

CREATION OF THE KITUI ASOMI

By

G.C.M. Mutiso
WORKING PAPER NO. 304

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
P.O. Box 30197
Nairobi, Kenya

October, 1977

Views expressed in this paper are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Institute for Development Studies or of the University of Nairobi. This paper is not for quotation without permission of the author, as specified in the Copyright Act, Cap. 130 Laws of Kenya.

CREATION OF THE KITUI ASOMI

a. Prewar Creation of Local Control Institutions

In a meeting with chiefs held on December 30th 1912 the D.C. Kitui explained to chiefs 1. that they "are creations of Government only and their sole authority lies in the government. Therefore the government can remove and replace them at any time without loss to itself". 2. that "many chiefs are deliberately working to upset the Nzama and they were warned that there would be no hesitation in deposing any or all of them if they could not mend their ways." 3. that "several chiefs had deliberately attempted to deceive officers on points of custom and as to decisions of Nzamas and that this could only be accepted as proof that such chiefs had received bribes from one of the parties. They were warned to desist from this practice." 4. that sub-chiefs were "not to expect pay for all of them."¹ The D.C. was letting the chiefs know in no uncertain terms where the source of their power, authority and legitimacy were. Mutiso² has argued that there are basically two classes in a colonial society. These are the asomi who are validated by colonial institutions and values and the non-asomi who exist in antagonism to colonial institutions and values particularly as refracted by the Asomi class. For Kitui the most important stratum of the asomi class are the chiefs since missionaries did not effectively operate in the district until 1920s. Other strata of this class are interpreters, tribal retainers teachers and traders. We shall consider them seriatim.

When Ainsworth established Kitui administrative centre in 1998 he and the subsequent administrators recognized many people in many villages as chiefs (Headmen.). However Kamba tradition never recognized one person as a ruler. Within the western framework of distinguishing executive, judicial and legislative functions it can be put that the oldest men constituting Atumia ma Ithembo of a group of villages (Kivalo) formed a judicial and legislative body. The Nthele and Anake young married men and young unmarried men but circumcized, formed the executive body which was charged with defence basically but which also implemented the decisions of the Atumia. Invariably the wisest of the atumia ma ithembo would be seen as a spokesman and the most brave of the Nthele would become the natural leader. It is this informal selection of leadership which led to some confusion about local rulers. Also for purposes of the colonizer the attributes he desired of a local leader - the primary one being communication with the colonizer in Swahili - led to

some peculiar people being appointed chiefs simply because they had been porters/traders in Mombasa and could speak the language. In other situations the head of a lineage (Mbaa) or clan (mbai) could be picked if the administrator chanced to visit a settlement and a leader was pointed out to him. This problem of who was appointed leader by the initial colonizers needs urgent comparative research to establish clearly what the indigenous population saw as a leader and what the colonizer (administrator trader or missionary) saw as a leader. It is in the images each held of the other that we shall sort out colonial expectations.

As far as Kitui many people were given 'chits' as recognition of their leadership between 1898 and 1909 but as far as I have been able to gather from the record there was no attempt at systematic administration until 1908. What is clear is that by 1909 sons were beginning to succeed fathers. Ainsworth is probably responsible for the idea of passing fathers chiefly powers to the son. He argues the case for this in Retrospect.³ He is also busy trying to establish the ruling line.⁴ Finally he comes up with the idea of using a headman (chief) for a geographical area which is not necessarily coterminous with Mbaa (lineage) or Mbai (clan).⁵ They were to be for an area embracing ivalo i.e. groups of villages and not kivalo i.e. one group of villages. Control over kivalo village was to remain a problem until the thirties.

Since Ainsworth was writing in retrospect we infer that administration up to 1910 was having problems selling the idea of chief to Kamba who still recognized their Nzama ya Ithembo as local ultimate authority. The Political Record Book states that by 1909 Kambas were ignoring chiefs⁶ therefore there was the need to increase chiefs' authority.⁷

The formula to increase chiefs authority executed in 1910 was to create chiefs/headmen for a group of ivalo, create a subheadman for a group of villages (a kivalo). To acknowledge traditional authority structure the administration created Nzama (Councils literally) at the Kivalo level. Yet the Nzama did not reflect the Nzama ya Ithembo which was based on age. In the 1911 Annual Report/^{it is reported} that chiefs were clashing with Nzama who were '3rd Grade Atumia' who were not respected but by 1911 the administration had reconstituted Nzama to have only "Atumia ma Ithembo or 1st Grade Atumia".⁸ The implication here is that the original Nzamas were composed of Anake - reflecting the Kamba society idea that you did send anake and when the colonial administrators tried

to pass on to them some rulership powers the society rebelled. By reconstituting the Nzama to be Atumia ma Ithembo the administration (Dundas) was recognizing the traditional ultimate local authority. But he was also creating power conflict between the subheadmen (subchiefs) who sought to control their kivalo Nzama ya Ithembo and the Chiefs (Headmen) who embraced several ivalo and thus were supposed to operate at a higher scale than had existed before. They did not have a Nzama ya Ithembo at that level. Some of them were not members of the Nzama ya Ithembo since they were not old enough to qualify. In fact it can be hypothesized that the Chiefs/Headmen had pushed Anake into Nzamas earlier so as to control them since some of them did not qualify by age and ritual for Nzama ya Ithembo.

It is this contest that subchiefs refuse to submit to "more powerful and acknowledge chiefs" e.g. in Ikanga and Voo or Tharaka / In Tharaka Paiboi, who was a Mutumia wa Ithembo and previously the dominant leader when the D.C. went to Tharaka in 1906, refused to submit to Mundu was Ngulu who was a Nthele Muthiani and not a Mutumia was Ithembo in 1907. / Paiboi was picked by Ainsworth,¹⁰ but note that by 1911 it is reported that "although we must now support Mundu was Ngulu as our elected (!) gazetted Chief should anything happen causing his deposition necessary I should be inclined to give Poiboi another trial"¹¹ Although the comment is that Poiboi is now loyal we need further research on his role in Tharaka resistance of 1906/07. It was subdued with 1/3 Company of KAR.¹²

We opened this section by quoting the administrations view of the chiefs in 1912. They as Nthele/Anake were sole creations of Government as rulers. They did not have legitimacy in traditional institutions which administration was trying to beef up so as to win the population. Clearly the Government position is to support the Nzama sya Mathembo against the Chiefs. In a summary of Baraza Held on December 1912 which we quoted at the beginning it is further stated"1) If the people see that the Nzama and Government are one they will obey the Nzama but if they know the Nzama to be working against the Government they will not be feared" 2) "It was impressed upon the (Nzamas) that the control of their areas is now left to them and the government has only to supervise and control the Nzamas". 3) Trials were to be conducted by not less than thirty elders sitting and they were to be paid in tembo. Appeals of those near Kitui were to be heard at the DC's Office and all others were to be heard by Officers (European) on march."¹³

In the 1913 Annual Report it is stated "It is thought that the awe in which natives stand of the government is often overrated. By passive resistance they obtain their own way while they pretend to be only anxious to do as they are told.....The native authority itself has appeared in much altered aspect of late. Despite years of endeavour to establish authority in persons designated as Chiefs or Headmen, this has most singularly failed. This is in part due to the character of the tribe but principally to the real native authority which however imperceptible yet constitutes an irregressible buffer and opposition to the chief. The chief having proved a failure but the Councils (Nzama) at least indispensable, a different scheme is called for. The Chief cannot even be the head of the elders unless he is both of tribal standing and of an age at which he would be useless for active work of any sort -----

The present lack of responsibility on the elders who are absolutely the ruling class on whom everything depends is one of the great obstacles to successful administration.....The Akamba have always made the Chief (read leader) their servant above all things and have persistently resisted submission to any authority"¹⁴ "The tribe neither likes or respects us nor does it hope much from us. This would not surprise us for year after year they have contributed more and more to revenue without however perceiving any corresponding advantage derived to them. Their opinion is that we have solely to get their money and under present circumstances we cannot remove this impression or honestly dispute it"¹⁵

Thus several basic conclusions can be reached thus far about the prewar period. First that administration picked Anake and at best Nthele and imposed them as Chiefs/Headmen of a wider regional unit (location) than (group of ivalo) than had existed before. Under them were created subheadmen who were in charge of ivalo (groups of villages) which at least existed before for collective sacrifices (Mathembo ma Muviti) and where Atumia ma Mathembo were recognized. Usually subheadmen were Atumia ma Mathembo. Thus conflict between subheadmen and Headmen/Chiefs was structurally instituted. The institution of Councils (Nzama) at the Kivalo level was an attempt to recognize legitimate traditional authority structure but given the initial membership of Anake and Nthele preferred by Chiefs/Headmen the population refused to accept this Nzama. This led to conflict not only between the people and the colonial authorities but also led to conflict between the European officers and the Chiefs/Headmen. European Officers reorganized the Nzama to include Atumia ma Ithembo in their effort to get support of the population. This was also instituting conflict between the Nzama and the chiefs but the European Officers at this point favoured the Nzama over the Chiefs.

