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Abstract

The study through the topic: An investigation of Zimbabwe’s contemporary heritage practices of memorializing war: A case study of the Heroes’ Acres in Matabeleland South Province focuses on post liberation war memorialisation and management in the post-colonial state of Zimbabwe. It analyses the emergence and management of war memorials and shrines in the form of heroes’ acres, in the province of Matabeleland South in Zimbabwe from 1988 to 2010. Zimbabwe attained independence in 1980 after a long protracted war waged by two guerrilla movements against the unilaterally declared independent state of Rhodesia led by Ian Smith. Post-1980, ZANU (PF) became the dominant political party in the new state now renamed Zimbabwe. A national memorialisation structure was established soon after independence; charged with ensuring a befitting memorialisation of the war of liberation. Post-independence political contradictions between the parties notwithstanding, the results of the 1980 election showed an ethnicized landscape, a trajectory that has been at the centre of the national political discourse. Political disturbances in the Matabeleland and Midlands provinces became one of the most important and interesting historical issues that unsettled the nation in respect of memorialisation. Against this background, this research proposes to assess how political actors contributed to the issue of memorializing a war in post-1980 Zimbabwe. Using the central question which arose from a critique of Zimbabwe’s memorialisation structure as a graded one, in which the local site subordinates the national, the research aims to examine whether the shifts in the political and management spheres of the heroes acres as represented by the inclusive government currently governing the country and the transferring of management duties of heroes acres to the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, has managed to challenge the claim made above. By embarking on this work, the research aims to examine whether the local memorial sites actually act as mere subordinates in a deliberate graded structure to the national shrine represented by the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, within the politics of memorialisation.
CHAPTER 1

PRODUCING HISTORIES IN WAR MEMORIALS

Introduction

This work is an attempt to examine post liberation war memorialisation and management in the post-colonial state of Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe attained its independence after a bitter struggle and war of liberation between the then Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) state of Rhodesia led by Ian Smith and the liberation forces which fought under the banners of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) led by Robert Mugabe, in its later stages of the war, and the Zimbabwe African People’s Union (ZAPU) which was led by Joshua Nkomo.\(^1\) The Unilateral Declaration of Independence by the Rhodesian state was done in 1965 and the pro liberation forces of ZANU and ZAPU responded to this action by embarking on a full scale war in 1966.\(^2\) This war came to an end in 1979 after an agreement was reached between the warring parties at Lancaster House in the United Kingdom.\(^3\) These agreements set the platform for both majority rule and one person one vote elections. After the elections in 1980, the former liberation movement of ZANU which had added a Patriotic Front (PF) code on to its name, attained the largest share of the votes with its former allies ZAPU (which had also added the same PF code) becoming the second largest party in the country.\(^4\) Even though the two parties formed a short-lived unity government immediately after attaining independence, ZANU (PF) was the majority party in that government, and this meant that it had the powers to dictate all government operations including that pertaining to its decision to memorialise the war that had brought independence.\(^5\) It is the manner in which

---

2 D Martin and P Johnson, The Chitepo assassination (Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1985), p 5 However Dumiso Dabengwa ‘ZIPRA in the Zimbabwe War of Liberation’ in N Bhebe and T Ranger (eds) Soldiers in Zimbabwe’s liberation war (Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications, 1995), p 27 argues that ‘contrary to these claims that ZANU started the armed struggle in 1966 in Chinhoyi, the fact is that ZAPU’s armed struggle started in 1965 when small units were sent into the country’.
this war has been memorialised that has been a subject of both criticism and discussions. The main way of such memorialisation in independent Zimbabwe is the National Heroes’ Acre that was built in Harare in 1981.

Norma Kriger\textsuperscript{6} and Richard Werbner\textsuperscript{7} in their respective works pertaining to this Heroes’ Acre dealt with in a quite comprehensive manner, the politics surrounding the issue of national heroism and memorialisation in post colonial Zimbabwe. Their respective works resulted in a critique of the establishment of the Heroes’ Acre itself especially its exclusionary tendencies in the recognition of hero ship status. In his critique, Werbner for instance emphasised strongly that Zimbabwe’s memorialising structure was one which is an ‘unmistakeable representation of a nation of – in Zimbabwean usage – the chefs over the povo or masses, a nation of graded levels, subordinating the local to the national, the hinterland to the capital.’\textsuperscript{8} Even though this critique sounds very substantial the question that arises is, does this claim arising from a research done prior to 1998, still have substance given the political changes that have taken place and the ways liberation war shrines are managed?

It should be known that after Werbner’s analysis, two significant changes have occurred. The first is that in 1998, full management of all war shrines was transferred from the ministry of Defence to the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe (NMMZ), a parastatal constituted by an Act of Parliament and falling under the Ministry of Home Affairs. By virtue of it being constituted by an Act of Parliament, NMMZ is supposedly directly answerable to the larger community than political parties, and this community is all the people of Zimbabwe. The same act empowers the NMMZ to fully research and preserve the country’s heritage. Furthermore, there have also been some significant changes on the political scene in Zimbabwe after the year 2000. This period saw the emergence of a new political party, the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) which challenged the grip on power of the ruling ZANU (PF) party, a party which both Werbner and Kriger argue was central to the exclusion


\textsuperscript{8} R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 87.
and inclusion processes of the war shrines and memorialisation. The persistent challenge eventually resulted in the formation of a multi party inclusive government in the year 2009.\(^9\)

Previously, direct conferment of hero ship and direct usage (as in burials) of the heroes’ acre was the prerogative of the former ruling party ZANU (PF)’s Politburo. Prior to the rise of the MDC in 1999, the war veterans is another group whose role in Zimbabwean memorialisation politics starting from its formation in 1990, that is worthy examining in this discussion and work on Zimbabwe’s memorialisation program.

However, when given the above arguments and analysis, which calls for a re-examination of Werbner and Kriger’s postulations, the questions that this mini-thesis will have to tackle is: has the NMMZ as a cultural institution managed to transcend the graded memorialisation structure given the political and management shifts as noted above? And did these graded memorialisation orders ever exist? And lastly, what is the role of these political groupings in this whole discussion of Zimbabwe’s memory project. As a way of trying to answer these questions, this work will seriously interrogate Werbner’s claim of the local site as subordinate to the national shrine, by analysing the idea that brought about the local sites of memory as well as examining the nature of historical public knowledge that they produce.

To fully understand and investigate what the local site envisages in relation to the politics which Werbner and Kriger pointed out, this work concerned itself with investigating how the heroes’ acres in Zimbabwe’s Matabeleland South Province fits into the whole discursive topic of war memory in Zimbabwe. The Matabeleland South Heroes Acre was chosen for this enquiry for several reasons, with the main one being that this is the region where PF ZAPU, whose fighters Werbner alleges were marginalised from the memorialisation trail by ZANU (PF), operated from. It is also in this region that since the post war period, opposition to the ruling ZANU (PF) has always emerged. In the 1980 elections, PF ZAPU led by Joshua Nkomo won 84 per-cent of the total votes casted in Matabeleland South Province\(^10\) with the

\(^9\) At the time of writing this work (2011) ZANU (PF) has been involved in a two year inclusive government with two other parties namely the Movement for Democratic Change (Tsvangirai) and the Movement for Democratic Change led by Professor Arthur Mutambara.

MDC led by Morgan Tsvangirai also winning five out of the seven constituencies in the 2000 elections.\textsuperscript{11}

Furthermore, it was also in this region where the Zimbabwe National Army’s Fifth Brigade is alleged to have embarked on a project from 1982 up to 1987\textsuperscript{12} of eliminating what were perceived as enemies of the government.\textsuperscript{13} The area today is one where the MDC, a political party that was formed in 1999 enjoys a great deal of support. More so, this research in Matabeleland South Province also opened up an opportunity to investigate the issue of the Great Zimbabwe symbolism at the local memorial shrines. According to Werbner, it is the ruins and other archaeological artefacts such as the soapstone birds found at Great Zimbabwe that were used as symbols of the new nation at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare.\textsuperscript{14} On the other hand, in the Matabeleland South region of Zimbabwe, it is the Njelele shrine in the Matopo hills that is regarded as having a greater symbolic value than Great Zimbabwe\textsuperscript{15} and what this work will do is examine how these symbols are represented in the heroes’ acres in southern Matabeleland and the implications and meanings that can be derived from such practices. Since this topic under discussion largely devolves around the issue of post colonial memorialisation, it is also important as part of introduction to undertake a general historical analysis of war memorials, as a way of creating an understanding the place of Zimbabwe’s own project in the global perspective and within its own history.

A history of war memorials

It can be argued that the concept of memorialising a country’s war history through the erection of monuments is not only synonymous with a country’s transition from a colonial

\textsuperscript{11} See Zimbabwe Elections Results-2000, \textit{The Zimbabwe Situation} \url{http://www.zimbabwesituation.com/results.htm} accessed on the 12th of October 2011.


\textsuperscript{13} Most historical productions produced by writers aligned to the ZANU (PF) government such as E. D Mnangagwa, ‘Post-independence Zimbabwe: 1980-1987’ tries to portray a distinction of ZANU (PF) as a political party and ZANU (PF) as government. For Mnangagwa, the alleged dissidents were enemies of the government which unfortunately was led by ZANU (PF), PF ZAPU, a political party alleged to have produced dissidents’ erstwhile rivals.

\textsuperscript{14} R. Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 87.

An analysis of the genesis of war memorials on a global perspective reveals that monuments to commemorate different types of wars have been erected in different countries in the world. Prominent among the list of countries which have erected monuments to commemorate these different types of wars alongside the individuals who participated or perished in them includes countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Australia. And of these countries, the United Kingdom is credited with having initiated the idea of an ‘empty tomb’ to remember the absent dead after the First World War. In the Caribbean although it was not dedicated to war remembrance, Jamaica also has what is known as the ‘national hero statue’ which was ‘erected after its independence’. In South Africa, both the apartheid era and its post apartheid era successors also built war memorials for the purposes of remembering war whilst Namibia followed Zimbabwe’s lead by constructing their own Heroes Acre.

However, perhaps the question that arises from all this is why the war, with all its association with grave violence, deserves such eternal inscription into the memories of people through the erection of permanent physical reminders such as war monuments and statues? And can the monument itself be regarded as part of the healing processes? After analysing the manner in which war has been memorialised globally, I have to concur with Savage’s postulation that:

Public monuments are the most conservative of communicative forms precisely because they are meant to last, unchanged forever. While other things come and go, are lost and forgotten, the monument is supposed to remain a fixed point, stabilising both the physical and the cognitive landscape.

---

16 R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p72.
18 For example M Burns, ‘A Completion of Memory? Commemorating a decade of freedom in South Africa: 1994-2004, Eras Edition 8 November 2006, Http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/eras accessed on the 10th of September 201, states that an example of war a memorial in South Africa’s apartheid era history is the Voortrekker Monument initially constructed to commemorate ‘the Great Trek and the Trekkers 1838 defeat of thousands of Zulus’ whereas in the post apartheid era, the ‘Freedom Park’ whose ‘first phase was unveiled in 2004’ commemorates ‘anti-apartheid freedom fighters’.
19 See N Shiweda, Mandume Ya Ndemufayo’s Memorials, pp 57-58.
Such a view of memorials has also been supported by Burns\textsuperscript{21} who reminds us that even though memorials are associated with violence, not always will they remain permanently fixed as places of mourning. Over time they can acquire more layers of meanings as their aesthetic or political value transforms them into symbols of national pride that became a part of the landscape.

For Burns, such a view was arrived at after noticing that:

Following what was then the bloodiest war in history (the Second World War) bereavement and remembrance did become part of the European landscape\textsuperscript{22}

Napandulwe Shiweda’s work touches on issues of memorialisation in both Namibia and Angola. She postulated that such memorialisation of a popular figure like ‘Mandume [Ya Ndemufayo] obviously promotes the recovery of nations that underwent violent conflicts’.\textsuperscript{23}

The United States of America had also gone through an internal bloody conflict known as the Civil War, whose end in 1865 also heralded the emergence of mass public monuments. According to Savage:

Before the civil war, one could stroll through most streets or squares without even encountering a bronze statue of a departed hero or even a stone shaft marking a historical event.\textsuperscript{24}

The situation gradually changed after the war resulting in ‘the number and variety of monuments erected throughout the country’ multiplying ‘exponentially’ with some of these ‘increasingly’ commemorating ‘the common man and, sometimes women’.\textsuperscript{25}

However, in the United States of America the question of what was being represented seems to have been a major problem. Its monumentalisation project faced new questions on the

\textsuperscript{21} M Burns, ‘A Completion of Memory?’
\textsuperscript{22} M Burns, ‘A Completion of Memory?’
\textsuperscript{23} N Shiweda, ‘Mandume Ya Ndemufayo’s memorials’, p iv.
\textsuperscript{24} K Savage, Standing Soldiers and kneeling Slaves, p 4.
\textsuperscript{25} K Savage, Standing Soldiers and kneeling Slaves, pp 4-5.
whole meaning of who should belong to the nation.26 Furthermore, apart from this aspect of belonging, the issue of who should be considered as a hero also emerged as memorials to those who had fought for the continuation of slavery like General Lee were also erected and accorded hero status by their own supporters. However, from an analytical point of view, such gestures meant that the American system signified a complete deviation from the norm of the ‘the earlier century’ whereby ‘public monuments had been part of rulership’.27 In other words, the end of the Civil War meant that memorialising was now seen as a ‘revelation[s] of popular will’.28

The Australian case was a bit different from the American one given above, in the sense that Australia itself as a country had joined the monumentalisation trail much later than the United States of America. The stimulating factor was the Great War of the nations which came to be known in historical narratives as the First World War fought mainly in European lands. The Australians were commemorating a war which was not fought on its soil and which also was not primarily theirs. However, whilst the American style brought in questions about the meaning of nationality, the Australian one actually fostered a new sense of what it meant to be Australian. According to Inglis, the shrine of remembrance in Melbourne ‘dedicated on the 11th of November 1934 by the King’s son, Duke of Gloucester’ 29 is one which fits very well in this category. Inglis further states that ‘on the 25th of April, children were delivered to the shrine for a special service’ where:

They were addressed by teachers and returned soldiers (and some men who were both) on the meanings of Anzac. Birth and/or baptism of the nation; sacrifice; rallying to the empire; holding on against impossible odds; fighting to defend the right, and being prepared to do it again.30

Thus the Australian case can be interpreted as one which created a platform whereby notions of heroism and allegiance were forwarded and where fighting in war on behalf of the British Empire was depicted as the making of the individual citizen and the nation of Australia.

Whilst Australia used the monumentalisation platform to show both allegiance and creating notions of Australianess, the state that was once called Rhodesia provided a similar as well as a different scenario altogether. It was similar in the sense that both states were creations of British colonialism and that they all used the opportunity of fighting wars to start their monumentalisation processes. It was different in the sense that whilst Australia started monumentalising as a country with a name, in Rhodesia monumentalisation immediately became an established entity used as a sign to mark the triumph of colonialism well before the colonised territories became an organised nation state.\(^{31}\) In actual fact, it was the occasion of the defeat of the local inhabitants that monuments memorialising such events were erected. Monuments that were erected to the memory of the fallen participants of the Second World War in the then Southern Rhodesia only provided a second string tier of heroes to an already established process.\(^{32}\)

In the then Southern Rhodesia, it can be argued that the process of erecting monuments for the purposes of war remembering started with the events surrounding the issue of the burying the founder of the newly acquired territory, Cecil John Rhodes, in the Matopos\(^{33}\) and this was followed by the accomplishment of his wish to have colonial war hero Allan Wilson\(^{34}\) and his party to be buried alongside him within the symbolic landscape of the Matopos. This site qualifies to be a war memorial in the sense that the British South African Company (BSAC) led by Rhodes’ had acquired ruler-ship of the country through a war that gave passage to its Director to be buried in the Matopos. Furthermore, other colonising heroes like Jameson and

\(^{31}\) In the former Rhodesia, the discursive issue of its nationhood is problematic in the sense that the territories were first owned by the British South African Company which only relinquished ownership in 1923.


\(^{33}\) For details about Rhodes’ burial in the Matopos see T Ranger, *Voices from the Rocks: Nature Culture and History*, p 27.

\(^{34}\) Colonial historical productions constructed Allan Wilson’s heroism and continued to construct it well after his death and burial. See for example, ‘story of Gwelo: From Laager to an Industrial centre’, *The Chronicle* supplement-50th anniversary of Gwelo, Thursday, 16 July 1964.
the Allan Wilson’s expedition party were also buried there. And as a way of commemorating the locals’ defeat and eventual allegiance, ‘the Ndebele Indunas were pledged to guard Rhodes’ grave, and remember their ‘surrender’ to Rhodes in 1896’.  

The case of Allan Wilson and his party is also more interesting in the sense that it was through Rhodes’ wish that Allan Wilson and his party came to be buried in the Matopos. This gesture lifted Allan Wilson and his party from an ordinary level of other soldiers who perished in similar wars elsewhere into hero status within the symbolic shrine of the Matopos. Previously the bones of Allan Wilson’s patrol had been buried in a ‘monumentalised grave at Great Zimbabwe in the late 1890s’. From this, it can be deduced and argued that like the Matopos, Great Zimbabwe was also revered during the colonial establishment as both a symbolic and a premier heritage site, and therefore, these plans by the white authorities to bury their dead in local public sites all but confirms the argument that they wanted to establish a new heroes order.

Furthermore, the conquest did not only give Rhodes the power to decide where he and the Wilson patrol members were to be buried, it also gave him power to tamper with existing monuments such as Mzilikazi’s grave. According to MacDonald, Rhodes tampered with this grave with the ‘objective to have M’Zilibazi’s brain capacity examined, as he thought, owing to the greatness and character of his work, that it would be large’. Further than that, it can be argued that Mzilikazi’s grave was tampered with to meet the new authorities’ new demands as well as to show the new power structure in the country. The act can also be

---


37 The burial at the World’s View hill in the Matopos had been designated through Cecil John Rhodes’s will as a ‘Consecrated burial ground’ and was therefore seen as prestigious in colonial era historical productions. See for example, Clause 3 of The Will and Docills of the Honourable Cecil John Rhodes.


39 For example the some colonial historical productions had linked the origins of Great Zimbabwe to people who were seen as belonging to the ‘white’ race. See for example, A Sinamai, ‘Contested Heritage: A Socio-Political study of Zimbabwe sites in Southern African countries’ (Cape Town: Unpublished mini-thesis, University of the Western Cape, 2003).

40 J. G McDonald, Rhodes a life, p 262.
interpreted as a significant move by the new colonial establishment which also included Rhodes himself to tell the locals that the personalities whom they regarded as their heroes were not more heroes than them. Thus a new hero-ship structure was created by first denigrating and erasing of the already known local heroes order.

Memorials in the Postcolonial State

Perhaps the question that usually accompanies the study of monuments is why do we need to study post war monuments? The issue of contention that this work investigates in the succeeding chapters is whether the post-colonial state has not created similar exclusionary problems as the colonial one. As we have seen, the key problem raised by Werbner and Kriger first, and also lately Fontein, is the exclusive nature of the post-colonial shrines themselves which makes many people refuse to identify themselves with the histories around the war shrines as they will be feeling that they are not well represented there. By exclusive nature, I am referring to the negation of the role played by the ordinary people in the retelling of the histories inscribed by war shrines and the failure by people racially constructed as ‘non-whites’ to be buried at the designated sites themselves. I will also be further referring to the exclusion of certain histories and the people who made such histories. Of great concern to Werbner in Zimbabwe’s postcolonial memorialisation is that its premier site of war memory namely the National Heroes’ Acre memorialised only ‘a select few, a national elite’.  

In relation to the above, there is need for us to assess how public histories that lead to the creation and erecting of memorials should be researched. In her assessment of the colonial archive, Ann Stoler forwarded two important schools of thought. She noted that ‘students of colonialism are rereading the archives against popular memory; others are attending to how colonial documents have been requisitioned and recycled to confirm old entitlements or to make new political demands. As part of a wider impulse, we are no longer studying things but the making of them’. Thus in relation to the issue of studying war memorials, she also further proposed that it is important to understand ‘the circuits of knowledge production’ and

41 R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of the Gun’, p 87.
42 A Stoler, ‘Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance: On the Content in the Form’ in C Hamilton et al (eds), Refiguring the Archive (Cape Town: David Philip, 2002), p 84.
that, it is now important to ‘read the archive, for its irregularities, for its logic of recall, for its consistencies of misinformation, omission and mistake, along the archival grain’.\footnote{A Stoler, ‘Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance’, p 84.}

In the case of Zimbabwe, to investigate the memorialisation process and results as pointed out by Werbner, I propose to use Ann Stoler’s analysis above that as in the production of historical knowledge, it can be argued that there is nothing like a singular version of history but that there are many versions of histories that can come out from an examination of any given phenomena. Thus in this case, all the versions of history in relation to a subject matter like a country’s memorialisation processes must be gathered and analysed. In the case of Zimbabwe, some of these versions include the assertion in which one of the main parties in the liberation struggles ZAPU is quoted as saying it was against the exhumation of its war dead for reburial in the designated heroes’ acres across the country.\footnote{J Brickhill, ‘War Victims and the work of the Mafela Trust’ in N Bhebe and T Ranger (eds) Soldiers in Zimbabwe’s liberation war volume 1 (Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications, 1995), p166.} On the other hand, one of the historical dimensions notes that such concerns were not raised when its late second Vice President Jason Z Moyo’s remains were exhumed from Zambia and reburied at the National Heroes’ Acre in 1980. Further, the motives and more histories behind ZAPU’s plans to create its own war shrine at Pupu,\footnote{This proposed war shrine was supposed to be for all ZAPU war dead and I suppose, its aim was to do away with the country’s memorialisation structures which included the provincial ones.} near Lupane, which is now the provincial capital of Matabeleland North province must be collated because if this project as alleged by the related histories was continued, it was going to be in direct conflict with the government’s plans of provincial heroes acres like Matabeleland South and had a potential to threaten even the national shrine project itself.

In conclusion to this section, it can also be argued that understanding the notions of historical knowledge production will also enable us not only to engage with assertions by authorities like Werbner and Kriger, but also those related to the whole notion of heroism which projects like heroes’ acres as memorials tries to depict. Thus in this case, this can help to deal with critical questions which this work examines such as what exactly constitutes or determines a hero and what are the processes and rituals involved in their declaration and recognition as heroes. And lastly, of importance again is the need to investigate whether the notion of heroism itself is a permanent inscription on someone or something, or is it something that is
subject to fluctuate within confined boundaries that are subject to continuous changes. However, before fully turning to the analysis of Zimbabwe’s main ways of memorialising war, it is also important to look briefly at some of the postulated meanings of global monuments. Such a discussion is important in the sense that it will create a platform to understand whether memorials can be regarded as ‘the’ means to an end in the quest to find a total encompassing way of memorialising a phenomena such as war, or that their creators create them with full knowledge that they also contain exclusionary aspects.

**Whose memorial is it anyway?**

Since this work discusses both the exclusive and inclusive nature of Zimbabwe’s memorialisation practice, it is important to note that problems about the ownership of the memorials is one issue that has for long been at the centre of this key aspect of representation. In most cases, most memorials the world over have been criticised for either under or over representing certain sections of the phenomena. Against the background of such contestations, the question that arises is whether there can be a war memorial that will be viewed as adequately representing and depicting both the people and the phenomena being represented? And furthermore, is it always true that those who fund memorialisation projects usually have a final say in the outcome of what is being depicted?

The reasons why these questions have been posed is that Zimbabwe’s own memorialisation project which is also the centre of this work has been criticised in the manner in which it has excluded or overemphasised certain sections of those who were supposed to be memorialised. Furthermore, the critics of the memorialisation practices have alleged that these shortcomings happened because the government had a heavy handed grip in the memorialisation programs, a grip that was also greatly aided by the fact that it also controlled the funds to build these sites of war memory.

