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Introduction to the report

During the last years most effort has been directed towards a development of the rural sector. The task is to raise the existing low level of productivity in traditional peasant farming and to create work opportunities for the rural underemployed or unemployed people. A labour-intensive, capital-intensive development of the rural sector along the ujamaa vijijini lines is planned.

Much energy is vested in working out plans for this development. Characteristica of the planning and plans are:

1. The plans are worked out by people who are not themselves involved in carrying out the plans.
2. The plans are worked out by people who are not themselves the consumers of the plans.
3. The plans are biased towards the technical and economic part of the development and too often neglect completely the human factor or reduce it to man-power.

Too often the reasons for an unsuccessful plan implementation is neglect of the human factor. The existing skills and organisations as well as the cultural and social commitments and limitations of the local population do not change over night and ought to be taken into consideration and regarded as the fundament on which to base the development.

It is the aim of this report: 1) to describe some of the socio-economic patterns at local community level, i.e. at the level of the consumers of the plans which are the fundament on which the plans ought to be based, and 2) to describe the development plan implementation as seen in the case-study-area.

The report is a preliminary of a very empirical and no theorizing content. This is mainly due to the fact that investigations are not yet finished. The report is based on data from the "traditional sector" of the communities in Bukoba District and has very little discussion on ujamaa. The reasons for this are:

1. By far the majority of the communities of Bukoba District are not involved in ujamaa at all.
2. The implementation of ujamaa can only take place based on the existing socio-economic system for which reason it seems necessary to start with a discussion of the existing socio-economic patterns.
3. The research on ujamaa in Bukoba District is not yet finished, especially the most important model for implementing ujamaa: the ujamaa-based diversification of the economy within traditional communities is not yet studied.
The methods of data collection on which the report is based are the Following:

1. Interviews by use of questionnaires of a random sample of farmers making up a 10 per cent sample.

   The questionnaires are similar to the ones used in all three districts of the region. They are written in Kiswahili but in many cases the interviewer translated the questions currently during the interview into Luhaya.

   The interviews were carried out in this area by my research assistant who is familiar with the area from former research work in the very area and who himself is a Mhaya.

   Most interviews took 2-2½ hours which indicates that the questionnaires were too long.

   The people were often somewhat reluctant but agreed all to be interviewed.

2. Interviews with all mabarazi in two villages on the size and composition of the household, the economic assets of the households and on the most common problems and cases of conflict in his 10-cell.

3. Informal interviews with all households in 3 selected 10-cells; collection of information on lifehistories of the head of household, marital histories, family development and farm development histories. Also a farm survey was undertaken and attempts were done to measure land. This was met with so massive reluctance that we had to give up if we wanted to go on working in the area. The reason for this is probably that our research coincided with the passing of the law on nationalisation of private houses which made the farmers fear that their land should be taken by government.

4. Informal interviews with labourers and prostitutes on their lifehistory, marital history and economic position.

5. Participant observation of the activities carried out in the village during a 5 week stay in the village. We stayed for 2 weeks in a tent until we were able to hire a room in a house occupied by labourers.

   It was the intention to have spent 5 months in the village. For security reasons we were asked to postpone the stay in the village as the owner of the house which we had been allocated was threatened by armed robbers. When the situation had released the border conflict between Uganda and Tanzania broke out and we were asked not to go and stay in the village. So finally in the end of October it was possible for us to go and stay in the case-study-area.

   During the research I have been assisted by my very competent interpreter and research assistant who has 5 years of experience in this type of work. All interviews have been carried out in Luhaya and translated into English.
Introduction

Bukoba District is one of the four districts of West Lake Region. Approximately 360,000 inhabitants, i.e. half of the total regional population, live in Bukoba District. Bukoba town is the administrative centre and the only town in the district and has only approximately 8,600 inhabitants. The majority of the population is mainly concentrated on the two mountain ridges running in parallel north-south through the district.

The cultural, social and economic pattern is basically the same throughout the district. Yet there are rather big socio-economic variations between the different local communities. These variations are mainly determined by the age of the community and the position of the community in relation to main traffic lines and good communication links to Bukoba town and the big working places. A further analysis of data on the variations will take place later and will be the basis of a forthcoming report on the development in Bukoba District as compared to Karagwe and Ngara Districts.

The figures in Fig. 1.a and b (p. 2 and 3) are shown here with the purpose of giving a possibility to place the case-study area, Maruku, within a socio-economic frame valid for the whole district.

As will be seen Maruku area shows the biggest average income- and expenditure-figures, employment as the main source of income and a big percentage of households with hired labour and with additional land in other areas. Economically the area is among the highest developed areas of the district. Culturally and socially the area shows many urban traits.

The area is selected as case-study area, then, because it is regarded as the most pronounced example of the tendencies of development which can also be expected in other areas of the district if no drastic changes are made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Average total acreage</th>
<th>Average cultiv. acreage</th>
<th>Average pure coffee acreage</th>
<th>Average other crops acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU Busimbe</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Katoma</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Maruku</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Kitwe</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Rushasha</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Bunazi</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Itongo K</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Itongo M</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Bukeile</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Mutoju</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Rugazi</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Nyakigando</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Kyamnyorwa</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O = old established settlement
N = new settlement
U = ujamaa settlement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Households with land elsewhere</th>
<th>Households with hired labour</th>
<th>Main source of income</th>
<th>Average income</th>
<th>Average expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OU Busimbe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Katoma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Maruku</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Kitwe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Rushasha</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>1270</td>
<td>1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Bunazi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Itongo K</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>coffee</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Itongo M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>coffee</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Bukeile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>coffee</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Mutoju</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Rugazi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Nyakigando</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>coffee</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Kyamnyorwa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>employment</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O = old established settlements  
N = new settlements  
U = ujamaa settlements  
OU = old established settlement with ujamaa unit

25 households are interviewed in each village. The average income are generally far bigger than the average expenditure, most likely because the farmers do not want to inform about their income. Most likely the degree if underestimation is the same all over, so that the relative sizes can be compared. The figures are taken from the regional questionnaire investigation carried out in May and June 1971.
The case-study area.

The area under study is called Maruku - Kanyangereko. It is a peninsula of approximately 50 sqkm situated 15-20 km south of Bukoba town close to the mainroad Bukoba - Mwanza.

The area falls within the high rainfall radius of approximately 30 km around Bukoba. The yearly average rainfall is approximately 170 mm. June, July and August are the driest months while April, May and November get the heavy rainfall. (See Figure 2 p.5). In these months the rainfall affects the proportion of available work time in agriculture as outdoor work is impossible during the hours of rain. The climate allows for cultivation all the year round.

The area is part of the former chiefdom of Bukara but is now divided in two administrative units: Kanyangereko ward and Maruku ward. Each ward is divided into a certain number of villages of a varied size.

The area has been populated long time ago. Archeological investigations carried out in 1969-70 show that people of the Mutundu dynasty have been in the area since the 12th century and have been conquered by the Hinda dynasty in the 13th century. Already in the 12th century the first permanently cultivated fields with the crop-pattern similar to the one seen to-day were established.

The area is densely populated. Moody's Figure 1 based on the 1967-census shows 145.3 persons per sqkm for Maruku while my Figure based on the total number of mabarozí (10-cell-leaders) in both Maruku and Kanyangereko and the average size of households for the area gives a population densely of 190.6 per sqkm.

The majority of the people in the area are the Bakara belonging to the Wahaya tribe. They are the landowning part of the population. The area is facing a massive in-migration of people who come to look for different kinds of work. The biggest group of in-migrants is the Banyaihangiro who are of the Wahaya tribe but coming from Ihangiro Division. Both men and women of Ihangiro come to Maruku. The men are labourers at the Maruku Tea-Estate, Maruku Research Farm, or in the fields of the Bakara, while the women besides working in the same type of jobs as the men of Ihangiro work as prostitutes.

The next biggest group of in-migrants are the Banyarwanda from Rwanda. They compete to a certain degree with the Banyaihangiro for the same jobs while the Banyarwanda are also the people employed as herdsmen.

Also people from other divisions of the district are met in Maruku, i.e. the Bahamba from Kianja, the Bayoza from Kyamtware, the Bahendangabo from Bugabo, and the Baziba from Kiziba. Some people come from even bigger distances, i.e. from Ngara, Karagwe or Biharamulo Districts or from Congo, or Uganda to work in Maruku.

---

### Rainfall in Maruku in mm and days per month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th></th>
<th>1970/71</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>64.77 mm</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>93.50 mm</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>49.28 mm</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>112.27 mm</td>
<td>11 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>96.52 mm</td>
<td>11 days</td>
<td>114.30 mm</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>69.60 mm</td>
<td>8 days</td>
<td>129.50 mm</td>
<td>11 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>278.38 mm</td>
<td>19 days</td>
<td>174.50 mm</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>90.42 mm</td>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>135.70 mm</td>
<td>18 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>140.21 mm</td>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>114.30 mm</td>
<td>6 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>148.10 mm</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>73.90 mm</td>
<td>4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>221.00 mm</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>158.12 mm</td>
<td>8 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>399.25 mm</td>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>553.20 mm</td>
<td>20 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>312.00 mm</td>
<td>16 days</td>
<td>440.00 mm</td>
<td>13 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>116.75 mm</td>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>25.40 mm</td>
<td>1 day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1986.28 mm</td>
<td>147 days</td>
<td>2164.69 mm</td>
<td>117 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>165.52 mm</td>
<td></td>
<td>180.39 mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of information: Yearly Report on Tea-experiments by Mr. McIntyre, Maruku Research Farm. 1971
The three biggest working places in the area are: Maruku Tea Estate, established in 1963, and Maruku Tea Factory, opened in 1967, and Maruku Research Farm, a government run research station established already in the German time. The research station covers 130 ha of land and carries out experiments and research on coffee, tea, bananas, foddergrass, dairy cattle and poultry. Also there is a forest reserve station employing people, Rubale Forest Reserve, a government forest plantation of different kinds of pinetrees.

In the area two farmers' co-operative societies offer their members the following services: marketing coffee and tea, providing coffee-seedlings, providing tractor, providing fertilizer and insecticides, providing extension-officers for advice, providing loans for cattle and farm improvements and providing scholarships. The co-operative societies in this area were among the first ones to be established in the district in 1950 and to-day approximately 50% of the farmers are members.

In 1969 the area got a piped water supply. The pipelines are still being expanded.

The area has three lower Primary Schools (st 1 to st 4) and three Lower - and Upper-Primary Schools (st 1 to st 7) and some few bush-schools which are more correctly kindergartens even if sometimes quite old children of 8 to 10 years age join them.

In the area two relatively well equipped medical dispensaries are found, the one is run by government and the other by the lutheran mission. The lutheran mission also runs an orphanage and a homecraft school for girls who have passed st 7.

A very characteristic feature of the area is the relatively big number of bars. 5 of the bars sell factory made bottled beer and spirits while all the other bars only sell locally made beer of pineapple, bananas and sorghum.

The roads in the area are all simple gravel roads which are in a very bad condition the most of the year. There are twice a day bus connections to Bukoba. Also the farmers who have cars use their cars for transporting people against payment from the area to Bukoba in the morning and back in the afternoon.

The Settlements.

The climatic as well as the soil conditions to a very high degree determines the settlement-pattern. Where soil conditions are reasonably good for permanent cultivation the villages are found.

A village consists of a number of houses from ten to several hundred. Each house is situated in the middle of the permanently cultivated fields which gives a scattered settlement type. Many of the fields are several hundred years old.

Small narrow paths passing through the cultivated fields connect one farm with the neighbouring farms. In the village no open space is seen indicating that there is no communal
public gathering place. One or several bigger paths, roads or cattletracks pass through the village connecting it with the surrounding grazing areas and the neighbouring villages.

Between the villages established as they are on "islands" of more fertile soil, soil conditions are poorer and only non-permanent cultivation is possible with the techniques used by the majority of the farmers. On these less fertile soils the public buildings are found, i.e. cattle-dips, schools, dispensaries and churches. The small shops - maduka - are, however, found within the villages as they are mostly opened in a part of the private houses.
Household-economies. A discription

The farming system.

The Haya farming system is based on 3 distinct categories of land: kibanja, emisiri and rweya, which will have to be defined.

Kibanja (pl. bibanja) is intensively used land mainly found on and around the hilltops (where the villages are situated) and cultivated with perennial crops.

Emisiri is the land of less fertility cultivated with annual crops. This land is found on the outskirts of the bibanja or in the open areas between the villages.

Rweya is the open grassland slopes outside the bibanja and between the villages.

The kibanja - establishment and maintenance.

The kibanja is individually owned clanland and absolutely the core of the farming system. As a matter of fact many of the bibanja in the area are centuries old. However, new bibanja are established or old ones expanded. The methods of establishment/expansion have changed very little for centuries.

First bush and grass vegetation has to be removed. The cleared plot is cultivated, i.e. grassroots are removed and soil hoed. The clean and cultivated plot is then planted with bambara nuts. When they are harvested finger millet is planted and this is followed by sweet potatoes and/or cassava. When these are harvested the soil is ready for planting bananas. This process takes from its very beginning until the first bananas are ripe approximately three years. However, the process can be speeded up a little by only planting sweet potatoes or cassava followed immediately by bananas.

Once the bananas are planted the farmer starts interplanting various other crops: Coffee is the most important, and it is the main cash crop. Next to coffee comes beans and maize. Still more crops can be interplanted: yams, cassava, tomatoes, pumpkins, calabash plants, pilipili, vegetables, pineapple or pawpaw, and the kibanja is fully established.

Also the farmer will start mulching which is spreading grass cover on top of the soil in the kibanja. The mulch in connection with the combination of crops grown give a good protection against evaporation and slows down the growth of the weeds.
Level 1: the tallest plants grown are bananas.
Level 2: the coffee, the maize and the cassava.
Level 3: the beans, pumpkins, vegetables.

It will be seen that the bananas close to the house are taller. This is due to the household-left-overs which are spread around the house.

During the process of establishment/expansion of a kibanja the farmer traditionally depends on an already established kibanja (his own or his father's kibanja) for seedlings to the new kibanja and for food and eventually money for his own needs until the new kibanja starts producing.

The establishment/expansion of a kibanja demands investments of 1) labour - either own or hired labour, 2) seedlings - from the old established kibanja, 3) compost/manure - banana peelings, withered leaves, household leftovers, or cow dung, 4) mulch - grass cut on the rweya.

A kibanja can be established/expanded without investment of money and most bibanja are established without money investments except may be for hired labour.

A kibanja is preferably established as close to other bibanja as possible and not in open uncultivated areas. This is to minimize the risk of attacks on the crops from wild animals and to be able to maintain close contact with the old kibanja on which the farmer depends. Also the attachment to the old kibanja is strong.

Maintenance.

Once established the kibanja needs only little daily maintenance. The maintenance consists of weeding, removal of withered leaves and stems and mulching. To maintain, the kibanja investment of labour is needed and very few farmers do invest anything but labour, however often hired labour.

The traditional way of maintaining the kibanja does not lead to improvement and increased production. Very seldom manure is added and seldom or never are old stems uprooted and replaced.

For a better maintenance and improvement of the kibanja government and co-operative societies' extension officers have for many years advised the farmers on modern techniques. The results have been meagre:
24% (1) of the farmers plant in rows when they eventually uproot and replant or establish a new kibanja. 
20% (1) add cowdung while 76% (1) just add the traditional green manure, i.e. banana leaves and stems.

No one cuts back the coffee while 85% (1) prune the coffee. The pruning is not in accordance with modern techniques but is the traditional cutting of branches.

52% (1) use insecticides against the much feared bananawili. 
16% (1) invested money in farm improvement. The total amount invested by the 16% was 120 shs (1) and they were used for tools.

The well-established kibanja has an economic value for the farmer. It also has a cultural value. It is the link between the Mhaya and his ancestors who established the kibanja, maintained it, passed it on and are buried in the kibanja. The kibanja is then more than a field as it is also the home, the family, the house. It is the very centre for the Mhaya's activities and thoughts - it is part of his identity.

The emisiri - establishment.

Usually the emisiri is found on the less fertile grass covered slopes between the villages. A rotation system of 1 years cultivation and 4 to 9 years follow is necessary.

Cultivation of annual crops on emisiri is by far the most laborious of the agricultural work. Every year new land has to be cleared and cultivated. The grasses and weeds are burned and the ashes spread on the soil. Various types of seedbeds are prepared depending on what type of crops are planted. Bambara nuts, ground nuts, finger millet, beans, sweet potatoes or cassava are usually grown on emisiri. These crops are additional food crops to the staple food crop, the banana. While the banana is rich only in starch these food crops are by far more nutritious.

The area under cultivation each year with additional food crops depends on the size of the household and the energy of the woman as only women grow these crops, and is limited by a shortage of available land for annual crops. The sample shows an average size of emisiri of 0.41 acre (1) per household.

The shortage of land is caused by the introduction in 1963 of tea as a new cash crop in Maruku. When fertilizer is added to the unfertile rwewa soil the tea bush is very fit for the climatic conditions in Maruku. 19% of the farmers (11) grow tea on a total area of 33 acres.

The rwewa.

The rwewa is the grazing area for the livestock and it is the source of mulch for the kibanja and the tea fields and of grass for the houses for roof and floor.

The possession of or admittance to all three categories of land is necessary for the farmer as the production on the kibanja is supported from the emisiri and the rwewa in an integrated system.

Figures marked (1) are based on the results of the questionnaire investigations of 25 households in Maruku village.

Figures marked (11) are based on the results of investigations of 166 households, the total number of households in two villages in Maruku area, partly overlapping the Maruku village.
The distribution of land.

The arable land in Maruku is almost fully utilized. The population density is big and a land shortage has already hit the people and can only be expected to increase. The distribution of land on individual families varies, 0.3 acre is the minimum size and 16 acres (1) the maximum size registered in Maruku. The main part of the population has less than the average size of land.

According to the regional questionnaire investigation 25 households chosen from a random sample of households and making up a 10% sample - the figures on distribution of land show:
Average total acreage per household : 3.63 acres
Average cultivated acreage per household : 3.48 acres
Average kibanja size per household : 2.84 acres
Average acreage of emaiiri per household : 0.41 acre
Average acres of pure stand coffee per h. : 0.22 acre

The results from the research carried out in all 166 households in two villages overlapping the area of the regional questionnaire investigations show:
Average size of kibanja per household : 1.60 acres
Average size of uncultivated privately owned land close to the kibanja per h. : 0.13 acre

These figures are most likely to be closer to the reality as they are based on the total number of households and not on a random 10% sample and as they have been checked by measurements in some cases and cross interview and interviewer's estimates.

The average size of kibanja of 1.6 acres and of 8% of the potential iibanja (= 0.13 acre of rweya close to the kibanja) not under cultivation can be compared to the figures from the study carried out by Jorgen Rald of a high population density area in Bukoba District. Rald gives the following figure of average size of kibanja of 1.7 acres and 36% of potential kibanja not under cultivation. These figures indicate that the situation of overpopulation is even worse in Maruku area.

Labour and labour organization.

Family labour.

The main labour used in the agricultural production is provided by the family. A distinct division of labour according to sex is seen.

The husband caretakes cattle, he normally does the digging of holes, manuring, planting and mulching of coffee and bananas. Also he harvests, hulls, sprays and transports the coffee and he brews the beer. In this he may be assisted by his sons. The male labour is used on the two main crops. If the farmer grows tea and invests his own labour in the tea he will be picking the tea leaves.

1) Land use in a Buhaya village, J.Rald, Dar es Salaam, 1969
The wife/wives normally do the weeding, cutting of grass for mulch and assist in planting of the coffee and bananas. Also the women harvest and transport the bananas except the pombe bananas, i.e. the bananas for making beer. All work with the emisiri crops is the responsibility of the women, and is carried out by only women.

The sexual division of labour shows that male labour is used for the types of works which has to be carried out seasonally and irregularly while the female labour is used for the work which has to be carried out almost daily all the year round.

Women are the stable labour in agriculture. According to a detailed analysis of labour-input in agriculture carried out by J. Rald in 1968-70 in Bukoba District the women contribute with twice as many hours of agricultural work during a year as do the men. (866 respectively 1621 estimated total number of hours per year).

Husband and wife make up the core of the household which is the productive unit. They depend on each other for a full use of their resources. Due to the culturally determined distinct division of labour according to sex, husband and wife do not carry out their work together. Most agricultural tasks are carried out by single individuals, not through co-operation, and not in groups. Both sexes have clearly defined tasks with the responsibility to carry them out. Each individual knows what he or she ought to do and determines if and when he or she will do it. There is a surprisingly little coordination of activities and little common decision making and planning within the family. Decisions concerning the main crops coffee, bananas and tea are taken by the men and decisions concerning the annual crops are taken by the women.

Forms of co-operation.

On the other hand co-operation exist between persons of the same sex.

Male co-operation: The herding of cattle is a group task based on the principle of reciprocity. The cattle owners of a certain village form an organization. Each cattle owner brings his cattle to the grazing areas in the morning and collects it again in the evening. Each member in turn will then be responsible for the herding of all the cattle of the village. He may contribute with his own labour of he may hire labour to take his turns.

Female co-operation: Before Uhuru the cultivation of annual crops was well organized. The Mrambwa - a male member of the clan which was the first one to settle in a certain village and as such regarded as having the most profound knowledge of the village and the soil conditions - was the leader of the women who wanted to cultivate annual crops. He choose the land and the time for starting the annual cultivation and he set the time for harvest. Since Uhuru and the abolishment

of the chiefdoms the Mrambwa has stopped working as a leader of the women as "he does not want to work for nothing" (he refers to the glamour at the chief's palace which he took part in as a person who had a kind of an official position).

The women do not have a leader any longer. They try to organize themselves. Those women who want to cultivate annual crops on the rweya start almost at the same time to open up small blocks of land, the usufruct right of which is individual. Each woman is responsible for the work on her own block. The women however have to coordinate their work so as to be ready for planting at the same time. The planting is done communally. The women in a group start planting in one end of the field and help each other until all planting is finished. This is necessary to make sure that the crops grow and ripen at almost the same time as the protection of the crops while growing and ripening has to be organized. Away from planting and protection which is done communally all other activities are done individually. There is no sharing of the harvest.

Also in each village the women have formed a women-organization based on the principle of reciprocity. The functions of the organization is to assist during times when one of the members faces big need for labour, i.e. at funerals, marriages, sickness or childbirth.

Hired labour.

There is a long tradition for hired labour in Buhaya. Manual field work, especially weeding and cultivating, is regarded as degrading work for the man in Buhaya. Every farmer will therefore strive to get women or hired labour for these tasks.

There is a big supply of labour in Maruku, partly due to the presence of the three big working-places and partly due to the reputation of Maruku as a relatively rich area. The labourers are as mentioned mainly Banyauhangiro and Banyarwanda but also labourers come from areas closer to Maruku and from Maruku itself.

Both male and female labour is available. The division of labour according to sex discussed above is not followed completely for the hired labour. If female labour is not available for weeding male labour is used.

Contracts: Some labourers are employed on a monthly basis. The salary is then 50 shs a month for as well female as male labourers. This is below official minimum wage and certain employers are aware of this. They are likely to write contracts for the labourers stating that they are paid the minimum wage while they orally agree to pay 50 shs.

Most labourers are employed on a piecework basis. A certain piece of work has to be done and the employer and the employee discuss about the payment. Both labourers on monthly basis and labourers on a piece work basis will often work for food, i.e. bananas, in the afternoon when the moneypaid work is finished.
The possibility of exchanging food for labour favours the farmers who have big bibanja as they will be able to convert a surplus production of foodcrops which cannot be stored into productive labour input in maintenance or expansion of land. The farmers with small bibanja are tempted to desist from eating bananas to be able to pay labourers to do the dull and degrading work of weeding and cultivation.

At the time of investigation - from June to December 1971 - 52% (1) of the farmers informed that they employed labourers. The number of employees is not constant throughout the year. There will be an increase in May, June, July and August at the time when the bananas are in plenty, and there will be an increase at the time when farmers get 2nd payment for their coffee.

Unfortunately it is impossible to get any reliable figure on the number of labourers in the area. There is a surplus of labourers in the area waiting to get a chance to get employment at one of the three big working places.

Generally the labourers are living under miserable conditions. In most cases they are responsible themselves for their accommodation. A variety of arrangements are seen:

1. The labourer is permitted to put up a small provisional grass hut in the kibanja of the employer.

2. The labourer may stay free of charge in an empty house on one of the bibanja of the employer to caretake the empty house.

3. The labourer may stay in an empty house against weeding the kibanja.

4. The labourer may rent a room in a house.

Due to the big supply of labourers in Maruku there is a big need for accommodation. This situation is increasingly exploited by farmers who put up houses of a bad quality and with small rooms, renting out these rooms to labourers for a monthly rent of 1/10 to 1/5 of their monthly salary.

Production and marketing.
Food crop production - perennial crop.

Four different types of bananas are produced - cooking bananas, roasting bananas, sweet-bananas and pombe bananas. None of the four types can be stored, they have to be consumed when ripe.

The production varies throughout the year. October, November and December are the months of lowest production and May, June, July and August the months of biggest production. It is difficult if not impossible to get exact figures on the size of the production. But of more importance than an exact figure is the fact that 1/3 of the farmers do not produce enough bananas all the year round to satisfy their family's need for the main food
crop. These farmers will have to rely on other foodcrops or if possible buy the bananas.

Food crop production - annual crops.

The most common annual crops are beans, maize, sweet potatoes, cassava, groundnut, bambara nut and finger millet. Except for sweet potatoes these crops can all be stored. The production varies according to size of household as generally only the amount needed of these crops are produced.

The size of the production is difficult to measure. All households grew beans and maize and were self reliant on these crops. Most households grew sweet potatoes and cassava and were self reliant for these crops. Only 18% of the households (1) grew bambara nuts and even fewer grew ground nuts. If at all eaten these crops will have to be bought.

Cash crop production.

Coffee.

Coffee is the main cash crop and to the majority of the farmers it is the only cash crop. Coffee is grown by all households in the two villages under study.

The majority of the coffee grown is coffee Rubusta while coffee Arabica is not so common in this area. Coffee can be harvested all the year round except in December and January. The size of the production varies according to number of stems, age of stems, planting pattern and husbandry. The lowest production registered per household was 1 kg and the biggest was 533 kg of clean beans in the year 1970/71.

The coffee stems in the area under study are very old and unable to yield much. According to the extension officers the production of coffee could increase considerably if the farmers would uproot the old stems and plant new ones. The farmers, however, seem for several reasons to be reluctant to do this.

Tea.

Only 19% of the farmers in the two villages under study started to grow tea and of these 22% have given up. The tea production varies according to the age of the teabushes and to the climate. In the dry months the bushes do not give so many leaves. In 1970/71 20,632 kg of green leaves were produced. It is an average of 859 kg per tea-growing household.

Marketing.

The co-operative society.

The co-operative union has monopolized the marketing of coffee and tea and in Maruku area they are the only crops marketed by the societies.
Only members of the societies can market their crops to the society. It is common that the sons in common take over their late father's share in the society. This indicates that the number of households delivering coffee to the societies are bigger than the number of shareholders.

The coffee can be delivered processed or unprocessed to the societies. By far the most coffee is delivered processed. This coffee is graded in two grades according to quality. FAQ for the best quality and undergrade for the poor quality. Most of the coffee delivered are graded as FAQ. There is only one grade for the unprocessed coffee, i.e. the berries. A first payment is paid to the farmer when he delivers his coffee. When the expenses of the society is calculated and deducted a second payment is paid out to the farmers. The tea is delivered as green leaves to the societies' collecting posts and sold to the tea factory.

The maduka.

Non-share-holders cannot market their coffee to the society. They can sell the coffee to a shareholder who then delivers the coffee in his name. Most common is to sell the coffee to the duka owners and receive either money or goods as payment. Hereby the farmer loose second payment and they also risk to get a lower first payment. The farmers are aware of this but their need for cash/goods may be so big that they have no other alternatives. Not only do the farmers lose the second payment, they also have to pay higher prices for their goods as compared to what they pay for the goods in Bukoba town. (see Fig. 3 on the prices of ordinary household goods in Bukoba compared to Maruku area).

As a matter of fact both wealthy and poor farmers make use of a direct exchange of coffee for goods from the duka, but only to the poor farmer to whom this is the only possibility to market their coffee, this is a beginning of a vicious circle ending when the farmer is so indebted to the duka owner that he will have to surrender his land.

Local markets.

All other crops but coffee and tea have to market through other channels than the societies and the maduka. Different annual foodcrops and bananas are sold on the local markets once a week in each area.

Eating-bananas and pombe-bananas are most often sold directly from the farm.

Employment.

30% of the farmers (11) have permanent employment outside their bibanja and get their main income from their salaries. Most of these farmers are employed in unskilled or lower skilled work, i.e. mainly craft and trade.
Age | Unskilled | Lower skilled | Higher skilled
--- | --- | --- | ---
25 to 40 years | 31% | 28% | 5%
41 to 60 | 17% | 15% | 13%
61 - | 8% | 8% | 4%

For the 2/3 of the farmers who do not have permanent employment the kibanja is the main source of income giving a stable yet small income which can at its best just satisfy the daily need for cash. If big expenditures are foreseen or unexpected expenditures turn up the farmers will have to look for temporary work. 15% (11) of the farmers had non-permanent employment at the time of investigation (September to December 1971) but the number of temporary employed farmers varies throughout the year.

Due to the closeness of the biggest working places in the district and to the fairly good means of transport it is possible for most farmers who have employment to stay at home on their bibanja and go to their work daily.

Sale of beer and destilled spirits.

Almost every household brews beer a varying number of times every year. Part of the beer is consumed by the household or given to friends and relatives and part of it is sold. In Maruku the quantity of beer sold is small. People here prefer to process the beer further by destilling it and then selling it to a higher price than the beer. It is impossible to get reliable figures on the production of destilled spirits or the income from sale of destilled spirits as it is illegal to destill and sell spirits. The sale of destilled spirits provides many household with a relatively good income.

Livestock.

Livestock is very rare in Maruku, 0.5. heads of cattle per household (1) and as source of income irrelevant. The cattle is kept for the sake of manure.

Income and expenditures.

In all peasant economie, Maruku included, it is very difficult to get figures on household budgets. The figures presented here ought to be regarded not as reliable figures on the real size of income and expenditures but as giving a picture of the relative sizes of income and expenditures.

Income.

From the co-perative society the income of the 166 households from the two main crops coffee and tea have been recorded. (Unfortunately they are not in accordance with the figures given by the farmers. For example one farmer informed
Figure 3.

List of prices of main household-goods in Bukoba town and Maruku area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Maruku area</th>
<th>Bukoba town</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene per bottle</td>
<td>0.90 shs</td>
<td>0.60 shs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking oil per beer bottle</td>
<td>0.30 -</td>
<td>0.20 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt per kg</td>
<td>1.50 -</td>
<td>1.40 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar per kg</td>
<td>1.65 -</td>
<td>1.60 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinned milk &quot;Ngombe&quot;</td>
<td>2.25 -</td>
<td>1.90 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ideal&quot;</td>
<td>2.20 -</td>
<td>2.10 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dried milk 300 gr</td>
<td>3.50 -</td>
<td>2.50 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Green Label</td>
<td>0.75 -</td>
<td>0.60 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Bond</td>
<td>1.50 -</td>
<td>1.25 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Bond sifting</td>
<td>1.30 -</td>
<td>1.10 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>0.25 -</td>
<td>0.20 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>1.10 -</td>
<td>1.00 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat flour pr kg</td>
<td>2.25 -</td>
<td>2.20 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice per kg</td>
<td>2.40 -</td>
<td>1.50 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts per kg</td>
<td>2.00 -</td>
<td>1.20 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing soap one piece</td>
<td>0.70 -</td>
<td>0.50 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.85 -</td>
<td>0.75 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00 -</td>
<td>0.80 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMO small</td>
<td>0.60 -</td>
<td>0.50 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet soap Lux</td>
<td>1.20 -</td>
<td>1.10 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanam</td>
<td>1.20 -</td>
<td>1.10 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marini</td>
<td>1.25 -</td>
<td>1.05 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astra</td>
<td>2.00 -</td>
<td>1.80 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>6.00 -</td>
<td>3.50 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butone powder</td>
<td>4.00 -</td>
<td>3.50 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soap</td>
<td>3.50 -</td>
<td>3.00 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that his income from coffee for the year 1970/71 was 77 shs, while the co-operative society’s books showed 1110 shs.

Average income from coffee per household delivering coffee to the society in the year 1970/71 was 220 shs.

Average income from tea per household delivering tea to the society was for the year 1971 518 shs.

The relative distribution of income on sources of income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Income in shs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>10,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodcrops</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>29,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average income from coffee per household delivering coffee to the society in the year 1970/71 was 220 shs.

Average income from tea per household delivering tea to the society was for the year 1971 518 shs.

The relative distribution of income on sources of income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodcrops</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average income per household per year: 1621 shs. (1)

The figures show that only 1/3 of the total income is from agricultural production and 2/3 is from employment.

Expenditures.

The relative distribution of expenditure on expenditure posts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Expenditure in shs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hired labour</td>
<td>2080/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>120/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-vestment</td>
<td>9310/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat</td>
<td>29158/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>380/=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average expenditures per household per year: 1409 shs. (1).

If the category domestic expenditures is broken up in expenditure-posts the following figures are seen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Expenditure in shs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire-wood</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>7997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>6780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School fees</td>
<td>5900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>2172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average per household: 11.6 319.8 35.2 271.2 81.4 236.0 86.8 37.6 86.4

These figures show that food and household goods (i.e. soap, kerosene, matches etc.) clothes and schoolfees are the big expenditure-posts.

The size of the amounts used for food and clothes indicates among other things that Maruku area is urbanized to a high degree.
The resources and their distribution.

The main resources are land, labour and capital. Cultural and economic factors cause that these resources are not equally obtainable for all members of the society. In the following the most important of the cultural and economic factors influencing on the distribution of the resources will be discussed.

Cultural and economic factors influencing on the distribution of land.

Officially all land in Tanzania belongs to the government, no land is privately owned. The Mhaya does not accept this. The centre for his activities is his private-owned kibanja.

To the Wahaya there are four categories of land according to the rights of ownership:

1. Government owned rweya land - rweya rwo bukama. This land is mainly the uncultivated rweya land between the villages. It is approximately 3 of the total land, and the most unfertile of the land. The main part of this land belonged to the chiefs before Uhuru.

2. Privately owned land. This land belongs to single individuals and can be dealt with solely according to their own interest. The size of the privately owned land is difficult to estimate as it varies over time. At the time of investigation this land made up 15% of the arable land. (1)

3. Clan owned land - kibanja kyo luganda. This land is owned by the members of the patrilineal clan in such a way that a member of the clan has individual usufruct right to a certain part of the land and the right to pass it on to his own children, but he is not allowed to deal with the land according to his own interests, he is subjected to the clan. This land made up 68% (1) of the arable land.

4. Borrowed land - kibanja kyo obutungwa. This is land which is unused by the owner and therefore borrowed out to a landless person or a person in need of more land.

Allocation of government owned land.

The government owned land is the land potential for expansion of both kibanja and for new cash crops, i.e. tea.

The farmer who wants part of this land sends in an application via the ward executive officer to the ward development committee. The committee makes investigations in the needs of the applicant for land and in the available land for distribution. If the results are positive land will be
given free of charge to the applicant. The parcelling out is witnessed by the elected member of the district council and two other witnesses. From the time when the applicant has cultivated his land he and members of his community regard this land as his private-owned land. He can deal with this land, eventually sell it, as he himself finds likely to do.

Obtaining of private owned land.

Private ownership to land can be obtained if land is granted by government or if land is obtained by purchase. As government owns all uncultivated land the land offered for sale will be bibanja or privately-or clan-owned rweya close to bibanja.

The supply of land for sale is small and there are normally serious reasons for selling land. The following are the main reasons for selling the land:

1. The seller regards his land as too small. He will most likely have a kibanja elsewhere.
2. The seller has an immediate need for cash. Especially sickness in a family has in several cases caused that the farmer had to sell his land to raise money for treatment.
3. The seller is indebted. He may have borrowed money or bought goods in the duka and mortgaged his land.

The price varies mainly according to the size and standard of maintenance of the land but also according to the seller's situation.

Witnessing the purchase of land are the barozi and two or three old men who are familiar with the village and know the borders of the bibanja.

As the main part of the arable land is clan land and can only be sold with the accept of the clan members of the seller who is in need to sell will sell without the accept of clan members and will state a higher price on the sales document than was actually paid to protect the buyer against the possibility of the seller's clan members to buy back the land. Many disputes over land are due to this "illegal" sale of land.

Allocation of clan owned land. Inheritance and the land tenure system.

Clan land is all land which has been inherited. All land, be it originally government owned land or privately owned land will end up being clan land when it is passed on to the sons after a father's death.

Land tenure.

It is a duty of a father to provide his son with land
at the son's marriage. The son will be given a piece of the father's land where to build a house and get his food. He will not be given the coffee trees and pombe bananas (sources of cash) growing on the piece of land given to him. The size of land which will be given to a son depends on the size of the father's land and the number of sons. The father will keep the biggest part of land for himself as he cannot know if he will get more sons and as he is responsible for reception of and entertainment of visitors.

1. father with 3 unmarried sons

2. father with 1 married son who has got land and two unmarried sons

3. father with 2 married sons who have got land and 1 unmarried son.

4. father who has given land to all 3 married sons.

The land which is given away to the sons still belong to the father and will belong to the father until his death. The father will keep an eye on the way the sons maintain the land and he can chase away, i.e. disinherit the son who neglects the land given to him.

Regardless of how many sons a man has, he must provide each of them with a piece of land. It needs not necessarily be a piece of land which the father has inherited but may well be a part of land he has bought or been given by government.