Who were the chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen? It is hard coming up with definitive list since almost any "officer" who went on a march designated somebody as something and they all later claimed to be chiefs! The "officers" did not keep systematic records of their recognitions. Similarly there is also a problem of gazetting. It is not clear from the Political Record Book whether those gazetted were Chiefs/Headmen or Subchiefs/Subheadmen. Up to 1909 their mention of leaders, Chiefs, Headmen, Subchiefs, Subheadmen, in an unsystematic way. The first systematic list is the list of Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen who met P.C. Hobley in 1909 produced as Table A.A.1. We should note that these are just from around Kitui other than the Tharaka nad Mumoni areas. Table A.A.2 Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen as listed by Dundas 1909/10 completes the list for the rest of District. These two tables and Table A.A.3 1910-11 List of Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen and their predecessor and Designated Successor, give us the Chiefs and Subchiefs of the 1909 - 1912 period when the administration was trying to shift power to the Nzamas. We should note that in table A.A.3 23 (2 out of 25) chiefs are not members of the Nzama and 14.6% (11 out of 75) of the subchiefs are not members of Nzama. 53% of those we know predecessors had uncles, fathers or grandfathers who were either subchiefs or chiefs. We should note that in the areas of close proximity to Kitui where the administration had reached in Stein Rokkan's there is no conflict of structuring power. Thus in Mutonguni, Mgeni, Mulango, Matinyani, Evotuni, Kitui the chiefs are also heads of their Nzama and there aren't other Nzama's under subchiefs. Chiefs have been differentiated from subchiefs clearly also. This is not the case in the periphery of the district. At Migwani there are two chiefs Nzambu (Isambu) and Mwandau both former hunters and rivals. Nzambu ultimately frames Mwandau as a poacher. The later is fired. The former is rewarded by Dundas by getting Kiomo, Kiome Mwingi and Kanyongo added to his Migwani location.¹⁵ Nzambu is not a member of Nzama. It is irrelevant for him. Note that in Voo there are four rival Nzamas, one under a chief who is not from Voo and 3 under subchiefs. All North Mumoni, Tharaka as well as East is not yet reached. In Mumoni there are 6 separate Nzamas.¹⁷ In Tharaka there are three¹⁸. Musau Kithesia of Mutonguni does not utilize, Nzama.¹⁹ Mutoni was Mue of Buboni (Mutiso East) has troubles with Nzama.²⁰ Kasioka was Kanadu of Mui overrides Nzama.²¹ Isika Kabuluku of Zombe has Nzama trouble.²² Musambi was Nthusi (stranger) of Voo does not get along with Nzama.²³ Kitili was Muthengi of Ikanga does not meet Nzama often.²⁴ Thus the documentation of the conflict of chiefs/subchiefs and Nzama from the official record.

Having listed the chiefs and subchiefs the next step in answering who they were is to try and get some notion of the origins of chiefs. Some were former cattle traders e.g. Kitili wa Muthengi of Ikanga who had the good fortune of being in the old trade route to coast. Some were former hunters and ivory traders e.g. Kalinga wa Ngumo of Ikutha, Kiema was Mumo of Kanziko, Ngovi was Katama of Mutha, Musembi wa Nthusi of Voo, Kabella of Mutha, Kalungu wa Kathanza of Endul, Wandau wa Kiema of Nzaoni, Nzambo Ndunda of Migwani, Makutha wa Nzioka of Endau, Mutoni wa Mue of Buboni/Mutito East, Kano was Siobeti of Mui. Some were rich cattle owners e.g. Wandwa Kitabi of Matinyani, Musau wa Kithesia of Mutonguni, Mubhi wa Nzioka of Siontheka, Kitili wa Muthengi of Ikanga. One was involved in ivory, slavery, commodities trade which was translated to cattle. This is Muli Kithusi of Mulango who is reputed to have had the station where Arab slavers stopped. As recent as 1910 and 1911 he was accused of trying to sell Kamba women to Arab slavers.²⁵ Some seem to have been porters/houseboys/employees in Kitui, Kibwezi and other towns e.g. Maingi was Kitetu of Kitui, Nzioka wa Kilinga of Mgeni, Mubhi wa Nzioka of Siontheka, Wikya wa Kanyolo of Evotini and Isika wa Kabuluku. Two were important Athiani. These are Kingau wa Kithome of Nuui and Mundu was Ngula of Tharaka. It is obvious then the most important category of origins of those who chiefs in 1911 was the hunter, ivory trader. Analytically this is not a watertight category because ivory trader can mean trading in Kitui, taking it out to Mombasa or elsewhere, being a porter or even exchanging ivory for other trade commodities. To even complicate things further usually great / hunters also became Athiani - same kinds of skills are required. The next important category seems to be those who had some kind of experience being employed. Out of the experience of trying to piece backgrounds of the chiefs from official records and interviews I have become more convinced that the critical factor in the documentation of chiefs and their role in colonial society is not their background but how they relate to colonial institutions.

What was the source of accumulation? Up to World War I there does not seem to have been a serious accumulation process / ^{by} the chiefs basically because they had not formalized their gatekeeping ^{role} for access to the colonial order. They had many rivals in the numerous subheadmen and Nzama elders. Also the mode of administration whereby the European officers settled issues on march meant that chiefs could be accused. Finally there weren't many favours which the chief could sell although as early as 1910/11 Kalungu was Kathanza ^{of} Yatta and Musembi wa Nthusi of Voo are accused of taking bribes.²⁶

But taxes could be beaten by disappearing into the bush. Conscription labour was as yet to flower and forced requisition of livestock for war had not started. Forced communal labour was still far away. This does not mean that the chiefs, su chief and Nzama Elders did not accumulate more than the ordinary folk. They were salaried and this set them apart from the population. With their income they could conspicuously consume tea and rice mainly - and begin to accumulate livestock by buying them cheap from those who needed the rupees for taxes. Infact this last point of selling livestock to chiefs who became the collecting agents for Swahili and Kikuyu livestock traders is remembered by the old people as the way chiefs became rich. This point of accumulation by raiding stock for taxes paying the tax and selling the raided cattle to Swahili traders comes from the oral tradition. It is not found in official records until after World War I.

The other major source of accumulation for Kitui chiefs in the prewar period was trade in ivory. We noted above that most of them were former hunters and ivory trade. Obviously they continued this. Dundas in 1909/10 reports that Mutia Kibungia of Mumoni was suspected of trading in ivory.²⁷ Mukuthu wa Nzioka of Endau and his people pay taxes promptly because they poach.²⁸ Nzambo Ndunda of Migwani is poaching.²⁹ Musili Kavungwa of Endui poaches.³⁰ Mundu wa Ngula of Tharaka poaches across the Tana.³¹ Kalinga wa Ngumo of Ikutha supports ivory trade.³² Although Kiema wa Mumo of Kanziko and Ngovi wa Katama are recorded as stopping Kamba-Galla Giriama cattle and ivory trade,³³ the oral tradition has it that these were the great sponsors of the trade and they only prosecuted rivals or strangers who did not give them and their syndicate the requisite cut.

One other source of accumulation which was going to get politicized in the later years was access to wu. In the early days this was not a serious issue since wu was easily available. Later wu was to be competed for between locations. Chiefs, as main beneficiaries, were to lead the agitation for changing location boundaries. But for the pre World War I period the official record notes that Mwendwa of Matinyani had his cattle outside the reserve in Yatta Tiva.³⁴ The oral tradition notes that Mwendwa cattle not only grazed Tava-Yatta area (Yatta Location), they also grazed between Tiva and Mwitasyano all the way to Mukuyuni, Mwakini and up to Thatha and what is presently Ikombe and Musingi in Machakos District. Other Chiefs like Muli wa Kithusi had cattle in Voo, Ikanga and Lower Yatta (between Tiva and Athi.). Kitili wa Muthengi of Ikanga and Kiema wa Mumo of Kanziko had cattle all the way to Ndiandasa in present day Tsavo and sometimes east of all the way to Itala on

the Tana where they usually met cattle from the Nuu and Endau Chiefs, Kingau was Kithome and Makuthu wa Nzioka respectively. Musau wa Kithesia of Mutonguni was stealing (raiding) other peoples cattle and hiding them in Yatta. He served his time and as Chief.³⁵ Some of these chiefs and later chiefs were to defend the range outside the legalistic reserve since they were the ones to utilize the weu (range) for their accumulation. It should never be forgotten that weu also included wild animals like elephants and rhino and leopards and lions which just happened to have ivory, horn and skins which could be sold.

