was broken down and a new hut built for the king when the *ikhanda* was enlarged. This floor is very large with a diameter of approximately 10 m. Twenty two support postholes have been identified, and the hearth is artistically designed with six lobes. The hut floor is situated in 'front' and on the right side or western extremity of what is thought to be the 'black' *isigidi*, with access to the upper cattle enclosure and central open area (Figure 6).

An analogy is also drawn between a military *ikhanda* and a normal Zulu *umuzi* where it is argued that certain elements of the *symbolical arrangements of space* found in the *umuzi*, in this case, the seniority of the right hand side, could have been assigned to the *ikhanda*. Therefore the king's hut was relocated to the right side. It is also argued that this hut was the king's private dwelling and not a reception hut and that its location and size was relevant to his superior status.

It is concluded that uMgungundlovu was enlarged and rebuilt in 1835. For this reason, the preserved remains found on the site, or site plans based on these remains, are not directly compatible with the descriptions of uMgungundlovu left by Gardiner and Stuart. An example of this is the mistake which Lawton had made by attempting to identify the king's hut with the aid of a site plan using Gardiner's and Stuart's descriptions. In spite of the fact that Gardiner's and Stuart's information is 'outdated' with respect to the size and layout of uMgungundlovu, their works are still valuable cultural-historical sources and represent a phase in the history of the site.

Erkenning

My dank gaan aan die Natalse Provinsiale Museumdiens en aan die Museum se opgrawingspan wat met groot opgewondeheid die vloer versigtig opgegrawe het. ’n Woord van spesiale dank aan Hester Lewis wat die veldtekening asook aan die Museum se opgrawingspan wat met groot descriptions.
Introduction

During the middle of the nineteenth century when the hunter-adventurer Cumming first rode into the valley of the lower reaches of the Lephala River, he found himself in the territory of the Ba ga Seleka. He had been hunting along the Limpopo and once more decided to move camp.

'On the first of July I inspanned at sunrise and marched to the town of the Baseleka, which I reached in about four hours, having crossed the Lephala on the way.... Seleka's town is built on the top and sides of a steep and precipitous white quartz rock which rises abruptly, and forms a very remarkable feature in the green forest scenery which surrounds it' (Cumming 1850:143).

Cumming had heard that these people had originally come from north of the Limpopo River and his interpreters spoke to them in Tswana and he consequently constantly referred to them as 'Batswana' or 'Bechuana'.

Cumming was probably not the first, and was definitely not the last, to presume the Ba ga Seleka to be of Sotho or Tswana origin. Subsequent and supposedly much more astute and sophisticated observers, not least of whom anthropologists, have repeatedly confirmed this presumption. Although some documents as early as 1937 referred to the Ba ga Seleka as 'ama Ndebele (maTebele)' (Anonymous 1937:1) indicating a Nguni connection, others were further confused by virtue of discovering that the Ba ga Seleka venerate the phuthi (duiker) as their totem which is generally found among Sotho speakers. One source in fact identifies their totem as tlou (elephant) (Anonymous (a) n.d) which corresponds with that of other Northern Ndebele groups.

Our current research in the Lephala valley has revealed that documentation as regards not only the origin of the Ba ga Seleka, but also the record of their subsequent ethno-history is unclear. This article is the first in a series that intends to supplement sketchy data on not only the Ba ga Seleka, but also their upriver neighbours the Ba ga Shongwane of Villa Nora whose ethno-historical record is characterized by similar contradictions.

Objective

As is intimated in the introduction the major goal of this article is to develop a more reliable perspective on the ethno-history of the Ba ga Seleka. More specific research problems are addressed: the potentially decisive role of the exhaustive recording of oral tradition in ethnographic research; the importance of a diachronic perspective for contemporary socio-cultural context; and rapport and reflexivity as keystones of the ethnographic exercise.

Method

While available documents and references concerning the Ba ga Seleka were as far as possible traced and studied, the most important research strategy used was intensive interviewing. The key informants identified for the purpose included the current ruler, the regent Tompi Zachariah Seleka, his councillors, the oldest men from the area and various other individuals who were identified as, or revealed themselves to be knowledgeable as regards 'tribal history and tradition'. Directed, but open-ended interviews were conducted. Although information was gleaned in this manner from individuals, it was found that group interviews and discussions were more productive and satisfactory. Having the gist of the collated documentary material at our disposal, the group context facilitated not only corroboration of this data with the testimonies of informants in general, but also of testimonies from different individuals. By means of the genealogical method a core genealogy of the line of descent and succession in the ruling house was compiled (cf. Bothma 1972:23) and this was used as a guideline and framework for pursuing questions on the history of the Ba ga Seleka.