However, it is important to note that this discourse on the relationship between representation and funding is something that the world has been living with for more than a century now. It can be argued that problems of such a nature reared their heads on ‘the Freedman’s memorial
to Abraham Lincoln erected in Lincoln Square in the United States of America in 1876.\textsuperscript{46} The Freedman’s memorial, as Savage noticed, has been ‘the first public monument in the United States America’ as a whole ‘to be funded by donations’ from ‘African Americans, most of’ whom had been ‘Union Soldiers’ in the American civil war of the 1860s.\textsuperscript{47} However, despite the fact that it was erected using donations from the African Americans, Savage described the memorial as one that depicted:

\begin{quote}
Lincoln standing, with an outstretched hand above a crouching slave whose chains have just been broken.\textsuperscript{48}
\end{quote}

And on such kind of representation, which normally should have portrayed both the two actors of a phenomenon namely Lincoln and the African Americans in a manner that would not raise controversy, Savage for instance was left with no choice but to criticise the depiction as one that had ‘condense[d] the complex and problematic history of emancipation into a single triumphant act by one great man’.\textsuperscript{49} However, to Savage, despite the critique, such a depiction was not surprising as ‘the money and design were not controlled by the donors themselves but by the well-connected white officers of a charitable organisation that had also been involved in the Freedman’s relief’.\textsuperscript{50} With this information, the question that also arises is what sort of lessons can be drawn from the Freedman’s memorial that was erected long back in 1876 to Zimbabwe’s memorialisation project that started more recently in 1980? What we see from the Freedman’s case is that sometimes monetary support alone is not enough without full political power. I shall return to full discussions on the effect of political control on war memory and war memorials themselves as institutions of power in the next chapters. For now what is required is to undertake a brief historical analysis of how war related issues have both been managed and defined as heritage in the colonial and postcolonial histories of Zimbabwe.\textsuperscript{51}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{46} K Savage, \textit{Monument Wars: Washington DC., the National Mall, and the transformation of the memorial landscape} (Los Angeles: California University Press, 2003) p 82.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{47} K Savage, \textit{Monument Wars}, p 83.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{48} K Savage, \textit{Monument Wars}, p 82.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{49} K Savage, \textit{Monument Wars}, p 82.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{50} K Savage, \textit{Monument Wars}, p 82.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{51} Even though Zimbabwe was subjected to many layers of colonialisms, my limitation of these to just the ‘colonial’ and the ‘postcolonial’ is greatly informed by Louise White, \textit{The Assassination of Hebert Chitepo: Texts and Politics in Zimbabwe} (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2003), p 6 who argued that limiting them to just two phases will allow for more discursive elements to take place.
\end{flushright}
A brief history of managing National Legacies in Zimbabwe

To start with, perhaps it is important to ask whether war memorials really constitute what is heritage in Zimbabwe. If they are, the next question is under what circumstances are they defined as heritage and who defines them? In the section that I have just concluded above, the key question raised was about ownership of the memorials. However, from an analysis of Zimbabwe’s memorials, what is clear is the fact that these are the brainchild of the government. Since this work seeks to discuss in full the events that led to key issues such as the exclusive and inclusive nature of sites of war memory, it is important as part of these introductory remarks to analyse the role that has been played by the government in managing these sites throughout the history of Zimbabwe. It is only through such a discussion that it will be easy to understand whether Zimbabwe’s memorials are graded from the point of management or that the grading system represents another phenomenon totally different from how they have been managed.

The origins of managing sites of war remembrance in Zimbabwe

It can be argued that any discussion on the imagination\(^5\) of Zimbabwe as a nation state will not be complete without mentioning the name of Cecil John Rhodes, a British born imperialist whose company the British South African Company was behind the initial colonisation of what we now know as Zimbabwe. Although this work is not about the history of colonialism, it is important to note that the Will of Cecil John Rhodes was the first legal document to be promulgated advocating for the construction of a war monument as well as to ensure its management thereafter. Clause 6 of the will specifically states that:

I direct my Trustees on the hill aforesaid to erect or complete the monument to men who fell in the first Matabele War at Shangani in Rhodesia the bas-reliefs for which are being made by Mr John Tweed and I desire the said hill to be preserved as a burial place but no person is to be buried there unless the government for the time being in Rhodesia until the various states of South Africa or any of them shall have been federated and after such federation the Federal

---

\(^5\) B. W Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1993), p 7 postulates that nations are imagined communities because all members of a particular nation state will never get to know each other.
Government by vote of two thirds of its governing board says that he or she has deserved well of their country.\textsuperscript{53}

Rhodes’ name continued to be involved with such legacies of managing what was deemed as important legacies as after his death in 1902. An ordinance was crafted to create a way of administering his legacies and estates in Inyanga (now Nyanga) and in the Matopos. After the removal of the BSAC as the governing authority in Southern Rhodesia in 1923, ‘his Majesty’s Secretary of State’ also transferred ‘the estates of (Rhodes) to the Government of the colony of Southern Rhodesia in 1925’.\textsuperscript{54} Such a transfer meant that Rhodes’ affairs legally became the affairs of the Government of Southern Rhodesia which later promulgated an act known as the ‘The Rhodes Estates Act’ to manage the related estates one of which contained sites of war remembrance. In 1939 an amendment to this act prohibited any burials from taking place within a radius of two kilometres from the burials at World’s View in the Matopos.

\textbf{Fig 1. Defining Heritage? Memorial engraving at World’s View Hill Memorial landscape}
The wording for such an engraving was borrowed from the Docills and will of Cecil John Rhodes. Photo by B Magadzike

\textit{From Rhodes’ will to the Historical Monuments Commission}

\textsuperscript{53} Clause 6, \textit{Will and Docills of the Honourable Cecil John Rhodes} dated 1\textsuperscript{st} of July 1899.

After the Rhodes Estates Act, the Southern Rhodesia Historical Monuments Act was the next act to be promulgated to look into the affairs of legacies such as monuments in 1936. The promulgation of this act resulted in the setting up of a commission to manage monuments. Upon starting work in 1937, the Historical Monuments Commission proclaimed a total of ten sites throughout the country. Of these ten sites duly declared as National Monuments, five of them were ancient ruins, one of which was a waterfall, two of them caves associated with the so called Bushmen paintings\(^{55}\) whilst the last two, namely the Shangaani Battle fields and the ‘hill known as World’s View’ were associated with war related legacies. Thus, it can be argued that war legacies also played a significant role in the determination of what was to be managed as national monuments.

After the Southern Rhodesia Historic Monuments Act of 1936, the Southern Rhodesia National Trust Act Chapter 72 of 1960, amended in 1963,\(^{56}\) was the next act to be enacted to manage monuments. The purpose of this act was to ‘promote for the benefit of the people of Southern Rhodesia’, the permanent preservation and protection of:

(i) Lands and buildings of a national interest, archaeological, historical or aesthetic interest;
(ii) Objects or collections of objects of any description having national, archaeological, historical or aesthetic interest, including furniture, works of art, flora, stamps and literature.\(^{57}\)

Of interest in the promulgation of this act is the fact that it is still not clear on how it was operational when given the fact that the Historic Monuments Act Chapter 70, which had also been enacted in 1960 to deal with similar phenomena was also in existence. However, it is important to note that just like the Southern Rhodesia Historic Monuments Act of 1936, this particular Act did not have the word ‘heritage’ in its wording and clauses and neither did it mention war graves and memorials.

\(^{55}\) It is important to note that the act also clearly stated that one of its mandates was to safeguard the legacies of the so called Bushmen paintings.

\(^{56}\) However according to current histories origins postulated by NMMZ in its publications, the National Trust Act is not mentioned and NMMZ links its history of origin directly to the Southern Rhodesia Historic Monuments Act.

\(^{57}\) See *The Southern Rhodesia National Trust Act* Chapter 70 of 1960.
The year 1972 can be best referred to as the turning point in the history of managing national legacies and sites of representation such as museums in the then Rhodesia. The National Museums Act chapter 71 was amalgamated with the Monuments and Relics Act Chapter 70 to form the National Museums and Monuments of Rhodesia Act, Chapter 313 of 1 October 1972. Just like the old Monuments and Relics Act before it, this particular Act defined a ‘monument’ as:

a) Ancient monument or  
b) Area of land which-
   i) Is of historical, archaeological, paleontological or other scientific value or interest; or
   ii) Has a distinctive geological formation; or
   c) Waterfall, cave, grotto, avenue of trees, old tree or old building or remaining portion of an old building; or
   d) Other object, whether natural or constructed by man of historical, archaeological or either scientific value or interest.  

If a synopsis of the above Act is carried out what comes out very clear is the fact that the word ‘heritage’ and war legacies such as sites and memorials were not mentioned in any of its clauses. It is important again to note that this is the same act that the independent Zimbabwe used to manage its national legacies for the first twenty years of existence before changing it in the year 2001. However, even the new version of this act namely the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe Act, Chapter 25:11 of 2001 does not mention war graves and the word ‘heritage’ in its wording even though there is room for an assumption that war memory might be catered for by the historical clause in the act. I shall fully refer to the meaning of these and other acts in the next chapters. Before undertaking an analysis of how this work has been arranged, perhaps it is important to note that even though most of the colonial era acts that have been discussed so far are not directly linked to most of those discussed in this work, they are however important in laying out the foundation for an understanding of the intricate issues that constitute Zimbabwean past and present day monuments. In support of such a line of thinking, Erik Meyer postulated that:

to understand the concrete constitution of monuments, museums, or memorial sites, one has to consider administrative aspects such as

\[58 \text{ See National Museums and Monuments of Rhodesia Act Chapter 313.}\]
financial and legal preconditions as well as the interest of political systems to resolve conflict.59

Thus in this case, an examination of the acts that have been discussed above makes it possible to understand the political interplay that exists between these sites and the political systems in existence at given times.

Chapter outline

This chapter served as an introduction to this topic of war memory as heritage in Zimbabwe. As part of this broad thinking of memorials in Zimbabwe, I also looked at memorials in other places around the world to find out their meaning and what they stand for. The next chapter examines the meaning of the National Heroes Acre that was constructed in Harare in 1981 within this broad topic of memorialisation methodologies in independent Zimbabwe. As part of the process of interrogating National Heroes’ Acre, the chapter will examine the many meanings that might be derived from it. The chapter will also examine what is really entailed by the National Heroes’ Acre in relationship to the allegations of it as perpetuating the idea of a graded memory. Chapter 3 examines the development of the Provincial Heroes’ Acre of Matabeleland South Province of Zimbabwe. In this examination, this particular development is examined as an ‘idea’ in its relationship to how it was implemented on the ground. The chapter will also try to examine whether the local heroes also produces public historical knowledge within the specific areas that they have been commemorated in. And the last chapter of this work will examine whether there are any changes pertaining to this memorialisation methodology. The chapter will also examine the implications this might have in the legal framework put in place to manage the sites of war memory as well as in the domain of heritage itself. I now turn to the examination of National Heroes’ Acre in Harare.

CHAPTER 2

THE NATIONAL HEROES’ ACRE IN HARARE

Introduction

Writing on the subject matter of silences that have occurred in African history, Jacques Depelchin argued that ‘when focusing on the colonial period, one runs into something which could only be called apartheidisation, whereby the histories of colonial powers are written as if they had no colonial possessions’\(^{60}\). With special reference to colonial era monumentalisation in the then Rhodesia that I have discussed in the previous chapter, one school of thought that comes out very clearly was the attempt by the colonial dominant masters to silence the histories of the indigenous inhabitants of the country they had just deposed from power whilst propagating what they referred to as their own achievements.\(^{61}\) As part of this broader plot, the colonialists even branded some of the indigenous rulers such as the Matabele King Lobengula as enemies of civilization\(^{62}\) whilst hailing their own leadership as having successfully created what they termed a Rhodesian tradition\(^{63}\) and heritage.\(^{64}\)

With the advent of independence, the concerned post colony initiated its own processes of trying to erase these histories by responding directly to the colonial era’s memorialisation process. In Zimbabwe, the National Heroes Acre in Harare which came out as a result of the liberation struggle can be referred to as the main post-colonial era response to that of its predecessor the colonial era. In support of this assertion on the role of different forms of postcolonial memorialisation such as heroes’ acres, scholars such as Napandulwe Shiweda

---


\(^{63}\) See, ‘Administrative minutes of the 29\(^{th}\) of November 1917’, NAZ Records file number A3/28/39-41. In these Administrative minutes, an after death image of Leander Star Jameson as the ‘brilliant inheritor of the Great Rhodesian Tradition’ was constructed.

\(^{64}\) See, ‘Sir Charles’s motto’, the weekly Supplement to the *Bulawayo Chronicle*, Saturday September 1927. In this article, Charles Coghlan, the first Prime Minister of Rhodesia was credited as having ‘helped Rhodesia into her heritage as one of the best self governed nations of the British Empire’.
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have even gone to the extent of asserting that ‘heroes’ acres attempt[s] to reframe our history’ and ‘to retrieve history from the distorted narratives of colonial representation’. However, contrary to this bold assertion portraying post colonial monuments such as the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, Zimbabwe as a framer of a new and all inclusive history, Werbner and Kriger have both argued that this site does not in any way adequately reframe an all inclusive history and neither does it depict its representational phenomena inclusively. In actual fact, both Werbner and Kriger have argued that instead of representing the liberation phenomena and all those seen as having participated for its cause, the heroes’ acre project ended up categorizing these participants into grades arguing that this was reflective of individual contributions during the struggle. Furthermore, both Werbner and Kriger have asserted that the project to initiate provincial sites of war memory such as the district and provincial heroes’ acres which this work will examine was also in a way, a reaffirmation of this grading system and an attempt to confine those deemed to have participated in a lesser way to the peripheries of history.

Given such contestations around this aspect of post colonial representation, the question that arises is, in what ways can people now understand this site which as we are told by the Guide to the Heroes’ Acre, was initially created as a site of national memory and is ‘the pride of the people of Zimbabwe’? Can it be viewed as a site that misrepresents Zimbabwe’s liberation phenomena or is it one that inclusively depicts all the intrinsic issues purported to have characterised such a war? It is against this background that this chapter lays the foundation for an investigation of Zimbabwe’s war memorial practices, which is characterized by sites of memory ranging from those perceived as district to the one

---


68 For example, the Ministry of Information and Publicity, Guide to the Heroes’ Acre (Harare: Government of Zimbabwe Publications, 1986), p 1 clearly states that ‘the heroes are classified in three categories and generally reflect the departed hero’s contribution to the nation’.


perceived as the national and erected in Harare, the capital city. In this case, since this National Heroes’ Acre was purportedly established to be the site of national memory, the chapter will largely concern itself in finding out why it has been seen by these different people such as Werbner and Kriger as one that became exclusive whilst others like Napandulwe Shiweda are arguing that it falls within the category of similar sites elsewhere created for the sole purpose of ‘framing’ new inclusive histories. To begin with, I start by examining the various ways this site can be understood.

**Understanding Zimbabwe’s National Heroes’ Acre**

The *Guide to the Heroes’ Acre* of Zimbabwe describes the National Heroes’ Acre that was constructed in Harare, the capital city of that country in 1981 as both the chief public knowledge propagator and visual representative of a phenomena popularly known in Zimbabwe’s historical narratives as the ‘liberation struggle’, meaning a war that was fought against its previous colonial occupiers. However, it is this specific branding of the National Heroes’ Acre as a site representing a phenomenon made into being by a host of multiple participators that has created major contestations both in the public and academic spheres.

After observing that only a specific sector of those who had participated in making this ‘liberation’ phenomena a success were being considered for burial at the site which had been reserved for the purposes of commemorating the collectiveness of participating in the event, Richard Werbner, Norma Kriger and also lately, Ciraj Rassool have all argued that contrary to its framing as both a purported propagator of public knowledge and a visual representation of a ‘liberation struggle’, the national heroes’ acre project was in fact, a huge disappointment to the majority of the many actors who had participated in its making. As most of these scholars argued, since this liberation struggle had roped in many actors, it was proper for any manner of its later day visual depiction to take into consideration the aspect of

---

71 Even though construction work of the National Heroes’ Acre started in 1981, its first burials took place in 1980.
73 R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of the Gun’, p 78.
collectiveness that had characterized the phenomena. Instead, what the project ended up doing was simply to represent the achievements and efforts of one group of these multiple actors, namely the elites.\textsuperscript{76}

Regardless of these criticisms, its face of public knowledge propagation in the name of the curator responsible for its day to day administrative and research work denies this aspect of misrepresentation and exclusiveness.\textsuperscript{77} According to him, the project must be judged on the basis of what it envisages and in the case of its critics, they never took this attribute of what a site of national memory such as the national heroes’ acre envisages into consideration. To Godfrey Nyaruwanga, the NMMZ’s Curator of Militaria responsible for this National Heroes’ Acre, the critics of the project were supposed to examine it beyond the aspect of its graves which are only a small section of the whole ‘memorial complex’.\textsuperscript{78} According to him, it is from this analysis that the inclusive aspect of the shrine and what it stands for can be fully deduced.\textsuperscript{79}

In agreement with Nyaruwanga that the National Heroes’ Acre represents many aspects other than its ninety-four burials,\textsuperscript{80} was Innocent Pikirayi who also argued that the significance of ‘architectural heritage’\textsuperscript{81} at sites like the National Heroes’ Acre must be taken into consideration as a way of fostering multiple understandings of the site. According to him, such a ‘manifestation of architectural heritage’ at important sites ‘creates a sense of continuity between the past and present’.\textsuperscript{82} It is important to note that Pikirayi’s invocation of the word ‘heritage’, in reference to a country’s history is one that is interesting and has also given rise to many debates around the global world. First of all, such invocation raises


\textsuperscript{77} My observation here is informed by the fact that a curator of militaria’s is regarded as the main person at the national heroes’ acre and apart from performing management duties, the person is also supposed to research historical data that will later be infiltrated into the public sphere by tour guides and by him or her in the case of that public constituting people regarded in society as important dignitaries.

\textsuperscript{78} Interview with Godfrey Nyaruwanga, National Heroes’ Acre, Harare, Zimbabwe 5 August 2011. For my usage of the term ‘memorial complex’, See R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the barrel of a Gun’, p 72.

\textsuperscript{79} Interview with Godfrey Nyaruwanga.

\textsuperscript{80} Ministry of Information and Publicity, \textit{A Guide to the Heroes’ Acre}.


\textsuperscript{82} I Pikirayi, ‘The Kingdom, the Power and Forevermore’ 765.
questions about what is really implied by national heritage. In some of the debates on heritage as topic, Davison for instance, views this notion of the heritage production and reliance by emerging nation states as one that is premised on the notion of ‘national heritage’ as that ‘body of folkways and political ideas on which new regimes’ find ‘their identity’.83 Also joining in what is implied by ‘national heritage’ debate, Tunbridge and Ashworth reminds us to think about ‘all heritage’ as ‘potential political instrument[s] whether that was intended or not’.84 And lastly, Laurajane Smith describes it as ‘an important political and cultural tool in defining and legitimizing the identity, experiences and social/cultural standing of a range of sub national groups’.85

With particular reference to Zimbabwe, it is important to consider the implications of the arguments postulated by Smith, Davison and also Tunbridge and Ashworth above. These postulations remind us that even though the idea of a ‘national heritage’ was also one of these multiple factors considered upon the conceiving and eventual construction of projects deemed to have a national outlook like Zimbabwe’s National Heroes’ Acre, it is important to understand the problems associated with such production and usage of heritage which I will now discuss below. Furthermore, in order to understand both the production of this heritage in the present and whether its usage quashes away the notion of exclusiveness at sites of war memories, it is also imperative to examine all the details surrounding its appropriation and the problems associated with such actions.

**Analyzing representation at the National Heroes’ Acre**

According to Pikirayi, the site is a reincarnation of two of Zimbabwe’s most famous stone ruins namely the ‘Khami’ and the ‘Great Zimbabwe’.86 Narrating his claim of this supposed continuation, Pikirayi boldly asserted that the ‘topmost walling’ of the Heroes Acre ‘is decorated by continuous horizontal chevron designs, like that found on the outer girdle wall of the Great Enclosure at Great Zimbabwe’.87 He further added that the ‘the walling is not

---

86 I Pikirayi, ‘The Kingdom, the Power and Forevermore’, p 765.
87 I Pikirayi, ‘The Kingdom, the Power and Forevermore’ p 765. Pikirayi’s view here was also collaborated by G Nyaruwanga, curator of the National Heroes Acre who took me on a tour of the National Heroes’ Acre. The
freestanding but levelled on top, and burial shafts are excavated from the surface’, making ‘these terraced platforms reminiscent of the Khami phase buildings…’. According to Pikirayi again, the platforms and the walling are not the only features of the ancient monuments that have been used at the national shrine. The famous Zimbabwe birds, archaeologically excavated at the Great Zimbabwe National Monument in the 1870s are also part of this national shrine.

Fig 2: Stone walls at the National Heroes Acre in Harare, Zimbabwe. Photo by B Magadzike

collaboration of Pikirayi’s view by Nyaruwanga also in a way shows how knowledge produced by a supposed ‘expert’ is later propagated for the purposes of public consumption.

88 Pikirayi, The Kingdom, the Power and Forevermore’ p 765.


90 Ibid, Pikirayi, p764.
With this knowledge of the type of ancient symbols used in the present to justify a supposed linkage between the present day Zimbabweans and the prehistoric ones, it is now important to discuss how usage of such symbols deals with the notion of exclusiveness perpetrated by scholars such as Werbner and Kriger. To begin with, it is important to note that the Great Zimbabwe and Khami Ruins phases or traditions, as they are referred to in Zimbabwean archaeological circles, were revered as powerful and prosperous regimes in a period known as the Iron Age period in Zimbabwe. In some present day historical productions which analyzed such discourses, these pre-colonial states’ remnants are used as tangible evidence and a reminder to present day Zimbabweans about how united their pre-colonial predecessors were. As part of these discourses, the ruling dynasties of these phases now represented in the present by the stone monuments were reputed to have united all the people living in lands that now constitute most of what is now known as present day Zimbabwe right up to the Mozambique coast. The discourses further allege that Changamire Dombo a ruler of the

---

91 For example, R S Burrett *Shadows of our Ancestors: Some preliminary notes on the archaeology of Zimbabwe* (Harare: University of Zimbabwe Photographic Unit, 1998), p 21 identifies these phases within a host of many others that he claims as characterising ‘the Iron Age sequence’ of pre colonial Zimbabwe.

Rozvi Empire, also associated with some of these stone ruins under discussion, also contributed in fostering one of these notions of pre colonial oneness in what is now known as Zimbabwe.

With this knowledge, present day supporters of these discourses further allege that it is through this appropriation of symbols such as the Great Zimbabwe or Khami, into a national commemorative project like the National Heroes Acre that constitutes an unrivalled gesture of inclusiveness as this heritage belongs to all Zimbabweans. They further allege that apart from just being a sign of inclusiveness, the same heritage is also a sure sign of a ‘nationhood’ and ‘civilization’ pre-existing the ones formed by the coming of the whites. And in this case, apart from just being a burial place, the National Heroes’ Acre is believed to signify reclamation of that which was supposedly lost. It is within this discourse of reclamation and continuity, that the then Prime Minister of Zimbabwe used the occasion of marking Heroes’ Day celebrations in 1981 to remind the populace about the desire to defend ‘culture’ as one of the reasons why the war of liberation was resorted to. In stating this importance of culture, Mugabe asserted that they had ‘also fought for the survival’ of their ‘culture’ even though they were now ‘accept[ing] the positive aspects of other cultures’. It is this same discourse of accepting others that has been used to justify why foreigners from North Korea were roped in to do the initial construction and designing of the National Heroes’ Acre.

