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Introduction

Chris Saunders

This publication brings together a number of the ‘think pieces’ prepared for a workshop convened by the Nordic Africa Institute (NAI) in Pretoria, South Africa, on 26–27 November, 2009. This workshop, which marked the end of the NAI’s Documentation Project on the Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa, was attended by leading scholars, researchers and others, from both the Nordic countries and southern Africa, concerned with documenting those struggles. The workshop participants discussed a range of issues relating to that objective, including issues of access and visibility, and ways in which co-operation between Nordic universities and Southern African universities could be furthered. It was agreed that it was important to document lessons learned from documentation and digitization processes to share the knowledge accumulated to date.

Other papers presented at the workshop and not included here may be found on the website www.liberationafrica.se.

The Nordic Documentation Project on the Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa was established in 2003 when Lennart Wohlgemuth was Director of the NAI, and in his presentation to the 2009 workshop he recalled that in the early 1990s Dr Ibbo Mandaza of the Southern Africa Regional Institute for Policy Studies in Harare, Zimbabwe, had persuaded him that the NAI should participate in a project on the history of liberation struggles in southern Africa. While the general project was unfortunately never completed, a research project was set up by the NAI in 1994 entitled ‘The National Liberation of Southern Africa: the role of the Nordic countries’. Tor Sellström, its co-coordinator, had worked closely with the liberation movements in the region over many years. The NAI project resulted in the publication of two volumes on Sweden’s role written by Sellström himself, and one each on Denmark, Finland and Norway, as well as a volume of interviews that Sellström had conducted with important actors in the struggles across the region. Sellström’s work was the first major study of international solidarity with the anti-apartheid struggle, and it has only relatively recently been followed by similar studies of such solidarity in other countries.1 After the publication of the NAI volumes, the Nordic project became a documentation one, which included establishing a

---

website on Nordic support to the liberation struggles in southern Africa (www.liberationafrica.se). Proscovia Svärd, who co-ordinated this project until 2009, helped identify material relating to the anti-apartheid movement in Iceland, which had previously been almost entirely undocumented.²

It was possible here only to include a selection of the papers presented at the Pretoria workshop. In the first group of papers that follow, Håkan Thörn, author of an important book on the anti-apartheid movement in general,³ sets the liberation struggles in southern Africa in a global context as a transnational movement that he relates to the world-wide search for global justice. Harri Siiskonen then considers the Nordic churches and governments in relation to the liberation struggles in southern Africa and offers suggestions for future research. Pekka Peltola discusses Finnish support to the liberation struggles in Namibia and Mozambique and Henning Melber the limits to liberation in southern Africa.⁴ Lene Christiansen tackles the issue of the political impact of how the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe is remembered. These papers by scholars from the Nordic countries remind us of the very extensive Nordic interest in the history of the liberation struggles in Southern Africa over many years. It is hoped that they will encourage continued interest in those struggles in the Nordic countries in the future.

The second set of papers included here relate more directly to the sources in Southern Africa for the history of the liberation struggles in the region and to digital initiatives in regard to them. The first of these papers considers what historians have written about those struggles so far and the kinds of sources they have used. Brown Maaba then provides a brief overview of the various liberation archives in South Africa. William Minter discusses problems associated with the use of digital technologies for creating a digital archive, and Pat Liebetrau draws on her experience as project manager of Digital Innovation South Africa (DISA) to write about digital preservation. Gary Baines tells us how difficult it has been to access information from South Africa’s Department of Defence Archives in Pretoria, and finally Gerald Mazarire explores the topic of rescuing Zimbabwe’s liberation struggle material.

It is hoped that these brief glimpses into ways to document the histories of the liberation struggles in the region will help future researchers identify sources and suggest lines of future enquiry. There is no doubt that much more research into the liberation struggles in southern Africa is sorely needed, and a key to that is adequate documentation.

---

⁴ Henning Melber was Research Director of the Nordic Africa Institute at the time the Documentation Project was initiated. He was not able to attend the workshop.
I would like to thank the NAI and its Director, Carin Norberg, for asking me to edit these papers, and Proscovia Svärd, who was the main organiser of the Pretoria workshop and who suggested the publication of these papers.
Part 1

Aspects of the History of Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa
This paper suggests that the post-war network of southern African liberation movements and solidarity movements could be seen as transnational ‘movement of movements’. In my book *Anti-Apartheid and the Emergence of a Global Civil Society* (Thörn 2006/2009), I argue that given the number of people that supported the transnational anti-apartheid movement, as well as its geographical dispersion and its achievements, there is no doubt that it was one of the most influential social movements during the post-war era. Existing as a transnational movement for more than four decades, its impact was not limited to the South African context, as it created transnational networks, organizations and collective action forms that made – and still makes – an impact on national as well as transnational political cultures. So the broader network of southern African liberation movements and solidarity movements proves a relevant case for contemporary theorising and research on transnational movements and global civil society. This approach involves putting questions such as: To what extent was the transnational network of southern African liberation movements and solidarity movements a predecessor of contemporary global social movements, such as the global justice movement? Could an analysis of the transnational network of southern African liberation movements and solidarity movements contribute to improve our analysis of contemporary global civil society?

Most research on the liberation and solidarity movements has focused on its national aspects, looking for example at the national liberation movements of southern African countries or the national solidarity movements in Britain, Australia, USA or the Nordic countries (cf. Fieldhouse 2005; Massie 1997; Jennett 1989; Voorhes 1999; Seekings 2000; Sellström 1999, 1999 ed; 2002; Eriksen ed. 1999; Morgenstierne 2003; Soiri & Peltola 1999). As national movements played a significant role, and national contexts were crucial for the dynamic of the struggle, this research has been important. Considering that there were anti-apartheid activities in more than 100 countries, there is indeed even more research to do about national movements and contexts. However, an analysis of the liberation struggle that limits itself only to different national spaces leaves out an extremely crucial aspect of the movement’s activities – and indeed an important source of its political influence. While studies of national movements often take some of their relations with movements in other countries into account (i.e. their international
relations), theoretically informed and systematic research on one of the most crucial aspects of this movement, its construction of transnational networks and forms of action, and its influence on supra-national institutions and transnational corporations, is largely lacking. The significance of the transnational anti-apartheid movement has often been mentioned in the context of social movement studies (Della Porta & Kriesi 1999) and international relations (Klotz 1999), but it has only in a few cases been researched and theorised (Crawford & Klotz eds. 1999; Thörn 2006; Shepherd 1977). Further, the little research that has been done using a transnational framework to the liberation struggle in the region of Southern Africa has, at least to my knowledge, mainly been concerned with solidarity with the struggle against apartheid South Africa (including my own book). Considering this, the history of the transnational dimensions of the liberation struggle in Southern Africa has only begun to be written. This paper will focus on this aspect, but to avoid any misunderstandings – I regard a transnational approach as one of several possibilities to take research on networks of southern African liberation movements and solidarity movements further.

In this paper I discuss some concepts and empirical results from my own research about the transnational anti-apartheid movement in order to formulate a number of suggestions regarding further research on the transnational aspects of the southern African liberation struggle. In the first section, I will make some conceptual clarifications in connection with a theoretical framework that highlights political globalization. The second part will discuss the anti-apartheid movement/liberation struggle in a social movement framework, informed by a postcolonial approach, and emphasising the importance of contextualising transnational relations. In the third part, I will highlight the importance of media and travel in the emergence of a global civil society; and the fourth part will make a brief comparison between the transnational anti-apartheid movement and the contemporary global justice movement. I will finally conclude by underlining some research questions that emerge from the discussion.

Border thinking: conceptualising transnational political action and global civil society

A number of scholars from different disciplines have argued that the study of global or transnational phenomena requires a theoretical and methodological approach that is different from the dominant paradigm that equals the study of ‘society’ with ‘national society’ (Wallerstein 1991; Beck 2000). Attempts to think about power, territoriality, identity, structure and action beyond the ‘nation state paradigm’, or ‘methodological nationalism’, have often been centred on the concept of ‘border’. Walter Mignolo (2000) has coined the concept of ‘border thinking’ in order to theorize present globalization in relation to the global history of colonialism. It
might also be used as a name for a ‘transnational approach’ shared by a number of scholars working in fields such as postcolonial studies, cultural studies, sociology, international relations and anthropology. Different from the images of a ‘boundless world’ of globalist ideology, ‘border thinking’ urges us to think in new ways about borders and boundaries, geopolitical as well as cultural or racial. It is an approach that pays particular attention to practices involving movements, mobility and diaspora – the crossing of borders and the construction of spaces across and in between institutionalized and relatively fixed boundaries – the latter understood in terms of ‘borderlands’ (Anzaldua 1999) or ‘third space’ (Bhabha 1994).

During the last decades of the 20th century, political action became an increasingly complex and multi-dimensional activity (Della Porta & Tarrow 2005). Politics was not just something occurring in the context of national arenas and international co-operations, but also became increasingly transnational and global. For the sake of clarity, I make a distinction between international processes, denoting interaction across borders including exclusively national organizations or institutions (such as states or national labour unions), transnational processes, referring to any interaction across national borders not exclusively based on national organisations or institutions, and finally global processes, which are different from international and transnational processes in the sense that they can not be reduced to interaction that links national spaces. The ‘global’ refers to a different form of territoriality than the national. Drawing on the perspectives on global processes of Held et. al (1999), Sassen (2006), Scholte (2005) and others, I argue that the concept of globalization implies a social space spanning over all continents; and that it can not be reduced to a set of relations between a number of nation states (or national organisations). National territories, institutions and organisations may be part of this space, and indeed provide links between the global and the national, but they perform different functions in the global context. With regard to the debate on whether globalisation should be perceived as ‘a-territorial’ or territorial in the sense of ‘glocal’, globalization is territorial in the sense that its institutions and processes are anchored in territories; and it is a-territorial in the sense that it is not ultimately defined by any territorial borders. Historically, as well as in the present, there is a connection between the different processes in the sense that global processes may be the (intended or unintended) consequence of international and transnational processes.

Regarding the concept of global civil society, contemporary discourses often simply refer to a steadily increasing body of actors, with diverse interests and identities, performing politics on a global level: social movements, NGOs (in various forms), private foundations and interest groups. I suggest a definition that is analytical rather than descriptive – global civil society is a political space in which a diversity of political experiences, action strategies, identities, values and norms are articulated and contested (Thörn 2007; Scholte 2007). It should be emphasised
that it is a space of struggle and conflict – over the values, norms and rules that govern global social space(s) – and ultimately over the control of material resources and institutions.

(New) Social Movements and the postcolonial condition

The anti-apartheid struggle was a multi-dimensional social movement. What does this mean? I analytically define a social movement as a form of collective action that articulates a social conflict and ultimately aims at transforming a social order; it is a process of action and interaction involving as a fundamental element the construction of a collective identity, or a sense of community, of ‘us’, sharing a set of values and norms, and ‘others’, i.e. antagonistic actors, (Thörn 1997). However, the dynamic of a social movement also involves conflicts and tensions not just in relation to the movement’s adversaries, but also within its own space – tensions often articulating the conflicts structuring the broader social context in which the movement is situated. Further, social movement studies have emphasized the importance of previously organized networks for the mobilization of a social movement (Della Porta & Diani 2006). Since networks are carriers of values, previously organized networks bring a historical legacy into the formation of a new movement. In the context of the anti-apartheid movement, that to a large extent was a ‘movement of movements’, the churches, the labour movement and the anti-colonial movements provided different networks with sometimes conflicting historical legacies. While these movements had to identify a common ground in order to bring about collective action, internal relations were also constantly defined by conflict. In the movement’s own terms it was a ‘the struggle within the struggle’ – ultimately a conflict over hegemony of the movement.

Empirically, a social movement can have national, international, transnational or global dimensions, depending on the territoriality of its different forms of collective actions. Given the definitions above, how should one characterise the territoriality of anti-apartheid? Organizationally, the anti-apartheid movement consisted of a network of organizations, action groups and networks. Some of them were national, such as British AAM, some of them were international, such as IDAF, and some of them consisted of networks of local groups, such as the South Africa Committees and the Africa Groups in Sweden (before they were formed into a national organization, AGIS).

Anti-apartheid did of course have a strong national aspect. The overthrow of a national regime was on top of the agenda. The anti-apartheid movement did not just act in the context of a national public sphere in South Africa (which had a fragile existence in spite of severe repression); national solidarity movements acted in national public spheres all over the world – from Britain to India and Australia – in order to influence public opinion and national governments to put pressure
on South Africa. Resistance to apartheid also had an international aspect, as it in some cases involved international organisations, such as the OAU, UN (Special Committee), EEC and labour internationals such as International Confederation of Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). A significant aspect of the collective action of anti-apartheid movement was however transnational, as organizations and action groups were part of a transnational solidarity network, which on the Southern Hemisphere had important nodes in Dar Es Salaam and Lusaka, and on the Northern Hemisphere in London and New York. London was vital in its capacity as a ‘postcolonial capital’, where the ANC had its main exile office and where South African exiles initiated AAM. New York was instrumental as the site for the UN Special Committee against apartheid, which played a key role in the transnational solidarity network. Here, information was exchanged, overall strategies were discussed, co-operation on campaigns, national as well as transnational, were co-ordinated, and friendships were made. It is important to underline that this to a large extent happened on an informal basis and that the work of the Committee was often regarded as controversial in the UN building.

Finally the anti-apartheid movement had a global dimension, particularly as it engaged in public communication across continents, addressing a global audience, as for example in the case of the Mandela concerts in 1988 and 1980, organised by British AAM and broadcast to the BBC to hundreds of millions of people in 68 countries. Anti-apartheid was thus multi-dimensional in the sense that it simultaneously operated on national, international, transnational and global levels.

These different levels constantly interacted with each other. For example, the globalization of the anti-apartheid struggle was initiated by South African liberation movements, and the transnational solidarity movement was always dependent on, and influenced by, the actions of South African organizations and networks – working inside South Africa or in exile. On the other hand, South African anti-apartheid organizations, whether mainly working on the inside or on the outside of their home country, were always heavily influenced by transnational processes.

The anti-apartheid struggle also involved alliances between states and actors in global civil society, as states in a few cases funded, and exchanged information with, movement organizations across national borders. It approached, interacted, and in a few cases closely co-operated with, national governments, such as those of India, Nigeria, Tanzania and Sweden, as well as intergovernmental organizations and communities, such as the OAU, the Commonwealth, the UN and the EEC. To use Kriesi’s and Della Porta’s (1999) notion of an international multilevel political game, the struggle against apartheid thus included three types of political interaction – transgovernmental interaction, transnational movement mobilization, and cross-level mobilization (between social movements in one country and a government in another country). These authors specifically emphasize the
anti-apartheid movement as an example of a case where transnational and cross-level mobilization put pressure on a national government (South Africa) indirectly, through influencing transgovernmental relations between Western countries and South Africa. However, I would argue that transnational anti-apartheid mobilization also directly put pressure on South Africa through economic (consumer) and cultural boycotts and through direct support to the internal struggle.

Transnational relations were complex and sometimes involved contradictions related to broader structural contexts, such as the cold war and the condition of postcoloniality. Situated in the context of the Cold War, the anti-apartheid struggle, like any significant political field during the post-war era, national as well as transnational, was divided along the conflict lines that constituted the bipolar political world order. Further, situated in the context of postcoloniality, the patterns of conflicts and positions taken in the context of international communities and transnational relations were to a large extent conditioned by the political history of colonialism. The complexity and power struggles involved in these relations need further investigation, as much research has either neglected this, and sometimes even reproduced colonial thinking, as is evident in the discourse on ‘new social movements’.

While the term ‘new social movements’ has often referred to new political phenomena appearing in Western Europe and the US, it is important to emphasize the significant role of anti-colonial movements in the South in the construction of transnational and global political cultures emerging with the new social movements (Thörn 2006; Young 2004). With a few exceptions (Slater ed. 1985, Wignaraja ed. 1993), it is only recently, in response to the current wave of global mobilization, that a number of attempts have been made to formulate analytical concepts that accounts not just for new social movements in the North, but also in the South (e.g. Gibson ed. 2006; Smith et. al. 2008; Olesen 2004).

The Eurocentric and evolutionist thinking often implied in NSM theory is clearly expressed by Christine Jennett as she is applying Alain Touraine’s theory of social movements in her analysis of the Australian anti-apartheid movement. The movement organization AAAM (Australian Anti-Apartheid Movement), consisting of predominantly middle-class Australian solidarity activists, is by Jennett defined as a new social movement, characterized by its orientation toward participatory grassroots democracy. The exile liberation movements, including organizations such as the ANC, the PAC and SWAPO, are by the same author defined as ‘historical movements’, characterized by hierarchical forms of organization and nationalist ideology.

In a sense new social movement theory has often implicitly been reproducing the Eurocentric evolutionist thinking of classical modernization theory, in which each country in its development has to pass through similar stages, and where the ‘underdeveloped’ countries of the South are always lagging behind the developed countries of the North. This mode of thinking is also based on ‘methodologi-
cal nationalism’ in the sense that the nation state is always the basic unity of the analysis, and development/underdevelopment thus always is related to ‘internal factors’. Relating the case of the transnational anti-apartheid movement to the debate on ‘new social movements’, it is evident that this movement, displaying all the characteristics associated with new social movements, emerged out of transnational interactions located in the context of de-colonization and that the collective experiences and action forms of the anti-colonial struggles in the South were extremely important sources of influence. It was initiated under strong influence not just of South African anti-apartheid organizations and exiles, but also of the broader anti-colonial struggle. The de-colonization process clearly marked established politics as well as the emerging alternative political culture in Britain at the time when the two internationally important solidarity organizations, IDAF and AAM, were initiated. These organizations were part of what in Britain in the late 1950s and early 1960s was called ‘new politics’, it an early conceptualization of certain forms of collective action, foreshadowing the latter ‘new social movements’ (Thörn 2006/2009).

Media and mobility

The liberation struggle in Southern Africa was parallel in time, and was indeed part of, the media revolution that changed the nature of politics from the 1960s and on. The changes included the emergence of a visualized transnational media space, as a part of the process of globalization (Tomlinson 1999; Thompson 1995). This is not only a space for the immediate transmission of news across the globe, but also a site of political struggle, where different political actors take part in a struggle of representation and interpretation, trying to influence public opinions. In relation to this media revolution John Keane (1991), in his influential book Media and Democracy, argued that we have seen a ‘slow and delicate growth of an international civil society’ (p. 143). In connection with my discussion above, I would however rather conceptualise this space as global, as it can not be reduced to the sum of national civil societies/media spaces.

Further, the role of the media for the emergence of a global civil society should be understood in connection with the increasing importance of travel, or mobility, during the post-war era. My research shows that travel, or mobility, had different functions within the anti-apartheid movement. First, conferences played an important role as a space for networking, discussions and co-ordination of national as well as transnational campaigns. Second, the exile South Africans played an important role as organizers and mobilizers, travelling extensively around the world, making speeches at solidarity meetings and thus giving ‘the other’ a public face. They were also often spiders in the ‘informational networks’ that is defining transnational activism (Keck & Sikkink 1998) and which were crucial for the movement’s media work.
Third, according to accounts of solidarity activists travel was related to an emotional aspect of solidarity activism, crucial for the individual’s motivation to engage in, as well as to sustain, solidarity action through the years. For some activists journeys to Southern Africa meant making direct experiences of the apartheid system that became a starting point for a commitment to the struggle. More important, travel facilitated personal encounters between South African activists and solidarity activists, sometimes developing into friendships. Some activists mention temporary visits by South Africans, for example by the UDF in the 1980s, as an important source of inspiration for the everyday routines of solidarity activism. It seems however, that it was the presence of exile South Africans that was the most important aspect in the process of giving ‘the other’ a face on the level of personal relations in the context of the solidarity movement. Hence, through making identification with ‘distant others’ something concrete for grassroots activists, travel seemed to have been a crucial element in making anti-apartheid solidarity possible.

Considering the important role ascribed to the presence of South African exiles by solidarity activists, it is reasonable to conclude that this is an important factor in explaining the fact that solidarity with the South African liberation movement had a stronger and wider support base in Europe and the US than did the liberation movements of other countries in Southern Africa; the latter did not have as strong exile presence in the Western countries as did the South African organizations. This does however need to be further investigated.

To conclude, I am arguing that the key to an analysis of the construction of transnational networks is to look at the combination of on the one hand mediated interaction, particularly the development of a number of media strategies, related to the emergence of new media and media technologies, and on the other hand face-to-face interaction, including exchange of information and experiences between individuals representing groups, communities and organizations with different locations in the world.

From liberation struggle to global justice

After the ‘global justice movement’ became visible in the World Social Forums in the South and in the streets in cities in the North (Seattle, Genua), as well as in a globalized media space, there has been an increasing interest in the globality of social as movements (Della Porta & Tarrow (eds.) 2005; Smith et. al. 2008; Sen et. al. 2003, Waterman 2001) and in the concept of global civil society (Glasius & Kaldor (eds.) 2004/5; Kaldor 2003; Keane 2003; Löfgren & Thörn eds. 2007). Comparing the transnational anti-apartheid movement and the global justice movement, the latter represent activism in global civil society on a different level. This is related to structural change during the last decades, resulting in new opportunities for global interaction, particularly the increasing availability of the
Internet and cheaper air travel. The number of participants at the World Social Forum (70–150,000) represents a qualitative jump also in terms of global civil society gatherings; in spite of the number of organisations that were part of the networks of the liberation struggle in Southern Africa, the number of activists at global gatherings was a matter of hundreds rather than tens of thousands.

But the fact that the globality of the World Social Forum is without historical parallel does not mean that it lacks historical links to previous post-war social movements in the Global South and North. A number of movement organisations, networks and individuals that took part in the anti-apartheid struggle are present in global justice movement. British AAM was transformed into Action for South Africa (ACTSA) in 1994, the latter engaged in solidarity work in southern Africa. Just like many other previous anti-apartheid activists, groups and organizations, it was involved in the Jubilee 2000 campaign for cancellation of the debts of poor countries in the South. IDAF was continued in Canon Collins Educational Trust for Southern Africa (CCETSA – initially funded by the British Defence and Aid Fund in 1981) assisting South African students and different education projects in South Africa. In Sweden, a network for solidarity with Southern Africa emerged out of ISAK. The Africa Groups has continued solidarity work in relation to Southern Africa, slowly increasing its membership base. There is however other ways of acting upon the legacy of anti-apartheid solidarity – and the ‘symbolical capital’ it might have generated. For example, a former chairman of ISAK was an important facilitator when the Swedish government, in competition with several other countries, sold Swedish fighter planes (JAS) to South Africa for a substantial sum of money.

