

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chieftdom

Yusto Clemence Mwandete

Catholic University of Mbeya, Department of Humanities

ABSTRACT: This paper explores the contradictions in the implementation of the British colonial indirect rule in Tanganyika with a case of the Usafwa Chieftdom of Mbeya. It specifically traces the causes of contradictions of indirect rule as part of ambiguities and complexities which posed problems in its implementation in Tanganyika and the Usafwa Chieftdom in particular. Primary sources of archival materials complimented with secondary sources including books, research papers, journals, and online internet materials to collect data related to this topic. After that comprehensive sources' survey, results of various studies were correlated in a systematic manner for further analyses to reveal the findings and draw conclusions. It analyzes how indirect rule was implemented in contradictory ways in relations to traditional institutions, the Mandate League of Nations, traditions, the European civilization mission, the "European question" or "thin white line" creation of tribes, customary laws, the operation of colonial economy, characteristics of the chiefs, colonial officers, land tenure and the process of urbanization. The paper by showing contradictions of indirect rule in British colonial rule intends to contribute to draw attention to scholars for further study or discussion on other wide range of factors which in contradictory ways influenced the implementation of indirect rule in Tanganyika or elsewhere. Indirect rule shaped British colonialism in many ways and has influences in the post-colonial states on some of specific issues like local governments, ethnicity and development.

KEYWORDS: Colonialism, Contradiction, Indirect Rule, Tanganyika, Usafwa Chieftdom

I. INTRODUCTION

Colonialism was a mechanism or policy in which one country maintained control or influence on other country.¹ Although it was sometimes justified by some scholars in the name of "civilizing mission", on the other hand it was questioned on the ground of injustice and economic exploitation. Colonialism was not a monolithic phenomenon. There were within it contradictory tendencies which defined the ways of its domination and subordination of colonies.² Colonialism had development by contradictions for the brutalities of exploitation, of subjugation, of deprivation and humiliation crushed the whole civilizations to serve imperialist interests.³ Colonialism entailed an alien imposition of power and a mixture of political and economic interests determining the government of the conquered country. Of all the factors for colonialism that were political, cultural, and economic, the greed for wealth, trade, resources, and cheap labour was the primary factor for colonization. It was all based on the struggle for power and domination of the world. In their ambitious endeavour, there were numerous inhuman activities and injustices which took place. The greatest but often overlooked was the erosion of the indigenous cultural knowledge, values and religion of many local groups of people. The colonization drive was based on European egoism and superiority complex. It was a belief in their superiority and numerous scientific discoveries.⁴

During the colonial conquest and in the early period of the establishment of colonialism in Tanganyika the German and British colonial powers relied on chartered companies to administer the colony. The Germans employed Germany East Africa Company while the British used the Imperial British East Africa Company for conquering and administering Tanganyika.⁵ In order to have

¹ G.T Mishambi et al (eds. (2002) *Africa from Nineteenth Century to 1990.*) 2nd Ed. (Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Institute of Education), p. 52.

² F. J. Kaijage (1983) "Labour Conditions in the Tanzanian Mining Industry, 1930- 1960". *African Studies Centre Working paper No. 83*, p. 17.

³ W. Rodney (1976) *How Europe Developed Africa* (Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House), pp. 287-316.

⁴ A. Mukaria (2021) "Colonialism: The Genesis of Degradation of Nature". *Academia Letter*, p. 5.

⁵ B. Itandala (1992) "The Anglo-German Partition of East Africa." *Tanzania Zamani, A Journal of the Historical Association of Tanzani*. Vol 1 No.1. p.14.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

effective occupation after the conquest of Tanganyika the colonial powers in their administration established methods and institutions of domination as part of their local colonial policies. Initially, the forms of the policies of administration were without clear, final objectives which could meet their expectations. They were short-range processes than well-defined policies, hence they were invented from practice in their course of administration⁶. Thus the policies were characterized by a series of ambiguities, contradictions, and problems in their implementation. Germans adopted the system of direct rule, at the bottom of the administrative ladder were the jumbes and akidas who were imposed as chiefs in Villages and reported to the District Commissioner. Direct rule required the dismantling of preexisting political institutions and the construction of centralized, territory-wide, and bureaucratic legal-administrative institutions that were controlled by colonial officials.⁷ British had priority of using indirect rule, but some circumstances like lack of chiefs in some societies compelled them to employ direct rule in Tanganyika. Indirect rule meant foreign rule through the indigenous rulers or governing local people through their traditional institutions.⁸ The use of British colonial indirect rule in the administration of colonies in Africa started in Nigeria, then in Uganda and finally in Tanganyika, but Malawi had to learn from Tanganyika.⁹ As in the three countries, indirect rule was much implemented, the areas became references of the British colonial administration in Africa and became appreciated as the Nigerian Model, Ugandan model and Tanganyikan model.

This paper explores the contradictions in the implementation of the British colonial indirect rule in Tanganyika by using the Usafwa Chiefdom of Mbeya as a case study. The paper discusses contradictions of indirect rule in relationship to the local traditions, Mandate League of Nations, the European civilization mission, the “European question” or “thin white line” creation of tribes, customary laws, the operation of colonial economy, characteristics of the chiefs, colonial officers, land tenure and the process of urbanization. It shows how all these phenomena influenced the implementation of indirect rule in contradictory, ambiguous and complex ways. It is revealed that indirect rule by itself was ambiguous system which used contradictory British colonial laws and policies in dynamic colonial situation of Tanganyika. Therefore, indirect rule portrayed its ambiguities, contradictions, and problems in Tanganyika and the Usafwa Chiefdom in particular.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The overall problem statement in this paper is that despite the increasing number of historians writing about the British colonial administration of indirect rule in Tanganyika and Africa in general, not much had been done to trace its contradictions in the implementation of the policy. Many scholars show that indirect rule used local institutions in the British colonial administration without analyzing the contradictions between the colonial and traditional institutions. For British colonial officials in Africa, indirect rule had many contradictions.¹⁰ The implementation of indirect rule was a complex process affected by a wide range of factors which made it to reveal its ambiguities and contradictions.¹¹ Moreover, the operation of indirect rule was affected by the Mandate League of Nations, traditions, the European civilization mission, the “European question” or “thin white line” creation of tribes, customary laws, the operation of colonial economy, characteristics of the chiefs, colonial officers, land tenure and the process of urbanization. Therefore this paper analyses all these factors as causes of contradictions in the implementation of the British colonial indirect rule in the Usafwa Chiefdom of Mbeya in Tanganyika.

