

https://dspace.org/

James Stuart and "the establishment of a living source of tradition'

Hamilton, Carolyn

1994-08-01
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/8762

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Seminar Paper
to be presented in RW 7003 SEMINAR ROOM
AT 4.00pm 1ST AUGUST 1994

Title: **James Stuart and 'the establishment of a living source of tradition'.**

by: **Carolyn Hamilton**

No **360**

Introduction

In the late 1970s and the 1980s scholarship on the Zulu kingdom under Shaka changed significantly as scholars began for the first time to draw heavily on recorded African oral tradition as an historical source, and to use local and regional histories as counterweights to official accounts emanating from royal houses and associated senior royal clans.[1] The major source of such oral traditions pertinent to the area including and adjacent to the Zulu kingdom is the papers of the Natal colonial official, James Stuart (1868-1942).

Between 1897 and 1924 James Stuart recorded the testimonies of nearly two hundred informants on a range of topics concerning the history of the Zulu and neighboring peoples. Stuart, a fluent Zulu linguist who was at first a court interpreter, subsequently a resident magistrate and finally a native administrator, sought out informants across south-east Africa whom he believed to be especially well-informed on historical matters. The notes of his interviews, variously in English and *isiZulu*, or a mixture of both languages, frequently appear to be verbatim accounts of his discussions.[2] Stuart meticulously dated all his notes and transcripts, supplied the names of his informants, noted down biographical information about them, and frequently recorded the circumstances under which the interviews took place. In many instances Stuart explicitly distinguished between his own views and the information given by his informants,[3] and cross-referenced to other sources which he considered relevant.[4] Stuart often went back over his transcripts with the informant in order to check and revise the text.[5] The result of his labors, preserved as the Stuart collection in the Killie Campbell Africana Library in Durban, and, since 1976, gradually available in published, translated and annotated form as the *James Stuart Archive*[6]--of which four volumes are already in print, and two further volumes are planned--is potentially the single most important source for the reconstruction of the precolonial history of the Phongolo-Mzimkhulu region.

The status and value of the Stuart collection as such a source has been thrown into doubt by, on the one hand, the corpus of work dealing with the invention of Africa by colonial writers,[7] and, on the other hand, by the recent debate over the mfecane. The work on the construction of the colonial subject suggests that the researches of officials like Stuart were aimed at the extension of colonial controls. Thus Daphna Golan depicts Stuart as

recording African oral tradition in order to ensure "control over the Zulu in times of rapid social change and increasing migration into the towns."[8] For Golan, such acts of "preservation" paradoxically "promoted the destruction of native legal and cultural systems...and the distort[ion] of its history."[9]

In his "case" against the mfecane, Julian Cobbing takes this argument one step further. He implicitly eschews the use of African sources because he believes that none are yet extant. He dismisses the testimonies collected by Stuart as fundamentally "tainted" by their recorder.[10] The *Archive*, in his view, is poisoned not only by Stuart, but also by earlier white writers of Zulu history who shaped the range of "historical fantasies" that informed Stuart's approach, and, indeed, in published form is further adulterated by the present editors.[11] The "Zulu voice" in the testimonies recorded by Stuart, Cobbing argues, "is drowned by those of the 1830s, 1900s and 1980s shouting in unison."[12]

Cobbing is obviously correct, but far from novel,[13] in emphasizing the impact on such testimonies of all the parties involved in their transmission. Scholars making use of the Stuart collection need to exercise extreme care in how they utilize its rich contents. As a preliminary move they must come to grips with the presence in the testimonies of Stuart himself.[14] In this paper I make a start on this task. I try to show that Cobbing's evaluation of the *Archive* is marred by two significant oversights. The first is that while it is indeed true that Stuart was fascinated by particular topics such as the reign of Shaka--he delivered dozens of lectures in Natal, and in Britain, on the subject of the Zulu monarch, and constantly directed his informants onto the topic of Shaka--the range of variant opinions in the recorded statements, and the extent to which these texts differ from Stuart's own synthesized versions, are strongly suggestive of the integrity of his recording techniques.[15] As such, they can be regarded as representative of contemporary African opinion and narratives to a far greater extent than Cobbing supposes.

Secondly, Cobbing fundamentally misunderstands Stuart when he describes him as "a representative and influential product of an unpleasant generation," whose "thought exemplifies the pathologies of colonial society which had internalized all the assumptions of the superiority of white civilization and the rights of naked power common to the generation that produced the First World War."[16] Cobbing portrays Stuart as a racist native

administrator who supervised "land seizures, taxation and *chibalo* [sic] labor," who "usurped" the powers of chiefs, crushed rebellion and "crudely denigrat[ed]" the Zulu people in print.[17] Cobbing claims that Stuart's motive for collecting so prodigious a body of oral tradition was to answer "the central riddle [as to] how ... the native [was] to be dispossessed of his land, set to work, administered, controlled, set apart, ordered around, treated as a child, impoverished, and dehumanized without the white man (and his wife) having their throats slit."[18] This evaluation takes no account of the complexity of Stuart's career, nor of the highly contested development of the native policies of the early twentieth century, and the tremendous ambiguity of the positions of their early formulators.

On the contrary, investigation of the vast residue of the unpublished Stuart papers--his diaries, private correspondence, draft manuscripts, and his notes to himself--reveals that Stuart was disenchanted with prevailing "native policies," that he objected to *isibhalo* labor levies and the dispossession of people from their land, and that he evinced a powerful commitment to giving Africans a say in their own affairs--to allowing them to be heard in their own words. In terms strongly reminiscent of modern scholars concerned with the view "from below," yet also captive to the discourse of his times, he objected to the keystone of imperialism:

> This question of the contact between the civilized and uncivilized races receives its expression almost entirely from the civilized themselves. The whole controversy is an *ex parte* affair--conducted by the civilized against one another, instead of by civilized and uncivilized. The uncivilized man's voice is never heard. In any case, it cannot be detected amidst all the Babel of talk that is constantly going on, most by people who know nothing of the situation as it is from the Native's point of view. In a question of this kind surely the voice of the people primarily concerned is of the greatest importance.[19]

Stuart lobbied publicly in lectures, publications and committee submissions for changes in Natal native policy directed at addressing African grievances. In significant ways, Stuart was painfully at odds with the prevailing sentiments of his fellow colonists.[20]

James Stuart and the development of an Idea

In 1888, James Stuart, then just twenty-one years old but able to speak good *isiZulu*, and already possessed of a deep interest in African politics,[21] took up a post as an interpreter

in Eshowe, the capital of the fledgling Zululand native administration.[22] Over the next decade and a half, Stuart gained a vast experience in what was known as native affairs. In 1894 he was sent to Swaziland as a British Government interpreter, and in October of that year accompanied a Swazi delegation first to Cape Town and then on to London to appeal against the Second Swaziland Convention.[23] For Stuart, it was the first of what were to be a series of trips to London in charge of the representation of colonial subjects from south-east Africa.[24] In December of that year, Swaziland became a protectorate of the South African Republic and in 1895 Stuart became the Acting British Consul in Swaziland. With an intervening spell as the first resident magistrate in the new district of Ingwavuma, Stuart was back in Swaziland in 1898-9 as Acting British Consul.