I have not come across any evidence that chiefs at this time were involved in honey or beeswax trade although Arab Swahili traders were trading in the commodity. The explanation might lie in the independence of the professional aniki (honey collectors) and the fact that most of the honey went into the local market - for pombe ritual and brideprice. Clearly honey production and trade needs to be studied. Aniki seem to be some of the most secretive of the Kamba people - only next to the awe medicine men. Significantly I have not come across one ^{Mwaniki} who became a chief or a subchief.

Local Level Domination by Chiefs

Between the beginning of 1911 when we have a fairly complete list of Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen and the beginning of 1915, 25% all Chiefs/Headmen are dropped. 52% of all 1911 Subchiefs/Subheadmen are dropped. The number of Subchiefs/Subheadmen was reduced by 46.7% in the same period. Thus by the beginning of 1915, 25% of the Chiefs/Headmen are relatively new appointed in the previous four years.

Between March 1915 and March 1916, 12.5% of the Chiefs/Headmen are dropped and 52.5% of the Subchiefs/Subheadmen are also dropped. The total number of Subchiefs/Subheadmen increased by 5%. Thus by March 1916, 12.5% of all Chiefs/Headmen are new in the sense that they had been appointed in the previous year. 42.9% of all Subchiefs/Subheadmen are new in the same sense.

Between March 1916 and March 1918, 8.3% of all chiefs/Headmen are dropped and 23.8% of all Subchiefs/Subheadmen are dropped. The total number of subchiefs/subheadmen is increased by 14.3%. Thus by March 1918, 8.3% of the Chiefs/Headmen are new in the sense that they had been appointed in the previous previous two years and 25% of the Subchiefs/Subheadmen are new in the same sense.

If we take the whole period from March 1911 to March 1918 we should note that over this period 15.2% of the Chiefs/Headmen are dropped and similarly 15.2% of them are new. Dropped and new chiefs average 1.6 annually out of 24. Of the subchiefs/subheadmen between March 1911 and March 1918, 44.6% are dropped and 30.3% are new. The dropped Subchiefs/Seadmen average out to 10 annually. The new Subchiefs/Subheadmen average out to 7 annually. The above details are found in Table A.A.4, list of Headmen and Subheadmen 31-3-1916. Table A.A.6, list of Headmen and Subheadmen 1917/18 and Table A.A.7 Changes in Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen March 1911 - March 1918.

We have used the category dropped in an agglutinated sense to embrace both those fired, resigning and dying. We intend here to analyze the meaning of dropped further. Towards this we would like to point out that we have not found out what happened to Evotuni Location and its Chief Mwikya wa Kanyolo who in 1911 was considered ready, cooperative, and progressive. He was a planter of trees and rubber and could speak, read and write Swahili. However he was overbearing to Nzama.³⁶ The annual reports have incomplete data reasons for being dropped. We however out of the fairly complete 1915/16. Annual Report have reconstructed dropped into three categories a) those who died in office (2) those who were dismissed and forced to resign (3) those who resigned normally and (4) those promoted. Of the three chiefs dropped in 1915/16 Kingau wa Kithome resigned because of ill health (category 3) Ngothi was Ithuli was fired/forced to resign because he was chronically drunk. (Category 2). Mundu was Ngula was fired/forced to resign because of his politics with Poihoi (Category 2). Thus $\frac{2}{3}$ of the chiefs who resigned this year violated some officers view of their duties. Of the 21 subchiefs dropped in 1921, 6 or 28.6% were promoted to chiefs. (Category 4). These were Mumoni subheadmen who were to take over locations later and Poihoi Challenge in Tharaka. 2 or 9.5% died in office (Category 1). They are Kathuli Nzau or Mui and Mwanzia Nzubi of Ukazzi. 2 or 9.5% resigned normally (Category 3) and were replaced by their sons. They are Nzou Kasimu and Mwee wa Maingo both of Mulango. 11 or 52.3% were fired or forced to resign for one reason or other. The majority had to do with the competition for control between headmen and subdeamen e.g. Kitundu Sumbi and Nungu wa Kingati who were rivals to Headman Nzambo who engineered their firing or Kitosio Masila of Mulango dismissed for holding an illegal Nzama or Mitau Ilehu of Nzaoni dismissed on application of Headman Ngondi wa Moki or Mbaiwa wa Musyimi (Soo) of Zombe dismissed for being obstructive to the chief. Mutinda Mutui was dismissed for "boarding fine money".

Thus we can conclude that by 1915/16 the administration was already gathering an experienced pool of subheadmen from which to draw headmen. Furthermore it was shifting power away from the Nzamas and the subheadmen to the chiefs. The administration had a fairly stabilized chief pool also. The other significant conclusion is the shifting of constituencies in the already reached locations. The most clear case is the appointment of subchief Hamisi wa Kaboo in Mulango Location to represent the interests of the Swahili Kamba. The second aspect of shifting constituents is the appointment of five Headmen in Mumoni to join Mitau wa Kathunga. These are Mukwekwe wa Nguli, Mutui was Ndei, Mwanzia wa Maana, Igabha wa Mwambi and Nzau wa Mwinza. Their appointment was the first step towards the creation of many more locations in north Kitui. From 1914 an Assistant D.C. is stationed at Mumoni³⁷. Incidentally this was also expansion of control. Of particular interest also is the intensification of control over Voo by firing most of the subchiefs.

In the previous section we had discussed how the administration view of administering and controlling Kitui particularly between 1909 and 1912 was to strengthen traditional native authority. This in essence meant giving power to the Nzama, making sure the Nzama were old men Atumia ma Ithembo and finally making sure that Headmen would issue orders through the Nzamas. We also commented that subchiefs were in charge of the 'natural' units ivalo and tended to be Atumia ma Ithembo. They thus had linkages with the population which gave them a hedge on the chiefs who were younger and not Atumia ma Ithembo. (colonial officers picked young men (Nthele or Anake) who could do things which old men could not^{viz}). The Chief cannot even be the head of the elders unless he is both of tribal standing and of an age at which he would be useless for active work of any sort"³⁸). By 1914 and perhaps 1913 the administration view of how to administer and control had changed drastically in favour of chiefs over Nzamas and subchiefs. This resulted in administrative organizational processes in favour of chiefs. By 1914 there were 24 locations with Headmen and Sub-headmen. The second organizational process change was the very role of Nzamas. Before they had been seen as native authorities with quasi-judicial, quasi-executive (administrative) and quasi-legislative duties in the area of tradition. In a colony all power ultimately emanates from the colonizer, thus delegated powers to native authorities or areas which they are given competence are fake- thus the theoretical standpoint of quasi-powers Chiefs were to act through

Nzamas. By 1914 Nzamas were being relegated to the area of quasi - judiciary and to a minor extent quasi - legislators of tradition. The Chief was increasingly the executing agent of colonial law and programs and to the extent that deepening of colonial situation leads to a greater denial of tradition the Nzamas became more and more irrelevant and the chief more powerful. However by 1914 the Nzamas were taking over the 'burden' of officers hearing cases thus freeing 'officers' to institute the third organizational change. Officers travelled more than before. "As a great deal of travelling among natives is necessary, it is arranged as far as possible, that two officers (out of four) are always on tour.) Now that the majority of the cases are heard by the Native Councils (Nzamas) the work of the station is not exoruous and the benefits derived from constant visits to locations is obvious."³⁹ Travelling was necessary to show the ruler. Benefits were that areas were integrated into the image of the colonizer. To the extent that the chief was the agent, guide and interpreter for the 'officer' on march he also began to partake of the aura of the officer - aura of power. Nzamas could discuss tradition and even mete justice in traditional views but if these violated the colonizers notions - they were overruled as the 'officer' was also the magistrate of the District.

In the redress of power between subheadmen/Nzamas and chiefs the intermediate 1914 step was to create dual categories of headmen. "Only those subheadmen who are presidents of Councils (Nzamas) are gazetted, the remainder being nominated by the Council and appointed by the District Commissioner".⁴⁰ Although ultimately gazettelement of a headman depended on the D.C. (being advised by the chief) existing as a D.C. appointed headman meant you were not paid. Thus a relatively deprived group of subheadmen started seeking gazettelement. The view of the administration about chiefs and the good chief are enunciated in the 1914/15 Annual Report as follows "The majority-----are lazy and anathetic and unable or unwilling to exercise their powers----- (Ngovi wa Katama of Mutha and Kiema wa Mumo of Kanziko) stand out as being the best men in the district-----"r. Osborne and Mr. Scholefield both say these men are despots which is perfectly true, but in order to bring the Akamba into line, despotism tempered with justice is most desirable"⁴¹ By 1915/16 even the idea of separate Nzamas under subheadmen not under chiefs/headmen is rejected. "It is desirable to reduce as far as possible these sub-Councils (subchief/ sub-headmen Nzama) as they tend to undermine the authority of the Headman. The President of the Sub-Council considering himself in no way subordinate to the Headman."⁴² All power at the local level was to be given to the chief. He