III. METHODOLOGY

This paper is a result of qualitative undertaking that followed interpretive approaches in describing data by using the already available information and facts with critical analysis of their contents. Primary sources of archival materials complimented with secondary sources such as books, research papers, journals, and online internet materials to collect data related to this topic. Thus the discussion in this paper is analytical where qualitative techniques were applied to investigate the major guiding questions. The techniques were involved to explore different events related to the contradictions in the implementation of the British colonial indirect rule in Tanganyika by using a case of the Usafwa Chiefdom in Mbeya. The paper is joining a discussion on the British colonial administration policy of indirect rule by showing the contradictions it experienced. The paper uses the case study to reflect what happened in many other local societies of Tanganyika where indirect rule was applied through the local authorities. The paper

⁶ G R. F. Betts (1985) “Methods and Institutions of European Domination”, in Boahen A. (ed.) *General History of Africa, Vol. VII Africa under Colonial Domination from 1880 to 1935*, (Paris: UNESCO), p. 314.

⁷ M. Lange (2009) *Lineage of Despotism and Development, British Colonialism and State Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), p. 4.

⁸ B. Okelo. Op. Cit. p. 147.

⁹ E. Green (2011) “Indirect Rule and Colonial Intervention: Chiefs and Agrarian in Nyasaland, ca. 1933 to the Early 1950s”. *The International Journal of African Studies, Vol. 44. No. 2.* p. 255. See also M. Perham (1934) “Some Problems of Indirect Rule in Africa”. *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts. Vol. 82. No. 4252.* P. 692.

¹⁰ T. Frederiksen (2014) “Authorizing the “Natives”. Governmentality, Dispossession and the Contradictions of Rule in Colonial Zambia”. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers. Vol. 104. Vol. 6.* p. 1274.

¹¹ E. Green. Op. Cit. p. 249.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

is acting as part to arouse enthusiasm to scholars for further study or discussion on other wide range of factors which influenced the implementation of indirect rule in Tanganyika or elsewhere. Indirect rule shaped British colonialism in many ways and has influences in the post-colonial states on some of specific issues like local governments, ethnicity, development etc

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

Indirect rule meant governing local people through their traditional institutions.¹² A number of factors accounted for the various contradictions in the British colonial indirect rule, including its implementation through the traditional institutions. Indirect rule affected the traditional institutions in various ways either by altering their structures or functions.¹³ Moreover It was highlighted that, indirect rule was itself an ambiguous system which operated in contradictory custom laws, role of local authorities and different segments of the British colonial government.¹⁴ Many literatures discuss traditional institutions with little consideration of highlighting that they included chieftaincies, traditional courts and local authorities. The colonial administration and traditional institutions existed in incompatible and separate forms of rule.

Traditions were complex and dynamic, always kept changing, hence needed continuous reinterpretation and reconstruction by people as agents.¹⁵ The role of agency of people in traditions has made some scholars to relate that task to the acts of creation, invention, fabrication or making of traditions. British colonial authorities across Africa researched, recorded, and legally recognized the local traditions and those which they found not suitable were discarded, called them barbaric.¹⁶ Chiefs were the supervisors of the accepted traditions.¹⁷ There had been a lot of discussion on traditional institutions, but little had been done on local traditions on the way they influenced the implementation of indirect rule.

Many studies of “civilization mission” have not much related indirect rule with “civilization mission”. They discuss European civilization mission in relationship to imperialism. Explanation on the “civilization mission” was taunted, including the notion of “white man’s burden,” together with other aspects of imperialism, which dominated Africans in different forms.¹⁸ It had embodied that civilizing mission, the condemnation and dismissal of local “traditions” and “custom” as backward. From this point of view, to civilize was thus to erase traditions and modernization became Westernization.¹⁹ White men claimed to have superior traditions and civilization. Frederick Lugard’s ‘Dual Mandate’ was meant as a guide for over-coming ‘backwardness’ and including local people into modernity along European lines, it was contrary to that. It was only rhetoric of the British indirect rule policies, which were never really dual.²⁰ It was to Lugard’s thinking though not always to other colonial officials that the traditional local governments should be progressively modernized.²¹ British colonial motives in Tanganyika or elsewhere were economical and cultural although sometimes were disguised in the name of civilization mission. Indirect Rule policy never operated in the interest of the people as there was neglect in the provision of the basic social services.

Indirect rule promoted tribalism for easy domination of local societies. Tribal differences became effective tool of the imperial policy of divide and rule. Some tribal groups were labeled martial, fit to be recruited as soldiers, other for labourers and some were marked as intelligent as opposed to the rest who were characterized as lazy. All were denominated of course as uncivilized.²² Several studies insisted that colonial authorities invented ‘tribalism’. By emphasizing on the strength of ‘tribal’ differences and rivalries, colonialists made it more difficult for local people to unite and oppose colonialism. However, in certain circumstances local circumstance affected the implementation of indirect rule in Tanganyika by hindering the invention of chiefs and the creation of tribes by the colonial officials to be effective adjuncts to colonial government. Some areas were not populated by discrete tribes or composite tribes thus had no tribal unity and institutions.²³ Although many authors highlighted indirect rule that it was implemented through local tribes, but less observation was done on the British use of direct rule and its contradictions.

¹² E.S. Atieno Odhiambo et al (1977) *A History of East Africa* (Malaysia: Longman Group Limited), p.143.

¹³ L. Palagashvili (2018) “African Chiefs: Comparative Governance under Colonial Rule”. *Public Choice*, 174, p. 290.

¹⁴ R. P. Neumann (1997) “Forest Rights, Privileges and Prohibitions: Contextualizing State Forestry Policy in Colonial Tanganyika”. Vol. 3. No. 1. pp. 62 – 63.

¹⁵ T. Spear (2003) “Neo-Traditionalism and the Limits of Invention in British Colonial Africa”. *The Journal of African History*. Vol. 44. No. 1. P. 3.

¹⁶ R. P. Neumann (2000) “Primitive Ideas: Protected Areas Buffer Zones and the Politics of Land in Africa”. In Broch-Due and A Schroede (eds.) *Producing Nature and Poverty in Africa* (Stockholm: Elanders Gotab), p. 234.

¹⁷ M. Mamdani (1999) “Historicizing Power and Responses to Power: Indirect Rule and Its Reform”. *Social Research*. Vol. 66. No. 3. P.877.

¹⁸ Mishambi G.T. et al . Op. Cit. p. 1.

¹⁹ M. Mamdan. Op. Cit. p. 867.

²⁰ P. Skalnik (2004) “Chiefdom: A Universal Formation”. *European Journal Of Anthropology*. Vol. 43. p. 86.

²¹ R. Oliver and A Atmore (1981) *Africa Since 1800, 3rd Ed.* (USA: Vail Ballou Press, Inc.), p. 162.

²² I.G. Shiviji (2009) *Accumulation in an African Periphery, a Theoretical Framework* (Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota), p.2.

²³ J. Willis (1993) “The Administration of, Bonde, 1920-60: A Study of the Implementation of Indirect Rule in Tanganyika”. *African Affairs*. Vol. 92. No.366. pp. 59- 67.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

Literature on land tenure and indirect rule focused on the influences of Mandate of the League of Nations. The Mandate emphasized that Tanganyika was to be administered in the interests of the material and moral well being and the social progress of its inhabitants. The Mandate's influences on land tenure were outlined in the 1923 Land Ordinance.²⁴ The ordinance observed the Covenant of the League of Nations by supervising the British colonial government in regard to land tenure to adhere to African laws and customs existing in the areas in which the land was situated. But some colonial agricultural policies contradicted against traditional agricultural practices.