In June 2000, I interviewed former anti-apartheid media activist Danny Schechter, today working with Globalvision, an alternative media organisation, and Mediawatch – The Global Media and Democracy Supersite, a project that aims at supporting media critique and media activism, and to which more than 400 organizations and organisation from all over the world were connected at the time of the interview. As an example of the fact that different individuals can carry the learning processes of the anti-apartheid movement into very different contexts, he showed me Ben Cashdan’s documentary ‘The two Trevor’s go to Washington’. It follows two South Africans, Trevor Manuel and Trevor Ngwame, both of them former anti-apartheid activists, on their journey to the IMF/World Bank meeting in Washington in 2000. Trevor Manuel visits the meeting as South Africa’s Minister of Finance and as the chairman of the boards of governors of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Trevor Ngwame is a grassroots activist from Soweto that goes to Washington to protest against the global policies of the IMF and the World Bank – following on the protests against the WTO meetings in Seattle in December 1999. In the film, there is also a short interview with an activist participating in a demonstration in Washington, Dennis Brutus, who started
SANROC (The South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee), which led the international campaign for a sports boycott on South Africa.

These are only a few and indeed anecdotal examples, but interesting enough to motivate further research on the continuities between the transnational liberation struggle in Southern Africa and contemporary global politics in different contexts as they show that in the practices of social movements, collective experiences are made that to its individual participants, organisations and networks, constitute learning processes, which might be carried into other contexts.

To conclude, there are many continuities and similarities between the transnational anti-apartheid movement and the contemporary ‘global justice movement’. There is however a certain displacement; while both movements simultaneously mobilize nationally and transnationally, the anti-apartheid movement put a stronger emphasis on pressuring national governments to impose sanctions, while the present global justice movement puts more weight on addressing supra-national institutions and organizations such as the WTO, IMF, the World Bank or G8; a change reflecting the increasing globalization of politics and economy.

Some suggestions for further research

Drawing on the themes presented above, I suggest that future research on the transnational and global political dimensions of the liberation struggle in Southern Africa could possibly focus on the following themes:

1. **Transnational and global political action strategies**: In what sense did the political actions of different sections of the liberation struggle in Southern Africa have transnational and global dimensions?

2. **Structural contexts**: In what sense was the transnational interaction conditioned by the cold war divide, the postcolonial condition, and the increasing cultural, political and economical globalization? How did these structural dimensions intersect and interact in the liberation struggle and in what sense did it create restraints and opportunities for political action?

3. **Social movements**: What was the influence of previously existing social movements and their networks on the liberation struggle? What were the influences on, and of, the new social movements that emerged at the time of the liberation struggle? What were the major practices for consensus building in the liberation struggle? What were the important tensions and conflicts? How should one understand relations between the armed struggle and transnational collective action of social movements? How should one account for and compare the impact of these two dimensions of the struggle?

4. **The media**: In what sense did the media revolution have an impact of the liberation struggle? What were the main media strategies of the liberation struggle?
What were the strategies for approaching established media? How were transnational informational networks created and what roles did they play?

5. **Travel, exile and diaspora**: What was the role of travel, exile and diaspora in the liberation struggle? How did travel interact with media work? What role did exile communities play in the emergence of solidarity movements in different parts of the world?

6. **Global Civil Society and power relations**: To what extent was the liberation struggle part of, and contributed to, the emergence of a global civil society? How should one account for power relations in connection with the interaction between civil society actors based in the Global South and Global North? What are the continuities and discontinuities between the liberation struggle in Southern Africa and contemporary transnational and global movements?
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Southern African Liberation Struggles and the Nordic Countries

Ideas for Research

*Harri Siiskonen*

In social sciences and historical studies the liberation struggles in southern Africa have mainly been approached either from the perspective of national or international politics (see e.g. Marx 1992; 2004; Thörn 2006) or from the perspective of the liberation movements and their leaders (see e.g. Meli 1989; Peltola 1995; Nujoma 1994). Support and assistance to the liberation movements within western societies has also been investigated, but has been only a minor branch in international research related to the liberation movements. However, Nordic countries have generated quite a rich research tradition that has focused on analysing the collaboration between Scandinavians and the liberation movements. In the 1990s the Nordic Africa Institute (NAI) played a decisive role in encouraging research dealing with the African liberation movements in the Nordic context. The conducted research projects focused on the Nordic support to and connections with the national liberation movements in southern Africa. As a result of this program case studies focusing on Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden were compiled. These studies illustrate well the involvement of Nordic civil societies in development issues and solidarity and humanitarian work. They show the very important role that NGOs (Non-Governmental Organisation) and FBOs (Faith-Based Organisation) played in increasing consciousness about the humanitarian and political situation in southern Africa within the Nordic societies (Sellström 1999a; Sellström 1999b; Sellström 2002; Soiri & Peltola 1999; Eriksen 2000; Morgenstierne 2003).

From 2003 the NAI Documentation Project on the Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa has been a continuation of the completed country studies. The data collected and identified by the documentation project in the different Nordic countries open excellent possibilities to widen and deepen our understanding of the prevailing attitudes towards the southern African liberation movements in the Nordic societies (http://www.liberationafrica.se/; http://www.liberationafrica.se/intervstories/). The objective of this paper is to present and assess the relevance of the collected data for historical and social science research. In this paper the data are approached in the Nordic context and assessed from two perspectives: 1) collaboration of Scandinavians and Scandinavian organisations with the liberation movements. 2) impact of the southern African liberation movements on increase of interest towards development and solidarity issues in the Nordic countries. In
assessing the relevance of the data, special attention will be paid to possibilities of comparative research between the Nordic countries, while constraints related to utilisation of the identified data (e.g. language of the documents and availability of the data) will also be discussed.

The Nordic churches and the southern African liberation struggles

The connections of Scandinavians to the African continent date back to the pre-colonial period. Following the first short-term contacts of explorers and traders, Nordic churches have had continuous contacts with southern Africa from the nineteenth century through their missionary organisations. Many of the present-day southern African churches have been established on the foundation of missionary work. For example, in the northern part of Namibia the Finnish Evangelical Mission (called previously the Finnish Missionary Society) began its work in 1870. The responsibility for administration of the established parishes was gradually transferred from the Finnish missionaries to the Ovambo ministers. The last step on the way to an independent church was taken in 1954 when the Evangelical Lutheran Ovambo-Kavango Church was established (it is called today Evangelical Lutheran Church in Namibia, ELCIN). The development of many African churches has followed the path from a mission church to an independent church. Becoming an independent church has not necessarily meant breaking ties to the “mother church”. It has been usual that collaboration between the “mother churches” and the new independent African churches has continued through material and expert help (see e.g. Buys & Nambala 2003; Notkola & Siiskonen 2000).

In African societies churches had a very influential position, particularly on the grass root level. In addition to their religious tasks, churches played an important role in providing educational, health and social services. During the liberation struggles African churches and the Nordic church aid and missionary organisations and their workers operating in the field were often in contact with the liberation movements, in many ways. In addition to direct material support to the liberation movements Nordic missionary organisations and their workers played an important role in passing information to freedom fighters operating in the field. A great advantage of the Nordic FBOs, compared to the corresponding organisations representing the old colonial powers, was that they did not have to carry with them the burden of a colonial legacy. Collaboration between the African churches and the western missionary organisations during the liberation struggles is an interesting research topic that has not been researched profoundly. Due to the explosive situation in the field, written records about this collaboration are scanty in the missionary archives, which mean that key persons involved in the collaboration should be interviewed.

In addition to bilateral collaboration the Nordic churches have played an
important role in the international central organisations of churches: the World Council of Churches (WCC) and the Lutheran World Federation (LWF). Thembeka Mufamadi’s paper on the Program to Combat Racism (PCR) approved by the WCC Central Committee in 1969 reveals how anti-apartheid work was done actively behind the scenes (Mufamadi 2009). From the Scandinavian perspective a relevant topic would be to investigate the role of the Scandinavian churches in international anti-apartheid work, particularly in the central organisations of churches. The archives of these central organisations include numerous files dealing with the southern African liberation movements and reveal the role that the Nordic representatives played in these organisations (see e.g. http://archives.oikoumene.org/query/).

The finding-aids of the archives of the Nordic churches and the church related organisations identified by the NAI Documentation Project give an impression of close contacts between the Nordic churches and mission organisations and the southern African liberation movements. The archives of the Nordic churches and mission organisations provide excellent possibilities for comparative research in the Nordic context, focusing for example on topics such as: How did the Nordic churches and mission organisations collaborate with each other when making decisions concerning support to the liberation movements? How did the Nordic churches and mission organisations try to influence on the governments of their home countries in issues concerning political and material support to the liberation movements? How was collaboration between the liberation movements and African FBOs arranged and conducted?

In addition to administrative documents and correspondence, the archives of the church related organisations include holdings of private persons that may include background information for understanding official decisions. The economic support of the Nordic governments to the church-related organisations may reveal something of their semi-official position in development and foreign policy.

The Nordic governments and the southern African liberation movements

The finding-aid of the NAI Documentation Project includes information on the archives of, say, the Danish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). Timo-Erkkı Heinö’s Politics on Paper: Finland’s South Africa Policy 1945–1991 (1992) is one of the few publications to focus purely on the foreign policy context. Sweden became the first Western country to enter into direct relationship with the southern African liberation movements, by a parliamentary decision of 1969 (Sellström (2002)). The commitment of the Nordic governments to assist the southern African liberation movements, and cooperation between them in the Cold War conditions have only been slightly touched in academic research. On the national level parliamentary
discussions often laid down a foundation for foreign policy formulation. Parliamentary papers, not indexed by the NAI Documentation Project, form an important group of sources when investigating the commitment of the Nordic societies to support the southern African liberation movements. The parliamentary papers and archives of the foreign ministries provide excellent data for understanding the development of foreign relations between the Nordic countries and the states in southern Africa. Many leaders of the liberation movements came to represent the governments of the post-apartheid states.

An interview with the Swedish Ambassador to Namibia (1990–1995), Sten Rylander, who had long experience of working in southern African countries, reveals that relations between the coming rulers of post-apartheid South Africa and Sweden were on the knife edge in the early 1990s. One of the questions to Ambassador Rylander concerned relations between the ANC and the Swedish government during the transition process to democratic South Africa in the early 1990s.

One thing that bothered me a lot during this period was the policies pursued by the conservative Swedish government (1991–94) as regards developments in South Africa. We really lost a lot of momentum during this time. Instead of building on our long-standing and very close relationship with the ANC over several decades, and using it as a springboard to a new dynamic bilateral relationship with the new emerging South Africa, Prime Minister Carl Bildt and his colleagues in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs decided to shy away from contacts with the ANC, probably thinking that they were unreliable “communists” who could not be trusted in the build-up to a democratic transition. They instead started to nurture the Democratic Party and other contacts outside the broad ANC alliance. In early October 1993 I wrote a long report to my government about cooperation with the ANC and future relations with South Africa with critical comments from a Namibian perspective. After all, there had been a parallel in Namibia with close and trustful cooperation with SWAPO in the preparations for independence and in the successful transition to democracy and national reconciliation in that country; a process which had been up until then extremely positive, also in terms of the official bilateral relations between Sweden and Namibia. I felt very strongly – together with many of my colleagues – that it would be a tragedy if we now missed the opportunity to be in the lead among the international partners in helping to shape up South Africa’s democratic future. I urged the government to rethink – in the light of the positive experiences in Namibia – and to return to the legacy of close Swedish cooperation with the ANC.

My constructive criticism was not taken lightly in Stockholm and I was taken to task in a most embarrassing manner by the then Secretary for Foreign Affairs,

---

1 Most parliamentary papers are available in electronic form from the late 1980s (see e.g. http://www.riksdagen.se/templates/R_Page____283.aspx).
Ambassador Lars-Åke Nilsson. I was effectively told to shut up and not to interfere in this discussion. I did not accept this kind of mastering from the political leadership in the Ministry and insisted that I had a right and duty to participate in the debate. I later raised this with the Inspector-General of the Ministry and finally got an official apology. Later on in 1994 the conservative government lost the general elections and was replaced by a new Social Democratic government under the leadership of Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson. The new government quickly repaired the damage and restored excellent relations with the ANC – but the loss of momentum during the previous years was a fact and we could have been better prepared when the South African transition and break-through came in 1994. Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson went on an official visit to South Africa and Namibia in March 1995. It was indeed my very great pleasure to receive him in Namibia together with President Sam Nujoma just a few weeks before my departure from the country. (http://www.liberationafrica.se/intervstories/interviews/rylander_s/).

In addition to interviews with Nordic activists, the NAI Documentation Project has interviewed many eminent African politicians involved in the liberation movements. These interviews give a good impression of how relations between the liberation movements and the different Nordic countries were established and how they were developed during the liberation struggle. Such oral data offer excellent possibilities to explore opinions within the liberation movements about the Nordic support to them. African perspectives on western support to the liberation movements have not been much discussed in research done to date.

The liberation movements in international diplomatic circles

The Nordic Secretaries-General of the United Nations (UN) – Trygve Lie and Dag Hammarskjöld – were involved in the independence processes of the Asian and African colonies from the late 1940s. A key person who had long-term contacts with many leaders of the liberation movements was the Nobel Prize winner, President Martti Ahtisaari. In 1977 he was appointed UN Commissioner for Namibia and he worked as a Special Representative of the Secretary General for Namibia from 1978 to 1988, while during the transition process to independence he headed the UNTAG (United Nations Transition Assistance Group) operation in Namibia 1989–1990. The official documentation of Ahtisaari’s work tells only of the official side of his work. When approaching Namibia’s independence process from a political and diplomatic perspective it would be extremely important to interview President Ahtisaari. In addition to Ahtisaari, other Nordic diplomats worked in high-ranking posts in the UN and other international organisations. From the point of view of future research, it would be extremely important to make a list of eminent Nordic diplomats who were involved with anti-apartheid issues and to
interview them. And a totally unexplored topic related to the Nordic support for the liberation movements is cooperation between the Nordic countries in international organisations, of which the most important was the UN.

Solidarity work: involvement of civil society

Traditionally missionary societies were the most important channel in the implementation of humanitarian work in African colonies. Western missionary societies have assisted African churches in health care, education and social work by human and material help. The struggles of the Asian and African colonies for independence increased interest in Western societies to channel solidarity work for supporting the African liberation movements. Activation of solidarity work coincided with the birth of great mass movements in the Western World (e.g. student radicalism, civil rights movement in the United States, rising concern of the state of environment, etc.).

In the Nordic countries particularly, the southern African liberation movements gave impetus to the establishment of many solidarity organisations. In Sweden several local Africa Groups supported liberation movements against imperialism and racism from the 1950s. In 1974 the existing local groups formed the Africa Groups of Sweden (AGS) to lobby decision-makers, and consciousness about the southern African situation was spread through campaigns, fundraising and information activities.

The growth of interest worldwide on development issues reflected on to the Nordic humanitarian work. From the late 1960s it was characteristic that especially the central organisations of trade and student unions became involved in the international solidarity work. In Finland the Central Organization of the Finnish Trade Unions (SAK) began its solidarity work in the 1970s and in 1986 a special sub-committee Trade Union Solidarity Center of Finland was established to conduct SAK’s humanitarian work. In addition to trade unions, student unions became interested in solidarity work. In the 1970s and 1980s NGOs did not restrict themselves only on lobbying decision-makers in the home country, but wanted to actively take part in the solidarity work in their target countries, or in the refugee camps if the liberation struggle prevented them entering the target country. Presence in the field was important in the activation of old members and the recruitment of new ones in the home country.

The role of NGOs in supporting the liberation movements has only been narrowly touched in research; there is a lack of comprehensive research that would approach the liberation movements from the perspective of NGOs. Interviews with NGO activists should complement the written sources and deepen our understanding of the role of NGOs during the liberation struggles. Another topic worthy of research is the financial support from the Nordic governments to the
solidarity organisations working with the liberation movements; this indirect channelling of funding indicates how governments kept up semi-official contacts with liberation movements.

Constraints related to the use of Nordic sources in research

When assessing the usability of the data identified by the NAI Documentation Project from the perspective of international researchers and comparative research, three major problems emerge. The first is the physical accessibility of the data. Excluding the interviews, most of the identified data are located in the national or other archives in paper form. This means that a researcher doing comparative research has to visit several archives. Accessibility to the data complicates comparative research between the Nordic countries. A second problem is that the data has not been identified and indexed in the different Nordic countries according to the same principles. This comes out very clearly for example when considering the activities between the foreign ministries and the liberation movements. The identified database includes information only about the archives of the Danish ministry for foreign affairs and the archives of SIDA in Sweden. The Nordic countries had quite similar organisations for implementation of foreign policy and development cooperation. Despite the fact that the database does not include information from all the Nordic countries, the Danish and Swedish examples illustrate the possibilities that the archives of the foreign ministries provide for comparative research. The third major problem related to the identified archival data is that in every Nordic country national languages have been used as administrative languages. Using the Finnish data is difficult for non-Finnish speakers. In practice the language of the Nordic documents restricts the sphere of their users mainly to researchers commanding the Nordic languages. Almost all interviews of the NAI Documentation Project have been conducted in English and are available in electronic form. Interviews and audiovisual data provide excellent possibilities for comparative research and can be used by international researchers (http://www.liberationafrica.se/intervstories/).

Ideas for organising research

Despite the above mentioned constraints, the data identified by the NAI Documentation Project provide excellent possibilities for research, and particularly for comparative research. The data can be approached both in the Nordic and international context. The data collection provides relevant sources for a wide range of disciplines from humanities and social sciences to international politics.

A Nordic research project would be the best way to increase interest on the southern African liberation movements in different Nordic countries. Until now
NAI has played the crucial role in encouraging research and documentation, but Nordic universities should now take the main responsibility in finding and defining internationally relevant research topics and in promoting networking of researchers. In addition to Nordic research collaboration, it is also extremely important to have close contacts and collaboration with researchers working with records produced by the southern African liberation movements themselves. Comparative analysis of records produced in the south and in the north would widen our perspectives on the anti-apartheid movement, and so increase our understanding of the past and the present both in the South and in the North.
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A strong national identity is a very important asset for any nation and, in a globalised world, is important for individual citizens too. In order to know where to go, it helps to know where one is coming from. All nations are based on a common understanding of their past. The past, however, is not uniform or linear, but consists of many interacting developments, often producing conflicting trends. While it is a task of governments and politicians to simplify history, to make it easily understood by citizens, this necessarily leads to oversimplification and a sometimes dogmatic interpretation of what happened. It is not unusual that political leaders and their parties dictate the history of a nation in order to glorify and justify their own actions. Today, a fashionable story is that of liberation struggle as the foundation of the society. Such a story is used to legitimise the permanent hold of power by those who participated in it, on the winning side. This is the core of politics in Zimbabwe, Namibia and Mozambique, among other countries.

The task of researchers is to provide a more sophisticated understanding of history, based on a multitude of facts. Researchers look for documents and different views and remembrances, trying to distil facts out of them, working and building a meaningful picture out of all the messiness of history. The history of a country is constantly refined and rewritten, especially by its citizens but also internationally. Understanding of the past is never complete, but we should try as hard as we can to know where we have come from, in order to know where we are going. Archiving is an activity aiming to the future. The task of national archives is to collect and preserve, to conserve for long time, essential facts. The main point is the authenticity of records and information, their provenance and evidential value. In addition, the archives should be easily accessed and available for research.

AACRLS Finland

The Finnish Committee for Archives of Anti-colonial Resistance and Liberation Struggle (AACRLS Finland) was established formally in 2004 as a part of a Namibian effort to save the history of their struggle for independence. The mission statement of AACRLS states: "The AACRLS Project strives to collect and safeguard the historical record of the Namibian struggle against colonialism, to make this record accessible to the public and to make it a living memory among the Na-
“The work in Finland had actually started already some years before. The Committee consists of members of the Friendship Society, National Libraries and Archives, Trade Unions, churches and universities, all of which participated in solidarity actions during the struggle between 1960 and 1990. Together with a multitude of NGO's they spent tens of millions US dollars in support of the long but victorious struggle, and even more after the independence of Namibia.

Why are Finns and Nordic people more generally, interested in the history of African nations? Basically, because we are part of that history. Finland has a long-standing commitment to Namibia through missionary work since 1870. Sweden saw about half a century ago that the international evil of apartheid must be fought against in order to build a more peaceful world for us and especially for our children. In the series of books on the Nordic countries and liberation in southern Africa, published by the Nordic Africa Institute, the Nordic contribution has been detailed. It is significant, amounting to hundreds of millions of US dollars.

Oral histories

An area of particular interest for African historians is oral histories. Oral histories are the traditional way to remember and present history in Sub-Saharan Africa. An understanding of the importance of this form of document has since the 1960’s rapidly increased in Europe, too. To be credible, researchers and ordinary people must be able to check and analyse oral histories. It is necessary to confirm first hand what happened, what was actually said, who said it and under which circumstances. Oral history tells us more about what people believed they had to do in a historical situation and what they think, at the moment of narration, than what they actually did. It is not historical truth, but gives new angles to find the whole picture, the truth.

The basic material of oral research is life histories and autobiographical narratives. In Finland, it became fashionable to collect oral histories in many archives using a variety of methods. Their value lies in this diversity; the material has been collected from different generations, genders and social classes. Collecting key documents, films, diaries and interviews of the activists gives Namibian and other researchers a possibility to look into the area of international solidarity. It is an important activity which today does not count sufficiently in the writing of history. With the aid of interviews it has been possible to gain insight into the experiential aspect of the past. The disadvantage of chronological distance can be insignificant compared to the benefits that come from a narrator’s personal participation and involvement.

Oral histories have a special value in covering the difficult times in nations’ histories. Official writing never can cover the whole story because there are always victors and the vanquished. But people remember dramatic turns, motivations
and victims in the past. Family members and closest friends are not forgotten and stories about them often come out. The main thing is to secure the availability and preservation of the oral histories, and to arrange them sensibly, wherever they are, and to provide indexes and catalogues.

In Finland, we are arranging private archives, cataloguing them, copying samples of documents, but we do not normally send originals anywhere if the donor does not expressly wish it. There is a lot of work involved, more than voluntary effort would provide, although we have got good expertise for free. In the 1990s other resources were scarce. Thanks to the 1999 Cape Town Post-Anti-Apartheid Conference, where the Frontline States participated together with Nordic countries, Sweden decided to provide funds for this purpose through the Nordic Africa Institute. Later, the Embassy of Finland in Windhoek provided funding, while the Namibian AACRLS got funding from Europe. The formal part of the work is now over and the collected results have been delivered to the National Archives of Namibia in the form of a hard disk and a roll of microfilms.

