

Assessment of an Indigenous Learning Project: The Khoekhoe and San Early Learning Centre in Heidedal

Piet Erasmus

*Department of Anthropology, University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa
E-mail: erasmus@ufs.ac.za*

KEYWORDS Language. Khoekhoe. Culture. Indigenous Peoples

ABSTRACT Two years after the opening of the Khoekhoe and San Early Learning Centre (KSELC) in Heidedal, the project comes under review in this contribution. It is arguably one of the greatest challenges for an indigenous learning project to establish synergy between the two environments in which the children find themselves. What made this particular project even more challenging was the fact that the Khoekhoe culture and language have all but disappeared, or that they have largely been abstracted into primordial forms. Despite these cultural challenges, the project also faced certain political and economic obstacles. While the pedagogical successes of the project were less than dramatic, it contributed unexpectedly to establishing a broader Khoekhoe consciousness, as well as a deeper understanding of the challenges the Khoekhoe revival faces in general.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act 108 of 1996) makes provision for the promotion and development of the country's indigenous languages¹ (see Chapter 1 on languages, section 6, subsection 5a (ii)). The Pan South African Language Board (PanSALB) was established with the specific function of monitoring the implementation of language policies. Moreover, international support for the development of the Khoekhoe and San languages came from the United Nations Special Rapporteur, Mr Rodolfo Stavenhagen (2005: 16). Cognisant of the marginal situation of the Khoekhoe and San² in South Africa, he urged that 'particular efforts [...] be made to preserve, promote and develop' these languages, emphasising that 'this is, furthermore, a recognised international human right'.

It was in the climate described above that a growing number of people, who wished to reaffirm their Khoekhoe identities³ and to reconnect with their culture and learn a Khoekhoe language, requested the Department of Anthropology at the University of the Free State during the course of 2007 to conduct a pilot study into the feasibility of a Khoekhoe and San Early Learning Centre (KSELC) in Heidedal. As a result of this request, the KSELC was launched with the collaboration of local Griqua and Korana people in 2010. The main objectives of the KSELC were to assist those people who wished to revitalise and develop their Khoekhoe language skills, and to create a teaching environment that would re-

spect the Khoekhoe heritage and culture. Before the opening of the centre, research was conducted on Khoekhoe-related issues in Heidedal, such as identity, perceptions, attitudes, views and meanings, as well as the expectations of the role or influence the KSELC would have in the promotion of awareness of Khoekhoe matters. The data obtained during this survey has been published elsewhere and reference to the data is made briefly and only as needed⁴.

During the process of data collection, the Department of Anthropology faced various questions about the KSELC initiative, such as: What is the value of the knowledge the children will acquire? Can it really empower the children? Will it prepare children in any way for mainstream education? Are the children not the victims of their parents' political views? These probing questions impressed on us the necessity of assessing the project at every step, from the time of its implementation onwards, in terms of functioning, failures and successes. The data of the first two years of the operation of the KSELC is presented and interpreted in this contribution. While the data of the study prior to the launching of the KSELC was largely quantitative in nature, the data regarding this (second) study is qualitative. Through our systematic, active involvement in the whole process we inductively discovered, analysed and verified our views regarding the functioning, critical outcomes and value the KSELC could add. Before discussing the qualitative data, the Khoekhoe people and the community of Heidedal will be introduced briefly.

2. THE KHOEKHOE⁵ —A BRIEF HISTORY AND THE CURRENT CONTEXT

There are various theories concerning the origin of the Khoekhoe (*cf.* Boonzaier et al. 1996: 12–14; Chidester 1996: 46–52, 63–67; Schapera 1965: 26–50). Today, it is generally accepted that the Khoekhoe originated in the region of the northern border of present-day Botswana, where they initially subsisted as hunter-gatherers, and eventually became herders⁶. From there, they moved southwards. There is archaeological evidence that their forebears settled in present-day Namibia and along the West Coast, towards the Cape, approximately 1 600 to 2 000 years ago. The Khoekhoe, together with the San, occupied vast parts of the central interior of Southern Africa and are regarded as the original or indigenous inhabitants of this region (Boonzaier et al. 1996: 4–27; Buys 1989: 6–8; Engelbrecht 1936: ix–xii; Elphick 1973: 2–84; Malherbe 1984: 1–48; Penn 1995: 2–45). They had their own culture, language and identity (Carstens 1966, 1985; Schapera 1965; Engelbrecht 1936) and, according to Tobias (1955: 263), a [distinct] racial basis.