It was at this time that Stuart began collecting historical testimonies from informants identified as knowledgeable on African custom and Swazi history and keeping detailed notes of his conversations. In particular Stuart's investigations were aimed at clarifying aspects of customary law, and he was beginning to develop a deep curiosity about African institutions and a critical stance on their interpretations by European administrators.[25] In this Stuart was fundamentally influenced by Sir Theophilus Shepstone. Throughout his career as Secretary for Native Affairs, Shepstone had withstood settler demands for the release of African labor from the homesteads. In the 1890s, until his death in 1893, Shepstone lobbied hard against latest developments in Natal native policy, and what he saw as pressure from the Natal colonists for the dismantling of the "tribal system." Shepstone reminded Natalians that the African inhabitants of the territory were aboriginal, and further argued that recent changes in native law were confusing, inconsistent and inappropriate. The central thrust of his argument concerned the preservation of indigenous institutions. Stressing the importance of greater "knowledge of native manners, customs, and laws," Shepstone warned

> One thing is beyond doubt that to suppress native management by their own laws in Natal would be to release every native in it from all the special personal control that he fully understands, that he so much needs, and that he has all his life looked up to.[26]

It was a warning Stuart was to take to heart.

By the time Britain officially declared war against the South African Republic, on 10 October, 1899, Stuart was back in Natal, working as a magistrate in the Lower Tugela

district.[27] In his absence from Zululand a number of significant changes had taken place. In 1898 the exiled Zulu king, Dinuzulu, had returned to Zululand, but as "government *induna*" rather than as king. This period also saw the appointment of C.R. Saunders as Civil Commissioner and Chief Magistrate.[28] Saunders was sympathetic to African concerns and initially hoped to harness Dinuzulu's authority to the administration, but came under pressure from nervous settlers and officials, particularly in the period of the Anglo-Boer War, to try and minimize Dinuzulu's hold over the Zulu people. The conflicting pressures on Saunders reflected growing divisions within the Natal government between those officials who sought to shape native policy in the service of settler needs, and those administrators like Stuart who were influenced by Shepstonian thinking and who believed that stable native administration depended on the continued existence of indigenous institutions, largely uncorrupted by colonial interference.[29]

This period also saw the growth of African protests against the policies of the Natal native administration, notably in the pages of *Inkanyiso*. The protests were led by the *amakholwa*--Christian, educated Africans who sought exemption from "tribal authorities" and "tribal law." In June 1900, the Natal Native Congress (NNC) was formed with the aim of extending the activities of an earlier body, the Funamalungelo Society of exempted Africans, which had led the way in fighting for representation and rights for exempted Africans in the 1880s. The members were largely *amakholwa*, although an attempt, initially unsuccessful, was made to include chiefs. The Congress was not campaigning for full political rights for Africans but merely for the right to be represented in Parliament by sympathetic whites. As Mark Radebe put it at the inaugural congress, "the natives must not rely too much on themselves, but where possible, must endeavor to enlist the sympathy of English gentlemen."[30] One such English gentleman who was present at the June meeting was George Hulett, an old associate of Stuart's, who had accompanied the 1894 Swazi delegation to London.[31] Like Stuart, Hulett spoke good *isiZulu* and was well-acquainted with African affairs. Hulett was accused by the Natal Prime Minister, Hime, of being instrumental in initiating and organizing the Natal Native Congress, and in refusing to allow the Under Secretary for Native Affairs to attend. Hulett and the activities of the NNC were soon the object of a police investigation.[32]

I have not uncovered any evidence directly indicative of Stuart's attitude to the NNC. There are, however, several significant pieces of evidence which show that at this time he shared many of the concerns of the Congress. In about September, 1900, Stuart was posted to Ladysmith as Acting Magistrate.[33] Here he was frustrated by the trivial nature of his daily tasks, but found opportunities to pursue his interest in African law and the position of Natal Africans. One of the signs of concordance between Stuart and the NNC was that fairly soon after his arrival he was approached by local Africans who enquired whether he would be available for nomination to represent them in parliament, a request that obviously delighted Stuart.[34]

In a further indication of the nature of his concern with NNC matters, Stuart and his assistant, Ndukwana,[35] began to have lengthy discussions--many of them held in Stuart's room, no. 12, at the Royal Hotel in Ladysmith where he was staying--with local Africans, including prominent leaders of the local *kholwa* community,[36] regarding their complaints. Topics covered included complaints against the government, discussions of the current and earlier systems of native administration, land grievances, the breakdown of chiefly authority, the looseness of African women and the loss of control by fathers of their daughters.[37] Of his conversation with John Khumalo, headman of the Roosboom *kholwa* community, Stuart noted that Khumalo was averse to the abolition of the "tribal system" and was disaffected with the administration, charging that most officials did not know what they were doing. "John does not place great reliance in the young Englishmen of today;" noted Stuart, "they do not go as thoroughly into matters as Somsewu [Sir Theophilus Shepstone], Mr. J. Bird, etc., and yet they fancy they know more than their elders."[38] Stuart's conversations with John Khumalo, however, reveal Stuart to be made in the mould of Shepstone and Bird: his notes of the conversation are testimony to careful, sustained discussion over a number of days--matters gone into most thoroughly--as well as to a genuine concern to elicit African opinion. The picture which they paint of Stuart in nightly consultation in his hotel room with well-informed Africans suggests a scenario heretofore little seen in Ladysmith. John Khumalo himself commented on the unusualness of the arrangements, laughingly calling Stuart's room "*KwaSogekle, kwa Tulwana,* for it is there that elderly men meet."[39] *KwaSogekle* literally means "the place of the maze," i.e. the maze of spittle drawn on a hut

floor by men engaged in communally smoking hemp. The Thulwana was one of Mpande's *ibutho*, made up of men born c.1834.[40]

In response to the complaints ventured in these conversations, Stuart suggested that what was needed was a man responsible for native affairs who must be "a good and reliable Zulu scholar, be entirely independent of the Natal Government, hold office for five years at a time and be allowed to be re-elected, or let him go on indefinitely during pleasure [sic], and be in direct touch with natives in every part of Zululand and Natal. Let all native cases," he continued, "civil and criminal, all executive work, be dealt with by the present Secretary for Native Affairs etc., and let the officer's duties be purely diplomatic." Khumalo and Ndukwana, Stuart noted, "thought such proposal would give great satisfaction." "I think," Stuart continued, "that such an appointment, of a man who has native interests at heart, would safeguard and promote native interests better than having representatives in the House."[41] In effect, Stuart was restating Shepstone's long-held position. Where Shepstone had, in his own way, been both "a good and reliable Zulu scholar," and independent of the Natal Government," in 1900 the Native Affairs Department could claim neither qualification.

Like Stuart, the *amakholwa* were also protesting the lack of knowledge of African matters and the silencing of themselves.

> We Natives are not admitted to the franchise, consequently we are unrepresented in any political matters, thus we are forced into the state of dumb beasts, which can never express the pains of their bodies, nor advise as to the best way of managing them in order to get good service from them...I am afraid the Government's knowledge of us is entirely derived from Magistrates, Administrators of Native Law, the Secretary for Native Affairs, and farmers.[42]

Thus, if Stuart was not directly behind the NNC, he was certainly preoccupied with similar concerns. Andre Odendaal has described the Natal Native Congress as aiming "to cultivate political awareness," and as a "forum for ventilating grievances."[43] It is difficult to view Room 12 at the Royal Hotel in this period in different terms. It was these shared concerns which led Stuart to the vision of native administration and of his own future that underpinned his truly monumental research efforts.