was also to control the Nzama. Thus in Mgeni the subordinate Council under subheadman Nzambo wa Mutei is abolished/subsumed under Headman Nzoka wa M Malinga's Nzama. In Mulango subordinate Council under Subchief Nzou wa Kasimu is abolished/subsumed under Headman Mulli wa Kithusi's Nzama. In Voo subordinate Council under Subchief Mwanza wa Nguthi is abolished/subsumed under Headman Kivoto wa Nzuki's Nzama. In Mumoni we should note that those subheadmen to be promoted to Headmen are also presidents of subordinate Nzamas. We should further note that all the 10 existing subordinate Councils in 1916 are abolished / absorbed into Headmen Nzamas by March 1918. (See Tables A.A. 5 and A.A.6.) Thus between 1914 and 1918 Chiefs structurally dominate the all governing (colonizers) institutions at the location level and they do not have any rivals. Thus the chiefs were now in a position to become/create Manyenya-Mbatwa - literally those who lick the sticks used for roasting meat - composed of sub-headmen, Nzama elders and tribal retainers. The 'officers' were roasting the meat. The others slaughtered the goats, roasted it, waited when it was being eaten and were so gluttonous that they fought over the pieces thrown to them and stayed to lick the sticks.⁴³ It is in the contexts of chiefs and these appendages subchiefs, Nzama elders and tribal retainers, that we must understand popular opposition to imposition of the colonial situation reflected in the Ngai Dancers.⁴⁴ Why were the chiefs allowed to accumulate power or to put the question another way why was control over the local area taken out of 'native authority' (Nzama) and away from the traditionally know level of Kivalo to the anonymous location level? The explanations are the extraction duties which chiefs were to perform. The primary duty was to collect hut and poll tax. Table A.A. 8 Kitui Comparative Statement of Revenue 1901/02 to 1922 gives us the picture. We should notice that with the creation of many subchiefs in 1906/07 the hut and poll tax percent increases dramatically. With the reorganization into Headmen and subchiefs and Nzamas in 1909/10 there is a subsequent dramatic jump. However the ensuing conflict over control of Nzamas and the plethora of subordinate councils led to reduction in the proportion of hut and poll tax from years 1913/14. In the subsequent years popular resistance in the form of Ngai Dancers arose and continued to oppose taxation and porter recruitment up to 1918. By 1916 the D.C. was complaining that whole locations were taking to the bush and to avoid porter recruitment. Of course 1917/18 to 1918/19 and 1919/20 there is not only famine but meningitis and flu. Thus although the proportions of hut and poll tax appear to be reduced they can be explained. We should note that in spite of the depression after the war by 1920/21 the proportion is 92.2%. One should note that other than the years of famine meningitis and flu i.e. 1917/18-1919/20 and the Ngai Dance/opposition to porter recruitment

year of 1916/17 there is a steady growth of the absolute amounts of hut and poll tax. The chiefs were required for purposes of making sure that the hut and poll taxes were collected' They are the ones who followed their 'natives' when they migrated or ran into the bush. By 1918 they were controlling Nzamas subchiefs and tribal retainers.⁴⁵

The chiefs were needed also for the second aspect of forced extraction. This was the recruitment of porters for the War. Before the significance of extracting portage can be shown several points are worth making. The first is that relatively speaking Kitui was rich by 1910. After the drought/famine and rinderpest disasters of 1896-1899 the herds had recovered and colonial control of the surrounding areas had allowed herds to spread out east to Galla country, south into Tsavo, south and west into Yatta and Northwest into Mumoni and Tharaka. Ivory was also being traded through Arab/Swahili, Nyamwezi and Swahilized Kamba. An area needing detailed research is the origins and trade patterns of Arab/Swahili Nyamwezi, Swahilized Kamba and their relationship to society. In field interviews there seems to be a relationship between the people involved in local trade and identified by Cummings.⁴⁶ as Andu Anene up to 1850 and Arab Caravan trade particularly of ivory, slaves and live-stock. Kimambo in Economic History of the Kamba 1850 - ⁴⁷ touched on the question but we need to show how trade related to socio-political institutions. A useful approach is suggested by Memon⁴⁸ where the source of trading communities and the relationship of the rise of trading communities and the co-relation ship of the rise of Mombasa and Zanzibar are touched upon. It is in the context of the relative wealth that the Kamba refuse to labour as reported in Annual Report of 1913⁴⁹. In the same it is further reported that the Kamba employ Kikuyu and that "the employment of Kikuyu by the Akamba does not tend to incline the latter to work"⁵⁰. In the same report it is reported that there are 3,000 Kikuyu cattle traders⁵¹. It is not realistic that this many people would all be cattle traders. That is likely to have been explained to the D.C. and he misunderstood it is that Kikuyus would come to Kitui during famines and work. Since Kitui cattle were valued in Kikuyu land they would be the payment. This was also the reciprocal ethnical institution of individual Kithua rather than the collective Kithua discussed by Cummings.⁵² I do not doubt that some were pure traders. Of course there is some validity in the Kikuyus being labour but it was not formal employment. An individual who went to Kithua attached himself to a relatively rich man and accumulated goats/cattle over some years. Sometimes they married into that family and were absorbed. Other times they went to Kithua after some years. The same phenomena was true in Machakos particularly Iveti and Kangundo. The point

though is that livestock wealth made the Kitui Kamba of this period relatively wealthy and they did not choose to labour for others.

By May 1915 the district was required to produce 175 young men for the War. This had risen to a request of 275 monthly by February 1916⁵³. An extra 500 for Railway were requested for June 1916.⁵⁴ The monthly request represented between 2.35% and 3.70% of all estimated anake in the District in 1915/16. Thus if they were supplied at the first rate from May 1915 to January 1916 i.e. 9 months, 1575 would have been supplied. This is 21.22% of the estimated total population of anake. Even if we assume that all the greybeards were eligible for recruitment it would still represent recruitment of 5.53% of all estimated males in the district. Incidentally the official record reports that in 1915/16 they supplied 4627 i.e. 62.35% of all anake or 16.39% of all males as labour to the following institution.⁵⁵

Carrier Corps	3083
Indian Traders	1432
KAR	25
Police	38
Ex Police Special Duty	25
Scouts	33
Total	4627

Assuming that the rate of recruitment from January 1916 to March was 275 monthly plus the extra 500 special request and the 1728 porters for Indian traders reported for the year, all labour supplied would be 6353 or 85% of estimated anake or 23.65% of all estimated males. If the same rate of extraction of labour i.e 275 monthly continued in 1917/18 together with the 312 reported porters for Asian traders, 3612 or 52.65% of estimated anake or 13.59% of all males would have been recruited for labour. It should be then clear that between 1915 and 1918 at least 50% of all anake or 10% of all males were forced to become labour mainly in the Carrier Corps and as Asian Trader porters.

How was this process of impressing labour organized? Once the D.C. got the district quota he divided the quota among locations as he divided the livestock quota. It was then the duty of the chief to supply the 'officer on march' or bring to Kitui the bodies and cattle he had been allocated. There

was opposition. "The outstanding feature this year is the supply of porters, there has been lots of trouble in getting men -----". The nature of the country, long stretches of uninhabited bush, make it difficult to administer the people as any one who wished to evade an order has only to retire to the bush and he is practically safe"⁵⁶. There has been some trouble to get the men in some of the more backward locations but it was comparatively easy matter for the first six months after six months after it became more and more difficult"⁵⁷. "The supply of porters was kept up but the matter got worse and worse, whole locations would take to the bush when they heard an officer was coming and there would either have been open opposition or the supply would have stopped shortly when in March 1916 the Director of Military Labour decided to begin repatriating men"⁵⁸. It was hoped that forced labour in the Carrier Corps would educate the natives to go out to work voluntarily later and it remains to be seen whether this will happen. Personally I do not think it will."⁵⁹

"There was practically no desire to labour but war losses, famine and influenza have caused, in my opinion, much greater havoc than estimated. The Carrier Corps and other natives have not yet been fully paid up and there seems to be no lack of money".⁶⁰ "There is no doubt whatever that the impression gained by the natives who have served in the Carrier Corp is not good---few will want to go out again -----Labour for government is always forced and in many cases that for private enterprise ----- there is no such a thing as voluntary labour here -----men recruited for local Government work are ex Carriers and 500 which have been called for the Railway (but not yet supplied) will be ex Carriers Or else men who have been rejected for military work and are consequently unfit-----". This tribe responded exceedingly well to the call for military labour but it was not because they wanted to go as Carriers, they had no patriotic feelings towards the War, they went because they had to: The fact that they went without active trouble is what should be placed to their credit. At present there is a reaction here and great opposition to the call for labour for the Railway"⁶¹ "In October 17th 1917 Lieutenant Willis came here to recruit men for the 3rd KAR. He had special instructions that enlistment was To be voluntary and as I expected, he had no success and did not get a single . This was not surprising, a yeast majority of the young men have been in the Carrier Corps and could hardly be expected to volunteer for 3 years further service yet"⁶³. Thus the D.C. reported an opposition to impressing labour. If you had access to the chief and you had livestock you could transfer the cattle to the chief and keep your sons home so said Kiumo wa Mbaa Kanyaa in Ikutha in 1974.