Oral tradition or what the Ba ga Seleka themselves refer to as 'the history of the mouth', for them as for many people in the world, still constitutes an important available source for reconstructing the past. Care was hence taken to control the variables and to evaluate the limitations inherent in the process of recording oral tradition. We are essentially in agreement with Vansina (1972) that if an oral tradition is found to have an internal contradiction or if it is not corroborated by facts established from other sources, it should be regarded as unreliable. However, in the present study we established a number of what we shall call 'strategic confirmers' which provided constant measures of reliability.

We first visited the Lephala valley in 1989 as part of an archaeological survey team which, in the Ba ga Seleka area, identified and confirmed a number of earlier village sites. The next visit in the following year served as an orientation to the tribal area, settlement patterns etc., and to meet the leaders at the tribal offices, to explain our objectives and the need for the research, to get permission to work in the area and to ask for advice and co-operation. Subsequent visits not only entailed informal discussions and intensive interviewing, but also provided the opportunity to increasingly develop rapport and intentionally to create a research climate conducive to eliciting reflexive responses. Our most recent visit served the purpose of presenting a final draft of this article to key people in the area in order to provide them with the opportunity of discussing it and commenting on it. The final version thus importantly also has the blessing of the Ba ga Seleka.

Geographical and socio-cultural context

The Ba ga Seleka live in the semi-arid Lephala valley near Beauty in the northwestern Transvaal and close to the Botswana border (Figure 1). Politically they are officially included in a detached part of the Mokerong district of Lebowa (De Beer 1983:173). According to Government Gazette No. 2611 of 24 December 1954 the Ba ga Seleka tribal area comprises the following farms:

- Beauty No. 919 (also known as Seleka's location);
- Rietfontein No. 624;
- Kafferskraal No. 381;
- Harry Smith No. 772;
- Olfantsdrift No. 1021 (remaining extent); and
- Witfontein No. 383 (remaining extent).

The area is sparsely populated. Apart from their Botswana neighbours across the Limpopo and the surrounding White farmers, their closest neighbours are the Ba ga Shongwane of Bobiditidi to the south near Villa Nora. The more numerous Bagananwa are a considerable distance away to the east in the Botshum district of Lebowa. Their relative isolation from people other than Tswana-speakers and a long history of...
or Laka of Mapela and Bakenberg and the Ba ga Letwaba or divisions are also mentioned by Ziervogel (1959:4-5). He (Beer 1986:31). With the exception of the Ba ga Seleka these Mokopana were the first to go, followed by the Ba ga Laka, major divisions of the Northern Ndebele nor does he include because he neither relates them genealogically to the other suggestions that the Ba ga Seleka is a branch of the Ba ga Kekana (Moletiane and Vaaltyn sections), the Ba ga Langa subdivided into smaller groups, e.g. 'During their stay at Maune consisting of five tribes, today comprise the 'Northern Lekgopung several sections of the tribe hived off. The Ba ga Ndebele people' (Jackson 1969:41; Van Warmelo 1974:67; De Beer 1979:67-69; Seymour-Smith 1986:278).

From the preceding discussion it is clear that there are some 'missing links' regarding the Ba ga Seleka's position within the comprehensive Northern Ndebele context. However, there is not only some uncertainty about the Ba ga Seleka's position, but also about the unity of the Northern Ndebele as such, despite their alleged consciousness as a 'distinct ethnic grouping'. Jackson (1969:45) says in this connection that there is '... no easy solution to the apparent contradiction between the ostensible unity of the Transvaal Ndebele as demonstrated on the one hand by their genealogies and their chain of communication for ritual affairs and, on the other, by the three-way division as demonstrated by the different totems and possibly by linguistic differences'. He further suggested that only further investigation of inter alia, the descent groups of the Ndebele will help to clear up uncertainties about their past.

Recent work by De Beer (1986) supports earlier findings on the position of Vaaltyn Kekana and the Langa of Mapela and has shed light on their ties with other Northern Ndebele groups. Some of these issues with regard to the Ba ga Seleka will be addressed subsequently.