Inheritance.
The father will leave a testimony written down or orally passed on to his bloodbrothers who are not clan members. This will be opened at his death.

Generally daughters do not inherit land as they have their homes at the clan land to which they marry. They may
inherit one or two coffee trees and animals or share in animals.

The sons inherit land but the land is not divided equally and the order of succession is not automatic. There are three categories of inheriters:

1. omusika
2. mainuka
3. kyaburwaburwa.

Omusika inherits his fathers house, personal belongings, speer and the main kibanja. This is the kibanja on which the ancestors stayed, the kibanja closest to the patrilineal lineage, but not necessarily the biggest kibanja or piece of kibanja. He also takes over the father's position in the clan and the father's responsibility for wife/wives and smaller children and relatives.

Mainuka inherits the biggest or next biggest piece of the father's land.

Kyaburwaburwa gets the smallest piece of land. If there are more than one kyaburwaburwa they will share equally the rest of the land when omusika and mainuka have got their parts.

The qualities and characteristics of the sons are determining for their inheritance position. The intelligent, well behaved son, who has always been polite to the father and taken proper care of the father's land given to him will be chosen by the father to become omusika.

The most common is that the firstborn son will become omusika and the lastborn son will become mainuka.

At the time of inheritance a reallocation of land within the family often takes place. The omusika leaves the land which his father gave to him to move to his late father's house and land. The mainuka may stay but will get the land which was originally given to the omusika while the kyaburwaburwa will remain on the pieces given to them by the father.

Any transaction with clan land including the allocation of inherited land is registered by the clan members. Clan land will preferably be kept in the position of the members of the clan. A childless man's land will be passed on to the nearest male relative in direct male line. In case of sale of clan land a buyer from within the clan will be given priority. Only if such a buyer is not found land will be sold to an individual from outside the clan.

The inheritance rules are the cause of an unequal distribution of the main resource and they are the cause of the commonly strained relations between brothers. The brothers will compete to be in high favour of the father in the hope to get the bigger piece of his land. If a man has more than one wife the inheritance rules are complicated further - details are not given here and strained relations are seen not only brothers, but between half-brothers and brothers and between co-wives.

During the last 25 to 30 years a fundamental change in the inheritance rules has been under way. It has been more and more common for a father to let his daughters inherit
land. Such land inherited from father to daughter cannot be passed to the children of the daughters as they do not belong to the same clan as the father and daughters. Land inherited by a daughter will at the death of the daughter pass back to a male member of her clan. However, land bought by a woman can be passed on to her children.

Cultural and economic factors influencing on the family labour.
The main labour input in agriculture is the family labour, especially the female family labour.

The female labour can be provided by own family i.e. young unmarried daughters, divorced sisters of the head of household or divorced father's sisters of the head of household.

The main female labour, however, is provided from other families through marriage. Every individual is member of a patrilineal family group, the clan. The clan is exogamous which means that the male member of a clan have to marry women from other clans while the female members of the clan marry out of the clan.

As it was the responsibility of the father to provide his sons with land, their basic means of subsistence, it is also the responsibility and duty of the father to provide his sons with a wife. A son can claim a wife from the father, but he can only claim to be provided with one wife. The son himself has to arrange for eventual other wives.

There are certain limitations on the time of marriage and the availability of wives:

1. The father's resources are determining for the time of marriage. The father has to pay the brideprice which here consists of contributions of big amounts of pombe, meat, sheep, cloth and money. At the time when he is ready to pay the brideprice he must also be prepared to give away a part of his kibanja to the son. Sons of wealthy men will marry at an earlier age than sons of poor men, hereby getting an earlier start on their own carriere.

2. The number of a son in the sibling group is determining for the time of marriage. It is a rule that the eldest son marry first. The attitude to age as a dominant principle has not changed while the marriage arrangements have changed so that the children themselves take the initiative to marry. Conflicts between brothers are therefore common.

3. The woman has to be brought into the man's clan which indicates that the man's clan depends on the willingness of the woman's clan to give the woman away. With the changes in the marriage arrangements this factor is becoming of less importance.
35% of the first-marriages in Maruku are of the element type, i.e. the young couple arrange themselves for the marriage without asking the parents. Fine and brideprice have to be settled and paid afterwards.

64% of the first-marriages are of the traditional type where the parents arrange for the marriage.

86% of all non-first-marriages are of the elopement type, while only 13% of the non-first-marriages are of the traditional type.

Main characteristics of the female labour brought into a man's household and clan.

The woman have a lower education than the men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No school</th>
<th>St 1</th>
<th>St 2</th>
<th>St 3</th>
<th>St 4</th>
<th>More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure needs a comment: The average age of the men interviewed is 58 years while the average age of women is 36 years. The possibilities are increasingly better which means that nowadays not only sons but also in an increasing degree daughters get a chance to go to school. So if the average age of women had been as high as that of the men the school attendencies figure for women should have been lower.

No women in the two villages under survey have had any agricultural training and only two women had joined courses in domestic science, handicraft etc.

The woman brought into a man's household is a foreigner who the man's family cannot fully rely on. When she is brought into the man's house she is kept secluded for a period of two months and up to two years depending on the economic position of the man, i.e. how long time he can be without the labour of the woman. During this time of seclusion she is taught the foodhabits, living and customs of the man's family and shown the borders of the land she is going to cultivate and the qualities of this land. She remains a foreigner in her husbands family all her life, but the longer she stays, the older she becomes, and the more children she gives birth to, the more integrated she will become, the more responsibility she will get. An indication of this is the increasing influence she will get on the use of the family's money.

The woman is brought into a man's family to work there, to replace the family's own female labour. The Haya way of expressing to marry is to say that "a man gets a hoe". The most important part of the brideprice is the hoe given to the woman's family by the man's family to replace the female labour they give away. Also in elopement marriages a hoe is
left in the woman's father's house the day she is eloped. The woman is expected to use her labour in the fields of her husband and in the house of her husband, to assist him in increasing his socio economic position. In case of divorce her efforts are not honoured. She simply gets nothing, sometimes she will even have the clothes bought to her by her husband.

The woman is also brought into the family of the man to give birth to his children. The childbearing ability of a woman is of utmost importance. Lack of ability to bear children is solely due to the woman and often ends in a divorce in which case the brideprice, i.e. only the money part of the prideprice, is paid back. If a woman have given birth and divorces, the brideprice is not paid back indicating that she has fulfilled her duty. She does not have any right to any of the children born by her in case of divorce. The children belong to the man's family.

The woman is supposed to assist her husband in increasing his socio economic position by working in his fields and giving birth to many children. His position increases if he gets many bibanja and many wives with children. Her career possibilities are, however, limited. The highest position she can reach is to become mother of children, especially sons. The wealthier the husband becomes the more competitors she will have, as she will have to share his wealth with co-wives.

The desire to get material items such as many clothes, shoes, jewellery, good furniture etc. is big and increasing. The woman has no direct admittance to cash, she often regards herself as the unpaid labour of the husband. This is found in Maruku area where the married women are confronted with the female hired labour receiving their monthly salary, or when the married women compare their living standard with that of the returning prostitutes who have been working in the big East African towns for some years, and have been able to equip themselves. If the married woman feels that her needs are not satisfied she will divorce. The divorce rate is very high:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage of divorces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 40 years:</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 60 years:</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 -</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a tendency for the women to stay single after divorce, the average number of marriages among women is 1.2, while the men are likely to remarry, the average number of marriages for men is 3.5.

However, 24% of the total number of households were
single men and out of these 10% were completely without female labour (i.e. not assisted by daughters, sisters or father's sisters). Lack of female labour is a serious problem for a man. Female labour can only be partly replaced by hired labour, as the female hired labour tasks are mostly limited to weeding and cultivating, while fetching water, cultivating annual crops, and domestic work is out of the female-hired-labour-sphere.

The female labour is said to be the stable labour in the Haya agricultural system. It is the stable labour with regard to the tasks carried out, i.e. the daily maintenance of the mainfields and the production of food. But due to the frequent divorces and remarriages the female labour is instable and the result is an in- and out-flow of women to a man's household. The man tends to let his shifting wives carry out their work according to traditional methods, he is not interested in investing in education of his wife/wives. The instability of the female labour has a stagnating effect on the agricultural system and is a barrière to an effective farmmanagement and a modernisation.

The male family labour.

The male family labour is provided only by the man's own family, i.e. by the father and his sons. When the sons marry they will work on their part of the kibanja and will assist the father on his part of the kibanja if they do not have employment.

The admittance to capital.

Among the farmers of Buhaya there is a reluctance to discuss topics such as capital, credit and savings. This makes it difficult to get information on the factual situation concerning these topics.

Savings. 44% of the households (l) have been able to save money and out of these 36% have been able to increase their savings within the year 1970/71. The majority of the people who save money make use of the bank (in Bukoba town) and the co-operative society for posting the money.

Credit and loans. The co-operative society. Member of the co-operative society have a possibility to get loans from the society. There are different types of loans:

1. Short term loans - they are mainly given in the months of December, January and February at the time when there is almost no coffee ripe to be picked and delivered, which means that the farmers have no income. The loan is given to satisfy the farmers' need for money for schoolfees, treatment, food, etc. The size of the loan depends on the number of kilo coffee delivered and cannot go beyond 0.10 shs. per kilo. The loan
is interestfree and is repaid by deduction from the second payment of coffee.

2. Long term loans - are loans running over a period of 3,5 or 7 years. These loans are meant for farminprovement. The size of the loan given to the applicant depends on his delivery of coffee, on his capability as a farmer, on the decision of the co-operative society's committee members and permanently employed staff and on the union. (The farmer seems to get from 1/3 to 1/4 of the amount applied for). There is an interest of 5% on these loans.

3. Loans for tea. These are specific loans. Fertilizer, seedlings tractor and expertise are given to the teagrowers, the repayment is a deduction of 0.10 shs. of the kilo price until the expenditures to establish the tea are repaid.

Generally the loans granted by the societies are given to the well established farmers of the progressive type and not to the majority of farmers who have difficulties in establishing and maintaining themselves. Few applications of loans have been accepted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Farmers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

from Maruku farmers' co-operative society which have 1100 members.

The duka-owners and other private persons. The maduka in Maruku are based on an ability to give credit or accept coffee as payment, as they have to compete with the maduka in Bukoba which do not accept coffee as payment but have lower prices. The majority of the farmers make use of the credit facilities.

A stratified rural society.

The availability of bibanja or potential bibanja land in the area under study is highly limited and due to cultural and economic factors unequally distributed. A compensation of the limited amount of land has started to take place not by a more intensive cultivation of the land but by making use of alternative resources outside the bibanja, i.e. mainly employment and business.

As shown the majority of the farmers have bibanja of a size below or around the average size of 1.6 acres which indicates that the variations in sizes are small. Even if the variations are small the figures on possession of/admittance to other economic assets correlate with the size of land holding to such a degree that it is valid to talk about tendencies of strata of farmers with different economic positions. See Figure 4 and Figure 5.
Figure 4.

The distribution of economic assets on strata based on land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B-1</th>
<th>B-2</th>
<th>B-3</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strata A</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strata B</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strata C</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = rweya land close to the kibanja.
B = income from coffee, B-1 = more than 1000 shs. a year
    B-2 = more than 500 shs. a year
    B-3 = no income from coffee
C = members of the co-operative society
D = tea growers
E = cattle owners
F = employment
G = land elsewhere
H = permanent stone house

Figure 5.

The distribution of work according to education on strata based on land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Unskilled work</th>
<th>Lower skilled work</th>
<th>Higher skilled work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strata A</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strata B</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strata C</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19.2% of the farmers have more than 2 acres of kibanja. They make up strata A.

28.9% of the farmers have between 1 and 2 acres of kibanja. They make up strata B.

51.2% of the farmers have less than 1 acre of kibanja. They make up strata C.

Strata D is made up of the unknown number of individuals who do not have land.

Strata A. Approximately 1/3 of the farmers have an income of more than 1000 shs. a year from coffee. Also more farmers from this strata have diversified their economy with tea, cattle and employment, and more of the farmers of this strata have been able to invest in a permanent stone house. Also more farmers have been able to buy land in other areas. Farmers of this strata seem to have higher skilled jobs with a higher income than do farmers in other strata.

Of interest is that approximately half of the farmers of this strata have delivered no-coffee to the co-operative societies in the year 1970/71. As all farmers grow coffee this may indicate that these farmers have satisfied their need for household goods by selling coffee directly to the duka owners.

Strata B. Fewer farmers of this strata have high incomes from the coffee and fewer farmers have diversified their economy with tea and cattle while more farmers are seeking money through employment. The higher percentage of farmers having employment may explain the higher percentage of farmers having uncultivated rweya land as they may be short of labour to cultivate their rweya land.

Of interest is the very high percentage of farmers who are members of the co-operative society and deliver coffee to the society.

Strata C. There is a remarkable drop in percentage of farmers who have big income from coffee and a big increase in percentage of farmers who do not deliver their coffee to the co-operative society. This most likely indicates that they are forced by lack of cash to sell their coffee to duka owners to obtain the necessary household goods.

Approximately 1/3 of the farmers of this strata are members of co-operative society. This show that as much as 2/3 of the farmers by not being members of the society are excluded from the loans and credit facilities and assistance in farm improvement given by the society to its members.

Also there is a remarkable decrease of percentage of farmers who have diversified their economy or been able to obtain a permanent stone house. Fig. 5 shows that more farmers of this strata have unskilled, lower paid work.

Strata D. This strata includes the landless persons who depend on farmers of the other strata for their existence. The number of landless men is relatively small, while the number of landless women is big.
A woman is regarded as having her land at the place where her husband lives as long as she is married. In case of divorce she is left on her own with no land forced to depend on her father or her brothers if she does not want to go out in prostitution. Due to the high divorce rate number of landless women is high. They are the ones making up the real yet hidden rural proletariat.

The figures show that for all strata the majority of the farmers have only their bibanja to rely on. For them the living-standard and the daily life pattern is very similar whether the farmer has 1, 1½ or 2 acres of kibanja.

The figures, however, also show the tendencies that the farmers who have more land establish themselves through a diversification of the economy. In these tendencies a guide line is given to the cause of the big socio-economic differences.

The most important factor in the diversification is employment. The farmer who finds himself employed in a well paid permanent job will be on his way to establish himself among the elite of the rural society, who diversify their economy further with for instance cattle, tea, duka, lorry or buses.

If it is at all relevant to talk about a stratified society the distinction between the strata ought to be drawn between the very few who have established themselves with a highly diversified economy and the big majority who have land - big or small - but no diversified economy, and the few totally landless.

The Haya society - the individual career society.

To throw further light on the problem of socio economic differences in the Haya society it is useful to investigate the Kihaya vocabulary.

In Kihaya there is no word for groupings of people based on socio economic criteria. There are, however, many words for persons having different socio-economic positions but they are all words for individuals.

The semantic content of these words will show the different socio economic positions an individual can obtain and reflect the culture specific values on which the Haya society is based.

Njanga: A very poor person who is without a kibanja, may be because he has mortgaged and surrendered his land or a person who have for some reason or other completely neglected his kibanja.

Omworo: A poor man who has a small kibanja, who may or may not have target work outside his kibanja, who has no surplus as all income is used for clothes and food.
Omukombe: A rich man who has kibanja, permanent employment or own business and who has some capital.
Omutungi: A rich man who has kibanja, who has various other sources of income, who has capital but who is still not so well-established that he is in a source economic position.
Omwami: A rich man who has many bibanja, who has also diversified his economy with sources of income outside agriculture, who has cattle, many wives and many children and whose father has died indicating that he is the family authority himself.
Omukunde: A "very, very rich" man who has established himself with many sources of income: many bibanja (many wives and many children), employment, duka, transport, houses for renting etc.

Attached to the concepts Omwami and Omukunde is an idea of such a high degree of economic establishment and security that the families of persons called omwami and omukunde will always have enough food and satisfaction of the daily needs, while this is not the case for omutungi and omukombe.

The Haya hierarchy of positions are not based purely on economic criteria. Culture specific social criteria such as many wives, many children, famila potestas are criteria without which top positions cannot be obtained.

The main criteria for the top positions is the possession of many bibanja. The first kibanja is generally inherited. The acquisition of the following bibanja is a matter of personal effort. A kibanja can be obtained through labour input in opening up new land or an already established kibanja can be bought. There is a general opinion among the Wahaya that a kibanja cannot give the surplus needed to purchase another kibanja. Therefore it is regarded as necessary to get incomes from outside own kibanja. When the new kibanja is obtained it needs maintenance. The maintenance cannot be done solely by hired labour. The Mhaya's idea is that a home has to be set up as the bananas do not grow well "if they do not smell the smoke from the kitchen fire" (compare the use of household-left-overs for the nourishment of the bananas). A man cannot rely on the women of his family to come and live in his land, as they are married away to their husbands. He will have to get women from other clans, i.e. to marry. A new wife is then placed on the new kibanja. The main purpose of her maintenance of the kibanja is to provide food for the family established by the man and herself on the new kibanja. She is declined to maintain the kibanja according to age-old methods as this is what she has learned.

The main purpose of getting more land is to obtain a higher social position and not to be able to develop the agriculture. Once the high position is obtained the farmer may or may not maintain his sources of income from outside the kibanja.

The socio economic processes described here run in a
closed circle leaving possibility for a slow economic growth. The means of raising one's position are the means of consuming the position, i.e.:

An omwami and an omukonge will per definition have many children who are consuming heavily from his properties for satisfaction of the daily needs and education. According to the inheritance rules every son must have a part of the father's property, and one eventually two of the sons will get bigger share. By the death of the father who was either omwami or omukonge all his sons except one or eventually two will find themselves as omworo with small bibanja and facing a situation where they have to build up their own position in the same way as the sons of omworo. Only the Omusika will have a better starting point as he will take over the father's position and benefit from the social relations created by the father.

To clarify the course of the socio economic processes the concept: the family development cycle and its relation to the use of resources will be used.

The Family development cycle and the use of resources.

The household is a group of individuals making up a family. It is not a static unit as it does not have the same size and composition over time, consequently its needs and interests are not the same but change over time. So does the use of available resources to satisfy the needs.

Every family for biological reasons pass through a development cycle which begin with the establishment of the family at the marriage of the man and woman, passes through phases of birth of children, bringing up of children and marrying off children and ends with the death of the man and woman.

For analytical purposes the family development cycle is divided up in three phases:

Phase I: The married couple starts getting children and brings them up.

Phase II: The children start marrying

Phase III: All children are married off.

The family's use of resources to fulfill its needs will be discussed for each phase.

Phase I
Phase 1 covers the time when the man, the head of the household, is from approximately 25 to approximately 40 years old. The man has been given one piece of kibanja and one wife from his father and he may or may not have been given a separate house. The man will, however, have no admittance to the cash-sector as all coffee and pombe-bananas belong to the father as long as he is alive.

The female labour input: The wife is expected to work in the kibanja and in the emisiri as she is responsible for the food production. Also she is expected to do the domestic work such as fetching water, cooking, cleaning, and washing. This period also is child-bearing period for the wife. During late pregnancies and childbirth her labour input has to be replaced mainly by relatives but eventually by hired labour. A common excuse for not growing bambara nuts was wife's pregnancy and childbirth during the growing season of bambara-nuts.

Part of the production of food will be used for payment of hired labour to replace the lack of male labour due to the absence of the husband.

The male labour input: As the husband has no direct admittance to the cash-sector as long as the father is alive his main interest will be vested in trying to get employment to earn the much needed money without which he cannot satisfy the daily needs of his family, without which he cannot hold his wife in marriage and without which he cannot increase his position.

The money earned are used to build a good house for, for food and clothes and material items for he himself and his family, for hired labour and for himself to go out drinking and visiting the prostitutes. If anything is left it will be saved.

This phase is the time when the man's interests are not in his kibanja, i.e. in agricultural development. The kibanja after all still belong to the father and he may find that the piece of kibanja given by the father will not be the same as the piece he will inherit from the father.

The kibanja cannot at this time satisfy his need for money. It is the place where he hopes to get the food and where he has his permanent home.

This phase is, however, the man's chance to build up his own position, raise his own wealth from the "platform" he got from his father while his children are still small and before he has to provide his children with "platforms" to start their career.

Also this phase is the time of biggest strains in the relations between husband and wife. Her demands for material items are big, in Maruku area they are increasing due to the
presence of the prostitutes and the hired labour. Her admittance to cash goes via the husband. He determines how much can be bought. In the kibanja she is doing the same work as the hired labour being paid by her husband while she feels that she gets no payment. In her eyes his interest are selfish, if he increases his position by means of her labour her position is only partly increased as she will have to share other women/wives. Therefore the divorce rate is high in this phase, it is 40.9% compared to 11.8% in the other phases.

Phase II

At the age of approximately 40 years most men will have buried their fathers. The father's land will have been shared by the inheritors. Also at this time the children are grown up and will soon start marrying, expecting to get land, possibly house, and a wife from their father.

The female labour input. The wife still works in the kibanja and on the emisiri, responsible for the food production. She will by now have stopped producing children. She will assist in expanding the kibanja with the purpose of preparing land for her sons.

The male labour input. In this period the man's interests will be vested more in his kibanja, in how to improve it, develop it and expand it. The percentage of men having employment outside kibanja decreases in this phase to almost half the number of the previous phase. The man therefore will invest his labour in his kibanja, his main money income is from the kibanja. Money will be used for food, clothes, purchase of land for his sons, hired labour and investment in farm improvement. Also some money will be spent on beer and to a minor degree on prostitutes.

This phase is the time when there will be a drain on the husband's resources by his sons.
Phase III

This is the phase in which the man will have married off his children and when he and his wife can enjoy their old-age.

The female labour input. The wife is still expected to work in the kibanja and on the emisiri to provide the food. She will also use part of her time in helping her sons' families, i.e. especially the daughters in law during their pregnancies and childbirths.

The male input. The man will be looking after his coffee and bananas but at this time his labour will be the beer drinking together with men of his own age. The money used comes from the production on his kibanja and the main part of his income will be used on beer.

The described processes show that in all three phases the female labour is concentrated on the kibanja with the purpose of increasing the food production concurrently with the growth of the family and of expanding the kibanja - if possible - for the sons to get a bigger and better piece of land.

The male labour is concentrated differently in the different phases. In phase I the male labour is vested in getting cash which cannot be provided from the kibanja as the cash crops belong to the father, with the death of the father a switch in the use of male labour is seen from being vested in a sector outside the kibanja. Due to the culturally and economically determined interests canalizing the labour differently at different times of the life of a man the man's motivations differ and he will accordingly be receptive to different types of development projects at different times depending on which phase of the developmental cycle he is in.
Summary:

The Haya farming system is centuries old. It is based on a combined use of 3 categories of land: Kibanja, emisiri and rweya. It centers around the cultivation of one stable food-crop, the banana, and one cash-crop, the coffee, which is centuries old and formerly cultivated solely by the chiefs and just recently, in the beginning of this century, introduced to the ordinary farmers.

The female labour is the main labour in agriculture, vested in the production of the food of the family. The male interests have traditionally been vested in farm-external activities; consequently the male labour input in agriculture is small. The use of hired labour fitted well into this system as the man could go on vesting his time and interests outside the kibanja replacing his own efforts in the kibanja with hired labour.

The kibanja being the main field has an economic value to the farmer as it is the basis of his existence. But of equally big importance is the cultural value of the kibanja. It is giving the farmer a social identity in the community in which he is living as it relates him to the family he is a member of, thereby giving him a certain position in relation to other families. An increased number of bibanja are the means of getting a new identity, a higher socioeconomic position. Therefore there is a great reluctance to move from the family-kibanja to areas if virgin land.

In the oldest settlements such as Maruku the consequences have been a fragmentation of land in so small pieces that the farmers can hardly any longer satisfy the basic needs from the kibanja but have to supply the food production with food-stuff bought.

There is, as mentioned, a tradition for farm-external activities and this tradition is carried on and has created a pattern in which effort is used to find sources of income outside the kibanja to compensate in the limited possibilities of existence on the kibanja.

The tradition of farm-external interests can partly explain the stagnation of the agricultural economy. Also other reasons have caused a stagnation:

The circulation of values run in an almost closed circle in which the means of increasing the economic growth are the consumers of the same growth, i.e. a man expands his land resources by means of wives and children who consume the production in such a way that each generation finds itself on the same of even an aggravated starting point with regard to land resources as did the previous generation.

The land tenure system and the authority structure within the family has a stagnating effect as decision making on the main crops is in the hands of the old generation who is likely to be more conservative and who is less motivated for changes.

The main labour in the agricultural system, the female
labour, is less educated, underprivileged and unstable. There is a high divorce rate resulting in an in- and out-flow of women to a man's household which tends to keep the female labour-pattern at a status quo as no interests neither from the man nor from the society is vested in an improvement of this pattern.

The Mhaya himself feels that the agricultural economy is stagnating. He has, however, not much confidence in the possibility of improving bibanja of a size of between 1 and 2 acres to such a degree that the basic needs can be satisfied. He has sought extra-agricultural alternatives.

Government, however, is vesting all means and effort in an agricultural improvement and development. There seems thus to be antagonisms between the interests of the government and those of the farmers, yet both parts are interested in economic growth.

The response to planned development.

At a background of the characteristics of the Haya farming system and the described socio economic processes the response from the local communities to the different development approaches undertaken by government and other institutions as seen in the case-study-area will be discussed.

The development strategies.

For the relief of the stagnant economy various development approaches have been tried all aiming at agricultural development:

Intensification of the farming system
Diversification of the economy
Relocation of the people

Intensification of the farming system.

Bukoba Co-operative Union (BCU) has for many years worked with the problem of intensifying the farming system. Extension officers with agricultural training are attached to every society with the aim of approaching farmers on their own bibanja to demonstrate new techniques which can lead to increased production. BCU has set up demonstration plots in the different villages to demonstrate to the farmers the effect of using modern techniques. Also BCU has set up nurseries to provide better seedlings for new-plantings. Loans facilities for farm improvement and for purchase of cattle are provided for the farmers.

Government has worked along the same line as BCU by sending out extension officers with agricultural training. All work done centers around the two main crops, coffee and bananas, and a better and more intensive husbandry of these crops.

The response. As discussed previously the response to the many years of effort has been poor. The planting pattern as well as the techniques are still the traditional, the
majority of the coffee trees are old and in a bad condition.

Built-in mechanisms in the institutionalisation of the development approach are part of the cause of the poor response. The services of BCU are only accessible for the members of the societies whereby the poorest half of the farmers are excluded. Certain services are not even for all members but only for the progressive members to whom the risk of giving loans is regarded as being smaller.

An intensification approach to the problem of stagnant economy seems to be contrary to the socio economic patterns at local community level. Land is for the provision of food and for establishing a higher socio economic position and not for vesting money and effort in.

In the approach of the farmers the stable labour, the women, who are responsible for the daily maintenance, were not approached. And in approaching the male farmers it is worth to be aware that only the older men in phase 2 and 3 are decision makers with regard to coffee as coffee belongs to them. They are likely to be more conservative and to have less interest in increasing their production as after all the sons can determine to work on the coffee after the father has passed away. The younger farmers in phase 1 - if approached - do not have their main interest in the kibanja and do not have the authority to introduce any changes concerning the coffee.

The grading system of the coffee is so rough - only two grades: FAQ and undergraduate - that the farmer who invest in an improvement of his office will get the same price per kilo as the farmer who does nothing to his coffee.

Diversification of the economy.

Parallel to the intensification of the farming system a diversification of the mono-cash-crop economy is carried out. Innovations are introduced which have to fit into the existing farming system as this is still expected to be the basis of the economy.

Tea-smallholders. In the case-study-area the most important of the innovations is the introduction of tea as a supplementary cash crop to coffee. In 1959 plans were set up to introduce tea in terms a small-holder-out-growing scheme in which the small-holders should grow tea on their individual fields delivering green leaves to a tea factory partly owned by government and partly by the co-operative union.

The rweya should be used for tea and land provided free of charge to the farmers who wanted to grow tea. Tractor, fertilizer, seedlings and expertise were provided by the co-operative union on a loan basis to be paid back through a deduction of the kilo price of green tea leaves while transport was provided free by the co-operative union.

A more detailed analyses of the tea scheme is carried out and reported by A.A. Moody. Here the response to the tea
innovation will be discussed solely within the framework of the existing socio economic pattern of the local community.

The response. The first tea was planted in 1962-63. In the 10 year period of tea cultivation the percentage of the farmers who have responded to the innovation in the two villages under study has increased to 19%. The recruitment of new tea growers have stagnated and in the last years 22% of the tea growers have given up growing tea due to a feeling of too little return to costs. This response cannot be regarded as satisfying especially when it is considered that the factory does not receive leaves enough to run its full capacity.

Again built-in mechanisms in the institutionalisation of the development approach partly cause the low response. Only members of the co-operative societies can be accepted as tea growers and it is only those members who are regarded as good, stable farmers by the committee members of the society.

It was, and this is interesting, the well established farmers who were the first to respond to tea as an alternative to their already diversified economy = i.e. farmers in the late phase I or in phase II. For instance 33% of the tea growers have permanent employment. Therefore, most of the small holder tea is cultivated by hired labour which means that 1/3 of the income from tea has to be deducted as this is the payment to the hired labour. This is part of the reason why the farmers feel that their income from tea is small.

The majority of the farmers who have given up growing tea are in phase I of the family development cycle at a time when their need for cash is big. They do not feel that tea cultivation satisfies this need as compared to other alternatives open to them, i.e. employment and business.

The introduction of tea, then, fitted into the existing socio economic pattern by being accepted as another possibility to diversify an already diversified economy and has not been regarded as an alternative let alone to other existing alternatives which appeal more to farmers in phase I.

Ujamaa.

After the tea has been introduced in Bukoba District the Arusha Declaration has been published. The consequence of the Declaration is a fundamental change in the approach to development. The rural sector has priority with regard to investments in development. The aim is to transform the rural sector to a sector based on the principles of ujamaa. This means that not only a technical or economic innovation is introduced, but the innovation must be introduced parallel to the introduction of a quite new socio economic
system. This can only be expected to be a complicated process.

In Bukoba District two models for relief of the stagnant economy through a transformation of the rural according to ujamaa principles have been tried:

Diversification of the economy
Relocation of the population.

Diversification based on ujamaa.

As tea was already introduced on individual small-holder basis in the case-study-area no plan to change the basis of the tea cultivation in this area has been made.

However, in the area response to implement the Arusha Declaration is seen. Tea-ujamaa-units have been formed. The response came from the women who saw a chance to try to get an income of their own through communal efforts. The tea-ujamaa-units are of minimal economic influence but they are an interesting social phenomenon.

Three units have started in the area:

Unit 1: has 30 members, 2 acres of tea under cultivation and a yearly income of approximately 4000 shs to be shared by the members.

Unit 2: has 78 members, 1 ¼ acre of tea which is almost neglected, and no income from the tea.

Unit 3: has 30-40 members, 1 acre of tea, and an income of 136.50 shs last year from tea, to be shared by the members.

The units recruit members from the women organisations in the villages, i.e. from existing co-operative organisations yet without any communal basis. Only married women or divorced women who have established themselves with house and kibanja are members. No landless divorced women are members, as many of them work as prostitutes and prostitutes are not wanted as members, as they are regarded as unreliable and unstable.

The units had all expected some government support but up to now they have got no support in establishing their tea fields.

Away from the problem the women have faced in getting the permission of their husbands to participate in such work, the main problems have been to organize the work in the tea fields and to share the income. All three units have passed through problems of low and irregular attendency in the work in the field and problems on how to estimate the value of already invested effort to be able to set up an entrance-fee for new members and how to share the income.

Unit 2 has failed completely, unit 3 is on its way to give up while unit 1 has solved its problems. The solution finally chosen has "killed" the ujamaa principle but brought the unit into a condition where tea is produced, i.e. into a
block scheme with individual ownership of a part of the field and the income from that part. (It can be noticed that the solution found by unit 1 seems to be the solution which several of the newly started tea ujamaa units in Katoke Tea Scheme are choosing).

Away from these women-tea-ujamaa-units no other ujamaa activities are found in the case-study-area.

It should here be mentioned that tea is introduced on ujamaa basis in Katoke area 30 miles south of Bukoba Town. The Katoke Tea Scheme has started recently and tea is just being planted. Also dairy cattle has been introduced recently on ujamaa basis. 7 units exist in the district involving 364 families with a total of 210 heads of animals. The research on these units is not yet finished, so a discussion on their functioning and their effect will be left for a later report.

Relocation of the population.

A relocation of the population was the first model for implementing ujamaa. The relocation was thought to be an ideal economic and political solution to the problem of the stagnated economy and to overpopulation facing Bukoba District as:

Unused arable land could be opened up,
The problem of the rural proletariat in the overpopulated old settlements could be solved, by relocating the farmers with small land,
The new socio economic system was easier to introduce when the new settlement - the ujamaa village - was started.

Seven of the ujamaa villages established in 1968 in Bukoba District still exist involving 520 families (out of a total of 70-80,000 families in the district). However, none of the ujamaa villages are found in the case-study-area for the simple reason that no land is available for new settlements.

The case-study-area which is heavily populated was a potential recruitment area for settlers to the ujamaa villages. Yet none from the two villages under study and very few from Maruku area have responded to the offer of land and assistance to form a new settlement.

The reasons for lack of response should be self-evident from the description of the socio economic processes. The Mhaya is motivated for getting more land, but not for communally owned land, not when he has to move so far away from his family land, not the purpose of developing agricultural methods and not when the offer of land is given on the condition that the Mhaya cannot just place a wife and children on the land but has to be active himself. The Mhaya is also motivated to earn money but the very low income obtained by the wajamaa last year for the first time during three years is not appealing to him.
THE BUKOBA TEA SCHEME: TEN YEARS OF DEVELOPMENT
"MAPINDUZI MAJANI"

Tony Moody
BUKOBA TEA SCHEME - HISTORY AND INTRODUCTION

Tea was first grown in Bukoba before 1914 by the early German settlers at Maruku (1). These early plants are still to be found there, and when Makonge Farm became Maruku Research Station in the 1950's some seeds were taken from them to start the first tea trials in Bukoba district. These trials proved encouraging, and as the climate of the district was suitable for tea cultivation, (1400 mm. - 1500 mm. rainfall per year), it was decided that tea could be cultivated as a cash crop by smallholders in an area around Bukoba town. Adequate rainfall can be expected within 40 miles north and south of Bukoba, and within 15 miles of the lake shore. In 1960 a smallholder scheme was proposed and it was to include a tea estate to guarantee supplies for the future factory. At this time, the proposed scheme and factory were the direct concern of the Ministry of Agriculture.

In July 1962 (2) a field officer was appointed to Maruku to establish a nursery and district demonstration plots, and then to start looking for interested local farmers near the research station. The 1961-2 planting season was occupied with starting the demonstration plots and the nursery. In mid-1962 meetings were held between the Bahaya Native Co-op Union, the Bahaya Council, the Regional Commissioner and the Tea-Scheme officers, and then at the beginning of the 1962-3 planting season, meetings were called amongst registered coffee farmers at Kanyangereko, Maruku and Kitendaguro societies and by the beginning of the 1963, 168 farmers had applied to grow tea. At this stage, applicants had to prepare their own land, initially 1/3 acre, and after inspection by the tea officer, they were given the planting material. By January 1963, 5 farmers had planted their 1/3 acre (the first was Bw. Felician Thomas, who was included in a sample survey of Tea Growers made by the author in 1968-9)(3). However, the first year's planting was slower than expected because of the very hard work required for clearing the Bukoba Rwuya grasslands and the Area Commissioner had to hold special meetings of farmers to persuade them that the hard work would be rewarded. At this early stage there was doubt that the new cash crop would be economic. In view of this, some "progressive" farmers, who were regarded as influential in the community, were taken to Kenya to be shown smallholder tea there. But the main problem facing expansion of the scheme remained the reluctance of farmers to cultivate the new land without assistance, and the following season (1963-4) it was resolved that tractors would be made available.

Initially, one District Council tractor was used, but later the Bukoba Co-operative Union supplied the tractors, and since 1964, most new tea plots in the Maruku scheme have been cultivated by these tractors. In fact the targets set for expansion of the Maruku scheme in this last year (1972) have been partly upset by the late arrival of the B.C.U. tractors, although the targets themselves were also very ambitious (see below). It is thought that Bukoba Tea Scheme is distinguished amongst the other tea schemes of Tanzania by this almost complete reliance on subsidized tractor cultivation. By the 1966-7 planting season there were 3 B.C.U. tractors available, and that year was the
The greatest expansion of the Maruku scheme, by nearly 65 hectares, of which 10 1/2 hectares were planted in the new Katoma block scheme. As the scheme has expanded into wider spread areas, supervision and distribution of tractors has faced more problems and costs, and this year's late arrival of tractors has been largely due to delays in receiving spare parts. But in the earlier years, when the tractors were able to start ploughing at the beginning of the season, many new growers were able to plant and harvest a crop of bambara nuts from the newly cultivated land before planting tea in March-April.