By the 1800s most of the independent Khoekhoe societies had been destroyed. In 1798 already, John Barrow, visiting Little Namaqualand, reported grimly: ‘The Namaqua Plains are now desolate and uninhabited. All those numerous tribes of Namaquas, once possessed of vast herds of cattle, are in the course of less than a century dwindled away to four hordes, which are not very numerous and in a great measure are subservient to the Dutch peasantry. A dozen years, and probably a shortened period, will see the remnant of the Namaqua nation in a state of entire servitude’ (Hoernlé 1985: 23). The missionary, Hahn, and the philologist, Bleek, began using phrases such as ‘the broken people’, ‘the disappearing people’ and ‘the dying-out race’ (Chidester 1996: 68–69) when speaking about them in the late 1800s. Schapera (1965: 49–50) reported in 1930 as follows on the inhabitants of Little Namaqualand: ‘Their tribal cohesion and culture have, however, been completely destroyed by contact with the Europeans’. Various authors echo this view, and maintain that, by the early twentieth century, the Khoekhoe were a fast-disappearing group (*cf.* Schapera 1965: 47; Kies 1972: 34–36; Boonzaier et al. 1996: 129; Maingard 1932: 103; Ross 1975: 575).

A range of factors contributed to what Marks (1972: 77) has called ‘the ultimate disappearance’ of the Khoekhoe as an ethnic entity. General colonial discourses described the ‘national character’ of the Khoekhoe with hostility and bias. They were depicted as an uncivilised, morally degenerate and lazy people with an innate desire to steal cattle (*cf.* Marks 1972: 55; Strauss 1979: v; Coertze 1983: 111; Buys 1989: 65; Coertze and Coertze 1996: 157; Kies 1972: 32; Marais 1968: 94; Pretorius 1963: 36). Colonisation, however, did not only mean negative stereotyping, but had a tremendous influence on the disintegration of Khoekhoe communities, their absorption and assimilation into colonial society.

Another reason for this alleged extinction has been the tendency of the Khoekhoe towards acculturation and assimilation (*cf.* Marks 1972: 77; Waldman 2007: 164; Legassick 1969; Lye 1970; Lye and Murray 1980; Ross 1974). As a matter of fact, intermingling with other groups - through trade, war and intermarriage - seems to have been such a common occurrence, that Boonzaier et al. (1996: 129) indicate that by the 1950s it was widely accepted that there were ‘hardly any pure Hottentots left in Namaqualand’. This view is endorsed by Beach who observed as far back as 1937 that it was no longer possible ‘to find a pure representation’ of the Khoekhoe (Buys 1989: 55).

Various economic factors also contributed to the disintegration of the Khoekhoe, including the migration of white ‘Trekboers’ and ‘Bastards’ into the interior. Their movement placed limited environmental resources under pressure, resulting in renewed clashes and conflict between the Khoekhoe and other groups (Ross 1975; Buys 1989: 101–102; Van der Merwe 1984: 57).

Even religious factors played a role. While missionary societies generally played an important role in respect of the establishment of Khoekhoe communities during the 1700s (Waldman 2007: 163), their involvement with the Khoekhoe was double-edged. The missionaries obtained large tracts of Khoekhoe land and alienated them from their heritage despite heated disputes. Cut off from their land, Khoekhoe cohesion and identity suffered and deteriorated (Schoeman 1985: 88, 2002: 100; Erasmus 2007; Erasmus et al. 2008).

Lastly, the inevitable influence of political factors came into play (Buys 1989: 84–85; Schoeman 1985: 85). After 1948, the National Party com-

menced with the active implementation of its policy of racial segregation. Two laws of the time are crucial to understanding the context. First, by virtue of the provisions of the Group Areas Act, 1957 (No. 77 of 1957), land was demarcated for racial separation, while forced removals, with a view to doing away with so-called 'black spots', were the order of the day. Various Khoekhoe communities were affected by these circumstances and they were resettled in urban locations or reserves for Coloured people. Secondly, according to the *Population Registration Act* of 1950, all South Africans who were not White or Black were regarded as 'Coloured' – the umbrella concept for the 'residue' – those who did not fit into the first two categories. The Khoekhoe were labelled as 'Coloured' and were politically, culturally, socially and economically constrained to renounce their origins⁷. Children of Khoekhoe descent were forbidden to speak any other language but Afrikaans or English on the 'Coloured' school playgrounds, and parents, fearing discrimination, avoided teaching their children this language.