In another conversation with John Khumalo in December, 1900, Stuart and Ndukwana discussed the notion of Christianity as *ukukhanya* (literally, to light up). The thrust of the

conversation was critical. Ndukwana "strenuously maintained that the *Zulu life and civilization* was *ukukhanya*,"[44] a point that Stuart and the others present seemed to concede. Stuart sketched the scenario of a girl who is adopted by a European family, who is treated as one of the family until a certain age when the parents send her to eat her meals apart in the kitchen "thereby letting it be understand [sic] that there is an impassable barrier between the two." "What kind of enlightenment is that," railed Stuart, "which allows its clergy to shake hands with their native parishioners at the mission station, and when they meet them in the street in towns will pass them by practically as strangers?"[45] Stuart's comments as recorded in this conversation were, for the time, extraordinarily radical, significantly in excess of the remarks made by the identified "agitator," George Hulett. Whereas Hulett at the inaugural congress of the NNC, comfortably asserted the superiority of whites over blacks, Stuart comments reveal him to be markedly less confident of white advantage, and significantly less arrogant.[46]

The possibility that Stuart's interest in the NNC and the Ladysmith conversations were forms of intelligence gathering needs to be considered. Stuart's evident sympathy for the situation of his informants, as well as his active engagement in the suggesting of solutions together with the absence, as far as I have been able to ascertain, of any official reports of the conversations, argue against this. Furthermore, there are indications that at about this time he received a severe reprimand from his superiors. I have been unable to establish the exact reason for it, but one possibility is that his concern with African grievances was not looked on favorably.[47] This suggestion is supported by the fact that Stuart was subsequently reprimanded for allowing Africans to discuss new taxes and to voice their opposition.[48]

Stuart addressed an extraordinary letter to his mother at this time, in which he revealed himself to be possessed of a powerful life motivation. The letter is so strangely and strongly worded that it is worth quoting at length.

> It will interest you to know that I am making slow sure progress finding nothing to retract but everything to confirm and establish. My ideas of things broaden day by day thanks to my perpetual heavy reading and systematic inquiry. I am in reality directing the whole of my intelligence to storming a fort of vast magnitude. The chances to every ordinary mortal are of course

> dead against my ever succeeding but I don't care a rap what anyone thinks. I just go plodding along in my own way. Nearly four years of this perpetual haggling and nagging at generalities and universals in numberless aspects has opened my eyes more and more to the meaning of what I am at...I am moving along slowly and I think, surely, and the day will come, I can't say when, when my work, carefully and methodically prepared, will be able to bear the public gaze and stand criticism. The more I think of it the more I feel that this great subject depends for its exposition not so much on talent as on intention. A great object had to be attained, to show that this Idea is true, well, it doesn't really matter how this is done so long as it is done.....I hope you will keep in mind that not the manner but the substance is the important point. I am still, as I have always been, master of my Idea. The whole thing takes its orders from me. Is it no triumph to be master of such Idea so vast if not vaster than that of Christianity? And so, day by day, I will proceed, tramping this way and that way through this vast jungle and forest trying to find the day. I am humble and, I hope, cautious and persevering. And so another year is coming to a close leaving me I think the richer in light than I was at its beginning.[49]

Nowhere in this letter does Stuart explicate directly what his "Idea" is, but, as I hope to show in the coming pages, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that Stuart was talking here about his work in collecting African testimony and information, and his conception of himself as the ideal interlocutor between African and white colonial society.[50] Precisely how he understood his task, what constituted his "Idea," and how it was linked to his understanding of the development of native policy are some of the questions which the rest of the paper seeks to elucidate.

The intense and frank discussions which Stuart held in this period with Khumalo and Ndukwana were key in shaping his conceptions of native policy. Khumalo was an educated Christian who perceived the value of conserving old forms and whose ideas on the role of traditions in securing social stability accorded well with Stuart's. Stuart increasingly advocated the preservation of "traditional tribal institutions." He was to insist on "going into matters in a thorough fashion," and believed that Africans needed a good (white) man on whom they could rely to mediate between them and the government. The interviews with Ndukwana imbued Stuart with an abiding sense of the depth of knowledge about African "customs" that it was necessary to gain before the real nature of key institutions could be properly understood. Stuart was at this time also taking down detailed notes of conversations

on topics such as the *sisa*-ing of cattle, "Zulu festivals," controls over women's marriages, symbols of office, diviners, marriage, burials, circumcision, *amaLala*, clan names, land and land tenure as well as historical matters such as details of Shaka's life and death, origins of the Zulu, and many other subjects besides. The Ladysmith conversations thus exposed Stuart, on the one hand, to the extent and nature of African grievances and the richness and meaning of African cultural practices, and, on the other hand, led him to make a vital connection between the two. From henceforward, Stuart was to argue that the key to native policy lay in greater knowledge and understanding of indigenous institutions and practices. Stuart's early years in native administration laid in place his "Idea" for the collection of materials on African history and "custom," and forged his understanding of the position of Africans in Natal and Zululand

The role of the Idea in conflicts over native policy

In April, 1901, Stuart took up the position of Assistant Magistrate in Durban.[51] The move inaugurated a new period in his life, as he now entered directly the world of white colonial politics, coming closer to the seat of native policy-making, and under the spotlight of the Durban press. While in Durban, he continued to advocate the importance of the appointment of a knowledgeable expert in African customs to high office in the native administration, but his writings and public pronouncements were freer of the overt political concerns which dominated his stay in Ladysmith and governed his communication with men like John Kumalo.

The dominant issue in native policy in Natal at the time of Stuart's Durban appointment, was the failure of the Native Affairs Department (NAD) to ensure a constant and adequate labor supply for the colony. With the completion, in 1895, of the Durban-Rand railway line, the Rand was increasingly able to attract Natal laborers to the highveld on contracts. Natal settlers held strong notions of the inbred idleness and irresponsibility of Africans, and the necessity of teaching them the habits of industry and the value of labor. Labor was viewed as the first step towards civilization. The position of African women was the object of special settler attention, for women's labor was seen as the means that enabled African men to be idle, and to avoid the colonial labor market.

The NAD refused the colonists' demands to prevent the migration of Natal labor to the Rand, as well as to increase the hut tax. While the colonists required the government in power to do everything it could to ensure a constant labor supply in the colony, the Secretary for Native Affairs (SNA), Frederick Robert Moor, also considered it his duty to see to the welfare of the African worker.[52] Moor was, nonetheless, under pressure from his white constituents and, as a member of the farming community himself, was not unsympathetic to their needs. He responded that Africans were active on the colonial labor market, but that demand exceeded supply. He had a number of plans to increase the supply. One plan that was not successful was to import labor from Portuguese East Africa. Another was to provide adequate accommodation for migrants from outlying areas in the towns. Moor wanted more than mere barracks, but the Durban Town Council, reluctant to spend the money, resisted his plans. It was in this period, on 1 June, 1902, that the first passes were issued in Durban. Essentially, Moor, whom Marks has argued was unlike his successors in that he was not an extremist in his expectations of native policy, was trying to maintain a delicate balance between the interests of white employers and African workers.

When Moor left office in August 1903, Natal had ten years of responsible government, for eight years of which he had controlled the Native Affairs Department. Moor had run the department in what was essentially the mould of Shepstone but with the added complication of his being an elected official and thus more susceptible to settler pressures than Shepstone. Like Shepstone, Moor believed that the "tribal system" was the only effective means for governing Africans. In his view, the authority of the Supreme Chief, the Secretary for Native Affairs and the African chiefs had to be maintained. Following in the Shepstone tradition, he discouraged the system of exemption from customary law which had been provided so as to make it possible for Africans to turn their backs on traditionalism and "tribal" life. Likewise, Moor was opposed to granting the franchise to the Africans. He also resisted the idea of land being held in freehold and this became a major issue on the mission reserves.[53] However, where Shepstone was highly critical of the existing *Code of Native Law* for its failure to reflect African practices, Moor saw it as an effective instrument through which absolute control over Africans could be achieved.

