Pre-Independence Zambia

 Thou art depraved, O thinking man
 And thy good to thy nature tied;
 Born free, yet everywhere in chains,
 And in forced freedom thine trust earns

Brief Introduction

In this chapter, the story of pre-independence Zambia is told, with implications on the political and economic future of the nation. The creation of Northern Rhodesia is discussed and the first four of five significant events that laid the foundation of the difficulties and challenges Zambia would face after independence. The 1964 Barotseland Agreement is discussed in the context of competing traditional and state demands.
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§ 5.1 Colonialism: Not an Excuse

There is a dodgy, uncontested but popularized view that colonialism should not be factored in discussions of the precarious economic, cultural and political conditions in which most African nations are found. Parag Khanna, a Senior Research Fellow at the New America Foundation, and author of How to Run the World, appeared Monday, February 21st, 2011 on CNN’s Parker Spitzer and alluded to this interpretation. There is, downright, no excuse for dictatorial regimes such as existed in Libya, Egypt, Tunisia, or indeed, in Zimbabwe, which used colonialism as an ante for their autocratic harangues. But colonialism still remains a key factor in the discussion about Zambia’s quest for true freedom. Colonialism laid the querulous foundation upon which the conflicts and economic and political problems Africa presently countenances are based. Discussing colonialism is inevitable for Zambia. If not for lessons to be learned, it should be for future resource and wealth preservation.

Colonialism sold Africa to the West. For example, in Namibia, “White Namibians make up just six percent of the population but control over 90 percent of the land.” Perhaps the Mugabe land reforms were too ambitious, but the truth remains that developed formations have always

---

1 Parag Khanna, How to Run the World: Charting a Course to the Next Renaissance (New York: Random House Publishing Group, 2011)
3 Ibid.
been custodians of their own resources; Africa has not. Talib Ray has, indeed, educated: “Today Africa is plagued with leaders who are confused by the thought that [other] countries are going to show them the way to economic independence. History has shown otherwise.”

It is, therefore, the position of this book that history must be brought to bear on events that have consigned Africa to a poor and diminished continent. In stating that, however, I do not intend to demean the fact that Africans themselves have contributed to this state of affairs. Indeed, Marcus Garvey has correctly observed that, partly, “The…stumbling block in the way of progress in the race [African race] has invariably come from within race itself.” However, that has been only in dealing with the symptoms of the disease rather than the cause of it.

In a controversial article dubbed, “African Solutions to African Problems.” Musiitwa argues that (sic), “African’s failure to accept some responsibility for about 50 years of substandard leadership forces conversation to revert to the source of ‘all’ Africa’s development problems: colonialism.” Despite being written from an Afropolitan perspective, the article offers two irrefutable facts and one canard, a grave misconception about colonialism.

First, and undeniably so, colonialism is the source of, if not all, then most of Africa’s developmental problems. And this is clarified in the ensuing pages. Second, there is something like African solutions to African problems. Third, admittedly, African leaders are partly responsible for the underdevelopment of Africa, but African leadership is not sub-standard, and this book has demonstrated that.

§5.2 Interesting History

To think of the history of Zambia, is to think of that of Africa at large. Correctly, Zambia has been called the Real Africa. The nature and environment of Zambia has changed from what Sir Charles Dundas, a colonial administrator of the old days described as, “flat, featureless bush and low forest land,” to constituting now some of the most attractive landscapes of the world.

4 Ibid., p. 4
5 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid., defines Afropolitan as, “A cosmopolitan African, with global exposure and viewpoints, who retains a commitment to, knowledge of and passion for Africa.”
11 See §21.7, especially page 513
12 The phrase, “Zambia: The Real Africa” is used in relation to Zambia’s tourism potential. The nature of Zambia is barely unspoiled attracting thousands of tourists from all over the world. Zambia is unarguably very rich in both scenery and wildlife, making Zambia the tourist heart of Africa. Experts agree that Zambia’s environment has remained unchanged since the very beginning of time.
Despite this, however, as Grant has painfully acknowledged, Zambia hugely remains forgotten. Grant laments, “Zambia is the forgotten country of Africa. Celebrities don’t go there, nor, it seems, do foreign journalists or world leaders. This is a pity, because Zambia is both a beautiful and an interesting country.”

Beautiful, that is common knowledge, however, interesting, that is where the story begins. It is interesting because although Zambia has been in existence for decades, it seems that its history has been unfairly written from the 1900s for those who care, and from 1924, for historic record. There is, thus, an urgent need to accurately record history because it repeats itself, as the French say, “plus ça change, plus ça reste la meme,” or indeed, as George Santayana has truthfully presaged, “Those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it.”

The rude reality is that Zambia is barely known outside its eight-bound borders. Its talents remain untapped, its resources undermanaged, and its image, if not mired in media reportages, is hardly known. “We have found that a staggering 60 percent of the wealthy highly educated people in North America, Europe and Asia either had never heard of Zambia or knew nothing at all about the country.” What is unknown, or what has blatantly been ignored about Zambia, is the focal point of this chapter.

§5.3 Early Inhabitants

The discovery of the fossils of the so-called Kabwe Man or Broken Hill Man at Broken Hill or Kabwe in 1921 shed more light as to who could have occupied Zambia in the far away past. Kabwe Hill Man could have been living in this area between 123,000 and 107,000 B.C or possibly as early as 248,000 B.C. Archaeologists have long established that Homo Habilis who lived about 1.8 million years ago and is considered the earliest human being known to the world, “lived also in Zambia.” In fact, Zinjanthropus bones have been found in Zambia “not far from Lusaka.”

Nonetheless, the original inhabitants of modern day Zambia could have been the Bushmen (also called Sans), who were hunters and gatherers and who also lived a nomadic life with Stone Age technology. They mainly gathered fruits and nuts, but they also hunted antelopes.

The Bushmen were the only inhabitants of the region until the 4th Century, when the Bantu

---

14 William Grant was one of the last generations of British Colonial Service Officers in Northern Rhodesia (Zambia). He served there at the apex of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland from 1958 to 1961. In his book, Zambia, Then and Now: Colonial Rulers and their African Successors, Grant makes a hearty comparative analysis of the Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) under which he served as a Colonial Service Officer with the Zambia under the African successors. He calculates that Zambia was under British Government colonial rule for 40 years (1924 – 1964) and under self-government for 42 years (1964 – present). He charges that both have had almost equal time to make their mark.
16 This may be translated into English as, “The more things change, the more they remain the same.”
18 Reference is made from the notes I posted on my website http://www.our-zambia.com. Some of the source reference materials were taken from Wikipedia, the online dictionary.
19 Homo Rhodesiansis: Rhodesian Man was one of the first names for Kabwe Man
22 Ibid.
23 In early years, the territory that is called Zambia had no recorded history. People moved around freely in a nomadic fashion, establishing settlements where they could under the rule of African chiefs.
people started to migrate from the north. Historic records show that Iron Age began in Zambia in A.D 50. The earliest Bantu speaking people who inhabited the territory could have been the “Ila who came into the country during the first century and introduced the Iron Age.” By A.D 1200, the Tonga had settled at Sebanji Hill in Zambia. The Bantu people had a far more developed technology. They were farmers and had iron and copper tools and weapons, as well as knowledge about pottery.

Even today the Ila and Tonga people are knowledgeable and good farmers in food production and cattle farming. They were sedentary and lived in small self-sufficient villages with a few houses, growing sorghum and beans, as well as keeping cattle and goats.

These early migrations were joined by the Bisa, Lala, Chewa, Lenje, Lozi, Lunda and Bemba by the 12th Century. The Mbunda, Luvale and Kaonde joined later. They “co-existed or integrated with people that were already there before them.” These all collectively speak a Bantu language which is linguistically similar. The similarities themselves could have arisen as a result of contiguous tribal proximity.

The early farmers practiced Chitemene agriculture and they had to constantly move further south when the soil was exhausted. The indigenous Bushmen were either assimilated into the new culture or pushed aside into areas not suitable for agriculture. Agriculture led to the growth in population. By the 11th and 12th centuries a more advanced society was beginning to emerge. Even though most villages were still self-sufficient, long distance trade was developing. Copper mining was intensified. Copper crosses were probably used as a currency. Ivory carvings and cotton textiles were other export commodities. One of the most famous archaeological sites for this period is Ing’ombe Ilede. The increase in trade resulted in larger political units and more complex social structures.

The period between the 16th and 19th centuries saw the emergence of organized Iron-Age kingdoms as well as widespread immigration. Four kingdoms were established in this period - and these were the Kazembe-Lunda in the north which centered around the lower Luapula River, the Bemba in the north-east, the Ngoni in the east and the Lozi in the west on the upper Zambezi River.

The territory of the present day Zambia, being far inland, did not have direct contact with non-Africans until relatively recently in its history. Arab and Portuguese traders were visiting by the 18th Century. The first recorded visits by Europeans to the area we presently call Zambia

24 Grotpeter et. al, supra.
26 Grotpeter et. al, supra.
27 The Bantu people of Central Africa had used copper tools as back as the fourth century. When the representative of the British South Africa Company (BSAC) under John Cecil Rhodes came and signed mineral concessions with Chief Lewanika, and their subsequent claim to have discovered copper deposits in the area presently known as Zambia, the natives had been using copper for generations.
29 Slash and burn agriculture
30 At Ing’ombe Ilede, trade in the form of batter system boomed. Batter system is the exchange of goods for goods.
31 The Ngoni under Zwangendaba crossed the Zambezi River in 1835 and moved north. It is believed that they crossed the Zambezi River under the Eclipse of the Sun. “The Ngoni in the Eastern Province of Zambia fought many wars before the arrival of the White man. However, the Ngoni warriors did not constitute a standing army in the sense of the modern armies of today. Albeit, they had drawn lessons from Shaka Zulu’s approach to warfare, and that partly explains their success as they moved from South Africa to the north. They were eventually halted by European armed forces with their superior weapons in 1898.” (Bizeck J. Phiri, “Civil Control of the Zambian Military since Independence and Its Implication for Democracy.”)
32 Zambia is a landlocked country; it does not have a seaport or coastline.
were the Portuguese. Manoel Caetano Pereira and Dr. Francisco Jose Maria de Lacerda visited Zambia in 1796 and 1798, respectively. Both came via Tete in Mozambique to Mwata Kazembe’s Capital to try and get the chief’s agreement to a Portuguese trade route between their territories of Mozambique and Angola. Lacerda died within a few weeks of arriving at Kazembe’s Kingdom but left a valuable journal which was carried back to Tete by his priest and which was later translated into English by the explorer Sir Richard Burton.

It is believed, however, that the Portuguese first settled in Zumbo, Mozambique, in 1720, which is just across the Luangwa River from Zambia, at the confluence with the Zambezi River. Around 1820, they had settled on the Zambian side at Feira. So it is very likely they were visiting the Zambian territory between 1720 and 1820.

5.4 Terra Nullius

I would posit from the outset that the history of Africa in general, and then of Zambia in particular, as written by European historians is highly misleading. Africa teemed with thriving civilizations as far back as the 13th Century. Ancient states such as Ghana, Mali, Bornu, Axum, Kivu, Benin, and the Bantu kingdoms in central-southern Africa were hives of political, economic and cultural hegemonies.

