority of these buildings are in the southern part of the settlement and appear to the left of the picture. Such a distribution largely coincides with the distribution of thatched roofs (as opposed to those of corrugated iron) and represents the original core of the village. The maps accompanying Plate I and subsequent air photographs of Idiroko indicate the area of ground shown in each particular photograph.

Plate II looks to the south-west and largely encompasses the whole of Idiroko. Again the buildings utilized by customs, immigration officials and the police are indicated in red. To the left of the picture is the nucleated village and stretching parallel to the road is a ribbon development of customs and police barracks. This photograph clearly indicates how Idiroko is situated on the banks of the Ajarra stream which forms the boundary in this area. It is also easy to observe how cultivated land is confined to the Nigerian side of the boundary. This is largely because the River Ajarra here forms quite a broad belt of low-lying marshy land which is usually too wet for cultivation and, moreover, difficult to cross. During the rainy season the Ajarra floods and the road into Dahomey has had to be constructed on an embankment.
Plate III shows the newly constructed international highway which swings away to the right approximately half a mile from Idiroko. When Idiroko was last visited (April 1968) this road was not in use and all international traffic had still to pass through Idiroko. However, when the new combined Dahomey/Nigeria customs centre is opened there will be no need for international traffic to enter the village.

Plate IV shows the new customs centre which has recently been completed. As the photograph indicates, the boundary follows the Ajarra which lies in the marshy, vegetation-filled valley and is totally unsuitable for building. Thus the new border post had to be built on one side of the boundary rather than on it. The Nigerian side was chosen and each state has its own building within one large compound a few hundred yards or so from the actual boundary. On the left of the photograph, also in red, are shown the existing Dahomean customs and immigration posts in Igolo village. The buildings shown in blue in Plate IV were all constructed in the ten months between June 1967 and April 1968. Most of the buildings are either shops or refreshment halls and were built in anticipation of the opening of the new customs centre. Thus in the last two years there has been a conspicuous migration towards the boundary itself. Although still somewhat skeletal in form, one can observe the beginnings of a linear settlement developing as the raison d'être of two settlements (Igolo and Idiroko) is partially moved to a site between the two. Already there is an almost constant ribbon development from Idiroko, through
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Ikolaje, past the new customs centre, across the boundary and on
through Igolo. Part of this development is seen in Plate V. At the
bottom of this latter picture one can see the road from Idiroko
joining the new international highway at Ikolaje. Near the boundary
is the new customs centre (in red) surrounded by the group of new
buildings and across the Ajarra stream a string of buildings stretches
on to Igolo. A considerable amount of building is forecast to
concentrate at each side of the Ajarra near the new centre. Igolo
and Idiroko will no doubt remain dormitory centres for the boundary
officials but each will lose its importance as a minor market centre
when traders move near the boundary.

Further Boundary Effects on Settlement

Apart from the boundary being the raison d'être of certain
settlements, the political division has had, in some cases, consider-
able effect on the morphology of existing villages. Ilara, for
example, is a small village (population 2,300) situated on the
boundary 17 miles south-west of Meko. When the boundary was delimited
in 1889, Ilara was placed entirely within Nigeria. Today the settle-
ment is split by the boundary. The boundary line superimposed on
Plate VI indicates most clearly how much of the village is situated
within Nigeria while a section of the settlement parallels a seasonal
road leading into Dahomey. Boundary posts which were erected in
farmland belonging to Ilara are now to be found within the built-up
area of the village as is clearly seen in Plate VII. Since the
establishment of the boundary there has been some amount of ribbon
development along the route into Dahomey. In most cases the siting of the buildings has not been haphazard as new buildings were specifically built in Dahomey despite some difficulties of taxation and the de jure charge in nationality. Immediately over the boundary line the inhabitants can legally trade in Dahomean merchandise. Thus, while goods brought up from Ibadan and Lagos are on sale in the Nigerian half of the settlement, goods from Cotonou and Porto Novo can be bought in the Dahomean sector. While stalls in the Nigerian half stocked goods entirely made in Nigeria or imported through Lagos, the traders across the boundary were seen to be selling goods originating from both Dahomey and Nigeria. This was attributed to the difference in customs effectiveness. While the Dahomean authorities to some extent overlooked Nigerian goods on sale in Dahomey Ilara, a strict watch was kept for Dahomean goods entering the Nigerian section.

In the Dahomean sector of the village one trader had an estimated annual turnover approaching £8,000. Almost all his goods went into Nigeria. The trader in question was born in the Nigerian section of Ilara and moved some 50 yards into Dahomey to build a shop and a house in 1962. Despite the relative isolation of the village from Porto Novo and Cotonou the inevitably higher prices of the goods stocked were still considerably below those existing in Nigeria. This can be seen in Fig. 30 which shows the prices for selected articles in Porto Novo (Dahomey), Ilara (on the boundary) and Abeokuta (Nigeria).

Ilara may also be taken as an example of a settlement whose function has been influenced by the boundary. Since the border was
PRICES FOR SELECTED ARTICLES IN PORTO NOVO, ILARA, AND ABEOKUTA

(MAY 1968)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DAHOMEY (Porto Novo)</th>
<th>BOUNDARY (Ilara)</th>
<th>NIGERIA (Abeokuta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gin (1 bottle)</td>
<td>800 Fr (26/-)</td>
<td>900 Fr (29/-)</td>
<td>47/6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whisky (1 bottle)</td>
<td>900 Fr (29/-)</td>
<td>1000 Fr (32/-)</td>
<td>51/3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 cigarettes</td>
<td>800 Fr (26/-)</td>
<td>900 Fr (29/-)</td>
<td>50/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C F A Francs and Nigerian Pounds)
established Ilara has developed into an important rural market centre (See Chapter 9) Today, with the village stretching across the boundary, its market attracts traders from both countries. People and produce are brought from as far as 150 miles away. Despite the periodic customs checks the dual nationality of the village makes it possible for Nigerians to buy cheaper Dahomean goods and the Dahomeans to stock up with cheaper Nigerian produce.

The Effect of using Marshland and Rivers as the Boundary Site

During the last 50 years writers have generally expounded the virtues of marshland for use as a boundary site. Semple describes marshes and swamps as more effective than rivers and forming one of the natural boundaries that segregate. She quotes such historical examples as the Romney Marsh in England which fixed the western boundary of the Saxon kingdom of Kent and also the Bourtanger Moor which acted as a frontier between Holland and Hanover. Like Semple, most writers on boundary classification have taken examples from temperate latitudes and more especially from Europe and North America. In general little work has referred to historical boundaries or frontiers within the tropics.

From observation in Africa it is suggested that the maxim of marshlands making good boundaries must be re-examined. To decide on the relative value of a tract of marshland as some form of frontier the area must be considered in relation to the surrounding region. In the European context the marsh had little economic value. Whether the
marsh provided the boundary of the English parish or some large scale national frontier it was always a barrier, an area to be avoided, it had little or no attraction save as an area of asylum during times of war. Such marshy areas are found in Africa and an area in particular is found along the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary.

North of Porto Novo stretching for 30 or 40 miles is an area of marsh which is largely devoid of population, roads, and any economic activity (See Fig 31). Relative to the surrounding country the marshland in question is too wet for agricultural exploitation and from pre-colonial times the area has acted as a frontier. During the long period of warfare between Dahomey and the Egba in the nineteenth century the area provided a refuge for minority groups and today appears as an anthropological shatter zone occupied by such tribal sub-groups as the Nago and Ahor.

Not all areas of marshland in Africa however must be looked upon in this light. In regions where rainfall is lighter or in places where rainfall is distinctly seasonal, a tract of marsh may exist as such for only a short period during the year and for the remainder provide the only area where agriculture may take place. Thus, in savanna and grassland areas where rainfall is seasonal, marshland may provide a relatively attractive area for settlement and occupation. In his "Analysis of Boundaries in Intertropical Africa" (9) Barbour quotes an example from Western Sudan between Dafur and Wadai where the dry season lasts for about seven months of the year. During this winter period animal owners as well as cultivators move to the large
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sandy wadis to take advantage of the shallow wells in their bed. Summer cultivation, too, proves most profitable in the alluvial soils of the wadis and so the population map throughout the year picks out the drainage lines with large areas much less densely populated in between. However, the international boundary between the Sudan and Chad has been sited for much of its length along the Wadis Kaja and Tini. As Barbour continues, "the convenient physical boundary proves therefore to be more of a magnet than a barrier between peoples." (10)

Similar circumstances occur along the northern section of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary where the boundary line cuts through an area of marshland for some 50 miles. In the European context marshy areas have often proved excellent frontier zones and thus, to the European boundary commission, such an area might have appeared an excellent site for a boundary. However, in the relatively dry area - as in the northern savanna and scrubland of Nigeria - the areas of marsh and surface water has undoubtedly proved to be an attraction rather than a suitable international barrier. This can be seen in Fig. 31 which shows the site of all marked settlements on the 1,500,000 map in relation to rivers and marshland. Marshland along two sections of the boundary is shown near Eggua in the south and in the vicinity of Babana in the north. In the northern section there is a conspicuous cluster of settlements where the boundary cuts through the area of marsh which occurs along the upper courses of several of the Niger tributaries. Associated with cross-boundary movement in the
northern area of the boundary is the problem of nomadism. In the north is the region of the Fulani cattle people who, as the dry season approaches, lead their herds of cattle and also goats towards the Niger which forms a perennial source of water. The east-west tributaries of the Niger which cross Borgu and the international boundary may be seasonal like the other Niger tributaries and there is some cattle migration to and fro across the international division toward the Niger. Thus where water is scarce, as in this northern area, marshland appears attractive to settlement whilst in the southern section excessive water produces an area largely devoid of settlement.

In Chapter 5, which dealt with the nature of the boundary, it was shown how rivers were used in several places as the political divide between the two countries. The river Okpara (a tributary of the Ouémé) forms the international boundary for approximately 80 miles (See Fig 32). The border follows this river along the middle section of its course, while the headwaters and lower section are in Dahomey. Similar situations are quite common in West Africa. The boundary between Dahomey and Togo follows the Mono River for part of its length. Rivers divided like this between two states are often a source of friction and so it will probably be of value to determine what economic value the river is or might be to the riverine peoples. In the future, transportation downstream or the use of a common water resource for power or irrigation may provide problems. Though the river is easily distinguishable as a divide between two countries, its
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function as a boundary may be modified considerably if the river forms an area of attraction. In a part of Africa where the natural regions run east-west and where road transport is difficult, the north-south river and its valley may tend to form a single economic unit rather than an adequate politico-economic divide.

Similar circumstances of a riverine boundary are found for a short distance along the headwaters of the Yewa River to the west of Ibadan.

Watercourses used as political divides are frequently, and in more economically advanced territories, rightly criticized. In the case of the Yewa and other rivers in the area, it appears that the waterway was used in pre-colonial times as a political boundary rather than a factor of attraction to surrounding peoples. A similar situation is found further to the east along the River Ogun. Although the river was used by the Egba for trade with the coast, the river was used to some extent as a political barrier. At Abeokuta only recently has there been urban development on the west bank facing Dahomey. Moreover, in a region of seasonal river-flow and with a rock-strewn watercourse, there was little encouragement for the development of important riverine waterways providing sources of attractions rather than natural barriers to be used as political divides.
CHAPTER EIGHT

THE EFFECT OF SPLITTING EXISTING POLITICAL UNITS

In pre-colonial Africa the major unit to which the individual appears to have given allegiance, apart from the family or clan, was the settlement in which he lived and the tribe into which he was born. Today the only example of a village being split by the boundary seems to be Ibara and as we have seen, such a division has been deliberately created in the post-partition period for economic reasons. Nevertheless, the boundary must have crossed land belonging to villages existing at the time of partition. At the other extreme it has been shown that despite initial intentions existing indigenous political units were split. In this chapter, an attempt is therefore made to analyse the results of splitting existing political units at these two levels of village and kingdom.

The Village and the Economically Functional Boundary

When the boundary was delimited the boundary commissioners paid considerable attention to local conditions wherever possible. The boundary was drawn around existing settlements and though at times it
followed existing tracks it did so at a distance and was taken across them as little as possible. Thus, as was shown in Chapter 5, long sections of the boundary are formed by a series of arcs and semi-circles skirting boundary settlements. Such places as Gurai and Kenube in Ilorin Province, Nigeria, are centres of boundary semi-circles whose radii are up to ten miles long. Considering such a situation and bearing in mind the widely scattered nature of agricultural land surrounding the settlements, it is very probable that today village lands are split by the boundary. As Goddard\(^1\) has shown for Oyo, settlements in this part of Africa depend on farmland distributed over a wide radius. However, it must be remembered that most boundary settlements have grown rapidly since partition and the semi-circles drawn then might have adequately surrounded the agricultural land belonging at that time to any particular border village.

The function of this boundary as a barrier has not been enforced and, as we have seen, local movement from one side to the other has continued. Under the original boundary agreement border populations were allowed to keep any land belonging to them in the adjacent state, and the movement to grazing lands and water supplies was allowed to continue. In other words, the boundary had very little meaning in the day-to-day life of the peasant farmer near the border. As villages grew, on the Nigerian side for example, the expansion in some cases was greater on that side of the boundary. This was not due particularly to the functions of the boundary as a barrier but rather
more to the better roads and more markets developing at that side of the boundary.

With only a scatter of customs posts and few roads near or crossing the boundary, the latter is only seen to function in a few areas. With limited or no demarcation and a lack of motorable roads for customs patrol, agricultural economies have been able to continue functioning in a pattern similar to pre-partition times. With no complete line of boundary markers, barbed wire fences or a strip of felled woodland as in parts of Europe, for example, it has been possible for farmers to continue cultivating land over the border, although many village markets have not been able to maintain their trading region, and the local migration of market traders has continued despite the international division. Moreover, because of little or no customs supervision some village markets in Nigeria still have a hinterland within Dahomey and vice-versa.

Thus it is possible to envisage a situation where, in certain local aspects, the economic boundary between the two countries varies areally from the political line dividing Dahomean and Nigerian settlements. There are various factors which might have aided such development. Initially, one could consider the physical landscape as a factor, where pre-colonial marketing areas and trade movements might have been influenced by physical regions. Between the Okpara and the Niger, for instance, there are several rivers, including the Niger, which cross the boundary in a transverse direction. These river valleys functioned both as a routeway, and to some extent as a local economic
unit, and on a local level take little heed of the political division.

Fig. 33, for example, shows the position of the political boundary in relation to the drainage pattern and main watershed. Although both run in a general north-south direction there is considerable variation between the two. Nikki, it can be seen, is situated at the head of the Oli, one of the Niger tributaries in Dahomey. This valley which crosses the boundary has for long been a minor routeway with considerable commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Nikki and such settlements as Yashikera and Gwelte in Nigeria. (These latter two are among several settlements in the area which claim to be founded by Nikki and inhabitants in both villages have relatives living across the border.) Despite the ban existing (at the time of field work) on the export of foodstuffs from Nigeria, the long established trade in agricultural produce between settlements in Nigeria and Nikki still continues. However, most of the movement is into Nigeria and is therefore legal. Today, settlements as far south as Shaki (approximately 120 miles away) obtain supplies of yam flour, maize and millet from Nikki - apart from goods of more dubious agricultural origin. The movement up-valley on the other hand is comprised mostly of manufactured goods. On sale in Nikki were considerable quantities of plastic and enamelware from Ibadan and Lagos. The main reason for this was that Nikki was nearer to Ibadan by motorable road than to Cotonou 234 miles as opposed to 315 miles. Road surfaces on the Nigerian side of the boundary are also, for much of the distance incomparably better than the equivalent major roads.
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in Dahomey. Thus for goods entering Dahomey legally the duty was often offset by considerably lower transport charges.

Apart from some movement of cattle, most other movement along the valley today is by motor vehicle along the Yashikera-Nikki road. Traffic is light but constant. Records at Chikanda on the boundary indicate that there are approximately fifty vehicles per month. These figures conceal the fact that, apart from the occasional tourist, there are in reality only three or four lorries which cross the boundary. These ply to and fro between Nikki and Yashikera or Shakī taking food one way and manufactured goods in the opposite direction. One must not over-emphasise, however, the trans-boundary movement in this area. The main roads from Nikki lead to southern and central Dahomey. The road leading to Nigeria is extremely poor on the Dahomean side of the boundary and is not always passable except for heavy lorries. What is stressed, however, is that despite a political boundary and tariff barrier in the area, related settlements continue to maintain pre-colonial social and economic relationships to a considerable extent - though no doubt in a modified form.

Communications may also affect the economic orientation of settlements in a region where customs control is largely absent. In some areas of the boundary, roads and (in the case of Dahomey) a railway, run parallel with the border. As Fig 34 shows, a road may run within two or three miles of the Nigerian side of the boundary, while the Dahomean counterpart may be up to 40 miles away. Thus a
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Fig. 34

- Area of Dahomey economically part of Nigeria
- Area of Nigeria economically part of Dahomey
- Main road
- Settlement
- Track, foot path
- International boundary
- Economic frontier

Legend:
- Green indicates Dahomey
- Pink indicates Nigeria

Map highlights the economic frontier and the main roads and settlements between Dahomey and Nigeria.
settlement in Dahomey perhaps five or ten miles from the boundary would find the road in Nigeria considerably nearer than that in its own territory. In such a situation, where there is no effective customs barrier between that village and the nearest road, it is not unusual for the inhabitants to use that road in the neighbouring state as an outlet for locally produced foodstuffs as well as to bring in imported goods. Such a situation occurs with villages like Sandilo, Diguidirou and Tiapa. All three settlements are situated in Dahomey, but the nearest motorable road in that country is up to 25 miles away. Towards the east, however, there is a road on the Nigerian side of the boundary and which is less than five miles away in places. With small populations of two or three hundred persons and not being under any effective customs supervision, the inhabitants of these villages can walk or travel by bicycle to centres in Nigeria. Thus, people from Sandilo cross over to Suya to sell agricultural produce and occasionally to buy manufactured goods which have come by road from Lagos and Ibadan. Similarly, Tiapa residents trade in Gural. As a result it is quite probable that all the outside economic transactions of these Dahomean settlements may be entirely across the boundary and therefore the villages may be regarded as being economically part of Nigeria. An attempt to illustrate this cartographically is shown in Fig 34 which shows the area along 100 miles of the northern section of the boundary. In this area it proved impossible to visit most of the small settlements situated away from the improved road. However, some idea of their economic orientation was obtained by questioning
inhabitants from these villages when they visited settlements on the road. On the basis of their answers it was possible to draw in the approximate position of a local economic frontier between Dahomey and Nigeria in this locality. Though the economic divide is not so abrupt or clear-cut in actuality, such a map does show the striking influence of the transport network along a boundary whose function is not strictly enforced.

Similar circumstances of an economic frontier varying from the political boundary can be seen where Nigerian settlements are economically orientated towards Dahomey. Such an example is Wasinmi, in Ilorin Province. As is indicated in Chapter 12, the village was first developed by Dahomeans after the boundary was delimited. Though situated on the Nigerian side of the boundary the nearest Nigerian settlement (Ijio) is more than 25 miles away and is only connected by a dry-season foot track (See Fig 68 and Plate VIII). Across the riverine boundary in Dahomey, however, there are several tracks and, within 15 miles or so, a motorable road, a railway and several settlements. Thus, while acting as middleman in the movement of alcoholic liquors to the east and Iseyin cloth to the west, the inhabitants tend to look towards Dahomey for marketing.

The importance of roads and railway lines as factors in the development of this economic boundary is largely due to political factors. As Hodder indicates in his thesis on Yoruba markets, "the importance of roads in maintaining and expanding markets and trading
activities was realised by both the British and French governments in their respective territories, and along the border their competitive aims strongly reflected this realisation. Thus, within ten or so years after the delimitation of a colonial boundary in the area, the French were establishing and encouraging markets in border villages and at the same time linking them to the capital by motorable roads. By 1913 an eight-foot wide road stretched from Porto Novo through boundary settlements to Alagbe near Ketu. At Ifönyi the French authorities built a large market which attracted considerable numbers of people from as far as Ilashe and Humbo on the British side of the border. Markets established at Gbojo and Modogan also attracted customers from the Nigerian side of the border. As a result of official encouragement given to markets on the French side, trade within rural markets on the Nigerian side of the boundary apparently declined. In 1913 there was a complaint that the Dahomean markets at Ifönyi, Gbojo and Modogan had an adverse affect on market trade at Idofa, Asa, Humbo and Meko. The markets in these latter settlements were described as "rather deserted or overgrown, or considerably dwindled in size.

Thus, within 20 years of the establishment of the colonial boundary, settlements in one colony were becoming economically orientated toward the neighbouring state and a functional boundary seemed to be developing in a different location to that of the political division.
Along the southern section of the boundary the attraction of Dahomean markets to people over the border was due, in official opinion, to the new boundary road. In 1913 it was suggested that the chief of Aiyetoro in the then Badagry District be given a trade jurisdiction over Meko District with the intention of establishing markets in the boundary villages in an attempt to divert trade from Dahomey into Nigeria.

In a further attempt to evaluate the existence of a present-day economic boundary between Dahomey and Nigeria the region to the south of the coastal lagoon was considered as superficial map evidence suggested that this part of Nigeria may have been economically orientated towards Dahomey. As indicated in Fig 35, the coastal sand-bar is approaching seven miles wide at the boundary. To the west and north-west lie Porto Novo, a first class road and the railway, all of which are within five miles of the Nigerian border. To the east, the sand-bar decreases in width for approximately 15 miles until it becomes less than one mile in width opposite Badagri. Between the bar and the mainland the lagoon is less than half a mile wide. A sand road stretches from Igbobele on this wedge-shaped piece of territory across the boundary where it connects with the international highway in Dahomey. Being cut off from any sizeable markets in Nigeria by the lagoon on the one hand and being connected by road to the railway, the major routeways and to the largest towns in Dahomey, one might imagine that the area would be very much part of Dahomey. Quite the reverse was found to be the case. The boundary proved to be
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an almost complete economic barrier. On the one side villages look towards Porto Novo to market their produce while immediately the Nigerian sector is reached, people look towards Badagri across the lagoon.

Such a complete division in economic orientation is probably due to the efficiency of the Customs and Excise officials in this area. There is a Dahomean customs post at Dja while Nigeria relies on customs patrols from the centre at Idiroko and a hulk moored on the lagoon. On the Dahomean side of the border villagers were questioned at Poguidi and Dja. In these settlements all goods on display appeared to come from Porto Novo. At Asiri less than two miles away from Dja, but across the boundary, goods on sale came from Badagri. Cigarettes, kerosine and tinned food had all come from Lagos via Badagri. The reason for there being exclusively Nigerian goods on the Nigerian side of the border was given by the inhabitants at Asiri as the customs patrols. Duty receipts were demanded for Dahomean goods on sale in Nigeria. Thus, for manufactured goods at least, whose origins (whether Cotonou or Lagos) were usually obvious, the inhabitants found it more convenient to spend more energy and probably more money in buying things at Badagri. With agricultural produce, however, the picture was considerably different. Although at the time of questioning a ban existed on the export of all foodstuffs, the palm-oil kernels were sent by the lorry-load from the Nigerian side of the boundary to Porto Novo.
The Pre-colonial State  Ketu and Borgu

Along the boundary Ketu and Borgu are the only two units which had any resemblance to a state and which the boundary has been accused of splitting. As was indicated in Chapters 3 and 4, however, both units were split before partition. In this context, therefore, it is pertinent to examine the effects such a fossilization of existing conditions had on their inhabitants.

Ketu

The town of Ketu was destroyed in 1886. In 1889 the colonial boundary was defined, splitting the original kingdom. Four years later, in 1893, the first groups of people returned to the ruined settlement. Groups of Ketu people who had been taken prisoner by Dahomey in the seiges of 1883 and 1886. Two years later, in 1895, the Anglo-French Boundary Commission met at Badagri and delimited the southern section of the boundary. In Ketu the division, which to some extent had existed for a considerable number of years before the destruction of the capital, was used and Ketu town fell to Dahomey while Meko became situated in Nigeria. The political boundary became increasingly effective and the rebirth of any united Ketu kingdom became impossible.

Culturally and socially the kingdom has attempted to some extent to remain one. Replacing what might have proved to be a temporary political frontier by a more permanent international boundary, however, has resulted in the two halves growing increasingly apart, both politically and economically.
Culturally the Ketu people are distinctly one, and even today usually consider themselves as one. When a Ketu king comes to the throne he makes a tour of the pre-colonial kingdom. Today this tradition is continued and the Oba takes several months to move from settlement to settlement, from Dahomey into Nigeria and back into Dahomey. The most recent tour, lasting several months, took place in 1964 when the present Alaketu came to the throne.