The chiefs were needed for the third important function of the war years. This was extraction of military livestock. The Annual Report of 1914/15 states that Mumoni Kamba donated 270 cattle, 390 shoats and 614 Rupees⁶⁴. The oral tradition argues that the chief just raided homes and got the best livestock which he took to the officer'. In 1915/16, 1667 cattle were procured for the military.⁶⁵ These are the ones which got trekked to collection point at Kitui. If a chief lost some by disease on the way he went back and raided more, so states the oral tradition. Who shall ever know the actual numbers raided from the people? Many argue that chiefs raided for themselves even when there was no military requisitioning. In following three family herds in Kangundo Machakos I turned up data that during the same period each family was handing over to the chief 4 oxen and 8 goats per year.

We should however note that there also were forced sales to supply Nairobi - bi primarily and few livestock went to Fort Hall. In 1916/17 cattle exports were fairly high, to the military and Nairobi Market. The following year¹ of the cattle died of starvation and East Coast Fever⁶⁵

We have so far shown the chiefs being allowed to accumulate power so as to be the agents for recruitment labour, requisitioning cattle and collecting taxes. These are the sources of accumulation for the chiefs, subchiefs and the tribal retainers of which there are 140 for the whole district in 1915/16⁶⁶ i.e. 6 for every location. They were living off the land, to wit "At present there is no provision for paying these tribal retainers and the pay of the Headmen is too small to allow them being paid a regular wage out of that, they are recognized by government, receive a metal arm badge and are exempted from payment of Hut Tax in respect of one Hut but there the matter stops. It has been the custom for these men to demand Rs1; from the plaintiff in each case before they summon the defendant and this was done with the sanction of the councils, but it is a bad custom and open to much abuse so it has been prohibited."⁶⁷

Footnotes

IDS/WP 304

1. Kitui District Political Record Book 1898-1912.
Summary of Baraza Held in Dec. 30th 1912. pp. 295-296.
2. Mutiso, G.C.M. Kenya: Politics Policy and Society E.A.L.B. 1975.
Chapter I.
3. Political Record Book. op.cit. pp. 28-31.
4. Ibid p. 1-3.
5. Ibid p. 18.
6. Ibid p. 57.
7. Ibid p. 58.
8. Ibid p. 7.
9. Kitui District Annual Report 1911 p. 16.
10. Political Record Book op.cit. p. 154-156.
11. Annual Report 1911 op.cit. p. 21.
12. Political Record Book, op.cit. p. 154-156.
13. Annual Report 1912 p. 294 and Annual Report 1913 p. 6.
14. Annual Report 1913 p. 5-6.
15. Ibid p. 10.
16. Political Record Book p. 234 and 690, Dundas. op.cit. p. 113.
17. Ibid p. 236.
18. Ibid p. 237.
19. Ibid p. 233.
20. Ibid p. 234.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid p. 239.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid p. 237.
26. Ibid pp. 238 and 240.
27. Ibid pp. 115-116.
28. Ibid p. 234.
29. Ibid p. 235.

30. Ibid.
31. Ibid p. 237.
32. Ibid p. 240.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid p. 233.
35. Ibid p. 237.
36. Ibid p. 238.
37. Annual Report 1914/15 p. 19.
38. Annual Report 1913 pp. 5-6.
39. Annual Report 1914/15 p. 19.
40. Ibid. p. 8.
41. Ibid and Annual Report 1915/16 p. 6.
42. Annual Report 1916 p. 4.
43. For a more academic (!) definition of manyenyambatwa and their relationship with asomi see Mutiso. op.cit. pp.216-218 where the Machakos District case is discussed.
44. Research on Popular Resistance in Kitui will be published later. See Annual Report 1914/15 p. 4 and Annual Report 1915/16 p. 15 for Ngai Dancers Comments.
45. See Annual Reports 1910/11 to 1922 for details on the above paragraph.
46. Cummings.op.cit.
47. In Ogot, B.A. (ed) Hadith 2. Nairobi. EAPH 1969.
48. Mercantile Intermediaries in a Colonial Spatial System. Wholeselling in Kenya 1830-1940. Ph.D. Thesis. University of Western Ontario. pp. 86-91.
49. Annual Report 1913 p. 33.
50. Ibid.
51. Ibid.
52. Cummings: op.cit.
53. Annual Report 1915/16 p. 27.
54. Ibid.
55. Ibid p. 27 and Annual Report 1917/18 p. 45.

56. Annual Report 1915/16 p. 13.
57. Ibid p. 27.
58. Ibid p. 28.
59. Ibid p. 59.
60. Annual Report 1919/20 p. 3.
61. Annual Report 1917/18 p. 46-47.
62. Ibid p. 25.
63. Annual Report 1914/15 p. 26.
64. Annual Report 1915/16 p. 29.
65. Annual Report 1917/18 pp. 35-36.
66. Annual Report 1915/16 p. 9.
67. Ibid.

TABLE A.A.1 List of Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen who
Met P.C. Hobley December 1909

<u>Name</u>	<u>Location/Sublocation</u>
1. Muli wa Kithusi	Mulango
2. Maingi wa Kitetu	Kitui (Changwithya?)
3. Nzoka wa Kalinga	Mgeni
4. Mwikya wa Kanyolo	Euotuni
5. Mbuvi wa Nzioka	Siontheka
6. Mwendwa wa Kitabi	Matinyani
7. Mumo wa Malu	?
8. Ndungo wa Mwingo	?
9. Mitau wa Yumbu	Matinyani/Viango
10. Munyasia wa Mulu/Mulu	Mgeni/Mutendea
11. Mitau wa Chia/Chaa	Matinyani/Mutendea
12. Kiema wa Mangaya	Tharaka
13. Mutie wa Kabandi	Mumoni
14. Musila wa Syengo	?

Source: Kitui Political Record Book p. 53

TABLE A.A.2 Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen as Listed by
Dundas 1909/10

1. Izambo Ndunda	Migwani, Mwingi, Kanyonda
2. Mwendau Kiema	Migwani, Izaoni
3. Katuei	Gai
4. Mutia Kibungia	Mumoni
5. Kano Siobeti	Mutito
6. Kasioka wa Kanandu	Mui
7. Munithia Kyalo	Endau
8. Mukuthu wa Nzioka	Endau
9. Mutoni Mue	Boboni
10. Kabella	Mutha
11. Ngoui wa Katama	Mutha
12. Mutinda	Mutha
13. Kiema wa Mumo	Kanziko
14. Kalinga wa Nguno	Ikutha
15. Kitili	Mutomo/Ikanga
16. Nzoo	Mulango/Mwewe
17. Isika	Yatta
18. Kalungu Isika	Yatta
19. Poiboi	Tharaka
20. Mundu wa Ngula	Tharaka
21. Musembi wa Nthusi	Voo

Source: Kitui District Political Record Book
Kitui District by C. Dundas 1909/10

TABLE A.A.3 1910 - 1911 List of Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen and their Predecessors and Designated successors

