

RE-QUESTIONING THROUGH INVESTIGATING 'HERITAGE' PRODUCTION PATTERNS: THE CASE OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KING SHAKA IN KWAZULU, 1977-1992

by

Nsizwa Dlamini

(Doctoral Student, Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research, Private Bag 3, PO Box Wits 2050, Johannesburg, South Africa, dlaminin@wiser.wits.ac.za)

1. INTRODUCTION

The history of KwaZulu, covering the period from the early 1970s to the mid-1990s has been an area of interest for most historians writing on the recent history of the eastern region of southern Africa. This history, 'exhausted' the subject of the use of the 'past' by Chief M.G. Buthelezi to both legitimate his leadership position of the Zulu people and to construct 'Zulu ethnic nationalism'.¹ Dominant in these productions is the idea that King Shaka was the significant symbol in the versions of the past that were presented by Buthelezi. In developing this view, these productions relied largely on the speeches that Buthelezi delivered during this period. Looking at the period between 1977 and 1992, I point to the limits of the idea. My engagement with this view is not to suggest that it is incorrect, but rather to suggest that there is space for further questioning of the significance of Shaka in KwaZulu during this period. This, I argue, requires a shift from a heavy reliance on Buthelezi speeches, but rather their incorporation into an engagement with what I call the 'heritage archive' of the period. This archive enables a deeper understanding of the notion of the production of the past within a discourse generally referred to as 'heritage'.² An understanding of this production, I argue here, provides spaces for the questioning of the significance of Shaka as a central symbol of legitimation by Mangosuthu Buthelezi in KwaZulu. This material displays interesting cultural heritage preservation patterns which provide space for the questioning of the significance of King Shaka in KwaZulu.

¹ See for example, P. Forsyth, 'The past in the service of the present: the political use of history by Chief A.N.M.G. Buthelezi 1951-1991' *South African Historical Journal* Vol. 26, 1992, pp. 74-92, D. Bonnin, G. Hamilton, R. Morrell and A Sitas, 'The struggle for Natal and KwaZulu: workers, township dwellers and Inkatha, 1972-1985', Morrell, R. (ed.) *Political Economy and Identities in KwaZulu-Natal: Historical and Social Perspectives* (Durban, Indicator Press, 1996), pp. 141-178, D. Golan, *Inventing Shaka: Using History in the Construction of Zulu Nationalism* (London, Lynne Rienner, 1994), and G. Mare and G. Hamilton, *An Appetite for Power: Buthelezi's Inkatha and the Politics of 'Loyal Resistance'* (Johannesburg, Ravan Press, 1987).

² The material is stored at the Amafa aKwaZulu Natali Headquarters at Ulundi, in their Pietermaritzburg office, KwaDukuza Museum, and South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

In structuring the paper, I provide a brief background to my analysis, mainly to outline the context for the emergence of KwaZulu and to justify my constant reference to Buthelezi rather than the KwaZulu elite as a key individual in the subject under study. Part of this background is an outline of the emergence of formal heritage preservation institutions in KwaZulu. This will be followed by an analysis of the significant royal figure in the period between 1977 and 1985. This period was characterised by a focus on the preservation of Cetshwayo's heritage in KwaZulu. I will then look at initiatives to preserve Shaka heritage in the period between 1985 and 1992 in Natal and analyse the KwaZulu's relationship to that.

2. BACKGROUND

In the early 1970s, the South African government started to implement its 'homeland' system in KwaZulu. This system was part of the official policy which was articulated as apartheid policy. In KwaZulu, the political leadership led by M.G. Buthelezi took advantage of the system and consolidated its power bases using Zulu ethnicity and Zulu history. The appeal to Zulu ethnicity by Buthelezi intensified with the establishment of KwaZulu. In fact, it was during this period and through the 'homeland' structures that Buthelezi began to assert himself as the leader of the Zulu nation. New institutions and structures that were established in this period became important machinery for the reconstruction of the Zulu ethnic nationalism and Buthelezi's leadership of it.

One of these early institutions was the Zulu Territorial Authority (ZTA), established under the Black States Constitution Act No. 21 of 1971. The apartheid policy was founded on ethnic separation, the establishment of ethnically based administrations, and represented an attempt to meet threats to white supremacy.³ Increased worker militancy in the 1950s and rapid urbanisation by African people was one of the pressures exerted on the South African government.⁴ The separate development system that saw the establishment of the ZTA sought to meet these pressures. Following the establishment of the ZTA, further developments towards the establishment of the KwaZulu 'homeland' occurred.

³ Mare and Hamilton, *Appetite for Power*, 1987), p. 29.

⁴ *Ibid.*

On 30 March 1972, the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly (KLA) came into being, with 75 nominated and 55 elected members.⁵ The KwaZulu Executive Council (KEC) was established as an executive body in the governance of the ‘homeland’ that was in the process of creation. The KEC was headed by the Chief Councillor, M.G. Buthelezi. KwaZulu was not a geographically unified area. It was composed of part of the historical Zululand – an area north of the Thukela and south of the Phongolo River, and several areas within the boundaries of Natal. The creation of the KLA was a first step in the granting of ‘self-government’ to KwaZulu. This was important to Buthelezi as it signalled the ‘rebirth of KwaZulu’.⁶ Towards further political consolidation, Buthelezi established a political movement which mobilised around ‘Zulu’ ethnicity.

The year 1975 saw the launching of Inkatha Yenkululeko Yesizwe (National Cultural Liberation Movement). According to Mare and Hamilton, Inkatha arose as a Zulu organisation which was inextricably tied to the KwaZulu ‘homeland’ structures.⁷ There is quite a detailed published history of Inkatha and a range of explorations of its role in KwaZulu. In this study I do not intend to engage in this area.⁸ Rather, I want to highlight the idea that Inkatha provided another structure for both the elevation of Buthelezi as a prominent leader in KwaZulu (some would say in South Africa) and the expression of ‘Zulu’ nationalism that was rejuvenated during this period. The KwaZulu Government structures, particularly at executive levels, had a symbiotic relationship with Inkatha.⁹ Key figures in the KLA and the KwaZulu Cabinet were members of Inkatha. Buthelezi said that ‘no one escapes being a member [of Inkatha] as long as he or she is a member of the Zulu nation.’¹⁰ Inkatha was formed when KwaZulu had not become a self-governing territory. Further developments in this regard took place two years after the formation of Inkatha.

⁵ See *Republic of South Africa Government Gazette*, No. 3436, Proclamation 70, 1972. Also see, T.G. Karis and G.M. Gerhard, *From Protest to Challenge: A Documentary History of African Politics in South Africa, 1882-1990, Vol. 5: Nadir and Resurgence, 1964-1979* (Pretoria, Unisa Press, 1997), p. 254.

⁶ APC, Natal Room Collection, Gerhard Mare Collection (hereafter GMC), PC 126/2, ‘A Luncheon Address to Members of the Rotary Club of Durban South. By Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu, Durban, 20 November. 1972’.

⁷ Mare and Hamilton, *Appetite for Power*, p. 60.

⁸ See, *Ibid.*, pp. 45-97.

⁹ T.G. Karis and G.M. Gerhard, *From Protest to Challenge*, p. 253.

¹⁰ *Verbatim Report of the Special Sessions of the Fifth KwaZulu Legislative Assembly* (hereafter *KLA Debates*), Vol. 5, 9-18 April 1975, p. 134.

On 1 February 1977, KwaZulu became a self-governing territory in accordance with the provisions of the Black States Constitution Act. The KwaZulu Executive Council became a Cabinet, and the Councillors became Ministers, headed by the Chief Minister (M.G. Buthelezi) instead of Chief Councillor.¹¹ One can say that this was the last stage in the official administrative creation of the KwaZulu homeland. In the homeland system certain responsibilities, such as external affairs and defence, remained the prerogative of the South African government and not the KwaZulu Government.¹² This was the case since KwaZulu was not an 'independent sovereign state'. Significant in the establishment of the KwaZulu 'homeland' and the KwaZulu Cabinet was that the establishment of these structures elevated Buthelezi's leadership.¹³ The official position that he obtained through these structures, according to Karis and Gerhard, enabled him to predominate over other chiefs and over King Goodwill Zwelithini.¹⁴ Buthelezi was also able to sideline opposition within Inkatha.

Notable was the removal of Sibusiso Bhengu, Inkatha's general secretary since 1975, from the movement in 1979. According to Karis and Gerhard, Bhengu was dismissed because he was popular with students, mainly due to his criticisms of the exploitation of the workers.¹⁵ Buthelezi also successfully dealt with chiefs that opposed him in KwaZulu. These were mainly Chief Mhlabunzima Maphumulo and Chief Elphas Molefe.¹⁶ Maphumulo, who was chief of the Maphumulo 'tribe' in the Mpumalanga Regional Authority, was accused by Buthelezi of a plot to overthrow the KwaZulu Government.¹⁷ He was also accused of encouraging King Zwelithini to resist the law which required that the King of the Zulu people 'hold himself aloof from politics'.¹⁸ Buthelezi's conflicts with Maphumulo resulted in the replacement of the chief as chairman of the Mpumalanga Regional Authority on instructions

¹¹ Thorrington-Smith, Rosenberg and McCrystal, Town and Regional Planning Consultants Development Economists, *Towards a Plan for KwaZulu: a Preliminary Development Plan* (Ulundi, KwaZulu Government, 1978), p. 7.

¹² Thorrington-Smith, Rosenberg and McCrystal, *Towards a Plan for KwaZulu*, p. 7.

¹³ Bonnin, *et al*, 'Struggle for Natal and KwaZulu: workers, township dwellers and Inkatha, 1972-1985', in Morrell, (ed.) *Political Economy and identities in KwaZulu-Natal*, p. 147. According to Bonnin *et al*, the composition of the KwaZulu Cabinet itself and Buthelezi's manipulation of KwaZulu elections further entrenched Buthelezi's power in the KwaZulu Cabinet.

¹⁴ Karis and Gerhard, p. 253.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 268.

¹⁶ See, *Echo*, 13 March 1980, *Natal Witness*, 28 March 1980, *Natal Witness*, 29 March 1980. On Molefe, see Mare and Hamilton, p. 32. Although they do not go into detail on this conflict, they do highlight the existence of the conflict during this period.

¹⁷ *The Star*, 22 Oct. 1977.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

from Buthelezi.¹⁹ Buthelezi was equally successful against Molefe, chief of the Sotho people in the Nquthu District. Chief Molefe challenged Buthelezi's 'appeals to Zulu ethnicity under the banner of a common history and heritage.'²⁰ According to Forsyth, Molefe and his Sotho-speaking following refused to be part of KwaZulu and wanted to create their own 'Sotho mini-homeland'.²¹ These moves were not successful, as the Nquthu area remained under KwaZulu, and an Inkatha branch was opened there in 1981.²² Clearly, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Buthelezi was the most influential leader in KwaZulu.

He was thus 'free' to lead the ethnic mobilisation that was to characterise the 1980s. This ethnic mobilisation and the promotion of the personal political interests of Buthelezi, was advanced through the conventional political spheres (through structures outlined above). However, as I will show here, cultural heritage was also central in the ethnic mobilisation that was promoted in KwaZulu. It also linked up with the promotion of Buthelezi's personal interests. The political interests of both Buthelezi and the 'Zulu nation' would be advanced in the cultural sphere. The preservation and, to some extent, the reshaping of the Zulu ethnic nationalist heritage were important in this regard.

2.1. BACKGROUND TO INSTITUTIONALISED HERITAGE PRESERVATION IN KWAZULU

A brief historical background of the structural and legislative context of national heritage preservation (particularly relating to monuments) is an important introduction to the institutionalisation of cultural heritage preservation in KwaZulu. At a national level, formal cultural heritage preservation began in 1923. During this year, the first legislation to protect monuments, the Natural and Historical Monuments Act, was passed. The Act established the first official body responsible for the preservation of South Africa's heritage – the Commission for the Preservation of the Natural and Historical Monuments of the Union (commonly known as the Historical Monuments Commission).²³ The Historical Monuments

¹⁹ *Echo*, 24 April 1980.

²⁰ P.D.S. Forsyth, 'The past as the present: Chief A.N.M.G. Buthelezi's use of history as a source of political legitimation', Master of Arts Thesis, Department of Historical Studies, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, 1989, p. 127.

²¹ *Ibid.* Also see *KLA Debates*, Vol. 6, 21-30 April 1975, p. 380.

²² APC, GMC, PC 126/2, 'Inauguration of Inkatha Branches in the Molefe Area. Speech by the Hon. Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, President of Inkatha; Chairman of the South African Black Alliance and Chief Minister of KwaZulu. Molefe Area, Nquthu District. 24 October 1981'.

²³ See Section 1 (1) of the Act in *Gazette Extraordinary* No. 1311, 10 April 1923.

Commission (HMC) compiled a register of the monuments of South Africa, and passed laws that protected these monuments.