The colonial doctrine of terra nullius, which dominated the 1884-5 Berlin Congress in the quest to acquire land in Sub-Saharan Africa, was a suppressive thesis which postulated that colonized land was empty of human inhabitants and, therefore, could be claimed and settled in by colonists. The Berlin Congress, ironically, declared terra nullius the very land in which gigantic ancient states and empires thrived to be shared among the major European powers for occupation and colonization.

The very idea of congressing to share Africa with “no single African representative at Berlin,” by ambassadors, who had not set foot in Africa, is grossly exploitive. Britain, France, Germany, the US, Belgium, Italy, Japan, and many nations in Europe in their imperial quest deemed Africa “unclaimed space,” culminating in the “biggest land grab in history.”

33 The Arabs came in as traders and merchants, while the Europeans were missionaries, civil servants, commercial farmers, miners, adventurers, and entrepreneurs.
34 He was a mixed person of Goanese and Portuguese blood; he was a trader.
35 Francisco Jose Maria de Lacerda was an explorer.
36 Modern day Luangwa
37 In his Society Must be Defended, Michel Foucault posits that the victors of a social struggle use their political dominance to suppress a defeated adversary's version of historical events in favor of their own propaganda, which may go so far as historical revisionism.
38 Zambia is as large as France, Switzerland, Austria and Hungary combined, covering 750,000 square kilometers and lying in the tropical belt on South Central Africa. Zambia is about 10 to 18 degrees south of the Equator. Zambia is located on a high plateau, averaging 1,300m above sea level. Zambia lies within the tropical latitude with the general plateau height giving it a moderate climate which has earned Zambia the nickname, the “air conditioned state.” The climate is very temperate with little humidity (only in wet season). The country, although landlocked, has many lakes and rivers with beaches and water spots. There are three distinct seasons: cool and dry from May to August; hot and dry from September to November; and warm and wet from December to April. Only in the valleys of the Zambezi and Luangwa rivers is there excessive heat and it is only during the hot and dry season. Also see the Preface to this book.
39 “Empty land”
41 See Firstbrook, The Obamas, p. 104
42 Ibid., p. 99
43 Ibid., p. 100
prominent statesman has noted this irony in the context of the relationship between the public law of Europe and African law:

If we take a look at the historical facts, we shall see, in the first place, what legality used to be taken to mean in Africa and what it was which used to be called “African law” as opposed to “the public law of Europe”; an African law illustrated – if one can apply the term – in the monstrous blunder committed by the authors of the Act of Berlin, the results of which have not yet disappeared from the African political scene. It was a monstrous blunder and a flagrant injustice to consider Africa south of the Sahara *terra nullius*, to be shared out among the Powers for occupation and colonization, when even in the 16th Century Vitoria had written that Europeans could not obtain sovereignty over the Indies by occupation, for they were not *terra nullius*.

By one of fate’s ironies, the declaration of the Berlin Congress which held the Dark Continent to be *terra nullius* related to regions which had seen the rise and development of flourishing states and empires. One should be mindful of what Africa was before there fell upon it the two greatest plagues in the recorded history of mankind: the slave-trade, which ravaged Africa for centuries on an unprecedented scale; and colonialism, which exploited humanity and natural wealth to a relentless extreme. Before these terrible plagues overran their continent, the African people had founded states and even empires of a high level of civilization.44

Ammoun raises five very scintillating issues. In the first place, the consideration of Africa south of the Sahara *terra nullius* was robbery of gigantic proportion to Africa. Europe could not, in essence, deny that it had neither the moral nor legal justification in branding Africa an empty land. In the second place, declaring Africa an empty land was a clear disregard for African law.45 For even before borders and boundaries were demarcated in Africa, powerful states and great empires had existed which secured their spheres of influence through conquests.

Even up to now Africa continues to face debilitating mutinies through tribal and civil wars owing to the fact that many of its clans were displaced through the scramble for land by the major European powers following the Berlin Congress. The imperial scramblers cared less what would result from the vicious dislocations.46 In Zambia for example, to date, there exists dislodgments among people who presently occupy the eastern part of Zambia. The Chewa people of Malawi and of eastern Zambia are one and the same people who were dislodged by boundaries drawn by the colonists. The same could be said regarding the people who inhabit the Luapula Province. These people do not only share the border but both the cultures and traditions with the people in southern Congo DR.47

In the third place, the Act of Berlin designation of areas in which great states and empires had thriven *terra nullius* was meant to dominate Africa, and in doing so, take advantage of the plentiful human and natural resources to power the accoutrements of the Industrial Revolution in Europe. Ambition and a relentless quest to occupy other territories in order to exert imperial supremacy was the ultimate motivation for declaring Africa an empty land.

45 In Zambia, for example, “The first law that existed...was the indigenous law of the tribes.” See John Hatchard and Muna Ndulo, *The Law of Evidence in Zambia: Cases and Materials* (Lusaka: Multimedia Publications, 1991), p. 1
46 Mbulo argues in the case of the Makololo and the Luyi or Lozi people whom he conceives were one people before colonization, thus, “[Dr.] Livingstone tried to deal with the Makololo and Lozi (the Borotsi, later Barotse, as David Livingstone called them) throughout as separate peoples, an aspect of the European colonial attempt to rationalize African peoples by tribalizing them. The fact still remains that Africans are one people. People of southern and central Africa all originated from the Luba-Lunda kingdoms speaking the Bantu languages” (Potpher Mbulo responding to “President Banda Should Set up Barotse Commission of Inquiry” by Henry Kyambalesa on *Zambia News Features*, October 31st, 2010)
47 Also see Chapter One
In the fourth place, Europe advanced the principle of *terra nullius* in Africa because of Africa’s strategic advantage for mobilizing resources. Ancient kingdoms in Africa were established in regions with enormous environmental and climatic conditions suitable both as protective castles and mineral wells. Europe had learnt this from political and Christian missionaries who had expedited to Africa in the last half of the 19th Century.

Fifth and last, both slavery and colonialism were an affront to the future interest and well-being of Africa. Slavery has moral and economic consequences wherever it has been experienced. The longevity of slavery is tantamount to the potential human and economic losses a group of people suffers. In Africa, slavery lasted for over four hundred years. In human and economic terms, this meant depletion in human capital and future productivity.

The implicit consequence of slavery is the breaking, dehumanizing of the human spirit, which in the long run reduces a people to less than humans, unable to exercise independent rational thinking, and perpetually depending on others for intellectual and creative advancement. According to M’Bokolo, “Four million slaves [were] exported via the Red Sea, another four million through the Swahili ports of the Indian Ocean…nine million along the trans-Saharan caravan route, and eleven to twenty million across the Atlantic Ocean.” Slave trade is an international crime.

Colonialism, on the other hand, is anathema to a people’s political and economic gains. Colonialism did to Africa’s political destiny what slavery did to its emotional and intellectual esteem. As argued previously, and more than slavery, it was colonialism that set the foundation for civil wars and ethnic tensions in Africa:

For a full three months the European nations haggled over the partition of the continent, completely ignoring any of the cultural or linguistic boundaries already established by the indigenous populations. By the end of February 1885, Africa had been carved up into fifty irregular countries. In this “imperial” map of Africa, borders were often drawn arbitrarily, with little or no regard for ethnic unity, regional economic ties, migratory patterns of people, or even natural boundaries.

Thus, to date this pattern of ethnic-based conflicts can be found in Chad, Liberia, Ethiopia, Congo DR., Sudan, Guinea, Kenya, Nigeria, and so on. The manner in which Africa was shared was highly injurious to the future of African peace. Queen Victoria, the most acquisitive of all imperial forces, even suggested acquiring ‘the big mountain [Kilimanjaro] in Africa’ for her grandson, the Kaiser of German!

§5.5 *Theories of Domination*

It seems in the history of civilization that for a people to dominate another people, such a people first have to advance a theory or thesis against the dominated. In the case of Africa, there was an overwhelming theoretical basis why the Black people of Africa deserved to be enslaved and colonized. Europe and America used a two-pronged hook of racism and H. Rider Haggard’s

---

49 See Firstbrook, *The Obamas*, p. 91; however, it would be improper not to mention that slave trade was rife in Zambia where the last slave cargo was stopped at Chipata in 1898.
King Solomon’s Mines\textsuperscript{52} to justify the enslavement and colonization of the Black Africans, respectively. Historian Basil Davidson writes:

The racism that we know, was born in Europe and America from the cultural need to justify doing to Black people, doing to Africans, what could not morally or legally be done to White people, least of all to Europeans. To justify the enslavement of Africans, in short it was culturally necessary to believe…that Africans were inherently and naturally less than human…. That was the cultural basis…of the slave trade and of the modern imperialism of Africa which followed the slave trade.\textsuperscript{53}

Experience in the West still tells a great deal about European and American thinking about Black Africans. Never did I question my own sense of intellectual prowess until I relocated to the West. From the beginning I was greeted with an aura of doubt, doubt that even what I thought I knew was less peremptory in the light of historically held views about the Black people of Africa. Black people, for the most part, in the presence of their Western counterparts have to repeatedly prove themselves first before they could be accepted. As modern as 2007, biologists such as James Watson\textsuperscript{54} still promulgate the Kantian racial sobriquets that “Africans have received from nature no intelligence that rises above the foolish,”\textsuperscript{55} joining the long line of the so-called Western thinkers like Votaires, David Hume, Georg Hegel and Hugh Trevor-Roper who have fed imperialistic avarice with impetus which has contributed to the subjugation and plunder of Africa.

Colonialism was founded on a very strong theoretical base. In King Solomon’s Mines Revisited: Western Interests and the Burdened History, Minter asserts, “[Haggard’s] King Solomon’s Mines came off the press in London in September 1885, only six months after the European powers had met in Berlin to set the rules for dividing up Africa.”\textsuperscript{56} This book gave impetus to what would become of European imperialism in Africa. It, in part, informed the doctrine of terra nullius, and this resonated with the thinking of the time. Hegel’s claim that Black Africans exist in the Infancy of Humanity became “the ideological justification for colonialism.”\textsuperscript{57} Zambia, just like Africa in general, lost more than a thousand years that not even hard labor could compensate in Europe’s scrambling for Africa’s territories. Europe and the Americas on the other hand, gained much more than they could possibly need for a long time to come.

It is against this background that I will detail the story of pre-independence Zambia, bearing in mind that what is discussed is a quintessential analysis of Zambia’s genuine desire to rubble off the shackles of unjust enrichment by colonial powers, the legacy of unequal treatment, and to celebrate the tremendous bravery of those who struggled with their might and life for Zambia’s political independence.

\textsuperscript{52} H. Rider Haggard, King Solomon’s Mines (London: Cassalle and Company, 1885)

\textsuperscript{53} Carina Ray, “We Have a History,” (January 2008), New African, No. 469, p. 24

\textsuperscript{54} James Watson was involved in the discovery of the structure of DNA. In 2007, he declared that the people of African descent were not as intelligent as the people of European descent. This is despite the fact that research has shown that race is indeterminate of intellectual dexterity. Consequently, Watson’s pontificating has gone a long way in dealing a dearth blow to the people of African descent, especially in perpetuating inequalities in the workplace. His racist stance was so influential that he has adamantly stated that “people who have to deal with Black employees find this not true” that all people are equal!

\textsuperscript{55} See Carina Ray, supra.

