

The historiography of southern Africa

The general
history
of Africa
Studies and
documents 4

In this series:

1. *The peopling of ancient Egypt and the deciphering of Meroitic script*
2. *The African slave trade from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century*
3. *Historical relations across the Indian Ocean*
4. *The historiography of southern Africa*

The historiography of southern Africa

Proceedings of the Experts Meeting
held at Gaborone, Botswana,
from 7 to 11 March 1977

unesco

Published in 1980 by the United Nations
Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
7 Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris
Printed by Imprimeries Réunies de Chambéry

ISBN 92-3-101775-6
French edition: 92-3-201775-X

© Unesco 1980
Printed in France

Preface

In 1964, the General Conference of Unesco, as part of the Organization's effort to further the mutual understanding of peoples and nations, authorized the Director-General to take the necessary measures for the preparation and publication of a *General History of Africa*.

As part of the preparatory work, scientific colloquia and symposia on related themes have been organized. The papers prepared for discussion and the exchanges of views on a wide variety of subjects at these meetings have provided valuable historical material which Unesco has decided to make known as widely as possible by publishing it in a series entitled 'The General History of Africa: Studies and Documents'.

The present book, the fourth in the series, contains the papers presented and a report on the discussions on them that followed at an Experts Meeting on the historiography of southern Africa held at Gaborone, Botswana, from 7 to 11 March 1977, with the participation of fourteen specialists.

The authors are responsible for the choice and the presentation of the facts contained in this book, and for the opinions expressed therein, which are not necessarily those of Unesco and do not engage the responsibility of the Organization.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of Unesco concerning the legal status of any country or territory or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitations of any country or territory.

Contents

Introduction	9
Themes of discussion	11

Part I: Historiography of southern Africa

Problems of southern African historiography, <i>L. D. Ngcongco</i>	17
Historiographical traditions of southern Africa, <i>David Chanaiwa</i>	25
Comments on recent historical writings concerning Angola and Mozambique, <i>René Pélissier</i>	45

Part II: Research and teaching on the history of southern Africa

The importance of southern African history in the school curriculum: a synthesis, <i>Balam Nyeko</i>	57
Research in Botswana, <i>A. C. Campbell</i>	64
The promotion of the study of history at the National University of Lesotho, <i>Elleck K. Mashingaidze</i>	66
History research in Malawi, <i>J. B. Webster</i>	71
History research in Swaziland, <i>N. M. Bhebe</i>	73
Teaching and research on southern Africa in the United Kingdom, <i>Shula Marks</i>	75
History research at the University of Zambia, <i>B. S. Krishnamurthy</i>	81

Part III: Experts Meeting on the historiography of southern Africa

Opening session of the meeting	85
Summary of the discussions	87

Appendixes

1. List of participants	109
2. Bibliography	110

Introduction

On the recommendation of the International Scientific Committee for the Drafting of a General History of Africa, Unesco organized, with the assistance of the University of Botswana and Swaziland, a meeting of experts on the historiography of southern Africa. (The list of participants is given in Appendix 1.) By recommending the holding of this meeting, the committee had in view two objectives: first, to obtain additional information for the finalizing of the chapters of the *General History* related to this area, and second, to encourage planned research and publications on the history of southern Africa.

As a basis for the discussions, several working papers were prepared and are reproduced here. The first of these, by L. D. Ngcongco, Professor at the University of Botswana and Swaziland, deals with problems of southern African historiography, emphasizing the imbalance between the research and studies on the history of the indigenous African groups, particularly before their contact with white immigrant groups, and those on the activities of the immigrant and politically dominant white minorities. Professor Ngcongco surveys the existing literature, summarizes the evidence on Iron Age cultures in the region and draws conclusions concerning the migrations of the southern African Bantu-speakers.

Dr David Chanaiwa, Associate Professor of History, California State University, Northridge (United States), analyses the historiography of present-day southern Africa (except for Mozambique and Angola), and identifies the imperial, missionary, colonialist, African and liberal-revisionist traditions. He also suggests future directions for southern African historiography.

Professor René Pélissier, of the University of Paris, in his paper seeks to identify a number of trends in historical writing over the last half century concerning Angola and Mozambique and makes suggestions for the improvement of the historiography of these two countries.

The importance of southern African history in the school curriculum is stressed by Professor Balam Nyeko of Makerere University, both as a means of recovering Africa's dignity in the post-colonial period and as a nation-building subject. His paper, together with details on research and

teaching in the history of southern Africa which several participants presented at the meeting, appears in Part II.

Lastly, Part III contains the main points raised during the discussions, together with the recommendations the meeting submitted to the Director-General of Unesco.

Themes of discussion

In advance of the meeting, Unesco sent the participants the following suggestions concerning the themes of discussion.

Population movements and structures of power

Since the history of the area has been widely affected by population movements, the experts, after they have examined the different theses, might take stock of the question, and in particular determine the stages and the importance of migrations. They might take into account the linguistic data, since they contribute considerably to a better understanding of history. Particular attention might be given to the study of ethnonyms and toponyms, since oral traditions have retained the names of places which have marked out the different steps of the settling of ethnic groups in the area.

On the basis of the various studies that have been published on the conception, organization and development of power in the area, the experts might endeavour to bring to light the political structures and the economic and social organization which have marked the evolution of the different States of the area; they might study in particular the formation of the States, as well as the systems of exchange set up between them.

Iron and agriculture in the evolution of southern Africa

Numerous studies have been carried out regarding the appearance of iron and its repercussions on the agricultural systems of the area. The experts might examine possible relationships between the iron-age cultures and present civilizations, and review the question, taking into consideration the different arguments in existence.

Foreign interventions and their repercussions on the evolution of the area

Following the study of the peopling and the political, economic and social organization of the area, the experts might examine the different aspects regarding the contacts between southern Africa and the outside world, from the first coastal contacts to the contemporary structures, including resistance to foreign occupation and the setting up of colonial regimes. Foreign interventions and the changes they have brought about in the evolution of the political, economic and social structures of southern Africa might be stressed.

The importance of teaching the history of Africa, and especially of southern Africa

Since all the experts invited are academics, they might review the present situation as regards the role and place of the teaching of African history and, in particular, the history of southern Africa. History contributes to a sense of awareness at national and continental levels. The experts might, through concrete examples, show the growing importance of the teaching of national history and African history in the educational systems of their countries, from primary school to university.

Ideological definitions; confrontation of ideologies and concrete problems: independence movements, Bantustans, etc.

The experts might examine existing arguments and concepts regarding the period of decolonization of the area, giving particular attention to the liberation movements. They might also study the role of Pan-Africanism, the Organization of African Unity and the United Nations. The concrete solutions envisaged in certain countries, such as independence movements, Bantustans, etc., should be emphasized.

Critical survey of scientific production in the different countries of southern Africa and of ways of improving it

The experts from the area will submit for examination by the meeting the list of the achievements, as well as the research plans, of their institutions in the field of history. As soon as they arrive in Gaborone, they will transmit to the Secretariat of the meeting the documents to be discussed under this item.

Setting up of a medium-term research programme

On the presentation of the research plans by the different institutions and taking into account the problems raised during the meeting which need to be examined in depth, the experts might set up a medium-term research and publication programme and propose methods of co-ordinating the research work of the different centres, it being understood that each centre would remain autonomous.

Part I
Historiography
of southern Africa

Problems of southern African historiography

L. D. Ngcongco

The problem of southern African historiography is predominantly a product of the political climate of the region. Present-day southern African society has developed from the interaction of two broad cultural streams, namely the indigenous African peoples and immigrant white groups. The result has been that for centuries historical research has been conducted on the assumption that the indigenous African groups had no past worth studying, since their culture remained static. All the attention of historians was accordingly focused on the activities of the immigrant and politically dominant white minorities in southern Africa. The result has been a gross imbalance in the volume of studies of the two groups. Thus, while southern Africa was (for a time at any rate) the region of Africa with the greatest volume of historical literature, the studies on the indigenous black societies have remained the most undeveloped—particularly for the period before their contact with white trading or immigrant groups. Because black societies have been largely considered extraneous or at best peripheral to the main focus of southern African historical writing, a severely limited historiographical tradition has been pursued and perpetuated with such tenacity and doggedness that not even the tremendous gale that blew through the Western world following Trevor Roper's challenging outburst roused southern African scholars from their sleep of generations. The focus on the study of the past of the dominant white minority has been strengthened by a rigid insistence in southern African universities (and generally speaking by southern African-based publishing houses as well) of the inadmissibility of non-archival sources as valid evidence for historical reconstruction. The deliberate exclusion of the witness of allied disciplines such as archaeology, social and physical anthropology, linguistics, inherent in this narrow disciplinary focus has not only deprived southern African historiography of all the insights and imagination that have enriched studies elsewhere on the continent but has contributed tremendously towards maintaining the one-sidedness of historical studies in the region, and thereby subjected future generations of African scholars to what Professor Ranger has aptly termed 'the distortions produced by the tyranny of the evidence which is available to them'. (Ranger, 1968.)

Even within the limited field of archival sources for evidence, there has been a disturbing selectivity in the use of source materials.

With a few exceptions the tendency of major professional historical works has been to open with events written from Dutch sources, whether these were in southern Africa or in Europe. The effect again has been to highlight the seventeenth century as marking the start of the historical period for this region. Everyone now knows that nothing can be more misleading. The rich Portuguese archives that have contributed so much to the understanding of African histories of many East African societies—especially those along the coast—documents which have also illuminated the study of the precolonial history of the societies of Zimbabwe as well as those of Mozambique and Angola have been studiously neglected by southern African scholars.

As has been suggested by some authorities (Wilson and Thompson, 1969), the neglect by professional historians of certain sources prior to the seventeenth-century Dutch documents could stem from an intentional attempt to support the socio-political system. But even where there has been a conscious wish to break with the narrow traditions of the past, there has still remained a marked incapacity to make a clean break with the past. Perhaps much of this has to do with the fact that southern African researchers on southern African history are predominantly whites, while blacks are, if not altogether hampered, certainly offered no incentives for free or unrestricted research in that country.

In the study of southern African history, especially that concerned with traditional African societies, the more enterprising historians have been working on the compilations of amateur historians such as A. Bryant, G. E. Cory, D. F. Ellenberger, J. C. Macgregor, W. C. Holden, S. M. Molema, T. Soga, G. W. Stow, G. M. Theal and A. Wookey. Studies by scholars like Martin Legassick, Shula Marks, William Lye and Gerrit Harinck—all published in *African Societies in Southern Africa*—have been concerned with the rewriting and reinterpretation of these early works which, while relying on oral traditions collected in the nineteenth century, were at the same time based on a number of non-scientific assumptions (Legassick, 1969) and tended 'to be somewhat romantic works, mixing fact with fiction and lacking the technical apparatus of scholarly writing' (Thompson, 1969). As has already been observed, a tremendous amount of critical evaluation and analytical work has been done on these compilations, mainly in history departments of some universities in the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and other overseas countries, as well as at some universities on the African continent itself. Here the process of rigorous re-examination and analysis of this corpus of recorded traditions as well as the careful comparison with other sources, published or otherwise, has been progressing with pleasing results. It is worth noting again that most of this work is taking place outside southern Africa itself. Scientific studies of the kind conducted by Jan Vansina among the societies of the Congo region,

D. P. Abraham for the Shona, B. A. Ogot for the southern Luo, I. Kimambo for the Pare and M. S. Kiwanuka for the Baganda remain largely unaccomplished for many of the societies of southern Africa. While the problem of contamination of oral traditions by feedback from the recorded traditions is a serious one it still remains a pity that one does not learn that theses or monographs are in preparation at any of the southern African universities by students working there. But even for those studies now being updated the problem of chronology for the period covered by the oral traditions has not been seriously tackled.

Elsewhere in Africa, archaeology has contributed enormously to opening up the frontiers of African history, but in southern Africa archaeological research has not been uniform. In Zambia and Rhodesia archaeological investigation had developed considerably well in the pre-UDI days. Among the principal archaeologists who worked in that region were Desmond Clark, R. Summers, Keith Robinson, D. W. Phillipson, J. C. Vogel, Peter Garlake and T. N. Huffinan.

Until the middle years of the 1960s, Iron Age archaeology in South Africa was lagging far behind that in Zambia and Rhodesia. Most of the thrust in the excavation of Iron Age sites came from Revill Mason of the Witwatersrand University working in the Transvaal and to a lesser extent from Robin Derricourt, who worked on the Transkei coast. While Iron Age research in South Africa has been somewhat limited in extent, it has been more gratifying because it has laid greater stress on economic archaeology instead of cultural archaeology. In other words, the difference here has been between those who stressed technique in their quest for objective description and those who looked upon themselves as social scientists seeking a solution to a problem, how people lived, with models based on available evidence even though such evidence was acknowledged to be incomplete.

As has already been observed, until about two thousand years ago, different physical environments had given rise to different major regional varieties of the Late Stone Age such as the Wilton Smithfield and Nachikufuan types. This division of the Late Stone Age cultures into Wilton Smithfield-Nachikufuan appears to reflect more ecological regions than ethnic/linguistic differentiations into San or Khoi as we understand them today. As Inskeep observes, the archaeology of central and southern Africa suggests a similar pattern of events throughout the region; nowhere is there any good evidence pointing to the independent discovery of metallurgy and domestication of animals and plants by Late Stone Age hunter-gatherers (Inskeep, 1969).

Inskeep proceeds to observe that the early historical and contemporary expression of the Iron Age is the Bantu-speaking societies. In its early stages, the spread and growth of the Iron Age settlements tended to overlap and merge with the Late Stone Age patterns. The southward expansion of the Early Iron

Age can be traced from the known radio-carbon dates. Between the Zambezi and the Limpopo the earliest known date is (Calder's Cave) 20 ± 80 B.C., which is on the northern scarp of the Zimbabwe Plateau.

Mabveni on the south-eastern scarp is dated A.D. 180 ± 120 . South of the Limpopo the earliest date is for a site at Silver Leaves near Tzaneen on the north-eastern edge of the South African Plateau. The date is A.D. 270 ± 55 . Other pottery from the same site was dated A.D. 330 and A.D. 1100.

Further south, two Iron Age sites have been dated to about the same time. On the eastern edge of the Plateau, in Swaziland, a site known as Castle Cavern has been dated at A.D. 400 ± 60 , while a site at Broederstroom in the Brits District of the Transvaal (west of the Witwatersrand) was dated A.D. 460 ± 50 .

The dates for the pottery finds at Silver Leaves sites brought the Early Iron Age in South Africa into line with countries to the north of the Limpopo, as well as demonstrating that negroid peoples had already settled south of the Limpopo by the third century A.D. Perhaps these finds and the dates also suggest that the Silver Leaves sequence and the other sites further south (like Castle Cavern) were no isolated phenomena.

Linguistic evidence has been adduced mainly by Ehret and his students (at the University of California, Los Angeles) which does not appear to be out of harmony with other kinds of evidence on the distribution of Early Iron Age culture in South Central Africa. Ehret and his team (using a specially modified 90-word core adapted from Morris Swadesh's universal 100 words) produced a correlation study between two groups of languages in the region of South Central Africa. One group consisted of the greatly varying Shona dialects spoken between the Limpopo and the Zambezi, and the other comprised Sotho, Nguni, Tsonga, Chopi and Venda—the latter group referred to as the South-east Bantu. According to Ehret's team, earliest Shona-speaking populations would have developed in what is Rhodesia today, while the proto-South-east Bantu would have evolved south of the Shona-speakers—probably somewhere in the northern Transvaal regions.

Ehret and his collaborators found that the highest correlation was between Venda and Shona (55 per cent); then came Tsonga with Shona (41 per cent) followed by Chopi (38 per cent), Sotho (37 per cent) and Nguni (35 per cent).

They maintain that the determination that the Shona and South-east Bantu form separate subgroups linguistically indicates that there were two centres of spread of Bantu speech to wider areas of south-eastern Africa. The study deduces from the correlation percentages between Shona and different languages of the South-east Bantu group a strong pointer to the fact that proto-Nguni and proto-Sotho/Tswana were rapidly extended from origins in the Venda/Chopi/Tsonga centre, which to this day remains chiefly distributed

along the lower Limpopo valley, i.e. the north-east Transvaal. By contrast Nguni and Sotho/Tswana have become very widely diffused southwards on both sides of the Drakensberg range. It is interesting to compare the degree of compatibility between the Ehret thesis and the Guthrie Greenberg Linguistic history hypothesis explaining the diffusion of Bantu-speakers in sub-Saharan Africa.

If deductions from historical linguistics would lead us to posit a prolonged period of interaction between Shona-, Venda- and Tsonga-speaking groups in the area between the Zambezi and the Limpopo (Monica Wilson suggests this for the Nguni—see Wilson and Thompson, 1969), then we have to ponder the question of the high degree of cognates shared by the Sotho and Nguni groups of languages, as well as the considerable similarity in practices such as patrilineal descent, circumcision and polygamy.

Where do the basic similarities of language and customs as well as socio-political organization stem from if not from the type of interaction that is said to have subsisted between the Shona, Sotho, Venda and Tsonga groups? On the other hand one is struck by the fact that all these other groups observe totems to mark descent, and the Nguni, as a rule, do not. Then Nguni clans are strictly exogamous (as are Shona), while intermarriage is not only possible but sometimes preferable among the Sotho/Tswana, Venda and Tsonga peoples.

Very few scholars still doubt that the Iron Age cultures of southern Africa were the work of Bantu-speaking farmers and pastoralists, who produced food while continuing to hunt wild animals, and also engaged in mining. These Bantu-speakers were also well-versed in metallurgy. From all this evidence it appears highly probable that these men who brought the Early Iron Age into southern Africa were the ancestors of present-day Bantu-speaking societies of southern Africa, and that they entered the region from a northerly direction.

At this point it may be useful to look briefly at developments during the Late Iron Age. Some of the trends observed during the Early Iron Age continued into the Late Iron Age. But settlements now tended to be larger by comparison. Indications are that Late Iron Age peoples showed a greater dependence on domestic animals as well as cultivation. There is evidence of extensive exploitation of copper and iron outcrops south of the Limpopo, while gold was worked mainly in, say, north-east and south-east Rhodesia. The Leopard's Kopje culture of Rhodesia, which flourished around the ninth century A.D. is a famous example of such cultures, while the best known Leopard's Kopje sites were those of Khami near Bulawayo and Mapungubwe in the Limpopo valley, located just inside the Transvaal.

In South Africa, the Late Iron Age is represented by sites in the Magaliesburg-Witwatersrand area. These sites are characterized by numerous stone-walled settlements (Mason, 1974). But as was the position for the Early Iron

Age, evidence for the Late Stone Age is grossly inadequate. In the Magaliesburg-Witwatersrand area, Mason and his team have found that cultural continuity of Early into Late Iron Age has justified their recognition of what they have called Middle Iron Age.

According to this classification the Middle Iron Age would run from 'some time around A.D. 1000 . . . until approximately A.D. 1500-1600' (Mason, 1974). This Middle Iron Age is represented by villages excavated in the Olifantspoort area, Melville Koppies and Platberg (near Klersdorp). The villages excavated in these localities varied in size between ten and twenty huts arranged in a roughly circular or elliptical pattern, and these may have been surrounded by a wooden or thorn-bush stockade. The huts themselves were approximately two metres in diameter with very hard-pressed or plastered mud floors. Among the various remains at these villages were pottery assemblages, teeth of cattle and sheep or goats, iron tools and at some places 'well preserved carbonized seeds of millet'.

Thus the cultures described by Mason and his team as Middle Iron Age cultures must clearly have been of the Bantu-speaking communities of South Africa, almost certainly the Sotho-Tswana peoples. The location of these Middle Iron Age sites, the substantial huts grouped into small villages or hamlets even though stone walling was still limited at this period, tend generally to confirm the impressions created by oral traditions of the Sotho-Tswana peoples that their traditional 'homeland' lay near Rathateng, near the confluence of the Madikwe and Crocodile rivers.

According to the Mason classification, the Late Iron Age in the Magaliesburg-Witwatersrand area runs from approximately the beginning of the seventeenth century. The earliest dated Late Iron Age site is a mid-sixteenth century one (approximately A.D. 1550). As already observed, Late Iron Age settlements were considerably larger than those of Middle or Early Iron Ages. At the mid-sixteenth-century site of Olifantspoort, Mason and his team exposed at least 88 well preserved huts out of a total of 120 whose debris protruded noticeably above the ground (Mason, 1974). The architecture of Late Iron Age settlements appears to have been more complex since the archaeologists working on Olifantspoort 20/71 observed that hut floors of the Late Iron Age very frequently included two separate compartments, while sliding doors separated the outer from the inner compartments. Excavations at the Platberg site 32/71 established a distinct relationship between the settlement pattern of prehistoric Iron Age societies and those of a modern Bakwena *kgotla* of Bpo-Ntloedibi in Molepolole.

Two other Late Iron Age cultures had been earlier identified by Mason. These were the Uitkomst and Buispoort cultures, named after the type of sites representing those cultures. Uitkomst sites had been found to be concentrated in the central part of the southern Transvaal, around the source of the Odi

(Crocodile) river near modern Pretoria. Buispoort culture sites, which have a much higher density, were reported to occur mainly in the vicinity of the Rustenburg and Zeerust districts, that is, in the area to which the traditions of the Sotho-Tswana point as their centre of dispersion, while Uitkomst sites were dated from about A.D. 1060 to A.D. 1650. The first Buispoort site was dated about A.D. 1350, but, as already observed, recent work by Mason and his team has resulted in a fifth century A.D. date for the 'Buispoort' site of Broederstroom 24/73 (Mason, 1973).

In a recent re-evaluation of recorded traditions of the Sotho-Tswana, Martin Legassick has suggested a geographical identification of the Buispoort culture complex with the Kwena-Hurutshe cluster of lineages, and the Uitkomst complex with the Kgala-Pedi cluster (Legassick, 1969).

The chronology that emerges from the incomplete and piecemeal Iron Age research south of the Limpopo appears to give support to that indicated by oral traditions of the Sotho-Tswana peoples, even though Iron Age chronology has pushed back the chronology for the sub-Limpopo area to the middle of the first millennium A.D. Dating by royal genealogies places the foundation of several of the Sotho-Tswana States in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. While these broad indications may be taken to suggest the emergence of Sotho-Tswana kingdoms, the formation of centralized States should not be confused with the first presence of Sotho-Tswana peoples south of the Limpopo. This probably stretches back many centuries earlier. Nor is it suggested that this is the earliest example of state formation.

Conclusions

What tentative conclusions are possible from the foregoing? While it is still too early to draw any firm conclusions about the migrations of the southern African Bantu-speakers, it can be safely suggested that the first millennium A.D. for the Iron Age in southern Africa is generally indicated and is also widely accepted. There cannot now be any doubt that, in the main, the bearers of the Iron Age cultures of South Africa were of negroid origin, and that they came into southern Africa from regions in the north.