In line with the contemporary international climate which favours the recognition of indigenous linguistic, cultural and identity rights (Darnell 1994: 7; Kuper 1994: 537; Stavenhagen 2005: 7–8), the present political dispensation has granted constitutional accommodation and recognition to traditional communities and their leadership. This has given an important incentive to those Khoekhoe who acknowledge their Khoekhoeness and who wish to support and promote Khoekhoe revival and re-identification. As this article is not about Khoekhoe identity as such, it is not necessary, in the researcher's view, to critically engage in the proposal of directions, modes, reasons or courses in respect of the Khoekhoe identity revival⁸. What is important, however, is to remember that most Khoekhoe are in a painful period of transition from a system where they have been denied the opportunity to be Khoekhoe and a new one where the situation is still undefined, fluid and uncertain.

3. A HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF HEIDEDAL

Heidedal forms part of the greater Mangaung Local Municipality, Free State Province, South Africa, and was formerly a residential area for so-called Coloured people⁹. The railroad connection between the Cape and Transvaal (1890)

created employment opportunities and lured large numbers of non-White workers to Bloemfontein. Schoeman (1980: 286), in his history of Bloemfontein, distinguishes between Coloured and Black communities and describes community activities closer to the cultural activities of the Coloured people from the Cape than to those of Black people from the rural Free State. The fact that the Coloured people settling in Bloemfontein were initially predominantly Anglican and English-speaking also suggests that they were originally from the Cape. Schoeman (1980: 291) is convinced that there was a growing consciousness of an own identity amongst the Coloured people and that they were determined to maintain it in the face of the overwhelming numbers of the Black population. This was why they petitioned the town council in 1902 for their own, separate residential area. Until then they had been living among the Black residents in the Waaihoek location. In response to the petition, the town council decided to reserve a separate part of Waaihoek as a Coloured residential area. However, in 1919 the town council decided to move Waaihoek and to develop a separate area for the Coloured people elsewhere¹⁰. The newly established Coloured area was located in a very deprived area; it was bordered by the sewerage farm, the railway line and the road to Dewetsdorp beyond the 'poor white settlement' known as Uitkoms (Schoeman 1980: 290). The residents wanted to give it the name Belmont, but the municipality officially named it Heatherdale (in reference to the proliferation of heather flowers). The name was later changed to Ashbury, and then, in 1977, it was renamed Heidedal, the Afrikaans translation of the first name, Heatherdale (Schoeman 1980: 291).

The cultural roots of the Heidedal community are complex. The Coloured population was, as indicated, initially predominantly Anglican and English-speaking. The influx of Afrikaans-speaking people from predominately Khoekhoe decent (mainly Griqua and Korana, but labelled in terms of apartheid legislation as Coloured people) from the Free State rural areas dramatically changed the cultural landscape of Heidedal¹¹. Over time, Western influences came to dominate to such a degree among these people that very little knowledge or understanding remains of the past Khoekhoe culture and identity; many people hold on to imaginary views, but with enthusiasm and pride in their cultural heritage.

There are no specific historical records about the Khoekhoe in Heidedal. Looking as far back as 1980, no reference to them could be traced in the two local newspapers, *Volksblad* and *The Friend*. Neither could any reference to the Khoekhoe be found in the records of the Bloemfontein Municipality or in those of the Heidedal Management Committee. The inhabitants of Heidedal were regarded, and many saw themselves simply as members of the group collectively referred to as Coloured people. However, this does not mean that there was not any Khoekhoe awareness among the inhabitants. During 1983, for example, a local minister, Rev. Gordon of the then Dutch Reformed Mission Church came up with the idea of a 'Griqua national registry'. Because of his position as a church minister, Gordon neither could, nor would, become involved in politics, but was nevertheless sympathetic towards the Griqua revival. A local leader, Mr Johannes Kraalshoek, experienced it as a great personal triumph when he was the first person to be registered as a Griqua in the registry. According to Kraalshoek, the people in Heidedal were for the first time prepared to admit to being Griqua rather than Coloured people. They began talking about themselves as such with pride. Today, different revival groups that have formed over the past few years around the Khoekhoe identity¹² exist in Heidedal. These groups have organised themselves in so-called 'Houses', that is, revival movements acknowledging specific leaderships and which already have improvised, or are in the process of improvising, different, opposing and distinctive ways of creating and transforming their identities. The leaders of these various Houses all have their own political aspirations, viz. to be recognised by the national government as the only true representative of the Khoekhoe. It is important to emphasise the fact that there is no single Khoekhoe structure; no one, common, shared value system, culture, or set of ideals.

Concluding this description of Heidedal, it is important to point out that the data collected through sampling during the study prior to the development of the KSELC revealed a very high unemployment rate, low income, and no or little schooling among residents.