\textsuperscript{56} William Minter, King Solomon’s Mines Revisited: Western Interests and the Burdened History (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986), p. 3

\textsuperscript{57} Ray, supra., p. 24
§5.6 Invasion of Zambia

Life as we know it in Zambia, concentrated mostly in urban areas, was an invention of European expedition to Zambia. About 2000 years ago, there about the time of Jesus Christ, the indigenous Zambians were hunter-gatherers. They lived by collecting wild fruits and hunting game for food and using the skins of the animals as marts. Between the 15th and 19th centuries, these indigenous Zambians were displaced by advancing Bantu speaking tribes migrating from the Luba and Lunda kingdoms in what is present day Congo DR and Angola. They were flanked by the Ngoni people from the south towards the end of the 19th Century. To understand the composition, expedition and migratory adventures of these people, it is important to pay attention to their oral traditions and local myths and legends. One such rich tradition, which also forms part of the historic recollection of the people we call the Bemba in Zambia happened between the 15th and the 19th centuries.

Young has argued against tribal histories, contending that, "Most of them describe in more or less picturesque detail, how a tribe was founded by a band of adventures." He admits that these stories may contain, in general, a large kernel of truth, "but it is important to realize that they do not necessarily give us the literal truth." Accordingly, he devalues them as mere myths. Their main purpose, he reminds, is not to record what really happened, but rather, to explain and justify the customs and institutions of the present day.

However, it is vital to understand that these stories are based on historical facts. Indeed, their memory has been compressed and transformed into moral lessons for today, and that should not be a nefarious assumption why they should be believed. For the most part Western history is recorded, but it was not always so. Homer depended on local myths and legends to write the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* in 800 B.C. Similarly, most of Zambian history in pre-European invasion period can only be deciphered from local myths and legends, and also now through anthropology as well as archaeology.

The Bembas are those who consider themselves subjects of the Chitimukulu, the Bemba's only paramount chief. They live in villages of 100 to 200 people and numbered 250,000 strong at Zambia’s independence. There are over thirty Bemba clans, named after animals or natural organisms, such as the royal clan, “the people of the crocodile” (Bena Ng’andu) or the Bena Bowa (mushroom clan). They were the people who finally put a halt to the northward stride of the Nguni, Sotho-tswana and Ngoni people.

Reference shall be made to the Bembas as a way of illustrating the incomprehensive nature of the doctrine of *terra nullius*, dispelling the notion that the descendants of Zambians were landless before colonialism. Similar histories such as of the Lozi people of Zambia provide

---

58 Human beings or simply people
60 Ibid., p. 63
61 Ibid.
62 Ibid., p. 64
64 From “History of the Lozi People” by Jay Samungole, (Lusaka: Unpublished, 2010), used by permission:

The Barotseland region of Zambia represents a large autonomous kingdom in the Western Province. The earliest known tribe of the Lozi people to settle in the area, the Luyi, migrated from Katanga in the Congo. They were ruled by a long line of female rulers until their settlement on the Bulozi flood plain. The earliest of these rulers was named Mwambwa, who was succeeded by her daughter, Mbuyuwawambwa. According to legend, they both married Nyambe, the “maker of the world, the forests, the river, the plains, all the animals, birds and fish.” Mwanasolundwi Muyunda Mumbo wa Mulonga, a.k.a, Mboo, the son of Mbuyuwawambwa, was chosen as paramount ruler of the
irrefutable evidence of the flamboyant and booming kingdoms in the area which came to be called Zambia.

§5.7 Kola\textsuperscript{65}

In a country called Cula or Kola, there was a chief called Mierda. He had a number of sons by different wives, but one day he heard of a woman with ears as large as an elephant’s, who said she came from the sky and belonged to the crocodile clan. Her name was Mumbi Mukasa, and the chief married her. They had three sons, Katongo, Chiti and Nkole, and a daughter, Chilufya Mulenga. The impetuous young men built a tower that fell down and killed many people. Mukulumpe was furious. He put out Katongo’s eyes, and banished Chiti and Nkole. Mukulumpe pretended to relent and called back the exiles. However, he had dug a game pit to kill the three of them. Katongo, though blind, warned his brothers by using his talking drum. When they arrived at the palace, the king humiliated them by subjecting them do menial work. Chiti and Nkole left the kingdom for good, and took with them their three maternal half-brothers Kapasa, Chimba and Kazembe and their entourage.

They fled east, until they came to the middle reaches of the Luapula River. Chief Matanda of the Bena Mukulo ferried them across. In their haste, they left behind their blind brother Katongo and their sister Chilufya Mulenga, who Mukulumpu had locked up in a house without doors. They dispatched their half-brother Kapasa to break out Chilufya Mulenga, which he did ingeniously. But on the way to Luapula, Kapasa fell in love with Chilufya. When it turned out she was pregnant, Kapasa was disowned by Chiti. The group meanwhile had fallen in with a ‘white magician,’ Luchele Ng’ananga. When they arrived at the Luapula, Kazembe decided to settle there, but Nkole and Chiti were uncertain. When Luchele Ng’ananga conjured up a fish from a mortar, they took this to be an omen to head eastwards, and moved toward the plateau of the Chambeshi River, near Lake Bangweulu.

They crossed the Safwa Rapids, and the Luchindashi River, where there was a quarrel between two women, and part of the group stayed behind, forming the Bena Nona (mushroom clan), the royal clan of the Bisa people.

The others continued southwards where they encountered the Lala people, who asked them for a chief, and were given a man called Kankomba. The migrants then turned eastwards to the Luangwa Valley and among the Nyanja\textsuperscript{66} and the Senga (or Nsenga) peoples, they encountered a

---

\textsuperscript{65} Samungole, \textit{supra.}, used by permission.

\textsuperscript{66} The people who are considered to be the Nyanja are actually the Chewa people. Nyanja is a dialect which developed in trading centers with its root being Chewa. In some instances Nyanja and Chewa are taken as one because the difference between them if any, is minimal. There are presently over 1.5 million Chewa throughout Malawi and Zambia,
chief called Mwase. Mwase’s wife, Chilimbulu, was very beautiful, and her stomach was adorned with elegant cicatrizations. Chiti fell in love with Chilimbulu, and seduced her when Mwase was out hunting. When he returned and caught them in the act, the two chiefs fought, and Chiti was grazed by a poisoned arrow, after which he died.

Nkole and his followers took Chiti’s body with them, looking for a grove suitable for his burial. They encountered the magician Luchele Ng’anga again, and he directed them toward a majestic grove called Mwalule or Milemba. At Mwalule, they found a woman called Chimbala. They also found another visitor, the Bisa headman Kabotwe, who was there to trade and pay respect to Chimbala.

After Chimbala gave them permission to bury Chiti, they managed to get Chimbala to marry Kabotwe, ensuring Chimbala’s ritual ability to purify those who buried Chiti. Kabotwe became the keeper of the grove, and received the title Shimwalule, which his matrilineal descendants inherited. However, Nkole had sent out a party to raid cattle from Fipa chief Pilula to provide an ox hide shroud for Chiti. Then, he dispatched a party to avenge Chiti’s death, killing Mwase and Chilimbulu. Their bodies were burned at Mwalule, but the smoke overcame Nkole, who also died, and now also had to be buried at Mwalule.

The Kola migrants adopted matrilineal succession, and Chiti and Nkole were succeeded by their sister Chilufya Mulenga’s son. He was also called Chilufya, and was too young to rule as chief, so Chiti’s half-brother Chimba ruled in his place. The Kola migrants left Mulambalala, their site near Mwalule and crossed the Chambeshi River north. The disgraced Kapasa, however, settled on his own in Bulombwa, driving out Iwa chief Kafwimbi and his cattle.

The others traveled westward up the Kalongwa River, where two men, Kwaba and Chikunga found a dead crocodile. As the chiefs were of the crocodile clan, this was taken as a good sign. Here, the Kola migrants made their Capital, Ng’wena (Crocodile) on the Kalungu River and settled the surrounding country. The groups then living in the area were called Sukuma, Musukwa, Kalelelya and Ngalagansa. They were driven off or killed by the Kola migrants, who were by now called the Bemba.

When Chilufya the king grew up, Chimba handed him the royal bows belonging to his uncles Nkole and Chiti. Chilufya thereby gained the praise name ‘Ca mata yabili’ (of the two bows). Chilufya, however, insisted that Chimba keep Nkole’s bow, allowing him to found his own village at Chatindubwi, a few miles north of the Kalungu River.

Thereafter, the Bemba became many. New villages and chiefs were founded, and many chiefs succeeded Chilufya. All of these paramount chiefs took the name of the original founder, Chiti Mukulu (Chiti the Great).

However the Chewa are not considered people of Malawi, nor people of Zambia, but people from the Nyanja group of Bantu. The history of the Chewa people includes a number of stories of fact, tradition, ancestral beliefs, and spiritual influence creating the modern day Chewa culture. Legend holds that over one thousand years ago, Bantu speaking people of Nigeria and Cameroon migrated to – among other places – the Luba area of Zaire, or what is now known as the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Nyanja group of Bantu settled within the Luba area known as Malambo and conquered more and more land from other Bantu peoples. Eventually their central locale shifted from Malambo to the region of Choma; a vast mountainous and plateau region known today as northeastern Zambia and northern Malawi (formerly Nyasaland). In Malawi, the Chewa are predominantly concentrated within the central region, surrounding the Capital City of Lilongwe, in areas such as Dedza, Kasungu, Dowa, Ntchisi, Mchinjui, Ntcheu, Salima, and Nkhoto Kota.
§5.8 Thriving Kingdoms

From this account, as too is from that of the Lozi or the Nyanja peoples, it is clear that the descendants of Zambians were a well-organized people with thriving kingdoms, laws and order. They acquired lands and held claim to territories by conquests. In the places where they finally settled, whether by conquest or *jus soli*, they set up political structures and hubs of power. Among the Bembas, for example, the Paramount Chief or Chiti Mukulu was the supreme ruler, who was assisted by chiefs and headmen. Similarly, among the Lozis, the Litunga is assisted by subordinates known as *indunas*.

By the 19th Century, the descendants of the modern day Zambia had an established traditional legal system consisting of sound customs and conventions. Land was collectively owned by the people entrusted to the chief as the guarantor of land rights. The chief in turn delegated the demarcation and distribution of land to local headmen.

What was true of land policy in the present day Zambia between the 15th and 19th centuries was also true of Britain between the 11th and 13th centuries. In 1066 a Norman General from Normandy by the name of William the Conqueror, occupied what is known as England. He found no harmonized law and different groups resolving their particular disputes according to the customs of that particular area. William introduced a Feudal System and appointed a form of circuit court system to arbitrate land and criminal matters on his behalf. These circuit judges necessitated a common application of legal precedents throughout the land based on the principle of *stare decisis*. These common customs became known as the common law.

By the mid of the 19th Century, Europeans comprising explorers, traders and missionaries began to penetratZambia. Notable among them was David Livingstone, a medical doctor from England who, in the company of his African helper Chuma, claimed to have discovered the Victoria Falls in 1855. The Livingstone town in the Southern Province of Zambia is named after David Livingstone.