However, it is important to note that the aspects which I have just discussed are not the only ones in which the 57 Hectares memorial landscape of the National Heroes Acre is allegedly trying to challenge the notion of exclusiveness. The tomb of the Unknown Soldier is one of the main features at the National Heroes’ Acre and is also viewed as a symbol fostering the idea of inclusiveness. Inside the tomb are two miniature coffins containing soil collected from the sites of the former liberation camps in Zambia and Mozambique where thousands of

---

94 For example, it can be argued that Pikirayi and A Sinamai referenced above are disciples of such school of thought.
95 A Sinamai, ‘Contested Heritage’, p 22.
96 See ‘Don’t betray the fallen says Mugabe’, *The Zimbabwean Herald*, 11 August 1981.
fighters against colonialism were allegedly massacred by Rhodesian forces during that war.\textsuperscript{98}

It is also on this Tomb of the Unknown Soldier that on the day of celebrating and remembering the dead heroes, the State President performs rituals purportedly on behalf of the whole nation by laying a wreath in honour of all those who died fighting against forces of colonialism. And all these rituals are believed to be forwarding the idea of oneness in that the President is seen as representing everyone in the nation state and that the soil itself ‘commemorates the many who died in the liberation war’.\textsuperscript{99}

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is not the only place where alleged ‘inclusive’ rituals are performed. More rituals presented as nation-uniting rituals are also performed at the eternal flame which is designed like a ‘hilt of a sword’\textsuperscript{100} and situated on top of a hill at the memorial landscape. The flame, first set alight on the eve of Independence, is hereby believed to signify both the coming of freedom and the overcoming of colonialism, all aspects revered as binding Zimbabweans together. As part of this unitary and inclusive discourse, the green and red colours that compose the flames of this symbol are seen as signifying a new prosperous nation that came out of blood spilled during the war and also evoking a notion of readiness to spill more in defence of this independence.\textsuperscript{101}

\textit{The National Heroes’ Acre: a critique of its representation}

From an analytical point of view, past heritage, rituals and symbols at the National Heroes’ Acre are all aspects which have been used to justify a quest for inclusiveness in this commemorative project of remembering a war of national liberation. But, as already questioned in the previous section, does this usage of heritage symbols and the invocation of culture represent a means to an end in answering the concerns raised by scholars like Werbner and Kriger? As we have seen, the disciplinary practice of archaeology was used by Pikirayi to produce evidence and knowledge about how the glory of the past reincarnates itself in the present at sites deemed to be of national importance such as the national heroes’ acre. And, it is this knowledge that is infiltrated into the touring public by NMMZ’s staff at

\textsuperscript{98} See also I Pikirayi, ‘The Power the Kingdom and Forevermore’, p 765.
\textsuperscript{100} R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 85.
\textsuperscript{101} Interview with Godfrey Nyaruwanga, 5 August 2011.
the National Heroes’ Acre. However, even though archaeology is a disciplinary practice that has been used to construct an understanding of how past societies existed and gradually evolved into present day ones, it has however been criticized for the manner in which it creates senses of ‘belonging’ and ‘not belonging’ in the societies which have tried to interpret and apply the knowledge it has produced.

Indeed, the legacy of archaeology as a disciplinary subject matter that produces knowledge about global societies has not been totally pleasing. In actual fact, it is the same disciplinary subject that has been used by ‘countries such as Israel’ as vehicles ‘to authenticate’ their ‘claims of ownership’ and reasons for “the occupation of” countries such as ‘Palestine’. ¹⁰² Palestine has not been the only country to be affected by the exclusionary tendencies of this disciplinary subject matter as in countries such as Germany and Rwanda, its use and interpretation eventually ended in large scale disasters. ¹⁰³ Furthermore, the legacy of the discipline in explaining the historical origins of Egypt is also well known. It was through an archaeological examination of the ‘Egyptian mummies’ that ‘Cuvier’ is reputed to have deduced that the ancient ‘Egyptians were not’ and ‘could not have been – black: nor race of Negro’. ¹⁰⁴

And for Zimbabwe, the assertion of a Great Zimbabwe culture whose basis of origins lies in the evidence that was provided by the same subject matter of archaeology, both its usage and interpretation in the present signifies a desire for a large scale exclusion of other people from belonging to this country. For example, people who are not descendents of those alleged to have been associated with these cultures are therefore omitted from this kind of a nationalistic discourse that the Great Zimbabwe culture of the past tries to propagate in the present. That present day Zimbabwe is composed of people who migrated into it at different times after these Great Zimbabwe or Khami cultures is not a deniable fact. And in this case, the mere usage of symbols of the past as the basis of the argument that the commemorative project of

the National Heroes’ Acre is inclusive is thereby eroded by the very exclusionary messages that both the discipline of enquiry used and the discourse of heritage usually carry.\footnote{My argument here is greatly informed by D Lowenthal, \textit{The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History} (London: Viking, 1996) p 128 who postulated that ‘heritage passes on exclusive myths of origin and continuance, endowing a select group with prestige and common purpose’ and that ‘heritage keeps outsiders at bay through claims of superiority that are unfathomable or offensive to others’ and also by Laurajane Smith, \textit{Uses of Heritage}, p 60 who also postulated that ‘the nationalising tendencies of heritage do reinforce a sense of collective memory that ignores the subaltern and other sub-national forms of memory and remembering and works to define the ‘inner character’ of race and nation’.

This argument of exclusionary tendencies by the dictates of a disciplinary practice has not been one without representational precedence. According to Tony Bennett, ‘in the nineteenth century’ another disciplinary practice namely ‘anthropology’ that had played a central role to the ‘ideological functioning’ of the ‘exhibitionary complex’\footnote{T Bennett, \textit{The birth of the Museum} (London: Routledge, 1995), p 350.} led to the castigating of people deemed as ‘primitive’ to an ‘out of history’ position to ‘occupy a twilight zone between nature and culture’.\footnote{T Bennett, \textit{The birth of the Museum}, p 350.} Thus in this case, the presence of the Great Zimbabwe or Khami cultures at present day sites of memory such as the National Heroes’ Acre all but enhances this discourse of including others connected to the civilization seen as represented by it whilst confining others to positions totally out of the same history.\footnote{For example R Werbner, ‘Memory and the Post Colony’, p 85 identifies the people associated with the stone monuments as ‘Shona’, a claim which will automatically exclude those identified otherwise.} Furthermore, not only does the usage of stone monument cultures create problems of belonging within Zimbabwe itself alone. The mere presence of sites of a similar nature in neighbouring countries such as Botswana and South Africa\footnote{For example, A Sinamai, ‘Contested Heritage’, asserts that stone monuments such as those found at both Great Zimbabwe and Khami are also found in South Africa and Botswana.} is a potential case for an across the border conflict with Zimbabwe which claims superior inheritance of such heritage by claiming to be the ‘host nation’ of people deemed to have been behind the construction of such heritage.

Furthermore, one aspect that has been used to justify a claim of oneness at the National Heroes’ Acre is the performance of rituals associated with both paying tribute to the dead heroes and remembering the phenomena of war itself. These rituals are represented by the symbolic laying of wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the State President and the use of two catafalques as part of the broad concept of paying tribute to the dead. Indeed, the
ceremonies at the National Heroes’ Acre are characterized by these performative rituals meant to instil a sense of oneness in this quest to remember and mourn the dead heroes. These catafalques play an important role in the highly performative ceremonies of the National Heroes Acre. Even though the ceremony of body viewing is not conducted at the national shrine itself, the catafalque in the front is used to rest ‘the coffin’ of the dead hero always covered by a national flag ‘during the ceremony of burial’. The other one behind, represents a cave, which in Zimbabwean past and contemporary traditions is revered as the burial place of important people such as the traditional leadership like Chiefs. According to my informant, Nyaruwanga, the argument here is that, those declared national heroes are highly regarded in the same category as chiefs and should also have been buried in caves and even though they are now buried in platforms, the catafalque is a representation of how they should have been buried. According to Nyaruwanga again, this practice was also a symbol that signified oneness, as such burial practices encompass all Zimbabweans. However, contrary to this assertion by Nyaruwanga, these catafalques do not exist at the Provincial and District heroes’ acres which I will examine in the next chapter. And by placing them at the centre of the burial rituals at the national shrine all but leads to an erosion of the claim that burials should not be used to forward a claim of exclusiveness as they are only a small part of this national memorial complex.

110 The commemorative rituals for the dead starts at the Stodart Hall in the high density suburb of Mbare where ceremonies associated with viewing the body are conducted. According to Jason Moyo, ‘The Father of the Nation: Stodart Hall, in Harare’s Oldest township looks nothing like a National Monument’, The Mail and Guardian Newspaper 16 April 2010, the Stodart Hall is associated with the first riots that led the Rhodesian authorities to enact ‘the law and order maintenance act to contain the riots’. So the Stodart Hall is believed to be intertwined to the histories of the struggle.

111 R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 83.

112 G Mahachi, ‘Some Zimbabwe Iron Age Burials interpreted in the light of recent Shona Mortuary practices’, Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Cambridge, May 1986, p 3. However, investigations by the author also revealed that such burial practices as stated by Mahachi are not only practiced by the Zimbabwean Shona people as the grave of the first Ndebele King Mzilikazi is also located in a cave and in a hilly area. See illustration number 6.

113 Interview with Nyaruwanga, 5 August 2011.
However, even though all in all, these performative ceremonies are intended at creating a notion of Zimbabwe as united in commemorating a war of national liberation or in mourning an actor seen as having played a key role in the making of this phenomenon, the same practice is also in one way or the other, a spectacle of exclusion and a display of immense power and knowledge relations worthy discussing in this work. In his studies of the ‘Foucauldian theories of governmentality’, Bennett noted that one of the ‘strategies’ of those ‘governing’ was to:

enrol the governed as active agents in their own governance, implanting the objectives of the government into dynamics of selfhood so that they become self-acting imperatives for the individuals concerned.

Thus, on the occasion of ceremonies at the National Heroes’ Acre, the general public and most of the junior soldiers are made to feel like they are also part and parcel of the echelons

---

114 T Bennett, *The Past Beyond Memory*, p 27.
115 T Bennett, *The Past Beyond Memory*, p 27.
of power joined together with those who have it in the quest of commemorating or mourning something similar. But when the actual event of mourning or commemorating will be taking place, the same public and most of the junior soldiers acquires the position of spectators of this spectacle from a distant north western stand whilst the representatives of the State also gazes at the same more closely from a south eastern view. In the event of the ceremony being a burial, the coffin containing the dead body wrapped with the colours of the national flag is brought to the shrine by gun carriage before being paraded and rested on one of the catafalques where it acquires the position of an ‘object’ on display supposed to be gazed upon by the public.

Meanwhile, the whole commemorative process is indeed a state function whose main actor will be the State President who presides over it with the majority of the public being expected to watch or join in through the various forms of applauding such as dancing, singing or ululating. The role of the junior soldier in this spectacle is one that also specifically limits him or her to the performance of acting as the courier of the dead body, firing the gun salute and providing security. The Minister of Home Affairs who is in charge of one arm of state security system namely the Police always plays the role of master of ceremonies at this event. And lastly, in the event of a burial, the public is gradually excluded from anywhere nearer to the burial place itself. This space is reserved only for close relatives of the dead hero and the representatives of the state led by its president. These are the only people allowed to bid farewell to an individual who as the whole nation is told, ‘Now belongs to the whole nation of Zimbabwe’\textsuperscript{116} after having risen beyond his/her own family. The performative ceremony usually ends with the president giving back the flag used for wrapping the coffin to the spouse or any close relative of the buried hero.

However, a conclusion of this section is not possible without discussing the meaning of the spectacles of display that I have mentioned above. And in this case, such a discussion will not be possible without thinking about Tony Bennett’s rather interesting tenets about such power and knowledge relations in his work on the ‘exhibitionary complex’.\textsuperscript{117} As Bennett noted:


\textsuperscript{117} T Bennett, 	extit{The Birth of the Museum}.
The exhibitionary complex was also a response to the problem of order, but one which worked differently in seeking to transform that problem into one of culture - a question of winning hearts and minds as well as the disciplining and training of bodies.\textsuperscript{118}

Thus, with reference to the above ceremonies and structure of the National Heroes’ Acre, I am also inclined to question whether they are not organized in a particular manner meant to instil a sense of order and discipline in an otherwise unpredictable society.\textsuperscript{119} And as I want to argue, contrary to the notion that the site is one in which people oriented power is derived from, it is one in which that power is articulated more in favour of those who already have that power. For example, the site itself is manned by Police details from the Zimbabwe Republic Police during the day and by members of the Presidential Guard who are present for 24 hours\textsuperscript{120} everyday of the year. And all these agents of a state’s security system are meant to articulate the nature of the state’s power and its preparedness to discipline whoever goes against it. Yes, it can be argued that there is no force of cohesion used for people to attend the ceremonies at the National Heroes’ Acre shrine, but as Bennett stated, there is need to think of this in the sense of it being a ‘cultural technology’ meant to ‘organize’ such a ‘voluntarily self regulating citizenry’ into a disciplined and orderly society.\textsuperscript{121}

**Remembering colonialism, war and the quest to build a stronger post colony**

Within this broad scope of questioning how inclusive is Zimbabwe’s National Heroes’ Acre, perhaps it is also important to also analyze it in its context as a place of national remembrance. Since one of the ideas that initially brought the National Heroes Acre into existence was to challenge colonial era claims of nation founding, artwork was also used to

\textsuperscript{118} T Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, pp 334-335.

\textsuperscript{119} My argument here stems from the fact the Heroes’ Acre was established soon after attainment of independence and there was no better way to instil a sense of order in a new society than creating sites to aid those in the top echelons of power to discipline society and president Mugabe has always used the occasion of celebrating the National Heroes’ day to send messages of disciplining society and for example in a *Zimbabwe Herald Newspaper* of Monday the 11th of August 1980 report titled ‘Don’t betray the fallen says Mugabe’ he asked Zimbabweans whether they ‘were showing the same degree of selflessness our heroes showed’ or they were now ‘taking advantage of the independence to improve individual positions forgetting social obligations’.

\textsuperscript{120} See also for example, National Heroes Fly in today, *The Zimbabwe Herald*, Monday 11 August 1980, when Nathan Shamuyarira the then Minister of Information and Publicity declared that ‘all heroes’ acres’ were ‘to be guarded permanently each day beginning Tuesday (the 12th of August 1980)’.

\textsuperscript{121} T Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, p 335.
advance such notions. In this case, artwork was used to tell the stories of colonialism and resistance and also to respond to colonial era commemorative art that forwarded claims of original nation founding. The murals at the National shrine whose histories and meanings were analyzed in different ways in the works of Werbner, Pikirayi, Rassool and Kriger falls within this scope and grand plan of rewriting the story of colonialism and the road to independence in art form.

In this case, it is important to note that when the idea of murals was being applied at the National Heroes’ Acre, it was not the first time such an art form has been for the purposes of commemorative projects in the history of a country. During the colonial times, bas reliefs were used at sites like the World’s View. And the one shown in the photography below is one of these examples. In this case, it portrays Allan Wilson’s much publicized ‘last stand’, most of these relief sculptures also carried lots of meanings pertaining to the phenomena they were representing.

Figure 5. Bas reliefs at the Allan Wilson Memorial, World’s View, Matopos showing men on horses and with guns. Photo by B Magadzike.

At the Heroes Acre, as Werbner correctly noted, relief sculpturing was used to ‘depict the route of the liberation struggle against the white settler state, from early encounters with police and their dogs to the triumphant march into the capital led by Comrade Mugabe,

122 Allan Wilson’s story was part of the colonial narratives of heroic deeds and the events around it continued to receive public attention well after their occurrence. For example, see ‘The Story of Gwelo: From Laager to an industrial centre’, Supplement to the Chronicle, 16 July 1964.
wearing a suit and a tie rather than his liberation war Socialistic tunic’. However, of these mural depictions, Werbner also lamented about what he thought was their unrepresentative nature in terms of racial contribution to the cause of liberation. According to Werbner:

Racial opposition dominates the murals, and the liberation struggle is represented as a simple racial conflict: fighting on the heroic side of good blacks are blacks only; whites with their black henchmen and dogs, attack on the other side. Those who bear the identity Coloureds in Zimbabwe have no place in the murals.

However, even though I would like to concur with this assumption by Werbner, I would also like to argue that even though he correctly pointed on the racial depiction of the murals, the notion of hero declaration itself challenges this assertion and continues to challenge it. This argument was also ably supported by one of my informants Nyaruwanga, who stated that the murals had a reflection of the support given by considered external friendly forces such as the Russians and Chinese. According to him, grenades made in both Russia and China are the weapons depicted in the mural. Depictions of these grenades also in a way represents the two guerrilla movements that were involved in the war of liberation namely ZANLA as supported by Chinese weapons and ZIPRA as supported by Russian ones.

On the other hand regardless of my analysis about the reliefs above, there is need to assess the assertion of war time assistance for the cause of the liberation struggle having been received from communist countries only. Indeed, such assertions need credible historical analysis to determine their exact basis. In this case, it is important to note that singling out and crediting former and practicing communist countries as having helped in bringing about Zimbabwean independence raises a question about post colonial representation as represented by this National Heroes’ Acre. This question emanates from the fact of whether such representation does not tantamount to the processes of exclusion and inclusion that I have

123 R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 84. Werbner’s interpretation here was also collaborated by Nyaruwanga who actually added that the Murals were actually a depiction of six books all telling the Zimbabwean road to independence story.

124 R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 84.

125 As I write this thesis (October 2011), an Indian Bharat Patel was declared a National Hero in September and his ashes will be sprinkled at the National Heroes’ Acre during the commemoration of the national heroes’ day in 2012.

126 Interview with G Nyaruwanga, 5 August 2011.
discussed in this chapter. In this case, it will be exclusion and inclusion by race and geographical place of origin.

On another note, I would also like to argue that Werbner’s usage of term ‘coloured’ also falls within this broad scope of constructing racial affinities according to skin colour lines. It is important to note that the ‘coloured’ racial connotation did not exist in Zimbabwean historiography\textsuperscript{127} and was only borrowed from apartheid South Africa where it was used to justify racial segregations in terms of skin colour and to deny access to resources to people by creating a graded form of racial segregation.

The making of National Heroism in Zimbabwe

From time to time, in the complex panorama of human experience, men and women emerge from the throng with deeds of heroism that are an example and inspiration to their fellows. The causes to which they dedicate, or even lose, their lives may be accidents of time and circumstances. Were they to be born into another era, they would still display these qualities of nobility, selflessness that destine them for a special place in history or in the hearts and minds of their counterparts. This week, Zimbabweans take time off from the day to day cares to remember those they hold in the highest esteem. In any nation of diverse peoples, it is natural and inevitable that there will be diverse views. It is important for all to respect those views. This is a time to remember. To remember not the issues that divide, but the personal courage and sacrifice of those whom we honour. Many heroes achieve international acclaim. But there are others too. The son remembered by the mother, husband by the wife and children; the boyfriend by the girlfriend he left behind. Heroes everyone.\textsuperscript{128}

As observed by the above Editorial Comment that appeared in the \textit{Zimbabwean Herald} of the 11\textsuperscript{th} of August 1980, Zimbabwe is indeed a nation of diverse people and diverse beliefs. And, of these diverse ideas, it is the question of who amongst these diverse people deserves to be declared a hero that usually takes centre stage in these discourses of inclusion and exclusion in memorialisation. Even though this particular editorial was trying to make people feel that

\textsuperscript{127}See for example, I Mandaza, \textit{Race, Colour and Class in Southern Rhodesia} (Harare: SAPES Trust Books, 1997), p 249. Mandaza argues that the use of this racial category was ‘part of’ Southern Rhodesia’s ‘White settlers’ strategy to ‘use the existing framework of a Cape Coloured Community to contain whatever threat the phenomenon of miscegenation (and half castes) might have posed to the ideological structure of white racial supremacy’

\textsuperscript{128}Comment, \textit{The Zimbabwean Herald}, 11 August 1980
all of them belong to different categories of heroism, it is the nature of Zimbabwe’s heroism categories that has been the major source of problems in its memorialisation project. And because of these problems, what is needed is a thorough analysis of their nature.

The reason why this aspect centred on the discourse of the making of national heroism has also been singled out for examination, is that that it is intertwined to its counterpart ‘the making of the National Heroes Acre’. These two when combined form a thorough understanding of all the aspects that informs Zimbabwean memorialisation and the National Heroes’ Acre itself. Zimbabwean memorialisation involves both the site under consideration and the bodies that are buried there. So far, what this work has done was to examine the other part namely ‘the memorial site’ without adequately dealing with the question of who is this national hero supposed to be buried at the National Heroes’ Acre. In Zimbabwe, critics of the concept of the making of heroism have always roped in the aspects of ethnicity and political party affiliation as the key culprits and usual suspects that lead to the exclusion of others from the concept of national heroism. Against this background, I start by examining the existence of ethnicity in Zimbabwe before analyzing its role in this discourse of the making of national heroism in Zimbabwe.

National Heroism, ethnic, political party and memory consciousness in Zimbabwe

The Lancaster House negotiations that took place in London in 1979 recommended that the warring parties in the then Zimbabwe Rhodesia should reach a ceasefire and prepare for elections to be supervised by the United Nations. These recommended elections were eventually held in 1980 and ZANU (PF) won 57 of the seats, mostly in the Shona speaking provinces of the country with PF ZAPU winning 20 of the seats mostly in the Ndebele speaking areas of the country. The other three seats reserved for Africans were won by Abel Muzorewa’s United African National Council (UANC). It was the outcome of these results

---

129 The country had been renamed Zimbabwe Rhodesia after some elections which saw Abel Muzorewa’s party winning the majority. Muzorewa proceeded to form a unity government with Smith, Sithole, and Chirau and in order to make the unity Government work and to appeal to Africans that the war was over, they decided to rename the country Zimbabwe Rhodesia. However, after Nkomo and Mugabe refused to take part in that arrangement and vowing to continue with the war, the British intervened and appointed Lord Soames as Governor and thereby restoring Rhodesia as the name of the country.

130 As already stated in the first chapter, both ZANU and ZAPU had adopted the acronym Patriotic Front during the war. For ZANU the acronym was important in the sense that it distinguished them from Sithole whose party was also claiming usage of the name ZANU
that revealed the alleged existence of an ethnic or regional divide and the specific power bases of the main political parties in the country. However, contrary to an expected imminent explosion along this alleged divide, the winning ZANU (PF) party decided to form a Unity Government with both PF ZAPU and the defeated Rhodesian Front of former Prime Minister Ian Smith.

After the formation of this unity Government, the first public sign of fragility and claims of ethnic divisions was immediately noticed right at the top governmental level itself. This was seen through public sentiments issued by cabinet Ministers from ZANU (PF) itself. Surprisingly, the first such Minister to echo these sentiments and accuse PF ZAPU of being a tribal party was Enos Nkala who ironically was also associated with the notion of ‘Ndebele’. Nkala ran a series of attacks aimed at Joshua Nkomo whom he first accused of being a self appointed ‘Ndebele King’ before telling him that his PF ZAPU party was in Government at the will of ZANU (PF). Nkala also further accused PF ZAPU of having only made a small contribution to national independence before taking aim at PF ZAPU’s war time backers, the Soviet Union which he accused of having supported a ‘tribal leader’. In order for the Soviet Union to recuse itself and be allowed to open a Diplomatic Mission in Independent Zimbabwe, Nkala advised it to make a statement denouncing its war time alliance with PF ZAPU.131

It was not long before another government minister from the ZANU (PF) side of government claimed that ZANU (PF) through the legacy of starting the war of liberation was justified in its domination of government affairs. On the occasion of celebrating National Heroes’ Day in 1980, Nathan Shamuyarira asserted that it was ZANU (PF) that had started the war. Speaking in his capacity as Minister of Information and Tourism stated that ‘it should be stressed that we are remembering all the sons and daughters of Zimbabwe who died fighting for Zimbabwe during the 14 years of National struggle from the Sinoia battle of 1966132 to the Lancaster House agreement of 1979’.133


132 This battle that took place near the present town of Chinhouyi formerly Sinoia on the 28th of April 1966’ is reputed to have pitted seven ZANLA guerrillas and the Rhodesian forces. All the seven guerrillas perished at this battle site. See also, C Banana, Turmoil and Tenacity: Zimbabwe 1890-1990 (Harare: The College Press, 1989), p 366.

From the above, what comes out very clear is the fact that Shamuyarira had issued a very important statement that was to go a long way in the creation of political party and national memory consciousness in the history of Zimbabwe. By asserting that the struggle was started in 1966 by ZANU\textsuperscript{134} elements, Shamuyarira had set an unprecedented tone in the manner people should understand the history of the struggle and the individual political party contribution. This statement was later to be contradicted by his counterpart from PF ZAPU, Dumiso Dabengwa who challenged this assertion later in the stages of contemporary Zimbabwe when he also claimed that ‘ZAPU’s armed struggle’ had ‘started’ earlier ‘in 1965 when’ its ‘small units were send into the country’.\textsuperscript{135} It can also be argued that such ethnicized and political party affiliated statements by high ranking leaders of ZANU (PF) were also in a way, aimed at consolidating power and the grip on the history of the struggle and the memories of it.

