OMALY SY ANIO, 1994, 33-36, 465-478

THE OBSTRUCTION OF SWAZI LAND TENURE SYSTEMS TO RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, 1894-1955

by

Bonginkosi A.B. SIKHONDZE(*)

Introduction

Studies in pre-colonial and colonial history have shown that some societies inherited certain beliefs and practices from their predecessors which thwarted any forms of change. Since these beliefs and practices were transmitted from one generation to the next, the word used to refer to them here is "tradition". It may not be the most nearest word to the notion that is being expressed here, but it has some affinity to the whole idea. The notion is closely linked to adamant opposition to change, that necessitated the restructuring of the order by which society functioned even when alien influences came. These practices have been dubbed as traditional to connote their atavistic nature towards the developmental projects of some individuals in certain communities.

Traditional institutions of Kingship and Chieftaincy have been, and continue to be, dominant in land allocation and use in Swaziland. The institution of chiefs

(*) Department of History, University of Swaziland.

has been noted for its observance and preservation of the *status quo* in land allocation and other aspects of life in their chiefdoms or domains. Due to lack of National Committees to monitor the behaviour and activities of chiefs in relation to the above- stated duties, some of them have abused their powers. Sometimes chiefs were ill-advised by members of their *ad hoc* committees on how to frustrate prosperous cultivators by reducing the amount of land already allocated to them. Sanctions against land enclosure by prosperous cultivators were common, and most of these were coined by envious members of the above-mentioned committees. In order to facilitate the flow of goods into and out of the communities the construction of passable roads became paramount and some of them could not avoid traversing fields of disgruntled community members. In such cases staunch opposition was encountered resulting in the abandonment of these viable projects. In that wise, not only did the envious conduct of the traditional committee members frustrate the progressive efforts of diligent members of their communities but, the whole community concerned was denied access to the social facilities in question. These things were all done under the pretext that progress would lead to the Swazi culture being contaminated, something which was thought not to auger well for the "policies" of the state. The latter aimed at the retention of the *status quo*.

Sources and definition

The inadequate nature of colonial records and those which came into existence after decolonisation have made it necessary for the author to also use some oral sources. Archival and departmental records concentrated on those issues which touched upon settlers at the total exclusion of issues which concerned the indigenes *per se*, save only those which were criminal. The bias nature of colonial records might have been strengthened by the traditional institutions which made it difficult for the aggrieved members of society to report their problems directly to the colonial authorities. Their cases were dealt with conclusively at the level of the chiefly traditional courts, which were not given much publicity unless they were of a criminal nature. Thus, no records of such cases or issues were reported on or recorded for future reference.

Since the present study has its starting date as 1894 it was thought that oral research could play an important role in bringing the study to desired fruition. Events which occurred from the 1920s still constitute living memory for those who have not suffered severe illnesses which often weaken the functioning ability of their heads. These oral sources have been drawn from the victims of the system which were checked and balanced by seeking the reactions of the accused and even the views of uninvolved observers. Clues about each of the above

groups were secured from several meetings of different regional Farmers Associations and Farmers' Producer and Marketing Cooperative Unions. It was at such meetings that problems of the production of both food and cash crops were discussed, and these debates gave rise to an interest to pursue a study of land allocation ; Land enclosure ; and land ownership (as private property) in a Swazi Context of the concept of ownership with an aim to ascertain the degree of their frustration of economic development in the territory.

In an effort to balance the study, recourse was made to some published works which have close affinity to the topic. Among such works are those of MCI Daniel, Hughes, Kuper, Marwick, and others[1]. However, most of these either shallowly looked into the mode by which Swazi cultivators used the land and demonstrated their inability to solve the continued decline in production in Swazi Agriculture. This study therefore demonstrates some of the major problems of small scale cultivators, and these are discussed under major themes like land allocation, land enclosure and credit facilities. In short, this study is about the political economy of rural Swaziland, since it examines the powers of the traditional leaders in relation to cultivation, and the obstructive nature of the "Swazi" concept of land tenure and use patterns.