Pottery traditions point to contact between Early Iron Age societies of South Africa and those of Zambia and Malawi (Nkope), and even as far north as Kwale in Kenya. Further, Mason saw a relationship between the Broederstroom pottery and that of communities living along the coastal regions of Natal and the Transkei, while Derricourt has argued that archaeologically the similarity between Transkei coastal pottery and NCZ (i.e. pre-Zulu pottery from iron-working people in Natal) clearly suggests a southward direction of movement of Cape Nguni (Derricourt, 1974). From this and other

factors referred to earlier, it seems very likely that the peoples who later became distinguishable as Nguni and Sotho-Tswana were at one time together (at least during the southern African Early Iron Age). What remains unclear is the chronological picture.

Several problems still face the student of the Bantu migrations into southern Africa. If the Nguni and the Sotho were at one time together, where and when did their separation occur? What were the routes of their migration southwards? When did they cross the Limpopo? Did the Nguni follow or precede the Sotho in crossing the Limpopo (considering that it is thought that the ancestors of the Nguni occupied the site of Castle Cavern), dated to about the fifth century A.D.?

Then also we remain ignorant of why the Early Iron Age societies did not appear on the whole to be cattle-keeping. To what extent does available evidence confirm that the Nguni were, as Oliver and Fagan suggest, an amalgamation of 'a formerly matrilineal stock of cultivators and fisherfolk . . . and a patrilineal and pastoral stock, with a strong aversion to fish-eating'.

Another problem is that most of the archaeological evidence that is available from Iron Age sites south of the Limpopo, i.e. on the Transvaal highveld and parts of the Orange Free State (area west of the Drakensberg) deals with the Sotho-Tswana. More archaeological research still remains to be done in the areas between the Drakensberg range and the Indian Ocean, as well as in southern Mozambique, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland and Namibia.

References

-
- MASON, R. J. 1974. Background to the Transvaal Iron Age. New Discoveries at Oliphantspoort and Broederstroom. *J. S. Afr. Instit. Min. Met.*, Vol. LXXIV, p. 211-16.
- MASON, R. J. *et al.* 1973. Early Iron Age Settlements of Southern Africa. *S. Afr. J. Sci.*, Vol. LXIX.
- WILSON, M.; THOMPSON, L. (eds.). 1969. *Oxford History of South Africa*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Historiographical traditions of southern Africa

David Chanaiwa

This study has been designed to provide an analysis of the historiography of present-day South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Malawi.¹ In compliance with a request by the International Scientific Committee to confine it to twenty pages, we have constructed a classificatory model to control and delimit what could otherwise appear very confusing and impressionistic.² The result is a procedure which identifies the imperial, missionary, African, colonialist and liberal-revisionist traditions of southern African historiography, on the basis of the fundamental assumptions, attitudes, themes, methodologies, sources, terminologies and audiences of the authors. To test the validity of the classification, this essay concentrates on the most basic and enduring subjects of southern African history: for example, the Zimbabwe civilization, the Zulu revolution, colonialism, the Great Trek, racism and nationalism.

As a caution against over-simplification, we need to note that the traditions are not necessarily exclusive and deterministic. Some of them overlap on certain subjects; for example, the imperial, missionary, and colonialist on the Zulu revolution, or the African and liberal-revisionist on racism. And, in each category, the authors show some divergencies in style, qualifications and tempers. Furthermore, some of the traditions have changed with the passage of time and circumstances. But there has been an underlying climate of opinions, assumptions and colleguemanhip in each tradition that merits categorization and generalization. We have also provided historical depth by treating the traditions through three historiographical periods: 1800–1950 and 1950 to the present.

The imperial tradition

The major characteristic of imperial historiography has been its European orientation. William Greswell's *Our South African Empire* (1885), Sir Harry Johnston's *British Central Africa* (1897), Eric Walker's *A History of Southern Africa* (1928), John S. Galbraith's *Reluctant Empire* (1963), and Ronald Robin-

son's, John Gallagher's and Alice Denny's *Africa and the Victorians* (1968), all treated southern African history as an extension of European history, and especially as an aspect of the British Empire since 1783. Imperial historians have essentially treated British imperialism in southern Africa as part of European international politics. According to one of them, Arthur Percival Newton, 'The destinies of South Africa have been moulded within the British Empire, and their shape has been altered by forces that have affected the whole.'³ For causes of imperialism, the majority of them emphasize political developments in Europe and strategic concerns over the Cape sea route to India (e.g. Robinson and Gallagher, 1968).

They explain the internal dynamics of southern African history primarily from the perspectives of settler colonialism, nationalism and prominent personalities such as Rhodes and Kruger (Millin, 1933; Walker, 1934 and 1953; Lockart and Woodhouse, 1963; and Marlowe, 1972). They treat missionaries as well-meaning agents of British interests and the British Empire. John A. Hobson in *The War in South Africa* (1900), John Harris in *The Cartered Millions: Rhodesia and the Challenge to the British Commonwealth* (1920), and Henry Labouchere in *Truth* emphasized the predatory 'conspiracies' and machinations of the financial oligarchy, which, they said, was dragging Great Britain into colonial wars and inhuman exploitation of Africans.

But, whether jingoists, Little Englanders or 'negrophilists', imperial historians generally have treated Africans as part of the environmental factors (land, sea, rivers, minerals) that have affected the development of the British Empire. After claiming that the primary object of his research was the 'deeper political causes' of the unification of South Africa, Newton then said, 'Native affairs are, of course, not included in this statement, though they often have an economic bearing.' (Newton, 1924, p. xxi.) Greswell apologized to the readers for his sketchy narration of San, Khoikhoi and Sotho cultures, explaining: 'This mention of the Kafir races has led me to interrupt slightly the historical continuity of my chapters by a general review of the aborigines of South Africa.'⁴ The so-called general review amounted to nothing more than uncritical excerpts from missionary, explorer and colonialist sources.

Imperial historians have explained both imperial and settler interference in, and invasion of, African societies (e.g. the Zulu, Ndebele, Bemba and Ngoni) by placing strong emphasis on 'tribal' warfare, slave trade and 'savagery' (Greswell, 1885; Johnston, 1897; Newton, 1924; Millin, 1933; and Marlowe, 1972). British expansion is, therefore, treated as either preventive annexation from fear that an area (e.g. Natal or Central Africa) would be acquired by a potential European enemy (Portuguese, Germans or Afrikaners) and used against the British; or as humanitarian intervention and 'pacification' from fear that the Africans and/or Boers would engage in warfare to the detriment of themselves and the British. But as 'distant' observers, they also have

idealized the 'civilizing mission of the British race' and imperial trusteeship. While they shared with missionaries and colonists pseudo-scientific racist notions about the supposed inferiority of the blacks, they, however, credited the 'civilized native' with the ability for growth and excellence.

The missionary tradition

The missionary tradition was one of the most prevalent forms of historiography during the first and second periods. Historically, missionaries, and to a lesser extent explorers, were the first Europeans to observe, record and study African history, culture and languages. Consequently, the other traditions depend a great deal on missionary archives for 'primary' sources. It is, therefore, important to understand both the nature and limitations of missionary historiography.

The missionaries of the first period were products of the pseudo-scientific racism and cultural chauvinism of Europe.⁵ As a self-acclaimed avant-garde of 'Christian civilization', they often portrayed themselves as dauntless servants of God, surmounting all sorts of climatic and 'native' obstacles by force of their racial, spiritual, moral and technological superiority.⁶ The missionary was expected to keep a diary (journal) and to propagandize foreign missions to metropolitan donors. The audience expected to read about resounding successes of the Gospel against 'heathenism' in the 'Dark Continent', and to catch the thrills of what it was like to live 'beyond civilization'. As Cairns has amply stated, the missionary was 'torn between the demands of truth, the propaganda necessities of the cause, and sentiments of fidelity to the martyrs who had passed on to their reward'.⁷ Thus, he had a vested interest in the historical, cultural and racial assassination of the African. The denial or caricature of African civilization provided missionary enterprise with purpose, meaning and signifiante. Consequently, missionary historiography of this period was characterized by yellow journalism and sensationalist ethnography.

To Robert Moffat, Mzilikazi was 'a savage who is on the summit of power and a bloody and merciless tyrant'.⁸ To the Rev. Thomas Morgan Thomas, in *Eleven Years in Central South Africa* (1873), the Ndebele were 'degraded descendants of Ham'; to the Rev. D. Fred Ellenberger, in his *History of the Basuto: Ancient and Modern* (1912), the San were 'utterly irresponsible savages' (p. 7), and the Sotho had 'for many centuries groaned under the yoke of witchcraft' (p. 248). The African was stripped of his history, culture and humanity and left with cannibalism, polygamy, superstition and witchcraft; and a special vocabulary was developed to distinguish him as 'a noble savage'.

The missionaries not only endorsed the idea of imperialism like the im-

perial historians, they also perceived it in theological terms as a vindication of biblical prophecy (Moffat, 1842; Mackenzie, 1887; Carnegie, 1894). They saw God in history, or, more explicitly, history as God. In *Missionary Labours and Scenes in Southern Africa*, Moffat claimed that 'the Gospel of Christ is the only instrument which can civilize and save all kindreds and nations of the earth' (p. 11). The Rev. François Coillard, author of *On the Threshold of Central Africa*, claimed that the British South Africa Company (BSAC) represented 'strength, civilization and Christianity'. He went on to say:

In this great European struggle for Central Africa, England is taking energetic measures to assure herself of the lion's share. Should we blame her? Ought we to be glad or sorry for it? Who can read the future? The great thing is to remember that, amid the surging of the nations, God reigns.⁹

By theological deduction, the missionaries concluded that the Africans had no history because they had 'no concept of God', and thus sanctified imperialism with divine justification. Settler invasions of the Zulu, Ndebele, Xhosa, Bemba and Ngoni became 'Holy Wars' against 'heathenism' (Carnegie, 1894; Bryant, 1911). The breakup and disorganization of the African societies were heralded as progress:

The wild adventurous days have passed away, and every year is seeing great changes coming over these primitive peoples. Civilization is changing the whole social condition of the natives, and the old tribal order is disappearing.¹⁰

Thus, missionaries treated imperialism with an aura of religious utopianism and universalism.

Missionaries approached the subject of settler colonialism with ambivalence. A few of them, like John Moffat and David Carnegie, actually preferred settler to imperial expansion because they thought that the former was more efficient, realistic and thus effective.¹¹ But many of them placed more emphasis on humanitarian guardianship and imperial trusteeship than their average countrymen. Some, like John Philip and John Mackenzie, made it their responsibility to 'fight' for 'native rights'.¹² Their ambivalence stemmed from the fact that they too, like the imperial and colonialist writers, believed in the 'inherent' superiority of the white race and culture, and they saw colonization, commerce and Christianity as inseparable allies (Philip, 1828; Howitt, 1838; Livingstone, 1866; Mackenzie, 1887). They were broad-minded philanthropists who sought to smooth cultural contact between the colonizer and the colonized.

To begin with, they were worried about the bad examples (to the Africans) of the irreligious and materialistic elements of the settler populations. They were opposed to uncontrolled settler expansion, brutality and exploi-

tation of the Africans. In *Colonization and Christianity*, William Howitt complained about 'the monstrous and earth-encompassing evil, which the Europeans have committed against the aborigines of every country in which they have settled'. In *Austral Africa, Losing it or Ruling it*, Mackenzie denounced the 'hammer-and-tongs policy of a certain class of colonial politicians . . . the conquest, spoilation and unending degradation of all coloured peoples' (p. 493). He proposed a formula for metropolitan-controlled settlement of Central Africa, including the structure and function of government. He was opposed to Cecil Rhodes, the BSAC and monopolies. Instead, he wanted the British Government to sponsor the settlement, set prices for land (acquired by conquest), offer low-interest loans, levy taxes, and pay for roads, railways and dams.

There were slight variations in missionary historiography of the second period, 1900–45, the colonial period proper. The missionaries were then proselytizing conquered and dominated Africans, whose gods and spirits had been proved vincible and powerless, and whose culture had been shattered. There was security for them and their converts; and African customs considered un-Christian were then prohibited by colonial decrees. Furthermore, there was an abundance of European manufactures to overhaul African societies. In this relaxed atmosphere, the missionaries not only shed some of their aggressive messianic traits, but also undertook a well-meaning but haphazard study of the African past.

The motives were primarily utilitarian: 'to prevent making the most dangerous mistakes from mere ignorance of the true nature of [African] rites or superstitions'.¹³ Some missionaries also hoped to effect some corrective censure of European prejudices, racism and exploitation, especially after the unification of South Africa and the increasing victories of apartheid, as well as the advent of settler government in Southern Rhodesia. They hoped to influence District Commissioners, settlers, fellow missionaries, and educated Africans. 'The book is addressed to those who can influence the development of the African, to the authorities dealing with the so-called native problem, and to educated Africans. . . .'¹⁴ Others actually hoped to initiate an historiography of the African past:

The importance of this work may not be fully realized at the present moment; but its lasting value will be better appreciated a hundred years hence, when native-born historians, then beginning to emerge, will be highly thankful for our having herein put on permanent record this account of the simple civilization of their forefathers.¹⁵

These first Africanists, Bantuists or antiquarianists (as they called themselves) began the 'investigation' of African history and observation of the African's physical, mental, social and moral life, which led to a prodigious output of books.

But, despite their professed objectives, the missionaries wrote African history in terms of the attitudes, curiosities and theories (e.g. Hametic theory) of their age. As self-acclaimed, self-righteous experts, they paid little attention to African oral traditions and relied on guesswork, hearsay and excerpts from other missionaries, explorers and colonists. They still treated African history as 'simple civilization', and used the same set of terminology (savages, barbarians, primitives, etc.). They saw superstition instead of religion, and tribes instead of kingdoms. In fact, one gets the impression that they were portraying African history to prove that the African had no civilization and that he 'needed' Christianity and Europeanization. They rarely perceived individual distinctions among Africans—only a mass of 'heathens'. African kings, soldiers, midwives, craftsmen and witches were all lumped together as agents of historic darkness, stemming way back from the 'Curse of Ham'.

The African tradition

Comparatively, African historiography is the one that has changed the most from the first through the third periods. The historiography of the first period was essentially an African version of the missionary tradition. The authors were Christian intellectuals, educated in mission schools and dependent on missionary printing presses.¹⁶ They were first and foremost preachers and teachers, psychologically alienated from their African culture and thus from themselves. For example, John Tengo Jabavu (1859–1921), the famous founder-editor of *Imvo Zabantsundu*, was a devout Methodist, Tiyo Soga (1829–71) was the first African minister to be ordained (United Presbyterian) in the United Kingdom, and Walter B. Rubusana (1858–1916), the first African member of the Cape Provincial Council, was a Congregationalist minister. They accepted colonialism as a matter of life, admired the white man for his power, wealth and technology, and accepted the supposed cultural inferiority of the black race.¹⁷

They shared the universalism and utopianism of the missionaries, and, within the colonial system, they wanted to elevate Africans to 'civilized Christendom', through Christianity, education and industrial schools. But, unlike the missionaries, they also were influenced by Booker T. Washington's doctrine of black economic self-determination and by the Pan-Africanism of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. They founded fraternal organizations (e.g. John Langalibalele Dube's Zulu Christian Industrial School and Natal Bantu Business League), newspapers and musical groups patterned after the 'Tuskegee model'.

When writing, they seemingly were motivated by intellectualism, religiousness, and not by African historical consciousness. They translated

religious-oriented English literature into African dialects. For example, Tiyo Soga translated *Pilgrim's Progress* into Xhosa (*U-Hambo Lom-Hambi*), Rubusana translated E. G. White's *Steps to Christ*, Samuel Edward Krune Mghayi translated E. W. Smith's *Aggrey of Africa* (*U-Aggrey wase Afrika*). They wrote poems derived from European themes, as well as African history, customs and proverbs (e.g. Tiyo Soga's *U-Tywala* (Beer)). They also composed music (mostly hymns), such as John Knox Bokwe's *Amaculo ase Lovedale* (Lovedale Hymns), Enoch Sontoga's classic *Nkosi Sikeleli I-Africa* (God Bless Africa), and Ntsikana's classic *Ulo Thixo Omkhulu, ngose Zulwini* (He, the Great God, High in Heaven). The period also saw a proliferation of African newspapers, e.g. Jabavu's *Imvo, Leselinyana* of the Lesotho Mission, *Indaba* of Lovedale, William Wellington Gqoba's *Isigidimi*, and Nathaniel Cyril Mhala's *Izwi La Bantu* (The Voice of the People).

On the whole, these Africans were writing religious and didactic literature, intended for educated blacks and the white missionary/liberal world. They wrote sermons in the guise of poems, novels and music. Like the missionary, they were opposed to polygamy, paganism, superstition and witchcraft, and they did not see God or greatness in the African past. They hoped to lead the Africans into the European world, and had faith in themselves, Christianity, missionaries and white liberals. They not only neglected African history, but also failed to perceive the realities of settler colonialism. But, though their works are not historical, they are historiographically invaluable for revealing the social and intellectual history of nineteenth-century southern Africa.

African intellectuals of the second period belonged to, and reflected, the colonial era proper. These were Africans who had either observed or participated in frontier wars, the Anglo-Boer War, the Zulu Rebellion (1906), the Ndebele/Shona uprisings, the Barwe Rebellion and the First World War. More important, they were the ones who bore the heaviest burden of settler colonialism, with its notorious apartheid, pass laws, contract labour and degradation. They were surrounded by fellow African victims of the 'Black Problem', who, as described by Davidson Don Tengo Jabavu, were then landless, voteless, helots, pariahs, social outcasts in their fatherland with no future in any path of life'.¹⁸ Their historiography was characterized by near-presentness, racial consciousness and a 'growing feeling of distrust in the white man's lordship, loss of faith in his protestations of just intentions and loss of confidence in the old-time kindly protection of the British constitution'.¹⁹ This was a period of African non-violent, civil-rights protests, epitomized by the South African National Congress, the Southern Rhodesia Native Welfare Association, the Northern Rhodesia African Congress, trade unionism, separatism and Ethiopianism.

The thrust of African thoughts and actions centred on exposing and

(hopefully) correcting 'native disabilities', and, thus, on reform-oriented historiography. Of the most famous books, Solomon Tshekiso Plaatje's *Native Life in South Africa, Before and Since the European War and the Boer Rebellion* (1916) deals with the history of the Land Act and of segregation in South Africa. His objective was to present 'a sincere narrative of a melancholy situation in which, with all its shortcomings, I have endeavoured to describe the difficulties of the South African natives under a very strange law, so as most readily to be understood by the sympathetic reader' (p. 11). Davidson Don Tengo Jabavu wrote *The Black Problem* (1920), *Criticism of the Native Bills* (1935) and *Native Disabilities in South Africa* (1935). A few works, such as John Henderson Soga's *The South-Eastern Bantu* (1930) and *Ama-Xosa: Life and Customs*, Azariele Sekese's *Mekhoa le Maele a Basotho* (Customs and Proverbs of the Basuto) and Thomas Mokopu Mofolo's *Moeti oa Bochabela* (The Traveller to the East) dealt with African traditions and customs. Second-period authors still wrote poems, novels and music, as well as edited African newspapers as was done in the first era. They also wrote autobiographies and biographies (e.g. Dube's *U-Shembe*, Jabavu's *John Tengo Jabavu* and Mofolo's *Chaka*).

Generally, their historiography vacillated between élitism and mass action, hope and despair, moderation and militancy. They saw themselves as the most knowledgeable of African history, culture and interests. Jabavu pronounced that 'it takes a native to know a native'. He stated that he was writing his book for future African researchers:

One says designedly African researchers; for however sympathetic and good a European may be, he cannot undertake such a task with the minuted knowledge and enthusiasm that can belong only to the native African, who must himself be the victim of the untoward circumstances and difficulties under discussion.²⁰

Yet, these historians were not addressing themselves to the contemporary African masses, whom they often referred to as 'unsophisticated rustics'. They were instead speaking to the British public, missionaries, District Commissioners and white liberals. Plaatje was pleading for imperial trusteeship 'on behalf of five million loyal British subjects who shoulder "the black man's burden" every day'.²¹ Jabavu was aiming at 'an all-round practical exposition of the native problem by a native . . . providing both negative and constructive criticism'.

Thus, while missionaries were writing pre-colonial African history, the Africans were concentrating on the origin, nature and effects of colonial laws. They did not even investigate causes of colonialism itself, African resistance, separatism and Ethiopianism. Their dependency on missionary presses, their reformist, liberal, Christian orientation and their elitist political ideology

prevented the development of truly African historical consciousness.²² Like their predecessors of the first period, missionaries and white liberals, they still looked up to Christianity, education, industrial skills and humanistic goodwill for African development. Their significance, however, lies in their vast amount of contemporary scholarly documentation of the inner workings and effects of settler colonialism, which provides an invaluable historical insight.

Colonialist historiography

The colonialist tradition is the only one that has been extensively analysed, that has been most consistent, and that has fully reflected the regional realities and necessities of settler colonialism. I myself have discussed the colonialist historiography of Zimbabwe in *The Zimbabwe Controversy: A Case of Colonialist Historiography* (1973). F. A. van Jaarsveld has analysed Afrikaner historiography in *The Afrikaner's Interpretation of South African History* (1963), Leonard M. Thompson in *Afrikaner Nationalist Historiography and the Policy of Apartheid* (1962). Basically, colonialist historiography has been predicated upon several interrelated factors which can be categorized as: predispositional—ideological, attitudinal and institutional complexes antecedent to the partition and conquest of southern Africa (e.g. pseudo-scientific racism, the Hametic theory, Calvinism and capitalism); historical—the migration, conquest and control of alien, hostile and numerically overwhelming indigenous peoples (e.g. the Great Trek, Pioneer Column, Anglo-Zulu War, Anglo-Ndebele War, Anglo-Boer War and the Barwe Rebellion); and the situational—the trials and tribulations of maintaining alien, settler supremacy, cohesion and sovereignty against African resentment, nationalism and guerrilla warfare.

The colonialist's predispositions were similar to those of the missionary and the imperial historians. But his historical and situational circumstances distinguished him not only from the missionaries, imperialists and Africans, but also from the other European colonizers of Africa, except for a few in Kenya and Algeria. While the missionaries were interested in the soul of the so-called 'noble savage', and the imperialists were promoting 'power imperialism', the colonists wanted African land, livestock and labour. They had to conquer, dispossess and exploit the African.

History of the first period, characterized by frontierism, speculation, warfare and rebellions, was written primarily to rationalize invasions, massacres and predatoriness. In W. A. Wills's and L. T. Collingridge's *Downfall of Lobengula, The Cause, History and Effect of the Matabeli War* (1894), we are asked to accept it 'as a law that, when savages come into contact with an advancing civilization, causes of friction must arise, which always end in the subjugation of the inferior people' (p. 11), and that the war was a 'struggle between civilization and savagery'.