The brilliance and magnificence at the sight of the African continent could have stunned Livingstone. His explorations in the interior could have changed his view of what had been termed the Dark Continent forever. Grant, attesting to this fact on Livingstone’s first view of

---

67 Right of soil  
68 Where land ownership was exclusively in the hands of the King  
69 The term *stare decisis* originates from the Latin maxim of *Stare decisis et non quieta movere*, which means “to stand by decisions and not disturb the undisturbed” or simply, “Let the decision stand.” It is a theory of the common law system which stipulates that the decision of a superior court is binding on an inferior court and on a court of co-ordinate jurisdiction so far as it is a statement of the law which the court is bound to accept. This doctrine demands that rules or principles of law on which a court rested a previous decision are authoritative in all future cases in which the facts are substantially the same.  
70 Most of these explorers were ruthless against the Africans. For example, the journalist Henry Morton Stanley who met Livingstone at Ujiji on November 10, 1871 and greeted Livingstone with those famous words, “DR. LIVINGSTONE, I presume,” is believed to have used, “excessive violence, racial abuse, and condescending language towards Africans” (Firstbrook, *The Obamas*, p. 98).  
71 In 1997, I wrote a poem called *Chitambo* (for this is the place in central Zambia where David Livingstone’s heart is buried) in tribute to Chuma who helped Livingstone travel the almost impassable jungles of Africa. This poem is found on page 93 of *Song of an Alien* and on p. 1047 of this book.  
72 David Livingstone did not discover the Victoria Falls; he renamed the falls which was called Mosi-oa-Tunya (or the smoke that thunders) by the indigenous people. This event informs us of the popularity of the doctrine of *terra nullius*, even before it was made official by the Act of Berlin in 1885.  
73 See the poem on page1041  
74 While to the White Europeans Africa was “dark”, it was only in as far as Europe remained ignorant about both the thriving civilizations and booming trade taking place there way before a European stepped foot on Africa. Firstbook attests, “Trade with both the Arabs and the Chinese [as early as 1414, a huge fleet of 62 Chinese trading galleons and 190 support ships under the
Africa, nods: “A vivid sunrise of silver, gold and blood red tinged its beauty with something a little intimidating, even frightening. How must Livingstone and the early explorers have felt on seeing it for the first time?”

The *first most significant event* that would shape Zambia’s political and economic history happened in 1888. In that year, John Cecil Rhodes sent his emissaries Joseph Thomson, Frank Elliot Lochner and Alfred Sharp to make treaties with King Lewanika. In 1890, the emissaries arrived in Barotseland. They obtained mineral right concessions from the local chiefs, including Chief Lewanika in what is the present day Western Province of Zambia.

§5.9 **British South Africa Company**

In 1891, John Cecil Rhodes and his British South Africa Company (BSAC) or the Company brought the administration of the territory under the charter of BSAC and administered it as a colony in two units of North-eastern and North-western Rhodesias. Attempts at unifying these two territories failed principally because of opposition from the White European settlers. The settlers abhorred the practice of employing Africans in administrative posts. This is very important and revealing to the future of Zambia.

The European settlers did not favor the idea of amalgamation because that would mean Africans taking up administrative posts. They feared this move because it would empower the Africans for leadership. The settlers preferred to relegate the Africans to low and general laborer jobs. This was the *second most significant event* in the history of Zambia. Zambia would, consequently, encounter massive shortages of educated leaders at independence. “In education, for example, Zambia had only 100 university graduates, about 1,500 had school certificates…and 7,000 had attained Form II certificates.”

In 1911, the two territories of North-eastern and North-western Rhodesias were formally amalgamated and Northern Rhodesia was formed. Northern Rhodesia remained a charter colony of the BSAC as a British sphere of influence until 1924. On April 1st, 1924 Herbert Stanley was appointed Governor of Northern Rhodesia. Subsequently, the administration of Northern Rhodesia was transferred to the British Colonial Office and Northern Rhodesia became an

---

command of Zheng He had crossed the Indian Ocean and landed on the African coast] disproves the myth that Africa—the ‘Dark Continent’—had little or no contact with the outside world until it was ‘opened up’ by Europeans” (Firstbrook, *ibid.*, p. 85; also see Korwa G. Adar and Isaac M. Munyae, “Human Rights Abuses in Kenya under Daniel Arap Moi, 1978-2001,” (2001) *African Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 1

75 Grant, *Zambia – Then and Now*, p. 25

76 However, prior, in 1872, the first English traders had arrived at the court of Sipopa in Barotseland.

77 However, the emissaries penetrated far inland in search of mineral deposits. For example, in 1910, Moffat Thompson “discovered” Nkana (Kitwe) copper source.

78 Section 14 of the Royal Charter of October 29th, 1889 entrusted the administration of Rhodesia to the BSAC and authorized thus: “In the administration of justice to the said peoples or inhabitants careful regard shall always be had to the customs and laws of the class or tribe or nation to which the parties respectively belong, especially with regard to the holding, possession, transfer and disposition of lands and goods, and testate or intestate succession thereto, and marriages, divorces, legitimacy, and other rights of property and personal rights, but subject to any British laws which may be in force of the territories aforesaid and applicable to the peoples or inhabitants thereof.” (Hamalengwa, “The Legal System of Zambia: Law, Politics and Development in Historic Perspective,” in P. Ebow Bodzi-Simpson, (ed.), *The Law and Economic Development in the Third World* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1992), p. 23). Thus, from the inception of colonialism, the British government had introduced a dual legal system in Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) of the African customary law and the English common law.


80 See John J. Grotziger; Brian V. Siegel; and James R. Pletcher, *Historical Dictionary of Zambia, Second Edition* (London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1998); other records place this event in 1916!
official British Protectorate with its Capital City at Livingstone. In 1935, the Capital City was moved to Lusaka. According to Hamalengwa, “Zambia was incorporated into the world economy as a Company State beginning from the end of the 19th Century. The Company, British South Africa Company (BSA Co.) had been given mineral rights over the territory.”

The wealth and survival of Zambia is tied to copper. In 1895, Frederick Russell Burnham of the BSAC did not discover copper by accident. The BSAC had stated in its aim that it wanted to exploit the mineral wealth north of the Limpopo River, extend the railways and telegraph system, and encourage colonization, et alia: “To develop and work mineral and other concessions under the management of one powerful organization, thereby obviating conflicts and complications between the various interests that have been acquired within the region and securing to the native chiefs and their subjects the rights reserved to them under several concessions.”

The BSAC had predetermined interest in Northern Rhodesia.

§5.10 Treaties or Hoaxes

The supposedly “rights reserved” for the natives were only a hoax, as after 1889 the BSAC began, in effect, to plunder first the western portion of Zambia, and later the northern trail. It carried out manufacturing of commercial and trading businesses, searched and dug for diamonds, gold, copper, coal and precious stones. The Company further carried out business in banking, sold and manipulated metals, manufactured and imported arms and ammunitions, and administered the affairs of the Company and of the native Africans. As mentioned before, effectively from 1889, Zambia become a Company State under the Royal Charter of October 29th, 1889.

By definition, a treaty, like a contract, is a settlement or agreement arrived at through negotiation. A treaty gives rise to binding obligations between parties that make it. It may outline the rights and responsibilities of the parties as they are agreed upon. However, treaties are only binding on parties that have adhered to them, save for peremptory norms.

Modern treaties are sanctioned by international law and are consummated in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which defines a treaty as an agreement between two or more nation-states over matters that they have agreed upon. Enforcement and interpretation of these treaties is as well governed by international law. By extension, a treaty can also refer to any agreement or contract that describes an agreement made between parties other than nation-states.

Imperialists used two approaches to dominating other territories: conquest or treaties. Through treaties, European nations, such as Britain, recognized the natives’ occupancy, ownership and governance of the territories they wanted to colonize.

Northern Rhodesia was providentially positioned in the sense that treaties, rather than conquests, were used to secure its territorial domination. The representatives of the BSAC used

---

81 “The colonial state and government were basically set up to cater for the interests of the Crown [British government] and colonial setters as well as international capital that was centered in the copper industry.” (Hamalengwa, “The Legal System of Zambia: Law, Politics and Development in Historic Perspective,” supra, p. 22)
82 The name Lusaka is derived from a village headman called Lusaaka who occupied the limestone area where the present Lusaka City is situated. His palace could have been located where the Manda Hill (National Assembly) is today.
84 F.L Coleman, The Northern Rhodesia Copperbelt 1889-1962, as quoted in Hamalengwa, Class Struggles in Zambia 1889-1989 & The Fall of Kenneth Kaunda 1990-1991, p. 25
85 Zulu attributes this approach to the subsequent peaceful and orderly independence transition as opposed to military operations in other colonized African countries: “In Northern Rhodesia [Zambia] and Nyasaland [Malawi] the nationalist
concessions to grab mineral and other rights in Barotseland. The term *concession agreement* refers to a type of negotiated contract which gives a company the right to do specific business in an identified territory. In the case of King (Litunga) Lewanika and the BSAC, a mineral concession agreement meant an agreement which granted the concessionaire (the BSAC) exclusive right to do business in Barotseland in exchange for some carefully negotiated terms.

As shown earlier, by the last half of the 19th Century, most tribes in the territory that would become Northern Rhodesia had strong and well-established kingdoms. To secure their kingdoms, leaders of these kingdoms often solicited for alliances with other strong kingdoms, missionary organizations or, in the case of Litunga Lewanika, chartered companies.

Lewanika wanted British protection from the nearby Matabele Kingdom.86 The Matebele had trekked upwards from the Zulu Kingdom of Shaka Zulu.87 The Matebeles were under their leader Lobengula. Lewanika also wanted protection from the Portuguese and from some of his own dissident subjects. However, that was not enough reason to sell the entire territory or most of the productive or mineral-laden land!

On June 26th, 1890 Lewanika signed a concession with Cecil Rhodes’ representative, Frank Lochner.88 “The concession covered all Lewanika’s country, allowing the Company to engage in manufacturing, mining, banking, the provision of infrastructure works and the importation of arms and ammunition.”89 Basically, all the talk about signing treaties or concessions by the Africans with the Europeans at that time was a ruse. The Europeans, unlike the Africans, were on a mission on the African soil. They had left the comfort of their own lands for much more than just simple adventure or expeditions as they called them. They were wealthy hunters, and wherever they found it, they used every arsenal at their disposal to acquire it.

It is travesty that Africa continues to fall for simple tricks even in the 21st Century. Africa tends to mistake openness to courtesy. By nature, Africans in general, and Zambians in particular, are very welcoming people. I remember when I was a child in the villages of Mibenge how we welcomed every stranger to our homesteads. It was customary then, and still is, that we treated our visitors with utmost courtesy. However, the acts of kindness we are so famous for have brought us nothing but poverty and have been used against us. This is not to advocate for meanness or unwelcoming attitude. History has proven that those who came to the African villages took advantage of the African courtesy and grabbed the wealth of Africa to the detriment of the Africans.