Apart from these somehow individual ministerial comments about the history of the struggle, perhaps it is important to note that in its first four years in office, the mainly ZANU (PF) government itself handled the issue of national memory and conferment of national hero status diligently with cadres from both parties being conferred with national hero status. The only exceptions during this period were Boysen Mguni and Ruth Nyamurowa, whose cases were discussed by Kriger.\textsuperscript{136} The case of Ruth Nyamurowa is a bit different from that of Boysen Mguni. Boysen Mguni had died in 1981 during a period when ZAPU elements were still part of government. However Nyamurowa had died during a trying and testing time in the history of the country now infamously known as the Gukurahundi period. The central government had claimed that there were dissidents operating in Matabeleland and deployed North Korean trained soldiers known as the 5\textsuperscript{th} Brigade under the auspices of controlling these alleged dissident activities.

\textsuperscript{134} My deliberate omission of the acronym (PF) arises from the fact that in 1966, ZANU was only known as ZANU as the (PF) was only a later day invention.

\textsuperscript{135} D Dabengwa, ‘ZIPRA in the Zimbabwe War of National Liberation’ in T Ranger and N Bhebe (eds) Soldiers in Zimbabwe’s liberation Struggle (Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications, 1995) p27. In this citation, Dabengwa argues that ‘contrary to claims that ZANU started the war in 1966 in Chinhoyi, the fact is that ZAPU’s armed struggle started in 1965 when the small units were sent into the country’.

\textsuperscript{136} N Kriger, ‘The Politics of Creating National Heroes’, pp 151-152. According to Kriger, the burial ceremonies for these two individuals were characterised by ‘open party conflicts’ and at both funerals, Joshua Nkomo the PF ZAPU leader asserted that both of them were very strong candidates for consideration as National Heroes.
The deployment of these soldiers was a disaster culminating into what is now known in the history of the country as the *Gukurahundi* wars, a war which according to its Shona derivation refers to the first rains of the season which cleans up chaff and leaves. The *Gukurahundi* wars reached their climax in 1985 amid reports of massive murders, rape, torture and killings of the general populace by the government soldiers in the Matabeleland provinces. This event helped to strengthen a Shona-Ndebele divide that had started to be articulated at national level after the 1980 elections. 1985 again can be referred to as the period when this divide was further intensified by the proposed second general elections that later took place. ZANU (PF) youths are said to have ran campaigns against mostly Ndebele PF ZAPU supporters throughout the country. There were also reports of destabilizations and killings ‘both before and after the general elections’.138

Up until that time notions of ethnicity and party affiliation had little impact on the issue of national memory and the way in which the liberation war history of the country was supposed to be understood and retold.139 In support of this argument, it is important to note that, by July 1984, the National Heroes’ Acre was now a burial place for seven national heroes from both sides who had been accorded this status by the government. These individuals included nationalists such as Herbert Chitepo, Leopold Takawira, Josiah Tongogara, Simon Mazorodze and Rekayi Tangwena from ZANU (PF) whilst from PF ZAPU there was George Silundika, Jason Moyo, and Masotsha Ndlovu.140 On the PF ZAPU side, it is interesting to note that the remains of Alfred Nikita Mangena had not been brought home for interment at the National Heroes Acre. And for this issue, Norma Kriger noted that this was primarily because PF ZAPU had not submitted his name for consideration as a national hero and secondarily because the problems associated with national hero conferment had already
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139 See, ‘Curfew over in Matabeleland South-Mubako’, *The Zimbabwean Herald*, August 2 1984. In lifting the curfew, Simbi Mubako, the Minister of Home Affairs is said to have remarked that ‘lifting the curfew will enable people to celebrate the forthcoming Heroes’ day without restrictions’ Mubako further reiterated that ‘the Government will keep a watchful eye over Matabeleland South and should any area harbour armed dissidents, sterner measures, including reimposition or extension of curfew will be taken’.

started and that the ZANU (PF) central committee had already taken its grip on this institution. I would however, like to argue that even though the allegations of exclusion raised by Kriger are correct, the name of Nikita Mangena was already enshrined in this category of Zimbabwean National Heroes. In a headline article, titled ‘Zimbabwe Hails its gallant Heroes of National Liberation’, the name and portrait of Alfred Nikita Mangena had also appeared alongside other heroes such as Chitepo, Silundika, Moyo and the trade unionist Masotsha Ndlovu. Thus, this argument scales down the accusation of a major bias during this period to a much lower proportion.

For me the turning point towards biasness along political party and perhaps ethnic lines was August 1984. 1984 should be remembered in the history of Zimbabwe and national memorialisation as the year in which ZANU (PF) held its congress, a congress that was to go a long way in shaping national history and national memory. Before the actual holding of the congress, ZANU (PF) had decided that it was going to have a Politburo as the head of its secretariat. Outlining the duties of the proposed forthcoming Politburo, Eddison Zvobgo, who by that time was the Party spokesperson, had indicated that ‘the Politburo will be the executive arm of the party and will be accountable to the 90 member central committee’.

Even though the effects of the Politburo were not immediately noticed at this stage, the other notable turning point from the congress of 1984 was the decision to merge the interests of the government and that of the party. In a statement issued by it, the congress is said to have resolved that:

\[ \text{ZANU (PF) is determined that Zimbabwe should become a one party state and that the process of establishing it should be lawful and constitutional.} \]

The same statement also further indicated that

\[ \text{Since Government was born out of the party and since the party and the people had become one, the supremacy of ZANU (PF) must be implemented by everyone without equivocation.} \]

---


Lastly, the same congress is also reputed to have called for ‘an executive presidency to be brought about in Zimbabwe without delay’.  

With knowledge derived from the above, perhaps it is now necessary to see how the above congress later proved to be the turning point of memorialisation and the peak of the rise of the claims of ethnic consciousness in Zimbabwe. All along, it should be noted that conferment of the above named heroes was done by the government. It had been the duty of the government Minister of Information and Tourism to announce state occasions such as conferment of national heroes and state functions such as celebrating holidays like the National Heroes Day. However, on the occasion of the death of Josiah Chinamano, the ZAPU vice president, it was Simon Muzenda the country’s then Deputy Prime Minister who announced the decision to confer Chinamano hero status as well as stating the date of burial at the national shrine. The death of Chinamano also set an interesting precedent in the history of national heroism in Zimbabwe as it was the first time that a relative of a dead hero was quoted by the press thanking an individual for according such a status to a deceased person. James Chikerema, a relative of Chinamano was quoted by the Herald Newspaper ‘praising Cde Mugabe, for respecting the late PF ZAPU vice president by declaring him a national hero’.

Indeed, the ZANU (PF) congress set a precedent for conferment of the national honour. It is not quite clear whether this particular congress also had an effect in the promulgation of the National Heroes Act which was enacted the same year. For Zimbabwe, after these two events namely the promulgation of the act and the ZANU (PF) congress, the precedent had been that, each and every time a person with credentials warranting declaration to be a National Hero dies it is the ZANU (PF) Politburo that makes the decision of conferring that individual with a hero status. It is not clear whether it was the president himself who decided to cascade the duty that was his through the act, or whether it was the effect of the 1984 congress that regarded the party and the government to be the same. Maybe in this case, the president was seen as a representative of the party. However, what is in history is that the same procedure took place after the death of Robson Manyika in 1985 and Maurice Nyagumbo in 1989. On

145 See ‘Call to give President Executive Powers’, The Zimbabwean Herald, 11 August 1984.
147 See ‘Hundreds pay Chinamano last respects’, The Zimbabwean Herald, 6 October 1984.
the death of Maurice Nyagumbo, President Mugabe himself made the announcement and made it categorically clear that ‘Cde Nyagumbo had been declared a national hero by ZANU (PF)’. Burials at the National Heroes Acre tend to confirm this grip by ZANU (PF) on this issue of national memory. The precedent has been that upon an individual’s death, it is now the ZANU (PF) provincial committees that send recommendations to the Politburo for it to confer statuses.

Thus, upon being asked questions on why certain deserving individuals who were not members of ZANU (PF) had not been accorded national hero status whereas others in similar cases had been accorded it, the party’s secretary for Administration, Dydmus Mutasa is said to have responded that:

on the question of Tekere, ZANU (PF) had not diverted from its norm in conferring him the status. In the case of Chikerema, he was never a member of ZANU (PF) and nobody ever sent a request that we confer him the status. In this case (of Tekere), I have a letter from Manicaland and it was on this basis that we held consultations. On Ndabaningi Sithole, again there was no request. He went away as a member of ZANU Mwenje, and nobody from Mwenje made a report. So we have not deviated; we have been sticking to our guns. On Tenjiwe Lesabe, what was asked for by Matabeleland Provinces was state assistance and that was done.

However, an analysis of how ZANU (PF) as a party has strengthened its grip on the institution of national heroism and thereby conferring such a status along party lines cannot be concluded without mentioning the incident of ZIPRA war time commander Lookout Masuku, an incident that was also noted by Kriger. Masuku had died in prison after having been accused of hiding arms of war in secret places throughout the country. What is in history is that Masuku was denied this honour upon his death and was later buried at the Lady Stanely Square cemetery in Bulawayo before being honoured with the national status again after the unity accord between ZANU (PF) and PF ZAPU. In contemporary Zimbabwean history, the burial of Lookout Masuku at Lady Stanely Square was not the only one. Several other declared heroes or later to be declared heroes from that province also found a permanent resting place there. However, for the subject matter of national memory, two questions usually arise from this precedence. The first question is whether Lady Stanely

---

Cemetery is fast rising to be a national heroes’ acre servicing the interests of the Matabeleland region and the second is whether such happenings do not in any way tantamount to a divided memory in a nation state?

**A divided memory or the other National Heroes’ Acre? The Lady Stanley Cemetery in Bulawayo**

As already stated above, Lookout Masuku, ZIPRA’s war time army commander and later Deputy Commander of the integrated Zimbabwe National Army that came into existence after the attainment of independence in 1980, was initially denied National Hero status. His remains were later buried at the Lady Stanely Square Public Cemetery in Bulawayo. Masuku’s case was not to be the only one of its kind involving PF ZAPU high ranking officials to be buried at this cemetery in Bulawayo. More and more individuals from PF ZAPU and the Matabeleland region in particular have found their remains being buried at this public cemetery. However, even though Masuku had been buried there because he had not been accorded the status that would have enabled him to be interred at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, the cases of others that now lie at this cemetery are a bit different. These cases are different in that, in some of the cases like the one of Dr Isaac Nyathi for example, the conferment of national hero status came a bit late, long after the deceased had already been buried.  

The other category of the veterans of the Zimbabwe struggle buried at this public cemetery includes some who were accorded national hero status but had in their life time vowed never to be buried at the National Heroes’ Acre itself citing different reasons. These heroes include Welshmen Mabhena, PF ZAPU’s Secretary General before the Unity Accord talks of 1987. However, in spite of the different individual cases of not being interred in Harare, the case of Lady Stanely Cemetery needs to be examined within this discourse of national shrines.  

*The other National Heroes Acre?*

---

151 Welshman Mabhena for example, vowed never to be buried amongst those whom he claimed did not deserve to be declared as National Heroes.
Pierre Nora, the Frenchman once argued that, ‘statues or monuments to the dead for instance, owe their meaning to their intrinsic existence; even though their location is far from arbitrary, one could justify relocating them without altering their meaning’. This statement tends to apply to the case of Lady Stanley Cemetery where people who have done deeds that may warrant national recognition (and that is according to what is being considered in terms of Hero declaration) are now buried. Regardless of where they are buried, those who now lie at this public cemetery are designated as national heroes. At present, the Lady Stanely Square is now home to eight declared national heroes namely Charles Gray, Lookout Masuku, Welshman Mabhena, Masala Sibanda, Lazarus Nkala, Dr I Nyathi, Ethan Dube and Swazini Ndlovu. However, the question that arises is whether this site can be viewed as a national monument or not. Just as Mugabe stated in 1983 and quoted in the previous chapter, the idea of celebrating national heroes aims to serve as a ‘permanent reminder to the nation and to posterity’. In this case, does this space of Lady Stanely Cemetery serve as this ‘permanent reminder’ about the history of national heroism? In response to this, I would like to argue that, contrary to Nora’s assertion about an unchanged meaning from a phenomenon such as heroism, the burial of these cadres at a public cemetery tantamounts to their erasure from the mainstream public history of the nation.

Figure 6. The rehabilitated graves of national heroes, Lookout Masuku, Tarcious Swazini Ndlovu and the cenotaph for Ethan Dube at the Lady Stanely Cemetery in Bulawayo. Photo by Blessed Magadzike

153 Ethan Dube disappeared in the 1970s and a cenotaph of his grave was also later constructed at the National Heroes Acre in Harare. The other cenotaph is at the Lady Stanely Cemetery in Bulawayo.
A Divided National Memory?

However, with special reference again to Nora’s assertion quoted above, the case of the national hero burials at Lady Stanely can also be viewed in another dimension which also questions the idea of a national memory. This question asks whether lessons of a ‘national memory’ can be drawn from Lady Stanely Cemetery especially when considering that it is first and above all, a public burial place which later came to have national hero burials. In this case, several arguments can be postulated. One of these is that the idea behind the collective commemorative project represented by the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare was one aimed at uniting people referred to as Zimbabweans in this aspect of national remembering. However, the separation of these graves from the others poses a serious threat to a perceived national unity and raises the possibility of a divided memory running parallel to the original ideals of national liberation as a single phenomenon. Furthermore, contrary to the idea of oneness, these graves, situated in the capital of the Matabele provinces, Bulawayo will appeal more to the people of that region. However, on the other hand, one of my informants Chief Malachi Masuku of Matopos differs with this opinion of a divided memory as he thinks that this is the only way in which people from the region will associate themselves with concept of national
heroism. According to him, these developments at Lady Stanley ‘brings their heroes closer to home for people in the region to appreciate them’\footnote{Interview with Chief M Masuku at Westacre farm, Matopos, Matabeleland South, Zimbabwe, 25 February 2011.}

However, in conclusion, all the issues discussed in this chapter, point to an exclusionary tendency in the manner in which the site of memory, in the form of the National Heroes’ Acre was premised upon. In the next chapter I now examine whether the idea of the local shrine was exclusive or not.
CHAPTER 3

DEVELOPING A LOCAL HEROES’ ACRE IN MATABELELAND SOUTH PROVINCE

Introduction

Chapter 1 of this work examined the genesis of war memorialisation in the geographical landscape that constitutes the nation state now known as Zimbabwe. It also tried to give a brief background to the politics that surrounds the issue of war memorialisation in Zimbabwe. The second chapter was focused on the production of historical knowledge emanating from the same attributes listed above, but was more focused on one monument namely the National Heroes’ Acre of Zimbabwe that is situated in Harare, its capital city. This particular chapter examines the development of local sites of memory such as the Provincial and District Heroes’ Acres in Matabeleland South Province as another way of remembering a war legacy in Zimbabwe. In this case, I propose to examine the idea of memorialising in relationship to its practice or its visual implementation on the ground. Also central to the discussions in this chapter will be an examination of the implication of the coming in of other players such as the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe into this same discourse of memorialisation. In this case, the NMMZ will be examined as an independent professional board whose operations are supposed to be different from that of the state proper. Furthermore, the chapter will also examine the meaning of the local sites of memory in a district, province or country’s history before finally looking at the problems associated with the ‘naming’ of wars regarded as worthy memorialising.

The rise of Provincial and District Heroes Acres: A synopsis of issues involved in Zimbabwean memorialisation

To undertake an examination of the issues that characterized the rise of war memorialisation in Zimbabwe’s past and present histories that has been elaborated in the preceding chapters, it can be broadly stated that three key ideas emerged out of the discussions. The first emanated from the fact that even though the aspect of war is generally regarded as destructive because
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of its association with the aspects of violence, killing and dispossession, it is the same phenomena, as this work has tried to argue, that was central to the construction of a nationhood under an organized single administration. Furthermore within this discussion of sites of war memory as a key feature of what can be referred to as the ‘national estate’, what has also been noticed is that when the first signs of heritage consciousness emerged in the colonial period of the country’s history, war played a central role in the shaping of definitions of what became its heritage.

Further to the above, the second important idea that also came out of this study of war memory was that, in the two historical phases identified, it was a war and not wars that were selected as ones befitting eternal national remembrance. During the colonial phase, the Matabele War of 1893 proved to be the war that produced heroes or people who were seen to have deserved very well of their country whilst the war of national liberation fought by ZANU (PF) and PF ZAPU against the Rhodesian Front between the years mid 1960s to 1979 was the one which was singled out in the post independent phase of the country as the foundation and basis of its eternal national memorialisation project. Lastly, what also came

---


3 Refer to my argument in Chapter 1 on sites of war memory being amongst the list of sites to be proclaimed as the first National Monuments in the then Southern Rhodesia.

4 Even though I am fully aware that Zimbabwe’s colonial history was not a singular phenomena, my decision here to limit its history to only the colonial and post colonial phases is still greatly informed by L White, The Assassination of Hebert Chitepo (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2003), p 6 who argued that ‘maintaining that Rhodesia was colonial and Zimbabwe Independent has allowed many discursive flourishes, given the play of the two countries, one illegitimate and one legitimate with two names’.

5 Even though the colonial state of Rhodesia was involved in many wars, my argument here stems from the fact that it was the sites associated with the Matabele War that were duly declared as National Monuments by the Historic Monuments Commission in 1937. Even though there were some World War memorials in Rhodesia, they were never considered as part of the colonial war national remembrance setup. In another case, the colonial establishment even refused to grant permission to the Memorable Order of the Tin Hats (MOTH) to erect a shrine at the World’s View burial grounds in the Matopos which had been set aside for the purposes of burying those who had done something deemed recognisable by the Rhodesian nation. See for example, the Minutes of the Historic Commission meeting held at Bulawayo on the 16th of July 1946. On another interesting note such colonial historical productions whose purpose was to glorify the Matabele War as ‘heroic’ have been challenged in the present day historical versions by for example, S Ndlovu-Gatsheni, ‘Mapping Cultural and Colonial Encounters, 1880s -1930s’ in B Raftopolous and A Mlambo (eds) Becoming Zimbabwe: A history from the Pre-colonial period to 2008 (Harare: Weaver Press) 2009, p 39 who now sees such a war as one in which the ‘Ndebele[s]’ gallantly resisted ‘imperial forces’

6 According to ‘A Guide to the National Heroes Acre’, Ministry of Media, Information and Publicity, Zimbabwe Government, 1986, p 2 ‘these sacred shrines were built to honour the heroes of Zimbabwe, past, present and future. The heroes include national leaders, freedom fighters and dedicated supporters of the national liberation
out of the discussions in these two chapters was the fact that regardless of what type of a memorialising methodology is employed, it can still be subjected to criticism. This means that an attempt to be inclusive can be viewed as one that is exclusive and vice versa. As we have seen in the preceding chapter, the rise of the Lady Stanely Cemetery in Bulawayo as possibly another heroes’ acre was in another way, seen as one that was a result of exclusive tendencies but after a critical interrogation of such a practice, arguments that the same gesture constituted inclusiveness elements were postulated.⁷

Furthermore criticism of any format of memorialisation in Zimbabwe’s history is not a new phenomenon. Mainstream pre independence memorialisation was also a victim of such criticism as it found itself being labelled as a ‘past event’ that ‘casts a heavy shadow on the’ country’s ‘present and future events’.⁸ These criticisms later manifested themselves into pressure groups and organisations such as Sangano Munhumutapa and the Affirmative Action Group.⁹ These two organisations saw the Rhodes memorial in the Matopos as both unnecessary and an insult to the black ancestral spirits.¹⁰ In continuing this trend, post independent Zimbabwe’s memorialisation project was also not an exception from criticism. As this chapter will show, an attempt to be more inclusive by diffusing and localising the idea of a memorialisation project that had started with the creation of a National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, the capital city, by the post independent authorities was heavily criticised as one that was heavily tainted by exclusive tendencies.

As already alluded to in the introductory chapter, it was Richard Werbner and Norma Kriger who led the initial onslaught on this methodological approach on the Zimbabwean post-colonial memorialisation project. However, in contemporary studies of commemorative
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⁷ In one of my Interviews with Chief M Masuku of Westacre Farm, Matopos on the 25th of February 2011 he argued that the rise of Lady Stanely Cemetery as a potential National Heroes’ Acre was in line with the aspirations of the people of Matabeleland region who have for long periods, desired to have a national heroes’ acre much closer to home.

⁸ See, ‘Minister outlines stand on ‘old era’, The Zimbabwean Herald, 1 August 1980.

⁹ See for example, Joseph Muringaniza, ‘The Heritage that hurts’ in C Fforde et al (eds) The dead and their Possessions: Repatriations in Principle, policy and practice, p 320. Muringaniza described ‘Sangano Munhumutapa’ as a ‘Harare based, Shona dominated pressure group’ that ‘represents the wishes and concerns of only a small percentage of the Shona population’ whilst the Affirmative Action Group is described as a ‘pressure group campaigning for the economic empowerment of Blacks in Zimbabwe’.

related issues and when given the reasons he gave to support his argument, Werbner’s
critique is not surprising. In actual fact, the very basis of his arguments all points to the fact
that, many versions of analysis can be deduced from commemorative projects. As Savage
noted in the commemorative projects in the United States of America, ‘the Tomb of the
Unknown Soldier in Arlington cemetery, which included remains of the dead from the World
War 1, World War 2, Korea and Vietnam’ and ‘served as a national focal point for ritual
services on Memorial Day and Veterans Day’ was seen as not totally inclusive. According to
Savage, this was because it ‘did not satisfy the felt need for comprehensive recognition of’ all
‘the nation’s service men’.\textsuperscript{11} Instead, for Savage, the ‘Vietnam Veterans Memorial’ which
was erected in the United States Capital was a more ‘comprehensive War Memorial’ in that
‘it was ‘dedicated to all United States troops who had served in a national war than a subset
from a particular branch, division or locality’.\textsuperscript{12} In this case, even though Savage is correct in
making these comparisons, two key issues arise from this assertion. The first one questions
whether Savage was correct in referring to the Vietnam War was a national war in American
senses especially when given the fact that whilst it is true that some Americans had
participated in it, the morality of such a war is now being questioned.\textsuperscript{13} The second issue is
that even though the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington had been erected on the
basis of the need to commemorate all the Americans who had participated in the Vietnam
War, Savage still criticised its lack of comprehensiveness.\textsuperscript{14}

In view of the above, and with special reference to Zimbabwe’s commemorative project, I
would like to concur with Werbner’s critique, especially when given the fact that
memorialisation is a subject matter that can give rise to many contestations and can also be
viewed in many different ways just like what Savage did above. However, in order to desist
from the notion of having Werbner’s assessment as one that should be taken as given,
perhaps there is need to critically analyse the idea that gave rise to what Werbner refers to as

\textsuperscript{11} K Savage, \textit{Monuments Wars: Washington DC., the National Mall and the transformation of the memorial
landscape} Berkley and Los Angeles California: California University Press, 2003), p 266.

\textsuperscript{12} K Savage, \textit{Monuments Wars}, p266.

\textsuperscript{13} The morality of the Vietnam War itself has been questioned in some circles by for example, J Winter, ‘Sites
of Memory and the Shadow of War’ in Astrid Erll, Ansgar Nüning and S .B Young (eds) \textit{Cultural Memory
62 who mentioned the lack of ‘moral consensus about what was being remembered in public’ and ‘about the
appropriate time and place to remember it’

\textsuperscript{14} K Savage, \textit{Monuments Wars}, p 266.
a graded memorial order. The question that arises is if the idea of this commemorative project was one which was premised on the concept of trying to be more inclusive, then, why is it that Werbner criticises it on the basis of its exclusiveness? In order to understand the nature of this critique it is now important to move on to the examination of how this idea was implemented at the heroes’ acres in Matabeleland South Province of Zimbabwe.