Location	Sublocation	Chief	Subheadman	Clan	Predecessor	Successor	No. in Name
1. Mutongeni		Musao Kithosi	Kasombo Mhosi	Nhakanya	Fiphegia Weunya (father)	Nasinga Musao	20
2. Ngweni		Nzoka Kalinga		Amoti	Nzongo Mutiethau (uncle)	Nekwa Kilinga	28
	Mutendea		Munyasio Mulu	Simoni	Ndonga Katumo (uncle)	Nitau Ndonga (nephew)	
	Mutendea		Mumo Mulu	Nhamangi	Kiboni, Nkonio	Musila Mulu	
3. Nulango		Nuli Kithusi		Amini	Kithusi (father)	Untrustworthy	
	Kithumbangi		Rhooke wa Hamu	Nzamani	Mhlang wa Nthoka (uncle)	Lango (son)	
	Kabuta		Nakao Mulu	Amini	Mulu wa Mliona (uncle)	Nthuka Kilaha (nephew)	
	Stheo		Mwendo Malingi	Ezi	Kikango Kalichi	Mumambi (son)	
	Mweve		Munyoki Kilango	Ngwenzi	Nzao Kisiuni	Muyoka Kilango (brother)	
	Stheo		Kitaso Masila	Ngwenzi	?	?	
	Mweve		Kibuyu Malingi	Munzango	?	?	
4. Mutinyani		Mwendwa Kitabi		Simoni	Nkomoza Kithusi (grandfather)	Naku (son 6 yrs. old)	44
	Viango		Nitau Yumbu	Ragolia	Yumbu Nthei (father)	Mbutu Yumba (brother)	
	Mutendea		Nitau Chaa	?	?	?	
	Mutendea		Mwini wa Numba	?	?	?	
5. Mutoni		Muluya Kanyolo		Mitondo	Mbingo wa Kitabi	Mwanza Muluya (son 5 yrs.)	27
6. Kitui		Malingi Kitetu		Nzamani	Kithusi (father)	Mungao (son)	39
	Maini		Ndongo Mungo	Bamili	Mungo Mutwe (father)	Nuli Ndongo (8) (son)	
	Kamuthia		Sianda Mulu	Mamuhili	Koboi Mwenyu (father)	Munasia (son)	
	Kienzi		Nali Kibulu (1911 Nthumbi Nakali)	Mitondo	?	?	
	Nyambani Mifanani?		Azango wa Nuthaka				
7. Voo			Musambi Ithusi	?	Kifanga Sionzoba	?	36
	Kibaoni		Mwanza Nguthi	?	?	?	17
	Karar.		Musimba Mulu (subchief)	?	?	?	31
	Voo		Musimba Kifanga	Amini	Nitonga Konya (father)	Mulika Mwanthia (son)	44
	Kangae/Mijaoni		Nduni wa Ngaiango	?	?	?	46
	Kangevit		Lunda	?	?	?	
8. Kankiko			Kiema Mumo	Aye	Mumo Nzoka (father)	?	45
	Machina		Kandia Kisila	Mukitondo	Kisila Mweu (father)	Nziu Kisila (son)	
			Mwaka Mukiti B Inzambu Muzua				
9. Indau		Mukutha Kilingo	Mukutha Kilingo	Mukitutu	Nzioka Mhola	Mwea Mukutha (son 6 yrs.)	20
	Chao		Mwacha Kyalo	Kithumbi	Kyalo Thome (father)	Mathi Kyalo (son)	
10. Vuu		Kingau Kithome		Nhakanya	Mulu Malingi	Ndongo Mulu (brother)	27
	Mutoni		Mwaka wa Kizambu	?	?	?	
	Idoni (Ituni)		Mwabi	?	?	?	
11. Indui		Mwili Kapungwa		Kuinyu	Nathongi Ngema (uncle)	Mwalinga Kapungwa (brother)	18

TABLE A.A.3 (continued)

Location	Sublocation	Chief	Subheadman	Clan	Predecessor	Successor	No. in House
12. Ukwazi		Malungu Muteo		Mukitondo	Kilonga Kitini	Mvenga (son)	23
	Kimethengi		Munyasya Hdata	Mutloki	Kitali wa Kahulu	Eengim Hdata (brother)	
13. Mui		Kasloka Kanandu		Mukitutu	Kyumbia wa Nthai	Mutua Kasloka (son)	21
	?		Mvanzhia	?	?	?	
	?		Kitabi	?	?	?	
	Mu Ndungya		Makula Mhumbho	?	?	?	
14. Ikutha		Kalunga Nguno		Mukitutu	Kikumba Mvulu	Kitonga Nguno (son)	40
	Ngini		Mutisya Mutiandili	?	?	?	
	Kyandula		Mutisya Mambua	?	?	?	
	Ndillili		Nzinga Mumo	?	?	?	
	Vitu		Mutua Ngui	?	?	?	
15. Mutha		Ngomli Katana		Aumbi (Aombe?)	Mulungi Rebiya	?	12
	?		Mutinda	?	?	?	
16. Siontheke		Mbuvi Naloka		Mhaandeva	Nzoka Nguti (father)	Mwai Naloka (son)	68
	?		Ndinga Mushi	?	?	?	
	Kilonso		Ichau Matiki	?	?	?	
17. Zombe		Isika Kavaluku		Mutei	Kaheluku (father)	Mbituka Kimbiondo	24
	Makongo		Mhai wa Musyini	?	?	?	
18. Mutito		Kano wa T-oveti		Mhas Ndeva	Sioveti Mwingi (father)	Mutunga Kano (son)	16
19. Mutito/Bukoni		Mutoni wa Maa		Mutei	Nyambo Maa (brother)	Nguni Naila	18
20. Ikanga		Kacili Muthengi		Amuti	Musabe Muthengi (brother)	Mwau Kitili (son)	51
	Tihumila		Ndupde Kathuli	?	?	?	
	Elosia		Kietl Ngao	?	?	?	
	Mutomo		Mutinda	?	?	?	
	?		Mvilya Ngette	?	?	?	
21. Yatta		Kalungu Kathangu		Nzauni	Kathanza Muthuka (father)	Mbau Kalungu (son)	24
	Kiumu		Musa Mutymithya	Mhaunzi	Mvulu Kakoti	Eyelo Munga (son)	
	Ingomani		Muli Malingi	Mhaumbua	Ikuia Kithangua	Eyelo Ngumo	
	Nunguni		Nguta Kithome	Akitondo	Katoli wa Kalulu	Kilunzi Nguta (son)	
22. Miguani		Mambo wa Munda		Mutunya	Ngui Mutuandua	Kalimi Malinga	37
	Kiomo		Mboo wa Laha	?	?	?	
	Kingali		Mungu wa Kinunga	Mhausia	Matutu wa Ndii	Maluki wa Mungao	
	Mwingi		Kitundu wa Kiambi	?	?	?	
	Kanyonga		Mangala Nduba	?	?	?	
	Kyome		Kietl Kilewa	?	?	?	
23. Mamboni		Katunga Muthwa		Mha Ngoki	Kithunga Kiteni (father)	Mvulu Mutia (son)	17
	Katze		Ngamba Mwambi	Mutongoi	Munya wa Ngundo	Mbunge Ngamba (son)	
	Gal		Katvel Kimwele	Mbakanya	?	Mwau (son)	
	Mausoba		Mbau wa Ngoni	?	?	?	
	Nataka		Mutia wa Kavandi	?	?	?	
	Mbioni		Masilawa Kyengo	?	?	?	
	Tsekuru		Nzau Mwina	?	?	?	
	Masela, Kabuyu		Mvini Mwana	?	?	?	
	Etunda, Mungo			?	?	?	

TABLE A.1.1 (continued)

Location	Sublocation	Chief	Subheadman	Class	Predecessor	Successor	No. in House
	Kakuyu		Kasumbio Kinga	?	?	?	
	Mkongo		Katume Ndili	?	?	?	
	Etinda		Mulili Mutiothoka	?	?	?	
	Masoria		Makwa Kitabi	?	?	?	
	Nadia		Mboa Kitabi	?	?	?	
	Keningo		Nthomba Mibio	?	?	?	
	Ndatani		Mukwekwe Nguli	?	?	?	
	Ndatani		Sindava Ngowi	?	?	?	
	Ngomeni		Mangeva Kigau	?	?	?	
	Mutelo		Maudava Katumbi	?	?	?	
	Kyaso		Mutui wa Ndai	?	?	?	
26. Naoni		Mwendau Kieme		Mruenganga	Masaria Yiu	Ngundi Maki	6
25. Tharaka		Mundia wa Ngula	Munyika Mwangi	Thaka	Poihoi	-	21
	Kithura		Kamudi Karungo	Nao	Muthika Mutukiti	Nthia wa Kiaranga	
	Ubete		Kibibi Murebei	Kangila	Mashura Walingwa	Saba Kibilaage	
	Kirangano		Kababungoi Mutebi	Kangila	Mgeba Kirucha	Kikwanyo	
	?		Kiema Poihoi	?	?	?	
	?		Mtu Mirige	?	?	?	
	?		Tuto Mutebi	?	?	?	
TOTAL	24	25	25				

SOURCE: POLITICAL RECORD BOOK

TABLE A.A.4 List of Headmen and Subheadmen 1914/15

NO. LOCATION	Headman	Subheadman
A. Kitui	Maingi wa Kitetu	Sianda wa Mawoko Hami wa Kaboo
	Nzoka wa Kalinga	
B. Ngengi		Munyasia wa Mulu Nyama wa Mukula Nzambo wa Mutel
C. Marinyani	Mwendwa wa Kitabi	Mitau wa Yumbu Mitau wa Chaa
D. Mutonguni	Musau wa Kisesi	
E. Mutito	Kano wa Siobeti	
F. Buboni	Mutoni wa Mwele	
	Kasioka wa Kanandu	
G. Mui		Makolu wa Mbumbu
H. Endau	Makuthu wa Kaleki	Munuthia wa Kysalo
	Nzambo wa Ndunda	
I. Migwani		Kieti wa Kiliwa Nungu wa Kinungu Kitundu wa Sumbi
J. Nsioni	Ngandi wa Muoki	
K. Endui	Ngundi wa Ngeti	
L. Huu	Kiengau wa Kithome	
		Ngula wa Kikambu
M. Ukassi	Munyasya wa Ndata	
	Mitau wa Kathunga	
N. Mumoni		Mukwekwu wa Nguli Mange wa Kitau Ngombwa wa Ngonyo Mutui wa Ndogi Mabo wa Kimveli Mwanja wa Maana Mwilili wa Mutiethoka Katumo wa Nditi Nsau wa Mwinza Nsabu wa Mwambi Masila wa Kyengo Mutia wa Kavandi Mbau wa Ndonni Kasambio wa Kinga
	Munda wa Ngula	
O. Tharaka		Tuto wa Ngeligeli Kamundu wa Karunga Palboi wa Chalange Kipubi wa Ngulumbu
P. Siontheke	Ngothia wa Ithuli	
		Ndinga wa Mwaki
	Muli wa Kithusi	
Q. Mulengo		Nzgo wa Kisemi Mwee wa Maingi Kitosio wa Masila
S. Yatta	Kathunga wa Kathangu	
T. Zembe	Isika wa Kabaluku	Mbu wa M-Sy-m.
V. Ikanga	Kitili wa Muthengi	Mutinda wa Mutu.
W. Voo	Kivoto wa Nzuki	Mutinda wa Mutu.
X. Mutha	Ngowi wa Katama	
Y. Kansiko	Kiema Mumo	
Z. Kuthu	Mutha wa Mutinduzi	Munyasya wa Mutinduzi Mutha wa Mutinduzi Nzgo wa M-Sy-m.