**From KwaZulu to Botswana**

Mazwe (Figure 2) is generally identified as the ruler who led a group of Northern Nguni people, later to become the Ba ga Seleka, from KwaZulu in the late seventeenth century. This periodically residing in Botswana, has much to do with their obvious Tswana socio-cultural orientation (Van Warmelo 1974:67).

As regards the White farmers of the area, the Ba ga Seleka provide an important source of labour and relations with them are good. Unsolicited information provided by our informants during the early stages of the project, emphasize that these good relations had existed for more than a century and also extended to the government of the old Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek (ZAR) in the Transvaal. Some of the reasons for this will unfold in the ensuing account of the historical vicissitudes of the Ba ga Seleka.

In spite of the fact that the Ba ga Seleka are generally referred to as Tswana by virtue of their language and culture and because of this were 'classified' by Schapera (1976:10) as 'Eastern Tswana', it is not clear whether they have any ethnic affiliations with the Tswana. Scrutiny of the genealogy of the lineage of the ruling house of the Barolong boo-Seleka (see Molema 1987:17 and Schüler 1965:25-29) as well as their totem affiliation (see Matthews 1940:1-2) has revealed for instance that they have no ties with this branch of the Tswana.

Their Ndebele origin is however intimated in various sources (cf. Van Warmelo 1974:67; Benso 1976:14, De Beer 1983:173).Ellenberger (1937:33) in fact regarded the Ba ga Seleka as part of the original Northern Ndebele stock before it subdivided into smaller groups, e.g. 'During their stay at Lekgopung several sections of the tribe hived off. The Ba ga Mokopana were the first to go, followed by the Ba ga Laka, the Mwauna, the Ba-ga-Letwaba and the boo-Seleka'. According to the sources these major divisions, namely the Ba ga Kekana (Moletlane and Vaaltyn sections), the Ba ga Langa or Laka of Mapela and Bakenberg and the Ba ga Letwaba or Maune consisting of five tribes, today comprise the 'Northern Ndebele people' (Jackson 1969:41; Van Warmelo 1974:67; De Beer 1986:31). With the exception of the Ba ga Seleka these divisions are also mentioned by Zier vogel (1959:4-5). He suggests that the Ba ga Seleka is a branch of the Ba ga Kekana of Moletlane, but there seems to be some doubt in his mind because he neither relates them genealogically to the other major divisions of the Northern Ndebele nor does he include them in his general account of the Northern Ndebele (Zier vogel 1959:7). Further uncertainty arises about the Ba ga Seleka's true historical and kinship ties with the other groups of the Northern Ndebele when their totem allegiance (phuthi — duiker), which is different, is considered. The latter groups, as has already been indicated above, venerate the elephant (tlou) as their totem. That totem allegiance is often a pointer to the history and origin of a group is generally accepted (cf. Mönnig 1967:235; De Beer 1979:67-69; Seymour-Smith 1986:278).

The figure above illustrates the genealogy of the ruling lineage of the Ba ga Seleka.
was a period in KwaZulu when trade and environmental variables, population pressure and the formation of larger political federations caused wide-spread instability. Although the phenomenon of class or groups of people splitting off and moving away after disagreements was not uncommon, it is unclear what had affected Mazwe and his people in specific terms, but migrate they did, eventually to settle on the banks of the Phuthiatsana River on the border of what is now Lesotho. It is interesting to note that Van Warmelo (1935:58, 60) refers to the presence at that time of a 'tribe', the Phuthi, who were one of those "... who had come from the East ..., and ('n) the Northern districts... a number of tribes known as TšeBel ... people of Nguni extraction who settled in these parts very long ago, and have in part adopted the customs and language of their Sotho neighbours. Little more is known about them, their history also being practically unrecorded'. Whether this reference to the Ndebele also includes other Sotho groups of Ndebele origin such as the Bahlahkwa and Bathako is not clear. According to our informants it was during this period of their history and specifically their contact with the Baphuthi that the Ba ga Seleka adopted phuthi (duiker) as their totem which they have kept till this day and which has, *inter alia*, put their Ndebele origin and their ties with the other Northern Ndebele groups in dispute. When Mazwe died he was succeeded by his son Mothasedi who also died during their stay in this area. It was only upon the succession of Mothasedi's son, Tselapedi I, in what by now was late in the eighteenth or early in the nineteenth century, that the Ba ga Seleka moved again.