**Taking the idea of the nation to the people?**

On the day of celebrating the National Heroes’ Day in Zimbabwe on the 11th of August in 1989, of the twelve individuals who had been accorded national hero status and buried at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, nine of them were nationalists belonging to both ZANU and ZAPU, except for three who had been involved in combat related issues. Of these three, one of them was a former commander of ZANLA, the military wing of the former liberation movement of ZANU (PF) whilst the other two had been senior commanders of the same military wing15 with Robson Manyika having started his military career with ZIPRA, PF ZAPU’s military wing.16 During this time, the common soldier had not found a place in mainstream postcolonial memorialisation, a situation which created a hierarchical elitist order that was later to be criticized by both Werbner and Kriger. However, the question that keeps on recurring is whether Werbner and Kriger were justified in critiquing a hierarchical elitist commemorative system.

**Towards a local heroes’ acre in Matabeleland South Province**

Even though I concur with both Werbner and Kriger’s assertions that the memorialisation project established soon after the attainment of independence was one that gave rise to an elitist burial place in which only the nationalists were celebrated whilst common soldiers were being omitted, I would like to argue that their assessment did not take into consideration the meanings and implications of the eventual promulgation of an idea to have provincial based local heroes’ acres. In this case, it is the promulgation of this decision to eventually

---


include those who had been omitted from the memorialisation trail represented by the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare that must be examined for its merits. Unlike Werbner and Kriger whose criticisms were focused on how an idea was implemented without analyzing the basis of the same idea, my assessment of the rise of Provincial Heroes’ Acres in Matabeleland South Province is one that is premised on a thorough examination of the implications and meanings of both the practice and the idea fused together.

It can be argued that the eventual promulgation of the idea to include ordinary fighters most of whom were not known outside their respective districts or areas was arguably one that was intended to achieve an all encompassing and inclusive national commemorative framework. In this case, it can also be stated and argued that the idea to bury ordinary soldiers in the respective areas where they had hailed from, was also in line with the fact that unlike the nationwide popular nationalists and most of their senior commanders, most of them were not known outside their areas of origin and therefore it would be proper for them to be accorded a befitting recognition as heroes in their respective areas of origin.

With special focus on Matabeleland South Province, it is important to note that most of those who were buried at the various shrines created in its six districts including the provincial one in Gwanda, were locals who had participated in the liberation struggle and had hailed from the districts and the province respectively. However, it is also important to note that the creation of both the local sites and the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare are projects which have not gone down very well with some of the former fighters themselves. One of my informants, War Veteran X, argued that both the National Heroes’ Acre and the local ones were institutions that propagated historical distortions as well as acting as misrepresentation sites of an armed struggle. War Veteran X argued that when they were fighting, ‘they had fought to liberate every inch of the Zimbabwean landscape’ and as a result, ‘creating a hierarchical memorial order gives rise to an assumption that whilst certain individuals had fought to liberate the whole country, others were fighting to liberate districts or provinces, thus creating a false historical discourse about the war of liberation’.

17 My critique of Werbner and Kriger’s assessments here is based on the fact that their main concern was the differences in grave type, places of burial and pensions for the dead heroes and they never examined the exact meaning of this idea to have provincial and district sites in relationship to the subject matter of memory.

18 My argument is premised on the basis that what I am dealing with is a phenomenon that had seen others players being left out in the initial phase.

19 Interview with War Veteran X, Mafela Trust Offices, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe, 21 August 2011.
However, War Veteran X’s assessment and argument above takes us away from the core of my argument which is based on the idea of memorialisation versus the implementation of the actual practice on the ground as represented by the discrepancies that exists in burial types and the pensions. Instead, War Veteran X’s analysis raises questions about the relationship between local sites of war representation and the idea of national memory and history. Of these questions, perhaps the most important one is: can the provincial and district heroes’ acres such as those in Matabeleland South Province also produce knowledge about Zimbabwe’s national history? And further to that, can the same also produce knowledge about the issue of memory and remembrance both at the local scale up to the national level? In order to understand these, it is now important to turn to the examination of these issues as they occur in the region here under study.

**The Matabeleland South Province Heroes and Heroes’ Acres [not] in national memory and history**

From an assessment of the above factors that led to the creation of locals heroes’ acres in Zimbabwe including those in Matabeleland South Province, what comes out very clearly is the fact that even though Kriger and Werbner critiqued the burial practices at the local sites of memory they nevertheless completely left out the analysis of the idea that was behind the creation of these local sites. What has also emerged from the analysis is that even though the burial practice was exclusive by nature, the supposed idea to instigate local sites of war memory was one that was arguably premised on the principle of inclusiveness. However, even though it has been spelt out that the idea of having local shrines was apparently intended at addressing these exclusive elements, it is now important to examine how these claims to inclusive tendencies produced notions of exclusion in the Heroes’ Acres in Matabeleland South Province

*Locating the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre*

---

20 This working concept is borrowed from the title of Leslie Witz’s paper ‘Africa [not] in world history’, Unpublished paper presented at the Centre For Humanities Research in Africa’ weekly seminars, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town South Africa, 2010.
In terms of geographical space, environment and location, all the burial sites designated as spaces for the heroes’ acres in Matabeleland South Province conforms to the ideas that were considered before the setting up of the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare. Whilst the idea to have a National Heroes’ Acre in Harare was because it was the ideal place where both the capital city and seat of government were located, it was the same idea that was also used to locate basically all the heroes’ acres in Matabeleland South Province. In line with this idea, all the local heroes’ acres in the province are located at the main service centres of each and every concerned district. In this case, the District Heroes’ Acre for Bulilimamangwe District is located at Plumtree the main centre, for Insiza at Filabusi, for Matobo at Kezi, for Beitbridge in Beitbridge, for Mzingwane at Esigodini and lastly the one at Gwanda which was initially for Gwanda District was gradually transformed to become the Provincial Heroes’ Acre.21

Furthermore it is important to note that whilst the National Heroes’ Acre was constructed in the Warren Hills area, a hilly place located to the south west of the city centre, it is the same concept that was also used in the determination of locating all the local sites of war memory in Matabeleland South Province. For instance, the main provincial site which is the one located in Gwanda was also constructed on a hill in the north eastern outskirts of the town. Hills are revered as the ideal burial places for important people in Zimbabwean traditional societies. In this case, it can be argued that this gesture of locating the provincial sites on hills was a continuation of the same idea that was considered when developing the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, the capital city.

21 I am extremely grateful to Nqabutho Dhlamini a former work colleague for alerting me about the location of the other District Acres I could not manage to visit because of both financial and viability constraints.
Figure 8. View of the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre taken from a Gwanda residential suburb. Note that it is located on a hill. The Heroes’ acre is located just behind the small building shown in the photography: Photo by Blessed Magadzike

Furthermore, the location of the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre is not the only similarity that can be drawn between the two burial spaces. As this study later found out, there are so many lines of similarities that can be drawn from the two. The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier which is a replica of the conical tower at the Great Zimbabwe National Monument also characterises this burial shrine. Even though there are some differences in the designs of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Provincial Heroes’ Acre and the one in Harare, there are some similarities in the nature of rituals that are conducted there. At the provincial level, it is at this Tomb of the Unknown Soldier that the representative of the president in the province, who in this case is the Provincial Governor and Resident Minister, lays a wreath in honour of the war dead during ceremonies such as the National Heroes’ Day. It is at this site that the Provincial Governor also reads the speech of the state president to the people during these ceremonies. In this case, the reading of the presidential speech at the main local site during these memorial ceremonies can be seen as a gesture that is supposedly meant to unite the country in memory and remembering.
However, the use of symbols borrowed from one part of the country into a totally different region has not gone down well with a section of the society. According to my informants, Chief Masuku of Matobo, the councillor for Gwanda Ward 14,\textsuperscript{22} Councillor G Ndlovu,\textsuperscript{23} War Veteran Mpofu of Esigodini,\textsuperscript{24} Mzingwane District and Mrs Banana also of Esigodini,\textsuperscript{25} the usage of symbols borrowed from elsewhere at local sites of memory propagates the importance of the symbols of that particular region at the expense of local ones. According to these locals of Matabeleland South Province, since the site of memory is a local one, symbols that are synonymous to the region should be used as an awareness of its existence within the nation. Furthermore, for them, usage of these borrowed symbols is tantamount to their exclusion from the nation. On the other hand, Chief Ndlamba also of Gwanda categorically stated that since the idea of the war memorials was the central government’s brainchild, the usage of a single symbol was appropriate especially when given the principles of the unity accord signed in 1987 which advocated for a united Zimbabwe.\textsuperscript{26} This view was also supported by Mr Jackson Ndlovu, the Director of the Edward Ndlovu Memorial library in Gwanda who argued that the Great Zimbabwe symbol was not only uniting but envisaged the aspirations of all Zimbabweans as Zimbabweans.\textsuperscript{27}

Apart from the location, and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier discussed above, comparisons between the Provincial and the District Heroes’ Acres can also be drawn in terms of the grave type. Just as the graves at the National Heroes’ Acre have granite slabs and tombstones, the same initiative has also been applied on the provincial graves. In this case, it can be argued that this should also be seen as an attempt by the state to continue with the idea that had initially brought the local sites of memory into existence, one that is premised on the concept of redressing the exclusive tendencies that had existed before.

\textsuperscript{22}Interview with Chief Masuku, Westacre Farm, Matobo District, 25 February 2011.
\textsuperscript{23}Interview with Councillor G Ndlovu, Celesa Business Centre, Gwanda, 23 February 2011.
\textsuperscript{24}Interview with War Veteran Mpofu, Banana homestead, Esigodini, Mzingwane District, Matabeleland South Province, 24 February 2011.
\textsuperscript{25}Interview with Mrs Banana, Banana homestead, Esigodini, Mzingwane District, 24 February 2011.
\textsuperscript{26}Interview with Chief Ndlamba, Gwalanyemba Communal Area, Gwanda, 23 February 2011.
\textsuperscript{27}Interview with Jackson Ndlovu at Edward Silonda Ndlovu Memorial Library, Gwanda, 24 February 2011.
Questions can also be raised in respect of the historical knowledge that emanates from the local heroes’ acres and those who are buried there. One of the questions that arise is whether these sites and the dead buried can claim a place in the district, provincial or even national memory and history? And furthermore to this, since I have already argued that the idea of having graded heroes acres was one supposedly premised on the basis of propagating the
heroisms of those who were relatively unknown outside their own areas at a local scale, the
question that arises is what knowledge pertaining to history and memorialisation has been
produced at that same level they are being recognised at? To analyse these questions, let me
now turn my focus to the aspect of examining the whole memorial landscape of Matabeleland
South Province to determine whether there is any historical knowledge produced from the
local sites and the legacies of the buried dead that has filtered into the public spaces of both
the districts and the province. It is this kind of knowledge, if there is any, which will create an
opportunity to analyse whether the development of the heroes’ acres was meant to completely
alleviate the graded memorial allegations.

Analysing the memorial landscape of Matabeleland South Province: A critique of
representation

From an analytical point of view, it can be argued and stated that evidence gathered from this
research so far points to the fact that war memorialisation in Matabeleland South Province
confirms Werbner and Kriger’s assessment of a hierarchical representation. On a historical
scale, it can also be further stated that from Cecil John Rhodes to the post colony,
memorialisation in the province has been heavily tilted in favour of those individuals who are
well-known. This analysis of public knowledge production on the commemorated also
confirms the notion that apart from the burials and memorial landscape, the image of the
common soldier cannot produce any knowledge for public consumption. Just as the imposing
figure and name of Allan Wilson managed to overshadow all of his colleagues who had
fallen with him and had been buried in the same memorial landscape of World’s View in
Matobo District, the same story can also be used to explain how postcolonial local heroes
have been obscured from both the public space and the domain of public knowledge
production at the very local scale let alone the country at large.

An investigation of the Matabeleland South Province memorial landscape produced results
that points to the fact that this domain is still dominated by the memories of individuals who
were declared national heroes. Indeed, the legacies of declared local heroes such as Joel
Dhliwayo (whose grave is illustrated above) and the rest of his colleagues lying elsewhere at

28 For example, a high school in Harare the Capital city is named after Allan Wilson whilst nothing much is
known about those who participated in the so called ‘last stand’ with him.
other designated places have not been able to produce knowledge worthy filtering into the public spaces of the province and districts. As I will show, the only claim to public space by Joel Dhliwayo and his colleagues remain confined within the limits of the grave space and the memorial shrine where their remains are interred at the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre in Gwanda. Instead, it is the imposing figures of declared national figures who also hailed from the same province of Matabeleland South such as Joshua Nkomo, Jason Moyo and Edward Ndlovu who are memorialised in many places in both the capital and Bulawayo the second city, which have also conquered the public spaces in the local districts and the province in general.

The local and only Polytechnic College in the province was named after the memory of Joshua Nkomo who had been born in the Matobo District of Matabeleland South Province and during the time of his death was serving as one of the country’s vice presidents. Furthermore, another high school in the Matobo District of the province, Joshua Mqabuko High School was also named after the same man. And lastly, the Umdala Wethu gala, a commemorative festival to remember both Nkomo’s reincarnated legacy as father of the nation and the occasion of his death was also held in the Beitbridge district of the province in the year 2005. Similarly the only Public Library in the province was named after the memory of Edward Ndlovu, who like Joshua Nkomo also hailed from the Gwanda District of Matabeleland South Province. Lastly, one secondary school in the Mzingwane District of the Province is named after Jason Moyo who hailed from its district of Bulilimamangwe. With this in mind, the question that arises is why is it that knowledge about alleged national figures continues to dominate public spaces ahead of the local personages even in areas supposed to be their own domain?

With special reference to the above question, perhaps it is important to note that in the studies of commemorative related projects, the domination of public spaces and the memory terrain by certain individuals has not been synonymous to Matabeleland South Province only whereby the legacies of individuals such as Joshua Nkomo, Edward Ndlovu and Jason Moyo continue to dominate public knowledge about the struggle and heroism even at the local scale. In her studies on post apartheid representation in South Africa, Buntman also noted that at Robben Island:

> It is however, above all Mandela who is a symbol. Tours to and tourists on Robben Island inevitably focus on Mandela, and even where the mass nature of incarceration and the sacrifice of other prisoners is addressed, there is little understanding of the collective life prisoners created and the reciprocal relations of support and inspiration that prisoners gave each other, including Mandela.\(^{32}\)

---

31 See also S. J Ndlovu- Gatsheni and W Willems, ‘Making sense of cultural nationalism and the Politics of commemoration under the third Chimurenga in Zimbabwe’, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 35, number 4, (December 2009), p 956. Here Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Willems asserts that, Nkomo for instance was further honoured with accolades such as the ‘silver jubilee’ alongside late and living regional leaders such as ‘Tanzania’s Julius Nyerere, Zambia’s Kenneth Kaunda, Botswana’s Sir Seretse Khama, Mozambique’s Samora Machel and Angola’s Aghosthino Neto’.

Buntman also further lamented this domination of incarceration narratives ‘beyond Robben Island’ by Nelson Mandela, as one that had degenerated to the extent that required the ‘PAC president, Stanley Mogoba’ to ‘remind[ed] the public that he too’ once served time ‘at Robben Island’. Thus, with reference to the above, what comes out clearly is the fact that Matabeleland South Province’s local heroes or even the local heroes’ acres have no other role in domains such as the public sphere, production of local histories on war memory and local commemoration let alone national memory and history.

On another note, to undertake a closer assessment of the sign post pictured above, it can be stated that apart from welcoming visitors to the highest institution of learning in the province, Joshua Nkomo is further associated with aspects such as vision, wisdom and spirit, all preserves which the local heroes have been excluded from associating with. And more importantly Joshua Nkomo is further associated with a corporate institution namely Intermarket Financial Holdings. Thus in this case, it can also be argued that, the act of focusing on Nkomo at the local scale at the expense of the local heroes further implies that whilst those lying at the local shrines had also fought for the liberation of the country, their brands are not being associated with such aspects and hence the turn to an imposing figure such as Joshua Nkomo. The same can also be said of the Edward Ndlovu Memorial Library in Gwanda. On the occasion of its official opening, the library was officially opened by two ambassadors from the United Kingdom and Canada.

---

33 F Buntman, ‘Politics and Secrets of Political Prisoner History’, p 20. See also C Rassool, ‘The Individual auto/biography and history in South Africa’, pp 255-256 who asserts that ‘nowhere else was the preoccupation with biography and attributes of political leadership as a mode of understanding the past in new South Africa so acute as in the case of Nelson Mandela. The late 1980s and the early 1990s saw a veritable “scramble” for Nelson Mandela’s life as biographies in virtually every medium were produced’.

34 Intermarket is a Zimbabwean financial institution with interests in banking and money markets.

35 Interview with Jackson Ndlovu, at Edward Ndlovu Memorial library, Gwanda, 24 February 2011. See also, memorial plaque at the library pictured below.
The only time when the local heroes’ acre gets publicity is on the occasion of celebrating national holidays like Heroes’ Day, whereby people gather at the Provincial shrine to commemorate the event as well as to hear the presidential message to the nation. However, a lot of arguments and contestations can be drawn from this type of commemorative procedure. One such matter that arises is about whether such a practice does not turn the occasion to be more exclusionary in one way or the other. In this case, it can be argued that since the focus will not be based on the ideals of commemorating arising from local scale, but one based on those prescribed by the state, such a gesture can have negative implications on the war memorialisation at the local scale. This is so because, such a practice further denies heroes from the province and the local scale a chance to produce their own commemorative ideals. To further augment this line of thought, it is also important to note that Werbner also felt the same thing when he asserted that ‘in all this memorialism, a whole official version of nationhood and national order has been more than merely imagined; it has been realised and enforced, from top down...’ 36 Even though I am fully aware of the state’s struggles and supposed aspirations to prescribe a sense of oneness during the days of national

36 R Werbner, ‘Memory and the Post colony’, p 79.
commemoration and I would therefore want to concur with Werbner above, and affirm the argument that the relationship between the local shrines in Matabeleland South Province and the public commemoration holidays is one in which leverage to coverage and a place for existence is one that is not focused on the local scale per se but on what is prescribed from higher authorities based in the capital.

Since it has been argued that the exemption of local heroes from mainstream history and public spheres is that they lack adequate biographies to fulfil what Rassool refers to as ‘great lives’, it seems that the government had already pre-seen that the idea of having local shrines had not been matched by implementation and practice long back in 1993. 1993 is the year which signals what I want to argue as the provincial and district heroes’ Acres’ turn to heritage. As I will show, it is not surprising that the person who first initiated the heritage prescription was none other than the State President Robert Mugabe himself. In 1993 Mugabe in his capacity as President of the country, pleaded for the domain of heritage led by the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe to help save the provincial and district heroes’ acres from decay. During a visit to the then Queen Victoria Museum and now the Museum of Human Sciences in Harare in October 1993, Mugabe ‘proposed that the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe’ must ‘adopt the provincial and district heroes acres as National Monuments to ensure that they are taken care of’. In arriving at that decision Mugabe is said to have noted that they ‘should be adopted as national shrines so that they are accorded the dignity they deserve’. Mugabe’s initial call must not be seen as surprising. In actual fact, many scholars of heritage have already written extensively explaining this unsurprising relationship between those in institutions of power and the domain of heritage in general. In his contribution to this particular discussion, Davison sees ‘heritage’ as ‘essentially a political idea’ which ‘asserts public or national interest in things traditionally regarded as private’. J. E Tunbridge and G. J Ashworth also concurred with Davison’s argument of heritage as derived from a political basis. Deriving their argument from the ‘dominant ideology thesis’ postulated by Arbercombe et al in 1980, Tunbridge and Ashworth argued that ‘heritage interpretation is endowed with messages which are

38 See ‘President calls for elevation of Provincial and District Heroes’ Acres’ The Zimbabwean Herald, 29 October 1993.
deliberately framed by an existing dominant regime, or alternatively are developed by an opposition group with the objective of overthrowing a competitor”. They also further cemented their argument by stating that he/she ‘who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past’. Thus in this case, Mugabe as the President through the powers vested in him, virtually controlled all these aspects and hence the call to determine the direction for the local sites to follow. I will later examine the political implications of such a prescription in full, in the next chapter. For now, let me examine the implication of this turn to heritage on local war memorials in Matabeleland South Province.

The turn to heritage: Matabeleland South Province war memorials and the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe

In their studies on the rise of ‘Cultural Nationalism and the Politics of Commemoration in Zimbabwe’, Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Wendy Willems found it imperative to follow in the footsteps of the cultural theorist Antonio Gramsci and ‘treat culture as pivotal to the reproduction of power’. They also found it similarly important to concur with Gellner that ‘culture is particularly pivotal during moments of crises’. However, with special reference to the call for the heritage turn mentioned above, it is rather difficult to point out whether it was because of an attempt by the state itself to reproduce power or that as noted by Gellner and quoted by Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Willems above, the state had found it necessary to revoke the institution of culture since it was in a moment of a ‘dignity’ crisis caused by the failure to adequately implement an otherwise brilliant idea.

Notwithstanding the above, for Zimbabwe, this turn to heritage is an important period in history as it creates an opportunity for there to be an examination of whether the local sites such as those in Matabeleland South Province were in any way helped from this attempt to solve a ‘dignity’ crisis by turning to heritage. Furthermore, what will also be interesting to

40 J E Tunbridge and G J Ashworth, Dissonant Heritage (Chichester: John Wiley and Sons) 1996, p 47.
42 My usage of the term ‘heritage turn’ is informed by P Hutton’s analysis of the emergency of a new historical thought known as the ‘linguistic turn’. See P Hutton, ‘Recent Scholarship on Memory and History’, The History Teacher, Vol. 33, Number 4 (August 2000), p 535.
examine at the local scale is the question of national monument status which in Zimbabwean terms is the highest honour that can be bestowed on a site deemed to be of historical, archaeological or natural importance. As already stated in the previous chapter, the National Heroes’ Acre started being referred to as a national monument long back in 1980 and there has been no recorded report of it having suffered a ‘dignity’ crisis. What also needs to be examined is the relationship between the turn to heritage and Werbner and Kriger’s concerns. In this case, the question that arises is: was this call an attempt to remove the graded allegations by bracketing all the war shrines under the domain of heritage?

Reactions to heritage prescription

An analysis of the events that took place on the day when the call for heritage salvation was made indicated that the statutory board tasked to implement such a turn did not accept the idea in a wholesale manner. Instead, the then Chairperson of the Board of Trustees for the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, Gilbert Pwiti is said to have responded to the President’s call by ‘recommending that amendments should ‘be made to the National Museums and Monuments Act’ promulgated in 1972 to bring it in line with present needs’. Here, two schools of thought emerge from both the call and the response. The first such school of thought draws us back to the time when the National Heroes’ Acre was constructed. The National Heroes’ Acre was referred to as a national monument without any rituals associated with such proclamation being undertaken. And on this, it can be asked why the state failed to ascribe this heritage tag to the local sites immediately when the idea was conceived? Furthermore, many meanings on the discourse of heritage can also be deduced from the response of the chairperson of the board of Trustees.

Nevertheless, at this instance, it is important to discuss whether the turn to heritage which brought in the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe as a player alongside the

---

44 According to the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe Act, national monument status is the highest honour that can be ascribed to a site of cultural or natural importance. The deproclamation of such sites is normally viewed as a sign of that same site having lost its significance and claim to such status.

45 ‘The president calls for elevation of Provincial and District Heroes Acres’.

46 The rituals involve the recommendation of a site to be proclaimed as a national monument stating as a recommendation initiated by the Board of Trustees for NMMZ who later forward the request to the Minister of Home Affairs who then publicly announce the gazetting of such a site in the Government Gazette.
state has managed to challenge the hegemonic processes that led to a graded system practice in the way sites of war memory were being managed. It is important to note that, when the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe assumed control of managing war related sites, such mandate was only limited and confined to the management of the National Heroes’ Acre and the Provincial Heroes’ Acres. The District Heroes’ Acres were not covered under this arrangement. Against this background, the District Heroes Acres were denied a place in the heritage domain.