The annual expansion of tea, in each society is shown below in Table 2. After the 1963-4 season the expansion was steady, and has always been subject to fairly intensive supervision by the officials of the tea scheme at Maruku Research Station. By October 1964, these officials numbered 2 Field Officers, based at Maruku, and 7 Assistant field officers based in the field. From an early stage the close supervision was based on definite policy lines and some forceful persuasion. Early applicants were not approved unless they had at least 1 acre of land available for planting. Table 1 below which shows the average sizes of tea plots now in each area in the scheme, shows that the average estimated area in most parts of the scheme is still around one acre, although there are everywhere farmers with much more than one acre (0.4 hectares), so there must still be many farmers who have not yet planted one acre, even amongst those who started in 1964. The one-acre criterion was conceived on the basis of a target income, or security of income to repay the loans for fertilizer and planting material. In reality the farmers have chosen the size of their tea plots according to the labour requirements and availability.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maruko</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyangerekro</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitendaguro</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itahwa</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwagati</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minazi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhendagabo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushasha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaagya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even in 1971, there are still a large number of farmers who have less than 0.4 hectares (1 acre) of tea, as these averages show. Only in Katoma, started in 1967, does the average plot size stand well in excess of 0.4 hectares. (Bushasa, 1969-70 is an average of 2 only).
However, at the end of the 1965-6 planting season it was reported that "Smallholders have fallen short of target for this year by 22 acres because we restricted the number of new growers to allow all established growers to make up their plots to one acre"(2), and later that "several growers who started in 1964 have still not completed their one acre plots...if they do not plant next season they will be stopped...")'(2).

Fertilizer application was also a practice that was a subject of forceful persuasion in the early days, before any of the farmers had started plucking. Those who did not collect their fertilizer at all in the first year they should have applied it, were not allowed to extend their plots until they took the fertilizer. Since the tea started yielding, however, deductions have been made from the price, at approx. 12-15 cts./kg. to amortize the loans for fertilizer and planting material. If no interest were charged, and if yields were good, these loans could be amortized only after 16 years. Now, of course, it is in the farmer's interest to take the fertilizer since he is paying for it and now it is not applied only when it is available.

The first large scale pruning on the scheme took place in July-August 1966, and an intensive extension effort ensured that all the 1964 planted tea was pruned by the beginning of the 1966-7 growing season. This season was the first year of picking for the 34 hectares that were planted in early 1964, and the factory opened in July 1967. Before the factory was opened, the Government bought the leaf and destroyed it, so that growers did not have to await the full operation of the factory. Initially, the factory announced that it would pay 30 cts./pound of green leaf (66 cts./kg.) but then it was reported that ...since the factory announced that it would pay 30 cts., growers have lost interest, some have not pruned, others have not picked... the factory may be able to make a second payment in 1972..."(2). By the end of 1967, the price was raised to 77 cts./kg. and the same price stands today. Until 1969, however, the deduction for loan repayment was only 11 cts./kg., but now it has been raised to 15 cts./kg. to quicker amortize the loan. In Maruku society there is an additional deduction of 2cts./kg. for the services of a society secretary. The 15 cents deduction should cover the cost of fertilizer, seedlings and tractor cultivation, but the transport of the green leaf from the buying posts to the factory is still a cost borne by the B.C.U. and not the farmers. The gross price of 77 cents is set by the factory, in relation to its own costs of production on the estate and the price obtained from made tea on the London auctions.

In 1970 all the tea harvested from the smallholders, the estate, and the schools, prisons etc., produced 301,856 kg. of made tea when it was sold after processing in the factory. The total price obtained was 2,107,000/- shg., or 6/98 shg. per kilo of made tea. During processing the green leaf shrinks in weight so that 4.5 kg. of green leaf are required to produce 1 kg. of made tea. Thus, the equivalent price for the green leaf after processing is 1/55 shg. per kilo, and the factory's margin is 78 cts. per kilo.
A discussion on the pricing policy follows below, but the present price of 60 cts. (net) per kilo seems already to have determined for the Maruku, Kanyangereko, Kitendaguro, Itahwa and Rwagati farmers, how much tea they are prepared to cultivate in relation to the value of their labour inputs. (These are discussed in detail in Moody, 1969(3)).

Table 2 shows that in some of these societies, the new tea planted each year has already passed a peak. Each year also, a few farmers neglect their plots as they find the labour inputs too demanding, or the yields un-rewarding, although the tea itself is nowhere yet fully mature. In 1965 even before the tea was yielding, and when there were only 200 growers 25 people had already neglected their plots (2). By 1966 this number had risen to 39, and in 1971 it was around 50 farmers (4). Of course, these facts are not to be taken as an out-right condemnation of tea by farmers. For the abandonment of plots is also a reflection on the changing social conditions of farmers, changes in the family labour force, or changes in the family economy with the acquisition of a new job outside agriculture etc. Other farmers are known to have sold their tea, or part of it, if they found that they had originally planted too much. Earlier, tea growers seem to have inspired some form of jealousy within their communities, for there are records of tea plots that were maliciously burnt. In 1965, 10 plots were burnt in Kanyangereko, Kitendaguro and Itahwa (2), and in 1966 the total was 36.

Until 1967, tea was grown by each farmer on his separate plots in the Maruku Tea Scheme, comprising the societies of Maruku, Kanyangereko, Kitendaguro, Itahwa and Rwagati. In 1967, a new scheme was started, the Bugabo Scheme, and the first development in this was a block-farming scheme at Katoma. In the first year 29 farmers joined this scheme and 10 1/2 hectares were planted, the average first year's planting by each farmer being higher here than so far achieved in the whole scheme, 0.36 hectares. The land for the block was obtained from the V.D.C. after some persuasion, and all was ploughed in one block by the B.C.U. tractor. Later extension advice and supervision was consequently easier, and the block has now grown to 63.2 hectares and has 150 members.

Bugabo Scheme has now expanded to include growers from other societies, and blocks have been started in Buhendagabo, Buzi, Bushasha and Kaagya since 1970. At the end of 1971 there were 173 registered growers in these societies, but the amount of tea planted is still small, 32.6 hectares, or an average of 0.2 hectares (1/2 acre) per grower. Some of these groups are becoming Ujamaa groups. There is now a nursery in Bugabo, which is designed to supply planting materials for the scheme as it expands. Katoma, however, remains the largest part of the Bugabo scheme, and it is still run on a block basis, with each farmer being the individual owner of his part of the block.

The latest development in the Bukoba tea schemes is the Katoke Tea Scheme, which first started planting tea in 1971, on Ujamaa basis only, in the southern part of Bukoba District which is suitable for tea cultivation. This area extends from Kagondo, adjacent to the tea grown in Rwagati Society southwards almost as far as Kagoma. The annual rainfall decreases southwards in this area and must be marginal for tea cultivation in the south. A very large nursery has been built at Katoke but so far the development has been slow. Nineteen Ujamaa groups planted tea in 1971, on land that was ploughed for them.
Originally, 59 hectares were ploughed, but eventually only 18 hectares were planted, and the average amount of tea planted for each of the total 369 Ujamaa members is 0.05 hectares.

The Bukoba Tea Scheme has now been set targets by the Tanzania Tea Authority, which now controls the whole scheme, including the factory, to expand the planted tea in all three schemes to a total of 2200 hectares by the end of 1974. During the late 1970's two new factories should be built, one at Bugabo and one at Katoke, to process all the leaf that should come from this new tea. However, at present the tea factory at Maruku is still only operating at half-capacity, although the new areas are too far from the factory for the leaf to be transported to Maruku in time for it to be processed before it withers naturally. In the "Standard" of 3 March 1972, it was officially announced that Tanzania has received a loan from the International Development Association to cover the cost of construction of these factories, in addition to the costs of expansion in the other smallholder tea schemes in Rungwe, Lupembe and the Usambaras elsewhere in Tanzania.
Table 2 below summarizes the amount of tea that has been planted in each society each year up to the end of the 1970-1 season, and the number of growers who planted tea.

### Table 2

#### ANNUAL PLANTING OF TEA IN EACH SOCIETY (hectares)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maruku Scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maruku Area</strong></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kanyangereko</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitendaguro</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Itahawa Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rwagati Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minazi Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitwe Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Maruku Scheme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areal</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugabo Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katoma Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buhendagabo Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushasha Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaagya Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buzi Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bugabo Scheme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Growers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katoke Scheme (Ujamaa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujamaa Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The source of the statistics in this table, are the planting registers at the Tea Scheme offices at Maruku, where the stumps issued to each farmer are recorded each year that he takes them. According to the recommended spacing, 8650 planting stumps should be used to plant one hectare, and the area figures in the above table have been calculated on this basis. This source was chosen because it is the only source that gives details for each farmer, but the total areas calculated from them are slightly different from the estimates made by the Tea Scheme officials. In general they are likely to be over-estimates, but not very much, and they are the only source of comparative statistics other than measuring plots.

In Maruku Tea Scheme, tea planting seems to have passed a peak in Maruku, Kanyangereko, and Kitendaguro societies, which are the areas nearest to the factory. In Rwagati, Minazi and Kitwe, planting still appears to be increasing, and further expansions in the Maruku Tea Scheme will probably be in these areas. In the former areas, the number of growers extending their existing plots has exceeded the new growers substantially since 1967, and table 3 shows what percentage of established growers in the first three societies extended their plots in 1970 and 1971 respectively.

Table 3  PROPORTIONS OF GROWERS WHO EXPANDED THEIR PLOTS IN 1970 & 1971 IN THREE SOCIETIES OF MARUKU TEA SCHEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>1971</th>
<th>(1967)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maruku Society</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>(53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyangereko Society</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>(81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitendaguro Society</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>(34%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The last column in parenthesis, show how these proportions of expanding plots were in 1967, when tea planting was at its height in these three societies, and it should be expected that, just as the number of new farmers each year is falling off in these places, so the number of expansions will also fall, as the available area diminishes, and the "demand" for the new cash crop becomes "saturated".

"Drop-outs", or farmers who have neglected their tea since they planted it, are also an annual feature in these areas, but exact statistics for the annual rates, and where, are not yet available, although it is hoped to determine these later. They are not, as stated on page 4, to be seen as a failure of the tea scheme, for they are an expected feature of the response to a new innovation, but they should not be ignored in the preparation of estimates of the future development of the tea scheme. In future planning of the Bugabo Tea Scheme, for example, these features that have been seen in the Maruku Scheme: rate of accession of new farmers, rate of extension by established farmers, and the rate of drop-outs, should be considered as reasonable models in the estimation of targets.

The Bugabo Tea Scheme, as seen in table 3, still consists largely of the Katoma block, and the expansion of this has been better and more sustained than any of the groups of separated farmers in the Maruku Scheme. Each year there are still more new growers than extensions, and each grower there has a larger average plot than the Maruku farmers. In the other societies of the Bugabo Scheme, it is still too early to judge how the future expansion will be, but it is a large area well-suited to tea, and there is a large nursery to supply the seedlings.

The Katoke Scheme is still in its infancy, and there tea cultivation is a "double" innovation, because it is all to be grown in Ujamaa units; a new crop and a new socio-economic system of production. Thus, although there should be success, it may take a little longer before rapid expansions occur, as groups of farmers have first to get together, and decide on co-operation before they decide how much tea they can plant. In 1971, 59 hectares were optimistically ploughed, but only 18 hectares were planted, but when the number of people who originally responded to the call of "Ujamaa", in early 1971, dropped from 600 to 364, by the time the tea was planted. It is still much too early to judge this scheme, as the pattern of development is for a village group to decide to open an Ujamaa tea plot, and then to apply for tractor cultivation and seedlings. At the beginning it is easy for a large number of people to volunteer membership, and for the tractor to cultivate a large area. But then, when the ujamaa work starts with planting, it is very likely that some early volunteers will see that they do not really have either the time nor the incentive to extend their agricultural activities, and so cease their interest. Thus less tea was planted in the first year, to match the real membership of the groups, and this is shown in table 4, which summarizes the achievements of each Ujamaa group in the first year of planting, 1971. The authorities have established a target of 0.2 hectares per head per year, which was very far from being met in the first year, but this is not surprising when the different nature of Ujamaa farm management is compared with the individual system. An individual
who first plants tea, soon sees how much his labour can deal with, and he adjusts his work schedule accordingly, but a group of farmers have to decide on the mutually convenient days they can work together and in this way, less than the maximum available labour is used initially, although communal work is itself probably more productive for tea in terms of labour input per unit area.

Table 4  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ujamaa Group</th>
<th>Original Members</th>
<th>Members July '71</th>
<th>Hectares ploughed</th>
<th>Hectares planted</th>
<th>Hectares per Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nyakashaju</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwemage A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwemage B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahumulo</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwakayanja</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izigo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruzinga</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binengo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nshambya</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayoga</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>by hand</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitonga</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishenge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawela</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nsisha</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>by hand</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitobo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>by hand</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayondwe A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayondwe B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muyenge</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanyinya</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 600 369 59.3 17.71 0.05

It is interesting to note from this table (5) that Rwakayanja, Izigo and Mawela Ujamaa groups, distinguished by having planted the largest amounts of tea per member, are also three of the smallest groups, three whose membership did not change from the beginning and almost the only three who planted all the land that was ploughed for them. Conversely, Nsisha and Muyenge Ujamaa groups, who have the largest drop in membership, are still two of the largest groups and are the two groups where the tea planted per member is least, 0.01 hectare, ten metres by ten metres.
Finally, a recent report by an officer of the Katoke Tea Scheme (6), makes an interesting comment on the membership problems of the scheme. It has not been thoroughly checked, but he reports on the enrollment of new Ujamaa members for the 1971-2 planting season. He states that out of 98 early applications for this season, only 28 were accepted, as the others were not registered share-holders in their cooperative societies. This would mean that Ujamaa tea farming was being restricted to farmers who already sold coffee.

Future Targets

In 1971 the Tanzania Tea Authority established targets for expansion of the tea scheme in order that there should be a total of 2200 hectares planted by 1975, so that the future three factories would be provided with enough tea for economic running. These targets were detailed in a report from the T.T.A., and claim to have been modified from earlier targets which were considered too ambitious "in the light of actual expansion". These targets are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5: TARGETS FOR EXPANSION OF THE BUKOBA TEA SCHEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Maruku Growers Area</th>
<th>Bugabo G/Area</th>
<th>Katoke G/Area</th>
<th>Total Growers Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970 (actual)</td>
<td>168 50.1</td>
<td>134 30.9</td>
<td>369 18.3</td>
<td>671 99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-2</td>
<td>611 219.0</td>
<td>620 178.0</td>
<td>636 200.0</td>
<td>1867 597.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-3</td>
<td>- 288.0</td>
<td>- 199.0</td>
<td>- 201.0</td>
<td>- 688.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-4</td>
<td>- 616.0</td>
<td>- 124.0</td>
<td>- 181.0</td>
<td>- 466.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (including pre-1970)</td>
<td>1666 1000.0</td>
<td>1000 600.0</td>
<td>1000 600.0</td>
<td>3666 2200.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The basic notion behind all these targets is that there should be a minimum area of tea per individual grower or Ujamaa participant of 0.6 hectares (1 1/2 acres). This is clearly stated in the target directive, "all who have not yet achieved the minimum acreage should do so, farmers who have already planted 5300 stumps (0.6 hectares) should not be given any more, and the few farmers who are permitted to grow more should not get more than 7000 stumps (0.8 hectares)".

This is a very authoritarian and not very practical approach, bearing in mind how tea expanded up to 1970. Referring back to Table 1, it can be seen that all the farmers who had started planting tea by 1967 in the Maruku Scheme, have still in 1971 only achieved an average planting of 0.38 hectares, and by now, most of them will have decided what is the maximum area they can maintain with their available labour. This average is very far short of the supposed minimum overall area of 0.6 hectares per farmer. However, the details of the targets do not specify that these farmers should be persuadeed to increase their plots, rather than that effort should be concentrated on the new growers who started planting in 1971, and who will have planted in 1972. Amongst these new growers there are firstly those who are in the original
society areas, and secondly those who are in the new areas of Maruku Scheme; Minazi and Kitwe. The new growers in the former areas are not likely to become such extensive planters as the original farmers, or else their enthusiasm to plant should have been demonstrated by earlier participation in the scheme. But that is only hypothetical, and could only be proved by a social survey of the new that is not feasible in the available time. Even so, this is not such an important criticism of the estimates as the doubt that 611 new growers can still be recruited within the Maruku Scheme. Reference to Table 2, if the present trends of recruitment are interpolated in the most favourable way, for Maruku, Kanyakgereko, Kitendaguro, Itahwa and Rwagati, for the next three years, then it is difficult to forecast a maximum recruitment of more than 230 new growers in these areas, viz., Maruku 15, Kanyakgereko 35, Kitendaguro 30, Itahwa 50 and Rwagati 100. This would leave a total of nearly 400 to be recruited in the two newer societies of Minazi and Kitwe, or nearly 70 per year in each, which is the maximum recorded in two only of the original societies, and once only in each of them. Until now, the average recruitment of new farmers per society, has been 21 per year.

The recruitment targets for Bugabo and Katoke are not so easy to criticise from the past records, as the areas where expansion will take place are all completely new to tea. In Bugabo it is also unlikely that anywhere near the target minimum acreage will be achieved for all the potential recruits, unless all the blocks that develop in Bugabo have the same success as Katoma block. In Katoke it is even less likely that each of the projected new 656 Ujamaa participants will be represented by 0.6 hectares of planted tea by 1975. However, the total area of tea could be achieved, if this criterion were relaxed, and instead, greater effort went into expanding the number of Ujamaa participants joining the scheme in 1975.

In some respects, these targets are unfortunate, although they are judged necessary to justify the construction of two new factories. It could be really very difficult for the otherwise hard-working tea scheme personnel to fulfill them, because they were an over-estimation of the likely response of Bukoba farmers to tea planting in future. The targets are unfortunate, because if they are not met, they imply a hypothetical and non-existant failure for tea to be accepted in Bukoba. If the mistake has been made in setting "maximum possible" targets, rather than "likely" targets, to justify two new factories, then it would be advisable for an alternative, or more gradually workable plan to be envisaged for the Bukoba schemes. It may not be difficult to start with one new factory, south of Bukoba, that could serve Katoke as it expanded and also take leaf from Minazi and Rwagati societies that presently goes to Maruku factory, whilst the latter could take the leaf from all Bugabo and the remainder of Maruku, and money could be then better spent first on improved feeder roads to the Bugabo scheme and more transport facilities.

**TEA PRODUCTION AND YIELDS**

*After planting, tea is not ready for plucking for a little over two years, and it receives its first pruning at the end of the second rainy season after planting. Thus, the tea planted in December-April 1962-3, was first pruned in July 1965, and plucking started in September 1965. According to the cultivation system chosen; the tea is then*
regularly pruned as it gets older, which in Maruku has been at the end of the 3rd, 6th, and 9th years of plucking and should thus continue every third year. The yields increase gradually until maturity is reached after the tenth year of plucking, but always fall slightly in the plucking year immediately after a pruning, although their subsequent rise should be to continually rising levels.

The officer in charge of the tea scheme in 1967 was asked for estimates of the possible yield of small-holder tea in Bukoba, over the years, and according to the yields of the early demonstration plots and experiments he submitted the yields shown in Table 6, as "conservative" estimates:

Table 6  EARLY (1967) ESTIMATES OF TEA YIELDS IN BUKOBA
          DURING FIRST 10 YEARS
          (KILO GREEN LEAF PER HECTARE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yield</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>5500</td>
<td>6700</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>7800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(planting)(pruning) (pruning) (pruning)

All these estimates show, are the type of trend in yields, as the actual yields that have so far been achieved in the tea-scheme are substantially in determining the necessary capacity of the factory, and yields so far achieved on the tea estate, are closer to them. Both small-holder and estate yields are shown below.

There are no accurate records of the yields in the small-holder scheme and these can only be determined as the best possible estimates from the amount of green leaf that has been plucked from the beginning. The first green leaf that was plucked from the scheme was in the 1965-66 season, from the first 1.2 hectares that were planted. Then in September 1966 the first large scale pluckings were made from the 36.6 hectares that had been planted in 1963-4. The Bukoba Tea Factory did not open until July 1967, and until then the green leaf was bought by the tea-scheme for 30 cents per pound, and destroyed. After July 1967, the factory bought the leaf and processed it for sale, first at 35 cents per pound, and today at 77 cts./kilo.

Annual yields of tea are best shown with respect to "plucking" years, from September to August, and not to calendar years, as the first month that tea is plucked in Bukoba is usually September. Records of the total green leaf harvest of the scheme are available from September 1966, and these are shown as totals for each plucking year in Table 7 below, with reference to the hectares of tea each year that "came into bearing".


### Table 7: Annual Production of Green Leaf and Made Tea from the Bukoba Tea Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hectares &quot;Coming into bearing&quot;</th>
<th>Total Green Leaf Harvest (kilo)</th>
<th>Made Tea Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966-7</td>
<td>36.6 (+ 1.2 from year before)</td>
<td>51,552</td>
<td>11,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>158,880</td>
<td>35,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-9</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>241,962</td>
<td>53,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>381,931</td>
<td>84,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>568,731</td>
<td>126,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As tea yields vary with age, and as this variation is an important to know as the yield levels, than estimation of the yields from these overall figures in Table 7 is not a simple case of dividing total production by total area. This would give a yield average to all ages of tea, for 1970-1 of 2180 kilogrammes per hectare. However, it is possible to partition each years total production into parts attributable to the areas of tea of different ages, in production in that year, using the following set of equations:

\[
Y_1 = \frac{P_1}{A_1} \\
Y_2 = \frac{P_2 - (A_2 \times Y_1)}{A_1} \\
Y_3 = \frac{P_3 - (A_3 \times Y_1) - (A_2 \times Y_2)}{A_1} \\
\ldots \ldots \text{etc.}
\]

where \(A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_n\) = the area in years 1,\ldots,n

\(P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_n\) = the production of green leaf in years 1,\ldots,n

and \(Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n\) = the estimated yield of plucking years 1,\ldots,n

This has been done and the results are shown below in Table 8.

For estate yields it is much easier to calculate the average yields of tea of different ages, as complete yield records are kept on the estate for the yield of the different blocks of known age and area. (This is not possible to apply to a sample of small-holders, as they all have tea of different ages from which the harvest is all collected together).

Table 8 below, then shows the estimated yields of different aged tea on the smallholder scheme, as Kg./hectare green leaf, the equivalent of made tea, and the equivalent net return per farmer per 0.4 hectare average plot at 60 cents net price; and the same yields that have been achieved on the estate.
Table 8  ESTIMATED YIELDS OF SMALL-HOLDER AND ESTATE TEA FOR DIFFERENT PLUCKING YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plucking Year</th>
<th>Estate Yield</th>
<th>Small-holder Yield</th>
<th>Made Tea equivalent</th>
<th>Net return for 0.4 ha.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>1319 kg/ha.</td>
<td>1364 kg/ha.</td>
<td>303 kg.</td>
<td>327/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>3024 kg/ha.</td>
<td>2128 kg/ha.</td>
<td>473 kg.</td>
<td>510/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>4624 kg/ha.</td>
<td>1244 kg/ha.</td>
<td>276 kg.</td>
<td>298/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>3285 kg/ha.</td>
<td>2832 kg/ha.</td>
<td>640 kg.</td>
<td>691/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3547 kg/ha.</td>
<td>788 kg.</td>
<td>851/30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of small-holder yields are considerably below those of the estate, and the early estimates shown in Table 6. They are, though, averages of 100-300 different plots in each age group, and the variation in the yields between farmers is known to be large. (Moody, p. 17). In an earlier sample survey of 23 tea small-holders, it was found that the standard error was approx. 17% but this variation could be higher for the whole population. Some of the better farmers should be achieving yields higher than the estate. The average family in the tea scheme, of one man and his wife and 2-4 children at home, who are also cultivating their food crop plots can only manage about 0.4 hectares of tea. If all this tea were now in it’s 5th year of yield, then the net annual return would be about 850/00 shillings, at the net price of 60 cents per kilo.

The annual variation in small-holder yields is about the same as the variation in the estate yields, although the level is lower. The estimation technique shown above, gives results that are consistent with rising annual yields and falls immediately after pruning. If these yield levels were maintained for the small-holders, and the rate of increase continued to follow this pattern, then it would be possible to project the annual total production for the scheme, with the use of the same equations that were used to estimate the annual yields. This is done in the next section.

PROJECTED PRODUCTION OF GREEN LEAF BY BUKOBA TEA SCHEME - 1972-1976

To estimate the future production of the tea schemes in all three areas, until 1976 it is only necessary to guess the total plantings of the next two years, and the yields per hectare of small-holder tea for 5 further plucking years. The latter has been done by comparison of actual yields achieved so far with the estimates made in 1967, where the level of actual yields seems to stay consistently about 1500 kg./ha. below the estimated yields. The annual variation of both estimated and actual yields, however, is similar. It is more difficult to guess on the future plantings of the tea scheme, when it is considered that the targets that were set last year were extremely ambitious. The original target that was set for this year was over 500 hectares, and at the date of writing it seems that the scheme will be lucky if 100 hectares are planted before the end of the season. To allow for estimation of the maximum possible production by 1976, a generous estimate will be made that 100 ha. are planted
this year, and that 500 ha. are planted next year. These estimates are tabulated below, in Table 9, that shows the projected total production of the scheme until 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area coming into bearing</th>
<th>Yield in nth. year of bearing</th>
<th>Total Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-2</td>
<td>40 hectares</td>
<td>2000 kg/ha. (6th year)</td>
<td>672,036 kg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-3</td>
<td>43 hectares</td>
<td>4000 kg/ha. (7th year)</td>
<td>842,905 kg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-4</td>
<td>100 hectares</td>
<td>5000 kg/ha. (8th year)</td>
<td>1,171,675 kg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-5</td>
<td>100 hectares</td>
<td>3000 kg/ha. (9th year)</td>
<td>1,425,828 kg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-6</td>
<td>500 hectares</td>
<td>6000 kg/ha. (10th year)</td>
<td>2,305,426 kg.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these projection are for the maximum possible production by 1976, then there could easily be a short-fall of these estimates by as much as 750,000 kg., by then. If 500 ha. are planted next year, then it will be 5 times as much as the scheme ever has managed to plant to date, and it is also likely that the estimated yield for small-holder tea in its first productive year, shown in Table 3, will prove to be a high average for the whole scheme as it comes into production.

TEA PRICES AND PROCESSING

The average selling price for Bukoba Tea, between January and June 1971, was 8/33 shg. per kilo of made tea, f.o.b. in Dar-es-Salaam? This is equivalent to a value of 1/35 shg. per kilo of green leaf at a processing ratio of 1:4.5. The B.C.U. sells the small-holder tea to the Tea Company factory at 77 cents per kilo, and pays the farmer 62 cents per kilo, thereby recovering 15 cents per kilo to amortize the loans it makes to farmers in fertilizer and planting material and tractor cultivation.

The average selling price quoted above was high in 1971, but for the sake of this discussion, it could be assumed that the selling price was 8 shillings, as the factory costs of production that are available are for the same period. The structure of the Bukoba Tea Company is not unusual in the Tanzanian context, in embacing both a factory and an estate. The whole purpose of the estate was to ensure that there would be enough tea for the factory to remain in operation, whatever the response and production of the small-holder scheme.

However, the accounting and costing of a structure such as this, makes it rather difficult for the price of the small-holder tea to be judged fairly against its actual selling price.

The Company Accounts allow the costs to be broken down into the following elements:

- Estate variable costs
- Factory variable costs
- Company fixed costs
- Accounting costs (profit and loss account)
- Brokerage fees
All except the accounting costs have their direct relevance to the pricing of Bukoba Tea. Until the present, the Bukoba Tea Company is running at a loss, for two reasons. The first is quite expected; in that the factory is still running very much under capacity, but this is a situation that will inevitably improve. The second reason is that Bukoba is proving an expensive place to run a plantation-economy estate, in relation to the productivity and cost of labour. The estate yields are high, but so are the costs of production. For the period January-June 1971, the estate costs of production per kilo of green leaf were 67 cents, of which half was the cost of plucking. The costs which are directly relevant to the small-holder tea are the following:

1. **Factory variable costs**: 42 cents/kg. leaf (manufacture, packing, freight)
2. **Company fixed costs**: 62 cents/kg. leaf (administration, welfare, services)
3. **Brokerage fees**: 12 cents/kg. leaf

There are probably economics of scale to be made on both the factory variable costs and the brokerage fees, but they will be assumed to be constant, as labour, transport etc. costs will probably rise at the same time as the production of green leaf. However, the discussion is how the returns to the farmer could be affected, if they were to be directly considered in relation to the selling price of Bukoba Tea. The company fixed costs relate both to the running of the estate and the factory, as the same permanent staff administers and maintains both operations. If these costs were equally attributed to both the estate production and the factory processing, then the total cost of processing etc., that were relevant to the small-holder crop would be 85 cents per kilo of leaf. This compares with the present actual margin of: 1/76 - 0/77 = 1/01. The author has not had access to all the facts behind the pricing of tea, and is in no way qualified to suggest a new pricing policy, but the following facts prompt a concern in the price of tea to Bukoba farmers, and its dominant influence on the development of the scheme:

1. The high labour inputs and low consequent returns to labour, are influencing the acceptance of tea as a small-holder crop (3).
2. The present deduction of 15 cents per kilo, probably does not cover all the costs of tractor cultivation, and at least gives a long period of loan recovery.
3. A higher price, resulting in a more rapid increase in production, would increase the throughput of the factory, and lower the costs of processing etc.

The discussion of the Bukoba Tea Company costs should not imply that they are fundamental and crucial factor at stake, but they are taken as a tangible example of a cost appreciation that should be made in the Bukoba scheme, now that such grand expansion plans have been prepared. The price of the small-holder tea was set long ago, as a uniform price over all Tanzania, but for the above-mentioned reasons it is important for the price structure to be examined again, as it is a crucial factor in the development of the scheme.
CONCLUSION

This is a preliminary report on the state of the Bukoba Scheme during the 1971-2 season. It is mainly a collection of basic information from various sources, concerning the history, expansion and production of the scheme. It shows that the scheme has progressed steadily, if slowly, as a new source of agricultural production in the most heavily populated part of Bukoba district, where opportunities for expansion in the agricultural sector are limited. However, tea is a very labour intensive crop for the small-holder type of farmer, and the labour requirements in relation to the labour availability of the usual house-hold, set a definite limit on the size of cultivation that one farmer can achieve. As tea yields increase slowly, and as the best yields can only be obtained with careful husbandry, the average annual incomes that so far are typical from the average 0.4 ha., are small in comparison to the work input, and to alternative incomes in the urban and industrial sectors, whose opportunities are geographically close to the tea-growing area. Thus, there has been a drop-out of some farmers since the beginning as the returns from young tea are less than either the opportunity cost of labour or the leisure preference of some farmers. This is a major factor behind the slow growth of the scheme, although this growth should continue to be steady as the scheme expands into different areas of Bukoba district. It will be very interesting to see how tea can be adapted as a crop to be grown in Ujamaa in the present expansion of the Katoke scheme.
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A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SIX UJAMAA VILLAGES
IN KARAGWE DISTRICT - WEST LAKE REGION

Tony Moody
Introduction

This is the first preliminary report on a Regional Study, West Lake Region, designed to study rural development in West Lake Region with emphasis on problems of implementation of the Ujamaa policy, and carried out by the Institute for Development Research, Copenhagen, in cooperation with Bureau of Resource Assessment and Land Use Planning, University of Dar es Salaam, and sponsored by the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Development Planning, Dar es Salaam.

During the work to obtain the information on which the report is based, government and party officials and leaders in the Region and the District have been extremely helpful.
UJAMAA IN KARAGWE

In Karagwe district there are seven Ujamaa villages. Five of these were established in 1968, first as Makazi Mapya (Raid 1970) and were situated on undeveloped areas in different parts of the district. (Map 1) shows their location in relation to the areas of traditional settlement. These villages were Kihinda, Kibimba, Rukuraijo, BUKangara and Kamugambo. These are the villages where the greater part of Government assistance has been concentrated, and all are organised on a similar pattern to other Ujamaa villages in the country. Every settler is first allowed to develop his private plot of food crops, and the whole village joins to work in the communal production of cash and food crops. Other communal activities have gradually become a feature of life in these villages and some have now started communal building enterprises. Since 1968, throughout West Lake Region, an attempt has been made to increase the influence of Ujamaa by persuading traditional villages to start a communal enterprise outside their private farms and businesses. In Bukoba district this has occurred principally in the tea-growing area, where, recently, new tea plantations have been established as Ujamaa units, and other villages have organised Ujamaa dairy units.

Only two traditional villages in Karagwe have so far established Ujamaa enterprises in this way. These are Omkagando and Kandagesho, whose members have started growing maize and beans communally, intending to start communal coffee production at a later date. These then are the seven Ujamaa villages of Karagwe.

The Scope of this Study

The overall study of Ujamaa in Karagwe has been made in three parts. This report is the first part which compares the main features of development in all but one of the seven villages. (Kamugambo could not be visited in the time available).

The second part is a more detailed study of one of the original 1968 villages - Bukangara. The third part is also a more detailed study, of one of the newer "spontaneous" units - Omkagando.

This first part of the study compares Kihinda, Kibimba, Rukuraijo, BUKangara, Kandagesho and Omkagando. It compares them on the basis of general information on population and production and the degree of success in their communal activities. Each village has responded to Ujamaa in a different way, and this is reflected in the communal outputs - notably cash and food crop harvests. The field work of the study was made in a similar way in each village. Usually 1-3 days were spent at the village, leaders were interviewed, the communal fields were measured with compass and chain, and all available village records were studied. These records were very variable.
Some villages had well kept cash books, whilst others were keeping records of village funds on assorted scraps of paper. All villages, however, had kept a register of work on the communal field, and these were a useful source of data on the variability and regularity of communal work, as well as the changing membership of the village. Only one village had incomplete records in this respect, and that because it was a "new" village and it had not yet had advice on how to keep these records.

Because the field work was carried out halfway through the growing season, it is not yet possible to relate this year’s labour inputs to this year’s outputs, but this can be done later, after post-harvest visits in July.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF EACH VILLAGE AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

1. KIHINDA
   (a) Population

Kihinda is situated in the Murongo Division of Karagwe, near the Uganda/Rwanda border, in an area of rolling grassland that has recently been taken from a Government-controlled hunting area. Since establishment, the soil has proved fertile, although the rainfall is not very reliable, and the settlement has expanded rapidly. It is now the largest Ujamaa village in Karagwe, with a total population of over 900 persons, and its organisation is split into three parts - Kihinda A, Kihinda B and Kihinda B1. Although the population is large, over 2/3 are children, and a large majority of settlers are immigrants from Rwanda and Uganda. Table 1 shows the tribal and sex/age composition of the total Kihinda (A, B, B1) population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribal Origin</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karagwe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ever since the establishment of Kihinda, in 1968, there has been a majority of Rwandan members, and the few new members that have joined in later years have been mostly Rwandans. For the population of Kihinda A details are available for male members to illustrate this, and this is shown in Table 2 which classifies the male population of Kihinda A according to the date of arrival and the tribal origin.
TABLE 2
Arrival of Male Population in Kihinda A by Tribal Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribal Origin</th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karagwe</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1968, only 20 per cent of the male members of the new village were Wanyambo from the local part of Karagwe, and since that date only one Mnyambo has joined. The only increasing trend in membership is in refugees from Rwanda. In this respect, Kihinda is largely an Ujamaa refugee settlement, for members of a landless class across the border in Rwanda. Of course, the border is only a colonial relic and an artificial population boundary in this part of Africa. Without it there would doubtless have been, long ago, regular large migrations of population from the heavily populated Rwandan uplands to the empty parts of Karagwe. But the low proportion of settlers originating in Tanzania makes Kihinda Ujamaa village an insignificant solution to the settlement problem of any landless class that may exist in that part of West Lake Region. There is much more evidence that this problem is still largely met by the spontaneous opening of new traditional settlements in the parts of Karagwe that are still only lightly settled.

The dominantly Rwandan population of Kihinda has produced a marked and very characteristic effect upon the agricultural development of the village which is not met in the other Ujamaa villages of Karagwe. This is described below.

Because of the large size of the whole village, it has been split into three separate parts, Kihinda A, Kihinda B and Kihinda B1 of which Kihinda A is the largest with 86 active male member, the others having 37 and 32 respectively. Each part has its own chairman and committee and controls its own labour and crop economy. But all three parts share the one secretary and the Government officers, Agricultural Officer, Rural Development Officer, Medical Officer and two Teachers.

The growth of male population in Kihinda has been slow since the first 1968 settlement, although emigration of the early settlers has been very slight. The whole of Kihinda may have the most stable population of any of the Karagwe Ujamaa villages.

The historical population records of the whole village are neither complete nor explicit, but the approximate growth, since the beginning of 1960, is shown in Table 3.
Both the female and child populations have increased in the last year much faster than the male population, as the men have become settled and then married, and the natural population growth of Kihinda is well exceeding the growth by immigration.

(b) Economic Development

Kihinda is the only Ujamaa village in Karagwe where there has been no attempt to limit the area of private cultivation by each household. It is true that few households in the village have more than one acre of bananas, but most households have also two to three acres of annual grain crops - maize, millet and sorghum. The restricted time-table of this survey did not permit any sample measurement of these private plots, but it was easy to estimate these areas visually. Kihinda A is a completely linear village in layout, all the members' homes standing along the single road through the village. Behind each member's banana plot and homestead there is a large area of undeveloped land on the hill-side, and much of this area has been cultivated with private fields of maize and sorghum.

This large area of private cultivation distinguishes Kihinda from the other villages as much as the large size of its population, and its dominance of Rwandan refugees.

It is this last fact which undoubtedly explains the pattern of private cultivation, as, traditionally, Rwandans are far more reliant on grains than on bananas as their principal food. Since the other Ujamaa villages of Karagwe are settled mainly by local Nyambo people, whose staple food is bananas, the restriction on one acre of bananas per household is an effective restriction of the total size of private cultivations.