4. THE KHOEKHOE AND SAN EARLY LEARNING CENTRE

After the necessary preparations (taking care of the rent and renovating a venue), the KSELC

finally opened its doors in the second half of 2009¹³. Because there was no one in Heidedal who had a command of the Khoekhoegowab language, a teacher from Namibia was appointed for a period of two years – the duration of a work permit for a Namibian citizen in South Africa. Some 20 pre-grade R children and six adult learners enrolled for classes.

Prior negotiations with the different Khoekhoe Houses in Heidedal led to the Department of Anthropology undertaking to raise seed money in order to initiate and establish the project over a period of two years. Financial support was obtained from the South African National Lottery Board and PanSALB. The agreements between the community and these two organisations stipulated that funds be employed within certain budgetary specifications. The Khoekhoe community also had to shoulder the responsibility of running and managing the project. For this purpose, a school governing body (SGB) was constituted by, on the one hand, representatives from the parents, the different Khoekhoe Houses and the teacher in an executive capacity. On the other hand, representatives from the Department of Anthropology, the Free State Department of Education, the Department of Social Development and PanSALB would act on the SGB in an advisory capacity. According to its constitution, the SGB had to meet at least once a term.

The main responsibilities of the SGB were identified as 'the promotion of the highest possible quality of education' to the learners of the school and 'raising funds for purposes of effective governance' of the school. Considering the poverty and the high rate of unemployment in the Heidedal community, it was decided not to levy school fees. Thus, funding posed a major challenge to the SGB. In order to confront this challenge (and to create greater awareness and visibility of the Khoekhoe culture at the same time), it was decided to hold fairs with mainly traditional dishes and craftwork at the KSELC, to establish a craft centre where the unemployed could be trained, and to register the KSELC at the Department of Social Development in order to receive a government subsidy. The Department of Social Development responded to the application by stipulating certain health requirements (to which the KSELC conformed) and the adherence to an approved curriculum as conditions for the subsidy. But, although the Free

State Department of Education has a standardised Pre-grade R Curriculum, education laws determine that such programmes take place in the *mother tongue* of the learners. Consequently, the fact that Khoekhoegowab is not the learners' mother tongue disqualified the KSELC from receiving a state subsidy. To make matters worse, the undertaking of the Department of Education to appoint a teacher did not materialise. This meant that the project also had to accept the responsibility of paying the teacher's salary.

So, the SGB was faced with the increased burden of finding funds. The SGB was fully informed about the financial challenges of the project and took various decisions regarding fundraising initiatives, but did not take steps to carry them out. Although it would seem as if the SGB did not want to accept ownership, one has to point out, in all fairness, that most of the community members serving on the SGB had full-time occupations and scant experience in the management of such an institution.

Soon it also became clear that the different Houses represented on the SGB distrusted one another and were afraid that one of them could profit from the project at the cost of the others. The result was that they opposed one another as much as possible, accusing the other Houses of bad faith. The representative of the Department of Anthropology was caught up in the disputes. He was accused of being partial and of lacking the necessary sensitivity for the developmental projects. For the sake of the continuation of the greater project he was replaced.

The learners' future was compromised in various ways by the discord among the opposing Houses. First, they were caught in the midst of a political game. The Houses acted on the assumption that the House that could 'provide' the most children should have the most say in the management. As a result, the different Houses tried to fill the limited number of spaces with their 'own' children. This inevitably resulted in some Houses' children being turned away. When this came to light, an alternative suggestion was made - this involved that the number of entries be divided equally between the Houses. But this also did not solve the problem because it was argued by some that the number of members, or the support base, of the Houses differed and that the entries had to be proportional to these numbers. However, there were no audited numbers indicating membership and this suggestion could not be accepted. When this suggestion

fell through, one of the Houses ended their involvement with the project and tried to set up a rival project, which failed.

Then there were attempts at personal financial gain from the children. The project budgeted for food and transport, and the members of the governing body tried to get their family members' tenders for the delivery of these services accepted. Apart from attempts to milk the project as much as possible through outrageous tender amounts, the prospective suppliers did not always comply with legal requirements (transport being a case in point). It also transpired that, when some of the Heidedal community members became aware of the nutrition scheme, they enrolled their children at the KSELC for this reason only. It was immaterial to them that it was about learning a language and a culture, what it meant to them was that their children would receive food (which, in many homes, was not the case) and that they would be kept constructively busy in a safe environment. To have sent these children away, would have consciously added to their misery. Their presence at the KSELC meant, however, that there was an indigenous and a non-indigenous component.