Land allocation : Swazi nation land

The introduction has already mentioned that the allocation of land to cultivators at the regional level has been a prerogative of the chief, and that arrangement has remained in force todate. Chiefs have carried out this task with the assistance of committees set up at regional levels, on a formula approved by the King and his Council. This provision was considered and approved by the King in order to ensure that all parties concerned were treated with justice[2]. The meaning of this clause (with justice) is that, with the advice of members of the Chief's Council, land allocation would be carried out in a way that would meet the socio-economic needs of the people. Land was required for a settlement which was accompanied by economic activities which were carried out on the land. This comprised mainly agricultural and pastoral farming, both of which formed the back bone of Swazi rural economy[3].

1. See J.B. McI Daniel, *The Geography of The Rural Economy of Swaziland*, Durban : University of Natal, 1962 ; A. Hughes, *Land Tenure, Land Rights and Land Communities on Swazi Nation Land in Swaziland*, Durban : Institute for Social Research, 1972 ; H. Kuper, *The Uniform of Colour*, Johannesburg : University of Witwatersrand Press,1947 ; and B. Marwick, *The Swazi*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1940.
2. Interview Madami Dlamini, Mafutseni, 28 July, 1980 ; Alfred Mabuza, Mafutseni, 29th July, 1980 ; and Brian Manana, Lwandle, 15th September, 1982.
3. A. Hughes, *Land Tenure, Land Rights and Land Communities on Swazi Nation in Swaziland 1972* ; Swaziland National Archives (SNA), Rcs 520/38 Resident Commissioner to High Commissioner, 24 Pretoria, 1938.

The principle which guided the Chief and his Council (among whom were his administrative officer, and runner) in land allocation was the size of each homestead which included its population. As a principle, it does not mean that it was followed to the letter when the actual allocation of land was finally carried out. Be that as it may, part of the responsibility for a Chief was to ensure that his Community produced primarily food before considering the production of other options like cash crops[4]. However, the latter were produced on a very limited scale during the period under discussion. While chiefs were supposed to know readily the sizes of the homesteads in their chiefdoms so that land allocation was not carried out in a vacuum, it was also encumbent upon the head of each homestead or family to contact the chief and his council on the need for additional land to his share. Such developments were occasioned by expansion to various families, and expansions of this nature also created a need to expand the volume of production. The latter was dependent on land expansion.

The chief ascertained the validity of the application for additional land by sending one of the key members of the committee to assess the capacity of the family's land in relation to the size of the family making an application. In their assessment of the above, some members of the Chief's Committee deliberately "closed their eyes" to the impact of international trade which had come with colonialism. It was the latter that had also facilitated the introduction of the ox-drawn plough into Swaziland in 1894[5]. The use of the ox-drawn plough led to the expansion of land each family cultivated after the above date. At this time other food and cash crops were being introduced[6] which meant an inevitable expansion in the amount of land allocated to each family. Land was divided between the two types of crops ; cash and food crops.The backward technology of the hand-hoe was gradually receding because it was ineffective for the production of maize. The latter was inevitably planted in well broken up soil to facilitate the spread of its roots which sought various minerals in the soil. Maize growth depended on how deeply its roots anchored in the soil and that determined the height and yield of the crop[7].The ox-drawn plough proved to be more effective in this regard than the hand-hoe[8].

In their allocation of additional land to their subjects, chiefs had to reckon with the above outlined development. However, chiefs' reactions to these

4. See B.B. Sikhondze, "Some Factors Which Impinge Upon Food Security in Southern Africa : The Case of Swaziland" ; in K.K. Prah (ed.), *Food Security Issues in Southern Africa*, ISAS - CTA, Roma, 1988, pp. 127-130.
5. SNA Rcs 245/39 District Commissioner, Southern District to Government Secretary, 14th July 1939.
6. SNA Rcs 520/38 Government Secretary to High Commissioner, 15th October 1940.
7. See B.A. Sikhondze, "Some Factors Which Impinge Upon Food Security in Southern Africa", 1988.
8. *Ibid.*

developments were highly discriminatory. While some applicants received additional land others were slapped with a scornful rejection or refusal. Gross inequality in individual farmer agricultural prosperity has, for years, been the cause of the ill-feeling by the Chief and his Committee towards prosperous cultivators[9].The excuse the Chief and Committee used to cover up their corruption was that cash crop production was not catered for in Swazi Customary land tenure and use. This excuse was first coined in the period of the First World War when cotton production spread to Swazi Nation Land (S.N.L.) in response to the world demand for the commodity[10].