In Alexander Wilmot's *History of the Zulu War* (1880), George McCall Theal's *History of South Africa* (1888), Frederick Courtney Selous *Sunshine and Storm in Rhodesia* (1896), F. W. Reitz' *A Century of Wrong* (1900), S. J. du Toit's *The History of Our Land in the Language of Our People* (1877), Africans were invariably caricatured as 'the most inveterate cattle thieves', 'merciless ravagers', 'warlike native tribes', traitors, liars, etc. The causes of frontier wars were always African thievery, treachery and the 'massacre' of 'innocent' white women; or missions of 'mercy' on behalf of African 'allies'. In *History of the Boers in South Africa* (1887), Theal told us that 'Tshaka governed his people with such cruelty as is hardly comprehensible by Europeans', and as 'only persons of black skins and savage habits' would (p. 29). These frontier diaries, like the journals of missionary pioneers, were hurriedly written in the heat of aftermath of battles and occupations by soldier-settlers, or speculators-turned-historians. Thus they reflect the anxiety, alienation and instability of frontiers as well as the author's desire to make the metropolitan readers and critics empathize with the dangers and thrills of frontiermanship in the 'Dark Continent'.

However, English-speaking and Afrikaner historiography differed on British imperialism, missionaries and Afrikaner nationalism. English authors (Wilmot, 1880, 1894; Wilmot and Chase, 1869; Wills and Collingridge, 1894; and Selous, 1896) who were appreciative of British diplomatic umbrella and military aid, associated themselves with imperialism, but were resentful of the humanitarian opinion of Exeter Hall, and, especially, of the Aborigines Protection Society. They were champions of Anglo-Saxonism, and were often anti-Afrikaner. In the introduction to *Downfall of Lobengula*, Selous says: 'In conclusion, I will say that the political effect of the conquest of Matabeleland will tend to secure the eventual supremacy of the Anglo-Saxon in South Africa, for the Dutch States are now completely surrounded' (p. 12). The Afrikaner authors (du Toit 1887, Reitz 1900) on the other hand, concentrated on the wrongs endured by the Boers at the hands of the British, missionaries, and Africans. The major subjects of their 'logs' were the Black Circuits, Slaughter' Nek (1815), emancipation, the Great Trek, 'Dingane's War', British occupation of Natal, the Keate Award, Majuba, the Jameson Raid, and the Anglo-Boer War. Their central theme was that of a 'chosen people', God-loving and peace-loving, who converted South Africa from a 'wilderness into the promised land', who treated slaves in the Cape Colony 'better' than 'in certain other British possessions, such as the West Indies', and were persecuted by the British owing to the ignorance of British secretaries of state of the local affairs of a continent six thousand miles beyond the range of their experience and comprehension' and to the 'conspiracy of deception' by local imperial agents and, especially, missionaries who were 'indiscriminating champions of everything native'. English settlers, Rhodes, and the BSAC were

generally treated as agents of British imperialism; and Africans as traitors and allies of the British through the missionaries. Thus, Afrikaner historiography of this period reflects a mixture of Calvinism, persecution-complex, frontiersmanship and racism.

Both English-speaking and Afrikaner historiographies of the second period were mainly predicated upon the prevailing situational factors. The settlers were then confronting the characteristic fragment problems of self-identity and self-determination in an alien and hostile environment. They needed not only historians but also a distinctive historical folklore of their own, one that would be the basis of their brand of colonialism and would give meaning and purpose to white individuals as well as motivate them into active participation. The political leaders even went to the extent of appointing 'official historian laureates' (e.g. Theal for the Cape Colony, Richard Hall and then Hugh Marshall Hole for Southern Rhodesia). Like the missionaries, colonialist historians also investigated the pre-colonial African past. They wrote on the Bantu migrations, the Zulu Revolution, Mfecane, the Zimbabwe civilization, Nguni migrations, and slave trading—the major subjects of African history today.

But their treatment of African history was characterized by negative historiography. Their objectives were (a) to write a lily-white history of southern Africa, (b) to disrobe the African of his history, cultural heritage and humanity, and (c) to emphasize racial struggle as the central theme of southern African history.

A typical case in point has been the colonialist historiography of the Zimbabwe civilization.²³ The spectre of the 'Zimbabwe ruins' and the fact that the indigenous Shona people they had intended to colonize forever claim to have developed the civilization have always haunted the more diehard settlers of Rhodesia. Therefore, their 'historian laureates' have struggled to prove foreign origins of the 'ruins' (Hall, 1905, 1909; Paver, 1957; and Bruwer, 1965). According to Hall, the Zimbabwe civilization was 'the importation of Asiatic culture in its most perfect form consequent upon the exploitation of Rhodesia for gold by Arabs, Persians and Indians in pre-historic times'.²⁴ Bruwer claims that.

the Phoenicians, the most famous traders, miners, mariners, builders, inventors, manufacturers and colonizers of their time, were responsible for the breath-taking effort which turned Rhodesia topsy-turvy a few centuries before and a few centuries after the commencement of the Christian era.²⁵

The Semites are supposed to have settled in Rhodesia and initiated both mining and stone-building between 2000 and 1000 B.C. They then dominated the historical development of 'Rhodesia' from about 2000 B.C. to A.D. 900.

By A.D. 900, we are told, the Bantu arrived and brought about the tragic extinction of the Semitic race and the inevitable 'Kaffirization' of the Zimbabwe civilization. The Semites, we are told, were either 'exterminated by Kaf-firs', absorbed into the Negroid race through intermarriage, or wiped out by endemic tropical diseases. In the end they lost both their physical identity and their superior culture:

The Zimbabwe culture shared the inevitable fate of all civilizations imported on to the African continent, whether at Carthage or Egypt. So long as the foreign connection was sustained so long did they exist, but on the connection being disturbed, certain overburden and subsequent oblivion were their inevitable fate.²⁶

The supposed period of Bantu dominance, which Hall determines to be from A.D. 900 to 1650, became the 'Bastard Period'.

Thus, both British and Afrikaner historians transformed the pseudo-scientific racism and cultural chauvinism of nineteenth-century Europe into a settler ideology, which in turn explained and fortified the colonial process itself. They treated the historical process as mere racial struggle between white superiors and 'natives', good guys and bad guys, and between life and death (Leyds, 1906; Bell, 1909; Evans, 1916; Preller, 1930, 1937; and Cronje, 1945, 1946, 1947). Archibald R. Colquhoun, the first BSAC administrator in Mashonaland, stated in *The Afrikaner Land* that 'To deny this law of the [English/Afrikaner] solidarity of national racial life is to shut one's eyes to the whole trend of history' (p. 7). He was 'utterly averse to the idea of race miscegenation'. He and his fellow-English historians were advocating the so-called 'clean slate theory'—reconciliation of English/Afrikaner rivalries for an 'undivided and unqualified South African patriotism'.²⁷ To them the 'Black Problem' was 'the first, the greatest, and the most pressing of all the difficult questions that arise'.²⁸ They were then, like the Afrikaner, critical of the 'ruthless and unscrupulous agents of [British] imperialism', such as Chamberlain and Milner (McCord, p. 13), of missionary education and of urbanization of the African.

Afrikaner historians, however, only partially responded to the English historians' 'clean slate theory'. First, they wanted to correct English historiography of the preceding era, which had 'misrepresented' them, by rewriting southern African history from the Afrikaners' point of view (e.g. Leyds, Cronje, Preller). They updated the themes created by their predecessors, and provided new bibliographies and footnotes. British imperialism was still treated as 'a record of astonishing mistakes', with emphasis on 'methods of barbarism', treachery, and on missionaries as trouble-making negrophiles.

But their predominant target was then the African. Like that of the English historians, their historiography was predicated upon racial consciousness,

and written with a we-told-you-so attitude towards the English. They strove not only to disrobe the African of history, but also to prove that the Afrikaners were the first inhabitants of South Africa. 'The Kaffirs were invaders from the north, and did not appear upon the scene until the Cape Colony had been occupied for over a hundred years';²⁹ became the focal mythology of their historiography, which has been perpetrated to this day.³⁰ The current twist is the new emphasis on 'Bantu tribalism' in contrast to white solidarity. The Afrikaners, English, Jews, Germans, and even Japanese are treated as constituting one ethnic national white community, while the Africans are subdivided into the Zulu, Xhosa, Sotho, Tswana, Tonga and Pedi. Then, as Rhoodie, a student of Cronje, says in *Apartheid and Racial Partnership in Southern Africa* (1969), 'From the above it is clearly inferable that the white group is, numerically speaking, the largest ethno-national community in South Africa, thus contradicting the common belief that the whites constitute a minority.'³¹ To him, as to his predecessors, history is still a 'racial struggle' (p. 7).

In the third period, English colonialist historiography of South Africa has been overshadowed by Afrikaner. But the Rhodesian one has been perpetrated to this day. The historiography of Bruwer's *Zimbabwe*, A. J. Peck's *Rhodesia Condemns* (1968), Desmond Lardner-Burke's *Rhodesia: The Story of Crisis* (1966), and Lewis H. Gann's *A History of Southern Rhodesia* (1965) is essentially the same as that of Hole's *The Making of Rhodesia* (1926) and Hall's *Pre-Historic Rhodesia* (1909). The obvious difference is in the subtler methods of selection, omission and presentation, as well as the aspiration to accuracy of details of Gann and to a lesser extent Hole, as opposed to the cruder methods of invention, argumentation and documentation of Hall, Peck, Bruwer and Lardner-Burke.

The liberal revisionist tradition

The roots of current revisionist historiography go back to the late nineteenth-century humanitarian culture of Europe, and especially to the 'Cape liberal tradition' exemplified by the Cape Franchise, the South African Institute of Race Relations, the South African National Congress, the Liberal Party (South Africa), the United Federal Party (Rhodesia and Nyasaland), and by John X. Merriman, Jan Hofmeyr, Garfield Todd and Albert Luthuli.³² Its basic force has always been a southern African liberalism of Africans, coloureds, Asians and whites, who have sought to ameliorate racial discrimination and to extend equal rights to 'all civilized men' through the existing colonialist parliamentary system. As stated by Alfred Hoernle in *South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit* (1939), it was a liberalism that fell short of the 'dream world' of the 'Great Society of All Mankind, with a world-religion,

a world-culture, and perhaps a world-language advocated by philanthropist missionaries and Aboriginists'. Instead, it devised 'another way of conceiving the ideal of universality' in a 'race-ridden' world of southern Africa (p. xii).

The white liberals were first and foremost 'Europeans' and colonizers. Together with the imperial, colonialist and missionary historians, they studied history with a Euro-centric view of people 'in possession of political power, privileged social status, economic and cultural superiority, in a land the majority of the inhabitants of which are non-Europeans, over whom they have gained mastery by conquest' (Hoernle, p. xii and xiii). As Hoernle stated, the liberals were committed to white supremacy owing to the belief that 'no development can take place in South Africa, except with the consent of the dominant white group' (p. 167), and that both cultural assimilation and adult suffrage would cause the 'displacement' of 'a higher culture' by 'one more primitive' (p. 165).

Their historiography has been characterized mainly by socio-political criticism, based on the belief expressed in Leo Marquard's *Liberalism in South Africa* that 'the custodian of civil liberty is the minds of men and women' (p. 52). In the first period, liberal historiography, like that of the abolitionists and philanthropic missionaries, was concerned with the materialism, destruction and brutality of settler colonialism and appeals for imperial trusteeship. For example, in *History of the Zulu War and its Origin* (1880), Frances E. Colenso was denouncing the war (p. 7):

England's collisions with savage races bordering upon her colonies have in all probability usually been brought about by the exigencies of the moment, by border-troubles, and acts of violence and insolence on the part of the savages, and from the absolute necessity of protecting a small and trembling white population from their assaults.

'No such causes' led to the Zulu War, she said (p. 1). According to her (and subsequent revisionists), Sir Bartle Frere 'produced' the war because the 'subjugation of the Zulus and the annexation of their country formed part of a policy which had occupied the minds of certain British statesmen for many years' (p. 7). The scare in Natal, she said, was 'forced' upon the settlers by 'a certain section of the colonists' who wanted booty, land and labour, and by 'young lads' who were 'simply dazzled by visions of military distinctions, excited by the popular phrases in perpetual use about fighting for their country, and doing their duty as soldiers' (p. 6). She denounced the Langalibelele episode, and the invasion of the Mangwe people, who had been 'attacked, killed and taken prisoners', and stripped of their possessions 'without even the shadow of reason for such treatment' (p. 63). Olive Schreiner, who 'never once met Rhodes without a royal fight' and was as concerned about Africans as she was about wild beasts and fauna, denounced the 'material civilization',

the destruction, and brutality of Rhodes and the BSAC in *Trooper Peter Halket of Mashonaland* (1897).³³

In the second period, African and liberal historiographies were very similar. Jabavu's *The Black Problem* reads like Hoernle's *South African Native Policy* or Lord Oliver's *The Anatomy of African Misery* (1927). Like the Africans', liberal historiography was characterized by a present-mindedness, and an emphasis on colonial laws and administrations and on the 'impact of white domination on the non-European population'. The liberals, like the Africans, were particularly distressed by the 'disquieting departure' to apartheid in South Africa.

They investigated bills, statutes, reports, and books for facts, motives, and theories to expose and explain the black problem, e.g. E. H. Brookes, *The History of Native Policy in South Africa Until 1924* (1927); C. W. de Kiemiet, *A History of South Africa* (1941), and W. M. Macmillan, *Bantu, Boer and Briton* (1963). According to Olivier, white racism was based on 'evil principles of slave-theory and capitalist exploitation' derived from five 'fear-complexes' of job competition, reverse discrimination, miscegenation, Africanization, and political control (p. 208–26). In *Race Attitudes in South Africa*, MacCrone traced the historical and psychological factors, and in *Black Man's Burden* John Burger saw capitalist-imperialist forces at work. Some, like Monica Wilson in *Reaction to Conquest* (1936), Isaac Schapera in *Western Civilization and Natives of South Africa* (1937), and Ray E. Phillips in *The Bantu in the City* (1937), were concentrating on effects. Others, like David Randall-MacIver in *Medieval Rhodesia* (1906), and Gertrude Caton-Thompson in *The Zimbabwe Culture: Ruins and Reaction* (1931), were countering colonialist attempts to disrobe the African of history; but as stated in *The Zimbabwe Controversy* (p. 123), they primarily supplanted the Semitic by the Hametic myth.

As a group, the liberals adopted problem-oriented and interdisciplinary approaches to provide historical outlines and academic analysis or contemporary issues, controversies and conventions. Given their Euro-centric cultural orientation, they were not interested in 'pre-European native culture' *per se*, nor in African traditions and points of view. They applied European social science theories to explain an African-based historical process, while relegating the Africans to the role of 'natives' and objects of the European 'civilizing process'. Thus, culture contact became a one-way process of 'Westernization' in which the African was either civilized or tribal, educated or raw, urban or rural, Christian or pagan, without an exchange, let alone Africanization (Wilson, 1936; Schapera, 1937; Phillips, 1937). African responses to colonialism that had no known precedents in European culture and no theories to explain them (e.g. Ethiopianism) often were treated as deviant, primitive, millenarian and/or irrational.

Current revisionism: summary and conclusion

The group that constitutes revisionists is a conglomeration of black, Asian, coloured, and white, of southern African and foreign, of capitalist, Marxist, and socialist, and of locally-based and exile scholars. The majority are young university-trained and professional historians, specializing in African studies.³⁵ The revisionists are now pursuing an integrationist historiography that treats southern African history as the result of a give-and-take interaction among blacks, whites, coloureds and Asians—people of diverse origins, languages, technologies, ideologies and social systems. They are attempting to counter the pseudo-scientific cultural chauvinism of their forbearers, the racist exclusivity of colonialist historians, and also the present-mindedness and ‘emotionalism’ of the nationalists.³⁶ They have improved upon colonialist terminology from ‘natives’ to Africans, blacks or ‘non-Europeans’, from ‘tribes’ to groups or societies, and from ‘pagans’, ‘savages’, ‘primitives’ to traditionalists or peasants.

Revisionism, however, is not only a new phenomenon, it also reflects the racio-colonialist realities of southern Africa. Currently, the vast majority of the revisionists are white. The most senior revisionists (e.g. Monica Wilson, Leo Marquard, J. S. Marais, Terence Ranger, Leonard Thompson, and Leo and Hilda Kuper) are what Philip Curtin has called ‘re-treads’:³⁷ scholars originally specialized in European studies who switched to African studies after the Second World War. The ‘re-treads’ deserve credit and respect for their pioneering work and for training young revisionists.

But, given their colonial upbringing and training, they essentially have perpetrated the ‘intellectual and emotional self-discipline’ of the Cape liberal tradition.³⁸ Their prefaces and introductions are often full of claims to truth, accuracy, scientific methodology, objectivity (unemotional disinterestedness), and historical perspective. Some of them avoid topics like African nationalism, Pan-Africanism, and liberation movements on the grounds that the topics are too much with us and, thus, too controversial; and they discourage a Zulu, Shona, or Bemba revisionist from writing about his group because he would not be ‘objective’. Others place emphasis on scholarly training and experience to the extent of excluding black scholars at their symposia and from contributing to edited volumes, on the paternalistic grounds that the blacks are not ‘qualified enough’.

Undoubtedly, the historical profession has a responsibility to maintain the integrity of scholarly standards, to prevent the perversion of history into special pleading, and to ask the advancement of knowledge beyond the colonialist or nationalist needs of the moment. But there is always the danger of grandstanding, alienation, and irrelevance in too much intellectualism. There is also the danger of these senior white revisionists playing a colonialist

role as 'intellectual District Commissioners' in their interactions with African 'native' scholars. Furthermore, it is possible for them to perpetuate (intentionally or not) the presumed 'identity of interests' between white liberals and African élites that proved hallucinatory during the first and second periods and, thus, stifle the emergent African historical consciousness.

More importantly, all revisionists ought to be sensitive to the fact that the very archives, diaries, reports, and monographs we depend on for 'scientific evidence' have themselves been distorted by the intervening historiographical traditions we have discussed, especially in southern Africa, where the prejudices of the colonizer and the exigencies of colonial administrations have determined what was to be recorded and where it was to be stored. Thus our historical insight and usefulness should stem, not from mere reliance on records of the past and from cold-blooded 'objectivity', but from our deepest commitment to the history, people and region about which we are writing. Our ability to judge with honesty, fairness and balance should be predicated equally upon our integrity as upon our intellectual training and seniority, because it requires humility and the mitigation of our fears and prejudices stemming from our cultural rather than academic personalities.

In conclusion, both the historical process and the historiography of colonial southern Africa have been predicated upon white supremacy on one hand, and African/liberal opposition to it on the other, resulting in divergent traditions and lack of communication among the scholars. Current revisionism seemingly is a good beginning of a wholesome historiography. Its success, however, depends on the interest and commitment of the scholars. The following projections for the future direction of southern African historiography should be taken as suggestive.

We need (1) to correct the pseudo-scientific and exclusive historiography of the colonialists, as well as review the 'Bantuism' of the missionaries. We need (2) to guard against both Euro-centric and Afro-centric historiography and to establish the theme that history is the interaction over time among peoples of diverse origins, and that its base was much more diversified than its Euro-centric superstructure. Allen Isaacman's *Mozambique* is certainly a good beginning. In this respect, we need to be critical of our personal judgements, since we have seen from this essay the correlation between the historical and cultural experiences of the historian and his historiography.

Then (3) we should emphasize the most recent revisionist intellectual thought, methodology and terminology, and expose our new findings to each other, to teachers, students and laymen. We need (4) to develop more symposia, such as this meeting on the historiography of southern Africa, and more inter-personal and inter-university exchanges among blacks, coloureds, Asians and whites, and among senior and junior, locally-based and exile scholars. We should (5) expand our horizon beyond major events and colourful indi-

viduals to the cultural, diplomatic, legal, literary, musical, religious and artistic aspects of southern African history; and beyond blacks and whites to the historical contributions of coloureds and Asians.³⁹

We need (6) to conduct extensive collection of oral data on past and contemporary events, and from big and small societies, before the traditions perish. Simultaneously, we should avoid the pitfalls of over-specialization or provincialism (South Africa, Botswana, Malawi, etc.) at the expense of the regional congruity and uniqueness of southern Africa. The major episodes, such as the Zimbabwe civilization, Mfecane, Great Trek, contract labour and African nationalism, were regional rather than provincial. As we have seen, all the historiographical traditions we have discussed also treated history regionally. In short, we need a historiography that is integrated, factual, analytical and scholarly, as well as humanistic and relevant.

Notes

-
1. I have not discussed the traditions of Mozambique and Angola—only because of my limited ability to translate Portuguese—and I am hoping that there will be full presentation of those traditions at this meeting on the historiography of southern Africa. For a bibliography on Angola and Mozambique consult Gerald J. Bender, *Portugal in Africa*, Los Angeles, 1972; Instituto de Angola, *Boletim bibliografico*; Margaret J. Greenwood, *Angola: A Bibliography*, Cape Town, 1967; and Mario Augusto da Costa, *Bibliografia geral de Mozambique*, Lisbon, 1946.
 2. As far as I can ascertain, this is the first attempt to discuss the historiography of southern Africa on a regional basis. There have been reviews of the colonialist and revisionist traditions of South Africa. See, for example, Leonard M. Thompson, 'Afrikaner Nationalist Historiography', *Journal of African History (J.A.H.)*, Vol. III, No. 1, 1962, p. 125-41; F. A. van Jaarsveld, *The Afrikaner's Interpretation of South African History*, Cape Town, 1964; Shula Marks, 'African and Afrikaner History', *J.A.H.*, Vol. XI, No. 3, 1970, p. 435-47; Martin Legassick, 'The Dynamics of Modernization in South Africa', *J.A.H.*, Vol. XIII, No. 1, 1972, p. 145-50; Stanley Trapido, 'South Africa and the Historians', *African Affairs*, Vol. 71, October 1972, p. 444-59; and Lewis H. Gann, 'Liberal Interpretations of South African History', *Rhodes-Livingstone Journal*, Vol. XXV, March 1959, p. 40-58. I would like to caution the reader not to perceive this discussion as a castigation of our forbearers, but as an exercise in professional self-criticism and house-cleaning. The books have been selected for representation and illustration of traditions, and not because they were necessarily the best or worst in their tradition.
 3. Arthur Percival Newton, *Select Documents Relating to the Unification of South Africa*, p. xxvii, London, 1968, originally published in 1924.
 4. William Gresweel, *Our South African Empire*, London, 1885, p. xv.
 5. See H. Alan C. Cairns, *The Clash of Cultures*, New York, 1965; and David Chanaiwa, *The Zimbabwe Controversy*, Syracuse, 1973.
 6. See, for example, Robert Moffat, *Missionary Labors and Scenes in Southern Africa*. New York, 1969; and François Coillard, *On the Threshold of Central Africa*, London, 1971.