### TABLE 3  Population Growth of all Kihinda since 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 1970</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1970</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1971</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1971</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4  Areas of Planted Communal Fields in Kihinda A 1971-72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Area, hectares</th>
<th>(acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>2.1060</td>
<td>(5.2a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>1.5652</td>
<td>(3.9a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>5.3719</td>
<td>(13.3a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee, beans</td>
<td>0.6933</td>
<td>(1.7a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>2.3714</td>
<td>(5.9a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AREA</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.1078</strong></td>
<td><strong>(29.9a)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The maize and sorghum should be the principal cash crops this year, although the acreage planted is considerably smaller than that reported last year. This may mean that larger private shambas are seen as a better source of cash crop, which would be an unwanted development in an Ujamaa village. The peas and beans are intended as a supplementary food crop and will probably be shared between the villagers. The coffee has only been planted this year, as elsewhere, and although Kihinda is the largest village, the area planted is the smallest in any of the villages except Kibimba which is also the smallest village, and the only village that has not yet planted its coffee.

The most reliable statistics for the economy of previous years in Kihinda are from the cash returns from communal crops that were sold, as no accurate measurement has been made of the communal areas that were planted, or of the weight of crops that were harvested. Because of poor acreage estimates of this year's crops, it is difficult to estimate the areas that were planted in previous years. However, Table 5 attempts to interpolate these areas from the areas reported, using the difference between the reported and actual areas of 1971-72 and the yields, as a basis of comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Reported area 70-71</th>
<th>Probable area 70-71</th>
<th>Reported area 71-72</th>
<th>Actual area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>24a.</td>
<td>10a.</td>
<td>15a.</td>
<td>5.2a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>30a.</td>
<td>12a.</td>
<td>10a.</td>
<td>5.9a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10a.</td>
<td>3.9a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>7a.</td>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only recorded communal harvest for 1969-70 (the first year of communal production) in Kihinda A was approximately 47 bags of red sorghum; red sorghum is a popular cash crop in Murongo division and is sold on the local market as a brewing grain. All the 1969-70 harvest was sold for 2,350/- shs. and the income was shared between all the Ujamaa families, making an average-of 31/30 shs. for each family.

In the 1970-71 season, maize, sorghum peas and groundnuts were harvested communally, some being sold, the rest being shared directly as food-stuffs. These harvests are summarised in Table 6.
### TABLE 6  
Communal Harvests in Kihinda A  
1970-71 crops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Sorghum</th>
<th>Peas</th>
<th>Groundnuts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total harvest</td>
<td>41 bags</td>
<td>51 bags</td>
<td>9 bags</td>
<td>6 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hectares</td>
<td>4 ha.</td>
<td>5 ha.</td>
<td>5 ha.</td>
<td>2 ha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. yield/ha.</td>
<td>700 kg</td>
<td>720 kg</td>
<td>140 kg</td>
<td>180 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount sold</td>
<td>7 bags</td>
<td>51 bags</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>rotted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross income</td>
<td>350 shs.</td>
<td>2550 shs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared as food</td>
<td>2380 kg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>700 kg</td>
<td>store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average cash/family | 4/10 shs. | 30 shs. | - | -         |
| Average food/family | 28 kg | - | 8.2 kg |          |

In this second year of communal production, there was an insignificant increase in the average cash return per family from the communal harvest, and the shared food supply was negligible compared to the free distribution of maize flour and cooking oil that continues to these villages. Such achievements are not sufficient incentive for the Kihinda villagers to spend more time on communal production, and consequently, individual production still flourishes as the mainstay of family income. The area of this year's crops, and their appearance would not seem to promise any increase in the communal yields for this year (1971-72), (the actual yields will be reported later).

Finally, the villagers have obtained a mining licence, to enable them to attempt a communal exploitation of some tin deposits which have been found near the village area. There is not yet any organised plan for this, but the village may achieve some success, provided that they obtain the appropriate guidance and assistance.

However, if the village does not develop a more dynamic economy in the years to come, and if it continues to expand its area, merely to accommodate more Rwandans, then Tanzania stand to lose an alternative foreign exchange income, as this expansion would be into an area set aside for professional hunting that is still rich in trophy game.

2. RUKURAIJO  
(a) Population

Rukuraijo is the second smallest Ujamaa village in Karagwe, but this year it has by far the largest absolute area of communal cultivation. However, unlike the other villages of Bukangaga and Kihinda, it has no piped water supply, no medical assistance, and no school. The population is still
small although the original settlement area was laid out for over 100 families. The present population largely consists of the same members that came in 1968 and has grown slowly since then. Unlike in Kihinda, all but 4 of the present male population of Rukuraijo are Wanyambo people from Karagwe. They have come from the areas of older settlement in the district - Nyabionza, Nyaishezi and Nyakahanga - with the chance of obtaining land when traditional family land is no longer available. However, their small number indicates that, if there is a need for such new settlement in Karagwe, then Rukuraijo is not yet a well-frequented destination. Table 7 shows the changing population between the end of 1969 and the end of 1971.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1969</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1970</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1970</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1971</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1971</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The small size of Rukuraijo may be attributable to its position. Unlike most other Karagwe villages, Rukuraijo is not situated in the middle of an undeveloped area, but it is neighbouring to an area of recent traditional settlement, and not far from the main transversal road of the district.

The results of a questionnaire survey (not yet published) conducted in Rukuraijo and this neighbouring settlement, show that the settlers in the neighbouring settlement have mostly arrived since 1966. By mid-1971, the average size of private farm in that area was over 5 acres (2 hectares). As the main complaint of the settlers in Rukuraijo Ujamaa village is that they wish to increase the size of their private banana plots it is easy to see, that a prospective new settler, choosing between Ujamaa and other types of settlement, can be strongly influenced by a traditional preference to cultivate a large banana plot outside the Ujamaa situation, in the neighbouring new-settlement area.

(b) Economic Development

This attitude is still dominant, according to opinions heard while staying in Rukuraijo, even though Rukuraijo communal field was so large this year. The 1970-71 harvest was late being sold, and some of the crop was wasted, and this discouraged some people of the value of communal production. When last year's crops were eventually sold, however, they yielded over 100/- per family, and if this year's maize crop from 10 ha. is sold in good time, then it may inject more enthusiasm into communal production, as the yield should be a good one.
In fact, Rukuraijo is an interesting example in the study of success in Ujamaa villages. Although there is not yet an obvious feeling of great communal enthusiasm in the village, Rukuraijo has by far the largest area of communal crops per head of population.

In general it would be expected that the amount of communal production was the most direct and most significant measure of conviction to Ujamaa in any village. But the greater area planted by Rukuraijo this year, is not associated with a greater communal labour input than in any other village. This is shown in Table 8, which relates the total labour force, the communal days' work per head in Oct.-Nov.-Dec.1971, and the acres per head of communal cultivation in each Karagwe village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Total labour</th>
<th>O/N/D days work/head</th>
<th>Communal acres/head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rukuraijo</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibimba</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bukangara</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kihinda A</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kandagesho</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omkagando</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that, although Rukuraijo leads the other villages in a more than double amount of communal crops per head, this has not been achieved with any greater labour input during the first months of the new season.

The reason for this, and the reason why the extent of communal cultivation is not yet a measure of success in Ujamaa villages, is the existence of factors which are still more dominant in this early developmental stage. In all the Ujamaa villages, great degree of responsibility for communal cultivation is still shouldered by the Ministry of Agriculture through its extension workers, or through the use of the District Council tractor in the primary cultivation of all the Ujamaa fields. In its desire to guide these new settlements, the Government is still a strong influence over the decision-making attached to this side of the development of a communal economy in Ujamaa villages.

If the most work-intensive agricultural task is not dependent on the labour input of the villagers, then the size of the communal cultivation is not an effective measure of the degree of communalism. The area of communal agriculture is only a measure of the amount of tractor-ploughed land that the village has actually planted, and subsequently maintained. Both planting and maintenance are agricultural activities whose labour requirements are extremely variable as they depend on so many factors - the crop planted, its spacing, the heaviness of the soil, the quality of work, and particularly, the management of these activities.
The large area of communal maize, in good condition, at Rukuraijo is more dependent on these factors, in particular the last one, as there is an able and enthusiastic extension officer in the village. He is still more effective than the village leadership in mustering attendance at work and directing the work which is done.

But because these are still early days in the development of Ujamaa, and Ujamaa ideas are fairly revolutionary to the traditional society of West Lake, then an immediate response to communal economies should not be expected. Rather, as in the case of Rukuraijo, if external factors first demonstrate the potentials of communal production, then a positive reaction within the community should follow later. The Karagwe Ujamaa villages are all still in need of positive, practical assistance in demonstrating these potentials.

The actual areas of communal crops at Rukuraijo this year are shown in Table 9.

### TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Area, hectares (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>9.9272 (24.5a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>4.2106 (10.4a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/beans</td>
<td>1.9910 (4.9a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.1288 (39.8a.)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike for Kihinda, the official estimates of these crop acreages at Rukuraijo are very close to the measured acreages. As the same extension officer was responsible for measuring the previous years' communal fields, these estimates are taken to show the comparison between the last three years' communal fields, and are shown in Table 10.

### TABLE 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1969-70</th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/beans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large expansion in acreage after the first year was on the encouragement of the same extension officer, under the direction of the district office. The expansion in the area of beans this year, however, seems to have been a mistake, because the larger field is in a very weedy condition, and it is difficult to imagine that the total harvest will exceed that of the previous year from a smaller field.
Rukuraijo has also kept good records of its harvests from the communal fields and its disposal to the benefit of the village members. Table 11 summarises the details of the 1971 harvest.

**Table 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Beans</th>
<th>Groundnuts</th>
<th>Peas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total harvest</td>
<td>40 bags</td>
<td>23 bags</td>
<td>20 bags (unshelled)</td>
<td>1 bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount sold</td>
<td>36 bags</td>
<td>17 bags</td>
<td>2 bags</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross income</td>
<td>1080 shs.</td>
<td>1700 shs.</td>
<td>30 shs.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared as food</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 bags</td>
<td>1 bag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average cash/family | 43/20 shs. | 68 shs. | - | - |
| Average food/family | - | - | 20 kg | 3\frac{1}{2} kg |

At least in Rukuraijo there was a cash return that was significant to each family.

In Bukangara (see below) there was no cash return to families in 1970-71, and it was necessary there for men to work outside the village to earn approx. 40/- per month on private farms in the neighbourhood. But even this cash return at Rukuraijo was insignificant in relation to the costs of production incurred by the Government with its provision of tractor cultivation and fertiliser. However, in these first years of Ujamaa, the Government must view such assistance as direct aid and a written-off cost, if it is to show Ujamaa settlers the value of communal production. Even so, all plans that have been prepared by the Government agencies postulate the economy of the villages to be self-supporting and accountable from the very beginning.

These plans do not, however, under-estimate the difficulties of making tractor cultivation payable in Ujamaa villages, and plans for 5 villages (Development Plans for Bukangara, Kibimba, Rukuraijo, Kihinda, Kamugambo - Regional Planning Team, Bukoba, 1970) propose a gradual conversion to ox-cultivation in each village. In early 1970 oxen were provided to 3 villages, together with ox-ploughs and, at Rukuraijo, even an ox-drawn seeder. However, in no village have the oxen been used for cultivation, and in Rukuraijo they are still kept at the near-by ox-training centre, although two cultivation seasons have now passed. In both Bukangara and Rukuraijo some of the original oxen have died, and the obvious conclusion is that it was an innovation that was introduced too soon. If the Government was first of all introducing an entirely new social and economic way of life in the new settlements, it should have expected that a few years outside supervision was needed (free tractor cultivation) before the village could be expected to further adopt an entirely foreign technical innovation to speed the "take-off" in its economy.
KIBIMBA

(a) Population

Kibimba is the smallest Ujamaa village in Karagwe. The total work force is only 26 persons, and the communal fields measure less than 15 acres. Only three new settlers have come to Kibimba since 1968, and two of these came early in 1971, but have been absent from the village since August. It is reported that when the village was formed in 1968, there were over 100 adult settlers in which case there has been a very large exodus. But one report from early 1969 states that "many settlers who originally left their own shambas nearby to come and join the community are now leaving and returning to their former land." (Ujamaa Village Report, Karagwe, 03.04.69). So this exodus was largely of people trying to use the new settlement to increase their private land and leaving when they saw that Ujamaa was something different. The actual living conditions of Kibimba are the least attractive of any of the Karagwe villages. It is not the only village without a piped water supply, but the natural supply is over 2 miles distant and over a hill. It is both 8 miles from the nearest dispensaries in either direction ("abira and Nkwenda), and there are very poor medical facilities in the village. The only Government "inputs" are an extension officer and a very small mud-walled store. The attitude to communal cultivation is discouraging, as shown by the weedy state of the fields. Further it seems that Kibimba is badly situated in relation to the irregularities of the local rainfall, and suffers from the same rain-shadow problems as Bukangara. (Report on Bukangara, Moody, 1972). Only 8 miles nearer the Karagwe scarp at Omkagando and Mabira, the rainfall is already more reliable.

Population statistics are first available for April 1969, and these show that the early exodus, if there were originally so many as 100, occurred in the end of 1968, as the total adult population then was only 42 persons.

Table 12 summarises the population statistics available since 1969.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1969</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1970</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1971</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1971</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be seen that the active male population of Kibimba has shrunk to an extremely low level, and by 1/3 in the last eighteen months. It would seem that, from these figures, most of the men who have left were single, and that the few who remain have only kept the total village population at an equal level by taking wives and starting families. Not only is Kibimba the smallest Ujamaa village in Karagwe, but it has also the least encouraging population statistics.

(b) Economic Development

The communal fields that were measured in Kibimba were not well maintained, but they were no worse than those at Kihinda. They were the smallest area of communal crops in any village, but in relation to the active population Kibimba has the second largest area of communal cultivation this year. (Table 8, p. 11). The measured areas of the 1971-72 communal crops are shown in Table 13.

### TABLE 13 Areas of Communal Crops at Kibimba, 1971-72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Area, hectares</th>
<th>(acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>2.1190</td>
<td>(5.2a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>2.1662</td>
<td>(5.4a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>1.0794</td>
<td>(2.7a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/beans</td>
<td>0.4965</td>
<td>(1.2a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.8611</strong></td>
<td><strong>(14.5a.)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that the late start of the rains this year is responsible for the poor appearance of the crops that were measured.

The maize was late and very uneven, the coffee had not been planted by February, though the seedlings were at the village. But everywhere was very weedy, and better weeding should reduce the yield loss of a poor rainfall. This year's communal cultivation is about the same as that of the previous year, and the smaller population that will be in Kibimba for harvest should benefit from a slightly increased yield per head. The progress in communal planting is shown in Table 14.

### TABLE 14 Communal Cultivation at Kibimba, 1969-72 (acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1969-70</th>
<th>1970-71</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/beans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6½</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The acreage figure for last year's cultivation is only an estimate, but, allowing for exaggeration, there has not been any real increase in communal cultivation in the last year. The whole harvest from last year's communal field was, or is being sold, and none was shared directly as food. It was stated that the beans and groundnuts harvested last year were taken to the market, but that the village has not yet received anything from their sale. For the sake of comparison with the previous villages, Table 15 includes an estimate of the value of these crops, and shows the average return per family resulting from the 1970-71 communal harvest.

### TABLE 15 1971 Communal Harvest at Kibimba

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Beans</th>
<th>Groundnuts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total harvest</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8 bags</td>
<td>5 bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount sold</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>all?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross income</td>
<td>1006 shs.</td>
<td>750 shs.?</td>
<td>750 shs.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared as food</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average cash/family 59/20 shs. 44/10 shs.? 4/40 shs.?

If the village realises a return for the bean and groundnut harvests that it claims, then the harvest compares well with that of Rukuraijo, but until now the cash from the maize is the only return that has been shared. (As elsewhere, on the basis of work input in the communal field). If there is any improvement in the return per family in 1972 it will be because there are less people to share the harvest between, rather than because of an increased harvest. None of the crops seen promised spectacular yields.

4. BUKANGARA

(This section is a summary of the population growth and economic development of Bukangara for comparison with the other villages. For a fuller description see: "Report on Bukangara Ujamaa Village, Moody, 1972").

(a) Population

By population, Bukangara is the third largest Ujamaa village in Karagwe today. In the appearance of its layout and amenities it seems to be the best village in the district. There is a school with three standards and two teachers, a water pump and tank, a permanent store, and medical, rural development and agricultural officers stationed in the village. The leadership is relatively well-organised and this year the communal fields were looking well-cared for. However, the population and economic records of the village do not compare so well with other villages. Population growth since September 1969 is shown in Table 16.
Of the four original villages described in this report, Bukangara is the only one with a substantial net loss of population in the last two years. Unlike in Kibimba, there has not been natural increase to compensate for the loss by out-migration.

(b) Economic Development

The measured areas of the 1971-72 communal crops are shown in Table 17.

TABLE 17 Areas of Communal Crops at Bukangara 1971-72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Area, hectares</th>
<th>(acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>4.6785</td>
<td>(11.5a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>2.0210</td>
<td>( 5.0a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee/beans</td>
<td>2.4860</td>
<td>( 6.1a.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oranges</td>
<td>0.3597</td>
<td>( 0.9a.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with the population the total communal cultivation is not very much. Reference to Table 8 (p. 11) shows this in comparison with the other villages, despite the fact that the labour input for the beginning of the 1971-72 season appears to be so much higher. Acreage figures for communal cultivation in previous years are only available as estimates, but even allowing for considerable over-estimation, there has certainly been no increase in the communal cultivation this year.

Table 18 below shows the use made of the yields from the communal harvests last year. Beans, sorghum and maize were grown, and the beans were the only crop sold for cash. Unlike the other villages, Bukangara set aside a larger part of the cash return as savings, for re-investment in an Ujamaa shop. (415 shs.) and 60 shs. were saved in the local society. (This is how the situation was reported, but 20 bags of beans should sell for considerably more than 475 shs.) If this is true, then Bukangara is unusual in not sharing any of the cash between the village members, although there is an obvious need for a cash income amongst them which is often met by members who absent themselves from the village for 1-2 months to find work with large farmers, for 40 shs. per month. Even the portion of the communal harvest that was distributed as food
was low, and if the same situation occurs this year then it must be very difficult to persuade the members of the value of communal production. This year, coffee has been planted in the communal field, although there have been difficulties in planting it all at the right time, and only 1/3 of the plot has been planted this year due to shortage of seedlings. This will be another delay in the opportunity for members to enjoy communal wealth.

TABLE 18  1971 Communal Harvest at Bukangara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Beans</th>
<th>Sorghum</th>
<th>Maize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total harvest</td>
<td>27 bags</td>
<td>17 bags</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount sold</td>
<td>20 bags</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross income</td>
<td>475 shs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To village savings</td>
<td>475 shs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared as food</td>
<td>7 bags</td>
<td>17 bags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cash/family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average food/family</td>
<td>11 kg</td>
<td>28 kg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE NEW UJAMAA VILLAGES

Both these villages, Omkagando and Kandagesho, are "traditional" villages that have been persuaded to join together in some communal production whilst the members still retain and continue to develop their private plots. Both villages are situated outside the denser areas of old settlement of Karagwe and, as such, are in areas where there is still much available land for agricultural expansion. Kandagesho has been settled within the last fifteen years, and Omkagando has members who have been there all their lives, but who are still the first generation of settlers in the area.

Both villages have communal fields of about 3½ hectares, and organise communal work much in the same way as the original Ujamaa villages.

But in both cases the organisation is quite spontaneous and does not rely on Government pressure and extension workers for its continuation as in some of the other villages above. Naturally, the Government has given them some encouragement in the form of adopting the Ujamaa constitution, consultation concerning the communal enterprises and tractor ploughing to open the communal field, but basic planning is very much in the hands of the village leadership. This leadership has the foundation of tradition behind it, as the present leaders have been village leaders before the present policy. Further, the communities have built up gradually over time and there is more inherent cohesion in their social structure. In this way the adoption of Ujamaa as a new economic order may be submitted here to a fairer test than in the other 1968 villages, where the new economic order has been accompanied by such sudden social changes for their members.
Kandagesho is the most recent Ujamaa village and only
started communal cultivation this season. As a tradition-
al village it is quite recent and lies on the periphery of
the Bushangaro settled area in the west of Karagwe. It is
about ten miles (16 km) from Nyabionza in Kayungu sub-di-
vision. Most of the members have come to Kandagesho in the
last fifteen years from Nyabionza and Kayungu to open new
land, and immediately to the south and west of the village
is still undeveloped bush. In this respect the village is
still largely in a pioneer stage and Ujamaa has apparently
been embraced as an effective future policy for increasing
the cultivated land further into the bush (this was also
stated by the village chairman). Beans were planted on the
communal field this year and the village expect to harvest
40 bags. Since the tractor ploughed the land, communal work
has been organised experimentally. They intend to sell
these beans and share the proceeds, depending on the work in-
put. The present intention is only to keep back 20% of the
sales price as village funds for reinvestment which they say
will go towards starting a shop. However, they also intend
to expand communal cultivation to coffee next season, and in
such a village where the private agricultural sector is well-
developed, then it should be possible to keep a larger pro-
portion of the communal wealth for reinvestment.

Most village members have well-established private plots of
coffee and bananas, and the chairman and secretary have each
about 4 acres (1½ hectares). Hence there is not the immediate
need here for the communal field to supplement the liveli-
hood of the village members, and such a village should be in
a better position to use its communal profits to extend its
communal economy. However, this is the very first year of
Ujamaa at Kandagesho, and its Ujamaa organisation is still
little influenced by external political or economic advice.

During 1971 communal work was organised on about 10 days per
month, and at the end of the year there were 46 male and
16 female participants, while new members appear to be joining
all the time. Table 19 summarises the main statistical
details of Kandagesho and Omkagando.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kandagesho</th>
<th>Omkagando</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of starting</td>
<td>July 1971</td>
<td>June 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men members, dec.71</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women members, dec.71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal maize</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal beans</td>
<td>3.19 hectares</td>
<td>1.70 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal cabbages</td>
<td>0.16 hectares</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. OMKAGANDO

The village is situated 3 miles (5 km) south of Mabira, in the northern part of the main Karagwe scarp. It is only 6 miles north of Kibimba, but the area does not seem to have the same rain-shadow problem (see page 11), although the latter is so close. Some of the older village members have spent their whole lives in the vicinity, but they arrived as pioneers, and there is still undeveloped land near the village, although not the empty bush that is adjacent to Kandagesho.

The Ujamaa enterprise was started in 1970, so there has already been a full season of communal production. The membership on foundation was 20 persons, and this had risen to 33 by the end of 1971. The main motive behind the Ujamaa production seems to be purely for communal benefit, and the first aim is to build a co-operative shop with the proceeds of the communal harvest. Last season the communal field of 2½ acres produced 5 bags of beans, of which 4 bags were sold for over 300 shs. which has all been put towards the shop. In February 1972 construction had begun on the shop, and a young member of the village had gone to Katoma Rural Training Centre on a building course for Ujamaa members. This year the communal field is over three times as large, and maize and beans were being harvested at the end of February. The village intended to plant sorghum when these harvests were complete, which would also be sold as a cash crop. Assuming that sufficient funds are obtained from this year's harvests, and the shop can be established, the village intends to continue to plant communal coffee next season.

Because there is still no real land pressure around Omkagando, there seems to be little inequality within the village regarding the size of private plots.

The young members and the older ones who are now living without their children have one or two acres of coffee and bananas, but the members with large families who have been in Omkagando for a few years have between four and eight acres of coffee and bananas. Including the young members, who have only just started their private plots, the average number of Robusta coffee trees per member is over 250 trees, equivalent to half an acre of pure coffee, (though it is mixed with bananas over a larger area). This is a reasonable source of private wealth, and security and it may point to why these new villages seem more encouraging to the management of their communal enterprises. In these new villages Ujamaa is not achieving any amelioration of a class structure in society as a whole, but it is giving an opportunity or the benefits of communalism to be shown amongst a social group who did not have a tradition of communalism in agriculture.
Similarly, these "new" Ujamaa villages differ from the earlier ones in the part that women play in the communal work. Because most members already have large private farms, then the women are less free to join in communal work. Consequently, in both these new villages little over 1/4 of the members are women, whilst in the other villages there are approximately equal numbers of men and women in communal work.

Inevitably, such villages as Kandagesho and Omkagando are going to develop in quite different ways than the other type of village: they have greater stability and entity as communities, but in that they will always be able to fall back on individualism if their communal experiment fails. But their voluntary spirit, and policy of gradualism are much more part of how President Nyerere originally envisaged rural transformation into Ujamaa. There will be positive results from the other villages described above, but due to the way they were originally established as Makazi Mapya, their populations will still take some time to stabilise into settled societies, and so it will still be some time before their economies really rely on communal production.
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I. Ngara District.

Ngara District is located in the extreme south-western corner of West Lake Region, where it borders on Biharamulo District in W.L. Region, Kibondo District in Kigoma Region, and on Burundi and Rwanda. The District is divided into two Divisions, the Northern Bugufi Division with 58,000 inhabitants and covering 837 sq. km., and the southern Bushubi Division with 38,000 inhabitants in 2,012 sq. km., giving a District total of 96,000 inh. and 2,850 sq. km.

A. Physical and climatic features.

Bugufi Division is bounded to the north and south by the rivers Kagera and Ruvubu, which meet at Bugufi's north-eastern end, and continue towards Lake Victoria as the Kagera River.

The main physical feature of Bugufi is the ridge, running southwest between the two rivers from the point where they converge. Around Ngara town it reaches its maximum height of 1,850 m above sea level, i.e. 550 m above the level of the two rivers. Here it also splits up into two main branches, both continuing towards the southwest, with an increasing number of side branches. There is one long valley between the two main branches of the ridge, and numerous valleys to the north and south, from the ridge down to the Kagera and Ruvubu rivers.

Average annual rainfall at both ends of the ridge is around 1,030 mm. Below the ridge, towards the two rivers, it is probably somewhat lower. The rainfall peaks in the whole district are usually in November and March-April, with July and August as the driest months. Bushubi Division is part of a highland which stretches all into western Biharamulo and eastern Burundi, with peaks ranging up to 1,650 m above sea-level evenly spread over the whole area. It is cut dissected by numerous valleys and rivers, running in all directions, but in Bushubi usually ultimately leading out into the northern and western border-river: Ruvubu.

Average annual rainfall ranges from 850 mm in eastern and central Bushubi over 940 mm to the north and south up to 1,030 mm in the western part of the Division.

B. Population.

In 1967 there were 96,000 inhabitants in Ngara District. Compared with the results of the 1948 and 1957 censuses, this means that there has been an annual population decrease of 0.2% from 48 to 57 and an even larger annual decrease of 0.7% between 57 and 67, whereas the Region as a whole had annual increases of 1.4% and 2.5% for the same periods.

The male/female ratio in Ngara District is 80 (males pr. 100 females). Only one district in Tanzania (in neighbouring Kigoma Region) has a lower sex ratio. About 11,000 of
Ngaras inhabitants are not Tanzanian citizens, and among these the number of males and females are just about equal. Among Tanzanian citizens the ratio is 79, but in the productive age group, from 15 to 54 years, it is as low as 55. From 0-15 years the sex ratio is 92 and above 54 years it is 108. \(^5\)

All these figures indicate a heavy emigration, especially among men in the productive ages. Interviews with people in the District showed that the migrants can be divided roughly into two groups. One part of them are people, who go to find seasonal employment on the cotton and coffee farms in Uganda and return to Ngara after some 6-8 months. The other main group consists of people, who, perhaps after some seasons as seasonal labourers, decide to settle outside Ngara, as permanent labourers in Uganda, or by acquiring farms of their own, either in Uganda or in Southern Karagwe midway between Ngara and Uganda.

The trek from Ngara to Uganda has been going on for many years. Old people in the District will tell how, in their youth, they used to walk up to Uganda, passing through Rwanda. Government reports from the 1950ies talk about "the annual migration to Uganda." \(^6\)

Also internally the District shows a high degree of mobility with people moving from one part to another.

There are two major tribes in Ngara, the Washubi in Bushubi and the Wahangaza in Bugufi. They are both very closely related to the Warundi and the Wanyarwanda. The languages are about the same, and they have common clans, so that for example a shambo (from the shambo clan) from Bushubi is recognized as a clansman by the Rwandese Washambo and vice-versa. For a long time people from Rwanda and Burundi have been settling in Ngara, and they are usually, after living there for some years, regarded as Washubi or Wahangaza like everybody else. The same happens when people move from one of the two divisions to the other.

Actually the now 60,000 strong Hangaza tribe didn’t exist until about 100 years ago, when the Buhangaza Kingdom was created to comprise a conglomeration of people, who had recently moved from Rwanda, Burundi and Bushubi to settle in the formerly almost uninhabited Bugufi.

The above-mentioned 11,000 non-Tanzanians in Ngara are mainly Wanyarwanda and Warundi. One distinct group is the Rwandese refugees in the two refugee settlements, most of whom do not want to become Tanzanians, but expect some day to return to Rwanda. Another group is the more recent part of the continual flow coming from Rwanda and Burundi to settle permanently in Ngara. A third group is young men, mainly Warundi who seek seasonal employment with Ngara farmers. Lastly there are quite a lot of Rwanda and Burundi women who have married Ngara men, and people of both sexes, who come to visit or live with relatives in Ngara.
The population of Ngara is quite unevenly distributed. The highest concentrations of people are on the Bugufi ridge around Ngara town, on its two mainbranches and the valley between them, and on the side-branches in south-western Bugufi. (The former Mabawe Sub-division has a population density of 121 inh./sq.km. compared with the District total of 34 inh./sq.km. It is as high as in the more populated areas of Bukoba District.) Descending from the ridge towards the Kagera and Ruvubu rivers, there are fewer and fewer people, and more and more uncultivated, rather wild bush-land, with plenty of wild animals.

In Bushubi the villages are more scattered, often with large stretches of bush between them, but the major part of the population lives in a broad belt along Ruvubu which forms the western and northern boarders, on the slopes of the many valleys leading down to the river. (The south-eastern former Subdivision of Murusagamba has a population-density of only 11 inh./sq.km.)

C. Agricultural development.

Agriculture in Ngara, like Bukoba and Karagwe Districts, is based on permanent farms centred around the perennial banana plantations, supplemented by annual crops like beans, sorghum, cassava, maize etc., with perhaps coffee as a cash-crop. However, this agricultural system, which is old in the other two Districts, was not established in Ngara until the period between the two world wars, and only after the second world war did it really become predominant. The following table shows the important difference which still exists between the three districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Produce mentioned as main or secondary</th>
<th>Ngara</th>
<th>Bukoba</th>
<th>Karagwe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bananas</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many more farmers in Ngara District still regard the annual crops as their main or secondary produce, and even on farms with bananas and coffee as the most important crops, it will usually be seen, that beans and sorghum take up quite a large area.

Nowadays the main foodcrops are cooking bananas and beans, which constitute the normal daily diet. 50 years ago people would grow millet, sorghum and beans, and eat porridge made
of millet or sorghum with beans. Especially in Bushubi sorghum-porridge is still often eaten instead of bananas.

Banana-pombe has taken the place of pombe made of sorghum as the most widely used alcoholic drink used for special occasions like weddings etc.

Coffee is the principal export crop, but it is far from having achieved the same prominence in Ngara as it has in Bukoba and Karagwe Districts. The table above showed, that only 30% regarded it as their main or secondary produce, and probably not more than 1/2 of all households grow it at all. Annual production is only about 1/5 of that of Karagwe (with about the same population) and less than 1/50 of that of Bukoba (population 4 1/2 times that of Ngara). Coffee did not spread in Ngara until the 1930ies and at least since the middle of the 1950ies the production has been more or less stagnant.

The following table shows the development of coffee production in the last 15 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production t</th>
<th>Total payment to growers '000 Shs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956/57</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957/58</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958/59</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959/60</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>1.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960/61</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961/62</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962/63</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963/64</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964/65</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965/66</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966/67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967/68</td>
<td>(260)</td>
<td>(800) (approx.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968/69</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969/70</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970/71</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>(700) (approx.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not only has the production been stagnant, but the prices, and thereby, the payments to growers, have been declining, even more so compared with the beginning of the fifties, when prices were higher than in any of the years shown in the table. Only the last two years have shown a (probably temporary) upward trend with regard to prices.

Apart from the fact, that coffee in Ngara has since its introduction almost always been grown in pure stands, the standard of coffee husbandry is very low, despite the efforts of the
government agricultural extension service. The Bugufi Coffee Cooperative Union has no extension service of its own, and it has stopped producing and distributing seedlings - leaving this to individual farmers and a few communal nurseries.

All coffee produced in Ngara is hard arabica, which is bought from the farmers in only two grades, grade 1 and grade 2, with grade 1 usually being 70% of a year's production. Some years ago experiments were conducted to examine the profitability of changing to mild coffee - the experiments seemed promising, but the whole thing was given up before anything could be said definitively. 10

Very little of the coffee is produced in Bushubi - less than 10 tons of a year's total production.

Several other export crops have been tried in Ngara District.

Tobacco has been grown for a long time in Bushubi, but from about 1935 it was pushed by the colonial administration as an export-crop.

The local administration encouraged farmers to grow it and a formal marketing organization was set up by the Nyamirembe Native Tobacco Board, which also served the neighbouring Biharamulo and Kibondo Districts. In 1956 NNTB bought 21 tons of fire cured tobacco from Bushubi for about 20,000 Shs, but even then it was estimated, that twice as much was sold on the local coil market, where the farmers got a much better price for their low-grade tobacco. The total value of the tobacco production was estimated at 100,000 Shs, much of it from export out of the District. In the years around 1960 only 1-2 tons a year were sold through the formal marketing channels, due to their bad organization, and the low prices - compared with the coil market - which were offered for the major low-grade part of the crop. In 1963 the board, now NTB made a last effort, and bought 25 tons at 38,000 Shs, but most of it was still unpaid when the organization broke down that same year, due to mismanagement and misuse of money. For two years ad hoc arrangements were made, but very little tobacco was brought, and since 1966 no formal marketing organization has existed.

It is impossible to say how much is now produced and sold on the coil market. The agricultural reports for 1965-69 estimate from 10 to 60 tons a year. If a guess that the Washubi earn about 100,000 Shs, a year from tobacco is not too wrong, then this crop is by far the most important export-crop in the Division. 11

In the mid 1960ies the administration put much effort into encouraging smallholders in Bushubi to plant sisal as a new export-crop. Some 350 ha were planted, but before they started producing, the sisal-market had broken down, and nothing was done to help the farmers process and market their sisal. Now only small amounts are produced and sold as rope in the local market. 12
The administration has in the later years also tried to develop wheat, white sorghum (not the traditionally grown red beer variety) and groundnuts as new export-crops, but as hardly any experimenting, planning and marketing considerations were made before farmers were told to start growing them, wheat and sorghum especially were almost complete failures and have now been given up. Groundnuts are mainly produced for local consumption, but may still become an export-crop in the area.

Most years, Ngara, and especially Bugufi Divisions has a surplus of the main food crops, bananas and beans, which are then exported, the bananas going to Mwanza and Shinyanga Regions, the beans to neighbouring Regions more or less legally to neighbouring countries. This export may bring something in the region of 100,000 Shs. a year into Ngara District. 14

D. The District economy.

The Ngara District economy in terms of the occupation of the people, is completely dominated by agriculture. In 1967 of a total 37,500 economically active persons 97% were engaged in agriculture. Of 1,500 employees 660 were employed in agriculture. 640 were employed in the service, clerical or professional sectors, more than half being teachers. Only about 200 people were engaged in processing, construction etc.

However, if we try to make a tentative account of flows of money and monetary incomes in the District, we get a very different picture. (It must be stressed, that this account does not pretend to be anything but a rough approximation, based as it is on weak statistics and "informed guesses").

According to section C, the flow of incomes into the District from export of agricultural products, coffee, tobacco and other crops, can be put at a total of about 1 million shillings a year.

Most of the employees in services etc. are employed by agencies outside the District, and taking into account that more than half are teachers with an annual income of 6,000 Shs. or more, this may be estimated to bring 2-2 1/2 million shillings a year into the District in wages etc.

A third external source of money coming into the District is that part of their salaries which seasonal labourers bring with them from Uganda. No exact data exists, either on the number of labourers coming home per year, or on the amount of money they bring with them. Compared with a sex ratio for Tanzania as a whole of 95, Ngara District has a male deficit of some 7,000, all in the productive ages. A majority of these have probably left for good. Results of our questionnaire survey show that in the sample village the grownup males have on average been away for seasonal employment in Uganda once every 10 years, or 10% of them every year. So with about 20,000 grownup males, to estimate the total annual temporary
migration to Uganda at around 2-2.500 doesn't seem too unreasonnable.

Interviews and discussions with the people who had been to Uganda several times, indicated that the normal thing would be to bring 1.200 Shs home on return. If all this is true, the annual flow of incomes from migrant labourers may be put at 3-400.000 Shs.

In our survey-sample about 25% of all household expenditures are used to buy local farm-products, which means, that a total of 3 1/2 million Shs. of incomes from external sources would generate about 1 1/4 million shillings incomes from farm-products locally marketed. The remaining 75% of the expenditures are mainly paid out of the district for imported manufactured goods, like clothes, building materials, utensils, oil, sugar etc. Part of it must be used to pay the 200 people employed in processing etc. Their incomes may be put at a total of 3-400.000 Shs.

A final account would thus show the following estimated annual incomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Income (Shs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sector: incomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from export</td>
<td>1.000.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; internal markets</td>
<td>1.250.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; seasonal labour</td>
<td>350.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.600.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services etc.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; salaries</td>
<td>2.250.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing etc.:</td>
<td>350.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.200.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With about 20.000 families in the District, this would mean an average/annual monetary income per family of 260 Shs.

As shown in section C not much development has taken place for many years with regard to export-incomes. The major economic growth in the district originates from the services etc. sector, where f. ex. the number of educational personnel has more than doubled since independence in 1961. As a result, trade in agricultural products in internal markets and processing etc. has probably also increased. Of course, improved services do not just cause increased incomes but are in themselves a source of increased welfare.