The outbreak of World War One coincided with the demand for land on S.N.L. by those Swazis who evacuated concessioned land. The Chiefs and their Committees had a busy schedule which made them respond to two sets of demands for land. On the one hand already settled Swazis needed additional land for reasons already explained, and on the other the new comers who were coming from privately owned land required to be allocated some land. Most of the latter category of applicants had already been exposed to the western culture whose maintenance could be done either by selling wage labour to mining industries and settler farms in South Africa or by working on settler farms in the territory[11]. Others opted to expand their farming activities by including cash crops of the nature mentioned above.

Trade was no longer confined to cash crops but even food crops began to play a dual role during the First World War[12]. Never before had food crops commanded a lucrative market as they did in the period 1914-1918 and the years which followed later[13]. An effective response to the market demand for these items was determined, among others, by the cultivators' access to adequate land in order to respond effectively to the market demands. Incidentally, the war situation rendered the market for cotton and maize lucrative because both commodities were in high demand to support the War Economy[14]. Maize was required to feed the soldiers who did not produce while cotton was used for the manufacture of explosives, without which the prosecution of the war could have been hampered[15]. In their deliberations on the amount of land each diligent

9. *Ibid.* ; A. Hughes, 1972.
10. B.A. Sikhondze, "Swazi Responses and Obstacles to Cotton Cultivation", *TransAfrican Journal of History*, 13, 1984.
11. Interview Lajolwane Dludlu, Ngololweni, 16th May, 1988.
12. B. B. Sikhondze, "Swazi Responses and Obstacles to Cotton Cultivation", 1984.
13. *Ibid.*
14. SNA Rcs 346/17 Government Secretary to Director of Native Affairs, 8th October, 1918.
15. See B.B. Sikhondze, "The Development of Swazi Cotton Cultivation" ; Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1989. Chapter 2.

cultivator should be allocated, Chiefs had to bear in mind all the factors, outlined above. Some of the new Swazi settlers on SNL already owned ox-drawn ploughs whose effect on agriculture was twofold : in the process of expanding the volume of food each cultivator produced, the plough also created a need for more cultivable land[16]. The latter expanded the bagful problems for the chief in an area where such developments were prevalent.

Applications gradually trickled into the offices of the Resident Commissioner, D. Honey, at this time for permission to settle and farm on crown land where cultivators hoped to be exempted from the bewildering obstacles of chiefs who were opposed to economic development on SNL[17]. The provision of Crown Land to accommodate "progressive and enterprizing" Swazi farmers was an admission on the part of the colonial state that Chiefs on SNL were an obstacle to economic development[18]. It was also hoped that agricultural demonstrators would carry out their duties effectively because Crown Lands lay outside the domains of Chiefs. Apart from serving as a refugee for frustrated Swazi cultivators, Crown Lands were used as settlement areas for those Swazis who were ejected from title deed land in 1914 and later years[19]. At least these efforts, by the Colonial State, were a pointer to the unprogressive tendencies of the chief on SNL.

In response to the expanding market demands for cotton, tobacco and maize, more ox-drawn ploughs were purchased, and to the ratio of the ownership of these was at one plough to ten homesteads (1:10) by 1914[20]. Pressure continued to pile upon the chiefs to accommodate these changes by expanding the amount of land each homestead was allocated. These changes were accompanied by a rise in the number of schools and children who attended them particularly in the 1920s[21]. The demand for money was gradually growing. This money was required for the purchase of school clothing, writing materials and other related expenses[22]. While tobacco and maize markets were entirely under government control that of cotton came to be controlled by the Swaziland Power Company (SPC) and government on a marginal scale. The decision to allow the SPC a lion's share in the marketing of cotton was arrived at due to the fact that as a merchant company, the SPC had contact with some consumers whom they could feed with Swaziland cotton[23]. However, this aspect is slightly off point here because the

16. *Ibid.*
17. SNA Rcs 320/20 Resident Commissioner to High Commissioner, 11th October, 1918.
18. SNA Rcs 459/38 Government Secretary to District Commissioner, 14th July, 1939.
19. *Ibid.*
20. SNA Rcs 320/20 Resident Commissioner to High Commissioner, 11th October, 1918.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*
23. SNA Rcs 751/23 Government Commissioner, Secretary to Resident 16th September, 1923.

focus is land tenure and use. The implications of such a development was an expansion in the use of land, and need to develop it in order to raise its yield capacity. The Table below shows the output since the duration of the war in those crops whose markets were already accessible.