7. Cairns, op. cit., p. xii.
8. Moffat, Rhodesia National Archives, MO/5/1/1.
9. Coillard, op. cit., p. 381.
10. Donald Frazer, *Winning a Primitive People*, Westport, Conn., 1970, p. 7.
11. Robert U. Moffat, *John Smith Moffat*, New York, 1969; and David Carnegie, *Among the Matabele*, London, 1894.
12. John Philip, *Researches in South Africa*, New York, 1969, Vol. II, p. 327; and John Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, New York, 1969, Vols. I and II.
13. Henri A. Junod, *The Life of a South Africa Tribe*, London, 1927, p. 8.
14. Henri P. Junod, *Bantu Heritage*, Westport, Conn., 1970, preface.
15. A. T. Bryant, *The Zulu People as They Were Before the White Man Came*, New York, 1970, p. xi.
16. See Daniel Kunene, *The Beginning of South African Vernacular Literature*, Los Angeles, 1967.
17. See R. Hunt Davis, 'John L. Dube: A South African Exponent of Booker T. Washington', *Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 4, December 1975; Shula Marks, 'The Ambiguities of Dependence: John L. Dube of Natal', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2, April 1975, p. 162-80; Manning Marable, 'A Black School in South Africa', *Negro History Bulletin*, Vol. 37, No. 4, June/July 1974, p. 258-61. Also Peter Walshe, *The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa*, Berkeley, 1971; and T. O. Ranger, *The African Voices in Southern Rhodesia*, London, 1970.
18. Davidson Don Tengo Jabavu, *The Black Problem. Papers and Addresses on Various Native Problems*, Cape Town, 1920, p. 16.
19. *ibid.*, p. 1.
20. *ibid.*, preface.
21. Solomon T. Plaatje, *Native Life in South Africa*, New York, 1969, p. 15.
22. The historiography of both the first and second periods significantly differs from that of the Africans after the Second World War who were influenced by African nationalism, historical consciousness, and a liberationist ideology. See, for example, Nosipho Majeke, *The Role of the Missionary in Conquest*, Johannesburg, 1952; and Mnguni, *Three Hundred Years*.
23. For the major works of the forerunners of the diffusionist school consult James Theodore Bent, *The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland*, London, 1893; Alexander Wilmot, *Monomotapa*, London, 1896; Richard N. Hall, *Great Zimbabwe, Mashonaland, Rhodesia*, London, 1905, and *Pre-Historic Rhodesia*, Philadelphia, 1909. Also Bertram G. Paver, *Zimbabwe Cavalcade*, London, 1957; and Andries J. Bruwer, *Zimbabwe, Rhodesia's Ancient Greatness*, Johannesburg, 1965.
24. Hall, *Pre-Historic Rhodesia*, op. cit., p. 478.
25. Bruwer, op. cit., p. 140.
26. Hall, op. cit., p. 479.
27. J. J. McCord, *South African Struggle*, Pretoria, 1952, p. 1.
28. Archibald R. Colquhoun, *The Africander Land*, London, 1906, p. xiv.
29. W. J. Leyds, *The First Annexation of the Transvaal*, London, 1906, p. 27.
30. See, for example, N. J. Rhoadie and H. J. Venter, *Apartheid*, Pretoria, 1960; and Jan Botha, *Verwoerd is Dead*.
31. N. J. Rhoadie, *Apartheid and Racial Partnership in Southern Africa*, Pretoria, 1969, p. 8.
32. See R. F. Alfred Hoernle, *South African Native Policy and the Liberal Spirit*, Cape Town, 1939; and Janet Robertson, *Liberalism in South Africa*, London, 1971.

33. See also Olive Schreiner, *Thoughts on South Africa*, Oxford, 1901, and *An English South African View of the Situation*, London, 1899.
34. See also I. D. MacCrone, *Race Attitudes in South Africa*, London, 1937; John Augustus Ian Agar-Hamilton, *The Native Policy of the Voortrekkers*, Cape Town, 1928; Monica Wilson, *Reaction to Conquest*, Oxford, 1936; Isaac Schapera (ed.), *Western Civilization and the Natives of South Africa*, London, 1937; John Burger, *The Black Man's Burden*, London, 1943; and Ray E. Phillips, *The Bantu in the City*, Cape Town, 1937.
35. See, for example, Henry S. Maebelo, *Reaction to Colonialism*, Manchester, 1971; and Allen F. Isaacman, *Mozambique: The Africanization of a European Institution*, Madison, Wis., 1972.
36. See, for example, Leonard Thompson's criticism of Majeke and Mnguni in 'Afrikaner Nationalist Historiography', p. 133, footnote 22.
37. Philip D. Curtin, 'African Studies: A Personal Assessment', *African Studies Review*, Vol. XIV, No. 3, December 1971, p. 361.
38. Recent reviews of Wilson's and Thompson's *Oxford History of South Africa*, Vol. II, Oxford, 1971, Van Jaarsveld's *Awakening of Afrikaner Nationalism*, London, 1961, Walshe's *Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa*, and Helmut Bley's *South West Africa Under Vermer Rule*, Evanston, 1971, for instance, have all commented that the books were unusually well-documented and footnoted, but also that the authors either ignored or Europeanized the Africa side of the story, and made little use of African oral traditions.
39. See, for example, J. S. Marais, *The Cape Coloured People*, London, 1939; and Bridglai Pachai, *The International Aspects of the South African Indian Question*, Cape Town 1971.

Comments on recent historical writings concerning Angola and Mozambique

René Pélissier

Of all the territories of southern Africa, Angola and Mozambique are the ones which have the twofold particularity of having been in contact longest with the world outside Africa and of being the two countries which probably stand in greatest need of myth-dispelling historians. To be quite clear, it should be stated from the outset that the few remarks set out below make no claim whatsoever to completeness. Who would dare to make such a claim? Nor are they meant as a bitter criticism of what exists; rather they seek above all to identify a number of trends in historical writing over the last half century. Neither the Angolans nor the Mozambicans are responsible for certain deficiencies which will be pointed out; on the contrary, they will have to suffer the consequences of them for a long time yet, despite all the goodwill that is presumably theirs.

Portugal is a country with a small population speaking a language which is still not very familiar to foreign Africanists. Moreover, its nationals went to Africa not to cultivate literature there but indeed to carve a better destiny for themselves than they had known in their homeland. It is therefore to the credit of certain Portuguese writers that they have done so much with so little means and in an atmosphere of indifference, since they could hardly expect academic advancement because colonial history, and a *fortiori* African history, were practically never taught in their institutions of higher learning. Nor, with very rare exceptions, could they look for any financial benefit. We shall therefore find a host of well-meaning amateurs who generally lack training in history, with the exception of some who were in good standing with the previous regime (1926–74). That regime had practically isolated Portuguese Africa, and since its predecessors were established at a time when intellectual exchanges with Africa were few, a search through Portuguese historical bibliography shows it to be behindhand to an extent that only specialists can appreciate.

Generally speaking, erudite works—leaving out of consideration memoirs, formal statements, eye-witness testimony, accounts of military campaigns, administrative reports, etc.—concerning Portuguese-speaking Africa may be divided qualitatively into two broad categories: works by Portuguese and those by foreign authors, since the place that should be filled by Portuguese-speaking

African writers has been left woefully empty thus far. With a few honourable exceptions, those in the first category are lordly amateurs perfectly typified by the missionary with leisure time and official funds at his disposal, or the administrative officer interested in old papers that have survived the carelessness of human beings and the voracity of termites. It will come as a surprise to nobody to learn that in both cases the results of their work is a history, or rather a colonial chronicle, which confines itself to exalting the glorious ancestors of the colonists and the civilizing mission of the metropolitan country. Such writers attribute qualities to Africans only to the extent that those qualities serve to enhance those of the conqueror.

Thus the courage of the Ovambo and the Nguni peoples is recognized because it serves to recall that of Major Alves Roçadas, of General Pereira de Eça, of Mousinho de Albuquerque and other 'heroes' of the António Enes *escol*. In this way the monarchy and the first two republics were able to build up without much effort a gallery of eponymic heroes whose names adorned not only street signs, but also served to designate capitals of districts and many more humble townships. (Out of sixteen district capitals in Angola in 1974, four had African toponyms, and eight had been given the names of what were formerly called the 'great colonists', in this case four officers, three statesmen and an explorer-businessman. The other four were called after a metropolitan saint and three Portuguese toponyms.) There is no better way of dispossessing people of their history than by giving them the names of the conquerors of their forefathers for their addresses.

In other words, this way of writing history from the colonial point of view would be laughable in its unremitting ethnocentricity were it not for the serious defect of overlooking the role of Africans. For most of these writers there is no salvation outside the Christian European model. Is it any wonder then that most historians are ignorant of even the name of King Bumba in the Cassange (nineteenth century) or, nearer to our time, King Mandume of the Cuanhama (died 1917), men who, had they found English-speaking or French-speaking historians, would have been looked upon as African resistance fighters of the calibre of Gungunhana or the Cruz family in Mozambique, who have been 'rediscovered' by Anglo-American writers.

Studied ethnocentrism is thus the first flaw in these works, but for those on the inside it is not the most disturbing one. The great deficiency in regard to Portuguese works lies in the fact that these writers have hitherto never concerned themselves seriously with the contemporary period. If we had suitable bibliographies available, we should probably find that for every ten books and articles devoted to the period before 1800 there were only one or two Portuguese historical studies on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Until quite recently Portuguese history books devoted about half or even two-thirds of their pages to what preceded Portugal's Babylonian captivity, in other words the period

from 1580 to 1640. All the rest was submerged under the waves of decadence, with a few peaks emerging here and there, the beginning of the nineteenth century being regarded as the bottom of the barrel and light reappearing only well into the twentieth century. This outlook is naturally changing, and a work like the *História de Portugal* by Oliveira Marques (Lisbon, 1973) marks a healthy turning point. Nevertheless, as regards Africa, the evil has already been perpetrated and has marked generations of African intellectuals.

Take the *História de Angola* by Ralph Delgado (Benguela and Lobito, 1948–55), the fourth and last volume of which stops at 1737; the *História de Angola* by Noberto Gonzaga (Luanda, n.d.) which out of 380 pages devotes—if that verb applies—only some sixty to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; the *Resumo da História de Angola*, by José Ribeiro da Cruz (Lisbon, 1940), which allocates a tenth of its text to the period 1800–1940; or the *História de Angola* by Alberto de Lemos (Luanda, 1929), the first and only general work to have been written by an Angolan: in all these works we find the same pride of place accorded to the period of the initial conquest, while the fact that the real and complete conquest took place only in the twentieth century is deliberately ignored. This chronological disequilibrium is somewhat less dramatic as regards Mozambique, since the only Portuguese textbook of any value—essentially military and exclusively from the Portuguese point of view—namely the *História Militar e política dos Portugueses em Moçambique*, Vol. II, by General Teixeira Botelho (Lisbon, 1936) provides a volume of over 700 pages for the period 1833–1930.

In short, Portuguese writers were only rarely or superficially interested in the history of the Africans, and they did not even establish any bases for the historiography of the most significant period so far as understanding present problems is concerned. This distortion has long enabled writers who have lost the clarity of their vision as a result of wearing blinkers to maintain that Portugal had been in possession of Angola and Mozambique for five centuries and that such long-standing ‘colonization’ founded its legitimacy on its antiquity. In reply, Africans, drawing on these truncated textbooks, asserted that they had suffered five centuries of slavery and exploitation. In other words, it is high time that Portuguese-speaking historians abandoned their stock phrases, brought themselves up to the scientific level reached by their neighbours and endeavoured to see things in proper perspective, unless they wish to leave the writing of recent history to foreign authors alone, a policy which would seem dangerous in any country.

Having sufficiently stressed these two defects in Portuguese historical writing, we should by no means conclude that everything produced in this field is mediocre or dull, for while it is true that Angola and Mozambique have had very few competent Portuguese-speaking historians, they have, on the other hand, had zealous compilers whose activity was fragmentary and scattered,

yet meritorious in many ways. We might even go so far as to say that had the Portuguese archivists been as liberal and as thorough with respect to the recent period as they were for their favourite centuries, they would hold a unique place in African historiography.

It will suffice to mention a few recent titles (within the last fifty years) of collections of documents, several of which have no equivalent in other countries, at least so far as their breadth is concerned. As regards Angola, the *Arquivos de Angola*, published sporadically, contain—and this is unusual—documents which spill over into the twentieth century. Similarly useful for that country are the gigantic collections of the *Monumenta Missionaria Africana: Africa Occidental* (first and second series) by Father António Brásio, who is well known to western Africanists. He is also to be credited with five volumes of texts, with commentary, on the Holy Ghost missionaries in Angola in the nineteenth century, under the title of *Spiritana. Monumenta Historica. Angola* (Leuven, 1966–71) and a volume of documents on the Congregation's great man in the Portuguese Congo (and in Mozambique): *Dom António Barroso. Missionário, Cientista Missiólogo* (Lisbon, 1961). It is to Albuquerque Felner, former governor in southern Angola, that we owe a large volume: *Angola. Apontamentos sobre a Ocupação e Início do Estabelecimento dos Portugueses no Congo, Angola e Benguela* (Coimbre, 1933) and three volumes on southern Angola: *Angola. Apontamentos sobre a Colonização dos Planaltos e Litoral do Sul de Angola* (Lisbon, 1940), which contain texts dating down to the middle of the nineteenth century. Lastly, so as to belie accusations of living in the past, the Angolan poet Fernandes de Oliviera received authorization to publish two volumes of annotated texts (nineteenth century) drawn from the colonial archives of Lisbon: *Angolana* (Lisbon, 1968 and 1972).

As regards Mozambique, the major event is still the bilingual edition (in Portuguese and English) published with the assistance of the National Archives of Rhodesia, of the *Documents on the Portuguese in Mozambique and Central Africa, 1497-1840* (Lisbon, 1961–71), the seventh and last volume of which comes down to 1560. We get a bit closer to the contemporary period with the *Documentação avulsa Moçambicana do Arquivo Histórico Ultramarino*, abridged by Francisco Santana (two volumes, Lisbon, 1964–67) which deals with the beginning of the nineteenth century. The collection *Relações de Moçambique Setecentista* by António Alberto de Andrade (Lisbon, 1955) contains texts on the last half of the eighteenth century. Carvalho Dias with his *Fontes para a História, Geografia e Comércio de Moçambique (Seculo Dezoito)* (Lisbon, 1954) and Montez in the journal *Moçambique, Documentário Trimestral* (Lourenço Marques, 1952–57) have also provided numerous documents relating to the eighteenth century.

This partial list enables us to see that, in addition to other collections of documents that are also interesting for African studies, Portuguese compilers

amassed more than thirty thousand and perhaps forty thousand pages of archive extracts in some forty years, which is an enormous achievement. Their effort suffered, however, from a lack of co-ordination and from the poor organization of colonial archives in the metropolitan country, not to mention the political censorship which governed the choice of texts to be reproduced. That censorship became more meddlesome and onerous as one approached the twentieth century, except, paradoxically, in the case of the military archivists, who cannot be too highly praised.

However this may be, the original work done and the syntheses compiled by Portuguese-speaking writers pale somewhat before the work of non-Portuguese professionals. The major reason for this is perhaps to be found in the disillusioned remark made by a very great Portuguese historian—of the period known as the Discoveries—who said recently: ‘The Portuguese do not like history; they only like its myths.’ It should be recalled again that serious historians were few and far between, since there were practically no professional opportunities in the field of colonial or African history (certainly not in Angola, though there may have been some marginal openings in Lourenço Marques).

Truly scientific works are therefore relatively rare and are concerned primarily with explorations, colonial expeditions and missions. Among the most useful books about Angola by modern writers, mention may be made first of all of Ralph Delgado, whose *História de Angola*, already referred to, though uncompleted at his death, is still a mine of information. His major work is still probably his impressive *Ao Sul do Cuanza* (two volumes, Lisbon, 1944), while *O Reino de Benguela* (Lisbon, 1945) and *A Famosa e Histórica Benguela* (Lisbon, 1940) make him an authority—subject to verification on certain points—as regards the centre and south of Angola up to 1940. Beginning as a journalist, he later became virtually a professional writer of patriotic history, though he was never crowned with laurels. Next we may mention Captain Gastao Sousa Dias, whose posthumous work *Os Portugueses em Angola* (Lisbon, 1959) covers the period down to 1815; and the missionary Silva Rego, who was considered almost an official historian in the final years of the colonial regime. He is the author of *A Dupla Restauração de Angola (1641–48)* (Lisbon, 1948) and, less detailed but more ambitious and popular, *O Ultramar Português no Século XVIII* (Lisbon, 1970) and *O Ultramar Português no Século XIX* (Lisbon, 1966). Silva Rego’s main claim to our gratitude is for founding and directing the Centro de Estudos Históricos Ultramarinos, whose journal *Studia* is well known to many Africanists—or, if not, deserves to be because, though it is dominated by missionary writers who are sometimes Americanists or Orientalists, it has published significant articles on Angola and Mozambique. The centre has also published more than seven volumes of Portuguese colonial history, among which are many of the collections of documents referred to above. In this connection, mention should necessarily be made of the Agência

Geral do Ultramar, till its demise in 1974, the publishing organ of the Overseas Ministry, whose publications varied in quality but did include some re-editions and an impressive list of works dealing with military matters.

Among the officer-historians, Colonel Hélio Felgas with his *História do Congo Português* (Carmona, 1958) deserves something better than oblivion, boldly going as it does beyond 1920. The same may be said of Lieutenant-Colonel Almeida Teixeira with his *Lunda* (Lisbon, 1948) and of the history of the conquest of the Dembos, compiled by Captain David Magno in his *Guerras Angolanas* (Oporto, 1934). General Ernesto Machado in his *No Sul de Angola* (Lisbon, 1956) has given us a serious study of the military crisis of 1914 in southern Angola. Leaving the officers behind, but still in the south, we find the useful work of Mendonça Torres, who, with his *O Distrito de Moçâmedes nas Fases da Origem e da Primeira Organização* (Lisbon, 1950), gives us a picture of regional colonial history, which however does not overshadow the very detailed *Ao Sul do Cuanza* by Ralph Delgado mentioned above. We might add the work *A Questão da Lunda* (Lisbon, 1966), by Eduardo dos Santos, which provides a diplomatic history for the north-east.

As for the resistance movement and nationalism of the Angolans, subjects which were naturally taboo for a long time, no comprehensive work of value has yet come to light, though there are hundreds of primary and secondary sources.

Passing on now to Mozambique, we find a much leaner harvest among the Portuguese-speaking writers, even though that country in the final years of colonialism had a professor of history working in the field. Practically everything that the Portuguese published on Lourenço Marques is the work of Alexandre Lobato with, *inter alia*, his *História da fundação de Lourenço Marquês* (Lisbon, 1948), *História do Presídio de Lourenço Marquês (1782-1799)* (two volumes, Lisbon, 1949 and 1960) and *Quatro Estudos e uma Evocação para a História de Lourenço Marquês* (Lisbon, 1961). This professor also worked on the Zambezi in his *Colonização Senhorial da Zambézia* (Lisbon, 1962), on the sixteenth century in his *A Expansão Portuguesa em Moçambique* (three volumes, Lisbon, 1954 and 1960), on the eighteenth century in his *Evolução Administrativa e Económica de Moçambique* (Lisbon, 1957), on Mozambique Island, on Sofala, on Niassa, with Mousinho de Albuquerque, etc. Lobato is undeniably the Portuguese writer with the most complete view of the colonial history of Mozambique.

In the same Luso-centrist vein, mention might also be made of two volumes by the administrator Almeida de Eça, who, with his *História das Guerras no Zambéze* (Lisbon, 1953-54), has published an amateur, but a clear-sighted, coherent and basic account of the victorious resistance of the Cruz family to Portuguese occupation in the nineteenth century. More ambitious in his encyclopaedic approach, Major Mello Machado ventures into a rather

neglected field, namely that of northern Mozambique, with his *Entre os Macuas de Angoche* (Lisbon, 1970).

Let us leave aside the unfortunate compilations by Mário Costa, Simões Alberto, Francisco Toscano and Júlio Quintinha and consider a writer of notable stature, one who is well known to Africanists in the West, Navy Commander Teixeira da Mota, who has given us with his *A Cartografia Antiga de Africa Central e a Travessia entre Angola e Moçambique, 1500-1860* (Lourenço Marques, 1964), a useful compendium of what is known about Portuguese explorations in southern Africa. Since he is a sailor who speaks many languages, he is remarkably well informed about what has been published abroad on his subject. This quality, which is rare among his compatriots who pride themselves on being historians, is shared by an ethnologist, Rita Ferreira, the author of bibliographical works but also of ethno-historical studies such as her *Etno-história e Cultura Tradicional do Grupo Angune (Nguni)* (Lourenço Marques, 1974) and even her *Povos de Moçambique. História e Cultura* (Oporto, 1975).

We shall conclude this inevitably very incomplete list (if only because hundreds of articles in Portuguese have been omitted) and turn now to foreign authors, practically all of whom write in English and French and who should therefore be better known to most Africanists, at least by reputation. We shall confine ourselves to merely giving the names of writers, beginning with Angola.

The Angolan Congo is particularly favoured by Belgians such as Bontinck, Guvelier and Jadin, who devote themselves to the Catholic missions, by the Franco-Portuguese writer Latour da Veiga Pinto, who studies diplomatic relations in the nineteenth century, by the French writer Balandier and the Franco-South African Randles, both of whom are experts in sociological history, and by the Englishman Anstey, who is well known for his work on British interests in the north-west. Another Englishman, Martin, has written an economic history of the Cabinda region.

The Angolan north-east and trade with Lunda have been the subject of serious study by the Belgian writer Vellut. In the British writer Birmingham the Moundu in northern Cuanza have found a historian who deals carefully with the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while the Cassange has an ethno-history, the only one so far as Angola is concerned, written by the American Miller, who also writes authoritatively about the Tschokwe.

In central Angola, the Ovimbundu are better known through the American missionary Childs, while the first acceptable Angolan regional history has been written about southern Angola by a British author, Clarence-Smith. Mention should also be made of the comprehensive work of the Belgian Vansina on the precolonial period, the study made by the American Samuels on education at the turn of the nineteenth century, and the history of the 'scramble for Africa' as seen by the Portuguese, written by the South African Axelsson, whom we find also writing about Mozambique. Likewise extremely

perspicacious and elegant are the British writer Hammond for everything concerning Portugal's renewed interest in Africa at the end of the monarchy, and the great American pioneer Duffy, not forgetting, of course, another Englishman, Boxer, the leading authority on the history of Portuguese expansion throughout the world.

Angolan nationalism is covered by the Americans Marcum and Wheeler, and by the French writer Pélissier, who has also written a work on the resistance movement and revolts in Angola in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a work which, even if lacking in more obvious merits, has at least its size to commend it (three volumes).

Going on to Mozambique, we find a good many foreign writers dealing with the outlying parts of the territory (e.g. Abraham, the English-speaking Africans Bhila, Mudenge, etc.) or with Livingstone's expeditions in Mozambique, but relatively few specialists on Mozambique itself. To the rather outdated compilations of the British writer McCall Theal we might, however, add the original works by the South African Axelson, the German Hoppe on administration in the seventeenth century, the American Smith on southern Mozambique, the German-speaking writer Schebesta, who treats of missions, and the remarkable studies by the American Alpers on the Yao people, trade in the north by the British writer Newitt and the American Isaacman on Zambezia and by the American Hafkin on the Swahili sultanates, as well as the thesis by the German Liesegang on the Nguni of Gaza and the work of Randles on the sixteenth century and the Monomotapa.