The presence of the BSAC in Barotseland is the point in issue. The agreement Lewanika
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86 Or the Ndebele Kingdom
87 Shaka Zulu was an illegitimate son who became one of the most decorated warriors in Africa. He devised a short-specialized spear he called *Asegai* and coached his *Impis* (warriors) to fight barefooted and attack his enemies very early in the morning.
88 The Lochner Treaty was signed by Lubosi Lewanika of the Second Regime of the Litunga Royal Establishment, himself the successor of King Lubosi of the First Regime. He was the 18th Litunga. The line of the Litungas or Lozi rulers from (1) Queen Mwambwa are: (2) Queen Mbuyawamwambwa (3) King Mboo Muyunda Mwana Silundu (4) King Inyambo (5) King Yeta I Ya Musa (6) King Ngalama wa Ingalamw (7) King Yeta II Nalute Mucabatu (8) King Ngombala (9) King Yuba Ikandanda (10) King Mwanawina I (11) King Wananawanda Liwale (12) King Mulambwa Santulu (13) King Silumelume Muimui (14) King Mubukwanu (15) King Sipopa Lutangu (16) King Mwanawina II (17) First Regime: King Lubosi; Second Regime: Lubosi Lewanika (18) King Tatila Akufuna (19) King Litia Yeta III, CBE (20) King Mwanang’ono Imwiko I (21) King Mwanawina III, KB (22) King Mbikusita Lewanika II (23) King Ilute Yeta IV (24) King Lubosi Imwiko II
89 Cedric Pulford, “Barotseland: A Unique African Kingdom”
reached, if it can qualify to be an agreement at all, was for the most part a one-sided deal. Moreover, it cannot be said that Lewanika wanted the BSAC protection because he believed the Company would protect him. Thirteen years after being swindled of mineral rights in Barotseland, the Company literally obliterated Lewanika’s most feared neighbor, Lobengula of the Matebele people.

Pulford writes that within a few years Lobengula, Lewanika’s arch-rival was dead. The 1893 Matabele war started over a small incident when the telegraph link was cut and wire stolen. The Chartered Company seized the opportunity and treated this as a *casus belli*.90 Maxim guns made short work of Lobengula’s *impis* (regiments). The king fled his Capital, Gubulawayo (close to today’s Bulawayo), and soon died, probably of smallpox. However, the process of assimilation was by now unstoppable for Lewanika. Barotseland became absorbed into Northern Rhodesia at first under the Company and, from 1924, as a British Protectorate.91

The Company did not only sign more treaties, it went ahead and plundered Lewanika of resources.92 One of the conditions for grabbing the wealth of the Lozi people of western Zambia was in exchange for some members of Lewanika to study in London. In 1898, Lewanika was again hoaxed into another concession called the Lawley Concession.

This concession “reduced Lewanika’s annual subsidy from £2,000 to £850 and gave the Company judicial powers in disputes between Whites or Whites and Blacks. It was the blueprint for the Lewanika Concession of 1900. This affirmed the Company’s administrative authority over the king’s domains. It excluded prospecting in the Barotse heartland - and yet an astonishing postscript provided that if gold in worthwhile quantities was not found outside the reserved area, it could be sought inside the reserved area!”93 The Company until 1909 soldiered on and grabbed all the arable land in Barotseland.

In 1917, Paramount Chief Yeta appealed to the British government claiming that the Company’s “rights were obtained in its capacity as the government – the inference being that without the responsibilities of administration it must also abandon its rights.” In short, the African chief had come to realize too late that the Company had played the game of *cat and mouse*, plundering the area of its wealth and yet not taking full responsibility of developing or administering the area competently. From the beginning the relationship between the Company and the British government was suspicious, described by some as “a peculiar one.” In fact, the Company’s revenue in terms of royalties from minerals had risen from £12,781 in 1925 to £300,000 in 1937.94 This was nearly half of the total Northern Rhodesian government income from the mines.

The Company has been cited as an “accomplice in the intrigue of continued African servitude”95 with the colonial establishment. The Company owned “large tracts of land throughout the territory from which it collect[ed] royalties or rent.”96 Thus, any agitations by the

90 “Justification for acts of war” from Latin *Casus* or case, and *Belli* or bellic, literally “of war.”
91 Ibid.
92 Cecil Rhodes was not the only colonialist filled with avarice and disregard for the African continent. One called Karl Peters, described as the “Man with blood on his hands” by the people of East Africa, and the man whom both Kaiser Wilhelm II and Adolf Hitler later feted as the ideological hero of German, is said to have made a total of twelve bogus agreements with the Sultans, grabbing a total of 60 thousands square miles of the East African mainland. Peters is believed to have treated the Africans with cruelty and angst. See Peter Firstbrook, *The Obamas*, p. 105
93 Ibid.
96 Ibid.
Africans for political independence were seen as treasonous to its business interests. Consequently, the Company did “everything to support Welensky and his gang.”

To return to the argument, the Company maintained that it signed legitimate concessions with the Africans. It has relied upon the bogusly created agreements to advance its thesis of the acquisition of land and mineral wealth in Barotseland. For all intents and purposes, the details of the Lawley Concession beg for elucidation. For “if gold in worthwhile quantities was not found outside the reserved area, it could be sought inside the reserved area” was a clear mark of the subtlety of the nature of these agreements.

For one, it is doubtful if Lewanika read it this way. For another, it is even cynical, because there is hitherto no record to show that a similar version of the agreement in the Lozi language in which the Litunga was eloquent was present. This line of thought is attested to by the article which appeared on the front page of the Toronto Star:

More than a century ago, a blind Ojibway chief from Northwestern Ontario named Missabay marked an ‘X’ on a treaty written in English, a language he did not speak. The chief didn’t have a lawyer acting for him or his people from the Mishkeegogamang First Nation and played no part in negotiating the treaty (Emphasis added).

The British MO in imperial conquest in colonial domination was the same everywhere. In Canada, it involved an Ojibway chief who was neither proficient in English nor did he consent to the treaty. And yet the so-called James Bay Treaty No. 9 came into being as a legitimate agreement.

And as mentioned above, for example, Yeta was himself confused of what he was doing; he thought he was signing the treaty with the British government. Generally, “these treaties were hardly worth the paper they were written on, as it is unlikely that the Africans had any idea of what they were actually ceding.”

Subsequently, it is reasonable to believe that in the case of Litunga Lewanika, he could have construed the agreement as securing a smaller portion, as was customary for the African kings or chiefs in those days to do to their subjects and to the foreigners for temporary exploitation. In the absence of verifiable translation of the agreement to the contrary, the contract was at best a one-party formality and at worst a non-binding indenture.

The Barotseland Concession lacked credibility from the word go. The witness present, Col. Colin Harding, whose job was to attest to the signing of this resource-depleting exercise, was himself schemed into the process. He was, in fact, not told the details, and the activities surrounding the signing were highly suspicious. Harding is quoted as saying: “On more mature consideration [Lewanika] realized that it carried him further than he had meant to go.”

Contrary to writers like Caplan who contend that the concessions were desirable for the Litunga, a material witness vehemently disputes that fact. Harding informs that Litunga Lewanika shortly after being lured into signing this agreement regretted. He realized that the Company representatives had hoodwinked him. Not only was the Litunga guilty of what he had been crooked into doing, Harding was also as culpable: “I would like to say here that although I was present when this Ratifying Treaty was signed and my name

---

97 Ibid.
99 Ibid.
100 Firstbrook, The Obamas, pp. 105-106
101 Pulford, supra.
was appended as a witness to the other signatures, the full contents of the document were not divulged to me,”102 Harding distances himself.

Pulford has examined this whole so-called treaty at length and has made scintillating discoveries. For example, he postulates that the 1890 and 1898 were not the only treaties the Company caused the Litunga to sign, *volenti non fit injuria*; more were to come. By a simple exchange of letters in 1904, Pulford intimates that Lewanika gave the BSAC farming and settlement rights throughout his kingdom except the Barotse valley and the area near Sesheke.

To understand the nature of the treaties Lubosi Lewanika of the Second Regime signed with the Company, it is important to examine the person of the Litunga through whom the Company accomplished its dream. On November 4th, 1885, Lewanika recuperated his throne by a bloody battle which toppled Tatila Akufuna. From there he became the most sympathetic of all the Litungas to Western philanthropy. It is easy to understand why. He had just regained his throne after being deposed by Ngambela Mataa in September 1884. Mataa installed Tatila Akufuna. Fearing for another overthrow, he welcomed the Company with both hands. Immediately on June 27th, 1889, he signed the Ware Concession. Just a year after that, on June 26th, 1890, he signed the Lochner Concession.

Lewanika then attended the Coronation Ceremonies of King Edward VII and Queen Alexandra at Westminster Abbey in London in 1902 and was, subsequently, decorated with the medals of King Edward VII in the same year.103 More to his tribute, he abolished slavery on July 16th, 1906 and was again decorated, this time, with the medals of King George V in 1911. He was succeeded by another ambitious Litunga, King Litia Yeta III, on March 16th, 1916. Yeta III continued the legacy of Lewanika and won the title of the Commander of the British Empire (CBE) on January 1st, 1946.104

The above background is necessary to understanding why it was easy to dupe Lubosi Lewanika in signing treaties between 1889 and 1909.105 Consequently, the Wallace Concession was reached in 1909. According to Pulford this treaty reiterated farming and settlement rights except in areas where prospecting was prohibited, such as the heartland. He adds that villages and gardens in Barotseland were uprooted, albeit with unconscionable consent and shoddy compensation. “The consent need not be that of the people affected, however. It could also be given by the High Commissioner of the territory – i.e. a Briton.”106 The colonialists had not only the ambition to invade another territory, but the courage, too, to usurp land rights and authority natively reserved for the African traditional rulers. Through a meager wage, they could buy most chiefs who in turn would render their services of soliciting for manpower for the colonialists.

---

102 Ibid.
103 “Before 1900, Lewanika at one time protested to London and to Queen Victoria that the BSAC agents had misrepresented the terms of the concession, but his protests fell on deaf ears. Why? It is because he was in the first place chosen for convenience. The British were the masters of deception. They had just used the Litunga. The Litunga came back from London crowned as a British knight and he still wears that spectacular British uniform at the Kuomboka Ceremony while the British just laugh at our naivity. We must be fools, indeed” (Mhulo)
105 These events remind me of the verdict Judge Reilly of Kitchener court in Ontario, Canada gave to one of our clients on April 18th, 2011. The judge began by calling our client “an evil person; you’re a clever liar – but your lies didn’t convince the jury.” Then the judge hammered that our client “took advantage of” the vulnerability of two pimps with extensive criminal records. The victims were White and our client was Black. So if those who allegedly take advantage of the vulnerability of others are evil and clever liars, the Company took advantage of the vulnerability of Lewanika, and therefore, could, in the words of Judge Reilly, be deemed evil and clever liars!
106 Muimui, supra.
According to Dauti Yamba, a chief might be suspended from receiving his monthly wages, but to the people he still ruled.107

§5.11 Foundation for Democracy

I have argued in The Burden of Zambia and elsewhere in this book that Zambians are by nature liberal and democratic. If democracy was promulgated in Greece, and found its niche in the American Declaration of Independence, democracy was, however, a common feature of the African chiefs and kings in the territory we now call Zambia.