Tselapedi I at first took his people to a region around Witsieshoek on the banks of the Wilge River and it was during their stay here that his brother Maita left with a section of the tribe and settled at Soutpan in the Waterberg district. The line of succession from Maita went from father to son through his father's younger brother Radipabe and his elder brother, Motlhabya. It is furthermore not unlikely that the split resulted from a disagreement between these brothers after the death of their father.

At Mmaleoko trouble soon arose between the people of Molthabya and the Ba ga Langa (Laka) people but after several small skirmishes the Ba ga Seleka under Molthabya eventually conquered them. Meanwhile, more or less at that time, in Botswana Radipabe and Lebodi and their followers joined *kgo* Legwale of the local Bakwena to undertake a raid to Bonyani in the present Zimbabwe in order to seize cattle from the Shona people. In the fighting that ensued *kgo* Legwale was killed and the raiders returned home to Mokwena. In their travels along the Limpopo, Radipabe and Lebodi had seen the Ngwapa mountain with a small river, the Talete, running from it and upon their return to Mokwena, and having mourned the death of Legwale, they asked the Bakwena permission to leave on the pretext of wishing to search for their elder brother Molthabya, and his people. Having obtained this permission they took their people to the mountain Ngwapa where they settled. Radipabe became ruler, subjugated a few of the smaller tribes of the region, which our informants were unable to identify, and levied taxes on them.

The first years on the Lephalala

Molthabya had in the meantime heard of his brothers' movements and decided to settle closer to them in the vicinity of Beauty, an area through which he had originally taken his people on their trek from Botswana. Molthabya, however, was by this time an old man and he died during the migration to Beauty. Molthabya was succeeded by his second son in order of rank, Seleka I. Why Pote, the one highest in rank did not succeed, is unclear. Our informants could also not shed more light on the circumstances around this succession. Having succeeded his father, Seleka I continued with the migration and settled his people at a hill called Mmatshwana, a few kilometers from Beauty and the confluence of the Lephalala and Limpopo Rivers, and just south of the present-day main village of the Ba ga Seleka. On their way to Mmatshwana they had encountered the Ba ga Shongwane, later to become their southern neighbours on the Lephalala, who were on their way from Shonaland in Zimbabwe to Buffelskraal in the Waterberg district. The Ba ga Seleka found the Molwantiwa, a small tribe with tau (lion) as totem, already living in the area around Beauty and the latter as well as the Ba ga Shongwane eventually lived under the jurisdiction of Seleka I.

*Kgo* Seleka I sent a few messengers, Ramakwadi, Sebakwa and Dinta Mmadeli to Ngwapa in Botswana to inform his rangwane, his father's younger brother Radipabe, that his elder brother, Molthabya had died and that the Ba ga Seleka had settled at Beauty. It would seem that Radipabe regarded Seleka I as a possible threat to his position as tribal head for he refused to receive the messengers and had them chased away from his mo&até (capital). Radipabe's younger brother, Lebodi, however, received and treated the messengers well, giving them karasses as gifts. Radipabe resented this act of kindness and interpreted it as contrary to his wishes and it heralded the
beginning of strife between him and Lebodi. Radipabe grasped every opportunity to give vent to his anger at Lebodi. One such incident occurred during a kgotla (council meeting) and involved a man called Maropeng, who must have been a young patrilineal relative of Lebodi since he called Radipabe 'grandfather' i.e. father's father.

'One day while they were at the kgotla Radipabe pointed out a dog and said that it was his. Maropeng said: 'This is my dog'. The men also said: 'Yes chief the dog belongs to Maropeng'. Radipabe immediately jumped up, stick in hand, and cracked Maropeng's skull with it. He fell down stone dead' (Anonymous (a) n.d.).