In 1934 the Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act No. 4 replaced the previous Act. Through this Act, the HMC was given powers to recommend to the relevant minister that a place or object be officially declared a monument by notice in the Government Gazette.²⁴ More significant changes occurred in the late 1960s. These were marked by the passing of a new legislation, the National Monuments Act No. 28 of 1969.²⁵ Under this Act, a statutory body, the National Monuments Council (NMC), replaced the HMC. The NMC was given additional powers to protect monuments – known as declared ‘national monuments’ and other aspects of South African heritage.²⁶

The National Monuments Act accommodated all measures necessary for conservation of ‘historic buildings and townscapes’.²⁷ Moreover, significant improvements in the legislation were made from previous laws. These included the introduction of provisional declaration of national monuments. This enabled the NMC to protect immovable properties for a maximum period of five years while it investigated the desirability of permanent declaration. As indicated, a detailed exploration of the legislative development of heritage legislation is not the intention of this brief section of the study.²⁸ Rather, the motive is to highlight that there were existing heritage legislative frameworks and structures which could possibly shape the emergence of the KwaZulu heritage legislation. The NMC, just like the HMC, had neglected sites associated with Zulu history as national monuments. It failed to do this even when ‘native’ administrators in the late 1930’s and 1940s had pushed for the formal recognition of Zulu heritage.

H.C. Lugg, who was Chief Native Commissioner of Natal in the 1930s had identified Zulu cultural heritage sites, mainly those associated with the Zulu royalty.²⁹ These included sites relating to King Shaka, King Dingane, King Mpande and King Cetshwayo. In the case of

²⁴ *Government Gazette*, Proclamation No. 66, 4 May 1934.

²⁵ See the *Republic of South Africa Government Gazette* Vol. 46, No. 2343.

²⁶ See *Ibid.*, p. 4, Section 5 of the National Monuments Act.

²⁷ *Government Gazette*, Vol. 46, No. 2343, p. 2.

²⁸ For a detailed account of the development of heritage legislation, see C. van Riet Lowe and B.D. Malan (eds) *The Monuments of South Africa* 2nd ed. (Pretoria, Government Printer, 1949).

²⁹ See H.C. Lugg, *Life Under a Zulu Shield* (Pietermaritzburg, Shuter and Shooter, 1975), pp. 89-110.

King Shaka, the focus was King Shaka's grave site which was declared a national monument by the HMC in 1939. In the case of Dingane, the focus of Lugg and the HMC was on his 'spring' at Mthonjaneni, his Mgungundlovu royal homestead and his grave. In the case of Mpande, the focus was on the site of his former homestead, Nodwengu. In the case of Cetshwayo, his Ondini homestead was seen as worthy of preservation.³⁰ In 1940 a 'small part' of the Ondini site was fenced and declared a national monument.³¹ Lugg was exploring the possibilities of the declaration of the sites associated with these kings as national monuments. With the exception of the Shaka grave site and the Ondini site, none of the above sites were declared national monuments under the HMC. When the NMC took over the preservation of heritage from HMC in 1969, it inherited the management of these heritage sites. In 1975, Buthelezi wrote to the NMC requesting them to declare as national monuments sites relating to Zulu history in KwaZulu.³² He was not successful in this.

The reason for Buthelezi's failure in this related to the new legislation that was emerging. The National Monuments Act of 1969 was subjected to the provisions of the Black States Constitution Act of 1971. This meant that the jurisdiction of the NMC fell away within the self-governing territory of KwaZulu. The NMC was to focus its heritage preservation activities in Natal. There was, therefore, a need for new legislation to preserve heritage in KwaZulu. The origins of the new heritage preservation legislation and institutions have their origins in Buthelezi's idea of the reconstruction of Ondini, Cetshwayo's royal residence which was burnt by the British during the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879 (the residence is also referred to as Ondini II).

³⁰ See, AKN Office, Pietermaritzburg, Ondini, Mahlabathini: Cetshwayo's Kraal (hereafter OMCK) file, Vol. 1, file No. 2/5/7/11; H.C. Lugg (Chief Native Commissioner: Natal) to the Secretary for Native Affairs: Pretoria, 23 June 1938 and 9 Nov. 1938. Also see H.C. Lugg to the Secretary of the Historical Monuments Commission (HMC), 17 Nov. 1938, file No. 2/5/7/11. For the period between the early 1940s and mid 1940s, see correspondence between H.C. Ward (Acting Assistant Native Commissioner: Mahlabathini) and Secretary of the Historical Monuments Commission (HMC). For the period from the late 1940s to 1950s, see correspondence between C.E. Mayer (Assistant Native Commissioner: Mahlabathini) and the Secretary of the HMC. See particularly, H.C. Ward to Secretary of HMC, 19 Nov. 1941, and C.E. Mayer to the Chief Native Commissioner, 11 Aug. 1945, file No. 2/5/7/11.

³¹ M.G. Buthelezi, 'The KwaZulu Government, museums and cultural heritage' *SAMAB* Vol. 17, No. 4, 1986, p. 176.

³² AKN, Pmb, OMCK file, Vol. 1, 2/5/7/11, M.G. Buthelezi to the Secretary of Historical Monuments Commission [referring to NMC], 27 March 1975.

3. INSTITUTIONALISING KWAZULU HERITAGE: A FOCUS ON KING CETSHWAYO

The original idea of the reconstruction of Cetshwayo's Ondini homestead came with Chief Minister, Buthelezi.³³ He proposed the idea to the KwaZulu Cabinet, saying that 'for some years I have felt the need to recreate a Zulu village exactly as it may have been 100 years ago, as far as this is possible.'³⁴ He argued that the reconstruction of Cetshwayo's 'Great Place' would provide many advantages to the Zulu. What he had in mind as the finished product was 'a replica of his Place exactly as it would have been, occupied at least by one family who will dress traditionally, have a herd of cattle and domestic animals and practice traditional skills such as the forging of iron, skin curing and the preparation of foods etc.'³⁵ Buthelezi emphasised the need for 'authenticity' in the reconstruction of Cetshwayo's 'Place'. He argued, 'I do not think that a blade of grass should be cut or a sod of earth turned, until there has been proper research and planning.'³⁶ It is in this light that he proposed the establishment of the Planning and Research Committee for the Reconstruction of Ondini.

The Department of Chief Minister and Finance, headed by Buthelezi, then invited experts to participate in the formation of the Planning and Research Committee.³⁷ He received positive responses from 'heritage practitioners' in both KwaZulu and Natal. In 1979 the Committee held its pre-launch meeting with J.K. Dladla (Organiser of Cultural Affairs within KwaZulu's Department of Education and Culture), G.A. Chadwick (National Monuments Council), G.B. Cunningham (Architect) and J.A. Pringle (Natal Museum). Also part of the Committee was Buthelezi and six Cabinet Ministers, three representatives of the Zulu King, the Zulu Royal Family and the KwaZulu Development Corporation.³⁸ R. Rawlinson and T. Maggs (an archaeologist from the Natal Museum) joined the Committee at a later stage. Important here was the balance between representatives of the KwaZulu Cabinet and Government, the Royal Family, and specialists.³⁹ Buthelezi chaired the meetings of the Committee, which were held in the KwaZulu Cabinet building in Ulundi. The Minister of Education and Culture chaired

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Amafa aKwaZulu-Natali Headquarters (hereafter AKN), Ulundi, KwaZulu Planning and Research Committee (hereafter KPRC) file, M.G. Buthelezi, Chief Minister, Memorandum to the Cabinet (undated).

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ AKN, Ulundi, KPRC file, The Department of Chief Minister and Finance to J. Pringle, 14 Dec. 1979. Also see, AKN Office, Pietermaritzburg; Ondini, Mahlabathini: Cetshwayo's Kraal (hereafter OMCK) Vol. 1, G.A. Chadwick, (NMC: Natal Regional Office) to Prof. Nkabinde (Rector: University of Zululand), 19 March 1980.

³⁸ Buthelezi, 'The approach of the KwaZulu Government', p. 175.

meetings in Buthelezi's absence.⁴⁰ The decision to reconstruct Cetshwayo's 'Place' at Ondini was taken on 11 March 1980 during the official launch of the Planning and Research Committee.⁴¹ Here plans were laid for the partial reconstruction of Ondini.

As pointed out above, a small part of the Ondini had been declared a National Monument in 1940. Plans of the Committee called for archaeological excavations and research to establish knowledge about the ground plan. This would be followed by the reconstruction of parts of the site. There was, however, uncertainty with reference to terminology to describe Ondini. Committee members were not sure whether to refer to the site as 'Ondini Great Place' or 'Ondini Royal Residence'.⁴² As a final decision could not be reached, the matter was taken to the Cabinet, which opted for the latter term.⁴³ On 13 July 1981 the reconstruction of Ondini was officially launched with archaeologist R. Rawlinson starting excavations.

A viewsite coupled with a toposcope, a diorama, a fully equipped museum complex, a curio shop and an amphitheatre, were planned, while the Royal Residence would be 'a living, working entity with pottery, iron smelting and working, the preparation of skins for clothing or shields, typical Zulu agriculture, and cattle raising being practised in the typical Zulu way.'⁴⁴ The 'Royal huts', the palisade, the entrances, the princes and commander's huts and some military huts would be reconstructed.⁴⁵ Excavation of existing hut floors and research into the shape and dimension of Ondini was seen as an important aspect of the project. In 1981 the excavation of the hut floors was begun by Rawlinson, and progressed throughout 1982. In 1983, the outer palisade of the Royal Residence was erected. The cattle byre (*isibaya*) was also palisaded. Furthermore, a number of huts were reconstructed over the original floors exposed by excavation. The Ondini Royal Residence was opened on 24 November 1984. The period after the opening was characterised by the ongoing maintenance of the site.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 175 – 176.

⁴⁰ AKN, Ulundi, KPRC file, Minutes of the Inaugural Meeting of the Planning and Research Committee for the Reconstruction of Ondini, Cabinet Conference Room, Ulundi, 11 March 1980.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² AKN, Ulundi, KZPRC file, Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of the Planning and Research Committee for the Reconstruction of Ondini, Cabinet Conference Room, Ulundi, 15 Jan. 1981. For the model of the Ondini Royal Residence that was proposed, see Illustration 1 of this thesis.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* Also see *Natal Mercury*, 30 July 1981.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

Buthelezi was central in the emergence of the Ondini project. It was from his vision that the project emerged. He got support from both the KwaZulu government and some ‘white’ Natalians who were knowledgeable about aspects of cultural heritage preservation. Explaining the willingness of white experts from Natal to participate in the preservation of Zulu cultural heritage during this period has been one of the difficult tasks of this study. In fact I have not found a convincing explanation for this phenomenon. To speculate, during the late 1970s there was increased interest in the Anglo-Zulu War in Natal. This was mainly the result of the centenary of the war, which was celebrated in 1979 in Natal. I suspect, fuelled by these celebrations, that there was a growing interest in Zulu culture and the need for its preservation.

The Anglo-Zulu War commemorations were largely organised by white individuals from Natal under G.A. Chadwick of the NMC. The KwaZulu government also created a committee under F.T. Mdlalose, the Minister of Interior, to ‘collaborate’ in commemorations. Interestingly, the committee created in KwaZulu was also dominated by white Natalians, nominated by Buthelezi. A.B. Colenbrander, E.W. Hastie and I. Player, described by Buthelezi as Zulus, formed this committee.⁴⁶ The interest shown by these individuals, coupled with a possible lack of expertise by Zulu people in the area of commemorations, are possible factors for their involvement. These factors do provide the groundwork for further thinking about the participation of white experts on the Planning and Research Committee. This white group was also co-operative in the attempts to establish a formal monuments body specifically for the preservation of KwaZulu cultural heritage. The establishment of the Planning and Research Committee co-existed with attempts to establish a KwaZulu monuments body.

3.1. THE BIRTH OF THE KMC AND PRIORITISED HERITAGE(S)

In 1977, there were attempts to establish a committee that would formulate legislation for the preservation of heritage in KwaZulu. The KwaZulu National Monuments Committee was established, closely attached to the Department of Education and Culture, and headed by J.A.W. Nxumalo. The developments towards the establishment of a formal statutory body for the protection and conservation of KwaZulu heritage were marked by the emergence of a Bill to establish this structure.