Stuart shared a number of his superior's views, notably his belief in the importance of the maintenance of the "tribal system." He was thus able to flourish--at least, to a degree--under the Moor administration. In some respects, however, he was critical of Natal native policy. In Stuart's view, one of the problems with Moor's approach was that he was following Shepstone's system, without the necessary qualifications. Shepstone's system depended on an intimate knowledge of African society and on Shepstone's ability to play the role of chief.[54] As an editorial in the *Natal Witness* of 19 January, 1901, pointed out, Moor did not have that knowledge, nor was he able to build the kinds of relationships with African chiefs that Shepstone did. Stuart's reservations about the existing native administration as a whole, were focused on precisely this problem.

With his move to Durban in 1901, Stuart, as magistrate, had to deal on a daily basis with issues and problems raised by these defects in the administrative system. He protested against the implementation of the poll tax because it was, in his view, oppressive and a danger to the maintenance of the indigenous social system, and because it was widely regarded as harsh. The labor problem also impinged on him directly. One of Stuart's greatest concerns at this time was the problem of *togt* labor. Since 1870 *togt* daily laborers were required to obtain licenses to work. This enabled the authorities to control the influx of Africans into the towns. In 1902 the Togt Labor Amendment Act tightened still further the regulations controlling *togt* laborers, requiring them to live in designated premises.

In April 1902, Stuart, in his role as Acting Assistant Magistrate in Durban, pondered the problem of the "precariousness of domicile of the Native."[55] Prefacing his discussion with a description of "the bloodsucking greed of invisible speculators" which resulted in widespread rent squatting, and references to "our somewhat unsympathetic form of Government and civilization," Stuart argued that "altruistic measures" were necessary "to combat baneful selfish grasping." The solution which he proposed was the establishment of a "native township" in Durban, that was not a "location...the slovenly huddling together of 'blind mouths,'" but,

> the institution, on a large scale, of a school of practical training in the ways of civilization in a way which does not interfere with their own modes of life, whilst steadily inculcating our own and which actively assists them in combating blazing economic influences on their homes, wives and children--

> tending to very destruction--which irresponsible speculating Companies and individuals in all parts of the Colony bring to bear on them.[56]

In advocating education as a source of security, Stuart was going further than Moor, who was strongly criticized by some administrators and liberal colonists for a failure to provide for African education in his period of office in the Native Affairs Department.[57] Despite the fact that Stuart's document was radical for its time, it was filled with stereotypes such as the notion of African precariousness of life being due as much to "the perpetual motion of Africa" as to the indicted land companies. Stuart echoed the settlers in talking about "the indolence natural to the native" and the need to inculcate a love of labor.

While prisoner of certain stereotypes, Stuart broke free of their bondage in other areas. This escape was a consequence of his close contacts with Africans in Natal. Over the next few months, Stuart had a series of discussions about native policy with a range of African acquaintances.[58] On one occasion, he discussed the dubious benefits of European civilization, and suggested

> a vigorous attack on European civilization. I called up Rousseau's *Contract Social* and his doctrine of 'back to nature,' and said those who could read between the lines would see in my published views something very akin to Rousseau, although in penning them I had not got Rousseau in mind.

Stuart continued,

> Europeans must somehow be universally educated in regard to Zulu affairs, for only in that way can they arrive at a firm, right, universal policy. The sufferings of the Zulu people lie too deep for words; they feel, but cannot tell what they feel.[59]

Stuart concurred with Shepstone that the *Code of Native Law* misunderstood fundamentally a number of the basic institutions and practices of African society. These ideas underlay his researches into "customs." The need for Europeans to learn more about African society, especially in order to make policy, was to be a constant refrain in Stuart's writing, and was a motivating force behind his collection of material on African history and society. Stuart began at this time systematically to research the early history of the inhabitants of the Zululand-Natal area, accumulating hundreds of pages of notes. I have elswhere documented these researches in detail.[60]

In the course of his emergence as an expert on Zulu affairs, Stuart's "Idea" began to gain clearer shape, as evidenced by this long stream-of-consciousness sentence in his private notes:

> Begun without any definite aim, the work has at length, by its scope and fullness so impressed its character on me, as to give rise to an intention to convert the whole...into an instrument for bettering the future of the people, and this in two principal ways (a) by placing so much of their folklore, language, history, habits and customs, praises, proverbs etc. on record as to form perhaps the nucleus of a far more extensive and thoroughgoing undertaking, having for its object the establishment of a living Source of Tradition upon which subsequent generations must more and more depend, not from idle curiosity, but vital national necessity; for, to keep fresh and alive the traditions of a people otherwise losing them through the peculiar circumstances they are placed [in] as regards the white races, is to provide them with a fountain at which all must at all times drink in order that, mindful of a strenuous past, they may be men of character and backbone, not a mongrel set of waifs and strays, blind as to the past and, therefore blinder still as to their future, for tis ever the past that lights up the future.
>
> Now as to the second way in which the future of the Zulus can be bettered. Not only would a systematic record of Zulu life, character, and achievement serve to inspire others to improve it, it would help materially to enlighten the white people among whom the Natives live as to what the latter really are. Europeans are eager to have this information, but it is not properly forthcoming. The gulf between the two races continues to yawn, with nothing to bridge it. And yet it is on this and this alone that mutual trust and sympathy are built up and depend.[61]

For Stuart, answers to "the native question" lay in historical knowledge of African society. Not only did that research have to be done, and a thorough enquiry made, but it also had to be written down and preserved for the Africans concerned as much as for the administrators.

Stuart's other researches

The research was not limited to the views of Africans. To his oral archive Stuart added the fruits of his researches amongst written sources. He began combing the writings of early travellers for information which he cross-checked against his oral sources.[62] In September, 1903, for example, Stuart acquired a copy of Nathanial Isaacs' two volume account of his sojourn in Natal, *Travels and Adventures in South-East Africa.*[63] Stuart's

markings in the margins of his copy of Isaacs' *Travels* show that he cross-referenced details in the text with the African oral testimony which he had recorded,[64] as well as with a host of other written accounts, both published and unpublished.[65] Where Isaacs described Shaka as a "savage," Stuart pencilled in the margin, "A mistake. He was a barbarian."[66] The distinction for Stuart was clear: the lifestyle of a savage was unpalatable, that of a barbarian different from his own, rougher perhaps, but fully comprehensible. Stuart likewise annotated his notes of oral interviews with references to published sources, highlighting discrepancies between the sources.

One of the written sources which Stuart had access to was the papers of the late Henry Francis Fynn. He had been consulting Fynn in Bird's *Annals of Natal*, but, around this time, Fynn's son gave Stuart his father's papers to prepare for publication.[67] In a letter to a London publisher regarding the editing, Stuart spelt out his method of dealing with the Fynn papers and specified the kinds of editorial interventions he was making.[68] The letter is significant, for Fynn's *Diary* has been subject to considerable criticism--even labelled a forgery--because of the difficulties of distinguishing the hand of Stuart from that of Fynn. The letter, taken together with an understanding of Stuart's working methods more generally, provides a starting point for the close textual analysis of the *Diary*. Having the Fynn papers in hand, was a great advantage for Stuart, and they probably influenced his syntheses of Zulu history in no small measure.

Many years later, after he settled in England in 1922, Stuart augmented his oral and published sources with archival material. He systematically combed newspaper sources such as the *South African Commercial Advertiser, The Cape Town Gazette and African Advertiser* and the *Grahamstown Journal*, as well as the missionary publications at the British Museum for items pertinent to the early history of Natal and Zululand.[69] He used these data both to flesh out Fynn's *Diary*, as well as to augment his own writings. Throughout his researches, however, Stuart carefully provenanced every new detail of information, and rigorously distinguished between evidence from different sources.

