

# Integrating Tanganyika People into Capitalist Economic System: Plantation and Settler Agriculture Economy During the British Colonial Rule, 1920s-1950s

Mikidadi Hamisi Alawi

Catholic University of Mbeya (CUoM)

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803237S>

Received: 21 July 2024; Revised: 28 July 2024; Accepted: 01 August 2024; Published: 05 September 2024

## ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper was to investigate how Tanganyika's colonial economy was impacted by plantation and settler agriculture. Its methodology mostly draws from archival sources and documentary reviews. The results showed that there were two phases that occurred throughout the colonial era. The first phase, which ran from the 1920s to the 1930s. It was noted at this period that the Economic Great Depression and World War I had contributed to the economic crisis. Each of these had an impact on the economies of capitalist nations. In their colonies in Africa, a few of these nations engaged in plantation and settler agriculture. In addition, Tanganyika magnified its exploitation of its natural and human resources in order to rebuild its affected capitalist economy from the aforementioned tragedies. From the 1940s to the beginning of the 1950s was the second phase. This phase demonstrated how the global economy and politics were impacted by the politics of the Cold War and the Second World War. In order to effortlessly increase productivity, certain colonial economic policies were altered at this phase. In conclusion, the paper highlights the integration of the Tanganyika people into the capitalist economic system and finds that plantations and settler agriculture were critical to the exploitation of the economic resources of the Tanganyika people during British colonial rule. Based on the results of the current study, it was recommended that the labor question has become an important issue in all aspects of development. Human labor should be used with extreme caution by society, because human labor is appropriately accounted for in cases of exploitation.

**Keywords:** plantation, labour, settler, agriculture and colonial economy

## INTRODUCTION

The latter half of the 19th century witnessed significant upheavals across Africa, impacting countries like Rwanda, Burundi, and Tanganyika. Rodney (1979) characterizes this era as marked by profound pre-colonial transformations in Africa's political, social, economic, and cultural structures. These changes were closely intertwined with the rise of capitalism in Europe, particularly monopoly capitalism. As industrialization surged in countries such as Germany, Italy, and France during this period, European nations faced challenges in meeting the demands of their industries. This led to a pressing need for raw materials, inexpensive labor, markets, investment opportunities, and outlets for surplus production. Consequently, Europeans turned their attention to Africa, which served as a target for their expansionary endeavors driven by export capital.

The imperialist nations rushed to Africa to fulfill their economic objectives, triggering an intense scramble among capitalist powers. To address this competition, the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 became

necessary. This conference resulted in the colonization of nearly all African countries, with the exceptions of Liberia and Ethiopia, primarily through the use of force. However, colonization alone proved insufficient to address the economic challenges faced by European powers. Consequently, colonial economies emerged as an integral component. Rodney (1979) describes colonial economy as an extension of the economic system of the colonizing power. Alternatively, colonial economy can be understood as a distinct economic system, encompassing agriculture, industry, and trade, developed during the colonial period to meet the demands of the colonizers.

Following the First World War (1914-1918), the British government undertook the task of reconstructing, reorganizing, and reinstating the colonial economies initiated by the German colonialists in Tanganyika. However, much of the colonial economic infrastructure remained largely unchanged, with many structures preserved from the German era (Lewycky 1979). Production continued to be dominated by export-oriented ventures, primarily focused on raw materials destined for the metropolis. Transitioning from German to British rule in Tanganyika posed challenges in attracting sufficient British investors to engage in the production of raw materials (Mpangala 2000).

During the early 1920s, peasant production held greater prominence compared to plantation and settler farming, primarily due to an economic crisis affecting European settlers. Drawing from the example of British Cameroon, where Germans outnumbered British settlers and controlled all valuable plantations, the British administration opted to promote peasant production over encouraging European settlements in Tanganyika (Nindi 1979).