Next, it must be considered that, for the greater part, the children and parents alike had been immersed in the Western world. They were exposed in only a very limited, selective and fractured way to aspects of the Khoekhoe culture. Children and parents alike did not have an integrated, holistic, coherent, unitary image of the Khoekhoe culture. It is doubtful that the KSELC could ever have equipped the children sufficiently to bargain, negotiate or imagine a place for them inside the Khoekhoe culture. The role, place and meaning that the curriculum assigned to the culture reduced it to an 'add-on' element. It was little more than a simple curiosity: a couple of toddlers who could recite a few verses from the Lord's Prayer, who could count up to ten, who could execute a few steps of the traditional reel. But, in order to claim indigeneness, the approach depended largely on emphasising and perpetuating primordial cultural elements; while historical change and the acculturation of the Khoekhoe over the last centuries were ignored.

5. DISCUSSION

In terms of purely pedagogical results the first two years of the KSELC cannot be consid-

ered a success. However, in the broader picture of indigenous matters, the KSELC delivered specific (accidental) outcomes that promoted indigenous activity and awareness in Heidedal. The following points are pertinent to the development of the institution:

- ♦ The KSELC gave the Khoekhoe people the opportunity to exercise the right enshrined in the Bill of Rights of the *Constitution of the Republic of South Africa*, 1996 (Act 108 of 1996) to determine their own means of economic, linguistic and cultural development, as well as the right to determine their identity.
- ♦ Through its development it was confirmed that: 'Every people has the right and the duty to develop its culture' (The UNESCO *Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Co-operation*, 1970. Article 1(2)).
- ♦ Its mission was in line with the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 61/295¹⁴, which states that 'indigenous peoples have the right to an education in their own languages and cultures using indigenous training methods' (Article 15 of the Declaration).

The fact that Khoekhoe languages have become virtually extinct in Heidedal, to give way to Afrikaans as the first language for most residents, is of paramount significance. It means that the traditional role assigned to language – whether considering indigenous education¹⁵ or ethnic revival¹⁶ – is absent in the case of the Khoekhoe of Heidedal. Nevertheless, this fact does not mean that language as identity marker is unimportant in the current Khoekhoe revival movements. In fact, language revival was the driving force behind the establishment of the KSELC.

What has been said about the Khoekhoe languages is also true about their culture and explains the deficient base of the KSELC curriculum. While a dominant ontological point of view in social sciences is founded on the assumption that the modern individual is no longer defined by, or functions in terms of, essentialist cultural elements but by rational assumptions, this is not true for the Khoekhoe. The research done prior to the development of the KSELC has shown beyond any doubt that there is a general public perception about who and what the Khoekhoe

are. This perception is shared by the broader Khoekhoe community and informs, to a very large extent, their claims to the status of being indigenous. While it is not possible for a primordial culture to revive completely, the elements that the inheritors themselves regard as important, will survive and will be exploited and developed.

Mention has been made of clashes in personal interest between the Houses and the negative impact this had on the functioning of the KSELC. If one takes into consideration that the Khoekhoe's political structures and cultural institutions have been destroyed over time, the competition among these Houses for political recognition from the government becomes understandable; it is part and parcel of political revival and the search for new structures. As clarity is gained regarding the legitimacy of claims, it will probably result in greater collaboration between the Houses. Discord should not be a lasting hurdle to achieving their ideals.

In conclusion, the researcher wish to point out a major obstacle to indigenous learning in South Africa to which the KSELC experience bore clear witness: there is a discrepancy between sanctioning the promotion of indigenous languages through the South African Constitution and the activities of PanSALB on the one hand, and the provisions of the Education Department laws that exclude state subsidies for the learning of indigenous languages by non-native speakers on the other hand. The discrepancy between what we profess and what our laws allow us to do may well put paid to indigenous learning projects.

NOTES

1. The Constitution refers to the 'Khoi, Nama and San languages'. The Khoekhoe languages include Nama or Khoekhoegowab, !Ora and Xiri or Gri.
2. Stavenhagen (2005: 7) acknowledges the Khoekhoe and San as indigenous to South Africa. As a consequence of the diversity of indigenous peoples, no one definition can fully comprehend the term. Thus, the UN has refrained from a definitional classification of such peoples, preferring an understanding of them based on: historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed in the territories of indigenous peoples; fairly definable ancestral territories that have been occupied and used before present-day state borders were drawn in the area; groups that currently form non-dominant sectors of society; indigenous communities, peoples and na-