After this incident Lebodi went to Seleka I for help and upon hearing of his departure, Radipabe is reported to have exclaimed: 'In Ndebele we say: 'Go Basotho', go you Khalahari people, (Anonymous (a) n.d.). Although there is some doubt as to the accuracy of the statement, it would seem to have derogatory implications and specifically emphasizes a 'we' (Ndebele, original stock) versus 'they' (those who have been influenced by Sotho-speakers) categorization. Lebodi and Seleka I decided that they needed more help against Radipabe and went to the Ba ga Kekana of Moletlane at Zebediela. The latter agreed and the combined forces eventually launched a surprise attack at the mountain of Ngwapa. They approached through the Mmametli pass under cover of darkness and killed Radipabe himself. Most of his followers escaped, however. A saying used in praise of Seleka I (also by himself) is said to have originated by virtue of these events,

'I am Makhurumolla (sic.) (the opener) of the lid of the pot of death' (Anonymous (a) n.d.).

Seleka I was by now (± 1840) an elderly man and it must have been while the Ba ga Seleka were living at Mmatshwana Hill that they were visited by the hunter Cumming (see the introduction). In spite of the fact that Mzilikazi and his horde were under his jurisdiction: the Ba ga Pesha genealogical rank, Kobe, became the next

Back to Botswana

During these years contact with Whites was few and far between. Other than hunters like Cumming, the only white person to pass through the territory of the Ba ga Seleka in the middle of the nineteenth century was the Rev. Robert Moffat who was on his way to visit Mzilikazi in Zimbabwe. The Ba ga Seleka were at any rate not due to stay in the Lephalala valley much longer, for in 1858 Kobe decided to take his people back to Ngwapa in Botswana. What prompted this decision is not clear, but Kobe may have been influenced by news of the skirmishes between the Boers and the Ba ga Langa of Mankopane (Jackson 1969:73) that were taking place not too far to the southeast. Boer influence was also increasingly reaching out toward the northern areas of the Transvaal (Jackson 1969:66-67) as well as to the western parts after the Boer leaders A.H. Potgieter and Piet Uys had driven the Matebele of Mzilikazi out of the Transvaal. Within a year of resettling at Ngwapa, contact with Whites, especially missionaries, became more frequent. One such group from Lesotho, intending to do mission work at Bulawayo among the Matebele, were however driven away by Lobengula and they went to the Ba ga Seleka of Kobe instead. The missionaries who counted F. Coillard, Asere Segagabane, Aaron Mojakisane and Andreas Lesodi in their number, stayed in the area for five years, upon which they returned to Lesotho in 1884. Amongst those to be converted and baptized was a son of the late Radipabe, Mosenene Mathaba. According to genealogical data Mosenene and Mathaba were two different sons of Radipabe, so the information is somewhat contradictory. However, the son who was converted was baptized Sakaio by the Rev. F. Coillard in 1884. When the missionaries left for Lesotho in 1884, Sakaio went with them to attend the Bible school at Morija. Since Morija is today the headquarters of the Evangelical Church of Lesotho which was founded by the Evangelical Missionary Society of Paris, and which established the first white settlement in Lesotho in 1833, it appears that the Rev. Coillard and his colleagues belonged to this mission (Albertyn 1975:441).

While Kobe and his people were still settled at Ngwapa, his highest ranking son, Madidimala, left in 1882 with a section of the tribe to once again cross the Limpopo and establish their village in the Waterberg. Within a few years of their return to their previous environment however, Madidimala died.

At Ngwapa where the Ba ga Seleka under Kobe and other rulers had intermittently lived in close proximity to the Bamangwato for many years, intermarriage with them not only took place regularly, but there was also friction. As regards intermarriage for example, Gorewang Khamane married Keboile, the daughter of Kobe, and Seeleto, the sister of Kgabo — Tebela Mokwena. They gave birth to Botloseng Mosenyi of Kalamari and kgasile Rasebolai Khamane of Serowe, a later ruler of the Bamangwato.

The early part of the Ba ga Seleka's stay at Ngwapa was in fact characterized by an absence of disagreement. The Ba ga Seleka had re-entered Botswana during Sekgoma I's reign and he gave them permission to settle at Ngwapa. Kobe or 'Speak-barb' as he was called by the Bamangwato, sent five sheep to Sekgoma as a gift of allegiance and they lived in peace for a considerable time. Kobe was, however, already an old man in Sekgoma's early years and not long after the beginning of Khama's reign started he became 'blind and decrepit' (Mockford 1931:108).
The return to Lephala