Historiographies that have been published since then have generally mirrored changes to the methodology employed in earlier studies. Prior studies have focused on political history by examining the dominance of imperialism in Tanganyika. It is noteworthy that the concept of capitalism evolved throughout the colonial economy's transformation in African colonies. However, not much is known about the part that settler agriculture and plantations played in Tanganyika's colonial economy. Moreover, the changes of colonial economy were partially addressed. These changes were caused by fluctuations of global relations that were signposted by the effects of First World War, economic great depression the Second World War and politics of Cold War. In bridging this gap this paper has examined the impact of plantation and settler agriculture on the colonial economy of Tanganyika, 1920s-1950s.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

In this paper, the author employed library research, relying on secondary sources. This approach proved valuable as it involved the analysis and description of previous research. Through secondary research, the author examined existing research findings to delineate the extent of knowledge on the topic. It is worth noting that secondary research also serves to validate the necessity for primary research and to support and justify new studies. Additionally, the author utilized archival documents as primary sources in the research process.

## **THEORETICAL DISCOURSE**

### **Marxist theory on Surplus Value**

Surplus value, a concept in Marxist economics, aims to elucidate the inherent instability within capitalist systems. Following David Ricardo's labor theory of value, Karl Marx proposed that human labor constitutes the foundation of economic worth. Marx contended that capitalists remunerated their workers less than the value their labor contributed to goods, typically only enough to sustain them at a basic level. However, within the Marxian framework, this compensation represents only a fraction of the total value generated by

the worker's labor—termed “surplus labor”—with the remaining portion constituting “surplus value.” Marx argued that to generate profits, capitalists appropriate this surplus value, thereby exploiting laborers (James 2018).

Marx examined industrial capital and observed that it generated goods or products with both use value (intended for consumption) and exchange value. He elaborated that use value is inherently non-measurable and cannot be quantified, while exchange value, according to Marx, explains exploitation through the generation of additional value, known as surplus value, appropriated by capitalists (Danielson 1994). At the core of his analysis lies the origin of this extra value, where Marx concludes that labor time expended exceeds wages. He emphasizes that surplus denotes what remains after the full value has been extracted (Boss 1990).

Marx identifies two distinct types of labor time within a commodity: necessary labor time and surplus labor time. He defines the source of surplus as surplus labor time, contending that it is not uniform and varies across historical contexts. Marx emphasizes that surplus labor time can be quantified at any given moment. Furthermore, Marx clarifies that when capitalists appropriate surplus, it is not arbitrary nor a moral judgment of good or bad; rather, it stems from the intricate relationship between capitalists and workers. Exploitation occurs simply because of the capitalists' ownership position, with their degree of surplus determined by the extent to which they appropriate from workers (ibid).

This theory holds significance in this paper as it delves into the impact of plantation and settler agriculture on the colonial economy of Tanganyika. One aspect highlighted by this theory is how the labor power of the Tanganyika people facilitated their integration into the capitalist economic system. The plantations and settler agriculture notably contributed to the exploitation of the economic potential of the Tanganyika people during British colonial rule.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Role Played by the Plantation and Settler Agriculture in the Colonial Economy of Tanganyika.

#### Introduction

The paper has thoroughly examined the involvement of plantations and settler agriculture in the colonial economy of Tanganyika across distinct phases: the initial phase stretching from the 1920s to the 1930s, and the subsequent phase covering the period from the 1940s to the early 1950s.

#### From 1920s, to 1930s

In the 1920s, Lord Delamere from Kenya endeavored to promote settler farming in the Southern Highlands of Tanganyika; however, this initiative was disrupted by the Great Depression of 1929. Despite this setback, plantation agriculture experienced a significant resurgence, particularly focusing on sisal production from the late 1920s. According to Illiffe (1973), British investors selectively purchased profitable ex-German sisal estates during auctions. Sisal plantations came under complete foreign ownership, necessitating substantial initial capital investment for land clearance, planting, water supply, factory operations, and transportation of the bulky leaves. These estates were typically organized into three main sections: cultivation, processing, and labor settlement and housing (Adrama 1980).

However, this does not imply the absence of settler agriculture. Both the plantation and small-scale settler sectors made significant contributions to the production of necessary raw materials. Settler agriculture was primarily concentrated in specific regions such as Tanga, Moshi/Arusha, the Southern Highlands (including areas around Iringa and Mbeya-Mbozi, Tukuyu), specializing mainly in tea and coffee cultivation. The

nature of settler farms varied depending on the source of capital, which also determined the size of the farm. Company-owned farms, for instance, operated as branches of large corporations such as the Tea Plantation owned by Brooke Bonds in the Mufindi District. These entities mobilized capital from external sources, distinct from the colony's finances. Another category comprised small groups of affluent farmers with private incomes from sources external to Tanganyika, exemplified by figures like Lord Chesham and Delamere in the Southern Highlands. The final group encompassed small-scale farmers (Nindi op cit). In the 1920s, the southeastern coastlands, particularly Lindi and Mikindani, were associated with sisal and cotton plantations, followed by Morogoro and Kilosa in subsequent years (ibid). Rodney (1983) further contends that out of 162 sisal estates, 71 were situated in Tanga, 67 along the Central line (Morogoro and Kilosa), 18 in Lindi/Mikindani, and 16 in Moshi/Arusha (ibid).