Much has not been written about urbanization and destabilization as among the causes of contradictions during the use of the British colonial indirect rule in Tanganyika. The urban studies that now exist span from several social science disciplines with little contributions from historians.²⁵ The British colonial government feared detribalization due to urbanization for it led to the loss of tribal identity. It was impossible in urban areas given the different lifestyles, occupations, settlement patterns and above all heterogeneous populations of urban areas to retain tribalism. Scant works on detribalization due to urbanization are related to towns of West Africa in Nigeria. There were large towns, such as Lagos, Calabar and Port Harcourt, whose African inhabitants were to a great extent detribalized and could only be governed through municipal or town councils.²⁶ Thus destabilization accompanied urbanization and at one time detribalization was considered as natural consequence of urbanization which ended in contradicting to the British colonial policy of divide and rule through tribalism.

V. DISCUSSION

A. The Colonization of Tanganyika

Before the First World War Tanganyika was under German colonial rule after signing the Anglo-German Delimitation Agreement on 1st November 1886 and from that time the territory was named as German East Africa. It was administered by the German East Africa Company starting from May 1887. The failure of the company caused the German government to take direct control of the territory on 1 January 1891.²⁷ The German government in administration adopted the system of direct rule. In order to facilitate administration, they divided the territory into about twenty-two districts by 1914. At the bottom of the administrative ladder were the jumbes and akidas who reported to the District Commissioner. The jumbes and akidas were the literate Arabs who were imposed as chiefs in villages.²⁸ German colonial rule came to an end with their defeat in the First World War and in 1919. German East Africa was placed under the supervision of the British as mandate of the League of Nations by Article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles.²⁹ Several names were proposed by British colonial officials to substitute "German East Africa", they included 'Smutsland' (in honour of South African General Jan Smuts); Eburnea, (Latin for Ivory); New Maryland, or Windsorland (in honour of the new British Royal Family name Windsor); Victoria (after Britain's Queen Victoria: 1837-1901); Tabora and Kilimanjaro.³⁰ The British decided to call the area as Tanganyika Territory, a name that was officially given to their area in January 1920.³¹ In taking the territory, the new British administration under Sir Horace Byatt, followed a policy of caution and gradual recovery. In the administrative sphere, during the tenure of Byatt, there was relatively little break with the previous structure. The twenty-two districts established by the Germans were retained and so too were the services of the experienced jumbes and akidas.³² Thus the British initially when took control of German East Africa, took control also of the system of local administration established by the German colonialists.

B. Causes of Contradictions of British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika

Tanganyika was mandated to Britain after German losing the war in 1918, Article 23 of the Covenant of the League of Nations laid down general obligations for the well-being of local inhabitants. The international supervision was effected by a permanent Commission of the League and also by a Department of the Secretariat of the League.³³ The League of Nations had influences in the implementation of indirect rule in Tanganyika. Article 22 of the League Covenant presumed that Tanganyika should develop

²⁴ R. P. Neuman. Op. Cit. 48.

²⁵ D. F. Fahy and D. Potts Eds.(2006) *African Urban Economies Viability, Vitality or Vitiatio* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), p.14.

²⁶ A. Okoth (2010) *A History of Africa 1800 – 1914. Vo. 1* (Dar es Salaam: Ujuzi Educational Publishers Ltd) p.325.

See also J. D. Fage (1961) *Introduction to the History of West Africa* (London: The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press), p. 180.

²⁷ B. Okello (2002) *A History of East Africa* (Kampala: Fountain Publisher Ltd.), p. 160.

²⁸ Ibid. p.180.

²⁹ J.C. Taylor (1963) *Political Development of Tanganyika* (London: Cambridge University Press), p. 24

³⁰ J. Illife (1979) *A Modern History of Tanganyika* (London: Cambridge University Press), p. 247.

³¹ J.C. Taylor, Op. Cit, p. 24

³² R. M. Maxon (200) *East Africa an Introductory History* (Third Edition) (USA: Virginia University Press), p. 187.

³³ N. Bentwich (1946) "Colonial Mandates and Trusteeship" *Transaction for Grotius Society*, pp. 122 – 123.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

towards the European standard of civilization and until it was able to stand by itself.³⁴ Although, according to Lugard the British were supposed to use indirect rule in order to enable Africans to acquire experience in administration and get prepared for eventual self-government,³⁵ but self-independence was a long cry and the notion of training people for independence was nothing but a political gimmick,³⁶ in Tanganyika British did not willingly grant independence, pressure was applied on them first in order to force their colonial government to withdraw from Tanganyika and thus allowed it to govern itself. Moreover, no time scale was laid down for the local population in Tanganyika to take over, and the British acted as if independence was a long way off.

Sir Donald Cameron took over the governorship of Tanganyika in April 1925. Unlike Byatt, who had shown little interest in district administration, Cameron believed in action and positive reform in Tanganyika. He quickly set about remodeling the administrative structure of the territory.³⁷ In 1925, Cameron officially introduced a form of government called indirect rule into Tanganyika. Indirect rule was formulated by Frederick Lugard, in his book *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*, published in 1922.³⁸ According to Lugard, Britain held a dual responsibility in Africa: administration and economic benefits for the metropole, as well as ensuring development of the local people. The system was used in many British colonies, including Nigeria that relied on “traditional” authorities to administer local population according to customary laws.”The new policy intended that Africa “tribes” should be administered by their chiefs and elders under British supervision.³⁹ The British hoped this would encourage political and economic development without leading to “detribalization” or nationalist politics.⁴⁰ Tribalism was deliberately promoted in order to facilitate domination and hamper the growth of militant detribalized people who might define themselves as future citizens of a nation, rather than tribe.⁴¹ Thus by definition, indirect rule meant foreign rule through the indigenous rulers. The idea behind indirect rule was to govern Africans through their traditional institutions. In its classic or Nigerian form, Indirect Rule essentially involved using traditional African authorities to provide the basis of local government in the colonies.⁴²

