

2020-06-29

**Attention –**

- 1) South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)  
Tel / Cell - 021 462 4502  
E-mail - [info@sahra.org.za](mailto:info@sahra.org.za)
  
- 2) AMAFA aKwaZulu-Natali (AMAFA)  
Tel / Cell - 033 394 6543  
E-mail - [bernadetp@amafapmb.co.za](mailto:bernadetp@amafapmb.co.za)
  
- 3) Ngwao-Boswa Ya Kapa Bokone (NBKB)  
Tel / Cell - 053 831 2537  
E-mail - [rtimothy@nbkb.org.za](mailto:rtimothy@nbkb.org.za)

**Heritage Crime –**

**Proposed Declaration of the Harry Gwala Grave Site as a National Heritage Site (KZN) vs. The Proposed Dismantlement of the Orania Afrikaner Cultural Community and Town (NC).**

**1) Summary**

A news report on eNCA reported on 21 June 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rCkFW1pfjnk>) that:

“And South Africa’s Afrikaner only town Orania must fall, so says the Board Chair of the Harry Gwala Foundation, Panyasa Lesufi. He says Orania isn’t inclusive or a symbol of democracy. Lesufi was speaking during a wreath laying ceremony at the grave of struggle icon Harry Gwala. eNCA’s Siphamandla Goge has got this report: ‘In the Karoo desert of the Northern Cape lies this Whites only establishment, Orania. It was founded in 1991 as Apartheid was coming to an end. The town has been the subject of intense debate for years. Now the Harry Gwala Foundation Board Chair Panyasa Lesufi says Orania must go. He says the Whites only towns’ existence is not in the spirit of the democratic non-racial society’. (Lesufi): ‘We understand why that institution was established before. It has lived its time. It’s now that that place must be liberated, and all South Africans must be allowed to stay wherever they want to stay. We don’t say we want to stay with them, but you can’t have an institution that is established on the basis of language, or on the basis of the colour of their skin’.

In honouring struggle stalwart Harry Gwala, alliance partners and Gwala’s Foundation are calling for his grave site to be declared a National Heritage Site...”

The two components of this Heritage Case are intricately linked by Lesufi, having had used the same platform, the wreath laying ceremony at Gwala’s grave site to introduce and publicly announce both:

- 1) The proposal for the Harry Gwala grave site to be declared a National Heritage Site (KZN); and
- 2) The proposed dismantlement of Orania (NC).

Furthermore, Lesufi’s proposal for the declaration of Harry Gwala’s grave site indicates that he is either well acquainted with the contents of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No 25 of 1999 (NHRA 1999), being the only Act under which a site can be declared a National Heritage Site, or alternatively that he has already consulted with a heritage specialist.

The proposal for dismantlement of Orania is in contradiction with the very principles of the NHRA 1999, the preamble of which states that:

“This legislation aims to promote good management of the national estate, and to enable and encourage communities to nurture and conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations. Our heritage is unique and precious and it cannot be renewed. It helps us to define our cultural identity and therefore lies at the heart of our spiritual well-being and has the power to build our nation. It has the potential to affirm our diverse cultures, and in so doing shape our national character...”

It is argued in this Heritage Case that heritage have been used, by the accused, Mr. A. Panyasa Lesufi, with ulterior motives: The particulars of a single Act, the NHRA 1999, have been used by Lesufi to argue for the conservation and proposed declaration of a heritage site (the Harry Gwala grave site proposed for National Heritage Site declaration), while the particulars of the same Act, the NHRA 1999, have been ignored, and popular emotional and political support been garnered in arguing for the dismantlement of the Orania Afrikaner cultural community and town.

Assessment of this Heritage Case will have a significant impact on the heritage management industry, not only with reference to the specific outcomes thereof, but also the impact thereof on the many cultural communities living across South Africa, more than often not under any formal heritage protection status, with their livelihoods in cases threatened by various factors including developmental, economic, environmental, social and socio-political factors, to name a few.