⁴⁶ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Anglo-Zulu War Centenary 1879 to 1979. Speech at a Function to Commemorate the Battle of Ulundi – the Final Battle of the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879. By Prince Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi:

The Bill was drawn up and discussed in 1977. It was given to G.A. Chadwick (who was both a member of the KwaZulu National Monuments Committee and the Natal Branch of the National Monuments Council (NMC), ‘to make additions and amendments to the Bill based on the Republican Act [the National Monuments Act of 1969].’⁴⁷ These legislative developments amounted in 1980 to the passing of the KwaZulu Monuments Act (also known as the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly Act No. 19 of 1980). The Act sought to provide for the preservation of certain immovable or movable property as monuments and to establish the KwaZulu Monuments Council for that purpose.⁴⁸ The Act meant that the KMC undertook custodianship of a number of historical sites in KwaZulu that had previously been under the custodianship of the National Monuments Council (NMC). These monuments included KwaMondi, the Prince Imperial Monument, KwaNodwengu, King Dingane’s Grave, and the Ulundi and Isandlwana battlefields.⁴⁹ With the exception of the latter battlefield, very little energy was to be devoted to the development of these sites during this period.

The KMC was tasked by the ‘political leadership’ to identify a number of heritage projects.⁵⁰ It was pointed out that ‘some sites have much greater significance than others’ and as a result it was decided that certain sites will be prioritised and classified as ‘premier, major and minor projects’.⁵¹ The Ondini site was described as the ‘natural’ premier project. Ondini was envisaged not only as partially a ‘restored Royal Residence, but as a cultural centre for KwaZulu.’⁵²

The Ondini project was, therefore, important to the KMC as well as the Planning and Research Committee. The KMC and the Planning and Research Committee worked closely

Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha YeNkululeko YeSizwe. Ulundi War Memorial: 26 May 1979’.

⁴⁷ AKN, Ulundi, KPRC file, Minutes of the KwaZulu National Monuments Council Meeting, Office of the Minister of the Department of Education and Culture, 9 Nov. 1977.

⁴⁸ See Section 2 of the KwaZulu Legislative Assembly Act No. 19 of 1980 (KwaZulu Monuments Council Act) *KwaZulu Government Notice* No. 28, 1981. The first Council was appointed by the Minister of Education and Culture and was promulgated by the *KwaZulu Government Notice* No. 41 of 1983. The other Act of this nature came in 1989 when the Historical Monuments Act, 1989, of the Republic of Ciskei was passed.

⁴⁹ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes file, Minutes of the KMC Meeting, KwaZulu Legislative Assembly Conference Room, 5 Oct. 1984.

⁵⁰ Author’s interview with L. van Schalkwyk, Pietermaritzburg, 16 Aug. 1999.

⁵¹ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Reports file, KwaZulu Monuments Foundation, ‘The Road to the Future: The Preservation, Restoration and Development of Monuments in KwaZulu (undated).

⁵² *Ibid.*

together and they had overlapping membership. For example, Buthelezi was the chairman of the Planning and Research Committee and president of the KMC.⁵³ A memorandum recommending the amalgamation of the KMC and the Ondini Planning and Research Committee was soon made.⁵⁴ The Committee became a sub-committee of the KMC and its fund was operated from the KMC's account. Further consolidation in the sphere of cultural heritage preservation saw the establishment of a KwaZulu Monuments Foundation (KMF) which was launched for fund-raising purposes on 30 July 1981.⁵⁵

The KMF was launched by the KwaZulu political elite to elicit funds and aid for the 'preservation, restoration and development of KwaZulu's heritage.'⁵⁶ It became a registered fund-raising organisation on behalf of the KMC. It acted 'as a public arm' of the KMC. Amongst its main objectives, the KMF sought to give general support to the KMC; to make the aims and activities of the KMC known to the public and to elicit support; and to work for the increase of funds and facilities for the KMC.⁵⁷ The KMF, together with the KMC, prioritised cultural heritage projects that were to be carried by the KMC. As pointed above, the Ondini site had already been prioritised as a premier site. Other projects were identified as major and minor projects.

Amongst the major sites, Isandlwana battlefield was given priority. As is well known, this battle was fought on 22 January 1879 and was characterised by the 'bravery' displayed by both sides, the triumph of the Zulu army, armed mainly with traditional assegais and shields over the British using, for the period, modern firearms. The NMC had developed a viewsite and a diorama on the site of the British camp, indicating company positions and marking the lines of the Zulu advance.⁵⁸ On developing the site, the KMC hoped to mark the 'graves of the Zulu dead in a fitting fashion and keep the British graves and monuments in good condition.'⁵⁹ The Isandlwana Sub-committee would be established in the mid-1980s to carry out the development of the site. Also amongst the major projects was the Itusi Hill about 2 km

⁵³ See APC, GMC, PC 126/2, 'A Short Address at the Official Opening of the Nodwengu Museum by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha. Nodwengu, 20 August 1983'.

⁵⁴ AKN, Ulundi, KPRC file, Minutes of the KMC, Office of the Department of Education and Culture, Ulundi, 8 May 1980.

⁵⁵ *Daily News*, 1 Aug. 1981.

⁵⁶ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Reports file, KMF, 'The Road to the Future'.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

from Isandlwana. It was seen as ‘an ideal spot to view the battlefield [Isandlwana] from the Zulu point of view’⁶⁰ Also part of the list was Mangeni valley, 17 kilometres southeast of Isandlwana where the British commander, Lord Chelmsford, intended to establish a new camp and where he concentrated about half of his troops on the day of the battle. The sites where the Prince Imperial of France was killed, the Ulundi battlefield, Fort Eshowe, the Inyezane battlefield, and the Gingindlovu battlefield were other major sites. However, no major energy was devoted to these projects, with the exception of Isandlwana.

Minor projects were defined as ‘sites which played a significant role in the history of KwaZulu, but are not of such importance to warrant a major development.’⁶¹ These sites included Chief Sihayo’s stronghold; the Mabaso Hill, where the Zulu army bivouacked in the valley to the east of the hill the night before the battle of Isandlwana; the KwaPhindo area where a skirmish took place on the day of the battle of Isandlwana; KwaDwasa, where Cetshwayo was captured by the British on 28 August 1879; Enhlweni, an *umuzi* (homestead) where Cetshwayo was given shelter after he was driven from Ondini III and wounded in the thigh during the disturbance on a ridge in the Nkandla forest; and lastly, Chief Mnyamana Buthelezi’s grave.

In terms of the KMC’s and KMF’s prioritising, a larger part of the resources was allocated to the premier project, the reconstruction of Ondini Royal Residence. About R 1 980 000 was to be spent on the project, excluding the maintenance. Amongst the major projects, a bigger slice of resources was to be directed to the development of the Isandlwana battle site and the site of the death of Prince Imperial. Each was allocated R 60 000. These were two sites which symbolised Zulu triumph and bravery. I have touched above on the importance of the Isandlwana site to Zulu unity. The Prince Imperial’s death site had similar significance, captured in Buthelezi’s speech that he delivered on 1 June 1979 during the Prince Imperial’s centenary commemoration. He said that the death of Prince Imperial was ‘evidence of the picnic attitude that the invaders had towards the Zulu people and Zulu war, and the extent to which they underestimated the possible resistance that the Zulus were likely to put against that

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

invasion of their country.’⁶² The site was significant as the incident showed the power of the ‘Zulu people’ to the British. It was also important as the site of the death of an important figure, killed by the Zulu people in a campaign against them.

Amongst the minor sites, the development of Mnyamana’s gravesite was allocated R 30 000. It was an amount bigger than that of the other minor sites joined together. In fact this amount was bigger than that allocated to other sites identified as major sites. This is evidence to support my argument that cultural heritage preservation in KwaZulu was directly shaped by the political ambitions of Buthelezi. In the late 1970s Buthelezi was emphasising his maternal relationship, not only to Cetshwayo but also to Mnyamana, who was Cetshwayo’s Prime Minister. He said, ‘when the Zulu sovereign Nation was annihilated by the British ..., my mother’s grand father King Cetshwayo, was the King of the powerful sovereign Nation, and my father’s grand-father, Chief Mnyamana Buthelezi, was the Prime Minister of the sovereign Zulu Nation, and was also commander-in-chief of the entire Zulu army.’⁶³ This explains why the site with Mnyamana’s grave was given priority for development by the KMC and KMF. It also explains why sites relating to Cetshwayo were selected for development. Clearly, most of these projects related to the ‘heritage’ and history of Cetshwayo and the Anglo-Zulu War, which was fought during his reign. A further significance of Cetshwayo was symbolised by the declaration of the year 1983 as King Cetshwayo Year by the KwaZulu Cabinet.⁶⁴

3.2. KING CETSHWAYO YEAR: A HIGHLIGHT OF ASPECTS OF HIS COMMEMORATION

The commemoration of Cetshwayo involved the creation of a life-like statue of the Zulu king, which was built at Ondini and was unveiled on 13 April 1985. Another major aspect of this commemoration was the declaration of the reconstructed Ondini as a KwaZulu Monument. The Ondini Committee felt that the reconstructed and enlarged site should be declared a ‘National Monument in terms of the KwaZulu Monuments Act of 1980’ as part of the

⁶² APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Speech at a Function to Commemorate the Death of Prince Imperial of France. Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi; Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha YeNkululeko YeSizwe. Jojosini, Nquthu District, 1 June 1979’.

⁶³ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Inkatha YeNkululeko YeSizwe (National Cultural Liberation Movement) KwaZulu Elections Rally. Speech by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi: Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha. KwaMashu, Princess Magogo Stadium, 12 February 1978’. Also see ‘A Luncheon Address to the Kimberly-Clark Corporation Board of Directors. Residence of B. Landau, Chairman of the Carlton Paper Corporation LTD, 3 December 1978’.

⁶⁴ See, *Daily News*, 1 Aug. 1981.

commemoration of Cetshwayo.⁶⁵ Both the KMC and the DEC planned the programme for the ceremony for the commemoration of Cetshwayo, and the KwaZulu Cabinet indicated that the ceremony was to have both a 'historico-cultural' as well as a political theme.⁶⁶ This meant that both the Inkatha Youth Brigade and at least one regiment connected with King Zwelithini, such as uThulwana, should feature in the programme. The uThulwana regiment which was 'trained at Eshowe by Prince Gideon Zulu' would appear at the ceremony wearing the 'same dress worn in the battle by the original regiment'.⁶⁷

On 20 August 1983, Cetshwayo was commemorated at Ondini Royal Residence.⁶⁸ The opening of the reconstructed section of the Ondini Royal Residence marked the occasion. It also saw the opening of a small interpretative site museum relating to Cetshwayo and his Royal Residence, Ondini. It was also during this function that an enlarged area around Ondini II was declared as the first KwaZulu Monument (declared under Section 5.1© of the KwaZulu Monuments Act of 1980). In a speech during the ceremony, Buthelezi briefly explained the rationale behind the commemoration and cultural heritage preservation projects in KwaZulu. He said that, 'those of us who are in leadership positions at this time, work at great disadvantages because our roots were deliberately destroyed by many people, some even under the cloak of religion. The Cabinet of KwaZulu regards it as one of our main duties to rehabilitate the damaged psyche of our people. Nothing did more to our people's psyche more than being made ashamed of their culture.'⁶⁹ The preservation and development of cultural heritage in KwaZulu sought to promote Zulu nationalism. The KwaZulu leadership, through cultural heritage preservation, sought to reconstruct the 'Zulu nation' which once existed in the 19th century. This was intended to serve and promote largely political interests of the Zulu leadership, whose success would be at a great disadvantage without reference to (selected aspects) of Zulu past. It was for this reason that the KwaZulu Cabinet declared 1983 King Cetshwayo year. It was part of a conscious political use of a cultural heritage. This is further captured in Buthelezi's speech. In this he pointed out that he had 'inherited the burden that

⁶⁵ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, O.D. Dhlomo, Memorandum to the Cabinet, 29 March 1983.

⁶⁶ AKN, Ulundi, KCMO file, Minutes of the Steering Committee of Ondini, Ulundi, 16 Feb. 1983. Also see, AKN, Ulundi; KMC Minutes and Drafts file; O.D. Dhlomo, Memorandum to the Cabinet, 29 March 1983.

⁶⁷ *Daily News*, 30 July 1981.

⁶⁸ On this same day the Nodwengu Museum which commemorated King Mpande was opened. However, no relative energy in planning was devoted to this commemoration. As a result it is untraceable in the minutes and documents of the KMC.

King Cetshwayo picked up for the [Zulu] nation.’⁷⁰ He used Cetshwayo’s heritage to legitimate his leadership position of the Zulu nation. Cetshwayo, according to Buthelezi, was central to Zulu unity, just like Shaka. He pointed to growing Zulu unity, which he attributed to the legacy of Cetshwayo.⁷¹ During the ceremony, a foundation stone for the KwaZulu Cultural Museum was laid.