Although the role of Finland was not as impressive in supporting Mozambican struggle, the Finnish-Mozambique Friendship Society has started a similar project in cooperation with the Mozambique National Archives. We intend to collect the relevant material, archive it in digital form, and to produce a publication about the efforts made between 1960 and 1980.

Which technology?

We have come across a number of problems related to the new technologies, though the benefits of microfilming and digitising are obvious. Microfilming is a relatively fast and cheap method producing moderate standard documents which are easy to conserve and simple to look at. Microfilms last intact probably for several hundreds of years. The technology to read microfilm cards is simple and most probably available far into the future. The important question of copyright is routinely managed with microfilms. The restrictions are due to the fact that microfilms are restricted to libraries and thus cannot be scanned and read from a distance. Microfilms also do not save moving pictures.

Theoretically, digitising opens the archived documents for every internet user around the world. Searching is fast and purchase of copies can be arranged, when necessary. The price of separate hard disks for storage comes down fast at the same time as their capacity increases. The same applies to servers. But in practice, many problems emerge. Scanning of documents is slow. The collection of metadata is even more laborious. Copyright is difficult to control. A most serious problem is the vulnerability of digital form to erosion. Nobody can guarantee, that material will remain the same after 100 years, which is a short time for an archive. Similar, or worse, problems arise from the rapid development of digital techniques. New
standard equipment does not necessarily read documents stored more than ten-
fifteen years ago. Restoring all the files very often may turn to be an impossible
task for any archive. AACRLS Finland has tried to solve this kind of problem by
both microfilming and digitising material. Written documents are especially well
suited for this method.

Copyright

Copyright protects and advances intellectual creative work in its various forms.
Copyright belongs to the person(s) who has created the work. According to the
Finnish law, a juridical body, for instance a company, cannot create, only peo-
ple do. Neither can a computer or an animal. However, a person or a team may
transfer the economic rights of a creative work somewhere, to a firm for example.
An employer may demand these rights from an employee in his payroll covering
employees paid work. Still, the paternal right owner retains the moral copyright
although he has given up the ownership. Paternal right remains and the name of the
author is mentioned in the work “as good convention insists”.

There is no need to register a copyright and it can be inherited. In Europe,
copyright ceases when 70 years have passed after the death of the copyright holder.
Some classical works may be protected permanently. Only the copyright holder
can decide upon production of his work and about its public presentation. The
copyright holder has the right to a part of the retail sales. 5% is the minimum
share of the price. The paternal right means that the copyright holder should be
mentioned in connection with the work. Respect for copyright holder means that
without his or her consent a work cannot be wilfully altered or used for purposes
starkly against the honour and objectives of the copyright holder.

Laws of copyright are national, and there are important differences between
countries’ legislation. Anglo-Saxon countries, USA, UK etc, tend to focus on the
making of copies and selling them. In continental Europe the stress is more on
the protection of the author and his or her cultural rights. Also, the limit of the
copyright in the USA and Japan is 50 years, not 70. However, copyright is a glo-
bal thing, and it has been regulated internationally since 1886 when 14 countries
signed the Bern Convention. This convention is still the basis of the rights of
writers and book publishers. Today, the Bern Convention has over one hundred
signatories.

The European Union has been very active in harmonising copyright legisla-
tion in the member countries since the 1990s. It happens through directives, which
are not laws themselves but frameworks that member countries should follow and
implement in their own legislation. Five EU-directives have been given concern-
ing, for instance, the time limit of copyright, protecting databases, regulating pub-
lic broadcasting and harmonising lending and making citations. The general trend
has been to strengthen copyright. Here, too, all countries do not have the same interests. The Nordic countries generally favour more open and free access, allowing private copying of texts and electronic messages for non-commercial private purposes. Fair use and fair dealing is accepted.

In Finland, the archives have the right to give working copies of documents to researchers. The copies must be returned or destroyed after use. The commercial use of a recording may bring an income to someone, but somebody else may have the right to be mentioned in this occasion. It may be difficult to determine, who has the copyright to what in a recorded interview: informant, interviewer, organisation sponsoring the project, archives. These problems occur when radio and television want to broadcast an interview. Copyright problems may hinder the publication of documents. We can expect that the Internet will complicate and magnify copyright problems, as it has already done.

The rights of donors
Ethical considerations go beyond copyright law. For instance recorded oral histories: the testimony is considered part of the person himself/herself, or part of the community where the person belongs. By donors we mean persons and institutions that have donated archival material for safekeeping and use in the archives. They might or might not own a copyright to the material, but they have the right to place restrictions to the use of whatever they have given to the archives. If the donor has restricted the access to the private archive for certain period, even the writer of the letter is not entitled to have access to his letters. The consent of the donor must be obtained. The donor agreement sets forth the terms and conditions under which the archives acquire the authority to manage the material. The archives may publish information from the archived material to the extent allowed by data protection legislation. The maintenance of confidential relations with donors is an absolute requirement in all archival activities.

The principles of purchases and donor relations, as well as those of description and cataloguing, storage, and disposal, are all guided by an ethical code of conduct.

Respect of privacy
While the freedom of scientific research is respected, the researcher must agree not to use the record for the detriment or defamation of the person to whom it refers, or to damage or defame persons closely associated with him or her, or to violate other interests covered by the secrecy clause. In the event that archive material contains information of a delicate or intimate nature, it may be advisable to consider changing or deleting any names or identifiable characteristics from the text. This
must be agreed in advance with the archive. The reason for this can be protection of family values or secrets, fear of economic exploitation of the material, political considerations etc. In Finland, according to the secrecy provisions some record types that can endanger individual privacy are kept secret for fifty years after the death of a person whom the record concerns. If the time of the death is unknown, it is kept secret for one hundred years.

Accessibility

In the context of archives, a central issue is accessibility. Understanding cannot be veiled in all-encompassing secrecy. Herein lies the weakness of party archives. They tend to be closed, or open only for purposes suitable for the party. Research should be allowed to go on, students should be able to use a party archive, the media needs it, and artists and ordinary people may want to use it. Archives should be open as much as possible. Openness does not mean that there are no rules to control access. Restriction should be specific, however, and related to the aspects describe above. Accessibility means that archives should be constructed in a way that makes them easy to reach. This means that there should be indexes, catalogues, inventories and general guides available, as well as suitable places to look at them. Officials in the archives are expected to constantly upgrade their skills in the information and communication technology. This is not an easy requirement, but very necessary as the rewards of achievement in this area directly benefits the usefulness of the archive.
Forgive me, comrades,
if I say something apolitical
and shamefully emotional
but in the dark of night
it is as if my heart is clutched
by a giant iron hand:
“Treachery, treachery” I cry out
thinking of you, comrades
and how you have betrayed
the things we suffered for.

August 23, 2000

Dennis Brutus

Since they came to power in Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, the former anticolonial liberation movements have remained in control over the former settler colonial societies. An international solidarity movement had offered them support for their legitimate demands to obtain national sovereignty, the right to self-determination in independent states and the abolishment of racial discrimination. A project documenting the history of these anti-colonial liberation struggles and their support in particular in the Nordic countries should however not only look backward. Motivated by the notion of solidarity, it should be a forward-looking endeavour. For if solidarity is taken as a living moral, ethical and political obligation, which entails empathy as much as the loyalty to fundamental human values of equality and dignity to which all human beings should be entitled in an undivided manner, solidarity is not confined to a particular era or stage of historical processes. It is an ongoing commitment and engagement. It is from this point of departure and understanding that the following reflections deal

---

1 This text is based on earlier overviews of a similar nature (cf. Melber 2006, 2008 and 2009a), in continuation of my activities as Research Director of the Nordic Africa Institute from 2000 to 2006.

2 Dennis Brutus, *leafdrift*. ed. Lamont B. Steptoe. Camden, N.J.: Whirlwind Press 2005, 87. What follows is dedicated to the memory of Brutus, who passed away on 26 December 2009. As his family reminded us in the announcement of a memorial service for this poet activist: “Dennis believed being offered a choice of chains or gold plated shackles, while in reality you are mentally enslaved, is nonsense. Don’t accept the illusion of liberation.”
with the limitations of the liberation that became political and social reality in the post-colonial and post-apartheid era of the southern African societies.

The limits to liberation

When liberation movements took power, the political office bearers who moved into governments were often shaped by military mindsets. Their internalized way of thinking divided categorized people as both winners and losers and operated along lines of command and obedience. This thinking then was deeply entrenched in authoritarian political cultures. What happened after ‘liberation’ often fell short of expectations created among those who believed that the struggle against settler colonialism was for plural democracy and human rights and civil liberties. But when analysing the shortcomings of those who obtained political control over societies after a protracted armed struggle against minority settler regimes, one also needs to critically reflect upon those, who rendered support. The task should not shy away from the exploration and investigation of how those in solidarity have positioned themselves (if at all) vis-à-vis the new power structures and to which extent and how they are living and practising the erstwhile notion of solidarity in the context of the (not so) new inequalities and injustices in formal democracies, which often fail to respect even the most fundamental principles of true democracy.3

The knee-jerk reaction of the *Tiers-Mondisme* that emerged in the 1960s was to show solidarity with struggles for freedom among the “wretched of the earth”. Sometimes, these struggles were already then supported by means of a glorification of violence as an act of emancipation and liberation, as in Frantz Fanon’s *Les damnés de la terre*. His manifesto became a call to battle for the Algerian resistance movement against France, the colonial power. In his preface to Fanon’s book, Jean-Paul Sartre celebrated the revolutionary armed struggle as the ultimate form of claiming humanity by the colonized. He seemed to see violence as a purifying force that would turn the colonised into full citizens.4

In contrast to this uncritical propaganda of “revolutionary violence” as a liberating act (which in places was echoed in Fanon’s text), Fanon himself problematized the effects of violence among both the victims and perpetrators, and he spoke

---

3 This limited overview cannot delve deeper into this aspect. See Kößler/Melber (2006) for a detailed and (self-) critical case study on the solidarity movement with Southern African liberation movements in the then Federal Republic of Germany.

4 Sartre’s pseudo-radicalism contrasted with the position of Albert Camus, who was close to the non-violent libertarian convictions and as a result was ridiculed since the early 1950s by the influential intellectual leftist circle around Sartre. Interesting enough, while Sartre has never been actively participating in direct forms of practical resistance with personal risks, Camus had been questioning and adjusting his earlier convictions through his direct involvement and experiences in the French *Résistance* against Nazi occupation and the excessive forms and abuse of violence within the ranks of the underground organization.
out against excessive post-colonial authoritarianism. In penetrating analyses and withering criticism, he described what he had seen, mainly in West Africa, in a chapter on “the pitfalls of national consciousness” He criticized the new African elite for abusing power when securing privileges for themselves and turning entire states into instruments of control. His early warnings went largely unheeded, however. Not until the 1990s, when the shortcomings of revolutionary movements could no longer be ignored, did Fanon’s analyses come back into the foreground. Since then, those skeptical of the post-colonial failures and critical of the lack of achievements have returned to his early insights as relevant for the political realities of today.

The limits to liberation under former liberation movements in Southern Africa, in particular in Namibia and Zimbabwe and to a lesser extent in South Africa, were the thematic focus of a research project on “Liberation and Democracy in Southern Africa” (LiDeSA) at the Nordic Africa Institute. Established in late 2000, LiDeSA was operational until the end of 2006 and undertook a considerable amount of analytical efforts within a network of scholars mainly from the region to critically explore post-colonial authoritarian tendencies and their root causes.5 This summary offers a rudimentary insight into the focus of LiDeSA.

Wounds old and new

One must bear in mind that armed resistance was part of the solution in the Southern African settler colonies. While liberation did not come purely as a result of the barrel of a gun, the military component was a substantive element to accelerate the process towards self-determination. In the cases of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, it helped lead to negotiations for transitional arrangements under majority rule. The compromises required from all sides contributed to the transitional periods working out as part of a wider appeasement strategy, which in the cases of Namibia and South Africa were directly linked to, and were a result of, the end of the Cold War.6 At the same time, a decidedly patriotic form of writing history soon turned the independence struggle into a myth, upon which the erstwhile liberation movements based their claim to be the sole liberators (see for Namibia Melber 2003c, Saunders 2003 and 2007).

It bears repetition that the unscrupulously violent character of Zimbabwe’s ZANU regime already revealed itself in the early to mid 1980s, when a special unit

5 From LiDeSA emerged several volumes and many individual articles: see i.a. Melber (2002, 2003a and 2003b, 2006, Southall/Melber 2006 and Hulterström/Kamete/Melber 2007). A summary on the project and its results is accessible on the web site of the Nordic Africa Institute under the following link: http://www.nai.uu.se/research/areas/archive/liberation_democracy/

committed atrocities bordering on genocide; An estimated 20,000 people were killed, mainly in Matabeleland, where the opposition ZAPU had most of its support (Phimister 2008). Notably, the only organisation of influence that protested was the local Catholic Church. The rest of the world, including those who had originally shown solidarity, had little to say. The violence did not stop until ZAPU agreed to sign a pact with the ruling party. ZANU basically took them over. None of this hurt the Mugabe government’s bilateral and multilateral standing. When a new opposition party turned out to be a serious competitor, the Chimurenga became a permanent institution. Violence became the customary response to political protest. As political power shifted away from Mugabe after he lost a referendum in 2000, his regime became more violent, bordering on genocidal practices, as in the case of operation Murambatsvina (Ndlovu 2008).

The human-rights violations of SWAPO have also been downplayed (Lamb 2001 and 2002). In the 1980s, the organisation imprisoned thousands of its own members in dungeons in southern Angola, accusing them of spying on behalf of South Africa. These people lost their liberty in spite of never having been proven guilty; indeed, they were not even brought to trial. Many of them did not survive the torture. Those released are scorned even today (Saul/Leys 2003). With the newly established political opposition party RDP coming from inside SWAPO, politically motivated physical violence and hitherto unprecedented forms of hate speech entered the public sphere ahead of the parliamentary and presidential elections at the end of 2009. The new opposition was denied the right to campaign freely, since SWAPO declared that in certain areas nobody else was entitled to campaign (Melber 2009b).

South Africa had a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, but authoritarian tendencies have increased with internal divisions in the ANC between the camps of Thabo Mbeki and Jacob Zuma and the subsequent formation of the break away party COPE (Southall/Daniel 2009).

Victims as perpetrators

There is nothing new about military movements that are supposedly justified in ethical and moral terms losing their legitimation quickly. Since the French Revolution, liberators have often turned into suppressors, victims into perpetrators. It is not unusual for a new regime to quickly resemble an old one. Revolutionary violence as an act of emancipation has often turned out to be far less liberating than those promoting such acts (and the notion of “just war”) believed and tried to make others believe. The Indian psychologist and sociologist Ashis Nandy (1984), discusses how liberators tend to reproduce the past rather than offer true alternatives. In this light, the “anti-imperialist” Robert Mugabe turns out to be merely the final executor of the policies of the racist colonists Cecil Rhodes and
Ian Smith. Armed combat created new repressive institutions of the state for the dominant group within anti-colonial resistance. Resistance movements normally adopt rough survival strategies and techniques while fighting an oppressive regime. That culture, unfortunately, takes root and is permanently nurtured. It then becomes questionable whether there is any difference between the political systems they manage to throw out and what they establish in that place.

In May 1990, Albie Sachs spoke of this trend in respect to South Africa. In a lecture at the University of the Western Cape, this South African lawyer, who was crippled by a parcel bomb in Mozambique during his 24-year exile, expressed his doubts about ANC activists being ready for freedom. He worried about the habits they had cultivated. As Sachs put it then, the culture and discipline of resistance may have served a survival strategy in the underground, but these skills were certainly not those of free citizens. This may be why Nelson Mandela became a global icon in his lifetime: The many years he spent in prison kept him away from the daily intrigues and power plays prevalent in an organised liberation movement. Mandela preserved a spirit of human compassion and tolerance that a life of struggle and exile might not have afforded him. He was protected from the internal power struggles that marred all liberation movements in exile, when a strong will was required to maintain control in order to survive.

Jacob Zuma’s reputation for various allegations of corruption, charges of sexual abuse and martial (if not sexist) rhetoric (his favourite song is “Bring me my machine gun”) did as little prevent him from gaining a popular vote among the majority of South Africans as his demonstrative polygamy justified by Zulu tradition. Disappointed in the limits of the liberation they have experienced, many people are looking for substitute saviours of such dubious calibre. Fortunately, at the same time there are those to whom fundamental values of democracy, liberty and human rights matter more than submissive loyalty to an organisation or a new male chauvinist leader. Raymond Suttner is an example. He used to operate underground in South Africa as a member of the ANC, and spent years in solitary confinement as a political prisoner. As a member of parliament and later as ambassador, he represented the ANC government before returning to the academic world. He now points out that ANC ideology and rhetoric do not distinguish between the liberation movement and the people. He thus argues that the liberation movement is a prototype of a state within the state – one that sees itself as the only legitimate source of power (Suttner 2006). But he also carefully seeks to explain how underground structures cloaked individual, independent-minded thinking under a collective, which used democratic centralism as a guiding principle to ensure maximum discipline and loyalty as a prerequisite for the survival and ultimate victory (Suttner 2008).

Suttner’s study does not shy away from breaking taboos. As he suggests, the liberation organisation represented a distinct notion of family. There was a general
suppression of ‘the personal’ in favour of ‘the collective’. Individual judgment (and thereby autonomy) was substituted by a collective decision from the leadership. Such “warrior culture, the militarist tradition,” according to Suttner (2008: 119) “entailed not only heroic acts but also many cases of abuse and power” – not least over women. As he concludes: “Any involvement in a revolution has an impact on conceptions of the personal. Given the overriding demands for sacrifice and loyalty to something greater than oneself, it leads invariably to a negation of intimacy” (ibid., 138). As so often, women in many instances – as mothers, wives and daughters, but not least as objects for satisfying sexual desires – paid the highest price and sacrificed most. The limits to liberation and emancipation were maybe best documented during the struggle through gender relations and the abuse of women.

Beyond the “end of history”

As we now know, post-colonial life looks a lot like the colonial era did in respect to day-to-day life. The reason is that socialisation factors and attitudes from the armed struggle have largely shaped the new political leaders’ understanding of politics – and their idea of how to wield power. In governmental office, liberation movements tend to mark an “end of history”. Any political alternative that does not emerge from within them will not be acceptable. This attitude explains the strong sense of camaraderie between the Mugabe regime and the governments of Angola, Mozambique, Namibia and South Africa over many years. Typically, any political alternative cropping up in these countries as a result of disillusionment with post-colonial life will be discredited as part of an imperialist conspiracy designed to sabotage national independence. These governments never seem to even consider the possibility that their own shortcomings may be why opposition forces are becoming stronger. Instead, they think along the militaristic dichotomy of friend-foe, leaving no legitimate alternative to their own hegemony. Among each other they have entered regional alliances, which imply the backing of each other in times of challenging political alternatives. The prolonged support to Zimbabwe’s regime under pressure is just the most obvious case in point.

At the same time, the sad truth is that the opposition forces that do stand up against such governments tend to add to the problem, rather than to provide a solution. All too often, they only want to share the spoils of the state apparatus and its bureaucracy among their cronies once they are strong enough to constitute a true power option. Again, the relevant categories of thought are only winners and losers. Democracy, however, is about something completely different: compromise, and even search for consensus, in pursuit of the public good. To achieve that, one does not need military mindsets, but rather a broad political debate.

Looking at the history of the anti-colonial liberation struggles in Southern
Africa can open our eyes and sharpen our sensibility, awareness and understanding of the current processes of modified but continued forms of rule, which show clear limitations to genuine emancipation and liberation. A continued exploration of the legacy of the struggle and its impact on the organisation of post-colonial societies may help us reach a better understanding of current forms of dominance and the mindsets guiding these new forms of exclusion.

We should ask, therefore:

• Did the words and deeds of national liberation movements match a democratic agenda?
• How did the supporters (friendly governments, solidarity movement) perceive the liberation movements’ activities, and what was the response?
• What was the role of international agencies such as the United Nations and the OAU Liberation Committee?
• What implications had the specific socialization of the anticolonial activists on their mindsets and practices (social and cultural background, class, exposure to repression and discrimination and other relevant factors)?
• What were the views expressed inside the liberation movements on state, government and transformation and how were these views affected by negotiated, controlled change?
• What was the impact of the controlled change on the institutional and institutionalized transformation?
• How did inter-governmental relations in the SADC region reaffirm “the end of history”?

This provisional list suggests that we should not only critically revisit and examine the declared aims and goals of the liberation struggle and the understanding these represented, but also the mindsets, values, norms and expectations of those who supported such struggles for liberation. Based on such (self-) critical reflections, the notion of solidarity might live on with a similar uncompromising meaning and practice. Loyalty to this notion and previous actions guided by the concept would maybe even require under present conditions support of other organisations and individuals than those, who earlier on deserved such support while fighting against unjust minority rule based on racial discrimination. *A luta continua* as a popular slogan during the “struggle days” would then no longer translate into “the looting continues” but return to its true meaning. If implemented accordingly, it underlines the point that there is nothing like the end of history when it comes to social struggles for true emancipation, equality, liberty and justice.
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Zimbabwe’s Liberation Struggle Recycled

Remembering the Principles of the Struggle in Political Ways

_Lene Bull Christiansen_

Nowhere in Southern Africa is the memory of the liberation struggle being kept alive today in quite the same way as in Zimbabwe, and those following Zimbabwean politics over the last 10 years have been prompted to reflect on the dynamic between academic and political approaches to this history. Many academics working on the politics of remembering the Zimbabwean liberation struggle in recent years have been forced to re-think how ‘living history’ in the shape of active living politicians, who have long since been canonised as heroes of ‘liberation history’, are constantly writing and rewriting their own history in their daily practices of ruling the nation. Likewise, the active political reworking of liberation history into a recycled political programme, where a singular interpretation of the principles of the liberation struggle has served to underscore political authority, emphasizes the contentious political nature of all processes of sustaining the principles of liberation struggles. This think piece reflects on the contentious exercise of writing and preserving liberation struggle history and principles in the context of political discourses of authority and legitimacy based on the same liberation struggle history. These considerations have been inspired by the way in which liberation war history has been politicised in Zimbabwe over the last decade; however, the Zimbabwean example may open up questions which merit reflections beyond Zimbabwe’s immediate political context.

Liberation war legacy as contemporary political reality?

