Transformation as Development: Southern Africa Perspectives on Capacity Building and Heritage

Rachel King, Charles Arthur and Sam Challis

#HeritageMustFall

Development, capacity building, and heritage have become familiar bedfellows over the last few decades, particularly in post-colonial contexts. Together, they invoke myriad definitions, institutional arenas, actors, and practical permutations grounded in the central tenet that heritage can become a workhorse for positive social and economic change. In South Africa after democratisation in 1994, the initial view of heritage as a platform for multicultural reconciliation swiftly gave way to neoliberal, government-led empowerment projects delivered by an array of parastatal, non-governmental, and civil society agencies (Weiss 2014b:124). Concurrently, development (in its various interventionist and immanent incarnations) became increasingly distributed among state, private, voluntary, and NGO spheres, and yoked to heritage on the basis that cultural rights and self-determination are development concerns (Coombe and Weiss 2015). Consequently, both South Africa and Lesotho have witnessed increasing promises of social and economic capacitation, and demands for popular participation in heritage management. These have come via networks of heritage practitioners and institutions in each nation – Lesotho being independent but highly sensitive to its neighbour's economic and intellectual trends. We say 'demands' because within many recent forms of public archaeology participatory development is prescribed in such a way that it becomes an obligation rather than a choice, with responsibility for the 'failures' of such projects placed in whole or in part on community partners (Henry 2004:140; Dawdy 2009; cf. Pogge 2002; Englund 2008).

In addition to the obvious tension between neoliberal empowerment agendas and the pitfalls (even 'tyranny', Cooke and Kothari 2001) of participatory development (Žižek 2004:178-179; González-Ruibal 2009:114-115), the picture of capacity building and heritage management in southern Africa is further complicated by longstanding calls from heritage managers that their practice reform itself to become more relevant, inclusive, and sensitive to the needs of its contemporary political contexts (Shepherd 2002b; Ndlovu 2009; Pikirayi

2015). Over the past decade the southern African archaeological community has called for parity in access to archaeology as a discipline and profession, which should be undertaken at the academic and commercial institutional level. This movement, dubbed 'transformation' in contemporary political rhetoric and adopted by the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) in 2008 to cover the Southern African Development Community (SADC) bloc (ASAPA 2008), has emphasised equal access and representation as a quantitative measure (i.e. increasing the numbers of non-white and non-male archaeologists). This is in line with the recent national trend holding transformation synonymous with numbers-based affirmative action projects (Reddy 2008:219). In contrast to reformative projects elsewhere in African archaeology (e.g. Stump 2010, 2013; Lane 2011, 2015; Davies 2012), transformation treats the imperative for inclusivity primarily as a socio-economic argument rather than an epistemological one: the concern is that 'archaeology should provide practical benefits for society in general' (Stump 2013:269), with an emphasis on 'practical' and 'practice' that implicates institutions such as universities, museums, and the commercial sector as potential sites of economic empowerment. Transformation in archaeology, then, is aligned with a particular facet of development in southern Africa: the longstanding struggle – enshrined in South Africa's constitution – for redistributive socio-economic rights delivered through non-governmental and parastatal programmes specifically geared towards capacity building and, ultimately, job creation (Weiss 2014a).

Following recent comments by Innocent Pikirayi (response in Stump 2013), archaeology as a discipline has more at stake in this struggle than the emphasis on numerical and financial equality suggests. At issue is the degree to which transformation of African archaeology into a more socially representative discipline is about achieving relevance (intellectually and socio-economically) or, going further, restitution for archaeology's often painful past in Africa (e.g. Shepherd 2002a; Hall 2005). For Pikirayi in southern Africa, archaeology will become indigenous and representative only when the discipline and its methods (not merely its trowels, Shepherd 2003b) are accessible to non-white archaeologists. These calls for redress of colonial or apartheid-era wrongs embedded in the transformation conversation suggest that at least in southern Africa, increasing participation in archaeology alone may be insufficient to address the social imperatives placed on the discipline. The pervasive sentiment that the colonial past and its material evocations must work to redeem themselves or be declared moribund is nowhere more evident than in South Africa's Rhodes Must Fall movement: this campaign's assertions that legacies of colonial monumentality embody alienation from state and educational institutions have garnered national and international attention.[1]

These conversations around transformation address how themes of rights and neoliberalism articulate with networks of expertise, institutions, and publics active on multiple scales. As such they constitute fertile ground for investigating how different social, practical, and epistemological resources are called upon to address the insistence that heritage is, in itself, a resource for socio-economic change (Coombe and Weiss 2015:43). Here we focus on the experiences of heritage practitioners navigating the imperatives, demands, and potentials of capacity building agendas in southern Africa. In particular, we are interested in how struggles for socio-economic rights, under the twinned projects of transformation and development, are being expressed in the practice of heritage management.