The Umlazi Bakery and the flour manufacturers, SASKO, made considerable donations towards the purchase of cultural items and the development of the education programmes of the museum.⁷² Part of the museum collection was a collection of ‘old Zulu items, [and an] authentic British officer’s uniform’ donated by the Froom family.⁷³ The archaeological material collected from the Ondini Royal Residence by R. Rawlinson and from the Thukela valley by L. Van Schalkwyk was also displayed in the new KwaZulu Cultural Museum.⁷⁴ Other cultural items for displays were loaned from the Natal Museum through T. Maggs.⁷⁵ The museum was officially opened on 13 April 1985 in a ceremony to commemorate Cetshwayo’s death. In the opening speech of the museum, Buthelezi pointed to the importance of Zulu ‘living culture’.⁷⁶ The projects that were planned and completed during this period were part of this living culture that was an important aspect in the rebirth of KwaZulu. It was during the opening of the KwaZulu Cultural Museum, that Buthelezi pointed to the impossibility of a casting aside of ‘Zulu heritage’.⁷⁷ The KwaZulu Cabinet, together with the KMC, sought to promote selected aspects of the Zulu cultural heritage in conventional heritage spheres – in sites and museums, but also in literature.

⁶⁹ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘King Cetshwayo – King of the Zulu Nation: 1873-1884, “A King of Destiny Whose Wisdom and Statesmanship Live On”. By Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, Chief Minister: KwaZulu, President: Inkatha and Chairman: The South African Black Alliance. Ulundi, 20 August 1983’.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Oration by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha. Official Opening of the KwaZulu Cultural Museum, before the Unveiling of a Memorial to King Cetshwayo and those who served Him, by His Majesty the King of the Zulus. Ondini, Mahlabathini, 13 April 1985’.

⁷³ AKN, Ulundi, KCMO file, Minutes of the KMC, Department of Education and Culture, Ulundi, 12 June 1985.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

⁷⁵ Interview with T. Maggs, 4 Oct. 2000.

⁷⁶ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Official Opening of the KwaZulu Cultural Museum. Oration by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi: Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha. Mahlabathini, 13 April 1985’.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

3.3. THE KMC AND ACADEMIC HISTORIANS: WRITING KING CETSHWAYO'S HERITAGE

In accordance with the plans to commemorate Cetshwayo, the KwaZulu Cabinet suggested that three publications be produced.⁷⁸ In this direction, the setting-up of an Editorial Sub-Committee was recommended. According to Buthelezi, this was intended to counteract the bias in so much of the literature on Zulu history, which was viewed from a colonial perspective.⁷⁹ T. Maggs and A. Koningkramer of the KMC were given the task of identifying the members of the committee and they recruited J. Laband, J. Wright and R. Rawlinson.⁸⁰ In line with the 1983 commemorations, the KwaZulu Cabinet identified three subjects worthy of publication. These were the 'Guide to Ondini' by Rawlinson, the 'Biography of King Cetshwayo' by Laband and Wright, and 'Zulu Perspectives on the 1879 War' by Laband.⁸¹ Here I will focus on the latter two publications, as there is no available evidence of the publication process of the 'Guide to Ondini'. Old Mutual agreed to finance the costs of the publications.⁸² These publications, it was suggested, 'should be seen by a senior member of the KwaZulu Government before appearing in print to avoid conflict in historical perspectives.'⁸³ The immediate energies were focused on the Cetshwayo publication.

The manuscript of the 'Life of King Cetshwayo' was written and presented for scrutiny to the Chief Minister, Buthelezi.⁸⁴ The KMC members who had read the manuscript made their remarks. They felt that the formal titles of characters that appeared repeatedly throughout the manuscript tended to be monotonous and spoilt the otherwise good work.⁸⁵ It was intended that, once approved, three leather bound complementary copies of the resulting book would be presented to King Goodwill Zwelithini, M.G. Buthelezi, and O.D. Dhlomo.⁸⁶ On the 20

⁷⁸ Interview with T. Maggs, 4 Oct. 2000.

⁷⁹ Buthelezi, 'The approach of the KwaZulu Government', p. 177.

⁸⁰ Author's Interview with T. Maggs, 4 Oct. 2000. Also author's interview with J. Wright, 7 Aug. 2001.

⁸¹ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, Minutes of the KMC, Department of Education and Culture Offices, Ulundi, 6 Oct. 1982.

⁸² AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, L. Hartmann to O.D. Dhlomo, 17 Dec. 1982.

⁸³ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, Minutes of the KMC, Department of Education and Culture Offices, Ulundi, 6 Oct. 1982.

⁸⁴ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, O.D. Dhlomo, Memorandum to the Cabinet, 29 March 1983.

⁸⁵ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, Minutes of the KMC, Department of Education and Culture Offices, Ulundi, 27 Jan. 1983. This constant usage of titles to refer to historical actors was the result of Maggs' emphasis that there should be considerable amount of respect when writing about Zulu history. As 'white historians there was fear of insulting the KwaZulu leaders, especially Buthelezi'. Maggs therefore, insisted that the authors use titles constantly. Author's interview with J. Wright, 7 August 2001.

⁸⁶ AKN, Ulundi; KMC Minutes and Drafts file; Minutes of the KMC, Department of Education and Culture Offices, Ulundi, 5 May 1983.

August 1983, Laband presented the copies of *King Cetshwayo kaMpande* to these dignitaries.⁸⁷

The book was prefaced by Maggs who pointed to the popular nature of the booklet. It was the KMC's intention, according to Maggs, to produce booklets which were 'popular rather than academic but at the same time as accurate and authentic as possible in terms of modern historiographic standards.'⁸⁸ Writing a foreword for the book, Buthelezi pointed to the persistence of biased history both at school and university levels.⁸⁹ The publication was seen as an important beginning in a drive against biased histories. With this publication, Buthelezi was delighted that research had 'begun to explore our past in a more enlightened fashion'.⁹⁰ Buthelezi could not resist articulating the history he was publicly presenting during this period in this foreword. He emphasised his maternal relationship to Cetshwayo and the importance of the king within the history of the Zulu nation.⁹¹ He also brought in Mnyamana in a fashion similar to the speeches he delivered during this period.

Interestingly 'white' academic historians participated in this cultural rebirth of KwaZulu. By 1979, white academic historians were already challenging some 'colonial views' on the history of Zulu people, particularly with regard to the Anglo-Zulu War. In 1979, *Reality: A Journal of Liberal and Radical Opinion* devoted its issue to both radical and revisionist interpretations of the Anglo-Zulu War. The main contributors to this were J. Wright, J. Guy, and P. Colenbrander. Writing an introduction to the volume, Wright wrote an article titled 'Beyond the Washing of the Spears' in which he pointed to the limits of D. Morris's now classical work, *The Washing of the Spears*⁹² which, Wright argued, was still caught within the Eurocentric view that the war was the result of Zulu aggression.⁹³ Guy contributed an article titled, 'The British Invasion of Zululand: Some thoughts for the centenary year' in which he argued that the outbreak of the war could not be attributable to Cetshwayo, but rather to

⁸⁷ J. Laband and J. Wright, *King Cetshwayo kaMpande* (Pietermaritzburg, KMC and Shuter and Shooter, 1980). The publishers made a mistake here. The actual date for the publication of this book was 1983.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. vii.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. ix-x.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. x.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. ix.

⁹² D.R. Morris, *The Washing of the Spears: the Rise and Fall of the Zulu Nation* (London, Jonathan Cape, 1966).

⁹³ J. Wright, 'Beyond the washing of the spears', *Reality: A Journal of Liberal and Radical Opinion* Vol. 11, No. 1, January 1979, pp. 3-4. Wright had also co-edited a book with C. de B. Webb on Cetshwayo in 1978. See, J. Wright and C. de B. Webb (eds) *A Zulu King Speaks: Statements Made by Cetshwayo kaMpande on the History and Customs of His People* (Pietermaritzburg, University of Natal Press, 1978).

capitalist interests that were taking root in southern Africa in the mid-late 1800s.⁹⁴ Colenbrander focused on the role of the senior British officials in southern Africa in the late 1870s. He focused on Sir Bartle Frere's arguments that the war was provoked by Zulu aggression, and finds them to be without proof.⁹⁵ Significant about these contributions was that they confounded a long established view that Cetshwayo's aggression caused the war. This is captured in Wright's comment on the 100th Anniversary of the Anglo-Zulu War. He wrote,

'this month sees the one hundredth anniversary of the British invasion of the Zulu kingdom in January 1879. It also sees the beginning of a series of well-publicised "celebrations" organised by descendants of Natal's colonial settlers to commemorate what most of them would unquestionably regard as a victory a century ago of British civilisation over Zulu savagery. Though most of them will not consciously recognise it, one of the main functions of their coming together for these occasions will be communally to reaffirm this view, and thus to reinforce the ideology of white superiority which the white-skinned ruling classes of South Africa have long used, and continue to use, to justify their political repression of the country's black-skinned working classes.'⁹⁶

Oscar Dhomo praised these contributions and expressed his appreciation, particularly of Guy's contribution which he saw as opening 'new horizons in the search for a just and historically balanced estimate of the Anglo-Zulu War.'⁹⁷ Clearly, these revisionist and radical white academic historians broadly supported the thrust of the KwaZulu heritage initiatives. This group of young 'white' academic historians supported Buthelezi in the late 1970s as he was the only major 'black' leader left within South Africa who spoke fearlessly against apartheid within South Africa.⁹⁸ John Wright also pointed to the continuing publishing of school texts that were largely written from colonial perspectives.⁹⁹ One of these was Joubert's *History for Standard 10*.¹⁰⁰ This book was not well received by black students who were increasingly becoming more militant in KwaZulu.¹⁰¹ It was in this context that some white academic historians participated in the rewriting of Zulu history.

⁹⁴ J. Guy, 'The British invasion of Zululand: some thoughts for the centenary year', *Reality*, Vol. 11, No. 1, January 1979, pp. 8-14.

⁹⁵ P. Colenbrander, 'An Imperial High Commissioner and the making of a war', *Reality* Vol. 11, No. 1, January 1979, pp. 15-19.

⁹⁶ Wright, 'Beyond the washing of the spears', pp. 3.

⁹⁷ O.D. Dhomo, 'The Anglo-Zulu War of 1879: an evaluative review', *Reality* Vol. 11, No. 2, March 1979, p. 19.

⁹⁸ Author's interview with J. Wright, Pietermaritzburg, 7 Aug 2001.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ C.J. Joubert, *History for Standard 10* (Johannesburg, Perskor, 1980).

In 1981, Duminy and Ballard recognised the need for academic historians to ‘produce’ histories that were relevant to that particular period in KwaZulu and Natal in their introduction to a book, *The Anglo-Zulu War: New Perspectives*. They argued that ‘the historians’ most challenging task is to portray history in convincingly relevant terms. By linking the past one hundred years of Zulu history with the present, a greater appreciation of one’s own historical and cultural heritage may be realised.¹⁰² They pointed at Buthelezi’s pleas to academic historians that a ‘Zulu approach’ to the history of Zulu people be developed.¹⁰³ It was in this context that Wright and Laband participated in the KMC’s Editorial Sub-committee. As Wright pointed out, ‘it was under these circumstances that I got involved and interested in the writing of a biography of Cetshwayo. It gave us an opportunity to challenge apartheid interpretations on behalf of the chief [Buthelezi].’¹⁰⁴ It is for this reason that Wright chose to write a section on the period leading to the outbreak of the war, with Laband concentrating on the war itself.¹⁰⁵

The association between academic historians and the KwaZulu cultural heritage project was soon to end, as a result of the controversy surrounding the KMC’s second publication on the topic ‘Zulu Perspectives on the 1879 War’. The controversy caused by the conflict that emerged between the KMC and the Editorial Sub-committee academics was mainly about their presentation of a history that contradicted the public history espoused by Buthelezi. During this period, ‘new’ oral testimonies in the *James Stuart Archive* volumes was increasingly becoming a basic source for most historians researching Natal and Zulu history. Laband was no exception. In preparing the manuscript of *Fight Us In The Open*, he used some of the accounts by Zulu contemporaries about campaigns during the Anglo-Zulu War.¹⁰⁶ One of these accounts pointed to Mnyamana’s poor generalship as the cause of the Zulu defeat of

¹⁰¹ *Echo*, 9 April 1981.

¹⁰² A.H. Duminy and C.C. Ballard (eds) *The Anglo-Zulu War: New Perspectives* (Pietermaritzburg, University of Natal Press, 1981), p. xix.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* This approach was to be developed by white academic historians, especially since as Buthelezi argued, ‘Black Universities’ were not allowing black students to ‘present interpretations which challenged the “traditional view of historical events”.’ See A. Duminy, ‘New challenges in South African history’, *Reality* Vol. 11, No. 3, May 1979. At the Anglo-Zulu War conference held in Durban 1979, only one Zulu historian, J.S. Maphalala, presented a paper. He was also a member of the Inkatha Central Committee. His office had been attacked on 28 October 1983 by the University of Zululand students. See Mzala, *Chief with a Double Agenda*, p. 19.

¹⁰⁴ Author’s interview with J. Wright, 7 Aug. 2001. Also author’s interview with J. Laband, 20 Aug. 2001.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* For the section written by Wright, see *King Cetshwayo kaMpande*, pp. 1-14, and pp. 15-32 for Laband’s section.