It is regrettable, be it said in passing, that Mozambique was practically omitted from Volume V of *The Cambridge History of Africa*, even though there are many English-speaking specialists on Mozambique in the nineteenth century. We may also mention Jackson-Haight and Warhurst, working on southern Africa, who have made a detailed study of diplomatic relations in the nineteenth century. The period of decolonization has thus far given rise to nothing very substantial, except for the work of Middlemas, from Great Britain, on Cabora Bassa.

To conclude this very sketchy summary, we should like to make a simple observation and formulate a wish. It is clear that there is a dichotomy between the historical writing of Portuguese authors, hitherto defensive and often archaic in its techniques and the more scientific work—though often distorted by exasperation with the overweening attitude of Lisbon—by foreign writers. Now that decolonization has been achieved, it would seem desirable to set bitterness aside henceforth and to make up for the time lost by Portuguese-speaking writers so that those who have been notably absent from these intellectual contests may speak out in their turn. It is indeed time that Portuguese-speaking Africans stopped leaving to others the task of writing about their past. It is therefore necessary and urgent to train Angolan and Mozambican

historians so that they may tell us how they view what they read in the books of others.

Suggestions for the improvement of Angolan and Mozambican historiography

Minimal programme

A complete inventory should be made of all works of interest historically, geographically, economically, sociologically, etc., to be found in all the libraries of Angola and Mozambique, which deal with those countries and their peripheral areas.

Starting from this nucleus and from the sketchy bibliographies already in existence (cf. the interesting efforts made in this regard by the Sociedade de Geografia de Lisboa), steps should be taken to compile two scientific national bibliographies including texts published in non-Portuguese languages. (An inventory of non-Portuguese libraries has enabled us to discover more than 800 titles of foreign works, 70-80 per cent of which have been omitted from the most complete Portuguese bibliographies on Angola and Mozambique.) This work should be carried out taking into account *inter alia* the collections of the British Museum, the Library of Congress and several other British, American, French, Netherlands, German, Italian, Brazilian, Soviet and other institutions, in addition to the Portuguese bibliographical material.

Foreign works on these two countries, unavailable locally, should be acquired as well as Portuguese works likewise missing from local libraries. Where original works cannot be procured, reproductions in various forms should be obtained. The same holds good for relevant articles.

The former isolation should be overcome by a bibliographical awareness of other African countries. For example: the basic texts should be acquired on English-speaking and French-speaking Africa, on Brazil and the Indian Ocean. Specialized reviews and history textbooks (African history, etc.) should also be made available.

Inventories of local archives should be continued and completed. If possible, reproduction facilities should be installed on the spot where they are accessible to readers.

A provisional textbook of national history should be written in Portuguese based on the most recent work that has been done and determining periods and sectors which are still obscure.

The aforesaid textbook should be adapted for use in primary and secondary schools, and national history should be developed as a school subject.

One or more professorships in African and national history should be established or re-established in higher education by calling upon available specialists wherever they may be found. Opportunities should be provided for specialists teaching in Luanda and Maputo to go on short courses.

Fellowships should be made available for graduate students to attend certain African research centres abroad.

A programme should be launched for the collection of oral traditions, both in the interior and on the periphery of the two territories. Simultaneously, manuscripts should be collected in African languages (see missions, Swahili families, etc.).

Administrative and other reports drawn up during the colonial period, which contain elements of ethno-history and sociology that cannot be found elsewhere in written form, should be widely circulated.

Museums of national history based upon existing collections should be set up or developed. Specialized museums might also be established (e.g. Museum of the War of Liberation in Maputo).

Expanded programme

A general guide to Luso-African studies should be prepared as an aid to rapid retrieval (for example, a complete listing of archives, libraries, conditions of access, nature of collections, list of specialists, periods and questions to be raised and investigated, etc.). The guide should be periodically updated to give the current state of affairs.

An international review of high scientific calibre should be founded so that future Angolan and Mozambican specialists may publish in Portuguese, side by side with their foreign colleagues. Such a review might be a decisive step towards the launching of Luso-African historical studies in Portuguese on a solid footing.

Certain basic texts should be reissued and/or translated by scientific institutes, on the basis of the bibliographies and the acquisitions to be made under the minimal programme.

Work should be started on the Portugal volume of the series 'Guide to the Sources of the History of Africa', published with aid from Unesco.

A coherent programme should be drawn up for archaeological excavation continuing work already done.

A general history of Angola and Mozambique should be prepared, extending to several volumes.

Part II
**Research and teaching
on the history
of southern Africa**

The experts invited to the meeting were asked to furnish details on the status of teaching and research work in the field of history in the different countries of southern Africa. The information they gave is reproduced in the pages following Professor Nyeko's paper. Readers are reminded that it was valid as of March 1977 and that there have been further developments since.

The importance of southern African history in the school curriculum: a synthesis

Balam Nyeko

Conventionally, southern Africa is defined as comprising the present Republic of South Africa, Namibia (South-West Africa), Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Mozambique and Angola. For the sake of completeness in terms of both history and present-day reality, however, it is clearly necessary to add Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Malawi and Zambia. The thematic unity binding the history of the entire region is sufficiently strong to justify the adoption of this latter definition. From the Iron Age to the era of the African liberation movements there has been a marked continuity in the themes common to the history of this area. The early Bantu movements and settlement, the nineteenth-century Mfecane revolution among African communities, the mineral revolution and its aftermath, European imperialism and the African response to colonialism (including African efforts at ending white domination) are all historical developments that embrace the whole region and dictate a need to treat the area as one. This seems equally true of the problems we propose to tackle—and the main lines of research we shall suggest—in the rest of this paper.

Curriculum development—and in particular the place of history in this—has been a matter of concern to students of southern African history for some time. In his report to the then University of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland (UBLS) on the History Conference held in Gaborone, Botswana, 3-6 September 1973, Professor Thomas Tlou singled out as one of the objectives of that gathering the urgent need to provide historical data which could be used for the construction of more relevant and more meaningful history syllabuses for the schools of southern Africa. This was by no means the first or last time the point was made.

It has sometimes been suggested that the historian's chief task in his occupation should be the provision of such data through both his own original research and the interpretation of historical questions arising therefrom, as well as making available to a wider public a synthesis of existing information from other people's research.¹ It may be argued by some that the drawing up of school curricula falls strictly outside the historian's main area of concern. However, there is no denying that historians should indicate the relevance of the content of the subject they profess and in this way justify its inclusion

in the school curriculum. The rest of this paper therefore addresses itself to such questions as the nature of African history (especially in the context of southern Africa), the peculiarities of southern African historiography, the problems of teaching southern African history in schools and universities and the difficulty of Africanizing southern African history in the light of the recent changes in the writing and teaching of African history elsewhere on the continent. Out of all this, it is hoped that we shall not only demonstrate the importance of teaching southern African history as a course of study in institutions of learning, but also suggest possible lines of further inquiry that should help us achieve the objective of providing more relevant material in the way of subject content.

Towards a definition of African history

In the last quarter of the twentieth century it is patently anachronistic to ask whether such a thing as African history exists or not. It is now well over a decade since the detractors of African history—a chief among them Professor Trevor Roper of Oxford University—were effectively answered. Indeed, by the mid-1960s, the majority of scholars had agreed, to quote a leading East African scholar, that African history was an integral part of the study of mankind, and that no world history that omitted it could be complete.² What appears to have become a matter of some controversy in recent times, however, is what exactly one means by ‘African history’ and what one wants to emphasize in that subject. It is that history of the continent which ‘emphasizes African activity, African adaptation, African choice, African initiative’ and so on.³ How much importance should such history attach to the analysis of such phenomena as the role of the imperial factor in the colonial period and the activities of the white immigrant communities in certain parts of the continent?

The problem of defining African history seems to be particularly acute in respect of southern Africa, where matters are compounded by not only the deeply pluralistic nature of the population but also the very stark reality of the present political problems in the region. For here we have a situation in which the experience of the African population—the majority—was for a long time ignored by scholars working on the history of the region. In an effort to recover this aspect of southern African history—described by Leonard Thompson as ‘the forgotten factor’⁴—a number of works such as Thompson’s own *African Societies in Southern Africa* and the recent two-volume *Oxford History of South Africa* have, besides highlighting the dynamics of the internal history of the African peoples prior to white contact, laid great stress upon the theme of interaction. Thus, the term ‘forgotten factor’, while being capable of being interpreted as a reference to the history of the entire non-white population of

southern Africa, can in fact be narrowed down to the study of pre-conquest African societies in the region. This does not—and to our understanding is not intended to—provide a satisfactory definition of African history; for quite clearly African history continues right into the colonial and post-colonial period.

Attempts to Africanize the history of southern Africa do not seem to have met with great success as yet. If by Africanizing the history of the region one is referring to the giving of due prominence to African participation in the exercise of historical initiative, we seem to be still a long way from achieving that objective. To make this observation is not to denigrate the very significant contribution of scholars such as Omer-Cooper, Shula Marks and others whose works have kept the Africans truly 'centre-stage' of the events they describe.⁵ Yet there is the possibility, recently hinted at by Hyam, that Africanist historians, in an effort to restore the balance, may be tempted to argue that an Afro-centred history of southern African must deny that the imperial factor was of great significance in the total history of the African population here.⁶ Clearly, however, this would be unacceptable, as it would merely be echoing the same kind of argument marshalled by the now-discredited detractors of African history. As Hyam again points out, the only difference between the two arguments is that the Africanist historians would be implying that there was no history of European activities in Africa, while the earlier critics of African history had asserted that there was no history in Africa until the advent of the Europeans.⁷ On the other hand, it seems extremely difficult to make out a case for labelling as Afrocentred a study that deals or claims to deal with interaction between peoples of diverse origins, languages, technologies as the dominant theme in a society's history.

A definition recently suggested by two scholars seeks to combine both a geographical perspective and a concern with the 'local-centredness' of the history of Africa as two important features of African history. Thus Atmore and Marks have written:

By African history we mean the history of all the societies of Africa, whether black or white, based on the study of local evidence and from the vantage point of the local inhabitants, rather than that of the metropolitan centre.⁸

Implicit in the above characterization of African history is the relatively unimportant part allocated to the imperial factor—the metropolitan centre—in the past experience of the continent. Although this definition would no doubt suit many other regions in Africa, it is quite clear that it is one that is specially tailored for southern Africa, where the problem of black-white relationships has been particularly acute. It is a definition that would cater for the 'forgotten factor' and would seem to be the most appropriate for the moment. Moreover, in general, this definition does not seem to be at variance

with what Ogot proposed as 'the proper approach to African history' a few years back, which would seek to 'study how the different historical entities in the continent here evolved . . . and what have been the definable phases of growth in the evolutionary process'.⁹

The peculiarities of southern African historiography

In the introduction to the first volume of the *Oxford History of South Africa*, Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson have set out the characteristics that distinguish South African history from that of the rest of the continent.¹⁰ The task of analysing various aspects of South African history has all along been compounded by the rigidly stratified nature of South Africa's pluralist society. For the result has been that 'group focus' has loomed large in the existing historical literature about South Africa. What is purportedly the history of the whole region and the entire population has, by and large, been nothing more than a partisan defence of the points of view of one group *vis-à-vis* those of the rest. This was particularly true of Afrikaner-British relations during the nineteenth century. Thus, in the case of the Afrikaners a school of interpretation emerged in which the Afrikaner farmers assumed the posture of the wronged and viewed the British administrators as unwelcome meddlers in Afrikaner-African relations. On the other hand, the apologists for the British record in South Africa would insist that the British were merely being humanitarian and trying to clip the wings of the Afrikaners.¹¹ These extreme interpretations of South African history have generally died out, but the tendency to a somewhat narrow approach to Afrikaner-British relations still lingers on, presumably as a hangover from these earlier approaches. There is hardly any effort to consider the African dimension in these relations even in the more recent literature.¹²

The editors of the *Oxford History* also bemoan the fact that they and their collaborators in the work are all white people with a different outlook from that of the Africans who form the majority of the population about which they are writing. It can, in fact, be argued that the Africans themselves are not immune from the shortcoming that results from 'group focus' in the writing of southern African history. They, too, have their set of grievances against the white population as a whole; quite often the Africans' wrath has been directed against the Boers, regarded by some African groups as lesser evils than the British.¹³ A balanced treatment of South African history from the local African population has therefore not been easy to achieve. Given a heavy emotional investment of the African population in the current political struggles in the region, it would seem hardly realistic to expect them to do so. Other limitations include the lack of opportunities and financial resources for the African to engage in historical research.

If the preceding deals with South Africa rather than southern Africa as defined at the opening of this paper, it is because of the great influence the republic has exercised over its neighbours. That influence, in turn, provides one of the themes in southern African history which underline the importance of teaching the history of the region in schools and colleges. We should now turn to a consideration of the relevance of southern African history.

Southern African history in school and university curricula

The purposes of teaching or studying history at all have been outlined by various scholars, and it is not intended to repeat them here. Since some people in the independent African States especially have sometimes questioned the justification of investing large sums of money in teaching a 'non-productive' subject such as history in a State whose prime concern is 'development',¹⁴ a word or two on the importance of African history may be in order. History teaches us the past and in that way helps us to understand the present.¹⁵ It does not, of course, teach anyone to avoid the mistakes that were made by those who lived before us. In Africa today, in particular, the teaching of African history can be justified on a number of grounds other than its purely intellectual value. Not only have the governments of independent States emphasized the need for the digging up of information on Africa's past as a method of recovering Africa's dignity in the post-colonial period; they have also sought to emphasize that history should assume the characteristics of a nation-building subject. Thus, in the late 1960s, when Africa appeared to be overwhelmed by the disease of 'tribalism', some of the themes that history departments emphasized in African history were State formation, the creation of large political entities and the forging of a sense of unity, etc., trends which were particularly true of early nineteenth-century Africa. Consequently, the exploits of Chaka of the Zulu Kingdom, the nation-building techniques of Moshweshuwe of Lesotho as well as Sobhuza I and Mswati of Swaziland were emphasized. Those influences that tended to be divisive in African societies were given less prominence.¹⁶

In the past, African history was mainly political history: scholars of pre-colonial Africa researched into the origins of States or peoples, the evolution of their political systems; while those interested in the colonial period examined African efforts at modern political organization and the manner in which they 'won' their political independence from the metropolitan powers. In many cases African pre-colonial history amounted to little more than court history, since the data came from the royal courts and dealt specifically with the reigns of the various rulers. It was not people's history.¹⁷ On the other hand,

studies of modern African political movements in the colonial period tended to be 'elitist' history, dealing with a handful of educated Africans who had gained some prominence through Western education.

More recently, however, the emphasis has generally shifted away from merely political development to social and economic themes. For instance, within the region defined as southern Africa, a number of studies have lately been carried out on the causes of African underdevelopment; the factors responsible for the emergence of an African peasantry; the socio-economic basis of apartheid; the origins of white affluence, power and privilege and so on.

From a modern point of view—that is, a way of attempting to understand the present—these are much the most interesting aspects of southern African history. They also have the merit of being relevant and 'broader-based' than the court chronicles.

There has been, furthermore, a debate as to the importance of the colonial period in African history as a whole. Since colonial rule was, by and large, a mere seventy or so years in the history of most African communities, some scholars have questioned the wisdom of over-emphasizing it.¹⁸ There seems to be a general agreement, however, that though colonial rule was but an episode in the long history of the continent, it was an important episode whose effects are still with us today. Yet there seems little justification for treating it separately from the rest of the history of Africa. In southern Africa, in particular, where there have been over 300 years of black-white contact, with far-reaching results for both sides, one can hardly talk meaningfully of 'pre-colonial' and 'colonial' African history, since there is no clear-cut demarcation between the two.¹⁹

Current interest in southern Africa relates to the rise of, on the one hand, a powerful and wealthy white community and, on the other, a powerless and poor black majority in the region. This statement applies equally to the relations between the present Republic of South Africa and her neighbours—particularly the enclave States of Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland—and the former Portuguese territories, which during the past sixty or so years were transformed into South Africa's economic clients. It would be useful, therefore, for scholars interested in this region to probe the history behind all this. Furthermore, there would appear to be more profit in viewing the region as an integrated whole with an integrated history.

Notes

-
1. For comparison, see Roland Oliver, 'Western Historiography and Its Relevance to Africa', in T. O. Ranger (ed.), *Emerging Themes of African History*, Nairobi, 1968, p. 55.

2. B. A. Ogot, 'Some Approaches to African History', in Ogot (ed.), *Hadith I*, Nairobi, 1968, p. 2.
3. Terence Ranger, 'Introduction', in T. O. Ranger (ed.), *Emerging Themes of African History*, London, Heinemann Educational, 1969, p. xxi.
4. Leonard Thompson, 'The Forgotten Factor in Southern African History', in L. Thompson (ed.), *African Societies in Southern Africa*, London, 1969, p. 1-23.
5. J. D. Omer-Cooper, *The Zulu Aftermath*, London, 1966, and Shula Marks, *Reluctant Rebellion*, London, 1969, are real landmarks in the development of southern African historiography.
6. R. Hyam, 'Are We Any Nearer an African History of South Africa?', *Historical Journal*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, 1973, p. 616-26.
7. *ibid.*
8. A. Atmore and S. Marks, 'The Imperial Factor in South Africa in the Nineteenth Century: Towards a Reassessment', *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Vol. III, No. 1, 1974, p. 132.
9. Ogot, *op. cit.*
10. M. Wilson and L. Thompson (ed.), *The Oxford History of South Africa*, Vol. I, 1969, Preface.
11. For comparison, see S. Marks, 'Historians and South Africa' in J. D. Fage (ed.), *Africa Discovers Her Past*, London, 1970, p. 83-9; D. Denoon, *Southern Africa Since 1800*, London, 1972, p. 230-3.
12. S. Marks, 'African and Afrikaner History', *Journal of African History*, Vol. XI, No. 3, 1970, p. 435-47.
13. Research in Swaziland indicates that the Swazi on the whole viewed the British as lesser evils than the Boers.
14. See William Ochieng, 'African History in Post-colonial Reconstruction', *East African Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 6, June 1972, p. 14-17; article later included in the same author's collection of essays, *The First Word: Essays on Kenya History*, Nairobi, 1975.
15. E. H. Carr, *What is History?*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1961, p. 26, cited in Ochieng, *op. cit.*
16. History department memorandum to the Visitation Committee, Makerere University, 1970. The committee later recommended, incidentally, that one of the courses that should not be taught at Makerere was southern African history. It gave no reasons for this view. See Visitation Report, 1970.
17. The expression is from Professor D. Denoon, *Peoples' History*, inaugural lecture at the University of Papua New Guinea, 1973.
18. The literature on this whole question is vast, but see especially J. F. A. Ajayi, 'Colonialism: an Episode in African History', in L. H. Gann and Peter Duignan (eds.), *Colonialism in Africa*, Vol. I, Cambridge University Press, 1969.
19. For an interesting view in this connection, see S. Marks' review of D. Denoon, *Southern Africa since 1800*, in the *Journal of African History*, Vol. XV, No. 3, 1974, p. 491-3, where she writes that the main shortcomings of the book arise in large measure from Denoon's inadequate grasp of the nature of the precolonial societies of southern Africa.

Research in Botswana

A. C. Campbell

A large surface collection of stone artefacts was made by Dr Weyland, pre-1950, from all over Botswana. This has now been examined by C. K. Cooke, who is publishing a detailed description of a sample of the artefacts with distribution maps.

J. Yellen and P. Draper have been excavating a pan site on the north-western Botswana-Namibia border. They have found continuous living sites dating 6000 B.P., Late Stone Age, and immediately below have come upon late Middle Stone Age Floors. At the same time they are mapping occupied and deserted San sites in the vicinity and attempting to match these with excavated finds.

E. Wilmsen is excavating about fifty kilometres south of Yellen, also on pan; controlled sample radiating out from pan. He is also studying local San's diet, etc., and attempting to match as above.

H. Esche is working in Kweneng on San, generally with particular reference to the history of veld burning (a) by San and (b) by pastoralists, to see varying effects on vegetation and wildlife.

R. Pahl worked on Stone Age sites around Kanye, mainly early Middle Stone Age.

J. Ebert and R. Hitchcock worked mainly around Makgadikgadi on old shore-lines and beaches, using transect method. They worked on climate and have considerable material indicating Stone Age populations (numbers), life-style, etc. Thus also did an ecological investigation relating to modern San activities along the Nata River.

M. Tamplin made a short survey of prehistoric sites in eastern Botswana (about forty sites) and is now evaluating material, mostly Iron Age.

Mason and G. Cohen, the latter under Revil Mason's guidance, excavated one shaft in Specularite mine in south-eastern Botswana. R. Mason also examined modern settlement patterns of Kwena and Kgalagadi to relate these to excavations in South Africa at Broederstroom and Olifantspoort.

L. Lepionka excavated a massive hilltop site in eastern Botswana and recovered 250,000 faunal remains giving good indication of diet between $\pm 1400-1650$ A.D. He plans to return and carry out an Iron Age survey similar to Huffnam in Zimbabwe (Rhodesia).

E. Hanisch is working at the confluence of the Shashe and Limpopo rivers and turning up interesting K2 Leopard's Kopje and Zhiza pottery, with pottery similar but slightly different, not yet located in Transvaal, possibly indicating migration from the west.

R. Pahl has carried out Iron Age excavations near Kanye and has collected considerable oral history from the Ngwaketse who claim the excavation sites.

B. O'Connor is collecting traditional music all over Botswana. Her findings are to be analysed by the Library of African Music in the United Kingdom.

Richard Lee, Ide Vore, H. Harpending, M. Konner, M. Shustak and others connected with Harvard University have for ten years been recording San culture, with particular reference to resource utilization.

During the last seven years the Botswana Society has sponsored three symposia, on rural development, on sustained production in semi-arid areas, and on the Okavango and its future utilization. The society has also sponsored research in a small way by providing funds for recording oral traditions, traditional music and archeological research. It produces an annual journal, *Botswana Notes and Records*, which contains scientific and semi-scientific papers, etc.

The promotion of the study of history at the National University of Lesotho

Elleck K. Mashingaidze

General aims and objectives of the Department of History

These are outlined in the Department's Prospectus, *The Department of History 1976/77*, and in the University Calendar. The history syllabus offers a wide range of courses, which have been designed to provide undergraduates with a general knowledge of the history of Africa, with particular emphasis on the southern African region. The syllabus also offers courses in the history of Europe, modern Russia, modern China and the United States, since the American Revolution. There is, in addition, a special course designed to teach undergraduates to appreciate problems in the approach to the study of history.

Final-year students are also required to write research dissertations. This course includes seminars and the presentation of progress papers under staff supervision.

A new course on Lesotho and southern Africa has been introduced. At present it is being offered to first-year students only, but it is hoped that it will be developed into a special and compulsory paper for all history students. First-year students are required, among other things, to go on history excursions with their lecturers. The excursions are designed to acquaint students with their surroundings; places of historical interest, including possible Iron Age sites, are visited. Here it must be emphasized that no Iron Age excavations have been undertaken yet in Lesotho for lack of both funds and expertise, though possible Iron Age sites have been located. It is hoped that Iron Age work will be undertaken, possibly with Unesco assistance. Indeed, the new course on the history of Lesotho and southern Africa cannot be meaningfully taught until this has been done.

