THE EVOLUTION OF POLITICAL SYSTEMS IN SOUTH-CENTRAL ZAMBIA: 1894-1953

by

MAUD MUNTEMBA

Thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts in History

University of Zambia February, 1973

C O N T E N T S

P R E F A C E

The completion of this study had been made possible as a result of a decision made by the National Museums Board of Zambia to grant me some study leave from my professional duties as Keeper of History at the Livingstone Museum and also to award me a two years' study grant at the University of Zambia. To all members of the Board, I express my sincere thanks.

I would also like to thank Dr. A.D. Roberts who first suggested the study to me but who has since left the University of Zambia.

To my tutor, Dr. B.S. Krishnamurthy, whose patience, illuminating criticism and guidance have given me encouragement in my work, I wish to express my special thanks.

I am also indebted to the following for the help they gave me in my research:

1) The Director of the Livingstone Museum for the use of Museum research facilities;
2) The Director of the Institute of African Studies, University of Zambia, for offering me accomodation and criticism while on research in Lusaka;
3) The Director and staff of the National Archives of Zambia;
4) Mr. A. Chioza (Research Assistant) who helped me in the field but who, unfortunately, has since left the Museum employ;
5) Mr. D. Kaumba who also helped in the field;
6) All my Lenje, Leya and Tonga informants particularly Messrs. G. Shipekwa, M. Nsoka, Fr. Nchete and W. Kazoka.

7) My late father, Mr. S.B. Muntemba, also the late chief Mukuni, Siloka II and Vice President M. Chona for introducing me to most of my informants and whose recommendation of me to the Lenje, Leya and Tonga precluded any anti-female prejudice I might otherwise have been subjected to.

SUMMARY

Between 1894 and 1953 Lenje, Leya and Tonga political systems underwent some significant change. Inspite of the same colonial policy, however, the change did not always follow a uniform pattern. In the thesis I investigate the reasons for this. My contention is that the people's reactions, which were as responsible for the change as the colonial factor, were responsible for the differences. The people's reactions were themselves the result of pre-colonial political developments and systems.

I take the Lenje, Leya and Tonga to illustrate how three people with some cultural affinities and who were faced with the same problems (for example land alienation) may have reacted differently to the twentieth century political developments because of their varying pre-colonial political systems.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

D.C.	District Commissioner
J.A.A.	Journal of African Administration
J.A.H.	Journal of African History
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal African Society
Loc.	Location in the National Archives of Zambia
L.M.	Livingstone Museum
N.A.	Native Authority
N.A.Z.	National Archives of Zambia
N.C.	Native Courts
N.R.	Northern Rhodesia
N.R.G.	Northern Rhodesia Government
N.R.J.	Northern Rhodesia Journal
P.C.	Provincial Commissioner
P.M.S.	Paris Missionary Society
Prov.	Province
S.A.J.S.	South Africa Journal of Science

T E R M I N O L O G Y

Throughout this thesis I use the local terms 'Bulenje' and 'Buleya' to refer to the lands of the Lenje and Leya. By the same token it might be expected that I would refer to the land of the Tonga as 'Butonga'. The Tonga are reluctant to use the term 'Butonga' to mean their land; rather they use it to mean 'the act of being Tonga'. When talking about the land of the Tonga, therefore, I use the anglicised form 'Tongaland'.

SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

A. Precolonial Period

i) Lenje

My reconstruction of pre-colonial Lenje political developments has been based almost entirely on oral traditions collected in the field, by the method of tape recording.[1] There are hardly any written sources covering even the latter half of the nineteenth century. The few written references to the Lenje are those by some eighteenth century Portuguese travellers and traders which mention 'Arenje' trade with Zumbo.[2] Father Torrend who lived and worked among the Lenje for many years combined his pastoral work with some scholastic pursuits, but he confined his researches to the Lenje language and did not concern himself at all with their history.[3] The Reverend

---

1. This method was also used in the case of the Leya and Tonga. In all cases the majority of the people interviewed were people generally of fifty years old and over. See. Bibliography. Tapes are reposited in the Livingstone Museum.

2. Sutherland-Harris, N. "Zambia Trade with Zumbo in the Eighteenth Century" in Gray R. and Birmingham, D.B.(eds.) 1970. Pre-colonial Trade in Central and Eastern African. 231-242. Sutherland-Harris quotes several Portuguese travellers and traders who mention the 'Arenje'.

3. Torrend, J.S. 1931 An English-Vernacular Dictionary of the Bantu-Botatwe Dialects of Northern Rhodesia.

Gray, a Methodist Missionary, researched into the customs and history of the Lenje people, but his Shishimi sha Bene-Mukuni is itself a written record of oral traditions.[1] David Livingstone makes one reference to the Lenje only.[2]

In other societies anthropological works have provided invaluable secondary sources, but no such works have been carried out among the Lenje.

Archaeology has not yet covered the Lenje area. However, excavations carried out by David Phillipson on a Soli site at Twickenham Road, Lusaka,[3] might help us understand some aspects of Lenje Society and economic activities. The Lenje have become closely linked with the Soli over a long period of political, social and cultural contact. In most cases the two have been living side by side especially in the area around Lusaka.[4]

---

1. Gray S.B. 1954. Shishimi sha Bene-Mukuni.

2. Livingstone D. 1857. Missionary Travels in South Africa, 502-503.

   Schapera, I.(ed.) 1960. Livingstone's Private Journals 1851-1853. 44.

   Schapera, I.(ed.) 1964. Livingstone's African Journal 1853-1856, 11, n.5.

   Livingstone mentions a chieftainess "Sebolamakoea", (Chibulamukoa), a chieftainess in the neighbourhood of the Lukanga swamps. Traditions do not mention a chieftainess answering to that name. But Chibulamukowa means one without a totem or clan. Anyone who would have disagreed with other members of his lineage could have called himself thus. Lenje history is full of lineage quarrels and disagreements. Chieftainship genealogies reveal women chiefs especially in the Chipepo chieftaincy.

3. Phillipson, D., 1970. Excavations at Twickenham Road, Lusaka Azania Vol. V. 77-118.

4. Headman Lusaka from whom the name of the town was taken was a Lenje headman under chief Mungule. He was himself related to the Mungule family.

Notwithstanding the problem presented by the limited availability of other sources which led to my greater reliance on oral traditions, I was further faced with the problem of the nature of the traditions themselves. This was due mainly to the mode of transmission.

The Lenje fall under the jurisdiction of six chiefs who all but one[1] claim a unilineal lineage descent. Drawing support from members of their own lineage segment, these had broken off from the Mukuni and established independent chieftainships with autonomous governments. The history of the Lenje people has been passed down by people belonging to different lineage segments and chieftaincies whose main object in the preservation and transmission of history seems to have been to portray the particular lineage's and chieftaincy's importance in relation to the founding Mukuni, its importance in relation to and over the other lineage segment and chieftaincy and to justify its independent existence. An interest in the history of the Lenje people as a whole is minimised. Consequently, for example, we find that among the Lenje there were no official historians whose main task would have been to learn and transmit the history of the whole Lenje people. The Lenje did not have the Royal Bards whose songs usually reflect some historical events in the life of the people as a whole and especially those of tribal hero-chiefs.

---

1. Chief Chamuka, kaca to Mukuni 1, was appointed administrator for the area east of Chisamba by Mukuni II. Later, when various administrators established their own chieftainships, he did so too. But his is the only non-royal chieftaincy that has survived.

Nevertheless, this should not mean that there are too few traditions among the Lenje to make a reconstruction possible nor that the value of the traditions should be underrated.

Because of the need by each chieftaincy to justify its existence, traditions are rich in the developments of the particular chieftaincy. A careful historical assessment of these often by comparative methods have yielded very useful material for a historical reconstruction. Further, the fact that they all trace their descent to one ancestor provides some form of link and unity among the ruling lineages. All the chieftaincies have been transmitting the development prior to and that led to the break up of the unitary political system. They also followed up the developments that took place in other chieftaincies.

In addition to royal sources, individuals have proved good sources for oral traditions. Almost every Lenje man or woman, commoner or royal that I interviewed has some knowledge, often learned from a grandfather/mother or great grandfather/mother, of his/her history.

The institution of royal Museums has been perpetuated and held with great reverence. At the death of a chief some of his instruments and personal belongings were collected. These were stored in a house specially built for the purpose. This was always build further off the royal grove and near the village of the Keeper. They have proved to be a good source of information as the Keeper is supposed to know what belonged to which chief and for what purpose the instrument was used.

We can therefore associate external forces and interactions, for example wars or trade, with certain chiefs and periods.[1] Unfortunately, this man and his Museum are not easily accessible. But once one gets the chief's permission, the Keeper often opens up the place although he has power to veto the former's decision. Place names and songs are another source of information among the Lenje. Place names often reflect what is supposed to have happened where, who lived and who died where. One of the songs recorded in the field reflects the route said to have been taken by the Bene-Mukuni during their early travels from Mwati Yamfwa's kingdom. It also mentions names of some individuals which traditions also mention as having been some of the people who came with Mukuni.[2] Some individuals too acquired their names because of some historical events in which they were participants. Traditions hold that such was how Luyungi(Mukuni II) acquired the name Musaka ba Lenje(one who fishes the Lenje). He is said to have been responsible for subduing the Sala (then known as Lenje) and for pushing them westwards.

Finally, studies of such people as the Sala, Soli, Kaonde Lamba, Lala, Leya with whom he Lenje have been connected historically and culturally have proved useful sources for my

---

1. Mr. H.P. Haile, District Commissioner, Broken Hill Rural, 1956-1960, associates one knife found at Chitanda's court with early nineteenth century Portuguese knives he has noted elsewhere. Interviewed May, 1972.

2. "Lenje Songs". Tape recordings and transcripts, L.M.

reconstruction of pre-colonial Lenje political developments. They have also provided some material against which I could check my Lenje sources.

ii) Leya

As in the case of the Lenje, written sources on the Leya are very scanty. Both chief Mukuni's "Handbook of the History of the Leya"[1] and Messenger Sekwaswa's account, "History of the Livingstone District"[2] are recent written records of traditions. Discussions on the Leya by scholars like Abraham and Sicard[3] are tentative and draw a lot from Sekwaswa's account. Reverend Jalla in his "Traditions and Legends of the Barotse Nation" mentions the Toka and Leya,[4] but these are casual references only and he only mentions them in relation to the Lozi who are his main interest. Livingstone and other nineteenth century travellers refer to chief Mukuni's country and people.[5] Unfortunately, all these travellers were more interested in countries to the north, south and west of the Leya. We hardly learn anything about Leya social and political institutions or what was happening in the Leya country at the time from them.

---

1. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II 1957. "Handbook of the History of the Leya." L.M.

2. Head messenger Sekwaswa and clerk Mahiritona K., "History of the Livingstone District." L.M.

3. Sicard, H. von 1969. "On the Peoples of the Zambezi: Historical Notes" in Current Anthropology, 10, iv. 65; Sicard, H. von 1946. "The Origins of Some of the Tribes in the Belingwe Reserve" in Nada, No. 25. 93-95.

4. Jalla, A.D, 1909 "Traditions and Legends of the Barotse Nation." L.M.

5. Schapera, I. (ed.) 1963. Livingstone's African Journal 1853-1856, 2. 326-330.

Anthropologists are only now starting to study the Leya.[1] But Vogel is carrying out a series of excavations in chief Sekute's area, a few miles west of Livingstone.[2] His finds show some insight into the people's cultural and economic contacts and development. Nevertheless, our acceptance of archaeological evidence as sources is at the moment tentative because it has not been established yet whether the archaeological people are connected with the present day Leya.

My main sources therefore have been oral traditions. The Leya polity had continued under a single chief, Mukuni. Next to him has been the Priestess, Be-Dyango, who the Leya regard as co-ruler. In addition to her ritual duties, it has been the duty of the Priestess to learn all the history of the Leya people and of the royal house in particular. It was her duty to educate the new chief on the history of his people. The Priestess also looked after the royal graves and she had not only to know which chief was buried where, but also what a particular chief was famed for. Both she and the chief are custodians of Leya history and have proved good and helpful sources in my researches.

Succession to chieftaincy among the Leya rotated among four dynasties. Members of each dynasty are very well versed into the history of their dynasty. They have also learned in great detail the activities of a member of their dynasty who would have served as a chief. These too are good sources of oral traditions.

---

1. Mubitana K., Keeper of Art/Ethnography, Livingstone Museum, has been studying the Leya since 1970.

2. The results of some of Vogel's work have been published under the titles, Kamangoza .1970. and Kumadzulo. 1971. Museums Papers No. 2 and No.3.

Individuals too, royal as well as commoner, are a store of some traditions. A few old men and women remember life at the close of the nineteenth century.[1]

Place names and songs are another source of information among the Leya. Some islands on the Zambezi river will tell us what chief lived there or what happened there.[2] One song describes some of the functions of their chief and gives an insight into the relations between him and his people.[3]

Finally, traditions from the Toka, Sekute Leya and Lenje as well as histories of the Lozi and the Tonga provided me with some material for my reconstruction of pre-colonial Leya political developments.

iii) Tonga

In contrast to the Lenje and Leya the Tonga are poor in oral traditions but rich in written sources and archaeological evidence.

The Tonga have few traditions that go further than two generations. They are vague about their former home, their early movements and settlements and political developments.

---

1. One old woman and two old men were alive at the time the Leya used to journey to Panda ma Tenga to trade with the white traders there in the 1870's and 1880's.

2. For example, the island Kalai is also known as Kalunda by the local people. The word Kalunda is a praise word often reserved for chiefs in appreciation of their wisdom and ability to look after their people. Chief Sekute lived on Kalai island for a long time and the island became known as Kalunda as a result of this association with him.

3. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II, "Handbook of the History of the Leya" quotes one such song.

"We have been here since God made us" was the vague answer I got in the field whenever I put the question of their early movements to them. Because of this poverty in oral traditions, an invaluable source in preliterate societies, an attempt at a reconstruction f Tonga pre-colonial developments cannot go further back than the nineteenth century and especially the latter half of the nineteenth century when we encounter written sources.[1]

Neve theless, more extensive archaeological work has been carried out in Tongaland than in any other part of the country.[2] Archaeologists have discovered a continuous Iron Age Culture in Tongaland. Most have suggested that the ancestors of present day Tonga might have been occupying the land they occupy today since about the eleventh century.[3] Further, archaeological evidence affords us with some knowledge about the people's culture, the social structure, their economic life and trading activities.

---

1. Nineteenth century travellers like Livingstone, Holub, Selous and Westebeech all travelled to or through Tongaland o had heard of the Tonga.

2 Fagan B.M., Phillipson D.W., Daniels S.G. and Vogel J.O. have all carried out extensive research on Iron Age sites in both plateau and valley Tongaland.

3. Fagan B.M., 1965. Southern Africa. 77.

_____ (ed.). 1964, The Victoria Falls. 66-67

_____ 1967. Iron Age Cultures in Zambia, 1.

Scholars like Professors Elizabeth Colson,[1] Scudder[2] and Dr. Miracle[3] have done extensive work among the Tonga since the 1940's. Their works and especially those of Colson have proved very good sources in my reconstruction of pre-colonial political developments among the Tonga.

Finally, the second half of the nineteenth century saw many travellers through Tongaland, missionaries and traders in Bulozi.[4] Their references to the Tonga (whom they referred to as northern Toka) are useful sources for the post - 1850 Tonga society and developments.

B. Colonial Period

For the British South Africa and Colonial Office Rule I relied largely on archival material : Government files and notebooks, mission records, journals and anthropological and historical works and other books.

---

1. Especially her "The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia" in Seven Tribes of British Central Africa. 1951. 94-162.

   The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia. 1962.

   Social Organisation of the Gwembe Tonga. 1960.

2. Scudder, T. 1962. "The Ecology of the Gwembe Valley

3. Miracle, M.P. 1959. "Plateau Tonga Entrepreneurs in Historical Inter-Regional Trade." Rhodes-Livingstone Journal, No. 26. 34-50.

4. See p. 9, n.1

But I also drew on some oral traditions; I interviewed some old men who were alive in the early years of colonial rule, those who were told about Government activities by their fathers or grandfathers. I also interviewed people who had served in the British South Africa Company Rule either as chiefs or as messengers and kapasus. Chiefs, Councillors, District Commissioners and District Officers who had lived and worked under the 'Indirect Rule' system were also interviewed. I hoped that in so doing I will not only have filled in the gaps and substantiated some of the archival evidence, but also effected some sort of balance especially with regard the chiefs' and other indi enous officers' role in the whole development.

THE PEOPLE AND THE COUNTRY

The people whose political development forms the subject matter of this thesis are found in the central part of the Central Province and in a large portion of Southern Province from the Kafue river to the Victoria Falls. The Namwala and western portion of the Kalomo Districts, however, are occupied by the Ila, the Toka and Sekute Leya respectively, who do not fall within the present survey. But it is important to examine from the outset what people, in both pre-colonial and colonial days, constituted and constitute the Lenje, Leya and Tonga 'tribes' and in what way our reference to them as 'tribe ' is to be understood.[1]

NOTES.

1. The Lenje, Leya and Tonga were known by these terms in the second half of the nineteenth century:

   Schapera, I.(ed.) 1963. Livingstone's African Journal 1853-1856. 2. 359, where Livingstone refers to "The range Bolengue," viz. the Lulenje hills across the Kafue river. Oral traditions also indicate the Lenje were known by the term in pre-colonial days.

   Smith, E.W. and Dale, A.M. 1920 The Ila-Speaking people of Northern Rhodesia. 48, where they reproduce David Livingstone's map drawn in 1853. Livingstone marks the "Balea" on his map; in his Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambezi, 1865. 156, Livingstone mentions the "Balea".

   All the nineteenth century travellers, and missionaries who refer to the Tonga knew them by their name, "Batoka."

Based on A.V. Brelsford's "Tribal and Linguistic Map of Zambia" in The Tribes of Zambia

i) The Lenje

Lenje traditions hold that at the arrival of Mukuni, the founder of Lenje chieftainships, there were people of a different culture and language living in the lands the Bene-Mukuni later occupied. Traditions also indicate that the people that the Bene-Mukuni found in the land were agriculturalists, and they kept cattle. The language they spoke was akin to that spoken by the people to their south and to their west, who are known today as Tonga and Sala. The language spoken by the new-comers, however, was akin to present day Lamba and Lala. Old Mukuni songs reveal this affinity.[1]

But although their ideas of chieftainship were more advanced than those of the local people,[2] the new-comers were few in number. Thus gradually they were adopting the language of their ruled. Later royal songs indicate this change in language usage.[3] By the close of the nineteenth century all the Lenje chiefs were speaking the language known today as ci-Lenje. They also became agriculturalists and cattle keepers. But throughout the period, as they do to day, the descendants of the first Mukuni's group, viz. the ruling lineages, emphasised their separate origins and status by referring to themselves as Bene-Mukuni (people of Mukuni) while the earlier

---

1. "Lenje Songs" Tape and transcripts in Livingstone Museum.
2. See below chapter 1.
3. "Lenje Songs".

inhabitants and later immigrants to Bulenje were called Lenje.[1]

In chief Chamuka's area to the east of Chisamba, there was, in addition to the group referred to above, another group of people who claimed different origins and culture. The people in this group traced their origins to the Swaka and Lala to the north and south. They spoke a language more akin to Swaka and Lala than to Tonga and Sala. Their old songs bring out this affinity. To date this group uses ci-Lenje very rarely.

When another chief, Mukumbwe, founded his chieftainship north of the Lukanga Swamps, he found people of Lamba connections and spoke a language akin to Lamba. Later, some of these came under his jurisdiction.

Thus in pre-colonial Bulenje we find people of diverse origins: the descendants of the founders of the chieftainships, the people in central Bulenje, the people in the eastern parts and the people in the northern parts of Bulenje. These people had different cultures and spoke different languages. Nonetheless, towards the end of the nineteenth century, they all fell under the jurisdiction of Bene-Mukuni chiefs and politically identified themselves with them. Thus we might say that the Lenje formed a political unit but were culturally heterogeneous. When we talk of the Lenje as a group or 'tribe' in pre-colonial days, it is as a political unit that we are to understand them.

---

1. Today there is a tendency among most Lenje to claim kinship ties with the ruling lineages and it is difficult to tell the true Bene-Mukuni from those who are not. On the other hand, the ruling lineage happily call themselves Lenje as well as Bene-Mukuni.

But the same observation can be made in respect of the Lenje today. In the official Lenje area today there are many people from other areas among whom the majority are Tonga, Shona, Mbunda, Kaonde and Ila from Mumbwa. While the Shona and Mbunda have retained their identity, some Tonga and to a greater extent Kaonde and Ila look upon themselves as Lenje and are accepted by both the locals themselves and Government as such. In chief Chamuka's area a number of people who call themselves Lenje are of Lwano and/or Swaka parentage and are culturally Lwano or Swaka. Those who consider themselves pure Lenje do not accept them as Lenje, but Government refers to them as Lenje. Again some of the Twa of the Lukanga Swamps have claimed different origins and a separate identity from the Lenje while others consider themselves Lenje. On the other hand, the majority of the Lenje whom I have interviewed on the subject show a tendency to look down on the Twa. They therefore do not accept the view that the latter are part of them. Nevertheless, the Twa have always been counted as Lenje in the census. Thus today as in the last century people of diverse cultures and origins constitute the Lenje tribe.'

In the 1962 census the Lenje population figure stood at 112,000.[1] At the 1963 Northern Rhodesia population census the rate of increase per annum was estimated at 3%[2] and the

---

1. The quoted population figure is based on the estimates given in annexure V of the "Annual Report of the Ministry of African Affairs for 1962" The 1969 National census did not give tribal figures.
2. Kay, G. 1967. A Social Geography of Zambia. 46.

1969 Zambia population census showed a 16.2% rise over the one.[1] The present Lenje population, therefore (as that of the Leya and Tonga), should be viewed in the light of this overall national population rise.

Culturally, the Lenje have become akin to the Tonga and Ila as a result of a long history of social, cultural and economic contact. The Lenje language has very few traces of old Mukuni but bears strong similarities to Sala, Ila and northern Tonga. But one comes across some variations as one moves into the eastern part of Chamuka's chiefdom where the Lenje meet the Lwano people. One also notices some variations in chief Mukubwe's area where the Lenje have been living side by side and intermarrying with the Lamba and Lima.[2]

Except for the eastern part of chief Chamuka's area which has within its borders a portion of the Muchinga escarpment, Lenje is a flat woodland area and is sparsely populated.[3] The soil is comparatively good ranging from dark red clays just west of Lusaka, the Chisamba area and a few miles along either side of the Great North Road to reddish brown in the area round Keembe Agricultural Station; chief Mukubwe's area has plain soils while east of Chamuka is rock and rubble;[4]

---

1. Monthly Digest of Statistics, 4, ii. 1970.

2. When the writer visited chief Mukubwe in 1968, she observed that the chief spoke to his wives and children in Lima language. Most people who spoke in Lenje often slipped back into Lima.

3. Map, "Republic of Zambia, Central Province, Kabwe District" (Published for the Zambia Government by the British Government's Overseas Development Administration. 1972).

4. "Soils Map of the Republic of Zambia"(Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka 1968).

the rest of Bulenje which constitutes the largest area is sandveldt with the clay content ranging from yellowish-red to light yellowish-brown where poorly drained.[1] The avarage annual rainfall ranges from 900 millimetres to 1100 millimetres.[2] Cattle is the main livestock but sheep, goats and pigs are also reared.

ii) The Leya.

Leya traditions claim that the founder of their chieftainship had different historical origins from that of the bulk of the people who later came under his jurisdiction.[3] Consequently, he and his original group had a different culture and spoke a different language.

Thus sometime back there was a deversity of origins, culture and language among the Leya. But unlike the Lenje where the ecology, geography and later history of the country might have encouraged the continuation of cultural separateness, among the Leya there had developed an almost cultural homogeneity[4] towards the end of the nineteenth century. This might

---

1. "Soils Map of the Republic of Zambia." (Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka, 1968).

2. "Rainfall Map of Zambia." (Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka, 1968).

3. See below chapter 1.

4. One comes across some slight linguistic variations as one moves towards the northern-east where the Leya meet the Valley Tonga, and the west where they meet the Toka and the Subia.

be explained in terms of the smallness of the area thereby making contact more easy. The ecology of the country which forced the few people to live close to each other also facilitated cultural contact.[1]

But most important, perhaps, were the wars and raids that marked nineteenth century Leya history. The Leya men, young men and boys were thrown together more often as they went to war. The people as a whole identified themselves with each other and with their chief.

The geography of Buleya, the ecology, the wars and raids and finally the subjection to the Lozi all engendered and encouraged the people's sense of belonging to one political unit.

Thus towards the end of the last century, the Leya formed both a homegeneous cultural group, albeit with slight linguistic variations, and political unit. It is in both those senses that we shall use the term Leya in reference to pre-colonial days.

Today the Leya whose population figure stood at 16,000 in the 1962 census[2] fall under the jurisdiction of chiefs Sekute and Mukuni. But it is necessary at this stage to draw a distinction between the Mukuni and Sekute chieftaincies as it is between the Mukuni and Sekute Leya. The Mukuni

---

1. See below chapter 1.

2. The quoted population figure is based on the estimates in Annexure V of the "Annual Report of the Ministry of African Affairs for 1962." But the present Leya population should be viewed in the light of the 16.2% 1969 population rise over the 1963 National census.

chieftaincy seem to have had its origins in the Central Province.[1] Some of the Mukuni Leya had their origins in Mankie district[2] while others have some Tonga connections. The Sekute chieftaincy, on the other hand, appears to have had its origins in the Caprivi Strip or, possibly, Botswana. Most of his followers too trace their origins to Caprivi Strip, Botswana and Sulozi.[3] To date some Sekute Leya would rather call themselves Subiya. That both groups came to be known by the same name has been attributed to a marriage by one of the early Sekute chiefs to a sister of Mukuni. This linked the two royal families. Thus also at the time of choosing an heir to the Mukunichip,

---

1. See below chapter 1.

2. Abraham, 1961. Quoted by Sicard 1969. "On the people of the Zambezi: Historical Notes" in Current Anthropology, 10, iv. 465

   Chief Mukuni, Siloka II 1957. "Handbook of the Leya People." L.M.

   Sicard, H. von 1948. "The Origin of Some of the Tribes in Belingwe Reserve in Nada, no. 35. 94-95.

3. Brelsford, W.V. 1965 "The Tribes of Zambia". 72.

   Chief Mukuni, Siloka II 1957 /op. cit.

   Sekwaswa and Mahiritona, "History of the Livingstone District" L.M.

the Sekute family had to provide one for the Mukuni chieftaincy.[1] Later, both tried to prove their claims to an early settlement in Muleya in order to justify their claims to political ascendancy over the other. Thus Sekute laid claim to part of Muleya and consequently some Leya people. In 1921 boundaries of chiefs' areas were drawn up. Mukuni lost some lands and people to Sekute.[2] However, a survey carried out last year by Kafungulwa Mubitana, shows that in fact the Sekute area proper lies in the region west of Mambova known as BuSubiya and that a large proportion of Sekute's Leya are either Subiya, had moved from Mukuni's area or were once under Mukuni's jurisdiction.[3] In this study therefore the term Leya will be used in reference to the people of Mukuni only unless otherwise specified.

Culturally, the Leya have basic similarities with the Toka and Tonga with whom they have had some contacts over a long period. Basically, the Leya language is akin to Tonga. But there are also some marked traces of Lozi as most Leya and especially the royal family and other office holders had to learn Lozi when the Leya fell under Lozi political domination in the latter half of the nineteenth century.[4] For the most

---

1. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II 1957 "Handbook of the History of the Leya"; L.M.

   Chief Sekute and elders. Interviewed June and July, 1971.

   Headman Mukemu, Interviewed July, 1971.

2. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC4/1 N.A.Z.

3. Mubitana, K. Personal Communication.

4. See below chapter 1.

part the soil is quite poor, a "broken hilly country with mainly skeletal soils and flatter areas with much surface rock and laterite crust."[1] The Leya country has an average annual rainfall of up to 900 millimetres.[2] Sorghum and bulrush millet are the staple foods, but maize is also grown.

iii) The Tonga

The origins of the Tonga people or of their chieftaincies are hard to reconstruct. But Archaelogists have identified a continuous cultural trend[3] which indicates that the Tonga might not have had people coming in from the outside strong enough to introduce new social and political systems. Nevertheless, by the nineteenth century the Tonga were living in neighbourhoods some of which consisted of people of diverse origins, were culturally independent of the other and formed seperate political units from the others.[4] Most of the

---

1. "Soils Map of the Republic of Zambia." (Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka, 1967).

2. "Rainfall Map of the Republic of Zambia." (Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka. 1968).

3. Fagan, B.M. 1967 Iron Age Cultures of Zambia, 1(Kalomo and Kangila).

   Fagan, B.M. Phillipson, D.W., Daniels, S.G. 1969 Iron Age Cultures of Zambia,2.

4. Colson, E. 1969 "African Societies at the Time of the Scramble" in Gann, L.H. and Duigan, P. (eds.) Colonialism in Africa 1870-1914. 29.

neighbourhoods were organised on clan basis, but a clan is composed of people who belong to different lineages, of different origins and cultures. The Zambezi never formed a boundary and people moved freely from one bank to the other. Consequently, not only the Tonga from the southern bank of the river, but also some Shona found their way to the northern bank. In most cases, they became absorbed into local communities. This was especially the case where the people concerned were related by ties of kinship. Variation of custom also existed between the Valley Tonga and Plateau Tonga. For example, the Valley Tonga pierced their noses while the Pleateau Tonga did not.

Neighbourhoods also formed a political unit. In some instances several neighbourhoods formed one political unit. This was the case where a particular neighbourhood leader became renowned for his rainmaking powers and had other protective qualities such as the ability to defend his neighbourhood against any attack from other neighbourhoods and wild animals.

Nevertheless, each neighbourhood or group of neighbourhoods that formed a political unit was independent of the other and it did not concern itself with the political affairs of the other. Independent neighbourhoods came into contact with each other only when one neighbourhood's ritual leader had renowned medicine or rainmaking powers. People from far a field could then visit that neighbourhood.

Thus when we apply the term Tonga to the pre-colonial people on the plateau and in the valley, we shall remember that we are talking of people of diverse origins, who were culturally heterogeneous and who belonged to several independent political units.

As in the last century, today the Tonga 'tribe' consists of people of diverse origins and slight cultural differences. Some do not even consider themselves Tonga. People in the west, for example, think themselves to be more Ila than Tonga and infact some call themselves such.[1]

In Chief Sigongo's area are also found the Lengi. In the census they are counted as Tonga and will be treated as such in thesis.[2] In Chief Sigongo's area too are found some Rhodesian immigrants, the Goba. However, the Goba have intermarried with the local people, adopted most of the latter's customs and speak Tonga. Although the Goba have retained their distinctive name, they are in all respects Tonga, the Tonga themselves consider them Tonga and are counted as such in the Government census.

---

1. Colson, E. 1968 "The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia" in Gann, L.H. and Colson, E. (eds.), Seven Tribes of Central Africa. 96.

2. Informants from both the Lenje and Tonga independently these claims. They both claim this was a group that stayed behind after Mukuni the founder of both the Lenje and Leya chieftainships left that area after a short stay. Some Lenje were joining this group over the years. Chief Sigongo does not confirm the first assetion, but he agrees with the first one. He also says the Lengi came from present day Lulenje. He too calls them Lengi but he says that they live as the Tonga and that some of them have adopted the totem of the local people.

There are also some Ndebele settlements in Chief Monze's area. Despite the fact that there has been a lot of intermarrying between the Ndebele and local Tonga, the latter have retained their identity. Government census have treated them as a separate group. In the same way, the term Tonga in the thesis does not apply to them.

In the 1962 census the Tonga numbered 456,000, adding up to 11.4% of the country's population.[1]

Plateau Tongaland is an open savannah country. On the northwest it extends into the Kafue river flood plain where the Tonga meet the Ila. Here, the land is good for grazing and cattle are kept. To the east arable soils and agriculture rather than cattle raising predominates. Population too is evenly distributed. To the east of this where the country forms part of the escarpment we get rock and rubble soils.[2] The population is scanty, what population concentration there are being centred around the alluvial soils of the tributary deltas. Southwards in the valley we get some of the country's highest population density concentrations. In places this rises to just under 300 per square metre. This is because settlements have to be concentrated around epoaits of alluvial soils formed along the Zambezi banks or tributary deltas.[3]

---

1. Annexure V, "Annual Report of the Ministry of African Affairs for 1962." But the present Tonga population should be viewed in the light of the 16.2% 1969 population rise over the 1963 National census.

2. "Soils Map of the Republic of Zambia"(Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka.1967).

3. Scudder, T. 1962. "The Ecology of the Gwembe Tonga." 130; "Soils Map of the Republic of Zambia" (Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka.1967).

The average annual rainfall ranges from 900 millimetres in the Valley to 900-1000 millimetres on the Plateau. Small patches around Mazabuka, Kalomo and Sinazongwe average 1000-1100 millimetres.[1]

Maize is the staple food on the plateau while sorghum and bulrush millet are the staple foods in the valley. Cattle are the main livestock on the plateau. Goats and sheep are the main livestock in the valley.

---

1. "Rainfall Map of the Republic of Zambia" (Published by the Surveyor General, Ministry of Lands and Mines, Lusaka. 1967).

CHAPTER I

PRE-COLONIAL POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS.

Introductory

A number of factors influenced political developments in pre-colonial days. Encounters with other people, economic contacts and the country's ecology were both cause and effect of the political systems that operated among the Lenje, Leya and Tonga prior to the advent of white rule. The strength of the systems in terms of geography, organisation and relations between the leaders and the people were, to a great extent, the result of the responses to these factors.

i) The Lenje

The Lenje trace the origins of their chieftainships to the Lunda empire of the Mwata Yamfwas. Most traditions credit Mukuni, the founder of the chieftainships, with some royal connections. A few put him out as a wanderer out for adventure, albeit in possession of the Lunda ideas of chieftainship.[1]

Traditions hold that prior to the arrival of Mukuni, Bulenje was settled by people organised mainly in clan groups under their clan leaders. But it would appear that in some areas leadership cut across clan allegiances. In such instances certain individuals would have proved other qualities such as good huntsmanship (he could therefore protect the people against attack from wild animals) and military prowess. With such offers of protection, such individuals drew a following outside their clan confines. This seems to have been the case in respect of a certain Nakandanga who, according to traditions, took up leadership against the Bene-Mukuni in present chief Mungule's area, during their early days of conquest and expansion.

It was upon such communites that Mukuni and his followers, some of whom were his own relations, superimposed their leadership. It is not clear what shape Mukuni's conquest over the local people took. Traditions suggest that military operations were sometimes applied in cases where the original inhabitants, like those under Nakandanga,

---

1. This view was expressed by most of my commoner interviewees.

resisted the Bene-Mukuni, but peaceful negotiations were also adopted. The latter seems to have been the method adopted in the case of the area east of present day Chisamba. Here, Mukuni is said to have brought the people under his sway by winning the confidence of the local leaders. It is possible that given their type of organisation, Mukuni's ideas of chieftainship offered better protection to the people. Other groups which were opposed to Mukuni's leadership but could not fight him moved westwards and southwards into present day Salaland and Tongaland. But the Bene-Mukuni conquest and settlement was a gradual process which continued even after lineage fragmentation and the establishment of various chieftainships.