By January 1904, Stuart, having perceived the magnitude of the task involved in the implementation of his "Idea," was advocating the establishment of "a Department for studying natives, for listening to their grievances and suggestions as to their own government

as well as guiding and advising them on the one hand, and the Natal Government on the other."[70] Stuart envisaged that one of the department's first tasks would be the production of a monograph on the state of native affairs. "The whole should be presented from the Native point of view, indeed, the work's chief value would be the fact that it represented the problem from the Native standpoint."[71] Stuart's desire to see his Idea translated into a formal project was not motivated by practical concerns alone. Linked to his developing perception of the importance of greater knowledge of indigenous institutions, was a desire to invest his researches with a coherent methodology, and to win the support of the scientific community.

In December, 1905, Stuart prepared a memorandum for the British Association of Science, a delegation from which visited South Africa that year. In the memorandum[72] Stuart advocated the establishment of a department of anthropological science in each colony, with a carefully selected individual heading each division. Describing anthropology as "the Queen of the Sciences," Stuart argued that it had hitherto been despised because it failed "to combine interest in human nature of the past with that of the present" and was not yet "a guide and adviser in the world's affairs."[73] Stuart observed that anthropology had the potential to study fruitfully the process of contact between Africans and Europeans.[74] Noting that, due to "deeply rooted prejudices," European colonists, evidencing "repulsion in every feature of social and industrial life," deny Africans an equal share in their "advantages,"[75] Stuart argued that their prejudices and the concomitant injustices which resulted, were the result of "ignorance." The appeal to the scientific community was an attempt to gain support for his view of native affairs in the face of settler ignorance. Indeed, Stuart suggested that anthropology offered the means for overcoming these prejudices. He also argued that while the move towards the rapid Christianization and civilization of Africans looked, on the face of things, progressive, it was a notion based on an ethnocentric judgment informed by an inadequate understanding of African society. "What South Africa needs, as far as the Natives are concerned, is something which is radical and immediately radical and it is absurd to suppose that that can be obtained otherwise than under the agis [sic] of Science and by men competent to deal with and interpret facts brought before them."[76]

Stuart's vision accorded perfectly with the aims of the Association. The president, anthropologist A.C. Haddon, was, at this time, a persistent advocate of the establishment of an imperial bureau of ethnology. Haddon urged colonial officials to attend to the practices of subject peoples. If "officials unwittingly violated traditional customs their subjects would revolt; and officials seeking to improve the lives of colonized peoples required their subject's cooperation--which could be secured only if officials' proposals appealed to local values."[77] In his presidential address to the anthropology section of the British Association meeting in South Africa, A.C. Haddon spoke of Bantu social organization as lending itself to discipline and giving African people the capacity for great achievements when they were led by those of their own who possessed great executive ability--men like Shaka.[78] Haddon and Stuart's positions were almost identical.

In an effort to promote greater understanding of African institutions, Stuart conducted scores of public lectures on various aspects of Zulu history, law and customs. I have discussed these lectures in detail elsewhere.[79] Most significantly for the purposes of this discussion is the clear distinction between these texts--which were Stuart's own syntheses, ideas and understandings, even where they drew heavily on information from African oral sources--and his notes of conversations with informants on the same topics.

The synthesized versions are marked by Stuart's methodological sophistication in using the oral sources. He was alert to the fact that "Much that belongs to anterior days is often attributed to a later Sovereign, especially if remarkable and successful."[80] Stuart was also keenly aware of the problem of information passing out of oral accounts where there was not a clear cut memory "hook" for it. For oral data to survive historically, he noted, "they must possess qualities likely to endure and to pass into succeeding generations whilst their activity or genius should be such as to leave a mark in regions in which they dealt."[81]

Stuart's synthesized accounts were organized chronologically, in sharp contrast to the notes of interviews. Moreover, they were based on a comparative examination of the "recognized [written] authorities" as well an "independently enquiring of the natives themselves for such facts as tend to bring about more exact knowledge." While in his notes he was rigorous in keeping information from different sources precisely provenanced, he explicitly billed his lectures as syntheses. His own synthetic Shaka, for example was, not

unexpectedly, very different from that of his African informants, and for that matter, from that of the early traders, Isaacs and Fynn. Stuart's Shaka was, above all else, a powerfully constructive figure.[82]

In his lectures Stuart discussed the various institutions which Shaka introduced, or made use of, "to govern his country by means of an army, and to make that army as perfect as possible."[83] For Stuart, the collapse of the Shakan system had terrible effects on the social fabric of Zululand.

> What goes on now-a-days, both in Natal and Zululand, is not in any way a picture of what used formerly to take place The necessary royal sanctions having been removed, the moral standards having been undermined by foreign ideas, the people now, one and all, pursue their own inclinations, not unlike the savage waters of a sea which has overthrown the dyke that formerly held it back. The removal of that great restraint, which the awe-inspiring name of a despotic monarch imposed on a whole people, has resulted, under British rule, in a widespread dissolution; and it is already, not without difficulty, that we can collect together the several parts of a political system rapidly becoming effete.[84]

This then, was Stuart's response to the political anxieties of the disaffected Africans with whom he had been consulting intensely over the previous four years, and the anxious and fearful white settlers in his Durban magisterial district. Where the Natal Native Congress was advocating the opening up of access to colonial society as a means to redress the problems experienced by educated and Christianized Africans, Stuart, developing an analysis out of his historical researches, and influenced by his contacts with anthropologists like Haddon, advocated what was, in a sense, the opposite solution, the recognition of the strength of indigenous institutions, and in particular the importance of strong central leaders.

The language of Stuart's lectures, publications and official communications was carefully moderated to meet the expectations of his various audiences. In his private notes--and occasionally in public--he railed fiercely against the injustices experienced by Africans under colonial rule. In public he tended to be more moderate and diplomatic.

As we have seen, Stuart was motivated by a complex and powerful drive to accumulate as much knowledge as possible about African society and history. He took down accounts of indigenous history in a particularly meticulous fashion. He sought, as faithfully as possible, to record the original content of the testimonies he was given. Of course, within

such constraints, Stuart himself affected what was recorded in all sorts of ways. He selected many of the topics for conversation with his informants. He did not reproduce the content of the conversations exactly. Indeed, he could not have done so, no matter what techniques he employed. The full content of an oral text is always, inevitably, lost in recording. Much has been written, in other contexts, about the loss of the voice expression, the performance component, and their meanings, in the move from a spoken text to a written one. That literature brings useful perspectives to bear in the assessment of the traditions recorded by Stuart. Stuart, himself a performer in his role as a practicing *imbongi*, is likely to have been, to a degree, alert to such points, and indeed, this is borne out by his decision to record orally his praising. However sensitive to such issues he might have been, these performative aspects and the oral character of the accounts are lost in his records, leaving little trace. The absence must be noted.[85] While all recording techniques are, inevitably, unable to be faithful to the original, Stuart's specific recording techniques remain highly relevant. His meticulous documentation of dates and background information of other kinds, for example, can be seen as adding valuable content to the interviews. One of biggest interventions that Stuart made in recording a mass of oral material was to bring about a massive change in form, transforming spoken text into writing, turning the aural to graphics.

From oral to written text

Where sound is fugitive, writing can be described as permanent. Composition for the two different forms is likely to alter given their different degrees of permanence. A spoken narrative cannot be returned to and poured over, whereas a written text can. On the other hand, as happened when Stuart collected materials, an oral informant can be "cross-examined" offering, under questioning, elaborations and explanations, augmentations that a written text cannot provide.