The history syllabus

B.A. general

The historian and reconstruction of the past: Lesotho and southern Africa.

Europe: fourteenth to eighteenth century.

Africa to 1800.

Africa: 1800 to the present.

Historiography and methodology.

History of a region: (a) East Africa, (b) West Africa, (c) Central Africa,
(d) North Africa.

Europe: 1789 to 1917.

Themes in twentieth-century history.

Modern Russia.

The United States since the revolution.

Southern Africa: 1800 to 1890.

Southern Africa: 1890 to the present.

Dissertation or long essay. (This course includes seminars and the presentation
of progress papers under staff supervision.)

Religious innovations in colonial Africa.

N.B. Not all courses listed will be offered in any one year.

B.A. honours (nine papers)

Year I:

Africa since 1800.

One only of: (a) History of West Africa, (b) History of East Africa, (c) History
of North Africa, (d) History of Central Africa.

History of Europe since 1760.

Year II:

Three only of: (a) Slave trade, (b) Economic history of Africa, (c) History of
Islam in Africa, (d) Pan-Africanism, (e) Religious innovations in Colonial
Africa, (f) Nationalism and minorities, (g) African literature and modern
South Africa, (h) Revolution in the modern world.

Year III:

History of Lesotho and modern South Africa since 1800 (special subject).

Historical methodology and historiography.

Dissertation

This is an extended piece of work of not more than 1,500 words presenting
either new factual material and/or a new analysis of existing material. The
topic is chosen by the student in consultation with the staff of the Department.

Postgraduate work

The Department has one M.A. student doing research on the economic history of Lesotho.

Research

There are five of us on the staff, and we are all involved in research. Many reasons may be given for this involvement but I want to mention four only:

1. Research is enshrined in our contracts.
2. We undertake research for the sake of scholarship.
3. Our departmental journal, *Mohlomi, Journal of Southern African Historical Studies*, offers challenges and incentives.
4. Our new course on Lesotho and southern Africa can be viable only if each one of us supports it through research.

Staff and research interests

Professor and Head of Department: G. M. Haliburton, M.A. (Dal.), B.Ed. (Acad.), Ph.D. (London). Research interests: Religious movements, missionary activities in Africa. At present especially interested in missionary activities in Lesotho.

Senior Lecturer: S. I. Mudenge, B.A. (York, United Kingdom), Ph.D. (London). Research interests: History of the Rozvi Empire. Trade and politics in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century south-central Africa; central Mozambique, south-east Zambia and Zimbabwe. Eighteenth-century history of Munhumutapa. History of Pius XII College, Rome.

Lecturer: J. J. Guy, B.A. (Natal), Ph.D. (London). Research interests: History of Natal and Zululand from earliest times, but with special emphasis on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Pre-capitalist social formations in southern Africa with special emphasis on the effects of physical environment on human societies. Individual responses to the process of proletarianization in southern Africa.

E. K. Mashingaidze, B.A. (UBLS), D.Phil. (York). Research interests: Relationships between British imperialism and Christian missions in Central Africa. Missionary activities in Mashonaland. History of African education in Southern Rhodesia. Religious innovations in Southern Rhodesia. Resistance movements in Central Africa. African religious initiatives in Southern Rhodesia.

L. B. J. Machobane, A. A. (Piney Woods), B.S. and M.Ed. (Tuskegee), M. A. (Lehigh). Joined the Department in July 1976. Research interests:

Basotho history. Chief Motsoene and the politics of Lesotho. History of Leribe as a separate country. Lesotho novels as devices for teaching history.

Seminars

The Department runs the following regular series of seminars:

1. Undergraduate seminars.
2. Postgraduate seminars.
3. Mohlomi seminars, for staff and academic visitors. These are open to the public.

Conferences/workshops

The department hosted a History Workshop on Modes of Production in July 1976.

An International Southern African History Conference was organized and run from 1 to 7 August 1977. Between fifty and sixty historians, including some Unesco experts attended this conference.

Departmental publication

The History Department at the National University of Lesotho publishes a journal, *Mohlomi, Journal of Southern African Historical Studies*. You are all welcome to submit articles. The department also plans to edit and publish student dissertations.

Other activities to promote the study of history

The Department takes a great deal of interest in the preservation of archives in Lesotho. Indeed, I myself and a colleague are on the Lesotho National Archives Committee. In our capacity as university representatives on the National Archives Committee we are currently negotiating with the Government in Maseru for a transfer of the National Archives to the University at Roma.

Another colleague is on the Preservation Committee, which is responsible for the protection of places and buildings of historical importance in the country. Perhaps I should point out that this committee has also retrieved quantities of very valuable documents from districts in Lesotho. Some of this material is now packed in boxes in the University Library at Roma.

A campaign to collect oral traditions is being planned.

Perhaps I should also mention that plans are already under way for the establishment of an Institute of Southern African Studies. The Department of History is immensely interested in this too. I am, however, in no position to supply further information on this at the moment.

History research in Malawi

J. B. Webster

Barring unforeseen circumstances, the expatriate dominance of Malawi's historiography is over and culminated just before my predecessor departed in a flood of publications. Unlike my predecessor, I inherited an all-African department and I am not a Malawian specialist and unlikely to become one. My staff has a natural and healthy desire to bring to the world's attention a Malawian interpretation of Malawi's history. I look upon my personal role in the University as fostering, criticizing and facilitating this Malawian initiative. The department of history at Chancellor College operates a weekly research seminar throughout the academic year. Our final-year students must present a research paper to this seminar based on primary material, archival and oral. What follows is a summary of present research in progress in Malawi.

Present historical research in Malawi

- A. H. K. Bhila, *The Changing Pattern of Pre-Colonial African Trade in the Shona Country, c. 1600–1900.*
- O. J. Kalinga, *The Pre-Colonial States of Ulambya and Ngonde in Northern Malawi, c. 1600–1900.*
- Kings Phiri, *The Pre-Colonial History of the Chewa People.*
- J. B. Webster, *In-Depth Study of the Yao Chiefdom of Kawinga.*
- Elias Mandal, *The Kololo States of the Nineteenth Century in the Lower Shire Valley.*
- Z. Kadzamira, *Development Planning in Malawi in the Modern Period.*
- I. Lamba, *The Development of Western Education in Malawi.*
- G. Ngomezulu, *Survey of Sixty Pre-Historic Stone and Iron Age Sites in Dedga District.*
- R. Greenstein, *The Muslim Ulama of Malawi.*

The Zomba project

All members of the Department of History at the University of Malawi have embarked on a co-operative historical research project under the direction of Z. Kadzamira. Staff members, assisted by final-year students, will collect oral traditions in three districts: Chiradzulu, Zomba and Kasupe. This is an area of unusual ethnic diversity—Chewa, Yao, Ngoni, Lomwa—and the project expect to detail the history of the arrival and accommodations of each of these peoples.

Secondary-school teacher handbook

Staff members will present seminar papers, April to July 1977, on themes in Malawian history. After criticism and revision these same papers are to be presented to a conference of secondary-school teachers and thereafter form chapters in a teacher's handbook for Malawian history.

History research in Swaziland

N. M. Bhebe

Research on Swaziland is extremely undeveloped to the extent that there is no teaching material right from the earliest times to the present at primary, secondary and university levels. The work that has been produced is still in thesis form.

Three scholars have worked, or are still working, for a Ph.D. in history based on Swaziland: Philip Bonar has submitted to the University of London a Ph.D. thesis on Swaziland from the 1820s to 1880s; Balam Nyeko is about to submit a Ph.D. thesis on the concessions in Swaziland; and Francis Mashasha is working on a D.Phil. at Oxford on Swazi-colonial history.

Hild Kuper, the famous anthropologist, has a continuing interest in Swaziland and has recently produced a biography of His Majesty King Sobura II.

J. S. Matsebula's amateur work, *History of Swaziland*, remains the only work for use in Swaziland at all levels.

The archives have for a long time remained closed to the public because of lack of staff and facilities. But now the building is ready and we hope that it will be opened at the end of 1977.

Museum work is pursued vigorously, and both the Government and the public are co-operating in recovering cultural objects and other aspects of Swazi and neighbouring peoples' civilization.

Archaeological research

A Unesco team under the directorship of Dr David Price-Williams of City University College, London, will for the next five years be conducting research in Swaziland. There is full co-operation between the History Department of the University and the Unesco team. History students are put at the disposal of the team, and the Department pays for the students' expenses. The Department requires the students to produce dissertations on their work with the team. And the University has sealed the co-operation by appointing Dr Price-Williams

Honorary Research Fellow. He and his team are required by the Department to deliver public lectures and to lead seminars based on their work.

The University History Department

To foster research the Department runs an M.A. programme based on research and course work. The research is on topics in Swazi history.

B.A. level students are required to produce dissertations based on oral traditions. Stress is placed on the traditions themselves rather than on the syntheses of them.

Staff

Dr H. W. Macmillan is doing research on the colonial period. Dr W. N. Parsons is working on the history of the Swazi peasant economy.

Courses

There are several courses on Africa in general and on Swaziland in particular:

1. History of Swaziland.
2. Swaziland and her neighbours.
3. Southern Africa, 1800 to the present.
4. Africa from earliest times to 1800.
5. Africa, 1800 to present.
6. The African diaspora.
7. Africa and the world since 1945.
8. Resistance movements in Africa.
9. Imperialism in Africa.

Workshop and African Studies Institute

Finally the Department is seeking financial assistance to commence a workshop on Swazi history in order to produce a book for teaching purposes.

The University is also seriously considering creating an institute to work on the history of southern Africa.

Teaching and research on southern Africa in the United Kingdom

Shula Marks

University of London

We have four members of the staff with interests in this area: Professor Richard Gray and Drs Birmingham, Roberts and Marks.

Southern African history is taught at the undergraduate level as part of the three main outline papers on African history, which candidates reading one of the regional history branches, course unit students reading history and an ancillary discipline or joint-degree students reading history and anthropology, and history and an African language, can take. In addition, there is an optional subject open to all history students in the University, entitled 'Class, Colour and Capital in Southern Africa, 1870 to the Present', which will be taught from October 1977 (see below). There is a further optional subject on Christianity and indigenous religion in Central and East Africa, from about 1850 to the present.

M.A. one-year courses are taught on Maputo-Angola and on southern Africa ('Conflict and Interdependence in Southern Africa in the Nineteenth and twentieth Centuries').

Ph.D. students are supervised on southern African history; there are currently some ten students working on South African history; and about four or five on Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Zambia.

A fortnightly post-graduate seminar is held on the 'Societies of Southern Africa in the Nineteenth and twentieth Centuries' at the Institute of Commonwealth Studies. The collected papers of this seminar appear in photocopied form annually and are available from the Institute. Seven volumes have appeared.

Post-doctoral research

A three-year research project on 'The Making of the African Working Class in Twentieth Century South Africa' has been launched. There are two research fellows: an historian, Dr Charles van Onseler, and an anthropologist, Dr Mauraette Sebisi.

A three-year project for the collection of materials on the social, economic and political history of southern Africa has just been concluded. A full accession to the materials available in London on southern Africa, including the recently collected materials (which emphasized ephemera, and papers of African political organizations and individuals likely to be otherwise lost) is to be published shortly.

Other centres in the United Kingdom

The University of York has a one-year B.Phil. programme on southern Africa at its Centre for Southern African Studies. The Centre also holds annual conferences for students of southern African history and publishes the proceedings. It has two or three doctoral students and has also conducted a three-year project collecting materials on southern Africa.

The University of Sussex no longer appears to offer formal courses on southern Africa, but has a most important group of doctoral students (six) working on twentieth-century South Africa from a predominantly Marxist point of view. They are largely political scientists.

At the University of Warwick (Dr Legassick, Department of Sociology), the University of Oxford (Dr Trapido, Institute of Commonwealth Studies) and the University of Essex (Department of Sociology, Dr Harold Wolpe) important work on twentieth-century South Africa is in progress.

A new journal (from 1974) published by Oxford University Press, the *Journal of Southern African Studies*, publishes work in the social sciences and the history of the area. The editors are Drs S. Trapido (Oxford), C. van Onseler (London) and S. Cross (Norwich). The chairman of the editorial board is Professor J. Ranger.

Secondary schools

The extra-mural department of the School of Oriental and African Studies is very concerned with the teaching of Third World history in British schools. Members of staff address sixth-form conferences and conferences of school-teachers on African and Asian history and contemporary problems. In this, over the past couple of years, southern Africa has been reasonably well represented.

A study pack for use in sixth-form world history and current-affairs courses on Sharpeville is in the course of preparation. Through this it is hoped to alert students to the problems of historical methodology, and in particular the problems of bias in newspaper reporting, as well as introducing them to some of the structural components of the South African situation.

Proposal for a new optional subject

*Class, colour and capital in southern Africa,
1870 to the present day*

It is proposed to teach this course at the School of Oriental and African Studies as a one-year optional subject for the B.A. History Honours degree and joint-degree students, and as one course unit in the college-based course unit degree (in which it will not normally be available to first-year students). It is intended to begin teaching in the 1977–78 session.

The course will be taught by seminars, and will have two main aims: to explore the impact of industrialization on the late nineteenth-century economies of the region, and to study the relationship of class and colour in the changing social, political and economic circumstances of the subcontinent. For the purposes of the optional subject, southern Africa will include the present Republic of South Africa, Rhodesia, Zambia, south Mozambique, Malawi, Namibia and the ex-High Commission territories, Lesotho, Botswana and Swaziland.

The main emphasis, however, will be on the Republic of South Africa.

Topics to be covered will include the following:

1. The political economy of the region on the eve of mineral discoveries in South Africa.
2. Diamonds and gold: the nature of the discoveries; capital investment and the work process.
3. The evolution of labour policies on the diamond fields and the Witwatersrand. The migrant labour system, compounds and the role of the State on labour control.
4. The white working class. Trade unionism. The colour bar—prejudice or necessary protection?
5. The growth of a sub-regional economy. The BSA company north of the Limpopo.
6. The imperial factor: the South African war and the unification of South Africa.
7. The development of capitalist agriculture: South Africa, Rhodesia and Malawi. By owners and squatters.
8. African peasants and African 'reserves'. The land-apportionment acts in southern Africa.
9. The development of secondary industry and urbanization. Class formation amongst whites and blacks. The debate over 'national' and 'international' capital.
10. Industrialization, urbanization and the ideology of segregation: South Africa, Rhodesia and Zambia.

11. Mineral discoveries on the copperbelt, and the development of labour strategies on the copperbelt. Migrant labour, proletarianization and 'stabilization'.
12. The impact of the Second World War.
13. The rise of Afrikanerdom in South Africa. The nationalist victory of 1948—from segregation to apartheid.
14. The federation in Central Africa and its break up—economic implications.
15. The emergence of an African working class. (This will be a thread which runs through the whole course, tracing the different forms of African worker consciousness at different times and in different places: e.g. the early days of protest by desertion through to more formal trade-union and other organizations.) Class consciousness v. national consciousness.

This list of topics is not by any means exhaustive, but is meant to show the range that can be covered. By and large, the approach will be a mixture of the chronological and the thematic, and though for ease of exposition here some topics have been separately listed, in fact, as in the case of number 15, they will constitute a continuous thread in the discussion.

The literature in this field is considerable and growing, and the following suggested bibliography is by no means exhaustive.

Bibliography

BOOKS

- ADAM, H. *Modernizing Racial Domination*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1971.
- ARRIGHI, G. *The Political Economy of Southern Rhodesia*.
- BERGER, E. *Labour, Race and Colonial Rule*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1974.
- EPSTEIN, A. L. *Politics in an Urban African Community*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1958.
- FRANKEL, H. *Capital Investment in Africa*.
- FYFE, C. (ed.) *African Studies since World War II*, London, Longmans, 1976.
- GRAY, R. *The Two Nations*, Oxford, issued under the auspices of the Institute of Race Relations, 1960.
- GREGORY, T. *Ernest Oppenheimer and the Economic Development of South Africa*, Cape Town, Oxford University Press, 1962.
- HOBART-HOUGHTON, D.; DAGUT, J. *Source Material on the South African Economy, 1860–1970*, 3 vol.
- HORWITZ, R. *The Political Economy of South Africa*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967.
- HUNTER, G. (ed.) *Industrialisation and Race Relations*, Oxford, issued under the auspices of the Institute of Race Relations, 1965.
- JOHNSTONE, F. A. *Class, Race and Gold*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.

- KUPER, L. *An African Bourgeoisie*, New Haven, Conn.; London, Yale University Press, 1965.
- MASON, P. *The Birth of a Dilemma*, London, Oxford University Press, 1958.
- MITCHELL, J. C. *The Kalela Dance*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1956.
- RANGER, T. *The African Voice in Southern Rhodesia*, London, Heinemann Educational, 1970.
- SIMONS, H. J. *Class and Colour in South Africa*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1969.
- THOMPSON, L.; WILSON, M. *The Oxford History of South Africa, Vol. II*, London, Oxford University Press.
- VAN DER HORST, S. *Native Labour in South Africa*, London, Oxford University Press, 1942.
- VAN ONSELEN, C. *Chibaro*.
- WALSHE, P. *The Rise of African Nationalism in South Africa*, London, C. Hurst, 1970.
- WATSON, W. *Tribal Cohesion and a Money Economy*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1959.
- WILSON, F. *Labour in the South African Gold Mines, 1911-1969*, London, Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- . *Migrant Labour in South Africa*, London, 1947.
- WILSON, Godfrey, *The Economics of Detribalization*.

ARTICLES

- ARRIGHI, G. Labour Supplies in Historical Perspective: a Study of the Proletarianization of the African Peasantry in Rhodesia. *Jnl. of Devt. Studies*, Vol. VI, No. 3, 1971.
- BUNDY, C. The Emergence and Decline of a South African Peasantry. *African Affairs*, October, 1972.
- JEEVES, A. Labour on the Gold Mines, 1890-1905. *J. Southern African Studies*, Vol. II, No. 1, 1975.
- JOHNSTONE, F. White Prosperity and White Supremacy in South Africa Today. *African Affairs*, Vol. LXIX, April, 1970.
- LEGASSICK, M. Capital Accumulation and Violence in South Africa. *Economy and Society*, III, 1974.
- . Race, Industrialization and Social Change in South Africa: the Case of R. F. Hoernle. *African Affairs*, April, 1976.
- . South Africa: Forced Labour, Industrialization and Racial Discrimination. In: R. Harris (ed.), *The Political Economy of Africa*.
- MAWBY, A. Capital, Government and Politics in the Transvaal, 1900-1907: a Revision and a Reversion. *The Historical Journal*, Vol. XVII, No. 2, 1976.
- MORRIS, M. The Role of the State and Agriculture in South Africa. *Economy and Society*, 1976.
- PHIMISTER, I. R. Peasant Production in Southern Rhodesia. *African Affairs*, April, 1974.
- REX, J. The Plural Society: the South African Case. *Race*, Vol. XII, No. 4, 1971.
- SLATER, H. Land and Labour in Natal: the Natal Land Colonization Company 1860-1948. *JAH*, Vol. XIV, 1975.
- TRAPIDO, S. South Africa in a Comparative Study of Industrialisation. *Jnl. of Devt. Studies*, Vol. VIII, No. 3, 1971.
- VAN ONSELEN, C. African Worker Consciousness in the Rhodesian Gold Mines. *JAH*, Vol. XII, 1972.
- Various papers in the Collected Seminar Papers on the *Societies of Southern Africa*, 7 Vols. Institute of Commonwealth Studies, London.
- WOLPE, H. The White Working Class in South Africa. *Economy and Society*, Vol. V, No. 2, 1976.

THESES

- BUNDY, C.** *The Rise and Decline of an African Peasantry in South Africa.* Oxford, 1975.
- HENDERSON, I.** *Labour and Politics in Northern Rhodesia, 1900–1953.* Edinburgh, 1973.
- PERRINGS, C.** *Black Labour in the Copper Mines of the Belgian Congo and Northern Rhodesia, 1911–1941.* London, 1976.
- PHIMISTER, I. R.** *History of Gold Mining in Southern Rhodesia to 1953.* University College of Rhodesia, 1975.

History research at the University of Zambia

B. S. Krishnamurthy

The University of Zambia has an active programme of research in history. Not only has the Department of History its own programme but other departments of the university, notably the Department of African Studies and the Institute of African Studies, are also working on projects which have a direct bearing on the history of Zambian societies. The projects at present in operation can be listed as follows.

Students' projects

Students at undergraduate level participate in research programmes in several ways. Final-year students who study land and labour in Central Africa as their special subject produce research essays on these problems in Zambia. These essays, which are based on field work, have been published in three volumes on land labour studies.

A student project was launched in 1975, with financial assistance provided by the university, to collect oral traditions. A number of students were involved in this programme of oral traditions collected on Ceva, Zumbuka, Lale and Lenje societies, and at present deposited in the special collections section of the University of Zambia.

M.A. research

A Zambian student, Maud Muntemba, has done research work on Lenje political systems. The thesis is now deposited at the University of Zambia. Another M.A. thesis, on African Representative Council in Zambia, was produced by Dorothy Kent, and this is also available at the University Library. Both these theses have been based on a vast collection of oral data.

Staff projects

The Department at the moment is unfortunately expatriate-dominated since the departure of Mutumba Bull to serve Zambia in other capacities, which has been a great loss. However, the department is pursuing an active policy in Zambianization. There are now two Zambian lecturers who are on study leave to complete their Ph.D. dissertations and three Staff Development fellows who have completed or are in the process of completing their M.A. before studying for Ph.D., and two students who have been awarded Staff Development fellowships this year.

The staff have been working on various aspects of the pre-colonial and colonial history of Zambia. Papers based on field work have been produced on trade and politics among the Zumbuke (Dr L. Veil). The impact of ecology on economic development in the Eastern Province of Zambia (Dr Veil), pre-colonial social formation in the Hezhi-kehi area (Dr Keith Rennil), the influence of the Livingstone Mission on the emergence of the educated elite in Zambia (Dr John Cook), underdevelopment in the Kabuc rural areas (Maud Muntemba), the pre-colonial economy in the Luapula area (Mr Musambochime), and rural poverty in the Lombe area (Mr Luchembe).

Staff have also been doing research on neighbouring areas as follows: Dr Leroy Vail and Mr White on Sena sugar plantations in Mozambique, Dr Vail on Nyasaland railways, Dr B. S. Krishnamurthy on underdevelopment in Malawi, Dr Clarence Smith on class formation in Ovamboland, Dr R. Palmer on race and land in Rhodesia, and Dr Fay Gadsian on the press in Kenya.

Department of African Studies

The Department, in conjunction with other departments in the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, has mounted a project to study the implications of the transfer of technology during the colonial and post-colonial period.

Institute of African Studies

The Institute, under the directorship of Professor Kashoki, has been involved in various projects relating to the cultural history of Zambia. Mr Mapoma and Mr Omondi have made a large collection of traditional songs, especially from the Northern Province. Mrs Omondi has been engaged in the study of linguistics in relation to culture. The Institute has now launched a project for constructing an arts centre and a museum.

Part III
Experts Meeting
on the historiography
of southern Africa

Opening session of the meeting

His Excellency K. P. Morake, Minister of Education of Botswana, took the chair.