Kobe's son, Seleka II, second in rank for the position as tribal head, who was said to be stubborn and ambitious in nature and who had stayed behind when his higher ranking brother Madidimala, had returned to Lephala with a section of the tribe, now became the de facto leader of the Ba ga Seleka. Seleka II was also said to be envious of Khama's powerful position and envisaged the Ba ga Seleka also becoming powerful under his leadership with the help of the Boers. To this end he often allowed Boers from across the border to hunt in his territory. Khama, of the Bamangwato, found this unacceptable, especially when rumours reached him of Seleka II and a number of Boers plotting against him and his people. An emissary was sent to Kobe to warn him against such actions and thus a chain of events was set in motion which resulted in a battle with, and defeat for the Ba ga Seleka. Seleka II slipped across the border during the night leaving behind him a destitute Kobe and the scattered remains of his people. Kobe soon followed Seleka II, however; so during 1887 the Ba ga Seleka were again settled on the Lephala. (A detailed account of the above battle which took place around May 1887 is given by Mockford 1931:107-118).

A contributing factor to the events that eventually led to the battle with Khama occurred in 1886. This incident and actions that stemmed from it give one some inkling of the Ba ga Seleka's perceptions, as opposed to those of the Bamangwato (cf. Mockford 1931:107-118) of the eventual circumstances surrounding their departure from Botswana:

'In 1886 Mabote Seleka, a son of Kobe, coming from Kimberley, found the Bamangwato cattle posts on the banks of the Limpopo. He, together with those who were with him, burnt down the cattle posts and killed three Ngwato tribesmen. In those days that area did not belong to the Ngwato people as it does today and is known as the Tuli Block.

It was then that Khama III got an excuse for attacking the Seleka people because he had realized that Madidimala had crossed over to the Transvaal with a section of the tribe. Furthermore, a number of the Seleka tribesmen who constituted their armies, had gone to Kimberley for work. He brought his army and the battle raged the whole day. The Seleka tribesmen under Kobe at Ngwapa mountain drove their herds across into the Transvaal as there were no boundaries in those days as there are today. They left some of the cattle in the tribal head's cattle kraal to bluff Khama III. Many Ngwato tribesmen were killed because the Seleka people held the mountain strongholds and caves. Chief Khama III returned home to Shoshong disappointed. Chief Kobe trekked to Beauty, as he was blind, together with the tribe in 1871 (Anonymous (a) n.d.).

Kobe died two years after the Ba ga Seleka's resettlement on the Lephala and Seleka II hence officially became kgoS in 1889. Seleka II was the second son of Kobe by his principal wife (the mmaset&i$baba), Mmamosoke, because, as was seen above, the son highest in rank and rightful heir Madidimala, had already succeeded from the tribe with his followers. Shortly after he took over the reigns of the tribe Seleka II moved his headquarters (mo&ite) from Mmahlwana to Thothwane, where it is still found today.

Into the twentieth century

The year after his succession Seleka II took his son Mananya, his rightful successor, to President Paul Kruger and General Piet Joubert, then 'Superintendent of Natives' to be blessed by them. They then gave him the name Kutier. Seleka II visited General Joubert again the following year to complain about the land Khama, of the Bamangwato, had wrested from the Ba ga Seleka. They were apparently not entitled to a location in accordance with the terms of the Conventions of Pretoria (1881) and London (1884), due to their long sojourn in Botswana. To assist them in their request for land the ZAR government, through its Superintendent of Natives, offered them the farms Ballymore No. 564, Kroomstad No. 365 and Sonkwaide No. 1115 further south near Villa Nora. Today these farms are part of the Shongwane of Bobidiidi tribal area. The Ba ga Seleka refused this offer, however, preferring to remain on the farm Beauty. After further deliberations with the ZAR through the local Field Kornet, a Mr. Frikkie Grobler, the Seleka eventually bought the farm Beauty in 1903 for the sum of R2 000,00 (Anonymous (b) n.d.).

In the meantime the Seleka were visited by the missionary Helm, of the mission of the Dutch Reformed Church at Kranspoort, west of Mara in the Soutpansberg district. Further visits followed by Rev. Murray until Rev. Fourie started a mission among them (Anonymous (b) n.d.). Seleka II was converted in 1903 and baptized David, by Rev. John Murray. Shortly afterwards he took the initiative to abolish initiation schools among the Seleka.