Taking as its point of departure these linkages between capacity building, rights, and restitution, this chapter examines what happens when archaeological practice engages with the demands of transformation, with attention to how these engagements play out in the field. The significance of the trowel's edge as a site of knowledge production is well-established (e.g. Lucas 2001; Berggren and Hodder 2003), as is the educational potential of the archaeological process (e.g. Holtorf 2009). Here we focus on the intersection of knowledge production and skills transfer with concerns over livelihoods and the role of heritage in development.

We write from the perspective of two projects (Figure 8.1): the Metolong Cultural Resource Management (MCRM) Project, a four-year heritage mitigation programme associated with western Lesotho's Metolong Dam and funded by the World Bank and the British Government (Arthur and Mitchell 2010; Mitchell and Arthur 2010); and the Matatiele Archaeology and Rock Art (MARA) Programme, a six-year South African National Research Foundation-funded scheme combining a training agenda with rock art survey and excavation in the Matatiele region of the Eastern Cape Province (once largely within the apartheid-era Transkei Homeland). Looking to Lesotho and a former Homeland or 'Bantustan'[2] one is confronted by the demand for an archaeology that acknowledges the imperative of both job creation and engaged overseeing of heritage management (King and Arthur 2014). Here, we probe where archaeological capacity building projects – with their potentials for failure and disillusionment – intersect with broader ideas about social transformation.

<Insert Figure 8.1 near here>

We argue that conceiving of heritage as an economic workhorse regularly does more harm than good for the project of transformation. Expectations of heritage as a socio-economic

driver – and particularly as a platform for capacity building – generally works against the creation of local authority. We submit that this is a consequence of a broadly superficial coupling of transformation and heritage that neglects implications for systemic change, as well as the expectations of heritage that capacity building projects create. The projects discussed here (and several others throughout the sub-continent) were designed to mitigate or avoid processes that reproduce (and thereby underscore) divisions between experts and capacitated technicians. Despite notable successes these were ultimately stymied by limitations within the infrastructure of heritage management at the state, academic, and commercial levels.

In this regard, our work resonates with James Ferguson's (1994) seminal observations that development discourse obfuscates or obstructs local political processes. In his groundbreaking analysis of 'development discourse' related to dams and rural livelihoods in Lesotho, Ferguson demonstrates how 'development' as problematic and apparatus performs two seemingly contradictory yet devastating functions. As a problematic that defines poverty as a technical problem with a technical solution, 'development' explicitly de-politicises poverty. Masked by this political neutrality, the apparatus of development – and the array of state and non-state actors implicated therein – can facilitate the expansion of state power under the banner of a 'technical mission' addressing rural economic capacitation (Ferguson 1994:256). To this invocation we add Sarah Radcliffe's (2006:233) argument that where development thinking appropriates heritage as market-oriented, this implicates a mosaic of arenas, actors, and expectations that influence how people use heritage to position themselves relative to modernity and its socio-economic entailments (cf. Ferguson 1999:13-14). We disarticulate received narratives of transformation, community engagement, and development, and identify tensions and concerns that emerge from the practical corollaries of these narratives. Specifically, we highlight issues surrounding credentialing of trainees, knowledge production and the creation of expert/technician divisions, and recommend policies for the southern African heritage sector to address these.