The British encountered many different tribes in Tanganyika. They had strenuous task to control and rule over the tribal people. The local people, for centuries, were living according to their tribal traditions. The Safwa share a border to the West with the Nyiha and Malila, on the East with the Kinga, Wanji and Sangu, on the North with the Kimbu and on the South with the Nyakyusa and Ndali. Oral traditions of the Safwa claim *Inyumba Inditu* (dark house) in Njombe as the original home of ancestors of Chief Syoka Mazubha Lyoto, the first chief to encounter the British colonial government in Usafwa Chiefdom. The narrative shows that two sons of a kinga known as Mwemsi moved up to Rungwe and one of them who was known as Mazubha went up to Igale in Mbeya where he bore a son whom he called Syoka. Syoka Mazubha migrated to Mount Mbeya from Igale. He taught the Safwa of that area on how to make fire by the friction method (*ulupekeso*). After teaching them on how to make fire they started calling him *Mwalyoto* (big fire) and nominated him to be their chief and from that time he assumed political authority over the Safwa of Central Mbeya.⁴³ The original chief of the Safwa was Chief Mwanshinga of Igawilo, but when the British colonialists sought to work with chiefs in Mbeya the Safwa presented Chief Lyoto as a disguise to hide their original chief. In Mbeya they found the Safwa occupying areas of Chunya, Central Mbeya, some portions of Rungwe and Mbalali. Like in many parts of Africa, the early history of Safwa was also dominated by traditions of rulers. Usafwa Chiefdom in Central Mbeya area was under the chieftaincy of Mwalyoto or Lyoto. In the 1920s, the British found Usafwa Chiefdom under Chief Gilbert Ntundu Lyoto. British colonial government shifted the district headquarters from Igale to Mbeya urban centre in 1927.⁴⁴

In contrary to the intention of the British colonial government to insist on tribalism, almost in all towns of Tanganyika inhabitants were to some extent undergoing detribalization. According to 1928 census, Mbeya urban centre had 8561 people. Population increase made Mbeya to evolve into an urban centre and assisted it to attain a status of being a minor settlement in 1929.⁴⁵ On 1st January, 1936, Mbeya minor settlement became a township under the Township Ordinance Number 16 of 1935 through Government Notice Number 127. The census on 23rd August, 1948 showed that Mbeya Township had a total of about 184046 people, the Safwa were 21%, Nyiha 21%, Nyakyusa 11%, Nyamwanga 10%, Malila 10%, Sangu 8% and All Others 18%.⁴⁶ Thus in the 1940s, Mbeya

³⁴ J. D. Graham. Indirect Rule: The establishment of “Chiefs” and “Tribes in Cameron’s Tanganyika.

³⁵ F. J. D. Lugard (1965) *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*.

³⁶ W. Rodney. Op. Cit. p.307.

³⁷ R. M. Maxon. Op. Cit.

³⁸ K. Shillington (2019) *History of Africa*, (4th edition), (UK: Red Globe Press), p. 397.

³⁹ I. Kimambo et al (2017) *A New History of Tanzania* (Dar es salaam: Mkuki na Nyota), p. 144.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p. 145.

⁴¹ J. M. Mbilinyi (1980) “African Education During the British Colonial Period 1919 – 1961 in Kaniki M. H. Y. *Tanzania Under Colonial Rule* (Singapore: Singapore Offset Printing Press), p.240.

⁴² R. M. Maxon. Op. Cit. p. 188

⁴³ TNA. Mbeya District Book 1.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

Township was multiracial or heterogeneously populated with African ethnic communities and non-African communities of Europeans, Indians, Goans and Arabs a situation which enhanced detribalization due to urbanization and migration. That destabilization threatened the British officials, for with indirect rule, British colonial government intended to preserve and protect African cultures and traditions from rapid change.⁴⁷

Usafwa Chiefdom was a result of the British creation of chiefdoms in Tanganyika with their imagination of tribalism, otherwise the chiefdom could have been named according to its area of location as Mbeya Chiefdom. Indirect rule laid too much emphasis on one traditional institution, namely chieftainship. To the African situation that attitude was fundamentally wrong, because it ignored, the fact that no people could live by one institution alone. Putting in institutional terms that meant the institution of chieftainship could flourish where all the other essential institutions were in a similarly flourishing condition.⁴⁸ The British government's imagination that African traditional institutions were simply chieftain institutions was tied up with their belief in their policy of divide and rule which strengthened historical differences among local communities.⁴⁹ To secure their power and means of exploitation the British colonialists divided and rearranged local communities into discrete groups, on the basis of tribal attributes. To the British, political progress was mainly explained in terms of a hierarchical structure as that of their own monarchical system.⁵⁰ The belief developed that chieftain institutions brought order, organization and a progressive stage of African evolution. But in Usafwa areas or elsewhere chieftaincies in their original form were equipped by rituals, often sacred, underpinnings. They were institutions of wisdom and tradition, indeed authorities, not of executive governments and administration. The Safwa had traditional institutions which ranged from consensus-based authority systems that used negotiation rather than hierarchical procedures for public decision making to centralized systems of chieftaincy.

Moreover, indirect rule in its original form meant ruling the colonized peoples through their existing traditional institutions.⁵¹ It was a system which aimed to preserve the existing traditional political institutions and incorporate them into the colonial administrative system or more frequently where chieftaincies were created by the British colonialists were empowered to collect tax, dispense law and maintain order at the local level. Nevertheless, the basic demands of the British colonial system everywhere had the effect of modifying the institutions, hence of distorting the functions of and weakening basic traditional institutions.⁵² According to this system of administration, only people who had traditional authority like kings and chiefs would be used as agents of the colonial administration. The colonized peoples were supposed to be ruled by using their existing laws and customs, the colonial powers were not expected to subject them to alien laws and culture. However, in practice this system of administration was never strictly adhered to. The British who used it modified it to such an extent that on many occasions they appointed people who had no traditional authority to become chiefs and used them as their agents. Any local authority, which worked contrary to the interests of the colonial government, was destroyed and its power was shifted to another chief. It was for this reason that in 1931 Chief Mwanshinga of Igawilo Sub-chiefdom of Usafwa Chiefdom was deposed after he misused funds for administration and his position was taken by Malangalila as the acting chief and the local court of Igawilo under Mwanshinga was shifted to Izumbwe near Mbalizi.⁵³ Chief Makongolo as beneficiary of indirect rule of Ikizu Chiefdom was appointed chief in February, 1926. Makongolo was deposed in 1958 died in the same year.⁵⁴ Other examples of chiefs who were appointed included Chief Bambo Mkulungu of Wamatengo and Kahigi of Buhaya.⁵⁵ The British also interfered with the existing traditional rulers to abolish certain customary laws and cultural practices which they termed "barbaric". Thus with the implementation of the British colonial indirect rule, chiefs were manipulated as if they were administrative personnel who might be reposted or removed to satisfy colonial needs. Chieftaincies were abolished where considered superfluous and created where considered colonially useful. More significantly, the new set of social requirements imposed by British was quite alien to local custom and hence was incorporated into traditional institutions only by a distortive process.⁵⁶ It had been critically examined that the nature and dynamics of indirect rule in Africa were riddled with contradictions

⁴⁷ R. P. Neumann (2002) "The Postwar Conservation Boom in British Colonial Africa". *Environmental History*. Vol. 7. No. 1. P.20.

⁴⁸ Z. K. Matthew (1937) "An African View of Indirect Rule in Africa". *Journal of Royal African Society*. Vol. 36. No. 145. P. 434.

⁴⁹ A. I. Nwabughuogu (1981) "The Role of Propaganda in the development of Indirect Rule in Nigeria, 1890- 1929. *Journal of African Historical Studies*. Vol. 14. No. 1. 74

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ E. S. Atieno Odhiambo. Op. Cit.