¹⁰⁶ J. Laband, *Fight Us in the Open: the Anglo-Zulu War Through Zulu Eyes* (Pietermaritzburg, KMC and Shuter and Shooter, 1985).

the Zulu armies in their encounters with British soldiers at Kambula on 29 March 1879. Laband also used Ruscombe Poole's account, which pointed to the possibility that Mnyamana delivered Cetshwayo to Sir Garnet Wolseley.¹⁰⁷ On reading the manuscript, Dhlomo and Buthelezi were unhappy with these aspects of Laband's analysis.¹⁰⁸ Dhlomo decided to telephonically communicate with Laband.¹⁰⁹ He informed him of the need to withdraw the account and reshape his analysis.

According to Dhlomo, these particular accounts of Mnyamana's roles were 'unacceptable as they will cause a lot of conflict among the Zulus'.¹¹⁰ The matter was resolved when Laband decided to withdraw the above-mentioned sections of this study. The reasons for his compliance were mainly that, he was under pressure and that he wanted 'his' work to get published.¹¹¹ The book *Fight Us In The Open* was then launched at Ondini in 1985. Conflicts over the book marked the break-up of the Editorial Sub-committee. It further pushed Wright away from the activities of the KMC. Buthelezi's versions of history from the mid-1980s would be increasingly challenged from within South Africa and abroad.¹¹² Laband continued contact with the KMC in the late 1980s and was involved in their publication of *The Battle of Ulundi* and *Isandlwana* in the early 1990s.¹¹³

What I have highlighted in this section is that in the late 1970s and early 1980s, the KMC and Buthelezi received support from some white academic historians. Their support for the KMC was part of a revisionist scholarship that sought to rewrite Zulu history (in this case particularly the Anglo-Zulu War), a trend which had an overt manifestation in the late 1970s. There were worries by the KwaZulu Government that there was not enough training of black academic historians during this period. Simon Maphalala was the only black academic historian who presented a paper at the 1985 conference on the history of Natal and Zululand,

¹⁰⁷ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, Dr O.D. Dhlomo to Dr T. Maggs, 13 June 1984. See Appendix 3 of this thesis.

¹⁰⁸ Interview with Wright, 07 Aug. 2001.

¹⁰⁹ Author's interview with J. Laband, Pietermaritzburg, 20 Aug. 2001.

¹¹⁰ AKN, Ulundi, KMC Minutes and Drafts file, Dhlomo to Maggs, 13 June 1984.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹¹² On this see, *Natal Mercury*, 30 Sept. 1986. Mare and Hamilton's *An Appetite for Power* is one of the major published works that challenged Buthelezi's versions of history. See pp. 15-25.

¹¹³ See J. Laband, *The Battle of Ulundi* (Pietermaritzburg, KMC and Shuter and Shooter, 1988). And J. Laband and J. Mathews, *Isandlwana* (Pietermaritzburg, KMC and Centaur, 1992).

held at the University of Natal in Durban.¹¹⁴ This is a clear indication of the lack of black academic historians specialising in Zulu and Natal history during this period. This was part of the reason the KMC approached white academic historians, who were by then experts in their fields.¹¹⁵ Through their involvement in the KMC's Editorial Sub-committee, these academics produced a history that was in line with the cultural heritage that was promoted in KwaZulu during this period.

Their first publication captured all aspects of the heritage that was promoted during this period. Its central figure was Cetshwayo, it touched on his war and subsequent injustices against him. The second publication focused on the Anglo-Zulu War aspect of Zulu cultural heritage. It provided a Zulu interpretation of the war. As shown above, this publication could have diverged from the history that was presented by Buthelezi. This was impossible, especially since Buthelezi read the manuscripts of both these books. It was no surprise then that he objected, through Dlomo, to the treatment that Mnyamana received in *Fight Us In The Open*. The two publications were consciously linked to the cultural rebirth of KwaZulu and were selected in line with cultural heritage projects that were given priority during this period.

These publications were part of a promotion of certain aspects and figures within Zulu royalty and the downplaying of others. Figures and aspects of Zulu royalty who were not prioritised for development and preservation as Zulu cultural heritage(s) during this period included Dingane, Mpande, Dinuzulu, and Solomon. On 20 August 1983, however, during the commemoration of Cetshwayo, a museum commemorating Mpande was also opened. The Nodwengu Museum was built on the Nodwengu Royal Residence, Mpande's homestead. It was an initiative by the KwaZulu Government and the KMC.¹¹⁶ In the KMC records there is little evidence about the emergence of the Nodwengu Museum project. It was not part of the KMC's prioritisation in terms of its three categories – premier, major and minor. Buthelezi saw the museum not as a tribute to Mpande, but a 'tribute to all the founding fathers of the Zulu Nation'.¹¹⁷ Rather than focusing on King Mpande himself, as he had done with Cetshwayo, Buthelezi in his speech during the opening of the museum, focused on the

¹¹⁴ His paper was on the 'Participation of the early whites in Zululand in the Battle of Ndongakusuka, 1856-1861'.

¹¹⁵ See Maggs's preface in Laband and Wright, *King Cetshwayo kaMpande*, p. vii.

¹¹⁶ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, 'A Short Address at the Official Opening of the Nodwengu Museum. By Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi: Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha. Nodwengu, 20 August 1983'.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

‘cultural renaissance’ that was emerging.¹¹⁸ This cultural renaissance would enhance the pride of Zulu people in their identity. He did not explore the role of Mpande in Zulu history, but concentrated on Cetshwayo and Shaka. The latter, was noticeably, missing in this cultural renaissance which manifested itself in the sphere of cultural heritage preservation. His presence in this sphere, was limited to the annual commemoration of his death, the Shaka Day(s). This was the case despite Shaka’s prominence in Buthelezi’s public pronouncements of Zulu history.¹¹⁹ Before, moving on to this ‘absence’ of Shaka’s heritage, let me briefly outline the position of other Zulu royal figures in relation to the renaissance. I will focus largely on Dingane, who was part of the murder plot of Shaka.

3.4. ROYAL HERITAGE: SELECTIVITY AND RELEVANCE, 1977-1985

Dingane was insignificant in this rebirth of KwaZulu and the Zulu nation. Dingane became important to KwaZulu when the ‘homeland’ government was validating its claims to the Ingwavuma area, using Dingane’s grave as a pretext. Prominent figures in the rebirth, as we have seen, were Cetshwayo, Mnyamana and Shaka, whose presence was limited to Buthelezi’s speeches and the annual celebrations of Shaka Day(s) which were commemorated in KwaZulu since 1972. In his speeches, Buthelezi emphasised his relationship to the above Zulu leaders, particularly Cetshwayo (his ‘maternal great-grand-father’) and Mnyamana Buthelezi.¹²⁰ Buthelezi made attempts to erase Dingane from his public history by emphasising a close relationship between Shaka and Cetshwayo. Shaka was constantly seen as Cetshwayo’s uncle. This was done to forge a close relationship between Buthelezi and not only Cetshwayo, but also Shaka.¹²¹ He emphasised Shaka’s quest for black unity, which he used symbolically to suggest that was his role in Zulu politics during this period of the rebirth. Mpande and Dingane were clearly not central to Buthelezi’s public articulation of Zulu history. I want to argue here that central to the exclusion of Dingane was the fact that he was

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁹

¹²⁰ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Inkatha Yenkululeko Yesizwe (National Cultural Liberation Movement) KwaZulu Elections Rally. Address by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, President: Inkatha Yenkululeko Yesizwe (National Cultural Liberation Movement) and Chief Minister of KwaZulu. KwaMashu, Princess Magogo Stadium, 12 February 1978’. Also see ‘A Luncheon Address by M.G. Buthelezi to the Kimberly-Clark Corporation Board of Directors. Residence of B. Landau, Chairman of the Carlton Paper Corporation LTD, 3 December 1978’. Also see ‘Address by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi to the Eshowe Rotary Club. Eshowe Town Hall, 17 March 1978’.

¹²¹ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Speech by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu, President of Inkatha Yenkululeko Yesizwe (National Cultural Liberation Movement) and Chairman: The South African Black Alliance. Unveiling of King Cetshwayo’s Tombstone. King Cetshwayo’s Grave: Nkandla District, 27 September 1980’.

the one who led the killing of Shaka.¹²² Buthelezi could not use Dingane for his political legitimation.

During the 1982 Shaka commemoration at Ondini, Buthelezi argued that if anyone is as brilliant and as great as Shaka was, ‘there is a tendency amongst those he overshadows to want to get rid of him’.¹²³ Buthelezi here was using Shaka to symbolically explain the situation he himself was facing. He was clearly talking about the ‘threats’ to murder him during this period.¹²⁴ He symbolically stated that Dingane had his attributes, but was ‘clearly mediocre compared to King Shaka’.¹²⁵ He went on to say that ‘these are tragedies of life when God allows even foolish people to change the whole course of history.’¹²⁶ This public denouncement of Dingane was coupled with his insignificance in the cultural heritage preservation sphere. None of the KMC’s projects identified above related to Dingane’s reign. He was equally absent in the publication plans of the KMC’s Editorial Sub-committee. Dingane and the events that occurred under his rule were seen as insignificant in the rebirth of KwaZulu and the Zulu nation. Dingane only became significant in KwaZulu when he was needed by the KwaZulu Government in its battle over the retaining of Ingwavuma.

After ruling the Zulu nation for twelve years, Dingane was defeated by his brother Mpande who was in alliance with the Boers from the Republic of Natalia. He fled across the Phongolo River and sought sanctuary in the Kwaliweni forest in the Lubombo Mountains, where he was killed by the members of the Nyawo ethnic grouping in 1840. The area of Dingane’s death was part of the Ingwavuma district. The district, according to Webster, was largely administered by chiefs who not affiliated to the Zulu ethnic group.¹²⁷ The rest of the Ingwavuma population was ‘presumably’ Zulu. Zulu influence in the area came in 1977, when

¹²² APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘King Shaka Commemoration Function. Speech by the Hon. Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi M.L.A.: Chief Minister of KwaZulu, President of Inkatha Yenkululeko yeSizwe (National Cultural Liberation Movement) and Chairman: The South African Black Alliance. Ondini, 26 September 1982’.

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘Tenth Anniversary Celebrations of the Enthronement of His Majesty King Zwelithini Goodwill Ka Bekuzulu Ka Solomon Ka Cetshwayo Ka Mpande. A Short Address by the Hon. Prince Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi M.L.A. Chief Minister of KwaZulu, President of Inkatha Yenkululeko YeSizwe (National Cultural Liberation Movement) and Chairman: The South African Black Alliance. Mona Show Grounds, Nongoma, 5 December 1981’.

¹²⁵ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, ‘King Shaka Memorial Celebrations. Speech by Mangosuthu G. Buthelezi: Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha. Stanger, 24 September 1981’.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷ B. Webster, ‘Abafazi bathonga bafihlakala: ethnicity and gender in a KwaZulu Border Community’ *African Studies* Vol. 50, No. 1 and 2, 1991, pp. 248.

KwaZulu was granted self-government status and its control extended to what had been Tongaland.

In 1982 the South African government sought to give Ingwavuma to Swaziland.¹²⁸ The Zulu elite in the KLA opposed this move. According to Buthelezi, the attempt to give Ingwavuma to Swaziland was testimony to the existence of an alliance between ‘South African Boers’ and the ‘Black “boers”’ of Swaziland.¹²⁹ In responding to this, Buthelezi sent threats against the chiefs who wanted to join Swaziland.¹³⁰ This was coupled, according to Webster, by a ‘Zulu jingoism’ which involved enforced recruitment into Inkatha.¹³¹ In this struggle for Ingwavuma, the Zulu elite used Dingane’s historical presence in the area to legitimate their claim. Dingane’s bones and his grave suddenly became important for KwaZulu. Buthelezi insisted that he was not prepared to abandon Dingane’s grave.¹³² Dingane was now ‘respected as a King just like any of his predecessors and/or successors’.¹³³ In May 1982 Buthelezi, together with the KwaZulu Cabinet and KLA members, visited Ingwavuma.¹³⁴ The objective of the journey was to visit Dingane’s grave. The year 1982 therefore marked the beginnings of Dingane’s significance in the rebirth of KwaZulu and the Zulu nation.

In 1983, the Zulu political elite engaged in a cleansing ceremony where Dingane’s memorial and his tombstone were unveiled.¹³⁵ Buthelezi described this decision as ‘a public act of political and national rehabilitation of King Dingane’.¹³⁶ In this rehabilitation, Buthelezi re-emphasised the supposed conspiracy between ‘Swazis’ and Boers. He argued that the killing of Dingane by Silevana Nyawo and Nondowana Mdluli of the Swazis were early signs of the conspiracy between the Swazis and the Boers against the Zulu nation. In this speech during

¹²⁸ For detailed contemporary accounts on why the South African government sought to give the area to Swaziland, see *Work in Progress* No. 4, April 1978, pp. 1-5; No. 5, June 1978, pp. 10-13; and No. 27, June 1983, pp. 14-22. Also see pro-Inkatha accounts in *Clarion Call* October/November 1984, pp. 16-17.