Changing Spaces

ASAPA adopted its Transformation Charter in 2008, drawing heavily on South Africa's constitution in its attempt to address institutionally entrenched disparities between white and non-white archaeologists. The Charter advocates for actively recruiting students from diverse racial and economic backgrounds, and promoting equal access to employment and participation in all archaeological sectors (ASAPA 2008). It is these last two points regarding employment and participation (Sections 4.2 and 4.3, respectively, of the Charter) that

concern us here. While ASAPA's Charter is addressed to the entire SADC bloc, aspects reflect uniquely South African concerns, many of which pre-date democratisation in 1994. These include archaeology's role in education (Smith 1983; Mazel and Stewart 1987), popular culture (Hall 1995), university attendance (Maggs 1998), and the problems of an African past written by non-Africans (Hall 1984). Post-1994, South African archaeologists advocated for incorporating archaeology into primary and secondary school curricula (Esterhuysen 2000), revised university curricula to eliminate discussions of race and foreground public history (Shepherd 2003a:841), and launched public outreach initiatives to encourage previously disenfranchised communities to participate in archaeological practice and study (e.g. Parkington 1999; Esterhuysen 2000). Archaeologists such as Nick Shepherd (2002:76-77) argued for a post-colonial South African archaeology that took an active role in projects of restitution, social justice, and memory. This resonated with long-standing calls for African post-colonial archaeologies accounting for subaltern perspectives and redressing the wrongs of colonialism (e.g. Schmidt 1995; Stahl 2001). Encouraged by the advent of a national educational system premised in experiential and multi-disciplinary learning, archaeologists led public and participatory projects that engaged previously disenfranchised communities in the process of writing history 'from below'. This encouraged students to explore the discipline at secondary and tertiary levels (King 2012). Academic empowerment of under-represented constituencies in archaeology was eventually codified in the Transformation Charter (Smith 2009) but within the past decade this project has been heavily influenced by 'market-based imperatives', meaning that students are increasingly equipped to function in a sector where heritage significance is 'measured against economic and political priorities' (Esterhuysen 2012:10).

Alongside and occasionally intersecting with these developments, throughout the 1990s and 2000s South Africa saw a profusion of projects run through both non-governmental and government-sponsored agencies aimed at coupling archaeological skills transfer (including excavation, site management, and tour guiding) with revenue creation, often through tourism ventures. The underlying principle in the majority of these projects was either to capitalise upon an existing sense of cultural ownership or to instil such a sense in certain communities, thus illustrating the financial and symbolic value of their heritage. Within most of these projects, capacity building was a local solution for a local problem (*pace* Lafrenz Samuels 2009). Custodianship was devolved to programme participants in the expectations that both heritage and its stakeholders would become self-sustaining and profit-making (cf. Coombe 2009:397). Unfortunately, the disappointments or 'unfulfilled promises' (Chirikure et al. 2010) derived from such programmes outnumber the sustainable success stories (Duval and

Smith 2013). Tourism-based projects in southern Africa have rarely become self-sustaining and where they have, it is on the strength of natural rather than cultural assets (Meskell 2009). Attrition of trained personnel has been high when the programmes to which trainees were affiliated cannot pay salaries. Where training was site- or project-specific these individuals perforce had to seek work outside the heritage sector. Where heritage and its custodians fail to deliver on the promises of development, the relevance of this heritage and its connection to 'good citizenship' implied at the project's outset is often called into question (Meskell 2011).

For our purposes, it is useful to consider the situation of archaeology in Lesotho and how this differs from its neighbour. Since the early twentieth century, archaeological projects in Lesotho have been carried out almost exclusively by foreigners from foreign institutions (Mitchell 1992). Development of domestic heritage capacity was not a major priority as it was in South Africa. With the exception of the two-year Analysis Rock Art Lesotho Project run by Lucas Smits through the National University of Lesotho, which trained Taole Tesele as one of the first Basotho archaeologists, there was no heritage management infrastructure – including personnel and regulatory bodies to enforce existing legislation – developed for Lesotho until around ten years ago.

In the interim, archaeology in Lesotho was carried out largely through contracts connected to natural resource extraction projects. In 1986, the Lesotho Highlands Water Project (LHWP) began construction for the first of five dams designed to generate revenue for Lesotho. The project was marked by severe underinvestment in archaeological mitigation (Mitchell 2005). Several surveys and excavations were commissioned by the Lesotho Highlands Development Authority as part of the LHWP scheme (Lewis-Williams and Thorp 1989; Mitchell and Parkington 1990) and by the Lesotho Ministry of Works ahead of the construction of the Southern Perimeter Road (Parkington et al. 1987; Mitchell et al. 1994), but archaeological investment has largely been restricted by contract limits and expectations. While LHWP supported the creation of the heritage centre at Liphofung Cave (associated with Katse Dam) as a cultural tourism initiative to support local communities, the emphasis here was on revenue creation through tour-guiding using a prescribed textual description of the site rather than archaeological skills transfer (Scudder 2005:116). We argue that more sustained, far-reaching changes are necessary to transform Lesotho's heritage management infrastructure; the MCRM Project was the first instance in Lesotho where capacity building for heritage management was specifically built into a mitigation programme.