It is against the above background that only the Provincial Heroes’ Acre located in Gwanda became the only post colonial site of war memory in Matabeleland South Province to be incorporated into this heritage framework. Since the mandated managing institution, the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, coordinates its affairs by way of regional institutions, the affairs of the Provincial Heroes’ Acre in Matabeleland South Province was given to its Western Region headquartered in Bulawayo, the main centre of all the three Matabeleland Provinces. Not only did the state delegate duties that were supposed to be directly under its mandate, but it also left the managing institution with a dilemma of how to challenge the hegemonic processes that had been employed when the idea of having sites of war memory was initially promulgated. As we have seen, the state’s initiated process did not take into consideration the different layers of legacies that can be associated with the aspect of war memory. And for the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, the challenge was to deal with this aspect according to its mandate and mission statement.

According to its mandate, the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe is a statutory board brought about by an Act of Parliament. Its special mandate is to research and preserve for posterity all aspects of Zimbabwe’s cultural and natural heritage. Since it was enacted through an act of parliament, the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe is supposed to be answerable to the people of Zimbabwe and is expected therefore to respond to any questions that might arise from the same constituency it is supposed to serve, namely the people of Zimbabwe. At this juncture, according to its mandate, it is important to note that the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe as a research institution whose staff

47 Discussion with Dr Godfrey Mahachi at the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe Head Office, Harare, Zimbabwe, 28 January 2011.

complement includes people with high professional backgrounds in the scientific and the art disciplines, it is supposed to trace through research the diverse cultures and histories of these people of Zimbabwe. Unlike the state proper, the NMMZ is not expected to take issues as they are given. Instead, it is supposed to research them and provide answers worthy the scientific and cultural expertise they have at their disposal. For Matabeleland South Province, to deal with phenomena such as war memory, the NMMZ was hereby dealing with historical layers of the struggle which involved the mid 1960 to 1979 war and the one infamously known as the Gukurahundi war. Furthermore, as a research institution, the NMMZ was also expected to interrogate the individual political parties involved in the wars being memorialised.

**Professionalism versus mandate: A case study of Matabeleland South Province and the Politics of representing war legacies**

In its full length and breath, the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe’s mission statement states that the institution endeavours:

> To be the pride of Zimbabweans by providing excellent services to our public through securing, documenting, preserving and developing the national historical, cultural and natural heritage, and through promoting an understanding of that heritage.  

With such a mission statement, the commencement of this specific task to manage provincial and district sites of war memory was challenging for the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe. This challenge was evident right on the first day when the organisation assumed responsibility of these sites. The first such challenge involved the rather difficult task of finding a suitable term that was not only able to meet the demands of this challenge but one that was also able to adequately bring this new phenomena into its core business of managing and researching all heritage related issues. Above all, such a term was also supposed to be in line with the requirements of its mission statement as outlined above.

It is important at this stage to note that for the NMMZ, the argument of whether the war of liberation that had all along been memorialised by the state constituted what should normally be referred to as heritage or not is out of context here. As I have already explained in my

---

49 The National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe mission statement.
analysis of the representations made in the last section by the state’s highest official, namely the country’s president, such confirmation had already been made and stated categorically that both the liberation war and the related sites all constituted ‘heritage’. At the end of the day, the NMMZ was only left with the task of coining a suitable name to define such heritage as the President’s statement had already removed the possibilities of taking into consideration the discursive elements involved when defining what should constitute heritage and the declaration of such heritage places as national monuments. Notwithstanding all these, the NMMZ eventually managed to come up with a term namely ‘liberation heritage’. 

For Matabeleland South Province it can be argued that usage of the term also in a way managed to remove the graded hierarchical order of memorialisation that had been in existence. Despite the differences in burial places, all the sites of war memory became heritage sites and national monuments. Against this background, it can be argued that the application of the heritage tag indeed managed to equate the Provincial Heroes’ Acre in Gwanda with the national one in Harare, since both sites were now heritage sites memorialising a phenomena namely the war of liberation and the efforts of those who were involved in that war. Further than that, it can also be stated that this practice of heritagizing sites of war memory managed to restore the meaning of the idea that had initially led to the creation of the provincial based sites of memory. But if the heritage tag managed to bridge the gap on how people should view the provincial sites of memory, I would like to state that leaving out of the District Heroes’ Acres out of this equation, indeed managed to maintain the graded allegations.

It is important to note that for a province like Matabeleland South Province, usage of the term liberation heritage is both interesting and problematic at the same time. Usage of the term is interesting in the sense that the events which took place after the alleged liberation war that

---

50 According to the National Museums and Monuments Act [Chapter 25:11] Part IV section 20, the powers to declare a monument are vested in the Minister (of Home Affairs) who only does so at the recommendation of the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe Board Trustees. Thus, even though the state president is the one who gives such a minister those powers, the argument his role should be at the end of the process and not the beginning of it.

51 My argument here is derived from the fact that the term liberation heritage is now the one which is now commonly used by NMMZ staff and personnel when dealing with liberation war related legacies. But it is also important to note that usage of the word heritage is somehow problematic and also raises a lot of questions as it does not exist in the only legal apparatus from which the NMMZ derives its power, the National Museums and Monuments Act [Chapter 25:11] last amended in the year 2001.
gave birth to what should be accepted as ‘liberation heritage’ in this part of the country was not in full concurrence to its many meanings one of which refers to freedom. And more so, for people in a province, the term was also expected to answer questions about whose ‘liberation’ heritage it was anyway, especially when given the fact that the term liberation itself had been superseded by the legacies of the Gukurahundi wars discussed in the previous section. On another note, the mere usage of the term is also further engulfed into problems in the sense that despite the problems that later followed after 1980, the people of this region had also participated to the cause of the same phenomena that was now being termed as liberation. In this case, a question that still remains is; how can the people of this region be included into this heritage bandwagon as represented by the local sites of liberation war memory such as the Matabeleland Provincial Heroes’ Acre when they were not liberated by the liberation war?

It can be argued that the mere act of translating sites related to the liberation war into heritage places does not challenge the standing graded allegation theory postulated by Werbner and Kriger. In their own studies on the subject matter of the politics involved in war memory, Ashplant et al noted that ‘the use of the term war memory’ involves working ‘within implicit assumptions about what a war is’. 52 Thus in this case, for Matabeleland South Province instituting a site of war memory involves working ‘within implicit assumptions’ of what the terms liberation, war, and heritage entails.

The only way of analysing the implicit meanings of these key terms is to analyse the nature of the burials that took place after this turn to heritage in 1998. In this case, the nature of these graves continued to assert the efforts of the soldiers who were seen to have crossed the border into the neighbouring countries and later returned to fight for the liberation cause. And by doing so, the graded allegation is not challenged here, as the cause of liberation as seen in the memorial landscape, still further devolves into the discourses of exclusion and inclusion, with the soldiers who participated directly being included, whilst the masses that also helped them being excluded. Still on the issue of the war of liberation, whilst the most dominant historical productions on it have ascribed the eventual freedom to two parties namely ZANU (PF) and (PF) ZAPU, a thorough analysis of Zimbabwe’s struggle indicates that this war was not confined to and neither was it limited to the efforts of these two parties alone. The

Zimbabwean *Herald* Newspaper of the 29th of August 1981 carried out a report about ‘one of the earliest guerrilla trainees’ namely ‘Mr Felix (Hokoyo) Santana’ who ‘had died in a car crash’. The man who delivered the news was identified as a ‘ZANU (Sithole) spokesman’. Thus, if Santana’s death was announced by a ZANU (Sithole) spokesman, a gesture which might in a way confirm the name of the party that he might have belonged to and at the same time being identified as a liberation hero, then the argument that the war of liberation was fought by ZANU (PF) and PF ZAPU alone is diluted and rendered out of context. This statement is strong confirmation that ZANU (Sithole) also had members who had fought in the liberation struggle. The continued absence of liberation heroes from these and other parties outside the dominant ones brings in another dimension of exclusion by political party grading with those belonging to the smaller ones being negated to out of memory history.

On another note and in spite of the above, if the war allegedly fought by PF ZAPU, ZANU (PF) against the Rhodesian Front is envisaged as a war of liberation, then it can be argued that the people of Matabeleland South Province were indeed liberated by this war and its memorialisation and eventual heritagization is therefore justified. Furthermore, if this line of argument is followed, then the idea of instituting a memorial landscape in a province to remember the liberation struggle should now be seen as one that was also meant to include the people in one way or the other. In other words the memorial landscape will serve as an acknowledgement to the province that a war of national liberation was also fought in the province. However, despite this fact, the coming in of the infamous *Gukurahundi* war still challenges the discourse of the mid 1960s to 1979 liberation struggle as liberating.

Despite the above, general Zimbabwean historical discourses, especially those aligned to the ZANU PF led government around the late 1980s have tried to portray the *Gukurahundi* war as a war in which the government of Zimbabwe wanted to restore order in the Matabeleland Provinces. Writing about the origins of the war, Dydmus Mutasa for example stated that:

> When the elections came in 1980, following the Lancaster House agreement, ZANU (PF) won all the seats in Mashonaland and one in Matabeleland, whilst ZAPU won some seats in the Midlands and Matabeleland. Joshua Nkomo was stunned by the results and when Robert Mugabe invited him to form a government, he brusquely

---

refused to accept the job of President. However, he accepted the post of Minister of Home Affairs. But, following the discovery of arms caches on ZAPU properties in 1981 and the open fight between ZIPRA and ZANLA elements, Joshua Nkomo and other ministers from Pf ZAPU were stripped off their portfolios. Some ex ZIPRA elements deserted the army and started to wage a bush war in Matabeleland. The fifth brigade was moved in to try and bring the situation under control. This situation stunted development in Matabeleland; many people from South Matabeleland fled for refuge into Botswana.\textsuperscript{54}

Mutasa’s view on the dissidents as being related to the activities of ex ZIPRA elements was supported by his colleague in government, Emmerson Mnangagwa who also added that the dissidents wanted to ‘advance PF ZAPU cause’.\textsuperscript{55}

Contrary to Mnangagwa and Mutasa’s assertions about a ‘dissident war’, Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Wendy Williams give a completely different view from the one given by these two government officials. They summed up the background to the conflict by saying:

In the early 1980s, ZANU increasingly revealed its intentions to establish a one-party state and began to represent Nkomo as a ‘dissident’ leader responsible for destabilising the country. In order to eliminate ZAPU ‘dissidents,’ the Government sent the Korean trained Fifth brigade into Matabeleland and the Midlands in early 1980s, which resulted in the deaths of over 20 000 civilians.\textsuperscript{56}

In support of Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Wendy Willems above, Muzondidya, sees the Matabeleland crisis which led to Gukurahundi as one that created an ‘opportunity’ for the ‘government to crush its only viable opponent, PF ZAPU’. He further supported his line of thinking by alleging that ‘the violent and brutal methods used by the state to suppress the activities of a few armed political rebels during the Matabeleland crises were not unwarranted but’ rather ‘disproportionate to the security threat posed’.\textsuperscript{57}


\textsuperscript{56} S Ndlovu-Gatsheni and W Willems, ‘The rise of cultural nationalism and the politics of commemoration’, p 950.

What comes out is that the origins and reasons for the rise of the so-called Gukurahundi war cannot be wished away from the broader scope and discourses of memorialising wars related to the aspect of liberation. If the aspirations of people in Matabeleland South Province and the others were about fighting against a one party state which could have led to the suppression of freedoms, then it can be argued that this war can be seen as another war of liberation by the people in the province in one way or the other.

Thus, as these events happened, the question that arises is how did the NMMZ challenge this hegemonic system of representation that could have negated other possible ‘liberation’ war histories and thus in one way contributing to Werbner and Kriger’s critique of a hierarchical memorial order? An investigation carried out on the aspect of memorialising of war under the NMMZ era signified that contrary to its mission statement which required it to carry out research, the NMMZ accepted the liberation discourse as prescribed by the state. From an assessment of its management reports pertaining to visits to the Provincial Heroes’ Acre at Gwanda, the NMMZ only reported about the management aspect of the shrine and never spoke about the intrinsic issues of what constitutes the memorial landscape. For example, the report produced by the Curator of the National Heroes Acre whose duties include researching and managing war related legacies, only talked about the number of graves that had been rehabilitated and the need to keep the shrines clean. The same report never talked about the aspect of what is entailed by liberation heritage.

I shall return to a full discussion of the management of the liberation heritage in Matabeleland South Province as envisaged in the Provincial Heroes’ Acre in the next chapter. I will also examine the methodologies being proposed by the NMMZ to fully heritagise the war shrines in Matabeleland South province and the implications of the coming in of other players namely the war veterans and the MDC.

58 My argument here is based on the fact that negation of the Gukurahundi wars tantamounts to grading wars. With the Gukurahundi one being seen as a regional conflict not worthy memorialising

CHAPTER 4

CHANGES IN HEROES ACRES IN MATABELELAND SOUTH PROVINCE (1988–2010)

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I examined the rise of provincial based local sites of memory as an ‘idea’ in relationship to its practical ‘implementation’ on the ground. I argued that the idea behind the initiation of provincial based sites of memory was supposedly premised on the need to correct past mistakes as well as to include those who had been left out of the main project which had been put in place at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, Zimbabwe’s capital city. I also examined how the implementation of the idea on the ground was castigated as one that had caused a loss of ‘dignity’ and how such a proclamation was central to the further developments that these sites of war memory have witnessed up to the present. Furthermore, I also discussed this proclamation as one that had implications that tantamount to a prescription of heritage as the only cure that could have saved these allegedly ailing local sites of war memory from ‘dignity’ loss. Lastly, the chapter also examined whether the local sites of war memory in Matabeleland South Province were eventually transformed into sites of historical knowledge production just like what the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare had done in the production of the same after its initiation.  

As events outlined in the previous chapter continued to unfold, the NMMZ was eventually roped into the fold to manage sites of war memory because of its position as the country’s premier heritage institution and its relationship to the government which used it as its chief agent in heritage related issues. It is this entrance of the NMMZ into the management of war related legacies, that I now intend to critically examine to find out the impacts and possible

---

meanings such entrances usually have on the sites of war memory in Zimbabwe, especially those in Matabeleland South Province. To undertake such an analysis, I propose to interrogate such a happening in two different ways. The first one entails analysing it as a significant shift and change in the manner in which sites of war memory in Zimbabwe were to be understood and to be managed. The second one involves analysing the relationship between the changes implemented by the NMMZ and the domain of heritage. In this case, central to the enquiry will be to investigate why those specific changes were implemented and what is the meaning of that to Zimbabwe’s memorialisation system that has three tiers.

When undertaking a look at all the preceding chapters especially the last one which discussed the development of local sites of war memory in Matabeleland South Province, what has been noticed is that there was a struggle in the interpretation of war memory between state apparatus as represented by the ZANU (PF) led government and its competitors which manifested mainly in the form of PF ZAPU. Supportive evidence explaining the nature of such contestations was also given from both ZANU (PF) led government aligned sources, as well as from other leading academics such as Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Muzondidya. When the development of the provincial based Heroes’ Acres was finally undertaken, PF ZAPU which had been involved in these struggles for interpretation of war memory with ZANU (PF) was now part and parcel of a bloated entity synonymously renamed United ZANU (PF). In this case, it can be stated that by 1992 in the case of Matabeleland South Province,61 this PF ZAPU was no longer expected to challenge a system which they were now part of.62 This meant that after the dissolution of PF ZAPU, there were no major dissenting political voices in the struggle for the interpretation and representation of war memory in Zimbabwe.

---

61 This analysis is based on the fact that the burial of Jeremiah Sibanda, the first Provincial Hero to be buried at the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre took place in 1992. See the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe records for Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes Acre kept at the National Heroes Acre in Harare.

Against the above background, in addition to the analysis of the gradual museumization of the sites of war memory as signified by the entrance of the NMMZ into the management of these sites, this chapter will also thoroughly investigate the rise of other players that took over the struggle for interpretation mantle from PF ZAPU. In all this analysis, the challenge will be to examine whether such an entrance by these other players also managed to challenge ZANU (PF)’s interpretation and representation of war memory that as already stated, was criticised by Werbner and Kriger as a ‘graded one’. I now start by examining the impact of the changes brought about by the aspects of heritagizing and museumizing local sites of war memory in the Matabeleland South Province of Zimbabwe.

**Managing sites of war memory: NMMZ’s difficult task to restore lost ‘Dignity’**

As said in the previous chapter, entrance into the management of the war shrines by the NMMZ was not an idea that came out of their own intuition. In actual fact such an entrance was a result of a prescription prescribed by a state which wanted everything aligned to war related legacies to be managed by the NMMZ. In this case, after carrying out a synopsis of how the speeches by government officials were being made, the view that comes out clearly is that the NMMZ was perceived by government to be a professional semi independent institution that could offer better services than the government proper. To understand the issues under discussion here, it is important to note that contrary to the above assertion, NMMZ is not independent of government. Even though NMMZ derived its mandate from an Act of Parliament, its operations are somehow directly linked to the government as, in terms of reporting, it is supposed to pay its allegiance to the country’s Ministry of Home Affairs through its Board of Trustees. Furthermore, in terms of its own operations, the NMMZ

---

63 It is important to note that in African heritage discourses, statements by political leaders such as Mugabe have been highly effective agents of change and transformation in this sector of representation. After Mugabe, in South Africa, Zimbabwe’s neighbour, Nelson Mandela’s almost similar call for the transformation of sites of representation such as museums in 1997 has also had a huge impact in the transformation of this sector up to the present moment. See for example, L Witz, ‘Transforming museums on Post-Apartheid routes’ in I Karp and S. D Lavine (eds) *Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Displays* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), p113.

64 The National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe is supposed to operate as a Parastatal making it different from the government proper.

65 On this type of administration the arguments postulated by T Bennett, *The birth of the Museum*, p 338, makes sense. For Bennett, ‘in the second half of the nineteenth century, the preferred form of administration for museums, art galleries, and exhibitions was (and remains) via board of trustees and this is same thing happening in Zimbabwean museums in the 21st century. And as he continued to argue “through these, the state could retain
relies again from the same government for sustenance. In addition to these, two more issues further compromise the operations of this institution arising from this complex relationship with various state systems.

Firstly, as a government agency, the NMMZ receives a grant for operations from the national budget meaning it has to pay allegiance to the same government that funds it. But, by virtue of it being instituted by an act of parliament, it is also supposed to fulfil its mandate of professionalism discussed in the last chapter in conformity with the country’s supreme laws as defined by the legislature. In Zimbabwean legal circles, the legislature is an independent arm of a state system composed of two more namely the Judiciary and the Executive. In Zimbabwean political systems, composition of the legislature is by means of a multi-political party system meaning that unlike a cabinet which can be formed by one party that gains a majority, the legislature is a house for both the minority parties and the majority. In this case, the legislature is seen here on the opposite side of government and representing all sectors of the Zimbabwean society. By receiving a grant from a budget which in Zimbabwean cases is also ratified by parliament, it means the NMMZ has an obligation to the statutes of this parliament which entails serving all the people of Zimbabwe irrespective of political party affiliation.

In view of the above the NMMZ was left facing a problem. In this case, upon entering into the management of the Heroes’ Acres, it is not surprising that the NMMZ was already pondering on how to deal with a legacy that ZANU (PF) as a political party claimed total ownership of. Furthermore, what also compromised NMMZ’s position this time around was that the ZANU (PF) led government wanted to control some of the aspects in the general interpretation of heritage. Previously in its operational history, one of the NMMZ’s first Regional Directors, Dr Ken Mufuka, had to resign from his post citing unending government effective direction over policy by virtue of its control over appointments without involving itself in the day to day conduct of affairs and so, seemingly violating the Kantian imperative in subordinating culture to practical requirements’.

66 My argument here stems from the fact that the ZANU PF Politburo was the one which determined this important aspect of Zimbabwean war memorialisation procedure namely the proclamation of hero-ship.
interference in the interpretation of heritage at the Great Zimbabwe National Monument during an official visit by Prince Charles of Britain.67

Thus, when given this difficult task, it was not surprising that the NMMZ’s first port of call upon entering management of war shrines in 199868 was to spruce up the visual images of the sites of war memory in the provinces whilst leaving all the aspects that make up the discourse of war memory almost virtually untouched.69 And for Matabeleland South Province, all the reports that had been generated by NMMZ staff have all pointed to this specific area of ‘sprucing up’ the image of the war shrines as one area that the NMMZ has been striving to institute some changes. However, with special reference to Matabeleland South Province, perhaps it is now important to explore, the impact of these physical changes that the NMMZ concerned itself with on the subject matter of Zimbabwean war memorialisation.

Analysing the role of management shifts in managing war memory in Matabeleland South

Whilst it is true that in Matabeleland South Province, the NMMZ initiated a change that saw the sprucing up of war graves at the Provincial Heroes’ Acre in Gwanda to a total number of 18 graves out of the existing 27 being upgraded to headstone level by the year 2007. The number of upgraded graves increased to 20 out of a total of 32 in 201070 but the same cannot be said about the phenomena being represented. Historical public knowledge production by the NMMZ on what the liberation struggle entailed as represented by the local site is one area that has largely remained in its embryonic stage. As a result, the Provincial Heroes’ Acre has remained a burial place that is supposed to be only upgraded, preserved and conserved, and


68 The year 1998 marked the beginning of NMMZ’s management of sites of war memory and this entrance also received a boost from the Minister of Home of Affairs who in a speech, to mark heroes day in 1998, further asserted that the ‘NMMZ whose mandate was to manage national heritage will’ have to “spearhead the liberation heritage program” because “the struggle for our independence is an important component of heritage which should be protected and preserved for our present and future generations”. See Sandra Nyaira, ‘Zimbabweans set for Heroes’ Day with a difference’, The Zimbabwe Chronicle, 10 August 1998, p 1.

69 The NMMZ might be absolved of any wrong doing here as it can also be argued that what it was doing fell in line with its Act which is more preservation and conservation based than a research oriented one, see for example The National Museums and Monuments Act [Chapter 25:11] especially its Part IV subsections 24 to 28.

70 See L Mandima, ‘Report on the Visit to the Provincial Heroes Acres’.
has not evolved beyond this point to a situation whereby it can produce knowledge for the public domain about the war of liberation. In this case, the independence of the NMMZ in its professional deliverance of duty is hereby strongly questioned. As evidenced by the reports generated, the organisation has largely restricted itself to the physical task of sprucing up the visual outlook whilst negating the invisible aspect of it. I shall return to a full discussion on the implication and meanings of all this in one of the sections that follows after this.

For now, it is important to note that as part of the physical changes it wanted to initiate at sites of war memory in Matabeleland South Province, the NMMZ concerned itself with projects such as the need for a site custodian to man the place and to ensure its day to day maintenance and the putting up of a site museum that could relay information about the armed struggle. However, these other two initiatives had not been fulfilled during the time when the research for this project was carried out. Had a site museum been put in place, it could have created an opportunity for a thorough critique and analysis of the type of knowledge that could have been produced and exhibited.

Also of particular note in this endeavour by the NMMZ to upgrade provincial sites of memory in Matabeleland South Province was the special mention in one of the management reports by the Curator responsible for Militaria, in which he stated that ‘the Western Region’ had finally managed to ‘upgraded the grave of the late first President of Zimbabwe Canaan Sodindo Banana to the required standards’. Now, the mere mentioning of Banana’s grave creates another opportunity to examine the intrinsic nature of this particular happening as well as to explore the relationship between the person of Canaan Banana and the domain of heritage as represented by the NMMZ’s mentioning of him.

The making of Canaan Banana’s grave a heritage site

Of all the public personalities hailing from Zimbabwe in general and Matabeleland South in particular, the first president of independent Zimbabwe, Canaan Sodindo Banana’s story is one that deserves special mention and warrants a thorough analysis in this discussion of graded memory, heroism and heritage. During his life time, Banana had lived a life worthy

describing as ‘remarkable’\(^72\) in Ciraj Rassool’s terms. However, according to one of his biographers Malokele, on the eve of his death, he was ‘not declared a national hero’ and was ‘laid to rest as a national outcast in his rural home in Matabeleland South\(^73\) province.