The first speaker was Dr Phinias Makhurame, Vice-Rector of the University of Botswana-Swaziland, who stressed how essential it was for all the people of Botswana—and, more generally, for the peoples of the whole of southern Africa—to rediscover their past; no people could have a future if that people was ignorant of its past. Although not himself an historian, he was convinced of the great importance of a history of Africa to be produced by the black inhabitants of that part of the continent, after it had been presented for so many years only from outside by white writers. The Vice-Rector expressed this conviction even more forcibly in the following terms:

The bit of history that I did at school made me always look at the past of this part of the world from a foreign—or white—point of view. The personality, the dignity, the culture and the whole outlook of the African was buried under the assumption that he was a pagan, an uncivilized person, a slave, a tool of this white master without the capability to think for himself or to behave rationally. The whole viewpoint was distorted and adult Africans were looked upon and recorded in history books as childish and not worth bothering about. Today, thanks to the emergence of African historians and others who seek to unravel Africa's past in its real form, who seek to look at the African as he saw himself, the picture is changing considerably, the African is being given the dignity which he deserves. The knowledge of the past that is coming to the surface by the methods of oral tradition and others which do not allow racial prejudice to blur the truth will no doubt erase the records of the past and make Africa stand proud among the nations of the world—proud of its contribution to world development . . . [and]

As far as southern Africa is concerned, it is so relevant that you should be gathered here at this time to concentrate on the past which has had so much influence on what is happening now in this troubled part of the continent. It is my personal hope that you will find hidden somewhere in the past the truth of where things really went wrong. This may be encroaching into politics, but I believe that the politics of yesterday is the history which our children will learn tomorrow. . .

In his reply, the Unesco representative thanked Botswana for the hospitality extended to the meeting, which had been recommended by the International Scientific Committee. He showed how it fitted into the series of studies undertaken simultaneously with the preparation of the volumes of the Unesco *General History of Africa* which related to southern Africa.

The Minister of Education, then thanked Unesco for having agreed to hold the meeting in Botswana, and re-emphasized that the entire population of Botswana would be following its proceedings with great interest.

The history of this part of the continent, he said, had hitherto been written almost entirely by white observers. The present meeting should provide an opportunity for taking a great step towards a radical change in this state of affairs. He called on the universities of this region of Africa to give priority to research into its past, making use of all the technical methods available to historians today, so as to launch a genuine renaissance of African culture.

The Conference elected its Bureau as follows: Professor L. D. Ngcongco, Chairman; Professors N. Bhebe and J. B. Webster, Vice-Chairmen; Professor J. Devisse, Rapporteur.

Summary of the discussions

The experts were aware throughout the meeting of the existence of a fundamental difference between their lines of approach, without, however, producing a formal statement of its general implications, on which they failed to achieve a consensus in all the fields reviewed or touched upon. Nevertheless, this cleavage was a dominant feature of the entire proceedings.

A number of participants repeatedly referred to three desiderata: (a) that the history of southern Africa be studied as a totality and by a multi-disciplinary method; (b) that the writers of this history should constantly strive, by rediscovering the long process of evolution undergone by the societies in question, to throw light on the present situation of those societies as they struggle with the problems created by their liberation; (c) that this history should be analysed neither as an exclusively 'regional' nor as a 'specifically African' pattern of development but as one example, among others, of world historical trends. If such a history was to be really new in comparison with previous histories, it would not be sufficient for it to be written by historians from the region of Africa under consideration if they failed, in their studies, to apply a scientific method of global analysis.

This view regarding methodology, which was frequently reiterated, met with varying degrees of approval or criticism, entailing developments that will be examined under the relevant topics.

Population movements and structures of power, iron and agriculture in the evolution of southern Africa

The participants considered that it was impossible to deal with these two topics separately.

It was agreed that, in this field of inquiry, as in so many others, knowledge was increasing at a very rapid rate, so that it was continually necessary to modify synopses that had been prematurely produced on the basis of a few discoveries; theories concerning the peopling of this region of Africa had changed a great deal in the last ten years and were still changing.

The importance was stressed of maintaining a cautious attitude towards over-hasty conclusions at a time when systematic archaeological investigations had only just begun but were already yielding new evidence in the light of which previous theories had to be perpetually revised.

Early population of southern Africa

The participants did not go into the details of the analyses already made of the Central Sudanic languages in Central East Africa and of their possible influence on southern Africa—on the Khoikhoi or the San—but merely noted that, as archaeological research had proved, the entire southern part of the continent had been under human settlement for a very long time.

The abundant evidence recently brought to light by archaeological investigations extending as far as the Cape region had shown, for example, that sheep were widely eaten by the earliest inhabitants of the region. The 'Limpopo boundary' had no early historical significance whatever; nor was there any justification for drawing a line between the Stone Age and Iron Age periods when studying patterns of evolution.

Findings from the Early Iron Age had confirmed the presence of groups of agricultural peoples south of the Limpopo. The site at Lydenberg in the eastern Transvaal had yielded some fine ceramic heads. Broederstroom, where some material dating from the fifth century A.D. had been discovered, represented a major 'cradle' of African peoples. In the area to the south of the Limpopo, Iron Age objects dating from the third and fourth centuries had been found.

For reasons that will be given farther on in this report, the experts did not consider it very important to put a name to the peoples who inhabited the region south of the Limpopo at that time.

Critical appraisal of the 'Bantu migrations' theory

The participants were unwilling to continue to support the old hypothesis, for there was very little evidence of a continuous mass migration of peoples from north to south. The theory that such 'migrants' brought to the communities among whom they settled a structured language and highly developed skills was no longer accepted in its entirety without reservations and close scrutiny. However, this did not alter the fact that, throughout the whole of southern Africa, as elsewhere, the introduction of iron implements into agricultural methods was a development which merited particularly careful study because it gave rise to new forms of settlement and made it possible

to feed more people. The new approach merely meant that this development could no longer be automatically attributed to 'the arrival of the Bantu'.

On the strength of recent archaeological discoveries in central and southern Africa and of examples taken from other regions of Africa and other continents, the experts suggested the following more complex themes of study for the attention of the International Scientific Committee and the authors of the *General History of Africa*.

(a) If migrations did in fact take place, they could have resulted in a transplantation of skills as well as of people, sometimes but not always simultaneously. Datings for the introduction of iron should be treated with caution. A great deal of new data relating to this problem has been collected over the past few years and more evidence is bound to come to light. Signs of the presence of iron south of the Limpopo in the third century do not yet point sufficiently clearly to the conclusion that the whole region had by that time reached a stage of civilization based on the use of iron. These signs nevertheless invalidate the idea of the 'pioneer front' of a Bantu migration bringing with it both iron and a highly developed agricultural system. They also throw doubt on the hypothesis that any migratory movements occurred only in a straight north-to-south direction. The possibility of other movements in many different directions cannot be discounted.

It is therefore essential to examine the possible causes of such migrations. Some authors think that ecological factors (resulting in famines and especially droughts) played a major role in the Sotho migrations during the fourteenth century and in more recent migrations by other peoples. Other causes, which cannot be clearly discerned at the present stage of research work, probably drove other large or small, more or less closely knit, groups to leave their homelands. In general, the participants attach great importance to the idea that, for pre-industrial periods in particular, ecological factors should be widely studied as a possible explanation of population movements of all kinds and on every scale.

(b) The experts had similar doubts concerning the mass-migration theory. Precise figures are available for cases that have been studied which show that the size of the migrant group does not represent more than 10 per cent of the host population. It has been demonstrated from other examples that, when a migrant group has a strong socio-economic structure, this percentage is high enough to cause the host community to adopt its skills and language.

It follows that it is essential to study the dates and stages of socio-ethnic integration processes which the historian is able to deduce from a very small amount of data. It is much more important to understand such processes, which probably brought about changes in social and power structures, than to know the names of the groups involved if they have not been handed down in any form. The participants were of the opinion that, for early periods,

there was little point in trying to identify peoples by clear-cut ethnic and linguistic characteristics. The widespread implantation of the Bantu languages is probably the result of a long and gradual historical process and not of an organized movement of peoples migrating from north to south.

This is not to say that all attempts should be abandoned to trace evidence of a differentiation between peoples as far back as possible in their history. Care must be taken, however, to avoid becoming obsessed with ethnogenic problems to the point of approaching the history of this region as if its main object was to discover the remote origins of each of the peoples living there today, especially as these peoples are much more likely to be the product of successive fusions than ethnic entities having remained 'pure' throughout the centuries. The participants were aware, of course, that it was difficult to achieve the right balance between the two extremes.

A possible way of arriving at a better understanding of the origins of some groups, apart from using the methods of archaeology, might be to draw up charts of ancient toponyms, as the Scientific Committee had suggested. Such toponyms might be difficult to trace in a mainly Bantu-speaking region and even more difficult to interpret, but it should be possible, with perseverance, to find some of these early toponyms embedded in oral traditions, which have preserved quite a number of them elsewhere on the continent.

(c) The theory that the migrations may have occurred slowly and possibly in the form of a piecemeal occupation of new territory, substantial gains alternating with more or less permanent withdrawals, was supported by examples. Another interesting theory is that long-distance trade may sometimes have taken the place of human migration in so far as it resulted in the transplantation of skills and languages. This is sailing close to the wind of diffusionism, but the experts were well aware of the danger. Several participants also drew attention to the important theme of the manner in which the new arrivals were received by the indigenous societies and the extent to which the latter accepted or rejected innovations. This comes to much the same thing as studying cases of failure to integrate. The overlapping of linguistic characteristics—for example, the adoption of numerous clicks by Zulu speakers in the nineteenth century—suggests another line of approach to the problem of the movements and fusion of human groups.

This train of thought naturally led the experts to the conclusion that the question of 'origins' was less interesting than that of any processes of integration and fusion that can be discerned at a particular period and defined in terms of ecosystems displaying different degrees of complexity and social diversification.

At this point in the discussion, it was inevitable that attention should be drawn to the idea that peoples should be referred to by the names they themselves have chosen. While, for example, the Khoikhoi have thus called

themselves 'the men among men', the relevance of the word San is less obvious.

Having launched into semantics, the participants inquired into the meaning to be attached, in studies on this region of the continent, to the words 'migration' and 'movement of peoples'; no authoritative definition has been proposed for these terms, and it would be worth while to undertake a study of their precise significance in the geographical and historical context under consideration.

(d) In any event, the participants suggested that the theme of 'migrations' should be studied in future by gathering together the results obtained by all the various methods of investigation.

Archaeology continues, of course, to play its decisive role where early periods are concerned. Archaeologists, however, should now be prepared to work in close co-operation with historians and other research workers instead of identifying the various phases of history by examining scraps or local data which they have obtained more often than not by chance discoveries without doing systematic research. The purpose of archaeology in southern Africa should henceforth be, as it is in other parts of the world, to reveal the level of complexity of material cultures, the relationship between men and their environment and also, in so far as possible, the economic and social organization of human groups whose relics have been discovered. On this last point, an interesting example was brought to the notice of the experts in connection with the latest excavations at Zimbabwe.

Oral traditions, provided they are critically evaluated on scientific lines in the same way as any other historical source, yield information that sometimes goes back much farther than the point in time at which it became fixed in response to a need that had made itself felt in the society to which it relates. Several experts stressed the great importance of correlating the information extracted from oral traditions with archaeological findings. In any case, oral traditions raise questions of interest to historians, as shown by the examples relating to the Sotho-Tswana which are given in Professor Ngcongco's report.

(e) Although the theme was not dealt with specifically as such, it can be said, on the strength of the numerous allusions made to it, that the existence from very early times of large population centres, as, for example, among the Tswana or in the Broederstroom area, confronts historians, here as in other regions of the continent, with the following questions: How old are the towns? How were they laid out? What system may have been adopted for the division of labour within their confines?

Methodological approach

It became clear at this point in the discussion that the meeting was divided

over an important issue, for two radically different views were expressed regarding the methodological approach to this distant past. Some of the experts felt that the method of work adopted to date was disturbingly unscientific. They considered that the study of early African societies should be tackled in the same way as the study of any other early society in any other part of the world. From the methodological point of view, this idea seemed perfectly acceptable even if it sometimes ran counter to habitual lines of approach. The division of opinion was accentuated, however, when it became apparent that a number of these experts thought that the primary aim of studying early societies 'from the vantage point of the twentieth century' might be to discover the roots of present situations. The participants considered that the idea was an attractive one, but carried with it the danger, already mentioned, that its application to early African societies might result in arbitrary conclusions or disappointing results, for contemporary schemes of analysis were not always relevant to societies of the past because of the inadequate means of investigation actually available to us. Although very imaginative and mentally stimulating, this sociological method was probably not applicable to all ancient civilizations. It was indeed often apparent that, in the examples given, the method had been applied only to societies which existed later than the fourteenth century and even to much more recent societies.

Some difficulties arose in connection with basic definitions, because several experts feared the application of new mechanical schemes of analysis to the history of early societies in place of those which they were in the process of criticizing and at the very time when they were devoting a special effort to that task. The Chairman asked a small group of experts to draft a text to be submitted to the meeting with a view to clarifying the concept that had provoked most discussion and elicited the greatest number of reservations, namely, the concept of mode of production. The text, which is reproduced below, was adopted unanimously by the participants:

On a number of occasions during the discussions of the symposium on the historiography of southern Africa it was suggested that our understanding of the pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial societies would be increased if we were to utilize the insights of those scholars who have begun to analyse the different modes of production in evidence in different parts of Africa at different periods of time.

By a mode of production is meant the interaction of the forces of production (i.e. ecology, technology, etc.) and relations of production (i.e. how labour is divided, whether within the family unit, or through reciprocal exchange or on a class basis; how surplus is produced, extracted and distributed). In this articulation of the forces and relations of production, the latter is dominant. It is important to recognize that a mode of production includes economic, political and ideological levels and that in pre-capitalist societies in particular the distinctions between these levels are not clear-cut. Indeed, the reproduction of the social relationships in these societies may

well rely on the ideological level. The use of this framework enables certain fundamental questions to be explored in relation to African societies, which had hitherto been ignored.

While not aiming either to produce a grand abstract model of 'an African mode of production', or trying rigidly to fit an African society into Europocentric typologies it was felt that, where possible, the broad categories found useful in other parts of the world should be applied and empirically tested in specific African contexts.

It then remained to consider what positive conclusions could be drawn from the arduous discussion that had just taken place. The conclusions were easily perceived.

(a) The interest taken by sociologists in the information they could extract from historical studies had perhaps led them initially to expect too much, so far as early societies were concerned, from the methods of approach accessible to historians. The 'challenge' was nevertheless stimulating for historians.

(b) The participants would no doubt have found it less easy to reach agreement on this issue if the discussion had not turned on questions of chronology. Everyone agreed that history could not exist outside a properly constructed time frame.

All the experts were united in emphasizing the need to put an end to the arbitrary and premature division of time into an ever-increasing number of periods within the Stone Age or any one of the ages bearing the name of a metal, since such subdivisions only satisfied the people who made archaeological discoveries and had the unwarranted effect of disrupting the continuity on the basis of which the experts declared, this time unanimously, that they were anxious to work. Taking this 'long-term' view, they thought that the importance of the discovery of agriculture, which in some cases had preceded that of iron, had probably not been brought out with sufficient clarity, in so far as this region was concerned, by the studies hitherto produced by historians. The experts also unanimously acknowledged the necessity of comparing and correlating the various chronologies established by different scientific methods which were currently being applied to the history of the peoples of southern Africa.

(c) It was finally agreed that it would be a fruitful idea to compare several societies of the same period in order to evaluate their similarities and particularly their differences, to compare the conditions prevailing in one society at different periods and to take care not to divorce the study of these comparisons from that of the evolution of societies in other parts of the world.

Formation of the States

The discussion on 'the formation of the States' proceeded more smoothly, but this subject did not elicit such interesting and sometimes novel opinions as the previous topics.

Once again, semantics divided participants who wanted to abandon terms such as 'State' in favour of terms chosen by the African societies themselves to designate their power structure, from those who had no objection to the word 'State' provided that its meaning was more clearly and more rigorously defined.

The more searching inquiry into the conditions in which the State had emerged was less fruitful than it might have been probably because the supporters of the sociological approach held the view that the causes of the emergence of the State would automatically come to light in the course of the analysis of the dominant mode of production in evidence at a given period. It was suggested that the experts could conclude by saying that the emergence of the State undoubtedly depended upon a large number of very disparate conditions. While this was probably a safer and wiser conclusion, it did not invalidate the desire expressed by more than one participant to remove some of the difficulties besetting the examination of this problem in the case of African societies. In this matter, political science could greatly assist historians, without requiring them to abandon the socio-economic approach in their study of the unique characteristics of African power structures—so long as they refused to subscribe to any mechanistic theories or to copy alien schemes of analysis. Another point on which there could be no doubt was that the profound differences in the structure of the institutions of African peoples and those of the white peoples with whom they came into contact at various times accounted for more than one aspect of the external relations of African societies.

Foreign interventions and the repercussions on the evolution of the area

To a much greater extent than during the examination of the preceding items, and without shedding so much light on the subject, the debate on this point gave rise to opposing views that were not fully and systematically expounded. The search for a method of approach to the question occupied almost an entire working session.

Although not presented in formal statements, two rather different standpoints were outlined.

(i) Some experts felt that foreign interventions must be studied separately from their internal repercussions. The true motivation for imperialistic

intervention should be sought at the economic level. In southern Africa everything was centred around the white oligarchy, which gradually extended its sphere of influence from the Cape into the interior of Africa at the end of the nineteenth century. That oligarchy was not of course indifferent to the immediate opportunities for making sure profits, but it seemed to have considered it equally important to occupy large areas of land as a reserve of resources for future exploitation. The companies were more powerful than the government; they imposed their own solutions to problems; they turned all white settlers into agents of imperialism.

This view was considered too narrow by many participants, who thought that the situation was affected by quite a number of other factors which should all be studied as causes of white expansion.

It was also pointed out that this way of presenting the problem did not take account of all the relevant facts. In the case of Angola, the slave trade played a very different role, with even more drastic results. The study of the two forms of Dutch settlement in the Cape region and in the interior of Africa deserved attention; the statement which was made on this point was supported by detailed analyses, which were unfortunately not discussed. A debate on the responsibility of missionaries was dropped after an inconclusive exchange of views.

Apart from yielding some additional bibliographic information, the discussion of this first standpoint did not progress far beyond the consideration of a few general ideas.

(ii) On the other hand, a good many experts were deeply interested in the repercussions of foreign interventions on African societies and, perhaps even more, in the condition of those societies immediately prior to foreign interventions.

A working framework was suggested for the historians, who divided the time-span from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century into four periods in accordance with methods of approach that did not elicit many reactions. One expert, using clear and detailed examples, warned against the temptation to draw over-hasty general conclusions from analytical studies, laying stress on the simultaneous juxtaposition of different modes of production within the relatively small area represented by this region.

Possibly the experts, who had been extremely engrossed in the discussion of the first two topics, did not have enough time to devote to this question. Divergencies and difficulties in this field of inquiry may be too great to allow them to be dealt with adequately in so little time. Another possibility is that historiography has already furnished reliable information, so that there is no need for such radical revisions as those called for in the fields covered by the previous items. Whatever the reason, and even if a large and excellent stock of information on the nineteenth century is already available, the fact

remains that the approach of African historiography to the question of the impact of colonialism has not yet been satisfactorily defined. On this point also, the discussion was not as illuminating as could be desired.

The importance of teaching the history of Africa, and especially of southern Africa

The discussion on this topic was brief but clear, brought out some important ideas and led to the formulation of a recommendation.

As regards teaching and research work concerned with the history of southern Africa, the universities at the meeting have assigned an important place to the history of their region in their teaching, examinations and research projects. They would like the other universities of Africa, and ideally also universities or institutes located elsewhere in the world, to take a comparable interest in southern African history in order to set these studies in a less 'parochial' context.¹

It takes a long time to get the findings of research published, and there are other obstacles to publication which make it very difficult for authors to exercise their right to freedom of expression; journals published in every university, like all scientific periodicals throughout the world, are beset by financial difficulties. There is no publishing house in this region of Africa capable of bringing the writings of research workers before a reasonably wide public. There is a lack of good-quality popular works on the history of the region. In connection with this point, Professor Ogot offered to assist in the publication of one or two volumes written on the basis of the findings of southern African research workers and under their direction, and prepared for publication by them and the assistants of their choice.

A great effort appears to be needed at the level of primary and secondary education in order to Africanize curricula and make room for courses on the history of the southern part of Africa. In this field, assistance by government authorities is essential in order to speed up the changes that are desired by all the participants, even if they do not all want to see exactly the same kinds of change.

The meeting showed interest in the International Scientific Committee's project to make substantial summaries of the chapters of the Unesco *General History of Africa* available to the African public in the form of cassettes that could be used by the national broadcasting networks or possibly put on sale.

Ideological definitions; confrontation of ideologies and concrete problems; independence movements, Bantustans, etc.

The exchange of views on these questions brought out more clearly than any of the preceding discussions had done the points of historical method and general interpretation on which the experts were more or less strongly and explicitly inclined to agree or disagree.

So far as methodology was concerned, they easily reached agreement on the need for a multidisciplinary approach to historical studies. In this connection, several participants hoped to see entirely new surveys launched in a great many directions. Concrete examples were given to demonstrate the advantages of multidisciplinary surveys conducted in rural, industrial and urban environments; surveys of relations between social groups or classes, racial strata and their connection with social strata; and surveys carried out among refugees and guerrilla groups. Similarly, it was considered important, when a liberation movement had failed, to study the reasons for that failure and not to be satisfied with general theoretical explanations; the historian should not merely forecast successes but should also analyse the reasons for failures.

It was pointed out that historians were perhaps too prone to isolate themselves within their own particular methods of approach and might not have paid sufficient attention to the results obtained by research workers in related disciplines. Taking a more general view, however, it might perhaps be said that the sociologists' desire for a profound historical dimension was matched by an aspiration of historians to broaden their fields of inquiry and renovate some of their methods. History and sociology were undeniably converging, although the effects of this trend had only just begun to be felt. However, the debate on this point did not run its full course; had it done so, there might have been an opportunity of comparing two different ways of approaching the historian's job. There was no discussion of this question probably because the majority of the participants had no doubt already decided which of the two views was dominant and necessary.

The statement of the first view might have been to the effect that, while the historian should benefit from the scientific contributions made by related disciplines both to the method and substance of his own, his task was to preserve a certain degree of impartiality when considering the evidence produced by an investigation and to apply his integrity and lucidity to the assembling of a fully documented dossier for subsequent use by the men of action. The other view requires the historian to combine the work of making a fundamental analysis of the past with militant political action, and regards the objectivity required by the first view as an evasion of ideological commitment. According to the second view, of course, the historical method does not exist

independently and is merely one special branch of a general socio-economic method embracing all disciplines.

A more searching discussion of other points did not always lead to clear-cut conclusions. It was nevertheless of major interest because, as foreshadowed in the exchanges of views on the first two items of discussion, it gave rise to expressions of opinion that were apparently contradictory as regards their formulation but basically compatible as regards their substance.