Despite the promising adoption of heritage legislation in Lesotho (the National Heritage Resources Act of 2011), the lax enforcement of this law has meant that a job market has yet to develop. This is especially worrying given the impact that extractive resource projects have on cultural resources and the imperative for involvement of local heritage specialists. LHWP faced heavy media and academic criticism for its failure to adequately mitigate the loss of tangible and intangible heritage accompanying the construction of Katse and Mohale Dams, as well as the trauma that dam-affected communities felt when they were resettled (Thabane 2000; Mwangi 2007; Hitchcock 2015). While the MCRM Project was an effort to remedy this state of affairs (see below and Arthur et al. 2011), it is uncertain whether these remedies will be carried forward into the next phase of LHWP (King and Arthur 2014:171).

Of Experts and Empowerment

Rather than rehearsing these struggles and disappointments (for this, see Arthur et al. 2011 and King and Arthur 2014), our aim is to draw attention to facets of capacity building that bear further scrutiny. The drive to incorporate participatory perspectives in archaeological knowledge production is a familiar one in Africa (e.g. Schmidt 2005, 2011; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Jopela 2011), but here we are concerned with where this intersects with the imperatives of livelihoods that transformation and capacitation-as-development position themselves to address. The question of how to build capacity demands that we engage with the question of what work we want heritage to do, to the extent that this devolves to the choices made by individual actors or clusters of actors. This then prompts a further question: is capacity building in these contexts aimed at equipping individuals with a widely applicable skillset, producing archaeologists, or training heritage managers? Put another way, what are the ramifications of creating situations where individuals are deliberately enmeshed in heritage regimes with a mandate to make heritage pay?

The immediate and perhaps obvious answer to this last question is a loss of faith in heritage where it fails to live up to expectations of its ability to deliver progress and modernisation. If we take seriously Ndukuyakhe Ndlovu's (2012) position that South African archaeology is not 'citizen friendly' in its inability to sustain modern livelihoods, then the aporia engendered through the disappointments of heritage as an economic driver becomes dangerous. In Ndlovu's formulation, the failure of heritage to address socio-economic re-distribution has diminished its effectiveness as a development instrument, to the point where extractive development such as mines that actually damage heritage landscapes are preferable. Indeed, two days prior to this chapter's completion it was announced that the South African Department of Mineral Resources overruled the heritage preservation laws protecting the

National Monument site of Canteen Kopje in favour of allowing diamond mining, the argument being that the mine better serves the cause of economic empowerment than the archaeological site (see www.canteenkopje.com).

While Ndlovu's focus is largely on the shortcomings of heritage as a discipline and marketable product, our own work is concerned primarily with heritage as process in a capacity building context. Both the MCRM Project and MARA Programme were designed such that their research components and training for heritage management were mutually reinforcing. The MCRM Project's efforts toward developing skills and promoting jobs have been described in detail elsewhere, as has the Project's organisation and implementation (Arthur et al. 2011:240-241; King and Arthur 2014). Briefly, beginning in October 2009 and lasting 14 months, five professional archaeologists mentored an initial team of four trainees from the Metolong area who had expressed interest in participating in the Project. Employing a modified version of the Museum of London Archaeology Service's (MoLAS 1994) single-context recording system, trainees and professional archaeologists shared responsibility for the consistent, easily accessible formula of excavation procedures (extending to sorting and sieving stations) and interpretation. Over the course of six months, trainees were given increasing responsibilities until they could conduct test excavations unsupervised and mentor a new group of trainees. Trainees were also given responsibility for coordinating community engagement efforts, including organising and attending school visits and community meetings in the surrounding area (Sesotho, pl., *lipitso*). Primary and secondary schools within the Metolong Catchment were invited to visit the excavation, where they were given tours and participated in mock excavations. Combined with an open-site policy whereby visitors were encouraged to observe the excavations, local trainees were able to assert themselves as authorities on the archaeological process (Arthur and Mitchell 2012). Following the completion of the MCRM Project, four trainees have found employment on archaeological and cultural resource management (CRM) projects elsewhere in Lesotho and South Africa (see below), and one has completed honours and master's programmes in archaeology at the University of the Witwatersrand. Trainees-turned-technicians have organised themselves into the Lesotho Heritage Network (LHN, lesothoheritage.wordpress.com), an independent co-operative advocacy group for Lesotho's heritage and heritage professionals.