Considering this Heritage Case it is recommended that a reconciliatory approach, laying at the roots of the NHRA 1999 and having had been the standard industry practice for the past two decades, be followed: That the proposal for the Harry Gwala grave site to be declared a National Heritage Site be considered, but on the condition that necessary mitigatory measures be instated to ensure protection for Orania:

1. That SAHRA issues a provisional 2 year protection to Orania in terms of the NHRA 1999, Section 29(1)(a)(ii);
2. That the proposed provisional protection shall apply until such time as all heritage and other legal concerns relating to this case have been concluded, including possible renewal of the protection if necessary;
3. That SAHRA allows Orania to apply for a suitable permanent heritage protection. It is recommended that Orania considers a ‘Living Heritage’ site category [NHRA 1999, Section 2(xxi)], of preferably Grade III (Local Heritage Site) or Grade II (Provincial Heritage Site) protection status [NHRA 1999, Section 7(1)(b) or 7(1)(c)]; and
4. That a copy of the application / proposal for the declaration of the Harry Gwala grave site for National Heritage Site status be forwarded to ArchaeoMaps. Should no such application have been submitted to date, that a copy of the application be forwarded as soon as possible (ASAP) upon submission to SAHRA, and no later than 20 working days after receipt by SAHRA. Should the responsible heritage authority at any point in time, be it as a result of the application criteria or by choice of the applicant change from SAHRA to AMAFA, that concerns included in this case be transferred, and equally applied to AMAFA at such time.

It is requested that SAHRA confirms receipt of this Heritage Case, in writing, within 30 working days from the date of submission of this report i.e. on or before 11 August 2020 (2020-08-11). It is requested that SAHRA, on said date, stipulates in writing the way forward for the various parties involved in this Heritage Case.

## 2) The Accused

Mr. A. Panyasa Lesufi, Board Chair Harry Gwala Foundation & MEC Gauteng Department of Education, South Africa.

Postal Address: P.O. Box 7710, Johannesburg, 2000  
Physical Address: 6 Hollard Building / 111 Commissioner Street, Johannesburg, Gauteng  
Tel: 011 355 000 / 011 355 0669  
Facebook: facebook.com/HarryGwalaFoundation/

[For the attention of: Orania – Tel: 053 207 0062 / E-mail: inligting@orania.co.za]

### **3) Proposed Declaration of the Harry Gwala Grave Site as a National Heritage Site (KZN) vs. The Proposed Dismantlement of the Orania Afrikaner Cultural Community and Town (NC)**

#### **○ Harry Gwala –**

Harry (Mphephethwa) Themba Gwala (1920-1995), was a qualified teacher and politician, and member of the South African Communist Party (SACP – 1941), the African National Congress Youth League (ANCYL – 1942) and the ANC in later years. He played a prominent role in the liberation struggle of South Africa, both with reference to worker's unions and in Umkonto We Sizwe, the armed wing of the ANC. His Marxist teachings at Robben Island, whilst held as prisoner and often referred to as “our university”, is still hailed as the basis of the younger generation's ideology and theory in communism (<https://www.sahistory.org.za/people/harry-themba-gwala>).

#### **○ Orania –**

Orania is an Afrikaner town, situated along the Orange River in the Karoo region of the Northern Cape. The town was founded in 1990, with the first inhabitants having moved in in 1991. The town aims to conserve Afrikaner culture ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orania,\\_Northern\\_Cape](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orania,_Northern_Cape)) and comprises a current community of approximately 1,600 residents.

A news report on eNCA reported on 21 June 2020 (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rCkFW1pfnjk>) that:

“And South Africa's Afrikaner only town Orania must fall, so says the Board Chair of the Harry Gwala Foundation, Panyasa Lesufi. He says Orania isn't inclusive or a symbol of democracy. Lesufi was speaking during a wreath laying ceremony at the grave of struggle icon Harry Gwala. eNCA's Siphamandla Goge has got this report: ‘In the Karoo desert of the Northern Cape lies this Whites only establishment, Orania. It was founded in 1991 as Apartheid was coming to an end. The town has been the subject of intense debate for years. Now the Harry Gwala Foundation Board Chair Panyasa Lesufi says Orania must go. He says the Whites only towns' existence is not in the spirit of the democratic non-racial society’. (Lesufi): ‘We understand why that institution was established before. It has lived its time. Its now that that place must be liberated, and all South Africans must be allowed to stay wherever they want to stay. We don't say we want to stay with them, but you can't have an institution that is established on the basis of language, or on the basis of the colour of their skin’.

In honouring struggle stalwart Harry Gwala, alliance partners and Gwala's Foundation are calling for his grave site to be declared a National Heritage Site... ”

The Harry Gwala wreath laying event was fairly widely reported, with some reports focussing on Harry Gwala's history, legacy and the proposed declaration of the grave site as a National Heritage Site, including a report by the SABC (2020a), while others focussed on Lesufi's recommendation for the dismantlement of Orania (Dordley 2020, Nkanjeni 2020).