On the other hand, contrary to this assertion of ‘a national outcast’ by Malokele, the Zimbabwean Herald newspaper reported that ‘the ZANU PF Politburo in consideration of the role played by Reverend Banana’ had actually accorded him a state funded funeral, with ‘full military honours’.\(^74\) However, regardless of which type of funeral, ‘national outcast’ or ‘state funded’, what is known is that Banana was not laid to rest amongst the country’s national heroes at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare and neither was he declared a provincial or district hero. Further than that, giving him a state assisted funeral and then failing to bury him at the National Heroes’ Acre, is indeed credible evidence that Banana was not accorded national hero status.

In spite of these contestations around the legacy of Canaan Banana, he was suddenly brought back to the limelight when the NMMZ’s Curator of Militaria mentions him in his report. In its report on the ongoing work at the Heroes Acres in Matabeleland South Province, the Curator responsible for Militaria reported that ‘Mr Makuwaza the Senior Curator at the Natural History Museum responsible for the Western region’, Matabeleland South included, had told him that the ‘the grave of the late president of Zimbabwe Canaan Banana located at his homestead in the Esigodini area of Mzingwane district had finally been upgraded’.\(^75\)

However, it is this relationship between the grave of an individual who is reported in some circles as being a national outcast and in others as one who deserved a state funded funeral and the country’s premier heritage institution the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe that is of paramount interest here. Further to that, also of importance is the provincialisation of the grave as signified by the nature of the report as opposed to its lack of nationalisation as signified by his undeclared national hero status.


\(^{75}\) L Mandima, Report on Visit to the Provincial Heroes Acres- October 2007
Before analysing the meanings or the possible implications of the above relationship between the NMMZ and other discursive elements the grave might produce, there is need to undertake an analysis of Banana’s life history. It is only after doing so, that it will be possible to understand all the issues under discussion and why his case has been considered in this specific chapter which has been created for the sole purpose of investigating the changes that have taken place at the Provincial Heroes’ Acres in Matabeleland South Province.

**Analysing Banana’s political and social careers**

With reference to the above, it is important to note that during his life time, Banana had enjoyed a colourful public and political career which fully blossomed in the early 1970s before ending on the eve of his death in 2003. Banana’s public life and political career saw him rising from humble beginnings as a Methodist Church Minister, before joining the ANC on the day of its founding in 1971. The ANC was a political organisation founded as a ‘vehicle through which African political thought’ against exclusion by colonial authorities ‘could be expressed’. In the middle of this political career at the Geneva Conference, we are told, he defected from Bishop Abel Muzorewa’s UANC and joined Robert Mugabe’s ZANU. He cited disagreements with Muzorewa in the way in which the UANC was relating to the cause of the struggle against Smith as the cause for his resignation. At the eve of Zimbabwe’s independence, Banana was rewarded for his service and role during the struggle when he was given the largely ceremonial post of President of the new independent

---


77 See, Chief Reporter, ‘Canaan Banana dies’, *The Zimbabwean Herald*, 11 November 2003

78 See ‘Brief Notes on Contributors’.


80 As a student of biography, I was taught to analyse carefully the production of political biographies. And therefore, Banana’s eulogising might fall within this bracket of those political biographies written praise the biographical subject.


82 See ‘Notes to the contributors’ and A Chambati, ‘National Unity-ANC’, pp 147-159.
state of Zimbabwe. Banana served in this capacity from 1980 up to December of 1987 when Zimbabwe amended its constitution to create an executive presidency.

After the end of this political service he left public office to pursue a teaching career at the University of Zimbabwe. It was at the University of Zimbabwe that controversy started to emerge. Whilst at this institution, Banana made a scholarly controversy when he advocated for the rewriting of the Christian holy book of the *Holy Bible* arguing that ‘the bible should be relevant to our times and that the canon should be re-opened in order to include the continued record of God’s revelation to the World’.\(^83\) In the middle of this new career as a Theology professor at the University of Zimbabwe, allegations of Banana’s having a ‘dark past’ began to emerge. Of these dark pasts, he was accused of having a homosexual relationship with an aide de camp of his by the name of Jefta Dube\(^84\) whilst he was still State President.\(^85\)

For his homosexual relationship Banana was demonized by several members of ZANU PF.\(^86\) As a result upon his death, Banana was not accorded the national hero status.\(^87\) At the end of the day, Banana was given a state assisted funeral, with President Mugabe failing to attend his eventual burial in Matabeleland South Province in 2003\(^88\) before his legacy suddenly reappeared after his grave was eventually spruced up by a heritage institution namely the NMMZ.

---


\(^{86}\) See for example, M Epprecht, *Hungochani*, p 4 who states that in a ‘1995 speech’, the Zimbabwean President ‘Robert Mugabe’ described homosexuals as ‘worse than pigs and dogs’. Further to that, the mere act of engaging in homosexuality itself is itself, an offence in Zimbabwe and is punishable by a jail sentence of up to ten years in jail. Banana himself was a recipient of this received this maximum sentence.

\(^{87}\) According to the Chief Reporter, ‘Plans to bring Banana’s body home underway’, *The Zimbabwean Herald*, 12 November 2003, even the MDC president, Morgan Tsvangirai send in a condolence message stating that ‘Banana will be remembered for his courage and selfless contribution to the liberation struggle’.

\(^{88}\) See, Chief Reporter, ‘Ex- President’s burial on today’. Mugabe only visited the ‘Banana homestead in Malbereign’ and not Matabeleland South Province. According to the Herald, the then vice president of Zimbabwe Joseph Msika had in fact led the government delegation to the funeral.
With special reference to this case, there are several issues and questions that normally arise. The first question is: does this action mean that Banana was after all a hero? And secondly, with such a happening, can this then be regarded as a significant change and shift in the manner and ways in which both concepts of heroism and homosexuality are now perceived in Zimbabwe? And furthermore, with the unfolding of these events centred around a heritage institution, does this mean that the domain of heritage was being perceived to be a real unifier within the body of knowledge that informs the idea to re-correct mistakes, an idea, which as already stated in the previous chapter, was also behind the initial conception of the idea to have provincial based war shrines? And lastly, since through the NMMZ’s initiatives, Banana’s grave became fully rehabilitated whilst those of other provincial heroes whose remains are interred at the Gwanda Provincial heroes’ Acre are not, does this in any way, conform to the graded order allegations that have been levelled against Zimbabwe’s memorialisation practice? To try and unlock all these it is important to examine the gradual heritagization of Banana’s grave within the broad politics of Zimbabwe’s war memorial practices.

Figure 13. Standing at the fully rehabilitated grave of Canaan Banana, Esigodini, Mzingwane District. Photo by H Chiwaura
Against the background of the above, I would like to interrogate the events around Canaan Banana’s grave and whether such actions represents a significant change and shift not only in terms of official policy regarding the heroes and heroes’ acres in Matabeleland South Province but the whole country in general. Whilst it is true that Banana had been denied a hero status upon his death, what we now see in this unfolding of events is his re-admittance into these institutions of heroism and heritage through the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe’s involvement. Surely this indeed represents a turning point in the policies that deal with matters of official heroism declaration and heritage and thus warranting serious discussion here.

When I tried to research on the events behind the rehabilitation of his grave, I asked the former Senior Curator at the Bulawayo Museum responsible for Matabeleland South Province, Mr Simon Makuwaza, about the reasons that had enabled them as NMMZ to be involved in that rehabilitation work. In response, he told me that they got involved because, according to the orders he had received from his superiors in the NMMZ, Banana’s case was supposed to be treated in the same way as declared national heroes. And since he was buried in Matabeleland South Province, it was the mandate of his region to look after graves of such a nature in a befitting manner. However, in spite of this revelation about Banana’s status, a contradiction is that Banana’s name does not appear even in the most updated list of national heroes and those listed as heroes in general. Furthermore, judging by the decision of the ZANU (PF) Politburo as reported by the Zimbabwean Herald, Banana was not declared a hero but was accorded a ‘state assisted funeral’. Even though a lot of facts can be deduced from the discussion, the fact that NMMZ as the responsible board tasked with the management of war shrines and graves related to the same discourse also got involved, not only signifies their mere involvement but also signifies a whole lot of elements at play that could mean a huge shift in terms of official policies and ‘heritagization’. Furthermore, if it is confirmed that Banana was after all a hero through the documentation that NMMZ officials

---

89 According to G Nyaruwanga, the current Curator of Militaria at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare, NMMZ does not upgrade graves of Provincial Heroes whose families chose to have them buried at their homes.


91 Chief Reporter, ‘Ex president’s burial on today’.
claim to have received from their parent Ministry, which is that of Home Affairs, then it can also be argued that this too represents a shift in the way national heroes are declared in Zimbabwe.

For the purposes of this discussion, what is certain is the fact that the involvement of Mr Makuwaza and his team all but confirms the heritagization of the grave. And through the association of NMMZ and graves pertaining to both post and pre independence graves, the gesture also signalled some form of a ‘re-admission’ into the category of heroes of the person of Canaan Banana. In this case, the re-admittance is interesting in the sense that Banana had been previously omitted.

*Provincial or National: an analysis of Banana’s belonging*

With the above analysis, it is also important to try and locate Banana’s grave within the nation’s hierarchical memorial order to find out whether it is a provincial one or a district one. To begin with, it is important to note that despite all this controversy, in terms of outlook, Banana’s grave was upgraded fully to the standards of that of Chitepo discussed in the previous chapter. This fast track rehabilitation contradicts the fact that Joel Dhliwayo’s grave, also illustrated in figure 8 of the previous chapter had not been accorded the same treatment. On this aspect, two questions can be deduced. The first one is why is it that Banana seems to be receiving preferential treatment from the government through the NMMZ? Is it because he had lived a more ‘remarkable’ life than Dhliwayo? Or was he being given this treatment because he belonged to the generation of nationalists, most of them were now buried at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare? An investigation of all these questions leads to the confirmation that Banana was accorded a higher order than most of the dead heroes buried at the Provincial Heroes’ Acre in Gwanda and thus confirming Werbner and Kriger’s allegations of a highly graded memorial order. In view of my introductory remarks about the man, he certainly had a colourful biography an aspect which most of those buried at the Gwanda Provincial Heroes’ Acre greatly lacked.

---

92 I have already stated that the NMMZ officials claim that their involvement with Banana’s grave was a result of some orders being issued from the Government.
However, even though through its sudden reincarnation courtesy of the NMMZ, Banana’s grave is now enshrined amongst the war memory route in Matabeleland South Province, it is important to note that for both the confirmed heritagization of the grave and the still ‘clouded in controversy’ heroism of his, all but signifies a first for those who have a similar sexual orientation like him in Zimbabwe. Of late, President Mugabe himself has spoken at international forums castigating those who engaged in homosexuality. The question that arises is: why then does he seem to be allowing a government department that is supposed to act within the confines of the law (some of the laws which have been used to jail Banana) to embrace Banana as a candidate for national heritage? I shall however, deal with this issue when I analyse the implications of museumizing sites of war memory in Zimbabwe.

Another question that also remains is why in the case of Banana, exhumation was not considered especially given the fact that such precedence had been set when people like Jason Moyo and Herbert Chitepo were also previously exhumed? And if exhumation was not considered here, does it mean that Banana’s legacy was not worthy requiring such consideration? And overall does it mean that even though he had received rehabilitation treatment worthy national heroism, his grading was lower to the extent that he deserved to remain confined to his homestead? In this case, if this too is confirmed, then it can be argued that Werbner missed the point when he limited Zimbabwe’s memorialisation grades to just three namely, the district, the provincial and the national. 93 In spite of these questions, the rediscovery of Banana shows that there were some changes in the elements that makes up the discourse of war memory and heritage not only in Matabeleland South Province but in Zimbabwe as a country. In this case, what we have seen is that the NMMZ was central to this unfolding of events in Matabeleland South Province. Against this background, I now further examine the extent of these changes that were brought about by museumization as represented by this involvement of a museum institution, the NMMZ.

An abridged analysis on museumization of local sites of war memory in Zimbabwe: a case study of Matabeleland South Province

93 R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 78.
As already explained in this chapter, 1998 is the year in which the NMMZ attained full responsibility of all the local sites of war memory that had been put in place in 1990 and thereby marking a significant shift in the management of these sites from being directly government managed to parastatal managed. When the NMMZ took over in 1998, two significant events and issues took place. The first is the obvious museumization of these sites and the phenomena of war memory itself. The heritagization of Canaan Banana’s grave that has been discussed above also falls within this context of museumization. The second issue involves the continued interplay between the former direct managers and the phenomena of local war memory itself. In terms of the phenomena, which in this case entails the declaration of the local heroes themselves, what has been observed is that the government remained the sole declarer of those deemed to be Provincial or District heroes. As Lovemore Mandima the former NMMZ Curator of Militaria observed, by the year 2007, the general norm of ‘liberation war hero’ declaration still remained that when such a person ‘passes on, the provincial ZANU (PF) office informs the [provincial] governors immediately’. These ‘governors will then relay the information to the president’s office’ who in turn duly declares such a person as a liberation war hero.

On the other hand whilst this practice ensured that ZANU (PF) remained in total control of the phenomena under discussion, it is important to examine this in relationship with the coming in of the NMMZ. To understand this complex relationship to the subject matter under discussion, there is need to first undertake an analysis of how NMMZ proposed to deal with the entire phenomena in relationship to its museological disciplinary practices. In the year 2006, to ensure that these provincial sites of memory were in line with its operational framework, a group of NMMZ curators met on the 26th and the 27th of October 2006 at the Great Zimbabwe National Monument in Masvingo, southern Zimbabwe, to formulate a way forward on how to manage these sites of war memory. This particular meeting managed to come up with a mission statement that was to be central in the governing and management of

---

94 L Mandima’ Management of Heroes’ Acres by NMMZ’, A report produced for the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, October 2007, Provincial Heroes File kept at the National Heroes Acre, Harare, Zimbabwe

95 See Minutes of meeting on the Management of Provincial Heroes’ Acres held at Great Zimbabwe National Monument, 26th -27th of October 2006, Provincial Heroes’ Acres File, Kept at the Chief Curator’s Office, NMMZ Head Office, Harare
the Provincial Heroes’ Acres. The mission statement emphasised that the NMMZ endeavoured to:

Present to the public a coherent history of the Zimbabwean fight against colonialism through documenting, preserving and presenting artefacts and information relating to the struggle for independence in Zimbabwe and the liberation heritage in general at all Provincial Heroes Acres.96

The same meeting emphasised that this mission statement was in full conformity with the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe’s broad mission statement that has already been discussed in the previous chapter.

From the above Provincial Heroes’ Acres mission statement, what comes out clearly is that the NMMZ did not attempt to grade or provincialise the phenomena of war memory as it had been interpreted by the ZANU (PF) led government. In actual fact, my own reading of their mission statement shows an affirmation of the museum as a place of collecting and preserving whilst at the same time showing a concern for the history of the Zimbabwean struggle in general as a singular and not a plural phenomenon. Furthermore, the statement also deliberately avoided interpreting war memory as graded.97 In spite of this fact, the issue that still remains unanswered is to ascertain whether the graded memorial allegations were challenged by these changes.

From the mission statement, one obvious issue that comes out of it is the concern for the NMMZ to adhere to the dictates of the ‘museum’ as a place concerned with preservation and collecting. Similarly, these are also the dictates that informs most conservative museums around the world as well as the thinking of the global museums governing board, the International Council of Museums (ICOM) itself.98 And by subjecting the local sites of

96 See ‘Mission statement for Provincial Heroes’ Acres’, Minutes of meeting on the Management of Provincial Heroes’ Acres held at Great Zimbabwe National Monument, 26th -27th of October 2006, Provincial Heroes’ Acres File, Kept at the Chief Curator’s Office, NMMZ Head Office, Harare

97 Even though I have already argued that the NMMZ has failed to deal with the intrinsic issues that constitute war memory. This mission statement clearly shows that there was an endeavour to do so.98 According to M G Simpson, ‘Revealing and Concealing: Museums, objects, and the Transmission of Knowledge in Aboriginal Australia’, in J Martine (ed), New Museum Theory and Practice (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), p 155, ICOM’s ‘constitution has consistently emphasised’ that ‘the primary activity of museums’ involves ‘acquisition, conservation, research, communication, and exhibition of collections of objects of artistic, cultural or scientific significance’.
memory to such practices is a gesture that can be interpreted as one that shows an endeavour for uniformity with the already museumized National Heroes’ Acre discussed in chapter 2.

However, for Zimbabwe, what we have seen is that through Mandima’s analysis on the dominant practices of conferring hero statuses in the provinces, what this means is that whilst the NMMZ is a collecting institution, the power to do so in respect of the local sites of war memory themselves is one that remains out of their reach. This prestige as has been seen in Mandima’s analysis still remains in the hands of ZANU (PF) as a political party and not as government. What is clear here is that through declaring the alleged ‘deserving heroes’, ZANU (PF) acquires the position of collector of these supposed museum objects which in this case are the dead bodies of the heroes themselves. Furthermore, ZANU (PF) still maintains the role of documenting and periodically publishing the results of the collected objects.\textsuperscript{99} What this means is that the NMMZ is only left virtually in charge of only one practice namely the ‘preservation’ aspect of the graves and maintenance of the graveyard. If the analysis of the relationship between the sites of war memory and museums disciplinary practices is to be taken further, it can also be stated that even though NMMZ through its management of these sites of memory, remains fully responsible for the exhibitionary space of the objects of war memory (the graveyard), it is the ZANU PF led government that maintains the hold on the publication and communication\textsuperscript{100} of these collections as authentic and rare objects of wonder which of course will still be subjected to a graded interpretation.\textsuperscript{101}

In conclusion to this section, whilst there was an endeavour to challenge the interpretation of how war memory is supposed to manifest at localised sites of war memory such as the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre, what is evident is that there has been an

\textsuperscript{99} Through the information on national, liberation war and liberation heroes produced periodically in publications such as \textit{The Guide to the Heroes’ Acre}, ZANU (PF) also maintains a grip on one of these practices that should be normally associated with Museum work.

\textsuperscript{100} It is ZANU (PF) officials and the government that announces the death and declaration of heroes through the public media and the \textit{Guide to the Heroes’ Acre}. In the announcements, the immense contribution of the hero to Zimbabwe’s cause is always fully elaborated.

\textsuperscript{101} Outlining some of the messages communicated to the public through exhibitions, Ivan Karp, ‘Festivals’ in I Karp and S. D Lavine (eds) \textit{Exhibiting Cultures: The Poetics and Politics of Museum Displays} (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), 282 stated that exhibitions makes ‘the audience’ to be ‘aware of the high cultural and financial value inhering in the objects. Rareness, preciousness, or authenticity are communicated by the museum exhibition’.
undeclared contest between the NMMZ and the government in the general interpretation or war memory as it manifests at these sites. In conclusion, it looks like what the NMMZ has only managed to do is to register an intention of how it proposes to deal with war memory through its Provincial Heroes’ Acres mission statement. What has overally been seen is that it has so far failed to make significant inroads that would have seen the unification of war memory interpretation at local sites and the National Heroes’ Acre. Against this background let me now examine how other players such as the war veterans and the MDC fared in this bid to challenge ZANU (PF)’s interpretation of war memory as one that should be represented in a three tier system.

**Claiming the space: the possible effects of the rise of the war veterans on the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre**

Whilst in terms of terminology, according to the National Heroes Act [Chapter 10:16] of Zimbabwe whose latest amendment was in the year 2001, a hero is defined as one who has been proclaimed as either ‘a national, provincial or district hero designated as such in terms of section 3” of the Act, it is important to note that according to the Guide to the Heroes Acre, such terminologies were no longer being used when referring to both the people and heroism as a phenomena. According to the Guide to the Heroes Acre, the terms provincial hero, and district hero were changed to ‘liberation war hero’ and ‘liberation hero’ respectively with the burial places for the beneficiaries remaining unchanged. This mere act of changing these terminologies in government circles and not in terms of the National Heroes’ Act was not only a notable change that affected provincial based shrines like that of Matabeleland South Province, but as I will show in this section, it was also one that created problems of its own especially between the institution that was supposed to implement the hero designation on the ground, namely the NMMZ, and the War Veterans Association of Zimbabwe.  

---

102 National Heroes Act [Chapter 10:16].


104 Whilst according to N Kriger, ‘The Politics of Creating National Heroes’, pp 157-159, the former combatants started fighting for their social welfare around 1987, it was in 1990 that they organised themselves into a social welfare organisation. See also W Mhanda, ‘The Role of War Veterans in Zimbabwe’s Political and Economic Processes’ (Harare: SAPES TRUST POLICY DIALOGUE FORUM, April 2011 ) downloaded from Http://www.solidaritypeacetrust.org/1063/the-roleof-war-veterans, who argued that the War Veterans
Before analysing the problems that arose between the NMMZ and the war veterans, perhaps it is important to start with mentioning the possible meanings of such designations and terminologies. First and foremost, usage of such terminology all but implied that those who were designated as liberation war heroes were the ones who had actually physically participated in the actual acts of combat between the liberation movement forces and those of Ian Smith’s Rhodesian Front. However, regardless of lack of an act of parliament to back up such a change, recent provincial hero burial trends witnessed in Gwanda and elsewhere in Zimbabwe has shown that this change in terminology in official government circles such as the Guide to the Heroes Acre was gladly welcomed by the War Veterans Association.

On the other hand, the NMMZ citing the need to adhere to the law has refused to recognise the merits of such a change. In most of the cases, instead of relying on the War Veterans Membership Card alone as a prerequisite for a grave of the dead to be upgraded, the NMMZ has usually asked for the provision of the necessary documentation such as a letter from the office of the President which states that the deceased has been declared a provincial/liberation war hero. The Regional Director responsible for NMMZ’s Western Region in a letter to her superiors at the NMMZ Head Office, she cited the variations between the War Veterans Act and what was said by the Guide to the Heroes’ Acre, and complained that most war veterans in Bulawayo were now burying people at the Bulawayo Provincial Heroes’ Acre in Nkulumane, under the auspices of war veteran status without having the required permission.

Indeed, the Bulawayo Provincial Heroes Acre mentioned above has generated a great deal of controversy especially in the manner in which it has not only taken individuals from other

---

105 For example, recent trends have shown that whenever the death of a former combatant is reported, the burial of such an individual at the Provincial Heroes’ Acre is an already guaranteed issue.

106 For example E Nkiwane, ‘Provincial Heroes Acres Assessment Report’, National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, National Heroes File, boldly stated that ‘It is logic to conclude that all those burials that are random and cannot be verified are illegal and those responsible are guilty of breaching the Bulawayo City By Laws. There is no doubt that NMMZ is obliged to point this out and maintain the strictest position of upgrading only genuine burials. Through the Ministry of Home Affairs and Local Government there is no reason why those who carry out such illegal burials cannot be prosecuted’.

107 Regional Director Western’s Memorandum to the Executive Director of NMMZ, August 2007.
provinces such as Matabeleland South and made them into heroes, but also in how the war veterans have been stampeding for a space to be buried there. This led the former Curator of Militaria, Nkiwane to state that some of the Bulawayo graves were not of genuine deserving heroes which contrasts to the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes Acre which had genuine heroes buried there.¹⁰⁸ This comparative note by Nkiwane not only classifies Matabeleland South Province as an orderly grave yard but also put the word genuine in the limelight. Nkiwane’s use of the word ‘genuine’ is derived from the fact that for one to be buried at these shrines there should be a presidential letter confirming such genuinity.

However, another question arises with reference to the National Heroes’ Act that I have just mentioned. In this case, since by declaring someone as a liberation war hero when that wording is not enshrined in the Act, does that mean such a declaration is illegal?¹⁰⁹ Anyway, this all but challenges Nkiwane’s assertion of Matabeleland South as a shrine with genuine deserving heroes. In actual fact, it can also be argued that the most recent burials at the Matabeleland South shrine in Gwanda such as those buried after the year 2001 are all illegal burials¹¹⁰ whose burial statuses is not catered for by the country’s laws.