Socially there is a strong movement between the two halves of Ketu. Family ties cross the boundary and immigration regulations at Meko are waived to allow Ketu people to cross from one side of the boundary to the other. Politically and economically, however, the international boundary is proving increasingly important as a divide. Economically the boundary has cut Ketu from its main trade links - in the legal aspects at least. Prior to the colonial boundary the main trade route went south from Oyo, through Meko, to Porto Novo. To reach this the people of Ketu had several hours walk to reach Meko. Today such a trade route no longer exists and the boundary and tariff barrier divides Meko from Ketu. Factors which retarded Ketu's trade and development in other directions still remain. To the west is the Fon town of Zagnanado which is linked only by poor roads and even these are cut off for most of the rainy season when the River Ouémé floods. To the south are the Ahorî inhabiting the marshlands which prevented the Porto Novo railway from being extended any further north than Pobé, a small town approximately 25 miles to the south. The boundary, therefore, has stultified Ketu's growth and it is probable
that the town has not regained the size it attained a century ago. Bowen (7) in 1857, for example, gives the population of Ketu town as ten to fifteen thousand inhabitants while the 1947 census gave 10,000 (8).

Across the border in Nigeria, Meko, a once dependent farm, is as big, if not bigger than Ketu, and is much better built. Linked by a surfaced, all-season road to Abeokuta and the large urban centres of Western Nigeria, it has become today the most important settlement in what was the kingdom of Ketu.

To some extent the boundary may be regarded as providing some unity of outlook. That Ketu was originally split by internal forces has long been forgotten and the outcry today is against the region being split by an externally imposed colonial boundary. Like many boundary peoples the border location tends to reinforce any feeling of distinctness from more dominant neighbours on either side. This is especially the case with the Dahomey Ketu surrounded by the Fon and Ahori.

**Borgu**

It is extremely difficult to find any major effects resulting from the boundary dividing Borgu. Research in this direction has only served to show how Borgu was in reality two distinct political spheres under Nikki and Borgu when the boundary was established and brought different colonial masters to each section of Borgu.
In pre-colonial times there had been considerable unity during times of warfare with neighbouring states but the reaction in terms of fighting to the French and British was restricted to each half of Borgu and never was there a unified Borgu rebellion against the colonialists. In 1897 (9) for example, a year before the boundary was delimited across Borgu, the Bariba people rose against the French at Kouandé and Begouru and as a result of the fighting Nikki is reported to have surrendered. No assistance, however, came from the Bussa half of Borgu in the British sphere. Similarly, there was an uprising of the Bariba in 1916 (10) and this again was confined to the French colony. In British Borgu an uprising took place in 1915 (11) after Kitoro Ganl, the chief of Bussa, had been replaced by Turaki who was said to be of slave origin. No reaction or uprising to this move by the British is recorded.

Thus, in general, the boundary dividing Borgu may have replaced an existing frontier. The actual sitting of the boundary, however, did have localized effects within Borgu and provided a considerable problem in the Yashikera area. In this region the boundary follows the road linking Okuta, Boría, Wandu, Gural, and Yashikera in a line one kilometre away and making semi-circles of up to four kilometres radius around the villages. The boundary, however, was placed to the north-west of the road and villages leaving the latter in Nigeria and splitting them from Nikki. Within Nigeria these settlements came under the Emir of Kalama who had been installed by the British and such a situation appears to have been intolerable. In 1907, for instance, when the chief of Yashikera failed to ascend to the Nikki throne because
his settlement was situated in the British colony, he left Yashikera with his followers and settled at Nikki in the French colony. Similarly, in 1930, another chief of the same village committed suicide after he was deposed by the British for his insubordination to the Emir of Kaiama. Even today the older inhabitants and the present chief of Yashikera say their allegiance is to Nikki and not to Kaiama or Bussa. It would, therefore, have probably been more satisfactory had the facts been known, to establish the boundary somewhat to the south-east of its present site and give this string of settlements to Dahomey and the French sector of Borgu.

In both Ketu and Borgu, the key to this possible problem of splitting units is found in the ineffective nature of the boundary. In many aspects the barrier function of the boundary is not enforced and local boundary peoples can move from one state to the other at will. Were an attempt made to close the boundary (as happened between Togo and Ghana for example), or to regulate local movement in the area, or to strictly apply the boundary regulations, then considerable problems would almost certainly arise.
CHAPTER NINE

THE EFFECT OF THE BOUNDARY ON LOCAL POPULATION MOVEMENT AND TRADE

The Dahomey-Nigeria boundary has, in one respect, affected the movement of people and goods with regard to location, quality and quantity of movement and, in another respect, its actual presence of the boundary has created movement across it.

Local Population Movement

Considering local population movement to be that of people and goods over relatively short distances from village to village, or village to farm, it can be seen that the boundary has had little influence. In the boundary agreements, border populations were allowed to keep land across the boundary and move at will. Cultivators who were cut off from their land, at least theoretically, when the boundary was established continue to farm their land today - especially if it is their only property. Such local village-to-farm movement is either daily or seasonal. With the former, the cultivators leave home at day-break on foot, or on bicycle, and travel along the multitude of tracks which cross the boundary. Around Igolo, for example, there are several dozen families having land in Nigerian territory while a mile
or two away in Nigeria some of the inhabitants of Ikolaje and Idiroko have plots of land in Dahomey. According to Mondjannagni, up to 30 families cross the boundary to farm near Savé. It is quite probable, therefore, that such movements take place along most of the boundary - and especially in the densely populated southern section.

As regards the seasonal movement on a local scale, the cultivator usually leaves his village for up to two or three months. This type of temporary migration takes place especially in periods of planting and during the harvest season, and the peasant cultivator usually lives by his plots in a temporary hut. This movement used to take place in both directions along the boundary, but today the movement is mainly from Dahomey into Nigeria. Some writers have attempted to explain this one-way movement by attributing it to the poverty of the soil in Dahomey. A change in soil quality, however, would hardly follow the political boundary and, as Mondjannagni states, the soil in the boundary region is relatively rich. He would suggest that the problem arises from too much systematic exploitation of the land by a densely distributed population which knows nothing of the need to care for the soil. Such a hypothesis can only provide part of the answer, however, and economic factors may play a part. The Dahomean cultivator may be attracted to the Nigerian side of the boundary to grow and sell his crops due to better selling prices for some of his products. With the large urban centres of Yorubaland (Ibadan, 1 million, Lagos, 700,000, Abeokuta, 200,000) there is a much bigger and richer market for his
crops than can be found in Dahomey where the population for the whole country only just exceeds 2 million.

Apart from the movement of cultivators, one must also consider that of the petty traders. Once again the boundary has had little effect on patterns of movement. Markets are held at various intervals along the southern section of the boundary. The traders, usually women, leave their families and move from market to market, village to village, regardless of the boundary.

Another minor, but locally important, cross-boundary movement is that of water carrying. Again this has been little influenced by the political division. Whether streams are near the boundary or actually form it, they often provide a daily meeting place for women and children from both sides of the border. Where the boundary follows the Ajarra stream between Idröko and Igolo, for example, it is usual to see several score women and children walking to the border to fetch water and at the watercourse itself people from both countries may take their bath and water their animals. Thus while the stream forms a conspicuous boundary it does at the same time become a centre of attraction rather than a line of division.

A permanent but localized form of migration occurs with inter-marriage across the boundary. In areas where similar peoples are found on adjacent sides of the boundary this is still common. In Ketu, for example, an area which today is conspicuously split by the boundary, marriages still take place between people of Ketu town and Meko. There are signs, however, that the boundary does have a retarding
influence on this form of movement. As the boundary has an increasing dividing effect on local economies, so too are boundary peoples being drawn apart, to some extent, in their social movements.

Where the boundary crosses the coastal sand-bar the inhabitants on either side are Egun. On questioning, local inhabitants indicated that the border had little effect on their social lives and there was considerable movement to and fro to visit relatives and especially at festivals, births and deaths. Some of those interviewed, however, did think that fewer cross-boundary marriages were taking place. If this is the case it may be largely a result of the decrease in economic movement across the boundary. Boundary peoples looking increasingly towards the political and economic centres of their respective states rather than across the boundary for material benefit and education will also increasingly do so in the social sphere.

Other types of population movement on a local scale, however, have developed entirely because of the boundary and the development of two differing state systems on either side. Thus the very existence of a political division in a particular area has created movement merely to get to the other side one state providing a temporary "push" factor rather than the neighbouring state proving permanently attractive. As Rouch found with migration from French territories into Ghana, considerable impetus to movement stemmed from grievances against the French administration. Along sections of the boundary under discussion, for example, there is a temporary but annual movement into the neighbouring state to avoid taxation. During the two World Wars there
was a significant influx into Nigeria of Dahomeans trying to avoid military service. Such a movement of Dahomeans in 1939, according to Parrinder, led to the depopulation of parts of eastern Dahomey.

A more permanent type of migration has taken place along the northern part of the boundary into Sokoto Province of Nigeria where immigration from surrounding French territories has been encouraged by the construction of wells which were sunk in large numbers after 1928.

Other factors encouraging people to settle on the other side of the boundary include that of forced labour. This was particularly important with regard to the movement from Dahomey to Nigeria as well as from other parts of French West Africa to British territories. During the colonial period three types of forced labour were in use throughout French West Africa. The most common category, and the major source of irritation among the indigenous population, was termed "corvée" or prestation labour. This involved every male between 18 and 60 years of age being subjected to a certain number of days labour per annum and without pay. A second type of labour involved military conscripts and many men were taken into the army primarily for work on public projects rather than for military service. A third group - penal labour - involved prisoners generally serving jail sentences for minor civil offences.

Soon after the introduction of forced labour it was realized that at least the prestation variety was extremely uneconomic, and was
greatly resented by the African population. For boundary dwellers, moreover, a move of a few miles might take them into British territory where such a system did not exist. By moving and living close to the boundary it was found that by returning to Dahomey periodically their old farms could still be cultivated and at the same time several days of enforced labour could be avoided. Such a population movement does not exist today, however, as forced labour was banned soon after the Second World War. In 1946 prestation labour was abolished, in 1947 penal labour was reformed, and in 1950 work on public projects by military conscripts was banned. While it existed, however, such labour did provide a push factor for the Dahomean population and any resulting population migration would, to some extent, help in explaining the higher densities of population which exist today in some places along the Nigerian side of the international boundary, and the sudden drop in the vicinity of the boundary in Dahomey.

Education, too, became a push factor for certain sectors of the Dahomean populace. Unlike the British authorities in Nigeria the French introduced compulsory primary education in Dahomey. This cut down labour on the farms and, to the parents at least, made Nigeria appear more attractive. At the other extreme some people moved across the boundary specifically for education. In West Nigeria, for example, education facilities are considerably better than in Dahomey—especially in secondary and higher education. Thus, in 1967, several
students at the University of Ibadan, and greater numbers at schools in the region, had been born in Dahomey.

Temporary and permanent local migration has taken place from one side of the boundary to the other due to political factors. After the Nigerian military coup d'état on January 15th, 1966, for example, there was an influx of Nigerians into Dahomey. The coup took place on January 15th and by January 20th, it was estimated that over 2000 Nigerian refugees had crossed the boundary. Such a number is probably not an overestimation and it does provide factual evidence of large scale unrecorded movement. Most of the 2000 Nigerian refugees crossed into Dahomey within two or three days of the coup. The immigration figures, however, record only 1146 Nigerians as legally crossing the boundary during the whole month of January, and the majority of these, according to the immigration figures, crossed before the coup. For the sample year October 1965 - September 1966, total movement westward from Nigeria to Dahomey exceeded that to the east. In January, however, this general trend was reversed and recorded movement shows that 3,140 persons crossed at Idiroko into Nigeria and only 2,832 went to the Dahomean side of the boundary. Such totals make the figures for unrecorded movement in the opposite direction all the more impressive.

During the first two weeks of January, movement out of Nigeria averaged 131 and 114 per day for the respective two weeks - similar figures to the average daily movement throughout the previous year. During the latter two weeks of January, however, movement outwards
dropped to an average of 60 persons per day during the third week and 63 per day during the fourth. On the day of the coup, 123 people left Nigeria at Idiroko — an average number for January. On the 16th, when the news of the coup had become widespread, the number of recorded westward travellers fell to 38 and on the 17th to 8 persons. Numbers then increased but remained well below average until the end of the month — only on the last day of the month did numbers exceed 100. Thus, in the three days following the coup in Nigeria, up to 2,000 people crossed the boundary illegally and only 169 at the legal crossing point at Idiroko.

Similarly with movement into Nigeria, numbers decreased considerably after the 15th January. During the first two weeks of January, average daily movements across the boundary exceeded 130 per day. During the third and fourth weeks it dropped to an average of 55 and 76 persons per day. On the day of the coup the number of immigrants was an average 131. The following day this dropped to 57 and on the 17th to 15 persons. Movement then increased again but average figures were not reached again until the end of the month. Most of the refugees from the January coup d'état returned to Nigeria in the following months, the cross-boundary migration being only temporary. A longer term migration began later in 1966 after the Ibo persecutions and the declaration of independence by the Eastern Region of Nigeria. Once the civil war had started between the Federal and Biafran troops, Ibos remaining in Western Nigeria fled across the boundary into Dahomey. In April, 1968, communities of Ibos were found in several
boundary settlements in Dahomey. At Ifonyin, for example, only four miles within Dahomey, a community of over a hundred Ibo refugees were found living in the village. Many had previously been domestic servants in Western Nigeria and had stayed on in employment in Ibadan or Lagos until after the war had started. Anti-Ibo violence and their inability to reach the Eastern Region had then motivated their migration into Dahomey. Unlike the refugees of the January coup in 1966, the Ibo refugees had evidently considered their move to some extent permanent. Despite the initial inability to communicate verbally with the indigenous Fon, the Ibos had started to build their own homes in sections of the village designated by the local chief. Patches of land were being cultivated and some had acquired paid employment. Some of the men had joined the local blacksmith, and some young boys had started work pedalling bicycle taxis. On questioning, the Ibos indicated their desire to return to Eastern Nigeria but such a movement could not be foreseen (1968). Their numbers were increasing steadily in a string of settlements along the boundary. The boundary had thus, by its presence, effected a minor but significant change in the ethnic distribution of the area.

The Effect of the Boundary on Local Trade

In "The Economics of Location" Losch has written on the effect of political boundaries on economic regions. Fig 36 illustrates the comparison between economic frontiers and political boundaries. On the left of the diagram a few typical situations occurring in theoretical
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market regions at the border of the economic landscape are shown, while a political boundary is illustrated on the right. A market centre at 1, for example, might flourish as the economic boundary in itself has no effect. Centre 12, however, could not function as the political boundary would divide the region in two. The size of region 13 would then increase to incorporate the adjacent half of region 12. Regions 4, 5, 16 and 17 would remain unchanged where political and economic boundaries were coincident. Areas such as 2 and 3 would expand towards the economic border unless the intervening area was sufficiently large to support a third market centre. A similar situation would be seen in the case of areas 6 and 7. Areas 10 and 14, whose market areas are cut by the political boundary would have insufficient demand for a market and the areas would be taken over by adjacent market centres. Areas 8 and 9 which overlap are also too small when taken by themselves but could be consolidated into one area centred on the economic boundary. Thus, in the vicinity of the economic and state boundary, market areas become larger and therefore less numerous. As Losch states "the boundary gives more or less the impression of a wasteland, in so far as it is less thickly populated and many products can be obtained only from a distance or not at all. Prices are higher partly because more freight on the average is added to the factory price and partly because there is less competition." (10)

In order to test the Losch thesis a variety of markets were examined in the vicinity of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary. In
Chapter 6 it was shown how a wide frontier zone exists with regard to the geographical landscape as a whole. This, however, largely exists because of the process of state development and an expanding ecumene based on the state as a single unit. In order to determine the actual effect of the political boundary on the economic landscape and more specifically on market areas, six Nigerian markets within the vicinity of the boundary were observed in the Egbado Division of Egbado Province during June 1967. The markets, situated at Meko, Idofo, Oja Ata, Ijoun, Iwoye, and Idi Emi, are all within 20 miles of the boundary (See Fig 37). Meko is the largest of the settlements with a population of approximately 8,000 (1963) and at one time the administrative headquarters of the Egbado Province were situated there. The town is situated at the terminus of the tarred road which stretches westwards from Abeokuta. There is also a relatively complex network of seasonal roads and bush-tracks converging on Meko. The other market settlements are considerably smaller with populations less than 3,000. Idi Emi is the largest with a little more than 2,800. Situated 15 miles to the east of Meko, but on the same tarred road to Abeokuta, this settlement has developed rapidly after being established initially as a market. In the 1952 census it had a recorded population of less than 900 persons. Ijoun is situated on a seasonal but motorable road which parallels both the boundary and an extensive area of uninhabited marshland some 25 miles to the south of Meko. In 1963 the village had a population of approximately 1,800. Idofo has a population of nearly 1,500 and is situated almost on the boundary. It lies on the seasonal
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road less than four miles from Meko on the route to Ketu in Dahomey. Oja Ata (Lit market at the cross roads) as its name suggests, is primarily a market settlement. It is situated about three miles to the east of the boundary on a seasonal track leading from Meko to Ijoun and villages further south.

As market centres, however, their relative importance is considerably different from their size as a settlement. Whereas Meko is the largest settlement within 40 miles, as a market centre it is relatively unimportant. To measure this statistically with any accuracy would require details of the total numbers of people entering each settlement per market-day as well as details of sales within each village. This was impossible, but during June 1967 the numbers of persons entering each market by four-wheeled transport was recorded. These figures are given in Fig 38, and are illustrated graphically by Fig 39. Meko had an average influx by lorry of less than 200 persons each market day. Iđi-Emi, though only a quarter of the size of Meko as a settlement, had between 25 and 30 "mammy-waggons" regularly bringing up to 900 and 1,000 people per market day. Ijoun and Iwoye, of similar size, had four or five lorries bringing around 150 people to trade in the market whilst Oja-Ata, with a population of less than 900 had a market influx of up to 150 daily. Idoa, practically on the boundary, had only two lorries which regularly brought only 30 to 40 people while Ilara, situated astride the boundary, had an influx second only to Iđi-Emi when up to 20 vehicles brought an average of up to 600 persons to the market.
CHARACTERISTICS OF NIGERIAN MARKET SETTLEMENTS IN THE VICINITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY, JUNE 1967

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Vehicles</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ilara</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwoye</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idofa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oja-Ata</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ijoun</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meko</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7896</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idi-Emi</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C: Customs centre or distance from nearest population

Population: 1963 Census figures

Vehicles: Average number of vehicles entering settlement per market day

Passengers: Average total number of passengers brought per market day

Distance: Miles from boundary
As Fig. 39 suggests, there appears to be a direct relationship between the size and importance of the markets and their distance from the international boundary. As a whole it appears that market sizes tend to decrease towards the boundary - though settlements actually sited on the border seem to be influenced by a differing set of factors. As will be discussed more fully later, Ilara is today split by the international boundary and its market size is one of the largest in the vicinity. Similarly Iwoye is virtually on the border and some buildings of the settlement are found in Dahomey. Again its market is relatively large for a settlement of only 1,000 people. More people were found attending Iwoye market than those in such larger settlements as Idofa (pop 1,437) or Ijoun (pop 1,767). Several factors, however, tend to keep Iwoye's market at a size considerably smaller than that of Ilara. The village is situated on a better road than Ilara and is also slightly nearer to the customs centre in Meko. Moreover Ilara is situated on a through-route between Dahomey and Nigeria whereas the improved road from Meko stops in Iwoye.

With the remaining villages, market sizes increased steadily with distance from the boundary and, what is probably more important, with distance from the functional aspect of the boundary - the customs centres.

Idofa (pop 1,057) is approximately half a mile from the boundary and some three miles from the nearest customs post. Only two lorries come to the market regularly bringing an average of 44 passengers.
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The relative unimportance of this village may largely be explained by its position on a through-route half-way between Ilara and Meko. Much of the local traffic by-passes Idofa in favour of these latter settlements. Secondly a customs post was established in the village in 1922 (although it has since closed) and patrols from Meko frequent the area.

Oja-Ata is situated three miles from the boundary and eight miles by road from the nearest customs post. The settlement is small (791) but as the name suggests it was established primarily as a market. Four lorries came regularly to the market compared with two at Idofa - bringing three times as many people.

Ijoun, despite a population more than twice the size of Oja-Ata and twice the distance away from the boundary receives only the same numbers of vehicles on market day bringing a similar number of people. Despite being at the junction of several roads, market development in the village is retarded by the customs post which has existed there since 1919.

Meko with a population of 8,000 and situated eight miles from the boundary faces similar problems. The market is under constant surveillance by the customs and on average only seven vehicles attended the market with less than a total of 200 passengers.

Idi-Emi, on the other hand does not have a customs post and, situated 18 miles inland from the boundary, the market attracts up to 25 vehicles each day carrying up to a thousand people.
Thus, in these settlements, the political boundary acting simultaneously as an enforced tariff barrier is automatically cutting off any market region which might otherwise have developed had no boundary existed. To illustrate the effect of the boundary on market hinterlands flow-line diagrams were constructed (Figs 40-42) to show the directions and volume of vehicle traffic entering some of the markets. That for Ilara has special characteristics due to the settlement being split by the boundary and is treated more fully towards the end of the chapter.

Oja-Ata shows movement entirely concentrated to the west and south - the area to the north being virtually devoid of both roads and settlement. Ijoun is a centre for vehicles also travelling from the west and south as well as from Meko in the north. Both flow patterns, however, show a total absence of any vehicular traffic coming from the west across the boundary despite a network of seasonal roads and a few towns of considerable size. Iđi-Emi, on the other hand, is situated 20 miles or so by road from the state boundary and traffic appears to come from all directions except from the relatively uninhabited area to the north. The boundary appears to have little effect on this settlement although traffic from the west is less than that from the east and the south. Thus, Losch's 'economic wasteland' does appear to exist in the vicinity of the Dahomey-Nigeria border. In this area market regions are one-sided and the markets themselves small. The size of the individual market appears to increase with distance from the boundary and as market
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As the boundary in question is only some 75 years old, such a development in the economic landscape is relatively recent. It could perhaps be suggested that with such a small sample the economic wasteland of today is merely reflecting pre-colonial conditions. Such a suggestion, however, can be refuted in several ways. Initially a considerable section of the boundary was established through a pre-colonial frontier and such frontiers between tribal groups were often far from economic wastelands. At times important market centres grew up within tribal frontier regions as a point of exchange between two tribal groups. Ketu, as we have seen, is an excellent example situated in the frontier zone between the Egba and Dahomey where prisoners of war were exchanged as well as more usual economic produce. Secondly it is possible to demonstrate that the wasteland has developed as a result of the political boundary merely by comparing the pattern of markets today with that at the time of partition. Unfortunately, historical and statistical data is not available for the boundary as a whole but Hodder (11) has made such a comparison in the extreme south of the boundary area. His results are shown in Fig 43. In a zone 20 miles wide and parallel to the boundary for 40 miles, some 30 markets existed in 1912. Twelve of these were within one or two miles of the boundary. Fifty years later, in 1962, only ten markets remained on the same sites and only one of these existed within two miles of the border. Several new markets were established in the intervening period but only two out of nine were within five miles of the international boundary. To the north-west of Ipokia a cluster of ten
CHANGES IN MARKET DISTRIBUTION IN SOUTH-WEST NIGERIA 1912-1962 (After Hodder)
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markets existed along the north-south motorable road very close to the boundary. This road follows an important pre-colonial route-way to Porto Novo and despite the advantageous situation on an improved road only one of these markets existed in 1962. The market regions of these centres was increasingly split as the boundary was made to work more efficiently. Customs patrol along this section of the boundary has always been more effective than in more northern sections. Although it was possible for local inhabitants to continue to bring agricultural produce across the boundary to market after partition it was extremely difficult for local traders on the Nigerian side to bring goods legally imported through Lagos when across the boundary in Dahomey similar goods were often cheaper and bore smaller transport costs from Cotonou and Porto Novo. During field work in this area in some boundary settlements local people indicated that rather than expose cheaper articles brought over the border for re-sale in the market it was usually more convenient for people to go themselves to buy their goods individually in the adjacent state. Thus with the fear of customs patrols and with the competition from smuggled goods, many markets have either been abandoned or have declined considerably.

Some markets, however, appear to have flourished by having a location actually on the boundary. Such a situation might appear to contradict Losch's thesis when, under normal economic conditions, the tariff barrier situated along the boundary would split the economic region in two. With illegal trade, however, the tariff
barrier becomes the motive force behind such a movement. By having a single centre situated on the boundary between two states, both states form the two halves of the economic region and a whole new pattern emerges quite unrelated to the pattern of economic regions developed from legal trading. Within Nigeria or Dahomey, for example, the illegal-trading region extends as far as transfer costs allow articles to compete favourably with the cost of similar articles imported illegally through another centre, or with goods imported through legal channels. As illegal importation is often restricted to a few points, illegal-trading regions become relatively large. Such a situation was observed at Ilara, a small village astride the boundary between Ketu and Meko. Within the settlement two distinct markets have developed, one marketing area being in each state. As a result goods from within Dahomey may be brought into the village and legally displayed for sale in the Dahomean sector without fear of the customs patrols. Similarly Nigerian produce may be safely displayed and sold in the Nigerian half of the village.