[Reports include amongst others also an introductory statement by Lesufi (SABC 2020b) at the Harry Gwala Commemorative Lecture (by Charles Nqakula): “...We'll surely be angry that they have created a country within a country, with something that no longer makes sense, that is called Orania. A right-wing state for predominantly White Afrikaners. It has its own currency, its own schools and its own laws... ”. It is important to note that a number of these type statements have been made, directly juxtaposing the importance of the Harry Gwala grave site declaration against the dismantlement of Orania. However, an analysis of each statement is not deemed necessary at this time: The Lesufi eNCA (2020) statement is regarded as sufficient for purposes of reporting this Heritage Case to SAHRA.]

### **4) The Crux of the Heritage Case**

The two components of this Heritage Case are intricately linked by Lesufi, having had used the same platform, the wreath laying ceremony at Gwala's grave site to introduce and publicly announce both:

- 1) The proposal for the Harry Gwala grave site to be declared a National Heritage Site (KZN); and
- 2) The proposed dismantlement of Orania (NC).

Furthermore, Lesufi's proposal for the declaration of Harry Gwala's grave site indicates that he is either well acquainted with the contents of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act No 25 of 1999 (NHRA 1999), being the only Act under which a site can be declared a National Heritage Site, or alternatively that he has already consulted with a heritage specialist.

Attention for the time will not focus on the first proposal, the declaration of the Harry Gwala grave site as National Heritage Site, but on the proposed dismantlement of Orania:

- Firstly, the discrepancy in the two proposals are of primary concern for purposes of this report, being the proposal for conservation in accordance with a formal protection status (National Heritage Site status) for the Harry Gwala grave site, while directly threatening the very survival of another (Orania), this with specific reference to not only, but very importantly, the preamble of the NHRA 1999, which states stat:

“This legislation aims to promote good management of the national estate, and to enable and encourage communities to nurture and conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations. Our heritage is unique and precious and it cannot be renewed. It helps us to define our cultural identity and therefore lies at the heart of our spiritual well-being and has the power to build our nation. It has the potential to affirm our diverse cultures, and in so doing shape our national character.

Our heritage celebrates our achievements and contributes to redressing past inequities. It educates, it deepens our understanding of society and encourage us to empathise with the experience of others. It facilitates healing and material and symbolic restitution and it promotes new and previously neglected research into our rich oral traditions and customs.”

- Secondly, Lesufi’s statements as quoted by Goge (eNCA 2020); “Now the Harry Gwala Foundation Board Chair Panyasa Lesufi says Orania must go. He says the Whites only towns’ existence is not in the spirit of the democratic non-racial society”, and by Lesufi himself; “We understand why that institution was established before. It has lived its time. It’s now that that place must be liberated, and all South Africans must be allowed to stay wherever they want to stay”, are not only in contradiction with the principles of the NHRA 1999 as highlighted in the preamble “...to enable and encourage communities to nurture and conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations...”, but also indicates political undertones to the proposal for dismantlement of Orania, this with specific reference to Section 5(1)(b) and (5)(1)(d) of the NHRA 1999:

5(1) All authorities, bodies and persons performing functions and exercising powers in terms of this Act for the management of heritage resources must recognize the following principles:

(b) Every generation has a moral responsibility to act as trustee of the national heritage for succeeding generations and the State has an obligation to manage heritage resources in the interest of all South Africans;

(d) Heritage resources management must guard against the use of heritage for sectarian purposes and political gain.

- Thirdly, Lesufi’s statement “but you can’t have an institution that is established on the basis of language, or on the basis of the colour of their skin”, is again in contradiction with the NHRA 1999. A brief screening of the NHRA 1999, Section 2, introduces the reader to the concepts of conservation, cultural significance and the more:

(iii) “conservation”, in relation to heritage resources, includes protection, maintenance, preservation and sustainable use of places or objects so as to safeguard their cultural significance.

(vi) “cultural significance”, means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance.

It is furthermore argued that Orania is not a White town, but an Afrikaner town, with the emphasis on an Afrikaner cultural community: Not all Whites are allowed, the value system of the Afrikaner culture as practiced by the Orania community weighs stronger than skin colour. Second thereto race or skin colour is an aspect of culture – it is impossible to conserve the practice of a culture, whilst discriminating against the race of the cultural group.