⁵² R. F. Betts. Op. Cit. p.316

⁵³ TNA. Mbeya District Book 1.

⁵⁴ L. E. Y. Mbogoni (2013) *Aspects of Colonial Tanzania*, (Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota), pp. 48 – 54.

⁵⁵ O. Kapinga and V. A. Gores (2020) "The Post-Colonial Administration in Tanzania 1961 to 2019." *EAS Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*. Vol. 2. p.258.

⁵⁶ R. F. Betts. Op. Cit. p. 323.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

and ambiguities. The British colonial officials were often accused of imposing colonial structures on local people in the name of traditions. Local Authorities, for instance, were seen as colonial inventions that often lacked real legitimacy.⁵⁷

In the implementation of indirect rule through customary laws a lot of contradictions were also encountered. The British colonial officials were confused by the complexity of tribal customary laws and tribal laws. In Mbeya, the Safwa were divided with little regard to their original areas, they were split up into what the British thought were acceptable boundaries. It was only the area of Central Mbeya that became known as Usafwa Chiefdom. Other areas that belonged to the Safwa were called by other names like Utengule Chiefdom, Chunya Chiefdom, Usongwe Chiefdom, Umbwila Chiefdom., Usoha Sub-Chiefdom etc. Contrary to British expectations, African societies were not divided into neatly bounded, mutually exclusive, stable cultural and political systems, but were dynamic, changing communities, whose boundaries were fluid and ambiguous and whose members were often engaged in multiple contests for power and resources. And, finally, officials' efforts to learn about local societies in order to build on them frequently elicited conflicting testimony about the nature of tribal laws and customs.⁵⁸ Much like the way in which traditional institutions were incorporated within the overall structure of British government, tribal laws were also taken up in the colonial legal framework. Customary laws, purported to represent the legal principles of local people, were essentially amalgamated with colonially imported laws. As was the case with traditional institutions, customary laws were only accepted on the condition that they did not conflict with the basic principles of British laws.⁵⁹ Customary laws were intended to sustain traditional hierarchies endorsed by the colonial authorities. Thus the laws imposed over much of Tanganyika and the Usafwa Chiefdom in particular were intentionally designed to underpin the British colonial presence. The British argued that they used indirect rule because it was flexible and catered for the local variations in Tanganyika. However, there were many occasions when the British introduced and implemented policies which contradicted the existing customary laws. Donald Cameron the governor of Tanganyika from 1925, argued that on the other hand, customary laws were destroyed by indirect rule that used a European code of laws.⁶⁰

It is widely argued that Britain did not have enough European personnel who would be employed in the colonial administration. Some scholars called that as the "European question," or the "thin white line," the problem of how to rule a large number of local people with so few European personnel. That forced the British to rule Tanganyika indirectly by using traditional institutions such as chieftainships, customary laws and land tenure. This situation contradicted with indirect rule, which in turn intersected with British ideologies of racial, technological and cultural superiority. The East African Population Census in Mbeya Township on 23rd August, 1948 showed that there were about 421 as part of racial distribution of civil population.⁶¹ Indirect rule was thus a result of numerical weakness of the British colonial government in Tanganyika although simultaneously reinforced it. Inadequacy of European administrative personnel and poor communications were the major obstacles to the close supervision of local authorities. Personnel shortages forced District Officers to take chances that their chiefs would, as they did the right thing on their own.⁶² Thus while indirect rule provided an administrative structure of dealing with colonised people by less costly means, it turned out to be ineffective because it alienated the people from the administration and many colonial officials were frustrated by it and derived little satisfaction. The jurisdiction of chieftaincies was ill defined and many chiefs did not have independent sources of revenue other than the rebate from taxes they collected for colonial state. Some chiefs created resource bases outside of official channels. The inability to provide close European supervision left many chiefs free to pursue their own agenda at the same time as they tried to do what the government asked them to do. In so far as the British colonial administrators were few in number and African chiefs were free to do as they wished. British control in Tanganyika was more posture derived than absolute.

The implementation of indirect rule in Tanganyika contradicted with the motives of civilizing mission despite the contention that the colonization of Tanganyika or elsewhere in Africa was part of the 'White man's burden', that it was a moral imperative of Europeans to civilize Africans. European civilization mission meant introducing Western European culture, including the opening of formal educational institutions, introducing coded laws, preaching Christianity and introducing legitimate trade.⁶³ The British colonialists perceived local people in Usafwa Chiefdom of Mbeya as "primitive" and "backward;" people who could not realize the

⁵⁷ W. K. Yayoh (2015) Ethnographic Research, Local Power Brokers and the Political Reorganization of Colonial Ewedome, British Mandated Territory, 1914 – 1930s, *Contemporary Journal of African Studies* Vol. 3 No.2. p. 67.

⁵⁸ S. Berry, (1992) "Hegemony on a Shoestring: Indirect Rule and Access to Agricultural Land. *Journal of the International African Institute*. Vol. 62. P.330.

⁵⁹ M. Deflem (1994) "Law Enforcement in British Colonial Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Imperial Policing in Nyassaland, the Gold Coast and Kenya". *Police Studies*. Vol. No. 17. P. 47.

⁶⁰ D. Cameron (1937) "Native Administration in Tanganyika and Nigeria". *Journal of the Royal African Society*. Vol. 36. No. 145. P. 22.

⁶¹ TNA. Mbeya District Book 1.

⁶² L. E. Y. Mbogoni. Op. Cit. p. 55.

⁶³ C. Amone (201) "Intercultural Dialogue During the European Civilization Mission in Africa: The Acholi Encounter with British Colonialists in Northern Uganda, 1898 – 1962". In Fethi Mansouri (ed.) *Interculturalism at the Crossroads Comparative Perspectives on Concepts, Policies and Practices* (Paris: UNESCO), p.299.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

importance of development. They called them as politically backward as well as primitive in their daily practices and ideas.⁶⁴ However, the British colonial ambition of civilization mission and indirect rule, from the 1940s, became embedded in programmes of modernization for increasing overall economic production level in Tanganyika.⁶⁵ Moreover, the implementation of indirect rule in Tanganyika was dynamic and shaped by socio-economic changes that developed in Western Europe in the second half of the 19th century. It was with that notion that British colonial civilization mission became part and parcel of the Eurocentric ideologies of racism, cultural superiority and Western achievements. Colonization was a civilizing mission and not an attempt to study, understand or appreciate the African culture of any kind.⁶⁶ The British justified colonization of Africa on grounds that it was its moral duty to “uplift” Africans from their primitive state. Ample evidence suggests that all European powers did not think much of Africans or African culture and history. Civilizing the Africans was just a pretext and a subterfuge. The real motive was profits and wealth. Like other Europeans, nineteenth century British believed they had “mission to civilize” African colonial subjects. They believed to live life that did not undermine European racial superiority in the eyes of the colonized. They feared “going local person” of the anxieties was whether or not Britons abroad would “go local person”.⁶⁷ The British wanted to “civilize” the Africans, but not to the point where the Africans might claim equality with them.