As our reconstruction of pre-colonial Lenje depends almost entirely on oral traditions, we cannot ascribe a definite date to Mukuni's entry into Bulenje. Nevertheless, our data point to a date somewhere between late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In the first place, migrations from the Lunda empire date back to the seventeenth century. Again, an early seventeenth century date has been suggested for the founding of Bemba chieftainships.[1] The founder of the Lala chieftainship is said to have branched off from the Bemba at a later stage.[2] Lenje traditions suggest that the Lala chieftainship was already established at the time of Mukuni's arrival. The latter is said to have come in contact with the then Lala Kankomba in the eastern part of the area which

---

1. Roberts, A.D. 19 A History of the Bemba: political growth and changes in north-eastern Zambia before 1900 (PhD Thesis)

2. Vansina, J. 1968. Kingdoms of the Savanna. 89-90

the Bene-Mukuni were trying to bring under their rule. In the second place, some Portuguese documents make reference to trade between Zumbo and the "Arenje" during the second half of the eighteenth century.[1] Traditions also refer to trade with the Portuguese at Zumbo which they ascribe to the period after the establishment of the Mukuni chieftainship.[2] If the "Arenje" in the Portuguese documents are indentifiable with the Lenje of the post-chieftainship establishment period,[3] a late seventeenth century or early eighteenth century date is most probable.

The Lenje continued to be ruled by the Mukuni until after the death of Mukuni IV.[4] By this time they had established their headquarters in the neighbourhood of present-day Chibombo. They had also acquired most of the lands which they occupy today. In order to administer effectively and to guard against possible insurrections and outside attacks, the Mukunis had found it necessary to send envoys, mostly members of the ruling lineage, to outlying areas.

---

1. Sutherland-Harris, N. 1970 "Zambia Trade with Zumbo in The Eighteenth Century" in Gray, R. and Birmingham, D.B. (eds.), Pre-Colonial African Trade. 231-242.

2. One of my informants, Mr. Nsoka, cited some songs which refer to some of his ancestors going to Zumbo for trade. "Lenje Songs." L.M.

3. In her article, "Zambia Trade with Zumbo in the Eighteenth Century," loc. cit. Miss Sutherland-Harris is more inclined to identify the eighteenth century "Arenje" with the Lenje. I also tend to indentify the two.

4. Some traditions as those quoted by Reverend Gray in his Shishimi sha Bene-Mukuni put the break up of the unitary system to after the death of Mukuni III. But most traditions and a careful assessment of the various genealogies seem to point more to Mukuni IV than to Mukuni III.

Thus, for example, in the days of Mukuni I Chamuka, who had been Mukuni's Kaca (chief minister), was put in charge of the area east of present day Chisamba. Under Mukuni II Liteta,[1] Kapalamoto and Ceembe were made administrators in the eastern part of the chiefdom. When Chitanda was declared chief after the death of Mukuni IV, some members of the royal lineage resident in particular areas, such as Chinyoni in the area west of Lusaka, were made administrators. Later, most of these administrators declared themselves chiefs and established their own autonomous Governments.

Under Mukuni IV various lineages left the Mukuni neighbourhood to other parts of the chiefdom. Most traditions of the histories of individual chieftaincies attribute this to the cruelty of Mukuni IV. For example, traditions have it that it was to run away from Mukuni's cruelty that Chitanda's uncle left the parts west of the chiefdom and took Chitanda with him. This might have been the case. But one cannot overrule individual lineage interests and political ambitions. Succession disputes had occured after the death of Mukuni II when Shimalungwe, one of the contendants, is said to have been killed by the supporters of Lubonga-boombe who became Mukuni III. Succession disputes came up again after the death of Mukuni III. Chinyoni, apical ancestress of the Mungule line,

---

1. This Liteta is not to be identified with the present Lenje chief Liteta. Since British South Africa Company rule the former has appeared as a "Aluano" chief. The "Aluano" live in the Lwano valley and are a mixture of the Lenje, Lala and Swaka people. They now refer to themselves by the geographical name.

left for the area west of Lusaka ostensibly due to Mukuni's cruelty but actually in protest against the appointment of Mukuni IV.[1] Later, when Chitanda made Chimbwe, apical ancestress of the Ntitima lineage, administrator for the area bordering on Salaland, Maloca, apical ancestress of the Mukubwe line, went to the area north of the Lukanga Swamps in protest against the appointment.

It would appear that soon after the settlements of administrators and lineages in various parts of the chiefdom the Lenje found themselves involved not only in inter-regional[2] but long distance trade as well.[3]

---

1. Inter alia Matibini, S., Nsoka, M., Shipekwa, G., Tape in L.M.

2. Among others the Lenje traded with the Ila and Sala from whom they obtained salt, cattle, copper and ivory in return for cattle and iron ore. They also sold slaves and iron ore to the Tonga in return for ivory, cattle and salt.

3. It is possible that long-distance trade developed before some administrators and lineage heads had established independent chieftainships. Mumba, a Lenje chief mentioned in Sutherland-Harris' article op. cit., p. appears in the genealogy as the second chief to rule in chief Chipepo's area after Mukuni IV. The ancestresses of some lineages like Ntitima's and Mukubwe's went to their respective areas during Chitanda I's reign. Chitanda should have been Mukuni V. Further, non-royal administrators like Chamuka became independent chieftaincies after the royal ones.

The Lenje traded with the Portuguese from Zumbo and the Chikunda.[1] In the early stages of Lenje/Portuguese trade activities, the Lenje used to journey to Zumbo.[2] But later, the Portuguese agents, 'mussambazes', used to journey to Bulenje.[3] The Chikunda too travelled to Bulenje. It is possible that the Bisa, reputed for their trade middlemanship, acted as middlemen between the Portuguese, and the Lenje.[4] At times the Lenje themselves went to Zumbo and Feira.

---

1. In her article "Zambia Trade with Zumbo in the Eighteenth Century", op. cit., 233 Sutherland-Harris quotes extensively some Portuguese sources that refer to eighteenth century Portuguese trade with "Urenje" which she identifies with present-day Bulenje. Oral traditions talk about trade with the Portuguese. They mention the basambashi, the Portuguese trade agents 'mussambazes'. Among the relics found at chief Chitanda's court were 2 guns, 2 big muzzle loading guns, a revolver, a knife and some shells which indicate trade with the Portuguese and/or Arabs. The items were viewed and recorded by Mr. H.T. Going, District Officer, Broken Hill Rural in 1955: "Broken Hill District Notebook, K.D.A., 2/1 N.A.Z.

2. Suther-Harris, N. op. cit., 235 ; Oral Traditions.

3. Ibid. 238

4. Roberts, A.D. 1970. "Pre-colonial Trade in Zambia," Africa Social Research, No. 10. 728-729.

In the nineteenth century both the Arabs and the Mambari the latter coming in from the east coast through Kulozi and Ilaland, traded with the Lenje.[1] The Lenje exported ivory and slaves in return for guns, gun-powder, knives, cloth and beads.

It would appear from both oral traditions and written sources that trade was not a monopoly of the chiefs. Nonetheless, chiefs stood at an advantage over the individual entrepreneurs. We have noted that ivory and slaves were the chiefmost items of trade in both inter-regional and long-distance trade. In both items chiefs offered a better market. Chiefs were entitled to one tusk of each elephant killed by an individual under their jurisdiction. Also, tusks could be given to a chief as tribute or present. Chiefs also owned more slaves. They sometimes got them as court fines, sometimes they raided for them through their headmen and occasionally they bought them. Because of the rich market offered by the chiefs, traders went direct to them whenever they visited Bulenje.

Ownership of slaves also enabled chiefs to export and import more goods since they had a good supply of carriers. Moreover, most individual entrepreneurs preferred to conduct their trade through chiefs. Chiefs offered better terms of security on long trips. Dealing through chiefs also meant that entrepreneurs could get to the imports that traders brought in.

---

1. Livingstone D.L. 1857 Missionary Travels in South Africa 502-503;

   Schapera, I. (ed.) 1963 Livingstone's African Journal 1953-1956, 1, 11.

Thus in both inter-regional and long-distance trade chiefs were the greatest beneficiaries. Elsewhere, I have mentioned that it is probable that trading activities started even before some administrators had established independent chieftainships.[1] Administrators were the highest authority in their respective areas. Tribute and gifts of ivory from the areas under their authority were taken to them. They in turn sent some to Mukuni. As judges in their areas, administrators also obtained slaves and at times organised raids. Thus they could supply both items needed in long-distance trade. The wealth they amassed and distributed helped them win the headmen under them and through the headmen the people.[2]

One of the reasons why the Chitandas were held in higher respect among the Lenje was their ability to ward off the Kaonde whenever the latter tried to push southwards and eastwards. The availability of guns and gun-powder added to the Chitanda military strength.

The economic and political strength brought about by trade also engendered and/or intensified rivalries between certain chiefs. The Chitanda/Chipepo rivalry which, as we shall see, erupted under colonial rule, was precipitated and probably had its origins in Chipepo's eighteenth-nineteenth century economic strength. Chipepo was the direct descendant of the last Mukuni. Before the establishment of independent chieftainships

---

1. Above p. 31 n.3

2. Two of my informants, Shipekwa and Nsoka, mentioned that chief Chamuka who was in a more elephant infested area turned ivory trade to his benefit. It is significant too that both Ntitima and Mukutwe who were not so near the trade routes had smaller areas and fewer people under their jurisdiction. Shipekwa, G. and Nsoka, M. 1972.

every administrator used to send some tusks and slaves to Mukuni. Thus in the early years of long-distance trade Chipepo might have had more ivory in store than Chitanda. Further, Chipepo's court was nearer in distance to Zumbo than Chitanda's. More traders from Zumbo therefore traded with him.[1] His people too made more journeys to Zumbo.[2] Also the Bisa and Chikunda would have reached his area first before going on to the other chiefs. It is most probable that Chipepo's economic strength helped him retain more people who might otherwise have been won over by other chiefs. Until colonial times Chipepo retained the largest area and had more people under him than the other chiefs. His political strength which may have been sustained by the economic benefits of eighteenth-ninettenth century long-distance trade encoura ed him to challenge Chitanda who towards the end of the last century was accorded a higher status among the Lenje chiefs.[3]

From the above account a few points stand out in the Lenje political developments prior to the advent of colonial rule. The non-centralised political system was preceded by a centralised one. It is possible that such a polity was

---

1. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA2/1

2. Ibid.

3. During Company Administration Chipepo was viewed as the most important Lenje chief. Chipepo did not correct this impression.

necessary in the beginning as the Bene-Mukuni had just arrived into the area they were to occupy. To acquire more lands and impose their rule over other people, the enemy had to be faced collectively. Further, their numbers could not have permitted any major fission. In time, however, after the greatest odds had been overcome and with growth of population, fission and fragmentation within the society became inevitable. It must be noted nevertheless, that although succession disputes and lineage ambitions contributed to the break up of the unitary system, much of it was done for administrative purposes. With the conquest and subjugation of new people, members of the ruling lineage and trusted servants had to be sent out to administer them. This was also to weaken the Lenje political organisation as in time these minor rulers amassed so much support for themselves that they began to declare their administrative territories autonomous governments.

These developments were facilitated by the ecology of Lulenje. The fact that most of Lulenje is a vast woodland area comprising good soils facilitated less restricted population movements and ensured favourable cultivation wherever disgruntled members moved to. Besides, most of their neighbours to the west and to the south in present-day Salaland and Tongaland had enough good land themselves. Therefore, there was no danger of people disturbing the Lenje with regard to the search for better land.

To the political ambitions and ecological factors were added the economic ones. Long-distance trade worked towards

the growth in strength of the chiefs and administrators. Benefits of long-distance trade also encouraged rivalries which both precipitated and perpetuated the non-centralised political system.

Thus on the eve of colonial rule the Lenje political system was non-centralised. The country fell under the jurisdiction of several chiefs who were independent of each other. However, the majority of them claimed a unilineal lineage descent[1] and it is possible that a hierarchical system with a Paramount at the top would have developed had colonial rule not set in just then with Chitanda or Chipepo at the top. By the advent of colonial rule Chitanda was acknowledged as senior to the other chiefs, the position which Chipepo wanted for himself. According to the traditions, Chitanda was afforded the senior position primarily because he was the direct descendant of the ruling lineage apical ancestress. It would also appear that in addition to this, the important position the Chintandas continued to hold in Lenje society was due, as has already been indicated, to the respect the first Chitanda had received as a result of successfully warding off the Kaonde who were pushing southwards and south-eastwards from their area around Kasempa and Solwezi. (Chitanda is supposed to have got his name as a result of these successes. Chitanda comes

---

1. From the genealogy tables it appeats that only chiefs Chamuka, Liteta in the Lwano valley and Kapalamoto were not of the royal lineage.

from the verb Kutanda; to chase. Formerly he used to be known by the name Shankuba). Subsequent Chitandas are also praised for warding o f the Kaondes who after settling in present Mumbwa District were still trying to find their way east wards. Added to these was the reputation and respect the Chitandas were acquiring due to their sound sense of judgement especially in matters concerning succession disputes. Settling of succession disputes from other chieftaincies was one of the prerogatives of chief Chitanda by virtue of his senior position. Chitanda could reprimand any of the other chiefs if he felt the other was acting contrary to what was expected of him. Above all, it was he who decided when a chief was considered acceptable by instructing him to have some royal drums. To mark Chitanda's importance, he had three Kaca (chief minister) while the others had only one each.

Each chief had inherited all the characteristics that constituted the Lenje political institution . In the first place was the chief himself who had political, judicial and ritual duties to perform. The chief had to be chosen from either the deceased chief's nephew, nephew's son, or very rarely, brother. To help him carry out his duties were the Kaca. He was appointed by the chief and headmen from among the commoners. Kaca had judicial, executive and administrative powers. He often heard cases on behalf of the chief. Should a case get to the chief, Kaca could decide whether the proceedings were going along the right lines failing which he could summon some of the important headmen to help settle the

case. Kaca could decide which matters concerning the chiefdom should be decided upon by the chief in council and which he and the important headmen, the Baloba, could discuss, the chief being notified of the decision only. Kaca could not only advise the chief but also reprimand him should he feel there was cause to do so. He received gifts on behalf of the chief and could legitimately hold some of the gifts for himself. Whereas the chief could go to war, Kaca stayed at home to run the country's affairs. As my informants put it, he was the country's spearhead. If he got killed, who could run the country for them?

Below Kaca was Chipyeela. He was the priest and saw to all the ritual matters of Lenje society. In the event of any ceremony, he saw to the administrative side of ritual while it was the duty of the chief to eventually officiate. He was greatly feared and honoured by both the chief and people since he communicated with the dead ancestors who in turn held the key to the well-being of the chief and the people. Consequently, in stronger terms than Kaca, Chipyeela could reprimand the chief if he felt that it was due to the latter's negligence that some misfortune had occurred. Initially, Kaca could appoint any man from a family reputed for magical powers and deep religious inclinations to become Chipyeela. But as time went on, the post became identified with one family and infact the post became hereditary as the heir to Chipyeela the person became Chipyeela the ritual leader.

Then there were the headmen some of whom were Baloba, the chief's relatives who could either head a village or

simply remain important men in a village. These saw to the welfare of the people at the village level. They also carried out judicial duties. Some of them especially Balowa, could sit in council with the chief both in order to formulate policies or to help him judge cases that would have been referred to him. The headmen could allocate land to the people on behalf of the chief. But it was the chief's prerogative to allocate land to new-comers into the chiefdom. The political organisation also included Balanse, a group of young men who lived in a section of the chief's village. These hunted for the chief and in the event of war or attack could be called upon to go into battle. A candidate to the chieftaincy could not be selected unless he had once served as a Balanse. The Balanse also acted as the chief's and Kaca's messengers. It was out of this group that Mukatamweene was selected. Mukatamweene was the chief's own personal confidant in both political and personal matters.

ii) The Leya

The origins of the Leya chieftainship are quite obscure. But traditions gathered independently from both the Lenje and the Leya claim that the founder of the Leya chieftainship was the very Mukuni who had founded the Lenje chieftainships earlier. After founding the Bene-Mukuni chieftainship, Mukuni journeyed southwards and eventually settled near the Falls. He established the Mukuni chieftainship there. It is not the intention of the present work to prove the validity or invalidity of these claims. But the traditions reflect the view prevalent

among the Leya; that the ideas of chieftainship were brought to the area by an outsider.

In his handbook of Leya history the last chief Mukuni ascribed a fifteenth or sixteenth century date for the founding of the chieftainship.[1] But if we suppose (as chief Mukuni also claims) that the founder of the Lenje chieftainship was the same individual who founded the Leya chieftainship later, the above suggested dates would be much too early. An eighteenth century date would then be more probable.[2] Nonetheless, as we are handicapped by lack of written sources and have to rely on oral traditions, we can only suggest possible dates. But by the time of the Kololo raids in the late 1830's the Leya chieftainship was already established.[3]

Oral traditions maintain that at the arrival of Mukuni, the founder of the chieftainship, a woman who had originally come from south of the Zambezi organised the affairs of the people who later came under Mukuni's jurisdiction. The woman's name was Dyango. Her duties were mainly religious. Nevertheless, because of her ritual powers people appealed to her in matters they themselves could not settle. The credentials of these traditions may not be proved. But the Leya political system that emerged by the end of the nineteenth century comprised a woman Be-Dyango regarded by the Leya and Mukuni himself as co-ruler and whose main functions were those of a priestess.

---

1. Chief Mukuni, Siléka II. op. cit.,

2. The founding of the Lenje chieftainship was ascribed to a late seventeenth or early eighteenth century date. See above p. 29

3. The Kololo raided Mauleya on their way from the south. The Leya under chief Mukuni attacked the Kololo back: Livingstone D. 1857 op. cit. 517; Chief Mukuni Siloka II op. cit.

Mukuni is said not to have fought the local people but to have impressed both Be-Dyango and the people with his ideas of chieftainship. But it would appear that the newcomer was also impressed by the ritual organisation of the people he found in the land. At the death of the then Dyango, her successor and Mukuni agreed to work together as co-rulers, the former to answer to the ritual needs which the country's ecology and low rainfall rate necessitated; the latter to provide the political lead which, as our account of subsequent Leya history will show, became very necessary. Later, through marriage, the two became one family.

The ensuing Leya history was one of wars, raids and devastation of the country.

Sometime after the chieftainship had been established, the Leya were involved in some skirmishes with Sekute and his followers who were trying to settle in the western parts of Mukuni's chiefdom.[1] It seems Mukuni's Leya met with some successes each time Sekute tried to acquire some of Mukuni's lands. In 1855 David Livingstone recorded that Sekute and his followers were still confined to Kalai island on the Zambezi river.[2]

---

1. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II. op. cit.,

2. Schapera, I. (ed.) 1963 Livingstone's African Journal 1853-1856. 2. 326.

In the meantime the Lozi from the west were raiding the country for slaves. On their way from the south, the Kololo also raided and laid waste much of Buleya.[1] Under the next Mukuni Siankondo(he is said to have been on the throne when Livingstone visited the Falls in 1855)[2] the Ndebele from the southern bank of the Zambezi constantly raided Buleya. Sometimes they were repulsed. At other times they devastated the country. The Ndebele raids continued even after the Leya had come under Lozi political domination after the 1865 war.[3] In pre-colonial times the Zambezi river did not form a boundary. Some of Mukuni's people were on the southern bank of the river. Because of the constant raids from the Ndebele, Mukuni made one Siakabondo his sub-chief and was stationed at Mabuyu Oko Gura-the Big Tree- on the southern bank. Initially this office of a sub-chief was established so that the sub-chief could warn Mukuni of the approaching invaders. But he was also given power to settle small cases.[4]

In 1864 the Lozi under Sipopa's leadership regained their throne from the Kololo. But there were other groups opposed to Sipopa that wanted him off the throne. Sipatunyana,

---

1. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II. op. cit.

2. Ibid.

3. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II. op. cit.
Jalla, A.D. 1909 "Traditions and Legends of the Barotse Nation". L.M.
Both give a 1865 date for the war.

On their way to raid the plateau Tonga in 1893 the Ndebele sent an impi to raid the Leya; Mukuni, Siloka II. op. cit. The date for the 1893 raid was established by Colson." A Note on Tonga and Ndebele," N.R.J., 2, ii. 35-41.

4. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC4/1 N.A.Z.

a Toka who is said to have been taken captive during the Lozi raids earlier on and who had lived at Sesheke since, took opportunity of Lozi political confusion to return home. Nonetheless, it appears that he did not only do this but also supported some oppositionist parties. Sipatunyana organised the Toka and Leya to fight Sipopa's army when the latter marched against the oppositionists who had fled to Tokaland.[1] During the war Mujimaizi, the Leya chief and apparently military leader of the Toka/Leya group was killed. Thereafter, the Leya, together with the Toka, came under Lozi rule.[2]

However, the Lozi did not take over the running of the country. They did not introduce a system of government or policies that were foreign to the Leya. The Lozi were primarily interested in tribute which was mainly in the form of skins, grain, slaves and ivory, commodities which helped them meet the needs dictated by the ecology and geographical position of Mulozi and for their trading transactions. Thus as long as tribute was paid regularly, the Lozi would not concern themselves much with the Leya.

Nevertheless, the Lozi intervened in matters of succession. They demanded that the Leya send the names of the nominated candidates to the chieftaincy to Mulozi. The Litunga and his councillors selected the chief.[3] Possibly this was so in order that a man who either lacked qualities of military leadership

---

1. Mainga, M. 1969. A History of the Lozi People to 1900. (PHD Thesis). N.A.Z.

2. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II. op. cit.

   Jalla, A.D. op. cit.

3. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC4/1 N.A.Z.

or one who was sympathetic to the Lozi could be declared chief. This could both make the possibility of an insurrection remotely removed and ensure the continued flow of slaves and other commodities.

Lozi domination of Buleya continued until the introduction of British colonial rule.

From the above account of Leya history, it is clear that Leya political developments were greatly influenced by the country's ecology and encounters with other, and often stronger, groups.

The poor nature of the soil in Buleya, the low rainfall rate and the resultant occurence of drought and famine emphasised the significance of ritual among the Leya. Consequently, the importanqe of the priestess whose duty it was to lead the people in prayers of supplication and thanksgiving was brought to the fore. The wars and raids meant that the chief had to be away often, leading his people in battle. In the absence of the chief, the priestess had to sit in council with the councillors both to formulate policy and to judge. Thus gradually, by force of circumstances, the priestess Be-Dyango was widening her powers in the Leya political institution. Gradually too her powers were widened to include those of land tenure and receiving of birth and death reports. By the end of the nineteenth century the adcomodation of ritual into the political institution was complete, and the Priestess was viewed as co-ruler with the chief.

The ecology and low rainfall rate also had some effects on settlement patterns. There is a high population density in and around the capital with a few villages scattered in other places where there are the supply of water and the presence

of alluvial deposists.[1] Although the ecology worked to the people's disadvantage economically, politically it helped towards the survival of the unitary system. A disappointed contestant to the chieftaincy could not wander off to another part of Luleya to found a chiefdom of his own. If he did, he would neither be likely to find a suitable enough area for settlement nor, if he found this, would he have a big enough following. That most people lived in or around the capital village meant that the chief could easily keep them in check or that he could cultivate, through his headmen, his people's loyalty. On the other hand, the headmen with their scattered villages which were fewer than those under the chief's own direct control could not amass enough support for any movement against the chief even if they so wished.

We noted that nineteenth century Leya history was beset by wars and raids. For the chief, these had the function of throwing his image to the fore by uniting the Leya under one strong political and military leader. To the people, only the chief could offer the protection they needed. On his part, the chief expected the people's loyalty and a willingness to serve.

The frequent raids and wars also strengthened the political institution. In order for the society to survive the onslaughts, all the title holders like Mweendelezi we Cisi (chief minister), Mayasani (stand by army) and Mayumi (hunters)

---

1. In 1968 chief Mukuni put his village's population figure at 3,000 . This figure might be nearly correct since the Leya keep a record of all births and deaths.

had to be loyal, alert and efficient in their duties. The eventual subjection of Buleya by the Lozi had the same strengthening effects on the Leya political system and institution. As subject people, a disappointed contestant to the chieftaincy could not start a chiefdom of his own even if he so wished. Further, in order to avoid reprisals from the Lozi and the possibility of war, the Leya chief had to see that tribute was collected and dispatched in time. Thus again Mweendelezi we Cisi, the headmen and Bavwimi became more efficient in carrying out their duties. But above all, the subjection and brutalities suffered by the Leya during the Lozi slave campaigns deepened the sense of oneness among the Leya which a chief could foster for his own survival and that of the institution.

Thus at the end of the nineteenth century the Leya were under Lozi domination. They were operating under a unitary political system headed by a chief and the priestess Be-Dyango. The chief was chosen from one of the four royal dynasties: Mujimaizi, Mupotola, Siloka and Sianyemba, among whom succession to the chieftaincy rotated. But although representing a different dynasty, the new chief had to be a nephew of the deceased chief. It is interesting to note that although the Lozi made the final selection of a chief, they did not interfere with this sucession rule.

Be-Dyango was a royal female and had to be the chief's sister, daughter or father's sister.

The system incorporated a sub-chief stationed on the southern bank of the Zambezi river. He saw to the welfare of the people in the area there.

The Leya political institution also consisted of Mweendelezi we Cisi (chief minister) or Ngambela as he came

to be known after Lozi conquest. His duties were administrative and executive. He was a very important man in the Leya political system as he influenced the chief and the priestess greatly in their royal pronouncements and no suggestion or complaint from the other office holders could get to the two if Mweendelezi we Cisi was not favourable. Nonetheless, he could be deposed if it was felt that he was either over-exercising his powers or not executing his duties properly and efficiently. The capital village headmen or councillors advised the chief and Be-Dyango on this. Mweendelezi we Cisi was often non-royal. But he was made to marry either the chief's niece or daughter. This way, royal interests could be protected.

Below Mweendelezi we Cisi came Babetesi. Babetesi is the Leya word for judges. Thus their duties were primarily juridical. Often they and Mweendelezi we Cisi reached a decision which the chief merely endorsed. The Leya maintain that as the chief was father of both the good and the bad, he could not be expected to punish either of his children. On the other hand, this could be seen as a measure to protect the chief. The ill feelings of the punished would be directed against the Babetesi and Mweendelezi we Cisi and not against the chief. As a rule Babetesi resided in the capital village and were headmen of the village sections. But a village headman who would have proved himself good at settling disputes or who had other good qualities such as bravery, wisdom and the ability to win the confidence of the people could be promoted to Mubetesi(singular for Babetesi). The promotion was a royal pronouncement after presentation from the other Babetesi and Mweendelezi we Cisi. He would then move to the capital village and his village or villages would be looked

after by his heir apparent. On the other hand, should a Mubetesi fail in the execution of his duties, he could be demoted and another one put in his place.

Then there was Natamoyo whose rank is sometimes presented as being above and sometimes as being below that of Mubetesi. He corresponds very much with the Lozi Natamoyo (mother of life or mercy)who acted as a sanctuary for offenders.[1] It is possible, as my informants say, that before Lozi influence he used to be known by another name. But his duties as can be worked out from the data do not justify the post. According to my data, his duties were to carry out sentences. If the offender had been let off without punishment, it was his duty to educate him on the dangers of his actions. It is possible that while other offices survived after the onset of British Colonial rule, Natamoyo's office necessarily died out as most criminal cases were now referred to the boma. As one of the first offices to fall into disuse with the introduction of British rule, people's memories of it might be more hazy than of other offices which survived longer. But it is most probable that the Leya were in the process of incorporating the office into their system as a result of their contact with the Lozi system. But before it was fully incorporated, British rule came. One of my informants is Mujimaizi's grandson, Mujimaizi being the Leya chief who fought the Lozi in 1865. It is interesting that while he is well-versed in other

---

1. Mainga, M. op. cit.,

offices, he is so hazy on this one. Further, it is not clear whether Natamoyo was chosen from among the royals or commoners, whether from Babetesi and whether the office was promotional or not.

Below the above mentioned office holders who resided in the capital village came the village headmen. These could be head of one or more villages or hamlets and held administrative executive and juridical powers in their villages. But they had to refer more crucial matters to the capital village. The office was hereditary and a nephew or, in very rare cases, a son could inherit.

The Leya did not have a regular army, but there were young men known as Bayasani. These disbanded after a war and returned to their villages. But they always remained marked men. In the event of war and in answer to the summons from the capital, the headmen called on them as well as on new men to the profession to go and defend the country. Bavwimi (hunters) were expected to join Bayasani at such times. Bavwimi were hunters by profession. They hunted for the chief primarily for meat, skins, tusks but also to defend against wild animals. As we have seen, when the Leya came under Lozi political domination, Bavwimi became active in providing skins and tusks that were part of the tribute which had to be sent to Bulozi regularly.

On the eve of colonial rule, therefore, the Leya Political system was a centralised one. Because of their peculiar circumstances their political organisation was quite strong. But because of these same circumstance, their chiefdom could not expand geographically.

The Tonga

The origins of the Tonga and the development of their political institutions are not easy to reconstruct.[1] But Archaeologists have identified a continuous cultural trend in the Southern Province and have ventured to suggest that the ancestors of the present day Tonga could have been in that part of the country since about the twelfth century.[2] The few available traditions also refer to the Tonga as having been occupying the land they occupy today "since God made us." Some of the Tonga, especially those in the valley, were moving into Zambia from the Southern bank of the Zambezi at later stages.

The Tonga were organised on a more localised basis. These geographical localities are known as neighbourhoods. The size of the neighbourhoods varied. Some comprised as few as five villages or hamlets while others could be as big as up to twenty or thirty miles. Each neighbourhood was independent of the other. But if a neighbourhood rainmaker or medicineman was of great repute, the neighbourhoods overlapped ritually although not necessarily politically.

---

1. The poverty of oral traditions among the Tonga makes this task difficult. We have written sources for the latter half of the nineteenth century only.

2. Fagan, B.M. 1965. Southern Africa. 77.
   _____(ed.)1964 The Victoria Falls. 66-67.
   _____(1967 Iron Age Cultures in Zambia, 1

The origins and growth of the neighbourhood system are very interesting. It appears from our sources that anyone who wanted to live somewhere could go with his family or other kin to start a settlement, provided that he was assured of good cultivable land and water. Thereafter, he became known as Ulyanyika(owner of the land). Some sources suggest that some neighbourhoods were a result of the first settlements during the early Tonga population movements.[1] The movements and settlements were in clan groups. A man with more leadership qualities was picked as Ulyanyika. If Ulyanyika had the qualities people sought for, more joined him. Initially the qualities that drew people to such a person were those of rainmaking and reputation for medicine. As more neighbourhoods sprang up, however, there were some interneighbourhood wars and skirmishes. A neighbourhood Ulyanyika who often repulsed his enemies drew more people into his neighbourhood. Examples of these are those of Monze on the plateau and Mwemba in the valley. Monze and Mweemba are said to have been able to defend their neighbourhoods. Consequently, more neighbourhoods attached themselves to them. Hence some leaders came to have more than one neighbourhood under their jurisdiction. Another quality that drew people to a leader was that of good huntsmanship. This assured the people protection from wild animals. The ability to amass wealth, especially in the form of slaves and

---

1. This view was expressed by people in the valley. Chief Sigongo and his headmen. Tape in L.M.

Chief Mweemba, Siameja, Siamayuwa,

cattle, was another quality looked for in a leader. In fact non-ownership of slaves could disqualify the rightful heir to succession as a poor man would not be considered for a leader. Because they possessed qualities that ensured protection for the people and because of other duties such as judicial which they were performing in their neighbourhoods, the people designated their Ulyanyika, mwami, or chief.

However, ritual was of paramount importance in the people's lives. The plateau has very few perennial rivers. But the people were agriculturally minded. Good harvest depended on substantial rains which in turn could only be assured through the rainmaker's contact with the ancestral spirits who would in turn plead the people's cause to God. Other ritual performances such as the ceremonies held before the rains and thanksgiving ceremonies were all directed to the respective spirits, invoking them to ensure the well being of the people. Of necessity ritual came to the forefront in the valley too. The soil is rock and rubble in most parts of the valley. The valley too has a very low rainfall rate. This led to the frequent occurence of drought and famine. Among the Tonga, therefore, ritual formed a very important part in their political institution and often overshadowed other functions that neighbourhood leaders were expected to perform and did perform.

It seems that by the second half of the nineteenth century most of the neighbourhoods had come into existence. The political offices too had already evolved. Travelling through Tongaland David Livingstone wrote on 11th December, 1855,

"At a village of Monze's sister. We spent Sunday last with Monze the chief of all the Batoka we have seen".[1] Thirty years later Holub referred to 'Siasitema' (Siachitema) who was a strict master and ruler. According to Holub, Siachitema had a Council. Holub also referred to 'Mapansas' (Mapanza) who had "a geographical area and many subjects". When Mapanza was considering Holub's request for couriers and carriers, he was doing this in council with his advisers notable of whom was an old man who was "chancellor in the kingdom, medicineman and politician." Inspite of the efforts of Mapanza's brother to brush aside the advisers, in the end, Mapanza acted according to the advice of the latter.[2] Westbeech also referred to Mapanza "A Matoka chief in the outskirts of Bashukulumbwe."[3] In 1888 the great hunter Selous passed through the Batoka chief 'Monsi'(Monze). Passing through the valley he met Shampondo whom he referred to as headman, and 'Siamedzas' (Siameja), "an important headman." Of Mweemba he wrote, "biggest man and biggest scoundrel among them." He also made mention of Sinazongwe.[4]

Nineteenth century Tongaland was subjected to interneighbourhood wars and raids from the Portuguese (Pingola), Kololo, Ndebele and Lozi. Prior to the Kololo conquest of Bulozi, the Lozi had raided as far afield as the valley for slaves and animals. But the Kololo and Ndebele raids were more frequent on the plateau. Because of the constant raids, the Tonga were

---

1. Schapera, I.(ed.) 1963. Livingstone's Africa Journal.2. 350.
2. Holub, E. 1890. From Cape to The Land of The Mashukulumbwe (English translation still unpublished).
3. Clark, J.D.(ed.)1963. Diary of George Westbeech. 76
4. Selous, F.C. 1893 Travel and Adventure in South-East Africa. 205, 210, 211, 215.

forced to live in small and scattered villages. Referring to Monze's country David Livingstone wrote, "The population is not very large and is spread over a wide extent of country and this in order that should an enemy appear in any direction only a few people could be attacked before the alarm is spread. Even the chiefs live almost alone and they all appear as if living not in villages but in their gardens. This mode of life has been adopted within the last few years. Everywhere we come on the vestiges of large towns and extensive cultivation".[1] Livingstone's observation was confirmed thirty years later by Holub who added that the separate and scattered homesteads were useful from the strategic point of view. The enemies, more especially the Ndebele, could not use their tactics of setting the whole village on fire then.

The Ndebele raids which were more devastating continued until the early 1890's when the Ndebele came under British rule.[2]

But in order to avoid raids from the Lozi, the Tonga agreed to send items the Lozi would have raided them for regularly to Mulozi. Later, this turned into an exchange of gifts. The Tonga chiefs sent items such as skins, elephant tusks and grain. In return the Lozi Litunga sent some gifts. The present chief Monze has in his possession a number of Maamba a bulumbu(hoes of/foreigner) which had come from Mulozi through the this exchange of gifts.