What is more and this is in refutation of common assumptions to the contrary, the African kingdoms, though militaristic in expanding their kingdoms, in governance, they pursued the Rule of Law to the letter. In the territory we now call Zambia the Rule of Law did not emanate from the British Magna Carter;108 it was inherent in their customs, practices and government structures. In the case of Litunga Lewanika, Harding proffers evidence to this end:

Colin Harding, who traveled up the Zambezi from Victoria Falls to Lealui, gave an account (in Remotest Barotseland, 1905) of Lewanika’s daily routine. He sat in the courthouse between 9am and 10am, hearing complaints, promulgating laws and attending to other government business. The indunas, or senior officials, representing the people, sat on his right. They alone had the right to criticize the king. In Far Bugles, Harding praised Lewanika’s “charming personality,” his “loyalty and other inherent virtues.” When the Litunga visited London for the coronation of King Edward VII, with Harding in attendance, the king and his retinue were found not to touch alcohol. “Lewanika’s whole and consistent attitude was befitting a gentleman and a great native ruler,” Harding wrote.109

Lewanika died an honorable man, a king of meritorious distinction. However, Zambian history will not forget the injustices the Barotseland, and by extension, Zambia has suffered through colonialism. There are those who still argue that the poverty and economic difficulties Zambia experiences in the 21st Century are far detached from historic corollaries. This book begs to differ, and the plunder of western Zambia by the BSAC over a period of 20 years justifies this assertion. Until Zambians revisit their history, Zambia will continue to be foreign-owned. Colonists hoodwinked local African chiefs into signing shoddy treaties and claim mineral and other rights, and this is a lesson our history books should never sideline.110

---

108 The Magna Carter or the Great Charter of England of 1215 required the English King John to proclaim certain liberties and to accept that his will was not arbitrary. The Magna Carta was the first document that limited the king’s powers by law and protected the privileges of the barons or subjects of England. In essence, the Magna Carta introduced the Rule of Law to England where even the king himself was not to be above the law.
109 Pulford, supra.
110 In 1890, a treaty was signed between Lewanika and BSAC, what became known as the Lochner-Concession. The concession sloppily gave BSAC the right to carry out mineral extraction in Barotseland. This treaty, in fact, represented the start of the colonization of what would become Zambia. This western part of Zambia became an English protectorate – the Barotseland Protectorate - under British protection.
§5.12 Colonial Administration

In October 1998, I had a brief pleasure of passing through London, England. Though brief, but my mind was actively engaged. It is a well-known fact that Zambia did not only inherit the British system of education, but the British edifice as well. The Zambian education system is itself full of British overtures. Sometimes one would think as though Zambians were being groomed to live in England rather than in Zambia. In England, presently, there could be as many as two million Zambians living there, approximately the entire population of Lusaka. From the Victoria Train Station in Central London to the African market at Shepherd Bush, it is clear that what became of Zambia originated from Britain.

Since 1888 when the first BSAC officials entered Barotseland, the territory we call Zambia had come under British influence. Others would argue that, in fact, British influence extended earlier than the recorded history as the BSAC officials would have been to this area unofficially and surveyed the land, or how else could they have known of the existence of massive copper reserves in the territory!

John Cecil Rhodes, whom we shall discuss in §5.12, had a massive dream of connecting the dots of the British pockets into a great British Empire across Africa. He envisioned building a railway or road network running from Capetown in South Africa to Cairo in Egypt. The famous Cairo Road in Lusaka remains an essence of Rhodes dream. “Cairo Road – the name was a claim, a boast, then still a reality, if a tenuous one, that a person could drive right over the continent [of Africa] from Capetown in South Africa to Cairo in Eqypt without leaving the British-controlled territory.”

The British could be accused of anything, but lack of administrative prowess is none of it. In territorial vastness, the British Empire, at its peak, could have surpassed even its precursor, the Roman Empire. Good administration necessitated both its grandeur and influence. In Northern Rhodesia, the British administrative genius was everywhere.

At the helm, in London, was the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Secretary of State appointed the Territorial Governor, who was the highest ranking government officer in Northern Rhodesia. Under the Governor was the Secretary of Native Affairs who headed the Ministry of Native Affairs (MNA). The MNA, “decided all appointments in...the Provincial Administration.”

In Northern Rhodesia, the Provincial Administration (PA) comprised districts under a Provincial Commissioner. Under him were five districts each headed by a District Commissioner! The District Commissioner was assisted by District Officer Cadets – “It was therefore said that every [District Officer] Cadet carried a potential Governor's baton in his knapsack, but at the end that was a fallacy. After Sir Evelyn Hone, there would be no more Governors.”

---

111 While en route to Lusaka via Heathrow Airport, we decided to see London for a while as our plane would not be boarding until 12 hours later. We got a pass and stormed into London. In the shortest period of time I had been to Victoria Railway station, Shepherd’s Bush marketplace, shopping and various other adventures.
112 Grant, supra., p. 26
113 Ibid, p. 30
114 Him but not her; the commonest feature of British colonial administration was the lack of gender equality - women were not appointed to administrative roles. So in almost one hundred percent of the cases, the officers of the British colonial administration in Northern Rhodesia would be men.
115 Grant, supra., p. 30
District Officer Cadets were assisted by District Assistants, the only difference between them being, as Grant puts it, “that District Officers had degrees, usually honors degrees from ‘good’ universities, an achievement which was deemed to convey superior ability.” Grant later writes that with the District Assistants he had a pleasure to work, there was no single sign of inferiority in terms of either efficiency or judgment!

Still under the District Assistants were Learner District Assistants, who later on were assisted by African Administration Assistants and clerks. After independence, the Learner District Assistants and clerks easily assumed the positions left behind by the district and provincial officers, and etcetera.

It is not a surprise that the colonization of Northern Rhodesia began in earnest in the western portion of modern Zambia. Shortly after the 1890 Lochner Concession, the BSAC took control of mineral and land rights in Barotseland. This western part of Northern Rhodesia became an English Protectorate, sometimes known as Barotseland Protectorate. Northern Rhodesia was officially a Company State until 1924 when the British government took over full administrative control of the territory as a British Protectorate.

There is no denying that the western part of Zambia played a vital role in the journey to Zambia’s colonization. Despite the fact that Lewanika might have been deluded into signing the treaties that gave the BSAC enormous freedom to exploit not only western Zambia, but the rest of the country as well, the treaties were, nevertheless, enforceable. If not intelligently handled, western Zambia would pose a big challenge to the vision of a united Zambia. However, Kaunda, Lewanika and the Queen of England had other plans through the Barotseland Agreement of 1964.

§5.13 The Barotseland Agreement 1964

The Barotseland is Zambia’s political Achilles’ heel. As explained in this book, the area we now call the Western Province of Zambia was the first to enter into treaties and concessions that would later define the nation of Zambia. By independence, these treaties were still in force. After independence, however, there was need to redefine the place of western Zambia, vis-à-vis, the new nation’s geopolitical landscape. This was partially achieved through the Barotseland Agreement of 1964 (Agreement).

In the wake of the group calling itself the Barotseland Freedom Movement (BFM) and its attempt at lynching Alliance for Democracy and Development (ADD) president, Charles Milupi, on December 18th, 2010, revisiting the Agreement is in order. Realizing that the Barotseland issue would come up at some point in Zambia’s future, on April 16th, 1964, the government of Northern Rhodesia and the Litunga of Barotseland reached a provisional agreement to “conclude a permanent agreement.” This permanent agreement was concluded on May 18th, 1964 at the Commonwealth Relations Office in London. It was signed by Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, then Prime Minister of Northern Rhodesia; Sir Mwanawina Lewanika III, K.B.E, Litunga of Barotseland;
and the Right Honorable Duncan Sandys, MP, Secretary for Commonwealth Relations and for the Colonies. Hon. Sandys’ signature signified the approval of Her Majesty’s government.

The Litunga acted “on behalf of himself, his heirs and successors.” 120 This is very important in regards to the demands of the BFM. All the people of Barotseland, now Western Province, were represented in the Agreement. Moreover, the people of Barotseland, through the Litunga, agreed to “proceed to independence as one country and that all its peoples should be one nation.” 121 By signing the Agreement, the people of Western Province recognized that it was in the interest of Zambia’s peace to be a unitary state. In addition, the Agreement did more than just uniting Zambia; it also terminated all “treaties and other agreements subsisting between Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Litunga of Barotseland.” 122

The Agreement came into force on Zambia’s Independence Day. It guaranteed Western Province of the protection of human rights and freedoms. The people of Western Province acquired the same rights of appeal from the decisions of the Zambian courts and under customary law as all the peoples of Zambia. In addition, the Litunga of Western Province was recognized as the principal local authority for the government and administration of Barotseland. The Litunga would preside over issues related to customary law in the matter of land, forests, fishing, hunting, game preservation, control of bush fires, the supply of beer, and reservation of trees for canoes, among many others.

In stating that, “Government will provide peace and security to the Western Province” 123 in the wake of riots instigated by the BFM, Home Affairs Minister Mkhondo Lungu was in order. The government of Zambia under the Agreement is in charge of keeping peace and order throughout the entire nation. Moreover, pursuant to the Agreement which has provision for unlimited “jurisdiction and powers of the High Court of Zambia in relation to writs or orders,” 124 demands for cessation can only be decided by the High Court of Zambia.

It is imperative to note that calls for cessation are reverting, and even unwarranted, in the case of Barotseland. The position adopted in this book is that calls for the cessation of Western Province from Zambia are inimical at four fronts. First, it is highly unlikely that Western Province can stand on its own economically. The resources of Western Province cannot sustain the province for long. Indeed, the province is graced with land, rivers and minerals. However, and in relation to the overall survival of the area, the province stands to benefit from the collective allocation of the resources of Zambia as a whole.

Despite the Barotse Royal Establishment (BRE)’s vision, or indeed, of the Movement for the Restoration of Barotseland Agreement (MOREBA), 125 of a stand-on-its-own country, in the interest of Zambia as a unitary state, the cessation is a no-brainer. Mpombo agrees: “I am a solid supporter of Zambia as a unitary state but at the same time government must be cautious not to embark on reckless measures that can plunge this country into a serious political crisis.” However, notwithstanding Mpombo’s gallantry in settling political scores with President Banda, the only reckless measure that can plunge Zambia into chaos is acquiescence to cessation.

120 Ibid.
121 Ibid.
122 Ibid.
124 The Barotseland Agreement, supra.
125 The coinage of MOREBA, namely, “Restoration of Barotseland Agreement,” is itself an oxymoron; since by restoring the Agreement, they are actually consolidating Zambia as a unitary state.
Second, Zambia should cavil to any idea that misinforms of the long established unity of the nation. Cessation of Western Province from Zambia may, in the main, portend traves ty for the progress and development in terms of the economy and democracy. For over forty years, the unity of Zambia has been perpetuated mainly through tribal compromises in the allocation of administrative boundaries, official language affiliation and, in the Second Republic, through the motto of One Zambia - One Nation. Thus, “We are all essentially one and the same people. And recognition of our oneness has, no doubt, been the lynchpin of the enhanced and unmatched national unity which our country has enjoyed since independence.”

Third, under the Agreement, the Litunga enjoys tremendous rights and privileges unequalled to any traditional chief in Zambia. The mineral rights and treaties Barotseland entered into with the British government terminated at independence. Consequently, and pursuant to first above, Barotseland could be deprived of its economic anchorage if the cessation became efficacious.

Fourth, politically, legally and morally, Western Province remains a significant part of Zambia. In more ways than one, Western Province has come to define the unity which has solidified Zambia’s independence. In that sense alone, the Agreement is one of the most important instruments of Zambia’s independence, and provides an anchor to the cause of unity, peace and development in Zambia. The aforementioned notwithstanding, claims that the Litunga acquiesced to the colonization of Zambia as advanced by Caplan needs confutation. Assertions like Caplan’s have gone indubitably giving the impression that colonization could be justified.