Land tenure and the Mandate of the League of Nations also had contradictory influences in the implementation of indirect rule in Tanganyika and the Usafwa Chiefdom in particular. The Mandate’s influences were in the system of land tenure that the British colonial government chose for Tanganyika, outlined in the 1923 Land Ordinance.⁶⁸ The terms of the Mandate required the British colonial government to respect the rights over land of the local population and the Permanent Mandates Commission, ensured that the terms were observed. The first task of the British administration was to discover how these rights could be identified and protected. This was no easy task since there was a great diversity in the traditional laws and customs relating to land usage. There were three colonial categories of land in Mbeya District: tribal land, alienated land and public land but with emphasis by the 1923 Land Ordinance that all land in Tanganyika was public land.⁶⁹

The 1923 Land Ordinance had the most direct bearing on land usage during the period of British administration. Its intentions were made, clear from the preamble, which was as follows:

WHEREAS it is expedient that the existing customary rights of the natives of the Tanganyika Territory to use and enjoy the land of the Territory and the natural fruits thereof in sufficient quantity to enable them to provide for the sustenance of themselves their families and their posterity should be assured protected and preserved; AND WHEREAS it is expedient that the existing natives customs with regard to the use and occupation of land should as far as possible be preserved;...⁷⁰

The 1923 Land Ordinance, by declaring that the whole of the land of Tanganyika, to be public land, breached the terms of the Mandate regarding the need to respect the rights and safeguard the interests of the local population. Land ownership and management were among the ways in which the British failed completely to appreciate the Safwa customary laws and traditions. Land among the Safwa was customarily and communally owned although the oral traditions of the Safwa show that there was little development to feudalism (*Ikwilla*), but still nobody claimed private ownership of land.

The British colonial government set the Native Authority Ordinance of 1926 as part and parcel of their indirect rule. The Ordinance listed duties and obligations undertaken by the Native Authorities in their colonies. Section 4 of the Ordinance stipulated general duties of chiefs which were to maintain order and supervise the government in their extended areas of authority.⁷¹ Section 6 of the Ordinance dealt with prevention of crime and Section 15 empowered Native Authority to make rules, which had to be enforced in local native courts.⁷² The structure of native authority governments was made up of chiefdoms, sub-chiefdoms, village headmen areas and jumbates.⁷³ This structure slightly retained the form of German rule as only the position of akidas was replaced by headmen in the Usafwa Chiefdom. Archival sources include huge lists of jumbes with their respective jumbates in Usafwa

⁶⁴ Report on the History of the Creation of Mbeya Range Forest Reserve, in MSHZA, File No. F. 4/30.

⁶⁵ S. Feieman (1990) *Peasant Intellectuals, Anthropology and History in Tanzania*, (USA: The University of Wisconsin Press), p. 164.

⁶⁶ C. Amone. Op.Cit.

⁶⁷ L. E. Y. Mbogoni. Op.Cit. pp. 3 – 5.

⁶⁸ 1923 Land Ordinance.

⁶⁹ S. Charnley (1997) “Pastoralism and Property Right: The Evolution of Communal Property on the Usangu Plain, Tanzania.” *African Economic History*. No. 25. P.109.

⁷⁰ Land Ordinance, 1923.

⁷¹ TNA, 1926 Native Authority Ordinance

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

Chiefdom, for instance, Mwanambanzi of Nshishshi, Wazingwa of Njelenje, Elieseli of Shogwa, Mlekwa of Mumvwa, Mujenda of Mshewe, Shire of Shuma, Mohamed of Wayanga, etc. The list included headmen like Mwanmbashi and Gwazinga.⁷⁴ Although this procedure recognized the traditional tribal authorities, in some areas where the local people had no closely discrete tribal institutions or where there was a mixture of tribes, the people were required to choose their council of headmen. But still the authorities derived their power from the 1926 Native Authority Ordinance. For instance this happened among the Bondei and Zigua who had never had any tribal institutions, thus they continued with direct rule by using the akidas,⁷⁵ also at the coast and among stateless societies having no chiefs, it was not easy to implement indirect rule. Thus, the Native Authority Ordinance of 1926 gave power to local authorities to perform administrative, judicial and financial duties in areas of their jurisdiction.

Development of indirect rule in Usafwa Chiefdom was always accompanied by changes and readjustment, for the British colonialists did not abruptly impose their indirect administration. Firstly, they conducted wide researches on socio-political organizations of local people in Mbeya. It was not until 15th March, 1930 that the Usafwa Chiefdom under 'Mwene' Lyoto was gazetted as a native authority, which covered larger areas of central Mbeya town.⁷⁶ On the same date Usongwe Chiefdom under Chief Mwalyego and Utengule Chiefdom under Chief Merere attained their status as native authorities. Igawilo Sub-chiefdom under Sub-chief Mahinya was granted native authority status on 16th January, 1936.⁷⁷ The Native Authority Ordinance of 1926 imposed a political structure on the Usafwa Chiefdom in Mbeya town, which was not much new to them because the British colonial government found the chieftainship of Lyoto already well established and functioning in its traditional institutions. But in the process of its implementation, sometimes, the system of indirect rule faced challenges particularly in the aspects traditions, chieftaincies, land tenure, customary laws and tax collection.

Chief Lyoto and his sub-chiefs and headmen (*Afumu*) served as intermediaries between the Safwa and the colonial government. They ensured that the Safwa cooperated in implementation of colonial government policies. For example, in the Usafwa Chiefdom the chiefs were used to enforce unpopular and poorly understood policies like the agricultural conservation measures, but sometimes their objectives were ignored.⁷⁸ These problems alienated people from their native authorities and from colonial rule. The 1929 Native Courts Ordinance established courts under the chiefs' jurisdiction, which were part of the administration rather than the judicial system of the chiefdoms. Cases were heard and decided in accordance with traditional laws and custom, and to the surprise appeals were heard by the British colonial administrative officials rather than by the British courts established in Tanganyika.⁷⁹ So a dual system of laws was established, the British laws and customary laws. Judicial authority was largely laid in colonial officials; the new system of courts became an essential part of the means of establishing and maintaining laws and order. On the other hand, the new system brought with it many problems, both practical in long range.