---

1. Schapera, I./ op. cit., 1953 351 .

2. The last Ndebele raid was in 1893: See Colson, E. 1950 "Note on the Ton a and Ndebele," N.R.J., 2. 35

It had been observed in the case of the Leya that the Leya together with the Toka were subjects of the Lozi by right of military conquest. The Tonga, however, never came under Lozi political domination. When Holub visited Siachitema in 1885, he was informed about the many independent "Matoka chiefs of the northern parts", the northerners being independent of Lozi domination and "the real Matoka."[1] Holub also referred to Siachitema as the last of the Toka chiefs in the northeast who paid tribute to Lewanika. It is most probable that Siachitema like his northern brothers, did this to avoid raids. In 1888 Rev. F. Coillard referred to him as a petty chief of independent Batoka to whom Mathaha, a revolutionary Lozi chief, had fled.[2]

Nonetheless, it is true to say that the Lozi who had fled to Tongaland had stronger weapons and therefore were in a position to wield influence since the local people were frightened of them. Maracinuan, also known as Sikabenga, an oppositionist to Lewanika, had fled to Tongaland and established a settlement for himself and his followers about fifteen miles from Monze's village. The royalists who had pursued him did not in fact attack him as they were probably aware of his superior weapons and men. They ended up raiding the local Tonga who were in a less favourable position to defend themselves. The Tonga and neighbouring Ila were aware of Maracinyan's greater force. On his part, Maracinyan was aware of Tonga weakness and could

---

1. Holub, E. 1890. op. cit., .

2. Coillard, F. 1897. On the Threshold of Central Africa 307

therefore exploit this for his own ends. When Selous passed through Monze's country into Minenga's, an Ila country, Maracinyan sent his men to follow him and get some gun powder which he so much needed in the event of an attack from either the royalists or Ndebele. To accomplish this, the Lozi had to get the full co-operation of the local people. Thus although Minenga's people had been friendly to Selous when he had first arrived, they ended up attacking him and his men, killing several. Dispossessed of everything including his men and his rifle, Selous travelled back through Monze's. Monze had previously been both friendly and helpful to Selous and his men. But now when he learned of Selous' plight, he quickly begged him to leave his village. Ostensibly, Monze feared the Ila who had attacked Selous but in actual fact he knew that the whole plot had been engineered by Maracinyan.[1]

Yet inspite of this power, Maracinyan did not establish himself as political master over the Tonga. In the first place, he could not afford to antagonise them more than was necessary. If he did, the Tonga could easily work with the royal forces to capture Maracin an and his men. They could even spy on him for the Lozi at home. This way the Lozi could catch him when he would not have enough gun powder. Again, Selous reported that in August, 1888, the Ndebele had crossed the Zambezi with the help of Mweemba's people. Thereupon, they had attacked and devastated Maracinyan's settlement.[2] With two enemies, the

---

1. Selous, F.C. op. cit., 2[illegible]

2. Ibid. [illegible]

royalists and Ndebele, to contend with, Maracinyan could not have had much time to consolidate himself and establish any domination over the local Tonga. Thus although the Tonga were afraid of him because of his superior weapons and military record, they were not subject to him. They did not even send him tribute. Yet his was the nearest the Tonga had come to actual Lozi might and influence at close quarters. Nevertheless, the Tonga lived in fear of possible raids from the Lozi. Therefore they sent the items needed by the Lozi regularly which, as already mentioned, later turned into an exchange of gifts. This transaction continued until the introduction of British rule when it was discouraged.

The flow of goods between the Tonga and Lozi was only a minor fraction of the imports and exports into and out of Tongaland. In pre-colonial days the Tonga were active in both inter-regional and long-distance trade. Among others, the Tonga provided the Mbunda, Lenje and Totela with ivory, cattle and salt in return for slaves, guns, gunpowder and other essentials such as hoes.[1]

In the case of long-distance trade, the Tonga lay within the main trading routes and became part of the net works at a much

---

1. In the article "Plateau Tonga Entrepreneurs in Historical Inter-Regional Trade", Rhodes-Livingstone Journal, No.26. 34-50, Dr. Miracle also mentions the Ila, Mbala, Twa, Soli with whom the Tonga traded in iron ore, ivory, shells and other essential commodities.

earlier stage than the Lenje. Finds of cowrie shells from the east coast at the Kalundu mound and Gundu site which have been dated to between the fourth and sixth centuries, suggest some trading links between the people on the plateau and the coast.[1] At Isamu Pati site near Kalomo were found some cowrie shell ornaments and glass beads. The site has been dated to about the eleventh century.[2]

But the most revealing instances of long-distance trade activities with the people who might be the ancestors of the present day Tonga come from Ing'ombe Ilede site in chief Sigongo's area. At this site profuse remains of sea-shells, glass beads, Indian cloth, gold (which probably came from the southern empire of Mwene Mutapa), copper and iron were found. The profusion and nature of the goods and the presence of copper crosses of standard size and weight indicate that Ing'ombe Ilede was an active commercial centre for both inter-regional and long-distance trade. The remains of elephant bones on the site suggest that ivory (and salt to the neighbours) was the main item of export. Ingo'mbe Ilede has been dated to the fourteenth or fifteenth century.[3]

The long history of trade on the plateau and valley Tongaland became quite intensive by the nineteenth century. The Portuguese agents, the Chikunda and the Bisa, all visited the

---

1. Fagan, B.M. 1967. op. cit.

2. Ibid.

3. Fagan, B.M., Phillipson, D.W., Daniels, S.G. 1969. Iron Age Cultures in Zambia, 2i

   Fagan, B.M., Phillipson, D.W. 1969 "The Date of the Ing'ombe Ilede Burials", J.A.H., 10.ii. 199-204.

Tonga. It is probable that the Arabs also reached Tongaland.[1] In the second half of the nineteenth century the Mambari from the west coast who came in through Bulozi traded with the Tonga.[2]

Guns, gunpowder, beads, cloth and slaves(from the Chikunda) were the main imports. Ivory and slaves were the main exports.

Trade among the Tonga was not the monopoly of the chiefs, but individuals were very active in the trading activities. We have noted that one of the qualities looked for in a leader was the ability to amass wealth. The wealth greatly appreciated were slaves and cattle and other imported items. On breaking off from the village, an enterprising person could hope to amass a substantial following. He could not only start his own village but could even establish an independent neighbourhood if he had other qualities such as those of rainmaking as well. If the movement involved the whole clan, clan members could select an enterprising person to be their leader. On the other hand, a leader could easily lose his following or be forced to relinquish his position if he became poor. An heir apparent could not be selected heir if he was poor.[3] This did not only

---

1. In his researches Miracle came across a few people who remembered the Arabs. op. cit.

2. Schapera,I. 1963. Livingstone's African Journal, 1853-1856, 2. 330-331

3. This information was supplied by Mr. & Mrs. Kazoka in Chief Monze's area.

encourage the emergence and continuation of many and smaller neighbourhoods but also undermined the institution of chiefship; a leader today might not be a leader tomorrow; an heir might not get his position.

But trade enabled some leaders, who in addition to the ability to amass wealth would also have other leadership qualities, to expand their neighbourhoods. Examples of such leaders are Monze on the plateau and Sigongo in the valley. Monze was a more well-known chief to the world outside Tongaland such as Lozi. Traders therefore went to him. Again, because of his rainmaking reputation and ability to defend his neighbourhood against other neighbourhoods, he had a larger following and more neighbourhoods. He could therefore organise trade parties himself. This contributed to his growth in wealth. He was therefore able to retain and enlarge his following to the disadvantage of other neighbourhood leaders. Chief Sigongo's area was the richest in elephants. He was also the first Tonga chief to be reached by traders from Zumbo and Feira. He was therefore in a more favourable position to amass greater wealth. Thus although he did not have any rainmaking qualities, his neighbourhood grew.

The above account of Tonga history shows us that the ecology of the country, political encounters with other groups and economic factors affected the political developments in pre-colonial Tongaland.

Because of the ecology of plateau Tongaland, the initial settlers settled wherever good soil and water would have been

assured. Even what traditions there are among the Tonga talk of people settling in their clan groups according to the ecological dictates. Again, because of the vastness and the open and flat nature of the country, an individual could wander off to start his own village. Provided he had the desired leadership qualities to draw him a substantial following, he established his own neighbourhood. Again, throughout Tonga history provided he could gain access to his old gardens or be assured of another suitable piece of land, an individual who was not pleased with his leader could take himself off to another site or joined another village. Thus because the ecology of the country was favourable to less restrictive movements, a sense of individualism was engendered among the people and smaller-scale settlements were enabled. These settlement patterns encouraged the more localised political system.

In the valley, however, the ecology necessitated more concentrated settlement patterns. Consequently, although the political system was as localised as that of the Plateau Tonga, we find that here more people and more neighbourhoods fell under the jurisdiction of one chief. Informants claim that several neighbourhoods in the Upper River region were organised under the leadership of the lineage of the present chief Mweemba.[1] The same could be said in respect of Sigongo and Chipepo in the Lower and Middle River regions. Because they commanded larger geographical areas and had more people under them, the Valley Tonga chiefs had more authority than most of their Plateau Tonga

---

1. See also Colson, E. 1960 op. cit. 187-188;

counterparts. On the whole, the chiefly system seems to have been more developed here than among most on the plateau. Thus we find that when demarcating new districts and appointin chiefs in the valley, the British administrators appointed members of the indigenous ruling lineages with most ot the traditional neighbourhoods falling under them.[1]

Both on the plateau and in the valley the ritual leader or the ritual role of the secular leader came to the forefront. On the plateau there was much emphasis on ritual because the people were agriculturally minded. Ritual which could assure substantial rains formed an important part in the people's lives. That plateau Tongaland has few perennial rivers or streams made the assurance of rains all the more important. Ritual was of paramount importance in the valley too because of the poor nature of the soil in most places, the low rainfall rate and the drought and famine which this entailed.

Tonga history had been one of inter-neighbourhood wars and skirmishes and frequent raids from the Chikunda, Kololo, Ndebele and Lozi. Some of the effects these had on the Tonga, and this was more marked on the plateau, were to make them live in even smaller and more scattered settlements thereby setting back or retarding any evolution of a political institution on a wider geographical basis. I would venture to suggest further that the absence of political influences from outside the area could have fostered the continuation of the more localised political system among the Tonga. We have noted that the Lenje and Leya attribute

---

1. Colson, E. 1960 op. cit. 28, 187-188.

the origins of their chieftainship to some outside influence viz. the Lunda kingdom of Mwati Yamfwa. Further, traditions among the Lenje indicate that prior to Mukuni's arrival, leadership was based on an individual's personal qualities. Leya traditions also indicate the same but emphasize ritual powers as some of the qualities sought for. In the absence of other evidence, it is possible that the Lenje and Leya had been operating on more or less Tonga basis until an outsider with more advanced ideas of chieftainship based on wider geographical dimensions came along. We noted that among the Valley Tonga the chiefly system was more advanced than on the plateau and much of this has been attributed to ecological factors. But the valley people had been in contact with the Shona peoples in the south. Chief Mweemba's family is closely related with the chiefs on the southern side of the Zambezi river. Shona speaking people formed a good number of Sigongo's people. It is possible that the Valley Tonga with more contacts and influences from the south had been more in touch with and influenced by Shona ideas of chieftainship.

Added to the ecological factors and political encounters were the economic influences which not only affected the choice of a leader but encouraged both the birth of nieghbourhoods and their continuation.

Nonetheless, both groups of Tonga had continued to operate on more localised basis, the neighbourhood forming the political unit. At the onset of British rule each neighbourhood or group of neighbourhoods was led by a chief (Ulyanyika,)

Sometimes the same man could be ritual leader as well by virtue of having Basangu. Basangu were the ancestral spirits that enabled him to reach his ancestors. If the chief was not possessed by Basangu, there would be another man, woman or child in the neighbourhood who could be the ritual leader, Sikatongo. Sometimes a neighbourhood had two Basikatongo, but this was rarely the case. By virtue of the importance placed on ritual in Tonga society, the chief was subject to the pronouncements of the ritual leader.

The chief had political and judicial powers. He could summon his headmen if he wanted any decision reached on something. Sometimes all the people in the neighbourhood could be summoned. For example, when gifts had to be sent to Lulozi, the chief used to summon all the headmen and some of the ordinary people to decide who should go to Lulozi and what and how many items they should take. It was the chief's duty to see that whoever went was afforded maximum protection. Kinsmen of an injured man would receive compensation from the chief. Again, in inter neighbourhood wars, it was his duty to lead the people into battle and to see that his neighbourhood was protected. During raids it was his duty, through his headmen stationed at strategic places, to see that word got round his whole neighbourhood about the impeding danger. Thus the people had ample time to hide themselves. According to Holub this was often successful.[1] "Theoretically, newcomers should consult him (Ulyanyika) before settling near him but he has not redress save

---

1. Holub, E. op. cit.,

fighting if they did not."[1] My data, however, indicate that unless a stranger moved to completely unoccupied land (in which case he himself became an Ulyanyika), he had to consult the leaders in practice as well. A stranger had to have land for his fields. In pre-colonial days, the Tonga made their fields in or near old sites (matongo) where most of the dead would have been buried. Thus unless he had some lineage members who were prepared to give him part of their fields, a stranger had to consult the leaders who knew who was buried where or which land was free of burials. The consultation was necessary for the people did not wish to plough near or over the graves of persons they did not know in case the spirits objected.

In the case where the chief was rainmaker or ritual leader as well, chieftainship became more hereditary. The nephew whom the spirits, Basangu, chose or accepted also took over the secular office. In this type, the security of the chief was more assured because no one could challenge the spirits. In the case where the chief was of a purely secular nature, the people could easily depose him and put another one (usually a nephew) in his place if they were not pleased with him. It would appear, therefore, that functioning separately, the two offices did not have to be hereditary. That of the rainmaker or ritual leader depended on whether the spirits would decide to reside in his heir or would choose someone else. That of the chief depended on whether the people would still recognise

---

1. Colson, E. 1962 The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia: Social and Religious Studies. 216

the authority of the heir or whether he was thought a wise leader and capable protector and provider.

The Tonga emphasise that the duties of the chief were first and foremost to rule well (kulela kabotu); to see that his people did not fight or injure each other and that they were generally happy. On their part, the people appreciated the chief's services by giving him presents mainly in the form of meat, skins, elephant tusks and grain but which the ritual leader (if the chief did not incorporate this office as well) could confiscate.

Since many villages formed the neighbourhood complex, each village had its own headman. Some of the headmen were members of the chief's lineage, Banakokalia(those who eat from the royal hand). The headman was responsible to the neighbourhood chief. In cases where more than one neighbourhood formed the political unit, the village headman was responsible, through his neighbourhood chief, to the big chief who was the overrall head of all the neighbourhoods forming his political unit. Often when a man injured another belonging to a different lineage, both lineages met to try to find a peaceful solution so that relationships could be restored. Sometimes a solution was found. Where they failed, the injured could go to the headman. He in council with the village elders tried to find ways of placating the injured or of settling the matter to the advantage of both parties. Sometimes they were successful. But if they were not, they took the case to the chief who in council with other headmen especially Banakokalia would settle the case. Where more than one neighbourhood formed the political unit, the complainant could still appeal to the big chief if he

was not satified with the ruling. But all criminal cases had to be referred to the chief. In case of murder the ritual leader had to sit in council always. Murder was an offence not only against the injured party and community but against the spirits as well. Rites of purification had to be performed. Again, where the political unit comprised more than one neighbourhood, criminal cases could not be settled by the headmen or neighbourhood chief without reference to the overall chief and neighbourhood ritual leaders.

Nevertheless, the importance of ritual among the Tonga made the ritual powers of a chief (if he was both secular and ritual leader) more pronounced and he became more widely known in areas outside the geographical confines of his neighbourhood. The importance of and emphasis on ritual made the ritual leader (if he was not the chief as well) appear more prominent than the chief both to the people in the neighbourhood and to the visitors.

In the next chapter we shall see how the emphasis on ritual and size of most of the neighbourhoods which formed the political units led to the supposition that other functions such as the judiciary and policy-making that neighbourhood leaders performed had not existed in pre-colonial Tongaland.

Summary

The above survey of Lenje, Leya and Tonga pre-colonial political developments shows that whereas among the Lenje it was the ecology, some external political influences lineage ambitions and economic factors which influenced and effected the political system, among the Leya it was primarily the ecology and political encounters and economic factors which were both cause and effect of the political system operating at the end

of the nineteenth century.

The ecology of Bulenje enabled less restricted population movements and scattered settlements. Thus the Mukunis had found it necessary to send administrators to rule over the areas farther removed from the capital. In time these administrators established their own autonomous governments. Further, we have seen how with population growth, lineage fission and fragmentation started among the Bene-Mukuni. The assurance of cultivable land and water both for themselves and their animals enabled disappointed contestants to the chieftaincy to go off to another area. Because of the scattered settlements, they were assured of a following there. Long distances and lack of easy communications with the centre worked to their advantage and in time they established their own autonomous governments.

On the other hand, the presence of many rivers assured them a good enough harvest to meet their subsistence requirements. Therefore, although important, ritual was not as emphasised as it was among the Leya and Tonga.

In contrast to the Lenje, the ecology of Buleya and valley Tongaland was economically unfavourable. But it worked to their political advantages. Because of the ecology, settlement had to be confined to areas along the Zambezi and its tributaries where rich alluvial soils could sustain the crops. Consequently, in Buleya we find a high population concentration in and around the capital. This meant that the chief could easily keep check of what was going on in the country. The ecology of the country and settlement patterns it entailed also meant that a disappointed contestant to the chieftaincy could not easily wander off to

another part of Buleya to found a chiefdom of his own. If he did he could not have a big enough following. Thus the ecology of Buleya was advantageous to the continuation of the military political system.

Ritual too came to form an important part of the political institution. The low rainfall rate led to frequent occurences of drought and famine. Ceremonies to ensure the coming of the rains, of thanksgiving and of supplication became a marked feature in Leya society.

In the valley the ecology led to population concentrations. Thus we find that here neighbourhoods were larger both in size and population. Again, because of the low rainfall rate ritual came to play a very significant part in the political institution.

The ecology of plateau Tongaland enabled less restricted movements as people could be assured of arable land in most cases. Nevertheless, there are few perennial rivers on the plateau. Therefore, people had to settle where water was available. Added to this was the people's method of shifting cultivation. This led them to move more frequently and scatter more as they searched for good land and water. This was both cause and effect of the political system. Because of the ecology of the country the people had to live in scattered settlements. This gave rise to smaller neighbourhoods and also favoured their continuation.

Ritual became important among the Plateau Tonga too. The availability of arable land encouraged the Tonga agricultural mindedness. But they had few perennial rivers. The assurence of substantial rains became of paramount importance. Thus one of

the qualities sought for in a leader was the ability to summon rain.

Ecology therefore played some part in the political developments of the societies under our survey. It also emphasised the role of ritual among the Leya and Tonga. Nevertheless, it would appear that external influences and political encounters with other groups seem to have played an even greater part more especially among the Lenje, Leya and Valley Tonga.

Our study of Lenje history prior to the arrival of Bene-Mukuni suggests that the people were organised along localised patterns, often in clans. The arrival of Mukuni and later subjection of local people introduced a political system which was based on more developed ideas of chieftainship. But political ambitions of the segmented lineages were some of the factors that led to a non-centralised political system among the Lenje.

Among the Leya, the arrival of Mukuni added new concepts to their ideas of leadership and originated a chieftaincy. Harassed by the wars and raids, the Leya had to unite behind their chief and fight for their country and possessions. The sense of insecurity engendered by the raids deepened the people's dependence on the chief. Finally, the Leya subjection to the Lozi precluded any formation of other chieftaincies. It also strengthened the political institution as all the various office holders had to be alert and carry out their duties efficiently. It is also possible that the office of Natamoyo was adopted into the Leya political institution as a result of contact with the Lozi.

In the account we surmised that lack of outside political influences among the Tonga could have led to the non-emergence of chieftainships based on wider geographical dimensions. Because

the Tonga did not have bigger chieftainships in terms of population and because each neighbourhood continued to operate on an individual basis, they reacted differently to the raids from the way in which the Leya reacted. The Tonga found it necessary to meet the enemy by living in even smaller and more scattered settlements. Thus the raids worked towards the continuation of the more localised political system. On the other hand, we thought it a probability that contact with southern and Shona chieftainships could have influenced the Valley Tonga chieftaincies which were more developed than those on the plateau.

The Lenje and Tonga political systems were also affected by pre-colonial trade activities. Both the Lenje and the Tonga lay within the routes of long distance trade from the east and west coasts.

In the case of the Lenje, trade benefits helped the administrators to amass and retain a substantial following to establish independent chieftainships. Trade also enabled the chiefs to retain the wealth which ensured them a following and the people's respect. Rivalries which came as a result of the economic strength made some chiefs grow even more apart. This in turn encouraged the non-centralised system to continue.

In respect of the Tonga, trade and the wealth it entailed encouraged the emergence of several neighbourhoods since an individual who could have amassed some wealth could hope for a substantial following. On the other hand, that a leader could be made and rejected on the strength of his material fortunes undermined the institution of chiefship, and therefore the fear and respect for a chief did not become very deeply imbued in the people's hearts.

Among the Leya, on the other hand, trade did not seem to have had much effect on the political developments. In the nineteenth century when long-distance trade was at its height, the Leya were often fighting wars or suffering raids. By the time Panda ma Tenga, a station used by missionaries, travellers and traders as their centre on the southern side of the Zambezi river, the Leya were under Lozi political domination. Therefore they could not indulge in long distance trade as their masters demanded most of the ivory. Their masters did not permit them to trade in guns either.[1]

By the end of the nineteenth century, then, the Lenje were operating under a non-centralised political system. But there was some sort of hierarchy. Most of the important chiefs were linked by a unilineal lineage descent. Chitanda as the direct descendant of the oldest daughter of the apical ancestress was accorded a higher status. Appeals were made to him. The acceptability of a chief also rested with him.[2]

Among the Leya, a unitary system had continued to operate. But because of the importance of ritual, the priestess was viewed as co-ruler together with the chief.

---

1. In his account on the Trip to the Victoria Falls Holub wrote, "Some of the Batoka who resided upon the farther shore, under the dominion of their chief Mochuri (Mukuni) came over to us in their canoes, bringing goats, kaffir-corn, beer, and beans for sale. I afterwards met one of them again at Sesheke..... Sepopo, supposing that I had never seen a Batoka before introduced him to me; I recognised the man at once, but he took care not to show that he knew me, as he was conscious of having bought guns of us in direct contravention of the King's commands, an offence for which he was liable to the sentence of death."
Holub, E. 1881. Seven Years in South Africa. 199-200.
My Leya informants emphasised that no-one was keen on contravening this command.

2. He issued the royal drums which signified that a chief had been accepted as being suitable enough to rule his people.

The Tonga were operating under a non-centralised political system. However, there was no form of link among the various chiefs. A more localised system was also operating as each neighbourhood continued to function independently of the other. Ritual was greatly emphasised here. Therefore, the ritual leader could at times command greater authority than the purely secular chief.

The strength and weakness of the systems in terms of the chief/people relationship and geography determined the nature of the people's reactions and responses to colonial rule and also the changes effected to the systems. This will be the subject of our next two chapters.

CHAPTER II

POLITICAL SYSTEMS UNDER BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA COMPANY RULE

Introductory

In this chapter we shall examine change in the indigenous political systems as a result of colonial rule.

The British South Africa Company Administration introduced the policy of 'direct rule'. By this the Administration assumed political, legislative, judicial and administrative powers and was to execute them directly.[1] But the Company was always short of staff to execute its many duties. Consequently, it found it necessary to call on chiefs and headmen to perform some of these functions.[2] Indigenous leaders were aware of the Company's weakness and exploited it

---

1. The North-Eastern Rhodesia Order-in-Council 1900. A/2/7. L.M.;
   The Barotziland North-Western Rhodesia Order-in-Council. 1899. A/2/8. L.M.;
   High Commissioner's Notice No.68 of 1908. BS2/7. N.A.Z.

2. High Commissioner's Notice No.68 of 1908. BS2/7. N.A.Z.
   Northern Rhodesia Proclamation of the Administration of Natives, No.8 of 1916. S1/20/369. N.A.Z.

in order to safeguard their status. Change in the indigenous political systems must be seen as an interaction between two factors - colonial policy and its effectiveness on one hand and the responses of the indigenous leaders and common people on the other.

Until 1911 the country was partitioned into two administrative divisions: North-Eastern Rhodesia and North-western Rhodesia. North-Eastern Rhodesia was administered by a Resident Commissioner from Zomba, Nyasaland. The British high Commissioner based in Cape town, South Africa, was responsible for North-Western Rhodesia.

The relationship between the Administration and chiefs was not clearly defined in North-Eastern Rhodesia. In North-Western Rhodesia, however, it was defined by the High Commissioner's Notice of 1908.[1] The Notice remained in force until 1916 when the Proclamation of the Administration of Natives was promulgated.[2]

---

1. High Commissioner's Notice No. 68 of 1908. [illegible]2/7. N.A.Z.

2. Northern Rhodesia Proclamation of the Administration of Natives, No.8 of 1916. [illegible]1/20/369. N.A.Z.

When the country was first partitioned in 1899, Bulenje formed part of North-Eastern Rhodesia. In 1905 it was transferred to North-Western Rhodesia.[1] Thus together with the Leya and Tonga, the Lenje chiefs were subject to the High Commissioner's Notice of 1908. In the Notice the High Commissioner acknowledged chiefs and headmen as important parts of native administration. It was impressed on all Native Commissioners and Assistant Native Commissioners that they were to control the people through chiefs and headmen. The duties of the chiefs and headmen were also laid down. Chiefs were responsible for the general conduct of their people. They were to see that crimes and offences were prevented, to notify and publicise any administrative orders, to nominate district headmen and to help the Native Commissioner/Assistant Native Commissioner with the compilation of census and collection of tax. District and village headmen were to assist chiefs as well as to see to the good conduct of the people directly under them. Political, legislative and judicial powers still remained in the hands of the Administration and its Company staff.

---

1. When discussing the extension of the North-Western Rhodesia boundary in 1904, members of the Board had argued, "The title asserted by the Company to mineral rights in North-Western Rhodesia is more easily susceptible of strict proof in case of need than to similar rights in North-Eastern Rhodesia. The Board attaches great importance to this consideration": Letter from Members of the Board to Codrington, 1904. B1/2/281. N.A.Z.

The 1916 Proclamation still reserved the political, legislative and judicial powers for the Administration. But it clearly defined the status and duties of the chiefs and headmen throughout the country. In the Proclamation it was pointed out that a chief could only hold office "during the pleasure of the Administrator and upon good behaviour and general fitness." His duties, inter-alia, were enumerated as to prevent crimes and offences of evasion of any taxing and licensing laws; to apprehend and secure offenders and to hand these to the Native Commissioner/Assistant Native Commissioner; to nominate enough headmen for his sub-district for appointment by the Native Commissioner; to report to the Native Commissioner of any irregularities , misconduct or imposition on the part of any district headmen, village headmen or messenger of which he would have become aware. The duties of the district and village headmen were laid down as, inter alia, to prevent any "native" from occupying any land at, around or near a village unless a Magistrate or Native Commissioner would have authorised the occupation; to carry out the orders of the Magistrate or Native Commissioner; to assist in the compilation of census and collection of taxes; to report to the Native Commissioner any irregularities, misconduct or imposition on the part of any messenger. The Proclamation further stated that the chief, district or village headmen, "shall be deemed to be a constable and is authorised and require to arrest....." and any of them who would have neglected their duties or abused their authority, "shall be deemed to have committed an offence and shall upon conviction be liable to imprisonment with or without hard labour for more than six months and to a fine of not more than £10 or to

both such fine and imprisonment and dismissal."

Although further Proclamations were issued from time to time, the 1916 one provided the main operational basis until 1930.[1]

During the period of the British South Africa Company rule, Native administration was in the hands of the Administrator (two before the amalgamation of North-Eastern Rhodesia and North-Western Rhodesia). The Secretary for Native Affairs was in charge of the Department of Native Affairs. For administrative purposes, Districts and sub-districts had been mapped out in the early stages of Company rule. District Commissioners were in charge of Districts. Magistrates were in charge of sub-districts. They supervised Native Commissioners/Assistant Native Commissioners under them. Sub-districts were further divided into native divisions. In some cases these corresponded with the chiefs' areas. But in others more than one chief made up a native division. Native Commissioners/Assistant Native Commissioners based at the District Headquaters were in charge of these. But divisional headmen (sometimes also referred to as district headmen) were nominated to be in charge of each division. They were answerable to chiefs. Chiefs, divisional and village headmen in that order were in direct charge of their people and were responsible and answerable to the Native Commissioner/Assistant Native Commissioner. Messengers were employed and attached to each administrative centre, the boma. They carried messages from the boma to chiefs and headmen.

---

1. For example, The Administration of Natives(Amendement) Ordinance, 1927, where the only substantial addition to the 1916 one was an allowance made for the provision of labour in cases of emergency. S/1/2/464. N.A.Z.

It will be seen from the constitution that chiefs and headmen became very subordinate and ranked quite low in the whole political hierarchy. This low status, the deprivation of their political, legislative and judicial powers and the nature of their new duties put the chiefs and headmen in an awkward position vis-a-vis their people. As the Native Commissioner, Mumbwa sub-district remarked, "If he (the chief) made himself uncomfortable to those around him, intrigue would probably lead to his downfall. They are a prey to public opinion."[1] On the other hand, if the chief failed in the execution of Government duties, he stood in danger of being suspended or possible deposition. The District Commissioner, Livingstone, wrote in 1927 concerning headmen, "Theirs is a thankless task without any tangible reward. They are between the upper and nether mill-stones, represented by the District official on the one part urging them to efficiency and by their own people on the other, upon whom too great a display of energy and zeal cannot fail to render them unpopular and their life a burden."[2]

But at this point we shall turn to the Lenje, Leya and Tonga and examine in detail the effects of the new policy and administrative measures on the indigenous political systems.

---

1. Annual Report, 1915, Kafue District, Mumbwa Sub-District. ZA/7/1/9/1. N.A.Z.

2. Annual Report, 1927, Livingstone Sub-District. KSC6/1/1. N.A.Z.

i) The Lenje

Except for a few traders, the Lenje had not had much contact with white men in the nineteenth century. Company representatives did not go as far as Bulenje in order to explain their intentions.[1] Thus when administrative centres were set up in their area,[2] the Lenje and especially the chiefs were suspicious of white administrators. In 1902 the Administrator for North-Eastern Rhodesia wrote, "The attitude of natives in these Western Divisions has not been entirely satisfactory. The Bashukulumbwe, Walenje and Wasoli tribes have not hitherto come much into contact with Europeans and are suspicious and distrustful. Whilst not evincing active hostility, they are unruly and regardless of authority."[3]

---

1. Sharpe declared the area between the Luangwa and Kafue rivers to be under British 'Protection'. The declaration was later confirmed by Johnston: Hall, R. 1965. Zambia. 84-85;
when giving evidence to the Native Reserves' Commissioner in 1926, J.H. Clark, in charge of Broken Hill beerhall, claimed that he had been commissioned by the Chartered Company in about 1905 to obtain treaties from chiefs from Feira sub-district to as far as the Ila country. It was then that treaties with the Lenje chiefs were made. But his treaties were never acknowledged by the Company: Native Reserves Commission; Along or near the Railway line. ZP1/2/1. N.A.Z.

2. The first administrative centres were set up at Mwomboshi, south of Kabwe, and at Chipowa in the Lwano Valley in 1902. A native division station was also opened at Chitanda's (Bitanda) in the same year: Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA2/1. N.A.Z.

3. Report on Administration of North-Eastern Rhodesia for the two years ending 31st March, 1902. C1/16. L.M.

Despite the apparent good relations some chiefs, like Chipepo, enjoyed with Administration officers, Lenje chiefs continued to view the latter with suspicions and distrust. This attitude worked to the chiefs' advantage. The chiefs were anxious not to lose the people's support. On the other hand, the people would not transfer their allegiance from their chiefs to the new comers.

After 1905 the Lenje were placed under the jurisdiction of four different administrative units. Chitanda, Kasonkomona and Kapandula were put in Mumbwa sub-district together with some Sala, Ila and Kaonde chiefs. Mukubwe was in Ndola District. Mungule along with Soli chiefs was placed in Chilanga sub-district while the rest of the Lenje chiefs were in Broken Hill sub-district.

This administrative arrangement meant that the Lenje 'tribe' no longer formed a political and administrative unit. They now formed units with people who had formerly belonged to different political and administrative units.

The new arrangement also affected the Chipepo/Chitanda relationship and the status of the two chiefs in Lenje society. In the last chapter we noted that towards the end of the nineteenth century Chipepo had strengthened his political stand in terms of wealth, following and geographical area. But that inspite of this Chitanda continued to hold the senior position among the Lenje chiefs. The Administration, however, based the importance of a chief in relation to others on population and geographical area. When the Lenje were in North-Eastern Rhodesia, Chipepo was nearer to the administrative centre than Chitanda. After the 1905 administrative changes he was in the same district

with the majority of the Lenje chiefs after 1906 he was nearer not only to the growing town of Broken Hill but also to the line of rail. The opinion first formed by the Administration of Chipepo's seniority (based on large population and area) was perpetuated.[1] In 1908 the Native Commissioner, Broken Hill, referred to Chipopo, "a fairly intelligent man", as the "supreme chief" of the Lenje.[2] In 1936 the District Commissioner remarked of Chipepo in this period, "Chipepo appears always to have been the most powerful chief of the Balenje."[3] In 1922 his subsidy was

---

1. When the question of recognition of a Senior Chief rose in 1953 the District Commissioner wrote, "I have investigated their ancestry and it is clear that although they both descend from a woman Nkanga, Chitanda is the direct heir... but Chipepo had the largest area and the largest population; He was close to the first European arrivals and was a forceful character. He was near Broken Hill Headquarters at a time when Chitanda was administered from Mumbwa, it is not difficult therefore to see how he came to be regarded as the most important Lenje chief by the first Europeans": Native Authority, Central Province, Chiefs, 1949-1958. N/1201/3. N.A.Z.

2. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA2/1. N.A.Z.

3. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA2/1 N.A.Z.

put up to £6 while Chitanda was getting £2 per annum. Chipepo's subsidy rose to £36 by 1930 while Chitanda's stood at £7. For his part Chipepo did not want to correct this impression. As we shall see in the next chapter, he continued to enjoy this position until 1953 when the local people had a say in the matter and declared Chitanda Senior Chief.[1] However, some Lenje informants expressed the view that the other Lenje chiefs did not accept the official view and they continued to treat Chipepo as an equal.

Meanwhile, the Lenje and Kaonde chiefs in Mumbwa sub-district continued to accord Chitanda a higher status than the other chiefs. For instance, when chief Mumba, a Kaonde chief, died in 1917, the other chiefs accepted Chitanda's choice. They also nominated Chitanda together with Kaindu and Kasonkomona to divide the estate.[2] When Kasonkomona died in 1918, all the chiefs and headmen present would not nominate an heir because Chitanda was not present.[3] Although he was not the central figure in succession discussions from other sub-districts, Chitanda still held the power to grant the royal drums. Nevertheless, despite the fact that Administration officers respected the chiefs' reference to Chitanda, there is no evidence that

---

1. Native Authority, Central Province, Chiefs. 1949-1958. N/1201/3. N.A.Z.

2. Mumbwa District Notebook. KTJ3/1 Vol. N.A.Z. I am not sure why the Kaonde chiefs also accorded Chitanda this senior position. It is possible that they stood in fear of Chitanda because of the pre-colonial encounters when the Kaonde always met with defeat. As a result of these operations, Chitanda was able to extend his area to include some Kaonde villages. One of his Kaca was chosen from the Kaonde.