Ilara in 1950 had a population of 1,650. Today the number may be approaching 2,500 (12). On a market day, however, the village population may increase temporarily by up to 50% with people travelling in from both sides of the boundary to exchange goods. The market is held every fourth day and was observed during April and June 1967. Despite several hundred people entering the village on foot from nearby settlements several vehicles brought considerable numbers of market women and traders from further afield. The numbers of vehicles
coming each market day was remarkably stable. It was usual for 19 or 20 lorries to bring anywhere from 450 to 650 people - the average for June 1967 being 573 per market day. Most of the vehicles came from Nigeria, although up to ten vehicles regularly brought more than 100 persons from the other side of the boundary. (See Fig. 44) The striking characteristic of the people arriving by lorry was the distances they had travelled to attend the market. On the occasions when the village was observed, lorries came from the following towns: Meko, Ijoun, Abeokuta, Igbogila, and Lagos in Nigeria, Ketu, Porto Novo, Cotonou and Abomey in Dahomey. The nearest of these settlements to Ilara is Meko, approximately 12 miles away. Lagos, on the other hand, is more than 110 miles and Cotonou more than 100 miles distant. Moreover, Ilara cannot be reached by any surfaced road. From Meko on the one side of the boundary to Ketu on the other, the route to the village follows an earthen track which has several stretches of laterite boulders and is impassable to all but heavy lorries during the rainy season between May and September. Nevertheless, the movement of vehicles between Ilara and these towns in the interior of the two states is relatively constant throughout the year. It appeared usual for the same lorries to make the same journey every fourth day to the market. Ten lorries were observed on the 2nd April, 1967 and the same ten vehicles came to the market four and eight days later. The drivers confirmed that their visits were more or less regular throughout the year. Of the total vehicle-borne passenger traffic a little over 60% came from the Nigerian side of the
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border and over half of this came from Abeokuta

The character of the goods brought for sale varied considerably with the country of origin. From Dahomey items on sale to a large extent comprised alcoholic drinks and cigarettes. Most of the beer sold in Ilara came from Cotonou as Dahomean bottled beer could be retailed at ninepence per bottle cheaper than its Nigerian equivalent. Soft drinks also came mainly from Cotonou. All the spirits had been imported through Dahomey and were being retailed at prices approximately half those paid for similar items imported through Lagos. One particular brand of whisky with a retail price of 52 Nigerian shillings in Nigeria (May 1968) was selling for 32 shillings in Ilara. Locally produced palm wine was brought to Ilara from the Dahomean side of the boundary. Most of it on sale appeared to have originated from Limikon two or three miles to the north. From Ilara kegs of palm wine were sent to Meko and as far as Abeokuta. One of the main reasons why such a movement should take place in this direction is probably due to the more densely populated Nigerian side of the border. This would put a heavier demand on the available quantities of locally produced palm wine raise the price, and therefore attract importation from Dahomey. A network of better quality roads on the Nigerian side of the boundary would also enable the palm wine to be taken to urban centres in a fresh condition.

Foodstuffs coming from Dahomey were scarce. Rice and maize were brought in from Ketu. From the Nigerian side came yams, palm oil, and kola nuts, the latter being carried over 50 miles from Abeokuta,
despite, at the time of observation, it being illegal to export foodstuffs from Nigeria. From Lagos considerable quantities of Nigerian-made plastic and enamel goods were brought. Kerosine, too, was also delivered from Lagos. This sold at six- or seven-pence per "beer-bottle" and considerable quantities went in the direction of Dahomey where kerosine came from Cotonou and was considerably more expensive. In Ketu, for example, ten miles from Ilara, Dahomean imported kerosine sold at nine-pence per bottle.

Cloth in Ilara market came from both sides of the boundary. Most appeared to have originated from Abeokuta and Lagos but in the other direction other types of cloth on sale came from Lomé in Togo, via Cotonou and Porto Novo.

By virtue of Ilara's position and having sections of the settlement in both Dahomey and Nigeria, relatively large quantities of goods can be brought from both sides of the boundary for sale quite legally and without fear of customs patrol. Once merchandise arrives at the market it can be displayed at one side of the boundary before being sold in smaller quantities for transportation by a large number of individuals across the settlement and international boundary simultaneously. Thus the market at Ilara is characterized by a marketing hinterland quite unrelated to its size as a village of 2,500 persons, and a village which is not even connected by a metalled road. Its site, being astride the boundary, is not the only factor in determining the function and importance of this settlement. Its position in relation to customs posts and to the existing pattern of
roads in the vicinity plays a very important role. Ilara has the advantage of being a boundary crossing point and having no customs centre. Customs posts are only to be found 12 miles away at Meko and three miles away at Irocogny. Although roads lead from Ilara to the customs, there are several routeways which by-pass them — although they are subject to periodic patrols from the customs centres at Ijoun and Meko. The attraction, therefore, to use Ilara as an exchange point between Dahomey and Nigeria is considerable and usually profitable, its unique site providing the base for the development of an economic region quite unexplained under more usual economic norms.

Like Ilara, the village of Iwoye has a market remarkably large for the size of the settlement. Again the village is situated on the international boundary and some maps show buildings in both Nigeria and Dahomey. This village, however, does not show such a dramatic flow-line pattern as Ilara (See Fig. 45). Movement by four-wheeled vehicles on market days appeared to be entirely from the Nigerian side of the boundary. Trade in illegal merchandise was also not so important as in its counterpart to the south. Several reasons may serve to explain such a feature. The lack of Dahomean vehicles at Iwoye market is explained by its position on the left bank of the Yewa River. This could not be crossed easily by motorized vehicles and goods had to be transhipped on to bicycles to cross an area of marsh and the river before reaching the settlement. Secondly the character and direction of the motor routes appear to have hampered Iwoye's
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development as a centre of illegal trade. The village is not situated on a through-route between Dahomey and Nigeria. Moreover, the seasonal road leading from the village to the Nigerian side of the boundary goes directly to Meko and actually passes the customs post where all vehicles must stop. Consequently, although considerable amounts of contraband do pass through Iwoye, lorries are not the main means of transportation.

The Boundary as a Psychological Barrier

The boundary as a factor influencing the thought of border peoples has had a variety of effects. To some boundary people the boundary seemed almost impenetrable, while to most it created some sort of barrier. The difficulty of crossing the boundary by road gave Nigerian boundary peoples the impression that Dahomey was a great distance away. On the Nigerian coastal bar, a few miles from the boundary and only 20 miles or so from Cotonou, people in general considered Badagry to be considerably nearer. Away from villages virtually on the border any knowledge of the neighbouring state was limited. In Nigeria village folk could point out the direction of "Frenchland" but few of those questioned had been there. In Dahomey boundary peoples appeared to know more of their neighbours than their Nigerian counterparts. There was admiration for the greater prosperity in Nigeria and many seemed to have visited the country, had allowed their children to go to work there, or had even sent a son to school there.
Along the coastal bar where the boundary acts as a pronounced barrier, on the movement of manufactured goods at least, the boundary was seen to have a considerable psychological effect on the local inhabitants. To people of Asiri, in Nigeria, less than half a mile from the border, for example, settlements within their own country appeared considerably closer than those a similar distance away in Dahomey. Several villagers were questioned on distances from their village to Badagri and Porto Novo reached from Asiri by two routes: one may travel approximately 15 miles by track to the lagoon bank opposite Badagri or go some 20 miles via canoe via Igbobele and Apa. The inhabitants of Asiri, however, estimated the former route to be about ten miles. Porto Novo, on the other hand was estimated to be much further than Badagri - approximately 30 miles away although it is less than ten miles away.

During March and April, 1967 a rough survey was carried out among Nigerian boundary dwellers in a dozen settlements along the boundary. An attempt was made to show cartographically the position of the boundary as envisaged by dwellers in the vicinity. To the simple question of "how far away is the boundary between Dahomey and Nigeria?" the general answer was an overestimate. The results can be seen on the following map (See Fig 46). As a whole the boundary was thought to be up to ten and 20 miles further away than in reality. It can be seen that only in four places did inhabitants tend to know the exact position of the boundary. Three of the cases can be explained by all three settlements (Yashikera, Meko and Idiroko) being on the three
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roads which cross the boundary. Moreover the raison d'être of two of these settlements, Yashikera and Idiroko, is essentially the boundary as a large percentage of the inhabitants in both villages is involved to some degree in such boundary functions as customs, immigration control, police, or by acting as traders catering for the international travellers.

Okuta, on the other hand, is not involved in any legal cross-boundary traffic, yet the inhabitants in general knew exactly where the boundary was. This may be a reflection of the village's function as a transfer centre for contraband goods being moved from Nigeria to Parakou.

Between these four settlements are four zones and in each the boundary was estimated as being further to the west than in reality. Between Yashikera and Okuta estimates were relatively accurate and this is probably a reflection of the considerable illegal movement which takes place across the boundary in this area by local people. Between Okuta and Meko, Nigerians in the area thought the boundary was up to 20 miles west of its actual position. This is probably due to the fact that little trans-boundary movement takes place there. Between Okuta and Meko are considerable tracts of marsh and no roads and few foot-tracks cross the boundary. To reach Dahomey from a town such as Shaki and Iseyin today usually involves a considerable detour to the north or south and this has given the local inhabitant the impression of the boundary being a considerable distance away. South of Meko, however, the estimated position of the boundary tended to correspond
much more closely with the actual position. It is in this zone that much cross-boundary movement and virtually all recorded legal traffic takes place. Only along the coastal bar where little movement takes place does the estimated boundary swing to the west again.
CHAPTER TEN

THE EFFECT OF THE BOUNDARY ON LONG-DISTANCE MOVEMENT

Except for the long-term movement of tribal sub-groups in historical times prior to partition the long distance movement of individuals was extremely limited prior to the establishment of the boundary, the subsequent development of roads, and the introduction of mechanized transport. Although limited, the pre-colonial movement was extensive and it is known that for centuries the Yoruba and Hausa from areas within present-day Nigeria were trading with the Ashanti in what is now Ghana. The people came from areas now in Northern Nigeria and so it might be assumed that the route went well to the north of the coastal forest, as well as north of pre-colonial Dahomey. Slaves and cloth were amongst the merchandise which went to Ghana whilst kola nuts and some European manufactures returned. Another important routeway in pre-colonial times was along the lagoons and along the beach (See Fig 47)

Post-Boundary Movement

With the establishment of the politico-economic boundary and the creation of a limited number of customs posts the number of routes for
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the legal movement of trade in an east-west direction was reduced in number although a few new routes did develop.

During the nineteenth century one of the major trade routes was along the lagoon between Porto Novo and Lagos, where there was a natural outlet to the sea. The new boundary, however, gave impetus to the development of Cotonou and provided the basis for the construction of a jetty and later a harbour at that town, \(^{(1)}\) thus cutting off much easterly movement along the lagoon.

Prior to the establishment of the boundary, apart from the major routes in the north, there had been many tracks through the forests in the south and those in use at any particular time varied from season to season. During the rains, for example, many routes became flooded and could not be used for several months. The establishment of the border was accompanied by the introduction of four-wheeled animal transport in the north and shortly afterwards by motor vehicles in all areas. These new forms of transport demanded more than seasonal foot-paths through the bush. Wide, relatively level surfaces were required throughout the whole year and substantial bridges had to be built. Such factors as these resulted in more and more commercial movement being concentrated on fewer and fewer routes. Today, for instance, as far as recorded and legal international trade is concerned there is only one routeway of any importance between Nigeria and Dahomey. This goes from Lagos, via Idiroko, to Porto Novo and Cotonou and is the only metalled road which crosses the boundary.
In 1960 a survey\(^{(2)}\) was carried out by the Ministry of Works in Dahomey regarding traffic flow across the boundary along this road, between Porto Novo and Lagos via Igolo and Idiroko. It was found that in both directions an average of 343 vehicles were crossing the boundary daily. Out of this number 54\% of the vehicles comprised "cars" less than 16 cwt, and 42\% were vehicles between two and ten tons. As no vehicle larger than ten tons was recorded the remaining 4\% is accounted for by vehicles between 16 cwt and two tons. There are several factors influencing the character of vehicles crossing the boundary. The large proportion of cars may be explained by the fact that much commercial passenger traffic uses cars rather than buses. Small vans for commercial purposes are rare and are largely restricted to the larger towns. This explains the small numbers of vehicles between 0.8 and two tons. About two tons one begins to include the "mammy-waggons" which ply across the border with large numbers of passengers and a vast assortment of luggage.

In the 1960 survey mentioned above the lack of vehicles over ten tons would be explained by the state of the bridges along the international route. Until 1967 vehicles above this weight were prevented from crossing certain rather fragile bridges between Lagos and Porto Novo. In January 1967, however, the new road from Otta to Idiroko on the Nigerian side of the boundary was completed and the new bridges do not restrict the weight of vehicles moving between Lagos and Accra.

The exact number of people crossing the boundary cannot be known but in a sample year from October 1965 to September 1966 approaching
100,000 (3) persons were recorded as legally crossing the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary (See Fig 48)

Only at Idiroko (being on the main road from Nigeria to Dahomey, Togo and Ghana) are immigration records kept. Elsewhere it has been possible to compute numbers from the traffic records kept by customs officials at Chikanda and Meko - the other two points where vehicles normally cross the boundary. There being only six (4) custom-controlled crossing points where population movement can be measured (one customs post per 75 miles of boundary) unrecorded and technically illegal movement must be extremely widespread.

During the sample year from October 1st 1965 to September 30th 1966, some 96,409 persons were recorded as crossing the boundary at the three centres of Idiroko, Meko and Chikanda (the other three crossing points being numerically of little importance and also have no records). Nearly all the movement was concentrated at Idiroko where 91,745 people crossed leaving Chikanda in the north with 4,634, and Meko with a mere recorded 30 persons.

Although these figures probably account for by far the largest proportion of cross-boundary travellers they do not give the complete picture. No figures for example are available to show the numbers of petty traders who cross from one side of the boundary to the other to attend various local markets, no estimates can be made to indicate the numbers of farmers who live in one country but cross the boundary either daily or seasonally to cultivate their land, and it is impossible
Fig. 48

RECORDED MOVEMENT ACROSS THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY, OCTOBER 1965 TO SEPTEMBER 1966

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>EASTWARDS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>WESTWARDS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chikanda</td>
<td>Meko</td>
<td>Idiroko</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Chikanda</td>
<td>Meko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 1965</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3221</td>
<td>3321</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 1965</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3353</td>
<td>3519</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 1965</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>4162</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 1966</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 1966</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>3289</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 1966</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3791</td>
<td>3986</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 1966</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1966</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>4159</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 1966</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>4379</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 1966</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4784</td>
<td>4941</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 1966</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4650</td>
<td>4842</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 1966</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4628</td>
<td>4788</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45529</td>
<td>47538</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to know how many people cross the border illegally for such purposes as smuggling. Moreover, in the case of Meko, the 30 persons recorded as crossing the boundary in one direction or the other give no idea of the true volume of traffic actually crossing at this point. Meko belongs to the pre-colonial kingdom of Ketu which was split by the boundary and local population movement between the two halves is quite considerable. For the inhabitants of the Ketu kingdom travel documents are not usually required for crossing the boundary from one side of the kingdom to the other. Moreover traffic passing through Meko is not usually classed as international, as vehicles from both states usually stop at the village of Ilara which is situated astride the boundary. Passengers from Nigeria wishing to travel on into Dahomey alight in the Nigerian half of the village and cross to the Dahomean sector to board a Dahomean vehicle.

Despite the available figures not being adequate to give a totally comprehensive picture of cross-boundary movement, their study and analysis is of value because they account for most of the travellers and suggest factors which might influence cross-boundary traffic as a whole.

Initially one of the major characteristics of the cross-boundary movement, as indicated by the monthly totals, is that movement out of Nigeria to the Dahomean side of the boundary usually exceeds movement into the country. This is clearly seen in the 1965-66 figures for Chikanda which, though small when compared to the Idiroko figures, are more constant and represent the general longer-term pattern of movement.
Idiroko, though dealing with a much greater volume of traffic is much more sensitive to external short-term factors influencing international migration due to being on the only metalled road crossing the boundary and by being much closer to the administrative centre of both states as well as the large centres of population in southern Dahomey and western Nigeria. The international migration figures also demonstrate very clearly the importance of political conditions on either side of the boundary in influencing the direction and volume of population movement.

In Fig. 49, which shows the migration figures for 1965-66 as a graph, it can be seen that, although emigration from Nigeria in general exceeds immigration, there were several significant fluctuations. On two occasions — in January and May — movement out of Nigeria was less than movement into the country. The first occasion coincided with the first military coup in Nigeria.

During the latter part of 1965 it can be seen that movement in both directions was considerably lower than in late 1966 when movement had returned to a more usual volume. During late 1965 movement out of the country exceeded immigration by up to a thousand persons per month. This is probably due to the situation surrounding the Western Nigerian elections in October 1965. Intermittent civil strife was common, demonstrations occurred in the main towns, and open banditry occurred on the main roads. During this period considerable numbers of Dahomean and Ghanaian traders returned to their own countries.
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In January 1966 outward movement dropped to half the December level and movement into Nigeria exceeded emigration. Many of the foreign traders had left the country in preceding months. The influx into Nigeria is largely accounted for by Nigerian traders returning to their country once the army had taken control and conditions had become more peaceful. Such a trend occurred throughout January, February and March, but in April movement out of the country once again began to exceed immigration. In May, however, the pattern was reversed following the second coup. This did not have lasting effect, and by June emigration continued to exceed immigration for the rest of the year.

Chikanda, being relatively isolated and comparatively difficult to reach, did not witness such fluctuations following the two coups—although emigration did not exceed immigration by such a wide margin for the early part of 1966 at the time of the first coup. In May 1966, however, emigration rose rapidly when a considerable number of Ibos crossed to Dahomey to escape the anti-Ibo persecutions which took place in various centres in Northern Nigeria during that month.

**Location of Cross-Boundary Movement**

The following maps (Figs 50 and 51) have been compiled from a 10% sample of travellers crossing the boundary into Nigeria over the six-month period from October 1965 to March 1966. Two general trends are initially perceivable. On the one hand it is extremely striking how virtually all the traffic is concentrated on the southernmost of the three vehicular crossing-points and secondly the maps show the
MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE ACROSS THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY: IDIROKO

Fig. 50

Percentage of total easterly cross-boundary movement

International boundary

100 75 50 25 <5

0 40 80 120 160

MILES

UPPER VOLTA

NI GER

DAHOMEY

GHANA

TOGO

NIGERIA
MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE ACROSS THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY: CHIKANDA AND ILARA

Percentage of total easterly cross-boundary movement

International boundary

MILES

Fig. 51
great distances covered by cross-boundary travellers

Nearly 96% of all traffic crossing the boundary into Nigeria does so at Idiroko - as opposed to about 4% at Chikanda and considerably less than one per cent at Ilara. There are several factors affecting such a southerly concentration of traffic. Initially, in Ghana, Togo, Dahomey and Nigeria, whence most of the traffic originates, the heaviest concentrations of population are found in the south. Secondly, the only metalled road which links all four countries without a break does so along the coastal route.

Although the major route between Nigeria and Ghana is in general a coastal one, the road actually crosses the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary some 16 miles from the sea. The reason for this is mainly the physical environment. For most of the distance between Lagos and the boundary the coastal spit is extremely narrow (unlike Dahomey), and supports only small fishing villages. To the north of this is the lagoon which projects northwards in several places, producing in all a low-lying marshy area, some 10 to 15 miles wide, which prevents any east-west movement. The main road from Lagos parallels the coastline, 20-25 miles inland before turning south to Idiroko, Porto Novo and the coastal bar in Dahomey.

The main present-day route in an east-west direction is very different to that of pre-colonial times. Before the boundary was established, movement was usually concentrated much further to the north - north of the forest belt. Today the traffic network in the
north (crossing at Chikanda) is extensive but of little volume. This is largely a reflection of the lower density of population and the more scattered nature of urban centres. The quality of the roads is also lower and considerable numbers of cross-boundary travellers prefer to travel longer distances in a southerly direction to cross the boundary at Idiroko and to travel north again.

By itself the pattern of cross-boundary movement centred on Chikanda does not give a true picture of east-west movement. Despite a network apparently showing the opposite, traffic crossing the boundary at Chikanda essentially follows a north-south pattern. Most of the traffic goes from Nikki to Shaki, virtually due south. During the six months when the crossing point was observed there were also journeys made from Niamey to Lagos, Ibadan and other centres in Southern Nigeria while on several occasions there was some cross-boundary traffic from Sokoto in north-west Nigeria to Southern Dahomey and on into Togo. The only west-east route of any importance appears to go from northern Ghana through northern Togo, Dahomey to Jos, Zaria, Kaduna and other towns in Northern Nigeria. This route is even more important for illegal traffic than for recorded movement. Between Chikanda and Idiroko the third cross-boundary traffic network centred on Ilara is extremely limited - at least in respect of legal recorded movement. This is primarily due to the poor state of the roads crossing the boundary there.

The second major characteristic of the trans-boundary traffic pattern is the relatively long distances covered by the travellers and
also, away from the coast, the immense detours which have to be made in order to cross the boundary. In a consideration of all the recorded journeys made across the boundary the mode is certainly less than 200 miles for each journey, but a minority of journeys are considerably longer. A journey from Tamale in Ghana, via Chikanda, to Jos in Nigeria is approaching 1,000 miles, Sokoto to Lomé over 800 miles and Niamey to Lagos nearly 700 miles. Lack of east-west motorable roads across the boundary also necessitates detours on a large scale. Parakou and Shaki, for example, are 70 miles apart in a direct line, but to travel by road between the two involves a journey of approaching 200 miles.

**Volume of Cross-Boundary Traffic**

In the south, migration along the coast across the boundary is largely a movement between five towns: Accra, Lomé, Cotonou, Porto Novo and Lagos. Of the traffic entering Nigeria at Idiroko, nearly 98% (5) comes from the four centres in Ghana, Togo and Dahomey. The latter state provides most of the traffic moving into Nigeria and Porto Novo and Cotonou between them provide 62% of all the traffic along the southern route. Lomé accounts for 15% and Accra 21% of the traffic. From Idiroko on the boundary, over 90% of the traffic moves straight to Lagos and suburbs. Ibadan is the next most important destination in Nigeria, but receives less than 2% of the southern traffic.

A similar concentration of traffic between a small number of towns on either side of the boundary can be seen at the northern
crossing-point at Chikanda. Less than 4% of the total traffic entering Nigeria from Dahomey does so by Chikanda and almost all this moves from Nikki in Dahomey to a small group of towns immediately across the boundary in Nigeria. Some 67% of the Chikanda traffic goes from Nikki to Shak1, 97% from Nikki to Kish1, 6% from Nikki to Gure. Moreover, the Chikanda traffic in reality comprises only a few vehicles which make regular trips every few days back and forth across the boundary. In the six months when the Chikanda crossing-point was observed, most of the crossings were made by four vehicles. Between 1st October 1965 and 31st March 1966, the boundary at Chikanda was crossed by individual vehicles on 611 occasions. Of these crossings, 364 were made by three vehicles travelling to and fro between Nikki and Shak1, and a further 85 journeys by a vehicle travelling between Nikki and Kish1.

At Ilara recorded movement across the boundary is relatively insignificant and consists of a few vehicles making the trip throughout the year from Ketu in Dahomey to Meko, Aiyetoro and Abeokuta in Nigeria. Movement is to a large extent restricted due to the lack of any improved road crossing the boundary there.

As regards the nationality of cross-boundary travellers, only the Idiroko traffic can be considered as at that centre alone are immigration records maintained. Moreover, at least 95% of all recorded movement takes place at that point. Ninety-three per cent of the people crossing the boundary there came from only four countries: Nigeria, Dahomey, Togo and Ghana (See Figs 52 and 53.)
for statistics, Nigeria provided the greatest number of cross-boundary travellers with 53% of the total (48,248), Dahomey had 25%, Togo 9% and Ghana 6%. It is evident, therefore, that the number of people from any one country decreases to some extent with the distance of that country from the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary. No other African state has any significant number of people crossing the boundary. After Ghana the next highest number from an African state was Niger with 313 and Senegal with 175 persons. Thus from these figures there appears to be a considerable movement of people across the boundary along the coast between Ghana and Nigeria. This movement apparently does not extend any further east or west. Only 59 Ivory Coast nationals and 66 Cameroun citizens crossed this boundary. Neither did much traffic originate from countries near the boundary in the north. Niger and Upper Volta together accounted for less than 350 persons or 0.3% of the total Idiroko traffic.