In South Pare and Usambara, Kimambo observed a rapid surge in coffee and cotton cultivation among Africans. The Pare people had adopted this practice from the Chagga community in Kilimanjaro rather than from the Usambara region, even though the South Pare were situated on the outskirts of Usambara. This preference stemmed from the greater success experienced in Kilimanjaro compared to the slower progress in Usambara. The significant increase in coffee growers is evidenced by the following statistics: 140 coffee growers in 1922, 1,396 in 1924, 5,225 in 1925, and 8,388 in 1926 (Kimambo 1991).

In the 1920s, the southeastern coastal areas, particularly Lindi and Mikindani, were predominantly associated with sisal and cotton plantations. This trend was subsequently followed by the establishment of similar plantations in Morogoro and Kilosa in the subsequent years. Rodney (1983) elaborated that out of a total of 162 sisal estates, 71 were located in Tanga, 67 along the Central line (Morogoro and Kilosa), 18 in Lindi/Mikindani, and 16 in Moshi/Arusha (Rodney op cit).

The majority of former German plantations were acquired by European companies, while numerous mixed farms were acquired by British settlers. However, there was no additional land alienation, and many British settlements reflected continuity with the German era. In the plantation sector, non-British individuals were permitted to purchase estates left behind by the Germans. Starting in 1925, Germany became a member of the League of Nations, resulting in its nationals being entitled to equal treatment alongside other members (Nindi op cit).

Coffee and tea cultivation remained primarily in the hands of white settlers, although in certain instances, it was also undertaken by African peasants. For instance, the Chagga people in Kilimanjaro were actively encouraged after 1921 to cultivate Arabica Coffee, sometimes even in close proximity to European plantations (Brett 1973). The production of Robusta coffee in Bukoba ceased to be an issue, as there were no objections raised. However, starting from 1925, white settlers opposed the government's policy allowing Africans to cultivate coffee and tea, citing the increased risk associated with the crop. As they lobbied the government to restrict African production, Governor Cameroon recognized the challenges such prohibition would face in Moshi, fearing potential boycotts and strikes as he argued:

*that the cultivation of Arabica coffee by indigenous people in East Africa should primarily be limited to regions where it is already being cultivated. He proposed discouraging any expansion of coffee cultivation, except in areas lacking European coffee estates (Governor Cameroon, "Conference minutes 1973").*

In South Pare and Usambara, Kimambo observed a significant surge in coffee and cotton cultivation by African farmers. The Pare people adopted this practice from the Chagga community in Kilimanjaro rather than from Usambara, even among the South Pare residing on the outskirts of Usambara. This preference stemmed from the greater success experienced in Kilimanjaro compared to the slower progress in Usambara. The remarkable increase in coffee growers is demonstrated by the following figures: 140 coffee growers in 1922, 1,396 in 1924, 5,225 in 1925, and 8,388 in 1926 (Kimambo op cit).

However, British plantations were characterized by their significant size and external ownership, in contrast to Greek and Asian estates which relied on local financing, highlighting a distinction between metropolitan and local capital finance (Iliffe op cit). The ramifications of the expanding plantations included population growth in production centers and urban areas, expansion of farming in regions such as the southern highlands, northeastern Tanganyika, Tanga, Dar es Salaam, and Morogoro, and a severe shortage of wage labor. This shortage necessitated measures such as increased recruitment, exploitation, and the integration of African economies into the global capitalist economic systems (Kimambo op cit).