The dynamics of post colonial nationalism were critically depicted by Frantz Fanon in 1963 as being in imminent danger of developing into nothing other than the convenient rhetoric cover for bourgeois elites in their legitimisation of rule. And, while the analytical framework of Fanon’s analysis does not necessarily translate easily into the particularities of southern African political history or the contemporary political context in Zimbabwe, his insights into the dynamics of liberation war history in political discourses of legitimacy resonate with contemporary analyses of Zimbabwe’s identity politics. As such, the reflections of this think piece are not novel; rather they draw on thoughts which have been voiced by a number of Zimbabwean historians and political scientists over the last decade. My aim here is to place these analyses in a wider debate about the politics of history, and the condi-
tions under which the principles of the liberation struggles are sustained in contemporary politics. In Zimbabwe, being able to define the positive and negative legacies of the past has become a political discourse that underlines the dominance of the ZANU-PF party. This consists of an articulation of the party leadership’s ability to define the legacy of the past in a discourse of ‘insiders vs. outsiders’. This discourse has a temporal element, in which the nation is articulated as being in a permanent state of anti-colonial war (Raftopoulos 2009:213). In this discourse, the struggle, and the principles of the struggle, are not a thing of the past; rather the principles of the struggle are in a continuous process of adaptation to contemporary challenges or ‘attacks’ levelled against the sovereignty of the Zimbabwean nation.

In the post-war consolidation of ZANU as the dominate legitimate political force in Zimbabwe, an imagery of the liberation war soldier-heroes came to hold a symbolic meaning, as the political elite claimed that participation in the liberation war was the only valid political currency. Despite early overtures towards national unity and reconciliation (Raftopoulos 2003:220), this discourse of political legitimacy entailed generational, racial and class tensions that during the 1990s 2000s laid the foundation for the formulation of a political project with a narrow interpretation of the history of the liberation war: what Ranger has called ‘patriotic history’ (Raftopoulos 2004:165–166; Ranger 2004). With the entrance on to the political stage of the MDC party in 1999, and the government’s defeat in the 2000 constitutional referendum, the ZANU-PF government adopted the policy of official anti-colonialism and dubbed it ‘the third Chimurenga’ (see for example Mugabe 2001; Christiansen 2004; Ranger 2004).

Kizito Muchemwa writes of the “failure of the nationalist project and the collapse of the Zimbabwean economy” as being a product of the “disruptive nature of the binaries that haunt the nation” (Muchemwa 2009). Likewise, Robert Muponde has described the nationalist discourse of the ZANU-PF regime as oversimplified and rigid in its dualism between “binaries of insider/outside, indigene/stranger, landed/landless, authentic/inauthentic, patriotic/sell-out” (Muponde 2004:176). These binary oppositions have served to exclude political rivals of the ZANU-PF party from political legitimacy; most obviously the (former) opposition party MDC, but the inclusion/exclusion function has also been applied to independent media, civil society organisations, human rights activists, the urban poor, whites and non-indigenous blacks. One of the important features of this discourse is the construction of those it excludes as forming a threat to the nation, as opposed to the government, which in turn protects the nation from this threat. Depicting the MDC as ‘sponsored’ or ‘puppet-mastered’ by the British and/or USA in a neo-imperialist attempt to overthrow and impede on the sovereignty of the Zimbabwean government, has as such been a trope in this discourse (e.g. Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2008; Dorman 2003; Christiansen 2004).

Furthermore, the third Chimurenga discourse relies on the antagonistic lan-
guage of war, depicting political opponents as enemies or ‘sell-outs’ thus justifying violent punishment, as during the liberation war (Christiansen 2004:78–81). In the early 2000s the relative political inexperience of the MDC was utilised by the ZANU-PF government to depict the MDC in this fashion. An example of this was an incident where leaders of the MDC were shown on CNN receiving cheques from white farmers, who at the time were under attack in the Third Chimurenga land occupations. This footage was turned into government propaganda, as proof of MDC’s ‘sell-out’ status, having literally taken money from the hands of the white colonists (Willems 2005:101).

The preservation of culture

The third Chimurenga political discourse of permanent anti-colonial war rests on a number of discursive elements that are strategically articulated as markers of the ‘insider vs. outsider’ schema described above. Zimbabwean culture and traditions are among these elements. The purity of Zimbabwe’s cultural legacy is depicted as a litmus test of authenticity; being able to identify and ‘root out’ that which is damaging and protect that which is valuable in Zimbabwean culture is the privilege of the ZANU-PF regime. Here the legacy of the liberation struggle takes an important place, as cultural pride is attached to the anti-colonial struggle in a temporal construct in which the nation is narrated as rooted in a glorious pre-colonial past, only fully realised in the succession of anti-colonial struggles. Thus, defining ‘pre-colonial culture’ and the impact of colonial rule on culture is at the centre of the narrative of the nation. That which was lost during the colonial period, the gains of the liberation struggle, and the legacies of the war itself, are therefore important defining elements in the cultural construction of the nation.

This narrative is at times a laborious long term process, in which cultural and political elements ‘from outside’, must be re-articulated as traditional. For example, Christianity or socialism, as well as the material advances of the colonial period in the form of education and the institutions that the Zimbabwean nation took over from the Rhodesians in 1980, have been the subject of lengthy discursive processes both during and after Rhodesian rule, in which the norms attached to ‘foreign ideas’ has been naturalised as ‘traditionally Zimbabwean’ (Christiansen 2009). Culture and tradition thus become contested sites for the laborious exercise of inscribing contemporary cultural values into the articulation of authenticity and cultural purity, which is entailed in the third Chimurenga discourse.

Gendering the nation’s history

In the nationalist discourses a political discourse of kinship; of ‘fathers’ and ‘mothers’ of the nation has played a key role (Christiansen 2004; Christiansen 2007).
The President represents himself as the ‘father of the nation’ in a classical paternalistic style, but also, as ‘the head of the family’ acting as ‘the husband of the nation’ entitled to come down hard on anyone who attempts to metaphorically ‘steal or rape his wife; the people’. Likewise, departed male leaders of the liberation struggle are depicted within this metaphor. An example of this turn is the re-inscription of former ZAPU leader Joshua Nkomo into ‘patriotic history’ by naming him ‘father of the Nation’ (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2007), just as wives of such fathers of the nation are valorised as wives and depicted as true icons of African mother- and womanhood.

Connected to these mythologies is the image of the liberation war soldiers, who are praised as ‘heroes of the nation’, and through an intricate process of political negotiation granted official status in death by being buried in the Heroes’ Acre outside Harare. During the liberation war the military leadership had traded on traditional masculine images of naturalised authority in order to convey their own leadership in terms of masculine power, celebrating virility as a source of community leadership and authority (Campbell 2003:165). Thus, the hero status is ascribed a distinctly masculine quality. The soldier is depicted as the ‘quintessential Zimbabwean masculine man’; fighting for the liberation of his nation. As a counterpart to this image is the image of ‘mothers of the revolution’, which depicts women as ‘mothers of the soldiers’ (Rooney 1991:57). As the President and his political elite represent themselves as the rightful leaders of the nation through their role as liberators of the nation, the attributes of the liberation war soldier are ascribed to the political leadership in a way that underlines the mythology of ‘fathers and husbands of the nation’.

A gendered legacy of the liberation war

Of particular interest in my own research is the gendered dimension of this legacy of violence, and the subsequent ideological valorisation of violence, which has the liberation war as its point of departure. This has roots in practices of violence and gender inequality during the war, and in the subsequent nation-building process of the ZANU-PF regime. Jane Parpart has argued that claims to power during the liberation war were put in masculinist terms both on the nationalist and the Rhodesian side (Parpart 2008:186) and that the nationalists perceived the war as “an opportunity for ‘real men’ [...] Dominated by angry young men, who regarded violence as key to contesting [Rhodesian] state authority” (Parpart 2008:187). The war was a means by which to regain an African manhood subjugated by colonial oppression; there was a need to ‘fight like men’ in order to ‘penetrate’ and win back the country (Parpart 2008:191). Tanya Lyons has described how sexual violence against women was both a war tactic (as in many war situations) and a feature of the lives of female guerrillas during the liberation war (Lyons 2004:253–267).
These practices were clearly not official nationalist policy, although in some cases the practices were widespread and even appeared to be systematic.

Josephine Nhongo-Simbanegavi has described the gender ideology of the ZANU movement during the liberation war and in the subsequent nation-building efforts as highly ambivalent. Officially the ZANU movement upheld an ideology of gender equality, but at a practical level it subjugated women into subaltern, at times exploited, positions (Nhongo-Simbanegavi 2000:1–4, 97, 135–137, 145). Whereas ZANU’s official ideology of gender equality was based on what Nhongo-Simbanegavi calls a mythologized version of women's participation in the liberation war (Nhongo-Simbanegavi 2000:1), post-war discursive constructions of political legitimacy through liberation war credentials were masculinised in the image of the liberation war soldier. The imagery of the liberation war soldier, which came to symbolise the political legitimacy of the ZANU elite, was depicted as a benevolent masculine force. Violence was in this construction equated with the protection of the people, enacted in defence against colonial oppression or against neo-imperialists (Ranger 2004:232–234). The liberation war soldier represented the nationalist victory over the Rhodesians; a just cause, a democratic cause and in the government’s ideology, the only legitimate claim to power in Zimbabwe.

A violent gendered nationalism?

It is my contention that there is an interconnection between the political discourses of legitimate authority and private norms of authority, and that these function through gendered imaginaries of power and authority. In these imaginaries of power, private and political uses of violence have a gendered dimension. The practices of wartime have affected contemporary political discourses and practices of violence, especially in the discourse of ‘continuous anti-colonial warfare’ under the Third Chimurenga and beyond. Not only are the principles of the liberation struggle the subject of constant contemporary political negotiation; the legacy itself also entails a range of political practices, which are not conventionally described as ‘values of the struggle’, but nevertheless continue to function in post-1980 politics, with direct reference to the struggle.

Much has been written about the use of violence in Zimbabwean politics. Indeed President Robert Mugabe’s famous assertion of having ‘degrees in violence’ has become a standard reference in describing that which has been termed a political culture of violence. An example of this is the so-called Operation Murambatsvina in 2005. By the middle of the 2000s the potency of the third Chimurenga discourse was seemingly waning. The social and economic meltdown (the failure of the land reform programme), the chronic inflation, failure of public services and erosion of living standards was becoming painfully tangible in people’s everyday lives. The MDC had become more politically mature, and the brutality of
the ZANU-PF regime was becoming a constant presence for ordinary citizens. In Operation Murambatsvina the government demolished ‘illegal urban settlements’ and enforced prohibitions on informal trading, leaving thousands of people homeless and without livelihood (UN 2005). In this context the reiteration of the third Chimurenga discourse of insiders vs. outsiders seemed to be losing currency. However, a new formulation of the MDC as the enemies of the nation emerged in the nationalist discourses of the ZANU-PF government. This discourse depicted the MDC party as an inherently violent aggressor, against which the government needed to act decisively in order to protect the people. This laid the ground for the violent arrest and detention of the leadership of the MDC party in 2007, when President Mugabe declared that he had rightfully punished the MDC because they were plotting to violently overthrow the government (Star 03.04.2007).

Sabelo Ndlovu-Gatsheni has argued that in Zimbabwe, violence is not only a political culture, but that violence lies at the ‘core of statecraft’ for the ZANU-PF regime (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2009). Inspired by Ndlovu-Gatsheni’s argument, I have viewed political uses of violence and discursive representations of violence as part of a political discourse of legitimacy. In the nationalist discourses of the ZANU-PF regime, and particularly throughout the third Chimurenga, Mugabe’s frequently reiterated response to international condemnation of the regime’s violent oppression of dissent was that Zimbabwe is a sovereign nation, and that international condemnation of his rule constituted ‘outside interference into domestic issues’. This discourse has generally been read in an anti-imperialist vein, and analysts have pointed out the skilful discursive use of state-sovereignty in a discourse of anti-colonialism aimed against the former colonial power Britain and the West in general (e.g. Raftopoulos 2003:231; Muponde 2004:176; Sylvester 2003:29). As described above, it also has connotations to a patriarchal dispensation of power (Campbell 2003:9–14): Mugabe as the patriarch of ‘his house’; a patriarch, who will not tolerate resistance either from inside or outside forces. This patriarchal dispensation of power also designates the ZANU-PF government to act as the protector of the people. The construction of the ZANU elite as the protector of the people is historically linked to the reification of political legitimacy through violence.

During the liberation war young guerrilla soldiers consolidated their legitimate status through the violent punishment of ‘sell-outs’ among the civilian population in the rural areas in a complex dualism of punishment and protection (Alexander et al. 2000:172–173; Moore 1995:379–380). Mike Kesby has shown how counter-insurgency tactics on both sides of the conflict relied on violent control of people (Kesby 1996:564). His study shows that contestation over male authority between the young guerrilla soldiers and local patriarchs was a key element in the complex manoeuvring of counter-insurgency warfare, and that violence was a tool with which the young guerrillas achieved authority over local patriarchs (Kesby
Guerrilla soldier masculinity thus became the symbolic attribute of power and legitimacy through the liberation struggle.

Contentious issues

The post colonial positioning of the ZANU-PF government as the legitimate leaders and protectors of the nation based on their liberation war ‘credentials’ was an integral part of the nation-building project after 1980. Norma Kriger has argued that immediately after independence, the symbolic status of the liberation war became “an important emotional symbol and source of legitimacy for the governing élite” (Kriger 1995:139), and that the way in which the regime constructed symbols of national identity out of the liberation war was a testament to their “commitment to hierarchy, bureaucratic control, and top-down decision-making” (Kriger 1995:145–146). Kriger has developed this argument by showing how liberation struggle credentials have been important in internal rivalries within ZANU-PF (Kriger 2006). This positions women with political ambitions in a contentious position, as they are simultaneously expected to display masculine liberation war credentials, which very few women posses, and to fit into the gendered discourse of kinship, of fathers and mothers of the nation, in which political authority is ascribed to men. Furthermore, the temporal construct of the nationalist discourse of the third Chimurenga is such that it renders the present state of the nation irrelevant to political debate, as political authority is depicted as rooted not in the successes or failures of present-day rule, but in the continued anti-colonial struggle.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni asserts that as an ideology Zimbabwean nationalism has been marred by this legacy of authoritarian militaristic leadership and that the valorisation of violence has plunged the country not only into a political and economic crisis, but also into a crisis of national identity (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2009). On the one hand, one might see this as inevitable owing to the violent legacies of liberation struggle, the gendered discourses of violence and political legitimacy with which the ZANU-PF regime sustained its hold on power after 1980. On the other hand, the constant re-articulation of those discourses in relation to shifting political conditions suggests the contentiousness of these discursive processes. As such, the sustained practice of political violence, enacted as a continuation of the war, suspending the nation in a permanent state of anti-colonial struggle, can be read as a constant ‘opening’ of the historical discourse for new interpretations, as the war itself is depicted as ‘not yet over’. The national raison d’être is in the third Chimurenga discourse the war itself, and ending the war would mean facing up to contemporary political challenges.

I would therefore argue that the politics of remembering the liberation struggle is indeed a contentious struggle over the definition of the ‘narrative of the nation’, as this narrative construct defines and delimits the boundaries of the nation.
and forms the ‘script’ and ‘cast’ of national politics. Keeping alive the principles of the struggle is as such conditioned on the politics of re-articulating the history of the nation, in its many possible contemporary versions.
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Part 2

Sources for the History of Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa
Until recently, little of the writing on liberation struggles in southern Africa was scholarly, and much of it was highly polemical, though of course there were exceptions. Any history of writing on the liberation struggle in South Africa would immediately notice, say, Edward Roux’s classic *Time Longer than Rope* (1948), the volumes in the *From Protest to Challenge* series, which began to appear in the early 1970s, and the work of, say, the political scientist Tom Lodge. In more recent writing, especially of the more popular kind, one often finds romanticisation, and triumphalism on the part of those whose movements emerged victorious. Triumphantist history either ignored or minimised difficult issues in the past, such as the imprisonment and torture of activists in exile. It tended to be uncritical, assuming that criticism would somehow bring the struggle itself into disrepute. Popular work, often highly descriptive, usually lacked much sense of historical context, while those who were themselves involved in struggles sometimes in their writing saw those who presented alternative views or took other courses of action as enemies or ‘counter-revolutionaries’.

Though there has been an outpouring of work on the South African struggle in recent years – most notably in the form of memoirs by those involved and biographies of key people in the struggle – elsewhere in the region relatively little has appeared. We are only now moving into an era in which we can expect considerable history-writing by scholars who use sources as academic writing requires and analyse critically new topics or old ones from new angles. By the end of the 20th century, scholars interested in this field increasingly recognised that a more critical, contextual approach was needed, one that did not only focus primarily on great men and the broad national story, but which also interrogated in detail what happened at the local level and brought out the complexities and nuances involved. In

---

1 In some of what follows I draw upon my Introduction in *Social Dynamics*, 35 (2) September 2009, to four of the papers presented at the workshop on ‘Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa: New Perspectives’, held at the Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town (UCT), September 2008.

recent years one can detect a shift beginning from institutional top-down histories to work that looks ‘critically and in a more differentiated way at the movement’s dynamics, fissures and tensions’. The new approaches in the literature not only began to bring out the complexities involved, and tackle issues hitherto unexplored; some scholars now began, say, to write on how struggles were memorialised, or on the legacies of the liberation struggles, tracing how what happened during the struggles helped shape what happened afterwards.

The lack of balance and nuance in much of the writing on the struggles to date has reflected the fact that relatively few professional historians have engaged with this history. There are a variety of reasons for this. There are not all that many historians in the region, and some of them are relatively unproductive, in part because of the pressures of teaching. Among those who are active researchers, there has perhaps been a reluctance to tackle so controversial a topic, which often enters into current debates, and one that is still not all that far in the past, and is difficult, therefore, to see in perspective. Disillusionment with the outcome of the struggles may have helped dampen the enthusiasm of those who were themselves active during the struggles.

To my knowledge, the only academic conference to focus directly on the liberation struggles in the region to date was the one held at the University of Cape Town in September 2008, and at the time this think-piece was written the papers from that workshop had yet to appear in print. One of the aims of that workshop that was little achieved was to explore links between different struggles in the region. For too long those who have studied the liberation of southern Africa have failed to notice, let alone analyse, such links, and have confined their work to a particular struggle. Another intended aim of the workshop was to begin to compare the struggles in the different countries, to show similarities and differences. Whether dealing with discrete histories or links or comparisons, historians should work to puncture the myths that have grown up, in part from what Scott Everett
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4 E.g. the paper by Gary Baines on Freedom Park as liberation memorial in *Social Dynamics*, 35(2) 2009 and articles by Raymond Suttner linking the liberation struggle to present-day issues.
5 Four papers appeared in *Social Dynamics*, September 2009, five in the *South African Historical Journal*, March 2010. Sponsored by the Centre, the workshop was made possible by grants from the Harry Oppenheimer Institute, UCT, and the Nordic Africa Institute. About 40 scholars attended, most from South Africa but a number also from Zimbabwe, while individuals came from Australia, Germany, Lesotho, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States. At a public session, held on the last day of the workshop, Vladimir Shubin of the Institute for African Studies in the Russian Academy of Sciences, Raymond Suttner of the University of South Africa and Thula Simpson of the University of Pretoria spoke and the new edition of Vladimir Shubin, *ANC: A View from Moscow* and Raymond Suttner, *The ANC Underground in South Africa* were launched.
Couper calls ‘the nationalist process of historical homogenisation’. To date there is no adequate general survey of the liberation struggles in the region to refer students to, let alone, say, any detailed discussion of the historiography of the struggles.

Among leading recent examples of scholarly work in this field that come to mind are the special issue of the *Journal of Southern African Studies* that appeared in mid 2009 and the volumes of the South African Democracy Education Trust (SADET) project on ‘The Road to Democracy in South Africa’. While the former contained a rich array of papers on aspects of exile history of liberation movements and international solidarity, mostly by scholars either based in Britain or who had done their research there, those behind the latter tried to find younger black South African scholars to write chapters. Many of these, for a variety of reasons, do not have academic positions in University History Departments. Though the SADET volumes have been criticised for focusing too heavily on the armed struggle, and for being a nationalist project that does not recognise the importance of, say, independent working-class action, this is the single most important publishing project relating to the liberation struggle in South Africa to date. It concerns not only the history of the struggle as it unfolded within South Africa itself but also, in a series of volumes, some of which have still to appear, regional and international dimensions of the South African liberation struggle. There is nothing comparable yet for the other countries in the region, though the Hashim Mbita project of the Southern African Development Community envisages a volume on each of the countries in the region.
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6 S.E. Couper, “An Embarrassment to the Congresses?: The Silencing of Chief Albert Luthuli and the Production of ANC History”, JSAS, 35(2) 2009.
7 The study of the archive of the liberation struggles in the region, and its history and its limitations, is to be a sub-theme of the National Research Foundation (NRF) Chair in Archives and Public Culture at the University of Cape Town, where Brown Maaba is undertaking a Ph.D on this topic. Hillary Sapiere cites an unpublished survey of the writing on the armed struggle in South Africa by Thula Simpson: Sapiere, “Liberation Movements”, p. 275, n. 8.
8 *JSAS*, 35(2) June 2009: Special Issue: Liberation Struggles, Exile and International Solidarity.
9 E.g. J. Hyslop in Load-shedding, *Writing on and over the edge of South Africa* (Johannesburg, 2009). The SADET volume on the 1970s produced a clash of views over the importance of white activists in the revival of the black labour movement. Not only did two chapters reach different conclusions, but the authors of the one chapter declared in a footnote their disagreement with the retitling of their chapter by the editors: see *Road to Democracy*, vol. 2, p. 243 n. 1 and M.Legassick, “Debating the Revival of the Workers’ Movement of the 1970s”, *Kronos*, 34 (November 2008).
10 See SADET, *Road to Democracy*, volume 3 (2 parts) on international solidarity. Further volumes are to appear on the assistance given the South African struggle by African states and by international organisations such as the United Nations.
11 This is organised from Dar-es-Salaam, where the general editor is the historian Arnold Temu. It has no website and there is little information in the public domain about it.
Sources

One of the key reasons, I suggest, why historians have not devoted more attention to the liberation struggles in the region is the problem of sources. This has various aspects to it, and I will first consider archival sources before moving on to digital ones, though there are some common features involved. We can notice first that the relevant sources are widely dispersed and often difficult to find, even if access is possible. Material from within the liberation movements has disappeared, owing to the conditions in which the movements operated, often from exile and in a situation of war. One of the aims behind the Aluka project, funded initially mainly by the Mellon Foundation and based in Princeton, New Jersey, was to repatriate, if only virtually, material from the rest of the world to South Africa, but to date this has only happened on a very limited scale. It must of course not be forgotten that much of the written record that existed was destroyed, much of it deliberately by agents of the state. Oral history was often difficult if not impossible, to collect during the struggle itself, and the trauma involved has often made it difficult for people subsequently to speak about their experiences. On the other hand, a vast amount of documentary material does exist on the struggles, even if widely scattered, and there are numerous collections of interviews that are beginning to become available to scholars.