As regards direction of movement, slightly more than half of the people were moving out of Nigeria. It appears that there is usually a net loss of population from Nigeria along this migration route. During the year 1965-66 movement across the border out of Nigeria totalled 46,216 and arrivals 45,529. The net loss from Nigeria was thus only 687 or approximately 1.5% of the total outward movement. Such a small net loss, however, conceals a large number of variations. Regarding Nigerians, for example, there was a net loss of nearly
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A twenty per cent sample of monthly movement between October 1965 and September 1966

### Movement into Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>2565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerien</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>4052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of annual total</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Movement out of Nigeria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>3343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerien</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of annual total</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THE MOVEMENT OF TRADERS ACROSS THE DAHOMEY - NIGERIA BOUNDARY AT IDIROKO

Fig. 54

### ORIGIN OF TRADERS ENTERING NIGERIA AT IDIROKO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>Porto Novo</th>
<th>Cotonou</th>
<th>Lome</th>
<th>Aflao</th>
<th>Accra</th>
<th>Atake</th>
<th>Monrovia</th>
<th>Abidjan</th>
<th>Pobe</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>901</strong></td>
<td><strong>1025</strong></td>
<td><strong>555</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1546</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4052</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of annual total | 22.2 | 25.2 | 13.6 | - | 38.1 | - | 0.4 | - | 100 |

### DESTINATION OF TRADERS LEAVING NIGERIA AT IDIROKO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESTINATION</th>
<th>Porto Novo</th>
<th>Cotonou</th>
<th>Lome</th>
<th>Aflao</th>
<th>Accra</th>
<th>Kumasi</th>
<th>Takoradi</th>
<th>Abidjan</th>
<th>Save</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerene</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>613</strong></td>
<td><strong>1228</strong></td>
<td><strong>764</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1619</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4286</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of annual total | 14.3 | 28.6 | 17.8 | 0.1 | 37.7 | - | 1.2 | - | 100 |
**RECORDED MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE OUT OF NIGERIA THROUGH IDIROKO**

**OCTOBER 1965 to SEPTEMBER 1966.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>2163</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>2094</td>
<td>2687</td>
<td>2877</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td>25584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>*749</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>10330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4155</td>
<td>3924</td>
<td>4016</td>
<td>2073</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>3036</td>
<td>3555</td>
<td>3431</td>
<td>4368</td>
<td>4965</td>
<td>4809</td>
<td>4918</td>
<td>46216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Nigerian</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>*22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages to nearest whole numbers)
### Recorded Movement of People into Nigeria through Ibioko

**October 1965 to September 1966**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>2467</td>
<td>2530</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>2580</td>
<td>22649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>12802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>3741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3221</td>
<td>3353</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>2283</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>3791</td>
<td>3457</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>4784</td>
<td>4635</td>
<td>45514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahomean</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togolese</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanaian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages to nearest whole numbers)
3,000 in the same period. There are several factors which might explain this movement. There is an increasing movement of traders out of Nigeria to Dahomey, Togo and especially Ghana. Secondly, there is a movement of workers from Nigeria to Ghana. According to the 1948 census in Ghana, there were almost 50,000 Nigerians in Ghana who were not born in the latter country. Today, according to Stapleton, this number has increased to at least 67,000. The movement of Dahomeans, on the other hand, was in favour of Nigeria during the 1965-66 period. The 12,800 Dahomeans crossing the boundary into Nigeria exceeded those going in the opposite direction by almost 2,500. This movement into Nigeria is, according to Mondjannagni, one of the young men between 20 and 30 who look for adventure in Nigeria under the pretext of looking for work. On questioning they call themselves "drivers", "mechanics", or "fitters" but usually they have no professional training and, as Mondjannagni indicates, often resort to robbery and pilfering: "ils n'ont en fait aucune qualification professionnelle, et se livrent fréquemment les actes de brigandage." (8)

There is also a movement of "qualified" workers over which the boundary has little control. These people are often the employees of banks or commercial undertakings which have branches in several West African countries. Examples of such undertakings could include C F. A O, S C O A, Messrs John Holt, or J B Ollivant. Although the individual branches are becoming more and more independent there has been some transfer of staff to various branches in different countries and as a
result there are a large number of Dahomeans permanently settled in Nigeria. In general the movement can be summed up by examining the differential of income and living standards on either side of the boundary.

The Movement of Traders

The major factor behind the cross-boundary movement today is trade. During the period from October 1965 to September 1966, a 20% sample of all cross-boundary travellers at Idioko revealed that more than 45% called themselves "traders." Almost all these were Nigerian or Dahomean, 75% being from Nigeria and 16% from Dahomey. The remaining 9% was made up mainly by Togolese (5%), Ghanaian (2%) and a scatter of traders of 14 other nationalities. The destination of the various nationalities varied considerably. Unfortunately, records were not available to show the movement of traders within Nigeria. However, as more than 97% of all the recorded easterly movement went to Lagos, it might be assumed that a similar percentage of the traders were destined for that town - especially as nearly half of the total migrants were traders. In a westerly direction, however, out of Nigeria, the destination of traders by nationality varied significantly. With Dahomean traders, for example, there was a simple cross-boundary movement between Lagos and Porto Novo or Cotonou, more than 96% of the Dahomeans moving out of Nigeria were destined for the latter two towns.

With the Togolese and Ghanaian traders, despite the largest single group of each nationality travelling to his own capital (either Lomé
or Accra), the migration records did show however that almost equally large groups of these traders went to Cotonou, (43% of the Togolese and 36% of the Ghanaian) Some traders of these nationalities did trade between Cotonou and Lagos, but they were relatively few In this case the figures are inflated due to the way in which the individual trader filled in his immigration card In most cases, he gave his first stop on his journey west (which was often Cotonou or Porto Novo) rather than his ultimate destination

In the case of the Nigerian traders approximately one-third stated their destination to be Dahomey and more than one half went to Ghana Considering what has just been stated, however, probably considerably more than half ultimately reached Ghana This through-movement between Nigeria and Ghana along the Lagos-Accra boundary developed during the colonial period The route through Dahomey and Togo was regarded to some extent as a corridor °of great value both to Nigeria and the Gold Coast as facilitating inter-communication between the two colonies °(9) Trade between Nigeria and a neighbouring French colony was rarely considered Thus, even today, the situation remains and for most of the Nigerian traders the whole of Dahomey and Togo act as a type of frontier - the traders preferring to trade in a country with the same official language and until recently the same currency and where families could settle and live almost permanently

In considering the movement of traders throughout the year there is a pattern similar to that of the population movement as a whole In the latter part of 1965 movement out of Nigeria tended to decrease
slowly with a sharp drop in January 1966, at the time of the coup d'état. There was a sharp rise in the weeks after this event. There was another drop in the movement of traders following the second coup in May, but the decrease was by no means as great as in January. What is apparent from these figures is that political events on one side of the boundary did not affect the movement of traders as much as the migration considered as a whole. In Fig 56 the percentage per month of all population movement in a westerly direction is shown as well as percentages per month of traders and non-traders. Of the three groups the traders are seen to be the least affected by political events such as the coup. Considering the total figures for migration per year it might be assumed that approximately 8.3% of the total might cross the boundary per month - if migration were constant throughout the year. In January, 1966 however, all movement was below average. However, while only 3.5% of non-traders crossed the boundary, almost 6% of the traders crossed into Dahomey. With the figures dealing with Nigerian nationals, a similar comparison is even more striking (See Fig 57). Throughout the sample year the percentage movement of traders varied from 5.8% in January to 11% in August 1966, a total range of 5.2%. With Nigerian non-traders, however, the range was 13.7%. In January only 1.9% of the total crossed into Dahomey compared with almost 16% in July.

Another important feature of the cross-boundary movement is the large number of female traders. Almost a third (32%) of the
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traders enumerated were female and of these over 60% were Nigerian and approximately 25% Dahomean. The movement of these female traders did not differ significantly from the movement of the traders as a whole.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND THE BOUNDARY AS A LIMIT
 OF TARIFF PROTECTION

International trade is a product of the international boundary. If such a feature as a world federation existed then the world economy would be indistinguishable from what is usually referred to as a national economy. As it is, the world is sub-divided into a mosaic of political and economic units and trade between each of these units is considerably less than the trade within them. In other words, the network of political boundaries is a negative influence on the global economy. "The political division of the world", states Wright, "tends to hamper the natural division of labour and the course of trade which would otherwise be influenced only by physical geography and demography. Political boundaries are obstacles to movements of population, commodities, capital, management and information, not only because of legal regulations, but also because the familiarity of producers and consumers with national law, administration, language and culture and the identification with national symbols and territory favour the home market." (1) Nevertheless, international trade does take place despite these obstacles and despite, moreover, the added problems
of differing monetary systems, taxation and banking regulations, and other trading formalities which may vary from state to state.

Across the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary trade does take place but it is extremely limited in both amount and value. Details of the international trade of both countries are given in Fig 58. In 1966, for example, the total trade between Dahomey and Nigeria was worth less than £500,000 and in the last 15 years it has not exceeded £700,000 in any given year. Such an amount also forms a small percentage of the total external trade of each country. In the ten year period 1957-66, for example, only an average 2.3% of Dahomey's external trade was with Nigeria and this latter state had less than 0.8% of its trade with Dahomey. A similar situation applies to most African countries though these figures are certainly lower than those for the continent as a whole.

There are several reasons which have created this situation, but two may be regarded as of premier importance. Initially both states until recently formed part of an imperial economy, each being on the same side of a colony/metropolitan-state relationship. Secondly, trade between Dahomey and Nigeria was retarded as each state belonged to a separate and distinct imperial economy— one centred on France, the other on Britain.

As regards the former factor, where each state formed one part of an imperial organization, the economy of Dahomey or Nigeria was orientated towards imperial self-sufficiency rather than towards producing a national economy within each state. In general the colonies
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Dahomey imports from Nigeria</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dahomey exports to Nigeria</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Total Dahomey-Nigeria trade</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Total Dahomey exports</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>6,510</td>
<td>5,160</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,960</td>
<td>3,733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Total Dahomey imports</td>
<td>6,160</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>11,030</td>
<td>9,050</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>11,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total Dahomey external trade</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>11,760</td>
<td>10,350</td>
<td>17,540</td>
<td>14,210</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>16,450</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>17,210</td>
<td>18,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Total Nigeria exports</td>
<td>127,530</td>
<td>135,550</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>199,710</td>
<td>173,160</td>
<td>168,540</td>
<td>189,670</td>
<td>214,650</td>
<td>268,270</td>
<td>252,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Total Nigeria imports</td>
<td>152,470</td>
<td>168,270</td>
<td>178,400</td>
<td>215,890</td>
<td>222,400</td>
<td>203,230</td>
<td>207,560</td>
<td>253,880</td>
<td>275,130</td>
<td>256,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Total Nigeria external trade</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>301,850</td>
<td>341,900</td>
<td>385,690</td>
<td>355,690</td>
<td>371,760</td>
<td>397,320</td>
<td>466,530</td>
<td>543,430</td>
<td>539,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Total Dahomey-Nigeria trade as a percentage of the total Dahomey external trade</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Total Dahomey-Nigerian trade as a percentage of total Nigerian external trade</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Total Dahomey-France trade</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>6,210</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>9,030</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>10,630</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>9,370</td>
<td>8,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Dahomey-France trade as a percentage of total Dahomey external trade</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Total Dahomey-UK trade</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dahomey-UK trade as a percentage of total Dahomey external trade</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Total Nigeria-UK trade</td>
<td>144,451</td>
<td>147,705</td>
<td>162,848</td>
<td>171,087</td>
<td>161,406</td>
<td>144,204</td>
<td>144,666</td>
<td>159,325</td>
<td>186,519</td>
<td>181,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nigeria-UK trade as a percentage of total Nigeria external trade</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Total Nigeria-France trade</td>
<td>4,804</td>
<td>5,213</td>
<td>4,306</td>
<td>7,416</td>
<td>6,281</td>
<td>5,834</td>
<td>7,365</td>
<td>6,972</td>
<td>6,496</td>
<td>5,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nigeria-France trade as a percentage of total Nigeria external trade</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trade figures in £'000 Sterling
specialized in a small selection of raw materials and foodstuffs which were exported in return for manufactured goods from the metropolitan country. Dahomey, for instance, relied heavily, and still does, on the production of palm oil. In 1960, for example, out of exports worth £6.5 million, some 83% comprised "oil seeds, oil nuts, oil kernels and palm oil." (2) Nigeria, partly due to its size and more varied physical environment as well as perhaps a more enlightened colonial policy, was able to rely on a larger selection of agricultural crops or mineral products. In 1960 total exports worth £169 million included palm kernels and palm oil (23%), cocoa (21%), groundnuts (13%) and rubber (8%). (3)

Each colony was thus in a similar economic situation, and with limited manufacturing industry in either state little of the raw materials produced could be exported across the border. Instead, the movement of the colonial exports was predominantly to the metropolitan country. Thus, in the years preceding independence, between 60% and 70% of Dahomey's external trade was with France - and even since independence this figure has not dropped below 50%. In Nigeria the economy in colonial times was not tied so closely to that of Britain and by independence less than 45% of Nigeria's external trade was with that country.

As a result of such a policy, crops grown on the Dahomean side of the boundary generally went to France while a similar crop harvested a few miles away across the border might follow a parallel route to Britain. Only very rarely was the crop taken legally across
the inter-colonial boundary. Nigeria rarely traded with France and the franc zone and Dahomey had little contact with Britain and the sterling area. Thus while 63% of Dahomey's external trade on average was with France in the four years before independence, only 2.5% was with Britain. With Nigeria a similar situation prevailed and while 48% of the external trade was with Britain, less than 1% was with France.

After independence two themes have dominated the international trade of the former colonial territories. On the one hand there has been a tendency to reduce if possible the dominance of the former metropolitan power in the international trade of each state, and on the other hand, a move to increase "Pan-African trade" and reduce the influence of the politico-economic boundaries of the colonial period.

In the first respect, the pre-independence trend of declining trade with the former metropolitan state continued. In 1966, for example, only one-third of Nigeria's external trade was with Britain as opposed to more than one-half ten years earlier. A similar trend took place between Dahomey and France, though by no means as fast.

With regard to the second trend the first three or four years after independence saw a rapid increase in trade between Dahomey and Nigeria. Between 1960 and 1963 total trade between these two states doubled - though the increase was only worth £300,000. Though the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary and associated economic barriers did not witness such drastic changes as that of Upper Volta and Ghana in 1961(4), agreement was reached in 1962 as regards a joint customs post.
along the boundary, cooperation in the suppression of smuggling and an agreement on the customs duties of both countries. Plans for a common customs union between Nigeria and Dahomey were also discussed. It was anticipated that such a trend would facilitate the pan-African movement and that the boundaries of Africa could at some time be abolished or at least they would decrease in importance. Politicians in the newly independent states envisaged Africa becoming a "more homogeneous field in which national boundaries would present less formidable barriers to communication, travel, trade and migration." To a large extent, however, the very opposite has taken place, and today boundaries in Africa are often greater barriers to economic and population movement than they were in the colonial period.

With Dahomey and Nigeria (despite a sudden increase in trade between the two immediately after independence and reaching a maximum in 1963-64), trade has levelled off and now appears to be declining. (See Fig 58) Being no longer a component part of a larger imperial economy (though trade preferences between former colony and metropolitan power continue to some extent) considerable economic specialization has been envisaged. The motives for such a development have been just as much political as economic. Light manufacturing industries have mushroomed, protective tariffs have been increased and the boundaries have generally tended to become more prominent barriers than in the pre-1960 colonial period.

In theory, such developments have been criticized. Diallo Telli, for example, has stated at the Organization of African Unity that
"there can be no true social-economic development without co-
ordination, harmonization and planning which transcend the political
frontiers" (8) Such warnings, however, have been little heeded until recently. In the last two years definite plans - though at a
preliminary stage - have been made to develop a West African Common
Market, comprising 14 states (9).

As the situation remains today, however, the economy of both Dahomey and Nigeria (as in many developing countries) shows a
combination of a still considerable trade with the former colonial
power protected with trade preferences and secondly a variety of light
industry protected by high tariffs. The former characteristic of this
trade is illustrated by the importation of cigarettes into Dahomey
Cigarettes from France enter the country duty-free, while those
manufactured by the Nigerian Tobacco Company in Ibadan (less than 80
miles from the Dahomey boundary) are subject to an import duty of 100
percent; (10)

The establishment of industry protected by high tariffs is often
based on economic nationalism and other political factors rather than
purely economic grounds. Markets in many new states are often not large
enough or do not have sufficient purchasing strength (though Nigeria in
some respects is an exception) to support a large variety of new
industry. Despite pre-independence intentions there has been little
move towards any form of common market to overcome this problem. The
situation today between the Dahomey and Nigerian economy is to a large
degree illustrated by the bottling industry to be found in each state.
In 1949, when a plant was established in Nigeria to produce "Star" beer and soft drinks, some 2,000 gallons of soft drinks were being imported per annum. By 1964 there were 12 full-scale plants in operation with a capacity of 12 million gallons - though only 4.5 million gallons were being produced. Bottling plants were underused and incurring considerable losses. Of a bottling venture in the Western Region of Nigeria, the Coker Commission (11) reported a loss of £200,000 on an outlay of £670,000. Within Lagos there are factories producing lager beer, soft drinks, and "Guinness". Sixty-five miles away, however, in Cotonou, Dahomey, there are plants producing soft drinks and lager beer. "Guinness", in this case, is still imported direct from Britain as in the colonial period. Though extreme, this example does illustrate both the duplication of industry within each state and the negligible nature of inter-African trade.

Although inter-regional trade within Dahomey and Nigeria has developed out of all proportion since the establishment of colonies and their associated boundaries, it has been shown that trade across the boundaries has been extremely limited. Though general reasons have been given for this - and ones which can be applied to most countries in Africa - it is important at this stage to examine in more detail these retarding factors in relation to the boundary in question.

Apart from the most obvious negative effect of having similar economies and therefore little which might be traded, the most important barrier to trade is in the form of tariffs as well as in exchange.
controls and quota systems. In the actual process of getting goods from one side of the boundary to the other, most international boundaries provide a considerable amount of "red tape" which involves much expense and time in filling in forms, acquiring licenses, visas or certificates. In newly independent countries such as Dahomey and Nigeria, problems are often accentuated with nepotism, corruption, and low levels of efficiency and literacy. The boundary itself, moreover, represents the division between two differing official languages. This latter factor provides a distinct problem as, although the indigenous population may speak the same language at either side of the border at any point, the boundary officials are not usually of local origin and often have to rely on English or French as a means of verbal communication.

Trade is also hindered by the differences in traditions and tastes which have developed in each state. This is to some extent exemplified by considering the customs developed during the colonial period. As regards beverages, for example, coffee drinking is considered more usual in French-speaking Dahomey, while tea, a common drink in Nigeria, is to a large extent unknown in Dahomey. Vin ordinaire, bulk imported and locally bottled, from North Africa and Southern France, is drunk in considerable quantities by the indigenous population of Dahomey while in Nigeria a glass of wine is largely the prerogative of the expatriate. The major reason for this, however, is probably the prohibitive tax on alcoholic drink in Nigeria. Thus, markets for certain goods are largely confined to one particular state.
Another major but less obvious characteristic of the international boundary is what Hoover terms its "circuity" (13). Centres for immigration, customs and boundary police are extremely expensive to maintain and thus are only found at limited intervals along a boundary. It is a general rule that the smaller the volume of cross-boundary traffic the fewer the crossing points and this is certainly the case with the boundary in question. In 435 miles there is only one centre where customs, police and immigration authorities are found together. This is at the twin centre of Igolo-Idiroko. A few other minor centres, however, have customs and police. As all legal traffic must pass through one of these centres, a considerable amount of international traffic has to make a more circuitous and expensive journey. Lagos, for example, is 45 miles from the boundary yet to cross into Dahomey legally one must travel more than 60 miles. Porto Novo is five miles and Ibadan 60 miles from the boundary yet the distances to it by motorable road are 30 and 120 miles respectively. Between Lagos and Cotonou the straightline distance is 65 miles by road through the legal crossing point it is nearly 110 miles.

When the boundary of a trade area coincides with a political boundary it usually produces a sharp rise in transfer costs. This in turn distorts marketing patterns. Because of the political boundary between Dahomey and Nigeria coinciding with the tariff boundary between the two states what might have been the "natural hinterland" of Porto Novo or Lagos will have been reduced considerably.
The effect of a boundary trade-barrier as well as its "circuity affect" is shown diagrammatically in Fig 59. Line AB represents an international boundary while C represents a centre of production or perhaps in the West African context the distributing centre for imported goods. Within one economic region producers or importers could theoretically supply a given item at the same price within the area bounded by the arc DEFG. If transfer costs for moving goods across the boundary entailed no extra costs or circuity at all, then the items of production could also be delivered anywhere within the arc EF at the same cost. If the boundary does increase transfer costs (with perhaps a tariff), but cross boundary movement is possible at any point along the boundary, then the item produced can only be sold for the same price across the boundary anywhere within arc HI. (The radius of the latter arc will vary indirectly with the tariff increase.) In this case all the shaded area would be lost to the producer at C. If, however, cross boundary movement was only possible at one point, i.e., through Customs post J, the area in which goods can be sold at the same price will be reduced to DEKMLFG. Thus the loss due to concentrating traffic through J is represented by the stipled area.

A model for Lagos might appear more like Fig 60. In this case line AB represents the Guinea coast and CD the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary. EF would represent the market area of an item at the same retail cost if the political boundary had no economic function while GH would represent the reduced market area if perhaps tariffs existed.
CIRCUITY MODEL FOR SOUTHERN SECTION OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY
but movement was allowed at any point along the boundary. In reality, however, legal movement of trade must pass through Idiroko (I) and arc JKL represents a still further reduced region of same cost due to the single entry point.

Such a model was tested by using passenger fares for the "Peugeot taxis" which ply between Lagos and major towns in Nigeria as well as the main centres in Dahomey, Togo and Ghana (See Fig 61). It was seen that the boundary has considerable effect in increasing passenger fares initially due to the circuity affect of the boundary and secondly due to the expense involved in the mechanics of getting from one state to the next - time spent at the border as well as the purchase of travel documents for vehicle, passengers and driver.

Within Nigeria, to travel by Peugeot transport cost (1968) approximately 1.6 Nigerian pence per mile while a journey over the boundary to Dahomey increased to 2.2 pence per mile and the journey involving the crossing of two and three boundaries - as one would do travelling between Lagos and Accra - rose to 2.8 pence per mile. A journey from Lagos to Ibadan, for example, usually cost approximately 12 Nigerian shillings in 1968 for a distance of 90 miles, while for a similar distance a journey to Porto Novo in Dahomey would cost 20 Nigerian shillings (14).

The effect of tariffs on the price of delivered goods is shown diagrammatically in Fig 62. To simplify the model only the costs of processing and distribution are assumed to vary. Such is the case in extractive industry where transported raw materials are not an important
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factor in costs. In the diagram, A B C represent three processing centres, and X a tariff wall. Line DE represents the rise and fall of processing costs between ABC and it can be seen that in the absence of any trade barrier the final retail price of goods from A is cheaper than similar goods processed at either B or C. If, however, there was a tariff at the boundary amounting to FG on shipments from Dahomey into Nigeria, then the final cost of goods transported from A will still be cheaper than those produced at B but more expensive than those produced at C. Thus a tariff of FG value would help Nigerian production and at C production would be shielded from Dahomean competition and a market could extend from H to I. If the tariff was raised to FJ the cost of goods from A in Nigeria would be so great that both B and C could compete. C could have a market extending to K and B could control the area between K and L while goods imported from A should sell across the boundary as far as L. In order to prevent goods entering Nigeria economically, the tariff would have to be raised by FM.

To test this model and to illustrate the effectiveness of the boundary as a tariff barrier, the case of plastic/polythene goods was studies, despite the lack of any statistical data. In both Dahomey and Nigeria polythene goods are on sale; those in Nigeria are generally produced within the country while those in Dahomey are imported either from France or Nigeria.

With the tariffs existing in 1968, a superficial view suggested that the general movement of plastic goods across the boundary was
towards Dahomey. Within Dahomey the price and origin of the various plastic goods and the retail outlets depended not only on the existing tariffs but also on the effectiveness of the Dahomean customs authorities in enforcing the tariffs. By comparison of tariffs alone, goods originating in France would have lower duty, but in some cases this appeared to be counterbalanced by goods of Nigerian origin having lower transfer costs - the main centres of consumption being within 75-150 miles from Nigerian plastic factories.

The picture is complicated by smuggling whereby the tariff wall is side-stepped. This activity generally takes place across the northern section of the boundary and Parakou is an important receiving and distribution centre for the plastic goods. Avoiding the tariff, however, does not compensate for the extra transfer costs which would otherwise have allowed goods to be moved southwards again to be retailed in the main centres of the country. Thus, within Dahomey, there are three distinct distribution patterns of imported plastic goods. Initially there are goods imported legally into Dahomey from Nigeria and France. Retail costs are similar, but distribution, except in the more specialized goods, is generally restricted to the south. In the north are goods illegally imported from Nigeria and which can bear extra transfer costs and compete at similar prices (with higher transfer costs but lower or no tariffs) to those imported legally through southern Dahomey. The amount of duty avoided, however, does not appear to be sufficiently great to enable the goods to be
transported southwards again to southern Dahomey to compete with legally-imported goods.