¹²⁹ *KLA Debates*, Vol. 25, 21 April – 11 May 1982, p. 761.

¹³⁰ *Natal Witness*, 06 Nov. 1984.

¹³¹ Webster, ‘Abafazi bathonga bafihlakala’, p. 248.

¹³² *KLA Debates*, Vol. 27, 4-28 June, 1982, p. 861.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 965.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 814.

¹³⁵ This was done despite the uncertainty on the exact location of Dingane’s grave. Burton *et al* point out that ‘the exact location of Dingane’s grave was a matter which local people would not discuss’. See M.N. Burton, M. Smith, and R.H. Taylor, ‘A brief history of human involvement in Maputaland’ in M.N. Burton and K.H. Cooper (eds) *Studies in the Ecology of Maputaland* (Grahamstown, Rhodes University, 1980), p. 436.

¹³⁶ APC, GMC, PC 126/2; ‘King Dingane Ka Senzangakhona – Second King of the Zulu Nation: Unveiling of a Memorial Near the Spot Where King Dingane Was Assassinated and of a Stone on His Grave by King Zwelithini

the cleansing Buthelezi said, ‘after King Dingane usurped the Zulu throne after King Shaka’s assassination he was accepted by the Zulu Nation as the King of the Zulus. Part of the history which was enacted during his 12 years reign represents our history and our cultural roots.’¹³⁷ Although to a lesser extent, coupled with this ‘rehabilitation’ of Dingane, the battle of Ncome, fought on the 16 December 1838, began to be emphasised by KwaZulu leaders. In this rehabilitation, Boer victory was de-emphasised and replaced with an alternative re-interpretation in 1982. Led by Buthelezi, this re-interpretation asserted that not the whole Zulu army was defeated by the Boers in 1838. The Zulu army, according to this re-interpretation, was ‘split in 1838 and only a section of them was annihilated by the Boers in 1838’.¹³⁸ This re-interpretation served to suggest that the Boer victory during the battle of Ncome was not as major as was claimed by ‘settler’ historians.

Also emphasised in this rehabilitation was the significance of the battle in Zulu resistance against colonialism. Indeed on 16 December 1983, Dingane’s Day was officially commemorated for the first time in KwaZulu. However, this was to be the only significant commemoration of the battle sanctioned by the Zulu elite in this period. Clearly, Dingane’s heritage was only significant when KwaZulu faced prospects of losing Ingwavuma. He was not commemorated annually like Shaka. He was not emphasised as a major royal figure in Buthelezi’s speeches. Unlike sites related to Cetshwayo’s reign, those of Dingane’s reign were not part of the KMC’s prioritisation for development and preservation as heritage.

4. KING SHAKA’S HERITAGE: NATAL AND KWAZULU IN A PUZZLING DIVISION OF LABOUR

Clearly, in the period between 1977 and 1985, cultural heritage in KwaZulu was preserved for largely political reasons. I have pointed out here that aspects of Zulu history, particularly royal history, were selected in line with political objectives. The Ondini project, seen as a major cultural heritage project in KwaZulu, promoted Buthelezi’s version of history, one which linked him closely to royalty. This was a history which sought to legitimate and validate Buthelezi’s claims to the leadership of the Zulu nation that was being reborn. The ‘cultural

Goodwill ka Bhekuzulu – the Eighth King of the Zulu. Speech by Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Minister of KwaZulu and President of Inkatha. Gwaliweni, Ingwavuma, 18 June 1983’.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸ *KLA Debates*, Vol. 27, 4-28 June, 1982, p. 965.

renaissance' that was taking place in KwaZulu during this period served aspects of this validation and legitimation. Aspects of royal heritage were carefully selected in line with political objectives. The two publications of the KMC were part of the usage of cultural heritage. Clearly, the publications, like the Ondini Royal Residence project, were part of a rebirth of KwaZulu. The subjects that were selected for these publications were in line with cultural heritage projects that were given priority during this period. They were also in line with the history that was presented by Buthelezi. The publications were, therefore, more than popular documents of Zulu history.

Shaka, like Cetshwayo, was also a major figure in public articulations of Zulu history by Buthelezi. Unlike Cetshwayo, however, no site associated with Shaka was developed and preserved by the KMC during this period. The only site relating to Shaka which was a declared national monument was the site of his grave in Stanger. The area was outside KwaZulu, so this monument fell under the NMC. The KMC would need to co-operate with the NMC to purchase or be involved in the development of the site.

4.1. CO-OPERATIVE PRESERVATION: THE KMC, NMC AND NPA

From the mid-1980s, there were initiatives towards closer co-operation between cultural preservation institutions in KwaZulu and Natal. This co-operation occurred at two levels. It occurred within Natal, between the NMC (Natal Branch) and the Natal Provincial Museums Services (NPMS). It also occurred at the regional level between the KMC, NMC and the NPMS. The earliest form of co-operation in the sphere of cultural heritage preservation took place in Natal between the NMC and the NPMS in the early 1980s.¹³⁹ The NPMS sought to work with the NMC, which was a body which had expertise in the area of monuments, heritage sites and their formal protection. The NPMS had managed a number of museums which were also interested in the preservation of historical sites in Natal.¹⁴⁰ The NMC offered structural support in its protection of sites in Natal. This resulted in the formation of a Natal Provincial Administration/National Monuments Council Liaison Committee in 1985.¹⁴¹ The NMC and the NPMS drew up a joint schedule of work. Furthermore, both the NPMS and the

¹³⁹ NPA, *Natal Provincial Administration Annual Report 1989/1990* (Pietermaritzburg, NPA, 31 March 1990), p. 13.

¹⁴⁰ An example was the Stanger Museum which was involved in research about the declaration of King Shaka sites as national monuments.

¹⁴¹ NPA, *Annual Report 1989/1990*, p. 13.

NMC made funds available for common projects. Since there was growing cultural heritage preservation activity in KwaZulu, there was a felt need for the NMC and NPMS to co-operate with the KMC at regional level. Chadwick who was director of the Natal Regional branch of the NMC, had already co-operated with the KwaZulu leadership, particularly in the drawing up of the KwaZulu Monuments Act of 1980.

Formal collaboration between the NPMS, NMC and the KMC started at a high political level. The origins of this co-operation lie with the KwaZulu/Natal Indaba conference which began on 8 April 1986 in Durban. The KwaZulu/Natal Indaba involved discussions between the Natal Provincial Council and the KwaZulu government over a joint administration and legislature in the region.¹⁴² It intended to negotiate a new legislative dispensation for Natal and KwaZulu as a 'single geographic, economic and administrative region'.¹⁴³ The Indaba sought, according to Mare and Hamilton, to resolve the national crisis of profitability, governability and stability at a regional level.¹⁴⁴ The delegates proposed a two-chamber legislature with a governor, a prime minister, a provincial executive, standing committees, cultural councils, traditional councils composed of chiefs, and an economic advisory council.¹⁴⁵ Most of these proposals were not legislated. Only a provincial executive and standing committees were established. The provincial executive was formalised with the inauguration of the KwaZulu/Natal Joint Executive Authority (JEA) on 3 November 1987, an act which was sanctioned by the South African government.¹⁴⁶ The JEA was established in terms of the Joint Executive Authority for KwaZulu and Natal Act, No. 80 of 1986.¹⁴⁷ The Act meant 'to provide for the joint and co-ordinated exercise of power and performance of functions by the Government of KwaZulu and the provincial executive authority of the province of Natal, for the establishment for this purpose of a joint executive authority and for incidental matters.'¹⁴⁸ The JEA was composed of ten members, five of whom represented the Natal province and five the KwaZulu Government. There were compelling factors that forced closer and formal co-operation between the KwaZulu Government and the NPA.

¹⁴² G. Mare and G. Hamilton, *Appetite for Power: Buthelezi's Inkatha and the Politics of 'Loyal Resistance'* (Johannesburg, Ravan Press, 1987), p. 44.

¹⁴³ Mzala, *Gatsha Buthelezi: Chief with a Double Agenda* (London, Zed Press, 1988), p. 205.

¹⁴⁴ Mare and Hamilton, p. 171.

¹⁴⁵ Mzala, *Chief with a Double Agenda*, p. 207.

¹⁴⁶ *Natal Witness*, 15 Aug. 1985.

¹⁴⁷ See *Republic of South Africa Government Gazette* Vol. 255, No. 10411, 3 Sept. 1986. Also see NPA, *Annual Report 1987/1988*, p. 1. Also see *Natal Witness*, 4 Sept. 1986.

¹⁴⁸ *Government Gazette* Vol. 255, No. 10411, 3 Sept. 1986, p. 1.

These imperatives ranged from social issues to serious economic and political issues. In the 1980s, the growth rate of urbanisation escalated in KwaZulu and Natal. The most rapid rise in urbanisation, according to A. Jeffery, occurred in the period after 1985.¹⁴⁹ In the period between 1985 and 1989, she points out that the urban growth rate was 2,4 percent. This growth in urbanisation coincided with economic recession which was characteristic of the whole of South Africa in the period under study. As Jeffery points out that ‘while economic trends in the country as a whole were negative from 1976 to 1994, KwaZulu/Natal experienced particular economic hardship as a result *inter alia* of its high population concentration, limited employment opportunities and inadequate economic growth as well as natural disasters such as droughts and floods.’¹⁵⁰ These social and economic hardships were coupled with political unrest, which led to unrest and violence from the mid-1980s in the Natal and KwaZulu region. In 1984, for example, violence broke out when ‘crowds’ in Lamontville resisted Buthelezi’s visit to incorporate the ‘township’ under KwaZulu.¹⁵¹ The Shaka Day rallies which were held annually in Stanger, were increasingly becoming scenes of violence. According to Bonnin *et al*, in Stanger traders had to close their shops on Shaka Day because of ‘damage done by those who attended the rallies’.¹⁵² Since these factors affected both KwaZulu and Natal, it was necessary for the two to co-operate at an executive level. The KwaZulu government was unable, and perhaps unwilling, to deal with these issues alone. This was also the same with Natal which was equally affected by unrest. These factors were partly responsible for the formation of the JEA.

This co-operation at executive level led to the formation of different forums on areas of mutual concern between Natal and KwaZulu. One of these areas was the sphere of cultural heritage preservation. In this sphere, the KwaZulu government co-operated with Natal mainly because it was legally limited in its capacity to develop and preserve cultural heritage sites that related to the history of the Zulu people. It could not legally develop sites in Natal, as it had done with the Ondini Royal Residence. Furthermore, by the mid-1980s the KMC had

¹⁴⁹ A. Jeffrey, *The Natal Story: Sixteen Years of Conflict* (Johannesburg, South African Race Relations, 1997), p. 3.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 49 – 51.

¹⁵² D. Bonnin, G. Hamilton, R. Morrell and A. Sitas, ‘The struggle for Natal and KwaZulu: workers, township dwellers and Inkatha, 1972 – 1985’, in Morrell, R. (ed.) *Political Economy and Identities in KwaZulu-Natal: Historical and Social Perspectives* (Durban, Indicator Press, 1996), p. 174.

realised the need for the expertise that both the NMC and the NPMS had in cultural heritage preservation. This expertise was needed to develop the sites within the boundaries of KwaZulu. Hence, co-operation extended not only to sites outside KwaZulu, but also to sites in KwaZulu.

The formation of the JEA led to the formation of the KwaZulu/Natal Heritage Liaison Committee in 1987, a standing committee proposed during the Indaba.¹⁵³ This Liaison Committee fell under the JEA, and was composed of representatives from the NPMS, NMC and KMC. Natal was represented by two institutions, mainly because the NMC focused on the development and preservation of monuments whereas the NPMS focused on museums and curation. The KMC needed these skills in the development and preservation of Zulu cultural heritage sites. After its formation the Liaison Committee identified ‘flagship projects’ which would be areas of co-operation. These were the ‘Ulundi/eMakhosini’, ‘Rorke’s Drift/Isandlwana’ and the ‘Stanger/Dukuza’ projects. By the Ulundi/eMakhosini project they referred to the continued development and maintenance of the Ondini Royal Residence and the development and preservation of the eMakhosini (the ‘Valley of the Kings’). Described by J.L. Smail as ‘a wide depression surrounded by numerous hills each studded with mimosa bush and euphorbias’,¹⁵⁴ the area containing the burial sites of the early Zulu kings, including Nkosinkulu, Phunga, Mageba, Ndaba, Jama and Senzangakhona.¹⁵⁵ (The eMakhosini project did not materialise until the mid-1990s). The Liaison Committee also identified the Rorke’s Drift/Isandlwana project as an area for co-operation. I will deal with this project in the last section of this chapter.