3. Mumbwa District Notebook. KTJ3/1. Vol.1. N.A.Z.

they themselves regarded him as the most important Lenje chief even over the chiefs in Mumbwa sub-district.

This short survey of the status of Chitanda and Chipepo in this period brings out two points. In the first place a new idea was introduced to the Lenje ideas of senior chief. To the Lenje the criterion for Chitanda's senior status had been primarily that of primogeniture. Chitanda as direct descendant of the oldest daughter of the apical ancestress was accorded the higher status. Now, however, the importance of a chief was determined more by the population under him and largeness of his area. Secondly, the Lenje were now subjected to two senior chiefs: Chitanda whom the people still held as senior and Chipepo whom Administration viewed as the most important Lenje chief.[1]

However, although Chipepo was considered the most important Lenje chief, the Administration did not view him as Paramount Chief. Administration officers dealt with individual chiefs directly. For their part, each chief tried to maintain his status among his people without reference to either Chitanda or Chipepo.

---

1. Probably this/why is one colonial officer later remarked, "Hitherto the Lenje country was divided equally between Chitanda and Chipepo....." : Central Province Native Courts. N/1759/2. N.A.Z.

The Administration gave chiefs power to nominate headmen when vacancies occured. Chiefs together with headmen were also authorised to nominate an heir to a chieftaincy. They could also act as assessors in cases involving their people when requested by Administration officers and give the latter advice on 'native custom' when necessary. Thus as in pre-colonial days chiefs and headmen played a leading role in matters concerning succession appointments and disputes.[1] Chiefs and headmen were also given the duties of tax collection,[2] promulgation of laws, orders and notices and arresting of criminals. However, they were not allowed to make laws or formulate policies of their own. They were not given judicial powers and they were deprived of their right to allocate land. But in pre-colonial days these had been the mainstay of their authority. That they could no longer fulfil such functions robbed their institutions the basis of their strength.

The Administration, however, was silent on the question of ritual. The indigenous offices in this field continued to function undisturbed.[3]

---

1. The District Notebook and Annual Reports reveal that chiefs and headmen dealt with succession matters.

2. Chiefs and headmen assisted Native Commissioner/Assistant Native Commissioner by summoning the people to the capital village or to each village in readiness for the latter's visit. Sometimes they were expected to collect taxes themselves and take them to the boma.

3. The first mission station in Bulenje was opened by the Wesleyan Methodists at Chipembi in 1912. But there was not much missionary impact on the people. My father was one of the group sent out from Chipembi Mission in the early 1930's on evangelising missions and to open up centres and schools in other parts of Bulenje. He told me that in fact by then most places had not been reached by the missionaries. Even where the Bible had reached, it had not yet altered the people's religiosity.

In respect of the new duties, Administration Proclamations added new dimensions to the functions of chiefs and headmen which at the same time placed the latter in an embarrassing situation vis-a-vis their people. Tax collection seems to have been the most embarrassing duty among the Lenje chiefs and headmen and one which could have undermined their authority greatly.

Tax was introduced in Lenje in 1905. Most people did not understand the meaning of the new tax. Some of my interviewees were old enough during the latter half of Company rule. They recall how many of the people could not understand the purpose of the new taxes. As one of them remarked, "We used to give things to our chiefs. But this was in appreciation of what they did for us. We gave it willingly. But we did not know where the new taxes went. We knew they were not for the chiefs but for the bwana."[1] Some people would not pay the taxes. But those who did not pay because they could not and those who deliberately avoided paying because they did not see why they should pay, were often imprisoned with hard labour.[2] The people who formerly expected their chiefs to protect them from outside attack or danger now expected their chiefs and headmen to protect them against the 'new menace'. Instead, to some people, the chiefs and headmen seemed to aid the Native Commissioner to extract taxes from them or to expose them to the penalties that followed failure or evasion payment. The old man quoted above

---

1. Headman Mukonka. Literal translation from Lenje. Tape in L.M.

2. Proclamation No.16 of 1905. ZP11/2. N.A.Z.

went on to say, "Some of the people were disheartened that the chiefs did not shield them.... Few realised that the chiefs were as helpless as they themselves. Those whom the chiefs helped meet their tax obligations were often headmen and other important men in society. Some of us who understood what was happening stood up for the chiefs. But instead of telling them that the chiefs were helpless, we told them all sorts of lies..."[1]

The loss of their political, legislative and judicial powers scandalised the chiefs and headmen who thought that they had fallen in the estimate of their people. One old man alive at the time recalls how Chitanda was demoralised by the limitations to his powers.[2] This view is expressed by most people in other chieftaincies.[3] That they no longer held the right to allocate land seems to have affected the chiefs and headmen very greatly.

We have observed that in pre-colonial days it was the prerogative of chiefs and headmen to allocate land to people. Now they could not do so without having first obtained permission from the Magistrate, Native Commissioner/Assistant Native Commissioner, who often did not want to part with the best land. In Lulenje, chiefs Mungule's, Chamuka's and Liteta's areas contain some of the best arable lands in the country. People here were disappointed when headmen hesitated to allocate them land or when they were told, after a long wait, that they could

---

1. Headman Mukonka. Literal translation from Lenje. Tape in L.M. Unfortunately, I could not make him tell me what lies they used to tell the people.

2. Headman Mukonka. Tape in L.M.

3. Chitentabunga of chief Chipepo;
Katutwa of chief Ntitima;
Nsoka, M. and Shipekwa, G. of chief Liteta.

not give them land near their villages and that they would have to go elsewhere where land might be available. As the Assistant Magistrate, Chilanga sub-district, admitted in 1915, "When the headman requires lands, the officials are hesitant in case the land might be wanted for European settlement. Villagers look to the headmen to provide them with land. When he is unable to do so, they lose confidence in him"[1] The presence of settler farmers posed further problems for the Lenje chiefs and headmen. Although the question of Native Reserves was raised during Company rule, it was not taken up seriously until after 1924. Hence, some people continued to live in the proximity of the farmer. This proximity to the farmer exposed such people to certain ideas which were contrary to their traditional way of living. They were developing individualistic tendencies which they would have noted in the farmer. Thus they did not feel it necessary to remain under the headmen's authority and control. Often, those who did not want to obey the headman or remain within his sphere of control ran to the farmer who was willing to take them on as tenants. As his tenants, the farmer extracted two months' free labour every year, and this often during the working season. But as tenants, the people were entitled to the farmer's and not to the headmen's protection.[2]

Thus it would appear that the whole institution of chiefship was undermined because while the new policy deprived Chiefs of their political, legislative and judicial powers, their new duties were often at variance with what the people expected of them. Both

---

1. Annual Report, 1914-15, Luangwa Province, Chilanga Sub-District. ZA/7/1/1/7. N.A.Z.

2. Ibid

the damage done to the institution and the chiefs' and headmen's dilemma cannot be denied. These undermining factors notwithstanding, the indigenous leaders were able to maintain their status quo. In the first place, they exploited Administration weakness.

The Company did not employ enough staff to perform its many duties and ensure that chiefs and headmen kept to within their sphere of operation. Administration officers could not cover all the districts as often as was necessary. For example, in 1914-15 the Native Commissioner, Broken Hill sub-district, made four journeys which all added up to eighty-two days of travelling. He covered the whole sub-district during his journeys. In the administrative year 1917-18 only one tour appears in the District Notebook to chiefs Chipepo's, Liteta's and Ntitima's areas. It was made between 6th August and 22nd September. Forty-nine villages were visited, an avarage of one day to a village. During each visit to a village, the Native Commissioner compiled the census, collected tax, inspected crops and did other miscellaneous jobs.[1]

The infrequent tours worked to the advantage of the chiefs and headmen who continued to perform some of their former duties especially in the judiciary. My informants told me that chiefs and headmen continued to listen to both criminal and

---

1. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA2/1. N.A.Z.

civil cases.[1] But now they adapted their sentences to the new ideas of justice. For example, in pre-colonial days a thief used to have his hands chopped off; a witch used to be burnt alive. Now the chiefs and their advisers realised that such sentences could not be carried out without getting themselves into trouble with the Administration officers. Therefore, they adjusted their sentences. In most cases the offender was merely asked to compensate the injured. In more serious cases such as murder they referred the case to the Native Commissioner's court. At times they weighed the situation carefully. If they realised that the sentence could not be kept away from the boma or where they suspected the ability of either party to keep the secret from the boma, they reported the case.[2] A record of case tried in the Native Commissioner's court, Mumbwa sub-district, during the year 1922 renders support to the view that chiefs and headmen used to fulfil some of their judicial functions. Out of a recorded population of 28,993 only 144 civil cases and two of witchcraft were tried in the Native Commissioner's court.[3] The number of witchcraft cases tried seems too small and I suspect that more civil and criminal cases were settled by the indigenous leaders.[4]

For their part, the people continued to take their problems to the chiefs and headmen and did not look up to the Administration officers whom they rarely saw.

---

1. Chitentabunga; Nsoka, M. ; Shipekwa, G.

2. Nsoka, M. and Shipekwa, G.

3. Mumbwa District Notebook. KTJ3/1 Vol.1. N.A.Z.

4. In 1927 the District Commissioner, Mumbwa sub-district, reported that in Company days chiefs used to try 'petty' cases: Annual Report, Mumbwa sub-district. KDC6/1/9.N.A.Z.

Where failure to comply with Administration postul tions would have landed the chiefs in trouble with Government, they sometimes sought out ways to avoid both trouble with Administration and unpopularity with the people. For example, in order to avert some of the unpopularity which their role in tax collection engendered, where they could, and especially in respect of important men in society, chiefs, and to a less extent headmen, paid for the people. The people reimbursed them later.[1] This was easy for them to do when tax could be paid in cash or kind. Chiefs still received presents of grain, meat, chickens and eggs from the people.[2] As the old man quoted above explained, the few who understood the situation (mostly those helped by the chiefs and headmen) also tried to avert the people's disappointment in their chiefs and headmen.[3]

At times chiefs adopted methods of passive resistance in their dealings with Administration officers. Chief Chipepo affords us an example of this. At the onset of colonial rule, Chipepo's area stretched as far as the present town of Kabwe. The mine there was opened in 1906. Thereupon, Chipepo was asked to move his people farther away from the mine. The need for the removal became more pressing with the emergence and growth of the town. Chipepo agreed to comply but did not act upon his word when he got back home. The chief realised that people would not forcibly move from their land. Consequently,

---

1. Nsoka, M. and Shipekwa, G.

2. In the 1950's chiefs were still given presents of meat, eggs and chickens. Personal observation.

3. Headman Mukonka. Tape in L.M.

he feared that if he insisted, he would alienate himself from them. When an officer confronted him as to why he did not carry out the orders, the chief at times remained silent and appeared stupid or blamed his people whom he said would not listen to him. The Administration was short of personnel and could not mount an eviction campaign. Besides, they had often found Chipepo a sensible chief. They put the blame on his people whom he could not control. The solution presented itself when with the growth of the mine and town, the people found that they could not graze their cattle. Thus, gradually, they moved westwards and eastwards.[1]

Mungule presents another example. Mungule's area offers some of the best farming land. From the early days farmers had settled in his area in the west and south of present day Lusaka. Before farms were fenced, people used to go and build in the proximity of the farms and the chiefs and headmen allowed them to. Although the farmers could make use of labour from the people near their farms, they were always complaining of "native"cattle straying into their land. In any case, the Lenje did not make good employees.[2] As a result, farmers were not very sympathetic towards them. The offcers constantly reminded the chief and headmen to move their people from the proximity of

---

1. Chitentabunga; Nsoka, M. ; Shipekwa, G.

2. In 1923 the Acting Native Commissioner and Magistrate, Broken Hill sub-district, had complained that the Lenje worker was "here to day and gone tomorrow." Annual Report, 1923, Luangwa Province, Broken Hill Sub-District. ZA7/1/5/7. N.A.Z.

the farms and not to allow their people to occupy land near the farms. The chief agreed to comply with the orders but did not execute them. At times he discussed the matter with his headmen and councillors. Often they all agreed to play the game of "let us wait and see". To the officers the Lenje leaders appeared to be weak and unable to control their people. The officer in-charge, Chilanga sub-district once remarked, "It is extremely difficult to rule the native of the sub-district through their chiefs and headmen.... They are supine, effete, back-boneless..... The elders of the Asoli and the Alenje present a heart-breaking problem."[1] While this statement might have some substance in it in that the recent developments at times made it difficult for chiefs and headmen to execute their duties, the officer did not realise that sometimes this middle course of passivity and apparent spinelessness was deliberately simulated by the chiefs and headmen in order to save themselves out of awkward situations.

In 1915 Mr. Tagart, Native Commissioner, Mumbwa sub-district, went on tour to get some porters for the war. Chief Kasonkomona told him that he could not give him carriers since no-one obeyed him (Kasonkomona) any longer. He also told him that he did not know anyone whom he could nominate as a district messenger. It is possible that district messengers were viewed as administration stooges at this time. The post was therefore not

---

1. Annual Report, 1924, Kafue District, Chilanga sub-district. KDC6/1/6. N.A.Z.

popular. However, Tagart realised the game the chief was playing at. He remarked, "Kasonkomona gave the impression that he was a hopeless passive resister of the old school."[1] But he left the chief's area without having obtained carriers.

The result of the Administration policy and measures on the one hand and Administration weakness and the initiative of the indigenous leaders on the other was that the Lenje became a part of the country-wide system. They became subjected to the same administrative structure and policies as other groups in the country. Chiefs ceased to be the superior authority. They were now answerable to the Native Commissioner, Magistrate and so on to the Administrator. The hierarchical system with one chief, Chitanda, considered as senior also underwent some change. Now there were two chiefs accorded a higher status: Chitanda whom the Lenje still recognised as their senior and Chipepo whom the Administration acknowledged as the most important Lenje chief. In respect of the organisation, the Administration adopted the offices of the chief and headman only. However, the two offices did not carry with them the former decision-making and legislative functions nor the right to allocate land. But chiefs and headmen undertook other duties such as those of tax collection and policing their area.

Notwithstanding these changes, there was some continuity in the system. To the people the chief was still the authority whom they still regarded as their father and benefactor. Functionally, the chief still played a leading role in succession matters; he still performed his judicial duties; he still fulfilled his ritual functions. The system as it continued to

---

[1] Mumbwa District Notebook, KTJ3/v. N.A.Z.

operate among the people still encorporated the office of Kaca. My informants told me that following the 1929 Native Authority and Native Courts Ordinances, the already existing Kaca and councillors, some of whom were Kalowa, were called upon by chiefs to provide Native Authority councillors and court assesors.[1] In 1936 the District Commissioner, Broken Hill, referred to Kaca who, he was told, had always existed.[2] Most people still went to see Kaca before taking their problems to the chief.

Chipyeela too continued to perform his duties since the Company did not concern itself with ritual matters and Christian influence was not yet felt.[3] Mukatamweene who had been the chiefs confidant in political and personal matters also continued to perform his duties. However, the office of Balanse became non-functional in its capacity as a stand by army. To defend the country was in the hands of the Administration. But in the first few years of Company rule Balanse still hunted for the chief. Often when chiefs were called upon to provide messengers for the 'Loma' or porters both for the touring Administration officer and, during the war, to send to the war front, they drew on Balanse[4]. Thus Balanse in part died out and in part took on new functions.

---

1. Chitentabunga; Nsoka, M.; Shipekwa, C.
2. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDC2/1. N.A.Z.
3. Above . p. 86 n. 3
4. Chief Chitanda. Tape in L.M.

ii) The Leya

On the eve of colonial rule the Leya had been Lozi subjects by right of military conquest. Prior to Lozi conquest, they had been subjected to raids from the Lozi, Kololo and Ndebele. Ndebele raids continued even when the Leya were under Lozi political domination.[1] They continued until the early 1890's when Matebeleland came under British rule. Although the Leya sometimes repulsed the enemy, the Ndebele often devastated Leya country. When they were Lozi subjects, the Leya sent tribute to Bulozi regularly. But the Lozi sent their own men to get slaves from Buleya. The Lozi were quite harsh to the people during such visits. Sometimes they carried away Leya women and children while they killed others.[2] British rule was therefore welcomed by the Leya who saw in it an end to the raids and Lozi domination.[3] The chief and his councillors were anxious to sign their own treaties with Company representatives in order to be assured of a much longed for protection.[4] Nonetheless, they envisaged a protection which while keeping the Ndebele and Lozi at bay, would leave them to run their affairs their own way.[5]

---

1. Colson, E. 1950. "Note on the Tonga and Ndebele," N.R.J., 2. 35 for the last recorded Tonga raids. My Leya informants say that the Ndebele attacked the northern parts of the chiefdom before proceeding to plateau Tongaland; Chief Mukuni, Siloka II, "Handbook of the Leya History." L.M.

2. Mukemu. Tape in L.M.

3. Ibid.

4. In 1955 chief Mukuni maintained that he was in possession of documents signed in 1897 with Company men. These also defined his areas of influence. N.1101/1. N.A.Z.
Unfortunately, chief Mukuni died before I could ask him about these claims. The present Mukuni could not produce these documents although he affirmed the late Mukuni's assersion.

5 Mukemu. Tape in L.M.

But when, gradually, it became clear that Mukuni's sub-chief on the southern bank was no longer answerable to him as a result of the boundary drawn up between the two countries,[1] the Leya chief and other indigenous leaders became suspicious of the actual intentions of the new comers. When tax was introduced in 1904, their previous experiences under the Lozi of the status that tribute implied made them question whether the white men had not to come to stay as their political masters. Their fears were confirmed by the ensuing Company Proclamations.

The suspicions entertained by the Leya chief and other leaders were reflected in some of the steps the chief took in his dealings with the Administration. This worked to his advantage as it precluded some embarrasing and harmful situations the chief would otherwise have found himself in with regard his people. For example,when the bridge across the Zambezi was completed in 1904, Company officials offered the chief some presents as a token of thanks for providing most of the men who worked on the bridge. Chief Mukuni, suspicious of Company intentions, consulted his councillors and headmen whether to accept the gifts or not. The consensus was that if the chief accepted the gifts, it would indicate his total acceptance of the men. It would also appear as if he had connived with the white men to extract cheap labour from his people and that he did not care for the many Leya who had died while working on the bridge. To the people it would also indicate that the chief was ready to sell his country and people to Company men in exchange for the few nineties they offered him. The chief preferred the people's support. He turned down the offer of gifts.[2] But the Leya chief

---

1. See below p. 99

2. Chief Mukuni and councillors.

knew what a superior power could do to apparent disobedient subject people.[1] Thus he co-operated with the Administration as much as possible. For example, in 1917 the Native Commissioner, Livingstone sub-district, commented that chief Mukuni was of some assistance to Government.[2] In 1922 the Native Commissioner wrote of the chief, "The new Mukuni appointed in 1918 is now about 40 and is keen and has some intelligence."[3]

When the British South Africa Company first took over the administration of Matebeleland, they had declared the Zambezi river the boundary between Matebeleland and Northern Zambezia.[4] By this the Leya people who in pre-colonial days had stretched to the southern bank of the river found themselves outside Mukuni's jurisdiction. Siakabondo, Mukuni's sub-chief in charge of the people there, was made a chief and placed in Wankie District.[5]

---

1. The Leya remember what happened to their fathers and grandfathers if tribute was delayed. The Lozi Litunga sent impis to raid Buleya and these were always accompanied by atrocities like killing of the women and carrying away others. That is why it was necessary for the Leya to become efficient in the dispatch of their tribute: Mukemu. Tape in L.M.

2. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC4/1. N.A.Z.

3. Ibid.

4. Matebeleland Order-in-Council, 1894, A2/6. L.M.

5. Livingstone District Notebook KSC4/1. N.A.Z.; Chief Mukuni, Siloka II. 1957 "A handbook of Leya History." L.M.

In 1900 the Leya were placed in Batoka Province and were administered from Kalomo sub-district together with the Toka, Tonga Nkoya and Sekute Leya.[1] In 1906 the Toka, Nkoya and Leya were moved into Livingstone sub-district.[2] But although district boundaries were mapped out as early as 1900, it was not until 1921 that chiefs' boundaries were properly demarcated.[3] Mukuni lost yet more people who lived to the west of Livingstone town. These were placed under Sekute's and Musokotwani's jurisdiction.

Thus the new district structure brought changes to the Leya political system. There was no longer a sub-chief. Further, the Leya formed an administrative unit together with the Toka, Nkoya and Sekute Leya. In the past all these groups had operated independently of each other both politically and administratively.

Nevertheless, administration officers dealt with each chief indepenently. Each chief too met the challenges brought by the recent developments independently of the other.

According to Administration Proclamations, the Leya chief was empowered to nominate headmen. Headmen were given power to nominate an heir to a chieftaincy. Both the chief and headmen were authorised to help in the collection of tax, to promulgate laws, orders and notices and to arrest criminals. In 1919-1920 the Native Commissioner reported that the chief and headmen were assisting Government in the collection of tax and reporting

---

1. Batoka District Notebook. KSD5/1. N.A.Z.
2. Ibid.
3. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC4/1. N.A.Z.

matters of importance such as deaths, disease and crime. He also noted that the chief and headmen were settling adultery and divorce cases.[1] The chief and headmen, then, still played an important role in matters concerning succession. They also settled some "petty" civil cases. But new dimensions were added to their functions. Now they had to perform duties which formerly their position would not have allowed for. They had to arrest criminals, mainly tax defaulters, and hand them over to the boma. The chief had to promulgate laws and orders whereas in former days this was the duty of his subordinates. He had to collect tax. Yet previously although some of the chief's duties had been to see that tribute was collected and dispatched to Bulozi on time, he did this through his juniors, Mweendelezi we Cisi, the headmen and Bavwimi. That he never left the capital village for this purpose added to his own importance in society as well as to the awe and respect with which the people regarded the institution of chiefship.

The chief and headmen were also deprived of their legislative, political and judicial powers (except to settle "petty" cases). They could not formulate policy nor allocate land without prior consent of the Magistrate, Native Commissioner/Assistant Native Commissioner.

Of the new powers and duties what scandalised the chief most was his role in tax collection. Both him and headmen were embarrassed by the fact that they had to arrest and hand over criminals who were mainly tax defaulters. To them these duties

---

1. Annual Report, 1919-1920, Batoka Province, Livingstone Sub-District. ZA7/4/3. N.A.Z.

were beneath the chief's dignity. They feared too that to fulfil their new duties would upset the equilibrium of their institutions. The chief's and headmen's institution rested as much on the people's support and respect as on the office holders' ability to fulfil the functions pertaining to their office. By playing a role in tax collection and by handing tax defaulters over to the boma, they would antagonise the people.[1]

That they could no longer allocate land worsened the chief's and headmen's fears. Although most of Buleya is rock and rubble, the chief and headmen were still required to refer cases to the Native Commissioner before allocating land. Most frustrations came from people around the present town of Livingstone and in the north-eastern parts of the chiefdom. Here, some land was required for settler farms. The anticipated growth of the town also meant that people could not get land within the proximity of the town. Frustrated, people often appealed to the chief (and the priestess who advised the chief on matters of land distribution) to help them get land. But the chief was as handicapped as the headmen. However, he could not explain to the people that he no longer held absolute power over land in case he fell in the people's estimate and they doubted his power in relation to that of the new comers. In some cases people were moved from the lands they occupied into less favourable areas. Those who were moved lost faith in their chief. Others, however, decided to go and work on settler farms or seek other jobs in town or with the Sawmills. But even where this was the case most people still preferred to own some fields

---

1. Chief Mukuni and Ngambela.

which their wives could cultivate while they were away at work or to which they could return to work at week-ends or during holidays.

Notwithstanding some misgivings that some people might have had towards the chief and headmen and inspite of the threats to the indigenous institutions posed by the administrative measures, the Leya chief and headmen maintained their status. In the first place, the chief and headmen took advantage of the infrequent tours by Administration officers due to shortage and the constant change of staff. In 1913 the Assistant Magistrate, Mr. C. Bellis, made two tours: one in August and one in November. The one in November lasted one week during which he covered seventy-five miles. The purpose of the journey, as that one in August, was to collect tax.[1] Again, from the District Notebook we gather that only thirty-two tours were made between August 1911 and December 1922 by various officers to different parts of the sub-district. Of the thirty-two tours the purpose of twenty was entered as collection of tax. The other twelve dealt with miscellaneous subjects such as: the movement of cattle, to follow up reports on indigenous people occupying land on proposed settler farms, to report on timber cutting, to deal with land applications and for general inspection and collection of tax. In 1915 the Native Commissioner admitted that constant transfers meant that officers hardly had time to get to know the sub-district under their charge or the chief and headmen. The chief and headmen rarely visited the <u>boma</u> and were themselves practically not visited.[2] The Native Commissioner made these

---

1. Livingstone District Notebook. KSG4/1. N.A.Z.
2. Annual Report, 1914-1915, Batoka Province, Livingstone Sub-District. ZA7/1/2/3. N.A.Z.

remarks in connection with the drop in tax in the previous year. The Native Commissioner observed that because of the constant change of staff and infrequent tours, tax collecting was left to the chief and headmen who were ignorant people and therefore could not collect tax efficiently. But in the previous century the Leya chief and other office holders had been quite efficient in collecting and dispatching their tribute to Bulozi. It is most probable that the chief and headmen took advantage of this Administration weakness in order to shield their people from the hateful tax.

The infrequent tours, amount of jobs officers had to see to on tours and the constant change of staff also left room for the chief and headmen to perform some of their former duties such as judicial ones.

In 1919 the Native Commissioner reported that the chief and headmen settled some civil cases such as those involving adultery and divorce.[1] But in fact my informants say that most people, who rarely saw the Native Commissioner, took most of their cases to the headmen and chief. Thus many more civil cases and also criminal ones were dealt with by the chief and headmen. But the jury had to adjust their sentences in order to avoid getting into trouble with the Administration. Cases such as those of witchcraft and ownership if ivory which used to be punishable by death had to have their sentences readjusted. Thus in the case of witchcraft often only compesation was asked for. If a commoner was found in possession of ivory, he was merely asked to surrender the ivory to the chief. But cases of a more serious nature such

---

1. Annual Report, 1918-1919, Batoka Province, Livingstone Sub-District. ZA7/1/4/3. N.A.Z.

as murder were often sent to the Native Commissioner's court.[1]

Sometimes the chief and headmen adopted methods of passive resistance. In 1913 the Native Commissioner complained that he could not make the chief and headmen assist Administration. The Native Commissioner thought that this was the case because the Leya leaders did not have much control over their people.[2] Yet our survey of nineteenth century political developments indicates that the Leya chief had a strong hold over his people. Leya songs also reveal the reverence in which the people held their chief.[3] Probably, the chief and headmen deliberately misled the Native Commissioner into believing this in order that they could avoid assisting Government in matters which, in their view, were against their people's interests. Other factors which helped the Leya leaders maintain their status were the Leya nineteenth century experiences and the country's ecology.

We noted that in pre-colonial days the Leya had been beset by wars, raids and political subjection. This had fostered a sense of oneness among the Leya and sympathy for their chief. The coming of white rule was seen as yet another incident in the long history of foreign invasions. They Leya people, therefore,

---

1. Chief Mukuni, Ngambela and three old men.

2. Annual Report, Batoka Province, Livingstone Sub-District. 1912-1913. BA7/1/1/3. N.A.Z.

3. In "A Handbook of Leya History," chief Mukuni, Siloka II quotes one such song.

continued to rally behind their chief as they had done previously when faced by external challenges. Moreover, when they were Lozi subjects, the Leya had always sent tribute to Bulozi, failure or delay of which resulted into severe treatment from their overlords. These experiences had taught them both the duties of a subject people and the consequences of failure to fulfil the obligations. Consequently, most people did not hold it against their leaders because of the latter's role in tax collection. Some could even even understand the chief's incapability to fight for the land from which some people were moved.

The ecology of Buleya was also of political advantages to the chief and headmen. Because most of Buleya is rock and rubble, land required for settler farms was limited. The number of people affected by land problems was, therefore, small. Besides, in order to avert acute problems of hunger and famine, it was necessary to let the people live where they could grow substantial food. Thus, for example, when the question of land alienation in the twenty-five mile zone on either side of the railway line was raised in 1913, the Native Commissioner, Livingstone sub-district, argued that the people in his district could not be pushed farther east or west because of the poor nature of the soil there.[1] Most people were not moved. It is also possible that because of the nature of the soil, the Native Commissioner did not hesitate to give the permission for the chief or headman to allocate land when and if referred to. I suspect that some headmen might have been allocating land without reference to the Magistrate or Native

---

1. Letter from C.H.S. Bellis, Native Commissioner, to the Secretary for Native Affairs, "Land twenty-five miles zone on either side of the Railway." ZA1/9/74/5. N.A.Z.

Commissioner. The latter might not have noticed this since most of the land was of a poor nature. Further, as no steps had been taken to combat the frequent occurence of drought and famine, ritual was still of paramount importance in the people's lives. That the chief continued to fulfil his ritual functions enabled him to retain the people's respect and trust in him.[1]

While on ritual, we might mention another aspect which enabled the continuation of the people's faith in their chief. According to Leya religiosity, after his death, the chief joined the throng of other chiefly ancestors to become an object of worship himself.[2] This enhanced the people's awe and respect held for their chief. Further, the people believed that a chief attained some divine attributes at his installation.[3] Thus the people would not transfer their allegiance from their chief to another even though the chief might have appeared not to have been able to protect them from the Administration officers and the new measures.

Between 1894 and 1924, then, the Leya political system underwent some changes. In the first place, the Leya became

---

1. The Administration was silent on ritual matters. The chief continued to perform his ritual functions undisturbed; The first mission in the area was opened by the Universities Mission in Livingstone town in 1910. In 1968 the priestess Be-Dyango claimed that the waning of people's fervour for the indigenous religious ceremonies could be dated back to the Watch Tower Movement which did not find its way into the area until the 1930's. But even in the 1930's the movement did not capture many adherents in the Province: Native Affairs Annual Report for the year 1935. VIII N.R.G. 194/54 L.M.

2. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II and Priestess Be-Dyango.

3. Ibid.

a part of a territorial administrative and political structure. The chief ceased to be the authority in his area but became subordinate to the District Administration officers who linked him to Central Government and the Administrater. Within the territorial framework the Leya also formed an administrative unit together with other groups who had all been independent of each other in the past. Further, the Leya system ceased to have a sub-chief in its institution. The functions of the chief and headmen, the only two offices incorporated in the Administration structure, also took on new dimensions such as policing their area and handing over criminals to the boma. The two offices were deprived of their legislative, policy-making and judicial functions as well as the right to allocate land. The chief's functions as a military leader also ceased. This was the case partly because wars and raids had come to a stop but partly also because military affairs were now in the lands of the Administration.

Inspite of these changes, however, there was some notable continuity in the indigenous political system. This was due to Administration inability to execute all of its many duties, the leaders' endeavours to retain the support of the people and the people's continued faith in their institutions. To the people, the chief was still their authority and he still enjoyed the respect and awe the people had always accorded him. Chiefs and headmen also continued to carry out some judicial and political (succession and possibly allocation of land) functions.

Ritual continued to be of importance among the people and Administration did not concern itself with ritual matters. The chief continued to perform his ritual functions. Consequently, the office of the priestess continued to operate. The priestess also regained her central position in succession matters which

she had lost when the Leya were Lozi subjects. Prior to Lozi conquest of Buleya, the priestess's pronouncements in matters of succession had been of great importance. Only she could perform the necessary rites that bestowed some divine qualities on a newly installed chief. Thus selections had to be favourable to her and were often directed by her wishes. When the Lozi demanded that the final selection remain with them, the priestess lost this prerogative. However, under Company rule it was no longer required that the Lozi interfere with the Leya succession.[1]

Because the chief and headmen continued to perform some of their former duties, some of the other indigenous offices continued to function too. Mweendelezi we Cisi and Babetesi continued to function. In 1917 the Native Commissioner referred to one Samanyati as the chief's adviser.[2] My Leya informants refer to Samanyati as Mukuni's Mweendelezi we Cisi.[3]

Other offices which constituted the political institution in pre-colonial days died out while others took on other functions. The office of Natamoyo became non-functional. In the last chapter we noted that the duties of Natamoyo appeared to have been those of carrying out punishments which were usually of a criminal nature. Under the new administration, however, the passing of judgements and execution of punishments were the p prerogative of the Native Commissioner. Even where the chief and other indigenous office holders dealt with criminal cases, the

---

1. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC4/1. N.A.Z.
2. Ibid.
3. Ngambela and councillors.

nature of the sentences they passed did not neces itate the office. Bayasami in their capacity as a stand by army also did not function anymore. The Leya were no longer raided and military matters were now the concern of Administration. Bavwimi who had helped Bayasami at times of wars and raids and also saw to it that skins and elephant tusks were available to send to Bulozi were no longer needed to perform these duties. Nevertheless, it appears that under Company rule the chief still recieved meat and skins hunted by these young men.[1] But with the diminishing of their duties, Bavwimi were gradually redirecting their energies on to ritual. During this period religious ceremonies were still organised with great fervour. Bavwimi, painted in war marks, took it upon themselves to go round the villages announcing the coming ceremony. At the time of the ceremony, they led the processions as they moved from village to village. They were often joined in this by the would have been Bayasani. Soon, the name they used to be known by was dropped. They became known only as Basilombelombe(people of LombeLombe, a stream where they assembled and dug white chalk with which to paint themselves.)

---

1. Ngambela and councillors.

iii) The Tonga.

For most of the nineteenth century the Tonga were subjected to raids from the Chikunda, Kololo, Lozi and Ndebele. The last Ndebele raid was in 1893 during which forty babies are said to have been burned to death, several men hanged and some women carried away.[1] Thus the introduction of British rule over Matebeleland and Bulozi was hailed by the Tonga. Chief Monze declared in 1900, "Why should I pay tribute (to Lewanika) when I am under the British Queen."[2]

The Tonga thought that British protection would save them from Ndebele and Lozi raids. But they did not envisage a protection which would make them political subjects as well. When tax was introduced in 1904, the Tonga realised that they were in the same relationship which they had experienced with the Lozi in the nineteenth century. When settlers started moving in to take up land in the area between Kalomo and Mazabuka and parts of the valley in the Lower River region.[3] Tonga fears of

---

1. Colson, E. 1950. "Note on the Tonga and Ndebele," N.R.J.,2 35.;
Hall, R. 1965. Zambia. 91.

2. Hall, R. 1965. Zambia. 94.

3. This followed the 1900 concession with Lewanika whereby the Company was conceded "rights to make grants of land for farming purposes in any portion of the Batoka and Mashukulumbwe to white men approved by the King." ZA1/15/H/1/4. N.A.Z.
The first application for land on the plateau was made in 1902 by Mr. Walker. He occupied his land in 1903: "Correspondence concerning first farm to be granted in North-Western Rhodesia." E5/7. L.M.
The first application for land in the valley was made by the Vlabakis brothers in 1905. They occupied the land in 1906: Gwembe District Notebook. KTE2/1. N.A.Z.

the significance of British protection increased.