With the recording of the oral testimonies of large numbers of informants and their transformation into written words, Stuart established a corpus of material that was less changeable than its oral precursors. At the same time as it gained permanence, and became visible as words, it also acquired new authority. The written word claims the right of being a reliable record of what a person said. As Walter Ong has argued, this marks a transition

moving from a situation where knowledge is equated with hearing (in *isiZulu* for example, the verb to know, *ukuzwa*, is also the verb "to hear") to a situation where seeing is equated with truth ("I see what you say" meaning I know or understand what you say"--*ukubona*, "i see/acknowledge").[86] For Stuart, knowledge of African society demanded research that involved asking and listening, but it also entailed writing down, preserving, and fixing, and, in so doing, conferring authority on the written word. The public impact of this was, at the time, limited because Stuart published little (with the exception of series of Readers produced in *isiZulu* in the 1920s), but it is of increasing importance with the publication since 1976 of his notes.

Written accounts, merely by virtue of being written, are more uniform and more sequential (or linear), than oral accounts. Written words are things in space. In other words, they have a spatializing bias, as well as a specific linear temporality. These features affect the logic of the arguments of oral and written texts. Thus the understanding of both time and logic are likely to be different in written and oral forms, even when the words are identical. In oral narratives, time is typically mixed up and not linear. The temporal pattern between the beginning and the end of the story is often anarchic, dependant on the psychodynamics of the incident described and the narrative occasion. Prophecy is a feature well-suited to this situation. It confers explanation as the event being inevitable or ordained, and eliminates the need for chronologically organized explanation in terms of cause and effect. By previewing a story, prophecy offers a map of the coming narrative which is useful in a situation where the text cannot be poured over.[87] Thus the very nature of explanation in oral and written narrative is likely to be different, while the imperative for a story to explain is likely to be stronger in the written account. In the oral account, illumination, rather, is the appropriate mode.

There is a marked distinction between Stuart's notes (written transcriptions of spoken texts) and his synthesized accounts (often speeches given from written texts) in terms of the distinctions discussed above. His notes are not chronologically ordered. They reflect, for example, his informants' uses of prophecy, omens, divination episodes and other associated devices typical of the organization of oral texts. Accounts of historical events are interspersed with material on other topics, and digressions abound. His own syntheses,

whether spoken or written, were chronologically ordered into tightly organized historical narratives, favoring explanation over elucidation. Where the notes manifest a preference for structuring historical knowledge in terms of stories and personification, Stuart's syntheses approach historical knowledge in terms of systems and concepts. Thus where Stuart's informants focus on episodes in the life of Shaka, and on his personality, in his syntheses, Stuart examined key institutions of Shakan times such as the *amabutho* system, the licensing of marriages and their effects.

Furthermore, in situations where language is spoken not written, there is no fixed linguistic standard comparable to the codification in a literate society with its dictionaries, grammars and orthography committees. In other words, there are no permanent authorities. This is not to say that a spoken language is without internal laws, but rather to say that the drive for uniformity and regimentation inherent in print is absent. Thus the tendency of spoken languages to evolve new spoken forms, constantly to modify modes of expression in close response to the changing world in which they operate, is lost in transcription, as is the investment of meaning in onomatopoeia, sound word plays or puns, and sound exclamations. Fritschi, considering the question of what happens when an oral tradition is put in literate form comments:

> ...putting oral expression into literate form means taking a cultural object that is living and hence meaningful under definite, specific conditions, and putting it into an environment governed by different forces and expectations. Formerly in a concrete situation, presupposing exchange, knowledge, and an awareness of connections, oral discourse is cut off from its probably vital surrounding organism. In a written form it can somehow be likened to a piece in a museum, which, though getting a lot of attention, has lost a lot of its meaning because it is separated from its genuine environment.[88]

To make these points is not to support the whole idea of scientific history and abstract reasoning as depending on the invention of writing.[89] Rather, it is simply to point up some changes in form between the original spoken narratives and Stuart's written notes, and vastly greater differences between Stuart's written notes of oral texts and his own synthesized texts.

However, it does seem that Stuart believed that the transcription of African oral texts into written form--making them, thereby, into permanent, unchanging texts--was to open them up to scientific enquiry--in other words to open African history up to objective and

critical investigation; to render it analyzable, and ultimately, to make it authoritative. Writing, in his view, allowed for the accumulation of knowledge, and this had, of course, implications for the corollary of increasing information, control. Indeed, Stuart linked overtly his recording activities to the building of a more effective bureaucracy.

Conclusion

This paper suggests that the private, unpublished Stuart stands in marked contrast to the public figure. Stuart employed a different language in his private papers and correspondence to that of his public pronouncements. In the former, Stuart was more tentative and more exploratory, frequently revealing himself to be morally outraged by the effects of colonialism of the African communities of Zululand and Natal. In the latter, Stuart spoke as an authority on Zulu customs and history, at the same time as he stressed the importance of still further researches. The public Stuart was a dynamic policy-maker imbued with a powerfully paternalist vision regarding British rule over its colonial subjects. I do not mean to suggest that there were two distinct faces to Stuart, one private, the other public. There were many features common to both visages. The first was never wholly free of imperial ideology and racial prejudice common at the time, nor was Stuart's sense of moral outrage ever wholly absent from the second. In both miens, Stuart was concerned with the fundamental issue of the nature of African and European integration, and the problem of the differences between the "lower" and "higher" races. In both Stuart was also concerned with "bettering the future of the [Zulu] people."[90] In a single document Stuart could assert the superiority of the European and call for equality of opportunity for Africans.[91]

Stuart, partly as a result of his immersion in Zulu affairs and his noted linguistic skill, was no mere perpetuator of imperial hegemony, or representative of his "unpleasant generation". Rather, he was a highly self-conscious cross-cultural broker, mediating between the African and European colonial worlds in which he moved.[92] He sought not simply to implement imperial policies, but to reform and reshape them in a manner informed by a closer understanding of indigenous institutions. He was highly critical of Natal native policy and very receptive to the articulation of African grievances. His approach was essentially tactical, and he was adept at choosing the right languages for all the many audiences, African

and European, that he had occasion to address, and whom he sought to sway. The great ambiguities of his position are perhaps best captured by the countless lists of proposed, but always ultimately rejected, book titles which survive in his papers. "The White Man's Tyranny in Africa" was one cry straight from Stuart's heart; "Civilization of lower races: a tyranny" was another mediated through the discourse of his time.[93]

Crude caricatures of Stuart as the exploiter of African oral tradition for resources to facilitate and legitimate white access to land, and the labor of Africans, are contradicted by the mass of evidence pointing to his grand Idea, and his complex understanding of the task which he set himself. Stuart, like Shepstone before him, sought to protect Britain's colonial subjects from the land and labor demands of the settlers. Again like Shepstone, Stuart sought in African tradition a vision of sovereignty on which to base native policy. The image on which he drew, like Shepstone, was that of Shaka.

Shula Marks is quite correct to see in Stuart's recording efforts and his publication of the Readers an effort to shore up what he saw as Zulu tradition.[94] But, we also need to understand how Stuart viewed the relationship between knowledge of African tradition and native policy, and, secondly, the extent of his particular interventions in the material he collected and published. Stuart had an extremely serious commitment to getting to know a vast deal about the native inhabitants of Natal. He was irritated by more facile approaches, and he employed a methodology that kept synthesizing activities out of his notes, and ultimately, also out of the Zulu Readers.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, a sharp distinction must be drawn by scholars using Stuart's materials between his notes and his own compositions. There are strong motivations for regarding his notes as being remarkably faithful to the spoken originals. The chief changes, I have suggested, were a product of a change of <u>form</u> from oral to written text. In sum, James Stuart made an enormous effort to preserve the content of the historical accounts which he heard, and I have argued in this paper that this was a consequence of his view of the necessity within native policy-making of an understanding of indigenous institutions in their original forms.