24

24

40

128 2nd location is last in all records
after appearing in Annual Report 1911
Source: Annual Report 1914: p 5-7

TABLE A.A.5 List of Headmen and Subheadmen 31 - 3 - 1916

Location	Headman	Appointment Gazette Date	Subheadman	President of Ntomo or President of Subordinate
A. Kitui	Maingi wa Kitetu	12/8/15	Hamisi wa Kaboo	President of Ntomo
		12/8/15	Sianda wa Ndulu	President of Ntomo
B. Kitui	Nzoka wa Kalinga	12/8/15	Nzambo wa Mutei	PSN
		-	Munyasia wa Mulu	-
		-	Nyamu wa Mulu	-
C. Matinyani	Mwendwa wa Kitabi	28/8/15	Mitau wa Chas	PSN
		-	Mitau wa Yumbu	-
D. Mutonguni	Musau wa Kisesi	12/8/15	-	PSN
E. Mutito	Kano wa Siobeti	12/8/15	-	PSN
F. Buboni	Mutoni wa Mwee	12/8/15	-	PSN
G. Mui	Kasioka wa Kanandu	12/8/15	Mwatha wa Kasyoka	PSN
		-	Makola wa Mbumbu	-
		-	Malongie wa Kitabi	-
H. Endau	Makuthu wa Kaleki	12/8/15	Munithia wa Kyalo	PSN
I. Migvani	Nzambo wa Ndunda	12/8/15	Kieti wa Kilewa	PSN
		Probation	Mangala wa Ndumbu	-
		-	Matiti wa Katumo	-
		-	Nzambo wa Ndobi	-
J. Nzoni	Ngondi wa Muoki	12/8/15	Evui wa Mbobi	PSN
K. Endui	Ngundu wa Ngeti	12/8/15	-	PSN
L. Nuu	Mathoka wa Mviu	-	Matabu wa Munumbi	PSN
		-	Ngula wa Kikumbu	-
M. Ukassi	Munyasia wa Ndatta	12/8/15	-	PSN
N. Mumoni	Mitau wa Kathunga	12/8/15	Nabo wa Kimweli	PSN
		-	Nasila wa Kyengo	-
		-	Ndau wa Ndoni	-
	Mukvekve wa Nguli	12/8/15	Ndau wa Kitau	PSN
	Mutui wa Ndei	12/8/15	Mutia wa Kavandi	PSN
	Mwanzi wa Maana	12/8/15	-	PSN
		-	Katumo wa Ndilli	-
		-	Kasambio wa Kinga	-
		-	Mwiliili wa Mutiethoka	-
O. Tharaka	Paiboi wa Chalanga	12/8/15	Tuto wa Ngeligeli	PSN
		12/8/15	Kamundi wa Karunga	PSN
		12/8/15	Meni wa Rugassa	-
P. Siontheke	Mbubi wa Nzioka	5/1/16	Ndinga wa Mwake	PSN
		-	Ezika wa Musyimi	-
Q. Mulango	Muli wa Kithusi	12/8/15	Mutuvya wa Ngongwe	PSN
		-	Muli wa Nzoo	-
		-	Mumuve wa Mwee	-
S. Yatta	Kalungu wa Kathanzi	12/8/15	-	PSN
T. Zombe	Ezika wa Muthengi	12/8/15	-	PSN
V. Ikanga	Kitilli wa Muthengi	12/8/15	Mailu wa Kathulli	PSN
W. Voo	Kimoto wa Nzuki	12/8/15	Mwasia wa Mutei	PSN
		-	Nzoka wa Ndungu	-
		-	Ndune wa Ngai	-
		-	Mwanzia wa Nguthi	-
X. Mutha	Ngomwa wa Katama	12/8/15	Mutinda wa Nguluku	PSN
Y. Kanziro	Kiema wa Mumo	12/8/15	Nzambu wa Musuu	PSN
Z. Ikutha	Maila wa Mutindiasya	12/8/15	Nzinga wa Mumo	PSN
TOTALS	24	24	42	

Source: Annual Report 1915/16 pp. 11-12

TABLE A.A.6 List of Headmen and Subheadmen 1917/18

Location	Rank	Name	PAY (RS)	Remarks (PN) (SCS)
A. Kitui	Headmen (H)	Maingi wa Kitetu	250	President of Nguni (PN)
	Subheadmen (S.A.)	Hamisi wa Kaboo	50	Second Class Staff (SCS)
B. Ngeni	H	Nzoka wa Kalinga	154	PN
	S.H.	Nzambo wa Mutei	-	PN
	S.H.	Munyasia wa Mulu	-	PN
	S.H.	Nyamu wa Mukula	-	PN
C. Matinyani	H	Mwendwa wa Kitabi	160	PN
	SH	Mitau wa Chaa	-	PN
	SH	Mitau wa Yumbu	-	PN
D. Mutonguni	H	Musau wa Kiessia	120	PN
E. Mutito	H	Kano wa Siobeti	120	PN
F. Buboni	H	Mutoni wa Mwee	80	PN
G. Mui	H	Kasioka wa Kamandu	100	PN
	SH	Kathuli wa Nzau	-	PN
	SH	Mwatha wa Kasoka	-	PN
	SH	Makola wa Mbumbo	-	PN
H. Endau	H	Makuthu wa Kaleki	80	PN
	SH	Munathia wa Kysio	-	PN
I. Mirwani	H	Nzambo wa Ndunda	250	PN
	SH	Kitundu wa Sumbi	100	PN
	SH	Kieti wa Kilewa	-	PN
	SH	Nungu wa Kinungu	40	PN
J. Nzaoni	H	Ngondi wa Kiema	180	PN
K. Endui	H	Ngundi wa Ngeti	84	PN
L. Nuu	H	Mathoka wa Mviu	140	PN
	SH	Matabu wa Munubi	-	PN
	SH	Ngula wa Kikumbu	-	PN
M. Ukazzi	H	Munyasia wa Ndata	120	PN
	SH	Mwinzi wa Nzumbi	-	PN
	SH	Nyamu wa Mathuku	-	PN
N. Nguni	H	Mutia wa Kathunga	400	PN. SCS
	SH	Mukwekwa wa Nguli	80	PN
	SH	Mangeva wa Kibau	-	PN
	SH	Mutui wa Ndei	100	PN
	SH	Mutia wa Kamandi	60	PN
	SH	Mwinzi wa Maana	60	PN
	SH	Katuma wa Ndili	-	PN
	SH	Ngabu wa Mwambi	-	PN
	SH	Kasambio wa Kinga	-	PN
	SH	Ngombwa wa Ngonyo	-	PN
	SH	Mabo wa Kimweli	-	PN
	SH	Nzau wa Mwinzi	100	PN
	SH	Masila wa Chengo	-	PN
	SH	Mbau wa Ndonne	-	PN
	SH	Mwiliili wa Mutiethoka	-	PN
O. Tharaka	H	Munda wa Ngula	80	PN
	SH	Tuto wa Ngeligeli	60	PN
	SH	Kamundi wa Karunga	40	PN
	SH	Poiboi wa Chalange	80	PN
	SH	Kipubi wa Ngulumbu	60	PN
P. Siontheke	H	Ngothia wa Ithuli	260	PN
	SH	Ndinga wa Mwake	-	PN
Q. Mulango	H	Muli wa Kithusi	360	PN. SCS
	SH	Mwee wa Maingo	-	PN
	SH	Nzoo wa Kisemi	40	PN
S. Yatta	H	Kalungu wa Kathansi	100	PN
T. Nzombe	H	Ezika wa Kabuluku	144	PN
	SH	Mbui wa Soo	-	PN
V. Ikanga	H	Kitilli wa Muthengi	150	PN
	SH	Mutinda wa Mutui	50	(Suspended Pending Trial)
	SH	Ndundu wa Kathuli	-	PN
W. Voo	H	Kimoti wa Nguiki	260	PN
	SH	Mwasia wa Mutei	-	PN
	SH	Nzoka wa Ndunga	50	PN
	SH	Nduni wa Ngai	-	PN
X. Mutha	H	Mwanza wa Nguthi	30	PN
	SH	Ngongi wa Katama	180	PN
Y. Fanziko	H	Mutinda wa Nguluku	-	PN
	SH	Kiema Mumo	180	PN
Z. Ikutha	H	Nzambu wa Musuu	-	PN
	SH	Mwaka wa Muiadaga	180	PN
	SH	Mwaka wa Muiadaga	60	PN
	SH	Mwaka wa Muiadaga	-	PN