Throughout the Second World War to the end of 1946 Tanganyika continued to be ruled by use of indirect rule with observation of terms of the Mandate of the League of Nations. After the end of the Second World War, the League of Nations was replaced by United Nations, which set up the Trusteeship Council that took the position of the Permanent Commission of the League of Nations. Tanganyika became a trust territory under the Organization of United Nations. The British colonial government was obliged to rule trust territories in reference to terms of the Trusteeship Council. Article 76 stated specifically that trust territories were to be developed towards self-government.⁸⁰ Under Article 87 of the Charter, the Trusteeship Council had the power to make periodic visits of inspection to all trust territories.⁸¹

After the end of the Second World War the British colonial government set a plan of development and modernization which came out as new forms of colonialism in Africa that popularly came to be known as "the second colonial occupation."⁸² Colonial authorities continued to see local societies as primitive and backward, possessing no attributes that could contribute to their future political and economic development. The difference was that local societies were then viewed as transformable through the application of science and the introduction of planned capitalist development.⁸³ In colonial administration, the Local Government Ordinance of 1953 was set up to replace the native authorities with district councils. It created municipal, town and district councils. The native authorities did not have jurisdiction power to foreigners. This Ordinance made the functions of the councils to be exercisable in respect of all persons in the area under their jurisdiction.⁸⁴ It was amended in 1957 with emphasis on multiracial

⁷⁴ MSHZA. Report on the Creation of Mbeya Range Forest Reserve. File No. F. 30/4..

⁷⁵ J. Willis. Op. Cit. p. 56.

⁷⁶ TNA, Mbeya District Book 1.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Mbeya Southern Highlands Zonal Archives. Agricultural Notes. File. No.AGR. 1/50.

⁷⁹ R. M. Maxon. Op. Cit. p. 189.

⁸⁰ Taylor, Op.Cit. p. 73

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² . Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 436.

⁸³ R. P. Neuman . Op. Cit. pp. 28- 29.

⁸⁴ U.R. T. President's Office Regional Administration and Local Government. History of Local Government in Tanzania. P. 7.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

constitutional development.⁸⁵ Before the change from native authorities to colonial local governments, the British colonial government started by recruiting personnel to operate the local governments and training was conducted at Mzumbe from 1945.⁸⁶ Mr. William Mbanga, the Treasury Secretary of Usafwa Chiefdom Native Authority was among the first Africans who attended several courses on local government at Mzumbe in 1945 for six months. Mbeya Southern Highlands District became a district council by the Local Ordinance of 1957, on 1st July, 1957 by the Government Notice Number 167 of Proclamation Number 18.⁸⁷ The local government replaced the native authorities in Mbeya, but it remained impossible to abolish positions of chiefs. However, there was contradiction on failure to abolish the positions of the chiefs, who retained control over laws and orders. One of the main obstacles was the diversity of political systems, in 1951 Tanganyika contained 435 native administrations. In 1952 local government was further complicated by multi-racialism. Officials realized that the crucial problem was the relationship between purely African local administrations for Europeans and Asians were small in number.⁸⁸ Slowly the chieftainship of Lyoto lost its judicial and financial administrative duties but remained with its traditional power among the Safwa in Mbeya. To achieve national unity legal steps were taken with the Chief Repeal Act No. 13 of 1963 that brought the indirect rule, a chief-based traditional institutions introduced in 1926 and the Native Authority to an end. Also the Act, made illegal for former chiefs to reclaim or challenge their lost positions.⁸⁹

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper has revealed that the British colonial indirect rule faced a number of ambiguities, complexities and problems which had contradictory tendencies in its implementation in the Usafwa Chiefdom and Tanganyika at large. Indirect rule was influenced by changing status of Tanganyika as a Mandate under the League of Nations and Trusteeship under the Organization of United Nations which also had ambiguous and contradictory conditions. The implementation of indirect rule was also shaped by individual British colonial officials. The ways the governors of Tanganyika enforced indirect rule differed from one another due to the prevailed political situation. Sir Horace Byatt, the first governor, was moderate and pro-Africans; Sir Donald Cameron was described as ‘the first great governor’⁹⁰ and the most active, while Sir Edward Twining and Sir Richard Turnbull had a lot of constitutional changes during the implementation of indirect rule.

It is realized that indirect rule was necessary for the British colonialism, but contradictory political and economic factors made it to have contradictory consequences on traditional institutions. It was imposed as a disguise to give the impression of accepting local traditions, customs, chieftaincies with their chiefdoms, while in reality, it was done mainly to sustain colonial interests to subordinate and dominate local people. Therefore, traditional institutions were retained for the maintenance of colonial rule. Indirect rule disintegrated traditional institutions and laid foundation for total colonial domination. It established the British colonial hegemony in Tanganyika. The British colonial indirect rule promoted a dependency conditions on local traditional authorities and, by implication, on their communities. Because of colonial control over local authorities, chiefs came to depend more and more on the colonial government for the legitimacy of their power, survival, and their resources. Colonialism depended on codes, ordinances or proclamations, and legislation to control local societies but colonial laws and policies were contradictory and ambiguous about traditional rights. The colonial policies served, and to some extent succeeded, to undermine and disintegrate the traditional institutions in Tanganyika and the Usafwa Chiefdom in particular. Indirect rule created the conditions for the operation of neocolonialism which later uses indirect forms of subordination and domination of local people.⁹¹

REFERENCES

- 1) Amone, C. (2017) “Intercultural Dialogue During the European Civilization Mission in Africa: The Acholi Encounter with British Colonialists in Northern Uganda, 1898 – 1962”. In Fethi Mansouri (ed.) *Interculturalism at the Crossroads Comparative Perspectives on Concepts, Policies and Practices*, Paris: UNESCO.
- 2) Atieno Odhiambo, E.S. et al (1977) *A History of East Africa*, Malaysia: Longman Group Limited.
- 3) Bentwich, N. (1946) “Colonial Mandates and Trusteeship” *Transaction for Grotius Society*.
- 4) Berry, S. (1992) “Hegemony on a Shoestring: Indirect Rule and Access to Agricultural Land. *Journal of the International African Institute*. Vol. 62.

⁸⁵ TNA, Mbeya District Book 1.

⁸⁶ Agricultural Notes. File No. AGR. 1/50.

⁸⁷ TNA, Mbeya District Book 1.

⁸⁸ A. Eckert (1999) “‘A Showcase for Experiment’: Local Government Reforms in Colonial Tanzania, 1940s and 1950s”. *Africa Spectrum*, Vol. 34. No. 2. P. 220.

⁸⁹ S. M. Seim (2015) “Political and Policization of the Tanzania’s Agricultural Marketing Co-operative”. *European Journal of Business and Management* www.iiste.org ISSN 222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 222-2839 (Online) VI. 7. No. 25. P. 170

⁹⁰ A. Coulson (2013) *Tanzania a Political Economy* (United Kingdom: Oxford University Press), p. 127.