NOTES

1.D. Hedges, "Trade and Politics in Southern Mozambique and Zululand in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries," Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1978; H. Slater, "Transitions in the Political Economy of South-East Africa Before 1840," D.Phil.thesis, University of Sussex, 1976; P.Bonner, *Kings, Commoners and Concessionaires*, Cambridge, CUP, 1983; C.Hamilton, "Ideology, Oral Traditions and the Struggle for Power in the Early Zulu Kingdom, MA thesis, Wits, 1985; J. Wright, "The Dynamics of Power and Conflict in the Thukela-Mzimkhulu Region in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries: A Critical Reconstruction," Ph.D. thesis, Wits, 1990.

2.In many instances the interviews are recorded in the first person, i.e. the voice of the informant. In some cases Stuart used a shorthand form of recording a conversation and wrote up the interview afterwards. In a number of instances both the rough notes and the subsequent transcriptions survive, providing a clear indication of Stuart's methods. (See, for example, Killie Campbell Africana Library (KCAL), Stuart Papers (SP) file 59, nbk 34, pp.40-9 for the rough notes of an interview with Ndukwana and compare with the transcript done the following day, file 53, pp.124-9 and file 73, p.76.) Stuart further made note of when he wrote up accounts some time after an interview. (See, for example, file 59, item 32, pp.36, 38. In this instance Stuart interviewed Socwatsha kaPapu on 27 August, 1909, and wrote up the interview the following day. In a margin note to himself Stuart observed, "This account will have to be checked having been written from memory.") These features are not confined to the examples cited here but are characteristic of the Stuart collection as a whole.

3.See, for example, SP, file 60, item 3, pp.12-13 where a line drawn in the margin marks off Stuart's own thoughts from the body of text given by Socwatsha. Also see SP, file 70, item 9, interview of 6 January, 1902, where Stuart meticulously notes that one of those present disagreed with the main informant. Again, these features are not confined to the examples cited here but are characteristic of the Stuart collection as a whole.

4.See, for example, SP, file 59, item 32, pp.34, 38; file 58, item 25, p.24; file 58, item 22, p.1, Socwatsha. See also C. de B. Webb and J. B. Wright (eds.), *The James Stuart Archive of Recorded Oral Evidence Relating to the History of the Zulu and Neighbouring Peoples (JSA)* Pietermaritzburg and Durban,, vol.1, p.177, Jantshi, where Stuart has inserted into Jantshi's testimony of 12 February, 1903 a cross-reference to information given to him by Socwatsha in April 1916. These features are not confined to the examples cited here but are characteristic of the Stuart collection as a whole. I am grateful to John Wright for providing me with a collated photocopy of the entire original Socwatsha testimony.

5.5.See, for example, file 70, item 9. Stuart interviewed Socwatsha on 29 December, 1901, and recorded from him the *izibongo* (praises) of Cetshwayo. He then went over his written version with Socwatsha on 5 January, 1902, finally marking the praises "checked and revised," and initialing them. Evidence of this procedure occurs throughout the collection.

6.See note 4 above.

7.For a critical discussion of this body of work see C. Hamilton, "Authoring Shaka: Models, Metaphors and Historiography," Ph.D thesis, The Johns Hopkins University, 1993, chap.2.

8.D. Golan, "Construction and Reconstruction of Zulu History," Ph.D thesis, Hebrew University, 1988, pp.51, 58-9.

9.Golan, "Construction and Reconstruction of Zulu History," p.5. Also see p.57. While Golan is sharply critical of Stuart's distortions and manipulations in service of a colonial agenda, in practice she makes no attempt to allow for his impact on the oral traditions which she discusses in part three of her thesis.

10.This view of Zulu oral tradition is spelt out at length in J. Cobbing, "A Tainted Well. The Objectives, Historical Fantasies and Working Methods of James Stuart, with Counter-Argument," *Journal of Natal and Zulu History*, XI, 1988, pp.115-54.

11.While Cobbing dismisses Stuart's informants' versions of Shaka, he does concede that under certain (unspecified) circumstances the *Archive* may yield historical data. ("Tainted Well," pp. 116-7) Cobbing has been criticized previously for condemning Fynn's *Diary* as a "forgery" and then citing data from it, without qualification or explanation, in support of a particular substantive point made elsewhere in his argument.(C.Hamilton, "'The character and objects of Chaka': A Reconsideration of the Making of Shaka as 'Mfecane Motor'," *Journal of African History*, 33, 1992, p.43, note 17)

12."The Tainted Well, " p.135.

13.J.Vansina, *Oral Tradition: A Study in Historical Methodology*, Chicago, Aldine, 1965; D. Henige, *Oral Historiography*, London, Longmans, 1982; J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1985; P. Curtin, "Oral Tradition and African History," *Journal of the Folklore Institute*, 6, 1969, pp.137-55.

14.Not only do they need to evaluate the impact of early settler and missionary accounts on Stuart and possibly on some of his informants, but they must also take account of the "chain of transmission" of the stories within African society. (See Hamilton, "Ideology and Oral Traditions," chap. 1; and Hamilton, "Authoring Shaka," chap. 4). The conventional notion that written sources are somehow more reliable than oral ones, or at least subject to less change, is currently subject to a new and penetrating critique. Oral and written texts alike are seen to be products of equally creative activities. See D.W.Cohen, "The Undefining of Oral Tradition," *Ethnohistory*,36, 1, 1989, pp.9-17.