TABLE I:

COMPARATIVE OUTPUT AND RETURN FIGURES IN COTTON AND TOBACCO - AGRICULTURAL EXPORT COMMODITIES 1917-31

YEAR	lbs	£	lbs	£
1918	1,911	—	—	—
1919	2,737	—	—	—
1920	411,350	10,282	1,035,000	25,875
1921	274,400	6,860	200,000	7,500
1922	142,148	2,013	214,230	5,432
1923	366,692*	17,700	324,150	8,000
1924	783,289*	6,221	240,500	7,909
1925	641,608*	7,013	250,190	6,981
1926	1,243,177*	13,900	780,000	22,750
1927	536,500	11,270	1,262,500	36.825
1928	850,814	13,785	1,283,250	37,428
1929	2,618,913	37,961	1,068,400	35,613
1930	3,224,182	26,868	578,330	14,397
1931	1,532,132	9,578	298,413	9,082

Source :

1. *Swaziland Colonial Reports for the years 1931*
2. *Empire Cotton Growing Corporation : Annual Reports of the Council for the years marked with an asterisk, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926.*

These figures do not only represent volume in trade but volume of the concerns of the chief regarding the allocation of land to diligent farmers. But since the land yield depended on land development, the latter could not be done

without recourse to western principles of agricultural development, an aspect that will be discussed after the exhaustion of Swazi application for allocation on clan land.

Clan land

Refuge was often sought from those clans who owned land, and its history dated back to the time when clan competition for land was keen[24].The explanation on why such land could not be administered by regional chiefs has remained unclear. The final authority on the distribution and use patterns of clan land remained in the hands of the head or leader of each clan. Such an arrangement was contrary to Swazi customary tenure of land in SNL, because it presupposed that there was some miniature community within each chiefdom, whose administration was vested in their leader. But such mandate was confined to the distribution of land. Land distribution in this context encompassed allocation of usufructuary rights and the cancellation of the said rights whenever the condition dictated[25].

It could no longer be denied that the concept of a miniature society within another was seen to be in practice. The duration of access to the usufructuary rights of the land was determined by the success with which the client lubricated the wheels upon which the otherwise loose and fragile relationship on which the rights to the land was granted. Said otherwise, the client was obliged to pay tribute to both his immediate "landlord" and the chief of the region in the domain where the rights were located. In that arrangement the cultivator had to reckon with two lords, an exacting concern for someone whose successful prosecution of his economic activities were dependent upon an intelligent management of all the resources which facilitated agricultural farming[26]. However exploitative the structure might have appeared, it was in agreement with the whole Swazi concept of reciprocity. The latter system operated on the basis that while the chief played the role of a leader in his domain, those whom he led "paid" for his leadership services by cultivating, planting, weeding and harvesting his fields. Clan leaders seem to have followed suit by accepting tribute in a variety of forms[27].

By the 1920s, at a time when trade became a dominant factor in the economy of the territory, tribute to both Chiefs and clan leaders assumed the form of cash.

---

24. B.B. Sikhondze, "Some Factors Which Impinge Upon Food Security in Southern Africa", 1988.
25. *Ibid.*
26. Interview Madami Dlamini, Mafutseni, 21st October, 1982 ; Brian Manana, Lwandle, 11th March, 1982.
27. *Ibid* ; Nganga Mamba, Maloma, 21st February, 1980.