§5.14 Caplan’s Misleading

Equally as important to the mineral plundering debate of Zambia, is the fact that the copper deposits could be found everywhere in the present day Copperbelt Province of Zambia in the 19th Century. Frederick found the natives wearing copper bungles, bracelets and local farmers using copper implements. The natives had been using copper even prior to the arrival of the European settlers. The Company can, thus, not claim it held mineral rights to the territory because it was responsible for “discovering” the deposits.

Most books detailing the history of Zambia deliberately omit these points. This is understandable. Most of the primary sources from which the history of Zambia is crafted were the works of European researchers and writers. The history of Zambia itself was written from this Euro-centric perspective. It is, therefore, expected that salient dynamics bordering on self-incrimination would be omitted.

Caplan contends that Africans actively sought for European domination. In the case of Lewanika of Barotseland, Caplan concludes that Lewanika learned from the Shona and Ndebele revolutions of 1896-7 which were crashed. In order to avoid the Shona-Ndebele mistakes, Lewanika willingly entered into the Lochner Treaty which Caplan describes as “the most important example of accommodation in that area of the continent.” This assertion is not only historically misleading, it is misplaced, too.

---

126 The One Zambia - One Nation motto was effectuated by the then Western Province Minister, the late Sylvester Chisembele. See Weekly Angel of March 20th – 26th, 2006 at page 10. See also §6.9
129 Ibid.
130 Ibid.
The Lochner Treaty which Caplan asserts was signed because Lewanika had learned a lesson from Lobengula of the Matebele or Shona-Ndebele revolution of 1896-7, happened before the fact. So Lewanika could possibly not have foreseen the clash. The Lochner Treaty was signed in 1890, way before the Shona-Ndebele clash! John Cecil Rhodes was driven by imperial motive, not altruism, when he exploited the territory which became Zambia. He was first and foremost a colonizer, then a businessman.

§5.15 John Cecil Rhodes

A quick glance at John Cecil Rhodes will reveal that he was an influential, shrewd and profit-motivated colonizer. John Cecil Rhodes was born in 1853. By the 1900, he was one of the most powerful personalities, businessmen and politicians in South Africa. His influence was felt both at home and abroad. Williams described the extent of Rhodes’ influence in this manner: “He is the only colonial statesman who has to such extent struck the imagination and affected the thoughts of Englishmen at home and abroad.”

Caplan’s assertion of Rhodes as an accommodator of the African interests is a falsity when one considers the modus operandi of his mission in Africa. First, he had wanted to conquer Africa at any cost, proposing a railway from the Cape to Cairo. In this quest only imperial glory mattered, the interests of the natives did not. Second, Rhodes was not such a man who would accommodate the natives and Williams himself attests to this fact:

Less than six years later the “cypher’s” name was on every tongue as the autocrat of one of the greatest industrial undertakings in the world, as Prime Minister of his colony and as the founder of what promised to be a vast new dominion for the Empire. At home, indeed, the quality of his eminence was never so incontestable as at one time it was in South Africa. To many he was a bugbear - the type of the dishonest and unscrupulous politician, who uses politics to rig the market and the wealth thus acquired to corrupt politics, a man who filched away an empire and slaughtered innocent savages or plotted against a friendly state to put money into his own and his fellow-conspirators’ pockets (Emphasis added).

It is important to observe a few things here. Rhodes died in 1902. The above words were written in 1921, barely two decades after his death. Rhodes is described as an autocrat. An autocrat is “a ruler who has absolute power, a person who expects obedience.” This is not a kind of a person who would accommodate the people who Williams calls “innocent savages.” The dictionary defines savages as people who are “primitive and uncivilized.” Evidently, Rhodes plundered the Africans both of their rights and natural resources in order to advance both his and the imperialistic agenda of the British Empire. Rhodes was a murderous, corrupt and dishonest politician and imperialist.

131 Basil Williams, Cecil Rhodes (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1921), p. 4
132 Ibid.
134 Williams refers to “slaughtered innocent savages.” Rhodes was, thus, a murderer of the Africans, whom they called savages. This explains why his successors cared less for the plight of Africans in Northern Rhodesia.
135 Ibid., p. 621.
§5.16 Second Scramble

The third most significant event in history that would affect the Zambia of today was the scramble for Zambian copper deposits by two most powerful nations on earth, Britain and the US. In 1925, extensive copper deposits were discovered on the Copperbelt, 15 years after Thompson “discovered” copper deposits in Nkana (Kitwe). Two companies competed for domination of the copper fields. The first was the Rhodesian Anglo-American Corporation, a British company based in South Africa. The second was the Roan Selection Trust, a US company. Both companies began constructions on the Copperbelt.

In 1931, in order to increase investment profits, the American cartel started to restrict copper supply. This was bitter-sweet to Northern Rhodesia. Unable to meet demands, consumers sought alternative and cheaper materials instead of copper. The result was that the price of copper crashed. Many employees were sucked. White Europeans returned to South Africa while Africans went back to their villages to farm.

A thorough investigation of the forgone is proper in the light of the future economic implications for Zambia. In a nutshell, and bearing in mind the 1931 restrictions on copper supply leading to the crash of the price of copper, commandist policies have always posed a challenge in the case of Zambia. Shortly after the attainment of independence, the economy of Zambia thrived despite very few educated Zambians. This economic boom would continue throughout the First Republic. In 1972, through the Chona Commission, the UNIP government made one major error, a repeat of the scenario under investigation. Zambia’s economy remained strong in the First Republic mainly due to the perpetuation of the free market practices and the absence of a command economy.

The example of the 1930s in Northern Rhodesia is one future Zambia’s political leaders and technocrats must not ignore. Despite the fact that only two companies dominated at the time, competition was still necessary to ensure maximum productivity. When this was denied and the invisible hand completely obliterated, the economy of Northern Rhodesia broke down.

Something very dramatic needed to be done in order to offset the mini-recession of the 1930s. At the 1932 conference of copper producing nations held in New York, Rhodesian companies objected to interventions and sought for free competition in the copper marketplace. By 1933 normalcy had returned to the industry (thanks for a return to competition both at local and global levels), previous restrictions on competition had elapsed and Northern Rhodesia was once again in a very powerful position. Consequently, the BSAC sold all its mining rights to the Northern Rhodesia government.

---

136 In May 2011, the Mandela Institute at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, was offering a Ph.D scholarship at the University of Bern on the second scramble for Africa; also see BBC of May 19, 2011; David Blair, “Why China is Trying to Colonize Africa,” The Telegraph, (August 31, 2007); Julio Gody, “Second Scramble for Africa Starts,” Blackpresence.co.uk (May 29, 2009); and John Ghazvinian, Untapped: The Scramble for Africa’s Oil (Orlando: Harcourt Inc., 2007)

137 Fluctuation in copper prices is oft-cited as one of the causes of Zambia’s economic malaise. However, the 1931 scarcities in the copper supply were artificially created by the cartel.

138 Generally, the period between 1964 and 1972 is referred to as the First Republic. This period is synonymous with great economic boom, a thriving democracy and massive political pluralism in Zambia. However, it was just a matter of time before economic deficiencies inherited from the colonial administration would be felt.

139 Chiluba, Democracy: Challenge of Change, p. 120

140 First proposed by Adam Smith, the idea of invisible hand implies that human needs are best served by free competition in the economic marketplace. The only role of government is to enforce the rules of property and contracts to make competition possible but not to direct the process itself. However, as evidenced in the wake of the 2008 economic meltdown, regulation of key financial sectors is necessary if the market economy is to be saved from greed.
This last move, together with the British style of Indirect Rule,\textsuperscript{141} consolidated British colonization of Northern Rhodesia. A high-flying school of thought supposing why Britain decided to impose indirect, as opposed to direct, rule on Northern Rhodesia is that Britain did not have adequate resources to running direct governments. The official policy on Indirect Rule in Rhodesia was adopted by the British colonial administration in 1928. “This policy meant that the British settlers would utilize existing African institutions such as chiefs and local courts to govern Africans. To effectuate Indirect Rule, the Native Authorities Ordinance and the Native Courts Ordinance were passed in 1929.”\textsuperscript{142} It is alleged that for the most part, colonialism was hardly felt in areas ruled by chiefs such as the villages. However, colonialism meant occupying and controlling lands and resources which historically belonged to the Africans. Moreover, Indirect Rule gives credence to the veracity that the Africans had functional institutions even prior to colonialism. The notion that Africans could not rule themselves was, therefore, superfluous.

The distinction between direct and Indirect Rule was fundamental. Before 1924, the Company’s Native Commissioner did not regard it as part of his functions to build up the role of the chiefs in local administration. But if that was the case, why then was Indirect Rule imposed? Lord Hailey explains: “The general effect of the policy was to preserve the outward form of the indigenous systems, but to undermine the authority of the chiefs both by making them depend on the administrative officer and by taxation which obliged large numbers of men to leave their villages for considerable periods of time (Emphasis added).”\textsuperscript{143}

Indirect Rule was not designed to empower the African chiefs, it was a calculated policy aimed at destroying the power of the African chiefs. It was a cover-up designed to “undermine the authority of the chiefs.” It was even more; it was meant to disrupt the African village so that able-bodied men could leave for service in the European haciendas for meager pay. In fact, Europeans knew exactly what they were doing. They, for instance, knew that one day the Africans would evict them from Africa, and the administration fashioned a stratagem: “For two or three generations we can show the Negro what we are: then we shall be asked to go away. Then we shall leave the land to those it belongs to, with the feeling that they have better business friends in us.”\textsuperscript{144}

Colonialism was business as usual; it was a long-term investment in Western Capitalism. Indirect Rule constituted what in vernacular is called a Mouse Bite.\textsuperscript{145} It was a ruse designed to tame the hatred and pain of domination in the Africans. But the colonialists knew too well that it was just a matter of time before the Africans would rise and claim their land back.

The masterminder of Indirect Rule, Sir Frederick Lugard,\textsuperscript{146} thereafter, Lord Lugard, popularized what he called “dual mandate” in his book \textit{The Dual Mandate in British Tropical

\textsuperscript{141} The British concept of Indirect Rule was enumerated by Lord Lugard. Like the French policy of association, the system delegated power to local chiefs and others with pre-existing claims to local power. However, these powers were given to people sympathetic to British interests. The local chiefs collected taxes, decided outcomes of local disputes, and quelled any anti-British sentiments and riots among the people. The system worked so well that Britain did not have to expend any more capital than was necessary to control its African colonies. This had an added advantage of keeping Britain’s financial and personnel costs to a minimum.


\textsuperscript{143} Richard Hall, \textit{Zambia} (London: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965), p. 103

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., p. 104

\textsuperscript{145} A mouse is known to bite hard while cautiously tenderizing the wound so that the victim least feels the pain. In that way, the rodent can inflict a far-reaching damage.

\textsuperscript{146} Lugard fought against the Arab slave owners in Nyasaland in 1888. He became the doyen of the British administrators in Africa. He retired in 1919 as Governor-General of Nigeria.
Africa published in 1922. The central thesis of the book, which became an essential reading for every ambitious cadet in the African territory, was that, “The imperial power would stay in [Africa] while it could, impact what it felt was good for the indigenous people and then retire gracefully but keeping her trade after the flag had been lowered.”