With 97% of the economically active population engaged in agriculture, and an average family-income of only 13- Shs. from farm-products, it is clear that by far the major part of the agricultural production never enters the monetary sector, but is consumed by the producers themselves. How big the actual production is, is impossible to estimate, but from observation it seems, that most families produce enough in normal years to cover their needs, for the basic foodstuffs, bananas and beans. The nutritional situation seems satisfactory. The main development trend in the non-monetary sector is the continued expan-
sion of the banana-shambas, and the consolidation of the relatively recent agricultural system centered around bananas with beans as the main supplementary crop.

Although most agricultural production is for home-consumption, the agricultural sector in Ngara District should not be regarded as essentially a subsistence economy. First of all, there is a whole range of goods, which are regarded as essential by any household, such as clothes and blankets, oil, salt and matches and some tools and utensils, which can only be obtained in the monetary sector. Secondly all aspirations with regard to improved material welfare are directed towards goods obtainable in the monetary sector, better clothes, shoes, furniture, tea, sugar, milk, beer and cigarettes and at a higher level bicycles and radios, corrugated iron roof or even a cement house. Important exceptions here are meat and pombe, which are produced by the consumers, but just as often bought for money. Thirdly most agricultural expansion and innovation is evaluated in terms of its monetary profitability, Labour-investments, the most common form of investments are often paid for with money, as salary to hired labour or dowry for a wife. Even the drive to expand the banana shambas, which is largely motivated by family and security reasons, does have a monetary element in it, as banana pombe is one of the most important sources of farm-income. Finally the use of social services, such as schools and hospitals (at least the more esteemed mission hospitals), usually involves payment of money by the individual.

From this I think it can be concluded that any development-planning for Ngara District, must take into account the very weak monetary sector, with very little self-enforcing growth, and the aspirations of the people, which are directed towards increased monetary incomes, and to a certain extent improved and cheaper social services.
II The village surveys.

For the village surveys in this study 631 interviews were made with heads of households in 26 selected villages in Bukoba, Karagwe and Ngara Districts.

In Ngara District 7 villages were selected. These villages were not chosen as a random sample of all villages in the District, but deliberately selected, to be - as far as was possible with limited information - representative of different parts of the District and its different types of villages, especially taking into account our interest in the new Ujamaa Villages.

It is believed, that the selected villages are fairly representative, with regard to the main subjects of the survey, demography, social and economic structures and agricultural system, but strictly speaking there is no proof that the results are valid for anything but the 7 mentioned villages.

In each village a sample of 25 heads of households was chosen for interviewing, but first randomly selecting 5 ten house-cells from a list of all cell-leaders in the village, and then randomly selecting 5 members of each of these cells.

In Bugufi Division 4 villages were selected.

Mukindidili/Murgwanza is one of the old villages in the densely populated area around Ngara town, where it is located on the northern slope almost at the beginning of the valley between the two main branches of the Bugufi ridge. It has about 250 households, or some 1300 inhabitants. There is hardly any un-cultivated land in the village. To the east, south and west the village borders on similar villages on either side of the slope from the ridgetop down to the Kagera River. The District hospital and an old primary school are situated in the village and the District center, Ngara town, with District Administration, police line and prison, post office, dukas and market, is only about 5 km away.

Mabawe, on one of the numerous side branches at the south-western part of the ridge, is also an old village in a densely populated area. There is a primary school, a completely new rural health center and some dukas. It is a very big village, and for the sample survey one of the sections, into which the people themselves divide it, was singled out. Even this section has more inhabitants than Mukindidili/Murgwanza.

Mukumba village is situated north of, and below, Mukindidili/Murgwanza in one of the valleys leading from the ridge to the Kagera river. This large area, between the ridge and the river was inhabited later than the ridge itself and the valley between the two branches, starting with the slopes nearest to the ridge, and gradually moving through the valleys out towards the Kagera. As Mukumba is right below the steep upper slope of the ridge it is not a completely new village and most of the inhabitants
were born there. However, the area is not so densely populated as up the ridge, and until recently it has been possible for new-comers to find uninhabited land there. The nearest services are all in Mukididili/Murgwanza about one hour's walk up the hill, or half an hour back down to Mukumba. Mukumba probably has about 1000 inhabitants.

The last village surveys in Bugufi Division is Ntobeye Ujamaa Village, which was started in 1968 as a new settlement in a large almost uninhabited area on a kind of peninsula formed by one of the bends of the Kagera river and one of its tributaries. There are now about 150 families in the new settlement, of which less than 10 lived there before 1968. The settlement was laid out as a block of 150 two-acre plots, one for each family to live on and cultivate individually. Around it there is plenty of uncultivated bushland, which is gradually giving way to communally cultivated fields. It is a rather special feature of Ntobeye Ujamaa Village that it does no longer consist only of the people in the new settlement. Between the new settlement and the Bugifi ridge there are a number of small villages, most of which have been fairly recently established by people moving into open new, but traditionally organized individual farms in the formerly empty bush. All these villages, comprising about 125 families, together known as Old Ntobeye, were in 1970 incorporated in the Ujamaa Village, which now covers the whole area between the ridge and the river.

From Ngara town there is a new 20 km road to the new settlement, but the walking distance is much shorter, taking about 2 hours uphill or one hour downhill. In the new settlement there is a primary school with three classes and a small dispensary.

In Bushubi Division 3 villages were studied. All 3 are situated in the main population belt along the Ruvubu River.

Mbuba village at the northern end of the belt covers the slopes on both sides of the small ridge on which the main road from Bushubi to Bugufi runs. It is 10 km from the main town of Bushubi, Rulenge, and the same distance from the Ruvubu river. Like most traditional villages in Bushubi it is rather small, with about 50 households and 250 people. Between Mbuba and the neighbouring villages there are rivers and swamps of inhabited bushland. Even within the village itself there is uncultivated land.

There is a small market, a primary school and a dispensary in Mbuba, but the nearest dukas are in Rulenge.

Mukibogeka is another traditional village, located in the western most part of Bushubi. It is about the same size as Mbuba, but doesn't have any services of its own. The nearest school, dispensary, dukas etc. are in the small trading centre Bukiriro 6-8 km east of Mukibogeka. This whole area between Bukiriro and the Burundi border is covered with small villages with stretches of bush between them.
To the east of Bukiriro the sparcely populated central part of Bushubi Division begins. On its edge, a couple of kilometres from Bukiriro is Nyabihanga Ujamaa Village, which was started in 1968 as a new settlement on two uninhabited hill-sides and the valley inbetween. It has the same lay out and organization as the new settlement in Ntobeye. It has about 70 households or 200 inhabitants.

Besides the interview surveys in these 7 villages, with formal questionnaires designed to be used in all survey-villages in the whole Region and administered by students from the University of Dar es Salaam, 3 of the villages, Mukididili/Murgwanza, Ntobeye Ujamaa Village and Mbuba, were subjected to further study. The author of this paper has lived in each of these villages for 1-2 months, conducting further informal interviews and discussions, measuring the farms and collecting data on the farming systems of individual farmers, participating in meetings and getting information on communal activities.

The following paragraphs are based on some of the results of the formal questionnaire survey (the processing of which is yet far from being completed) as well as on the more informal study of the 3 villages mentioned.
III "Traditional" villages in Ngara District.

A. The farming system.

Ever since the cooking banana became the staple food-crop in Ngara, agriculture in the District has been based on small, permanent, individually owned farms.

Usually the villages are located on hillsides which do not slope too steeply. On such a hillside, the whole area between the top and the swampy valley-bottom, are covered with small farms. Each farm is centered around a house or a cluster of houses, where the owner, his wife/wives, children, other family members and livestock live. Around the house is the banana shamba and on land outside but adjacent to the banana shamba are the annual crops. Sometimes a man may have annual crops all the way round his bananas, but sometimes a small group of banana shambas may be seen, each with its land for annual crops bordering on one side only. Some people have more than one farm of this kind, sometimes within the same villages but more often in different villages, and they usually have a wife and her children living on each farm. In the more densely populated village it is not unusual besides the regular farm or farms, to have some land for annual crops in a less densely populated area which is not too far away.

The average landholding, and the way it is used by the farmers in each of the five villages in our sample is remarkably similar. (See table 1) According to the farmers' estimates of their own farms, the average farmer in Bugufi has 2 1/2 ha land, 3/4 ha with bananas, 1/4 ha with coffee, 1 1/4 ha used for annual crops and 1/4 ha lying fallow during a certain year. The Bushubi farmers have an average of about 3 1/2 ha land, of which 1 ha is planted with bananas, hardly anything with coffee, 1 1/2 ha with annual crops, and 1 ha is lying fallow. The difference becomes rather insignificant when it is taken into account, that tobacco which replaces coffee as the cash crop in Bushubi, is included under other crops, and that in Bushubi, because of less rain and soil fertility, the same area of land yields somewhat less than in Bugufi, and must lie fallow more often.

There are no farmers who do not grow bananas, and except for a few old ones they are continuously expanding their banana shambas. Contrary to what is the case in Bukoba and Karagwe Districts, bananas are traditionally grown pure stand in Ngara, with only a few vegetables interplanted near the house, except for bananas planted in the last one or two years, which are often interplanted with beans and maize. Although it is difficult to see in an old banana shamba, the farmers claim that they have almost planted in rows. So two of the "extension-service messages", pure stands and rows, are not new to Ngara farmers. But others, like spacing, proper planting with manure, spraying etc. are very little needed to. There are three main varieties, the cooking banana, the beer banana and the sweet eating banana, the last being the least widely grown.
Coffee is grown by nearly 2/3 of the farmers in Bugufi, but only 1/7 in Bushubi. The coffee is usually grown pure stand on a small plot next to the banana shamba, but in a few cases it is found interplanted with the bananas, or on plots away from the farm, but near the roads which is a reminiscent of a time when colonial officials ordered it to be this way to ease their job of supervision. The coffee plots are small and generally badly maintained. The average plot for those who have coffee in Bugufi is 1/3 ha, and only 3 (or 4%) of the sample farmers had more than 2/3 ha. In 1970-71 only half of the coffee-growers stated that they had any income at all from their coffee, and they had a meagre average of 320 Shs. per ha.

Among the annual crops beans and sorghum (a red beer variety) are by far the most important, as they are not only grown by almost all farmers (table 7), but also take up the major part of the area used for annual crops. (See case studies). Other crops like maize, millet, cassava and sweet potatoes, peas and groundnuts are in any single year grown by a smaller number of farmers, and in a smaller part of their land as well. In any year there are two crop-seasons, corresponding with the rainy seasons in the autumn and the spring (if such terms may be excused). Certain rules are followed for the rotation between different crops on a given field over a number of seasons. In Bugufi the following sequence, or a variation of it, is quite common:

Autumn: beans - spring: sorghum - autumn: millet - spring: same millet, then peas - autumn: fallow - spring: beans - autumn: beans - etc. etc. In Bushubi its more usual to see sequences of beans in the autumn and sorghum in the spring for a number of years, then followed by some years fallow.

The rootcrops, cassava and sweet potatoes, which strictly speaking are not annual crops, seem mainly to be grown on less fertile plots, or on plots which need a "rest" from the normal rotation.

Tobacco is a special case among the annual crops. In Bugufi it is grown only on very small bits of land by a few farmers, whereas in Bushubi about half the farmers have tobacco, which is the main cash crop there.

The sample farmers were not questioned about their tobacco area as separated from annual crops, but of the farms measured in Mubua village, those who had tobacco, had between 0,13 ha and 0,4 ha. In this village most of the tobacco is not grown on the regular farms, but in a certain valley some 15 minutes walk from the village. 7 years ago this valley was cleared for very thick bush, and divided up in small individual plots by the people participating, from Mubua and a few neighbouring villages, who wanted to grow tobacco there. Although the tobacco is thus grown in one big block, it is the individual farmer who sows and maintains his own small nursery during the autumn-rain, plants out in, cares for and harvests from his plot during the spring-rain, and processes and sells his harvest.
The Bushubi tobacco is said to be of very low quality. In the 1950's when an organized marketing system was operating very little was done to improve the quality, because Ngara was a marginal area. The farmers did not have much incentive to improve either, as the prices offered by the marketing organization for the higher grades tobacco were not more than the farmers could get for low quality tobacco on the local coil market. Since the marketing organization collapsed, hardly anything has been done about the tobacco, which was even written off as an important cash crop in the last annual agricultural report.

All members of the household take part in agricultural work on the farm. Although it is not as marked as it seems to be in Bukoba and Karagwe, there is also in Ngara a certain division of labour between men and women. The main rule is that expansion of the farm, that is bush-clearing and all activities connected with planting of bananas, coffee and tobacco, are the responsibility of men while the growing of annual crops is the women's job. However, the men often take part in cultivation, weeding and harvesting of these crops, especially those men who do not have any job outside the farm. Only domestic work is strictly the domain of the women.

Neither are there any strict rules for how incomes from sales of crops should be divided, which is often a cause of discussion between men and women.

Many households (Bugufi 22%, Mbuba 15%, table 10) occasionally use hired labour for the harder farmwork like bush-clearing, cultivation and planting bananas. Most of these labourers come from Burundi to find temporary employment in Ngara. While working there, they live on the farm of a certain farmer, contributing some labour in return, but most of the time working for other farmers, who pay 1 sh for 5 hours work in the morning, or some foodstuffs for work in the afternoon. Some of the poor farmers in Ngara also earn a little money this way.

Livestock is kept by more than 2/3 of the sample farmers, as well in Bugufi as in Busubi, but in Bugufi only 9% have cattle, a few goats being the most usual, while in Bushubi, where grazing areas close to the villages are more plentiful, 34% have cattle (table 8). Cattle are kept for their milk, while goats are slaughtered. Cattle for slaughtering are imported from Kahama District.
B. The farm-family cycle.

Ideally the farm and the family follow each other closely in a well balanced cycle. When a young man becomes old enough to marry, his father will supply the dowry and land to establish a farm, including enough bananas to feed the son and his new wife. The main work done in the banana shamba is planting, so every year he will expand it, and as the family grows, they will also be able to increase the area grown with annual crops. After some years they may be producing a surplus, and he can then marry a second wife. If he has land enough she will be living and working on the same farm as the first wife, if not he can ask a relative or the authorities, formerly the chiefs now the Ward Development Committee, to be given uncultivated land in the same or a neighbouring village to establish a second farm. When the farm or farms have again been expanded to give a surplus, the time has come when he has to start supplying maturing sons with dowry and land. In spite of continued expansion-work, the farm will now be diminishing as is the family it has to feed, until in the end it is just enough for the old man, his wife(s) and the youngest son, who with his family stays on with the parents. He gradually takes over the farming, has to support the parents in their old age, and inherits the remaining farm when they die. This is of course an ideal, which in many cases is not fulfilled. In modern times two factors have especially contributed to the frequent non-fulfillment of the ideal.

For at least 20 years there have been population pressure in the densely populated areas around the Bugufi ridge, and in or between the villages there, hardly any unused cultivable land is left. Of the 23% of the sample farmers in "traditional" villages in Bugufi, who stated they were given a major part of their land by the administration (table 6), only one lives in Mukiddidili, and those in Sabawe all got the land before the second world war. Even in Mukumba, below or near the ridge, all who were given land by authorities came before or around 1950. With the population pressure the possibilities for expanding the farms have become limited.

At the same time the establishment of a cash economy and of certain goods, for which money is needed, as "necessities", means that it is no longer sufficient to produce for the consumption of the family only - a surplus for selling is necessary. Thus a new demand on any surplus production, is created competing with the wish to use it to expand one's own family or to support maturing sons.

As a result it is now normal, that only the youngest son, who takes over when the father dies, and perhaps the oldest son, inherit any significant amount of land in the home village. Other sons get nothing or only a new banana tree in the shamba, the rest of which will belong to their young brother. To establish a farm and a family these young men then have to move away from their village, to a usually isolated place in the bush between the ridge and the rivers, which is the only area where they can get land. There they have to start the hard work of clearing bush, cultivating virgin land and building
a house, without any initial support from an already established
shamba, with little access to social services etc., and with the
crops continuously threatened by attacks from wild animals,
such as wild pigs and monkeys. While the subsistence needs at this
stage in the family cycle are relatively small, some of the
major demands from the monetary sector fall in this establish-
ment-phase. In the first few years he usually has to pay in-
stallments on the dowry, which is nowadays a total of 300-1000
Shs. in money. Housebuilding and household gods cost money.
Soon school fees and other costs in connection with the children
are added.

To obtain the cash needed in this period, many go to Uganda for
6-8 months a time to find seasonal work on the cotton and
coffee farms there. With only the wife and children left behind
to look after the farm, much work has to be done when the man
returns just to get the farm back to where it was when he left,
and not much time is left for expansion. Even if he decided to
stay, and instead get some money from the smaller salary he can
earn as a farm-labourer in Ngara, it will retard the expansion
of his own farm. An example of such a village is old Ntobeye,
where although there are a few big farmers, the average farm,
and the areas under the different types of use, are smaller than
the averages in the three "traditional" villages in Bugufi.
(table 1).

The only alternative for the majority of young, uneducated men,
is to migrate for good. Many chose this alternative, perhaps
after some years as migrants, seasonal labourers, and settle
either as permanent labourers or get small farms of their own,
usually in Uganda, but sometimes also in Karagwe on the way
between Ngara and Uganda.

In Bushubi there is no problem of relative land-scarcity like
in Bugufi, but the interference of cash-economy into the tra-
ditional farm-family cycle is the same, and seasonal migration
to Uganda (and also to cotton-farms in Geita District) is
widespread, whereas permanent migration seems a little less
usual than from Bugufi.

The relatively high proportion of old farmers in Bugufi com-
 pared to Bushubi, among our sample farmers, may be explained
by this higher rate of permanent migration of young men to new
villages or out of the District. (table 2.).

C. The village economy.

The basis of the farming system and the ideal farm-family cycle
just described is that production on the farms is first and
foremost meant for home-consumption, and that it has to satisfy
the basic needs for adequate food for the families living and
working on the farms. There is hardly any specialisation, and
when occasional exchanges do take place within the villages it
is usually an incidental surplus which is sold and covers an
incidental need. It is impossible to give any estimates on total
or mean production in this sector. When asked, the sample farmers
gave so obviously unreliable answers about their harvests of
foodcrops, that no value can be attributed to them at all. However, from observation the basic food-situation appears to be relatively good, with shortages of bananas and beans for the daily diet being very unusual, and quite regular supplements of other foodcrops in most families.

But in spite of the importance of this "subsistence sector" it would be entirely wrong to describe the Ngara village economy as a subsistence economy - or even as mainly a subsistence economy.

First of all there is hardly a family, which is not already involved in the monetary sector, to obtain a variety of goods, which are now regarded as essential, and to earn the money necessary to buy them. Secondly nearly all expectations and hopes for the improvement of the material and social situation are directed towards the monetary sector and the goods, services and security and status obtainable only from money. Even basic social structures like marriage and beerdrinking have been monetarized. A normal dowry now includes a rather large sum of money and beerparties are no longer part of a network of mutual obligations between friends and relatives helping each other with farm-work etc., but it is a rather semi-public thing, where almost everybody can go to the home of a man who has brewed beer, and buy and drink beer for 50 cents a bottle.

So with regard to social and economic interactions between households in the villages the flows of money, incomes and expenditures become more and more important.

The information given by farmers on their cash incomes and expenditures over a year cannot possibly be very accurate, but they are the only data we have, and without taking the exact figures too seriously, they may still give us a certain picture of the situation, and with the assumption that the deviations are reasonably uniform, they may also allow comparisons to be made between groups and categories within the material.

For two of the sample villages though, the information was deemed to be so wild that they must be left out of consideration for this analysis, and as one is Mukibogeka, one of the two "traditional" villages in Bushubi Division, the following should be seen as mainly valid (roughly?) for Bugufi.

A first comparison of mean total expenditures with mean total incomes (tables 9 and 10 respectively) immediately gives an illustration of the unreliability of the figures. In "traditional" Bugufi villages the income is 200 Shs. pr. household pr. year, while the expenditures add up to 323 Shs. pr. household pr. year! In Mbuba the figures are 457 Shs. and 551 Shs.! Of these figures the expenditures are more likely to be true, but even if that cannot be taken for sure, the figures can certainly be taken as an indicator of the very low level of the cash sector in Ngara District.
The cash sector in Bugufi is characterized by the lack of a major cash crop. Of the 200 Shs. mean total income 82 Shs. comes from sources outside agriculture, that is mainly salaries for a small group of government employees. 9 Shs. comes from animal products, and only 109 Shs. from agricultural products. Even among the agricultural products the cash - or export-crop, coffee, accounts for only 22% of the incomes, while pombe, which are exclusively sold locally in the villages or to bars in the small towns, earns 53%. Bananas and other foodcrops, which are partly sold locally, partly exported to neighbouring Districts, covers 10% and 15% respectively of the mean income from agricultural products. So the two major sources of income, pombe and non-agricultural employment, are not items which have a limited demand, and cannot be the basis for future economic development.

Of the 323 Shs. mean total expenditures only 19 Shs. is for farm-expenditures or investments in the farm, and of this more than half is used for hiring labourers. The remaining 304 Shs. is used for domestic expenditures i.e. mainly for consumer goods. As much as 78% of this is payment outside the villages, primarily for manufactured goods like kerosene, matches, salt, sugar etc. and clothes, or for services such as school and hospital fees. Most of the 10% used to supplement the home produced basic foodcrops with animal products also goes to outside suppliers, in Bushubi or other Districts. The almost complete selfsufficiency in foodcrops is shown by the meagre 1% used to buy these, so the only product which causes money to flow within the local community is pombe, which is produced, sold and bought by almost everybody, and thus not a sign of a beginning specialization or division of labour within the villages.

In Mbuba our sample has much higher mean incomes and expenditures than in the Bugufi villages. This should not be taken as typical for Bushubi, as the minority of high income people are probably overrepresented, because Mbula is a small village, where services like school dispensary, church, market, catering for a whole group of villages, are concentrated. These high incomes mainly from agricultural products being only 86 Shs. compared with the 109 Shs. in Bugufi. Mbuba does have a cash-crop, tobacco, which is sold in a locally organized market in Bugufi and neighbouring Districts, and accounts for most of the 65% of the income from agricultural products ascribed to "Other crops". But the tobacco is not recognized by the government as something worth supporting and developing! The other major income-earner, cattle, is, but it is confined to 25% of the households, the rest having not inherited any and being unable to carry the initial cost of buying.

The expenditure side in Mbuba is also very much influenced by these two groups, the high-income-earners and the cattle-owners (which to a large extent overlap), especially with regard to the high farm expenditures, where hired labour is exclusively used by a few with high non-agricultural incomes and other farm expenditures are mainly for injections etc. for the cattle.
D. Socio-economic stratification and class-structure.

The above description of means (the average farmer) gives a certain idea of the types and levels of economic activities going on in the village. It does not, however, reveal the basic economic structures, which to a large extent determine the development trends in a society. In any society the organization of the means of production, the distribution of ownership and the sources and distribution of what is produced, are decisive for the future development of that society.

In Ngara District the main means of production is land, which can again be split up in three categories, banana shambas and coffee shambas, which are regarded as more valuable and are more valuable in terms of labour productivity when they are first established - then the third category, land cultivated with annual crops. Uncleared bushland is only a potential means of production. The distribution of land is far from equal, and to study this distribution and its consequences the sample farmers have been divided into three groups, small farmers, medium farmers and big farmers, according to their ownership of the three categories of land.

An analysis of the differences between these three groups, based on ownership of land, reveals a clear socio-economic stratification among the farmers in the traditional villages in Ngara.

In both Bugufi and Bushubi about 25% of the farmers may according to our criteria be regarded as relatively big farmers, in Bugufi the medium farmers are 30%, in Bushubi 15%, and the small farmers comprise 45% and 60% in Bugufi and Bushubi respectively. The smaller number of small farmers in Bugufi is due to the many landless or almost young men who have to move away from their old villages, which is also reflected in the small proportion, 18%, of young people among the small farmers in Bugufi compared with 41% in Bushubi (table 2).

In Bugufi the average big farmer has three times as much cultivated land as the small farmer, but he has been able to invest in, buy or inherit five times as much banana and coffee land. The Bushubi big farmer has 2 1/2 times as much cultivated land and almost four times as much with bananas and coffee as the small farmer. 90% of the big farmers in Bugufi grow coffee compared to only 33% of the small farmers, while in Bugufi the figures are 50% and none. (table 1)

The bigger farmers in both Bugufi and Bushubi generally grow a larger variety of annual crops than the smaller farmers. (table 7)

When acquiring their land just about the same proportion of the farmers in the three groups in Bugufi have inherited all or almost all their land. But 30% of the big farmers have been able to buy their land or expand their inherited farm by buying, compared to only 12% of the small farmers. With
the land allocated by the administration the figures are just the opposite. Bought land is of course better developed, better located or more fertile than the hitherto unused land distributed by the authorities. In Bushubi hardly anybody buys land, and the distribution of other means of acquiring land are difficult to analyse as the category, former nyarubanja, a now abolished traditional type of leasehold, may include as well unused bushland given to the present owner by the chiefs as well developed shambas inherited in the family through generations. (table 6)

The age distribution among heads of households (table 2) in Bugufi, shows the results of land scarcity in the old villages. The proportions of young and middle-aged people are relatively small, and as it is the would-be small farmers, who move away, young and middle-aged are underrepresented in this group compared with the total population, while they are overrepresented among medium farmers. Old people on the other hand are overrepresented among small farmers and underrepresented among medium, as many medium farmers turn smaller while fulfilling their obligations towards the end of their family cycle. Only few people start as big farmers while they are young, but the almost equal proportion of middle-aged and old among the big farmers may be taken as a sign, that those who have achieved the status of big farmer, have enough resources at their disposal to give sons a good start without reducing their own farms significantly.

The abundance of unused land around the villages in Bushubi renders the picture there different, with a large proportion of young small farmers, and a very small group of old people among the small farmers, which reflect the possibility here of helping sons to start on new land, without diminishing the fathers shamba significantly.

The smaller proportion of old people among sample farmers in Bushubi compared to Bugufi, is probably the cause of the slightly higher educational standard in the former Division. (table 3) And the concentration of young heads of households among small farmers there accounts for the high level achieved by this group. Apart from this category, the tendency is that the larger farmers also have more formal school-education.

The number of wives and the size of the family have several meanings in Ngara village society. It may be seen as an indicator of the labour resources readily available for the household, and as such the money for dowry and other expenses in connection with expansion of the family can be regarded as an investment. A large family is also regarded as a value in itself, increasing the welfare and social status of the head of household and the family as a whole. Again our sample shows that the bigger farmers more often than the smaller have been able to get two, three or more wives and to establish large families, thus obtaining the economic profit, social status and welfare accruing from these. (tables 4 and 5).
Besides land the only other important means of production in Ngara villages, is livestock. According to the information from the sample farmers the ownership of livestock is much related to the ownership of land. (table 6) 35% of the small Bugufi farmers have no livestock and none of them owns more than 10 units (= 1 cow or 10 goats or sheep). Almost as many medium farmers have no livestock, but 12% have more than 10 units, and among big farmers 30% have more than 10 units and only 18% have none at all. 24% of the big farmers own cows, and only 1 small and 1 medium farmer. Livestock is much more common in Bushubi, but still 37% of the small farmers have none. 22% small farmers, 38% medium and 75% big farmers own more than 10 livestock units. 19%, 25% and 75% have cows.

With regard to income and expenditure statistics we again have to confine ourselves mainly to Bugufi Division. (table 9 and 10). Here the mean annual income from sales of agricultural products is 55 Shs. for small farmers, 128 Shs. for medium and 190 Shs. for big farmers, and the proportions with less than 100 Shs. annual income in the three groups of households are 76%, 55% and 35% respectively. The sources of income are more varied for the big farmers, who get a smaller proportion from pombe and larger parts from coffee, bananas and other crops, than the small and medium farmers.

While the mean income from agricultural products for the big farmers is 3 1/2 times that of the small farmers, the differences in mean incomes from animal products and sources outside agriculture are much bigger. The small and medium farmers earn an average of 2 Shs. and 6 Shs. from animal products compared to the big farmers 26 Shs., and outside agriculture they obtain 10 Shs., 99 Shs., and 188 Shs. as their respective mean. Thus the small farmer gets more than 4/5 of his mean total income from sales of agricultural products, the medium farmer a little more than 1/2 and the big farmer somewhat less than 1/2 of his income.

Also in Mbuba the high mean incomes from sources other than agricultural products, comprising almost 60% of the mean total income for all farmers, derive mainly from a few bigger farmers having very high incomes of this kind.

On the expenditure side in Bugufi, the mean total expenditure of the big farmers is more than four times that of the small farmers. The proportions used for different categories of expenses are about the same, but about half of the big farmers use hired labour. In Mbuba none of the small and medium farmers use hired labour, the high expenditures on this all being incurred by that half of the big farmers who do.

All these statistics clearly reveal the existence of a social stratification in "traditional" villages in Ngara District, where those who own more of the means of production, land and cattle, are also generally better off with regard to all other indicators of social and material welfare. However, that should not be taken as a proof of the existence of a class-structure along the same lines, based on ownership of land and cattle! The presence of a statistical social stratification
in a society does not necessarily mean, that the people in the different strata have opposing interests - neither subjectively nor objectively.

The class-structure, which influences the development of a society, is based on definite, qualitative differences between the classes with regard to the system of ownership of the means of production, utilization of labour and the distribution of the produce between labour and means of production. In the agricultural sector in Ngara District such a system of qualitative differences cannot really be said to exist between what we have called small and big farmers.

Although there are, as described, differences in the amount of land owned, the system is based on every household owning land, and mainly depending on their own labour to produce on the farm, what they need to cover their own food consumption and a small surplus to sell for cash. There is no landless class, just as there is no real class of landlords basing their agricultural enterprises on the profits of combining landholdings and other means of production with hired labour.

The small group of agricultural labourers who do exist in Ngara, are usually not living there, but come temporarily from Burundi, and for those who hire them, even among the big farmers, they are normally only a small supplement to the dominant household labourforce.

Above, the figures in the tables were interpreted to show that for all social and economic indicators there are a larger proportion of big farmers than of medium and small farmers, who are significantly above the mean values for those indicators, but the tables may also be read the other way around, to show, that even among the big farmers there is still a majority who are not significantly better off than the majority of small and medium farmers. For example in Bugufi, 63% of the big farmers have no formal education, 65% have only one wife, 70% own 10 or less livestock units, 82% have incomes of less than 500 Shs. a year and almost half of less than 200 Shs. Almost half of the big farmers do not use hired labour, and those who do, use an average of less than 40 Shs. a year on this, meaning about one man-month of hired labour each. There are also major differences between the majorities in the groups of farmers with regard to land-use pattern and agricultural methods, and as a result the average income from agricultural products is less than 200 Shs. a year even among the big farmers.

This analysis then would tend to show the mass of Ngara villagers as a not completely equal, but with regard to major socio-economic features a rather homogenous group of smallholder farmers.

In the case-studies of villagers in Mukididili/Murgwanza and Mbuba there are however a few individuals who do not fit into this picture of the smallholder farmer. (They are too few to be treated statistically in a sample-survey, but do influence it considerably when they happen to be included, as seen in the
figures for Mbuba). These are people with substantially higher incomes and expenditures than the ordinary farmers, and who derive these high incomes from activities outside the agricultural sector, that is mainly from the government or the business sectors. They include the Ward Executive Officer, the teacher, the duka-owner, who is also an official in the cooperative, and the cattletrader, who is a former government, now Tanu official. With annual cash incomes of say 5000 Shs, or above their economic situation and behaviour is qualitatively different from that of other villagers, and although they live in the village and are part of its social structure, they have a main part of their engagements and connections in the much wider sphere outside and above the village community.

In the villages where they live, they have farms like everybody else. They are often among the bigger landowners in the village, and they do use more hired labour than is generally the case, but it is more important to note, that as a rule they do not seem to differ qualitatively from other farmers with regard to their land-use and agricultural techniques, capital or labour-inputs, labour organization and the outputs obtained from the farm. This has two major implications.

First, that the difference between this small group and the mass of farmers, is not a sign of a class-structure embedded in the agriculture dominated economic structure of the villages themselves. The few relatively rich people derive their positions from outside agriculture, and should probably be seen rather as the grassroots-representatives, or the last fringes, of an essentially urban based class of industrialists, businessmen and the "salaried". So the antagonism would seem to be one, not between small farmers or landless workers and big farmers, or "kulaks", or landlords, but between the smallholder farmers on one side, and major parts of the bureaucratic, industrial and business-sectors on the other. A further study of the structures and mechanisms characterizing this antagonism would involve the total Tanzanian economy and in the final analysis the whole international economy, and however important such an analysis is, it is quite outside the scope of this paper.

The second major implication, with more directly observable effects, is that people in Ngara (for whom this high-income-group is the ideal - and often their leaders) have not experienced, and therefore do not regard, agriculture as a possible means for any considerable social and economic advancement - or development. To get an income the farmers look for employment outside agriculture or outside the District, and those who have an income use it for consumer goods, or invest it outside agriculture in business or in education for their children. The few who do invest part of their high incomes from non-agricultural sources in their farms do it primarily to increase quantitatively its capacity for fulfilling its "traditional" role as supplier of basic food-stuffs and security for the family, not in order to change it quantitatively to become a basis for "selfsustained growth" or further improvement.
IV Ujamaa Development in Ngara District.

A. The New Settlements.

In 1968 a new factor was introduced in the development of Ngara District, with the establishment of the first Ujamaa Villages. This was of course part of a nation-wide drive - the philosophy and forces behind which should not be discussed here. But in its practical implementation, the Ujamaa policy was necessarily adopted to local conditions, in Ngara District like everywhere else, and this seems to have happened in an almost haphazard way, without being based on any analysis combining the general aims of Ujamaa with the specific socio-economic situation existing in Ngara.

Actually during the whole first year - 1968 - of the move to implement the new policy in West Lake Region, there was no element of Ujamaa, and the villages were not called Ujamaa Villages, but "Makazi Mapya" or New Settlements, what they were also limited to be at that time.

In Ngara District "Makazi Mapya" was not a new thing, as there has been, as well in the 1950s as in the early '60s government attempts to accelerate the existing move from overpopulated villages to the unused bushareas, by promoting and supporting more organized New Settlements. But these attempts had soon been given up as unsuccessful, probably mainly because the administration lost interest too quickly, and the new settlements took almost the same shape as any other recently but spontaneously established village. But in the new try, since 1968, government interest has been consistent and intensive, and with the introduction of Ujamaa, collective activities, these villages are becoming increasingly different from the spontaneous, individually organized new villages.

The original initiative came from the very top in West Lake Region, that is from the Regional Commissioner. The aim was to follow the Arusha Declaration by making people self-reliant. The whole exercise was government organized, especially officers of the Ministry of Agriculture were deeply involved.

Several uninhabited areas were surveyed and in those chosen the new settlements were laid out and individual plots for the new inhabitants were demarcated. In Ngara the initial allocation was two acres (0.8 ha) for each family, while in the rest of the Region it was only one acre. But everywhere the plan was, that after having built a house on their first plot and having cultivated the land around it, each family would be given more land in the area around this new village.

In Ngara District four such New Settlements were started in 1968, and a fifth followed in 1969. Three, Ntobeye, Ruganzo and Katerere, are in Bugufi Division, two, Nyamahwa and Nyabihanga, in Bushubi. They are all located on the edges of, and not too far from, the more densely populated areas of the two Divisions. There, meetings were held during the summer of 1968,
in many places the farms were measured by government officials, and people with little or no land were strongly persuaded to move to the new settlements. During the first year there was a busy traffic in and out of them, but by the end of 1969 the situation seems to have been stabilized. By then there were about 300 families or 500 adults living in the four villages.

In 1970 four more villages, three in Bugufi and one in Bushubi, were started along the same lines, except that these were more locally initiated by War Executive Officers and local Tanu leaders. So three years after the start there were in the spring of 1971 about 800 families with 1340 adults in the nine newly settled Ujamaa Villages. (table 11).

B. The people and the individual sector.

In Ngara District most of the settlers came from "traditional" villages relatively near the new settlement. Many were from the same villages and thus had already established social ties with friends and relatives in their new villages. This means that social relations in the new settlements did not have to be built up from nothing, but also that there exists a certain competition of loyalties between the new village community on one side and the different groups and the villages from which they originated on the other. It is not unusual for instance, to find Ntobeye Ujamaa Village almost empty over the week-ends, as the people have returned to their old villages to take part in social life there. In Ntobeye there is no dominating group, and there are also close relations among the respective "traditional" villages, which are all centered around Ngara town, so it doesn't seem to have damaged the emerging social cohesion in the new community. But in at least one other village, where major parts of the people came from two different parts of Bugufi, the village split up in two fighting factions, and finally one of them had to leave, to make the village function at all. (table 11, Ruganzo).

Contributary to the people retaining their ties with their villages of origin is the fact, that most of them had, and still have, land in those villages. Among the sample farmers in the new settlements 70% in Ntobeye and 63% in Nyabihanga have land in their old villages. (table 1). The farms are generally small though, but in this connection there is a marked difference between the settlers in Bugufi and Bushubi.

In Ntobeye the mean size of the settlers' farms in their old villages were stated to be 1,4 ha, or exactly the same as for the small farmers' category in those villages, but those who have moved to Ntobeye have a larger part with bananas and coffee and a smaller part for annual crops than those who have not moved. The age distributions show, that those small farmers who remained in the "traditional" villages only, are largely older people in the later phase of their farm-family cycle, whereas those who moved are younger farmers, expanding their banana shambas so they come in need of - in the first hand - additional land for annual crops. And with the start of the New Settlements they saw the opportunity to get this extra
land in a relatively convenient way. (In discussions a typical reason given for moving was the need for land to grow annual crops.)