On the Stanger/Dukuza project, the Liaison Committee sought to preserve and develop sites that related to Shaka, located in Stanger. This regional committee sought to provide a forum for the KMC’s involvement in cultural heritage preservation and development, particularly in relation to sites associated with Shaka in Natal. The KwaZulu Government, however, was interested in obtaining the Shaka Memorial from the NMC, rather than all sites identified as relating to Shaka. The NMC did not lease the site with Shaka’s Memorial to the KMC. In the

¹⁵³ KMC, *KwaZulu Monuments Council Annual Report for the year ending 31 March 1987* (Ulundi, KMC, 1987), p. 7.

¹⁵⁴ J.L. Smail, *From the Land of the Zulu Kings* (Durban, A.J. Pope, 1979), p. 20.

¹⁵⁵ Amafa KwaZulu-Natal, *The Valley of Kings: eMakhosini* (Ulundi, Sappi, undated), 1.

next section, I explore these patterns, pointing to the complexity and problems associated with the production of cultural heritage.

4.2. THE KMC AND THE 'QUEST' FOR KING SHAKA AND THE RELUCTANCE

The historical sites that related to the history of Shaka were sites where the KMC had minimal preservation activities. This was mainly due to the fact that these sites fell outside the jurisdiction of KwaZulu. Sites identified in this study were all located in Stanger, a town that was built in 1873 'over' the site of Shaka's royal settlement, Dukuza.¹⁵⁶ Stanger fell under Natal and was administered by the NPA.

There were five sites associated with Shaka, all located in Stanger. They were Shaka's Memorial; 'Shaka's spring'; 'Shaka's bath and pool'; 'Shaka's cliff' (also known as the Mavivane Execution Cliff) and 'Shaka's tree'.¹⁵⁷ With the exception of Shaka's grave site, known as Shaka's Memorial, all the other sites were not declared national monuments during the period covered in this study. From 1986, A. Gibb of the Stanger Museum which fell under the NPMS set about collecting oral data and records on the authenticity of these sites.¹⁵⁸ Gibb and her are quite prominent in the NMC's archive and was central in the NMC's moves to declare sites relating to Shaka as national monuments.

After Shaka was assassinated by his half-brothers, Mhlangana and Dingane, assisted by Mbopha, he was buried in a newly completed grain pit. Rocks were placed, in a pile, over the grave. In 1932, the 'Zulu people', led by King Solomon, erected a white granite memorial to commemorate Shaka's death. In June 1939, the memorial was proclaimed a national monument under the Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act No. 4 of 1934.¹⁵⁹ Under this Act, the site fell under protection of the Historical Monuments Commission (HMC), the forerunner of the NMC. In 1942, Killie Campbell, who was on the board of the HMC, attempted to track down sites associated with Shaka.¹⁶⁰ One of her

¹⁵⁶ AKN, Pietermaritzburg, Shaka , Dukuza and Allied Sites (hereafter SDAS) file, Vol. 4, file No. 2/5/7, A. Gibb, 'Sites on the Natal Coast Pertaining to King Shaka' (undated).

¹⁵⁷ See Illustration 4 of this thesis on the supposed position of some of these sites in relation to KwaDukuza and Stanger.

¹⁵⁸ See the King Shaka file at KwaDukuza Museum.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.* On details of the Act see *Government Gazette* Proclamation No. 66, 4 May 1934.

¹⁶⁰ See King Shaka file, No. 17403, Killie Campbell Africana Library (hereafter KCC).

correspondents informed her of ‘a Large Boulder which ... could be seen from the main Road nearly opposite Chaka’s [sic] Grave?’¹⁶¹ He informed Campbell that his late father had told him that ‘he had heard from an old Zulu that this stone was at the entrance of Chaka’s [sic] Kraal and he used to sit on it and sun himself in the mornings and watch his cattle driven out. Further that he was actually sitting on it when he was stabbed by Dingaan [sic].’¹⁶² The Native Commissioner of Stanger gave Campbell oral testimonies which were presented to the Commissioner in the early 1940s as affidavits about the rock and the exact situation of Shaka’s grave. These informants pointed out that the site declared as a national monument was a site where Shaka was buried.¹⁶³ Without further investigation into the site of the death of Shaka and the significance of the rock, the site was declared a national monument. In 1949, ‘Shaka’s rock’ was moved from a property across the road to the site of the monument.¹⁶⁴ It was placed behind the monument in order for it to be protected by the HMC which was responsible for the protection of Shaka’s Memorial. When the NMC was established under the National Monuments Act No. 28 of 1969, the site with Shaka’s Memorial fell under it. In highlighting the ways in which processes of cultural heritage preservation occurred until the mid-1980s, the NMC was, alone, involved in the protection of the site.¹⁶⁵ The NMC would not allow the KMC’s involvement in the development of the site as this was not legally permitted.¹⁶⁶ The KMC did, however, indicate its interest in inquiring about the possibility of the transfer of the site from the NMC to the KMC.

In 1984, the KMC requested the NMC ‘to lease the site’ to them for ‘a nominal rental’.¹⁶⁷ These requests took a serious tone in 1985 when the State Attorney of Natal advised that lots 169 and 170 in Stanger (the former was the lot where the monument stood and the latter was next to it) be transferred to the KMC.¹⁶⁸ The State Attorney recommended that steps be taken towards the ratification of an agreement between the KMC and the Stanger Town Council as a prerequisite to the transfer of lots 169 and 170 to the KMC. Not much success was made by the KMC in acquiring the site, however, as no formal agreement was reached between the

¹⁶¹ KCC, King Shaka file, No. 17403, B. Goddison to K. Campbell (HMC), 6 Aug. 1942.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*

¹⁶³ See KCC, King Shaka file, No. 17403; Affidavits made by Nodhlela [sic] Dube, 4 Dec. 1941; and Makeni Nxele, 11 March 1942.

¹⁶⁴ KCC, King Shaka No. 17403, The Magistrate/Native Commissioner (Stanger) to Miss Killie Campbell, 21 Dec. 1949. Also see AKN, Pmb, SDAS, Vol. 3, 2/5/7, G.A. Chadwick, ‘King Shaka Memorial, Stanger’, 1982.

¹⁶⁵ AKN, Pmb, SDAS, Vol. 3, 2/5/7, G.A. Chadwick, ‘King Shaka Memorial, Stanger’, 1982.

¹⁶⁶ AKN, Pmb, SDAS, Vol. 3, 2/5/7, G.A. Chadwick to J.K. Dladla, 25 Oct. 1982.

¹⁶⁷ AKN, Pmb, SDAS, Vol. 4, 2/5/7, J. K. Dladla to the Director (NMC), 11 Oct. 1984.

KMC and the Stanger Town Council. In 1987, the KwaZulu government purchased a ‘residential property’ in Stanger, opposite the Shaka Memorial.¹⁶⁹ This move had positive implications for the KMC, as the purchased property would ‘serve as a much-needed form of rest and change facility for the [Zulu] Royal Family and the Chief Minister during King Shaka ceremonies’.¹⁷⁰ The purchase of the site was finalised by the KwaZulu Department of the Interior in 1988.¹⁷¹ Even when the residential property was purchased, the monument remained under the NMC.

The reason for the NMC’s reluctance to lease the site to the KMC related to the politics of legitimisation. It wanted to legitimate its existence and dominance as a national body for the preservation of heritage through preserving more ‘indigenous’ heritage. This process had its origins in the 1930s and 1940s. The NMC was historically a body which focused largely on the preservation of white cultural heritage. The Shaka sites in Stanger were important to the NMC as the Council hoped to show that it represented all South Africans, black and white.¹⁷² Here were signs of an early affirmative action strategy to preserve other cultural heritages beyond British colonial and Afrikaner cultural heritages.¹⁷³ According to an NMC statistical analysis conducted in 1991, there were only two ‘Zulu’ and five ‘Anglo-Zulu’ cultural heritage sites (mainly sites of the Anglo-Zulu War) declared by the NMC.¹⁷⁴ By contrast, there were 161 ‘white’ monuments declared by the NMC.¹⁷⁵ With the exception of the Shaka Memorial, all the plans concerning sites associated with Shaka were the result of the NMC and NPMS initiatives. In 1993, the NMC sold the Shaka Memorial site to the KMC.¹⁷⁶ In my research I was unable to establish why this transaction occurred in 1993 and not before that.

¹⁶⁸ AKN, Pmb, SDAS, Vol. 4, 2/5/7, State Attorney to the Director-General, 15 Aug. 1985.

¹⁶⁹ KMC, *Annual Report*, 1988, p.2.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁷² In 1990 the NMC was attempting to declare Chief Albert Luthuli’s house a national monument. See AKN, Pmb, LTMD (SSS), No. 9/2/418/5, A. Gibb to A. Hall, 4 Oct. 1990.

¹⁷³ AKN, Pmb, Administration of Conservation Policy, 9/P, A. Hall, ‘Strategy for Affirmative Action in Natal Region’, 7 Aug. 1991.

¹⁷⁴ AKN, Pmb, Administration of Conservation: Policy, 9/P, A. Hall, NMC Natal Region Memorandum: Statistical Analysis of the Relevance of Declared Monuments in the Natal Region, 2 May 1991. Also see, A. Hall, and A. Lillie, ‘The National Monuments Council and a policy for providing protection for the cultural and environmental heritage’ *SAHJ* Vol. 29, 1993, pp. 102-117.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁶ KMC, *KwaZulu Monuments Council Annual Report*, (not paginated).

In 1986, the NMC identified sites which were said to be relate to Shaka. Influential here was Gibb. She compiled reports on the sites that were identified. These reports were based on oral interviews she conducted with Zulu-speaking people in Stanger. She identified ‘King Shaka spring’, ‘King Shaka bath and pool’, the ‘Mavivane cliff’ and ‘King Shaka’s tree’ (also referred to in documents as ‘Shaka’s sitting under a tree’). Shaka’s spring was on land owned by the Borough of Stanger. The interest in the site was raised by its mention in ‘local tradition’. Gibb pointed out that ‘according to local tradition it was from this spring that King Shaka’s drinking and washing water was drawn every day.’¹⁷⁷ In addition, she pointed to local geographical features which, she argued, were in line with this local tradition.¹⁷⁸ There was no similar spring anywhere in the vicinity and it was, according to Gibb, very similar to Dingane’s spring at Mthonjaneni where ‘the water seeps out from a cleft in a sandstone layer’.¹⁷⁹ Based on these accounts, the authenticity of the site was considered as beyond doubt. It was to be developed through fencing, providing a gate; improving access through the construction of a road and parking, the placing of signposts and the erection of an interpretative plaque. These activities would be performed together with the KMC, which would in addition provide the caretaker for the site.

Shaka’s bath and pool also belonged to the Borough of Stanger. Again the founding of this site was linked to local tradition. The tradition here stated that Shaka was in the ‘habit of bathing in the pool and then lying in the sun to dry on the ledge above it.’¹⁸⁰ According to Gibb, as the site was ‘recognised by the Zulu Royal Family in the past’, there was no reason to question it.¹⁸¹ Like Shaka’s spring, she pointed to the local geography which proved its ‘authenticity’. In developing the site the KMC and NMC planned to fence it to provide a ‘service gate’, improve access, and provide an interpretative plaque and the cutting of exotic flora. These sites were provisionally declared as national monuments in terms of Section 5 (1) (c) of the National Monuments Act No. 28 of 1969.¹⁸² They did not fall under the KMC in the period covered in this section. Rather, they were developed by the NMC into a conservation

¹⁷⁷ AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, Minutes of Special Committee, Stanger, 4 April 1986.

¹⁷⁸ KwaDukuza Museum (hereafter KDM), King Shaka file, A. Gibb, ‘King Shaka Spring’, 1986.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁰ KDM, King Shaka file, A.Gibb, ‘King Shaka Bath and Pool’, 1986.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁸² AKN, Pmb, Shaka Memorial, Dukuza Vol. 2, 2/5/7, Director (NMC) to The Town Manager, 4 Sept. 1987.

area in the mid-1990s.¹⁸³ Provision for the involvement of the KMC in the development of the above sites was made.¹⁸⁴

The third site was the ‘Mavivane execution cliff’ (Mavivane means shivering with fear), which like the other two, belonged to the Borough of Stanger. The site is on the outskirts of Stanger, rising up beyond the Mavivane stream. Also drawing from ‘tradition’, the cliff was identified as a site where Shaka disposed of the ‘unwants’. Authenticating the site, Gibb said that the idea that Shaka was ‘fond of disposing of errant subjects by having them thrown over high cliffs or hills is in fact correct’.¹⁸⁵ The ‘unwants’, according to this ‘tradition’, were taken to the top of the cliff, stabbed, and their bodies thrown over the top of the cliff, down into a deep pool at the foot of the cliff in the Mavivane stream. Gibb pointed out that ‘one can still feel cold shivers going up and down one’s spine, and the presence of foreboding and death, while standing at the foot of this cliff, and while visiting this site.’¹⁸⁶ It was on these grounds that she motivated for the preservation and declaration of the site as a national monument. The, however, was not declared a national monument. It is still considered for such a status. The fourth site, was Shaka tree. It is the politics surrounding this site which point to a possible disinterest on the side of KwaZulu in the preservation of sites relating to Shaka. For this reason I devote a subsection to the subject.