That leads me to issues of access. Let us first notice here that there is a general twenty-year prohibition on access to official South African records. In Namibia it remains thirty years, as in the United Kingdom, meaning that only material to 1979 is at present accessible. The secrecy that was necessary in the struggle itself, a time of war, has undoubtedly flowed over into the time of peace, and there is a general reluctance by liberation movements to make material accessible. Some of this reluctance is understandable, as when the names of informers may be mentioned, but much is based on an ignorance of how relatively little really sensitive material there is in the records. In Namibia some of the SWAPO archive, hitherto entirely inaccessible, is now available online, but at a cost of some hundreds of rand per page, and efforts to secure easy and cheap access for educational purposes

12 See www.aluka.org.
13 Verne Harris, when working for the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in the late 1990s, discovered that over forty tons of material on the era of late apartheid had been destroyed in the furnaces of the Iscor steel-works outside Pretoria earlier in the decade. See his “‘They Should Have Destroyed More’: the Destruction of Public Records by the South African State in the Final Years of Apartheid 1990–1994” in V. Harris, Archives and Justice: A South African Perspective (Chicago, 2007).
14 Ninety interviews were done by Max du Preez for the Human Sciences Research Council on the transition in South Africa, but to date they are not available. Some of the SADET interviews are being published; the first volume of stories from the 1960s has already appeared. Hundreds of hours of interviews conducted by Padraig O’Malley for his project entitled “The Heart of Hope: South Africa’s transition from Apartheid to Democracy” can now be accessed on the website of the Nelson Mandela Foundation: www.nelsonmandela.org.
have to date got not been successful. One comment on this website is: Contains an extensive database of documents from SWAPO, but access is very cumbersome. Password login makes it inaccessible to Google search.

The best-known example in South Africa of an archive that is difficult to access is the large archive of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), now in the National Archives in Pretoria. This is only accessible, if at all, via a complicated bureaucratic process, while the TRC website, maintained by the Department of Justice, has become difficult to use: many of its links are broken and material that was once accessible on it is no longer, including amnesty applications. Other state archives are extremely difficult, if not altogether impossible to access, despite the efforts of, say, the South African History Archive, based at the University of the Witwatersrand, to obtain material under the Promotion of Access to Information Act. Many of the military records in the archive of the South African National Defence Force require, if access is permitted at all, a complicated and lengthy declassification procedure. ANC material that was available at the Mayibuye Centre at the University of the Western Cape was taken to Luthuli House and there weeded for ‘sensitive material’.

This leads me to offer a few comments on the many digital projects relating to the liberation struggles in the region that now exist. Historians tend to be conservative in their use of new sources and it is I think true to say that they have made little use of these sources, except in teaching. They have not been used for serious research except for the most basic searching for information. One of the most useful aspects of digitisation has been to make whole runs of periodicals readily available, but where archival and oral material is concerned the value of the digital projects is less apparent. Most of these projects are not co-ordinated, and a search-engine does not always bring up relevant information from the range of relevant sites available. (How many scholars know that a convenient listing of many of them is available at http://www.noeasyvictories.org/search/smartsearch1.php? This list is, however, far from comprehensive, and does not include a number of sites.)
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15 See the SWAPO Party Archive and Research Centre: www.sparc.na. I engaged in an email communication with Per Sanden, the key person behind this important project, about the issue of cost once I became aware of it.
20 Personal information.
21 I have used the DISA and Aluka sites in undergraduate teaching at UCT.
of important digital repositories.)\textsuperscript{22} Some of the sites are far from easy to use, other than for the most basic searching for specific information. Context is often entirely missing from the documentary material that has been put online. The online material is often deliberately merely selective of what is in an archive, and the scholar who is tantalised by what can be found online will have to visit the archive itself for serious research. The well-known and valuable Digital Innovation South Africa (DISA) and Aluka sites, which have been pioneers in this field,\textsuperscript{23} might by now have contained much more material had it not been for prejudice on the part of key South Africans against a US-funded project and well-meaning but in my view misguided fears of the ‘loss’ of heritage material. The result has been that much material that could have been digitised has not been, and what is available online is partial and skewed towards material from outside South Africa.\textsuperscript{24} Funding for such expensive digital projects has begun to dry up, and it may be that the scale of funding that has been available for a new technology in the past few years will not continue to be available in the future.

Today liberation history remains highly controversial in all the countries of the region, not least because of its contemporary relevance, for parties now in power continue to draw much of their legitimacy from their role in the struggle. As Jacob Zuma was campaigning for election as ANC presidential candidate in April 2009, for example, many commentators made reference to his role in the struggle in the late 1980s,\textsuperscript{25} while the singing of liberation songs that seem to suggest shooting or killing people continues in early 2010 to be a source of controversy. As time passes we should be able to view the liberation struggles more dispassionately, without the distorting effects of seeing them through the lens of current controversies, while new sources will presumably become available for historians to exploit. We must hope that research in this important field will increase and new perspectives open up, as historians ask new questions and come up with new answers.
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\textsuperscript{22} These include, say, the O’Malley material cited above, and various university sites, including that of the University of Cape Town.
\textsuperscript{23} For Aluka see above; the DISA website is at http://www.disa.ukzn.ac.za/.
\textsuperscript{24} I was a member of the DISA executive council for many years, until I resigned, and was on the regional committee of Aluka, now defunct because of lack of funds in the current financial downturn.


Liberation Archives in South Africa

An Overview

*Brown Bavusile Maaba*

The liberation of South Africa in the late twentieth century is an intense focus of interest in historiography. However, this paper does not attempt to say anything new on the history of the liberation struggle as such, or to survey that complex history. Instead, the paper seeks to put South Africa’s liberation archive in context, by discussing how it was formed and how it has helped shape the writing of the history of the struggle to date and how it may affect such writing in future as well as its strength and weaknesses. This paper focuses on the official and formally established documentary archival collections within South Africa relating to the liberation struggle. These include the African National Congress archives housed in the library at Fort Hare University; the Pan Africanist Congress archives and those of Black Consciousness Movement (BCM)-oriented liberation movements lodged at Fort Hare in the National Heritage and Cultural Studies Centre (NAHECS) building; the Mayibuye Centre at the University of the Western Cape (UWC); the Historical Papers at the University of the Witwatersrand and the South African History Archive (SAHA) also at Wits University.

The growth of liberation archives in South Africa

After the release of Nelson Mandela from prison in 1990 and the unbanning of the ANC, the PAC and many other political organizations exiles returned home, many political prisoners were released from prison and the apartheid regime was, after many years of dilly-dallying, prepared to sit down with their arch enemies in an effort to find a peaceful political settlement. In the midst of the unfolding political situation of the early 1990s, liberation movements such as the ANC and the PAC had to attend to party matters as well. In addition to the repatriation of their cadres, there was a need to repatriate archival material to South Africa to allow researchers access to documents generated during the years of exile life. Such documentation included letters, speeches, telegrams, memorandums, minutes, audio visual tapes and some artefacts.

The ANC, by far the largest and arguably well-organized South African liberation movement, had applied its mind to the issue of archives long before its unbanning Mohammed Tikly, the director of the Solomon Mahlangu Freedom College (SOMAFCO) in Tanzania from 1982, believed that it was important for
the ANC to preserve its exile records so they could be made available to researchers in post-apartheid South Africa. There were confidential ANC documents that needed to be kept in secrecy until such time that they could be declassified. Tikly therefore proposed that a new library be built with a basement section where the ANC material would be kept in relative safety. He encouraged SOMAFCO students to take library science and archives studies at tertiary level, as such skills would be required in a liberated South Africa. The SOMAFCO library was never used for archival purposes as Tikly had envisaged, mainly because his vision was never seriously pursued, but some SOMAFCO students did show an interest in library and archival studies. One who undertook archives studies in Germany and Britain was Mosoabuli Maamoe and he and John Pampallis, an ex-SOMAFCO teacher, and a Finish librarian who was a volunteer at SOMAFCO, were instrumental in repatriating the SOMAFCO material to Fort Hare in 1992. Funded by Batlagae Trust, a body established to attend to the needs of ANC returnees, the three went to SOMAFCO and ensured that the archival material was repatriated to the University of Fort Hare. The PAC and the BCM-oriented organizations also sent their material to Fort Hare. The liberation movements chose Fort Hare for its history and as a hub of black intellectualism, for the university had nurtured high profile politicians such as Nelson Mandela, Robert Sobukwe and Barney Pityana of the BCM movement.

Meanwhile, some ANC cadres who had been exiled in Zambia and London settled in Cape Town on their return to South Africa. They understood that the Mayibuye Centre at the University of the Western Cape was to house ANC material and sent London and Zambian material there. Over the years, Mayibuye Centre developed into a formal archive, housing, besides ANC material, different collections, including those of Desmond Tutu and Wolfie Kodesh, which includes interviews with exiles. Repatriation of the liberation movements’ documents from exile greatly supplemented the work of institutions like Historical Papers at the University of the Witwatersrand and the South African History Archive (SAHA), which house documentation mostly generated from within the country. Established in 1965 as a section of William Cullen Library, Historical Papers grew over a period of time to house collections ranging from trade unions such as the Industrial and Commercial Workers’ Union, the Metal and Allied Workers’ Union, and the Food and Canning Workers’ Union to political organizations such as the United Democratic Front (UDF). This archive also houses material pertaining to the ANC and the BCM movement and individual collections of the papers of politicians such as Helen Suzman and Robert Sobukwe. In the Sobukwe collection, for instance, there are letters he wrote while he was incarcerated on Robben Island. SAHA came into existence in the 1980s, the brainchild of political activists who noted the importance of preserving struggle related documents. Today the organization houses trade union material, posters and photographs of political
activism, UDF papers and some documentation emanating from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

Other than these “major collections”, pockets of material shed light on the history of the struggle in South Africa. Student records at the University of Fort Hare, for example, contain files of former Fort Hare students such as Govan Mbeki, Mangosuthu Buthelezi, Sobukwe and Pityana. The Manuscript and Archives Department at the University of Cape Town holds collections of papers of the National Union of South African Students and the Unity and BCM movements.

The strength and limitations of liberation archives

Historians have used the struggle archives to produce outstanding works that give readers new insight of the history of the struggle in South Africa. Books on the ANC such as The Dream Deferred: Thabo Mbeki by Mark Gevisser and Oliver Tambo: Beyond the Engeli Mountains by Luli Callinicos, have used the ANC archives at Fort Hare, the Mayibuye Centre and Historical Papers, to reveal the inner workings and the dynamics of power struggle within the ANC. Jeremy Seekings’s The UDF: A History of the United Democratic Front in South Africa, 1983–1991, sheds light on the formation of the UDF in 1983 and that organisation’s confrontational relationship with the apartheid state. Both Kwandi Kondlo’s In the twilight of the Azanian Revolution: the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania and Thami ka Plaatjie’s chapter on ‘The PAC in Exile’ in The Road to Democracy draw from the NAHECS collection to reveal, the PAC’s turbulent and trying times in exile. Work on “The Black Consciousness Movement in South Africa, 1970–1980’ which relies on the NAHECS collection as well as Historical Papers, reminds the readers of the role of the black consciousness movement in shaping the politics of South Africa in the 1970s and beyond. No one had previously demonstrated that the BCM movement established itself as a fully fledged organisation in exile. Jabulani Sithole and Sifiso Ndlovu’s work on the labour movement covering the period 1970–1980 draws on archival sources from the ANC archives and the Mayibuye Centre to show how effective unions were in the struggle against apartheid.

Though books and journal articles have been written using these archives, more use could be made of them. Studies like that of Shireen Hassim on women
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in the liberation struggle could greatly benefit from the ANC archives at Fort Hare, which have a sizeable number of documents on the ANC Women’s Section in exile. These cover the organisation’s links with sister organisations in exile, fundraising, assisting in the health sector of the ANC as well as dealing with the needs of the movement’s children in exile.4

The Mayibuye Centre holds documentation from the International Defence and Aid Fund (IDAF) which funded ex-political prisoners. Many ex-political prisoners like Jacob Zuma could not make ends meet after being released from prison in the mid 1970s. The apartheid setting made it difficult for them to fend for their families. Any writer interested in the biography of Zuma could benefit from the file containing information on him. In this one learns how poor Zuma was after his release from Robben Island: he had no job, a family to feed and needed funds for his children’s education. Such information can explain why most liberation fighters had poor bank balances even in post apartheid South Africa.

Some of the liberation material remains under embargo. ANC documents were collected from various ANC offices outside the country and shipped to the organisation’s headquarters in Johannesburg, where the perceived sensitive documents were removed before the rest was sent to the archives at Fort Hare. The whereabouts and fate of these documents is shrouded in secrecy. Only the first ANC consignment, the SOMAFCO papers, were sent straight to Fort Hare. Despite concerns expressed by the university community, the ANC collection at Mayibuye Centre was removed by the ANC and taken to their headquarters, where it was ‘sanitised’ before the remaining documents were sent to the ANC archives at Fort Hare.

In 1986 activist Taffy Adler wished to deposit boxes of union-based archival material with Historical Papers. He stated that “should I not have claimed these boxes within two years, I would request you to open them and place the contents within your collection under a blanket embargo for a ten year period”, after which “any bona fide researcher should have unrestricted access to the documents”.5 He later stressed that “the existing collection, and any other papers I place in the library are to be closed to anyone except myself until 2005. After that any items in the collection with the exception of the records of the unions and the federations may be placed on open access. The records of the unions and federations may only be used with the permission of the body concerned.”6

Some material in liberation archives has gaps and silences, while some lack depth. For various reasons the liberation movements and the archives divisions

---

4 For more on the role of women in the ANC see: University of Fort Hare, ANC archives, Women’s Section Collection.
of the country have been unable to retrieve all of the relevant documents either from exile or from within South Africa. In the case of exiled liberation movements like the ANC, there was lack of accountability on the whereabouts of some documents, while internally many organisations and individuals found it difficult to keep documents, as they could be used against them in the court of law. Some tried to hide documents and over a period of time they became lost or misplaced. Some documents, especially faxes, fade, making it difficult for researchers to read them. In other instances the paper is fragile as a result of the quality and age. In addition some documents were not kept in optimal storage conditions during the struggle era and have therefore been negatively affected or destroyed.

Given the problems mentioned above – gaps and silences, the fragility and loss of documents as well as their misplacement – what can be done? Oral history can be a tool in counteracting the problems associate with archival sources. There are many reasons why oral history is vital in ensuring a balanced history. The activities of struggle activists remain embedded in their minds. It is through their narrations, especially in the absence of written records, that we can recover lost history. Among the centres of excellence that emphasize the importance of oral history are the Wits History Workshop, the South African Democracy Education Trust, the Govan Mbeki Research Resource Centre at the University of Fort Hare and the Centre for Popular Memory at the University of Cape Town. Some oral history research projects have been undertaken with the view of covering the gaps and limitations brought about by liberation history material: the SOMAFCO oral history project carried out by Fort Hare historians, the ANC-University of Connecticut oral history research project, and the Labour Oral History Project being conducted by Wits Historical Papers, and historians who have made use of oral interviews to ensure balanced work include Luli Callinicos, Mark Gevisser and Jeremy Seekings.

In conclusion, I suggest we should:

- Encourage departments of education to emphasise history at school level.
- Encourage new university students to study history
- Organise history social clubs, where the importance of history will be emphasised.
- Promote history bodies, such as oral history associations.
- Introduce archival studies at the junior degree level instead of honours or masters level.
- Remind society that every nation or community has its history and hence the importance of emphasizing the discipline.
- Encourage communities to collect and preserve their own histories.
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In evaluating the impact of new technologies and electronic communication, it is essential to see them not in isolation but in relation to other preexisting structural inequalities. All of these inequalities, at multiple levels, will of course be reflected in the digital environment. These range from international inequalities between rich and poor regions and countries to inequalities between countries that are neighbors and divisions within countries by geography, race, class, and institutional status. In terms of access to information resources and opportunities to create and distribute knowledge, the “paper gaps” of access to books and other printed documents or gaps of access to other physical information resources – audio recordings, films, objects stored in museums – are even more difficult to overcome than digital gaps. Access to such objects requires traveling to where they are available or transporting them to and housing them in multiple locations. The costs of such efforts are much larger than addressing the gaps of digital access. This is the baseline of inequality of access to knowledge resources against which digital gaps should be measured.

We are all familiar with the difficulty of keeping up with published books and journals in any field unless one is fortunate enough to be located in an institution with a well-funded large research library. And even such institutions, in Europe and North America as well as in Africa, now face serious difficulties in maintaining their collections. For students and scholars at less privileged institutions (and that is the vast majority), access in printed form to basic sources, much less to a wider arrange of research, is a utopian dream. The same applies, of course, to activists, analysts, and other members of the public without an institutional scholarly affiliation, who also may have diverse reasons for being interested in this history.

As for unpublished archival documents, existing in some cases in single copies and often in many scattered locations, access remains confined to scholars with significant time and travel funding. The availability of copies is a basic requirement for expanding access as well as for preservation against the casualties of natural or social disasters. We are all aware of the irreparable loss of the archives in Guinea-Bissau in 1998, and the role that the Nordic Africa Institute has played in trying to reconstitute as much as possible of these historical resources. I understand that archivists continue to debate the relative advantages of microfilm and digital scanning as means of preservation, but from the point of view of the scholar, there is no comparison. The cost of microfilm, its lack of searchability, and the
awkwardness of viewing it all ensure that it is no rival to digital scanning as a way
to reduce inequalities in access to documents. And efforts such as the LOCKSS
(Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe; http://www.lockss.org) project for distributed
archiving of digital resources have significant potential for providing additional
levels of redundancy.

Given such inequalities in access to knowledge embedded in physical artifacts
such as books and printed documents, almost any efforts to provide digital versions
on-line, no matter how flawed, are likely to have a positive potential effect on
reducing inequalities in access to knowledge, despite the well-known “digital gaps”
between advanced industrial countries and Africa, as well as within the African
continent. To what extent this potential effect is realized, of course, depends
on whether maximizing such accessibility is a priority goal of those involved in
digitization efforts.

What is different about digital knowledge-sharing?

From the point of view of economics, the fundamental difference between
knowledge preserved on a piece of paper or another physical object and knowledge
preserved digitally is that the cost of making another digital copy and delivering it
to someone else tends to go down, and in fact approaches zero. As Yochai Benkler
has stressed in his book *The Wealth of Networks*, that tends to drive the price down,
since the market price of a product tends to be linked to the “marginal” cost of
producing another one. If the basic means of production and distribution (a
computer and an internet connection) are widely enough available, everyone above
the minimum threshold for access also has the capacity not only to access but also
to produce public knowledge. This is a familiar argument, now celebrated in such
popular manifestos as Chris Anderson’s *Free: The Future of a Radical Price*, and in
controversies over downloading of music and the future of the newspaper industry.
Benkler himself is more nuanced than the cyber-optimists, noting the joint impact
of legal codes and technology in shaping the potential liberatory effects of the new
information economy. Analysts such as Albert-László Barabási (*Linked*) and David
Singh Grewal (*Network Power*) note multiple ways in which concentration into
hubs and pressures to conform manifest themselves even in “open” networks such
as the web.

Most critical, for our purposes here, is the fact that the low cost of copying
and distributing digital copies, driving the effective price to zero, does not account
for the original cost of creating a document, whether it be the creative research
and writing that leads to an original text, or the investment in the multiple steps
necessary for making a significant set of printed originals available in digital
format. These costs, as anyone who has written a book or undertaken even a small-
scale digitization project is aware, are by no means trivial. And therefore the issue
of potential inequalities reappears with a vengeance, even if entry-level capacity continues to become more and more widely distributed.

This issue is most apparent in the case of originally published work, as visible in the crisis of the newspaper industry. Although that is most acute in the United States, the old business model of print publication is also threatened for newspapers in Europe and Africa and for book and journal publishers, both academic and commercial, around the world. So the move to free on-line circulation of knowledge, with all its potential, must be combined with consideration of how to ensure an income stream to content creators (such as journalists and researchers) and to content publishers (of books, journals, or websites) which provide the infrastructure for distribution of knowledge.

As a user of information, and as an advocate of the fullest possible open access, I would prefer that all information be free. As a free-lance information provider, through publications, reports, and websites, I am also well aware that such work, particularly for larger-scale efforts, requires resources, whether through direct institutional support, grants, or some other revenue stream. Aggregation of “free” efforts by multiple contributors, as in open source software, wikipedia, or other such collaborative ventures celebrated by Benkler and others, has significant potential. But even such efforts in practice benefit from hidden subsidies, which also require analysis if their success is to be emulated.

Websites with digital resources on Southern African liberation history

Since the end of the period of Southern African liberation history culminating in the South African democratic election of 1994, there have been a significant number of projects dedicated to preserving elements of that history and making them available to scholars, students, and the wider public. The results are significant, but every project has faced serious obstacles, both in terms of preserving oral and written records and in making those records more widely available. In the remainder of this think piece, my goal is to identify some of the major obstacles experienced by a range of projects, and to present a summary overview of the significant gaps that remain, both in terms of the content included and the wider availability of the results.

These efforts are quite diverse in origin, scope, and institutional structure. I included a listing in a targeted search engine on the website for No Easy Victories, a research project and book that I co-edited with Gail Hovey and Charles Cobb. That site does not yet contain the full text of the book (which will be made available at a later time, in agreement with the publisher), but it does contain excerpts as well as transcripts of a number of interviews done for the book. The search and brief descriptions of related sites is available at http://www.noeasyvictories.org/search/aboutsites.php.
As is easily visible on that list, sites focused on South Africa and sites focused on international solidarity are most prominent, with relatively little available on the other Southern African countries. (Note: The list does not include digital projects that are, to my knowledge, not available on the web, such as those that have been undertaken by the National Archives of Zambia.) And, as I shall note later, there are other significant ways in which the set of materials now available, as well as the sets contained by particular sites, fail to reflect the full scope of the history of the liberation struggles.

That should be no surprise. It is inevitable, and a constant challenge for historians, that there will be multiple biases determining which records (written or oral) are preserved, and which records that exist are most widely available, for multiple practical reasons. Obstacles are not distributed randomly, whether in the availability of the records to start with (for example, whether participants in the history have been interviewed before their death) or in terms of their availability either in physical or digital formats. But it is important to be aware of such disparities, and to make conscious efforts to address “gaps”, both for current projects and for historians who may make future breakthroughs precisely by paying attention to what is missing.