This fits well into the normal pattern in Bugufi. The young men with no, or almost no, land leave the old villages completely, to migrate to Uganda, or to open new farms in the bush. But younger people, who have got some, but not much land, start expanding their banana shamba, and after some time they have to look for more land for their annual crops. Usually they will not want to leave their old village, so if at all possible they just start some fields for annual crops on unused land not too far away from the old village, and if they later expand it to a full scale farm, they will normally get a second wife to live there, and live both places themselves. Sometimes, when the old farm is very small, they may give up growing anything but bananas there, and then move completely to the new farm. At least most of the second generation give up the old village and become permanent residents in the new village.

In Ntobeye many people still have their wives and children on their old farms, resulting in the much larger number of males than females there, although only 8% of the sample farmers are unmarried. And 29% have more than one wife, compared to 17% in Bugufi "traditional" villages. (Tables 11 and 4).

As mentioned the mean hectarage for those who have land in the old villages is about the same as for Small farmers there. The mean total landholding of the sample farmers in Ntobeye New Settlement (including the 30% with no land outside) is now closer to that of the Medium farmers in "traditional" villages, and the 70% with land outside are all in the categories Medium, or Big farmers in Ntobeye, with mean farm sizes about as big as the corresponding categories in "traditional" villages, (Table 1). So these rather young, former Small farmers, have with the expansion in Ntobeye become Medium or Big farmers.

The ownership by the Ujamaa Villagers of farms in the old villages, and the incorporation in the Ujamaa Village of some neighbouring, recently established, but traditionally organized, villages has meant, that the stratification with regard to farm-size is the same in the Ujamaa Village as in the "traditional" villages. Small, Medium and Big farmers respectively have just about the same mean hectarages in both places. (Table 1).

In the New Settlement 70% are in the categories Medium and Big farmers, while in Old Ntobeye (the incorporated villages) they are only 40% and Small farmers 60%. None of the Small farmers have land outside the village, and most of these live in Old Ntobeye, where they have started farms from scratch in the bush. The biggest farmers also live in Old Ntobeye, having inherited fully-developed farms, or established them while being supported by a farm somewhere else.
In Nyabihanga Ujamaa Village in Bushubi all the members live in the New Settlement. Slightly fewer people than in Ntobeye New Settlement have land outside the village, but the main difference is, that even those who do, have considerably less than the Small farmers in "traditional" Bushubi villages, especially with regard to land with annual crops and uncultivated land. (table 1). The age-distribution, and the distribution with regard to number of wives are the same for Small farmers in "traditional" villages, with a large majority of young and middle aged farmers with only one wife. (tables 2 and 4). There is not the same concentration of young farmers as was found in Ntobeye. In Nyabihanga the mean family size is smaller than that of Small farmers in "traditional" villages, while in Ntobeye it is like that of the Medium farmers. (table 5) and the educational level is lower in Nyabihanga, but higher in Ntobeye than in their respective "traditional" villages. (table 3).

In the Bushubi agricultural system land scarcity is not a problem, as the villages are surrounded with unused land of much the same quality as the already cultivated land. So young farmers in their establishment phase may always find land on the outskirts of their village, and do not have to look elsewhere for land expansion. This is why there are many in this category among Small farmers in "traditional" villages in Bushubi. And probably for the same reason - it seems that in Bushubi only the Small farmers with the very least prospects for the future have moved to Ujamaa Villages. For them the move is then more definitive. They have their wives with them (table 11, Nyabihanga), and for those who have any land outside, the small mean area of annual crops and uncultivated land, is caused by many of them giving up everything in their old village except the banana shamba.

When asked why they moved to Nyabihanga only 17% answered that they wanted to get land, while 72% has a more vague and ambiguous idea of following government policies. In Bushubi "traditional" villages 36% were more straightforward with the answer that people moved to get government help, while 42% said they did it in order to get land. (In Bugufi the answer to get land was given by 100% and 73% in Ntobeye and the "traditional" villages respectively.)

There are still differences with regard to landownership in Nyabihanga, especially between those with land outside the village and those without, but even the Big farmers in Nyabihanga have only just the same area with bananas as Medium farmers in "traditional" villages and less other land than even the Small farmers there.

In the New Settlements each family was given a private plot of about 0,8 ha. where they were supposed to build their house, and satisfy the family's subsistence needs by planting half with bananas and growing annual crops on the other half.
According to the study of Ntobeye, the settlers usually started to cultivate their plots for half to one year before they (more or less under pressure) began to live there, and as mentioned quite often only the man has come to live in a rather provisional hut, while the rest of the family is still in the old village.

The settlers had to get banana stumps and seeds for planting from their old villages, and for those without land there, this was often a problem. Later some maize, groundnut, and bean seeds have been distributed from the communal harvests, and the government has organized collections of banana stumps in the "traditional" villages (resulting in many low quality and immature stumps).

Although almost all sample farmers told they have 0.4 ha with bananas and 0.4 ha with annual crops in the new settlement, the case studies from Ntobeye show the more realistic picture, that many farmers have far from finished their banana planting, and neither have they as yet cleared and cultivated their whole plot. When the Agricultural Field Officer and some assistants in February 1971 made a rough foot-measurement, 118 farmers in the Ntobeye New Settlement had an average 0.15 ha under bananas and 0.4 ha planted with annual crops, showing that especially the banana planting is lagging behind.

Most farmers in Ntobeye now state that their individual plot gives them sufficient annual crops, whereas the few bananas they do have are hardly yielding anything yet. (Poor quality stumps take a longer time before they start yielding, and then still give smaller bunches). Those who have shambas in the old villages get their supply of cooking bananas and pombe from there. Others have to go and work for other farmers for bananas or money to buy for. Some even go to Uganda to earn the money.

In the first years the government supplied the settlers with some foodstuffs, mainly maize flour, but it was far from enough to cover the need, and it has now been stopped completely, as the villages are supposed to be self reliant. The government also provided the settlers with hoes and other hand implements, which are used as well on the individual plots as in the communal fields.

The most important government input into the individual sector is the supervision and advice of the Agricultural Field Officer stationed in the Ujamaa Village. Especially in the first years, before the communal fields took all his time, much effort was put into the promotion of more modern methods on the individual plots. But with limited resources, the main effects are that all bananas are planted in rows with proper spacing, and that on some plots also other crops are planted in rows and pure stand. It is worth noting, that planting bananas in rows with spacing has also spread to Old Ntobeye, and to some of the settlers' farms in their old villages.
In Nyabihanga the variety of crops grown on the individual plots are bigger than in the Bushubi "traditional" villages (table 7), whereas it seems that the opposite is the case for Ntobeye. However the figures are there influenced by a very small variation in Old Ntobeye. The abovementioned measurements made by the AFO showed, that in Ntobeye New Settlement a larger proportion of the farmers than in the "traditional" villages grow crops like maize and groundnuts.

Not in any of the Ngara Ujamaa Villages had the members by June 1971 got any income from the communal sector, and as the individual plots could hardly cover their need for food, a main complaint from the Ujamaa Villagers is always the lack of money to buy even the most necessary things like clothes, salt, matches and lamp-oil. Our sample farmers in Ntobeye gave a mean income of 40 Shs. for the year 1970/71 and mean expenditures of 107 Shs., both figures smaller than the corresponding ones even for Small farmers in the "traditional" villages, and although the interviewer had the impression that these figures are too low, because some people tended to "forget" their old farms, they do support the otherwise established impression, that money is so far very scarce among the Ujamaa Villagers. (tables 9 and 10).

It is interesting to note, however that in Ntobeye Ujamaa Village there are some farmers who employ hired labour.

C The communal sector.

1. Change from New Settlements to Ujamaa Villages.

During 1969 the development of New Settlements in West Lake Region was given a new direction with the introduction of communal production, and the name for the villages was changed accordingly, from "Makazi Mapya" (New Settlement) to "Kijiji cha Ujamaa" (Ujamaa Village). The idea of adding more land to the individual holdings, when the originally allocated plots were fully cultivated, was shelved and the emphasis shifted to opening and expanding communal fields, to be owned and worked collectively "for the benefit of all".

In Ngara a few small plots were started in the spring of 1969, but the new move did not gain full momentum until the autumn of that year. Since then all government and Tanu efforts have been put into encouragement of the communal spirit and work in the Ujamaa Villages. Government support like seeds and insecticides, tractors, draught oxen and implements, storage facilities and help with crop marketing have all been directed at boosting the communal sector. Schools, Tanu Youth League and others have volunteered to help the Ujamaa Villagers in their Ujamaa fields. The agricultural extension personal stationed in the Ujamaa Villages have been occupied full time with the management of the communal work.
The emphasis was put squarely on developing communal agriculture - and the results of the efforts in the first two years, 69/70 and 70/71, are shown in table 11. During the first year the five "old" Ujamaa Villages, with about 300 families, cleared, cultivated and planted a total of 88 ha of communal fields about a quarter with the crops beans, maize and sorghum, the rest with different other crops. The total harvests were stated to be 67 bags of beans, 175 bags of maize and 5 (five) bags of sorghum. The second year the same five villages, now with about 500 families, had 140 ha under crops, of which nearly 2/3 was maize and 1/3 was beans. No exact figures on the harvests have been available, but one report estimates a total of 80 bags of beans and 1,200 bags of maize. The last figure though seems vastly overestimated, as Ntobeye alone had 2/3 of the maize area and the harvest there is known to have been 350 bags only, so the proper figure is probably not more than around 500 bags.

The average yields per hectare have thus so far been something like 2 1/2 bags of beans or 6 1/2 bags of maize, which is rather low taking into consideration the improved seeds, insecticides and full time expert supervision and direction provided by the government. It is also surprising, that from the first to the second year the total area under crops was increased only proportionally with the increase in the number of families, although in the first year all work was done by hand, whereas tractors did most of the cultivation in the second year.

Most of the communal harvests have been used for seeds in succeeding seasons, or distributed in small portions among the villagers, as only Ntobeye has had an amount of Maize that was considered worth selling.

2. Ujamaa Village development Plans.

In the first half of 1970 West Lake Region was visited by a highpowered Economic Planning Team for West Lake Region Ujamaa Villages, consisting of an MP, a Regional Agricultural Officer, a Regional Economic Secretary, a Cooperative Officer, a Land Officer and a Water Engineer, all from different Regions. After visiting all Ujamaa Villages they made an economic Four Year Plan 1970/71 - 1973/74 for each village, which was then approved by the District and Regional Development Committees.

The recommendations and forecasts in the plans have not all been fulfilled, but they are still referred to as the aims for the development of the Villages, and therefore they have also influenced later short term plans, unfortunately in their own unrealistic direction.

To analyse more in depth the plans and the realities of the communal sector in Ngara Villages, one village will here be taken as an example.
Ntobeye Ujamaa Village, is the biggest and most developed Ujamaa Village in the District. In 1970 it was selected as the "best" in the whole Region. As such it is not entirely representative of the Ujamaa Villages in the District, but it may be a proper choice for a discussion of the potential for communal production in these villages.

The Four Year Plan for Ntobeye is an impressive document. 46 pages with detailed plans, year for year (and sometimes month for month), on acreages and crops, labour and capital inputs, costs and incomes of every single undertaking and the sources of the money to be invested.

The main points of the plan are as follows:

Each of the four years the village will communally cultivate 210-230 ha of food crops, that is 10 ha of bananas, 60-70 ha maize, 60-70 ha beans, 60 ha sorghum, 10 ha cassava and 10 ha sweet potatoes. Each year they will grow a further 220-230 ha of cash crops, divided into 10 ha bananas, 60 ha beans, 30-40 ha groundnuts and 60 ha simsim. 4 ha will be planted each year with vegetables and fruit trees, 4 ha with trees for wood and 24 ha of fodder grass.

From 1970/71 and onward the village should communally own 30 dairy cows, 300 head of beef cattle and 320 goats. They should also keep bees and have a fish pond.

In order to achieve all this the village must have two tractors with implements, 20 ox teams with implements (a total of 80 draught oxen), a cattle dip, a store, four groundnut shellers, four maize threshers and a grinder. It is necessary that the bush is cleared with bulldozer. The village should have a piped water supply.

The total investments would be 1,289,000 Shs., for which 823,000 Shs. in the first plan year. The total surplus is estimated at 83,000 Shs. in 1970/71, growing to 450,000 Shs. in 1973/74.

January 1971 the District Rural Development Officer, The Village Agricultural Field Officer and a village committee drew up a new short term plan for the first seven months of that year. They now aimed at a total of 234 ha of communal fields in 1970/71, comprizing 60 ha cassava, 10 ha sweet potatoes, 60 ha beans and 6 ha trees, fruits and vegetables. This should be accomplished with the one tractor and two ox teams already in the village.
3. Actual Size of Communal Fields.

The realities in Ntobeye look somewhat different than the plans.

The first year with communal production in Ntobeye was 1969/70, which the planners could have taken as their point of departure.

Already in the Spring 1969 a small 1 1/2 ha plot had been planted with sweet potatoes, but it was later destroyed by flooding. July to December the villagers cleared and hoe cultivated some 20 ha of former bush land. During the autumn season 1 ha was planted with coffee, 1 1/2 ha with cassava and 2 ha with beans. In the second season of that year 12 ha were planted with maize, 3 ha with beans, 1 1/2 ha with groundnuts, 1 ha with sorghum and 1/2 ha with bananas.

The second year, that is the first plan year 1970/71, ended with about 55 ha under cultivation, although some more had been cleared. In the first season of the year only 2 ha beans and 1 ha trees, fruits and vegetables were planted, while in the second season they had 40 ha maize, 4 ha beans, 4 ha groundnuts, and another 1/2 ha bananas was added to last years 1/2 ha.

4. Labour input.

While in the first year all work was done with hand implements, in the second year cultivation was done by tractor or draught oxen, which on the other hand meant that much more manpower had to be invested in the clearing of the land, as the ploughs can only work on fields where all treestumps and roots have been removed.

The following table shows the labour inputs over the whole year 1970/71, according to the Agricultural Field Officers daily work records:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Labour Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush clearing and uprooting</td>
<td>2930 man days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor cultivation</td>
<td>250 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ox cultivation</td>
<td>600 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand cultivation</td>
<td>100 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3900 man days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Plant maize</td>
<td>1450 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed maize</td>
<td>850 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvest maize</td>
<td>1100 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process maize</td>
<td>350 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3750 man days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans, plant, weed, harvest, process</td>
<td>700 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts, plant, process</td>
<td>250 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannaas, trees, fruits, vegetables</td>
<td>500 &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total agriculture</td>
<td>9100 man days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hunting (to protect crops)  1950 man days
Fencing  1400 "
Building, school, store, fishpond, etc.  1650 man days
Road repairs  1150 "
Charcoal burning  100 "
Total labour input Sept. - Aug. 1970/71  15,350 man days

About 15 ha were ox cultivated, but because of bad timing of cultivation and planting some of it had to be done again by tractor, so the tractor cultivated a total of about 50 ha. Only about 1 ha was cultivated by hand. The processing mentioned is mainly that of the proceeding years smaller harvest.

Visitors for instance government or Tanu officials, often take part in the communal work, but the only input of this kind with any economic significance, was 200 schoolchildren and their teachers, who stayed in Ntobeye during Youth Week to help weed the maize fields.

Communal work takes place four days every week, Tuesday to Friday, since November 1970. Before that it was only three days a week. On these work days one person from each household, the man, unless there are special circumstances in the family, is supposed to meet at 7.30 in the morning and work until 12 o'clock at noon, that is 4 1/2 hours, which with the time used for the roll call, going to and from the work and resting gives less than 3 1/2 hours real work per man day.

Even then the figures show that the rate of attendance is very low. With 276 families, but some exempted from work duty for different reasons, the potential workforce should be around 250 per workday. In 1970/71 the number of workdays were about 180, so the total potential number of man days for the year were 45,000 of which only 1/3 were actually realized.

Observation and information received in the village indicated, that this absenteeism was not evenly spread on all members, but that especially the people in Old Ntobeye, who among other things have a long way to walk, would often stay away from the communal work. Generally, the most consistent workers seemed to be those new settlers who have no land outside the village - unless when they are away to earn money as hired labourers.

It is interesting to note, that about half the total actual labour input were in investments with rather long term effects for production and services, that is in bush clearing, tree planting, fencing, building and road repairs.
5 Communal harvests and incomes.

The harvests from the communal fields are not very impressive either. The first years 150 bags of maize, 47 bags of beans, 6 1/2 bags of groundnuts and 2 bags of sorghum were harvested. The second year gave 350 bags of maize and 28 bags of beans. This means average yields of 9-10 bags, 12-13 bags of maize and 4 bags groundnuts per ha in the first year, and 5 bags beans and 9 bags maize in the second year. The coffee, cassave, and sorghum in the first year, and groundnuts and vegetables in the second, were all complete or almost complete failures, mainly because of late planting.

Parts of the maize and beans harvests and most of the groundnuts were distributed among the villagers or kept as seeds for the communal fields. The rest of the beans were sold to a few villagers and to local traders. Although the maize harvests were pretty small seen in relation to the area or the number of families in the village, the total was still big enough to warrant organization of its marketing. Unfortunately this was not done until more than a year after the first harvest, when the Regional Cooperative Officer managed to sell what damaging insects had left.

Up to now Ntobeye has, from the communal fields, realized about 5000 Shs, incomes from the first years crops, and should get about 15,000 Shs. for the 1970/71 harvest. No money has so far been paid to the farmers, as the 5000 Shs. were deemed too little to divide, and no proper work records existed to direct the distribution anyway.

The only non-agricultural communal production in the village so far is the charcoal burning, and even this is not a very big industry as the whole production in the first year was sold for about 200 Shs.

6. Positive experiences of the first two years of communal production.

Altogether these results do not seem very encouraging, compared with the targets in the plans, the massive government support and encouragement, or the number of households in the village.

However, a few consoling points should be noted.

If the government effort is looked upon partly as normal government services for the citizens, schools, dispensaries and agricultural extension service - and partly as an initial free grant for a development project, the 15,000 Shs. income in 1970/71 should not be seen by the villagers as too bad a result of their labour. Even including that half of the labour input which was essentially used for investments and services, the direct cash income is just about 1 Shs. per man day, which is the same as any of them could have earned as hired agricultural labourer in Ngara, and besides this they may expect further benefits from the services and investments.
The labour input is still organized much as it is in the individual, "traditional" agriculture, with all the members performing all the major agricultural activities with their hands, hoes, pangas and axes, the only difference being that on the communal field they all do it in one big field, instead of each doing it on his own small plot. But there are small signs of a beginning specialization and division of labour. The people to assist in ox ploughing are always selected from a limited group of members, who are thus gaining an increasing expertise in this operation. The government employed tractor driver has two assistants chosen among the villagers, who have gradually learned how to drive the tractor and acquired some basic knowledge on its maintenance. The charcoal burning and the vegetable garden are handled by two specific groups of villagers, and the leader of the vegetable group have attended a short government organized course. This is of course only a feeble beginning, but it does show a potential in the communal organization for combining large scale mass activities with smaller groups performing specific tasks.

In the plans hardly any new thinking appears with regard to which crops to grow, and the overall agricultural system. The planned crops are spread evenly over the whole traditional spectrum and for food as well as for cash. Seasons and timetables are the same as on the individual farms. However, in the realities of Ntobeye this has been altered completely - probably unconsciously - so the communal sector becomes qualitatively different from and complementary to the individual sector.

While the individual farms are primarily supposed to provide the families with their basic foodstuffs and perhaps an occasional surplus to sell, the communal sector is now regarded almost exclusively as a cash sector and is expected to bring increasing monetary incomes.

In the traditional system maize is only grown on a small scale and only to be harvested and eaten in the family as green maize. There are no maize mills or market for dry maize for flour in Ngara, so for the smallholders there is not much prospect in producing dry maize.

In Ntobeyes Four Year Plan maize was also only stipulated as a food crop. However in the two first years of communal production the only major cash crop has been dry maize, and even more so in the second year than in the first. Not only does maize in itself seem very suitable for large scale production at a rather low technical and managerial level. But it also fits well into the existing agricultural system in Ngara. The cultivation of the maize fields does fall in the same period as all the cultivation and planting work on the private fields for the first rainy season in October and November, but in Ntobeye it is now done by tractor or ox plough with little labour needed.

The first major labour input on the communal maize fields take place in December-January, when the maize has to be planted. This is just between the two labour-demanding cultivation and planting seasons on the private fields. Although some weeding
work has to be done from February to April, the second and last labour peak in the maize is not until the harvest in the dry months of July and August, which is after the harvest of the individually grown crops.

The West Lake Region imports maize, so with a large enough production in Ngara Ujamaa Villages to warrant its organized marketing, the market should be there.

Finally the communal organization also seems to lead to a more efficient use of the knowledge about modern agriculture represented by the AFU, the size of the enterprise allows a fairly reasonable utilization of the government investments in the tractor, oxen, maize threshers etc. Pure stand planting, proper spacing and fertilizer application is carried out on large areas. Experimenting with vegetables, Irish potatoes and yellow sorghum can be carried out on a reasonable scale, and still be so small compared to the total enterprise, that failures are in no way fatal.

7. Planning and participation - the problem of further development.

Two main problems stand out as stumping blocks for any further development of the communal sector. One is the complete lack of planning, even of the agricultural activities in a single season. The other is the very low participation in the communal work by the Ujamaa villagers.

Both the Four Year Plan and the One Year Plan for Ntobeye Ujamaa Village were, as has been amply demonstrated, utterly unrealistic and completely out of touch with any possible development in the village. This surely must have been realised also by everybody participating in the planning and everybody, who was at all involved in the Ujamaa Village policy in the Region. It seems as they were mainly designed to look impressive to people with no knowledge of realities in the District, and otherwise to end deep in the desk drawers of the administrators actually responsible for the implementation of the policies.

This at least was what happened, and if it had only been for the waste of government time and money, one could have regretted it, but it would not have harmed the actual development of the Ujamaa Villages. The villages, however, were afflicted with these plans, and therefore they never got the Ntobeye decisions on what crops to grow, what work to do, what services to invest labour in, how to organize labour, how to use the tractor and oxen etc., they have often been taken or altered from one day to the next - or have not been taken at all - and quite often under the influence of government officials who just happen to be present or of the presence or absence of some of the village officials. The result is first of all a generally observable lack of rationality and coordination in the utilization of the available resources, as when an already ploughed field has to be ploughed again because the planting was not done in time, or a whole planting season is lost, because clearing and cultivating go on and on to make the achievement
look greater in the reports. There have been complete failures because of too late planting, and the whole labour consuming task of erecting an electric fence around the maize field was almost a waste of time as it was started so late that it could not be done properly, and it was not ready until the end of the harvest anyway.

The lack of proper plans is also at least part of the reason for the unsatisfactory organization of the government support to the villages. Sometimes seeds get there too late and when finally planted the whole crop is destroyed by lack of rain or the seeds are never planted. In other cases it is decided to plant their own low quality seeds because they have little or no improved seeds. The marketing is done on an ad hoc basis and easily delayed with resulting losses from insect attacks, because there is no stable and foreseeable production of any of the crops, and no organized concentrated effort to get the processing done fast in order to have the crops ready for early aggregate marketing.

However, the most damaging result of the existing unrealistic plans and the lack of realistic plans is the effect on the spirit of the Ujamaa villagers, and thereby on their work attendance, the second major problem in the villages.

The villagers were told to discuss these plans, made up by high ranking government officials, and presented to them by the same officials. Every villager who understood anything must have known, that the targets in the plans were wild, and must have been sure that, as experts, the officials know so as well. Of course the villagers approved the plans, because of the fantastic government support promised them, because they were presented by such high ranking officials, and because nobody could take the targets seriously anyway.

Afterwards most of the promised government investments failed to materialize, everybody forgot about the plans, abd things went on in the same old haphazard way they had done before. The villagers were still being told to do this and do that and work hard, without anybody telling them why they were doing the opposite of what they had discussed in relation to the plans, without anybody seeming to know exactly what they were now aiming at, and therefore with nobody being able to explain or even understand what they had so far achieved and what was still left to be done in such and such a period. Nobody could have any clear idea of what was expected of them and what they could expect as a result.

No wonder then, that the ordinary villager, who had no experience in communal production, and who was treated to this theatre when he was for once given some concrete information instead of the usual talk of hard work and work together for the benefit of all, has difficulties in seeing the purpose of the communal sector and fails to understand its functioning and his role in it.
So the interest of the villagers is still their individual farms, which were also their reason to come to Ntobeye, or the other villages, in the first place. The participation in the communal work suffers accordingly whenever there is any work pressure in the individual sector - or any social event that has to be attended to.

This emphasis on the individual sector may change, when the villagers become more used to communal production, and especially when they begin to get an income from it. (In the discussions in Ntobeye on how to use the first years surplus there were - very small - signs that this was beginning to happen.)

It seems, however, that a necessary prerequisite for the proper functioning of the communal sector in the Ujamaa Villages, in terms of efficiency as well as in terms of the villagers' participation, is the constitution of a completely new planning process on the villages.

Such a planning process would first of all have to be realistic, that is the only way it can fulfill its purposes. It should be realistic both in the sense that it does not promise more government help than the government is really prepared to give, and is able to give at the promised time, and in the sense that the villagers, as well as expert advisers, are completely aware of what the set targets mean, and really believe, that they can be fulfilled. This requires that the plans are primarily made by the villagers themselves in open discussions with the government advisers. The advisers should see their role mainly as modern educators, who ensure that the planning process creates at least some understanding, awareness and commitment among the villagers in relation to communal activities they themselves have agreed on.

The planning process, which is thus also an educational and a mobilizing process, should not stop with the agreement on the plan. It must be a continuous process, where the villagers are regularly kept informed about the accomplishments and problems in relation to the implementation of the plan, about the efforts of the different groups and about the participation of the individual members. On this basis alterations in the plan can be made by the villagers themselves, and they can discuss problems in relation to work attendance.

A successful execution of these proposals demands two things of those officials involved. First they must know how to use and be willing to use at least the most simple modern educational methods and aids, such as signboards and posters, and stop believing that speeches or lectures are enough. Secondly in some cases there is a need to change attitudes towards discussing with uneducated villagers. In the later years visiting government and party leaders have taken part in the manual labour side by side with the villagers, which is highly appreciated by them. However, it is probably even more appreciated when an official sits down and discusses with the villagers on an equal basis instead of making a speech or a
lecture. Some do it, especially after the "Mwongozo", but many still seem to lack confidence in their own ability to make themselves understood by ordinary people, and without even trying they abandon the favourable educational situation of a free discussion with the villagers, in favour of a speech to them, perhaps followed by a discussion with the leaders and officials in the village.

In the educational and mobilizational process of planning and deciding for the development of the Ujamaa Village it is essential that all the villagers participate, and that they are encouraged and activated in this for them unusual situation by advisers who respect their right and ability to take decisions on their own problems, and who shows this respect by using educational methods which can provide the villagers with knowledge they feel they need and are able to use.

D. Village democracy.

In "traditional" villages in Ngara District no structure exists which enables decisions to be taken on behalf of, or by, the village as a unit. The only "traditional" institutions which still function to a certain extent are the clans and their clan assemblies, but they cover only part of a village or sometimes a part of each of several villages, and never one whole village. In the modern political and administrative set up, there are no organs between the small ten-house-cell and the Ward with its Ward Executive Officer, (WEO) Ward Development Committee (WDC) and Tanu Branch, comprising dozens of villages. The area of the former Village Development Committee, and Village Executive Officer was smaller than the Ward, but even that included several villages. The present Reconciliation Committees (Baraza la Usuluhishi) took over the reconciliation functions from the now defunct VDCs.

So the Ujamaa Villages are the only villages in the District, which have their own "local government". They are even exempted from the jurisdiction of the WDC and the Tanu Branch of the Ward in which they are located, as they have their own WDCs and Branches, enjoying the same status as the ordinary ones.

At least until recently none of the Ujamaa Villages had written constitutions, and their decision making structures were a mixture of more or less formal organs with no clear division of functions and without clearly defined membership.

In Ntobeye the General Meeting (Mkutano Mkuu) and the WDC may be regarded as the two official making bodies, as their meetings are usually called by the WEO, who also has to be present and write in the official minute book. Often also other government and party officials are present at these meetings.
The official General Meeting consists of all adults in the village, all government staff and the WEO, as its secretary. It is called by the WEO or the village leaders through the ten-house-cell chairman. The General Meeting is the highest authority in the village, but it only meets once every half year or so, and besides electing the Chairman, Vice-chairman and Secretary and nine members of the WDC. The participation in the meetings are highest when elections are on the agenda. In the last such meeting about 300 villagers took part, out of a total of 775.

The WDC is in practice more important than the General Meeting. It deliberates and decides on all matters concerning the communal sector, services, the economy of the village, discipline and expulsions, allocation of membership and plots in the village, all relations with the government administration and its officials stationed in the village. It is at the same time the Tanu Branch Committee. The WDC consists of the Chairman, the Vice-chairman, the Secretary, all ten-house-cell Chairmen, and eight members from the New Settlement and one from Old Ntobeye chosen by the General Meeting. The government staff and the WEO participate but are not allowed to vote.

The WDC has formed subcommittees for financial matters and to take care of guests. A women's committee was also formed, consisting of the only female member of the WDC and one more member, but the last has since left the village without being replaced, and the committee does not seem to be active anyway.

The day to day work in the village is supposed to be organized by a work committee consisting of the Chairman, the Vice-chairman, the Secretary and the Agricultural Field Officer, but this is not a formally constituted committee and as the other three only turn up irregularly most of the work is done by the AFO alone.

Finally there is a Staff Committee of all government staff in the village together with the three village leaders. The Staff Committee is mainly advisory to the WDC (with much influence though), but it can take decisions on confidential matters relating to the government administration, the staff and discipline in the village.

The structure described above may seem fairly straightforward, but in reality the picture is much more blurred.

First many meetings are held in the village, which do not fit into any of the type described. There are also meetings which might be termed as informal General Meetings, as meetings more like informal WDC meetings. The Chairman, or another village leader, may call a General Meeting without informing the WEO and thus without the meeting being reported in the minute book. An even more informal meeting may be formed by people who are assembled for a completely different purpose, for example a group of members returning from communal work, and the Chairman or any other leader may be present, but equally well they may not be there. Also the WDC may be called for a meeting without the presence of the WEO, and sometimes even a smaller
part of the WDC members who are incidentally present at a certain place and time may go aside, sit down and discuss and decide upon important matters.

Secondly it seems to be merely by chance that a matter is brought for one or the other of the different types of meetings.

A few examples may illustrate the fluid situation.

Neither of the two development plans was discussed and approved by official WDC or General Meetings reported in the minute book. The last of them was decided upon by a meeting called by the District Rural Development Officer, who has arrived unannounced to the village, and it consisted of those WDC members present at communal work that day.

The financial committee was formed and its members chosen in a formal WDC meeting, but when most of the members had left the village for different reasons new members were chosen by an informal General Meeting called by the Chairman to discuss the start of a cooperative duka in the village.

A meeting was held by members returning from work one day, and it was decided to grant a sum of money for the Secretary's journey to a course in Moshi. Later some problems in connection with the same journey were brought up and discussed in a formal WDC meeting.

Sometimes the Chairman and the FAO decides when and what to plant, sometimes the same decisions are taken by the WDC.

In a certain way these very flexible procedures may be advantageous, as they promote expediency in decision making, but the disadvantages seem bigger. It is often doubtful when, and if, a decision has been taken, and who is responsible for its implementation. Sometimes a decision is taken at one meeting and altered by a different meeting. Matters are left undecided, because nobody is clearly responsible for their solution. Coordination of decisions is almost impossible, as matters related to the same problem may be discussed by one body at one time and a different body at another time. All this contribute to the generally haphazard conditions in the communal sector.

The village democracy also suffers as the many informal meetings not just excludes many of the villagers from the possibility of participating, but also make it seem rather unimportant to try to participate. Furthermore the whole uncoordinated and confused structure makes it virtually impossible for any official to use the decision-making process and a coherent educational general idea about what is going on and to understand the basis and consequences of decisions they are supposed to take.

All this may be at least part of the reason for the poor participation in meetings, both in terms of the numbers of people turning up, and in terms of their activity during the meetings. Another reason probably is the generally rather authoritarian
attitude of and towards leaders and officials. Usually there is very little discussion at meetings, most of the talking being done by the Chairman or staffmembers, before a common agreement is reached on something close to the solution proposed by the leaders, who are also the ones who sum up the conclusions. Only very seldom is the summing up challenged and a vote taken, which even more seldom supports the challenger. In the meetings there is a "silent majority" of older people, who follow the leaders, and a few more outspoken younger ten-house-cell Chairmen, who sometimes express opposition to the leaders. Only in court-like situations do the older people take active part, then eagerly discussing the evidence, rules and precedences of the cases. The younger people are becoming more ready to consider matters relating to the communal economy and work, especially concrete questions where they can see their own interests are directly involved. A recent case was when they raised opposition to the Chairman's proposal that some of the 5000 Shs. income from the communal fields should be invested in a cooperative duka, and demanded to have it distributed among the villagers instead. This time they managed to create so much dissatisfaction, that no decision was taken, and the money remained in the bank.

In 1971 the old Chairman's reelection was in doubt for the first time since the start of the village, as the younger group nominated the Vicechairman as their candidate. They did not succeed in toppling the Chairman, who had strong support among the people in Old Ntobeye and the women, but they did get their candidate for the secretaryship elected, thus beating the incumbent, a protege of the Chairman.

There is hardly any element of ideological awareness or just political issues in this antagonism, but the very fact that some of the Ujamaa Village members break out of the normal humility towards authorities may be taken as a positive sign for the democratic process in the village.

E. Government support and personnel.

Besides getting land, the main motive so far for joining and remaining in the Ujamaa Villages has been the huge government support received by the villages.

In Ntobeye there is a primary school built by the District Council and two teachers employed by the government. The pupils in the school are exempted from paying school fees. There is a small dispensary supplied by government with a Rural Medical Aid and Dispensary Assistants. A policeman is stationed in the village to ensure law and order, and is in charge of the militia training. Game scouts are coming to the village regularly to help the villagers with vermin control. The village is now getting a piped water supply established by the W.D. & I.D. at a cost of about 100,000 Shs.
In short, Ntobeye has essential services, the lack of which normally makes the life in the villages in the bush unattractive.

The Ujamaa Villages were given food help from the government in the establishment period. By 1970 Ntobeye was deemed self-reliant, but two of the five original villages were still getting food supplies in 1971.

When the settlers started in 1968 they were given hoes, pangas and axes, and to strengthen the communal sector the government has later provided the village with the tractor and its implements, it pays the tractor driver stationed in the village, it has given draught oxen and implements and an AFO responsible for these only, and it has built the store and supplied maize, threshers for the communal fields also come from the government. Some of the villagers have been to courses organized by the government, and experts like Land Surveyors, Tsetse Officers, and Forest Officers regularly visit the village.

All this has of course had important effects especially on the development of the communal sector, but one government act has been more essential than anything else, namely the stationing in the village of an AFO, who has the overall responsibility to the government for the functioning of the village. Without his presence and direction, and often very hard work and commitment, it seems that the establishment and maintenance of any communal activities worth mentioning would have been virtually impossible.

The AFO in charge does not only have to be the agricultural expert, who gives advice on what to grow where, what techniques to use, and how to time the activities. He also has to be the daily initiator and organizer of all the communal work, ensuring that at least some decisions are taken and actually implemented. He must control, that tasks like keeping the attendance register and the cashbook are properly carried out, and sometimes do it himself. Whenever there are problems in the village he gets involved and is in the last resort responsible for their solving. As the officer in charge of the village he has to direct, support and coordinate the work of the other government employees in the village.

Finally the AFO is responsible for almost all communication between the village and the higher authorities, be it in the form of requests from the village to the government or in the form of reports to keep the administration informed about the village. Especially the detailed monthly reports demanded from him are a heavy burden added to the practical work in the village (and are probably not even used for any responsible purpose - except further report writing).

The high concentration of government personnel living in the Ujamaa Villages does not only have costs for the government, which seem very high compared with the limited economic potential of the village, but it also means that the formerly mentioned class antagonism between the smallholder farmers and the "salariat" is carried right into the supposed centers for socialist development.
The government personnel have standards of living and incomes, incomparable to those of the ordinary villagers. They hardly ever take part in manual work in the village. Except for the FAO in charge they do not integrate themselves in the village life, nor do they seem committed to the overall development of the village. They carry out their specific duties and in their free time maintain social relations among themselves or out of the village only, and still they are the ones who communicate most with visiting leaders and officials and whose words carry a lot of weight, when decisions are taken. There is also a tendency for some of the village leaders to be incorporated in the staff milieu, thus being estranged from the ordinary villagers.

Very little is done to improve the situation by putting more emphasis on programs to train the villagers to take over the tasks themselves, or by making those officers, who are indispensable, take part on an equal basis in the communal work, when they have nothing else to do. For example the assistants of the tractor driver are, on their own initiative, learning to drive, but with some further training they should be able to take over this job completely. Likewise it does not seem necessary to have an AFO in the village solely to take care of the oxen and their work, which could be done by trained villagers. The policeman in the village has hardly anything else to do but direct four weekly hours of militia training, this training should not surmount the ability of some former National Service members in the village, and neither should an occasional proper police function. At least it would be less demoralizing if the policeman did more than four hours work a week as long as he has to be there.