Thereupon, Monze went about collecting funds so that he could go to England to petition for the Queen's direct protection. He had heard that the Lozi Litunga had been petitioning for her protection.[1] Monze hoped that if he was protected by the Queen, his country would be saved from Company rule which threatened not only to make them subjects but to take away their good lands as well. He was warned about his activities several times, but he was recalcitrant. Consequently, he was held at Kalomo and Guimbi for two years.[2] He came out a beaten and disappointed man. This action had a shattering effect not only on Monze but on other Tonga chiefs and people who heard what had happened to him. The incident set the pattern for the chief-Administration relationship from now onwards. The Tonga realised that Administration officers could not be trifled with. Tonga fear of Administration was intensified by an incident which occured in 1907. About one hundred men in chief Sigongo's area rebelled against payment of tax. The Native Commissioner with the help of a few Administration officers fired on them. They killed some and wounded others.[3] Subsequently, this fear of

---

1. The Litunga had based his petition on Company lack of interest in protecting Barotseland, (the first Resident did not arrive until 1897), ignoring its treaty obligations and restricting his area more to Barotseland administratively. Monze thought that the purpose of the Litunga's trip to London when he went to attend King Edward's coronation in 1902 was purely to present a petition.

2. The story is widely known in Tongaland. But there is no archival evidence concerning it. Details of the story were provided by Chitamo, M.; Kazoka, W. and wife; Fr. Nchete Kazoka, W. and wife; Fr. Nchete.

3. Native Unrest, Kafue District, 1907. NWR3/24/6. N.A.Z.; Chief Sigongo. Tape in L.M.

Administration acted as a weapon for soliciting Tonga obedience over the next four decades.

The Batoka District, later changed to Batoka Province and comprising all Tongaland, was formed in 1900. Headquarters of the sub-districts at Kalomo, Mapanza, Monze[1] and Buni-Sijoba (Gwembe) were established between 1900-1902. In 1909 Mapanza was transferred to Kalomo sub-district. In 1922 Buni-Sijoba was transferred to Kalomo and Mazabuka sub-districts.[2]

In order to facilitate administration, especially with regard to census and collection of tax, chiefs and headmen were recognised. But the political system which operated in pre-colonial Tongaland had been so localised that in some cases only five villages within the radius of three miles formed the neighbourhood political unit. To recognise such areas as independent political units and chieftaincies and to operate through them was too cumbersome for the Administration. Therefore, in cases where neighbourhoods were very small, some were merged together to form one political unit. In such cases one man was acknowledged as the overall chief while others were relegated to the status of headman. But in the first stages of re-organisation not many neighbourhoods were merged. Smaller scale political units, therefore, continued to operate and most

---

1. After 1909 Monze sub-district became known as Mazabuka sub-district.

2. Kalomo District Notebook. KSP3/1 Vol.1. N.A.Z.; Mazabuka District Notebook, KSB3/1. N.A.Z.

indigenous chiefs retained their offices.[1]

Nevertheless, the administrators who, prior to coming to Tongaland, had been in contact with more centralized chieftainships often based on big geographical areas were not very sure whether chieftaincies had existed in most of Tongaland.[2] Therefore, they always asked the people to declare who the leader of the neighbourhoods has been. The people, suspicious of the administrators' intentions at times deliberately withheld the name of the indigenous chief.

The Tonga placed great emphasis on ritual. Where the chief was not the ritual leader, both he and the ritual leader were held in equal repute. In some cases, where the ritual leader had some rain-making qualities as well, he was held in higher regard than the purely secular chief. Thus when asked who was the indigenous chief, some people indicated the chief while others meant the ritual leader. There was also the confusion of language. When the Tonga use the word mwami, they refer to the chief. When they use the word Bami (plural for mwami) they refer to the ritual leader. A leader who was both secular and ritual was referred to as Bami, thereby emphasizing the

---

1. Before 1918 116 chieftaincies were recognized on the plateau: Colson, E. 1951 "The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia in (eds.) Colson, E. and Gluckman, M., Seven Tribes of British Central Africa. 102.; I could not find any information on the number of chieftaincies in the valley prior to 1918. But the number must have been big too. The District Notebook reported that about fifty-five chieftaincies existed before 1930: Gwembe District Notebook. KTE2/1. N.A.Z.

2. For example, Worthington, the first Batoka District Commissioner, was a Company man who together with Harding witnessed the 1900 concession between Coryndon and Lewanika.

importance of the ritual over his secular role. Thus when explaining the importance of their leader, the people emphasised his ritual activities. But Administration officers were not interested in ritual and its leaders. In cases where some neighbourhoods were amalgamated, the people often replied "we have no chiefs." The people were right in saying that they had no such chief. A chief claiming allegiance over other political units had not existed.

As a result, some people who had hitherto been of no social consequence were made chiefs while some indigenous chiefs were passed over or recognised only as headmen. In the case of the former, people rejected such chiefs since the latter did not possess the qualities which had drawn people to a chief. In some instances people who had until now recognised their own neighbourhood chiefs were not prepared to transfer their allegiance to someone else even though he might have been another neighbourhood's indigenous chief. Those who had been chiefs themselves would not accept the authority of the other chief under whom they were now placed.

As already pointed out, notwithstanding the early attempts at a re-organisation, there were still too many neighbourhoods and chieftaincies. Administration decided that even larger administrative districts with chiefs commanding larger geographical areas would be more advantageous both administratively and economically. Consequently, more amalgamations took place in 1918-1919. More chiefs were dropped out as only a few were selected to head the new chief's areas. Some hitherto chiefs were made sub-chiefs. Leaders such as Chona, Mwanacingwala, Siamaundu and Chongo who had been both secular and ritual leaders

in pre-colonial days and who until 1918 had been recognised as chiefs were now relegated to the position of headman. By this time other factors such as the ability and willingness to help the Administration were being taken into consideration. That chiefs were to be given a subsidy made the office of a chief more attractive and one to be contended for in some areas.[1] The result was that some of the chiefs who emerged were indigenous ones while others were not; some were the rightful heirs to the chieftaincies but others did not represent the rightful lines.

As in the earlier case both the people and the until now chiefs and other indigenous leaders were not prepared to accept the authority of the newly declared chiefs.

Thus the Administration introduced new ideas of chieftainship which cut across old neighbourhood confines; it introduced a new concept of chiefship whereby a chief who might not have had the qualities people sought for in a leader could be imposed on the people; it introduced ideas whereby people were to give respect to a leader because of his secular more than his ritual powers.

The changes also encouraged the Tonga not to have much regard for the institution of chiefship. This in turn made Tonga chiefs not to function effectively and efficiently. At the same time it made them turn to Administration and not to the people as the basis of their authority.

---

1. "Deserving" chiefs were given a subsidy ranging from £1-£5 per annum. By 1919 fifteen chiefs on the plateau(the number rose to nineteen by 1921) and ten in the valley were being paid.

Like chiefs elsewhere, Tonga chiefs were empowered to nominate headmen. Together with headmen they were given authority to collect tax; to apprehend and secure offenders and to hand these to the Native Commissioner/Assistant Native Commissioner; to carry out orders of the Magistrate or Native Commissioner. But chiefs and headmen, who due to the new concept of chieftainship were generally in a helpless situation, were often ignored by the people. The observation made by the Native Commissioner, Mazabuka sub-district, in 1915: "Chiefs and headmen do not give active help in the control and supervision of the natives and collection of revenue. Their help is more negative than active i.e. they are quiet and law abiding and give little or no trouble to government..... they show very little zeal for carrying out their duties....."[1] applied to a number of chiefs on the plateau. They could not exert authority because some of them never exercised any before or if they had, not always over the people now placed under their jurisdiction.[2] However, chiefs and headmen were aware of the fear of Administration within which the people stood.[3] Thus at times they solicited obedience by reference to Administration officers and were therefore able to carry out some of the required duties which it was necessary that they performed since Administration was the basis of their power. In 1920, for example, the Native Commissioner reported that chiefs and headmen were helping

---

1. Annual Report, 1915, Batoka District, Mazabuka Sub-District. ZA7/1/3/3. N.A.Z.

2. Kazoka, W. and Fr. Nchete.

3. Often the Tonga obeyed the chiefs and paid tax because of the fear of what might happen to them it they did not: Kazoka, W. and Fr. Nchete.

Administration in the collection of tax and reporting of crimes, deaths and disease.[1] In 1918-1919 the Native Commissioner noted that Simwatacela was giving assistance to Administration. The same was said of Singani and Mapanza in 1923.[2] Because chiefs relied on Administration, they displayed as little disagreement with Administration officers as possible. It is interesting to note that some of the indigenous chiefs recognised by the Administration were often referred to as cunning and of no influence. Thus Singani was described in 1918, "He is of little use to the Administration." After the 1918-1919 changes Singani was still retained as chief. In accordance with the new measures, he now had under him areas which had never been under his jurisdiction before. Thus "since writing above Singani has improved considerable and is really trying to help."[3] To the people, however, this only made chiefs and headmen more unpopular. They viewed them as Administration agents.[4]

We noted that Administration Proclamations deprived chiefs of their legislative, judicial and political powers. Among the Tonga this did not demoralise the chiefs to the extent it did to the Lenje and Leya chiefs. In the first place, as we have seen, some of the nominated chiefs had never before held any authority over the people now placed under them. The new measures could not have deprived them of anything they had never possessed before.

---

1. Annual Report, 1920, Batoka Province, Gwembe Sub-District. ZA7/1/4/3. N.A.Z.

2. Kalomo District Notebook. KSP3/1. N.A.Z.

3. Mazabuka District Notebook. KSB3/1. N.A.Z.

4. Kazoka, W., and wife; Fr. Nchete.

On the other hand, the people over whom such chiefs were placed had never conceded them any authority or respect. But even in cases where the chief would have been accustomed to exerting a certain amount of authority, often shared with the ritual leader, this was over the people in his own neighbourhood. In so far as the authority over the people in his former neighbourhood was concerned, he felt deprived. But in so far as the authority over the newly created area went, he could not have very disappointed by the measures. In the valley and in areas like Monze's on the plateau some chiefs were cetainly deprived of their traditional powers and they felt this deprivation.

Chiefs together with headmen found themselves in a worse position because they could not allocate land. As early as the first decade of the century, settlers had occupied land on the plateau and in the valley. Officers, anxious to preserve the best lands for settler farmers,did not allow chiefs and headmen to allocate good land to the people. In addition to this, sometimes people were asked to move in order to make room for the farmers. The people let out their anger and frustration over the chiefs who could not protect their lands. In some cases the people suspected that chiefs were deliberately letting the settlers take their land in order that they could win Government's favour.[1] Nevertheless, this was less the case in the valley. Other than a few patches in the Lower River region not much land was being set aside for settler occupation. But all the same chiefs and headmen were not supposed to allocate land without first getting permission from the Native Commissioner / Assistant Commissioner.

---

1. Kazoka, W. and wife; Fr. Nchete.

It must be mentioned, however, that despite the chiefs' and headmen's dependence on the boma the Administration was short of staff in Tongaland as elsewhere. Consequently, tours were not as frequent as they should have been. In 1914, for example, three tours were made in Mazabuka sub-district each to a different part of the district. The tours added up to forty days. Fifty-five villages and twenty-three settler farms were visited. During the tours tax was collected, "native" rights to land were ascertained, villages and farms were inspected and miscellaneous duties performed.[1] In the same year only one tour by probationer Williams was recorded in the valley. The tour was over a period of one day during which three villages were visited.[2] Lack of contact with Administration officers meant that the people were left to lead their lives as they had done before. The people could also ignore the newly imposed leaders without getting themselves into much trouble. Thus most of them continued to take their problems to the chiefs and headmen under whose jurisdiction they had been before the re-organisation and to the ritual and lineage leaders.[3] But where indigenous leaders settled criminal cases, they adjusted their sentences. For instance, formerly slaves were given as compensation to the injured. The leaders could not impose such a sentence now. They feared that the offender or his relatives might run to the boma for help.[4] I suspect too that because of

---

1. Mazabuka District Notebook. KSB3/1. N.A.Z.

2. Gwembe District Notebook. KTE2/1. N.A.Z.

3. Colson, E. 1960. The Social Organisation of the Gwembe Tonga. 169-175.
Twenty five years later Colson observed that lineage leaders still played a leading role in settling disputes.

4. Kazoka, W. and wife.

infrequent tours by Administration officers and the poor nature of the soil, chiefs and headmen in the valley continued to allocate land.

The above survey of Tonga developments during this period shows that with the advent of colonial rule the Tonga became subjected to territorial political and administrative measures. The indigenous system also underwent other notable changes. The hitherto very localised political system was being discouraged. Formerly independent neighbourhoods were being merged with others to form political and administrative units. One chief was chosen to lead each expanded unit. Alongside the geographical changes, there were new dimensions added to the concept of chiefship. A chief could be created even though he might not have qualities which people had appreciated in a leader. A chief could be placed over people who would otherwise not have given him their loyalty. That a chief could be placed over the people marked a development whereby it was not left to the people to place themselves under the leader of their own choice. As a result, in most cases the basis of power became the Administration and not to people. The functions of most chiefs too were purely those stipulated by the Administration. Furthermore, ritual was not considered of paramount importance. Therefore, leaders were chosen purely for their secular merits and not ritual powers. This last point brings us to another development in the system operating among the Tonga. The office of priesthood did not form part of the political structure.

Nevertheless, some features of the old order were carried on into the new system. This was primarily because the people rejected the new leaders and Administration did not have enough

personnel both to ensure the support which the new leaders needed and to perform most of the duties which fell within its jurisdiction. Thus the indigenous chiefs and headmen, recognised or displaced, and elders some of whom were Banakokalia continued to function. They listened to their people's problems, settled their cases and generally ensured that their people lived happily and in peace. Basikatongo also continued to function. Ritual continued to be of importance to the people's lives.[1] Also people continued to consult them with their problems. In fact people turned to them more as they turned away from the newly created leaders.

Summary

Under Company rule the Lenje, Leya and Tonga ceased to exist as independent administrative and political units. They became parts of a system operating throughout the country and were subjected to the same administrative structure, policy, orders and demands. According to Administration policy, chiefs and headmen, the only indigenous leaders recognised in the new system, ceased to hold any political and judicial powers. Their functions too took on new dimensions. They helped in tax collection, in policing the areas and in promulgation of laws and orders and notices (chiefs in the past did not undertake such functions). The three societies were also subjected

---

1. Inspite of early missions in Tongaland (1905 for the earliest on the plateau, 1901 for the valley), ritual was still of importance to the people. Colson, researching on the plateau in the 1940's and in the valley in the 1950's, noted the importance of ritual among the Tonga still:
Colson, E. 1962 The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia.
_____ 1960. The Social Organisation of the Gwembe Tonga.

to some administrative re-organisation: The Lenje 'tribe' no longer formed one administrative and political unit and saw the rise of Chipepo as the most important chief; the Leya lost a sub-chief; the Tonga saw the creation of large units and an imposition of chiefs over people who might otherwise not have accorded them loyalty. All the societies saw the separation between politics and ritual .

Despite the same Administration policy and measures, however, a uniform political system did not evolve in the three societies. This was because of the people's responses to colonial policy and manipulation of Administration constant shortage of staff by the leaders.

Among the Lenje, chiefs realised the significance of the new measures. They realised that the new duties they were called upon to execute could lead to their unpopularity among the people. Therefore even in direct confrontation with Administration officers, chiefs sought out ways to ensure the people's continued support. Their success in doing this contributed to the authority they still commanded over their people. In Buleya the chief also adopted ways to secure the continued support of his people. But the nineteenth century developments and the country's ecology also worked to his advantage. Among both the Lenje and the Leya the concept of divine chiefship also helped the chiefs. People still revered the institution of chiefship; they continued to view chiefship as being inseperable from religion. The chiefs continued to be an important figure in ritual. Among the Tonga, however, people placed under chiefs other than their former neighbourhood chiefs rejected the new chiefs. As a result, Administration

and not the people became the basis of power for some chiefs.

Chiefs and headmen also manipulated Administration constant shortage of staff. The Company was primarily an economic enterprise to whom administration of the country was important only in so far as it was to provide a framework of "law and order" within which it could pursue its economic interests. Outlining the Company's objectives in 1900, the Native Commissioner for Mkushi, Mr. Frances Jones, addressed the Lala with the following words, "We are fresh from conquering the Angoni. We have three things to say. First in this country there shall be no more war. Secondly, in this country there shall be no more slavery. In regard to all other things men shall do as they have done and as their fathers have done before them."[1] Since the country did not yield immediate economic gains and as mineral prospects diminished, the Company viewed the country more as a burden whose only useful function was that of acting as a link between the Congo and Southern Rhodesia.[2]

Because its basic interest was economic expansion for itself, the Company was not prepared to spend much, in the form of either money or personnel, on administration. The result of this was twofold. In the first place, there was always a shortage of staff in the field. In the second place, there were no development projects effected for the indigenous people. Therefore, there were not many changes to the people's way of life.

---

1. Gann, L.H. 1964 A History of Northern Rhodesia, Early days to 1953. 98

2. Roberts, A.D. 1968 "The Political History of Twentieth Century Zambia" in Ranger, T.O. (ed.) Aspects of Central African History 156-157.

Lenje and Leya chiefs and headmen took advantage of the constant shortage of staff to perform some duties, like judicial ones, which Administration policy did not permit them to perform. Some recognised old neighbourhood Tonga chiefs also took advantage of staff shortage and performed their old duties. But since people rejected the authority of chiefs to whom they had never owed allegiance, some chiefs could only carry out the duties stipulated by the Administration. In Tongaland too most people who rejected the new chiefs continued to refer their problems to the unrecognised leaders. Chiefs and headmen and the unrecognised Tonga chiefs and headmen found it easier to perform their duties also because of the few changes to the people's way of life. The people continued to live much as they had done before.

Among the Lenje and Leya, institutions such as those of Kaca, Mweendelezi we Cisi and Babetesi continued to function because chiefs continued to perform some of their old duties and the people continued to refer to them. Among the Tonga, the elders continued to function because the people continued to go to them.

In all the three societies people rejected the separation of ritual from politics. The office of priesthood continued to function. In Buleya the priestess was once more the key figure in succession matters. In Tongaland the Sikatongo was gaining more powers. People went to him with their problems as they turned away from the new chiefs.

In respect of other offices, the advent of colonial rule rendered some non-functional. Because the Company subjected all the groups which had formerly raided one another and it also

undertook defence matters, institutions such as Balanse among the Lenje and Bayasani among the Leya no longer functioned as stand-by armies. Bavwimi too ceased to function as tribute hunters. While Balanse and Bavwimi still executed some of their former duties (as royal hunters), they took on new functions as messengers and ritual heralds. The Leya also lost Natamoyo. It is interesting to note that while the Lenje and Leya lost some of the indigenous offices, none ceased to function among the Tonga. Probably this is a reflection on the pre-colonial political constitution which was less complex there. For example, there was no equivalent to Kaca or Mwendelezi we Cisi among the Tonga; there was not stand-by army or institutionalised hunters.

C_H_A_P_T_E_R___III

POLITICAL SYSTEMS UNDER COLONIAL OFFICE RULE

Introductory

Between 1924 and 1953 indigenous political systems were exposed to more pressures of a new and diverse nature.

Colonial Office adopted the policy of 'indirect rule'. By this indigenous political systems became the basis of African administration. Indigenous leaders were granted legislative, decision-making, judicial, administrative and executive powers. Yet the need to modernise and to turn chiefs' governments into modern local governments was such that colonial officers often dictated the extent and limits of the indigenous leaders' powers.

There was also an emerging class of educated and widely travelled blacks. The Government and Colonial Office felt they should be accomodated into the existing political system both to sublimate their political aspirations and to provide local government staff.

Christian religion was gaining more adherents. This also affected the indigenous political systems.

The indigenous political systems as they emerged in 1953 were

a result of the interaction of the above factors and the indigenous people's responses to them.

When, in 1924, the Colonial Office took over direct control of Northern Rhodesia from the British South Africa Company, it ran African affairs according to the 1916 Proclamation of the Administration of Natives. The 1927 Administration of Natives (Amendment) Ordinance merely added a section which enumerated the new duties of an individual to the officer in charge of a district. It also made provision for the supply of labour in case of an emergency.[1]

But at this time the Colonial Office was urging colonial governments to adopt the policy of 'indirect rule' as the basis for African administration. Advocates of the policy had postulated that not only would 'indirect rule' effect economies in colonial administration but also that the people would be more contented if they were ruled through their own indigenous institutions.[2] Most of the new officers who replaced Company

---

1. The Administration of Natives(Amendment) Ordinance, 1927. B/1/2/464. N.A.Z.

2. Lugard who promulgated the 'indirect rule' system and applied it to Nigeria had pointed out that by preserving indigenous institutions, the educated who might otherwise become discontented would find means through which they could have a voice in the control of their own affairs: Lugard, F.D. 1929. The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa. 141.

administrators were anxious to see th t the policy was adopted on Northern Rhodesia.[1] The District Commissioners' Conference of 1927 also recommended it. The transfer of Governor Maxwell from Gold Coast to Northern Rhodesia in 1927 sealed the adoption of the policy. Maxwell had earlier worked in Nigeria where the policy had been first applied and where it had proved successful. In 1929 the Native Authority Ordinance and the Native Courts Ordinance were drafted and passed by the legislative Council.[2] They became operative from 1st April, 1930.

By the Native Authority Ordinance, the 1916 Proclamation of the Administration of Natives was repealed. The Native Authority Ordinance of 1929 empowered the Governor to appoint a chief or any person either alone or in conjunction with headmen or elders to be the Native Authority for the respective area. A Native Authority could make rules for its area. For example, it could make rules setting out court fees. A Native Authority could also make orders for the general welfare of the people. It could make orders such as to prohibit any act or conduct which in its opinion could cause a riot, a disturbance or a breach of the peace. Native Authorities were empowered to arrest without

---

1. In 1924 the District Officer, Mumbwa sub-district urged the North rn Rhodesia Government to work and rule through chiefs and headmen; Annual Report, 1924. Mumbwa sub-district, Kafue District. ZA7/1/7/5. N.A.Z.;
In 1928 the District Commissioner, Luangwa District, condemned the system operating during the British South Africa Company Administration which tended to deprive the chiefs of all their power and authority: Annual Report, 1928. Luangwa District. KDA4/1/2. N.A.Z.

2. Native Authority Ordinance, 1929. B1/2/480. N.A.Z.; Native Courts Ordinance, 1929. B1/3/500. N.A.Z.

warrant, unless the rules otherwise prescribed any person accused of any offence against the rules.

Added to the chiefs' and headmen's legislative and administrative powers were the judicial ones granted by the Native Courts Ordinance. According to the Ordinance, the Governor could appoint a Native Court or Native Courts for each area as he deemed necessary. The Native Courts areas coincided with the areas which fell under the jurisdiction of the Native Authority. A Native Court was to consist of such chief, headmen or elders as the Governor directed. Native Courts were given power to try cases between two Africans and to impose fees. They could also try a person who disobeyed rules made by a Native Authority.

In June, 1930, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Passfield, dispatched a memorandum in which the paramountcy of the indigenous people's interests was emphasised.[1] The Secretary of State reminded the officers that indigenous institutions under the system of 'indirect rule' were to be fostered. He further stated that chiefs and their councillors were to be entrusted with ever increasing financial, judicial and executive functions.

In Northern Rhodesia many officers wanted to see Native Authorities take on the functions of a local government[2] and in

---

1. Memorandum from Lord Passfield, 1930. SEC/NAT/92. N.A.Z.

2. In 1935 Native Authorities were discussed under the sub-heading Local Self-Government Native Affairs Annual Report, 1935. VIII. N.R.G. 192/54. L.M.

1936 the recognition of Native Authorities as "self-governing local executies" was realised by the promulgation of the Native Authority Ordinance, 1936.[1] The Ordinance made provision for the establishment of Native Treasuries.[2] All revenue received on behalf of the Native Authority, for example court fees, fines, game and bicycle linenses, and a share of 3% from the central tax, was to go into the Treasury. Native Authorities could then pay out of their own treasuries salaries of their personnel and also build their own houses and schools and make their own roads.

The question of Native Authorities serving as instruments of local government gathered momentum after the war. In 1944 the Administrative Conference recommended that where the Authority was judged capable of carrying out services at the time undertaken by Government, such services should be transferred to that Authority and a Grant made for the work.[3] The 1946 Conference reiterated the same recommendation.[4]

---

1. Native Authority Ordinance, 1936. N/1/02/1. N.A.Z. Except for some verbal amendments effected by the Ordinances of 1946 and significant amendments of 1953 which empowered Native Authorities to legislate against African National Congress, the 1936 ordinance remained in force and regulated the constitution and powers of Native Authorities.

2. Accordingly, The Native Treasury Ordinance, 1936 was promulgated. It became operative in 1937. 8/17/4F. N.A.Z.

3. Administrative Conference, 1944. Vol. II. N.A.Z.

4. Provincial Commissioners' Conference. Vol. II. 1938-1950. N.A.Z.

Meanwhile, there was a new group emerging in the country. This was a group of educated and widely travelled people. Some had travelled as f r afield as South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Congo. Others were being influenced by Missionaries and other people from outside the country. In this group were to be found teachers, clerks, mine workers and individual entrepreneurs. The Government realized that if Native Authorities were to function as local governments, it had to use members from this group since these men would both appreciate the modernising duties Native Authorities would be called upon to perform and also be able to carry them out. As early as 1931 the Secretary for Native Affairs suggested that to make Native Authorities more effective, Authorities should be encouraged to invite educated or travelled men in order to hear their views.[1] The Provincial Conference in 1939 recommended that if Native Authorities were to keep in touch with the more progressive elements in their area, they should be encouraged to select representatives from this group as additional members in their Councils.[2] The Conference also observed that courts which hitherto had not had clerks to record cases were to have some now. These would obviously be drawn from the educated group. Courts were also to have assessors who were not always headmen and clerks as had been the case in the past.

But members of this group were also developing individualistic attitudes. This could jeopardise tribal consciousness.[3]

---

1. ZA1/9/79. N.A.Z.

2. Provincial Commissioners' Conference. Vol. II 1938-1950. N.A.Z.

3. District Circular No.5 of 1945. N/0901. N.A.Z. The chief Secretary attributed this to the intellectual and economic progress of the emerging class.

Further, they began to question whether the political system operating at the time was representative enough. This became accentuated after the end of the second World War. The end of the war brought back men who while serving in the war had met other men who held diverse political views. The returning soldiers spread political ideas that cut across tribal organisation. They were teaching others that it was po sible to have a government based on a country-wide level which could be manned from the top by the indigenous people themselves.[1] Therefore not only to provide Native Authority staff but also to check the developing attitudes, Government felt it necessary to accomodate these people in the already existing political system.[2]

The highwater mark for the call for Native Authority re-organisation both to make Native Authority into effective local governments and to accommodate educated and progressive elements was reached in 1947. In this year the Secretary of State endorsed Native Authority re-organisation and laid down

---

1. This information was supplied by two United National Independence Party politicians who did not wish to be quoted.

2. Some Zambia politicians to day maintain that the African Representative Council which was created in 1945 and where Africans could debate on matters which touched them most was intended to keep progressive Africans and especially the returning soldiers from anti-Government preachings. Since no African was a member of the Legislative Council at the time, there was no guarantee that their representatives could present their views, and especially those which criticised Government, to the Legislative Council: Politicians who expressed this view did not wish to be quoted.

the lines to be followed. In the dispatch he wrote, "I believe that the key to success in (African administration) lies in the development of an efficient and democratic system of local government..... local because the system of government (must) be close to the common people and their problems and efficient in a way that will help raise the standards of living and democratic because it must not only find a place for the growing class of educated men but at the same time command the respect of the mass of the people ....." It was hoped that in the political sphere such local government could provide the machinery for developing local opinion thus establishing a sound foundation for political development in the territory as a whole. Local government would also provide the experience and training in the control of public affairs to many people. As far as possible executive and financial responsibility was to be devolved on local government authorities. "In this process the aim is to give the progressive, trained, educated elements a full share of responsibility and to bring them into a harmonious co-operation with the traditional tribal leaders,"[1] the Secretary of State concluded.

The 1947 Summer Conference of Administrators endorsed the views of the dispatch.[2] The Cartmel-Robinson Commission set up to enquire into the financial relationship between Central Government and local Authorities also suggested that

---

1. No. 31 Confidential to Northern Rhodesia Government, 1947. N/0901, Vol. II. N.A.Z.

2. Administrative Conference of P.C.'s 1914-1960 Vol. I & II. N.A.Z.

Government should grant to local authorities enough money both to meet the cost of running the social services and to attract good enough men to fulfil the functions.[1]

Consequently, lines for re-organisation of Native Authorities were drawn up and effected in 1948. To effect economies, it was necessary where possible to abolish Subordinate Native Authorities as separate entities and to encourage the creation of large Superior Native Authorities by amalgamation. In view of these suggestions recognition of Subordinate Native Authorities was withdrawn and chiefs were to act as agents of the Superior Native Authority. This in turn necessitated the recognition of certain chiefs as Senior. They became Presidents or Chairmen of the Superior Native Authority Council (and Superior Native Courts). Superior Native Authority Councils were to be composed of all the chiefs, traditional councillors selected by chiefs and educated councillors selected by the Native Authority Council.

Alongside these developments was the question of abolishing or amalgamating some chieftaincies. As early as 1931 some officers had suggested that some Native Authorities should be amalgamated and the smaller and weaker ones done away with. The question of amalgamation came up again when the Native Treasury Ordinance was passed in 1936. Some officers felt

---

1. Financial Relationship Committee, 1949. ZP22/1. N.A.Z.

that the Ordinance as well as the whole system of 'indirect rule' could be more effective if small or not so well managed Native Authorities were merged into others.[1]

The need for amalgamation and abolition was taken up more seriously in post-war Native Authority re-organisation. Although primarily this was to make Native Authorities more effective, I suspect that some abolitions were effected by post-war economic considerations. Nevertheless, as Native Authorities had to offer attractive salaries to the educated men who would execute local government responsibilities, it was found necessary to effect economies where possible by abolishing certain chieftaincies.

From the above account we see that the Native Authority system was operating throughout the country. But the structure which emerged by 1953 was the result of a gradual development. When the Native Authority system was first introduced, chiefs were appointed Superior and Subordinate Authorities. In some cases chiefs were the sole Native Authority. In other cases, however, chiefs together with councillors (headmen or elders) were the Native Authority. Chiefs also presided over courts while some councillors acted as the assessors. But after 1936 emphasis was placed on Native Authorities functioning as local governments and Native Treasuries were established to make this effective. In 1936 too the Native Authority Ordinace stipulated that Subordinate Native Authorities and Superior Native Authorities were to be composed of a chief and Council in the case of the former and a Paramount Chief or some other

---

1. The Provincial Commissioners' Conference. Vol. II. 1938-1950. N.A.Z.

important chief and Council, a Council of Chiefs or the Tribal Council in the case of the latter. The Tribal Council was a composition of all the chiefs, headmen, elders and others who might wish to attend. Thus between 1936 and 1948 most chiefs were Subordinate Native Authorities exercising the powers granted by the Ordinances but subject to the control of the Superior Native Authority. Paramount Chiefs or other important chiefs in council were Superior Native Authorities. In cases where there was no such chief, a Council of all the chiefs of the 'tribe' or the Tribal Council became the Superior Native Authority. After the 1948 Native Authority re-organisation, Subordinate Native Authorities were abolished. These became agents of Superior Native Authority Councils. Superior Native Authority Councils were composed of all the chiefs of the 'tribe', hereditary councillors and elected councillors who were mainly commoners and who were to work as departmental officers. The Paramount or Senior Chief was President of the Superior Native Authority Councils. Superior Native Authority Councils employed in addition to departmental councillors, clerks to run Native Treasuries and courts. Kapasus were also attached to each court as well as to the Native Appeal Court.

Thus the Native Authority system (and Native Courts) was based on the indigenous political system and it incorporated the necessary indigenous political institutions: the chief, the headman, the councillor, the judges, the messengers. But it did not incorporate the institution of the priest since religious matters were now separated from political ones.

To link Native Authorities with Central Government was the District Commissioner and his staff. They were in direct control

of Native Authorities. The District Commissioner was answerable to the Provincial Commissioner and his staff. These were responsible to the Secretary for Native Affairs who was responsible for African Affairs and represented African interests in the Central Government, Legislative Council and to the Governor.

During this period, then, Government tried to make chiefs and other indigenous leaders shoulder legislative, judicial, administrative and executive duties. Nevertheless, the changing circumstances sometimes made indigenous leaders unable to carry out some of the duties they were called upon to perform. This in turn led some officers to ignore the indigenous leaders and to adopt more direct methods.[1]

Because of the need for development, it was found necessary to employ educated men as departmental and elected councillors. That they were educated sometimes led colonial officers to rely more on them than on the chiefs. This undermined the chiefs' authority and engendered an antagonism between the two.

Together with the educated councillors were other educated and progressive elements. Some of these people were developing individualistic attitudes; others had a tendency to dispute the judgement of the chiefs and the indigenous councillors.[2]

Furthermore, there were limitations to the indigenous leaders' powers. For example, the rules and orders the Native Authority

---

1. L. Taylor, District Officer in various parts of the country, 1959-1964, put it in these words, "Throughout the colonial era the initiative of the District Officer was a major driving force of government in the rural areas despite the Whitehall policy of indirect rule".
Kenneth Bradley brings out clearly the inherent contradiction between the theory of 'indirect rule' and what was practised in the field;
Bradley, K. 1966. Diary of a District Officer.

2. Native Affairs Annual Report for the year 1945. 192/54 L.N.

were empowered to make had to be submitted to the District Commissioner who had full powers to confirm, amend or rescind.[1] Even in the judiciary the District Commissioner given full powers to intervene, rescind or rehearse either of his own notion or on a petition of a complaint being made to him, the court's decision.[2] Again, like his predecessor in Company days, the chief could remain in office "during the pleasure and contigently upon good behaviour and general fitness."[3] He could therefore be dismissed or suspended. The Authority, of which he was the leading member, was liable to a fine not exceeding £50 if it wilfully refused or neglected to enforce any orders issued by the Provincial Commissioner or administrative officer.[4] That they were liable to deposition or suspension or to a fine placed the chiefs in a dilemma as they tried to avoid deposition by not acting contrary to the wishes of the officers and by carrying out the officers which were often not liked by the people.[5]

---

1. Native Authority Ordinance, 1929. B1/2/480. N.A.Z.
2. Native Courts Ordinance, 1929. B1/3/500. N.A.Z.
3. Native Authority Ordinance, 1929. B1/2/480. N.A.Z.
4. Ibid.
5. R. Hill, District Commissioner in various parts of the country from 1949-1964, expressed this view from personal experience of his dealing with the chiefs. Irrigation, agriculture and education rules seem to have been the most disliked by the people.

The Christian religion too was threatening the indigenous leaders' hold over the people in the religious field.

Thus in spite of Government efforts to strengthen the authority of the chiefs and other indigenous leaders, other circumstances were dictating against the latter. The indigenous leaders themselves were aware of this. Their efforts became concentrated on retaining the faith of the people. At the same time they tried to accomodate the changes. Thus while Government endeavour initiated certain changes to the indigenous political systems, the equilibrium of the institutions, viz. the relations between the chiefs and people and Government representatives, was maintained through the efforts of the indigenous leaders especially those of the chiefs.

Let us now see how the interaction of the above mentioned factors brought about the changes and also enabled continuity in the political systems of the Lenje, Leya and Tonga.

i) The Lenje

We have noted in the last chapter that under Company Administration the Lenje were administered from four different administrative districts: Broken Hill, Mumbwa, Chilanga and Ndola. Now, however, for the system of 'indirect rule' to work effectively, it was necessary to administer the 'tribe' from one centre. After 1930 steps were taken to move all the Lenje chiefs into Broken Hill District. By 1933 this was completed.[1]

---

1. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA2/1. N.A.Z.