It is also necessary to here draw attention to the NHRA 1999, Section 51, which states that:

51(5) Any person who –

(b) For the purpose of obtaining, whether for himself or herself or for any other person, any permit, consent or authority in terms of this Act, makes any statement or representation knowing it to be false or not knowing it to be true;

Shall be guilty of an offence and upon conviction shall be liable to such maximum penalties, in the form of a fine or imprisonment or both such fine and such imprisonment, as shall be specified in the regulations under subsection (3).

## 5) Particulars of the NHRA 1999 and Additional Definitions

The preamble of the NHRA 1999 states that:

“This legislation aims to promote good management of the national estate, and to enable and encourage communities to nurture and conserve their legacy so that it may be bequeathed to future generations. Our heritage is unique and precious and it cannot be renewed. It helps us to define our cultural identity and therefore lies at the heart of our spiritual well-being and has the power to build our nation. It has the potential to affirm our diverse cultures, and in so doing shape our national character.

Our heritage celebrates our achievements and contributes to redressing past inequities. It educates, it deepens our understanding of society and encourage us to empathise with the experience of others. It facilitates healing and material and symbolic restitution and it promotes new and previously neglected research into our rich oral traditions and customs.”

Section 2 of the NHRA 1999 further affirms the definitions of a number of cultural terms relevant to the debate as:

- (iii) “conservation”, in relation to heritage resources, includes protection, maintenance, preservation and sustainable use of places or objects so as to safeguard their cultural significance.
- (vi) “cultural significance”, means aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance.
- (xiii) “grave” means a place of internment and includes the contents, headstone or other marker of such a place, and any other structure on or associated with such a place.
- (xvi) “heritage resource”, means any place or object of cultural significance.
- (xviii) “heritage site”, means a place declared to be a national heritage site by SAHRA or a place declared to be a provincial heritage site by a provincial heritage resources authority.
- (xxi) “living heritage” means the intangible aspects of inherited culture, and may include –
  - (a) cultural tradition;
  - (b) oral history;
  - (c) performance;
  - (d) ritual;
  - (e) popular memory;
  - (f) skills and techniques;
  - (g) indigenous knowledge systems; and
  - (h) the holistic approach to nature, society and social relationships.
- (xiii) “site”, means any area of land, including land covered by water, and including any structure or objects thereon.

According to Section 3(3) of the NHRA 1999, and ‘Without limiting the generality of subsections (1) and (2), a place or object is to be considered part of the national estate if it has cultural significance or other special value because of –

- (a) its importance in the community, or pattern of South Africa’s history;
- (b) its possession of uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural or cultural heritage;
- (c) its potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of South Africa’s natural and cultural heritage;
- (d) its importance in demonstrating the principle characteristics of a particular class of South Africa’s natural or cultural places or objects;
- (e) its importance in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group;
- (f) its importance in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period;
- (g) its strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons;
- (h) its strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance in the history of South Africa; and
- (i) Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa.’

Section 7 of the NHRA 1999 describes the heritage assessment and criteria of grading of heritage resources and sites as:

- (1) SAHRA, in consultation with the Minister and MEC of every province, must by regulation establish a system of grading of places and objects which form part of the national estate, and which distinguishes between at least three categories –
  - (a) Grade I: heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;

- (b) Grade II: Heritage resources which, although forming part of the national estate, can be considered to have special qualities which make them significant within the context of a province or region; and
  - (c) Grade III: Other heritage resources worthy of conservation, and which prescribes heritage resources assessment criteria, consistent with the criteria set out in Section 3(3), which must be used by a heritage resources authority or a local authority to assess the intrinsic, comparative and contextual significance of a heritage resource and the relative benefits and costs of its protection, so that the appropriate level of grading of the heritage resource and the consequent responsibility for its management may be allocated in terms of Section 8.
- (2) A heritage resources authority may prescribe detailed heritage assessment criteria, consistent with the criteria set out in Section 3(3), for the assessment of Grade II and Grade III heritage resources in a province.