The little that has been done in this connection shows, that a main problem would be the incorporation of such tasks into the normal work organization in the village, where the members are credited with the number of days they do communal work, whatever kind of work they were doing. When the school was built in Ntobeye, it was criticised that the District Council did not employ the village members who are skilled in housebuilding, but had workers from outside the village only. So the DC proposed that these members should work on the schoolbuilding, but that the salary be paid to the village as a whole and the workers credited by the village with the appropriate number of workdays done. The housebuilding members of the village refused this, preferring to continue going to the "traditional" villages to find work there. Why after all should a villager share his well deserved salary with the other villagers, when none of the officials and leaders who proposed it do it themselves?
F. Ujamaa activities in "traditional" villages.

Earlier it has been mentioned that mutual help with agricultural work on individual farms, which used to exist in the "traditional" villages, has already for some time been almost completely extinct. Other more recent types of agricultural cooperation are, however, common in Ngara District. In those areas where the valley bottoms are used for cultivation in the dry seasons it is necessary that the villagers cooperate in the construction and maintenance of a network of small channels which drain the water from the plots. The work on the plots are done by the individual owner though, and the whole enterprise is completely separated from, and of minor importance compared to, the rest of the agricultural system.

Of more importance and incorporated in the overall system is the habit that several people from a village, who want to increase their farms by opening new fields in the bush, decide to do it together in a kind of block, where each has his own plot, but where they can cooperate in protecting themselves and the crops against wild animals, and have the social benefit of being many together at work and going to and from work.

In the aftermath of the Arusha Declaration this has been seen as a way to introduce Ujamaa in the "traditional" villages, and has been encouraged and supported, especially when changed from individual plots in a block to fully communal fields.

In Mbuba village in Bushubi two such blocks were started in 1966. One was a tobacco block in a valley outside Mbuba, where some of the ten-house-cells in Mbuba went together with some from a neighbouring village to clear the thick bush and divide the land into individual tobacco plots. The tobacco is still grown on an individual basis, and is the main source of income for the growers. This block does not receive any official attention.

The other block just south of Mbuba at the main road to Rulenge was supported right from its start. It was initiated by a District Council member living in Mbuba together with the VDC for the area between Rulenge and the Ruvubu river. All the villages in this area initially took part, but it was found that it was too far to go for those furthest away, so they left after the 1968 harvest. Now 13 small villages around Mbuba take part. In principle all households in these villages, a total of 347, are members.

Up to 1970 it was run as a combination of private plots and a communal field, but that year it was all pooled to become an Ujamaa field.

At the time the distant villages left, they had had a total income of about 4000 Shs. from groundnuts grown on the communal field, but almost all of it had been used for hiring a tractor, to cultivate, and for buying seeds.
Since 1969 the communal field has covered about 20 ha, and in 1971 a further 7 1/2 ha of former individual plots were included. In 1969 it gave a surplus of 2200 Shs. from groundnuts and 200 Shs. from beans. In 1970 the only income was 100 Shs. from beans. Of 8 bags groundnuts 6 have been used for seeds and 2 distributed among the villagers. Unsuccessful experiments with wheat and yellow sorghum gave only two bags of each. In 1971 7 1/2 ha was planted with groundnuts, 10 ha with beans and another 10 ha with cassava. Only the cassava fared well, so at a meeting it was decided that the soil was probably worn out, that only cassava should be grown there, and that another field should be opened somewhere else. By October they had cleared and started hand cultivating a new field of 12 1/2 ha, where they intended to plant maize and beans.

No money has so far been distributed to the members. They have about 2400 Shs. in the bank, and have decided to invest some of them in a cooperative duka.

In 1971 the land for beans and groundnuts on the old field were cultivated by a hired tractor, for which they will probably have to pay about 3500 Shs.

The cassava field was divided into small plots, one for each ten-house-cell, which was then responsible for all the work on that plot. The same system is used on the new Ujamaa field, where each cell will grow maize on half their plot, and beans on the other half. Using the cell structure this way makes it possible to control that all cells, and through social pressure within the cell all members, contribute a somewhat equal amount of labour. As no work record are kept, such a system is also necessary, should they come to distribute an eventual income. At present, however, it is clearly observable from the different standard of the ten-house-cell plots, that the system does not quite live up to its purpose.

The people from Mbuba itself are by far the most interested and committed, and they participate much more in the communal work as well as in meetings connected with it than people from the other villages. The reason is of course the whole organization of the scheme. It was initiated from Mbuba, and the fields accordingly located in the near proximity of this village. The communal store, given by the District Council, had to be placed near the fields and at the road, that is in Mbuba, and this is the meeting place for communal work or meetings. Resulting from, and strengthening, this pattern is the fact that the Chairman, the Vicechairman, and the Secretary as well as a large part of the Committee members, all are from Mbuba.

Although there are a formally constituted and elected Committee and General Meetings of all members, the actual decision making structure is just as confused as that described in Ntobeye, so naturally it tends to favour the participation of the members from Mbuba.
This skew interest and participation is one reason for the meagre results compared with the large number of member households. Another is the use of the same field for the same crop for too long. As the communal field makes possible the growing of crops to which the farmers themselves are not completely used, it is necessary that they are provided with expert advice. So they were in Mbuba up to 1968, when the agricultural extension personnel had to concentrate on the Ujamaa Villages proper. Not until 1971 were they again visited by an Agricultural Officer, who immediately advised a shift to another place and rotation between different crops, which is why the new field has been opened and will be planted with beans and maize.

Before work on the new field was started, some of the most distant villages decided not to take part, but to start their own fields nearer at home. The effort put into the new field by Mbuba and its closest neighbours indicate that this is a favorable development, and that even a further division into units of one, or a few, closely related, villages may be most profitable.

Also the people in Mukididili/Murgwanza are - at least in principle - members of an Ujamaa Field, but in this case the center of interest and leadership is in another village, and the participation from Mukididili/Murgwanza has been negligible.

For a long time the people in the densely populated areas on the Bugufi ridge have, as mentioned earlier, been used to cultivate fields in the bush below the ridge. In 1969 the VDC for Mukididili/Murgwanza and several other villages decided to start a communal field there, but the location is in a different area, and further away than the place where the people from Mukididili/Murgwanza are used to go, so except for a few ten-house-cell leaders and party officials they have taken little interest, even after seeing the field giving a 5000 Shs. surplus from sale of groundnuts the first year.
V. Conclusions

A. The objectives of Ujamaa.

As expressed in the Tanzania Second Five Year Plan the basic principles of the country's socialist Policy are:

"(i) Social equality - to spread the benefits of development widely throughout society.

(ii) Ujamaa - development of forms of economic activity which encourage collective and coope¬
rate efforts and avoid wide differences of wealth and income.

(iii) Selfreliance - development through the maximum mobilisation of domestic resources. Particularly through mobilisation of the people.

(iv) Economic and social transformation - rapid expansion of productive capacity create the basis for future economic and social transformation."

When trying to evaluate the development of Ujamaa in Ngara District up to now, and to assess its development potential in the District, these basic principles of the national Ujamaa policy must be applied to the socio-economic situation existing there.

It has been shown that Ngara District is essentially an agricultural smallholder society. Any step to implement the Ujamaa policy must be adopted to the circumstances in that society, aiming at solving its specific development problems in accor¬dance with the principles.

The Ngara smallholder society is, however, part of the wider national socio-economic structure, and an evaluation of development in Ngara must also take into consideration the relations between the smallholder society and this nationwide structure. The planning and implementation of the Ujamaa policy in Ngara District should lead to increased adherence to the policy's basic principles also in the context of this relationship.

B. Ujamaa development in the smallholder society.

With the limited extent so far of Ujamaa activities and the short time they have existed, none of the overall problems in the District could be expected to have been solved. The experiences gained may however, be taken as a pointer as to the possible impact of continued and expanded development of Ujamaa along the present lines.

In the analysis of the "traditional" villages two problems stand out as the basic ones.
The first is the land scarcity in the densely populated areas of Buguti Division, where the majority of the population lives. With little or no land available in the villages there, many farmers are unable to develop the normal farm/family cycle and are posed with the alternative of either leaving the District, permanently or seasonally, as migrant labourers or trying to open land in the bush and start a farm there. Hopefully the last solution has been a very slow process with plenty of inherent risks and problems, and many who chose it have had to combine it with seasonal migration anyway in order to make a living. So far many migration has been the least unattractive possibility, thus depriving the District of a large number of perhaps its more enterprising men in the productive ages.

The second major problem is the difficulty within the existing agricultural system to satisfy the growing need for monetary incomes, and especially the conflict between the culmination of the farm/family cycle around the middle of a man's life and the cash needs, which peak during his establishment phase. Changing the agricultural system and investing more labour or capital in it has seldom been seen as a possible solution to this problem, which is regarded as almost exclusively surmountable by obtaining incomes outside agriculture, or if that is impossible, as migrant labourer.

The establishment of the New Settlements has in many ways been a continuation of the existing movement of people from the densely populated villages to the uninhabited bush areas, but made more attractive, because of the usual hazards of starting a farm in the bush. With many people starting at the same time at the same place, they are able to give each other help and moral support. The fields are not quite as open to animal attacks as normally in the bush, and the settlers are less socially isolated. The government backing has appeared in the form of moral support by many visiting leaders and material help such as social services, advisors and free food, none of which are normally enjoyed by bush dwellers.

By these means the New Settlements have lessened the barriers against moving from the old villages into the bush, and have for many small farmers turned out to be a feasible way to alleviate the problem of maintaining a normal farm/family cycle.

Had the New Settlements been allowed to continue and expand along the original lines, they might have helped solving the problem of land scarcity, bush development and migrant labourers, but they did not contain any element which would otherwise make them different from the "traditional" villages. The problem would have remained - in the "traditional" villages as well by the way - to initiate changes in the farming system, which would enable people continue to meet the subsistence needs and social demands varying with the family cycle and at the same time to satisfy the increasing demand for cash incomes.
The communal fields, started in Ujamaa Villages as well as in "traditional" villages, seem, however, to have the possibility of becoming that element, by facilitating the introduction and expansion of cash crops as a significant and consistent addition to the farming system on a broad and equal basis.

In any effort to change the farming system, support, encouragement, and even supervision from government and party, are essential. The communal fields allow a concentration of the limited resources, without favouring individuals and endangering the social balance in the smallholder society.

Government experts and capital inputs can be more efficiently exploited by the large enterprise than on scattered smallholdings, and by being clearly separated from the existing agricultural system the communal fields allow the inputs to be concentrated in this change effort instead of being absorbed in the existing system.

Having in mind the weak marketing system in Ngara it is an advantage that the communal fields can produce a more reliable and larger aggregate crop, which is therefore easier to market than the occasional surpluses from individual smallholders.

The large scale makes it possible to rationalize some of the work operations, such as keeping watch against wild animals or processing the crops and to a certain extent planting and harvesting. Some new division of labour and specialization have been introduced.

The large scale also entails a spread of risks. Damage on a field by animals, disease or unfavourable weather, which may be near catastrophe for the individual is a minor loss for the collective, and experiments can be carried out on a reasonable scale without failures being fatal.

Perhaps the most important advantage, however, of the communal organisation is that it enables the introduction of a distinct cash sector, which is neither weakened itself by being incorporated in the general agricultural system with its emphasis on subsistence production, social security and obligations and a habitual work organisation, not destructive for that system. The communal fields seem to be regarded as something completely separated from the individual farm, and added opportunity, which may be beneficial, and at least do not interfere directly with the farm/family cycle etc.

A reasonable consistent labour input may be sustained even with irregular individual attendancy caused by demands of the individual farm and existing work habits. Even absence for a longer time because of illness or migration does not undo an earlier effort as it often would on the individual farm. In the long run the organised character of the Ujamaa activities, social pressure among the members and irregular incomes may promote more consistent work habits in this sector and a shift of interest from the individual to the Ujamaa fields, but this can only happen gradually during the development of the Ujamaa sector.
Even with initially minimal hectarage and labour input per member the communal field can still be large enough to ensure some of the advantages of large scale and a relatively stable output earmarked fro marketing, thus creating a basis for further development.

Introduction of a cash crop with a stable and regular production on equally small areas on individual farms does not seem feasible. It would either be a new crop, at least in the beginning giving rather insignificant incomes and having no established function in the farm/family cycle, and therefore it would not easily be integrated with the existing agriculture, but run a high risk of being more or less neglected. Or one of the existing crops might be tried, but in that case the difficulty of ensuring a reliable output specifically meant for marketing would remain. (The limited extent of an irregular coffee production is an example of the problems with the first type of crop, the losses incurred by the cooperative union when they tried to organize the marketing of beans an example of problems with the second ty. e.)

Finally the communal activities can become a way to alleviate the problem created by the difference in time of the culmination of cash needs and of the farm/family cycle, by enabling the young people to become members and get an income of their own before they marry and leave the parents to establish their own farms.

The potentials of Ujamaa in the development of the Ngara smallholder society are yet far from being realised, but the above analysis is based on the trends which can be seen in the District now. It shows that provided the pressing problems of planning, participation and village democracy discussed earlier in this report can be solved, Ujamaa may become a major contribution to the overcoming of the present development problems within the smallholder society, at the same time as it leads to increased adherence to the basic policy principles by the socio-economic structures in that society.

C. Ujamaa in Ngara and the wider national socio-economic structure.

This study has indicated that Ngara villagers are a rather homogenous group of smallholder farmers and that the major socio-economic differentiation is found between the smallholder society on one side and people engaged in the industrial, commercial and bureaucratic sectors on the other side. In spite of the relatively small number of people involved in them, these last sectors, whether state owned, parastatal or private, retain the direction of and the benefits from most investments in capital goods, infrastructure, education and social services, thus still concentrating major parts of the "benefits of development", "wealth and income" and the "rapid expansion of productive capacity to create the basis for future economic and social transformation" in the hands of a minority of the people.
Quite understandably the smallholders in Ngara regard induction of the individual into the non-agricultural sectors as the only way to really significant social and economic progress.

To achieve its overall aims the Ujamaa policy might well learn from the Maoist ideas of "using agriculture as the basis and industry as the leading factor", "to walk on two legs" and "one becomes two".

Applied to the concrete situation of Ujamaa development in Ngara District, these ideas would mean that although it has to be based on agriculture, by remaining exclusively so it could hardly contribute to the abolition of the antagonism between agriculture and non-agriculture.

Agriculture must be developed to "create the basis for future economic and social transformation", but an important element in this transformation should be an increasing take over by Ujamaa villages, alone or in cooperation, of non-agricultural functions. Initially, functions such as those presently carried out in the villages by government employees can gradually be transferred to trained villagers. Processing, transportation and marketing of the agricultural produce are natural tasks for the Ujamaa organization, and so are the production, repair or importation of the consumer goods and at least some of the capital goods used in the villages.

Emphasising social and cultural institutions, as well "traditional" as modern, in the Ujamaa community parallel with those presently based in the urban centers is also an important part of such a transformation.

In the long run the abolition of the gap between the sectors would demand the integration and expansion of large parts of the non-agricultural sectors within the Ujamaa communities on an equal footing with the basic agricultural production.

So far there are no signs that implementation of the Ujamaa policy in Ngara is directed at these longer term objectives, and it may be a first condition for this to change that the villagers themselves become more aware of their situation and start to revolt against it.

"We should gradually become a nation of Ujamaa villages, where the people cooperate directly in small groups and where these groups cooperate together for joint enterprises." "They would live together in a village; they would farm together; market together; and undertake the provision of local services and small local requirements as a community."

(Nyerere, Socialism and Rural Development.)
Notes:


3. Ibid.


6. As note 2. For example Annual Report 1959.

7. As note 5, TAB 320-ABS, 173, 174 and 175, and TAB 420-ABS 173, 174 and 175.

8. As note 4, p. 13.


11. As note 2.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. As note 5. TAB 311-V% 175.


17. The following criteria were used:

**Bugufi:** Big farmer, either  
Coffee or banana areas more than 1/10 ha above the mean for that village and areas of all three types of crops bigger than the mean minus 1/10 ha.  
**or**  
both coffee and banana area more than 1/10 ha above the mean.

**Small farmer,** either  
Coffee or banana area more than 1/10 ha below the mean for that village and areas of all three types of crops smaller than the mean plus 1/10 ha.  
**or**  
both coffee and banana area more than 1/10 ha below the mean.
Bushuni: Big farmer, Coffee or banana area more than 1/10 ha above the mean for that village and areas of at least two types of crops bigger than the mean minus 1/10 ha.

Small farmer, neither coffee nor banana area more than 1/10 ha above the mean for that village and areas of at least two types of crops smaller than the mean minus 1/10 ha.

Medium farmer, the remainder.

In principle the criteria are purely statistical, but they have been constructed at least to a certain degree to take the local situation into account.

18. As note 2.


21. All hectarages given here are as measured by the author. They do not correspond well with the figures given in various reports, probably partly because the AFO in the village from whom the last figures originates, uses more crude measuring methods, but also because of the tendency to give more importance to cultivated area than to size of harvest or yield per ha.

22. The AFO keeps a daily work record, based on reports from those in charge of each day's work groups on how many participated in the group that day. The material obtained includes the records for every day from September 1970 to August 1971, except the whole of February and three weeks of August. Figures for these periods were calculated on the basis of the obtained material and the work known to have been done in the periods.

Some of the people who live in Mukididili/Murgwanza. (Mainly told by themselves)

The washambo.

The two most numerous clans in Murgwanza are the Washambo and the Washanza clans.

Most of the Murgwanza washambo are descendants of two brothers, Kinyenzi and Ruhiga, who came from Rwanda around 1900. In Murgwanza they found plenty of good unused land, so they started to build and cultivate the land there. They went to the chief to tell him they had done so, and later they collected all their cattle from Rwanda.

Ruhiga has six sons, all of whom got farms on the land he had claimed. It is now divided between 12 grandsons and up to now 5 great-grandsons. Six of these grandsons have acquired additional land in villages below the ridge. Three grandsons and two great-grandsons have moved completely to such villages in order to get any land at all. Three of Ruhigas grandsons and six great-grandsons have migrated permanently to Uganda.

Only three Kinyenzis grandsons are now farming in Murgwanza. Simoni and Joseph, sons of Sekimonyo, each have a farm and two wives in Murgwanza plus another farm and a wife in a village below the ridge. One son of Simoni is married and has acquired land below the ridge in addition to a very small plot in Murgwanza. Joseph has given small parts of his farm in Murgwanza to a married and an unmarried son.

Rugurane, old Kinyenzis other son, had three sons himself. The oldest is now living in a village below the ridge where he has got a farm. The second went to Uganda to work as farm-labourer several years ago. Only his third son is now living in Murgwanza.

### Fields measured in Mukididili/Murgwanza:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clan</th>
<th>Total Land</th>
<th>Bananas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simoni Sekimonyo</td>
<td>1.5 ha</td>
<td>0.7 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalio Simoni</td>
<td>0.2 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josefu Sekimonyo</td>
<td>1.3 ha</td>
<td>0.7 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Joseph</td>
<td>0.5 ha</td>
<td>0.3 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petro Joseph</td>
<td>0.3 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All bananas</td>
<td>0.2 ha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ivan Kinyenzi was Rugurane's youngest son, and as such he was supposed to stay with the father and inherit most of the farm when he died.

He is 37 years old. Finished eight years in school. After his father died in 1956, and he had married his first wife in 1959, he worked 1960 to 1970 in permanent employment with the government (WD & ID) in Bukoba, Mwanza, Karagwe and Biharamulo. (And went to Kampala on the football team).

He has two wives and four small daughters. Three children have died. Each of the wives has a house with mudwalls and corrugated iron roof - built at a cost of about 2000 Shs. each. In a third house, an old one with grass roof, lives his mother. Each house is a separate household, having their own part of the fields for annual crops, bananas and coffee to care for and to get the products from. But the bigger children often help and live with their grandmother.

When he himself is at home, he stays two nights with one wife, then two nights with the other, and so on, and the wife with whom he stays will be cooking his food etc.

Most of the work on the farm is done by the women, but their husband may help them with the more laboureous work, or he - or they themselves - may hire a labourer to do it. The continuous expansion of the banana-shamba is specifically his responsibility.

Part of the money he earned while employed was used to hire labourers for this purpose. Most of the bananas are planted in his time. The father and grandfather had very little bananas.

He also planted the small coffee-plot himself, in 1957. Rugurane did plant some coffee on other people's land to be near to the main-road, which was then demanded by the extension officers, but this coffee was completely neglected while Ivan was in employment.
The farm usually gives them enough to cover their needs for food—especially cooking bananas and beans. On a special occasion they may slaughter one of their eight goats—and they get a few eggs from their chickens. They don't sell any of their crops—except coffee and an occasional bunch of bananas, when they have a surplus. From the coffee they may get 100-150 Shs., a year. In their every-day life they only buy small things like matches, lamp oil, soap, salt and not seldom a bottle of pombe. Unlike many other people they don't sell pombe—but invite neighbours, friends and relatives to drink when they have brewed. Both women and men then take part.

For most of the money he earned when employed, he used to build the two houses and expand the banana-shamba, and last year he bought about five acres land below the ridge for 100 Shs., from a man whom he knows well, and whose clan had agreed, which is necessary. He hasn't started cultivating it yet, and he does not intend to build there. He also says he would like to get a plot in Ntobeye Ujamaa Village—where he might stay or hire a labourer to stay like certain other employed people have done.

He is looking for employment again.

He is a member of Tanu since 1962, of BCCU and of NUTA.

When Kinyenzi and Ruhiga had settled other people came to find land at Murgwanza, and the King appointed a subchief to direct the distribution of land.

Erenesti Mushika is the grandson of a man who was given land in Murgwanza by the subchief. He was of a pot-maker clan, but as he also came from Rwanda, and was alone, he was adopted into the Washambo clan by old Kinyenzi. So the family are no longer pot-makers, but are regarded as a side-branch of the Washambo.
Ernesti is 43 years old. He went to school for four years, and in 1965 he participated in adult education classes.

He is now living with his wives number four and five - the two first have run away. He has one son - with the second wife - who has finished Standard seven, stays with the fourth wife, works a little on the farm, but has applied for a job as dispensary assistant. There are two small girls.

Each of the wives has a house with mud walls and corrugated iron roof.

Ernesti has one younger brother, and a cousin, the only son of his father's brother. They went to Uganda in 1962 and 1966 respectively - one when his father was still alive, the other when he was too young to take care of his dead father's shamba. Ernesti, who as the older son inherited very little, is now taking care of their shambas. He says, that TANU has said that those who have been away for a long time will get land somewhere else, in the Ujamaa Villages.

(People say he is not happy to talk about this, nor to tell which part of the farm is his own and which part belongs to the others. Because he fears to be sent to an Ujamaa Village himself. The others have the right to most of the farm if they come back - and the clan knows exactly what. Ernesti owns only a small plot around one of the houses and two small plots he has bought.)

He has 3/4 ha land below the ridge which he got in 61 from a man who had borrowed 300 Shs. to start a business, but could not pay them back. He usually grows beans and sorghum there, but not this year because he has been ill.

Before 1963 he went four times to work as a farm-labourer in Uganda. Since then they have had only the income from what surplus they can sell from the farm. In 69 they earned 90 Shs. from the coffee, but in 70 they didn't get any harvest at all. In 70 he sold pombe for 200-300 Shs, beans for 50-60 Shs and sweet bananas for 70-80 Shs.
all in the village or at the local market. They also sell an occasional bunch of cooking bananas. He sold three goats for 95 Shs, in 1970, has six left, and also earned 30 Shs. from his chicken. He owns a bull together with another man, and should get part of the calves, but it has not got any yet.

He is a member of TANU and BCCU: When the ten-house-cells were organized in 62-63 he was elected ten-cell-leader by those people who are TANU-members. (Because most of the other men are often away in employment, they say).

As ten-cell-leader he listens to people's problems and brings them to those responsible. He has also been appointed a local TYL leader in the TANU-branch-committee. As such he has local police functions.

There are ten households in his cell. They are all washambo. Three of the heads of households are government employees, and two earn money as local housebuilders. On the farms of these five, there are nine warundi labourers staying.

The labourers come from Burundi for a period of 4-8 months. They are allowed to build a temporary hut on the farms and in exchange they help collecting firewood or water outside their normal working-hours. In the working-hours they do the harder farm-work, 5 hours in the morning for 1 Shs, in the afternoon usually for some foodstuffs. They seldom work all the time on the farm where they are living. Normally they work a few days on many different farms in the villages. Now and then Ernesti employs one of them.

The Wahanza.

The wahanza in Murgwanza are descendants of a man who migrated from Burundi to Bugufi, near the Burundi border. Two of his sons, Bitwale and Rujuba later moved on, and settled in Murgwanza on the land west of the area the washambo had claimed as theirs. Their six sons and two grandsons are now farming in Murgwanza, whereas two grandsons have found land elsewhere, and one have migrated to Uganda.
Stephen Bitwale, son of Zefania, is a grandson of Bitwale. He is 32 years old, has one wife and six children.

In 1957 he finished teacher training and then worked in Dodoma and Bukoba. In 1960 he was posted to Murgwana as teacher. He got married and was given some land by his father. Since 1964 he has been posted to Korogwe, Bukoba, somewhere else in Bugufi and now in Bushubi.

All the time his wife has been living on the farm, where they have a cement house with corrugated iron roof.

He has planted all the bananas and coffee on the land his father gave him. A couple of years ago he bought more land, some with bananas, for 400 Shs. from a relative who sold all of his rather big farm here in order to move to Ntobeye Ujamaa Village.

They still don't get enough from their farm to be able to sell anything. The coffee doesn't give anything as he, as an employee, has to be away most of the time. And every now and then they have to buy foodstuffs. He also uses quite a lot of money for clothes, travelling and for beer and pombe.

He spends his holidays at home, taking care of the shamba - and talking, discussing and having a drink with colleagues and other government-employees, and sometime relatives. He has a transistor radio.

The money for all this comes from his salary of 550 Shs. a month, as do the payments to those warundi labourers who do most of the work on the farm.

In 1958 he became a member of TANU, but left one year later, because the mission didn't want its teachers to be members. Joined again 1968. In 1970 he aspired to become one of the two candidates for the Ngara parliamentary seat, but was not selected for it by TANU.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bitwales descendants:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banka Bitwale (B):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busabo Banka (BB):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerewazi Bitwale (G):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zefania Bitwale (Z):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen (Zefania) Bitwale (SZ):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas (inter-planted maize):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual crops, Autumn 70:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava/maize:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet pot.:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So/cassava:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edward Nyamwilahila is the biggest landowner in Mukididili/Murgwanza.

(All the following is what others say, as he refused to be interviewed or to have his farm measured. Because as he said, he can care for himself and doesn't need to be sent to an Ujamaa Village. We had better go to measure small farms. Some people say he is afraid to have his land divided among the small farmers.)

Nyamwilahila, father of Edward, was made subchief by the King, and was given much of Murgwanza as his personal landholding. The washambo and the wahanza who had settled there earlier fought against having their land included, and in the end they were allowed to keep it as their property.

Edward himself was made subchief in the present Kirusha ward, NW of Murgwanza, and got a similar landholding there. When his father died Edward inherited his land in Murgwanza, although he didn't become subchief there.

They were watutsi (of the "noble" clans) and pastoralists, so at the beginning they didn't cultivate their holdings themselves, but allowed the commoner agriculturalists to live there and cultivate the land. But it is alleged, that when he saw the farmers had opened the land, perhaps improved it by applying manure etc. and got a good product, the subchief often removed them to another place, and took the good land for himself or his relatives. Later people had to pay money for using the land usually 20 Shs. a year. Edward Nyamwilahila is said to have had about 100 people on his two holdings.

In 1962, when the system was abolished, some of the people left, and the land reverted to Edward. But some, who went to the court, were successful and the land became their property. Some people, who are said to be his relatives or servants are still living on Edward's land.
He now owns an estimated 12-15 ha in Murgwanza, probably 1/3 or so with bananas and coffee. As a big and progressive farmer he has been president of the BCCU since its start in the early fifties.

He also runs the only duka in Murgwanza, and has a herd of cows.

At least two of his sons are government employees, one being chief clerk at the Ngara District Headquarters.

The WEO.

Richard Sinibagiye. Is 47 years old. Went to school for 7 years. He has three wives, two on the farm here, and a third on a farm below the ridge. He has eight children, the oldest of them are still in school.

Before 1963 he was a Village Head¬man below the ridge, where he was given a farm of about 4 ha by the King. Since then he has been Village Executive Officer in different villages in Bugufi and Bushubi. 1969 he became WEO, since 1970 here in his home area, Nyamiaga ward.

His farm here is on the border be¬tween Murgwanza and Mukiddidiili, where to his ancestor had come from Rwanda four generations ago. This farm belonged to his grandfather, who had decided that the youngest grandson should inherit it. So Richard moved here in 1942. He has planted all the bananas and the coffee since then. He still owns three small plots, which were part of his father's farm, some distance away in Mukiddidiili. All his ten brothers have farms there now.

As he is usually away the whole day in his job - moving around in the entire ward on his bicycle - much of the work on the farm is done by hired labour, warundi, who are paid with bananas, beans and pombe. (The day we were there, there were four of them).
One part of the farm, which had been lying with bush for many years, was last spring lent to some neighbours, to clear, break and grow sorghum on. After one season he is now using it himself.

The farm-products are mainly for food. He hardly gets anything from his coffee, but he does sell some pombe and a little cooking bananas. The farm below the ridge is mainly bush, and gives very little. Neighbours are moving away because of the wild animals, who are destroying the crops.

By far his main income is his salary, from which he has also financed a cement, and a mudhouse, both with iron roofs.

The Ward Development Committee member.

Leonard Mkuba is 50 years old. He has five years education. He was born in another village, near Ngara town, where his father had a small farm. While Leonard was still a child, his father moved to Mukididili, where the subchief gave him a farm, which had been abandoned by another man. Later he gave his old farm to a brother, who remained in their old village.

As the only son, Leonard inherited the whole farm, when his father died, and since then he has increased it by buying small plots of land here and there in the village, for a total of 700 Shs. The last few years he has given some of it to his oldest son.

He has one wife and six children. The oldest son works as a skilled labourer for the government, is married and has recently built a stone house next to his fathers house with mudwalls and iron-roof. (So Leonard receives visitors in his son's house).

He is usually able to get a surplus from the farm, which he sells in the village, at the market in Ngara town, or to the Murgwanza hospital. In 1970 he sold pombe for about 200 Shs., bananas for about 100 Shs., beans also for 100 Shs.,
sweet potatoes for 50 Shs. and maize for 10 Shs. He also sold a goat for 30 Shs. and now has seven left.

He has one cow. It has been with calf three times, they all died, but at least he got milk 2-3 months each time.

In his house he runs a small duka, where he sells soap, salt, oil, cigarettes and cloth. His second son works there, sewing clothes for people. On the market days he brings his goods to the market, spreads them on a blanket on the ground, and does his business from there.

Leonard was elected ten-house-cell leader in the first election in 1962. There are 11 households in his cell. Two of the men are teachers, and one a skilled worker. The rest are farmers only. He doesn't know how many temporary labourers are staying there, as he doesn't use any himself.

In 1965 he became member of the Village Development Committee, and in 1970 of the Ward Development Committee, as representative for Mukididili Village. People here proposed a number of names, and the TANU-branch committee selected the members from among those names. As a WDC-member he goes to meetings, and works hard to show others a good example of progress. He went many times to work on their communal field below the ridge, even at night to watch against animals. When Ntobeye Ujamaa Village was started he took part in housebuilding there, because many of the members came from Mukididili.

Also in 1970 he became chairman of the Reconciliation-committee, which has five members, cover the same area is the old VDC, and has taken over the VDC's function as mediator in local disputes, f.ex. about land. When a case is finished they have to report it to the primary court, to which the parties to the dispute may also appeal. The members of the committee are selected in the same way as the WDC-members.

Leonard tells that, in the old days, they had much more cooperative work. A man would brew pombe, and call his neighbours, friends and clansmen. They would work for a day, and then drink pombe. It was mainly
for weeding sorghum, harvesting millet, planting bananas or house-building. He remembers it from his father's time. Now it is very seldom - mainly when building traditional houses.

Three who went to Ntobeye Village.

John Bavugilije is 26 years old. He went to school for four years. Has one wife and four children, all sons. His family has lived in Mukididili for more than seven generations. When his father died, he and his older brother each inherited about half of his farm.

In 1968, a VDC meeting in Mukididili called upon people to move to the new settlement at Ntobeye, so in order to get more land he acquired one of the plots, and started to cultivate it. He didn't move there permanently until 1969.

Now he lives in Ntobeye with the two oldest sons, who go to school there. But every week-end he goes to Mukididili to collect food from the farm there. The two small children are with their mother, who every second week-end follows her husband down to Ntobeye, comes back with him the next week-end, and stays on in Mukididili the following week. In this way they can take care of both farms.

Most of their food, especially bananas, they still get from the old farm in Mukididili. They don't have any surplus to sell. The last year he has had no money at all, so a main problem for him is that their clothes are worn out. He expects to sell some of the tomatoes he has started to grow, and perhaps groundnuts - but last year wild pigs took all his groundnuts.

The banana stumps to plant in Ntobeye he carried down from Mukididili, where he got them from his own or neighbours' farms.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Bavugilije (JB):</th>
<th>In Mukididili:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total land:</strong></td>
<td>1.52 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bananas:</strong></td>
<td>0.59 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coffee:</strong></td>
<td>0.01 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>annual crops, Autumn 70:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beans:</strong></td>
<td>0.08 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Be/maize:</strong></td>
<td>0.06 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cassava:</strong></td>
<td>0.52 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.66 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 71:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beans:</strong></td>
<td>0.26 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sorghum:</strong></td>
<td>0.14 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sweet pot:</strong></td>
<td>0.52 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.92 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **In Ntobeye: (9)**   |                |
| **Total land:**       | 0.85 ha        |
| **Bananas (inter-planted beans/groundnuts):** | 0.16 ha |
| **Annual crops, Spring 70:** |        |
| **Beans:**            | 0.07 ha        |
| **Sorghum:**          | 0.17 ha        |
| **Cassava:**          | 0.12 ha        |
| **Sweet pot:**        | 0.01 ha        |
| **Tomatoes:**         | 0.01 ha        |
|                       | 0.38 ha        |
| **Autumn 70:**        |                |
| **Groundnuts:**       | 0.17 ha        |
| **Millet:**           | 0.07 ha        |
| **Cassava:**          | 0.12 ha        |
| **Sweet pot:**        | 0.01 ha        |
| **Tomatoes:**         | 0.01 ha        |
|                       | 0.38 ha        |
Before he moved to Ntobeye he went to Uganda twice to work as a farm-labourer. Nine months each time. He earned 60 Shs. a month. Last time he came back, in July 1967, he brought 300 Shs. with him home, which were used for food and the clothes they are still using.

Liwingi Mandwa is now a member of the General Committee in Ntobeye Ujamaa Village. He is 29 years old. His father has a rather big farm in Mukididili, but on bad soil, from which he gave Liwingi the land he has there. He has three brothers. One is a policeman in southern Tanzania, and two have migrated to Uganda, where one has a farm and the other works as a farm labourer.

He started to cultivate his plot in Ntobeye in March 1968, built his house, and brought his wife.

In May 1969 he went to Uganda to find work as a farm labourer, and in December he returned. He had earned 39 Shs. a month - but all his money was stolen on his way back to Ngara. While he was away his wife used to live and work in Ntobeye.

In August 1970 he married his second wife - and paid part of the dowry with money the first wife had earned by selling maize while he was in Uganda. Now the first wife has moved back to Mukididili with two of her three children, and the new wife lives in Ntobeye with her husband and his oldest child, who goes to school there. Every week-end Liwingi goes up to see his first wife, and to bring back most of the food the family in Ntobeye eats.

They are only able to sell a little beans and groundnuts to get money for salt, soap and oil. He wants later to increase his two acres farm in Ntobeye.

The only thing he mentions he has to do as a committee member is to mobilize others for the communal work.
Isaya Ntakisigaye and his wife
Guriselda Isaya. He is one of the Murgwanza washambo, a grandson of Ruhiga. He is 44 years old and his wife 32. He went two years to school, while she has no education. They have four children. The oldest is 16 years and goes to school in Murgwanza, the three younger go to school in Ntobeye.

The shamba in Murgwanza was given to him, partly by his father, partly by the chief. It was rather small, so from 1955 to 66 he travelled almost every year to Uganda to earn money as a farm-labourer. Some of the money he used to buy 5 cows, but the claims from his neighbours for damage on their crops became too high, so in 1967 he applied to the VDC and was given, land in Ntobeye. That was before the Ujamaa Village was started. By the next year he had cultivated about 4 ha, but when the new settlement was laid out that year, he was left with only 1.6 ha, and was very upset and angry. But now, he says, he likes Ujamaa, where all work together.

In the meantime three of the cows have died, and two are too few to have alone, so they are now stationed somewhere else, with a relative, who has a herd of his own.

They are now living permanently in Ntobeye. They only go to Murgwanza now and then to collect bananas for food, or to make pombe. The rest of the land there they have lent to some relatives for annual crops. All other food, besides bananas, they now get from the farm in Ntobeye, but they still don't have a surplus to sell. They sell the pombe they make in Murgwanza, and may get 20 Shs. a month. When the cows are in milk, it is sold, and they may get about 30 Shs. a month. (1-2 bottles a day per cow, which is sold for 80 cents a bottle (3/4 liter)).

Isaya Ntakisigaye (IN):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Land Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mukididili</td>
<td>Total land</td>
<td>0.66 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bananas</td>
<td>0.31 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>0.04 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No annual crops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye (2)</td>
<td>Total land</td>
<td>1.64 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bananas (inter-pl. beans/groundnuts)</td>
<td>0.10 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual crops, Spring 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>0.06 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>0.22 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autumn 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>0.53 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>0.38 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Casava/millet</td>
<td>0.06 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gurisolda, the wife, was in 1968 elected by the General Meeting in Ntobeye, to be chairman of its Women's Committee, and as such to be a member of the General Committee. They were two members of the Women's Committee, but the other one has left the village, so now she is alone. It is her responsibility to tell the women how to wash their babies and their clothes, and to encourage them to take part in the meetings in the village. She has got no training for this at all.
The people in Ntobeye Ujamaa Village.