When the Native Authority Ordinance became effective, all the Lenje chiefs were declared Subordinate Native Authorities.[1] Each Subordinate Native Authority was composed of the chief and his indigenous councillors.[2] Chipepo and all the chiefs constituted the Superior Native Authority.[3]

By the Native Courts Ordinance, each chief was President of his court. Some of his councillors served as court assessors.[4]

In 1936 the Lenje Tribal Council was constituted as the Superior Native Authority. This was a composition of all the chiefs and their councillors. Instead of Chipepo serving as the permanent Chairman, the Council chose the Chairman by secret ballot before the proceedings of each meeting. But it appears that Chipepo continued to serve as Chairman until 1948 when he was retired.[5] Chiefs Chipepo and Chitanda had five gazetted and paid councillors each while the others had two or three each. The two chiefs were also Appeal Courts while the other were not. They remained Appeal

---

1. Native Authorities and Native Courts, 1928-1935. ZA1/9/27/5. N.A.Z.

2. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA2/1. N.A.Z.

3. Native Authorities and Native Courts, 1928-1935. ZA1/9/27/5. N.A.Z.

4. Ibid.

5. Indirect Rule, Central Province. NAT A/A/2. N.A.Z. In 1947 Chipepo was referred to as head of the Lenje Tribal Council. Loc. cit.

Courts until 1953 when the Appeal Court was set up at the Native Authority Council Headquarters.

In accordance with the Native Authority Ordinance, 1936, too the Lenje Native Treasury was established. It employed one clerk and in 1940 the Lenje Tribal Council could collect tax for its Treasury through the court clerks. In order to strengthen the Native Authority system, however, chiefs Kapandula and Mulando were abolished as Native Authorities and their areas were merged into Chitanda and Mungule respectively. Nevertheless, they were allowed to retain their courts and to receive a subsidy as Presidents of their courts until after the war.[1] In 1943 Kapalamoto's recognition as a Subordinate Native Authority was withdrawn. He also lost his court. His area and court went to chief Chamuka.[2]

The organisation and constitution of the Native Authority Council continued to operate along the same lines until after the 1948 Native Authority re-organisation. After 1948 the Tribal Council did not constitute the Superior Native Authority. Instead, the Council was to be composed of the chiefs, elected (one from each chief's area) and departmental councillors. Indigenous councillors could attend Council meetings not as paid councillors but as court assessors. In 1948 there were four departmental councillors for Education, Public Works, Communications and Agriculture and Water Development. In 1951

---

1. Chiefs, Central Province. SEC/NAT/66B. N.A.Z.

2. Ibid.

two more educated councillors were co-opted on to the Council as elected councillors.[1] In the meantime the Council lost the membership of two of its indigenous leaders. The chieftaincies of Kasonkomona (1948) and N itima (1949) were abolished.[2]

After 1948 too the educated Lenje were pres ing for the office of Senior Chief to be established in order to ring the Lenje Native Authority in line with other Authorities.[3] The District Commissioner was sympathetic to the request. In 1953 elections were held and Chitanda was elected Senior Chief.[4] He moved to Chibombo, the Lenje Native Authority Centre two years later in 1955.[5]

Thus by 1953 the Native Authority institution was fully established among the Lenje. A collective body of all the chiefs, elected and departmental councillors constituted this body. Chitanda, designated Senior Chief, was its President.

---

1. Native Authority Re-organisation. N/1201/1. N.A.Z.

2. Native Authority, Central Province, Chiefs. N/1021/3. N.A.Z.

3. District Commissioner to Provincial Commissionary. N/1021/3. N.A.Z.

4. District Commissioner to Provincial Commissioner. N/1021/3. N.A.Z.
   Chipepo also contested for the post. He lost by seven votes only. He got 319 against Chitanda's of 326. Some of my informants claim that Chipepo's many votes were due to the fact that most of his villa es are near Chibombo and therefore the majority of the headmen and elders came from his area.

5. Native Authority Re-organisation. N/1201/1. N.A.Z.

Chiefs acted as its agents in their respective areas. The new institution was to function as a local government. That it had established its Headquarters fully equipped with its Treasury, Court of Appeal, Council Hall, and personnel was a full realisation of its status as local government. The District Commissioner and his staff guided and advised the new body as well as represented it to Central Government.

As members of the Native Authority Council chiefs were given political, legislative, administrative, executive and judicial (as Presidents of their courts and members of the Court of Appeal) powers. Thus, for example, the chiefs could now allocate land in their areas. In 1950 they passed levy rules whereby every tax payer was required to pay two shillings per annum to the Native Authority Treasury.[1] In 1952 they vetoed the application by an Asian trader to start business in chief Chipepo's area.[2] Nevertheless, some of the duties they had to perform as members of the local government were either beyond their capabilities, below their dignity or might have led to some antagonism between them and their people. Examples of these are such duties as planning of Estimates,[3] seeing that

---

1. Lenje Native Authority Council Meetings. N/1202/1.Vol.1. N.A.Z.

2. Ibid.

3. H.P. Haile, District Commissioner, Broken Hill Rural, 1956-1960, observed almost ten years after the Native Authority re-organisation that the majority of chiefs could not follow Council discussions especially when dealing with Estimates. Often they slept through Estimates discussions.

people dug their latrines and thatched their houses[1] and that people sent their children to school or cultivated their fields according to the modern methods of agriculture.[2] It is possible that in some cases the chiefs were merely conservative and did not care for the many changes. The District Commissioner, on the other hand wanted to see that development was effected in the area. Thus at times he and his junior officers took the lead instead of working through the chiefs. At Council meetings the District Officer often dominated the discussions.[3] Because he could not get chiefs to execute some of the duties and at as fast a rate as he wished, sometimes the District Commissioner relied on departmental councillors to help him. Therefore he often spent more time with them when he visited the Native Authority Council Centre than he did with the chiefs.[4] In the field he

---

1. In 1951 the Provincial Commissioner complained to the Secretary for Native Affairs, on behalf of Mungule who was censored for not doing his duties, that chiefs should not be held responsible for thatching houses and digging latrines: Lenje Native Authority, 1950-1960 R/14/2/11/2, N.A.Z.

2. H.P. Haile, District Commissioner, Broken Hill Aural. 1956-1960.

3. In 1951 the Provincial Commissioner complained that the Native Authority was suffering from the domination of the District Commissioner: Lenje Native Authority, 1950-1960. R/14/2/11/2. N.A.Z.

4. Lenje Native Authority Council Meetings. N/1202/1 Vol.1. N.A.Z.

sometimes referred to the chief only when he felt it necessary to do so.[1]

That the District Commissioner relied more on the educated councillors placed the latter in an advantageous position over the chiefs. Because they could execute some of the local government duties and because of their education and wider knowledge, the District Commissioner was more favourable to their views than to the chiefs'. To quote an instance: In 1951 the first departmental councillors' term of office came to an end. (The term of office for councillors was three years). Either the old ones had to be reselected or new ones employed. The first Education councillor had been a teacher. But five years prior to his appointment, he had inherited a headmanship from his uncle. The other departmental councillors and educated elected councillors thought him quite conservative. They preferred one Mulando who was a high primary school teacher at the time and who had taught at mission centres away from his tribal area for over fifteen years.[2] The other progressives in the area, whose views the District Commissioner seems to have been sympathetic with, backed the departmental councillors. The President of the 'Lenje Progressive Association' entered into a long correspondence with the District Commissioner on the merits of having Mulando as the Education councillor. When Mulando

---

1. Lenje Native Authority, 1950-1960. R/14/2/11/2. N.A.Z.; H.P. Haile.

2. Muntemba, S.B. and Shipekwa, G. Tape in L.M.

was reluctant to take up this post because of its lower salary, the other departmental councillors and the 'Lenje Progressive Association' persuaded the District Commissioner to raise the salary because it was imperative that Mulando be co-opted on to the Council. The District Commissioner helped the departmental councillors persuade the chiefs to select in favour of Mulando and on a higher salary. Mulando was ultimately co-opted on to the Council in the same year.[1]

At times the educated councillors persuaded the chiefs to agree to their point of view by appealing to their knowledge of the whole country's affairs about which the chiefs were not so knowledgeable. For example, in the early 1950's African National Congress was on the ascendancy in the country. The educated councillors, backed by other progressives who saw the chiefs in their own areas, persuaded the Lenje Native Authority Council to allow Congress to open an office at Chibombo.[2] An incident which falls slightly outside our period but worthy quoting illustrates effectively how the educated councillors and other progressives appealed to their country-wide experiences to win the chiefs over to their views. Senior Chief Chitanda died in 1956. There were two candidates to the chieftaincy, both

---

1. Lenje Native Authority Reports, 1949-1964. R14/2/10. N.A.Z.

2. Lenje Native Authority Council Meetings. N/1202/1 Vol. 1. N.A.Z.
It appears that although permission was granted in 1953, the matter was not followed up seriously by African National Congress until 1956. Lo. cit.

his nephews. One of the two had lived at home and in fact had deputised for Chitanda when the latter went to reside at Chibombo. The other one and actually the more rightful claimant of the two had lived and worked on the Copperbelt for a long time. All the Lenje chiefs, headmen and elders felt that although the rightful claimant, the latter had been so divorced from his home conditions and ideas that he could not be entrusted with the welfare of the country. In the past it had been permissible to pass over the rightful heir if it was strongly felt that he could not make a good chief. The educated councillors and other progressives in Bulenje favoured the Copperbelt man. The educated councillors pointed out that choosing such a man would place the Lenje on par with other 'tribes'; that the District Commissioner and Central Government would respect the chiefs more if they chose someone knowledgeable of their ways. Although the District Commissioner was to keep out of the whole discussion, he sympathised with the educated councillors and made his inclinations known. After a lot of postponements, deliberations and persuasion, the Copperbelt candidate got the chieftaincy.[1]

If chiefs did not see a threat to their authority and status when the District Commissioner relied more on educated councillors, when he was more sympatheitic to the latter's views or when they themselves got swayed by these councillors, they became alarmed when some members of the emerging class threatened to undermine their authority in respect of the people. Most of the

---

1. Lenje Native Authority Council Meetings. N/1202/1 Vol.1 N.A.Z.

educated and widely travelled people were economically better off than the chiefs. People with material wealth were gaining some status in society. A story is told of chief Chitanda's nephew who had been away to South Africa for a number of years. He came back in the 1940's with a wireless set, some pieces of furniture, a bicycle and many clothes. Most people viewed him with higher respect not only because he was the chief's nephew, but also because of his comparative material wealth. They often sought him out for advice as a result of his status.[1] Teachers and other educated people were held in respect as much because they represented the white man's world which the people both hated and feared as because of their economic strength.[2]

Another factor which threatened to undermine the chiefs' authority and status as well as that of other indigenous institutions was the missionary factor. After 1930 the Methodist Mission was expanding its activities in Bulenje. By 1940 there was a substantial number of schools and mission centres scattered over the area. One minister stationed at Mpili Mission in chief Liteta's area from 1941, with short intervals, until 1959 was a very strong-willed and influential man. Some teachers and evangelists who served under him say that most of his church members and immigrants to Bulenje went to him with the problems they would normally have taken to their headmen or chief in former days.[3]

---

1. Chief Chitanda. Tape in L.M.

2. Efforts by Government throughout this period to raise the chiefs' salaries was directed towards checking this danger.

3. Matibini, A. and Shipekwa, G. Tape in L.M.

Intensified missionary activity also meant that most people were becoming Christians and some of them were giving up their involvement in indigenous rituals.[1] Most of the schools in Bulenje were missionary run. This meant that school children were brought up adhering to the new faith.

Chiefs realised that the limitations to their power, the execution of some of their new duties, the advantageous position in which the District Commissioner, the educated councillors and other progressives were have adverse effects on their status and on the relationship with their people. Therefore, they worked to ensure their people's continued support as much as possible.

In 1942, for example, Ntitima had given permission to one Shakalima to start a village. On one of his visits to the area the District Commissioner found that Shakalima should not have started a village because he did not have enough people. He told the chief to see to it that the village was disbanded. Ntitima, however, did not order Shakalima to break up his village. A few months later the District Commissioner sent for Ntitima. While at Broken Hill, Ntitima was instructed in the duties of a chief and the consequences of disobedience or negligence of his duties. Ntitima remained in Broken Hill for two weeks after which time he agreed to carry out the wishes

---

1. The Methodist Mission was uncompromising in its approach. Most followers gave up attending rituals out of fear.

of the boma. Officially the village became non-existent and it was scrapped off the official records. But in fact Ntitima did not carry out his orders. He knew that if he did, he could antagonise not only Shakalima but most of his people as well who would view him as a boma chief who would not stand for them. Thereafter, whenever a District officer visited the area, Ntitima avoided passing through or near Shakalima's village which has survived to today.[1]

Another incident occured in 1943. The District Commissioner was quite alarmed by the rise of dagga smoking among the Lenje. At one of the meetings the District Commissioner brought this to the attention of chiefs, headmen and elders and suggested that Native Authorities should make orders against the smoking of dagga. The chiefs, headmen and elders did not express an opinion. This was partly because some of the men were themselves dagga smokers, partly also because chiefs and headmen knew that most of the influential elders and a number of their men had been smoking dagga for a long time. Upon losing his patience, the District Commissioner asked the gathered leaders of the Lenje if any of them were dagga smokers. Chitanda, Chipepo and Ntitima were some of the few who put up their hands to indicate that they were. Chitanda and Chipepo knew that as the most powerful Lenje chiefs, the likehood of their being punished

---

1. Chitentabunga, Shipekwa, G., Nsoka, M.

without the risk of alienating the people was slim. Ntitima, as we have noted, had the tendency of not always acting according to the wishes of the boma (a tendency which might have contributed to the abolition of his chieftaincy). The matter was deferred to the next general meeting. Subsequent rules and orders made by the Superior Native Authority do not indicate that an order against dagga smoking was ever made. Perhaps the matter was never brought up again.[1]

One departmental councillor recalls how chief Mungule used to behave whenever his area was visited. Mungule's area offers some of the most fertile land in the country. In the early and mid 1950's Government was trying to introduce new and more productive methods of farming. The people did not fully appreciate them at the time and therefore did not want to be bothered about them. The chief did not want to appear to his people that he was for the boma by openly supporting the new measures nor did he want to appear to the officers that he was against by openly telling the District Commissioner that he and his people were not interested in the new methods. Therefore, whenever, the District Commissioner toured the area for this purpose, the chief often feigned illness or if he appeared, he would be too drunk to be of much use. The District Commissioner relied mainly on the councillor responsible for

---

1. In 1945 Chipepo was considered too old to rule and his nephew, Paka, was made his deputy. Paka was having difficulties in administering the area. His 'inefficiency' was put down to the strong hold the chief still had on the people and it was suggested that if Paka was to be effective, the court should be moved from the old man's capital village. On the other hand, it was found necessary to let Chipepo continue as head of the Lenje Tribal Council because he was stronger than Paka: Indirect Rule, Central Province. NAT A/A/2. N.A.Z.

Agriculture.[1]

At times chiefs used the educated councillors to get themselves out of a situation that could jeopardise their position. For example, even where the chief favoured the educational and agricultural projects but which he knew his people did not welcome, he often pushed the councillor responsible into the fore-front thereby making him take all the blame.[2]

Chiefs were also able to tone down the educated councillors' and other progressives' advantages over them. As the leading figures in the Native Authority Council, they had greater power in the selection of the educated councillors. Often they selected those who owed allegiance to them by ties of kinship(Mutakwa, councillor for Agriculture and Shipekwa, elected) or who were headmen (Chikalakasa, first Education councillor who had succeeded his uncle as headman). Others would have won the love and respect of the Lenje chiefs and people which they would not have servered (Mulilo, Works Councillor who originally came from Mumbwa and ho had served as a Methodist Mission teacher for many years before he became councillor).

Chiefs also encouraged friendhsips with ministers, teachers and other progressive elements.[3] Thus they made the latter view them more as friends than as antagonists. The President of the'Lenje Progressive Association' was often reminded that he was a member of the Mungule family.

---

1. Mulilo, E.

2. Mulilo, E., Nsoka, M. and Shipekwa, G.

3. In the 1950's chiefs still asked the help of teachers and ministers in solving their problems. They also gave them presents in the form of foodstuffs which they received from the people. Personal observation

Such efforts on the chiefs' part did not go unrewarded. The people continued to rally behind their chiefs. The idea of divine chieftainship which most people still believed in also worked to the chiefs' advantage. Thus, for example, when the Ntitima and Kasonkomana chieftaincies were abolished, people still viewed Ntitima and Kasonkomona as the chiefs. The fact that they were to take their cases to Liteta and Chitanda respectively did not make them alter their allegiance. One departmental councillor told me how it was difficult to get much work done in Chief Liteta's area. Since his success depended to a great extent on a chief's co-operation, he could not get much co-operation from Ntitima's people as he had to work through Liteta. Often he ignored Liteta and worked through the unrecognised Ntitima.[1] To date Ntitima's and Kasonkomona's people acknowledge the unrecognised chiefs. They refer to themselves as Bene-Ntitima and Bene Kasonkomona (people of Ntitima, people Kasonkomona).

For their part, departmental councillors could not afford to antagonise the chiefs much. They realised that to affect any development project, they had to have the chiefs' full co-operation. The educated councillors also realised that in any confrontation their interests would be identified with those of the chiefs and people vis-a-vis the District Commissioner and Provincial and Central Government. To cite an example. Bulenje was one of the areas which were affected by white farmer settlements. Although Native Reserves were declared as far back as 1930, boundaries were not clearly demarcated.The result was that in

---

1. Mulilo, E.

chief Liteta's area around Mwacisompola near Landless corner and farth r to the south farmers often complained of "native" cattle straying into their land. They also complained that local people were extending their gardens into their land. On the other hand, local people complained that farmers were pushing their farms into their land. Thus in the early 1950's the District Commissioner, some of his officers, chief Liteta and educated councillors and the farmers concerned went about setting beacons to mark the boundary. The chief, councillors and even messengers (not openly) joined forces against the District Commissioner and farmers as they argued where the boundary was supposed to be and the extent of unalienated land. Both the chief and councillors did not want the people to lose more land to the farmers.[1]

Nevertheless, chiefs were also aware that they could be deposed or suspended if they displeased Central Government by not carrying out its wishes and orders. Therefore, while striving to retain the people's support, they tried to keep on the District Office's good side. Thus we noted in Ntitima's case cited above that he would not openly challenge the District Commissioner over Shakalima's case. Mungule too would not openly tell the District Commissioner that he was against the new agricultural measures. Where they realised that they could not do the job properly or even understand, they relied on their councillors. At Native Authority Council Meetings most chiefs were unable to follow discussions especially when Estimates and Expenditure were brought up. They relied on

---

1. Nsoka, M. and Shipekwa, G.

their councillors. At Native Authority Council Meetings most chiefs were unable to follow discussions especially when Estimates and Expenditure were brought up. They relied on their councillors to interpret to them afterwards. They also relied on educated councillors to execute development projects.

On the other hand, however, like the educated councillors District officers realised the chiefs' hold over the people. If they wanted any development to be effected they had to have the chiefs' support.

The aim of the policy of 'indirect rule' was to administer the people through their own indigenous institutions. Our survey of the Native system among the Lenje reveals that there 'indirect rule' cannot be thus simply defined. The chief and other indigenous office holders - the headmen, the councillors, the assessors - were important members in the system. But the indigenous leaders could not function without colonial officers and educated councillors. On the other hand, colonial officers and departmental councillors could not execute their duties unless they worked through the indigenous leaders. Therefore, all the forces represented by these groups - the indigenous institutions, Central Government, the emerging middle class - were equally important. The Native Authority system as it operated among the Lenje was an interdependence of all the three groups.

In the same way change and continuity in the indigenous system must be seen both as a result of the colonial policy (which was dictated by political, economic and social developments) and an interaction and reactions of the above forces.

The need to use Native Authorities as instruments of local

government and to sublimate the political aspirations of educated and widely travelled men led to the inclusion of these men in the Native Authorities. Thus the system came to incorporate not only the indigenous leaders and Central Government representatives but educated departmental and elected councillors as well. The functions of the chiefs also took on new dimensions. As leading members of the Native Authority and leaders of their people they were charged with local government functions. But we have noted that in actual fact colonial officers and departmental councillors executed these duties more than the chiefs did.

In accordance with the policy of 'indirect rule', indigenous institutions were recognised as important parts of the system. Chiefs, headmen, and elders became Native Authorities and court Presidents and assessors. As Native Authorities, they could legislate and make decisions. Chiefs and headmen could also allocate land in their areas. Therefore although the nature of what they could legislate and make decisions about changed, chiefs, headmen and elders enjoyed these prerogatives once more. The institution of chiefship continued to enjoy the faith of the people and chiefs' efforts were directed towards ensuring their continued influence among the people. Although Government did not acknowledge the office of the priest in the political organisation and inspite of Christian success, most people still appealed to ritual in times of stress.[1] The chief continued to perform his

---

1. In 1950 there was shortage of rain in Fulenje. A rain-making ceremony was held at Chitanda's grove: Muntemba, S.B.

ritual functions. Under this period the office of senior chief was also recreated. The most imprtant criterion in determining seniority was, as in pre-colonial days, primogeniture. Chitanda became the Senior Chief.

The policy of 'indirect rule' allowed other indigenous offices to continue functioning. Kaca continued to function as councillors.[1] After 1948 they became unofficial members of the Council. Within the system, as already said, the institution of the headman was allowed to continue. Some of these were members of the Native Authority Council. Those who were not, administered their people on the village level. It appears from my sources that the word Baloba had fallen out of use by this period. But the one-time Baloba may have continued to function as headmen and councillors. The functions of Balanse were taken over by Kapasus who not only acted as court constables but as messengers between the chief and Native Authority Council Headquarters. The chief's political and personal adviser, Mukatamweene, also continued to function.[2]

Most people still believed in divine chieftainship. Chiefs were still buried and installed with the old attendant ceremonies.[3] Depsite Christian advance, people still appealed to old religion in times of distress. Chipyeela, therefore, continued to function.

---

1. Broken Hill District Notebook. KDA4/1. N.A.Z.

2. In 1956 Mukatamweene was living in chief Chitanda's capital village. Personal observation.

3. Muntemba, S.B. who was present at Chitanda Lewanika's burial in 1949 and Chitanda Semu's installation in 1950.

ii) The Leya

When the Native Authority system was introduced, chief Mukuni was declared a Subordinate Native Authority. The Authority was composed of Mukuni himself and four paid councillors[1] one of whom was the indigenous Ngambela.[2]

Chief Mukuni was also President of his court. There were some assessors, drawn from the old Babetesi.[3] The chief did not employ a clerk but recorded the cases himself.[4]

In 1936 the Native Treasury Ordinance was passed. Chief Mukuni could not establish a treasury of his own neither could the other chiefs in the Livingstone District. The Toka/Leya (sometimes appearing as Tonga/Leya) Superior Native Authority was formed in 1937. It ran the Treasury. The Toka/Leya Tribal council-comprising the six Toka/Leya chiefs, their councillors, headmen, elders and any who might wish to attend - constituted the Superior Native Authority. The Superior Native Authority did not have a permanent Chairman or President. (The Chairman was chosen by secret ballot at each Superior Native Authority meeting). But it was clear to all the chiefs that District

---

1. Native Authorities, Livingstone 1937-1947: File 50/39. N.A.Z.

2. In 1944 Ngambela Nzala wrote from Mukuni's court to the Lozi Litunga informing the latter of chief Mukuni, Siamakoka's death in 1943: Livingstone District Notebook. KSC3/1. N.A.Z.
The term Mweendelezi we Cisi was completely out of usage by now.

3. Chief Mukuni and Ngambela.

4. District Commissioner to Provincial Commissioner, 1933. KDB1/5/8/3. N.A.Z.

officers considered Musokotwani the most important Toka/Leya chief, a point which the officers based on Musokotwani's bigger geographical area and population.[1] The Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority started to effect some development programmes soon after the inception of Native Treasuries. In 1939 a Native Authority dispensary and in 1940 a school were built. On the officers' suggestion both were built at chief Musokotwani's capital. In 1946 Native Treasury offices were moved from Livingstone to Musokotwani's capital.

In 1937, too, the District Commissioner suggested that chief Katapazi should be declared Mukuni's sub-chief and be administered through the latter's Subordinate Authority. Katapazi, a cousin of chief Sekute, had moved eastwards in search of land in the nineteenth century. Although he was also Leya and geographically closer to Mukuni than Sekute, he acknowledged the latter as his overlord and despite the fact that eventually he was regarded as an independent chief, he and his people still acknowledged Sekute.[2]

He and his councillors did not accept to be placed under Mukuni. Nonetheless, he was declared Mukuni's sub-chief. But he continued to be President of his court until 1949 and to administer his area until 1951 when his area was merged into Mukuni's.

---

1. Native Authorities, Tonga-Leya Council Meetings. N/1102/1. By the same criterion Musokotwani was receiving a Government subsidy of £66 per annum while Mukuni was getting £42.

2. Katapazi and four headmen. Tape in L.M.

Meanwhile, in 1946 four southern Kalomo chiefs were transferred from Kalomo to Livingstone District. They became members of the Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority. In 1948 in accordance with the Native Authority re-organisation postulations, recognition of Subordinate Native Authorities was withdrawn. The Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority Council was to be composed of the ten chiefs, four departmental councillors and five progressives who were chosen by the District Commissioner. Musokotwani was chosen permanent President. However, the District Commissioner reported in 1949 that the Authority Council could not get enough educated councillors. It could only get two departmental councillors. In view of this more indigenous councillors were brought back on the Council.[1] But by 1950 four departmental councillors had been co-opted on to the Council. By 1953 the Superior Native Authority Council was composed of nine chiefs (the Katapazi chieftaincy was abolished in 1951), four departmental councillors, five educated councillors and some indigenous councillors who were also court assessors.

The Superior Native Authority constituted the Appeal Court. In 1950 Livingstone Rural had been moved into Kalomo District. The Superior Native Authority Headquarters was established at Zimba, forty-seven miles north of Livingstone. Council houses were put up there and the Treasury was moved from Musokotwani's village to Zimba in 1951.

As an instrument of local government, the Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority was charged with some development functions.

---

1. Native Authorities, Tonga-Leya Council Meetings. N/1102/1. N.A.Z.

The Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority was not rich,[1] but, as mentioned above, the Authority built a dispensary in 1939 and a school in 1940. In 1953 the Department of Water Development and Irrigation built weirs in the district. As a legislative body, the Superior Native Authority was strong.[2] In 1949 rules on registration of marriages, regular attendance of school and constitution of villages were formulated and put into effect.[3] In 1951 Public Services Rates Rules were postulated and applied.[4]

While the Superior Native Authority was the overall governing body, each chief was expected to administer and execute the functions of a local government in his area. It seems that even before the Superior Native Authority was formed, the Leya chief appreciated his functions in the new system. The Leya were fortunate in that their association with the Lozi had brought them into contact with formal education at an early stage. They were therefore able to understand and execute some of the functions of a local government. Mukuni Siamacoka who ruled from 1922-1943 had received his education at Nangoma in Nalolo, Barotseland.[5]

---

1. Hailey. Lord, 1950. Native Administration in British Tropical Africa, Part II. 116-117.

2. In 1949 the District Commissioner reported that the Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority was weak administratively, but strong as a legislative body: Native Authorities, Tonga-Leya Council Meetings. N/1102/1. N.A.Z.

3. Native Authorities, Tonga-Leya Council Meetings. N/1102/1. N.A.Z.

4. Ibid.

5. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC3/1. N.A.Z.

In 1932 the District Commissioner singled him out as the only chief who was capable and intelligent enough to perform the functions of a local government.[1] The chief was also efficient enough to record all his cases.

In 1943 Mukuni Siamacoka died. Siloka was installed as Mukuni, Siloka II. Like Mukuni Siamacoka, Mukuni Siloka II had gone to school. He had lived away from home for many years until when he was installed chief. From 1926-1936 he had worked for Messrs. Creed and Co. Ltd. in Livingstone.[2] From 1937-1943 he had worked as Treasury clerk for Guimbi Tonga Treasury in the valley.[3] Thus he could understand government policies. He also appreciated and encouraged development in his area. In 1950, for instance, the chief asked the boma to build a dam and sink some wells in his area. While the District Commissioner was sympathetic to this request, there was not enough money to sink the number of wells stipulated nor to build a dam. The Authority could only sink three wells. Consequently, the chief, certain that he could get his people's support, asked them to help the boma and Authority. Six wells were dug as self-help schemes in answer to the chief's call.[4] Three weirs were finally built by the Authority in 1953.[5] In education the chief without giving

---

1. District Commissioner to Provincial Commissioner, 1932. KDB1/5/8/3. N.A.Z.

2. Mukuni Papers. Capital village. Although he worked as shpkeeper, his life in Livingstone town brought him in contact with progressive ideas.

3. Mukuni Papers. Capital village.

4. Chief Mukuni and Ngambela.

5. Kalomo District Notebook. KSP3/1. N.A.Z.

offence, talked to the headmen and elders about the need to send their children to school. As a result, most people sent their children to school. The chief then turned to the District Commissioner and Education councillor and pointed out that since the people were eager to send their children to school, he could not afford to frustrate them through lack of enough schools. In order not to frustrate people's eager responses to development projects, it was necessary that another school be established for them. Kayuni school to the east of the capital was built as a result of this request.[1] Mukuni, too, took an active part in Treasury work which the Treasury clerk could not do efficiently.[2] District Commissioners often commended the chief as an intelligent,capable administrator.[3] Because Mukuni could himself execute the functions, the District Commissioner did not pose a threat to his authority by executing the functions himself or by depending more on departmental councillors.

The chief did not feel any threat from the departmental councillors either. When educated 'commoner' councillors were first co-opted on to Council in 1948, the Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority could employ two only. They were only able to

---

1. Chief Mukuni and Ngambela.

2. Hailey, Lord. 1950 Native Administration in British Tropical Africa, Part II. 116.

3. Native Authorities, Livingstone, 1937-1947. File No.50/39. N.A.Z. ;
Native Authorities, Southern Province. N/1101/ N.A.Z.
Chief Mukuni was reported as being inefficient in administering chief Katapazi's former area. This was probably the case because Katapazi's people would not transfer their allegience. Mukuni himself would not impose his authority over people whose loyalty he had never enjoyed.

employ four in 1950. The chief himself appreciated local government functions and could execute some. Thus both he and departmental councillors stood for the same interests. After the initial distrust (primarily because all came from Musokotwani's and Sekute's areas), chief Mukuni worked well with the councillors.[1] The chief also realised that his demands could meet with more favour on the Council if he had the backing of departmental councillors. Departmental councillors realised that they could only work with the chief's support.

It must be mentioned that the chief was able to execute the functions of a local government also because of his status in Leya society which precluded any resentment being directed against him as he pushed development projects. It would appear that the chief did not play a major role in securing the influence over his people. My researches have only revealed minor incidents in the early stages of the inception of the Native Authority system. It seems that at this stage the chief was not sure of Government intentions. It is said that sometimes when the District Commissioner sent for him Mukuni did not hurry to answer to the Commissioner's orders. At times he went as far as Maramba river, about four miles from Livingstone, and then he sent his Kapasus to ask the District Commissioner to come and meet him there. At other times the chief openly challenged the messenger to take word to the District Commissioner that as chief, he could not go to the boma and that the Commissioner

---

1. Mufaya and Mutema, A.

or one of his junior officers should go to him.[1] All these were efforts to impress his people that he and not the District Commissioner was the big man in his area. But chief Mukuni soon realised that as long as he performed his duties, there was no threat to his authority from Government officers. Thereafter, whenever the District Commissioner or any other Government officer visited his area, the chief gave him all the respect and good reception befitting an important visitor.[2]

It seems that the Native Authority organisation worked to the chief's advantage. When the Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority was established, Mukuni had to form government with some of his age-old political enemies. We have seen how in pre-colonial days there had been fights between Mukuni and Sekute. In 1921 Mukuni lost some of his lands and people to Sekute. Yet now he had to share his powers with Sekute and his councillors. The people were reminded of their old enemities Chief Mukuni was not on better terms with chief Musokotwani either. The preference for the latter as the most important Toka/Leya chief turned Musokotwani into Mukuni's enemy. Chief Mukuni felt that since both Musokotwani and Sekute were late arrivals to the area and he, Mukuni, was literate while others were not, he was more entitled to seniority.[3] To the Leya

---

1. Chief Mukuni and Ngambela.

2. Ibid.

3. Although the Toka and Sekute Leya do not agree, the Leya believe that Musokotwani and Sekute were later arrivals to the area: Chief Mukuni, Siloka II: "History of the Leya People." L.M.;
Chief Mukuni, Siloka II and Mukemu. Tape in L.M.

Musokotwani's senior position was viewed as yet another encroachment in their history of raids, subjection and humiliation. Therefore while welcoming their indigenous leaders' powers, most Leya were persuaded to look at the Toka and Sekute Leya with disfavour.[1] They banded themselves behind their chief. When the Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority finally got departmental councillors, two were Toka while the other two were Sekute Leya. This encouraged a spirit of oneness among the Leya while it made the chief view the councillors not as rivals who might try to win the people's loyalty from him.

It appears that chief Mukuni did not face much threat from other educated groups or from a growth of individualism among his people. As far back as 1915 the Native Commissioner had reported that individualism was developing in Livingstone District and that the whole system of tribal control was collapsing due to European, Bemba, Yao, Tonga and Lozi influence.[2] In 1933 the District Commissioner Livingstone reported. "Chief Mukuni's task yearly becomes more difficult as the villages near the town of Livingstone become more and more sophisticated and detribalised Natives from the town visiting these areas over the week-end increase in number."[3] However, the actual number of Leya affected by these developments was not staggering. Chances of economic growth which often leads to individualism were not many in Buleya. The soil is not rich in most of Buleya. Not many

---

1. Chief Mukuni and Ngambela.

2. Annual Report, 1914-15. Batoka Province, Livingstone District. ZA7/1/2/3. N.A.Z.

3. Tour Report No. 6 of 1933. KSC6/3/1. N.A.Z.

people could benefit through farming. There were not many industries in the area, the Saw Mills being the major employer. In 1939, it was reported that most of the jobs there were applied for by the Lozi from Barotseland.[1] There were not many settler farms in the area, thereby cutting down job apportunities and minimising settler influences. In 1950 only sixty-nine individual dwellers were recorded in the Toka/Leya Native Authority area. The number rose to one hundred and nine in 1951.[2] That there were few educated or progressive people who did not hold much influence over the chiefs or people is reflected in the fact that chiefs here could ban two educated councillors who were active in African National Congress activities in 1952.[3] That the middle class was in a weak position can also be seen in the fact that District officers could afford to back chiefs against members of the middle class. In 1953 chiefs, with District officers' backing, banned African National Congress from the Toka/Leya Native Authority area. There was no sharp reaction from the people.[4]

It seems that the Leya did not suffer many pressures as a result of missionary activities. Although the Universities' Mission, the Church of Christ and the Parish Missionary Society

---

1. Native Affairs Annual Report for the year 1939. VIII.N.R.G. 195/54. L.M.

2. Kalomo District Notebook Vol.1. KSP3/1. N.A.Z.

3. African Affairs Annual Report for the year 1952. 346/35. L.M.

4. Native Authority, Tonga-Leya Council Meetings. N/1102/1. N.A.Z.

had been operating in the area for some time now,[1] their activities were largely confined to within the town of Livingstone and rural areas to the west and north. When I interviewed Be-Dyango in 1968, she admitted that Christianity was adding to the declension of ritual fervour among the Leya.[2] But both she and chief Mukuni attributed this to the spread of the Watch Tower Sect in the area. The Sect had swept through most of Northern Rhodesia in the early 1930's. However, the Provincial Commissioner, Southern Province, reported that the Sect had not made many adherents in the Province.[3] Throughout the 1940's there were no reports of Watch Tower penetration in the area. Ritual continued to appeal to most people in Buleya. Furthermore, irrigation schemes only started to be effected in 1950. Until then, and in most cases even after then, people continued to resort to ritual to ensure the coming of the rains and a good harvest. Therefore, the chief continued to carry out his ritual functions in Leya society. That he was able to do so enhanced the people's faith in the institution of chiefship.