Provisional protection of heritage resources and sites are addressed in Section 29 of the NHRA 1999:

- (1) SAHRA, or a provincial heritage resources authority, may, subject to subsection (4), by notice in the *Gazette* or the *Provincial Gazette*, as the case may be –
  - (a) Provisionally protect for a maximum period of two years any –
    - (i) protected area;
    - (ii) heritage resource, the conservation of which it considers to be threatened and which threat it believes can be alleviated by negotiation and consultation; or
    - (iii) heritage resource, the protection of which SAHRA or the provincial heritage resources authority wishes to investigate in terms of this Act; and
  - (b) withdraw any notice published under paragraph (a)
- (2) A local authority may, subject to subsection (4), by notice in the *Provincial Gazette* –
  - (a) Provisionally protect for a maximum period of three months any place which it considers to be conservation worthy, the conservation of which the local authority considers to be threatened and which threat it believes can be alleviated by negotiation and consultation; and
  - (b) Withdraw any notice and publication under paragraph (a); provided that it notifies the provincial heritage resources authority within seven days of the such provisional protection
- (3) A provincial heritage resources authority may, by notice in the *Provincial Gazette*, revoke a provisional protection by a local authority under subsection (2) or provisionally protect a place concerned in accordance with subsection (1).
- (4) A heritage resources authority or local authority may not provisionally protect any heritage resource unless it has notified the owner of the resource in writing of the proposed provisional protection.
- (5) A heritage resource shall be deemed to be protected for 30 days from the date of service of a notice under subsection (4) or until the notice is withdrawn or the resource is provisionally protected by notice in the *Gazette* or the *Provincial Gazette*, whichever is the shorter period.
- (6) A heritage authority or local authority may at any time withdraw a notice which it has issued under subsection (4).
- (7) SAHRA shall inform the relevant provincial heritage resources authority and local authority within 30 days of the publication or withdrawal of a notice under subsection (1).
- (8) A provincial heritage resources authority shall inform the relevant local authority within 30 days of the publication or withdrawal of a notice under subsection (1).
- (9) A local authority shall inform the provincial heritage authority of the withdrawal of a notice under subsection (2)(b).
- (10) No person may damage, deface, excavate, alter, remove from its original position, subdivide or change the planning status of a provisional protected place or object without a permit issued by a heritage resources authority or local authority responsible for the provisional protection.

NB: The term “culture” is not pertinently defined in the NHRA 1999. For purposes of this document the definition by Els (1992) is used; it allows for application to varying cultures, assessment of cultural process impacting on culture and comparison between various cultures and associated cultural process, also across time. Els (1992) follows a holistic approach to culture, listing sixteen (16) universal aspect to culture as:

- 1) A judicial system; 2) A juridical system; 3) A social system; 4) Art; 5) Language; 6) A political system; 7) Games (& play); 8) A religious system; 9) A Procreation system; 10) A military system; 11) A health system; 12) A technological system; 13) A value system; 14) A philosophical system; 15) An educational system; and 16) An economic system.

## 6) Conclusion and Recommendations

This Heritage Case is submitted to SAHRA with the utmost concern. Any consideration of the Harry Gwala grave site for National (or any other) Heritage Site declaration status should be, and should only be considered in direct relation with the associated reported heritage crime i.e. the proposed dismantlement of Orania.

Never before in the history of democratic South Africa have intended heritage crime been committed with the blatancy described in this report. Never before in the history of democratic South Africa have public support for intended heritage crime been as openly garnered as described in this report, and as openly received. Never before in the history of democratic South Africa have the public stage been set, to through popular demand force a change in heritage law, as is evidenced by the series of recorded incidents directly or indirectly associated with this Heritage Case. This is no mere co-incidence, and to regard it as such would be a heritage crime in itself. Negative rhetoric from Lesufi towards the Afrikaner community in general, and Orania in specific, does not date to yester year. But should heritage management waiver before these incited emotional and political societal demands, where would this leave the heritage industry? One thing is certain, the Afrikaner community at Orania is not the most vulnerable of the cultural communities living in this land. Should a precedent be set by heritage management that the very principles of the NHRA 1999; Its reconciliatory essence, its communicative and consultative nature, its recognition of cultural diversity (both extinct and extant) and the need to research, conserve and manage this cultural heritage for present and future generations be jeopardized by a popularized high profile case, despite the many aspects thereof in direct contradiction with the NHRA 1999, then not only the principles, but the very business of heritage management will be called into account, and the stage be set for the demise of many a cultural community in South Africa.

Assessment of this Heritage Case will have a significant impact on the heritage management industry, not only with reference to the specific outcomes thereof, but also the impact thereof on the many cultural communities living across South Africa, more than often not under any formal heritage protection status, with their livelihoods in cases threatened by various factors including developmental, economic, environmental, social and socio-political factors, to name a few.