Furthermore, implying the words liberation, war and hero when referring to a site that has been put in place to memorialise a phenomenon such as the liberation struggle is also in a way contradictory as it all but freezes the institution of heroism in the province. In this case, by freezing I mean the gluing of this institution of heroism to a specific group of people who are seen to have participated in a war of liberation. In other words, what this implies is that after this generation of people categorized as heroes, Matabeleland South Province will no longer have anyone else deserving to be a hero. This also challenges the assertion by the Guide to the Heroes Acre, which states that ‘some of the heroes include contemporary and future sons and daughters of Zimbabwe of the same calibre as those fallen heroes whose dedication and commitment to the nation of Zimbabwe justify their burial at the sacred spots’.¹¹¹ Thus, in view of all this, it can be argued that whilst the change in terminology was

---

¹⁰⁸ E Nkiwane, ‘Provincial Heroes’ Acres Assessment Report’.
¹⁰⁹ Refer to my argument on note 31 about what the National Heroes Act says.
¹¹⁰ Investigations conducted shows that there are 11 heroes who were buried at the Gwanda Provincial Heroes Acre between the year 2003 and 2007. This list also includes Anna Sikwili who is the only female recorded to have been buried at this shrine.
¹¹¹ Ministry of Information and Publicity, A Guide to the Heroes’ Acre, p 2
meant to upgrade and reaffirm the contribution of those who had physically participated in the phenomena being represented, it nevertheless remained an instrument of exclusion in itself. In actual fact, such a change in terminology remained largely cosmetic as it only managed to reaffirm the graded memorial order of a three tier system. Regardless of the problems that might arise with the use of terminology, the scramble for a space at the Bulawayo Provincial Heroes’ Acre also signifies an interesting development in this whole discourse of trying to ascertain the nature of challenges to Zimbabwe’s three tier war memorial system. In this case there is need to examine the implications of this development on the Provincial Heroes’ Acre of Matabeleland South.

*The capital and the hinterland revisited: war veterans in the Matabeleland Provinces and the Bulawayo Provincial Heroes Acre*

Despite the Regional Director’s concerns about the lack of a legal backing to justify the war veterans’ claim to full ownership of provincial shrines, the mere act of mentioning one as a liberation war hero was a change that automatically promoted the soldier from the probability of being interred at a district shrine to the provincial one as defined by the terminology itself. Evidence gathered in this research from NMMZ reports showed that the hinterland versus the capital was a constant problem for the shrines in hinterland places such as Matabeleland South Shrine in the small town of Gwanda. Whilst there has been an upsurge in the number of recent burials at the Bulawayo Provincial Heroes Acre, very few recent burials have been recorded at the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre in Gwanda. When asked as to why the war veterans were shunning the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes’ Acre, War Veteran Mpofu attributed this to lack of development at the Gwanda Shrine. Most of them now prefer to be buried at the Bulawayo Provincial Heroes’ Acre, which is located in the capital of the Matabeleland Provinces, or their rural homes.

---

112 When given the politics that surrounds conferment of a hero status in Zimbabwe, the probability that of those who had been gun holders in the country’s war of liberation being buried at district shrines was very high especially when given the fact that participation in the post war period was also a considered factor.

113 See for example, E Nkiwane, ‘Provincial Heroes Acres Assessment Report’ NMMZ National Heroes File
According to War Veteran Mpofu, since Bulawayo is a large city, it was most likely to be given preferential treatment in terms of development. On the other hand, the former Curator of Militaria at the National Heroes’ Acre attributed the heroes’ drain from other provinces like Matabeleland South to Bulawayo on migration. According to him, Bulawayo was a much larger city and offered better opportunities for employment and other services and therefore, it was most likely that most war veterans had migrated to Bulawayo in search of these services and when they died they would be buried where they lived and not where they came from.

What has also been noticed is that whilst the war veterans accepted their promotion from the district based shrine to the provincial one, the War Veterans Association has not pressured the ZANU (PF) Politburo or the government for its members to be accorded burial spaces at the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare. From this happening, I am inclined to question whether this means that the war veterans through their pressure group the War Veterans Association as former ordinary combatants during the liberation struggle accept this somehow graded memorialisation arrangement as something that is justified instead of calling for a revamp of the whole memorial system altogether? Secondly, does this mean that they had accepted the notion that as soldiers they had not contributed “in a supreme way” during the liberation struggle to deserve burials at the National Heroes’ Acre?

From the war veterans to the MDC: the struggle for war memory in Zimbabwe

With reference to the above, what has been noticed is that by accepting burial places at the Provincial based shrines like the Matabeleland South Provincial one, the war veterans had indirectly accepted the graded memorial order and the fact that as the former militants in the struggle for the country their position was secondary to that of their political leaders. This means that through this acceptance, both ZANU (PF) and the government had scored a war interpretation victory over the former combatants. However, this victory by the political

114 Interview with War Veteran Mpofu, Banana homestead, Esigodini, Mzingwane District, 24 February 2011
116 For example, according to the ‘Editorial Comment’ that appeared in the Zimbabwean Chronicle of the 10th of August 2009, p 4 reinforced and even globalised this notion by alleging that “the national hero status in any part of the world is the highest honour that can be conferred to an individual” with “the recipient being entitled to be buried at the national heroes acre”
leaders to confine the former fighters to the provinces was not one that was given on a silver platter but has histories of being fiercely contested for. First and foremost, according to Astrow, the struggle between the political and the military in Zimbabwean history is something that is not new. In actual fact, on the ZANU PF side, Astrow traces the genesis of this conflict to the times of the liberation struggle itself, during the times of the Zimbabwe Integrated People’s Army (ZIPA).

According to Astrow the military leaders in ZIPA, such as Dzinashe Machingura, wanted the ‘politicians to be answerable to the military’ sparking a heated controversy which saw people like Machingura himself being incarcerated during the struggle itself. Within this controversy, Astrow also places the ZANU (PF) congress that took place in Chimoio in 1977 as the event and year in which the Politicians re-established their control over the military when they stated that ‘the military should accept the decisions of the Political Central Committee’. It is through this arrangement that saw the political gaining its superiority over the military to the extent that on the eve of independence, whilst the politicians awarded themselves with positions in the Government, most former combatants who could not be attested into the new national army were demobilised. Furthermore, the ZANU (PF) government further asserted this position in 1989 when the first ever liberation war awards were bestowed on individuals who had been ‘Central Committee members of both ZANU and ZAPU during the war’ and ‘members of the defence and police forces who held ranks of detachment commander and above in both ZANLA and ZIPRA’ during the liberation struggle. Despite this historical unfolding of events, 1990 marked the year of rebirth for the former combatants when they formed a ‘non partisan’ association to represent their

---

118 ZIPA emerged during the struggle for Zimbabwe as an amalgamation of forces from both ZIPRA and ZANLA under the leadership of Rex Nhongo.  
119 Now using his real name Wilfred Mhanda.  
123 See, Medals ceremonies to be held today, *The Zimbabwean Herald*, 12 August 1989.  
124 The role of former junior combatants in the war veterans association is also confirmed in a way by W Mhanda, ‘The Role of the War Veterans’ who lamented that some of the war veterans who assumed leadership of the organisation around 1999 had been very junior cadres during the war a position which should have rendered them incapable to ‘speak on behalf of all war veterans’.
interests. It was through this association that the war veterans or former combatants countrywide in Zimbabwe found the leverage to challenge their former colleagues the politicians for neglecting them into absolute poverty whilst they were plundering the country’s resources.

Through the vehicle of the War Veterans Association, the former combatants even had the audacity of challenging the state president at the National Heroes Acre itself. This balance of power was to continue until the time when the politicians had to take an advantage of a loophole in the war veterans’ fortress to regain their lost power. According to Mhanda, the politicians found the slight chance of regaining their superiority over the former military men when the ZANU (PF) Politburo refused to sanction the removal of the war veterans’ leader Chenjerai Hunzvi from leadership of the organisation. Through this support, Hunzvi himself had to repay through organising the war veterans to fight in the government’s corner during the period known as the third Chimurenga. Even though on the occasion of his death Hunzvi himself was rewarded with a burial place at the National Heroes’ Acre, most of his peers in the War Veterans Association have not been accorded such a status and it all but seems that they have found it prudent to be comfortable with burial places at Provincial Heroes’ Acres such as the one in Matabeleland South and not the National Heroes’ Acre in Harare. It is not surprising that through this move, all the cadres buried at the Matabeleland South Provincial Heroes Acre after the rise of the war veterans association all have liberation war credentials which were confirmed as such by a presidential letter to justify the genuinity which the former Curator of Militaria, Nkiwane said was lacking at Nkulumane. In conclusion to this section, it can also be reaffirmed that whilst it is almost certain that everyone who has been a former combatant is destined for burial at sites such as the one Matabeleland South, it can still be argued that in terms of war memory and how it is represented at the respective sites, the war veterans never challenged the existing three tier system. Instead, what they accepted was a position higher up that system.

125 W Mhanda, ‘The Role of the War Veterans’.
126 Chenjerai Hunzvi claimed to be a former ZIPRA combatant even though his role in the war was largely disputed by former high ranking ZIPRA elements such as Dumiso Dabengwa.
127 W Mhanda, ‘The Role of the War Veterans’.
128 Now, the invocation of the term third chimurenga in reference to a war against alleged forces of neo-colonialism in a post independent period is in itself a problematic affair. Problematic in the sense that it challenges the whole discourse of a 1980 liberation and raises questions as to whether the country was liberated by a war of liberation after all.
Advocating for real change heroes: the MDC\textsuperscript{129} and the interpretation and representation of war memory in Zimbabwe

One issue that has been evident in this work is the systematic progression of events pertaining to various challenges that were lodged by political organisations and other groups on the issue of how ZANU (PF) through its dominance of government had interpreted and represented war memory in Zimbabwe. It can be stated that since 1980, PF ZAPU led the political organisations challenging ZANU (PF)’s interpretation of war legacies. What I have also elicited so far is the fact that by 1989 PF ZAPU had negated this role after becoming part of the dominant establishment in Zimbabwe. In this analysis of the role that has been played by the rise of other political parties such as the MDC in the late 1990s as agents of change in war memory in Zimbabwe, I would like to start by drawing a distinction between challenging phenomena namely interpretation and representation. As I want to argue, interpretation and representation refers to two different phenomena. In the case of Zimbabwe, PF ZAPU’s challenges of the early to mid 1980s must be viewed as one that tantamounts to challenges on interpretation and not representation. As has been seen from Kriger’s analysis, most of the challenges that were lodged by PF ZAPU were focused on the calibre of people supposed to be buried at the National Heroes’ Acre\textsuperscript{130} and in this case meaning the interpretation of war events and not how they were being represented. On the other hand, Werbner’s critique of ‘the post colonial regime’[s]’ manufacturing of ‘grades of heroes from the local to the provincial to the national, each of whom would be buried in an appropriate place within a graded order of heroes’ acres’\textsuperscript{131} is more representational based than Kriger’s own. And in all this, PF ZAPU had not challenged Werbner’s critique but had been concerned with Kriger’s during its existence.

As events progressed, the rise of the war veterans saw them forwarding what can be interpreted as a mild challenge\textsuperscript{132} on the three tier memorial system before being guaranteed a

\textsuperscript{129} Movement for Democratic Change.

\textsuperscript{130} See N Kriger, ‘The Politics of Creating National Heroes’, pp 151-152. Here Kriger quotes Joshua Nkomo lamenting about colleagues whose National Hero statuses had been overlooked by the ZANU (PF) led government.

\textsuperscript{131} R Werbner, ‘Smoke from the Barrel of a Gun’, p 78.

\textsuperscript{132} I have already argued that the war veterans had been reluctant to challenge the established memorial order and had in actual fact accepted their second fiddle position.
step higher up the graded system. Now, despite launching challenges on different phenomena, one important fact to note is that these two organisations namely PF ZAPU and the war veterans had all experienced and had also been involved in one way or the other with the phenomena under representation, namely the war of liberation itself. For the MDC which became the first political party to seriously challenge ZANU (PF)’s grip on power before beating them in an election in March of 2008, such a relationship had not been existent. In actual fact, the MDC drew most of its membership and support base from the labour organisation, civic groups and the student movement most of whom had neither been involved with nor seen the war itself. It is this background that explains the complex position the MDC was involved in, when it tried to launch a challenge on a system which the ZANU (PF) leadership continuously stated that it belongs only to people who had an intimate relationship with the struggle itself. In the present day, such sentiments reached their peak in 2010 when in a speech marking the burial of Ephraim Masawi, a former ZANU (PF) politburo member, at the National Heroes’ Acre, Robert Mugabe made it categorically clear that ‘only Chimurenga war veterans’ were the ‘people who’ were ‘wanted’ at the National Heroes Acre and ‘not people who can lead others in factories and farms’. People like those he asserted ‘can have another’ burial place not the National Heroes’ Acre. With such statements, a question that arises is; is the MDC better positioned to challenge a phenomenon that it had not participated in the making of? In a bid to answer questions like these, Winter states that ‘the critical point about sites of memory is that they are there as points of reference not only for those who survived traumatic events, but also for those born long after them’.  

Whilst Winter’s argument above was made to make us to understand that sites of war memory will be points of ‘reference’ after the demise of those who would have created them, the same statement also creates a good opportunity for there to be a full examination of the MDC’s interest in the interpretation and representation of Zimbabwe’s sites of war memory. Whilst the MDC has not been open on how it perceives Zimbabwe’s three tire memorial systems, an analysis can still be deduced from how it perceives the whole concepts of Zimbabwe’s national heroism and national memory. First and foremost, it can be argued that  

133 See for example, B Raftopolous, ‘The Zimbabwe Crisis and the Challenges for the left’, paper presented at a public lecture, University of Kwa-Zulu Natal, 23 June 2005.  
the coming in of the MDC into the Zimbabwean political landscape with their slogan of ‘real change heroes’ signifies that both the phenomena of liberation and that of the struggle, are only confined to a particular timeframe. Even though the words ‘real change heroes’ have been used to refer to the MDC’s members who died in various cases of political party violence between them and ZANU PF, they can also have multiple meanings to Matabeleland South Province where the histories of the alleged Gukurahundi ‘massacres’ are said to be ‘silenced’. For the people of Matabeleland South Province who have resoundingly voted for the MDC members since its inception, the words ‘real change heroes’, can mean all ‘Zimbabweans who were murdered for merely asking for a better life in a purported free and democratic Zimbabwe’. And for them, this will further encompass all their currently ‘silenced’ heroes of the struggles allegedly fought in the quest for full liberation and freedom.

Even though it can be argued that the MDC also agrees to the general notion of national heroism and national memory, it is also important to further examine the intrinsic meanings of what is entailed by the ‘real change heroes’ concept in relationship to Zimbabwe’s three tier memorial system. First of all, it is important to note that the gesture of coining these words ‘real change heroes’, can be interpreted as one that asserts the notion that the MDC also embraces this concept of both the heroic and un-heroic others. However, just like the NMMZ’s mission statement discussed in the previous sections of this chapter, it can be argued that within this acceptance of the heroism concept, the MDC views it as a singular

---

136 According to V Bhebhe, ‘Spare a thought for real change heroes’, *The Zimbabwean*, 7 August 2010, the MDC perceived real change heroes as ‘those who lost life and limb as they sought to complete the unfinished business of our liberation struggle’.


140 See for example, LNkatazo, MDC Snubs Masawi burial, [http://www.newzimbabwe.com.news-3453-mdc leaders snub Masawi burial/news-aspx](http://www.newzimbabwe.com.news-3453-mdc leaders snub Masawi burial/news-aspx) accessed on the 17th of October 2010 states that ‘Tsvangirai and Mutambara had revealed that Mugabe had agreed at a meeting to take away the responsibility of conferring hero status from his party’s Politburo and give it to an independent commission’. V Bhebhe, ‘Spare a thought for real change heroes’ also reported that Morgan Tsvangirai the leader of the other faction of the MDC had reiterated the same point earlier in August 2010 when he emphasised that his party ‘demand[s] an all-inclusive, credible and legitimate body of eminent persons to determine and confer hero status’.
and not a plural phenomena.\textsuperscript{141} To support this point, in 2002 during the National Heroes’ Day celebrations, MPs from Matabeleland South Province such as ‘Mzila Ndlovu from Bulimamangwe, and Paul Themba Nyathi from Gwanda’ were reported to have attended the celebrations at ‘Bulawayo Provincial Heroes’ Acre’, whilst not even a single one of them had attended ‘the Matabeleland South Provincial ones’.\textsuperscript{142} From this happening, two messages can be further deduced. The first one entails the argument that the attendance by the MDC leaders of the Bulawayo Provincial Heroes’ Acre ceremonies where Bulawayo happens to be the Matabeleland provinces’ capital can be interpreted as one tainted with regional meanings and not necessarily an affirmation of the graded memorial system. It is not clear whether such behaviour conforms to one of my informants’ arguments that his region (the Matabeleland region) needed a ‘National Heroes’ Acre’ of its own for people from the region.\textsuperscript{143} On the other hand, such a behaviour can also be interpreted as one that nevertheless confirms the MDC’s endorsement of a graded memorial system since it was clear that the ceremonies were taking place at a designated ‘Provincial Heroes’ Acre’ namely Bulawayo.

In conclusion to this chapter, whilst it can be stated that the MDC has not directly challenged the graded memorial system, their silence on the issue as indicated by their reluctance to forward names for provincial or district hero declaration whilst they have done the same at the national can indicate that their interpretation of war memory is not one of a three tier system but one confined to a singular national framework.

\textsuperscript{141} My argument here is informed by the fact that whilst the MDC (both MDC formations now existent in Zimbabwe after the 2005 split) have previously forwarded Gibson Sibanda’s name as a candidate for consideration as a national hero, there is no recorded evidence of them ever having forwarded a name for consideration as a provincial, liberation or district hero. See also L Nkatazo, MDC Snubs Masawi burial, http://www.newzimbabwe.com.news-3453-mdc leaders snub Masawi burial/news-aspx.


\textsuperscript{143} Interview with Chief Malachi Masuku, Westacre Farm, Matobo District, Matabeleland South Province.
CONCLUSION

Whilst this work has tried to agree with Werbner and Kriger’s assertions that Zimbabwe’s memorialisation project is one that is tainted by the deliberate grading of people who participated in Zimbabwe’s war of liberation, it has however failed to agree with the methodology used in the critique. Instead, what this work recommended is that the examination should first of all separate the idea from the practice. As has been seen in the discrepancies between the implementation of the idea as stated in the Guide to the Heroes Acre\(^1\) and what the National Heroes’ Act\(^2\) as the legal document responsible for such phenomena says, is nothing but an indication that what is happening only refers to a particular stage of a continuing process that will also be subjected to continuous changes. In other words, what this work has shown is that the interpretation of sites of memory is not one that is galvanised to a specific framework but one that will be subjected to further reinterpretations leading to new forms of representation. On arriving at this decision, the postulation of Garry Baines in his work on the Freedom Park memorial in South Africa was taken into consideration. As Baines noted, “memorialisation is often a highly charged political process that leads to contestations between competing interpretations of past events”.\(^3\)

To revert back to the problems of interpretations in Zimbabwe’s own project, what has come out is that those who have assumed the role of producing a so called ‘official’ version of history pertaining to these sites of war memory as well as interpreting them currently belongs to a political party namely ZANU (PF), which also still holds a grip on the echelons of power in that country. However, such happenings where those in power dictate how the ‘official’ interpretation of the past must be done, is not surprising as has already been argued elsewhere in this work, but that it confirms the assertion of Tunbridge and Ashworth’s interesting reference to George Orwell’s assertion of he/she ‘who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past’.\(^4\) In this case, since those who are currently

---

2 See the National Heroes Act [Chapter 10:16] of Zimbabwe Part 2
3 G Baines, ‘Site of Struggle: The Freedom Park fracas and the divisive legacy of South Africa’s border war/liberation struggle’ in *Social Dynamics* Volume 35, Number 2, September 2009, p 331
controlling Zimbabwe’s ‘past’ have seen it fit to erect physical memorials in remembrance to
the liberation struggle which according to Webber and Kriger turned out to be highly graded,
I would like to state that this work sees this process as one which falls within the brackets of
‘archiving’5 and ‘collecting’ rather than one of instilling permanence. Indeed, the meaning of
that which is archived is not enshrined in this permanence but is one that can be subjected to
further scrutiny and change. As Mbembe observed on the ‘act of dying’6 that:

In as much as it entails the dislocation of the physical body,[it] never
attacks totally, nor equally successfully, all the properties of the
deceased (in either the figurative or literal sense). There will always
be elements that testify that a life did exist, that deeds were enacted,
and struggles engaged in or evaded. Archives are born from a desire to
reassemble these traces rather than destroy them.7

Indeed, Zimbabwe’s memorialisation project which involves acts of creating burial spaces for
the dead heroes under the pretext of eternally confining them to their grading systems of
either national, provincial or district, is in actual fact a process of archiving. Even though
upon their death, we are only told of only one version of history which is one that pertains to
how the concerned individuals came to be memorialised according to such a specific grade,
the fact that they are buried according to a process of creating national heroes, which is one
equal to that of archiving automatically renders them candidates for future scrutinising.8
Furthermore, as I have already indicated, this work views the coming in of the NMMZ, an
institution involved in both museums and monuments work, as one that positions the burial
spaces and the buried dead bodies into processes that transforms them into museums
‘collections’, with the burial spaces to that of monumentalisation.9 And all of these, museum

5 I borrowed this idea of war memorials as archives from K Savage, Monument Wars: Washington DC., the
National Mall, and the transformation of the memorial landscape (Berkeley and Los Angeles: California
University Press, 2003) p 283 who noted that ‘Lin’s monument was also an archive’
Town: David Philip, 2002), p
8 For example, D W Cohen, Comings of History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994) p 6 makes sense
in this argument as Zimbabwe’s current memorial project can be likened to an attempt to silence and suppress
history just like the women who constantly combed her hair to cover the scar tried to do.
9 This argument is shaped by E Meyer, ‘Memory and Politics’, in Astrid Erl, Ansar Nönnig and S .B Young
(eds) Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook (Berlin and New York:
Walter de Gruyter, 2008), p 178 who correctly observed that ‘insofar as communicative memory is shaped by
the biographical horizon of the experiencing generation’ it is important to note that ‘due to death of
objects, archival documents and monuments, are subject matters which have a potential to be revisited for further research, analysis and subsequent reinterpretation.

However, apart from deducing that Zimbabwe’s memorialisation project should be seen in the pretext of it being one informed by archiving processes, it is also important to note that one of the main aims of this work was to show that one version of seeing things should not be taken as the exact meaning of that particular phenomenon. Such a line of thought came out in chapter 2 where different versions about what the National Heroes’ Acre entailed were postulated and analysed. All of the versions produced showed that the National Heroes’ Acre is not informed by one meaning but by a complex of versions that depends on how different individuals see it.

In conclusion, it is important to note that this particular work was also informed by recent scholarship in museum and heritage studies that is calling for a ‘rethinking’ of these sites of representation like museums, monuments and memorials. Just as Ann Stoler postulated that ‘we are no longer studying things but the making of them’ and that we also need to be more critical in our use of ‘documentary sources’, the writing of this work was greatly informed by this approach. Instead of accepting the way things are arranged with particular reference to Zimbabwe’s sites of war memory, the approach which I took in chapters 3 and 4 was more critical and investigative. Lastly, above all, this work has also advocated for there to be a rethinking of what is entailed by what will eventually be referred to as national heritage. Even though, a lot of definitions have been postulated on heritage, with others like Abungu referring it as a ‘nation’s resources, be they cultural or natural’, information gathered in this work saw it fit to agree with Tunbridge and Ashworth who sees it as a product, constructed to suit present day needs. This was evident in chapters 3 and 4 whereby through the

contemporary witnesses, vital remembrance can only be perpetuated if it is transformed into institutionalised forms’.

10 See for example G Minkley, L Witz and C Rassool, South Africa and Spectacle of Public Pasts, p11. In this paper, Minkley, Witz and Rassool argue that ‘critical heritage studies’ calls for an in-depth examination and analysis of ‘histories that come to be constituted in the public domain’.


12 G Abungu, ‘Heritage, Community and the State in the 90s: Experiences from Africa’, paper presented at the ‘Future of the past: The Production of History in a Changing South Africa, Mayibuye Centre, Institute for Historical Research and the History Department, University of the Western Cape, 10-12 July 1996
machinations of the state, local sites of war memory were gradually heritagized and museumized.
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