Among the Leya 'indirect rule' may be said to have been applied. The chief here was in a position - due to his ability and status he continued to hold among his people - to carry out the functions of a local government. The chief was also able to

---

1. Since 1889 for the Parish Missionary Society (at Kazungula, forty-seven miles west of Livingstone); 1910 for the Universities Mission (in Livingstone town); 1923 for the Church of Christ (at Sinde, chief Musokotwani's area): Rotberg, R.I. 1965. Christian Missionaries and the Creation of Northern Rhodesia.

2. Priestess Be-Dyango. Tape in L.M.

3. Native Affairs Annual Report for the year 1935. VIII. N.R.G. 192/54. L.M.

administer his people effectively. He depended on District officers and departmental councillors in so far as he realised that their support with regard to Central Government and the Superior Native Authority was necessary. As much as possible, District officers and departmental councillors worked through him.

Inspite of his status in the Leya society, however, tthe chief was still subjected to the developments of the period. In 1937 Mukuni formed government with other chiefs. The Superior Native Authority became the overall legislative and decision-making body. What rules and orders he wished for his area had to be approved by the Superior Native Authority. After 1948 he formed government not only with other chiefs and their indigenous councillors but with educated 'commoner' councillors. He also became an agent of the Superior Native Authority although he could still make requests for his area. His functions, too, took on new dimensions. In line with modern local government functions, the chief executed new forms of duties: seing that people sent their children to school, that schools were built, that weirs and wells were dug. Mukuni was also expected to tour his area to see that people repaired their houses, kept their villages clean, dug pit latrines which duty(of touring) he was not eager to carry out.[1]

---

1. In 1949 the District Commissioner complained that although chief Mukuni was an intelligent and capable administrator, he did not tour his area often enough: Native Athority, Southern Province. N/1101. N.A.Z.
To the chief and people it was below the chief's dignity for *him to leave his capital village and go on tours to execute* the types of duties he was expected to: Ngambela and councillors.

To these changes was added the change we first noted under Company Administration viz divorcing ritual from politics. Hence inspite of being based on the indigenous structure, the new system did not incorporate the office of the priestess.

Despite the change to the Leya political system, the policy of 'indirect rule' allowed for some continuity in the system. As a Subordinate Native Authority and, later, member of the Superior Native Authority, the chief exercised some legislative and decision-making powers. Over his own people, he was the undisputed leader and was the chief administrator. As President of the court, he played a leading role in the judiciary. He could also allocate land. We have observed that inspite of divorcing ritual from politics and of Chritian advance, ritual was still important to the people. The chief continued to perform his ritual functions.

The policy of 'indirect rule' also allowed other indigenous offices to continue functioning. Mweendelezi we Cisi, now appearing in writing simply as Ngambela,[1] continued to be the chief's adviser and to perform legislative (as member of the Authority Council) and judicial duties. Babetesi who had been the country's judges functioned as court assessors. The headmen who were responsible for the welfare of the people and development programmes at village level continued to perform their administrative and executive duties. Some served on the Authority as councillors while others held the rank of Babetesi. They could also allocate land.

Ritual was still important to the people. The priestess continued to carry out her futies. Although her office was not incorporated into the new political system, both the chief and

---

1. Livingstone District Notebook. KSC4/1. N.A.Z.

other office holders consulted her even over political and judicial matters.[1] Chief Mukuni Siloka II informed me in 1968 that allocation of land to strangers was still Se-Dyango's prerogative.[2] Headmen and others who came to see the chief about certain problems still went to see Nyambela and the priestess before proceeding to the chief.[3]

In 1968 too I witnessed some headmen come to report some births and deaths to her. She was still the key figure in questions of succession to the chieftaincy.[4] We noted when we discussed the institutions under Company rule that Kavwimi stopped hunting for tribute to Sulozi but that they continued to hunt for the chief and also that their function as defenders of the country together with Kayasani had, by force of circumstances, ceased. Now, however, they no longer hunted for the chief as Government discouraged any form of forced labour. They and Kayasani concentrated on ritual only. They were no longer known as Kavwimi or Kayasani but as Kasilombelombe, a name which developed during Company days. However, even Kasilombelombe did not exist as an institution now. Any young man in a village at the time of the ceremony could volunteer himself to become a Musilombelombe (singular of Kasilombelombe).

Thus out of the eight offices which had functioned in pre-colonial days, five continued to function. Natamoyo (who became

---

1. Chief Mukuni, Siloka II. Tape in L.M.
2. Ibid.
3. Personal observation.
4. Following the death of Mukuni, Siloka II in 1971 there was a deadlock as Se-Dyango, for reasons connected with Leya succession rules, refused to accept the candidate and would therefore not perform the installation rites.

non-functional in Company days), Bayasani and Bavwimi by force of circumstances became non-functional.

iii) The Tonga

Government felt that in order for the policy of 'indirect rule' to work effectively, it was important to build a solid "tribal organisation" and to consolidate indigenous political institutions. It was necessary to establish as far as possible indigenous chiefs whose authority the people might not dispute. On the plateau chief Monze was asked to help ascertain the rightful chiefs.[1] The chief toured the whole plateau in order to fulfil the task. He was accompanied by some District officers. As far as possible Monze tried to establish the rightful chiefs. But this was not easier now than it had been for Company administrators. In point of fact the Company had acknowledged more chiefs than the new Government was prepared to accept. The result was that while most indigenous chiefs like Mwanacingwala, Siamusonde, Chongo were reinstated as chiefs, others like Chona were left out. Chona became a headman under chief Mwanza. He was made chief in 1936. Some lost their chieftaincies altogether. But even where the chieftaincies were re-established, these did not always go to the rightful lines.[2] Altogether, twenty-three chiefs were recognised.[3]

---

1. Native Affairs 1924-1928. KSB1/7/1. N.A.Z.

2. In 1942 Matyam Simwinga and Hamatoka wrote to the District Commissioner, the former complaining that Monze had overlooked his chieftaincy; the latter that his was the rightful line to the Mwanza chieftaincy: Native Authority, General, 1938-1948. 8/17/4R. N.A.Z.

3. Native Authority and Native Courts, 1928-1935 ZA1/9/27/5. N.A.Z.

In the valley Government officers decided which chiefs should be recognised. Out of figty-five chieftaincies, seventeen were recognised.[1]

Following the Native Authority Ordinance, 1929 most chiefs on the plateau and in the valley were declared Subordinate Native Authorities. Each Subordinate Native Authority was composed of a chief and two gazetted councillers. Each Subordinate Native Authority had a court. The chief was its President. Assessors were picked from among the headmen. Chiefs Monze, Mapanza, Singani and a Council of chiefs from around their area constituted the Superior Native Authorities on the plateau. In the valley chiefs Chipepo, Mweemba and a Council of chiefs costituted the Superior Native Authorities.[2] After the Native Authority Ordinance, 1936 the Tonga Superior Native Authority was formed. The Tribal Council - a composition of all the Plateau and Valley Tonga chiefs, their councillors and other headmen or elders - constituted the Tonga Superior Native Authority. The Superior Native Authority did not have a permanent chairman. The Chairman was chosen at each Native Authority Council meeting. The Superior Native Authority also served as an Appeal Court. However, two Treasuries were created: one for the Plateau Tonga and one for the Valley Tonga. Each Treasury employed its own clerk.

The system of one Superior Native Authority for all the Tonga was found too cumbersome. The distances were too vast for people to get to the Superior Native Authority meetings. The composition

---

1. Native Authorities and Native Courts, 1928-1935 ZA1/9/27/5. N.A.Z.

2. Native Authorities and Native Courts, 1928-1935. ZA1/9/27/5 N.A.Z.

was also too large. In 1945 the Chief Secretary laid out the lines for Provincial Native Authority re-organisation in the Southern Province.[1] In the first place, administrative changes were to take place. Kalomo sub-district was to become part of the Livingstone District. Hence the four southern Kalomo chiefs were moved into the Livingstone District and formed part of the Toka/Leya Superior Native Authority. The other Plateau Tonga chiefs were to be administered from the Mazabuka District while the Valley Tonga chiefs were to form their own District, Gwembe. These directives came into effect in 1946.[2] The composition of Superior Authorities were also laid out. The Plateau Tonga chiefs in Mazabuka District were to form their own Plateau Tonga Superior Native Authority while those in the valley were to form their own Valley Tonga Superior Native Authority. All the chiefs with two councillors each were to constitute the Superior Native Authority. Councillors were to be chosen by all the headmen in a chief's area. These directives were also effected in 1946.[3] No chief was declared permanent Chairman on the plateau. The Chairman was chosen by secret ballot at each meeting. In the valley, however, chief Chipepo was elected President as "first in importance among seven practically co-equal chiefs".[4] Each Superior Native Authority had its own Treasury.

The Superior Native Authority also constituted the Tribal Court where chiefs and councillors could be tried and an Appeal Court where courts under the jurisdiction of Subordinate Native

---

1. District Circular No.15 of 1945. N/0901. N.A.Z.
2. Native Authorities, General, 1943-1954. NAT/A/1. N.A.Z.
3. Ibid
4. Ibid.

Authorities could appeal.

In 1948 the Tonga Superior Native Authorities were subjected to the Native Authority re-organisation taking place all over the country. Recognition of Subordinate Native Authorities was withdrawn and chiefs became agents of the Superior Native Authorities. Superior Native Authorities were to be composed of chiefs, five nominted councillors and departmental councillors in charge of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Development; Education and Health; Veretinary, Game and Fisheries; Communications and Buildings. Although no official provision was made for the inclusion of indigenous councillors on the Superior Native Authority Council, such councillors could sit on the Council not as paid councillors but as paid court assessors.

In 1948 the Plateau Tonga Native Authority had for its members and employees the four departmental and five progressive councillors. By 1949 the Valley Tonga Native Authority could only co-opt two departmental councillors, for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Development and for Communications and Buildings. In 1950 a third councillor for Education and Health joined the Council. In 1951 the Authority was able to co-opt three elected councillors. In 1953 it employed its Veterinary, Game and Fisheries Department councillor.

In the meantime some chieftaincies had been abolished. On the plateau six chieftaincies were abolished and two others recreated.[1] More abolitions were effected in the valley. In

---

1. Native Authorities and Native Courts: 1928-1935. ZA1/9/27/5. N.A.Z.;
Native Authorities. SEC/NAT/89. N.A.Z.

order to strengthen the Native Authority system in 1936 the number of chiefs was brought down from seventeen to thirteen.[1] In 1940 four chiefs: mulindi, Siameja, Siampondo and Simakoba were deprived of their courts.[2] In 1946 only seven chiefs were recognised as Subordinate Native Authorities and held courts.[3]

In 1953, then, the Plateau Tonga Native Authority Council consisted of sixteen chiefs, (some Plateau Tonga chiefs were in Kalomo District) four departmental councillors, five progressive and assessors. Seven chiefs, four departmental councillors, three elected councillors and assessors composed the Valley Tonga Superior Native Authority Council.

Native Authorities were charged with the responsibilities of executing the functions of a local government and of administering their people.

As a local government the Tonga Superior Native Authority does not seem to have been very effective before the creation of two separate Superior Native Authorities and the inclusion of educated councillors on the Council. As legislative bodies both Superior Native Authorities seemed to have been effective. In 1950, for instance, the Plateau Tonga Superior Native Authority passed some Forestry rules to avoid soil erosion and some levy rates rules (two shillings for every tax-paying male).[4]

---

1. Gwembe District Notebook. KTE2/1. N.A.Z.
2. Native Authorities General, 1938-1948 8/17/4R. N.A.Z.
3. Gwembe District Notebook. KTE2/1. N.A.Z.
4. Native Authority Rules and Orders, Southern Province. 8/11/1R. N.A.Z.

The Valley Tonga Superior Native Authority passed the Communal Granary and Compulsory Cultivation of Cassava Orders.[1] In 1952 the Valley Tonga Native Authority organised labour and supervision on the remaining roads in the District. (The roads were by then called Native Authority roads).[2] On the plateau the departments of Agriculture, Education and Communications were commended for the good job.[3] In the valley, that of Communications was quite effective.[4] The Superior Native Authorities also gave financial assistance to Government for work being done in their areas. The Plateau Tonga Native Treasury was the richest outside Barotseland.[5] From 1947 the Treasury was contributing funds to the work of Government departments operating in the area; it paid for school attendance officers who at the time were controlled by the Jeanes College teachers; was providing bursaries; paid for the services managed by the Authority itself for example, the maintenace of roads; paid salaries of land and veterinary messengers; paid for the building and maintenance of court houses.[6] The

---

1. Native Authority Rules and Orders, Southern Province. 8/11/1R. N.A.Z.;
   Under the Communal Granary Order every adult had to contribute two four-gallon bins of grain to the communal granary. This was to be dished out to the people at times of famine.
   Under the Compulsory Cultivation of Cassava Order every adult was to plant fifty cuttings of cassava each year. Headmen were to supervise this.

2. Gwembe District Notebook. KTE 2/1. N.A.Z.

3. Plateau Tonga Native Authority, General. 11/8/3F. N.A.Z.;
   The first departmental councillor for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Development recalls how eagerly people responded to instructions from Agricultural assistants: Kazoka, W.

4. Native Authorities, Gwembe Reports, 1935-1958. N/1104/6

5. Administrative Conference of P.C.'s 1938-1950 Vol.II.N.A.Z.

6. Native Authorities, General,1943-1954 NAT/A/1. N.A.Z.

Valley Tonga Treasury was not as rich as the one on the plateau. but by 1947 it could also pay for school attendance officers. It gave financial assistance to Government departments and missionaries to maintain the schools. It paid for its own court houses.[1]

This notable change in the effectiveness of Native Authorities as instruments of local government is a reflection on the status of chiefs in Tonga society. Reasons for the chiefs' inability to execute their duties do not only lie in the fact that chiefs were uneducated or that they were conservative but that often people igonored them. The reasons for the people's attitudes to their chiefs are found in the history of chieftaincies among the Tonga. Here, more chieftaincies were abolished during this period and, from the people's point of view, some of the declared chiefs did not represent the rightful lines. The non-recognised chiefs and their people were not prepared to transfer their loyalties to the new chiefs. On the plateau the people's suspicions for most of the newly appointed chiefs were worsened by the nature of the appointments. That Monze went round with Government officers made people question the sincerity of the new chiefs whom they considered as Government appointees. The phrase "box chiefs" (box because of the small boxes containing letters of appointment) which the plateau Tonga used when referring to their chiefs shows the opinion people had of their chiefs.[2] In the valley chiefs who were deprived of their authority adopted a hostile attitude. When an opportunity offered itself they did

---

1. Native Authorities, General, 1943-1954 NAT/A/1. N.A.Z.

2. Fr. Nchete 1971. "History of Political Institutions of the Tonga." L.M.

not hesitate to work against the recognised chiefs. In 1953, for example, Siameja joined forces with African National Congress and urged his people not to obey Native Authority rules and orders especially those regarding cassava growing and communal granaries. He urged his people to ignore the chiefs and join African National Congress.[1] For their part chiefs exerted as little authority as possible. For example, land rights were in the hands of Native Authorities. In 1935 a District officer on tour in chief Monze's area found that one-hundred and fifty people had put up individual dwellings without the permission of the headmen and thereby extracting themselves from the latter's authority. Under the Native Courts Ordinance a chief could prosecute people who thus deobeyed. The chief was advised to prosecute the people, which he did. The chief also ordered the people to move back into their villages after the harvest, which order they ignored. The chief did not push the matter further. In 1951 thirty-two people were reported to have built outside the jurisdiction of a headman in chief Siamusonde's area. District officers reminded the chief that land rights lay with chiefs and that he could prosecute the people. The chief did not prosecute. The people did not move back into their former villages neither did they build bigger villages. In the end, District messengers evicted the people. They burned their houses down. In the valley at a suggestion from disgruntled former chiefs and members of the African National Congress, many people disobeyed the Native Authority. In fact the disobedience was so wide that the Valley Tonga Native Authority called on Government

---

1. Complaints in Gwembe District, 1953-1954. N/0001/2/15/1.N.A.Z.

to come to its aid.[1] The Provincial Commissioner rushed to the valley and after discussions with the Council, it was decided that African National Congress should be banned from the area.[2]

The theme of using Government as a weapon of solving awkward situations or of soliciting obedience runs through chiefs' dealings with their people in Tongaland. Often chiefs could only get anything done by reference to the boma. "If you do not do this the boma will deal with you" or "I am only carrying out orders of the boma."[3] People obeyed because of their fear of Government.[4]

Government was aware of the Tonga chiefs' weak position. In 1936 the Provincial Commissioner addressing chiefs at Kalomo exclaimed, "many of you have made laws. These are to help your people. Are you going amongst your people to see whether they are obeying these laws?---- in my heart I sometimes think you have done nothing."[5] Thirteen years later the Provincial Commissioner wrote, "There is little doubt that the political development of the tribe of this Province lies below rather than above and that the chiefs will play an increasingly smaller part in administration in future."[6] In actual fact after 1948

---

1. Complaints in Gwembe District, 1953-1954 N/0001/2/15/1. N.A.Z.

2. Ibid.

3. Kazoka, W. and wife; Fr. Nchete;
Colson made the same observation during her researches in Tongaland: The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia. 223-225

4. Kazoka, W. and wife; Fr. Nchete.

5. Native Authorities Gwembe and Kalomo, 1932-1935 KSP1/3/1. N.A.Z.

6. Annual Report on African Affairs, Southern Province, 1949. SEC/NAT/66F.

Government officers relied more on educated councillors than chiefs.[1]

This last point brings us to the position of the members of the middle class in Tonga society. In pre-colonial days the ability to amass wealth and to defend one's neighbourhood were some of the qualities people appreciated in a leader. This emphasis on individual achievement grew as opportunities for self improvement became greater. For example, on the plateau the presence of settler farmers deprived the people of some of their best lands. But it also enabled them to learn some better methods of farming. As opportunities for self-improvement through farming grew, some people felt that they could not very well remain within their villages. At any opportunity, the plateau Tonga left their villages to go and live as individuals owning their own land and other property.[2] Again, a number of Missions set up schools on the plateau at a comparatively early period. The Tonga came to appreciate education. In 1938 the Provincial Commissioner reported that most Africans were already awakened to the value of education and that even the most non-progressive Native Authorities were pressing for schools to be opened within thier areas.[3] Most educated Africans were employed as teachers

---

1. Oliver, W.H.

2. The Keemba Hill Farming Scheme in chief Chongo's area is an example of this. The cheme was started in 1931 by some former Rusangu Mission school teachers. Upon retirement, the teachers decided not to return to their villages but to live as individual farmers. Some formed as many as one hundred and five acres and owned such property as disc ploughs, tractors, planters,drilling and grinding machines and wagons: Mazabuka District Notebook. KSB3/1. N.A.Z.

3. Native Affairs Annual Report for the year 1938. VIII N.R.G. 195/54. L.M.

Authority re-organisation, the Valley Tonga Superior Native Authority had difficulties in finding suitable men to serve as departmental councillors. In 1949, as we have seen, only two departmental councillors were employed. One is also struck by the lack of chief/councillor antagonism and suspicions in the valley.

Chiefs on the plateau were also unfortunate in that a lot of people suffered from land alienation here. Consequently, not only were people's bitterness and frustrations turned against chiefs for not protecting their lands but when a situation presented itself, they were quick to join forces with African National Congress. At the time chiefs viewed Congress as a threat to their authority while people viewed it as a promise for better things, especially good land. To the people chiefs and Congress stood for two different interests, the former for conservatism, the latter for progress and land. In the valley non-recognised chiefs and their people used Congress as a means of expressing their non-acceptance of the recognised chiefs' authority.

It must be mentioned, however, that while people rejected the authority of the chiefs and inspite of a high percentage of educated and progressives (on the plateau), they did not completely reject their indigenous institutions. Some people still obeyed their unrecognised chiefs and their old neighbourhood leaders. Inspite of the presence of so many Missions, ritual still appealed to most people.[1] Some people continued to take

---

1. Colson, E. 1962. The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia.
   ——— 1960. Social Organisation of the Gwembe Tonga.

their problems to the Sikatongo. Some took their disputes to be settled by the village and/or family elders.[1]

In Tongaland 'indirect rule' as a method of governing people through indigenous institutions worked to a very limited point. Few chiefs could administer either as traditional rulers or as modern local governments. As traditional rulers, Government often intervened on their behalf or chiefs themselves referred to Government as the source of power. As local governments, educated councillors performed the functions of a local government more than the chiefs did. Inspite of being called upon to foster indigenous institutions, Government officers found that they had to work through departmental councillors. The latter had both the skill and (on the plateau) most people indentified their sentiments(not much loyalty for the chief) and interests (progress) with theirs. African administration in Tongaland, therefore, was an interaction of the two forces: Government (officers' direct methods and reference to it by chiefs) and the middle class.

Dependence on Government and the passing of initiative into the hands of non-indigenous leaders is the most notable change to the Tonga political system. The change whereby Government and not the people became the basis of power developed in Company days. This in turn was brought about by some change to the old neighbourhood system and concept of chiefship whereby a chief would have under his jurisdiction people who never owed him

---

1. Colson, E. 1962 The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia.
   _____ 1960 Social Organisation of the Gwembe Tonga.

allegiance. Under Colonial Office this was carried to an even greater extent. More chieftaincies were abolished; a "tribal organisation" of which the newly created larger political units were components was created; chiefs were called upon to perform more legislative and administrative duties over people who would not give them their loyalty. Coupled with all these was the strong force of the middle class and growing individualism (on the plateau). Chiefs found themselves in a weak position where the people would not obey them. Thus they were more and more dependent on government. In the words of the Chief Secretary most chiefs became "little more than bureaucrats in the Government machinery", who owed their appointment and authority to Government.[1]

In the midst of all this change, however, there was some continuity. Most people who ignored the change continued to acknowledge their old neighbourhood chiefs and headmen. The latter continued to listen to their people's problems. The headmen continued to administer their people on the village level. Ritual was still important to the people. The Sikatongo continued to function.

Summary

Under Colonial Office rule the Native Authority system was operating in all the three societies. In the system people were to be administered through indigenous leaders. In the judiciary indigenous leaders were successful. Even among the Tonga where chiefs were not so revered, assessors administered justice

---

1. District Circular No.15 of 1945. N/0901. N.A.Z.

satisfactorily.[1] In other spheres of administration the success of administering the people through indigenous leaders varied according to the latter's control over their people. Among the Lenje and Leya, chiefs had still some control over the people. Government worked and could only work through indigenous leaders. Among the Tonga chiefs did not have much control over the people. Administration through indigenous leaders was not successful. Under the Native Authority system indigenous leaders had to execute some functions of modern local government. Most Lenje chiefs did not receive any formal education, some were conservative and others did not want to carry out some duties which were at variance with the people's wishes. Here, Government officers and educated councillors executed such functions. But since chiefs had the force of the people behind them, colonial offices and educated councillors worked through them. Among the Leya indigenous leaders enjoyed the respect of the people (except in the areas where the Leya chief had never exercised any authority before). The chief was also educated and could carry out some of the modern functions himself. Among the Tonga where chiefs did not have much control, much of the administration and execution of the new duties were in the hands of colonial officers and non-indigenous educated councillors. Thus although the same system was adopted in all the three societies,

---

1. In 1945 the District Officer , Kalomo remarked that assessors were the only active and capable members and that as such they should continue to sit as Native Authorities, General, 1938-1948. 8/17/4R. N.A.Z.

The people's rejection of some of the change, was as much responsible for the change and continuity in the systems as government policy. Government policy allowed indigenous institutions - those of the chief, headman, councillors, judges - to continue enjoying judicial, legislative, policy-making, administrative duties and the right to allocate land. Government policy too (dictated by political social and economic developments of this period) led indigenous leaders to share government with members of the ermerging middle class. But Tonga rejection of most of the chiefs gave more power to educated councillors and partly led to Government officers' practice of administering through them. The leaders' initiative in avoiding situations which could have betrayed the people's faith in them ensured the support of the people which was important if the political equilibrium was to be maintained. This was the case among the Lenje and the Leya. In all the three societies the people were responsible for the office of priesthood to continue functioning. Among the Tonga the people were also responsible for the unrecognised chiefs and elders to continue exerting some sort of influence. The people ignored the new leaders and took their problems and disputes to the old neighbourhood leaders.

chief was the overall authority commanding respect from his people because of the political, judicial and legistative functions he performed. The chief was also revered here because of his divine attributes. The wars and raids, shortage of rains and famine emphasised the importance of ritual. Therefore, the priestess was regarded as co-ruler with the chief. Other offices of Mweendelezi we Cisi, Babetesi, headman, Bayasani, Bavwimi and Natamoyo were also respected. Nineteenth century experiences - wars, raids and subjection - engendered a sense of oneness among the Leya and deepened the people's sense of dependence on and respect for the leaders and other office holders.

In Tongaland a more localised system with each neighbourhood enjoying its own political independence was operating. Qualities sought for in a leader emphasised individual achievement. Thus a man who was capable of amassing wealth could find himself a leader. One who was capable of defending his neighbourhood could control more than one neighbourhood. On the other hand, a chief whose fortunes ran against him lost his following. In Tongaland the chief did not have divine attributes. A chief who was ritual leader as well had the divine attributes because, as ritual leader, he possessed Basangu. He was thus more respected for his ritual than secular powers. The importance of ritual also made Basikatongo command more respect than secular leaders. Ties between the leaders and the people (except the Sikatongo) were not very strong but the people respected chiefs, headmen and elders because the latter listened to their problems, settled their disputes and ensured their happiness.

In my study I showed that the relations between the leaders and the people in pre-colonial times affected change in the political systems during the first fifty years of this century.

The British South Africa Company rule adopted the policy of 'direct rule'. By this the Administration assumed the political, judicial and legislative powers. Chiefs and headmen were the only two offices recognised by the Administration. Their duties were primarily those of helping Native Commissioners/Assistant Native Commissioners collect tax and compile census; they promulgated orders and notices made by the Administration; they acted as policemen, arrested and handed over criminals to the boma.

Our survey of the indigenous political systems in this period, however, showed that among the Lenje chiefs and headmen were still more than mere agents of Administration officers. They still decided what was good for their people; they still tried both criminal and civil cases; chiefs still fulfilled their ritual functions. Despite the fact that Chipepo was accorded a higher status by Administration, Chitanda too continued to function as a senior chief. Thus two chiefs came to be above the other chiefs. By the new policy, other indigenous offices should have been rendered non-functional. But we saw that Kaca, Baloba and Mukatamweene continued to function much as before. Chipyeela too continued to function. On the chiefs' initiative, Balanse who ceased to function as a stand-by army took on new functions

as messengers. I concluded that this was the state of administration in Bulenje because leaders themselves took an initiative to safeguard their position. At times chiefs deliberately disobeyed Administration orders, sometimes they stepped in and paid their people's taxes instead of handing them over to the boma; at other times they simulated lack of control over their people. Indigenous leaders also exploited Company constant shortage of staff to perform their duties. By adapting themselves to the new situation, especially in the judiciary, they managed to perform their duties. The good relations and faith of the people indigenous leaders had enjoyed in pre-colonial days helped to ensure the people's support who continued to refer to them more than to Administration officers. The concept of divine attributes also helped secure the people's faith in the institution of chiefship.

In Buleya the chief, headmen, Mweendelezi we Cisi and Babetesi continued to perform the political and judicial duties. The priestess too continued to function. On their own initiative, Bayasani and Bavwimi whose functions as a stand-by army and hunters for tribute ceased re-directed their energy on to ritual. Ritual continued to be of importance to the people. I showed that these offices functioned as they did more so because of the common people's reaction than the leaders' initiative. My researches revealed one incident only in early Company days when the chief and other leaders decided what steps to take in order to avoid losing the faith of the people. I concluded that the nineteenth century experiences made the Leya look at twentieth century developments as more incidents in their series of subjection and humiliation. Their sense of oneness and

dependence on their leaders were accentuated. Administration shortage of staff left room for leaders to attend to their people and, with adaptation, they managed to perform their duties without getting themselves into trouble.

Among the Tonga we saw that newly created chiefs performed those duties stipulated by Administration only and that the basis of power for some chiefs became Administration and not the people. We saw too that alongside the recognised chiefs and headmen unrecognised chiefs and headmen of the old neighbourhoods continued to function. We noted too that Basikatongo gained more power as people who rejected the chiefs turned to them. My conclusions were that this was the case because people rejected the authority of chiefs to whom they had never owed allegiance. They rejected the idea that their neighbourhoods should relinquish their political independence. They refused to accept the ascendancy of secular over ritual powers.

Colonial Office adopted the policy of 'indirect rule'. By this Government was to administer the people through indigenous leaders. The Native Authority system was adopted in all the societies under our review. But our survey has revealed that how the system actually functioned varied. I concluded that again this was the result of the indigenous leaders' and common people's responses to the developments in that period.

In Bulenje chiefs, Kaca and headmen executed legislative and judicial duties. They also allocated land. But the mordern functions were carried out by Government officers and departmental councillors. This was the case because chiefs did

not receive formal education. This was also the case because indigenous leaders realised that their people did not welcome some of the new demands like sending their children to school or cultivating their fields according to the new methods of agriculture. Chiefs and headmen also realised that some of the new duties, for example inspecting villages and people's houses and urging people to dig pit latrines, were not only beneath their dignity but could also make them unpopular. They decided not to undertake such duties. They left them to educated councillors and touring District officers. Thus while indigenous leade s performed the functions which were not at variance with the people's wishes, colonial officers and departmental councillors fulfilled the others. I concluded that because of the force of the people behind indigenous leaders and the ability of the other two and also because chiefs could use the other two to avoid executing undesirable functions, each of the three forces was as important as the other in the Native Authority system in Sulenje. But we also saw that alongside their secular functions, chiefs still fulfilled their ritual functions. This was because the people rejected the idea of divorcing the concept of divine attributes from chiefship. The people too found that Christianity could not give them adequate answers in time of stress. At such times they resorted to ritual. Chipyeela continued to function.

Among the Leya, I concluded that administration was in the hands of indigenous leaders. The Native Authority system incorporated the chief, Nyambela, headmen and Batetesi (and

the priestess in her capacity as political adviser). We noted that these office holders executed their judicial and legislative duties. They also allocated land. The chief and Ngamzela had both received formal education. Therefore they were in a position to appreciate and execute the functions of modern local government. Because the chief still controlled his people, this was not difficult to achieve. That the chief both controlled his people and could execute his functions meant that departmental councillors had to work through him and with him. In fact, sources reveal that the chief executed local government functions more than the departmental councillors did. Because of his status and ability too, District officers worked through him. We noted too that as much for his secular functions people revered the chief because of the divine attributes they still associated with chiefship. Ritual was still important to the people too. Thus the chief and the priestess continued to perform their ritual functions.

In Tongaland administration was in the hands of Government officers and educated councillors. Chiefs did not have much control over their people. I found reasons for this in the history of chieftainships and sense of individual achievement among the Tonga. Chiefs were placed over people who had never owed them loyalty. The latter therefore rejected the authority of such chiefs. Further, the non-recognised chief did not accept the control of the other men. On the plateau there were also opportunities for economic progress. People sought out educated councillors because they/realised their weak position and asserted themselves as little as possible. The people's rejection

associated chiefs with backwardness. Chiefs

of the chiefs made the latter turn to Government as their source of power. Since some owed their appointment and authority to Government, most Tonga chiefs could only perform the duties with Government backing. They became more as Government civil servants than leaders of their people. I found too that people's rejection of the chiefs did not only lead to the transfer of power into "commoner" hands but also made people turn more to Basikatonga. This and the continued belief in ritual made the office of Basikatonga continue to function.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III (1)

List of chiefs, 1930[1]

i) Lenje

Chamuka

Chipepo

Chitanda

Kapalamoto

Kapandula

Kas nkomona

Liteta

Mukonka

Mukubwe

Mungule

Mulando

Ntitima

ii) Plateau Tonga.

Chikanta

Chisuwo

Chongo

Mapanza

Monze

Moyo

Mulindi

Mwanacingwala

Mwanza

---

1. Native Authorities and Native Courts, 1928-1935. ZA1/1/9/27/5. N.A.Z.

Namuswa

Namuzoka

Naluama

Sianjalika

Siabunkululu

Siachitema

Siakwale

Siamusonde

Siasikabole

Simaunda

Simonga

Simwatacela

Singani

Siowi

iii) Valley Tonga

Chiabi

Chipepo

Monga

Munyumbwe

Mweemba

Siabumbene

Siachobe

Siameja

Siandombosia

Siamkoba

Sianyunga

Sichulu

Sigongo

Simamba

Sinachilomba

Sinafwala

Sinazongwe

APPENDIX TO CHART A III. (2)

List of chiefs, 1953[1]

i) Lenje

Chamuka

Chipepo

Chitanda

Liteta

Mukubwe

Mungule

ii) Plateau Tonga

Chikanta (Kalomo District)

Chona

Chongo

Macha

Mapanza

Monze

Moyo

Mwanacingwala

Mwanza

Mwenda

Naluama

---

1. Native Authorities. SEC/NAT/89. N.A.Z.

Siachitema (Kalomo District)

Siamaundu

Siamusonde

Sianjalika

Simuyobe

Simwatacela (Kalomo District)

Singani

Ufwenuka

iii) Valley Tonga

Chipepo

Munyumbwe

Mweemba

Sigongo

Simamba

Sinandabwe

Sinazongwe

GLOSSARY

i) Lenje

Baloba	Royal headmen or elders
Balanse	Stand-by army and royal hunters
Chipyeela	Priest
Kaca	Chief minister
Mukatamweene	Chief's confidant

ii) Leya

Babetesi	Judges
Basilombelombe	Ritual heralds
Bavwimi	Royal hunters
Bayasani	Stand-by army
Be-Dyango	Priestess
Mweendelezi we Cisi	Chief minister
Natamoyo	Mother of mercy
Ngambela	Chief minister

iii) Tonga

Banakokalia	Royal headmen or elders
Sikatongo	Priest
Ulyanyika	Chief

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORAL SOURCES.

A. Informants

The ratio of the Lenje interviewees to the Leya and Tonga is very unbalanced. This does not mean that I was more interested in the Lenje than in the other two societies or that I had more access to them than to the others. This inbalance exists because when I started my research under the auspices of the Livingstone Museum in 1968, I was going to restrict my researches to the Lenje only. What research I did among the Leya then was purely as a means of checking my Lenje traditions.

The ages of all the informants are as they were given at the time of the interview, or the first interview in the case where more than one interview were conducted.

i) Lenje.

Bulungu — Headman. Chief Mungule. Age 65-70. Interviewed June-July, 1969.

Buunga, S. — Kapasu. Chief Chitanda. Now based at Chibombo, Chief Liteta. Age 45. Interviewed June-July, 1968; July, 1969; October, 1971; May, 1972.

Chibundi — Chief Liteta(former chief Ntitima's area). Age 60-70. Interviewed July, 1969.