In terms of projects focused on scanning written documents, for example, experience has shown that physical scanning is only one of the steps necessary to make the materials available; almost all projects have underestimated the cost of other steps, such as optical character recognition, preparation of metadata, intellectual property rights, and strategic use of both web and other media for distribution, as well as the challenge of sustainable financing. Before documents can be scanned, moreover, they must actually be collected in one place and organized in some way, i.e., only a minority of documents relevant for history are already preserved in an accessible physical archive. Individual scholars and research projects, in turn, have not yet taken full advantage of the opportunities for digital distribution to lower the cost of reaching a much wider set of readers, relying primarily instead on the increasingly expensive publication of printed books.

In the current “state of the field”, with a number of projects under way for several years, it is still too early, in my opinion, to be able to identify “best practices”. But let me make a few observations here that may stimulate debate that may be valuable for both ongoing and new projects. In particular, I will focus on three aspects: (1) the responsibility of individual scholars and research projects, (2) some specific obstacles to accessibility that can and should be addressed to maximize the usefulness of digitization projects, and (3) the major gaps and imbalances apparent in the set of digitized material currently available.
Responsibility of individual scholars and research projects

The technology now available to any scholar who has a computer and a workable internet connection, wherever he or she is located, makes it possible for that scholar to make research products, such as articles, books, and interviews, widely available through on-line publication. The additional cost is minimal and the advantages are great for individual scholars and projects as well as for increasing equity of access for the public and scholarly community. For many, the obstacle of unreliable or slow connections is very real, of course. But rapid change can be expected with the arrival of new fiber-optic cable connections for most African countries.

As a first step, therefore, all those involved in producing original research on liberation struggles in Southern Africa have an obligation to act on what John Willinsky calls *The Access Principle* (MIT Press, 2006). That is, in his formulation, “A commitment to the value and quality of research carries with it a responsibility to extend the circulation of such work as far as possible and ideally to all who are interested in it and all who might profit by it” (p. 5). Open access has been most widely discussed in the context of scholarly journals. But it is also a principle that can and should be applied by individual scholars and projects.

If a scholar retains (or has recovered from the publisher) rights to their own publication, and that publication is already available to him or her in electronic form (as is almost always the case in recent years), then fulfilling this obligation simply requires putting it on a website. With the availability of publishing sites such as scribd.com (which also allow the option for the document provider to charge a fee for downloading), and free customizable websites from Google and others, this is an option that should be open to all, with the skills required no more complicated than those required to produce a manuscript in the first place.

For authors or for publishers hesitant about possible loss of print sales, there is significant evidence already that on-line availability can be a driver of print sales rather than an impediment. The additional visibility given by on-line publication has the potential to significantly outweigh the frequency of cases in which downloads substitute for sales. To be sure, many publishers remain to be convinced, and authors may not be in a position to demand on-line publication or to negotiate retention of electronic rights. But the balance is changing, and there are an increasing number of intermediate options, all involving some mix of free and paid access to information. Open access, Willinsky notes, does not necessarily mean unequivocally free, since there are costs involved that must be paid by someone.

Even so, many costs will continue to drop. If a scholar holds rights to an out-of-print book, but lacks a digital version, for example, it should be possible to get a scanned version, including good-quality OCR, for a cost as low of less than $1 a page. If more scholars took advantage of these opportunities, it would have the
dual benefits of giving greater visibility to their work and making their research more accessible. There is also the option of making printed copies available at very low cost, through such self-publishing services as lulu.com (see, for example, the range of publications available from Eduardo Mondlane University mathematics scholar Paulus Gerdes, at http://stores.lulu.com/pgerdes).

Obstacles to accessibility and content gaps
As already mentioned, the physical act of scanning a document and producing a digital file is only a small part of the work required for a digitization project. Assuming that issues of intellectual property rights, access to documents for scanning, and an organizational infrastructure for doing the work are assured, I list obstacles to access, with brief descriptions of possible solutions, in the table at the end of the paper. In my opinion, each obstacle has the potential to have a significant impact on whether digital files are easily accessible to a broad range of users.

I do not propose to attempt a systematic analysis of “content gaps” available through current projects. But I do think it is helpful for all of us to think strategically about the most prominent gaps, and to do what we can to encourage efforts that may at least partially redress the imbalance. With respect to the international component of these histories, for example, our ‘No Easy Victories’ project focused on the inter-relationship between U.S. solidarity groups and African liberation movements. But with limited resources, we barely scratched the surface of interviews with relevant participants or exploration of relevant archives, such as that section of E. S. Reddy’s papers housed at Yale University, which cover a wide range of U.S. and international groups. Other projects, such as the Michigan State University African Activist Archive, JSTOR’s Aluka project, and others, have made scanned documents and video interviews available from a number of organizations. But I don’t think anyone involved in any of these projects would claim that the material made available is “representative” even of that particular small slice of the historical record. Significant groups such as the Council on African Affairs, TransAfrica, the Southern Africa Support Project, the African Liberation Support Committee, and the National Anti-Imperialist Movement in Solidarity with African Liberations (NAIMSAL), to name only a few, are hardly represented in documentation available on-line.

As an advisor to the Aluka project, I have had particular responsibility for trying to secure the inclusion of relevant content outside Africa dealing with the international component of this history. With the help of colleagues such as Ellen Namhila, Tom Tlou, Terry Ranger, and others on the Aluka Regional Advisory Committee, it was not too difficult to trace what we would like to include in order to present a diverse sampling of documentation. We initially targeted key international organizations, such as the United Nations and World Council of
Churches, as well as countries with easily available documentation such as the UK, the Netherlands, and the Nordic countries. E. S. Reddy was of great assistance not only with UN materials, but also with material related to India and around the world. But the fact of the matter is that numerous obstacles have made it difficult to complete even this limited selection, much less to find ways to encourage the digitization of documentation on equally important non-African participants in this history, such as Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, Cuba, or the geographically dispersed countries of the Commonwealth. Fortunately, the SADET project, with respect to South Africa, and the Hashim Mbita project, with respect to the region, have been able to take a more comprehensive approach. But making documentation as well as the resulting scholarly publications from these projects widely available on-line is a formidable task that I hope will not be neglected, even if it takes significantly additional time and resources.

Finally, the most obvious gap in the material now available on-line is between South Africa and the remaining countries in the region. For South Africa, while there is clearly much more work to be done, there is already available a rich array of documentation from a large number of projects. There is also a history of projects that have been unable to sustain on-line presentation of material, for a wide range of reasons, including institutional capacity and institutional rivalries. For countries outside South Africa, however, while the potential is significant, the results to date are limited.

This is predictable, given inherited differences in institutional capacity and resources. And the paths forward to overcoming this disparity are far from easy to discern. But it also should be unacceptable to any of us concerned with this history. I will not venture into detail into the obstacles, but in closing simply present a goal that I think should be a common objective. That goal should not only include making material from and about the region and more countries in the region available on-line, as has been done to a limited extent by the Aluka project. It should also include building capacity within each country for the full digital cycle, including not only selection and scanning, but also hosting presentation of the results on-line by national institutions as well as collaboration with regional and international initiatives. The best results will be possible if such initiatives are not regarded as contradictory but as complementary, in the best interests of all those with an interest in the widest possible access to this historical record.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Access to a document or set of documents may be restricted, requiring payment of a fee and/or affiliation with an institution. This may be the case not only with documents provided by profit-making institutions, but also for authors and other content creators expecting compensation for their creative work or non-profit institutions seeking cost-recovery for their expenses or required to limit access because of restrictions by rights holders, privacy restrictions, or other constraints.</td>
<td>From the point of view of accessibility, fully open access is of course preferable. If this is not feasible, there are other options that can increase accessibility to some extent. These include (a) open access to categories of users, e.g. African non-profit institutions; (b) low price, including scaled pricing by type of user and/or type of access required, (c) transparent pricing structure and convenient payment options for all categories of users. The number of practical technical options in this regard, for authors, publishers, and other institutions making documents available, is increasing. Since some publishers and institutions are reluctant to explore these options, those interested in increasing accessibility should take more creative initiatives to accelerate the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document is scanned image only**

A scanned image can be jpeg, tiff, or an image-only pdf. If the document has been scanned but there has been no OCR to provide text, then it is not searchable. Nor can one copy and paste text. This is in contrast to a "normal" pdf created by Adobe Acrobat or another program, which is generated from text, formatting codes, and any embedded non-text images.

(1 - preferred) Scanning software, as well as stand-alone OCR software, can produce a searchable pdf file. This file includes both image and text, which can be searched or copied. (2 - alternate) Make sure that the documents on your site are indexed by Google, which does its own OCR if text is not available.

**Document is scanned image only, or image+text (searchable image).**

File sizes are large. Downloads of long documents are not practical for low-bandwidth conditions.

(1 - preferred, if OCR meets minimum standards) Provide an alternate text (or html) version of the document. (2 - alternate) Use compression or split a document into sub-documents to reduce size of files. Obviously, effectiveness depends on the length of the document. (3 - additional) Make copies available on CD-ROM for off-line use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard pdf download</td>
<td>When pdfs are stored on a website for download, the user normally has the option of using &quot;right-click&quot; to download to disk, or simply to click to download within the browser. When pdfs are generated using a database program, however, the “right-click” option is often not available. For long documents, this means that the Adobe browser plug-in is overloaded, resulting in failure to download or freezing up the user’s browser, particularly for users with more limited memory, slower computers, or low bandwidth.</td>
<td>Provide an option for users to use the standard “right-click” download, which uses less memory and can take place in the background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to include both search and browse (navigation) options</td>
<td>Usable websites require both clear navigation and an effective search. Webusers differ in their preferences for locating information, some being search-dominant and others link-dominant (or navigation-dominant).</td>
<td>Pay close attention to both search and navigation in web and database design, to maximize the chances that users find the documents they want. Note that an “advanced (fielded) search” can serve as the equivalent of navigation, BUT studies show that very few users make effective use of advanced searches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse of “advanced search”</td>
<td>Advanced search options are overused and often ineffective. They are in effect the replication of a database programmer’s perspective in the public web interface. Most users will prefer full-text search. Fielded searches and boolean options are hard to explain and present clearly. They are useful to have, but NOT as a substitute for good navigation and a quick simple search.</td>
<td>(1) De-emphasize advanced search, (2) seek other ways to provide similar functionality, such as providing navigation. Even if the underlying mechanism is an advanced search, it can be presented in other ways. See <a href="http://www.useit.com/alertbox/20010513.html">http://www.useit.com/alertbox/20010513.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local search only</td>
<td>With the ubiquity of Google and other search engines, the most important issue is whether the full text of documents is available to search engines. Otherwise, the material is in effect “hidden” from the vast majority of users.</td>
<td>Even if a local search engine is implemented, with special features, project sponsors should demand that the technical team do everything possible to make the full content available to Google and other search engines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Obstacle: Missing or inadequate metadata

Metadata, or “data about data”, in this case documents, is often misconstrued as a “technical” issue or a “clerical” one, with design assigned to IT specialists and implementation to minimally trained data-input personnel, both unfamiliar with the content. The availability, visibility, clarity, and accuracy of such information, however, is highly valuable both to scholars and other users in locating and determining the relevance of a particular document to their interests. It is also essential to accessibility of computer-based content location tools other than full-text search.

**Solutions**

Despite the proliferation of standards and software interfaces for metadata, which are particularly well-developed for books in particular, there are no easy shortcuts for designing standards adapted to the diverse document types relevant for liberation history, or for developing software and processes that are both reliable and easy-to-use for data-entry and for quality control. There is much greater need for open sharing of experience on these issues.

### Obstacle: Cumbersome or misleading site navigation

Effective site navigation should make the documents available according to the selection criteria most relevant for most users through simple links, without requiring the use of complicated “advanced search”, incomprehensible file names or other impediments. Relevant explanatory text should be located strategically so that it is easily accessible when needed.

**Solutions**

Again, there is no easy solution to this issue. But the failure to resolve it is almost certainly linked to the failure to integrate content and usability considerations with the expertise of library and information specialists as well as technical database and site design issues. Best practice in large site design requires integration at all stages of team members with such diverse expertise. More common, however, is lack of communication or overreliance on technical programming at the expense of usable design.
Digital Innovation South Africa (DISA) has for the past ten years been at the forefront of digitisation efforts in the socio-political area of cultural heritage resources and more specifically of Liberation Struggles materials. This includes “published” and archival resources and other primary research resources. It is a collaborative initiative across many South African organisations, with DISA taking the collective responsibility for long term preservation of the digitised content. As with digital resource sustainability, digital preservation requires policies, strategies, infrastructure and commitment from the outset of any digitisation initiative. Preservation of digitised Liberation Struggles materials is no exception and presents additional challenges.

Digital data can easily be corrupted or lost and digital media for storage can be surprisingly fragile and quickly obsolete. Long-term active curation is required to ensure long term preservation of digital data. Simultaneously, however continued preservation of the physical materials also requires attention, and commitment. Active, as opposed to passive curation, calls for action: planning, policies, processes and strategies, beyond the initial digitisation process. Preservation is, or should be, an integrated part of the entire life cycle of digital resources. If the project has been undertaken as part of an organisation’s core function, then it is likely that at least some of these policies and processes may already be in place. If not, action is required to build the preservation support structure and decisions may have to be made as to what should be preserved for long term access. A preservation infrastructure to deal with long term technical, copyright and access issues forms the essential core. This requires skills, expertise and specialised IT knowledge. Most importantly, the use of common international and community based formats and standards to support the infrastructure which requires decisions to be made at the outset of the project. Long term preservation, to be effective, should be regarded as a vital component of the entire digital resource management cycle and not as a last minute add-on feature. To support this infrastructure entails human and technical capacity, which has an economic implication.

Most digitisation of cultural heritage resources, and struggles material in particular, is currently being carried out on a project-basis and is most likely to be funded from external funding sources. Funders want to see visible and tangible outcomes that can be used as measures of success, or otherwise, and hence the
undertaking of a large amount of production of digital resources as an output of a project is likely to be attractive. Inclusion of preservation costs in a proposal for project funding may well inflate the total costs resulting in a competitive disadvantage against projects under-costing on preservation or eliminating this activity totally. Furthermore, preservation is not a one-time cost but ultimately a series of ongoing costs beyond the end of a project. Indeed, the costs associated with long term preservation may, over time, be even higher than the original cost of creating the digital resources. If preservation costs are not included in the budget, who pays for long-term preservation? Who assumes the responsibility for the long term curation and integrity of these resources?

Projects undertaken as part of a national archive’s core function may be better placed than those undertaken by smaller independent archives. “Stand-alone” projects are the most vulnerable in this respect. Indeed DISA, as a funded initiative, is also at risk. Lack of national policies regarding the digitisation and preservation of “memory” resources results in an uncoordinated and fragmented approach which further complicates the preservation process and reduces it to an ad hoc basis, hardly the approach required for effective long-term preservation of memory resources.

Long-term preservation of digitised documents requires not only curation of the content but also of the context. This refers to the relationship of the digital content to the environment in which it was created. This includes, \textit{inter alia}, the semantic context, or the use of particular terminologies which may be implicit and which need to be made explicit. The context of relationships between collections of struggles materials also needs to be explored, made explicit and preserved.

Digital liberation struggles resources are at risk due to the scattered location of struggles documents, spanning across many communities, countries and regions, many of which may be relatively small and isolated. Much struggles material is to be found in under resourced countries which lack the infrastructures and resources to ensure long term curation and, possibly even long term access. The higher the perceived and demonstrated value of digitised resources, to a community, a region or globally, the more focus may be placed on preservation. The value of memory to a culture, in the form of resources, is invaluable, but often difficult and complex to measure. This value is often recognised by developed countries and who in turn may provide funding for digitisation purposes. However this has in the past lead to criticisms of imperialism.

Copyright restrictions may well result in many important documents not being digitised at all. Could this mean many physical struggles documents are lost over time? If sensitive materials are digitised and retain restrictions for access over time, ongoing management of copyright permissions for these documents is a challenge for long term preservation and requires attention at the time of digitisation.
Recommendations

Metadata, that is information about data, will increasingly play an essential part in preservation of cultural heritage content. International standards are being used to capture accurate information such as administrative details, context information, copyright and access permissions amongst others to document information that facilitates long term management of data. Information about an object’s provenance (custodial history) and rights management are perhaps the two functions that are at the crux of preserving cultural heritage resources. The metadata may be an integral part of the content or created and stored separately from the content. Either way it is an essential part of long term preservation of digitised resources.

Increased collaboration across institutions will help build capacity for preservation by sharing knowledge and skills. Attention to ensure that systems and infrastructures are compatible to facilitate sharing of data is an important step to sharing across network infrastructures. eIFL.net 1 is devoted to building a global, interoperable, trusted and long-term repository infrastructure. Their website has an extensive amount of documentation to support developing countries build their own capacity. They provide assistance with policies and strategies and advance the adoption of open source software and solutions to building repositories.

Use of open sources solutions provides an opportunity for increased interoperability underpinning a collaborative approach. Content management systems such as Fedora2 enable better management of content over a period of time where all changes to documents are retained as history of the data. Copyright and access permissions are easier to manage as they are software driven and not reliant on human intervention. DRIVER3 provides services to harvest from repositories exposing their resources to be made searchable from the DRIVER portal. This approach could work equally well for liberation struggles resources. By using portals and global networks, the visibility of liberation struggles materials will be raised, assisting in increasing the benefits of digitisation and the value of preservation. This may in turn lead to an increase and availability of funding for further digitisation of materials.

The use of international and archival community standards in the description of digital resources is a crucial element in preservation. Rich metadata to describe the data, the context and to maintain the integrity of resources, will become a cornerstone of any long-term initiatives. PREMIS4 (Preservation Metadata Implementation Strategies) defines a set of core preservation metadata with guidelines for its management and use.

The complexity of applying preservation metadata may result in a longer

---

1 See www.eifl.net/
2 See http://www.fedora-commons.org/
3 See www.driver-repository.eu/
4 See www.loc.gov/standards/premis/
take-up period due to a lack of skills and understanding of the requirements. This is a challenge that can only be overcome with increased training and skills development. It may be that as the importance and understanding of long-term preservation needs become more widespread, it will become a mandatory part of the agreement with funders that allocation of funds for building digital resources comes with an obligation to implement long-term preservation policies and practice. The complexity of long term preservation and the reliability to ensure these functions may suggest that the hosting of content by trusted repositories is clearly a favourable solution. In other words, leave it to the experts. An initiative such as DANS\(^5\) in the Netherlands, has a specific focus of hosting content for long term preservation, and seems a viable solution. This, of course, involves a cost but with economies of scale and skilled personnel to mitigate against disasters, this may well offer a cheaper option in the long run. DuraSpace will allow users to replicate and access their digital content in a “cloud” which it is hoped will substantially assist small institutions and archives who do not have the capacity nor resources to preserve their data over the long-term.

The use of liberation struggles materials in creating new knowledge, by supporting teaching, learning and research much more than currently may help in preserving digitised liberation materials. Making these materials widely accessible on local and global networks will help their preservation. The cloud based approach allows for better preservation of not only the digitised documents themselves but also for the preservation of comments and annotations – allowing for the development of new knowledge. Large scale text mining of these documents will promote use and research in new innovative ways.

**Conclusions**

Long term preservation of digital resources is no trivial matter. It requires not only institutional policy and strategies but national policy and strategies also. It requires active curation involving cost, sometimes higher than the initial digitisation costs. Liberation struggles documentation is at high risk due to the nature of the scattered collections and the underdevelopment of the regions in which the collections are found. Furthermore project based approaches to funding of digitisation of materials may not adequately take into consideration the ongoing costs required for preservation.

Several recommendations for successful preservation of these materials include the covering of at least a portion of the costs in project funding proposals. In the very near future funders will mandate the inclusion of these costs in funding proposals and organisations themselves will be under obligation to make provision

---

\(^5\) See www.dans.knaw.nl/en/
for preservation costs in annual budgets. Adoption of international and archival community standards for preservation metadata is an absolute requirement – however this requires skills development and training. DISA experiences have shown that metadata creation itself is a timely and labour intensive process, particularly in struggles documentation due to the anonymity of many documents, the deterioration of the physical documents which render a poor digitised copy, handwritten documents and the lack of context of many documents. It does not lend itself to large scale automated metadata extraction but relies on human capture of metadata.

Hosted collections on a third party server may go some way to ensuring a standards-based approach, with skilled personnel for active curation. Similarly cloud-based preservation solutions may also, in time, offer solutions. Struggles materials that are made available in a global context for teaching, education and research purposes will assist in preservation by growing the value of these digital resources. This in turn may provide more opportunity for preservation by tertiary institutions. But long-term preservation of struggles materials can only succeed on a large-scale basis with increased collaborative effort and funding made available specifically for this purpose.
Former authoritarian regimes have revealed some of their secrets to historians and other researchers who have gained access to their previously-sealed archives. This has provided some startling revelations about, say, the extent of the collaboration of German Democratic Republic (GDR) citizens with the Stasi. The records of the apartheid regime have not readily yielded their secrets in part because functionaries destroyed large volumes of top secret files.1 For instance, files relating to the nefarious activities of state agencies such as the Civil Co-operation Bureau (CCB) were shredded in order to cover its tracks when it became apparent that the De Klerk government was intent on negotiating a settlement with the African National Congress (ANC). Another reason for the slow progress in making the secrets of the apartheid state accessible has been the lifelong habits and institutional memory cultivated in archives of a regime that enacted a battery of laws to deny the public access to information deemed to pose a threat ‘national security’. So for instance, the investigations of the Truth & Reconciliation (TRC) were hindered by the deliberate concealment of extensive records of the Military Intelligence Division in the Department of Defence archives.2 Moreover, the TRC’s investigators did not have the time or the resources to conduct systematic research in the voluminous documentation generated by the highly-bureaucratic apartheid state. The passage of the Promotion of Access to Information Act (PAIA) has made it possible for individual researchers and archivists affiliated to projects such as the South African History Archive (SAHA) to apply for access to previously-restricted records. However, gaining access to records of the apartheid state involves a lengthy procedure of declassification which has further inhibited research and publication.

This “think piece” is an attempt to reflect upon my experience of the anomalies and vagaries of the workings of PAIA as it pertains to the Department of Defence’s Documentation Centre in Pretoria. The broad remit of the Promotion of Access to Information Act (No. 2 of 2000) is:

To give effect to the constitutional right of access to any information held by the State and any information that is held by another person and that is required for the exercise or protection of any rights; and to provide for matters connected therewith.