Land allocation was no longer dependent on the needs of the applicant/subject but on the cash proceeds which accrued from the transactions. This development was fairly recent to the customary nature of Swazi land tenure and use systems. It presupposed that land had already entered the market, a deviation from the Swazi concept that land was held by the King and Chiefs on behalf of the nation. Land was also not supposed to enter the market as a commodity. Acceptance of cash transactions both for sale and rental presupposed a different status for land. In certain instances, the transactions were camouflaged by being commuted to gifts most of which were expensive. Not uncommonly, some of the presents were in cash and the latter was becoming popular in the 1920s and 1930s[28]. These dynamics might at face value appear to have been internal yet their origin was induced from outside.

This phenomenon suggests that land had already become a commodity for some people. When considered in the Swazi context of land ownership and use, this is clearly contradictory to the Swazi concept that land belonged to the nation and could not be sold nor rented for cash[29]. Instead Swazi customary land ownership allowed that land could change hands gratis because it belonged to the nation in general. In fact, this untoward development was not peculiar to clan land *per se* but had spread even to the extent of influencing the chiefs' decisions on land allocation and use systems. Those subjects who required additional land for farming and had been given an unfair reception by the chief, resorted to the use of cash to influence the decision of the chief. Such dynamics owed their origin to the spread of trade and capital as a means to acquire those items which had become central to, or part of, the people's culture[30].

Not all the applicants whose economic muscle was firm enough to qualify for adequate land rights either with the chief or clan leader were serious cultivators. After they had acquired the land rights some of them used the said rights as a means to accumulate cash by renting it in turn to serious agricultural farmers.These practices were not only inhibitive to agricultural farming but even the provision of social amenities like trading centres, which could not function effectively without the provision of efficient roads were hampered[31]. All these facilities had serious implications for land allocation and use in Swaziland. Added to these changes were agricultural options whose history was still recent to the farmers and the territory in general. But the implications of these options

28. Interview L. Dludlu, Ngololweni, 10th September, 1988 ; Madomba Mkhaliphi, Hluthi, 11th November, 1990.
29. See A. Hughes, 1972.
30. SNA Rcs 459/38 Government Secretary to Resident, Commissioner, 21st November, 1938.
31. *Ibid.*

were far-reaching and involved even for traditional leaders like chiefs who had to ensure an adequate supply of land[32]. However, land allocation had various implications, and the main ones have already been alluded to above, and mention of them again would be an irritating repetition. Once land was allocated the cultivator had to improve its yield capacity which could not be achieved without crossing paths once again with the chief, who claimed to be the custodian of Swazi customary rights at the regional level. Land enclosure was yet another imperative phase in the area of agricultural improvement and development, and this aspect of economic growth needed the approval of the chief because of its implications.

Land enclosure and agricultural development

Some Swazi cultivators did not realize that unless land was fenced to facilitate its improvement, the yields would continue to be unimpressive. Land development involved the ploughing-in of the debris in order to enhance the hummus content in the soil[33]. Land enclosure became imperative here in order to stop animals from disrupting the process by entering the fields to eat the waste material. The latter usually assumes a variety of forms. Yet apart from preserving waste material, farmers (cultivators) usually planted the fields all the year round even in winter when livestock were not looked after by boys or herdsmen. In order to save labour time that could otherwise be invested in keeping livestock away from the planted fields or gardens, fencing became the only alternative. Yet when it is considered that communally owned land was not supposed to be monopolised by one individual at the expense of others, the practice of fencing land was anathema. This was the main factor for enterprizing farmers to apply for title deed rights in Crown Land[34].

Chiefs and their assistants opposed land enclosure because it would introduce to the community the feeling of individualism. Trespassing on enclosed land could lead to a series of conflicts. The problems of land enclosure would also interfere with social cohesion each community had hitherto enjoyed and cherished. Areas for winter grazing also diminished particularly in winter when livestock were let loose to forage for food wherever it could be found. Attached to land enclosure was the western practice of feeding livestock such as