Plantation and settler agriculture played a significant role in the colonial economies by facilitating the integration of local economies into the international capitalist economic system. Since the 1920s, European plantations served as models for African peasants, such as coffee growers in Kilimanjaro. Natives in Tanganyika were permitted to engage in cash crop agriculture alongside plantation agriculture. The rising prices of these commodities encouraged Europeans to sell seeds to local farmers. For instance, in Kilimanjaro, there were 6,716 coffee growers cultivating 987,175 trees in 1925. Five years later, this number had increased to nearly 6 million trees (Iliffe op cit). According to the annual report, in 1927, European settlers produced 45,019 hundredweight of coffee valued at £21,380, while peasant coffee production amounted to 86,880 hundredweight valued at £252,040. Notably, Shangali Ndeserua, a retired Machame chief, was one of the largest coffee growers (ibid).

Friendly relations developed between the British and Germans, leading some German settlers to remain in Tanganyika. For instance, in 1938, there were 6,514 unofficial European residents, including 2,100 Britons and 2,729 Germans (Iliffe op cit). Some urban estates and small sisal and coffee plantations were sold to merchants like the Karimjee Jivanjee family, who acquired sisal, coconut, and coffee plantations (ibid). Conversely, E.A. Brett argued that in 1938, there were 9,345 European settlers, with 4,054 being British and 3,205 German. In terms of land ownership, British settlers controlled 788,000 acres, while Germans controlled 476,000 acres, and Asians controlled 280,000 acres.

During the 1930s, not only sisal, coffee, and cotton were impacted, but also marginal pastoralists faced challenges due to falling prices caused by the Great Depression, which had repercussions on the global economy. Sisal estates halted expansion and significantly reduced production, labor force, and wage rates. For instance, prior to 1930, workers earned between 18 to 36 shillings per labor card (Kipande), but during the depression, wages dropped to 10 to 12 shillings, despite an increase in workload (Rodney 1979). The plantation labor force was halved, and the remaining workers were tasked with duties previously handled by the full estate labor force. This situation led to increased exploitation of African labor. However, despite such exploitation, the export of sisal did not decline during the Great Depression.

By 1938, sisal exports surged to 103,428 tonnes following the occupation of the Philippines and Indonesia by the Japanese. This resulted in the main competitors, Mexican henquen and Manila hemp, facing setbacks; Manila hemp due to its lack of competitiveness and henquen because of agrarian reforms implemented after 1934 (Crowder 1993). Consequently, sisal's share of the hard fiber market increased from 16 to 47 percent between the early 1920s and late 1930s, while sisal production rose from 50,000 to 258,000 tons between 1923 and 1938. This growth can be attributed to two main factors: firstly, many estates were managed by sisal merchants who could offset production losses with agency profits from larger quantities, and secondly, the inelasticity of supply of a crop requiring seven years to mature meant that sisal planted during the prosperous 1920s could only be harvested in the 1930s (ibid).

### **The period from 1940s to the early 1950s.**

The Second World War from 1939 to 1945 had a significant impact on the development of plantation and settler agriculture in Tanganyika. This was primarily because these plantations and farms relied on intensive

production methods, which were disrupted as labor forces were redirected to meet wartime demands. Some Africans were conscripted as soldiers and carriers, while others were compelled to engage in food production for the military. Tambila (1983), as referenced by Adrama (1980), argued that during the Second World War, labor recruitment for sisal plantations resembled practices akin to those of slave dealers.

Additionally, the export of sisal faced challenges due to maritime warfare, resulting in Tanganyikan sisal being sold at less than half of the price paid by Americans. Consequently, Africans experienced high prices for imported goods, leading to inflation that affected both rural and urban workers. Adrama (1980) noted that during the war, prices in Tanganyika nearly doubled, exacerbating financial strain. An inquiry conducted in Dar es Salaam in 1942 found that “some 87 percent of government employees... are in receipt of wages of which they cannot possibly subsist without getting into debt” (Adrama 1980).

To address this situation, the utilization of voluntary labor and labor conscription became prevalent. Chiefs were obligated to furnish a specified number of able-bodied men who were then required to work on plantations and settler farms. Following the conclusion of the war, committees for agriculture were established (Adrama op cit).