---

1 This included the wholesale destruction of military intelligence files in 1993. See Allan in Allan 2009:146; Africa 2009:19, 63, 71; Bundy in James & Van de Vijver 2000:16.
The purpose of the Act was, in part, to overturn the practices of the apartheid regime that "resulted in a secretive and unresponsive culture in public and private bodies which often led to an abuse of power and human rights violations". This was in order to:

- foster a culture of transparency and accountability in public and private bodies by giving effect to the right of access to information;
- actively promote a society in which the people of South Africa have effective access to information to enable them to more fully exercise and protect all of their rights.

The promotion of such access to information came with the proviso that:

the right of access to any information held by a public or private body may be limited to the extent that the limitations are reasonable and justifiable in an open and democratic society based on human dignity, equality and freedom as contemplated in section 36 of the Constitution.

In other words, PAIA makes provision for researchers to access information held by public and private bodies as long as such disclosures do not infringe upon the rights of third parties mentioned in the documents. However, the advances made by PAIA in ensuring access to information must be offset against other worrisome developments.

PAIA is not the only legislation on the statute books governing access to information. The apartheid era's Protection of Information Act (No. 84 of 1982) is under review. It was envisaged by the post-apartheid security establishment that new legislation – with the same name – better suited to the workings of the democratic order would replace it. In his submission in support of the bill to the Parliamentary ad hoc committee, Barry Gilder, then Co-ordinator for Intelligence, addressed concerns that the bill was open to abuse. He contended that this was true of all legislation which did not make provision for the oversight of its implementation. In response to the charge that the Bill was too vague with regard to defining the criteria that should be used to determine what types of information should be withheld and from whom it should be withheld, he sidestepped the debate about what constituted ‘national security’. Instead, he proposed the substitution of the phrase ‘national interest’ which went even further in seeking to protect information from the country’s ‘adversaries’ whom he defined as any government that seeks to use information to advantage itself in its dealings with the RSA or any domestic entity that sabotages, subverts or undermines government processes. He asserted that the bill balanced the imperatives of secrecy and transparency.3 So in

its present form this pending legislation represents a retreat towards authoritarianism which values secrecy above the public’s right to information. Indeed, the ANC has adopted the practices of the apartheid regime that denied that access to information was a citizen’s right. This might not necessarily obstruct historical research but it signals that the culture of secrecy has outlived apartheid.

Pickover ascribes the prevailing culture of secrecy to the nature of bureaucracy; to its belief that ‘sensitive’ and ‘strategic’ information must be kept secret. She holds that there are still significant problems in accessing information of both public and private bodies, which continue to be guarded by a hierarchy of generally unhelpful bureaucrats. This state of affairs has been ensured by the readiness to invoke (vaguely defined) notions of ‘national security’ or ‘national interest’ to justify government secrecy which, in turn, is seen to be in the public interest. However, the two are not necessarily synonymous. Pickover insists that “governments are merely the custodians of the information they create and collect on behalf of citizens”. She adds that “although there are mechanisms for civil society to participate in the decision-making processes of government, the various structures of government are unable to manage these effectively and in reality there is disjunction between policy and practice.”

My ongoing research project on the “Border War” has made me acutely aware of the disinformation and subterfuge that the apartheid state employed during the 1970s and 1980s. The Nationalist Party (NP) government and the South African Defence Force (SADF) did not take the public into its confidence. The authorities disclosed information about military matters only on a need to know basis. They repeatedly refused to disclose the truth about the number and nature of South Africa’s (often self-inflicted) casualties. Stories released to and published by the media were often contrived versions of what had actually caused the deaths of servicemen. This was compounded by the SADF’s reluctance to disclose the circumstances of soldiers’ deaths to their next of kin. Even the troops themselves were seldom informed about the strategic objectives of military operations in which they were involved. And they were sworn to secrecy in terms of the Defence Act and had to sign declarations not to divulge information pertaining to military operations.

5 Pickover 2005:3.
6 See Africa 2009:55 and Satchwell 1989. Section 118(4) of the Defence Act of 1967 rendered it an offence for a person to disclose any secret or confidential information relating to the defence of the country which came to his/her knowledge by reason of his membership of the SADF or employment in the public service. See. SADF members were made to sign declarations not to disclose information in terms of the Official Secrets Act that was repealed by the 1982 Protection of Information Act. Accordingly, any such documents signed after 1982 were null and void.
Thus the undeclared war was generally conducted amidst considerable secrecy and wild rumours, and many of its secrets remain hidden.

If it is not self-evident what such a project has to do with documentation of the liberation struggle, I should point out that the SADF became the apartheid state’s first line of defence (or attack) against the liberation movements – notwithstanding its steadfast insistence that it was politically neutral and merely defending the government of the day against “terrorist” organisations. I framed my request for access to previously declassified documents under the rubric: “Files related to SADF propaganda and its reading of propaganda created by those portrayed as the enemy”. I envisaged being able to develop an understanding of how the SADF constructed its perception of “the enemy” in terms of its “total onslaught” theorising and strategising. In the course of my research, I have read much material relating to how the SADF interpreted its objective to destroy the liberation movements – especially the ANC and SWAPO. As the SADF was proficient in documenting its activities, there are records not only of its destabilisation of the region but also of its cross-border strikes against ANC “targets” in neighbouring states. Although such activities have become common knowledge, they are not all a matter of public record. The TRC report, for instance, barely scratched the surface when it came to documenting the actions of the SADF in the frontline states. This is because the retired SADF generals proved obstructionist and were not willing to testify before TRC because they believed that it was prejudiced against the organisation. Had TRC investigators been able to conduct more systematic an investigation of the SADF records, it would undoubtedly have uncovered records to implicate the generals in the gross violation of human rights. Indeed, my research in the Department of Defence’s Documentation Centre has served to confirm my suspicions that there is a welter of evidence that incriminates the upper echelons of the SADF and their political bosses. If the political will existed to prosecute them, the ammunition (or “smoking gun”) could be provided to prove their culpability.

The prosecution of apartheid-era criminals, however, is not my concern. Rather, it is my wish to make a case for the relevance of my research to the documentation of the liberation struggle inasmuch as it provides insight into the workings of mindset of the most powerful arm of the apartheid state’s security apparatus. So I deem it necessary to study the propaganda of both sides involved in the liberation struggle or what the white minority called the “Border War”. To this end, I have examined the publications and other records of the Namibian liberation movement housed in Basler Afrika Bibliographien’s SWAPO Collection. I plan to also to consult the (online) archives on the websites of the Nordic Africa Institute, DISA and SPARC on the history of the liberation movements. But those movements have probably indulged in at least a measure of pre-selection of the material.

---

that finds its way into such archives. The liberation movements have skeletons in their closets and will undoubtedly seek to protect themselves from close scrutiny where certain sensitive revelations might prove embarrassing to the organisations and their political appointees. In the final analysis, the liberation movements, like the apartheid regime, will try to make accessible only those documents that show them in the best possible light, and this is likely to result in the writing of a sanitised history of the ANC and SWAPO’s exile years.

I have visited the Department of Defence’s Documentation Centre three times in the last two years in order to examine files declassified in terms of PAIA. I now illustrate the arbitrariness in the application of PAIA by officials tasked to process and approve such applications. The TRC Report states that it was not able to access files housed in the SADF archives on Operation Savannah, the codename given the intervention of South African troops in Angola in 1975/6. When I consulted the Documentation Centre’s archival lists, I noted extensive records relating to Operation Savannah in the Chief of Staff Operations group. I subsequently requested access to these files and they were declassified. However, I was informed that in a few instances I would have to consult copies of “masked” records. This meant that photocopies were made of the relevant files and that certain information would be blotted out. According to the covering letter received from the Centre in response to my application, certain records were “masked” in terms of Section 34 (i) the PAIA for the following reason:

The release of the record would involve the unreasonable disclosure of personal information about a third party, including a deceased individual in so far as these records contained personal information of deceased, missing or injured persons, the nature or type of their injuries as well as where these members were treated and personal information of the next of kin.

It turned out that one of these [appended] documents tabulated information relating to seven SADF members who had gone missing during Operation Savannah. As the document reveals, the deleted details refer to the force numbers, names, date of incident, and addresses of the next of kin of captured SADF members who were taken prisoner by the Angolans and/or Cubans. To withhold this information more than thirty years after the event seems ludicrous in the light of the fact that the identities of these South African POWs have long been known. Their names were first divulged by Radio Luanda and then released on a number of subsequent occasions when their captors paraded them before the international media. Even the suppressed and normally compliant South African media could not be prevailed upon to withhold their names from the public by the SADF. Indeed, they became a short-lived cause celebre when their release was negotiated in May 1978. Moreover, their names have been recorded in published accounts.

---

8 TRC Report, V.2, ch.2, p.4 #15.
of Operation Savannah. In fact, I came across the very information denied me in other files in other archive groups which were not “masked”. So what sense does it make to withhold such information? What purpose is served by the (inconsistent) application of the PAIA? Who is being protected by this measure?

In another instance, declassified files from the Chief of Staff Operations were masked in terms of Section 41. 1. b. (iii) of the PAIA which states that:

The release of the record would reveal information required to be held in confidence by an International Agreement or Customary International Law contemplated in Sections 231 or 232, respectively, of the Constitution. This record refers to a Memorandum of Understanding between South Africa and Israel.

In 1975 South Africa and Israel entered into a confidentiality agreement in respect of the exchange of supplies for the development of the apartheid regime’s nuclear programme. This memorandum of understanding (MOU) apparently defines what information can and cannot be released. Does the ANC government, which felt duty bound to honour the apartheid state’s debts, feel equally obliged to honour its diplomatic agreements? And here is the irony. The file in question did not contain – as might be expected – top secret documents pertaining to co-operation between South African and Israel in the former’s nuclear programme. Instead, the name of the country is blocked out in monthly media analysis reports compiled by the SADF’s Military Intelligence Division (MID) which noted that “hostile” media were broadcasting allegations to the effect that South Africa was receiving assistance from xxxxxxx [read: Israel] in developing nuclear weapons and in the training of soldiers in counter-revolutionary warfare. Again, it must be asked: what is the purpose of applying PAIA in this instance? Is this bureaucratic “bloody-mindedness” or a case of applying the letter of the law without recognising that the “clue” provided by the above statement and a reading of the context enables the researcher to identify the name of the country being withheld. In any event, the information being withheld is common knowledge.

In view of these examples, what purpose does PAIA serve? And my experience of the application of PAIA begs further questions: Who gets to decide what information I should be denied access to? Are the criteria used to make such decisions applied intelligently and consistently? When it comes to striking a balance between the right to know and the right to privacy, there is always going to be uneasy tension. So should it be up to officials or bureaucrats to mediate that tension on behalf of public/private bodies and determine who has the right of access to information? Whatever else we might wish to say about the Department of Defence Documentation Centre, there is a glaring disjuncture between policy and practice in the interpretation and application of PAIA. That this disjuncture is not

particular to this repository is confirmed by the essays in the recently-published volume called *Paper Wars*.12

One of the contributors to this volume concludes that PAIA is “a blunt instrument for researchers attempting to obtain documents from government departments”.13 PAIA is undoubtedly an imperfect instrument and the way in which it is interpreted and applied is inconsistent, even if the Documentation Centre has become increasingly efficient in processing PAIA applications and de-classifying documents for perusal. Unlike the TRC investigators, I do not have a sense of being ’stonewalled’, and by default, if nothing else, SADF secrets may yet be unmasked.
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Rescuing Zimbabwe’s ‘Other’ Liberation Archives

Gerald Chikozho Mazarire

Zimbabwe’s liberation struggle has been well documented over the past three decades. Apart from the oral testimonies of participants in the war, much of this material already existed in the public domain in the form of press releases, newsletters, minutes of meetings and communiqués of its main liberation movements and their organs. Very little primary material has come from private collections and it is public knowledge that none of these movements possess proper archives. The intra and inter-party rivalries that rocked the liberation struggle continue to haunt any effort to reveal individual collections to the public and, in this way, much of this crucial data has lacked systematic and proper care or been simply left to decay. Participants in the war lack confidence in existing modes of documenting and archiving this liberation heritage. Such material as manuscripts, letters, photographs, publications, tapes and videos has been encountered in people’s private libraries, locked up in trunks in their basements or, worse still, left in the custody of people who have no idea of its historical value. The paper argues that there are ways of rescuing these ‘other’ archives through advocacy and awareness campaigns by concerned scholars who could regain the confidence of the Zimbabwe liberation struggle’s witnesses, its veterans, their associations or families, to avail these private materials and otherwise create alternative repositories that compliment whatever efforts have been in place to archive this heritage. It details the work of the Zimbabwe Oral History Trust, an organization founded to rescue this scattered material.

The problem

The content of Zimbabwe’s liberation heritage is varied. It ranges from written, oral to audiovisual material. There are songs, dances, jokes, sayings and cartoons just as there are novels and academic books on the subject and more is still being produced. It still is a popular subject which is indeed everywhere in our midst. The ‘scattered’ nature of its content and its commonplace occurrence continues to give the impression that it is going to be around for long. The experience of researching Zimbabwe’s liberation war over the past few years challenges this assumption much as it confirms the availability of very rich material still lying ‘out there’. More alarming however, is the rate at which this material is being lost. There is grow-
ing concern amongst former participants in the war, institutions charged with the safe-keep of this heritage and practitioners in the field of history that this material should be collected and put together in repositories for posterity. But such material does not exist ‘out there’ in ‘cut and dried’ form, ready for collection. Much of it has to be solicited and often its custodians have to be convinced to release it, and may then name a price. Frequently researchers and archivists have been confronted with the ‘what’s in it for us?’ question by the originators or primary custodians of such material and it has been fairly difficult to offer any satisfactory answers. In this paper I wish to share some notes around the idea of a ‘rescue’ plan mooted after several encounters with liberation war data informally in the field, in the course of researching for various projects on the subject of Zimbabwe’s liberation war. Over the past five years three projects concerned with the liberation history of Zimbabwe were launched and completed and I have played an active role in all.¹

The use of the term ‘rescue’ here is deliberate. It implies a salvage exercise designed to save material presumed to be under threat although one needs to be clear, right from the beginning, what sort of material and what types of threats such material faces. Given the ‘spontaneous’ nature of liberation war data as already outlined, the biggest threat is the lack of knowledge of how this data exists in its raw form in the field. The first requirement in such a rescue plan is ‘awareness’ which in turn is dependent upon the skills of ‘identifying’ the relevant material. Once this is done, one needs to win the confidence of the custodians to gain access to the said material, let alone convince them to store it in a more reliable and accessible place. Beyond this it is possible to then launch a documentation exercise that involves two important activities ‘processing’ and ‘storage’. First we need to know the originators of Zimbabwe’s liberation war archive and how their information can be categorised.

The ‘gnawing gap’: Archives of African liberation movements

loyal to Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole and Bishop Abel Muzorewa (1978–80). Of these we know virtually nothing of the last four except material published about them in public sources such as newspapers, press releases and communiqués. ZIPRA had an archive in the sense of material composed of, amongst other things, ‘documents’ that were confiscated by the ZANU PF government at the height of the Gukurahundi conflict in Matabeleland between 1983 and 1987. This and other ZIPRA properties are still to be returned. Former ZIPRA members and its leadership formed a Memorial Trust named after the late ZIPRA Chief of Staff Lookout ‘Mafela’ Masuku, whose mandate is partly to record the war memories of former ZIPRA combatants. Most of this material is accessible upon request at the Mafela Trust offices in Bulawayo.

ZANLA possesses an archive, if this is taken to mean documents it generated during the war. The distinction between its archive and its library is somewhat blurred, the one being piles of files, reports and provincial communiqués produced by war commissars in contact areas, the other, a collection of its publications over time to the present day. The archive itself, in the basement of ZANU PF Headquarters building along Rotten Row Street in Harare, is far from orderly and not

---

2 ZIPRA was the army of ZAPU and ZANLA that of ZANU which were formed following the arrest and detention of the political leadership of both parties in 1964. ZANLA was formed almost immediately whereas ZAPU’s military activities were coordinated by its Special Affairs Department until a Revolutionary Council was set up in 1972 which led to the formation of ZIPRA. To an extent, and following a number of internal and technical problems, ZAPU and ZANU’s armies were nearly redundant by 1971. This lead to the formation of the Front for the Liberation of Zimbabwe in the same year and, although ZANLA and ZIPRA were revived shortly thereafter, FROLIZI survived and had an army that was recognised by the OAU Liberation Committee and was active throughout 1974. In 1974 however, the Frontline States, Zambia and Tanzania especially, were keen on forming a United Party to negotiate with the Rhodesians under the United States/Zambia and South Africa brokered detente exercise, this way the Zimbabwe Liberation Council was formed with a view to launch the Zimbabwe Liberation Army (ZLA). The result was tragic as cadres from ZANLA and ZIPRA turned on each other resulting in many deaths. Later with the involvement of the leadership of active ZIPRA and ZANLA guerrilla, ZIPA was formed. It scored a number of military successes but was undermined by the political leadership who had just been released from prison in late 1974 under detente. By 1976 ZIPA had broken apart. As for the auxiliaries, they were simply raised as private armies for the two African leaders of the Internal Settlement of 1978.

3 For an interesting analysis of FROLIZI using these sources see Tony Kirk, “Politics and Violence in Rhodesia”, African Affairs vol. 74 no 294 (1975) pp. 3–38, on ZIPA see David Moore, “Democracy, Violence and Identity in Zimbabwe’s War of National Liberation: Reactions From the Realms of Dissent”, Canadian Journal of African Studies vol 29 no. 3 (1995) and idem. “The Zimbabwe People’s Army: Strategic Innovation or More of the Same?”, in N. Bhebe & T.O. Ranger, Soldiers in Zimbabwe’s Liberation Army (UZP, Harare, 1995). FROLIZI may be a different case as a former member of its executive Dr. Nathan Shamuyarira reputedly has one of the richest collection of Liberation literature in his house. The Center for Peace Initiatives in Africa is in a ‘partnership’ with Dr. Shamuyarira of some sort and at their establishment in Vumba in the Eastern Highlands of Zimbabwe, their Documentation Centre holds a number of collections on liberation movements in the region.
complete, but is a typical example of a ‘rescued’ collection. It exhibits what can happen to an archive without a post-rescue plan. People who have used or accessed it have done so at the discretion of the party’s Publicity Department or through the goodwill of specific individuals.4

The Rhodesia Army Association archives in Bristol and the Ian Smith Papers at the Cory Library at Rhodes University in South Africa5 are well complemented by the avalanche of literature that has continued to be published by former Rhodesian operatives including individual memoirs and definitive institutional histories.6 This however has been biased towards white soldiers and white participants in the Rhodesian war. There is yet to be a definitive study dedicated to African soldiers in other sections of the Rhodesian army except a forthcoming history of the Rhodesian African Rifles.7

The implication from the foregoing is that any search for the history of participants in the war should begin at the level of what organisation or liberation movement they belonged and whether there are indeed any institutional collections that can form the ‘archive’. Sometimes good ‘archives’ do not fit such a straight-jacket and out there may never exist as collective memories but individual ones. It is possible from these individual memories to cut apart some of the internal contradictions and ambiguities of each movement and it is at this individual level that the search and rescue exercise can start. At this point therefore one should begin with listening for ‘silences’.

Encountering spontaneous data on Zimbabwe’s liberation war

Evidence about Zimbabwe’s liberation experiences has always been ubiquitous and spans a wide time spectrum. Systematic collection of these experiences dates back to contemporary exercises like the Keesings Archives, but most documenta-

5 The first batch of the Smith Cabinet papers have been used extensively in JRT Wood, So Far and No Further!: Rhodesia’s Bid for Independence During the Retreat From Empire 1959–1965 (30 Degrees South Publishers, Johannesburg 2005).
6 Peter Stiff’s Galago Books has continuously churned out such literature in large numbers for the past two decades, apart from this, the SAS, the Selous Scouts, the Rhodesian African Rifles and the Rhodesian Light Infantry now boast complete institutional histories.
tion projects on the subject began after Zimbabwe’s independence in 1980. There is a huge difference between the pre- and post-1980 material, the former being predominantly reflections on an ongoing experience and the latter being varied reminiscences based both on experiences and perceptions in retrospect. Much of the material covering contemporary events is now in the public domain either in published form or in collections in various libraries, archives or research centers. Biographical accounts augment both ends of the divide but post-independence reminiscences are much more spontaneous and richer, but problematic. The major challenge is with material that is still unavailable in the public domain and this can constitute both written and oral material.

Much has been written about the nature and occurrence of oral sources on Zimbabwe’s liberation war owing to the rise in the number of oral history projects on the subject in Zimbabwe. For this reason this section will concentrate on the silent oral sources in the Zimbabwean struggle that also occur spontaneously. Much of this is based on my personal experiences in the field, researching what turned out to be a popular version of the liberation struggle, dominated by triumphant narratives of former ZAPU and ZANU guerrillas and their supporters. I worked in Chivi, in southern Zimbabwe between 1998 and 2001 with a broad focus on nationalism and the life of common guerrillas in combat during the Second Chimurenga. This was at a time that ex-combatants were receiving their Z$50,000 (then the equivalent of US$4,500) gratuities and naturally, I targeted their weekly meetings at various townships and interviewed a number of them. Because I had acquainted myself with the leadership, I was frequently introduced at their meetings and interviewed as many as I wanted. One afternoon on one of the routine interviews I decided to take a break and have a haircut at a nearby barber shop at Chivi Business Centre. The barber shop was characteristically called ‘Jocks the Barber’. A short middle aged man attended to me and while he was cutting my hair, my attention was caught by a ‘Demobilisation Certificate’ displayed right

---


10 See Mazaire, “Collecting and Processing Liberation War Memories in Contemporary Zimbabwe”.

above the mirror, for every customer to see that Jocks was a proud ex-Rhodesian African Rifles Lance Corporal who left service in 1981. I asked the barber after the cut whose certificate it was and he proudly said it was his. He went on to say he knew about my work with the ex-combatants. He challenged me to be fair and non-partisan and interview everybody across the divide of the war if I was a genuine scholar. I was caught unaawares, yet of course, I had grown up in a context where the popular depiction of the war branded all African soldiers of the Rhodesian army as ‘sell outs’. Jocks and I had a long interview afterwards. He was proud of his service, he said, and he was recruited into the Rhodesian army because it was a job. Later, he felt it his individual responsibility to protect innocent civilians from his village who were continuously exposed to the brutality and intimidation of Patriotic Front guerrillas. After the war he used his pension to set up a barber shop, an occupation he learnt while he was in the army. He was able to introduce me to a network of other ex-Rhodesian soldiers.¹¹

Some prejudices against the so-called ‘sell-outs’ persist to this day. An initiative by New Ziana to interview former participants in the struggle for Zimbabwe has developed a very huge collection. One interview in particular struck me when it was aired on Zimbabwe Television in November 2008. This was an interview with Bishop Abel Muzorewa by a very hostile but quite inexperienced young journalist who literally interrogated the Bishop for being a Rhodesian Prime Minister in the Internal Settlement Government of 1978–1979. Muzorewa responded calmly and articulated his reasons as clearly as was possible, and it remains New Ziana’s best interview in this series. Oral archives of Zimbabwe’s war still remain lopsided because researchers are yet to transcend the stereotypes invented about this war defining heroes and collaborators. For this reason also, researchers have been unable to win the confidence and access information from those long considered to be on the ‘wrong’ side of the war.