Considering the effect of the boundary on east-west trading patterns which existed before partition, it can be seen how it has acted as a disruptive force. With a different economic system on either side, the boundary has tended to reflect trade movements back to the interior and economic centres of each state rather than attract or increase existing trade across the boundary. The example of trade in tobacco can be examined. With the establishment of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary the movement of tobacco into Nigeria from what is now south-eastern Dahomey became completely reversed. By the 1860's, tobacco grown in the Porto Novo region of what is now Dahomey was exported to Abeokuta (in present-day Nigeria) to be exchanged for slaves. Although the slave trade had been stopped, this movement of tobacco continued in an east-to-west direction until the early 1940's. In 1942, however, SOCOTAB (The Colonial Tobacco Organization), established itself at Savé, followed by SOPA (The Organization for Agricultural Production) at Bohicon, and were granted a purchasing monopoly for all tobacco sold in Dahomey. Most of the tobacco produced in that colony was bought by the two companies to be exported to foreign manufacturers, or to the two tobacco factories established in the same year at Dakar. As a result, Nigerian tobacco began to be (and still is to some extent) imported into Dahomey to serve the local market.
CHAPTER TWELVE

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ILLEGAL TRADE  SMUGGLING

In many African states smuggling is an important retarding factor in economic development. Differential taxes and values given to goods on either side of a boundary usually result in this activity, and, in countries where a high proportion of state revenue is derived from customs duties, the problems are extremely serious. By its very nature, however, this illegal trade is little documented and rarely features in any geographical writing. Research has shown how the development of this type of trade, due to the creation of a boundary and a coincident tariff barrier, has disrupted and modified local economies - though not necessarily for the worse in financial terms for those people directly involved in the industry. Today smuggling between Dahomey and Nigeria is of considerable size and importance. As Mondjannagni aptly states, it is "une institution nationale tous les commerçants indigènes et parfois même les commerçants européens en vivent plus ou moins".

Smuggling is a two way movement along this boundary and it is difficult to estimate in which direction is such trade the more important
From Nigeria goods often smuggled into Dahomey include bicycles, household goods, soap, cloth, electrical equipment, whereas in the opposite direction there is a movement of spirits, cigarettes, tobacco and cloth. The reasons for this movement in contraband goods is due to the large price differential between Dahomey and Nigeria and this in turn was to some extent due to differing colonial policies. French colonial policies, especially in the earlier colonial period, did not require dependencies to be financially self-supporting whilst Britain expected every colony to meet the cost of its own administration. In French colonies, tariffs were reduced in an attempt to attract foreign ships and traders to their ports and in the 1860's duties in French West African territories were either abolished or reduced to 4%. In the Lagos protectorate, however, tariffs were high and duty fell heavily on such items as imported alcohol and tobacco. Such a situation remains today. Mondjannagni illustrates this at the end of the colonial period by quoting price differentials in imported cloth. In 1960 a twelve yard piece of wax print from Holland would cost the equivalent of approximately £3, yet after duty had been paid the value in Dahomey would be approximately £4 15 Od and in Lagos, 75 miles away, the same article would cost up to £2 less. With such a price differential, smuggling of cloth has become widespread. Where the price differential is larger - in alcoholic drinks it is up to 100% - smuggling is even more common.

Even before a definite boundary had been delimited between the colonies of Dahomey and Lagos a considerable price differential
existed on goods entering Porto Novo and Lagos. On almost all goods the duty levied was to give Dahomey the price advantage and encouraged a movement of smuggled goods along the coast from Porto Novo to Lagos. Fig 63, for example, gives the customs duties in the two spheres of influence for 1887(5) some two years before the location of the boundary was actually decided. It can be seen that only with gun powder was a higher import duty applied in Dahomey. With other goods, however, there was either no duty or a considerably lower rate than at Lagos. Thus, even before the boundary existed there was a considerable movement of illegal traffic from the French sphere of influence around Porto Novo to that of the British centred at Lagos. As regards contraband liquor, quantities were relatively large as is demonstrated by the following extract from an appeal made by the chiefs and elders of Ketonu to the Governor of Lagos in 1888. Ketonu, at that time, was in the British sphere, though in the frontier area with the French zone, and apparently it suffered considerably from the import of cheap drink from Porto Novo. The appeal is dated the 17th May 1888, and commences:

"only from the commencement of the present month, no less than 22 puncheons of rum, 100 cases of gin, about 50 cases of muscat and tafia anisette imported from Porto Novo and sold in ten houses in Ketonu, besides less quantities in demijohns, and a few cases of gin muscat and tafia anisette brought by the market women every week from Porto Novo and sold, liquor become so cheap that it is within the reach of everybody, a gallon of rum is sold for only 8d and 4½d for a bottle."
### CUSTOMS DUTIES IN PART OF WEST AFRICA 1887

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Togo &amp; Southern Dahomey</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Drawback on transit for Porto Novo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gin</td>
<td>per case</td>
<td>3 8d-9 6d</td>
<td>10½d-1s</td>
<td>4½d per gall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>per litre</td>
<td>0 19d-0 48d</td>
<td>1 5d-1 75</td>
<td>4½d per gall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder</td>
<td>100 lb</td>
<td>2s 6d</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>1s per lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>per kilo</td>
<td>1 2d</td>
<td>4 25d</td>
<td>1½d per lb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guns</td>
<td>each</td>
<td>6d</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>6d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy</td>
<td>per gall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>6d per gall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other spirits</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>6d per gall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowries</td>
<td>per cwt</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>6d per cwt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>per ton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5s</td>
<td>2s 6d per cwt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4% ad val</td>
<td>½ of full duty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of gin. The town is in consequence fast becoming demoralized and can only become more degraded if this ruinous traffic continue.

Unlike the legal trade the route pattern of smuggling has developed largely along trade routes which often existed prior to the development of the boundary. Whereas legal trade is more or less confined to the major road linking the two countries and to some extent the coastal lagoon, the smuggling routes tend to follow the pre-colonial pattern of seasonal bush-tracks. Fig 64 shows the routes known to be used by smugglers in relation to the legal trading route and as the map indicates, smuggling appears to take place along four major sections of the boundary. The first of these areas is found in a zone stretching about 25 miles inland from the lagoon, secondly around the settlements of Meko and Ilara, thirdly between Save and the Iwere area, and lastly across the boundary in the area roughly between latitudes 9° and 10° north. The overriding factor influencing the location of smuggling routes appears, in general, to be the proximity of motorable roads to the boundary. In the southern smuggling zone - apart from the east-west lagoon route-way - there is a relatively dense network of all-season roads parallel with the boundary and within a few miles of each other for 20 miles or so inland from the lagoon. To the west of the boundary are the important urban centres of Porto Novo and Cotonou while to the east are Badagry, Ado, Ilaro, Abeokuta and Lagos - the latter being all within a hundred miles of the border and interconnected by surfaced roads. It will be seen that most of the smuggling along the boundary
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The second zone is centred on Meko where a tarred road projects westwards from Abeokuta to within ten miles of the boundary. This town, in turn, is only 17 miles from Ketu which is linked by an un tarred but all-season road to Pobé and the main urban centres of southern Dahomey. Similarly in the vicinity of Save the major road to the north swings to the east and parallels the boundary opposite to a seasonal road stretching from Iseyin and Oyo in Nigeria.

The northern area of smuggling is also related to the road pattern. On the Dahomean side an intertwined road and rail route parallels the boundary north of Savé as far as Parakou whence the road continues northwards to Nikki and Kandi. In Nigeria an all-season road parallels the boundary for approximately 60 miles and the nearest customs post is up to 50 miles away at Chikanda. The movement of smuggled goods across the boundary takes place to a large extent on bicycle with Parakou in Dahomey and probably Boria in Nigeria acting as the two main centres.

Parakou is largely a Yoruba town of some 14,000 people (1961). Many of the Yorubas are from Nigeria and are only temporary traders in the town. They trade almost exclusively in Nigerian goods or goods imported through Nigerian ports. The goods on sale include enamelware from Lagos, plastics from Ibadan, as well as native cloth from various parts of Western Nigeria. The importance of trade between Parakou and Nigeria is indicated by the eagerness of the Parakou Yoruba to obtain Nigerian currency. In March 1967, for example,
the official rate of exchange was 688 CFA Francs to N£ 1. In most centres it was possible to obtain 700 Francs by illegal exchange but in Parakou the Yoruba money changers usually gave in excess of 725 Francs, and on occasions up to 750 Francs.

Any investigation into legal trade, however, would reveal an extremely small amount of trade moving between Nigeria and Parakou. In April 1968, the market was observed and approximately 80 vehicles were found to call at the market each market day. The majority came from within Dahomey, several regularly came from Niger Republic and the occasional Ghanaian vehicle was to be seen. At no time, however, were any Nigerian vehicles observed at the market and it appeared that only on one or two occasions during the year did they come. This was confirmed by the records of vehicles crossing the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary. During the sample year October 1965 to September 1966 only seven vehicles crossed the border at Chikanda - the nearest crossing point - and declared their destination as Parakou. These comprised six cars and one bus and together they carried only 33 passengers. At Idiroko, the major crossing point in the south, no vehicles in the same period were recorded as travelling from Nigeria to Parakou.

The most impressive feature of the vehicles at the market was the distances they had covered to reach Parakou and these along considerable stretches of unsurfaced roads (See Fig 65). Apart from vehicles
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actually centred on Parakou the largest group at the market came from Cotonou (approximately 25%) and this town is over 350 miles away. For the first 80 miles (as far as Bohicon) the road is surfaced, but for the rest of the journey the road has a lateritic surface and is closed for considerable periods during the rainy season. Vehicles originating in Niamey had to travel approximately 400 miles while those from Accra came over 450 miles. Vehicles from such urban centres as Oyo, Ibadan, Iseyin or Abeokuta across the boundary in Nigeria, and considerably nearer than Niamey or Accra, were hardly ever seen in the market.

Borla, on the other side of the boundary from Parakou, acts as a trans-shipment point where goods are transferred from bicycle to motor transport and vice-versa. The village does not act as a market centre itself. Instead, contraband spirits and other goods are moved on to the larger markets of Ibadan, Abeokuta or Ilorin. Although fieldwork failed to provide any visible evidence of illegal trade here, Borla was the only settlement on an all-season road along the northern section of the boundary where Nigerian currency could be exchanged for the Franc. Borla is situated at the terminus of the shortest east-west track linking Parakou with the Nigerian boundary road. Fig 66 shows this route running from Parakou along the motorable road to Kika and thence a track leads to Parî, Borou and on to Borla. A more southerly route does link Parakou with the Nigerian road at Okuta (20 miles south of Borla) but this is somewhat longer, making a detour via Tendou. This latter route also has the disadvantage of crossing watercourses six times as opposed to only once in the case of the more
THE SMUGGLING ZONE ALONG THE NORTHERN SECTION OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY
northerly route. As a result, along this routeway, any east-west movement declines and probably comes to a standstill during the rainy season.

Further to the south, but along the same road which follows the Nigerian side of the boundary, in the vicinity of Shaki smuggling has long been conducted on a highly organized and considerable scale. In 1934 it was reported that a great deal of smuggling was taking place at a point about 50 miles to the north of Wasinmi and opposite to Shaki. Articles then being smuggled were cigarettes, corrugated iron sheets, bags of salt and large quantities of cloth. The procedure then, and probably even today, involved a lorry meeting carriers on foot and on bicycle from Dahomey along the road near Shaki, which in turn would act as a distributing centre for such towns as Iseyin, Oyo, Ibadan, Abeokuta and Ogbomosho.

In the central smuggling zone there is large-scale traffic in contraband in the Ketu-Meko area partially due to the presence of a dry-season road which by-passes the customs post at Meko (See Fig 67). Several roads from south and central Dahomey converge at Iro cogny some three miles within Dahomey. A single road then crosses the boundary at Ilara and then branches again. One branch, eight miles long, goes via Idofa to Meko where a customs post has been established at a point where the road enters the town. A second route, however, takes a longer course, via Oja-Ota, is a better surfaced track and enters Meko at the eastern end of the town, approximately three-quarters of a mile away from the customs post. Before this road reaches
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Meko, however, there are several other roads which branch off to settlements in the south. This route is used by heavy lorries to carry quantities of spirits and cloth from Dahomey to such urban centres at Ibadan, Abeokuta and Lagos.

Smuggling in this part of the Guinea coastlands to some extent is a seasonal occupation. In the wet season many tracks cannot be used and the dry-season road between Meko and Ketu is closed to all but the heaviest of vehicles. During the rainy season between April and October many rivers flood large areas and any east-west movement away from the roads is cut off. Such a situation applies to legal and illegal trade alike. The rains and swollen rivers have always been a factor in slowing down trade. In October 1934 the Resident of Oyo Province reported that around Wasinmi there had been no smuggling "for some time... owing to the flooded state of the rivers" (8). With regard to the Meko area, a report of the Preventive Service (1929) concluded that "apart from the obstacles of unfordable rivers, the country, in view of the absence of paths would be practically impenetrable" (9).

Social and economic consequences of illegal cross-boundary trade were examined in two settlements situated close to the boundary, Meridjonou and Wasinmi (See Fig. 68). Meridjonou is a village of approximately 1,200 inhabitants to the east of Porto Novo in Dahomey. Essentially, or at least originally, the inhabitants were farmers and fishermen. Since the establishment of the customs post there in 1913 many people have abandoned their former activity in favour of smuggling.
Today even school children are known to ply part-time across the border to earn money. Due to this change in the local economy land around the settlement has largely been abandoned. It appears that standards of living there have increased with the new occupation and food is often imported rather than grown locally.

Whereas Meridjonou was a village in existence before the boundary and whose economy was subsequently affected, Wasinni appears to be a settlement established largely because of illegal trade. This latter village was established in the late 1920's on the Nigerian side of the boundary by people from Meko, a small settlement across the River Okpara in Dahomey. In the early 1930's Wasinni had a population of less than 100 persons, today it is estimated to have over 500. In 1932 the District Officer at Oyo visited the village and reported that no effort had been made by the inhabitants to clear any land for farming. "There was little doubt that the inhabitants were acting at least as guides to smugglers." Today, conditions have not changed a great deal and Wasinni is ideally located for smuggling. The River Okpara is fordable there for eight months of the year and canoes act as ferries during the rainy season. The settlement is isolated and accessibility is difficult. No motorable road approaches the settlement from either side of the boundary and it is rarely, if ever, visited by customs officials. The function and economic importance of Wasinni is certainly out of all proportion to its size. This is obviously realized by both the inhabitants of the village and
of neighbouring settlements. The nearest Nigerian settlement to Wasinmi is Ijio, a small village situated at the western end of a road which stretches towards the boundary from Iseyin, through to Oke-Ho and Ijio. There, however, the road terminates almost 30 miles from the boundary and, up to at least April 1968, Wasinmi was not accessible to motor vehicles from the Nigerian side of the border. In June 1967, however, it was reported (11) that the Ijio and Wasinmi communities had embarked on the construction of a 28-mile road to link the two settlements. The initiative for the building of the road resulted from the "friendliness between the people and their Dahomean neighbours," and when completed the routeway would "help to promote trade in the area" (12). As it is possible for heavy transport to reach the river bank opposite to Wasinmi on the Dahomean side of the border it is quite possible for Wasinmi to develop in a way similar to Ilara in respect of the movement of contraband.

Although several attempts were made to visit Wasinmi it was impossible to get closer than 20 miles from the village by four-wheeled vehicle. In April 1968, the settlement was observed and photographed from the air. As Plate VIII shows, Wasinmi is a settlement of some 40 buildings, half a dozen of which have tin roofs. Cutting through the village a single footpath can be seen and this links Wasinmi with the River Okpara and then stretches as far as Ijio which is situated near the inselbergs seen on the horizon. As regards photographic evidence of economic activity in the area the lack of cultivated land is striking. Only three patches of cultivated land are shown on
the photograph and only one was actually under cultivation when the settlement was observed

To calculate the value of goods being smuggled across the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary is clearly impossible. The only basis for estimation is the value of goods seized by the Customs Authorities. In 1965 the approximate value approached £14,000 for goods found being carried illegally from Dahomey into Nigeria (See Fig 69). Such a value can represent only a small fraction of the total amount of illegal traffic. For Nigeria as a whole in 1961, the Customs Authorities seized, among other goods, 8 million cigarettes, 35,000 bottles of spirits and 18,000 lbs of tobacco and this formed "only a small fraction of the whole". Estimates of the total amount are necessarily vague and various. Some customs officials have suggested that perhaps only a tenth of the trade in smuggled goods is discovered. Considering the small number of customs officers and the difficult terrain over which they have to operate such an estimate is probably optimistic. In 1962, Okotie-Eboh, the Nigerian Federal Finance Minister estimated that goods smuggled between Dahomey and Nigeria was worth £750,000 or approximately one-third of all trade between these two countries.

Throughout 1965 the monthly value of goods seized along the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary varied from £2,400 in April to £95 in October. According to the customs officials the latter figure was unusually low. It was probably to some extent due to a drop in smuggling activity following the political unrest surrounding the
### CONFISCATED GOODS SMUGGLED ACROSS THE DAHOMEY - NIGERIA BOUNDARY 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Estimated Value (including duty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>721,390</td>
<td>£5581 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirits</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>4890 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmanufactured Tobacco</td>
<td>9,216 heads, 1,922 lb</td>
<td>2170 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches</td>
<td>26,184 boxes</td>
<td>520 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>387 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth</td>
<td>644 sq yards</td>
<td>185 3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware</td>
<td>21 aluminium pans</td>
<td>30 18 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>55 litres</td>
<td>28 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>88 lbs</td>
<td>7 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>19 bottles</td>
<td>6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfume</td>
<td>14 bottles</td>
<td>1.15 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24.0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£13,831 6 0d</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Region elections in Nigeria during that particular month

During the year there were 101 seizures connected with the boundary in question and these ranged from four to 13 per month. To some degree the seizure pattern corresponded to the climatic cycle of wet and dry seasons. As indicated earlier the period of rains slows movement down considerably and at times bicycle traffic is virtually stopped. Out of a total of 101 arrests only 41 were made during the six months between May and October and this period may be roughly taken as corresponding to that of the rains. It is also interesting to note that arrests increased slightly in August during the "little dry" season.

Of the goods seized over 90% comprised cigarettes, tobacco and spirits. Of these, cigarettes were the most important item forming 40% of seized goods with a value of £5,581. Spirits were valued at £4,890 and unmanufactured tobacco £2,170. The remaining £1,198 was made up of matches, jewellery, and cloth with small quantities of wine, coffee, beer and perfume.

Approximately three-quarters of a million cigarettes were seized during 1965. Most of these were varieties which were already being imported legally into Nigeria and which would therefore find a ready market. Thus, of the 721,390 cigarettes seized (made up of nine varieties), over 99% comprised "Craven A", "Consulate" and "State Express". All three brands were also already imported and sold within Nigeria. "Craven A" were by far the most common 470,060 were confiscated.
Of the bottled goods some 2,500 bottles of spirits were seized during the year and had a value of £4,890. The numbers of bottles, however, was somewhat inflated by the inclusion of 1,416 bottles of alcohol de Menthe on the seizure list. These were miniature sized bottles - probably one-eighth that of a normal spirit bottle. Taking this into consideration the most popular type of spirit smuggled appears to be schnapps. This is extremely popular throughout West Africa and today appears a traditional gift in many areas. Approximately 620 bottles of schnapps and a little over 400 bottles of brandy were seized in 1965. This latter drink is of increasing popularity - especially in the more educated sectors of the population. Whisky forms a poor third with only 60 bottles, while gin was surprisingly absent on the seizure lists. Only nine bottles were recorded as being confiscated. Rum, save half a bottle found among abandoned goods in a canoe, appeared to be totally absent from the illegal traffic.

The smuggling of unmanufactured tobacco is more widespread and important than the figures might suggest. With five cigarette factories in Nigeria (and none in Dahomey) the demand for certain types of tobacco in its unmanufactured state is considerable. On the seizure list this item came third with a value of over £2,000. In Dahomey, a kilo of unmanufactured tobacco could be purchased for approximately 100 francs CFA (= 2/8d) and by taking it into Nigeria illegally £1 per pound duty could be avoided.

Some 26,000 boxes of matches were seized and valued at £500.
Unlike most other goods, however, the varieties smuggled were not those already on sale in Nigeria.

Of the £400 worth of jewellery seized almost all comprised gold-plated trinkets, chains, bracelets, rings, which sell extremely well in the large urban markets of Yorubaland.

The cloth on the whole was either ordinary baft or cotton prints. The former would be destined for centres such as Abeokuta where it would probably be tie-dyed in a traditional Yoruba blue design. The cotton prints were generally colourful wax-prints of Dutch origin side-stepping the tariff-barrier by entering Nigeria through Dahomey and some of the cloth appeared to have previously been smuggled into Dahomey from Togo.

The 21 aluminium pans valued at £30 was an isolated case and it is unusual for a movement of such hardware into Nigeria. With a factory in Lagos producing relatively cheap aluminium goods the movement is usually the reverse. On occasions, however, traders in Nigeria do find a market for rather specialized items which might have originated from Japan through Dahomey.

The 88 pounds of coffee also represents an isolated case. Such a movement is rare as, unlike Dahomey, little coffee is consumed by the indigenous population in Nigeria.

Small quantities of wine appear to have been smuggled throughout the year. Usually this is almost entirely comprised of litre bottles.
of vin ordinaire which is bottled in Cotonou. On the whole, however, there is not a ready market for such drink in Nigeria as the bottle size and a "french label" makes its origins conspicuous. Similarly with beer, despite its relative cheapness and similarity to Nigerian bottled beer, its "Sobrado" label makes it largely impossible to sell in Nigeria on any large scale.

Transportation of Smuggled Goods

Smuggled goods may be transported across the boundary by canoe, lorry, car and bicycle, or on foot. If any of the former four methods were used, then it is evident in seizure records as details of the vehicle used are recorded. During 1965, out of 101 seizures, vehicles were involved only in 43 cases. One cannot conclude, however, that in the remaining 58 cases the goods were carried across the boundary on foot. A considerable amount of contraband material is smuggled on public vehicles (i.e. the "mammy-waggon"), though this method must necessarily be confined to the three routes where four-wheeled transport can cross the boundary. Customs officials have suggested, however, that only a small quantity of the seized goods were brought over on foot. By this method only a small quantity of goods can be carried. Nevertheless, this method does take place on a large scale and it is extremely difficult to stop (See Fig. 70).

Of the vehicles used in smuggling the bicycle is generally acknowledged to be by far the most common. Of the 101 seizures in 1965, 21 dealt with goods carried on bicycles. This method of transporting contraband is also far more common than the figures might
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport used</th>
<th>Number of occasions seized</th>
<th>Average value per trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>£21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>£935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>£192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated*</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>£64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>£137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes passengers on public transport and people crossing the boundary on foot.
suggest. Unlike motor vehicles, bicycles are relatively easy to hide in surrounding woodland, are silent and do not require powerful lights for crossing the boundary area at night. As was suggested earlier, goods are often taken by bicycle convoys and, on the 21 occasions when bicycle-carried goods were seized, a total of at least 35 bicycles had been used.

Cars and lorries are rarely used mainly because of the lack of motorable roads crossing the boundary. Ten cars and six lorries were seized in 1965.

Six canoes were also discovered carrying contraband during the year. This number, however, is in no way indicative of the frequency of this form of transport. Canoes are probably the most effective form of illegal transportation in this area. They are silent and at the same time relatively large quantities can be carried at one time. Although canoes can only be used in a few places, the coastal lagoon with its myriad of inlets and channels provides a perfect routeway that can also be used at night.

Fig 70 tabulates details of the transportation of contraband. It can be seen that the lorry carries the most valuable cargo per vehicle-trip. Despite an average of little over £900 per journey, the mode was considerably higher with an extreme cargo valued at £1,943. This is representative of smuggling on a large and organised scale. The lorries in this case are used exclusively for smuggling and usually carry large quantities of only one or two types of goods.
In March 1965, a lorry was found carrying 50,000 "Craven A" cigarettes, 348 bottles of brandy and 216,000 boxes of matches. In April 1965, a lorry carried seven sacks containing 1,680 heads of unmanufactured tobacco as well as 24 bottles of whisky. The total cargo was valued at £837. In the extreme case where the cargo was valued at nearly £2,000, approximately 250,000 cigarettes were being carried.

At the other extreme, cars seized by the customs carried goods valued at approximately £20 per vehicle trip. There are various factors which might explain this apparent anomaly. The only two improved roads which link Dahomey and Nigeria pass through centres of customs control. The tracks used by lorries, five tons and more in weight, are usually impassable for cars - it being common for even the heaviest lorries to be stranded on occasions during the rains. Thus the "car smuggler" is usually a bonafide traveller carrying a little excess to that stipulated by law. Thus the seized goods usually comprised a long list of a wide variety of dutiable articles - though usually in relatively small quantities. The following is a typical case study. On the 11th April 1965 a taxi was found attempting to by-pass the customs at Idiroko on the Nigerian side of the border. The taxi had taken people to Cotonou in Dahomey and was returning to Ilaro. With the fares paid by the travellers the taxi driver had bought a selection of items which could either be of use to himself or sold inconspicuously in his home town in Nigeria. The list of seized goods included four quart-bottles and one pint-bottle of schnapps.
one quart-bottle of whisky, one quart-bottle of brandy, three bottles of champagne, five bottles of Dahomean beer, three small bottles of perfume and one packet of ten boxes of matches. These, according to the driver's statement, were purchased for £4 7 Od in Dahomey, and would have a dutiable value of £20 11 4d in Nigeria. It is more probable, however, that these items cost between £10 and £15 and would have a dutiable value of more than £50. Similarly, in June a car was seized carrying 11 bottles of assorted spirits, 400 cigarettes and a few square yards of cotton prints.