15.Stuart never published anything on Shaka beyond the accounts in his five Zulu readers, *uTulasizwe, uHlangakula, uBaxoxele, uKulumetule*, and *uVusezakiti*, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1923-6. The accounts given in the readers are not Stuart's syntheses but are closely based on the testimonies of particular informants.
16.Cobbing, "Tainted Well," p.120.
17.Cobbing, "Tainted Well," p.119.
18.Cobbing, "Tainted Well," p.122.
19.SP, file 42, item xxi.
20.The material presented here is but a selection of my researches on Stuart. (See Hamilton, "Authoring Shaka," chaps. 7 and 8.) Assessment of Stuart demands examination of the spirit of the age and the situating of Stuart in the complex social and political landscape of Natal in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It requires a sketch of the social and cultural forms that shaped his world and full exploration of his many activities and their significance and effects. That would be a study in its own right. Indeed, I am beginning work on a manuscript for a combined study of Stuart and of native policy in this period. With this paper I am hoping to place in the public domain the beginnings of a different way of viewing Stuart and his collection than that presented by Cobbing.
21.For a detailed discussion of Stuart's acquisition of *isiZulu*, of the development of his interest in African politics and of the scope of that interest see Hamilton, "Authoring Shaka," pp.363-68.
22.See SP, unaccessioned diaries, "Diary" entries for 13, 21 and 25 May, 1888.
23.SP, file 8, item KCM 1865d, Stuart to his mother, 17 November, 1894.
24.In 1916 Stuart accompanied the Native Labor Corps to France. He also took charge of the Zulu section of the Aldershott pageant and the 1924 Wembley Exhibition, and when the praise poet who was part of the pageant was stricken with stage fright, Stuart, with limbs and face blackened, played the part successfully and undiscovered in his disguise.(*Natal Mercury*, 10 July, 1946; SP, file 10, item 7.
25.SP, file 74, reproduced in *JSA*, vol.2, pp.42-4; *JSA*, vol.1, pp.149-53, Giba; vol.3, pp.284-8, Mnkonkoni.
26.*Natal mercury*, 1 April, 1892.
27.Stuart seems to have left Swaziland in about March, 1900. (SP, file 8, item 1865, Stuart (Durban) to his mother, 24 March, 1900.)
28.This title was later changed to Commissioner for Native Affairs.
29.For a detailed discussion of these policies and the tensions with the Natal native administration see Hamilton, "Authoring Shaka," part three.
30.*Natal Mercury*, 6 June, 1900.
31.J.S.M.Matsebula, *History of Swaziland*, Cape Town, Longman Penguin, 1988, p.157; U.S.Duphelia, "Frederick Robert Moor and Native Affairs in the Colony of Natal 1893-1903," MA thesis, University of Durban-Westville, 1980, p.79.
32.A. Odendaal, *Vukani Abantu! The Beginnings of Black Protest Politics in South Africa to 1912*, Cape Town, David Philip, 1984, p.310, note 143.
33.SP, file 8, KCM 1865.
34.SP, file 8, item KCM 1865f, Stuart (Ladysmith) to his mother, November, 1900.
35.I have not as yet been able to establish when and how Ndukwana kaMbengwana came into Stuart's service. Stuart's first interview with Ndukwana occurred in October 1897. The location of this interview is not given, but in 1897 Stuart was posted to Ingwavuma. (*JSA*, vol.4, p.263) Stuart's notes include another interview with Ndukwana in July, 1900 at Impendhle and in August at Howick.(*JSA*, vol.4, p.269, Ndukwana) Ndukwana gave Stuart substantial testimony of his own and was present at a large numbers of interviews with other informants recorded by Stuart. Stuart discussed the individual testimonies with him, and used him to to locate further informants. Ndukwana was, in a number of ways, clearly very influential in the development of Stuart's understanding of the region's history. It is possible that Ndukwana was Stuart's *induna*, but this requires further substantiation.
36.*JSA*, vol. 1, p.223, John Khumalo commenting on Johannes Khumalo. *JSA*, vol.1, pp.213-4, Johannes Khumalo. Also see S.M. Meintjes, "Edendale 1850-1906: A Case Study of Rural Transformation and Class Formation in an African Mission in Natal," unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of London, 1988, p.354.
37.*JSA*, vol.1, pp.215-6, 222. 223. For a detailed discussion of the position of the Natal *amakholwa* see Meintjes, "Edendale," chapters 10, 11 and 12.
38.*JSA*, vol. 1. p.221.
39.*JSA*, vol.1, p.247, John Khumalo.
40.*JSA*, vol.1, eds. note 67, p.270.
41.*JSA*, vol.1, p.230, Khumalo.
42.*Inkanyiso*, 5 May 1892, letter from "Philanthropist."
43.Odendaal, *Vukani Abantu*, p.59.
44.My emphases, *JSA*, vol. 1, p.232, Khumalo.

45.*JSA*, vol.1, p.233, Khumalo.
46.Odendaal, *Vukani Abantu*, p.60.
47.SP, file 8, item 1865h, Stuart (Durban) to his mother, 5 April, 1901.
48.SNA 1/4/14 C43/05, 8 November, 1905 and SNA 1/4/14 C43/05, Minute, MNA c.8 November, 1905, both cited in S. Marks, *Reluctant Rebellion*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1970, pp.173-4.
49.SP, file 8, item KCM 1865, Stuart to his mother, December, 1900.
50.At the time of writing this letter, it was four years since Stuart first began to record African oral histories.
51.SP, file 8, item KCM 1865h, Stuart (Durban) to his mother, 5 April, 1901.
52.Duphelia, "Moor," p.138.
53.Duphelia, "Moor," pp.205-6.
54.Duphelia, "Moor," p.209.
55.SP, file 40, item xx KCM 23774, handwritten script by Stuart entitled "Observations by the Acting Assistant Magistrate, Durban on the *Labor Question* as existing in Durban," dated 13 April, 1902.
56.*Ibid.*
57.Duphelia, "Moor," p.209.
58.See *JSA*, vol. 3, pp.23-4, Mbovu, 9 February, 1903 discussion with Mbovu, Jantshi and Ndukwana on the land question, and discussion with Ndukwana about African resistance.
59.*JSA*, vol.1, p.93, Dhlozi.
60.Hamilton, "Authoring Shaka", chap.8.
61.SP, file 42, item ii. (emphasis in the original). Also see item xliii for further insights into Stuart's campaign for the preservation of knowledge of native custom.
62.See SP, file 52, item 1, KCM 24148, "Tshaka: a short account of his life, character and reign, preceded as introduction thereto, by remarks on the early history of the Zulu and Mtetwa tribes" (22 February, 1903) in which Stuart discusses his research methods, including his comparative examination of the "recognised authorities," as well as the importance of "independently enquiring of the natives themselves for such facts as tend to bring about more exact knowledge." (p.1)
63.See the date in the copies of Stuart's copy of Isaacs text, held at Killie Campbell Africana Library.
64.Stuart's copy of Isaacs, *Travels and Adventures*, vol.1, pp.66, 324.
65.See *JSA*, vol.1, pp.39, 57, 62, 63, 75, 103, 164, 167, 194, 220, 226, 237, 326, 330, 337; vol.2, pp.408, 413.
66.Stuart's copy of Isaacs, *Travels and Adeventures*, vol.1, p.350.
67.SP, file 49, item 14.
68.SP, file 49, item 14.
69.SP, uncatalogued manuscripts, "Extracts 1-7."
70.SP, file 49, item 13, KCM 24069.
71.Emphasis in the original.
72.SP, file 31, item xvi, KCM 23543. This document is a rough draft. I have not as yet been able to establish whether Stuart did indeed submit a memorandum, and, if he did, to what extent it differed from this draft.
73.SP, file 31, item 16, pp.1-2.
74.SP, file 31, item 16, p.24.
75.SP, file 31, item 16, p.3.
76.SP, file 31, item 16, p.15.
77.H.Kucklick, *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885-1945*, Cambridge, CUP, 1991, p.46.
78.H. Kucklick, "Contested Monuments: The Politics of Archaeology in Southern Africa," in G. Stocking, *Colonial Situations*, Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1991, pp.145-6.
79.Hamilton, "Authoring Shaka," chap.8.
80.SP, file 53, item 2, p.5.
81.SP, file 53, item 2, p.4.
82.SP, file 52, item 1, p.1; file 52, item 2, KCM 24149, p.26
83.Stuart, "Studies In Zulu Law and Custom" printed by Robinson and Co., (probably 1903), (hereafter "Marriage,") p.5.
84.Stuart, "Marriage," p.14.
85.85.On the shift from orality to literacy see J. Goody, *Interface between the Written and the Oral*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1987.
86.86.Walter Ong, "I see what you say," *Interfaces of the Word*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1977; Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of Dialogue*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1958; Ong, *The Presence of the Word*, New York, Simon and Schuster, Clarion Book, 1970. First published 1967. See also Gerhard Fritschi, *Africa and Gutenberg: Exploring Oral Structures in the Modern African Novel*, European University Studies, Number 9, Peter Lang, Bern, 1983, pp.18-23.

87.E.A. Havelock, *Prologue to Greek Literacy*, Cincinatti, University of Cincinnati, 1971, p.52.
88.88.Fritschi, *Africa and Gutenberg*, p.118.
89.89.For a critique of that position see R. Finnigan, *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication*, Oxford and New York, Basil Blackwell, 1988.
90.SP, file 42, item ii.
91.SP, file 40, item xi; also see file 42, item vi, for Stuart on the subject of rights for Africans.
92.See his comments, SP, file 42, item vi.
93.SP, file 42, item xxi.
94.S. Marks, "Patriotism, Patriarchy and Purity: Natal and the Politics of Zulu Ethnic Consciousness," in L.Vail, (ed.) *The Creation of Tribalism,* London, James Currey, 1989,p.220.