It is argued in this Heritage Case that heritage have been used, by the accused, with ulterior motives: The particulars of a single Act, the NHRA 1999, have been used by Lesufi to argue for the conservation and proposed declaration of a heritage site (the Harry Gwala grave site proposed for National Heritage Site declaration), while the particulars of the same Act, the NHRA 1999, have been ignored, and popular emotional and political support been garnered in arguing for the dismantlement of the Orania Afrikaner cultural community and town.

One argument would be, to with cognisance to the heritage compliance discrepancies already inherent in the case discard any further consideration of the proposed declaration of the Harry Gwala grave site as a National Heritage Site. But what good can come from such an approach? Both communities stand to lose much, at the very centre of which a wish to conserve and promote their heritages for present and future generations.

It is thus recommended that a reconciliatory approach, laying at the roots of the NHRA 1999 and having had been the standard industry practice for the past two decades, be followed: That the proposal for the Harry Gwala grave site to be declared a National Heritage Site be considered, but on the condition that necessary mitigatory measures be instated to ensure protection for Orania:

1. That SAHRA issues a provisional 2 year protection to Orania in terms of the NHRA 1999, Section 29(1)(a)(ii);
2. That the proposed provisional protection shall apply until such time as all heritage and other legal concerns relating to this case have been concluded, including possible renewal of the protection if necessary;
3. That SAHRA allows Orania to apply for a suitable permanent heritage protection. It is recommended that Orania considers a 'Living Heritage' site category [NHRA 1999, Section 2(xxi)], of preferably Grade III (Local Heritage Site) or Grade II (Provincial Heritage Site) protection status [NHRA 1999, Section 7(1)(b) or 7(1)(c)]; and
4. That a copy of the application / proposal for the declaration of the Harry Gwala grave site for National Heritage Site status be forwarded to ArchaeoMaps. Should no such application have been submitted to date, that a copy of the application be forwarded as soon as possible (ASAP) upon submission to SAHRA, and no later than 20 working days after receipt by SAHRA. Should the responsible heritage authority at any point in time, be it as a result of the application criteria or by choice of the applicant change from SAHRA to AMAFA, that concerns included in this case be transferred, and equally applied to AMAFA at such time.

It is requested that SAHRA confirms receipt of this Heritage Case, in writing, within 30 working days from the date of submission of this report i.e. on or before 11 August 2020 (2020-08-11). It is requested that SAHRA, on said date, stipulates in writing the way forward for the various parties involved in this Heritage Case.

[This report is made to SAHRA (AMAFA and NBKB), mandatory responsible for the implementation of the NHRA 1999, directly on SAHRIS, and without any contact with the accused / the accused's office.]

## 7) References

1. Dordley, L. Cape Town etc. 2020. MEC Calls for Orania to be Shut Down (<https://www.capetownetc.com/news/calls-for-orania-to-be-shut-down>).
2. Els, H. 1992. Akkulturasie: Teorie en Praktyk. Pretoria: University of Pretoria Press.
3. eNCA Reporter. (eNCA). 2020. Lesufi: Orania doesn't belong to a non-racial SA (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rCkfW1pfjnk>).
4. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orania,\\_Northern\\_Cape](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orania,_Northern_Cape) [Accessed: June 2020].
5. <https://www.sahistory.org.za/people/harry-themba-gwala> [Accessed: June 2020].
6. Nkanjeni, U. Times Live. 2020. End of the Ora? Orania in the Spotlight as Calls for it to be Shut Down (<https://www.timeslive.co.za/news/south-africa/2020-06-24-end-of-the-ora-orania-in-the-spotlight-as-calls-for-it-to-be-shut-down>).
7. SABC Reporter. (SABC). 2020a. Calls to Declare Harry Gwala's Grave a National Heritage Site (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DozF6XfYwWo>).
8. SABC Reporter. (SABC) 2020b. Harry Gwala Commemorative Lecture by Charles Nqakula (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NQTloLhMtm0>).

## Prepared by –



- 1) ArchaeoMaps (Karen van Ryneveld)  
Tel / Cell - 084 871 1064  
E-mail - [karen@archaeomaps.co.za](mailto:karen@archaeomaps.co.za)  
MSc WITS University  
ASAPA CRM Accreditation [Member nr: 163] –
  - o Field Director (Iron Age; Colonial Period)
  - o Principle Investigator (Stone Age)