On average, bicycles surprisingly carried goods with a value two and a half times greater than that of cars. Despite an average value of £49 16 Od of seized goods per cycle, values ranged from a little over £2 to two cycles carrying goods worth a total of £360. These figures are examples of two distinct forms of "cycle smuggling." On the one hand there is the traveller who attempts to bring a few articles across the boundary for his own use and, on the other, there are cycle-convoys belonging to relatively large-scale organized smuggling. In the former case a peasant returning from a plot of land across the border may bring across a selection of items for use in his own home, or for his family, or for sale in his village market. A typical example was seized in August 1965 when among personal belongings three packets of envelopes, four packets of blue, and two heads of tobacco were discovered.

At the other extreme there are cyclists who form part of an
extensive network of smuggling. In this case the cyclists act only as transport agents having a more or less defined route and linking two settlements on either side of the boundary. Much of this type of smuggling takes place around legal crossing points. Traders travelling from one country to the next with dutiable goods may stop at a settlement on the road prior to reaching the boundary. Here a specific cargo may be transferred to the cyclists and collected later at some pre-arranged place at the other side of the boundary. The trader then proceeds through the legal crossing point while his luggage makes a detour "through the bush." This type of smuggling is also used by small traders and shopkeepers who trade in settlements near the border. Many boundary villages and towns have centres where orders may be handed in for smuggled goods. The order, on being handed in, is forwarded with one of the cyclist transporters to an agent at "the other side" who purchases the desired articles and forwards them in the next convoy. Thus in the organized cycle-smuggling there are again two distinct categories: the private transporter who takes each specific cargo himself and secondly the continuous convoy smuggling between two centres on either side of the border. In the former group, seized examples included a few hundred cigarettes, or drums of caustic soda, a consignment of coffee beans or a quantity of metal roofing sheets. The cycle convoys on the other hand tend to have a more varied and valuable cargo. One group of three cycles in February 1965, was found carrying 10,000 cigarettes and 48 bottles of schnapps. Another convoy was found to be carrying 102 pounds of unmanufactured tobacco as well as 10,000 cigarettes.
The category of smuggling in which no specific vehicle was used had an average value of seized goods slightly higher than that of the bicycle. At £64 per head, however, such a figure fails to demonstrate two distinct types of smuggling in this category. Initially there is the group which includes goods physically carried over the boundary. At the turn of the century this type was second only to canoe transportation. Today, however, though still widespread, this method is of declining importance. There is a limit to what can be carried on the head and thus cigarettes, being relatively light-weight, are a common cargo. This is especially the case with market women travelling from one market to another, from one side of the boundary to the other. There is also the labourer and farmer travelling on foot who attempts to carry a selection of items he finds cheaper in Dahomey, for example, a few boxes of matches, washing blue, cigarettes, a piece of cloth. This category must also include the smuggling carried out by persons travelling in public vehicles. In this case the goods must be valuable in comparison with size. It is in this group that all the seized jewellery was found. In March 1965, on three different occasions, gold-plated jewellery worth a total of £360 was discovered amongst the luggage and on the persons of three travellers destined for central Yorubaland.

In areas where it is possible, canoe transportation is probably the most economic and successful form of smuggling. Along the coastal lagoons, already busy with fishermen and canoes legally carrying goods, it is difficult to detect contraband cargoes. Thus the number of canoes
seized in no way represents the extensive and valuable nature of this traffic. Again there are two distinct types of canoe smuggling. Initially there is the canoist who belongs to a relatively large network and in some respects acts like the cyclist in taking cargo from one point to another. For example one canoe discovered carrying contraband along the coastal lagoon had over £500 worth of goods destined for traders in Badagry. The boat contained 210 pounds of raw tobacco, 3,000 cigarettes, one salmanazar and 40 litres bottles of vin ordinaire, eight dozen bottles of schnapps and six bottles of brandy. On the other hand there is the fisherman/trader who participates in illegal traffic. Along the lagoon there are two important urban and market centres in close proximity to the boundary. These are Badagry in Nigeria and Porto Novo in Dahomey and fishermen and traders come from both countries to each of these centres. Fishermen from Nigeria, for example, are known to take their catch for sale in Porto Novo market and their takings are very often spent on goods which can bring high profits back in Nigeria.

**Destination of smuggled goods**

With the information available it is virtually impossible to determine with accuracy the destination of goods being smuggled into Nigeria from Dahomey. However, the seizure records for the western boundary do provide, where possible, details of the place of origin or home town of persons caught smuggling.

In 1965 out of 101 occasions when goods were seized by the Customs Authorities the origin of the smuggler is given in 77 cases.
The remaining 24 represent occasions when smugglers have escaped and the contraband was abandoned. In this group the total value of the 24 lots of abandoned goods was greater than that of the remaining 77 £7,837 as opposed to £6,002. One of the reasons for this is suggested on examining the character of the abandoned goods and the method of their transportation. Of the seven lorries found carrying contraband three were in the abandoned category. Cargoes in this latter group had an average of £1,300 while those whose drivers remained with their vehicles had an average value of less than £400. Those with a £400 average per lorry were probably individual lorry owners smuggling in their own vehicles while the higher value cargoes most probably belonged to some relatively large-scale smuggling organization.

In the 77 cases where the home town of the smugglers is known it is usual for it to be synonymous with the immediate or final destination of the goods. This does not apply to the six occasions when goods were seized from Dahomeans bringing contraband into Nigeria. In the 61 other cases, however, the origin of the smuggler is illustrated in Fig 71. Although this map should not be taken as giving an accurate picture of all smuggling which takes place across the boundary it does provide several suggestions as to the actual pattern. Fig 72, though similar to the latter map, gives the relative volume of smugglers per destination as indicated in the seizure lists.

As customs patrol is relatively uniform along those parts of the
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boundary where smuggling occurs, and as the customs for the boundary are under one organization centred in IaIroko, the pattern of seized goods probably gives a fair reflection of the relative distribution and concentration of all smuggling activity. The concentration of smuggling along the 100 or so miles between the coast and Meko is extremely conspicuous. It can be seen that the apparent destination of contraband is largely along an axis stretching between Cotonou (where most of the goods enter Dahomey), IaIroko (on the legal crossing point) and Ibadan (the largest town and market centre in Nigeria). Ilara and Abeokuta are also situated along this axis. During 1965 the destination of the contraband appears to have been confined largely to the Western Region of Nigeria. Only on two occasions, at Chikanda and Offa, were seized goods destined for outside the region. There are several factors which might explain this. Tobacco and alcoholic drinks being the most important items of contraband would not have such a large market in the predominantly Moslem, northern part of Nigeria. The then Eastern Region, on the other hand, has its own source of smuggled goods in the Cameroons and more especially the island of Fernando Po. Thus the destination of smugglers appears to be concentrated in two distinct areas. Initially there is a concentration of settlements immediately across the boundary from Porto Novo within 30 or 40 miles of the coastal lagoon. Secondly there is a string of towns along routes from Lagos and Ibadan which lead to the North or Mid-West Regions. Considering the actual numbers of smugglers and the destination, distribution is concentrated on settlements within a few miles of the boundary - especially Meko, Ijoffin and Badagry.
Such a pattern, however, represents one of middlemen rather than one showing the ultimate destination of contraband. This is reflected more clearly in Fig. 73 which shows the value of seized goods for each destination. In this case the importance of Abeokuta is indicated more clearly. Abeokuta being situated centrally between Lagos and Ibadan, acts as a type of "central clearing house." The importance of Ijoffin and Badagry and Meko is more as transit centres for goods destined for the larger urban centres of the interior.

Smuggling, as we have seen, takes place on considerable scale across the southerly sections of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary. Though only a small area was considered the results of the enquiry are largely representative of the African continent as a whole. The movement of contraband has taken place from times even before the boundary in question was delimited. In recent years this activity has probably increased considerably as the boundary functions have been enforced and tariff barriers increased since independence. A result of the political fragmentation and the profusion and diversity of currency and trading areas, smuggling must rank as a major obstacle in the development of national economies in Africa.
DESTINATION AND VALUE OF GOODS CONFISCATED ALONG THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY, 1965
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CHAPTER THIRTEEN

MEASURING THE RESTRICTIVE FACTOR OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY

THE INTERACTANCE HYPOTHESIS

In this and previous chapters it has been shown how the boundary restricts a wide variety of economic and social movements between populations on either side. To measure the exact extent of this restrictive factor of the boundary is clearly impossible, though it may, however, be demonstrated in an approximate quantitative form by using the interactance hypothesis model. This gravity model has been developed from the fact that groups of people tend to interact more as the groups become larger, nearer, and more intense in their activities. It states that the interaction between two places is directly proportional to the product of the populations (or other measures of volume) and inversely proportional to the distance between them. The fullest definition has been given by Dodd (1) and is shown below.

\[
I = \frac{KTTPPAA}{a^b b^a D}
\]
I stands for interaction. This can be extremely varied - trade, migration, or communications between two settlements being simple examples. \( K \) is a constant and is usually the reciprocal of the total number of interactions of the groups concerned. \( T \) refers to the time factor - a day or month, for example, over which the various interactions are measured. \( P_a \) and \( P_b \) are the populations of the two interacting groups while \( A_a \) and \( A_b \) are specific indices of per capita activity of the two populations. In the case of measuring interactions as regards transport, for instance, \( A_a \) and \( A_b \) might refer to vehicles per head in each population.

Interaction appears to be based on three major factors and these have been termed complementarity, intervening opportunity, and transferability. Two areas must be complementary in specific aspects to interact. There must be a demand in one area and a supply in another. Interaction, however, will not usually develop if there is any intervening source of supply between two areas - there should be no intervening opportunity. The third factor, transferability, refers to distance measured in real terms of transfer and time costs. If the distance between market and supply is too great and/or too costly to overcome interactance will not take place despite perfect complementarity and lack of intervening opportunity.

The factors influencing interaction and the formula for measuring it apply to physical movement of goods and people rather than to the spread of ideas and most other types of communication.
As Ullman\(^{(2)}\) states, for example, intervening opportunity would seem to facilitate rather than check the spread of ideas. Moreover, the similarity of the two regions would facilitate the spread of ideas more than the differences between them.

With regard to boundary studies the interaction hypothesis appears to have first been used by MacKay\(^{(3)}\) (1958). He applied the model to telephone calls between settlements in Canada and the USA and thence explained the differences between the actual interaction and the interaction expected according to the model in terms of the barrier effect of the Canada-United States boundary. In 1963 a similar study of cross-boundary telephonic communication was conducted by Logan\(^{(4)}\) in Australia.

For the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary an application of the interaction hypothesis has proved extremely difficult due to the lack of relevant and adequate statistics. However, the restrictive influence of the boundary has been shown in limited quantitative form by applying the model to the movement of vehicles between a selection of Dahomean and Nigerian towns. As MacKay\(^{(6)}\) discovered, the formula given by Dodds can be adequately modified for many types of interaction. For areas with similar intensity of activity, and by measuring interactions over unit time, \(T\), \(A_a\) and \(A_b\) have been disregarded, reducing the equation to the following:

\[
I = \frac{KP_{a,b}}{D}
\]
As this formula resulted in expected interactions constantly far in excess of the actual interactions measured over the period of a 24-hour day a further modification was made in a manner similar to Logan (7). Rather than allow the $K$ factor in the formula represent the reciprocal of the total number of interactions of the groups of settlements concerned it was decided that $K$ should represent the ratio of the sum of all $\frac{P_aP_b}{D}$ calculations to the sum of all the interactions recorded.

When the recorded and the calculated figures are graphed the line representing perfect correlation between the two is a $45^\circ$ line passing through the origin (See Fig 74) The data graphed shows interaction in the form of the average number of vehicles travelling per 24-hour day from one settlement to another in December 1963. In all 29 interactions are plotted 10 within Dahomey, 12 within Nigeria and 7 international. Once plotted various patterns emerge and the interactions can then be classified into six major groups four of which have positive average deviations (i.e., the measured volume of traffic is higher than expected) and two groups have negative deviations where measured interaction is considerably lower than expected (See Fig 75) Positive deviation on the whole occurred along most internal routes in Dahomey and Nigeria, along the corridor route linking Niger with the Dahomey coast, and fourthly on routes radiating from the transboundary village of Ilara. Negative deviation, on the other hand, was largely associated with cross-boundary routes (Statistical data for each group is given in Fig 75 and more fully in Appendix III.)
INTERACTION BETWEEN SELECTED CENTRES IN DAHOMEY, NIGERIA AND NIGER VEHICLES PER DAY

\[ I = \frac{K \cdot P_a \cdot P_b}{D} \]
Key to Figure 74

A Nigerian Internal routes
1. Ibadan-Lagos
2. Ibadan-Oyo
3. Ibadan-Abeokuta
4. Ibadan-Ife
5. Ibadan-Ondo
6. Lagos-Kano
7. Ilorin-Ibadan

B Dahomey Internal routes
1. Sakete-Porto Novo
2. Sakete-Cotonou
3. Sakete-Pobe
4. Abomey-Cotonou
5. Abomey-Allada

C Dahomey-Niger corridor routes
1. Parakou-Niamey
2. Parakou-Cotonou
3. Nikki-Parakou
4. Parakou-Porto Novo

D Nigeria routes converging on the boundary
1. Shaki-Iseyin
2. Shaki-Kishin
3. Shaki-Okeho

E Cross-boundary routes
1. Lagos-Cotonou
2. Lagos-Porto Novo
3. Lagos-Accra
4. Lagos-Lome
5. Abeokuta-Ketu
6. Nikki-Shaki

F Routes converging on Ilara
1. Ilara-Abeokuta
2. Ilara-Ketu
3. Ilara-Meko
4. Ilara-Porto Novo
## ESTIMATED AND MEASURED INTERACTION BETWEEN SELECTED CENTRES
### IN NIGERIA, DAHOMEY AND NIGER
#### MOVEMENT OF VEHICLES PER DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interacting centres</th>
<th>Miles apart</th>
<th>Estimated number of vehicles</th>
<th>Measured number of vehicles</th>
<th>Percentage variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Nigeria Internal routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan-Oyo</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan-Ife</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan-Ondo</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan-Abeokuta</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibadan-Lagos</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>+40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilorin-Ibadan</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos-Kano</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Dahomey Internal routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakete-Pobe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakete-Cotonou</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakete-Porto Novo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abomey-Cotonou</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abomey-Allada</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C Dahomey-Niger corridor routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakou-Cotonou</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+5285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakou-Agbav</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+18457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakou-Porto Novo</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki-Parakou</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+6789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D Nigeria routes converging on boundary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaki-Iseyin</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaki-Okeho</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaki-Kish</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E Cross-boundary routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikki-Shaki</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos-Porto Novo</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos-Cotonou</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos-Lome</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos-Accra</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abeokuta-Ketu</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F Routes centred on Ilara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilara-Meko</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilara-Abeokuta</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilara-Ketu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilara-Porto Novo</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within Nigeria vehicular traffic was enumerated along routes linking Lagos with Ibadan and Kano, Ibadan with Abeokuta, Oyo, Ondo, Ife, and Ilorin. On the whole estimated interaction in this group was remarkably close to that actually recorded - estimated interaction exceeding that measured by an average of 11%. Six of the routes had positive correlations and recorded interaction exceeded estimates to the highest degree along the Lagos-Kano routeway. Traffic along the Ilorin-Ibadan and Abeokuta-Ibadan routes was considerably less than expected (72% and 18% less respectively). In both cases such results are largely due to the factor of intervening opportunity and variations of it. In the case of Ilorin (100 miles from Ibadan) distances are too great for any local market traffic to develop and long-distance movement is usually direct to the Lagos entrepôt on the coast. Abeokuta, on the other hand, is not on the major route between the coast and the interior. Most traffic from Lagos to the north, for example, goes direct to Ibadan via Shagamu. Abeokuta in consequence is more directly orientated to Lagos than to Ibadan.

Routes within Dahomey are classified into two groups for this study. On the one hand there are routes which may be considered as purely domestic while on the other there is interaction associated with the major international routeway where Dahomey acts as a corridor between the Atlantic coast and the francophone territories to the north. In both cases positive correlations were recorded though in considerably varying degrees.
With the domestic routes of Dahomey interaction in general was higher than expected (+72%) though as in Nigeria the average result concealed considerable variation (three with positive correlation and two negative). Interaction between Abomey and surrounding settlements was considerably less than expected whereas movement of vehicles in the coastal area of Dahomey was much higher than estimated.

The international corridor route linking Porto Novo and Cotonou with towns in Niger and Upper Volta provided results with one major characteristic: a positive correlation with recorded interaction vastly in excess of that estimated. Four routeways were considered and on average the recorded interaction exceeded that estimated by nearly 7,000%. Between Parakou in northern Dahomey and Niamey in Niger the recorded excess was more than 18,000%. The latter figure illustrates well the political factor influencing interaction intensity where the tariff wall of the anglo-francophone boundary of Ghana and Nigeria funnels trade from the north to the coast through the Togo-Dahomey corridor.

Interaction across the tariff wall, on the other hand, is negligible. In this study two groups of routeways were used as examples: initially routes going towards the boundary (in the case of Nigeria) and secondly the routes actually crossing the boundary.

In the first case three routes were studies and these converged on Shaki - a town on the northerly route across the boundary. In all
three cases interaction was considerably less than expected (-20%, -57%, -51%). Similarly with routes actually crossing the boundary interaction showed a negative correlation. Movement between Lagos-Porto Novo and Lagos-Cotonou in Dahomey was 68% and 60% less than expected. Between Lagos and Lomé, where a second international boundary has to be crossed, recorded movement was 72% less than estimated and for the Lagos-Accra route (across three boundaries) the figure decreased to 86% less than expected.

In the north, movement across the boundary did in fact exceed that estimated. In this case, however, one must recall that nearly all the traffic consisted of two or three lorries making regular trips back and forth across the boundary.

The final group of routeways considered is that centred on Ilara. In Chapter 7 it was shown how this small village (population 2,300) lies astride the international boundary and thrives on smuggling. The settlement is situated on a route linking Ketu in Dahomey with Abeokuta in Nigeria and interaction between these towns was 32% less than expected. Movement between Ilara and settlements to the east and west, however, shows a completely different picture. Between the village and Meko (twelve miles away) recorded interaction exceeded estimates by 1,130% and for Abeokuta the figure was 600%. For movement between Ilara and settlements in Dahomey the intensity of movement recorded was even higher with recorded interaction exceeding estimates by 1,400% on the Ketu route and 1,438% between the village and Porto Novo.
As to the method of analysis used it is seen how the interaction hypothesis can be of use in the study of boundaries. Several general patterns and conclusions emerge and these are probably most adequately expressed graphically in the following maps (See Figs 76 and 77). The average daily movement of vehicles between the various centres considered is shown in Fig 76. Initially the heavy concentration of traffic in western Nigeria is most conspicuous. Traffic density is high between such towns as Abeokuta, Oyo, Ife and Ibadan and especially between the latter settlement and Lagos. Secondly it is easy to see the general north-south direction of movement. On both sides of the boundary traffic in general runs roughly parallel to the political division joining towns in the interior with the coast. Lastly the volume of cross-boundary traffic is conspicuous by its absence. The traffic as a whole is limited and what there is is concentrated to the very south of the boundary.

Fig 77 attempts to portray in graphic form the results of the interaction measurements. Flow lines are drawn diagrammatically for each interaction route and vary in width and shading density according to the rate and character of deviation from measured interaction. Routes with negative deviation are left unshaded and these can be seen in three types of situation. Isolated routes within each state, those approaching the boundary and those crossing the boundary.

The most conspicuous routes of all are those with positive deviations situated on the corridor route through Dahomey to Niger.
MOVEMENT OF VEHICLES PER DAY BETWEEN SELECTED CENTRES
IN WEST AFRICA

Fig. 76
MEASURED INTERACTION (VEHICLES PER DAY) BETWEEN SELECTED CENTRES IN WEST AFRICA: PERCENTAGE DEVIATION FROM ESTIMATED INTERACTION

Fig. 77
or those routes converging on Ilara - the centre for contraband traffic situated astride the boundary near Meko. Along all these routes the numbers of vehicles enumerated were far in excess of the expected figures.
CHAPTER FOURTEEN
THE DIFFERENT EVALUATION OF A BOUNDARY AREA BY TWO ADJACENT ADMINISTRATIONS

In West Africa as a whole, natural regions - whether of relief, climate or vegetation - have a general east-west trend. Running parallel to the coast through such countries as Ghana, Togo, Dahomey and Nigeria, natural divisions are in contrast to political divisions which, like rivers in the south of the area, stretch inland from the sea in a north-south direction. As a result on either side of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary, at any specific point, the physical landscape is extremely similar.

As was indicated in Chapter 5, the boundary crosses the coastal spit and lagoon before rising slowly to a narrow east-west plateau. There is then a general depression followed by a steady rise to the major east-west watershed in the vicinity of Nikki before the land descends to the major Niger Valley. Similarly, rainfall follows east-west belts and decreases on the whole from south to north. Along the coastal-bar annual rainfall is in the vicinity of 70 inches and this falls to about 50 inches some 80 miles inland. This is followed by a broad belt of slightly heavier rain which crosses the...
boundary where it follows the River Okpara. A decrease in rainfall then occurs steadily northwards until there is approximately 30 inches per annum in the area where the boundary reaches the Niger (See Fig 78).

With vegetation the first 20 miles or so of the southern section of the boundary passes through remnants of rain forest. This gradually gives way to Guinea savanna and, in the northern extremity, Sudan savannah. In all, the physical landscape is one of wide vistas and gradual change, in no place does the boundary correspond to any natural division. It is, however, possible to detect a distinct contrast in other aspects of the geographical landscape - in which we may include a complexity of economic, social, cultural and political patterns and developments.

With the superimposition of two colonial states which later became independent units, the two areas on either side of the political division have been viewed from different and at times almost opposing points of view. At the end of the last century the boundary was created to divide two political units which had been superimposed on a complex mosaic of existing political and human groupings. At each side of the boundary the "colonial situation" was established. This term, used by Wallerstein, refers to the situation when "someone imposes in a given area a new institution, the colonial administration, governed by outsiders, who establish new rules which they enforce with a reasonable degree of success. It means that all those who act in the colony must take some account of these rules, and that indeed, an increasing amount of each individual's action is
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Fig. 78
orientated to this set of rules, rather than to any other set, for example the tribal set, to which he formerly paid full heed" (2)

In essence, the colonial situation on both sides of the boundary was the same, but in its workings and results it was at times quite different. A new administration was set in a new and greatly enlarged political framework and territory. As Hargreaves states, it was within the new boundaries that the "technology, culture and institutions of the colonial powers gradually made their impact during the twentieth century. Neighbouring Africans with virtually identical cultural traditions now found themselves subject to different laws, learning different languages and different doctrines in school, using new transport routes which carried them towards different ports and capital cities. These new forces of division were, of course, felt more quickly and more strongly in commercially-developed areas than in the back country. Distant places without schools or roads often preserved old relationships with their neighbours across the frontier, sometimes to the confusion of colonial officials. Yet even in such places the new colonial frontiers would in the long run shape the political future" (3)

Old economies were destroyed or modified, the cash crop became increasingly important though its character varied from one side of the boundary to the other. The new period brought new religions, facilitated the development of some and discouraged others. Again, however, the character of the religious developments varied from state
to state

New forms of education were introduced and elites developed at one side of the boundary this small but relatively powerful group spoke English, while at the other side the elite, perhaps of the same or related tribes, came to speak French.

Within the new political unit security existed, movement was facilitated and individual horizons were vastly extended. Loyalties developed and were encouraged away from the individual family and tribe towards the newly created unit. On one side of the boundary, for example, the people of a split unit such as Ketu were encouraged to regard themselves as Nigerian while relatives at the other side were looked upon as Dahomean.

It is important to examine this state of affairs more closely in an attempt to determine how two powers with differing colonial philosophies and methods of administration could produce such contrasting developments on either side of the boundary in question.

Differing Colonial Philosophies and Administrations

In partitioning and taking control of large tracts of Africa, the British and French, as well as other powers, had one initial characteristic in common. Both countries considered that their conquest was morally right, though their reasons for occupation to some extent differed. Considering the empires as a whole, Britain's interest in territorial acquisition tended to be in those areas where British trade had been dominant. With the French, the movement into Africa
in general was much more of a military operation with a tendency to acquire as much land as possible. Although it will be shown, to some extent, to be different for the boundary region under study, Crowder's dictum that "with France the flag tended to precede trade, with Britain trade directed where the flag should be flown" is generally true.

Once the colonies had been created and their boundaries decided upon, differences from one side of the boundary to the other developed due to the administration of each state. At each side, a similar landscape and related peoples were subjected to considerably different policies of government and administration by the British and French. In 1937, Whittlesey wrote that "at only one point do their policies agree - both recognise the fact that Europeans cannot take permanent homes in tropical lowland Africa, but must regularly return to the middle latitudes for periods of recuperation". Although this is an extreme view, the differences between the one colonial system and the other were quite distinct.

The French attempted to restructure the political institutions of their colonies, while the British system was characterised by more gradual reform of existing conditions. This is admirably demonstrated in a comparison between the fate of the indigenous kingdoms and their rulers on either side of the boundary. In the case of the British territories, the traditional rulers of existing political units were used wherever possible under a system of indirect rule. This formed the basis of local government. Though responsible to a resident or district officer the chief appointed all officials who
were responsible to him. He administered traditional justice, levied taxes for the local treasury, and governed, in general, a political unit which had existed in the pre-colonial period. On occasions the traditional ruler had more power than in the pre-colonial times, when he may have been subjected to approval from a council or adviser, and even deposed or forced to commit suicide if he became too unpopular with his subjects.