Chief Chitanda — Age 50. Interviewed July, 1969; October, November, 1971.

Chitentabunga — Chief Chipepo. Age unknown. Interviewed May, 1972.

Mukonka — Headman. Chief Chitanda. Age unknown. Interviewed May and July, 1968; July, 1969; October, 1971.

Chief Mukubwe and three headmen — Ages unknown. Interviewed June, 1969.

Mulala, Rev. J.M. — Chief Mungule. Age 68. Interviewed May, 1968; June, 1969; October-November, 1971.

Mulilo, E. — Former teacher and Native Authority Councillor. Chief Liteta but originally from Mumbwa. Age 65. Interviewed November, 1971; May, 1972.

Muntemba, S.M. — Former teacher. Chief Liteta but originally from Mumbwa. Age 60. Interviewed May-July, 1968. June-July, 1969; April, 1971.

Mutakwa, S. — First Agricultural Councillor. Chief Mungule and chief Liteta. Age unknown. Interviewed May, 1969.

Muntu, A. — Chief Liteta. Age 35. Interviewed July, 1968.

Nceema — Headman. Chief Liteta. Age unknown. Interviewed June-July, 1969.

Ndoweni — Chief Liteta. Age unknown. Interviewed June-July, 1969.

Nkanga — Chief Chamuka. Age unknown. Interviewed July, 1968; July, 1969.

H. Nkwanga — Chief Liteta. Age 32. Interviewed June, 1968.

Nkwashi — Headman. Chief Liteta(formerly chief Ntitima's area). Age unknown. Interviewed June-July,

Nsoka	Headman. Chief Liteta. Age about 50. Interviewed June-July 1969; October, 1971.
Nsoka	Former boma messenger. Chief Liteta. Age about 65. Interviewed May-July, 1968; July, 1969; November, 1971; May, 1972.
Ntitima, Mrs.	Chief Liteta(formerly Ntitima's area). Age unknown. Interviewed June, 1969.
Sibalabala, J.	Former teacher. Chief Liteta but originally from chief Kasonkomona. Age 68. Interviewed June-July, 1969.
Shipekwa, G.	Former teacher and elected Native Authority Councillor. Chief Liteta but originally from chief Mukubwe's area. Age 54. Interviewed May-July, 1968; July, 1969; November, 1971; May, 1972.
Suze, S.	Chief Chamuka. Age 73. Interviewed July, 1968; June-July, 1969.

ii) Leya

Priestess Be-Dyango	Age unknown. Interviewed May, June, 1968; July, October, 1972.
Chuungwe	Chief Mukuni. Age unknown. Interviewed July, 1971.
Katapazi andfour headmen	Chief Mukuni(but unrecognised holder of the Katapazi chieftaincy). Ages unknown. Interviewed July, 1969; October, 1971.
Mufaya	First Toka/Leya Native Authority Works Councillor. Chief Sekute. Age unknown. Interviewed July, August, 1971.

Mukemu	Headman, Chief Musokotwane but member of the Mukuni chieftaincy. Age about 70. Interviewed May, 1968; August, 1969; November, December, 1972;
Mutema, A.	First Toka/Leya Native Authority Agricultural Councillor. Chief Sekute. Age unknown. Interviewed July, August, 1971.
Chief Mukuni, Siloka II	Age 60. Interviewed May, June, 1968; August, 1969.
Chief Mukuni	Age 43. Interviewed June, July, September, 1972.
Mukuni, M.	Chief Mukuni, Age unknown. Interviewed September, 1972.
Ngambela and three old men	Chief Mukuni. Ages: Ngambela about 68; others unknown but over 70. Interviewed September, 1972.
Simatele	Chief Musokotwane. Age about 65. Interviewed August, 1969; December, 1971.

iii) Tonga.

Habanyama	Kabwe. Former Valley Tonga Native Authority Works Councillor. Age 50. Interviewed May, 1972.
Habanyama and two old men	Chief Monze. Ages unknown. Interviewed August, November, 1971.
Kazoka, J.	Former Plateau Tonga Native Authority Agricultural Councillor. Chief Monze. Age 60. Interviewed May, 1972.
Kazoka, Mrs.	Chief Monze. Age 50. Interviewed May, 1972.
Chief Monze	Age 50. Interviewed August, 1971.

Chief Mweemba	Age 45. Interviewed September, 1971.
Mweemba, Sikatongo	Chief Mweemba. Age unknown. Interviewed September, 1971.
Nchete, Fr.	Mazabuka. Member of the Monze chieftaincy. Age 55. Interviewed November, 1971; May, 1972.
Nzila	Headman, chief Sigongo. Age unknown. Interviewed November, 1971.
Siamayuwa	Chief Mweemba, Age 70. Interviewed September, 1971.
Chief Sigongo	Age unknown. Interviewed August, November, 1971.
Chief Sinazongwe and four headmen	Ages unknown. Interviewed August, September, 1971.

iv) Former District Commissioners and Officers:

Haile, H.P.	District Officer and Commissioner, Acting Provincial Commissioner in various parts of the country, 1946-1964, including Broken Hill Rural, 1956-1960, and Broken Hill Urban, 1960-1962. Interviewed May, 1972.
Hill, R.	District Commissioner in various parts of the country, 1949-1964, including Lusaka-Feira District, 1963-1964. Interviewed May, 1972.
Oliver, W.H.	District Officer and Commissioner in various parts of the country, 1951-1964, including Lusaka Rural, 1955-1958 and Gwembe, 1962-1964. Interviewed May, 1972.

Taylor, L. District Officer in various parts of the country, 1959-1964. Interviewed May, 1972.

B. Manuscripts of recorded tribal Histories:[1]

Anonymous, "History of the Lamba"

Chewemukulu, G.S. 1941 "Kaonde Tribal History".

Chilamba, A. 1941 "History of my People: Short History of Batonga."

Cilekwa, M.J. 1941 "History of Batonga."

Dale, A. 1941 "History of the Baila."

Gray, A.D. 1961 "Stories of the Ancient Lore of the Bene-Mukuni."[2] (English translation of Shishimi sha Bene-Mukuni 1954. Capetown. Oxford University Press).

Hall, J.B. 1918 "A Paper on the Origin of the Baila: A Suggestion."

Jalla, A. (Translation) 1909 "Traditions and Legends of the Barotse Nation."

Kabodya, 1946 "History of the Soli."

Luwisha, K.K. 1941 "Sala Tribal History."

Matibini, S. 1941 "Tribal History for Balenje."

Mudenda, E. 1941 "History of Batonga."

Mufwesha, E. "History of the Soli."

Mukimwa, D. "Kaonde Tribal History."

---

1. All the Manuscripts listed below are in the National Museum, Livingstone.

2. Copy in the History Department. University of Zambia.

Mukuni, Siloka II 1957.	"Handbook of the Leya History."
Mulala, J.K.	"Bene-Mukuni History and Customs."
Munday, J.T.	"A Folk History of the Mkushi District in Northern Rhodesia."
Nabuyanda, T. 1941.	"The Pure Batonga Tribal History."
Nchete, Fr. 1971.	"History and Political Institutions of the Tonga."
Nkazi, L.M. 1941.	"Tribal History of Luano People."
Nkumbula, H.M. 1941.	"Brief Tribal History of the Baila."
Nkumbula, H.M.	"Life and Customs of the Baila."
Ntitima, J. 1941.	"History and Customs of Bene-Mukuni."
Sekwaswa and Mahiritona	"History of the Livingstone District."
Shankwaya, H. 1941.	"Brief Tribal History of the Baila."
Shilu.u, M. 1941.	"History of Bene-Mukuni."
Simakompa, J. 1941.	"Short History of Batonga."
Syaamaundu, J. 1941.	"Chief Monze and his enemies : His Talk with David Livingstone."
Wang, P. 1941.	"Tribal History of the Balala People."

ARCHIVAL MATERIAL:

The largest percentage of Government records listed below are in the National Archives, Lusaka. A few, which will be indicated, are in the National Museum, Livingstone.

A. African Affairs(including chiefs, headmen and African Administration).

Administrative Conference	1944 Vol.II	
Administrative Conference, Minutes	1949-1951	0044 Vols. I & II
Administrative Conference of P.C.'s	1914-1960	Vols. I & II
Administrative Conference of P.C.'s	1951-1952	0044/1

African Chiefs, General, Broken Hill	1953-1958	AFN 6
African Provincial Council, Central Prov.	1949-1947	N/2232
African Provincial Council, Southern Prov.	1949-1952	N/2212/1
Central Province		N/0045/5
Chiefs Courses	1949-1960	11/8/3F Vol.I
Chiefs, Deposals. General Correspondence	1929-1949	NAT/E/5/5/1
Chiefs, Recognition of, General and Prov.	1936-1948	NAT/E/1/5/7
Chiefs, Reports	1949-1960	NAT/17
Complaints on behalf of chiefs by Stephenson, J.P.	1949-1952	N/09/12/5
Conference on Practical Development of Local Government in Colonies, Cambridge.	Oct.1954-June,1955	G/0017/5
Development in Native Areas	1949-1952	0042 Vol.I-III
District Circular No. 5	1945	N/0901
D.C.'s Conference	1939-1947	Loc.6/2/7
D.C.'s Conference, Central Province	1945	SEC/NAT/77
District Touring, Broken Hill	1949-1960	R/4/7
Financial Relationship Committee	1949	ZP/22
Native Policy in N.R. Confidential, Memorandum	1950	3
No. 31 Confidential to the N.R.G.	1947	N/0901 Vol.II
Provincial and Area Teams, Central Prov.	1949-1956	N/0045/5 Vol.II
Provincial and District Organisation	1949-1952	N/0003 Vol.I
Provincial and District Organisation	1953-1957	N/0003 Vol.II
Provincial Councils; General Policy	1949-1950	N/0002
Rural Development, General	1949-1956	A/127/Vol.I
Rural Development, Gwembe	1942-1952	NAT/E/1
Rural Development, Parish and Peasant Farming		A/53
Tours	1938-1951	Loc.8/17/4F
Tour Reports, Chiefs	1948-1950	Loc.11/5/5F

Tour Reports, Correspondence	1950-1957	Loc.11/8/3F
Tour Reports, Kalomo	1940-1944	Loc.8/11/2R

B. Annual Reports(inclucing quarterly and half yearly)

African Affairs	1949	VIII N.R.G.225/56.L.M.
African Affairs	1950	VIII N.R.G.225/57. L.M.
African Affairs	1951	VIII N.R.G.544
African Affairs	1952	VIII N.R.G.346/53. L.M.
Batoka Province	1913-1926	ZA7/1/1/3-ZA7/1/10/3
————	1929	ZA7/1/12/3
————	1930	ZA7/1/13/2
————	1931-1932	ZA7/1/14/3-ZA7/1/15/3
Broken Hill District	1922-1929	KSA/8/1/KSA8/2/1
Central Province	1934	ZA7/1/17/2
————	1935-1940	SEC/NAT/6CB
Chilonga Sub-District	1917-1918	KDC6/1/6
————	1927-1932	KDC/6/2/1
Gwembe Sub-District(old Guimbi)	1908-1918	KTS/3/1/1/KTS3/3/1
Kafue Province	1907-1909	KDC6/1/1
————	1926	KDC6/1/2
————	1929-1932	KDC6/1/3-KDC6/1/5
————	1913-1925	ZA7/1/1/5-ZA7/1/8/5

Kafue Province	1925-1926	ZA7/1/9/1
———	1926-1931	ZA7/1/10/5-ZA7/1/14/5
———	1932	ZA7/1/15/3
Kafue Batoka	1933	ZA7/1/16/1
Kalomo Sub-District	1912-1932	KDB6/3/1-KDB6/3/2
Livingstone District	1919-1939	KSC6/1/1-KSC6/2/1
Luangwa Province	1913-1924	ZA7/1/1/7-ZA7/1/7/7
———	1924-1925	ZA7/1/8/6
———	1925-1926	ZA7/1/9/3
———	1926-1932	ZA7/1/10/7-ZA7/1/15/7
Luangwa-Kasempa	1933	ZA7/1/16/2
Magoye Sub-District	1911-1924	KSB6/6/1-KSB6/6/3
Mazabuka Sub-District	1919-1927	KSB6/1/1/1
———	1929-1934	KSB6/1/1/2-KSB6/1/1/7
———	1912-1913	KSB6/1/2
———	1951-1953	Box No. 7017
Mumbwa Sub-District	1926-1932	KDC6/1/9/KDC6/2/3
Native Affairs	1928-1939	185/54-196/54 L.M.
Southern Province	1934	ZA7/1/17
———	1935-1959	SEC/NAT/66F

C. District Notebooks.

Broken Hill (formerly known as Mwomboshi)	1905-1955	KDA/4/1
Choma	1952-1964	KTY/1
Gwembe	1902-1963	KTE2/1
Kalomo	1901-1963	KSP3/1
Livingstone	1904-1959	KSC4/1
Lusaka	1905-1951	KDT5/1
Mazabuka	1911-1924	KSB3/1
Mumbwa		KTJ3/1

D. Native Affairs(including chiefs, headmen)

Africa Order-in-Council	1889	A2/1. L.M.
Barotse Representative Induna, Batoka.	1905	NW/IN/1/5/3
Barotse Representative Induna, General.	1906-1908	NW/IN/1/5/2
Barotse Representative Induna, Kafue.	1904-1907	NW/IN/1/5/4
Barotse Tribute, Collection of	1929-1934	ZA1/15/H/1/6
Boundaries	1930	KSA1/1/1/1
Chiefs	1907-1909	NW/A/3/24/1
Chiefs, Appointments, Batoka Prov.	1930-1933	ZA1/42
_____, Kafue Prov.	1930-1934	ZA/1/4/4

Chiefs, Appointments, Luangwa Province	1930-1933	ZA1/4/6
Chiefs, Compaints Against	1931-1934	ZA1/9/27/8
Chiefs, Concessions from		ZA1/ 2
Chiefs, Disputes	1931-1933	ZA/1/3/1
Chiefs and Headmen, Appointments ad and Dismissal		B1/3/423
_____, Free Labour to	1926-1929	ZA1/9/27/3
_____, General	1916-1934	ZA1/1/27/1
_____, Batoka Province		ZA1/1/27/1
_____, Kafue Province		ZA1/9/27/1D
_____, Luangwa Province		ZA1/9/27/1F
_____, Subsidies	1917-1926	B1/2/146
_____, Subsidies and Payments	1924-1934	ZA1/9/27/2
Circulars Issued	1903-1931	ZA/2/1
_____, Administrators	1907-1924	NW/IN/2/2
_____, D.C.'s	1928-1933	KDB/3/1
_____, Secretary for Native Affairs	1906-1909	NW/IN/2/1
_____, Secretary for Native Affairs	1911-1932	ZA2/2
Diaries, Mwomboshi Sub-District	1908	KSA5/1
District Boundaries	1917-1933	ZA1/9/42
_____, Batoka	1915-1923	ZA1/9/42/2
_____, Kafue	1919-1925	ZA1/9/42/1
_____, Kafue-Batoka-Luangwa	1915-1925	ZA1/9/42/3
District Commissioner's Conference	1927-1934	KDC4/4/1
Finance Commission	1932	ZP8/1-5

Finance Inquiry Commission	1937	ZP11/1-2
High Commissioner's Notive No.68 of 1908		BS2/7
History of the Native Tribes	1930-1933	ZA1/9/162
_____	1934-1935	ZA1/9/162/4
_____, Kalomo	1933	ZA1/9/162/1
Human Geography on Tribes of various Provinces and Districts by D.C.'s		ZA1/15/0/1
Indabas, General	1924	KDC6/6
_____, His Excellency the Governor	1925-1933	2a1/9/59/1
_____, Secretary for Native Affairs	1924-1933	ZA1/9/59/2
Livingstone District		KSC1/5/1
_____, Chief's Meetings		KSC3/1
Local Government	1927-1934	KSB1/4/1
Mazabuka Sub-District	1924-1928	KSB1/7/1
_____	1929-1934	KDB4/1/1
_____	1931-1935	KSB1/7/1
_____, Chiefs and Headmen	1929	KSB1/1/1
Memorandum from Lord Passfield,	1930	SEC/NAT/92
Memorandum on Native Tribes and Tribal Areas of N.R. by J.M. Thomson	1930	182/54 L.M.
Northern Rhodesia Order-in-Council,	1911	A2/9 L.M.
Northern Rhodesia Proclamation No.3 of 1913		B3/1/1

Northern Rhodesia Proclamation of the Administration of Natives No.8 of 1916		B1/20/369
The Administration of Natives (Amendment) Ordinance	1927	B/1/2/464
The Barotziland, North-Western Rhodesia Order-in-Council	1899	A/2/8 L.M.
The North-Eastern Rhodesia Order-in-Council	1900	A/2/7/L.M.
Tour Reports, Batoka	1928-1929	ZA7/4/3
———	1930	ZA7/4/12
———	1931	ZA7/4/21
———	1932	ZA7/4/30
———	1933	ZA7/4/38
Tour Reports, Chilanga	1926-1933	KDC6/4/1
Tour Reports, General	1928-1934	ZA1/9/1/7
Tour Reports, Gwembe	1909-1922	KOB6/2/1
		KTE3/4/1
Tour Reports, His Excellency the Governor	1927-1933	ZA1/9/103
Tour Reports, Kafue	1928-1929	ZA7/4/5
———	1930	ZA7/4/14
———	1931	ZA7/4/22
———	1932	ZA7/4/32
———	1933	ZA7/4/41
Tour Reports, Livingstone	1920-1937	KSC6/3/1
Tour Reports, Luuangwa	1928-1929	ZA7/4/8
———	1930	ZA7/4/16
———	1931	ZA4/4/24

Tour Reports, Luangwa	1932	ZA7/4/34
_____	1933	ZA7/4/43
Tour Reports, Lusaka	1933-1934	KDB6/5/1
Tour Reports, Mazabuka	1912	KSB6/1/3
	1951-1953	Box. No. 7017
_____, Secretary for Native Affairs	1926-1934	ZA1/9/419
Villages, Size of	1915-1919	B1/2/258

E. Native Authorities

Native Authorities	1929-1934	KDB1/5/8/4
Native Authorities and Native Courts	1928-1935	ZA1/9/27
Native Authorities, Batoka	1929-1931	ZA1/9/27/5B
_____, Central Province	1929-1958	N/1201/3
_____, Chiefs, Southern Province	1952-1956	N/1101/3
_____, Courses for Chiefs and Mazabuka N.A. staff	1951-1953	Box No.7014
_____, General	1940-1949	NATJ/10
_____, General Policy	1947-1955	N/0901 Vol.I&II
_____, Gwembe Reports	1935-1958	N/1104/6
_____, Gwembe	1943-1954	Loc. 10.3.6R
_____, Gwembe and Kalomo	1932-1935	KSP1/3/1-KSP1/3/2
_____, Indirect Rule	1933-1934	ZA1/9/79
_____, Indirect Rule, Extension of	1931-1940	NAT/J/3
_____, Kafue Province	1929-1931	ZA1/9/27/5D
_____, Kalomo and Living-stone Council	1947-1957	Loc.10/3/6R

Native Authorities, Lenje Central Council	1947-1957	R/14/2/11/2,3,4,
_____, Lenje Council Meetings	1949-1958	N/1202/1 Vol.I
_____, Lenje Reports		R.14/2/10
_____, Livingstone	1937-1948	Loc.6/2/6-Loc. 6/2/7
_____, Luangwa Province	1929-1931	ZA1/9/27/5F
_____, Monze	1937-1951	Loc.8/17/4R
Native Authority Ordinance	1929	B1/2/280
Native Authority Ordinance	1936	N/1/1/02/1
Native Authority(Amendment) Ordinance	1953	File No.50/39
Native Authority, Plateau Tonga	1941-1951	Loc.11/8/3F
_____, Plateau Tonga Rules and Orders	1946-1958	N/1103/3 Vol.I
_____, Reorganisation	1949-1951	N/1201/1
_____, Rules and Orders	1943-1949	Loc.8/18/1F
_____, Southern Province	1951-1958	N/1101
_____, Southern Province Reorganisation	1950-1954	N/1101/1
_____, Tonga/Leya Council Meetings	1949-1957	N/1102/1

F. Native Courts

Native Courts, Batoka Province	1929-1934	ZA1/9/27/5A/BB
_____, Central Province	1949-1957	N/1759/2
_____, Establishment	1927-1929	B1/3/500
_____, General	1936-1958	Loc.2/8/1

Native Courts,	Judicial Powers; Inquiry Ordinance		B1/2/397
_____,	Kafue Province	1929-1931	ZA1/9/5A/B
_____,	Luangwa Province	1929-1933	ZA1/9/27/5A/F
_____,	Ordinance	1929	B1/3/500
_____,	Southern Province	1949-1958	N/1757/2
_____,	Warrants of Jurisdiction	1936-1950	Loc.11/8/3F

G. Native Reserves

Lands		1933-1935	KT1/2/1
Commission		1942-1943	ZP3
Farms		1908-1929	KSC1/2/2
General		1909-1931	KSC1/2/1
Rights of Chiefs		1932	ZA1/7/10
Native Reserves,	Batoka Province	1913-1921	B1/2/215
_____,	Central Prov.	1952-1962	N/1317
_____,	Commission	1926	ZP1
_____,	General and Water Conservancy	1931-1934	KDC2/19/1-KDC2/19/5
_____,	Kafue Province	1913-1921	B1/2/216
_____,	Kalomo District	1931-1932	B1/4/3/L.S.
_____,	Movements of Inhabitants into	1930-1931	KDB1/6/2

H. Native Tax:

African Exemption Ordinance,			Loc.2/10/1
Native Tax,	Amendment Ordinance	1925	B1/2/489
_____,	General	1927-1935	ZA1/9/17
_____,	Plural Taxation	1923-1927	ZA1/9/17/8

Native Tax, Reduction of	1926	ZA1/9/17/5
_____, Southern Province	1950-1956	N/1101/2
_____, Tax defaulters, Imprisonment	1931-1934	ZA/1/9/17/11
Taxation Review Committee,	1946	ZP.14

I. Native Treasuries:

Native Treasury, Fund	1939-1951	Loc.11/8/3R
_____, General	1946-1949	Loc.8/17/4R
_____, General	1944-1958	Loc.8/11/1R Vol
_____, Instructions	1938-1949	Loc.8/17/4F
_____, Ordinance	1936	Loc.8/17/4F

J. *Paris Missionary Society Records*

Autres Missions	1908-1929	L.M.
Rapports des Rapports	1894	L.M.
Rapports, Sesheke et Kazungula	1894-1939	L.M.

ARTICLES:

Ajayi, J.F. 1968 "The Continuity of African Institutions Under Colonialism," in Ranger, T.O.(ed.) Emerging Themes of African History. Nairobi. East African Publishing House. 189-200.

Akpan, N.U. 1955 "Have Traditional Authorities a Place in Modern Local Government?" J.A.A.,7, iii. 109-166.

Argyle, W.J. 1959 "Soli Chieftainships and Political Adptation" in Apthorpe, R.J.,(ed.),

From Tribal Rule to Modern Government. Rhodes-Livingstone Conference Papers 99-112.

Banwell, G.H. 1949 "Local Administration in Germany and its Lessons For Africa", J.A.A.,1,ii. 74-76.

Brown, R. 1959 "Indirect Rule as a Policy of Adaptation" in Apthorpe, R.J.(ed.), From Tribal Rule to Modern Government. Rhodes-Livingstone Conference. Papers. 49-56

Capriani, L. 1928 "The Anthropological Investigation of the Batonga of Northern Rhodesia," S.A.J.S. 26. 541-546.

Clark, J.D. 1954 "Early Man in Northern Rhodesia," N.R.J., 2,iv. 49-59.

Creech-Jones, A. 1949 "The Place of African Local Administration in Colonial Policy," J.A.A.1,i. 3-6

Colson, E. 1969 "African Socities at The Time of The Scramble" in Gann, L.H. and Duicnan, P., (eds.), Colonialism in Africa 1970-1860 Vol.1. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 27-63.

_____ "A Note on Tonga and Ndebele" , N.R.J.,2,ii. 35-41.

_____ 1953 "Everyday Life Among The Cattle-Keeping Plateau Tonga." Rhodes-Livingstone Paper No.9.

_____ 1951 "The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia" in Colson, E. and Gluckman, M.(eds.), Seven Tribes of British Central Africa. London, Oxford University Press. 94-162.

Colson, E. 1962 "Trade and Wealth Among the Tonga" in Bohanian, P. and Dalton, G.(eds.), Markets in Africa. North-Western.

Editor 1950 "The Finances and Functions of African Local Authorities", J.A.A.,2,ii. 3-9.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 1959 "Primitive Political Systems: A Preliminary Comparative Analysis", American Anthropologist, 61,ii.

Fagan, B.M. 1970 "Early Trade and Raw Materials" in Gray, R. and Birmingham, D.B.(eds.), Pre-Colonial African Trade. London. Oxford University Press. 24-38.

_____ 1970 "The Iron Age in Northern Rhodesia" in Fage, J.D. and Oliver, R.A., Papers in African Prehistory. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press,

Fagan, B.M. & Phillipson, D.W. 1969 "The Date of The Ing'ombe Ilede Burials," J.A.H., 10,ii. 99-204.

Flint, E. 1970 "Trade and Politics in Barotseland During the Kololo Period," J.A.H., 11, ii. 71-86.

Gray, R. & Birmingham D.B. 1970 "Some Economic and Political Consequences of Trade in Central and Eastern Africa in Pre-Colonial Period" in Gray, R. and Birmingham, D.B.(eds.), Pre-Colonial Africa Trade. London. Oxford University Press.

Griffiths, J. 1951 "Opening Address to The 1951 Cambridge Summer Conference in African Administration," J.A.A.,3,iv. 152-157.

Haile, M.P. 1959 "Chilwa Island in The Lukanga Swamp," N.R.J.,3. 381-386.

Lewin, J. 1938 "The Recognition of Native Law and Custom in British Africa", J.R.A.S, A Supplement.

Listowell, Earl 1949 "The Modern Conception of Government in British Africa", J.A.A., 1,iii. 99-105

Logan, W.M. 1939 "Native Administration in Northern Rhodesia", Peace Relations, 6, ii.

Macrae, F.B. 1928 "Some Technological Notes on The Tribes of The Mumbwa District", Nada, No.6. 56-67.

_____ 1929 "The Batwa in The Broken Hill District", Nada. 63-75.

Mair, L.P. 1952 "Native Administration in Nyasaland", Colonial Research Studies, No.5.

Marshall, A.H. 1950 "The Adaptation of English Local Government Principles to Colonial Territories", J.A.A., 2, iv. 34-39

Miracle, M.P. 1959 "Plateau Tonga Entrepreneurs in Historical Inter-Regional Trade". Rhodes-Livingstone Journal No.26. 34-50

North, A.C. 1961 "Local Government Training in Northern Rhodesia," J.A.A.,8,ii. 67-77

Oliver, R. 1966 "The Problem of The Bantu Expansion", J.A.A.,7,iii. 361-376.

Perhan, M. 1934 "Some Problems of Indirect Rule in Africa", Journal of the Royal Society of Arts for May, 18th.

Phillipson, D.W. 1970 "Excavations at Twickenham Road, Lusaka", Azania, 5. 77-118

Quiggin, A.H. "Trade Routes, Trade and Currency in East Africa". Occasional Paper of the Rhodes-Livingstone, No.5

Roberts, A.D. 1966 "Migrations From The Congo(A.D.1500-1850)," in Fagan, B.M.(ed.), A Short History of Zambia. Nairobi. Oxford University Press. 99-120.

_____ 1970 "Pre-Colonial Trade in Zambia", Africa Social Research, No.10. 715-746

_____ 1968 "The Nineteenth Century in Zambia" in Ranger, T.O.(ed.), Aspects of Central African History. Heinemann. 71-96.

_____ 1968 "The Political History of Twentieth Century Zambia" in Ranger, T.O.(ed.) Aspects of Central African History. Hienemann. 154-189.

Robinson, D.F.C. 1950 "Why Indirect Rule Has Been Replaced by 'Local Government' in The Nomenclature of British Native Administration", J.A.A., 2,iii. 12-15

Sicard, H. von. 1969 "On the People of The Zambezi: Historical Notes." Current Anthropology, 10, iv.465.

_____ 1948 "The Origins of Some of The Tribes in The Belingwe Reserve", Nada, No.25. 93-95.

Smith, M.G. 1956 "On Segmentary Lineage Systems", Journal of The Royal Anthropological Institute, 86, art II. 39-80.

Stevens, R.A. 1949 "The Application of English Local Government Principles in Africa." J.A.A., 1, ii. 68-73.

Sutherland-Harris, N. 1970 "Zambia Trade with Zumbo in The Eighteenth Century", in Gray, R. and Birmingham, D.B.(eds.), Pre-Colonial African Trade. London. Oxford University Press. 231-242.

Wallis, C.A.C. 1955 "The Foundations of Local Government in India and African" J.A.A., 7, i. 2-11.

White, C.M.N. 1950 "The Place of Training in The Development of African Local Government in Northern Rhodesia", J.A.A., 2, iii. 29-31.

Wrigley, C.C. 1960 "Speculations on The Economic Pre-History of Africa", J.A.A., I, ii. 189-204.

BOOKS:

Allan, A.W. 1965 The African Husbandman. London. Oliver and Boyd.

Banton, M.(ed.) 1965 Political Systems and The Distribution of Powor. London. Tavistock Publications Ltd.

Bradley, K. 1966 Diary of a District Officer. London. Macmillan.

Brelsford, W.V. 1965 The Tribes of Zambia. Lusaka. Government Printers.

Campbell, D. 1922 In the Heart of Bantuland. London. Seeley, Sewice & Co. Ltd.

Clark, J.D.(ed.) 1963 Diary of George Westebeech. London.

Coillard, F. 1971 (third edition) *On The Threshold of Central Africa.* Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.

Colson, E. 1962 *The Plateau Tonga of Northern Rhodesia.* Manchester. Manchester University Press.

_____ 1960 *Social Organisation of The Gwembe Tonga.* Manchester. Manchester University Press.

Doke, C.M. 1931 *The Lambas of Northern Rhodesia.* London. Harrap.

Fagan, B.M. 1967 *Iron Age Cultures in Zambia, 1 (Kalomo and Kangila).* London. Chatto and Windus.

_____ 1965 *Southern Africa.* London. Thames and Hudson.

_____(ed.) 1964 *The Victoria Falls.* Glasgow. Robert MacLohose & Co. Ltd.

Fagan, B.M. with Phillipson, D.W. and Daniels, S.G. 1969 *Iron Age Cultures in Zambia, 2.* London. Chatto and Windus.

Fallers, L.A. 1965 *Bantu Bureaucracy: A Century of Political Evolution Among the Basoga of Uganda.* Chicago. University of Chicago Press.

Fortes, M. and Evans-Pritchard 1940 *African Political Systems.* London. Oxford University Press.

Gabel, C. 1965 *Stone Age Hunters of The Kafue.* Boston. Boston University Press.

Gann, L.H. 1964 *A History of Northern Rhodesia: Early Days to 1953.* London. Chatto and Windus.

Gann, L.H. 1958 — The Birth of a Plural Society. Manchester. Manchester University Press.

Gelfand, M. 1961 — Northern Rhodesia in The Days of the Charter. Oxford. Basil Blackwell.

Gluckman, M. 1956 — Custom and Conflict in Africa. New York. Barnes & Noble Inc.

_____ 1963 — Order and Rebellion in Tribal Africa. London. Chatto and Windus.

Gouldbury, C. and Streave, H. 1911 — The Great Plateau of Northern Rhodesia. London. Edward Anord.

Gray, S.D. 1954 — Shishimi sha Bene-Mukuni. Capetown. Oxford University Press.

Hailley, Lord. 1950 — Native Administration in British African Territories, Part II. London. His Majesty's Stationary Office.

Hall, R. 1965 — Zambia. London. Pall Mall Press.

Hanna, A.J. 1956 — The Beginnings of Nyasaland and North-Eastern Rhodesia. Oxford. Clarendon Press.

Hellen, J.A. 1968 — Rural Economic Development in Zambia. Munchen. WeltforumVerlag.

Holub, E. 1890 — From Cape to The Land of The Mashukulumbwe (English Translation not yet published).

_____ 1881 — Seven Years in South Africa. London. Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle and Ravington.

Kay, G. 1967 — A Social Geography of Zambia. London. University of London Press.

Kirk-Greene, A.H.M. (ed.), 1965 — The Principles of Native Administration in Nigeria: Selected Documents 1900-1947. London. Oxford University Press.

Livingstone, C. & D 1865 Narrative of an Expedition to The Zambezi London. John Murray.

Livingstone, D. 1857 Missionary Travels in South Africa. London. John Murray.

Lugard, F.D. 1929 The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa. London. William Blackwood and Sons Ltd.

Mainga, M. 1969 A History of The Lozi People to 1900. (PHD Thesis).

Mair, L.P. 1962 Primitive Government. London. Hazell Watson and Viney Ltd.

Meebelo, H.S. 1971 Reaction to Colonialism. Manchester. Manchester University Press.

Middleton and Tait (eds.) 1958 Tribes Without Rulers. London. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Nzimiro, I. 1972 Studies in Ibo Political System. London. Frank Cass and Co. Ltd.

Perhan, M. 1937 Native Administration in Nigeria. London Oxford University Press.

Roberts, A.D.(ed.)1968 Tanzania Before 1900. Nairobi. East African Publishing House.

Rotberg, R. 1965 Christian Missionaries and The Creation of Northern Rhodesia, 1880-1924. Princeton. University Press.

Schapera, I. 1956 Government and Politics in Tribal Societies London. C.A. Watts and Co. Ltd.

_____(ed.)1963 Livingstone's African Journal, 1853-1856 1 & 2. London.Chatto and Windus.

Schapera, I. 1960 Livingstone's Private Journals, 1851-1853. London. Chatto and Windus.

Scudder, T. 1962 The Ecology of The Gwembe Tonga. Manchester. Manchester University Press.

Pinto, S. 1881 How I crossed Africa, 1 & 2. London William Clowes and Sons Ltd.

Selous, F.C. 1893 Travel and Adventure in South East Africa London. Rowland Ward and Co. Ltd.

Smith, E. and 1920 The Ila-Speaking Peoples of Northern Rhodesia, 1 & 2. London. Maxmillan and Co. Ltd.

Smith, M.G. 1960 Government in Zazau 1800-1950. Oxford University Press.

Stokes, E. and (eds.) 1965 The Zambezian Past, Manchester University Press.

Swartz, M.J.(ed.) 1969 Local-Level Politics. London. University of London Press. Ltd.

Tabler, E.C.(ed.) 1963 Trade and Travel in Barotseland. London Chatto and Windus.

Torrend, S.J. 1931 An English-Vernacular Dictionary for the Bantu-Botatwe Dialects of Northern Rhodesia London. Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co.

Vansina, J. 1968 Kingdoms of The Savannah. University of Wisconsin Press.

_____ 1965 Oral Tradition: A Study in History Methodology. (Translated from French by H.M. Wright). London. Routeledge and Kegan Paul.

Vogel, J.O. 1970 Kamangoza. Museums Paper No.2. Nairobi. Oxford University Press.

Vogel, J.O. 1971 Kumadzulo. Museums Paper No. 3. Lusaka Oxford University Press.

Wills, A.J. 1967 An Introduction to The History of Central Africa. London. Oxford University Press.

Wood, A. St. John 1961 Northern Rhodesia : The Human Background. London. Pall Mall Press.