After the Second World War, conflicts of interest arose among settler agriculture, plantation agriculture, peasant African farmers, and the colonial state. Sisal estate owners and other settlers opposed the government’s encouragement of cash crop production by peasants, fearing it would diminish the labor supply. Their objections clashed with the government’s “Grow more cash crop campaign” initiatives. Under pressure from estate owners, the colonial government prohibited peasants from participating in the cultivation of crops similar to those grown by settlers and plantation owners. Additionally, they banned the sale of sisal owned by Africans in various districts such as Geita, Kirumba, Maswa, Musoma, Mwanza, Shinyanga, and Ukerewe. Despite these regulations, plantations faced labor shortages due to the expansion of other crops like tea and coffee, which intensified competition for labor (Rodney op cit).

In another observation, it was noted that sisal plantations were the primary destination for laborers from various regions of Tanganyika. Rodney argued that by the mid-1940s, the Makonde people were traveling to the southern estates, staying there for a few months, and then moving northwards via Dar es Salaam to Tanga. This preference was made feasible by the opening of the Songea/Njombe road in 1936 and the introduction of lorry transport, significantly reducing what had previously been a two-month journey to a much shorter duration (Rodney op cit).

During the establishment of sisal plantations, planters initially estimated labor requirements based on the assumption that one laborer could produce one ton of fiber from one hectare per year, a ratio referred to as “one-one-one” by Tambila (1983). The British colonial government, acting through the state apparatus, provided plantation owners with crucial assistance in securing labor supplies at depressed wage rates, thereby enabling them to generate super profits. Various mechanisms were employed for this purpose, including the formulation of labor laws with disciplinary measures and the deliberate promotion of underdevelopment in certain regions, leading to uneven regional development. Additionally, due to land scarcity, poverty, and population pressures, labor migration served as a safety valve (Tambila 1983).

Since settler agriculture received minimal attention, it predominantly sourced its labor from nearby areas. For instance, settlers in Moshi/Arusha drew laborers from regions like Ugogo, Iramba, and Nyaturu. However, by the late 1940s, faced with a severe labor shortage, Moshi/Arusha settlers began competing for labor from the western and southern regions with the Sisal Labour Bureau (SILABU). Additionally, they established the Northern Province Labor Utilization Board in response to complaints that SILABU had neglected their labor needs (Rodney op. cit).

The colonial labor policy in Tanganyika was biased in favor of European colonialists. The majority of

Africans employed in plantations and other production areas received low wages as semi-skilled or daily-wage workers, enduring unfavorable working conditions that plunged them into poverty. The Annual Report of the Southern Province for 1939 sheds light on the dire situation faced by laborers in sisal plantations:

*The wages paid to laborers on sisal estates continued to be unreasonably low and showed no signs of improvement, despite satisfactory arrangements made by the Sisal Growers Association for the disposal of the fiber. In the Lindi and Mikindani districts, the current rates for various grades of labor were substantially as follows: skilled and semi-skilled workers earned between 12/- to 18/-, while unskilled workers earned between 10/- to 12/- for thirty days of work. However, the interpretation of “a day’s work” varied; for brushers and similar workers, it typically meant twelve hours, while for cutters and lower grades paid by task, it was determined by the employer. Few laborers in any grade completed their thirty tasks in less than six weeks, and many took much longer. Rations were seldom provided, except for a negligible number of workers under formal written contracts on some estates; laborers had to gather their own firewood and draw water at the end of the workday before cooking whatever food they had. Housing conditions were generally poor, falling below East African standards. Some estates deducted the value of issued working implements from wages, while others made no allowance for unfinished tasks, meaning that if a task was not completed on the day it was assigned, the day’s wages were forfeited to the employer (TNA, Southern Province Annual Report, 1939).*

The people of Tanganyika suffered from blatant exploitation, as their labor was undervalued and they worked under conditions that led to a decline in their health (ibid).

In another analysis, it was asserted that plantation and settler agriculture played a role in regional differentiation and food production. Regions specializing in export production, such as plantations, towns, and cash crop regions, were juxtaposed with less favored areas that provided migrant labor. Typically, each region specialized in a particular activity and supplied its specialty. For instance, Kigoma exported dagaa, Uvinza provided salt, Ugogo supplied cattle, Uzaramo produced charcoal, Tabora cultivated groundnuts, Uluguru grew vegetables, northeastern estates supplied fruits and maize, and Usambara contributed vegetables and tobacco. Meat was sourced from Mbulu, Singida, Masailand, and Usukuma (Illife op. cit).