- tions who consider themselves to be distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories (or parts of them) and who are also determined to maintain their distinct ethnic identity; cultures marked by an intrinsic spiritual connection to a specific territory and its natural resources; and finally, the fundamental element, self-identification as being indigenous (cf. Charters et al. 2009: 54-56 and Ninkova 2009: 19-21).
3. For example, during the forming of the National KhoiSan [*sic*] Consultative Conference of South Africa (NKCCSA or 'NKOK') in March/April 2001 in Oudtshoorn, there were 34 different affiliated organisations or 'Houses' from across the country.
 4. Cf. P.A. Erasmus, Old perceptions and new identities in Heidedal. 'I am the names you call me and the names that are no longer known', in *African Identities*, iFirst, 2012, 1-16.
 5. The collective term Khoekhoe is regarded in Khoekhogowab as a more accurate linguistic rendering than 'Khoikhoi' (cf. Trail 2002: 45) and suggests 'men of men' or 'people'. The term includes the Nama, the Griqua, the Korana, as well as various so-called revivalist Khoekhoe associations, such as the Inqua, the Chonaqua, the Attaqua, the Chainoqua, etc.
 6. The exact relationship between hunter-gatherers and herders remains arguable (cf. Maggs et al. 1991: 5-7, Ninkova 2009: 17-19 and Berzborn 2003: 330-334 for more detail). The debate is not pertinent to this particular study and is not entered into here.
 7. Although assimilation of the Khoekhoe into the coloured communities had started long before apartheid was instituted (Schapera 1965: 49-50), it was through applying apartheid's 'logic of difference' (Thornton 1996: 144) that the Khoekhoe were officially labelled 'coloured'. The concept of being 'coloured' seems to have emerged among freed slaves and their descendants between 1875 and 1910, that is, even before the Union of South Africa was formed (Erasmus and Pieterse 1999: 169). Jung (2000: 168-169) is of the opinion that the process started even earlier as he maintains that social and political identities created during the period of slavery were in fact responsible for the development of 'coloured' identities. Thus, the term was used long before the era of apartheid, but its meaning, according to Lewis (1987: 7-10), was more fluid during the nineteenth century.
 8. Social scientists reflect differently on the distinctive ways in which collective Khoekhoe and San identities are being transformed and given meaning in the post-apartheid era. Sharp (2006) for example, questions the motives underlying recent Khoekhoe revivalist actions. He rejects the notion of a distinct, authentic culture and, thus, also the concept of the retention of pre-apartheid or colonial cultural patterns and institutions of self-identification. (For more information cf. Sharp 1997, Sharp et al. 1994, Robins 1997 and Van der Waal et al. 2006.)
 - vernes (2008: 267-268) holds a different view. She opines that the Khoekhoe were written out of history in approximately the mid-1800s, disappeared from the social map and basically ceased to exist with a 'traditional culture'. But, she maintains, Khoekhoe self-ascription and self-naming did not stop (2008: 267). She emphasises that Khoekhoe authenticity should not be defined too strictly in terms of distinctive traits and customs (2008: 268), because they have subsequently developed various new ways of living as Khoekhoe (2008: 261).
 - The viewpoint that is adopted in this study concurs with that of Øvernes, and accepts that individuals possessing a common language, ethnic identity, oral history, and memory culture lived in the Northern Cape and the Free State, and that these people called themselves 'Korana' and 'Griqua' during the nineteenth and early twentieth century.
 9. Since its establishment in 1846, the inhabitants of Bloemfontein have been racially segregated (Erasmus 1983: 194).
 10. Waaihoek was considered too close to the white residential area (Schoeman 1980: 284). Another reason for the decision to demolish Waaihoek was the fact that it was situated on a valuable sandstone deposit that the City Council wished to lease as a quarry (Groenewald 1989: 20).
 11. In order to form a clearer picture of the changes, Van der Merwe (1972: 169) established that 98,04% of residents spoke only Afrikaans as their home language in 1972. Ten years later, De Vos (1982: 23) reported that at least 72% of the residents used only Afrikaans as their home language, while 17% spoke Afrikaans and an African language at home. At this stage, about 30% (the greatest single number) of the coloured people in the Free State lived in Heidedal while the rest of the coloured population resided in 53 villages across the rest of the province (*Volksblad* 1981-12-28).
 12. There are, for example, the Taaibosch-Davids Koranna House, the Free State Koranna Community Committee, the Children of !Kora and the Kraalshoek Griqua House.
 13. The KSELIC is housed in one of the school hostels of Dr Blok Secondary School in Heidedal.
 14. It was accepted by the Human Rights Council of the United Nations on 13 September 2007.
 15. In the preamble to the *World Declaration on Education for all*, it is recognised that 'traditional knowledge and indigenous cultural heritage have a value and validity in their own right and a capacity to both define and promote development'.
 16. The interweaving of language, culture and identity is probably at the root of most philosophical argumentation when it comes to the protection of group rights: it legitimises political claims for nationhood, is the point of departure of many revival strategies, and is regarded as an important element in constructing identity (Berzborn 2003: 327, Woolard et al. 1994: 60-61 and Urciuoli 1995: 527).