⁹¹ G. T. Mishambi et al. Op. Cit., p. 147.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chiefdom

- 5) Betts, R. F. (1985) "Methods and Institutions of European Domination", in Boahen A. (ed.) *General History of Africa, Vol. VII Africa under Colonial Domination from 1880 to 1935*, Paris: UNESCO.
- 6) Cameron, D. (1937) Native Administration in Tanganyika and Nigeria. *Journal of the Royal African Society. Vol. 36. No. 145*.
- 7) Charnley, S. (1997) "Pastoralism and Property Right: The Evolution of Communal Property on the Usangu Plain, Tanzania." *African Economic History. No. 25*.
- 8) Coulson A. (2013) *Tanzania a Political Economy*, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- 9) Deflem, M. (1994) "Law Enforcement in British Colonial Africa: A Comparative Analysis of Imperial Policing in Nyassaland, the Gold Coast and Kenya". *Police Studies. Vol. No. 17*.
- 10) Eckert, A. (1999) "'A Showcase for Experiment': Local Government Reforms in Colonial Tanzania, 1940s and 1950s. *Africa Spectrum, Vol. 34. No. 2*.
- 11) Fage, J. D. (1961) *Introduction to the History of West Africa*, London: The Syndics of the Cambridge University Press.
- 12) Fahy, D. F. and Potts, D. Eds.(2006) *African Urban Economies Viability, Vitality or Vitiating*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 13) Feieman, S. (1990) *Peasant Intellectuals, Anthropology and History in Tanzania*, USA: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- 14) Frederiksen, T. (2014) "Authorizing the "Natives". Governmentality, Dispossession and the Contradictions of Rule in Colonial Zambia". *Annals of the Association of American Geographers. Vol. 104. Vol. 6*.
- 15) Graham, J. D. Indirect Rule: The establishment of "Chiefs" and "Tribes in Cameron's Tanganyika.
- 16) Green, E. (2011) "Indirect Rule and Colonial Intervention: Chiefs and Agrarian in Nyasaland, ca. 1933 to the Early 1950s". *The International Journal of African Studies, Vol. 44. No. 2*.
- 17) Illife, J. (1979) *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, London: Cambridge University Press.
- 18) Itandala, B. (1992) "The Anglo-German Partition of East Africa." Tanzania Zamani, *A Journal of the Historical Association of Tanzani. Vol 1 No.1*.
- 19) Kaijage, F. J. (1983) "Labour Conditions in the Tanzanian Mining Industry, 1930- 1960". *African Studies Centre Working paper No. 83*.
- 20) Kapinga, O. and Gores, V. A. (2020) "The Post-Colonial Administration in Tanzania 1961 to 2019." *EAS Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies. Vol. 2*.
- 21) Kervinen, M. (2007) "Tribe of the Indirect rule: Tribalism in the Colonial reporting from Kenya Colony and Protectorate in 1920 – 1940 a Terminological Discussion". Master's Thesis Joensuu.
- 22) Kimambo, I. et al (2017) *A New History of Tanzania*, Dar es salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- 23) Lange, M. (2009) *Lineage of Despotism and Development, British Colonialism and State Power*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 24) Lugard F. J. D. (1965) *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*.
- 25) Mamdani, M. (1999) "Historicizing Power and Responses to Power: Indirect Rule and Its Reform". *Social Research. Vol. 66. No. 3*.
- 26) Matthew Z. K. (1937) "An African View of Indirect Rule in Africa". *Journal of Royal African Society. Vol. 36. No. 145*.
- 27) Maxon R. M. (2000) *East Africa an Introductory History* (3rd Ed.), USA: Virginia University Press.
- 28) Mbilinyi, J. M. (1980) "African Education During the British Colonial Period 1919 – 1961 in Kaniki M. H. Y. *Tanzania Under Colonial Rule*, Singapore: Singapore Offset Printing Press.
- 29) i L. Mbogoni, E. Y. (2013) *Aspects of Colonial Tanzania*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- 30) Mishambi G.T et al (eds.) (2002) *Africa from Nineteenth Century to 1990. 2nd Ed*. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Institute of Education.
- 31) Mukaria, A. (2021) "Colonialism: The Genesis of Degradation of Nature". *Academia Letter*
- 32) Neumann, R. P. (2000) "Primitive Ideas: Protected Areas Buffer Zones and the Politics of Land in Africa". In Broch-Due and A Schroede (eds.) *Producing Nature and Poverty in Africa* Stockholm: Elanders Gotab
- 33) Neumann, R. P. (2002) "The Postwar Conservation Boom in British Colonial Africa". *Environmental History. Vol. 7. No. 1*.
- 34) Neumann, R. P. (1997) "Forest Rights, Privileges and Prohibitions: Contextualizing State Forestry Policy in Colonial Tanganyika". *Environmental History, Vol. 3. No. 1*.
- 35) Nwabughogu A. I. (1981) "The Role of Propaganda in the development of Indirect Rule in Nigeria, 1890- 1929. *Journal of African Historical Studies. Vol. 14. No. 1*
- 36) Okello, B. (2002) *A History of East Africa*, Kampala: Fountain Publisher Ltd.
- 37) Okoth, A. (2010) *A History of Africa 1800 – 1914. Vo. 1*, Dar es Salaam: Ujuzi Educational Publishers Ltd.
- 38) Oliver, R. and Atmore, A (1981) *Africa Since 1800, (3rdEd.)* USA: Vail Ballou Press, Inc.

The Implementation and Contradictions of the British Colonial Indirect Rule in Tanganyika: A Case of Usafwa Chieftdom

- 39) Palagashvili, L. (2018) “ African Chiefs: Comparative Governance under Colonial Rule”. *Public Choice*, 174.
- 40) Perham M. (1934) “Some Problems of Indirect Rule in Africa”. *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*. Vol. 82. No. 4252.
- 41) Rodney, W. (1976) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House.
- 42) Seim S. M. (2015) “Political and Policization of the Tanzania’s Agricultural Marketing Co-operative”. *European Journal of Business and Management* www.iiste.org ISSN 222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 222-2839 (Online) VI. 7. No. 25.
- 43) Shillington (2019) *History of Africa*, (4th ed.), UK: Red Globe Press.
- 44) Shiviji, I.G. (2009) *Accumulation in an African Periphery, a Theoretical Framework*, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- 45) Skalnik, P. (2004) “Chieftdom: A Universal Formation”. *European Journal of Anthropology*. Vol. 43.
- 46) Spear, T. (2003) “Neo-Traditionalism and the Limits of Invention in British Colonial Africa”. *The Journal of African History*. Vol. 44. No. 1.
- 47) Taylor J.C. (1963) *Political Development of Tanganyika*, London: Cambridge University Press
- 48) U.R. T. *President’s Office Regional Administration and Local Government. History of Local Government in Tanzania*.
- 49) Willis, J. (1993) “ The Admnistration of, Bonde, 1920-60: A Study of the Implementation of Indirect Rule in Tanganyika”. *African Affairs*. Vol. 92. No.366.
- 50) Yayoh, W. K. (2015) “Ethnographic Research, Local Power Brokers and the Political Reorganization of Colonial Ewedome, British Mandated Territory, 1914 – 1930s”, *Contemporary Journal of African Studies* Vol. 3 No.2.

ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS:

Mbeya Southern Highlands Zonal Archives (MSHZA):

Agricultural Notes. File No. AGR. 1/50.

Report on the Creation of Mbeya Range Forest Reserve. File No. F. 30/4.

Tanzania National Archives (TNA):

1920 Land ordinance.

Mbeya District Book 1.

Southern Highlands Provincial Book.

The Native Authorities Ordinance of 1926.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution – Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0)

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.