Furthermore, plantation and settler agriculture in Tanganyika served as both a social unit and an enterprise. The communal living arrangements of workers not only encouraged others to pioneer the cultivation of coffee and other crops but also facilitated the adoption of Islam in regions like Unyamwezi, Undendeuli, and Kondo. Some Africans, unable to return home after their work contracts ended, became what Illife (1973) referred to as “walowezi,” settling on the outskirts of farms, known as “mwisho ya shamba.” These settlements, often named Chumbageni (the alien place), Ugogoni, Ubena, and others, resulted in the establishment of social infrastructure such as schools, churches, mosques, markets, hospitals, breweries, and butcheries (ibid).

The colonial government implemented laws and regulations aimed at encouraging Africans to become active participants in agriculture. In Masasi, for instance, a law was enforced mandating that every African must own at least one acre of land for agricultural purposes. Furthermore, the 1950 Annual Report for Mikindani District emphasized that “every cultivator shall cultivate sufficient grain and pulse crops to secure an adequate supply of food for family and other dependents.” These measures were introduced by colonial authorities to ensure adequate food supplies and alleviate poverty and food shortages (TNA, Mikindani District Annual Report, 1950).

During the campaign, the colonial government and its agencies made numerous efforts to encourage full African participation in agricultural production. Colonialists produced and disseminated various pamphlets to schools, aiming to educate children on proper cultivation methods in school gardens and farms. These pamphlets conveyed information on topics such as the benefits of contour farming and methods for

combating soil erosion. This suggests that African children were being prepared to become proficient agricultural producers within the colonial framework. Additionally, the colonial government provided loans to certain Africans. The 1955 Annual Report of Provincial Administration Masasi District states:

*...agricultural loans were extended to seven chosen Africans engaged in farming across various areas of the District from the local Development Loan Fund. This initiative, designed to demonstrate how local agricultural output could be enhanced through effective farming practices, emphasized the cultivation of both food and cash crops... (TNA, Annual Report, Provincial Administration, Masasi District, 1947).*

As indicated in the quotation above, the colonial government provided loans to some Makonde and individuals from other ethnic backgrounds. This led to bountiful harvests, enabling them to address challenges such as poverty and food scarcity. It was affirmed that the extensive agricultural planting campaigns and other endeavors undertaken by the colonial authorities yielded positive outcomes. The same report noted:

*...the farmers in the District positively responded to the propaganda disseminated by the District Office, encouraging a concerted effort to expand acreage and increase planting activity during the latter part of the year. It was decided by the Liwalis and the District Council that each individual should have one acre cleared and prepared for planting by the end of October, and the second acre ready by the end of November (ibid).*

As a result of these campaigns and propaganda efforts, Africans responded positively, with many of them acquiring farms of at least two acres for cultivation. The agricultural output enabled them to address challenges such as poverty and food shortages prevalent in their regions. Additionally, the Mikindani District Annual Report for the year 1953 indicates successful outcomes from the colonial government's campaign, with certain areas achieving notable progress. Consequently, groups of Africans were observed working collaboratively in thickets, engaging in activities such as cultivation and soil preparation for planting seeds (ibid).

Through directives from the government and its agencies, colonial officials undertook these initiatives primarily for their own interests. However, it became evident that these efforts also benefited Africans in their daily lives. Numerous outcomes stemmed from the endeavors of the colonial government. For instance, the 1958 Southern Province Report highlighted changes brought about by the introduction of superior tools, the utilization of insecticides, and the adoption of high-quality seeds. These measures led to the transition from traditional cultivation methods to modern farming techniques (TNA, Southern Province Annual Report, 1958).

The Southern Province Annual Report for 1954 notes that across nearly all areas of the province, maize and other crop production was robust due to ample rainfall. This resulted in African farmers earning higher incomes, as illustrated in the table below (TNA, Southern Province Annual Report, 1954).