Implicit in this philosophy was the development of Indirect Rule. This did not happen as the Africans became more and more marginalized. After 36 years, the administration would again claim it was empowering the Africans for administration through an Africanization program. The truth is, the administration did not prepare the Africans for self-rule, but for trade keeps “after the flag had been lowered.” This trend of using Africa as a source of raw materials and capital has continued today imbued in such subterfuges as donor support or responsible philanthropies:

Why do we with open eyes
Let the thief in and robe
Why do we with a piece of paper
Surrender all we have
Why have we allowed wealth-hunters,
Who masquerade as democrats,
To erase our memory of history
Why all this while we say, nod and finally sign,
Placing a dagger against hope?

§5.17 Africans Pay

The fourth most significant event in Zambian history that has had enormous impact on both the stability and conflict resolution dynamics of the Zambian society happened in 1935. This time it was not the moving of the Capital City from Livingstone to Lusaka. Rather, it was the first recorded shooting to death of six Black Africans by the White Northern Rhodesian police.

Just when relations between the White Northern Rhodesian government and the Black Africans were poised to be going in the right direction, mostly due to the announcement made by the British government, the unspeakable happened in Northern Rhodesia. The Africans were peeved with the shooting to death of their six countrymen. In 1935, the rates of the hut tax on the Copperbelt were raised. This led to strikes in Mufulira, Nkana (Kitwe) and Roan Antelope...
(Luanshya). The shootings happened when the White police was sent in to restore order in Kitwe.

The struggle of the Zambian people has also been, for the most part, the struggles of a working class.\textsuperscript{151} Removed from their lands in rural areas in order to work the mines and amass capital for the colonial capitalists, the Africans in Northern Rhodesia were underpaid, heavily taxed and harshly treated. In this way, therefore, colonialism manipulated capital and labor, two of the four means of production.\textsuperscript{152} The other two are land and technology. In the communiqué just before six of their counterparts were brutally gunned down and several others wounded, they brought out their common concerns:

Listen to this all who live in the country...we wish on the day of April 29\textsuperscript{th} every person not to work, he who will go to work, and if we see him, it will be a serious case. Know how they cause us to suffer, they cheat us for money, they arrest us for loafing, they persecute and put us in gaol for tax. What reason have we done? Secondly, do you not wish to hear these words, well list this year of 1935, if they will not increase us more money stop paying tax, do you think they can kill you, no. Let us encourage surely you will see that God will be with us. See how we suffer with the work and how we are continually reviled and beaten underground. Many brothers of us die for 22s. 6d., is this money that we should lose our lives for (Emphasis added);\textsuperscript{153}

This incident is unprecedented in the history of Zambia. There are three observations here. First and foremost, it was “how they cause us to suffer, they cheat us for money, they arrest us for loafing, and they persecute and put us in gaol for tax.” The statement is self-evident of the brutality of the colonial administration against the plight of the African workers. The people of Zambia endured cruel and inhumane treatment at the hands of the foreign entities in their own home country.\textsuperscript{154}

Second, the Africans mine workers asked, “Do you think they can kill you, no”? Sadly, they were killed. Six of their comrades were short dead when they went on a strike and this was because they wanted equal pay and equal rights in the mines. To think that the colonial machine came to Northern Rhodesia to help develop the colony would be an understatement and a grave injustice to those who perished for their rights.

Third and last, the mine workers take us down into the heart of the abyss; they allow us to see what happened underground: “See how we suffer with the work and how we are continually reviled and beaten underground. Many brothers of us die for 22s. 6d., is this money that we should lose our lives for?” The mine workers did not only suffer emotional, mental and physical abuse at the hands of the colonial masters, they also lost their lives, lives that could have been categorized as accidents in official reports.

Despite their infuriation, the Africans in Northern Rhodesia used the death of their six countrymen to get organized politically. They established the first Tribal Elders’ Advisory Council and then the African Urban Advisory in the Copperbelt, Central and Southern provinces.

\textsuperscript{151} For an extended discussion on the working class in Zambia, see Hamalengwa’s \textit{Class Struggles in Zambia 1889-1989} \& The \textit{Fall of Kenneth Kaunda 1991-1991}.

\textsuperscript{152} Capital, labor and productivity constitute the three ingredients of economic growth.

\textsuperscript{153} Translated by an African Clerk who was present at the scene, quoted in Hamalengwa, \textit{supra}, p. 30

\textsuperscript{154} In many respects, Africans still suffer from systematic discrimination in employment, access to status bar, and in various other areas of life when they immigrate to other countries.
World War II

In 1939, Britain entered into World War II. This meant that Northern Rhodesia militias had to participate into the war on Britain’s side. It was during this period that Northern Rhodesia experienced a great boom in the sale of copper which was in high demand for electric cables. As these events were unfolding in favor of the Africans in Northern Rhodesia, the White European workers were biting their nails. They threatened to strike but they feared that Africans would replace them. The Africans were willing to accept low pay.\(^\text{155}\)

Moreover, the settlers’ approach towards the Africans was that of marginalization. The Africans were expected to work in the mines but not to earn a good pay, to carry out the theory of Indirect Rule, but not to aggrandize its substance. Sadly, in 21\(^\text{st}\) Century Africa, this discrepancy has been allowed to mushroom and take root. To many in Europe and the West, Africa is a lost cause, just as it was a Dark Continent in the 19\(^\text{th}\) Century.\(^\text{156}\) But it should never be forgotten that it was, in part, the hydro-power of Southern Rhodesia that illuminated the Industrial Revolution, the gold of South Africa that brightened the world’s economic portfolios and the copper of Northern Rhodesia that won the war!

In 1939, thirteen Africans were killed in Kitwe when they threatened a strike for pay raise. This was just four years after the six perished. In 1935, the six Africans were killed for protesting a hut tax increase. In 1939, the thirteen were killed for seeking a pay raise. In the light of these two unfortunate events, it is clear that the settler government did not see Africans as equal partners in development. However, in the context of historic fairness, these shootings were insignificant in comparison to the Lumpa Uprising\(^\text{157}\) which resulted in the “death of 700 church workers were biting their nails. They threatened to strike but they feared that Africans would

---

\(^{155}\) It is important again here to make an observation. Whereas Britain’s policy of Indirect Rule gave relative freedom to African chiefs to control their own people – although such freedom only existed on paper – economic opportunities did not come that easy for the Africans. This same pattern would follow shortly after Zambia became independent. The colonialists were willing to grant the Africans political independence but not economic independence.

\(^{156}\) In fact, there has been a tremendous misrepresentation of Africa as a Dark Continent. As argued in this book, Europeans have written our history, mostly, from their perspective. By the time Europe was “discovering” Africa in the 15\(^\text{th}\) and 16\(^\text{th}\) centuries, Africa had been the cradle of life and civilization. Between B.C 285 and 247, Ptolemy II, King of Egypt had translated the first portion of the Hebrew Scriptures (the Torah or “Law”) into Greek at Alexandria. Thus, “Africa [is] the cradle of Biblical translation” (see Bigelow, White Man’s Africa, p. 2). If, therefore, the Bible is the symbol of light, why would a continent that received the first Biblical translation be dark? Moreover, Africa is also the first main home of Christian literature. In B.C 300, the earliest Latin version of the Scripture was made in Africa in the Coptic language of Egypt. And by 1200 A.D, Christian bishoprics were still in existence in Nubia, Africa.

Not only was Africa the cradle of life, civilization and light, Africa was also one of the first places to establish authentic trade. In 1150 A.D, Songhai merchants of Jenné founded Timbuktu, which became the center of trade in western Sudan. And politically, between 1308 A.D and 1331 A.D, the Mandingo Empire of Melle had reached its height of power under Mansa Musa. In fact, the empire was so extensive that it covered the whole of western Sudan. These historic facts, are, therefore, in direct contradiction with the popularized notion that Africans inhabited a “Dark Continent” and were devoid of economic, political or, indeed, religious organization.

\(^{157}\) The story of the Lumpa Uprising is one rarely talked about in Zambia. The Lumpa Church was founded by a woman called Alice Lenshina Mulenga Mubisha. The Lumpa (literally “better than all others”) movement was formed in 1953 and by Zambian independence, had a following of over 100,000 members. Lumpa’s attack on witchcraft, alcohol and polygamy seemed to have been well received by the people in villages. However, the movement was getting more powerful and becoming a threat first to the colonial, and in 1964, to the new Zambian government. In 1958, it built a grand cathedral at Zion and by 1964, it openly opposed earthly authority, rejected both government registration of the Lumpa Church and paying taxes. The church formed its own villages in defiance of established order and an affront to the traditional authority. The movement challenged the legitimacy of the Nationalist Party and of UNIP. Adherents of the Lumpa movement and UNIP caders clashed violently. In 1964, the Prime Minister of the African majority government, Kaunda, sent in two battalions of the Northern Rhodesia regiment. Violence erupted leading to the death of between 700 and 1500 Lenshina followers. Many villagers fled in thousands to Katanga in the Congo. Kaunda banned the Lumpa Church in August 1964 and proclaimed a State of Emergency that was
members during police and army attack.” But it should not be forgotten that it was due to colonialism and the struggles for independence that the Lumpa Uprising took place.

A breakthrough partially came in 1946 when some few educated Africans in Northern Rhodesia formed the Federation of African Welfare Societies. It is important to note here that, as will be expounded in §5.18, Africans had already been organized in this way as early as 1912 at Mwenzo Mission. However, the 1912 associations were village-based and conducted their business mostly in vernacular languages.

In 1948, the Federation of African Welfare Societies was changed to Northern Rhodesia Congress with Godwin Mbikusita Lewanika as its leader. This development could have reinforced the existing African Urban Advisory councils because they sent in delegates in 1948 and formed regional councils whose representatives met as the African Representative Council (ARC). In 1949, the African Mineworkers Union (AMWU) was formed. In 1952, Godwin Lewanika was succeeded by Harry Mwaanga Nkumbula as head of the Northern Rhodesia Congress, which was shortly changed to Northern Rhodesia African National Congress (ANC).

---

159 This was the first association of Africans, unlike the earlier African Urban Advisory Council, that conducted its affairs in English. Generally, the period between 1941 and 1964 saw the rise not only of the spirit of nationalism, but also of men and women whom history has unfairly silenced. Indeed, works like those of Henry Meebelo, David Mulford or Robert Rotberg, have attempted to cover the mass evolution of nationalism in Zambia. However, even such impeccable works seem to omit on certain men and women who worked relentlessly to birth the new nation of Zambia. Thus, Musambachime has charged, “Mentioned in passing or simply forgotten are veteran politicians who pioneered the fight for independence” (“Dauti Yamba’s Contribution to the Rise and Growth of Nationalism in Zambia, 1941-1964,” (1991) African Affairs, 90, p. 259). He mentioned some of such men as Dauti Lawton Yamba, Dixon Konkola, Miles Kaweche Banda, Nelson Nalumango, Paskale Sikota, Safeli Chishala, Henry Kasokolo, among so many.
160 Mwenzo Mission was opened by the Church of Scotland in 1895
161 Other records have 1948 instead of 1949, see, for example, Grotpeter et. al., Historical Dictionary of Zambia.