In the French colonies, on the other hand, traditional rule and society was considered somewhat irrelevant to the colonial aim. Traditional chiefs did remain (and this to some degree distinguished southern Dahomey from the rest of French West Africa), but they became much more part of the administration than their counterparts across the border. The French system placed the chief in an entirely subordinate position as regards the Commandant de Cercle, and he functioned as little more than an agent of the central colonial government. His duties were clearly defined and the area which he administered did not necessarily correspond to any pre-colonial unit. In an attempt to produce uniform political regions within their colonies, the French frequently produced cantons whose boundaries cut across those of existing political units. After the conquest of Abomey, for example, the existing political unit was split into its component states, and Allada and Porto Novo given similar status. What was left of Abomey was then sub-divided into nine cantons, each under a chief responsible to the French Resident.
In British territories it was usual to use a chief who already had traditional authority. In the French colonies, however, the Chefs de Cantons were recruited from a wide range of persons, ranging from descendents of old families traditionally destined to command to notable natives, old soldiers and local civil servants (10).

**The Economic Landscape**

In this respect the boundary as a division between two adjacent states can be clearly seen in the field. From the air, or when travelling by road through the southern crossing point, the change in character of the agricultural land is readily apparent. As one crosses from Nigeria to Dahomey the sudden appearance of a more plantation-type economy is striking. This is especially so from the air and the sharp division between two types of cultivation can be seen. Plates IX to XIII, taken in April 1968, show land on either side of the boundary in the vicinity of the villages of Meridjonou and Ijoffin. The boundary here follows the thalweg of the Ajarra Creek—a northerly and vegetation-filled projection of the coastal lagoon. On either side the physical environment is virtually the same—the same sandy soils, the same altitude and the same humid climate of the Guinea coast. The geographical landscape on either side of the creek boundary today, however, varies considerably. The contrast in vegetation between the two sides of the boundary is seen in Plates X and XIII. The latter photograph shows the Nigerian side where there are islands of high forest, scattered oil palms, areas of scrub and low bush as well as patches of open cultivation. Across the creek in
Dahomey (Plate IX) no high forest is seen and most of the area is given over to large oil palm estates. Elsewhere patches of palms are seen intermingled with cultivated areas. As Hodder and Newbury have remarked, "at least in the coastal zone, the regular, tidy plantations of oil palm, with the undergrowth cleared and controlled, and food crops growing between the trees in Dahomey, contrast strikingly with the untidy oil palm bush so characteristic a feature of the southern Nigerian landscape." (11)

Unlike Western Nigeria, both oil (12) and coconut palms are grown on a plantation scale (though not at all exclusively) in southern Dahomey. This is partly the result of differing policies in each country as regards agriculture during the colonial period. In British West Africa the government completely opposed the purchase of land by Europeans. Lord Leverhulme attempted unsuccessfully to persuade the Nigerian authorities to allow land to be sold freehold to establish oil-palm plantations. In French West Africa, however, land was conceded to Europeans and by the Second World War up to 3,600 acres (13) had been taken over by European planters. Similarly with coconut palms there are at least eight European-owned plantations (14).

Communications

The colonial period brought new methods and new patterns of communications. Road and rail patterns developed largely in the context of the individual state. Economies in West Africa as a whole tended to be tied to the production of raw materials to be exported to Europe in return for industrial and manufactured goods. The communications network
developed accordingly in response to this pattern and most routes converged on each state's ports, rather than with a neighbouring state (15) Anglo-French co-operation was rare. Roads and railways were not often built across political boundaries and there appears to have been little intention that they should do so in the future. On the Dahomey side of the boundary a metre-gauge railway line stretches as far as Pobé, and a two-metre line links Cotonou with Parakou. On the Nigerian side, however, main line systems have a gauge of 3ft 6 inches. Similarly, with roads, only in two places are there all-year roads crossing the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary. The road pattern is concentrated within the state limits and most roads in general lead towards the main urban centres on the coast. Such a pattern of communications may have had its advantages when each state was part of one large imperial economy. With independence of the colonies, however, the large imperial groupings have broken into numerous and often very small, national units. At this level the colonial communications network is certainly not adequate or correctly orientated. Since independence, and especially during the past five years or so, the trend has been to plan for a transport and route system more on the level of the economic region rather than for each individual state. The Economic Commission for Africa has divided the continent into five main economic regions of which West Africa forms one. A recent survey has been made for transport integration in six states of the western region and these comprise Nigeria, Dahomey, Togo, Ghana, Niger and Upper Volta (16). Thus, for the first time areas at each side of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary will be considered as one in the major transport plans of the future.
Attempts will be made to cut down the parallel routes which run north from the sea towards the land-locked states in the interior. Dahomey may lose some of the benefits of being a major north-south "corridor" state - though this might be compensated to some extent by improvements in east-west routes.

**Settlement**

It has already been shown in Chapter 6 how the superimposition of new state structures influenced both the distribution and size of settlements. The character of individual settlements is also seen to vary from one side of the boundary to the other - though this occurs only to a limited extent.

On the Nigerian side, in the south, settlement tends to be more concentrated than on the Dahomean side. Settlement plans also vary from one side to the other because of differences in the colonial systems. In rural areas, where the colonial impact was usually not so great, there are few distinct differences. One does, however, tend to see a greater profusion of zinc roofs, as opposed to thatch, on Nigerian territory, and this is a reflection of a higher standard of living in that country. In the towns, on the other hand, colonial policies were considerably different and today there is a distinct difference in urban morphology on either side of the boundary. On both sides pre-colonial urban centres existed, but while the British tended to build up new European communities on the outskirts of existing communities, the French, in their West African colonies preferred to establish a completely new settlement. This is reflected in a comparison.
between such towns as Badagry and Porto Novo or Abeokuta and Abomey. In the Nigerian settlements, urban morphology shows a town centre similar to that of a European pre-industrial city—a complex mass of narrow streets and haphazard, irregular building. In Dahomey the towns have been developed on a grid-iron pattern and avenues of trees along the main roads (usually converging on a central square) reflect the French background to the planning.

**Education**

In this aspect, there are notable differences to be found on either side of the boundary. The traveller from Nigeria is often immediately impressed by the quality of the French spoken by the Dahomeans. Indeed, the quality of the French spoken is certainly higher than the English spoken in general by the Nigerian and there appears to be no equivalent in French to the "pidgin English" so widespread throughout Nigeria. Part of this contrast is due to the differing educational policies pursued by the two colonial governments on either side of the boundary. While both governments followed educational policies to fit the African into the new colonial system, the two approaches were in detail quite different. France, it might be said, attempted to produce "African Frenchmen" whose loyalty in the first instance was to France. Britain's policy, on the other hand, was modifying and attempted to leave their colonial subjects as "Africans."

In Dahomey, as with the rest of French West Africa, French was the language of instruction from the first year in school. In British West Africa, primary schooling started in the vernacular.
On the whole, the individual on the Nigerian side of the border had (and still has) more opportunity for attending school. In Nigeria the array of secondary school establishments is certainly more comprehensive and in Dahomey university education has to be taken abroad. This was the case in Nigeria until World War II, and a "B A Dunelm was (at Freetown) probably the ambition of most students" (17). Now, however, the English-speaking student on the Nigerian side of the boundary has a choice of five universities at which to aim.

Religion

Further distinct differences on each side of the boundary can be detected in the religious developments in Dahomey and Nigeria. With the religions already in existence before the colonial period (Islam for example), the boundary has had little effect. Christianity however, to a large extent came with the boundaries and a differing colonial system on either side brought differing forms of this religion. The French brought Catholicism, the English were Protestants. Dahomey became a home for liberated Catholic slaves from Brazil, the British in Nigeria accepted Protestants from Sierra Leone. While the French brought one Roman Catholic Church the British brought and allowed to develop, a multitude of Protestant sects; the Anglicans, the Methodists, Baptists and Aladura churches, as well as a host of other "indigenous" churches which developed to cater for the needs of a polygamous society. Jehovah's witnesses were tolerated in Nigeria but proscribed in Dahomey and the rest of French West Africa.
According to Thompson, Dahomey's population stood at 1,716,000 in 1957, and of these over 1,144,000 were animists, 280,000 Muslims, and approximately 260,000 Christians. Of the latter, almost 93% were Roman Catholics. In Nigeria, on the other hand, although the percentage of Christians was considerably smaller, Protestants constituted two-thirds of the total as opposed to one-third Catholics. This variation in the religious make-up of the population is often quite striking at either side of the boundary. In Meko for example, the visitor first sees the large twin-towered African Church, whilst across the border 17 miles away in Ketu, the Catholic church is probably the most prominent building.

In southern Dahomey as a whole, the influence and power of the Roman Catholic church is extremely strong. In fact, as Thompson states, "it is hard to find a prominent political leader in Dahomey who is not a Catholic. (In 1945 of the two Dahomean delegates to the Constituent Assembly in Paris, one was a Dahomean Catholic and the other a French priest)."

The Development of an Elite and Nationalism

In the colonial context, the elite refers to a stratum of society with educational superiority as opposed to traditional status. It was to the educated elite that administrative and ruling power was handed when the colonies became independent. Any comparison, therefore, of the elite in both Dahomey and Nigeria is likely to facilitate an understanding of the changes in the boundary landscape in post-
independence years

At both sides of the boundary the elites had in common a western education, a common language within their own state, wore European clothes as a rule and adopted many European customs. For society as a whole, the elite became pace-setters, and a western education became the key to acquired status. In French West Africa this was especially true, in Nigeria traditional status in the form of the chief remained relatively important throughout the colonial period.

The French, in their empire as a whole, produced a small elite. In British territories this group was considerably larger, partly due to more education facilities, and partly to easier opportunities for studying abroad.

In both Nigeria and Dahomey as with much of Africa, the elites in general accepted the colonial boundaries. There was no move to return to the pre-colonial pattern but to acquire some control within the given political unit and framework. Initially the aim of the elite was to achieve a greater share in the government and administration of their country. In Nigeria, full independence as a political goal did not develop until the return of Azikiwe from the United States in 1937. In French West Africa "no major politician publically voiced the demand for it until 1958 " (21). Britain at an early stage accepted the legitimacy of future national independence to a far greater extent than the French in West Africa. The French concept of constitutional advance was to draw the colonies much closer to
After the second World War more and more Nigerians were allowed to participate in local legislature and executive while in Dahomey and the rest of French West Africa more and more Africans were allowed participation in the government in Paris. Political parties developed on both sides of the boundary in Nigeria indigenous organizations developed while parties in Dahomey were essentially mere extensions of political parties in the metropolitan country.

As a result of the different development of the two elites, Nigerians were produced on the one side, while on the other the ruling elite might be more justly defined as "French." The educated Dahomean was felt considerably more part of an empire and movement from one French territory to the next was relatively easy. Thus, from Dahomey, where educational development had been relatively early, a considerable migration took place of educated Dahomeans to other parts of French West Africa. In attaining independence and afterwards, this proved a problem. With considerable lateral mobility loyalties became dispersed - unlike in Nigeria where the elite was more static and worked for the independence of their country rather than a British West Africa as a whole. Consequently, in a country like Dahomey, vociferous government workers could be transferred to other parts of the Federation and thus dilute demands for independence. In Nigeria, however, such a system did not apply.
Post-Independence Developments

Since 1960, when both Dahomey and Nigeria became independent, various differing trends have developed on either side of the boundary. Such trends have not developed so much because the people of one state are so vastly different to its neighbour, but more because the two sets of people had belonged, for approximately 70 years, to two quite different state organizations and had been subjected to often differing sets of influences.

Culturally the years since independence have seen a tremendous development in French-speaking territories of negritude where old values have been re-asserted and old histories studied and glorified. Such a development has not taken place in ex-British territories to such an extent. It is, moreover, apt that the First Congress of Negro Writers and Artists in 1956 and the First Festival of Negro Arts in 1966, should have been held in French-speaking territories. Such a trend within the ex-French states, however, should not suggest that the English-speaking states are vacuums as regards cultural developments. Indeed, many Nigerians, such as Soyinka (23) argue that negritude has existed in their country throughout the colonial period. With such aspects as indirect rule, the British attempted to preserve as much as possible of the existing status quo. In French territories, however, the more assimilist policies imposed a more uniform system of French culture and attitudes over all the colonies. The outburst of negritude, therefore, in Dahomey and sister states, might be regarded as the nationalist reaction to the cultural domination of France. Politically
and economically Dahomey was much closer to France during the colonial period than Nigeria was to Britain. The state was considered as an overseas province of the metropolitan country with representatives elected to a seat in Paris. Trade unions and political parties were, to a greater degree, extensions of those in the mother country and the economy was more an integral part of the imperial system. Thus if Dahomey (despite a considerable reliance on French aid) appears to have moved further away from France in these fields than Nigeria has from Britain, it is perhaps a more natural reaction to the state of affairs existing prior to independence.

Another feature of post-independence Africa which has seen differential development from one side of the boundary to the other is Africanisation. This is a process whereby many of the jobs and positions occupied by expatriates in the colonial period are taken over by the African. Today, relatively few positions in Nigeria are held by Europeans outside teaching and in the commercial sector, except when they come as "experts" or advisers from international organizations or on foreign aid schemes. In Dahomey the process of Africanisation has not taken place at such a speed as in Nigeria. French territories in Africa have always had relatively more Europeans than the English-speaking territories. In the mid-1930's for instance, when the total population of French West Africa was only five-eighths of the British counterpart, there were, according to Whittlesey, only 11,000 Europeans in British colonies and about 31,000 in the French territories. In the 1960's during the years immediately after independence, Dahomey
still had a relatively larger European population than Nigeria. The variation in numbers and role of Europeans in these two countries is readily illustrated by the retail trade. In Nigeria, in such towns as Lagos, Ibadan or Port Harcourt, are large multi-story department stores under European management but with Nigerian counter assistants. In Dahomey, on the other hand, the few department stores in Cotonou are considerably smaller and in some cases employ French salesgirls. Also in Cotonou there are several small hotels and restaurants owned and managed by French families.

Another basic and important characteristic of African states, since independence, has been that of nation building and preserving unity. In such states, nation building must not be confused with nationalism. The latter refers largely to a reaction towards a colonial government and a demand for political independence, while the former is more concerned with the process of building a nation within the territorial boundaries which the state was given. A statement like Gottmann's (25) that "boundaries exist because each country feels it is different from the other" can hardly be applied to newly independent African states. In such territories the problem is in making each individual country feel different to its neighbour by having a unity of belief and feeling within the state. In recent years, probably the major problem in this nation building in Dahomey and Nigeria, as well as in most African states, has been the preservation of unity. So far, Dahomey has been successful in this respect. Nigeria, unfortunately, has not. As Emerson (26) so rightly states, "the integrating impact
of the colonial regimes has unquestionably separated the people on one side of the frontier from those on the other but it has not had an equal effect in producing internal unity" The importance of the colonial boundaries in separating people has been one of the major themes of this thesis. The boundary and its various functions have been largely responsible for this. Whether unity has been preserved on either side of the boundary, however, depends on the size and character of the political unit at each side and to the influences to which each unit has been subjected. With regard to Dahomey, for example, unity may have been maintained due to the size and population of the state as well as to French colonial policy. By African standards, Dahomey is small and has a population of little more than two million. Despite existing tribal units, and even what might be termed proto-states at the end of the nineteenth century, a uniform policy of administration was applied by the French to the state as a whole. Nigeria on the other hand has the largest population in Africa and is one of the largest in area. Within the state are found a vast spectrum of tribes and several of these have populations larger than many independent African states. Under the British system the variety of tribes and their differences was noted and catered for. Their individuality was maintained and even enhanced under such a system as indirect rule.

During the colonial period, however, unity within many African states was preserved because the population of the state had one common
unifying factor. This was the opposition of the indigenous population to the colonial master. With the attainment of independence there was no common enemy to unify the country. With no loyalties in common the individual loyalty lapsed to the tribal level and brought about a kaleidoscope of opposing forces at work within the state. Such a case has occurred within Nigeria since independence and in an attempt to check such tendencies the independent government has swung from one extreme to the other. At one stage a unitary state was declared as in the French colonial style and now the country has been sub-divided into 12 states, in a more extreme British pattern where tribal distributions have been more accurately catered for.

In the states of Dahomey and Nigeria the two processes of nation building may provide problems along the boundary between the two. Where tribes are split, loyalties will also tend to diverge. The problem will only be solved when national loyalties over-ride those of kin and tribe. The problem in the boundary area is whether such peoples as the Yoruba of Ketu in future will consider themselves Dahomean or will look across the boundary towards the Yoruba of Western Nigeria for leadership.
CHAPTER FIFTEEN

PROBLEMS AND POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS OF THE DAHOMEY-NIGERIA BOUNDARY

Since independence there have been extremely few changes in the colonial boundaries of Africa and none in that under consideration. Moreover, despite the large-scale outcry, boundary problems have not been as widespread as one might expect in one of the most politically fragmented regions of the world (1)

The boundaries inherited by the newly independent states have been accepted as the framework for nation-building. The boundaries themselves usually provide few problems and any friction between two states is usually derived from causes other than those of the line dividing them. As Acel states, "Il n'y a pas de problèmes de frontières. Il n'est que des problèmes de Nations." (2) This is to a large extent true, but difficulties do arise between states in which the boundaries are important factors. Present day boundary controversies have resulted to a considerable degree from "the fact that rivalries of colonial powers began in the days when too little geography was known." (3) Criticism of the nineteenth century partition, moreover, is usually based on twentieth century data. Comprehensive information
on the areas under consideration was not available to the boundary negotiators. All they could rely on were the treaties with indigenous leaders and accounts from a few European travellers or administrators in Lagos or Porto Novo. What information that was available was not always accurate. Contemporary maps at the time of partition varied considerably as was shown in Chapter 2. Nevertheless, the resulting political divisions in West Africa disrupt local life less than in many parts of the world, although there are potential sources of friction to be found in most boundaries. Using waterways as a boundary, for instance, has sometimes produced problems. The Dahomey-Nigeria boundary follows water courses in several places, and in other areas marshland has been used. It has been indicated that few problems have arisen though there are potential difficulties. Any economic utilization of the Okpara River by one of the riparian states may produce friction in the future. In the north, problems might arise with economic development arising from the Kainjí Scheme (4). In the marshland area north of the Chikanda crossing point there has been considerable population migration and localized friction may develop should one side of the area be developed at the expense of the other.

The most significant and conspicuous problem associated with African boundaries arises when tribal territory is split. Along the boundary under consideration no problems have arisen like those of the Ewe, Zandi, or Somali peoples, and it is doubtful if they ever will. As we have seen, the boundary to a large extent was placed within indigenous frontiers already in existence. Potential friction may
exist over the Yoruba in Dahomey. On various occasions the cry for assimilation with Nigeria has come from Nigerian sources, but these, to a large extent, have not been reciprocated by the Yorubas in Dahomey. At the time of independence, for example, the Action Group of Nigeria suggested that Dahomey should become a province of Nigeria. This was firmly rejected by Dahomey who denounced the "neo-imperialism of its English-speaking neighbours." Dahomey's reaction to any suggestion of re-drawing its boundaries is similar to many countries in Africa. The boundaries so bitterly criticised during the colonial period have been zealously guarded after independence. The most striking example is in the Congo, where the central government of Congo Kinshasha has striven desperately to maintain the unity and status quo in a state whose anomalies were criticised and acknowledged prior to 1960.

Perhaps the major reason why the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary has not as yet provided any serious political problems is because, like many African boundaries, it is not marking the effective limit of the national state. As we have seen in Chapter 6 dealing with the frontier zone, the colonial boundary was the framework and the limit within which a new nation-state was to develop. So far, however, few African states have fully developed all the area at their disposal, effective authority wanes rapidly away from the centres of power, and boundary functions are often negligible. Despite a boundary line on paper, Dahomey and Nigeria are still separated by more of a frontier or buffer zone where human and economic movement can still take place.
largely as before. This frontier zone is shrinking and has done so rapidly in the south, and in the future the boundary line will become one of firm authority, regulating movement and increasingly acting as a barrier to trade, migration and ideas. It will be at this stage that problems may develop and the initial difficulties may first appear in the case of Ketu. Although the boundary did in fact follow a frontier already existing in that area at the time of partition, its limited function did allow the two factions to come together to form a somewhat more united kingdom. This move towards unification was probably aided by the division existing between Meko and Ketu being replaced by one imposed from outside. A further factor in the form of colonialism probably brought the existing two minorities together more rapidly than had both sections of Ketu being placed in one colony. Thus, as was shown in Chapter 8, Ketu today considers itself as one in many respects, and puts the blame of its partition on the colonialists. Movement between the two sides is relatively easy and frequent, cross-boundary marriage and trade is common, the people to a large extent still look to Ketu as the capital of the whole kingdom. As more boundary functions are applied and maintained however, then friction may develop in Ketu and an adjustment in the boundary demanded.

Similarly in Borgu, a more efficient boundary may create problems with the settlements in the Yashikera area. Such villages as Okuta, Boria and Yashikera itself consider themselves as belonging to Nikki in Dahomey and considerable social and economic movement takes place across the boundary in that area. Should such movement be restricted, then problems may develop and a cry for boundary alteration arise.
CHAPTER SIXTEEN

CONCLUSION

This study of the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary has provided examples of the two extremes of the colonial partition. The northern section of the boundary was ultimately created on a "divide and rule" basis while in the south the siting of the boundary to a large extent took the existing political pattern closely into consideration.

In the north, while an attempt was made to use the treaty method, disagreements over the capital of Borgu led to a division of what at that time was believed to be one unit. Since then it has been seen how, in fact, the arbitrary boundary loosely coincided with a frontier between Nikki and Bussa.

To the south of $9^\circ$ north a consideration of pre-colonial conditions in this part of West Africa has shown that the boundary to a large extent expressed in linear form a state of affairs already existing in pre-partition times. Over a long period the Oyo Empire had been disintegrating and a frontier zone developed along a line of weakness between pre-colonial Dahomey and the Yoruba states to the east. The boundary was drawn along this frontier and although today
it splits an area such as Ketu, the boundary was, when delimited, merely fossilising the conditions already existing at that time.

Once created, the boundary area assumed special functions and characteristics. By merely being situated near the limits of the state, areas in the vicinity of the boundary became, to a varying degree, neglected - being away from developing economic centres of the state interior. A relatively empty zone developed. Population numbers, communications, and social facilities have been demonstrated to decrease in the vicinity of the boundary. This empty zone was termed a frontier zone, and in the case of Nigeria it was seen that, as state functions develop over an increasingly wider area, this zone is slowly decreasing in width and importance.

Within the frontier zone the landscape has been affected positively due to the boundary's function as a barrier. In the field this boundary landscape could be detected by the string of customs posts and a general increase in settlement numbers and road and footpath densities. As regards settlement, it was seen how the establishment of customs posts affected the form and function of various settlements and the Idiroko-Igolo crossing point was examined in some detail. Further boundary influences on settlement form and function were considered in relation to Ilara, where the village had over the years, developed in such a way as to be sited today astride the boundary.

By considering the areas of marshland and various rivers used as a boundary site it was shown that the general European concept of
marshland making a suitable frontier ought to be re-examined in relation to tropical areas. Along a southern stretch of the boundary where rainfall is heavy a tract of marshland did function very much as its European counterpart, too wet for agriculture the area was largely devoid of population and those villages which did exist had originally developed as sites of refuge during periods of pre-colonial warfare. In the north, however, a very different picture emerged where the marshy headwaters of several Niger tributaries proved to be the only area of permanent surface water in the vicinity, and, as a result, the marsh, far from forming a natural frontier, functioned as a zone of attraction.

Consideration was given in this study to the possible effect the boundary had on splitting various political units which existed at the time of partition. This was undertaken at the village level as well as for the pre-colonial state or tribal unit. From the village level it was seen how, in areas where the boundary did not function effectively, rural economies and social relationships could continue largely unchanged during the colonial period. Minor trade movements developed towards the nearest newly-created roads and, away from customs surveillance, villages in some areas became economically orientated to routes and markets across the boundary. Settlements on one side of the border came increasingly to belong, in economic terms at least, to the neighbouring state, thereby producing a local "economic" frontier between Dahomey and Nigeria which in disposition was often distinctly different and separate from the political division.
In other areas, however, where the function of the boundary was more enforced, what might appear as natural economic regions were sharply divided by the political division. Such a situation was considered in relation to the coastal bar, where local populations on the Nigerian side crossed the lagoon to trade in Badagri rather than travel shorter distances to centres in southern Dahomey.