4.3. KING SHAKA’S TREE: A TEST OF KWAZULU’S COMMITMENT THE PRESERVATION OF HIS HERITAGE

Knowledge about Shaka’s tree, like that of the sites outlined above, was based on oral tradition. According to this ‘tradition’, ‘at dusk one evening, Mhlangana, Dingaan [sic] and Mbopa [sic] crept around a tree under which, on a rock, sat Shaka – the Great Chief of the Zulu people. He was stabbed by Dingaan and crawled away to a point approximately 100 yards from the tree, where he died. He was later buried in a grain pit in the cattle kraal. This is recorded history.’¹⁸⁷ Gibb became aware of the ‘historical value’ of the tree in 1981.¹⁸⁸ She

¹⁸³ AKN, Pmb, Lower Tugela Magisterial District: Shaka Sites, Shakaville (hereafter LTMD SSS), 9/2/418/5, Minutes of the NMC, 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town, 8 and 9 Nov. 1994.

¹⁸⁴ AKN, Pmb, LTMD (SSS), 9/2/418/5, Minutes of the NMC, Offices of the Struwig Mendes Associates, 1 Sept. 1994.

¹⁸⁵ KwaDukuza Museum (hereafter KDM), KwaDukuza, A. Gibb, ‘Mavivane Execution Cliff’ (undated).

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁸⁷ KDM, King Shaka file, A. Gibb, ‘Shaka’s Tree’ (undated).

¹⁸⁸ AKN, Pmb, Shaka Memorial, Dukuza Vol. 2, 2/5/7, A. Gibb, The Natal Provincial/National Monuments Council Liaison Committee: Report for the Natal Regional Committee of the NMC, 21 July 1987.

requested that, like the ‘ultimatum tree’ on the bank of the Tugela [sic] River, that King Shaka’s Tree (a fig tree – *uMkhuhla*) be declared as a national monument with a ‘metal plaque/notice ... giving its history, in English, Afrikaans and Zulu, please’.¹⁸⁹ Positive responses to this plea only came in 1986 when the NMC indicated its willingness to apply provisional declaration as a national monument to the site with the ‘historic old fig tree’ thereon in terms of Section 5 (1) (c) of the National Monuments Act No. 28 of 1969.¹⁹⁰ In July 1986 the Stanger Town Clerk approved the provisional declaration of the property with Shaka’s tree located on it, and other sites that related to him.¹⁹¹

Unlike other sites, the site with Shaka’s tree lay in a private property. The NMC intended to purchase the site. It was proposed that once the site was purchased from its private owners, it would be consolidated with the site next to it – the one that was purchased by the KwaZulu government and managed by the KMC.¹⁹² The NMC had first to investigate matters of ownership before developing the site. Unlike other provisionally proclaimed sites (which were situated on the Stanger Townlands and were therefore held under the Borough of Stanger in terms of Deed of Grant No. 10052 of 1922)¹⁹³, the tree was situated on Lot 111 which belonged to Mr A.H. Desai and Mrs M. Desai.¹⁹⁴ The tree had to be provisionally declared a national monument to prevent the owner from developing the site.¹⁹⁵ The NMC informed the legal owners of the site with the tree thereon that the ‘tree is deemed to be a national monument and protected as such in accordance with the Act for a period of six months under Section 12.’¹⁹⁶ This section stipulated that no person may damage, destroy or alter a monument except by virtue of a permit issued by the NMC. The next step, following investigation of the authenticity of the site, would be its declaration as a national monument.

Mr Desai objected to these attempts of the NMC to declare the tree as a national monument. The grounds for declaring the tree a national monument were based on the idea that it was under this tree that ‘Shaka is reputed to have sat when he was murdered’ and as such it was of

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁰ AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, Director (NMC) to The [Stanger] Town Clerk, 03 June 1986.

¹⁹¹ AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, W.T. Byrnes (Stanger Town Clerk) to The Director (NMC), 21 July 1986.

¹⁹² See Illustration 5 on the model that was planned for the development of the site.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁴ AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, Acting Director (NMC) to Messrs A.H. and M. Desai, 12 April 1988. Also see, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7; Acting Director (NMC) to The Registrar of Deeds, 12 April 1988.

¹⁹⁵ AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, G.B. Cunningham to G. Chadwick, 5 Feb. 1988.

‘historical, cultural and ethnological importance’.¹⁹⁷ In objecting to these ‘values’ attached to the tree, Desai argued that ‘historical literature’ showed that Shaka was assassinated ‘on or about 22 September 1828’ at his military ‘kraal’, Dukuza.¹⁹⁸ According to Desai, no detailed descriptions relating to the site of Shaka’s assassination are given in historical literature.¹⁹⁹ No mention is made of a tree, ‘let alone the fig tree’. Furthermore, the fact that there were ‘numerous trees growing in the vicinity of the Shaka memorial and to the fact that numerous trees have been felled in that vicinity over the years to make way for development in the Town. ...it seems more likely that, if he [Shaka] was sitting under a tree, there are and were a number of trees, both existing and which have been felled, elsewhere in the area which are more likely to have been the tree in question.’²⁰⁰ The owner of the property also pointed out the age of the tree in his fight against declaration. As Shaka had died 160 years before 1988, the tree would need to have been more than 200 years old as it would have already been fully grown at the time of the assassination. This, according to Desai, was not possible, especially since his consultation with experts suggested that it was unlikely for a fig tree to have a life span as long as 160 or 200 years.²⁰¹ By the early 1990s the NMC realised that there were problems surrounding the tree’s authenticity. It was also aware of the pressure created by the legal correspondence to ‘lift the [provisional] proclamation’ of the tree as a national monument.²⁰²

In response to these pressures, the NMC contracted H.M. Brooks, a history graduate student at the University of Natal, to investigate the authenticity of the site. Brooks concluded that the proposed site was not an authentic site and that it was not worthy of preservation.²⁰³ She argued that ‘traditions’ that Shaka was assassinated while sitting on a rock under a tree could not be proven.²⁰⁴ Brooks’ report was significant in that after 1992, no further energies were

¹⁹⁶ AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, Director (NMC) to M. Desai, 15 July 1987. Also see Acting Director (NMC) to Messrs A.H. and M. Desai, 12 April 1988, 2/5/7.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.* Also see, AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, The Director (NMC) to Messrs A.H. and M. Desai, 21 Oct. 1988.

¹⁹⁸ AKN, Pmb, SDAS Vol. 4, 2/5/7, J.H. Nicolson, Stiller and Geshen (Attorneys) to The Director (NMC), 14 Nov. 1988.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*

²⁰² AKN, Pmb, LTMD (SSS), 9/2/418/5, A.B. Hall to Proclamation Section, Internal Memorandum, Natal Division, 7 Nov. 1990.

²⁰³ AKN, Pmb, LTMD (SSS), 9/2/418/5, H.M. Brooks, ‘A Review and Assessment of Documentary and Oral Evidence on the Validity of Claims Made for Sites Associated with King Shaka in the Dukuza Area (Stanger)’, March 1992.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

devoted to proclaiming Shaka's tree a national monument. It was no longer discussed in the Joint Liaison meetings. The focus was now the declaration of Shaka's spring, and Shaka's bath and pool as part of a conservation area that was proposed. The provisional declaration status of the tree was lifted.

More significant about politics about Shaka tree was that the KwaZulu and the KMC even though they were legally allowed to be involved in the development of sites relating to Shaka in Natal, were reluctant to do so. During the Shaka tree issue, the KMC and Buthelezi were absent. Even though the KMC was involved in the development of the sites relating to Shaka, its roles were minimal, an aspect detectable from the records. It was often involved in the planning of the development of these sites, but largely inactive on more practical issues. The KwaZulu representatives were inactive in the KwaZulu/Natal Heritage Liaison Committee. In fact the representative of the KwaZulu Government and the KMC, J.K. Dladla, was constantly absent from the meetings of the Liaison Committee.²⁰⁵ Active in the development and preservation of sites relating to Shaka was the NMC and the NPMS. It was these structures that were influential in appointing Brooks to research the authenticity of these sites.

Shaka has been identified by many academic historians as central in the construction of Zulu history.²⁰⁶ Interestingly, Buthelezi was never publicly vocal about these sites associated with Shaka. This was the case despite his celebration of Shaka's achievements as a Zulu King and the annual Shaka celebrations which were held in Stanger. The Shaka cultural heritage, instead, received far greater attention from the NMC and NPMS. Maybe academic historians who have placed great emphasis on Buthelezi's use of Shaka are missing an important unexplored point which emerges from this chapter – that Shaka was competing with King Cetshwayo as the central figure for political mobilisation and legitimation of the KwaZulu leadership, especially Buthelezi. With regard to Shaka's tree, Buthelezi was asked to visit the site and discuss the fate of the tree.²⁰⁷ He did not get involved in this regard. I have indicated above that Buthelezi was heavily involved with the activities of the KMC. Nowhere in the

²⁰⁵ See Minutes of the Liaison Committee at the AKN Office, Pmb, under the file – Co-operation: KwaZulu/Natal Heritage Liaison Committee, file No. 13/10/16.

²⁰⁶ See for example, D. Golan, *Inventing Shaka: Using History in the Construction of Zulu Nationalism* (London, Lynne Rienner, 1994), p. 2.

²⁰⁷ South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA), Cape Town, Dukuza/Stanger Shakan Sites, Lower Tugela District file, No. 11/89/1, A. Gibb (Hon. NMC Curator) to The Director (NMC) Natal Branch, 6 Jan. 1989.

records, particularly his speeches, does he talk about the Shaka Memorial and related sites, and the need for the KMC to be involved in their development. By contrast, he was constantly involved in cultural heritage that related to Cetshwayo. Cetshwayo, and the battle of Isandlwana which was fought under his reign, features in both Buthelezi's public articulations of Zulu history and in cultural heritage that he emphasised to be worth preserving. These two symbols were representations of the Zulu nation's struggles against colonial subjugation. Shaka was clearly suffering from the selectivity that characterised cultural heritage preservation in KwaZulu during this period.

There is evidence which suggests that the energies of KwaZulu and the KMC were devoted elsewhere, in the development of the battle of Isandlwana site. It was in the Isandlwana project that the KMC and institutions associated with it were active in the period under study. As I pointed out in chapter two, the Isandlwana battle site was one of the 'major sites' identified by the KMC in 1981. Buthelezi's commitment to Isandlwana in the period from 1986-1992, saw the opening of the National Historic Reserve of Isandlwana (as it became known) came on 18 January 1992. The project was significant to Buthelezi as provided further opportunities for the ethnic mobilisation of the Zulu nation. According to Buthelezi, when he officially opened the new site in 1992, the over-riding significance of the battle of Isandlwana 'where the Zulu army met the full force of the British army with little more than spears and their bare hands and defeated it, is the valour on the day of the battle. We as Zulus come from a warrior nation who know what valour and bravery is all about. We recognise it wherever valour and bravery are found.'²⁰⁸ This was typical of Buthelezi's speeches during the 1970s and 1980s. The development of the site where the Zulu nation showed its 'bravery' would assist in the consolidation of KwaZulu which was forged around ethnic mobilisation.

5. CONCLUSION

Clearly, the focus of Buthelezi and the KMC was the preservation of cultural heritage relating to Cetshwayo during the period under study. This, I have argued, provides spaces for the re-questioning of Shaka's significance in KwaZulu. This re-questioning is close to impossible, if a study on this subject relies only on speeches performed by Buthelezi during this period. These speeches reveal that both Shaka and Cetshwayo were central in the public history that

was constructed' by Buthelezi. However, if the heritage archive is incorporated into the 'source material' the centrality of Shaka in this public history becomes questionable. Patterns in heritage production which are only examinable through the use of both the heritage archive and speeches delivered by Buthelezi, are quite central in the re-questionability of Shaka as a key royal symbol in the construction of the Zulu nation and the legitimation of its leadership in KwaZulu. Heritage preservation initiatives in KwaZulu during this period, I have argued, were sanctioned by influential political leaders, mainly Buthelezi. The only projects that were given prominence by this leadership were only those that were associated with Cetshwayo's heritage. Shaka's KwaBulawayo homestead which fell within the boundaries of KwaZulu did not make it into the agenda. Unlike Cetshwayo, no publications were planned to celebrate Shaka's reign.

²⁰⁸ APC, GMC, PC 126/2, 'Official Opening of Visitor Centre and Isandlwana Historic Reserve. M.G. Buthelezi, 18 January 1992'.