Totals 24 24 48

TABLE A.A.7 Changes in Chiefs/Headmen and Subchiefs/Subheadmen March 1911-March 1912

A. MARCH 1911 - MARCH 1912

Location	Chief Dropped	New Chief	Subchief Dropped	New Subchief
Kitui	-	-	Mungo wa Mungo Wali wa Kibele Mthambi wa Makali Amunguwa Muthaka	Emisi wa Kahoo
Mutonguni	-	-	Nasombo Mbuti	-
Ngini	-	-	Namo Nale	Nyama wa Makulu Nzambo wa Mutai
Nutito	-	-	-	-
Nutito/ Naboni	-	-	-	-
Nzi	-	-	Mumasa wa ? Kitabi wa ?	-
Endau	-	-	-	-
Nigoni	-	-	-	Mboi wa Lahu Mungala wa Ndama
Endui	Mwali wa Kapungu	Nguni wa Nditi	-	-
Nzoni	Nzenda wa Kiama	Nguni wa Nuki	-	-
Nzi	-	-	Munshi wa ?	-
Chazi	Malungu wa Mutoo	Munyasia wa Ndeta	Munyasia wa Ndeta	-
Namoni	-	-	Nguni wa Munshi Katwi wa Kiamelo Mate wa Kitabi Nzoo wa Kitabi Mthambi wa Mibio Sianda wa Ngovi Mambo wa Katumbi	Nguni wa Ngoyi Kabo wa Kiameli Nzabu wa Munshi
Tharaka	-	-	Kibubi wa Marabel Kahabongoi wa Mutama Kiama Paboi Nzi Nizi	Paboi Chelango Kipubi wa Ngahumu
Sionthaka	Mburi wa Nzioka	Ngothia wa Ithuli	Ithau wa Nwaki	-
Nalango	-	-	Nthaka wa Nani Nakau wa Nwile Munyuki wa Kilango Kiburu wa Mairi	-
Yata	-	-	Nzasa wa Mutamitya Nzasa wa Mutamitya	Mali wa Mairi Ngata wa Kichome
Zombe	-	-	-	-
Voo	Munshi wa Ithuli	Kipoto wa Nzoka	Munshi wa Nguni Munshi wa Nwile Munshi wa Kitonga Munshi wa Ngai Lunda wa ?	-
Mutha	-	-	-	-
Kanziko	-	-	-	-
Ikutha	Kalima wa Ngomo	Mali wa Ngomo (Munshi?)	Mutaya Wandua	-
Natinyani	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	Munshi wa Nguni	-
Ikanga	-	-	Munshi wa Nguni Kieti wa Ngao Munshi wa Ngao Munshi wa Ngao	-
TOTAL	24	6	40	10

TABLE A.A.7 (continued)

2. MARCH 1915 - MARCH 1917

Location	Chief Dropped	New Chief	Subchief Dropped	New Subchief
Kitui	-	-	-	-
Ngoni	-	-	-	-
Ukani	-	-	Mumala wa Nambi Nyama Muthaka	-
Mutoguni	-	-	-	-
Mutito	-	-	-	-
Mutito/Muboni	-	-	-	-
Mai	-	-	Kathali Kana	Muthya wa Kanyoka Mulongu wa Kibabi
Kadai	-	-	-	-
Migveni	-	-	Munga wa Kingati Kitundu wa Sumbi	Mungala wa Mumbo Matiti wa Katumo Mambo wa Ndebi
Masoni	-	-	Edu wa Ndebi	Mitao Ilobu
Kadai	-	-	-	-
Kuu	Kingau wa Kithaka	Muthaka wa Mria	-	Mutaba wa Mumbi
Mumoni *	-	Mukwaka wa Ngali Mutui wa Ndai Mumala wa Mamba Ngabba wa Mumbi Kana wa Mriana	Mukwaka wa Ngali Mutui wa Ndai Mumala wa Mamba Ngabba wa Mumbi Kana wa Mriana	-
Tharaka	Munda wa Ngala	Foiboi Chalanga	Foiboi Chalanga Kipobi wa Ngulumbu	Muni wa Bugwana
Sionthaka	Ngothi wa Ithali	Mubi wa Kithaka	-	Isaka wa Masyini
Mulango	-	-	Kano wa Kisoni Kono wa Malingo Kitoio wa Masila	Mutwavya wa Ngongwe Mali wa Kano Mambo wa Mose
Yatta	-	-	-	-
Zembe	-	-	Mwai wa Masyini (G ¹)	-
Thanga	-	-	Mutinda wa Mutui	Mali wa Kithali
Voo	-	-	-	Munaya (Munaya) wa Mutui Kaka wa Kibanga Kono wa Ngai Mumala wa Mumbi
Matingani	-	-	-	-
Mutha	-	-	-	Kono wa Mamo
Kamiko	-	-	Mutinyi wa Mutindili Mutui wa Ngai	-
TOTAL				
24	3	3	21	18

* Note that in Mumoni Subheadman Mukwaka wa Ngali, Mutui wa Ndai, Mumala wa Mamba, Ngabba wa Mumbi and Kana wa Mriana are promoted to headmen but there are no locations created for them.

TABLE A.A. 7 (continued)

C. MARCH 1916 - MARCH 1918

Location	Chief Dropped	New Chief	Subchief Dropped	New Subchief
Kitui	-	-	-	-
Ngoni	-	-	-	-
Ukassi	-	-	-	-
Mutito	-	-	-	-
Mutito/Buboni	-	-	-	-
Mui	-	-	Malongi wa Kitabi	Kathuli wa Nsao
Endau	-	-	-	-
Migwani	-	-	Mangala wa Ndumbu Nambu wa Edohi Matiti wa Katumo	Kitundu Sumbi Mungu wa Kimungu
Nsaroni	-	-	-	-
Endui	-	-	-	-
Mutonguni	-	-	-	-
Muu	-	-	-	-
Matinyani	-	-	-	-
Mumoni	-	-	-	Ngoni wa Ngonyo
Tharaka	Paiboi Chelanga	Mundu wa Ngula	Mani wa Rugusaa	Paiboi Chelanga Kipubi wa Ngulumbu
Sionthaka	Mubiri wa Waika	Ngothia wa Ituli	Isika wa Masyini	-
Mulango	-	-	Mutuavyu wa Ngongwe Muli wa Nsao Munuu wa Mwaa	Mwaa wa Malingo Nsao wa Kisamai
Yatta	-	-	-	-
Zombe	-	-	-	-
Ikanga	-	-	Maitu wa Kathuli	Mutinda wa Mutui Munda wa Kathuli
Voo	-	-	-	-
Mutha	-	-	-	-
Kansiko	-	-	-	-
Ikutha	-	-	-	Mutinya wa Mutiamili Mutua wa Ngui
TOTAL				
24	2	2	10	12

TABLE A.A.8 Kitui Comparative Statement of Revenue 1901/02 - 1922 (Rupees)

Year	Total Revenue	Hut and Poll Tax	% of Hut and Poll Tax
1901 - 02	17208	1501	8.72
1902 - 03	27,890	16073	57.62
1903 - 04	33,230	23618	71.07
1904 - 05	67,375	50352	74.73
1905 - 06	61,342	46436	75.70
1906 - 07	83,513	71826	86.00
1908 - 09	80,508	71811	85.98
1909 - 10	102,755	88002	85.64
1910 - 11	109,318	102435	93.70
1911 - 12	166,349	109800	94.37
1912 - 13	123,507	114075	92.28
1913 - 14	146,814	119589	81.45
1914 - 15	143,066	120081	83.45
1915 - 16	139,264	121260	87.07
1916 - 17	155,629	120903	77.68
1917 - 18	226,517	197593	87.72
1918 - 19	226,540	181025	79.90
1919 - 20	237,283	183378	77.28
1920 - 21*	316,548	292165	92.20
1921* ^y	301,775	283823	94.05
1922 ^w	189,217	152534	80.00

N.B. * Currency in 1920/21 and 1921 is florins
y Nine Months of 1921. From this year Annual Reports embrace calendar year not March to March as before
w Currency in 1922 is shillings.

Source: Annum.