In 1893 Baitswi, son of Madidimala, the highest ranking son of Kobe, sought self-government from Seleka II. Whether this was the reason for the ensuing fight between Seleka II and Baitswi's followers is not known, but Seleka II, with the help of some White farmers under the leadership of F. Grobler, who was mentioned before, chased Baitswi and his followers away to Botswana during the reign of Khama III.

During the Anglo Boer War Seleka II supported the Bakemberg section of the Ba ga Langa against the Ba ga Mapela section by supplying ammunition to them (Jackson 1969:116). It is not clear why that happened but it may be because of past animosities, since it is a known fact that there was a time when Seleka had to render tribute to the Ba ga Mapela section (TNAD 1905:56).

The good relations between Seleka and the Boers of the ZAR, of which mention was made during interviews, stood the latter in good stead during the Anglo Boer War. When the British soldiers applied their scorched-earth tactics during the latter part of the war, Seleka collected all the cattle of the surrounding Boers and took care of them. After the war all the cattle with their progenies were handed back to their owners.

The Ba ga Seleka had to give shelter to the Ba ga Shongwane of Bobidiidi who were attacked by the Ba ga Langa of Mapela during the reign of their ruler Hans (Jackson 1969:103 and 121). Another event worth mentioning and which happened during the reign of Seleka II, is that a small group of Herero joined the tribe in 1906-7 after their flight from the present Namibia during the German/Herero war of 1906-7 (De Beer 1986:64-65). Although some of them returned to Namibia eventually, others remained behind and intermarried with members of the Ba ga Seleka.
Seleka II died in 1917 and was succeeded by Mananya (Kutter), the eldest son of his principal wife, the mmaset§taba, Madibaki. According to informants his reign from 1917–1946 was peaceful. Kutere is also mentioned by Van Warmelo (1935:89) after his visit to the Ba ga Seleka. The old informants remember that some men of the Ba ga Seleka joined the South African forces in 1918 shortly after Kutter took over as kgo§ and again during the Second World War (1939–45). Mention was also made of a ravaging locust plague which affected other parts of the northern Transvaal as well (De Beer 1979:91).

Kutere was succeeded in 1946 by Seleka III (David), the eldest son of mmaset§taba, Dorcas Leihlo. His rule was also said to be peaceful. A significant event during his rule was the establishment of the Seleka Tribal Authority in terms of Section 2 of the Black Authorities Act, 1951 (Act No. 68 of 1951) on 24 December 1954. The area over which this authority has jurisdiction is mentioned in the schedule to the Government Notice and included the tribal farms which were mentioned above (Government Notice 2611 of 24 December 1954). Seleka III did not marry a mmaset§taba with the result that his own younger brother, Tompi Zachariah took over as regent when he died in 1960. Tompi Zachariah's more than 30 years in office as regent have been characterized by wise rule and sound administration. The finances of the tribe are in a healthy state and he still has a strong hand in the tribal authority to such an extent that the 'civics', an organization of younger people who are in opposition to the tribal system and authority, have so far not been allowed much influence in the area. That their activities are, however, a cause for concern for the regent and the tribal authority cannot be denied.

The present ruler's talents were in due course noted by the higher authorities in Lebowa. After the restructuring of the Lebowa Territorial Authority during which greater powers were given to an executive authority (Proclamation R115 of 1969), kgo§ Zachariah was appointed as the executive councillor of the Department of Agriculture. When the Lebowa Territorial Authority was changed into a legislative assembly by Proclamation 225 of 1972 in accordance with the Constitution of the Bantu Homelands Act, 1971, (Act 21 of 1971) (see Breytenbach 1974:28, 49) kgo§ Zacharia served, inter alia as Minister of Justice in the cabinet of the then Chief Minister, Dr. Cedric Phatudi.

Since the status of kgo§ Zachariah is that of a regent and there is no rightful heir to the position as tribal head in the direct line and because a mmaset§taba has as yet not been married who could bear a successor, it is important for the Ba ga Seleka in the context of the traditionally orientated system to take steps in this direction in the light of the problems that succession disputes have often caused among other tribes in Lebowa (Wild 1982:7–18). Negotiations are according to respondents at present under way for a mmaset§taba to be married.