REFERENCES

- Berzborn S 2003. 'Ek is Nama, want ek praat die taal'. ['I am Nama because I speak the language.'] The Richtersveld and the National Language Policy in South Africa. In: T Hohmann (Ed.): *San and the*

- State. Contesting Land, Development, Identity and Representation.* Köln: Rüdiger Köppe, pp. 325–364.
- Boonzaier E, Malherbe C, Berens P, Smith A 1996. *The Cape Herders. A History of the Khoikhoi of Southern Africa.* Cape Town: David Philip.
- Buys JJ 1989. *Die Oorsprong en migrasiebewegings van die Korana en hul rol in die Transgariëp tot 1870.* [The Origin and Migration Movements of the Korana and Their Role in the Transgariëp up to 1870]. Master's Dissertation. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Carstens WP 1966. *The Social Structure of a Cape Coloured Reserve.* Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Charters C, Stavenhagen R 2009. *Making the Declaration Work: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.* Copenhagen: IWGIA.
- Chidester D 1996. *Savage Systems: Colonialism and Comparative Religion in Southern Africa.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Coertze PJ 1983. *Die Afrikanervolk en die Kleurlinge.* [The Afrikaner nation and the Coloureds] Pretoria: HAUM.
- Coertze PJ, Coertze RD 1996. *Verklarende vakwoordeboek vir Antropologie en Argeologie.* [Explanatory subject dictionary of Anthropology and Archaeology]. Pretoria: Coertze and Coertze.
- Darnell R 1994. Comments on Wolf ER 1994. Perilous ideas: race, culture, people. *Current Anthropology*, 35(1): 7-8.
- De Vos TJ 1982. *Maatskaplike ontwikkeling van die stedelike Kleurlingbevolking van Bloemfontein.* [Social development of the urban Coloured population of Bloemfontein.] Institute for Social and Economic Research. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Elphick RN 1973. *The Cape Khoi and the First Phase of South African Race Relations.* Michigan: Ann Arbor.
- Engelbrecht JA 1936. *The Korana. An Account of Their Customs and Their History with Texts.* Cape Town: Maskew Miller.
- Erasmus PA 1983. *Die invloed van die mate van etniese bewustheid op die volkswikkeling van die stedelike Suid-Sotho.* [The influence of the degree of ethnic consciousness on the ethnic development of the urban South Sotho]. Institute for Social and Economic Research. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Erasmus PA 2007. Koranna struggle against the colonial church: The case of Brandewynfontein. *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 30(1and 2): 29-35.
- Erasmus PA 2012. Old perceptions and new identities in Heidedal: 'I am the names you call me and the names that are no longer known'. *African Identities*, iFirst, 1-16.
- Erasmus PA, Besten M, Sauls G 2008. *The Pniel Estate: Its People and History.* Kimberley: The Sol Plaatje Educational Trust.
- Erasmus Z, Pieterse E 1999. Conceptualising coloured identities in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. In: M Palmberg (Ed.): *National Identity and Democracy in Africa.* Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council of South Africa, the Mayibuye Centre at the University of the Western Cape and the Nordic Africa Institute, pp. 162-187.
- Groenewald AC 1989. *Die Sosiale lewensomstandigheide in Bloemfontein, 1896-1899.* [Social living conditions in Bloemfontein, 1896-1899.] Master's Dissertation. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Hoernlé W 1985. *The Social Organization of the Nama and Other Essays.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Jung CE 2000. *Then I Was Black: South African Political Identities in Transition.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kies CW 1972. *Die Kleurlinge van Noord-Kaapland, noord van die Oranjerivier.* [The Coloured people from the Northern Cape, north of the Orange River.] D.Phil. Thesis. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Kuper A 1994. Culture, identity and the project of a cosmopolitan anthropology. *Man, The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 29(3): 537-554.
- Legassick MC 1969. *The Griqua, the Sotho-Tswana, and the missionaries, 1780-1840: The Politics of a Frontier Zone.* Ph D Thesis. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Lewis G 1987. *Between the Wire and the Wall.* Cape Town: David Philip.
- Lye WF 1970. *The Sotho Wars in the Interior of South Africa, 1822 - 1837.* Ph D Thesis. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Lye WF, Murray C 1980. *Transformations on the Highveld: The Tswana and the Southern Sotho.* Cape Town: David Philip.
- Maingard LF 1932. Studies in Korana history, customs and language. *Bantu Studies*, 6(2): 103-162.
- Malherbe C 1984. *Men of Men.* Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- Maggs T, Whitelaw G 1991. A review of recent archaeological research on food-producing communities in Southern Africa. *The Journal for African History*, 32(1): 3-24.
- Marais JS 1968. *The Cape Coloured People 1652-1937.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Marks S 1972. Khoisan resistance to the Dutch in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. *Journal of African History*, 13(1): 55-80.
- Ninkova V 2009. *Under the Big Tree: Challenges and Accomplishments of Gqaina, a Primary School for Ju/'hoan Children in Omaheke, Namibia.* Master's Dissertation, University of Tromsø, Norway.
- Overnes S 2008. *'Surviving the Cold': Khoe-San Identity Management among Street-People in Cape Town.* A dissertation for the degree of Philosophia Doctor, University of Tromsø: Tromsø.
- Penn N 1995. The Orange River Frontier Zone, c. 1700-1805. In: AB Smith (Ed.): *Einiqualand: Studies of the Orange River Frontier.* Cape Town: UCT Press, pp. 21-109.
- Pretorius R De V 1963. *Die geskiedenis van die 'Vrystaats' Griekwa 1825-1862.* [The history of the