Some of the participants felt that methods of approach were inseparable from ideology. The old ideology, which the evolution of the capitalist world shaped into many forms, with effects that might survive a country's accession to formal independence, had to be replaced by an ideology shaped by the demand for a rupture making it possible to turn a steady gaze on both the African past and the rapid transformation of African societies. The rupture had to be twofold: ideologically, there had to be a clean break with the piecemeal interpretation of African history that was current in the capitalist world, both inside and outside Africa; politically, there had to be a radical transformation of class relations when a country succeeded in gaining genuine independence. These participants expressed the opinion that the struggle for national liberation already belonged to the past history of southern Africa; it was not sufficient to pursue it as a goal in itself: liberation must go hand in hand with a radical transformation of society.

Other participants did not appear to be convinced that a methodical analysis of past history could produce a political analysis of the present situation that would automatically be correct. They preferred to take successive steps of a more empirical kind in their historical research and in their attitude to independence, liberation and the construction of a new society that would be different from former African society, from the society of the nineteenth century, from the society bearing the imprint of colonization and even from the society of the post-colonial era. They seemed uneasy about the effects of a systematic application of their colleagues' more radical approach and preferred to give the national struggle priority over the abrupt transformation of society.

There can be no doubt that these lines of thought owe much to the geographical and historical context in which the meeting took place and which could not leave any of the participating historians indifferent to the fate of the peoples of southern Africa.

Two equally important conceptions of a militant form of history capable of generating a new political, economic and social life emerged and challenged each other without, however, really clashing. The reservations due to differences in temperament, age, personal experience, social commitment and intellectual training in various disciplines should not obscure the fact that there was a common desire to achieve the transformation of society as well as national

independence, despite the divergence of views regarding the methods and stages involved.

The frequent references to what the experts regarded as the futility of winning nominal independence without the possibility of achieving true economic independence and a radical transformation of society were one of the most striking aspects of this discussion. The views expressed on this point contrasted sharply with the attitudes to independence which were typical of the 1960s, when leaders thought—wrongly, in the opinion of the experts present at the meeting—that they could dispense with profound economic and social changes.

Beyond this common ground, divergent views again emerged. Some experts feared that there would be instances of recolonization, while others stressed the overwhelming importance of the world economic and political context in which independence movements were making progress in southern Africa.

Even if they did not in themselves always constitute a fully developed method of approach to African history, these ideological preoccupations none the less threw a great deal of light on the thinking of the African participants in the meeting.

Since such arguments demanded close attention, the themes suggested for consideration by the Unesco Secretariat were not discussed in depth. They seemed less interesting and less important than the fundamental debate summarized above.

It is true that, by comparison with a searching ideological analysis of the situations existing in southern Africa, specific points such as Bantustans, participation in debates at the United Nations, and the role of Pan-Africanism are of relatively minor importance. Special attention was nevertheless drawn to the fact that a start had been made on a joint study of the dynamics of Bantustans, conducted by historians and other research workers active in the field of social sciences.

This debate, which was of fundamental significance, was tackled with lucidity and insight by the African experts participating in the meeting. It seemed that they desired simultaneously to make a more searching analysis of the political situations existing in this part of the continent, which is in a state of more or less openly declared war, and to find bases and methods, without imitating models alien to Africa, for constructing new societies which would be integrated into the contemporary world, having freed themselves from the worst constraints perpetuating their dependence, and would build their own past into their future structure as an essential element thereof.

The ideas put forward by the African participants are of capital importance as contributions not only to the historiography of this part of Africa but also to the work of the drafting committee for Volume VIII of the Unesco *General History of Africa*.³

An attempt to clarify certain concepts such as that of decolonization did not produce concrete results of any significance. It is probable that, in the case of this topic, almost every participant felt that fruitful methods of analysis could be derived from the preceding discussion.

Certain suggestions were made concerning a survey of liberation movements.

The first point on which the experts agreed was that these movements, which were originally led by bourgeois nationalists, had acquired a new significance and new ideological objectives with the development of the armed struggle. This change had in some cases resulted in more or less open conflicts between the 'traditional chiefs' and new leaders.

It would therefore be useful to examine the reasons that had induced these movements to adopt such a radical approach.

Secondly, the experts agreed that the leaders of these liberation movements should give serious thought to the types of society that they might be called upon to govern after liberation had been achieved, so as not to be 'overtaken' by the events of history.

One participant spoke of the valuable information that would be obtained, in his opinion, by studying the Africans of the western and eastern diaspora and their influence on the situations existing at present in southern Africa.

Critical survey of scientific production in the different countries of southern Africa and of ways of improving it

As requested by Unesco, several participants reported on the status of teaching and research work in the field of history in the different countries of southern Africa; the reports are reproduced in Part II of this volume. Various questions raised during the presentation of the reports elicited further details:

Swaziland: the African Studies Institute which the University of Swaziland was thinking of setting up was intended to deal with studies covering the whole of southern Africa.

Malawi: for the time being, the University of Malawi was concentrating its research on the pre-colonial period. Professor Webster, in his replies to the questions put to him, said that continuity was a marked feature of the life of societies before, during and after the colonial period. He also stressed the complex nature of these societies, in which numerous inter-ethnic relationships existed.

Zambia: as a result of the shortage of senior administrative personnel, the University of Zambia had been unable, until quite recently, to keep its history graduates on the teaching staff. The situation was about to change

in 1978, when four Zambian professors would be taking up their duties. It had not yet been possible to publish the proceedings of a symposium held at Lusaka in 1973 on religious matters.

Lesotho: no archaeological survey had yet been undertaken. An inventory of sites of historical interest was being prepared. Co-operation between the University of Lesotho and the universities of neighbouring countries was improving.

Botswana: archaeological investigations were providing material which would be very useful in dating work. No archaeological chart had yet been prepared, but an atlas was being produced in California.

Mozambique: research had been resumed since the country had won its independence. British archaeologists had carried out excavations, in close liaison with the University of Maputo, on sites comparable to the ones at Zimbabwe. The University, which was seeking the assistance of foreign scholars, was trying to set up an African studies centre. A request had been made to Unesco and also to the United Kingdom and France for historical documentation and aid in the preparation of textbooks.

Angola: here nothing seemed to have been done to promote research into African history.

In general, several obstacles seemed to be hindering, or even virtually blocking, research work. These obstacles, which were more or less difficult to overcome depending on the country, were as follows: (a) a policy for State archives that had not yet been defined with complete clarity; (b) lack of resources for rapid development of archaeological research, except in Swaziland where Unesco's aid was proving effective; (c) lack of bibliographical tools, even sometimes of the most rudimentary kind. It was beyond all doubt that the difficulties experienced by the universities of the southern part of Africa were incomparably greater than those of universities in any other region of the continent.

The meeting considered that the research done on Namibia was far from adequate. The experts unanimously agreed on the desirability of attaching a Namibian research worker to the Lusaka Namibian Institute if possible; at present a Namibian teacher was working at the Institute.

Professors S. Marks (United Kingdom) and J. Devisse (France) provided the meeting with information concerning teaching and research on southern Africa which was being done in their respective countries. Professor Marks answered questions from several participants on the training of young African research workers, the information supplied to the European public on the situation in southern Africa and the information supplied to the African public on research work being done in Europe.

The meeting emphasized the fact that, as a result of the present situation in this region of the world and especially in the southern part of Africa, the universities of southern Africa were experiencing difficulties in organizing

research and teaching in the field of history that were immeasurably harder to overcome than those of other universities on the continent of Africa.

It was true that the necessity created by such circumstances, which were sometimes those of sheer want, was the mother of invention, so that important changes and fruitful innovations were made in teaching methods. But if this state of affairs lasted much longer it would be bound to aggravate the imbalance, so frequently mentioned by the International Scientific Committee, between this region of Africa and the others. An exceptional effort was therefore needed, both within Africa and at international level, to find a way out of the present situation and facilitate the take-off of research and high-quality teaching in a region of Africa where, as was obvious, research workers were very keen to investigate, innovate and discover, but were deprived—unless they worked in universities outside Africa—of the means and time needed to conduct serious research projects.

In many cases, everything was lacking, including libraries. At the other end of the scale there did not exist, for example, any good popular textbook of the history of the region, and almost all the textbooks for secondary-level education had still to be written.

Setting up of a medium-term research programme

Consideration was given to the medium-term measures required in order to improve the research situation in southern Africa.

It was agreed that the most important measures were probably those designed to meet the needs of the existing universities, as described by the representatives of those universities present at the meeting.

Botswana, where work had already been carried out on oral traditions and archaeology, hoped that a more vigorous integrated effort to pursue historical research on Botswana itself and on southern Africa, would receive encouragement from external sources.

Lesotho hoped that the technical archaeological assistance granted to Swaziland by Unesco would be extended to its own territory.

Malawi wished to be closely associated with Unesco's ten-year programme on oral traditions.

Namibia would probably have a requirement for a research worker attached to the Lusaka Institute.

Swaziland would like an expert mission to be sent there for several months in order to assist in the preparation of a research programme, together with lists of books for which there was a need, and also to help with the production of essential basic textbooks.

The Unesco representative reminded States that it was important to set

out their objectives clearly and to send details to Unesco. The universities should: (a) take the lead in this activity; (b) strive to harmonize their research plans as much as possible; (c) make every effort to adapt themselves to the flexible research structures that Unesco had helped to create in central, eastern and southern Africa in connection with oral traditions and archaeology.

Reference was made to the regional historical documentation centre, the establishment of which had been recommended by the International Scientific Committee at its Lusaka session in 1973.³

The Unesco representative stressed the fact that Unesco aid could not take the place of the initiative and will to co-operate of States; he emphasized the need to refrain from setting up new and costly administrative structures but to try, on the contrary, to utilize all the facilities already in existence. He suggested that the major stumbling block created by the desire of every State to have a well-endowed regional institute on its own territory might be bypassed by adopting the practice of rotating conferences, working groups or research groups between countries.

Above all, he advised the participants not to 'tether' research within the confines of the present national frontiers, which, here as in other regions of Africa, sometimes cut across large pre-colonial entities.

Consideration was given to the possibility of creating a liaison bulletin between all the universities of southern Africa. This would be useful at two different levels: (a) internally: a 'newsletter' aiming simply to circulate information for internal consumption would in itself greatly improve relations between the universities without entailing heavy expenditure; (b) externally: the object of the bulletin would be to enable the universities of southern Africa to undertake immediate publication of reports on the research work being done under their auspices. The bulletin should not try to compete with the various journals which already existed in almost every State but should facilitate exchanges with other universities, both African and non-African.

In the case of the second type of bulletin larger funds would have to be invested than for the first type, and a concerted plan for its creation should therefore be worked out by all the universities concerned; if they reached agreement, they would transmit their joint proposals to their respective governments, which would in turn forward them to the Director-General of Unesco.

Recommendations

At its closing session the meeting adopted the following recommendations to the Director-General of Unesco:

Recommendation No. 1, to be communicated to Member States and their universities:

- (a) Whenever the history of southern Africa is the subject of a report on research work conducted by university methods, and whenever a work is published in this field of study, it would be desirable for a copy to be sent to the universities of southern Africa belonging to Unesco Member States.
- (b) African universities in other parts of the continent are invited to develop their exchanges of scientific information with the universities of southern Africa belonging to Unesco Member States.

Recommendation No. 2, concerning toponyms and ethnonyms:

- (a) All scientific organizations, whether African or non-African, should be invited to furnish the universities of southern Africa belonging to Unesco Member States with all the information they possess concerning toponyms and the names of ethnic, social and family groups in southern Africa.
- (b) Unesco should seek, whenever possible, to associate research workers from the universities of southern Africa with any international survey of these subjects that may be undertaken.

Recommendation No. 3, concerning the African languages:

With reference to the recommendations framed by the Cairo Symposium,⁴ the meeting wishes the languages of southern Africa to be studied on the lines laid down by the experts at Cairo. It also wishes southern African research workers belonging to the universities of Unesco Member States to be associated with any symposium, expert seminar or working group convened on these questions.

Recommendation No. 4. The meeting wishes this recommendation to be brought to the attention of the competent ministers in the various Member States:

- (a) Aid should be provided without delay for the publication of studies on southern Africa already completed by African research workers.
- (b) If the need for it is felt by the universities of the region, and after a concerted plan prepared by them has been presented by their respective governments to the Director-General of Unesco, aid should be provided for the publication of a specialized regional journal.
- (c) Unesco should provide aid for the speedy publication of one or two volumes of a popular history of southern Africa.
- (d) Aid should be granted by the States of southern Africa, within the framework of their economic planning, for research work in the human sciences and particularly in the field of history.
- (e) International aid should be provided to enable the research institutes and laboratories and scientific libraries of the universities of southern

Africa to procure equipment in accordance with detailed programmes drawn up by each of these universities and presented by their respective governments to Unesco.

- (f) Research work planned by various universities and described in statements presented to Unesco by their respective governments should be included in the programmes which Unesco is promoting in Africa in different branches of research (archaeology, oral traditions, social sciences, etc.).

Notes

1. With this in mind, the Rapporteur of the Committee after the meeting arranged for the present report to be sent to the various African universities.
2. Volume VIII deals with Africa since the Ethiopian War, 1935-75.
3. Negotiations between the countries concerned are being held on the possibility of creating this centre, probably in Lesotho.
4. See *The Peopling of Ancient Egypt and the Deciphering of the Meroitic Script*, Paris, Unesco, 1978. (The General History of Africa: Studies and Documents, 1.)

Appendixes

1. List of participants

Professor M. Balintulo, University of Botswana and Swaziland, Gaborone, Botswana.
Professor N. M. B. Bhebe, University of Botswana and Swaziland, P/B Kwaluseni, Swaziland.

Professor H. H. K. Bhila, University of Malawi, P.O. Box 280, Zomba, Malawi.

Professor D. Chanaiwa, 22243 Cass Avenue, Woodland Hills, Calif. 91364, United States.

Professor J. Devisse, 14 Avenue de la Porte de Vincennes, 75012 Paris, France.

Professor B. S. Krishnamurthy, University of Zambia, P.O. Box 2379, Lusaka, Zambia.
Professor Shula Marks, Cypress Tree House, Dulwich Common, London S.E.21, United Kingdom.

Dr E. K. Mashingaidze, National University of Lesotho, Roma, Lesotho.

Professor L. D. Ngcongco, Department of History, University of Botswana and Swaziland, Private Bag 22, Gaborone, Botswana.

Professor B. A. Ogot, Department of History, University of Nairobi, P.O. Box 30197, Nairobi, Kenya.

Professor J. D. Omer-Cooper, University of Otago, P.O. Box 65, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Professor R. Pélissier, route des Alluets, 78630 Orgeval, France.

Professor J. B. Webster, Department of History, Chancellor College, P.O. Box 280, Zomba, Malawi.

Professor R. T. Zwinoira, P.O. Box 983, Manzini, Swaziland.

Unesco representatives

Mr A. Gatera, Programme Specialist, Division of Cultural Studies.

Miss M. F. Lengue, Division of Cultural Studies.

2. Bibliography

LATE STONE AGE AND IRON AGE

Compiled by S. Marks

Articles: Archaeology

- DE MARET, P.; CAHEN, D.; VAN NOTEN, F. Radiocarbon Dates from Central Africa: a Synthesis. *J. Afr. Hist.* Vol. XVIII, No. 3, 1977.
- INSKEEP, R. R.; MAGGS, T. M. O'C. Unique Art Objects in the Iron Age of the Transvaal, South Africa. *S. Afr. Archaeol. Bull.*, Parts III and IV, Vol. XXX, 1975.
- MAGGS, T. Some Recent Radiocarbon Dates from Eastern and Southern Africa. *J. Afr. Hist.*, Vol. XVIII, No. 2, 1977.
- MAGGS, T. M. O'C. Pastoral Settlements on the Riet River. *S. Afr. Arch. Bull.*, 1971.
- MAGGS, T. M. O'C.; MICHAEL, M. A. Ntshetane, an Early Iron Age Site in the Tugela Basin, Natal. *Ann. Natal Mus.*, Vol. XXII, No. 3, 1976.
- MASON, R. J. Background to the Transvaal Iron Age—New Discoveries at Olifantspoort and Broederstroom. *J. S. Afr. Instit. Min. Met.*, Vol. LXXIV, 1974.
- MASON, R. J. *et al.* Early Iron Age Settlement of Southern Africa. *S. Afr. J. Sci.*, Vol. LXIX, 1973.
- PHILLIPSON, D. Archaeology and Bantu Linguistics. *World Archaeol.*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1976.
- SOPER, R. C. New Radiocarbon Dates for Eastern and Southern Africa. *J. Afr. Hist.* Vol. XV, No. 2, 1974.
- SUTTON, J. E. G. New Radiocarbon Dates for Eastern and Southern Africa. *J. Afr. Hist.*, Vol. XIII, No. I, 1972.

Surveys in recent books

- MARKS, S.; BIRMINGHAM, D. Southern Africa. In: R. Oliver (ed.), *Cambridge History of Africa*, Vol. 3 (A.D. 1000–1600).
- MARKS, S.; GRAY, R. Southern Africa and Madagascar. In: R. Gray (ed.), *Cambridge History of Africa*, Vol. 4 (1600–1790).
- (See also bibliographies at end of each volume.)

Specialist monographs: Iron Age

- DERRICOURT, R. M. *Prehistoric Man in the Ciskei and Transkei*. Cape Town, Struik, 1977.
- MAGGS, T. M. O'C. *Iron Age Communities of the Southern Highveld*. Pietermaritzburg, 1976.

Late Stone Age

- BISSON, M. Kansanshi: a Prehistoric Coppermine in North-western Zambia. *Archaeol.*, Vol. XXVII, 1974.
- CARR, M. J.; CARR, A. C.; JACOBSON, L.; VOGEL, J. C. Radiocarbon Dates from the Zerrisene Mountain Open Station Settlement Complex. *S. Afr. J. Sci.*, Vol. LXXII, 1976. (Namibia)
- DEACON, J. Patterning in the Radiocarbon Dates for the Walton-Smithfield Complex in South Africa. *S. Afr. Arch. Bull.*, Vol. XXIX, 1974.
- . *Where Hunters Gathered*, 1976.
- EVERS, T. M. Recent Iron Age Research in the Eastern Transvaal, South Africa. *S. Afr. Arch. Bull.*, Vol. XXIX, 1974.
- HUFFMAN, T. N. Cattle from Mabveni. *S. Afr. Arch. Bull.*, Part I, II, Vol. XXX, 1975.
- HUMPHREYS, A. J. B. Note on a Date for a Burial from the Riet River. *S. Afr. J. Sci.*, Vol. LXX, 1974.
- JACOBSON, L.; VOGEL, J. C. Recent Radiocarbon Dates from the Brandberg (Namibia). *S. Afr. J. Sci.*, Vol. LXXI, 1975.
- MAGGS, T. M. O'C. Bilobial Dwellings: a Persistent Feature of Sn. Tswana settlements. *S. Afr. Arch. Soc.*, Goodwin series I, June 1972.
- PARKINGTON, J. *Follow the San*. University of Cape Town, 1976. (Thesis.)
- PRINSLOO, H. P. Early Iron Age Site at Klein Afrika near Williespoort, Soutpansberg Mountains, S. Africa. *S. Afr. J. Sci.*, Vol. LXX, 1974.
- SCHWEITZER, F. R. Archaeological Evidence for Sheep at the Cape. *S. Afr. Arch. Bull.*, Vol. XXIX, 1974.

LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

- EHRET, C. Cattle-keeping and Milking in Eastern and Southern Africa. *J. Afr. Hist.*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1967.
- . Patterns of Bantu and Central Sudanic Settlement in Central and Southern Africa. *Transafrican J. of Hist.*, Vol. IV, No. 1, 1974.
- . Outlining Southern African History, 100–1500 A.D. *Ufuhannm*, Vol. III, No. I, 1972.
- . Sheep and Central Sudanic People in Southern Africa. *J. Afr. Hist.*, Vol. IX, No. 2, 1968.

- LANHAM, L. W. The Proliferation and Extension of Bantu Phonemic Systems Influenced by Bushman and Hottentot. *Proceedings of Ninth Congress of Linguistics, Cambridge, Mass., 1962*. The Hague, 1967.
- WESTPHAL, E. J. The Linguistic Prehistory of Southern Africa: Bush, Kwadi, Hottentot and Bantu Linguistic Relationships. *Africa*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 3, 1963.
- . A Reclassification of Southern Africa non-Bantu Languages. *J. of African languages*, Vol. I, No. 1, 1962.

MISCELLANEOUS STUDIES

Journal of Southern African Historical Studies, Vol. I, 1976. Published by Department of History, National University of Lesotho, Roma, Lesotho.

Summary: Maps of Lesotho and Surrounding Areas, 1779–1828, by David P. Ambrose; African Attitudes to Knowledge, by Earnest A. Rouch; The Dominicans at Zumbo: an Aspect of Missionary Work in the Zambezi Valley, c. 1726–1836; Edward Lion of Lesotho, by Gordon M. Haliburton; Christianity and the Mhondoro Cult. A Study of African Religions: Initiative and Resilience in the Mozoe Valley Area of Mashonaland; The Deployment of the Labour Force in Lesotho, by Larry S. Covley; The High Commission Territories 1908–1964: a Bibliography, by G. Neil Parsons.

CHANAIWA, D. S. (ed.). *Profiles of Self-determination: African Responses to European Colonialism in Southern Africa, 1652–Present*. Approximately 400 pages; with maps, charts, diagrams, index and bibliography.

Contents: *Introduction*: Southern African societies on the eve of colonization. *Section I: Responses to Partition and Conquest*. New Directions in the Study of African Resistance, by Dr Allen Isaacman; The Emergence of a Griqua State: an African Response to Colonialism and Christianity, by Dr William F. Lye; Herero Reactions: the Pre-colonial Period, the German Period, and the South African Period, by Dr Wade Pendleton; The 100 Years' War: Reflections on African Resistance on the Cape Eastern Frontier, by Dr Christopher Saunders; Xhosa Cattle Killing, 1856–1857: the Messianic Factor in African Resistance, by Dr Richard Ralston; The Barwe Rebellion of 1917: the Emergence of a Pan-Zambesian Consciousness, by Allen and Barbara Isaacman; Tradition and Armed Resistance in Colonial Africa: the Ndebele and Shona, 1896–1900, by Dr David Chanaiwa. *Section II: Responses to Colonial Administrations*. African Nationalism in a Settler Environment, by Dr Antony Ngubo; The Apostolic-prophetic Church Movement in Zimbabwe, by Dr Micah Tsonondo; John Langalibalele Dube, Booker T. Washington, and the Origins of South African Nationalist Thought, 1896–1899, by Dr Manning Marable; The Afro-American Factor in Southern African Ethiopianism, 1890–1906, by Dr J. Mutero Chirenje; Zambian versus Malawian Approaches to Political Change in Southern Africa, by Dr Douglas G. Anglin; Zimbabwe, Detente, and Neo-colonialism in Southern Africa, by Dr Agrippah Mugomba. *Summary and Conclusion*.