Written material

In the field researchers often encounter written accounts in the process of conducting oral interviews. By the time the war broke out Zimbabwe was a fairly literate country and most participants in the war were well educated. In most of the interviews I have conducted, it is usually the case that an informant cross-checks the accuracy of their account with personal notes that would have been written a long while back and carefully stored away. Normally, such notes or written narratives are sacred possessions that would not be released easily to a researcher. Sometimes, because of the differences experienced between and within liberation movements during and after the war, some people are not yet free to express themselves for

¹¹ Some of these interviews can be found under the ‘Mazarire Interviews’ at www.aluka.org
fear of retribution. Everybody seems to have faith in the written word and that this would speak for them and to posterity. At the launch of Edgar Tekere’s non-conformist biography; *Tekere: A Lifetime of Struggle*, in January 2007, Enos Nkala, a veteran ZANU politician vowed to write his own biography which would be published after his death!

This seems to have been a trend perhaps due to the contested nature of the liberation struggle and the proscribed environment over which it can be independently expressed in Zimbabwe. Ngwabi Bhebe interviewed a number of former members of ZANU’s Revolutionary Council, the ‘Dare ReChimurenga’. A section of them had been linked to the *VaShandi* rebellion and the attempted coup on the ZANU leadership in 1978, and they happily gave him their testimonies, while all the ones he interviewed provided written accounts. Three researchers conducting fieldwork for a book on the war in Matabeleland Terence Ranger, Jocelyn Alexander and JoAnn McGregor encountered Nicholas Nkomo, a former commander of ZIPRA’s northern front, who, when he was interviewed, revealed his 25 000 word autobiography written in English. Although it is a rich expression of his experiences and that of his colleagues in the ZIPRA war, Nkomo allowed these researchers access to it but refused their assistance to have it published.

Some other written accounts exist simply because of the participant’s willingness to write their experiences, yet because of lack of knowledge or funds to get the material published it is just kept in their possession until such a time that a researcher stumbles upon it. If not, it will never be availed to the public domain. I encountered Retired Major Alex Mudavanhu at his farm in Masvingo while on one of my many trips around Zimbabwe collecting oral interviews. He first gave me a very interesting interview and when he grew comfortable with me during a break, he retrieved his written account. It was well written but not well kept. It was written in ballpoint ink and one section of it had been spoilt after some liquid was spilt on it because he kept it in a temporary shelter at his new farm. He was not willing to release it until we struck a deal that myself and two research assistants would type it and give him a printed version and a soft version on CD. This he agreed to after we had left some identification. We were back at the farm the following weekend with his manuscript, the 44 294 word print out and the CD, much to
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12 Henry Hamadziripi had not written an account as such but gave a 30 page interview and confidential letters and notes, written while he was in Chimoio Prison, which Bhebe deposited with the National Archives of Zimbabwe see File MS939, Henry K. Hamadziripi, National Archives of Zimbabwe. Rugare Gumbo gave a copy of his ‘Reflections on my Role in the Liberation Struggle For Zimbabwe’ 52pp. (computer typed) n.d. now in the possession of the Zimbabwe Oral History Trust.


his delight. In a similar way Ngwabi Bhebe stumbled upon a manuscript written by a ZANU ex-detainee that details the harrowing experiences of life in Hwahwa prison between 1975 and 1978. The author Nicholas Rungano, a graduate of the University of Rhodesia, gave an articulate account in seventeen chapters, which enriches the growing literature on political prisoners in Zimbabwe.

Lastly there have been attempts by individual participants to write academic versions of the struggle for Zimbabwe. Some academics amongst Zimbabwe’s nationalists have successfully produced interesting studies on the war. There are others who were, or are still, involved in this exercise but because of other pressing commitments or death, their work remains inaccessible. I have in mind here Eddison Zvobgo’s incomplete seven chapter manuscript availed to Ngwabi Bhebe by the Zvobgo family after Eddison’s death. It is based on notes that Zvobgo constructed and called ‘Zvobgo Series Articles 1–20’ based on interviews with over 100 active nationalists and information from internal documents, press, legal and other contemporary sources. It has a missing first chapter (56 pages) which could have been the introduction because the corresponding articles 1–4 are also missing. This manuscript may have been completed by February 1982 and Zvobgo may have tried to publish this with Macmillan Press, London, around the same time (based on a message slip in one of the boxes). After that he probably lost interest and kept it safely stored away at his legal practice offices in Kensington, in the Avondale suburb of Harare. The title could have been ‘Patterns of Black-White Conflict in Zimbabwe’ for this phrase preceded each title of every available chapter. It is one of the most comprehensive analysis of events in Rhodesia between 1957 and 1975 in 671 computer typed pages.

In all, these are just but examples of written archives that would otherwise not be easily availed by their originators and continue to reside out there vulnerable to extinction if they are not rescued in time. Even then, any rescue exercise should not assume that it is a popular exercise where researchers walk into an informant’s home and rescue away the material. It involves, above all, winning the confidence of the people first to release their information and secondly building the confidence in them that it can be kept safely for posterity without chances of it exposing them or their families. This is what inspired the foundation of the Zimbabwe Oral History Trust.

---

15 The manuscript had no title and we voted to call it “The War Memoirs of Cde. Feya Muchabvuma (Rtd. Major Alex Mudavanhu) 1975–1980”, 114 pp., 2007, now in the collections of the Zimbabwe Oral History Trust.

16 N.M. Rungano, “Reflections of an Ex-Detainee” 56 pp. Type-written. n.d.

17 It is not like Rungano had no access to publication as such, he has published a novel before entitled Matters True to Life (Mambo Press, Gweru).


19 E.J.M. Zvobgo, “Patterns of Black-White Conflict in Zimbabwe”. Unpublished Manuscript, 671 pp. (c.1982). This source is now with the Zimbabwe Oral History Trust.
The economic crisis Zimbabwe has experienced over the past decade has affected most public institutions funded by government. The National Archives of Zimbabwe and the University of Zimbabwe are but two such institutions amongst many that have had their service to the public severely curtailed by the fiscal crunch. In the latter, staff shortages have resulted in serious backlogs in accessioning material and an increase in the number of thefts of collections including some concerned with Zimbabwe’s liberation war. In some cases storage facilities have literally collapsed.20 Although the culture of depositing material in the archives is not yet fully developed in Zimbabwe, the state of the archives has been one of the chief reasons why those who would deposit anything are no longer willing to do so.21 In the past decade alone only two collections to the liberation archive were deposited to the National Archives of Zimbabwe.22 To add to this no large scale funding has been forthcoming to boost any collections or maintain existing ones. From 2004 however three projects emerged at once that were all coincidentally about the Zimbabwean liberation struggle. The first was an initiative of three institutions in Zimbabwe that were concerned with the history of the struggle namely; the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, the National Archives of Zimbabwe and the University of Zimbabwe History Department. Their project was aptly titled ‘Capturing a Fading National Memory’ and obtained funding from the Zimbabwe government through Casino Licenses from 2004 onwards. I was seconded by the History Department as the Project Manager and later became part of its directorate. In the same year, I was invited to co-chair the Zimbabwe Chapter of Aluka Digital Resources, an American-based organisation that sought to digitise liberation war documents in partnership with various originating organisations. The other two co-chairs were Ivan Murambiwa, the Director of the National Archives and Ngwabi Bhebe a Professor of History and Vice Chancellor to the Midlands State University. In the same year again, the Hashim Mbita Project was launched in Zimbabwe and Ngwabi Bhebe and I were drafted into the research team as Focal Point and Associate Researcher respectively. While the last two projects wound up in 2008, the ‘Capturing’ project continues institutionally within the National Archives as part of its Oral History section.

In April 2008 Professor Ngwabi Bhebe called a meeting to found the Zimbabwean Liberation History Rescue Plan. The Zimbabwe oral history trust and the ‘Zimbabwe Liberation History Rescue Plan’

20 Recently in 2008, shelves housing collections of archives of the Federal Period (1953–1963) collapsed when someone stole all the screws to the shelves to sell on the black market. UNESCO and the Sida supported Culture Fund have provided grants to refurbish the air conditioning that had gone down in the repositories affecting a number of collections. At one point one needed to supply the archives orderlies with a torch to retrieve collections because all the lights in the dark repositories were dead.


22 The Daniel Madzimbamuto and the Eileen Haddon Collections.
bwe Oral History Trust (ZOHT). Ivan Murambiwa and the author were founding trustees. The ZOHT was registered with the following objectives:

- To collect, process and archive oral materials relating to the cultural, social and political history of Zimbabwe.
- To promote interest in the preservation of rare and or threatened oral material for public access.
- To undertake academic research relating to the same.
- To promote, train and interact with historians through workshops, conferences and symposia.

By June 2008 we were involved in consultations to establish a full Board of Trustees and secure premises to house collections in our possession and those we could solicit from others. Using resources from a few well wishers a house was secured to rent in Marlborough on no. 29 Harare Drive. We moved in equipment and three resident research assistants (drawn from the nearby University) and a caretaker. We have kept this fairly low profile until adequate funding is obtained and we seek at all costs to keep our image as a not-for-profit organisation that compliments rather than competes with like-minded institutions such as the National Archives and other documentation centers. The current work taking place involves continued collection and storage of material on various subjects of Zimbabwe’s history that affiliated members are involved in. Research Assistants are mostly involved in transcription and translation of the various interviews that exist or are brought in by individual researchers. They also conduct such services for a fee to other researchers. We are also slowly building a reference library on the premises which is getting richer and more sophisticated by the day. Our main project which we seek to sell out to donors is entitled ‘Rescuing The Zimbabwe Liberation War Archive’. This project functions from the premise that it knows of the existence of liberation war material ‘out there’ as elaborated above. It is therefore generally an advocacy exercise targeting two categories of people: creators of archives i.e. participants in the war or custodians of material left behind or entrusted to them by participants, witnesses, authors and others, and users of archives i.e. researchers and other non-official repositories. It will be pursued in two phases; the first, an awareness and publicity phase targeting the last category of people. It is known that various researchers, lecturers and students have worked on the liberation war, some have interviews, tapes, video collections and photographs in their personal possessions which they will be encouraged to come and share in a series of workshops conducted by ZOHT. At the end of these workshops their material can be copied and deposited with ZOHT as a secondary repository. The next phase of this stage is a publicity and fund-raising campaign which will result in the handing over of ‘rescued’ material to the National Archives of Zimbabwe, as the parent
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repository, at a public function graced by some of the creators. Public media and international organisations will be given a full catalogue of the deposits. This will boost the image of the National Archives and at the same time will encourage creators of those archives ‘out there’ to come forth with material or at least be aware of our project.

The second phase of the project targets the creators of the liberation archives ‘out there’ through the active participation of the users. We assume that funds will be raised in the initial phase to do two things, first, to avail funds to participating researchers to venture back into the field with the knowledge they gathered from the workshops to go and ‘rescue’ other archives. Secondly, to launch a seminar series based on research from the collections already at hand and those trickling in. In this way publications will result of edited collections of interviews and academic papers, individual studies, rescued books and, perhaps with time, documentaries. This way it is hoped that everybody across the divide of the war will be encouraged to contribute to its archive and by the same token confidence will be restored in our local institutions charged with the safe-keeping of Zimbabwe’s history.23

In conclusion

Zimbabwe still has much to know about its liberation struggle. Not everything is yet in the public domain, nor is everyone equally empowered to share their experiences in the struggle. Part of the reason for this is the political polarisation within Zimbabwe and the stereotypes that come with it. This has eroded confidence in the institutions that are charged with the role of keeping our heritage and bequeathing it to posterity and has compromised the professional integrity of scholars and archivists. All this notwithstanding, material ‘out there’ must be rescued and it is not too late to do so nor is it impossible to count on the cooperation of creators and users of these archives. If this begins at country level it is easy to spread the culture regionally. This paper is inspired by such thinking and is party to an organisation that is committed to seeing this happen by employing confidence-building mechanisms that will leave knowledge and history in the hands of the people.
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Background

In 1994, a project entitled “National Liberation of Southern Africa: The Role of the Nordic Countries” was conducted at the Nordic Africa Institute (NAI) by Mr. Tor Sellström. The project resulted into five publications covering the role of Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Finland in the liberation struggles. A substantial number of copies from different archival institutions were also accumulated. During the conduct of the project, a need to salvage the documents related to the liberation struggles both in Africa and the Nordic countries was identified. Even though there were efforts being made in South Africa to document the liberation struggles’ history, less was for example being done in Namibia and Mozambique. In other instances, archival institutions lacked the political backing, financial and technical capacity to take care of this important history and hence the risk for it to get destroyed. It was therefore of paramount importance to offer expertise and financial assistance to institutions both in the Nordic countries and Southern Africa, to systematically arrange and save the documentation. The private archives were also to be included in the salvaged. In 2003, NAI was therefore, mandated by the Foreign Ministry of Sweden, to be the facilitator for the work on the liberation struggles’ documentation and a project entitled “The Nordic Documentation Project” was created. The project’s mandate read as follows:

- To map documents which are relevant to research and for documentary purposes.
- To investigate the different ways of making the identified materials available to the interested parties.
- To develop a database of archival materials.
- To facilitate and promote collaboration among the parties interested in the liberation struggles history in both the Nordic countries and Southern Africa.
- To stimulate further research in both the Nordic countries and Southern Africa through dissemination activities and to facilitate access to the documentation.
- To actively inform about the Nordic documentation in Southern Africa with a particular focus on Namibia and South Africa. The Institute was to act as link between the Nordic countries and the concerned countries in Africa. The Insti-
The Institute has fully followed its mandate and identified institutions in Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland that hold documents on the liberation struggles. As a result of this work, a project web site that presents two distinct kinds of information was launched in April 2007. The website presents “search aids” for materials available in the Nordic countries, presented through a database format and a variety of other materials including posters, interviews, books, a few scanned documents and audio/visual materials. The database presents archival lists that direct information seekers to the respective institutions that are custodians of the archival materials. The full text archives’ link avails pdf-files that are in most cases in Nordic languages.

The substantial copies that were accumulated during Tor Sellström’s project are now part of the NAI archives. The 30,000 pdf-files were scanned and copied onto a DVD that can be made available to researchers. Due to the sensitivity of the materials, a decision was made on the 15 of February, 2008, not to make them available to general public. This was in respect of the personal integrity of the people involved. Researchers who have so far asked for the DVD have been cautioned to use the documentation with discretion.

The project has also supported the following projects as per the agreements that were signed between the Institute and the following organisations.

1. The Finnish Country Committee on Archives on Anti-Colonial Resistance and Liberation Struggle in Namibia (AACRLS) in Helsinki, Finland, 2005–2007
2. SWAPO Party Archives & Research Centre (SPARC) – Windhoek, Namibia, 2005–2007

The Finnish Archives on the anti-colonial resistance and Liberian struggle in Namibia (AACRLS) can be accessed via the Internet with downloadable pdf-files. The SWAPO Party Archives and Research Centre (SPARC) was inaugurated on the 20 November 2007. The centre now has a database, which it plans to make available to the general public. The Tchiweka Association of Documentation has published the MPLA’s History through Lúcio Lara’s documents and annotations. So far two volumes have been published and the third volume is in progress. The first volume (first published in Luanda in 1997) is entitled “A Broad Movement – Itinerary of
the MPLA through the documents and annotations of Lúcio Lara (up to February 1961). The second volume covers the period 1961–65 and the third volume is supposed to cover 1974 and expected to come out in 2008. These publications can be accessed in the institute’s Library. The Tchiweka project has also made its work available via the Internet even though it is Portuguese. The ANC in Mozambique Project resulted into both an English and Portuguese versions and captured the stories of the ANC in Mozambique. Information on both publications is available on the project website and the books can be accessed at the NAI library.


The Foundation was contracted to carry out interviews with institutions and people who were engaged in the various activities of the liberation struggle i.e. security, political, ideological and educators. Tanzania was a home to those who were involved in the struggles and acted as a bridge between the liberation movements and the rest of the world. It is indeed a shame that the Foundation failed to honour the agreement. After a lot of communication between the Project Co-ordinator and the Foundation, the Director and the Project Co-ordinator agreed to consider the project a failure and removed it from the Nordic Project website.

The project has also stimulated further research on the liberation struggles history by financially supporting an international conference and two international workshops that have revisited the history of the liberation struggles. The conference was held on 11–12 April, 2008 in Sigtuna, Sweden, under the theme, “Modern Solidarity - what did we learn from Southern Africa’s liberation? Popular Movements’ Meeting and Rally for Solidarity,” and was organized by the Swedish Solidarity Groups. The workshops entitled: The Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa: New Perspectives was organized by Professor Chris Saunders at the University of Western Cape, Center for African Studies on the 4–6 September, 2008 and Oral History: Southern Africa in the Cold War, Post-1974, 30–31 January 2009 was organized by Dr. Sue Onslow of the Cold War Centre, London School of Economics, U.K. and Anna-Mart van Wyk of Monish South Africa campus Remising, Johannesburg, were held in South Africa. A compile report from the international conference can be accessed at: http://www.liberationafrica.se/events/conf_reports/sigtuna/. Publications are expected from the two workshops that were held in South Africa and will be sent to the institute’s Library.

The project has also endeavoured to disseminate its work at international conferences (See Annex 1). Details of the different conferences can be accessed in the Project Hand-Over Report. Dissemination activities have been undertaken at the University of Iceland, Mid-Sweden University and the University of Joensuu in Finland. Some Swedish universities were contacted with an inquiry to deliver a
seminar on the Documentation Project but most of them responded negatively or did not respond at all.

In order to cater for the Portuguese speaking region the Institute in 2008 published Tor Sellström’s book entitled Sweden and the Liberation Struggle in Angola, Mozambique and Guinéa Bissau. A book launch was organised by Documentation Project in collaboration with the Swedish Embassy in Luanda, Angola and The National Historical Institute of Angola and was held on the 5th of June, 2008.

The project has facilitated the repatriation of documents to Namibia through its financial support to The Finnish Country Committee on Archives on Anti-Colonial Resistance and Liberation Struggle in Namibia (AACRLS) in Helsinki, Finland. In April, 2009 a Namibian delegation visited the Institute and digital copies of the documents related to the struggles were given to the delegation. SPARC, a project that was financed by Sida and administered by the Institute managed to train its employees in information management and digitization skills and the newly formed Namibian Ministry of the War Veterans is using it as an example in the establishment of its own digital archives.

The project was concluded at a workshop which took place in Pretoria, South Africa on the 26–27 November 2009 with the following objectives:

• To bring together the different documentation initiatives and discuss ways in which they could be linked to facilitate visibility and access for researchers and others.
• To identify ways in which co-operation between Nordic university institutions and Southern African university institutions can be established in order to stimulate research and to interest doctoral students in this important history.
• To discuss ways of writing funding applications for doctoral and post-doctoral research on the history of the liberation struggles in Southern Africa and the Nordic countries.
• To consolidate and document lessons learnt from the documentation and digitization processes in order to share the knowledge accumulated.

Participants at the workshop came from Namibia, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Iceland, Sweden, South Africa, Kenya, Senegal, USA and South Africa. Invitations were also sent to scholars in Mozambique, Angola, Lesotho, Tanzania but who for different reasons could not make it to the workshop. The workshop think pieces will be published and Professor Chris Saunders of the University of Western Cape, South Africa has been contracted to carry out the editing. NAI has committed to publish a web based version of all the revised think pieces and a selection will be done of the think pieces that will meet with the publications criteria for a workshop proceedings publication.
NAI has committed to publish the satisfactory think pieces from the workshop and Professor Chris Saunders of the University of Cape Town has been contracted to do the editing work. It was agreed at the workshop, that there will be a web version of the publication with all the revised think pieces and a book version that will consist of think pieces that will meet with the publication criteria.

Envisaging 2009–2010

The website and the database will be handed over to the Nordic Africa Institute’s Library for further use as a historical reference source. The maintenance of the website will be done by the Library.

The institute envisages a further use of the Project’s work through a collaboration that is hoped to be established with universities in the Nordic and South African countries, which are carrying out research on the liberation struggles.

The project, together with other documentation projects that have taken place in Africa, have the potential to enable researchers to look at current African challenges like the monopolisation of the political space in the name of the liberation struggles, promotion of human rights, accountability, reconciliation, democracy and development in the region. What lessons can we draw from the struggles in trying to resolve these challenges? The documentation of the Nordic solidarity with the struggles of the oppressed people of Southern Africa therefore, ought to be used as a source of information for the design of policies that will promote social justice and human rights.
Annex 1

Conferences and seminars/meetings where the work of Documentation Project was disseminated:

- The Documentation Project in collaboration with the Swedish Embassy in Luanda, Angola and The National Historical Institute of Angola held on the 5th of June, 2008 a book launch of Tor Sellström’s Portuguese version of *Sweden and the Liberation Struggle in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau*.
- Conference on the Swedish History Days at Greifswald University, Germany, 10–11, October, 2008.
- Workshop on the Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa: New Perspectives organized by Professor Chris Saunders at the University of Western Cape, Center for African Studies on the 4–6 September, 2008.
- Institute for Humanities, Mid-Sweden University.
- Dissemination Meeting at the University of Joensuu, Department of History Finland, 28–29 June, 2009
- Dissemination activity at the conference on Memory, Archives and Human Rights that took place on the 4th and 5th of June, 2009 in Copenhagen, at the Danish Parliament and in Malmö at the Malmö Museum.
This publication brings together a number of the ‘think pieces’ prepared for a workshop convened by the Nordic Africa Institute in Pretoria, South Africa, on 26–27 November, 2009. The workshop marked the end of the Institute’s Documentation Project on Liberation Struggles in Southern Africa. Leading scholars, researchers and others, from both the Nordic countries and southern Africa, concerned with documenting those struggles, attended the workshop. The papers included here concern both the history of those struggles and the sources for that history.