The village chairman.

Zacharia Barankwaje is 45 years old. He had only gone to school for two years, when his father died, and he as the youngest son had to leave school to stay home and help his mother on the farm up the ridge, which he inherited. His brothers are all farmers, but at least two or three cousins are WEO's or have other posts in the lower government hierarchy.

According to his own information, he has four wives, one on the farm he inherited after his father, which is about 1 1/2 ha, one is living in old Ntobeye, on a 2 1/2 ha farm, which he bought for 700 Shs. a number of years ago, and the two last ones are both in the new settlement in Ntobeye, each having her own two-acre-plot.

He has 10 children, the oldest is 18 years old and is working on the tea estate in Bukoba, the second is in the National Service.

Of the farm produce they sell maize, groundnuts, coffee, and sometimes goats and chickens. He has 11 goats and 20 chickens. No cattle. (Others insist that he has two more wives, each with an additional farm, and that he also owns cattle).

Before joining Ntobeye he had first been a housebuilder, which could bring him about 150 Shs. a month. Then he was Village Executive Officer for the area covering old Ntobeye, where he was also a ten-house-cell leader. At the same time he was a member of the TANU-branch Executive Committee.

When the new settlement was started, he felt he ought to join, because he was the leader of the people in the area, and saw people moving in and start living together. He did so, and was elected chairman right from the beginning.

Fields measured in Ntobeye:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas:</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual crops,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 70:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans:</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts:</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum:</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava:</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca/simsim:</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet pot.:</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 70:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans:</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts:</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr/maize/cassava:</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca/beans:</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca/millet:</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet pot.:</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the 1970 election, he won the seat for Nyamiaga Ward in Ngara District Council, with 80% of the votes, against an opponent, who is a big farmer and owns an eating house in Ngaru town. Since then he has had to be away from the village a lot, for meetings, and travelling all over the District to encourage nation-building and Ujamaa.

Some people say he was asked by the administration to move to the new settlement and become its chairman. There are complaints, that he is too much away from the village, and doesn't fulfill his duties as a chairman. They say he is busy as well with official duties as with private engagements. Recently he was reelected by the General Meeting for a new one-year term, with 145 votes against 143 for his opponent, the vice-chairman. It is said that mainly the women and the people from old Ntobeye voted for the incumbent).

The vice-chairman.

Jamus Ntakisigaye is of the same clan as the chairman, and was proposed by him when he was chosen as the village's first vice-chairman. He is about 30 years old and is married with one wife. He finished two years in primary school. He has worked as a labourer in Ngaru, Uganda and Dar es Salaam, and was paid 60-90 Shs. a month. He has a 2 ha farm near Ngaru town. He was his father's youngest son, and got the major part of his farm at his death. Half is with bananas. But the soil is not good, it has been used for too long time. He can get better annual crops harvests here in Ntobeye.

He started cultivating here in June 1969, and moved to live here in September. He came together with two neighbours from the old village, with whom he had been discussing the matter for some time.

He still goes to the old village every week to get bananas and brew pombe, which he sells - for 10-20 Shs. a month. He would like to expand his farm in Ntobeye.
As a vice-chairman he is supposed to mobilize people for communal work, and to plan the work together with the chairman, the secretary and the agricultural-extension-officer. He is also a ten-cell leader and as such has to report about work-attendance and illness.

Two ten-house-cell leaders.

Ndondogoti Binwa is 40 years old, with a wife and five children, of which the oldest go to school here in Ntobeye.

He started his farm in Ntobeye in 1962, when he moved there from a neighbouring village. To that village he had earlier moved together with his father and the whole family from a place near Ngara town. His father and two brothers are still farming in the neighbouring village, and he himself has ½ ha with bananas there. But as he could not get more he decided to move with his wife and child to Ntobeye, where very few people lived at that time. Now he only goes to the old village once a month to collect bananas.

He was very happy when the new settlement was started, because more people around means less wild animals. Now he goes for communal work every Tuesday to Friday, he is one of the charcoal burners. Only the wife is working on the private farm.

There are still too many wild animals, who damage the crops, so they can only get just enough to cover their needs for food, and bananas and sorghum for pombe. He does sell pombe, for about 30 Shs. a year, and small amounts of the crops, but they have problems with seeds. They use the money for soap and salt.

Dawson Masama is married, but has no children. He is 26 years old, and has gone four years to school.

His father Masama came to Ntobeye in 1968 and is now a member of the General Committee. Old Masama has about 2 ha land in a village next to Murgwanza,
half of it with bananas, and another 2 ha a bit down the ridge, all given to him by the former chief. As that will not be enough for his five sons, he acquired a plot in Ntobeye - and also because services like water and electricity (!) will be provided there. He now has a wife in Ntobeye and another in the old village.

A third wife, Dawson's mother, is dead. His oldest son is in another Ujamaa Village. The second is a teacher in Bukoba. The third son is studying at the University of Dar es Salaam. Dawson is the fourth, and the last is still in school. On the farm in the old village he now and then hires a murundi labourer for 1 Shs. a day - for money he gets from selling pombe.

Dawson himself has worked as a "house boy" and has been to Uganda twice as a farm-labourer, earning 30-60 Shs. a month. Could bring 100-150 Shs. with him home, after six months.

In 1966-68 he was in the National Service.

In 1969 he moved to Ntobeye, because being neither the oldest nor the youngest of the brothers he will get very little of their father's farm. And he could get no other land.

He is going to build a house instead of their present grass hut - he has bought some of the poles and was given the rest by relatives.

Besides the beans they get from their own field, he says there are three ways to get food and a little money: to ask from his father, to ask from relatives, or to earn by working on other people's farms. The last he does once every week. For a whole day he is paid 2 Shs. or 1 Shs. and some food.

He doesn't think the 2 acres is enough for a family, so he wants to expand it later on, but also he says, that it is up to the leaders to get them food from the communal farm.

Dawson Masama: (4)

| Total land: 0.84 ha |
| Bananas (inter-pl. beans): 0.25 ha |
| Annual crops, Spring 70: |
| Sweet pot.: 0.02 ha |
| Cassava: 0.12 ha |
| Autumn 70: |
| Maize: 0.10 ha |
| Groundnuts: 0.03 ha |
| Sweet pot.: 0.02 ha |
| Cassava: 0.10 ha |
|                      0.25 ha |
(Dawson is one of those few young men, who sometimes question the leaders' and officials' proposals at meetings. In the Spring 1971 he was elected member of the Financial Committee, and at the recent elections of village leaders he won against the incumbent secretary, who was supported by the chairman, with 120 votes against 75. Unlike the former secretary and the chairman he still takes part in the manual communal work.)

An old farmer.

Maliko Makuba doesn't know how old he is, but he was born under the German administration (so he must be more than 55 years old). He has a wife and five children. The oldest, a 15 year old girl is married, two go to school, and the two youngest live with their mother, who is staying one day every second week, in a village next to Murgwanza. There they have a second farm, every other week. The farm in the old village is about 1 ha, most planted with bananas. He himself goes there one day every week, to get bananas. All other food they get from the farm in Ntobeye. He has four goats and two chickens.

This year he has been able to sell beans for 10 Shs. bananas and pombé from the old farm for 20 Shs. and meat and eggs for 35 Shs.

He came to Ntobeye in 1968, because all people with little land were told to go, and also because the soil here is still new so they get better harvests.

He has been to Uganda as a farm-labourer many, many times. 6 months each time. The last time was about 10 years ago. Sometimes he could work for five people at the same time, and earn 20 Shs. from each, i.e. 100 Shs. a month.

---

Maliko Makuba: (11)

| Total land:      | 0.96 ha  |
| Banana (inter-pl. beans.): | 0.11 ha  |
| Annual crops, |       |
| Spring 70:  |       |
| Beans:      | 0.04 ha  |
| Maize:     | 0.01 ha   |
| Ma/cassava: | 0.04 ha   |
| Sorghum:   | 0.15 ha   |
| Sweet pot.: | 0.12 ha   |
| Vegetables: | 0.02 ha   |
| **Total**   | **0.38 ha** |

| Autumn 70:   |       |
| Beans:     | 0.12 ha   |
| Be/cassava: | 0.02 ha   |
| Cassava:   | 0.02 ha   |
| Groundnuts: | 0.02 ha   |
| Sweet pot.: | 0.12 ha   |
| Vegetables: | 0.02 ha   |
| **Total**   | **0.32 ha** |
A Murundi ex-labourer.

Minani Yohana is from Burundi. He is 30 years old and has a wife, but no children.

He left Burundi, because his father's farm there was too small, and it was not possible to get more land. Together with his present neighbour in Ntobeye, who is also a murundi, he worked several places in Ngara, and finally came to Ntobeye to seek work from the people they had heard had rather big farms there. They also wanted to ask for land to open their own fields in the bush.

That was in April 1968, and they hadn't heard about the new settlement. But when they arrived, they were told that in order to get land it was necessary to join. So they each got a 2-acre-plot. In the beginning he lived with one of the old people, who had been farming in Ntobeye for a long time, worked for him for the food, and also went to work for other people to earn a little money - at the same time starting his own farm.

Now he gets enough food from his own farm, except for bananas, which he still has to buy in neighbouring villages - at 2 Shs. a bunch.

He sells a little cassava, and has three goats and six chickens, which he intends to sell. But his main income now is from a small business he has managed to start. In the neighbouring villages he buys pombe, and sells it in a "club", a small house, he has built next to his own. He buys 3-4 debe (each 18 litres) a month at a 8-9 Shs a debe and sells it for 50 cents a bottle (each ½ litre), thus having a monthly profit of 10-15 Shs.

(He was accused of being a "rain doctor", keeping the rain away from Ntobeye. It was said he had been chased away from his home-village, and some villages in Ngara for that reason. In several meetings in Ntobeye complaints were brought against him, and although he
denied the charges, it was finally decided, that if the rain didn’t start within a certain time limit, they would do as they had always done to "rain doctors", that is beat them up, chase him away and burn his house. The rain did start, so he is still in the village.)

Three farmers who live in old Ntobeye.

Gerewazi Ndutie Ndazivunie is a very old man, who says the German administration began while he was a small boy. He was born in Ntobeye, where his father was the King’s subchief. The subchief controlled the distribution of land, and had many fields himself. Later he himself became village headman, who also had some control of land. As subchief and headman, they were given plenty of gifts of food and pombe. When the chiefdoms were abolished, he became ten-house-cell leader, which he still is.

He has two wives and two children. One wife lives with him on his farm, which he says is the only one he has. The other wife lives with his sister a short distance away, and helps her while her husband is in Uganda.

Somebody else told that there are actually two farms, one of them, which is only a bit smaller than the one measured, belonging to Gerewazi himself.)

About four days each month he has a labourer to help him on the farm. They are paid with bananas. They are warundi as well as people from Ngara, often from the Ujamaa Village or old Ntobeye, who have small farms and come when they are hungry.

In his ten-house-cell there are 11 households. Four of them have lived there for a long time, but seven have moved in since 1960. There are three men, who live up on the ridge, but have land here, which they come down to cultivate. In November 1969 they joined the Ujamaa Village. They were called to a meeting with the WED and the Ujamaa Village chairman, who asked them to join. When they saw they were called upon, they agreed, but there were some among

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gerewazi N. Ndazivunie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total land: 3.50 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas (interplanted beans/maize: 0.93 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual crops,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 70:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans: 0.06 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum: 1.04 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet pot.: 0.09 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 70:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans: 1.08 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be/maize: 0.07 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava: 0.06 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet pot.: 0.09 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them, who complained that they were not to be given free food from the government like the people in the new settlement.

He thinks they will profit from taking part in the work. They have already got the advantage, that some of the wild animals were chased away by the new settlement, and the tsetse flies as well. Later they may get food from the harvests.

He remembers, that when he was a child, many more people were living here, and even in the area where the new settlement was started. But then for a long period a lot of people died, and some went away to Uganda, when they saw the others die. In the end they were only a few left, so he is happy that new people are moving in now.

Minani Lilagendanwa. He is about 45 years old. Went just one year in school. He is married with two wives and six children. One son, the oldest, is a painter in Kampala, where he is married with five children. Another son is a policeman in Dar es Salaam, but his wife is living here with her parents-in-law.

He has two farms, the one here in Ntobeye, and another up the ridge near Ngara town with 1 1/2 ha bananas and 1 ha for annual crops. The farm in Ntobeye was his father's, but many years ago he left it to go and live with his grandfather, from whom he inherited the farm on the ridge. In 1962 his father died, and he got his farm as well. Most of it was bush and all the coffee and almost all bananas are planted since then.

He stays in Ntobeye every second week, on the other farm every second. One wife is in Ntobeye. The other lives up the ridge, with her grown up, yet unmarried, daughter and her daughter-in-law. But as there is more land for annual crops in Ntobeye, they have some fields there as well, and the weeks he stays there, the three women come down every day to cultivate etc.
Not only does the wife of the son, who is policeman, help them on the farms, he also sends them 50-60 Shs. each month. He will eventually get the farm where his mother and wife is staying. The older son will have nothing if he returns from Uganda - so he would have troubles even getting food, and would have no other possibility but to join a new Ujamaa settlement.

There was coffee on the old farm, but it was getting too old, so in 1969 he uprooted it and planted new on the farm in Ntobeye, where it is easier to get grass for mulch. Without advice from anybody he took seeds from the old trees, made a seedbed, and later planted the seedlings out. Since then the agricultural extension officer from the Ujamaa Village has told him to prune and use insecticides. He has only just began to get a harvest. Besides the coffee, he sells pombe from both farms for an average 10 Shs. a month. All other crops are for food only.

In his house he has a bag of salt, which he trades in small portions for beans with the people around here - not for his own profit, he says, but for another man in Ngara town.

Often he employes a labourer to work on the farm for two weeks, for 15 Shs. They are always warundi, because the people from Ngara want 36-40 Shs. a month, and they prefer to cultivate their own fields some of the days, whereas the warundi work every day.

Before he got the farm in Ntobeye, he himself went many times, six months almost every year, to Uganda to work. He could earn 125 Shs. a month, and used most of the money to buy clothes etc. in Kampala.

They joined the Ujamaa Village this year. Before they joined the chairman and the Area Commissioner came and told the ten-house-cell leaders that they were to join. They have got to be happy about it, he says, with all the social services, dispensary, school, water etc.

As he is ill, the chairman has exempted him from communal work, and instead he has to provide food for visitors.
John Gasago Ndabananyie is about 50 years old. He is from Rwanda, but has applied for Tanzanian citizenship. He has never gone to school.

In 1931, while he was still a child, he came to Tanzania with his brother, who worked as a housebuilder. His brother later returned to Rwanda to get a farm, but he himself found there was better here, so he stayed. For a long time he worked in different jobs, as a houseboy, a hospital worker and a cook. But in 1966 he resigned, because he saw, that being away in employment he could not care well for his family, and the farm in Ntobeye, which the VDC had allocated to him in 1964. It was all thick bush there, but it was the only place he could get land.

In 1968 he went to Uganda as a farm labourer for 7 months, and was able to bring 150 Shs. with him when he returned, 60 Shs. of which he used to pay tax, and 6 Shs. to buy a TANU membership card.

While in Uganda he heard about the new settlements in Ntobeye, and when he returned, he found the agricultural extension officers surveying it to support the Arusha Declaration, he asked to join and be given a plot.

He likes the Ujamaa Village and the cooperation there very much, and believes the communal fields will be an advantage.

When doing communal work he is usually assisting the tractor-driver. He has learned to drive the tractor, and to care for it, and hopes to be sent for a course. (When the village was invited to send somebody for a course, a young Standard VII leaver was chosen - but he disappeared, probably to go back to his home-village.)

John Gasago has a wife, who is from Ngara, and six children, two of whom are living with his former wife, their mother, who ran away. He doesn't know where they are.

The only surplus they have is a little pombe from which he can earn 15 Shs. a year.

---

### John Gasago N. (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total land</td>
<td>2.00 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas</td>
<td>0.40 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum</td>
<td>0.60 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet pot.</td>
<td>0.01 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>0.37 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>0.15 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet pot.</td>
<td>0.01 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.53 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### In the new settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total land</td>
<td>1.00 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas (inter-pl. beans)</td>
<td>0.40 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual crops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring and Autumn 70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>0.02 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People in Mbuba.

The former subchief's son.

Benedicto Rukamba. He is 54 years old. As a child he went to school for four years. As an active catholic and member of the church-committee he only has one wife who is from Bugufi. They have three daughters and four sons. The two oldest daughters are married in Bugufi and in Geita District. The third daughter is in teacher training college in Mwanza. One son is in secondary school in Bukoba, the three others in primary school here in Mbuba. His old mother-in-law is also living with them.

In the old days the King of Bushubi had two subchiefs in this northern part of the Kingdom. One was the father of the present Rulenge TANU-branch chairman, the other was Rukamba, Benedicto's father. As a subchief he had land in many villages, and many wives. When he died, Benedicto inherited all his land in Mbuba, including his present farm and a large area around it. Most of the present neighbours got their land as a kind of leasehold, although they didn't have to pay a fixed rent (as was usually the case in Bugufi), but would give occasional gifts of pombe or foodstuffs. After independence the system was abolished, and the land is now their property.

Before Independence Benedicto Rukamba worked as an executive for the King's Council in Ngara. After that he was Divisional Secretary till 1964. In 1965 he became member of the District Council and TANU-branch chairman. In 1970 he relinquished these posts, when Tanu selected him as one of the two candidates for the Ngara parliamentary seat. He lost though, against a young teacher from Bugufi Division.

In the Mbuba he was chairman of the VDC up to its abolishment in 1970, and as such he took the initiative to start the communal field in 1966. Since 1970 he is a member of the WDC, responsible for the monthly ward huntings, and a member of the Ujamaa field committee.

Fields measured in Mbuba:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
<td>16.00 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas:</td>
<td>27.70 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee:</td>
<td>0.50 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual crops, Autumn 70:</td>
<td>0.64 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be/maize:</td>
<td>1.40 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans:</td>
<td>0.59 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum:</td>
<td>2.09 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts:</td>
<td>0.22 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.90 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1969 he took part in the founding of the Myenzi Tractor Cooperative Society, for which he is still the chairman.

His father had the bananas and coffee down the slope planted in the 1930ies. In 1946 he himself built a cement house near the main road, which was then but recently constructed. In the 1960ies the bananas around this house were planted, and in 1969 the agricultural extension service helped him start a banana- and coffee-demonstration plot near the road. Insecticides and regular supervision are still being supplied by the government. On the farm he employs labourers, as well from Bushubi as from Burundi. The last year it has cost him 525 Shs. He also hired the tractor from the tractor cooperative society, to plough two acres, at a cost of 75 Shs. pr. acre. Sometimes, when he has brewed pombe, he invites his neighbours to drink the pombe, and help him with some work.

Last year he sold for 100 Shs. coffee, 25 Shs. Bambara nuts, and 200 Shs. pombe from the farm. Everything else was used in the household.

His main income is from cattle. He has 32 head of cattle, 4 goats and 6 chickens. The milk is used in the house, but last year he sold two cows for slaughtering for 700 Shs. and slaughtered two others and sold most of the meat for 600 Shs. (He is said to have about 30 more heads of cattle lent out to other people. One man told that he had been given three cows, who by calving had multiplied to a total of 24. In principle they all belong to the original owner, who gets 50 Shs. a year and some sorghum-pombe every time it is brewed. When an animal is slaughtered or sold, they share the meat or money equally. Only the milk belongs fully to the man who keeps the cattle.

It is also said, that Benedicto Rukamba imports cattle from Sukumaland for slaughtering in Bushubi and Bugufi. This year he bought and sold 17 cows just for the Easter festival.

He is highly respected in the village. He almost always take part in meetings etc., but usually doesn't interfere in the general exchange of opinions on a given subject, until towards the end of the discussion, when he will often try to draw conclusion
or state his own views, which then carry heavy weight among other villagers.

He is never seen in the pombe club or at similar gatherings.

The chairman of the communal field.

Zacharia Bukara is from Bugufi, but he now regards himself as a mushubi (of the Shubi tribe). He is 45 years old and went to school for 6-7 years.

His father had a farm near Ngara town, but a younger brother inherited most of it. For many years he was employed at road-building - in 1944 he worked at Mbuba, and as he had married a girl from Bushubi, he asked the sub-chief Rukamba for land, and was given his present farm.

From the farm they only have a very small surplus to sell, mainly pombe, and they now and then have to buy cooking bananas. They have 7 goats, all for their own consumption.

Three years ago he retired from his employment, built a house, with mud walls and iron roof, and started a "pombe club" in it. It is the only "club" in the village, besides one near the market, which is owned by a bar-owner in Rulenge, and only operates on the weekly market-day. He buys the pombe in the village and sells it in the "club", which he estimates has given a nett surplus of about 600 Shs. a year.

There are two warundi labourers living on his farm, helping him in the "club" and with farm-work.

Two of his sons have migrated to Uganda and one works in Mwanza as a bus-conductor. One daughter is married in Biharamulo and the other is living with her, so there is only one son living at home.

He is a ten-house-cell leader, and when the VDC was replaced by the WDC in 1970, and a special committee was elected to be responsible for the Ujamaa field in Mbuba, Zacharia Bukara was chosen as its chairman. He has also been appointed to lead the consumer-cooperative, they plan to start.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zacharia Bukara (ZB):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total land:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual crops,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 70:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorghum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
He is a member of TANU and TANU Youth League.

People in Zacharia Bukaras ten-house-cell.

Clemence Sebatwa is 45 years old with a wife and two young children. He came to Mbuba with his father when he was a child, from a village not far away from Mbuba. They left because their crops were continually destroyed by wild animals. It's also bad in Mbuba but the other place was even worse. In Mbuba they were given land by the sub-chief. As the only child he has inherited all his father's land, except a small plot, which is still being farmed by his old mother, who lives next to them.

According to what he says, they don't have any surplus to sell at all from the farm - but they do use a little money in the dukas and on the market. He owes the hospital 60 Shs. for medical treatment.

He has 2 chickens, which he recently bought, and 6 goats, after they sold one for 20 Shs. this year. (The wife is known in the village for her good basketry. So they probably do earn a little from that. Also she comments sarcastically, that it is easy to get the men to bring the crops to the market, because they buy pombe for the money they get, whereas only women care to clear bush nowadays. In adult education classes she learned to make nutritious food, but when the husband never brings the right things, onions etc., she cannot practice it.)

Fulgence Ruligo. He is 25 years old. He is married with two young children. His father had a shamba in a neighbouring village, but he died while Fulgence was still a child, so the older brother took care of the family and the farm. When Fulgence got old enough to marry, they disagreed on how to divide the land. He then asked Benedicto Rukamba for some land, and was given this farm.
He has just started to grow tobacco. Last year they could only sell sorghum for 6 Shs. and pombe for 10 Shs., so to get the money they needed to buy food and clothes, he worked as a labourer on Benedioto's farm and earned 70 Shs.

He has been to Uganda several times as a farm labourer.

He has also started to make beehives and hopes to earn money by selling honey.

He has paid 3 Shs. to TANU, but still needs so pay 10 Shs. to become a full member.

The vicechairman - his ten-house-cell and clansmen.

Mudui Ndagyihangwe, 55 years old. No formal education. He has two wives and an old mother-in-law living each in a traditional hut. He has only young children. His father, Ndagyihangwe, was sent to Mubua by the King to be a village headman. That was in 1920ies, and there were very few people living there. The old Ndagyihangwe got a lot of land, and in the end he had seven wives living around here. But only two of his sons are still alive.

The old people had very little bananas, because they had to carry the stumps all the way from Bukoba or Karagwe on their heads. They grew a little tobacco, otherwise it was all millet, sorghum and beans. It was not until the 1930s when the colonial administration started pushing it, that they really began growing bananas, coffee and tobacco.

Mudui has planted almost all the bananas on his farm himself, since 1935. He also planted some coffee, but as it didn't grow well, and he didn't get any harvests, he gave it up again, and concentrated on tobacco as a cash crop. In the colonial time tobacco growing expanded a lot in this area. He could earn 200-400 Shs. a year, and the marketing was organized, so he got all the money in one lump sum. He can still, in a very good year like last year, earn 350 Shs., but as the...
marketing system broke down just before independence, he now has to sell it little by little on the markets in Bugufi, and gets only 5 or 10 Shs. at a time, which then also disappears little by little, on pombe etc., without really being felt. The buyers on Bugufi either smoke it themselves, or collect big quantities, which they sell in Mwanza, Bukoba, Rwanda and Burundi. He doesn't know why the organized marketing broke down, it just disappeared, and the farmers were never told anything. He wishes it would be started again.

Aside from the tobacco, he earns a little money by selling bananas and pombe in the village. Sorghum they don't sell - that would be a loss. If they sell anything, it's sorghum pombe.

He says he has two head of cattle and 10 goats. The cattle he bought from money he earned by selling goats up in Karagwe.

When asked if the new house he wants to build will be with an iron roof, he said, that he didn't have enough money, and anyway he would rather spend it on buying goats. 10 goats become 20 in a year's time, and if you sell them in Karagwe you can have a profit of 3-400 Shs.

He also tells about a man in Bugufi, who owes himself and others in Mbuba a lot of money, for cows he bought from them on credit, in order to slaughter and sell them in Bugufi.

(According to the dipping register Mudui has six head of cattle and 18 goats - but then they may not be his own, all of them).

Mudui is a ten-house-cell leader, vice-chairman of the Ujamaa field committee, and member of the reconciliation committee.

(He is a very active participant in discussions at meetings, gatherings and in the pombeclub, where he likes to go - to see his clansman, Zacharia Bukara, and the other villagers listen to him.)
Kinyamwanga Ndagiyihangwe is Mudui's older brother. He is 75 years old. He never went to school, but all his children are getting education. He has one wife. Another died some years ago. His oldest son is Matthayo, who is married with two young children, and to whom he has given a small farm. The next son, also married, is a school teacher and doesn't have any land. One boy and three girls are still in primary school.

He got all his land from his father, some before, some after he died. He planted most of the bananas himself. He has also tried coffee, but gave it up, as it gave no profit. His only animals are five goats. He cannot tell how he gets money, but he uses quite a lot, especially for pombe. As he says he cannot sleep without a bottle.

(Both Mudui and Kinyamwanga stress that they have given the land to most of the people who live around them, and that in principle it is still their land. The two brothers do not seem to be on very good terms with each other, Kinyamwanga complaining that the younger brother is dominating, in village affairs and otherwise, and Mudui being afraid that Kinyamwanga's grown-up sons will take over his land, if he dies while his own children are still young.)

Dunia Gwampunzi is the only son of Mudui and Kinyamwangas elder brother, who died long ago. Dunia was brought up by Kinyamwanga, but now he has his father's farm, where he lives with his wife, four children, and his old mother. He never got any formal education.

He says he planted all the bananas on the farm himself. His only source of income is the tobacco which he gross on a plot in a valley some distance away, where about 50 people from this and neighbouring villages opened tobacco fields in 1966. He may earn about 100 Shs. a year from it.

Last year he also sold two bowls of groundnuts, which he got from the communal field. Therefore he is
quite happy about the communal field, and also because the money they got from selling the crops is kept as a communal reserve, so that if he gets sick, or his house burns, he can get help.

Like everybody else in the village he also cultivates a small plot in the swamp below the village, where they all grow beans from August to November.

He has three goats and a hen.

Rushatzi Moundule. He is of the same clan as Mudui and the others. He is about 50 years old, with two wives and eight children, seven of whom are still at home, while one is working in Mwanza as a cook.

His father lived in another part of Bushubi. After he died Rushatzi and his two brothers wanted to migrate to Uganda, because wild animals were destroying their crops all the time. The two brothers went, but he was offered the farm here by Mudui, whose brother, to whom it had belonged, died childless. So in 1964 he moved to this place. He finds that although there are many wild animals here, they are fewer than in the old village, because here there are many more people.

He has goats, which he bought from income from tobacco growing. The tobacco may give him 180 Shs. a year. He started growing it in 1966, when the ten-house-cell leader (Mudui) told them all to go and clear a certain valley, full of thick forest, and to start growing tobacco there.

He also now and then sell some pombe - but then he uses at least as much money to buy pombe at other times.

Two times he went to Uganda as a farm labourer.
Table 1

Mean Hectarages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bananas</th>
<th>Coffee</th>
<th>Other crops</th>
<th>Total cultivated</th>
<th>Uncultivated land</th>
<th>Total coffee</th>
<th>% farmers with land in other village</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mukididili</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabawe</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makumba</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPatha</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukibogeka</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small farmers</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium farmers</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big farmers</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bananas</th>
<th>Coffee</th>
<th>Other crops</th>
<th>Total cultivated land</th>
<th>Uncultivated land</th>
<th>Total coffee with land in other village</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small farmers</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium farmers</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big farmers</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye Ujamaa Village:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Ntobeye</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New settlement</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(land outs*)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small farmers</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium farmers</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big farmers</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihanga Ujamaa Village:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(land outside*)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small farmers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium farmers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big farmers</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Mean ha of land outside the new settlement, for those settlers who have such land. All other figures are the sum of the land owned by the farmers wherever it is located.
Table 2
Demography for sample farmers. Age of head of household:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15-34 years</th>
<th>35-54 years</th>
<th>55+ years</th>
<th>Mean years</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Traditional&quot; Villages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujamaa Villages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihanga</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
School-education of head of household:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1-4 years</th>
<th>More than 5 years</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Traditional&quot; Villages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujamaa Villages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihanga</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of wives of head of household</th>
<th>Households w. female heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 wife</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 wives</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 + wives</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Traditional&quot; Villages:</th>
<th>% of heads of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total</td>
<td>3% 79% 13% 4% 69 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>0% 87% 10% 3% 30 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>9% 82% 9% 0% 22 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>0% 65% 24% 12% 17 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total</td>
<td>0% 72% 20% 9% 46 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>0% 85% 15% 0% 26 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>0% 63% 25% 13% 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>0% 50% 33% 17% 12 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ujamaa Villages:</th>
<th>% of heads of household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye</td>
<td>8% 63% 29% 0% 24 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihanga</td>
<td>4% 83% 13% 0% 24 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of household:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Traditional&quot; Villages:</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total</td>
<td>19% 33% 37% 11% 5,3 persons 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>26% 35% 38% 0% 3,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>21% 50% 29% 0% 4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>0% 6% 47% 47% 9,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total</td>
<td>13% 23% 51% 13% 5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>15% 30% 48% 7% 4,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>13% 13% 75% 0% 5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>8% 17% 42% 33% 7,7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ujamaa Villages:</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye</td>
<td>16% 48% 36% 0% 4,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihanga</td>
<td>13% 50% 33% 4% 4,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6
Means of acquiring land by sample farmers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Inherited 80%</th>
<th>Bought 80-100%</th>
<th>Given 60-100%</th>
<th>All 40% nyaru-</th>
<th>N DK</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% of their land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Traditional&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total</td>
<td>59% 4% 23% 14% - 73 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>61% 3% 27% 9% - 33 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>57% 4% 26% 13% - 23 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>59% 6% 12% 24% - 17 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total</td>
<td>55% 2% 30% - 13% 47 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>59% 4% 30% - 7% 27 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>63% 0% 25% - 13% 8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>42% 0% 33% - 25% 12 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7
Annual crops grown by sample farmers June 1970-June 71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beans</th>
<th>Sorghum</th>
<th>Maize</th>
<th>Millet</th>
<th>Roots</th>
<th>Groundn. Tobac</th>
<th>N DK</th>
<th>N DK (Coffee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Traditional&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>72 3 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32 2 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23 1 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17 0 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushubi total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>47 0 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8 0 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12 0 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujamaa Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25 0 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihanga</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Livestock ownership by sample farmers.
Units (1 goat = 1 sheep = 1/10 cow = 1 unit)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of households</th>
<th>L/stock units</th>
<th>% of households owning cows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>21+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Tradit." villages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bugufi</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>6.2</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bushubi</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>33.0</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>34%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small f.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium f.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big f.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ujamaa</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihan-ga</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9

**Household incomes by sample farmers June 1970 - June 1971**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Small f.</th>
<th>Medium f.</th>
<th>Big f.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bugufi &quot;traditional&quot; vil.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbuba &quot;traditional&quot; vil.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ntabeye Uja- &quot;traditional&quot; vil.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maa Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Incomes from agricultural products:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shs. Range</th>
<th>0-100</th>
<th>101-200</th>
<th>201-500</th>
<th>501+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of house-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds hav-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shs.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110+ Shs.</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean inc.</td>
<td>109/=</td>
<td>128/=</td>
<td>190/=</td>
<td>86/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sales of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bananas</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cr.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pombe</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Incomes from animal prod.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shs. Range</th>
<th>0-100</th>
<th>101-200</th>
<th>201-500</th>
<th>501+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of house-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds hav-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shs.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all house-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds</td>
<td>9/=</td>
<td>2/=</td>
<td>6/=</td>
<td>26/=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Incomes from other sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shs. Range</th>
<th>0-100</th>
<th>101-200</th>
<th>201-500</th>
<th>501+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of house-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds hav-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shs.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all house-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds</td>
<td>82/=</td>
<td>10/=</td>
<td>99/=</td>
<td>188/=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total incomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shs. Range</th>
<th>0-200</th>
<th>201-500</th>
<th>501+</th>
<th>1001+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of house-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holds hav-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shs.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-500Shs.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510+ Shs.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>67/=</td>
<td>233/=</td>
<td>404/=</td>
<td>457/=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N: Number of households

Dk: Number of deaths
Table 10
Household expenditures by sample farmers June 1970-June 1971

Bugufi "traditional" villages   Mbuba "traditional" villages   Ntobeye
Total   Small f. Medium f. Big f. Ujamaa V.

| Domestic expenditures: | | | |
|------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| % of households using  | 0-300 Shs. | 310-500 Shs. | 510+ Shs. | Mean |
| 0-300 Shs.            | 62% | 22% | 16% | 304/= |
| 310-500 Shs.          | 87% | 9%  | 3%  | 155/= |
| 510+ Shs.             | 59% | 27% | 14% | 285/= |
| Total                 | 13% | 40% | 47% | 654/= |
| Mean exp. all households | 60% | 9%  | 30% | 458/= |
| % used for food crops | 1%  | 1%  | 1%  | 4%  |
| Animal prod.           | 0%  | 9%  | 11% | 9%  |
| Pombe                  | 1%  | 9%  | 9%  | 6%  |
| Other                  | 78% | 14% | 11% | 8%  |

| Farm expenditures: | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|---|---|
| % of households using | | | |
| hired labour         | 22% | 3%  | 10/= | 12% |
| Mean exp. all households | 3/= | 25% | 53% | 15% |
| Other; mean all households | 11/= | 19/= | 49/= |
| | 9/= | 6/= | 9/= | 44/= |
| | 15/= | 44/= |
| Total expenditures   | | | | |
| Mean                 | 323/= | 164/= | 305/= | 688/= |
| N                    | 69   | 32   | 22   | 15   |
| Dk                   | 6    | 2    | 2    | 2    |

N: Number of households
Dk: Number of observations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>Autumn 69</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 71</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 71</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
<th>Autumn 70</th>
<th>Spring 70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ntobeye</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>152 87 18</td>
<td>154 90 40</td>
<td>277 186 41</td>
<td>276 187 41</td>
<td>55 21 7</td>
<td>35 22 12</td>
<td>24 26 12</td>
<td>24 27 21</td>
<td>57 57 4</td>
<td>58 57 4</td>
<td>51 65 16</td>
<td>45 45 11</td>
<td>42 57 12</td>
<td>64 61 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruganzo</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>152 87 18</td>
<td>154 90 40</td>
<td>277 186 41</td>
<td>276 187 41</td>
<td>55 21 7</td>
<td>35 22 12</td>
<td>24 26 12</td>
<td>24 27 21</td>
<td>57 57 4</td>
<td>58 57 4</td>
<td>51 65 16</td>
<td>45 45 11</td>
<td>42 57 12</td>
<td>64 61 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyamahwa</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>152 87 18</td>
<td>154 90 40</td>
<td>277 186 41</td>
<td>276 187 41</td>
<td>55 21 7</td>
<td>35 22 12</td>
<td>24 26 12</td>
<td>24 27 21</td>
<td>57 57 4</td>
<td>58 57 4</td>
<td>51 65 16</td>
<td>45 45 11</td>
<td>42 57 12</td>
<td>64 61 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyabihanga</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>152 87 18</td>
<td>154 90 40</td>
<td>277 186 41</td>
<td>276 187 41</td>
<td>55 21 7</td>
<td>35 22 12</td>
<td>24 26 12</td>
<td>24 27 21</td>
<td>57 57 4</td>
<td>58 57 4</td>
<td>51 65 16</td>
<td>45 45 11</td>
<td>42 57 12</td>
<td>64 61 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1II
Development of Ujamaa Villages in Ngara District.
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of Ujamaa Villages in Ngara District.</th>
<th>No. of inhabitants</th>
<th>Cultivated Beans</th>
<th>Communal fields: planted and harvested annual crops</th>
<th>Oth.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Bananas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td>ha bags</td>
<td>ha bags</td>
<td>ha bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerere:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Started 1969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chivu:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Started 1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djuruligwa:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Started 1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibuga:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Started 1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyarurama:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Started 1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All villages:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 69</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 70</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 70</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>+88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Monthly reports on Ujamaa Villages from the District Agricultural Officer, Ngara, to the Regional Director of Agriculture, WLR, in Regional file P/Vil/SET/WL vol. 1-V.