32. *Ibid* ; SNA Rcs 260/32 Chief Zembe to Assistant Commissioner, Hlatsi, February, 29th, 1932.
33. This idea is implied in M.K. Knudson and V.W. Ruttan,"Research and Development of a Biological Innovation : Commercial Hybrid Wheat", *Food Research Institute Studies*, XXI, 1, 1988, pp.45-63 ; D. Grigg, *The Dynamics of Agricultural Change : The Historical Experience*, London : Hutchinson, 1982; T.W. Schultz, *Transforming Traditional Agriculture*, New York : Arno Press, Reprint, 1976.
34. SNA Rcs 459/38 Government Secretary to Resident Commissioner, 21st November, 1938.

cattle on the foliage and other food which farmers harvested from the fields and kept it somewhere to facilitate rationing it to the cattle in winter. Apart from the fact that it facilitated active farming in winter, land enclosure also limited the movement of cattle and reduced to a minimum the erosion of the soil[35].

Free movement created foot paths not only by cattle but by human beings as well, and these increased the incident of soil erosion whose combat was also difficult because these had been spread all over the territory. In short, the fewer the places which were affected by soil erosion the easier would be the counteraction to its vestiges. Land enclosure provided an easy solution such problems, and it also facilitated irrigation farming which involved the installation of equipment that needed to be protected against "attack" by stray animals[36].

At the beginning of the Second World War it had become obvious that chiefs would soon lose the fight with enterprizing cultivators. In 1938, for instance, the colonial state began to create a fund to facilitate land enclosure and the purchase of inputs that would help raise production in maize. In his correspondence to the High Commissioner (E.J. Harding), the Resident Commissioner in Swaziland sought to provide a loan to Swazi cultivators to enable them to fence their gardens. Land enclosure would facilitate the cultivation of vegetables and other crops whose production was not hindered by winter climatic conditions. In his reaction to the motion, E.J. Harding added that while such a venture was aimed at creating a source for cash for the farmers, it would also improve the nutrition standards for the farmers and their families[37].

It would be hard to say what motivated the colonial state to advocate land enclosure at this point. This period coincided with the outbreak of World War Two which created an insatiable market for food. The campaign to increase production in maize, for instance, was launched and financed by the colonial state at this time and it took off the ground in 1939[38]. In the maize growing areas the colonial state supported cultivators in their endeavours to enclose land and develop it to raise output in maize. In short, chiefly authority and adamant opposition to land enclosure and development lost in the face of pressure from the colonial state to ensure adequate food supplies[39], but the problem of credit facilities and the collateral, lingered. After World War Two the impact of international trade in Swaziland was also reflected in the expansion of cotton

35. SNA Rcs 520/38 Government Secretary to High Commissioner,16th August, 1940.
36. *Ibid.*
37. *Ibid.*
38. SNA Rcs 520/38 Resident Commissioner to Principal Secretary, Department of Veterinary and Agricultural Services, 15th October, 1940.
39. *Ibid* ; Interview Brian Manana, Lwandle, 20th December, 1980.

production which was resumed in 1946. Its production had suffered adversely during the war when the colonial state concentrated more on maize. Since its harvest took place in winter after cattle had been let loose to forage for food, farmers had to fence their fields to stop livestock from destroying the crop. By the mid 1950s, land enclosure had become the order of the day though chiefs did not keep quiet about it[40].

Traditional land and credit facilities

In the age when farming expanded to encompass both subsistence and commercial crops, credit institutions came to play an important role in providing credit facilities to the farmers. Most Swazi growers lacked access to title deed land, which banks accepted as collateral for any credit sought by the growers. These growers carried out their economic activities on SNL which was communal in terms of tenure. Unless a cultivator owned cattle which were accepted by banks as collateral for loans, the cultivator did not receive any financial backing from the banks. In certain cases growers kept cattle on behalf of wealthy relatives, and these were not supposed to be used as security for any loan sought from the banks[41]. These procedures needed the strict observation of the custodian grower. But most custodians of loaned cattle used them for security and failure to settle the bank loan led to the cattle being confiscated by the bank. This in turn led to the relationship being soured, and means to secure the forfeited cattle were sought by the debtor[42].

But it would be wrong to assume that the effects of such a development were always adverse. There were, however, cases where custodians came to own cattle as a result of gaining access to the usufructuary rights of their rich relatives. However, these instances were strictly limited because successes of this nature depended upon a number of factors such as grower diligence.These factors were also supported by the grower's scientific knowledge of the environment and the whole technology which supported farming[43]. In short, despite the barriers which were created by traditional economic structures, some internal dynamics provided a vent for those who were capable to rise above their social and economic stations. It becomes clear that some institutions were created to serve a certain purpose which turned round to do the opposite in the long run.