Population movement across the boundary was initially considered from the local point of view. Here, to a large degree, as we have mentioned, the boundary had little influence as, on the one hand, boundary agreements allowed border populations to keep land across the boundary and, on the other, the boundary function is not enforced in some areas—especially in the case of local movement from village to village and village to farm. Other local movement, however, was seen to have developed primarily due to the existence of the boundary. For various reasons, whether to avoid conscription, forced labour, political unrest or education, border peoples have been attracted from one state to the next. Trade on a local scale was also seen to have been influenced by the position and function of the international boundary. In a case study near Meko it was shown how the size of markets within certain settlements tended to decrease towards the edge of the state and in the vicinity of customs centres. Flow-line diagrams illustrated most strikingly how the market region of various border settlements could be cut off and appear lop-sided. In all, an economic wasteland had developed and this was illustrated by examining the distribution of markets in south-west Nigeria. The pattern of
markets over a period of 50 years was considered, and between 1912 and 1962 it was shown how, near the boundary, markets had declined and new markets had been established more towards the interior of the state. Illegal markets and trading regions, however, provided a completely different picture. A settlement like Ilara, situated astride the boundary, had a market hinterland extremely large for a village of a few thousand inhabitants and one which stretched several hundred miles on both sides of the boundary.

A consideration of the effect of the international boundary and the colonial period on long-distance movement and trade provided, initially, one major conclusion. In pre-colonial times routes to a large degree ran in a general east-west direction, while in the colonial period movement was gradually diverted to the south, and in most West African states the north-south route linking the interior with the newly established post came to epitomize the transport pattern. The establishment of boundaries had a further influence on routes - especially where these crossed the boundary. Traffic became concentrated on fewer and fewer routes. Motor transport (introduced early in the twentieth century) requires relatively level surfaces and bridges to cross water courses. As a result almost all movement between Dahomey and Nigeria is now along one road and this crosses the boundary at Idiroko.

At least 100,000 people cross the boundary annually. Movement out of Nigeria tends to be greater than movement into the country and this is especially the case with Nigerians. Almost all travellers
crossing the boundary comprised Nigerians, Dahomeans, Togolese and Ghanaians and their destinations were largely restricted to a string of towns along the Guinea Coast from Accra in the west to Lagos in the east. Movement of other nationalities or along other routes was largely insignificant. Nearly half of the cross-boundary travellers called themselves traders and a third of these were women. Movement across the boundary month by month fluctuated considerably, and it was seen how the political situation in any of the states along the major route influenced considerably the rate of flow. After the coup d'état in Nigeria in 1966, for example, cross-boundary movement dropped considerably, though for the traders it was 'business as usual' as their numbers were hardly affected by the political upheaval.

Trade as a whole across the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary appeared extremely limited - especially when compared with the total international trade of each state. This situation merely reflects the state of affairs in many African countries. Inter-African trade is negligible. Both Nigeria and Dahomey as colonies each formed one side of a colony/metropolitan-state relationship, each belonged to a separate and distinct imperial economy. As a result the economy of these states became orientated towards imperial self-sufficiency rather than towards producing a balanced national economy. Each colony specialised in a small selection of raw materials and foodstuffs which were exported in return for manufactured goods from the metropolitan country. Thus produce grown on the Dahomean side of the boundary would ultimately reach France while on the other side, in Nigeria, similar products
would be taken on a parallel route to Britain. Trade, like communications, rarely crossed the boundary. As a result, and even today, Dahomey is heavily dependent on France economically, and much of Nigeria's trade is still with Britain. Despite a considerable agitation for more inter-African trade such a movement is slow in developing and since independence the trade barriers between neighbouring African states can often be greater even than in colonial times. Partially as a result of increased trading barriers and tariffs, smuggling is rife and proves to be an extremely serious problem for many states. Along the boundary in question movement is largely from Dahomey into Nigeria, and it was shown that illegal trade has occurred continuously on a considerable scale from times even preceding the establishment of the boundary. Smuggling appeared prevalent along four sections of the border, and the location of this activity has largely depended on the pattern of roads on either side. The flow of contraband is largely concentrated across the southern sections of the boundary - near ports of entry, where roads are good, and near the densely populated areas of each state. Goods are carried by a variety of vehicles ranging from heavy lorries to bicycles, canoes and by people on foot. Moreover this activity varies in importance from large-scale organized smuggling to the individual farmer taking a few items for use at home.

As regards population movement, trade, and settlement, the boundary was seen to have a largely restrictive influence on the geographical landscape. In an attempt to demonstrate this retarding
factor by some quantitative method, an interactance model was applied
to the movement of road traffic at each side and crossing the boundary.
The results obtained indicate how traffic is largely confined to
north-south routes linking state interiors with the coast, and that
cross-boundary traffic is extremely limited. Interaction was consider­
ably more than expected on the north-south routes, and especially on
the Dahomey corridor route which funnels trade from francophone states
in the north to the ports on the Guinea Coast. More exceptionally
high interaction was found on routes leading to Ilara. While the
southern cross-boundary routes had interaction generally less than
half of that expected, interaction between this small boundary village
and settlements on either side was often more than 1,000% in excess of
that calculated.

Lastly, an attempt was made to show how the geographical landscape
varies from one side of the boundary to the other merely because the
two adjacent states are different and have had different philosophies
and policies to apply to similar tracts of territory. A different
colonial situation came to be applied to each side of the boundary.
Religion, administration, education, communications, economies, settle­
ment have all been influenced differently, and to a varying degree
Elites were created and nationalism developed. The boundaries, though
criticised, were in general accepted, and independence was granted to
the units they separated. Most of these units in Africa have proved
to be remarkably stable since independence, and no major revision can
be foreseen in the boundary we have considered. The boundary has
separated people and created distinct differences in the geographical
landscape and in every sphere of life on either side. To separate is the function of the boundary, the problems arise from the attempt at producing and maintaining unity on either side of this boundary.
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APPENDIX I

Previous Studies on Nigerian Boundaries

The boundaries of Nigeria are mentioned briefly in many works on the geography and historical evolution of the country and many of these have been cited in the text. There are, however, only two studies specifically concerned with the Nigerian boundaries themselves - both are unpublished Ph.D. theses.

J C O. Anene in "The Boundary Arrangements for Nigeria, 1884-1906" (unpublished Ph D. thesis, London, 1960) examines the validity of the generalised claims that the international boundaries of Nigeria were arbitrary and "injurious to the existing indigenous political order" He concludes that although the boundary arrangements cannot be regarded as uniformly satisfactory, they do reflect quite well the conditions existing at the end of the nineteenth century. As regards the Dahomey-Nigeria boundary, Anene discusses the indigenous political background and, after considering the disintegration of the Oyo Empire, the rise of Dahomey, and the "myth of Borgu unity", concludes with final settlement of the boundary between the two colonial powers.

boundaries but also those of the region and province in respect to
definition, position and function. Again his thesis is largely
historical and is based mainly on official correspondence and
reports, supported by some fieldwork. As regards the Dahomey-
Nigeria boundary, Prescott briefly outlines, as does Anene, the
indigenous political state of affairs during the 19th century.
He discusses the allocation of the boundary as well as its
delimitation and demarcation.

Thus, both theses terminate after considering the
evolution and demarcation of the boundary. It is here that
the major part of this study begins - in an attempt to determine,
after the processes of delimitation and demarcation have been
concluded, the effect of the boundary on the geographical and
economic landscape.
APPENDIX II

Agreement between Great Britain and France, relative to the Frontier between the British and French Possessions from the Gulf of Guinea to the Niger (Southern Nigeria and Dahomey)

19th October, 1906.

Starting on the coast of the Gulf of Guinea at the point at which it is intersected by the meridian passing through the middle of the mouth of the Ajara River where it flows into the Porto Novo lagoon, the frontier runs north along this meridian until it reaches the middle of the mouth of the River Ajara.

2. Thence it runs in the shortest straight line to the thalweg of the River Ajara.

3. Thence it ascends the thalweg of the River Ajara, its upper course being called the Iguidi (Igouidi), as far as the ravine entering the river from the north immediately to the west of Idiroko, leaving the town of Idiroko to the Colony of Lagos.

4. Thence it follows the ravine to its northern end.

5. Thence it follows a line drawn to a point on the north side of the shortest road from Ilashe (Ilashe) to Ikpaboro on the right (west) bank of the River IY1rawun (Iguiraoun).

6. Thence it runs 200 metres northward from the road, then westward parallel with the road at 200 metres distance until 200 metres east of the first road branching northward to Ikitun (Ikitoun), which
road it then follows northward to Ikotun (Ikotoun) at a distance of 200 metres parallel to and eastward of it.

7. Thence it follows a road running through the following places, as far as the River Amidu (Amidou), keeping always on the same side of the road and at the same distance from it Ikotun (Ikotoun), Idagbon (Ilagbo), Igbado (Bado), Modogan (Ogouissou), Agangan, continuing as far as the River Amidu (Amidou) along the road to Ibeyun (Ibeyan). Ikotun (Ikotoun), Idagbon (Ilagbo), Ilore, Isagbano, Okoko, Igbado Bado, and Modogan (Ogouissou) are in French territory.

8. On reaching the thalweg of the River Amidu (Amidou), the frontier follows it up-stream to a point 200 metres from and on the west side of the road.

9. From this point it runs parallel to the road which passes through Ibeyun (Ibayan) and Majano, keeping always on the same side of it, as far as its intersection by the River Ibu (Ibou). Ohumbe (Ohoumbe), Ibeyun (Ibayan), and Majano are in British territory.

10. Thence it follows the thalweg of the River Ibu (Ibou) downstream to its junction with the River Buru (Bourou), leaving Isale (Issale) in French, and Isuku (Isouko) and Asa (Aso) in British territory.

11. Thence it follows the thalweg of the River Buru (Bourou), leaving Ilimon (Illemon) in French territory, to a point 200
metres beyond the bridge which spans that river on the road from Ilimon (Illemon).

12. From this point the frontier runs parallel to and at a distance of 200 metres from the road to a point at which, after passing Ishada (Ichada), Mokofì (Ibokofì), Ibeyan (Ibìyan) and Tabolo, all of which are in British territory, it cuts the River Igunu Gauna.

13. Thence it runs due north to a point 200 metres south of the road from Ketu (Ketou) to Idofa by Alagbe (Itagbe), the latter being in French territory.

14. Thence it runs eastward parallel to that road as far as the River Yewa (Yeoua).

15. Thence it ascends the thalweg of the River Yewa (Yeoua) to a point 200 metres below the intersection of that river with the road running northward from Idanyìn (Idanhìm), leaving Idofa and Meko in British territory, and Ilikimo (Lìkimò), Idanyìn (Idanhìm), Ijalu (Idjalou), and Iselu (Selou) in French territory.

16. Thence it runs northward parallel to that road and 200 metres distant from it, leaving the road in French territory, until it meets the thalweg of the River Okpara (Oçpara).

17. Thence it follows the thalweg of the River Okpara (Oçpara) up-stream to a point where the thalweg is cut by a line drawn on the north side of, parallel to, and 1 kilom. from, the more southerly of the two roads between Tabíra and Werìa (Ouorìa)
18 Thence it follows this line eastwards to a point 5 kilom. from the wall or enceinte of the village of Tabira.

19 Thence it runs in a straight line to a point situated 5 kilom. from the wall of Tabira on the northern road from Tabira to Weria (Ouoria).

20 Thence in a straight line to a point situated 4 kilom. from the wall of Tabira on the road from Tabira to Tandu (Tandou).

21 Thence in a straight line to a point situated 5 kilom. from the wall of Tabira, on the direct road from Tabira to Kabo.

22 Thence in a straight line to a point situated 5 kilom. from the wall of Tabira, and 1 kilom. from the road from Tabira to Kenu (Kenou), measured at right angles to, and on the north of this road.

23. The frontier then follows a line parallel to the direct road from Tabira to Kenu (Kenou), on the north of, and 1 kilom. from, this road, to a point situated 2,100 metres from the wall or enceinte of the village of Kenu (Kenou).

24. Thence a straight line to a point situated 4 kilom. from the wall of Kenu (Kenou) on the road from Kenu (Kenou) to Kabo.

25. Thence a straight line to a point situated 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) kilom. from the centre of the town of Okuta (Okouta), on the road from Okuta (Okouta) to Kabo.

26. Thence it follows the circumference of a circle of 8\(\frac{1}{2}\) kilom. radius, having for centre the centre of the town of Okuta (Okouta),
to a point situated 1 kilom. from the direct road from Okuta (Okouta) to Boría, measured on the west of and at right angles to this road.

27 Thence it runs parallel to the road from Okuta (Okouta) to Boría, at a distance of 1 kilom. from, and on the west of this road, to a point situated 6 kilom. from the wall of the village of Boría.

28 Thence it follows a straight line to a point situated 4 kiloms from Boría on the road from Boría on the road from Boría to Wandu (ouandou).

29. Thence it follows a straight line to a point situated 4 kilom. from the wall of the village of Sīlā (Chuya) on the road from Sīlā (Chuya) to Sandīru (Sandilo) and Dīgīdurū (Diguídourou).

30. Thence in a straight line to a point situated 4 kilom. from Sīlā (Chuya) on the direct road from Sīlā (Chuya) to Tera (Tinra).

31. Thence in a straight line to a point situated 1 kilom. from the intersection of the Big Shīra (Chīra) River by the direct road from Sīlā (Chuya) to Gurī (Gore), measured at right angles to, and on the west of, this road.

32. Thence it runs parallel to the road from Sīlā (Chuya) to Gurī (Gore), on the west of, and at a distance of 1 kilom. from it, to a point situated 4 kilom. from the centre of the village of Gurī (Gore).

33. Thence it follows on the west side of Gurī (Gore) the circumference of a circle of 4 kilom. radius, described round the centre of that village as centre, to a point situated 1 kilom.
from the road from Guri (Gore) to Yashikira (Yassikere), measured at right angles to, and on the west of, this road

34. Thence it runs parallel to, and 1 kilom. to the west of, the road from Guri (Gore) to Yashikira (Yassikere) to a point situated 8 kilom. from the centre of Yashikira (Yassikere).

35. Thence it follows on the west side of Yashikira (Yassikere) the circumference of a circle of 8 kilom. radius, described round the centre of Yashikira (Yassikere) as centre, to a point situated 8 kilom. from the centre of Yashikira (Yassikere) on the road from Yashikira (Yassikere) to Nikki (Nikī).

36. From this point the frontier follows a line which is a tangent to a circle of 4 kilom. radius, having Grad Bete as centre and on the north-west side, as far as the point where the tangent meets the circumference of that circle.

37. Thence it runs in a straight line to a point situated 4 kilom. from the wall of Grand Bete, at a distance of 1 kilom. from, measured at right angles to, and to the north-west of, the direct road from Grand Bete to Karunzi (Garoussī).

38. Thence it runs parallel to the road from Grand Bete to Karunzi (Garoussī) on the west of, and at a distance of 1 kilom. from this road, to a point situated 4 kilom. from the wall of the village of Karunzi (Garoussī).

39. Thence in a straight line to a point situated due west of Karunzi (Garoussī), 4 kilom. from the wall of that village.
40. Thence it runs direct to a point situated 4 kilom. from the wall of Karunzi (Garouss1), and 1 kilom. from the road from Karunzi (Garouss1) to Kenumbe (Kenombe), measured at right angles to and on the north-west of this road.

41. Thence it runs parallel to the direct road from Karunzi (Garouss1), to Kenumbe (Kenombe) on the west side of, and at a distance of 1 kilom. from that road to a point situated 4 kilom. from the centre of the village of Kenumbe (Kenombe).

42. Thence it follows on the west side of Kenumbe (Kenombe) the circumference of a circle of 4 kilom. radius, described round the centre of Kenumbe (Kenombe) as centre, to a point situated 1 kilom. from and to the west of the road from Kenumbe (Kenombe) to Bes1 (Bess1) measured at right angles to this road.

43. Thence it runs parallel to the road from Kenumbe (Kenombe) to Bes1 (Bess1), on the west of and at a distance of 1 kilom. from this road to point situated 8 kilom. from the centre of Bes1 (Bess1).

44. Thence it follows on the west side of Bes1 (Bess1), the circumference of a circle of 8 kilom. radius described round the centre of Bes1 (Bess1) as centre, to the intersection of this circumference with the road from Bes1 (Bess1) to Sakamanji (Sakamandji).

45. Thence it runs in a straight line to a point situated 12 kilom. from the wall or enceinte of Dekala on the road from Dekala to Lu (Lou) and Daganzi.
46. Thence in a straight line to a point situated on the road from Dekala to Gauzhı (Gaodgı) at a distance of 3½ kilom. from the centre of Gauzhı (Gaodgı).

47. Thence it follows on the east side of Gauzhı (Gaodgı), the circumference of a circle 3½ kilom. radius, described round the centre, to a point 1 kilom. from the road from Gauzhı (Gaodgı) to Basso, measured at right angles to, and to the south of, this road.

48. Thence it runs parallel to the road from Gauzhı (Gaodgı) to Basso, to the south-east of, and at a distance of 1 kilom from this road, to a point situated 5 kilom. from Basso.

49. Thence it follows a tangent drawn from this point, on the south-west of Lusı (Lousı), to a circle of 3 kilom. radius, described round the centre of the village of Lusı (Lousı) as centre. It continues along this tangent to its intersection with a perpendicular to the road from Lusı (Lousı) to Babanna, the perpendicular being drawn from the point half-way between Lusı (Lousı) and Babanna.

50. Thence it follows this perpendicular as far as the point half-way between Lusı (Lousı) and Babanna.

51. Thence it runs in a straight line to a point situated 5 kilom. from Lusı (Lousı), and 1 kilom. to the east of the road from Lusı (Lousı) to Naganzi (Nagandgı).

52. Thence it runs parallel to the road from Lusı (Lousı) to Naganzi (Nagandgı) to the east of, and at a distance of 1 kilom. from this road, cuts the road from Babanna to Naganzi (Nagandgı)
and runs parallel to, and at a distance of 1 kilom. to a point situated 4 kilom. from the centre of the village of Nanganzi (Nagandgi) and 1 kilom. to the east of the road from Babanna to Nanganzi (Nagandgi).

53 Thence it follows to the east of Nanganzi (Nagandgi), the circumference of a circle of 4 kilom. radius, described round the centre of Nanganzi (Nagandgi) as centre, as far as the point on the south-east of Nanganzi (Nagandgi), at which this circle is touched by the longest common tangent to it, and to another circle of the same radius described round the centre of the village of Kude (Koure) as centre.

54 Thence it follows this tangent until it touches the circumference of the circle described round Kude (Koure).

55. Thence it follows this circle to a point situated to the east of, and 1 kilom. from, the road from Kude (Koure) to Kankali (Kankar1), the distance being measured at right angles to the road.

56 Thence it follows a line parallel to, on the east side of, and at a distance of 1 kilom. from the road from Kude (Koure) to Kankali (Kankar1) to a point situated 5 kilom. from the centre of Kankali (Kankar1).

57. Thence it follows on the east side of Kankali (Kankar1), the circumference of a circle of 5 kilom. radius, described round the centre of the village of Kankali (Kankar1) as centre, until it meets, on the east side, the longest tangent common to the last-mentioned circle and to another circle of 4 kilom. radius, described round Gusin-Sura (Gour1-Sare) as centre.
58. Thence it follows this common tangent to its intersection with the longest tangent common to this last-mentioned circle, and to another of 5 kilom. radius, described round Daku (Dako) as centre.

59. Thence it follows the last-mentioned tangent as far as its intersection with the circumference of the circle of 5 kilom radius, described round Daku (Dako).

60. Thence it follows the circumference of this circle, always on the east side of the road from Segbana to Samia, to a point situated 1 kilom from, and on the east of, the road from Daku (Dako) to Samia.

61. Thence it follows a line parallel to, on the east of, and 1 kilom. from the road from Daku (Dako) to Samia, to the intersection of the said parallel line with the thalweg of the River Wan (Oua).

62. Thence it follows the thalweg of the River Wan (Oua) up-stream to its intersection with a line passing through the following two points -

(1) A point situated 3 kilom. true west of the intersection of the River Wan (Oua) and the road from Daku (Dako) to Samia.

(2) A point situated on the road from Ilo to Lugu (Lougou) 37 kilom. from the enceinte or wall of Ilo, the distance being measured along the road.

63. Thence it follows this line to the above-mentioned point on the road from Ilo to Lugu (Lougou).
64. Thence it runs in a straight line to a point 8 kilom south, 23° west (true), of the cairn situated at the junction of the roads from Madekale (Madikale) to Tuandi and Madekale (Madikale) to Lolo, which cairn is about 3,000 metres from, and south of, the River Niger.

65. Thence in a straight line to the cairn mentioned in paragraph 64, and thence in the same straight line produced until it terminates at its intersection with the median line of the River Niger. The course of the frontier line is shown generally on the maps annexed to this Agreement, but in the event of any divergence being found between the line as described above and as indicated on the maps, the description shall be held to be authoritative.

The villages situated in proximity to the frontier shall retain the right to use the arable and pasture lands, springs and watering-places which they have heretofore used, even in cases in which such arable and pasture lands, springs and watering-places are situated within the territory of the one Power, and the village within the territory of the other.
### APPENDIX

#### ESTIMATED AND MEASURED INTERACTION BETWEEN SELECTED CENTRES IN NIGERIA, DAHOMEY AND NIGER

**MOVEMENT OF VEHICLES PER DAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>( \frac{\text{Pa} \times \text{Pb}}{\text{D}} )</th>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>MEASURED INTERACTION</th>
<th>Percentage variation from estimated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A NIGERIA INTERNAL ROUTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ibadan</td>
<td>637 379</td>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>665 248</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4 637 362 000</td>
<td>301 80</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>+40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ibadan</td>
<td>637 379</td>
<td>Oyo</td>
<td>112 349</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 072 100 000</td>
<td>134 90</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ibadan</td>
<td>637 379</td>
<td>Abeokuta</td>
<td>187 252</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2 611 179 000</td>
<td>169 95</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ibadan</td>
<td>637 379</td>
<td>Ile-Ife</td>
<td>130 050</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1 510 537 000</td>
<td>96 30</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ibadan</td>
<td>637 379</td>
<td>Ondo</td>
<td>52 234</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>364 116 000</td>
<td>23 70</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Lagos</td>
<td>665 248</td>
<td>Kano</td>
<td>295 000</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>274 472 000</td>
<td>17 90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ilorin</td>
<td>208 546</td>
<td>Ibadan</td>
<td>637 379</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 308 373 809</td>
<td>85 20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B DAHOMEY INTERNAL ROUTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sakété</td>
<td>15 000*</td>
<td>Porto Novo</td>
<td>78 300</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75 928 000</td>
<td>3 64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sakété</td>
<td>15 000*</td>
<td>Cotonou</td>
<td>109 000</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38 928 000</td>
<td>2 53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sokome</td>
<td>15 000*</td>
<td>Porto Novo</td>
<td>78 300</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75 928 000</td>
<td>3 64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Abomey</td>
<td>50 000*</td>
<td>Cotonou</td>
<td>109 000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>64 117 000</td>
<td>17 90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Abomey</td>
<td>50 000*</td>
<td>Allada</td>
<td>18 000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17 30 692</td>
<td>1 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C DAHOMEY- NIGER CORRIDOR ROUTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Parakou</td>
<td>14 000</td>
<td>Niamey</td>
<td>30 000*</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1 147 540</td>
<td>0 07</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+18 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Parakou</td>
<td>14 000</td>
<td>Cotonou</td>
<td>109 000</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>6 007 000</td>
<td>0 39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+5 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nikki</td>
<td>20 000*</td>
<td>Parakou</td>
<td>14 000</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4 814 000</td>
<td>0 28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+2 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Parakou</td>
<td>14 000</td>
<td>Porto Novo</td>
<td>78 300</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>3 943 000</td>
<td>0 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D NIGERIA ROUTES CONVERGING ON THE BOUNDARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Shaki</td>
<td>76 290</td>
<td>Iseki</td>
<td>92 220</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>134 521 000</td>
<td>5 75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Shaki</td>
<td>76 290</td>
<td>Kehi</td>
<td>42 374</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62 219 000</td>
<td>4 04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Shaki</td>
<td>76 290</td>
<td>Oko</td>
<td>34 311</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3 864 000</td>
<td>2 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E CROSS-BOUNDARY ROUTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lagos</td>
<td>665 248</td>
<td>Cotonou</td>
<td>109 000</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>690 500 000</td>
<td>4 90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lagos</td>
<td>665 248</td>
<td>Porto Novo</td>
<td>78 300</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>122 528 000</td>
<td>34 22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lagos</td>
<td>665 248</td>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>388 000</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>819 416 000</td>
<td>53 30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lagos</td>
<td>665 248</td>
<td>Lome</td>
<td>80 000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>272 092 000</td>
<td>17 80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Abeokuta</td>
<td>187 252</td>
<td>Koto</td>
<td>15 000*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4 312 000</td>
<td>2 91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Nikki</td>
<td>20 000*</td>
<td>Shaki</td>
<td>79 90</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14 663 000</td>
<td>0 95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F ROUTES CONVERGING ON ILARA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ilara</td>
<td>2 343</td>
<td>Abeokta</td>
<td>187 282</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8 004 414</td>
<td>0 54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ilara</td>
<td>2 343</td>
<td>Koto</td>
<td>15 000*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 19 000</td>
<td>0 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+1 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ilara</td>
<td>2 343</td>
<td>Koto</td>
<td>7 890*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 312 541</td>
<td>0 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ilara</td>
<td>2 343</td>
<td>Porto Novo</td>
<td>78 300</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2 074 750</td>
<td>0 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+1 438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Population figures from 1963 Nigerian Census 1961 DaHOMEY Census Estimate
Distances in miles
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