Table 1: Crops in Markets for 1952 and 1953:

Crops	1952 (Kilos)	1953 (Kilos)
Millet	49813	12888
Maize	44,096	3344
Rice	186,458	139,776
Cassava	1,821,633	477,034
Groundnuts	4393	0668
Simsim	1594	39265



Cashew nuts	1541,865	843,047
Copra	72,405	218,953
Kunde	201,688	172,396
Choroko	8932	3713
Mbaazi	–	23992
Njugumawe	52,020	174
Mbalika	–	327
Beeswax	–	61

Source: TNA, Annual Report of Southern Province, 1953, Acc No 188, file No GEN/1/2/5

The table provided depicts the quantities of various crops produced in the Southern Province. These figures corroborate the active agricultural engagement of Africans, particularly in the cultivation of cash crops like copra, cotton, and coffee, which contributed to their income generation. Additionally, the data reveal that while food crops such as millet, maize, and cassava were primarily cultivated for subsistence, they were also occasionally sold. Overall, these findings indicate the integration of local economies into the international capitalist economic system.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the plantation and settler agriculture sectors played a crucial role in harnessing the economic potential of the people of Tanganyika during the era of British colonial rule. For instance, Rodney highlighted in 1932 how sisal plantation capitalists in Tanganyika attempted to establish a rope factory, only to face opposition from British rope manufacturers. This illustrates the expectation that Africans were to primarily engage in raw material production. This underscores the envisioned role of plantations and settler agriculture in Tanganyika. Settlers and plantation owners sought to dictate the types of crops Africans could cultivate the scale of production, and the terms of participation in cash crop cultivation. They preferred control over African land and labor rather than the rise of an African capitalist class, promoting the perpetuation of a black labor force. Consequently, this paper contends that plantation and settler agriculture served as the cornerstone of the capitalist economy in Tanganyika.

## RECOMMENDATION

According to the recommendation, historians should consider the implications of their findings when studying Tanzania's economic history and how economic shifts have occurred throughout time. It was also advised that the labor issue be given significant consideration in all facets of development. Because it can be properly accounted for in times of exploitation, human labor should be employed extremely carefully by society.

## REFERENCES

1. Adrama, J. F. 1979. *The Political Economy of Plantation System in Colonial Tanganyika 1891-1961 in Tanzanian Economic History*. Vol. Vol.2.
2. Boss, H. 1990. *Theories of Surplus and Transfer: Parasites and Producers in Economic Thought*. Boston: Hyman.
3. Brett, E. A. 1973. *Colonialism and Underdevelopment in East Africa: The Politics of Economic Change 1919-1939*. London: Heinemann.
4. Danielson, Anders. 1994. "The Economic Surplus: Theory, Measurement, Applications." (*No Title*).

5. Furner, James. 2018. "Marx on Capitalism: The Interaction-Recognition-Antinomy Thesis." in *Marx on Capitalism*. Brill.
6. Iliffe, John. 1979. *A Modern History of Tanganyika*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Iliffe, John. 1993. *Africa under British and Belgian Domination, 1935-45*. Vol. 8. California: Heinemann. UNESCO.
8. Lewycky, Dennis, and Susan L. White. 1979. *An African Abstract: A Brief Background to Issues and Events*. Manitoba Council for International Cooperation.
9. Mpangala, Gaudens Philip. 2000. *Major Issues in Tanzanian Economic History: Pre-Colonial Economy and Social Formations*. Dar es Salaam University Press.
10. Nindi, B. C. 1979. "Colonial Agricultural Policy in Tanganyika between the First and Second World Wars'." in *Department of History Seminar Paper, University of Dar es Salaam*.
11. Rodney, W. 1979. *The Creation of Colonial Economy by Violence 1890-1900*, 'in Kaniki M.H (Ed) *Tanzania Under Colonial Rule*. London: Longman Group.
12. Rodney, Walter, Kapepwa Tambila, and Laurent Sago. 1983. "Migrant Labour in Tanzania during the Colonial Period: Case Studies of Recruitment and Conditions of Labour in the Sisal Industry." (*No Title*).
13. Tambila, Kapepwa. 1983. "A Plantation Labour Magnet: The Tanga Case." *Migrant Labour in Tanzania During the Colonial Period: Case Studies of Recruitment and Conditions of Labour in the Sisal Industry, Hamburg: Institut Für Afrika-Kunde* 29–56.

#### Archival Documents

1. TNA, Southern Province Annual Report, 1939, p. 11-12.
2. TNA, Mikindani District Annual Report, 1950,
3. TNA, Governor Cameroon, "Conference minutes 13" quoted in E.A Bret. Ibid. p. 230
4. plantation, labour, settler, agriculture and colonial economy