40. B.A.B. Sikhondze, "The Advance of Cotton Production and Swazi Cotton Producers, 1946-60", *UNISWA Research Journal*, 4, 1991.
41. SNA Rcs 459/38 Attorney General (E. Roper) to Government Secretary, 21st November, 1938.
42. B.B. Sikhondze, "Some Factors Which Impinge Upon Food Security in Southern Africa", 1988.
43. Interview Madami Dlamini, Mafutseni, 20th December, 1982.

Contradictions of this nature brought about various changes to the system of land allocation. Failure to counteract these changes was reinforced by the fact that not only did they benefit the plaintiff (growers or subjects) but even some chiefs. Some chiefs rented out some of their fields to those who needed more land than allocated. Unlike in the customary practice where the rental assumed any form, some chiefs began to insist on cash. While the explanation for this conduct might appear that there were internally and externally induced factors, the real cause was international trade, an external factor[44].

First, when the dynamics of trade prompted chiefs to rent part of their land rights for cash, they did so in response to the demand for money with which to acquire foreign goods and other social services. Education and western manufactured items were the main cause for the cash, hence the contention that what may, on superficial grounds, appear internal factors were evidently external. Initially, schools and churches had insisted that attendants should wear western clothes because traditional ones were thought to be "heathen" and associated with opposition to any form of development. In fact this was part of the effort by colonists to promote their culture at the expense of indigenous culture[45].

Conclusion

The study has demonstrated serious contradictions which have been inherent in the Swazi land tenure and use patterns. Chiefs with their committees have been shown as staunch custodians of Swazi culture, but when trade came with numerous temptations, it became difficult to isolate what was Swazi and what was foreign in the practices of chiefs. Chiefs became the incorrigible victims of western culture, which came to be "assimilated" in Swazi culture. Certain foreign practices were said to be Swazi to the extent that most Swazi practices became foreign. Take for instance the payment of tribute which had hitherto been done in kind was henceforth commuted to cash. Land itself could not be allocated to a subject until he had paid cash to the chief.

44. B.B. Sikhondze, "Some Factors Which Impinge Upon Food Security in Southern Africa", 1988.
45. *Ibid.*

FAMINTINANA

Matetika no hindrahindrain'ny rafi-piharian-karena nentim-paharazana ny fepetra sy soa toavin'ny rafi-piaraha-monina tompoiny ka tsy iraharahany loatra ny fandrosoan'ny fiharian-karena. Maro amin'ireo soa toavina ireo no najaina fatratra fahiny ary maniry hitana ny laharany fony talohan'ny fanjanahan-tany teo amin'ny fiaraha-monina afrikana izay voazanaka nefa efa afaka ankehitriny. Ny fitazonana ireny soa toavina ireny anefa dia mazava ho azy fa nataon'ny mpanao politika mba hiarovana ny tombontsoany. Mbola ny mpanao politika, ohatra, no mametra ny fahazoana tany na asa na loharanon-karena hafa. Ireny fanararaotana ireny, noho izy tsy mandraharaha ny teti-pampandrosoana sy izay ilaina amin'izany, dia misakana tanteraka ny fivelarana sy ny fandrosoana ara-toekarena.

RESUME

Les structures économiques traditionnelles sont généralement les projections des normes et des valeurs des sociétés qu'elles servent aux dépens du progrès économique. La plupart des valeurs sont consacrées et elles cherchent à garder le statu quo pré-colonial des sociétés africaines colonisées mais désormais libérées. Cependant, il est clair que le maintien de telles valeurs a été fait pour servir certains intérêts égoïstes des politiciens. L'accès à la terre, à la main-d'oeuvre et à d'autres ressources a en effet été et continue à être déterminé par les politiciens. De tels pouvoirs discrétionnaires sont pour beaucoup dans la frustation de la croissance et du progrès économiques car ils oublient les besoins et les stratégies du développement.