Conclusion

It was possible to cast more light on some of the misconceptions as regards the ethno-history and socio-cultural context of the Ba ga Seleka by tapping their oral tradition data resource. In the unfolding of their early history it became clear that their totem affiliation (phuthi — duiker), which differs from the tlou totem of the other Northern Ndebele, was adopted during their contact with the Baphuthi in Lesotho. During their migrations in Southern Africa they incorporated various Sotho elements, but especially Tswana into their ranks so that the Ba ga Seleka nucleus forms but a small minority of the total tribal population. In addition through their long contact and intermarriage with the Tswana, especially the Bakwena, they have virtually become Tswana in language and culture. They emphasized that they are still conscious of their Northern Ndebele identity and the number of times they relied on assistance and asked for support from other Northern Ndebele groups far to the south while Tswana and Northern Sotho neighbours were at hand, would seem to support this perspective.

The unraveling of the oral history of the Ba ga Seleka was only feasible and practicable on two counts. Firstly, by adopting an intensive strategy of group-discussion-interviews based on well established rapport and a reflexive perspective. Secondly, by consistently drawing from available documented data, meagre as it is, for purposes of verification. It was not possible to clarify all the contradictions stemming from the different sources, oral or written, but in such case the more probable version was identified. In the re-construction of oral ethno-history one is after all still dependent upon the vagaries of human activities which in turn, are subject to divergent perceptions.
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Ontwerp van 'n stimuleringsprogram vir swart jeugdiges
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Developing a stimulus program for black adolescents. The initiation of a community development approach in the black townships of the Northern Transvaal necessitated the introduction of a leadership course for adolescents. This course was designed on the life enrichment approach also used elsewhere in the country. The requests of our students lead to emphasis on the history of the different black peoples in South Africa as well as some of the more esoteric aspects of western culture. We had to adapt the original design through a process of action-research to accommodate the wishes of our students. Programs of this kind need to be followed by the organization of a full-fledged youth movement as the stimulus offered in these programs is much too short to ensure a lasting effect.

Die toepassing van 'n gemeenskapsontwikkelingsbenadering in die woonbuurte vir swartes in Noord-Transvaal het tot die ontwikkeling van 'n program vir jeugleiers aanleiding gegee. Hierdie program is op die lewensverrykingsbenadering gebou wat ook elders in die land vir jeugwerk gebruik word. Die versoek van die kursusgangers het tot die belemmering gelei van die gelykheid van die verskillende swart volke in Suid-Afrika asook enkele meer esoteriese dele van die Westerse kultuur. Daar is dus aanpassinge gemaak deur 'n proses van akse-navoring om die wense van die kursusgangers in ag te kon neem. Programme van hierdie aard behoor deur opvolgwerk binne 'n volwaardige jeugbeweging uitgevoer te word aangesien die stimulus wat tydens die bestaande programme aangebied kon word, te kort is om enige permanente gevolge te waarborg.

* Persoon aan wie korrespondensie gerig moet word en huidige adres: Hoogstraat 82, Pietersburg 0699, Republiek van Suid-Afrika.

Inleiding

In 1971 is die Wet op die Administrasie van Ban toesake (Wet nr. 45 van 1971) aangeraai. Hiervolgens is uiteindelik 'n veertiental administrasierade ingestel en mettertyd (vanaf 1984) omskep in Ontwikkelingsrade. Een hiervan was die Ontwikkelingsraad Noord-Transvaal met gesag oor alle stedelike woonbuurte vir swartes rofweg vanaf Nylstroom tot Messina.

Dit was staatstyd aan die Ontwikkelingsraad om 'n proses van gemeenskapsontwikkeling binne die swart woongebiede binne sy regsigte te stimuleer. Die amptelike stukke van die Raad weerspieël die feit dat die Raad hom die volgende as doelwitte gestel het: die daarstelling van gesonde sinvolle behuising; die versekering van menswaardige administrasie (Mostert 1990:2).

Die definisie van die Verenigde Nasies van die begrip gemeenskapsontwikkeling lê soos volg: '... Die processies waarin die deelname van die volk het voortgekom en wat kragtighede, verantwoordelikhede, sosio-kulturele, ekonomiese en administrasie-eenheidsontwikkeling ontwikkel het.' (UN1971.ST/SOA/106:2).

Die afweging van enige verdere amptelike riglyne en die bestaan van 'n algemene patroon van die oormane van Westerse kultuurgoedere deur swart mense het veral die verskillende afdelings van die Ontwikkelingsraad die