- 'Free State' Griqua 1825-1862.] Master's Dissertation. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Robins S 1997. Transgressing the borderlands of tradition and modernity; identity, cultural hybridity and land struggles in Namaqualand (1980-1994). *Journal of Contemporary South African Studies*, 15(1): 23-44.
- Ross R 1974. Griqua government. *African Studies*, 33(1): 25-42.
- Ross R 1975. The !Kora Wars on the Orange River, 1830-1880. *The Journal of African History*, 16(4): 561-576).
- Schapera I 1965. *The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Schoeman K 1980. *Bloemfontein: die ontstaan van I stad 1846-1946*. [Bloemfontein: the founding of a city 1846-1946.] Kaapstad: Human and Rousseau.
- Schoeman K 1985. *Die Huis van die armes: Die Berlynse Sendinggenootskap in die O.V.S., 1834-1869: 'n bloemlesing/geredigeer en vertaal deur Karel Schoeman*. [The House of the poor: The Berlin Missionary Society in the O.F.S., 1834-1869: an anthology edited and translated by Karel Schoeman.] Cape Town: Human and Rousseau.
- Schoeman K 2002. *The Griqua Captaincy of Philippolis, 1826-1861*. Pretoria: Protea Book House.
- Sharp JS 1997. Beyond exposé analysis: Hybridity, social memory and identity politics. *Journal of Contemporary South African Studies*, 15(1): 7-21.
- Sharp JS 2006. The end of culture? Some directions for anthropology at the University of Pretoria. *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 29 (1and 2): 17-23.
- Sharp JS, Boonzaier E 1994. Ethnic identity as performance: Lessons from Namaqualand. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 20(3): 405-415.
- Stavenhagen R 2005. *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People. Addendum: Mission to South Africa (E/CN.4/2006/78/Add.2)*. New York: United Nations, Economic and Social Council.
- Strauss T 1979. *War Along the Orange. The Korana and the Northern Border Wars of 1868-9 and 1878-9*. Cape Town: Centre for African Studies.
- Thornton R 1996. The potentials of boundaries in South Africa: Steps towards a theory of the social edge. In: R Webner, T Ranger (Eds.): *Postcolonial Identities in Africa*. London: Zed Books Ltd., pp. 136-162.
- Tobais PV 1955. Taaibosch Koranas of Ottosdal. *South African Journal of Science*, 51: 263-269.
- Trail A 2002. The Khoesan languages. In: R Mesthrie (Ed.): *Language in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 27-49.
- Urciuoli B 1995. Language and borders. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 24: 525-546.
- Van der Merwe RB 1972. *Die Kleurlingpotensiaal van Bloemfontein en sy omland*. [The Coloured Potential of Bloemfontein and Environment.] Institute for Social and Economic Research. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Van der Merwe W 1984. Bethanie in die Oranje-Vrystaat: 'n terugblik na 150 jaar. [Bethany in the Orange Free State: looking back after 150 years.] *Lantern*, July: 50-58.
- Van der Waal CS, Ward V 2006. Shifting paradigms in the new South Africa: Anthropology after the merger of two disciplinary associations. *Anthropology Today*, 22(1): 17-20.
- Waldman L 2007. Exploring the intersection of racial labels, rainbow citizens and citizens' rights in post-apartheid South Africa. In: J Moncrieffe, R Eyben (Eds.): *The Power of Labelling: How People are Categorized and Why it Matters*. London: Sterling, pp. 160-176.
- Woolard KA, Schieffelin BB 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 23: 55-82.