Following the ethos of the MCRM Project, the MARA Programme implemented similar strategies on the South African side of the border, employing a mandate that explicitly coupled research and transformation.[3] In keeping with its central mission of redressing the lack of historical and archaeological attention given to the Matatiele region of the former

‘Transkei’, it follows that archaeological practice should also redress the way communities are engaged in knowledge production and skills transfer. Since its inception in February 2011, MARA has been run in collaboration with the Mehloding Community Trust (www.mehloding.co.za), a local organisation certified in Fair Trade tourism that operates hiking tours through the southern Maloti-Drakensberg Mountains. This partnership is not with Mehloding as a tourism venture but rather as a community institution and resource base. Mehloding recruited participants in MARA’s training programme, which utilised Mehloding’s payment structures in compliance with Fair Trade practice. The training programme itself tracked closely with that developed at Metolong, largely because mentors and some trainees had previously been part of the MCRM Project. Two of the more senior alumni of the MCRM Project joined MARA and took responsibility for instructing junior trainees, all under the supervision and instruction of professional CRM archaeologists whose contracts specified that their duties included excavation *and* training. At MARA the training programme emphasised both excavation and rock art survey and recording, the latter being such a vast task that trainees are equipped to carry on surveying independently once the full MARA team returns to Johannesburg.

A specific aim of both the MCRM Project and MARA training programmes was to mitigate power relations within many field projects where often a single individual or small group is responsible for creative thought (Berggren and Hodder 2003), with a second tier of diggers afforded some limited decision-making responsibilities at the trowel’s edge, and below them a typically untrained group of ‘sorters’. In Africa, these ‘unskilled’ jobs are typically undertaken by local community members. The adaptation of the MoLAS (1994) system to take in the sorting and sieving stations was designed to extend interpretative participation to these jobs.

This is not to say that either project was free from conflict surrounding the implications of producing expertise and how this translates into livelihoods. While the MCRM Project and its training programme enjoyed a broad remit and resource base, the limitations attached to virtually all developer-led archaeological endeavours constrained the sustainability and replicability of the programme in several major ways. These included a fixed timeframe for the project, a budget in which training was only a small part, and the ultimate need for the client (the Government of Lesotho) to be amenable to making capacity building a priority in the development agenda. Further and more seriously, while the training programme equipped a handful of Basotho heritage professionals with an adequate skillset, Lesotho’s heritage

industry did not receive a similar boost and therefore a fully-fledged employment sector for these trainees has yet to emerge.

More specifically and turning to the inner workings of the projects themselves, MARA struggled to ensure steady and reliable cashflow from a university research system that is unaccustomed to paying salaries through research projects. The short-term, seasonal element of research fieldwork rendered any employment opportunities that it generated temporary. This has, however, been mitigated to some degree by the contiguity of field seasons generated by projects within the LHN. One of the major struggles (and even fault lines) within the MCRM Project training programme was devising and adhering to pay scales and a promotional structure. The responsibilities, hierarchical position, and reflective wage differences attached to trainees of different levels became of increasing concern during the course of the programme and, owing to lack of guidelines or precedent, was something we had not fully appreciated (King and Arthur 2014:172). Related to this was the question that trainees asked with greater regularity as the programme progressed: at what point are people transformed from trainees to heritage managers? While this could refer to and be resolved by the arbitrary creation of titles and ranks, this question speaks to the larger preoccupation of the technician/expert divide that has dogged concerns over knowledge production and authority in archaeological field contexts worldwide (Lucas 2001).

Relevant here is Laurajane Smith's (2004:2-3) observation that archaeological attention legitimates or de-legitimates views of culture, especially in CRM. That capacity building programmes endow heritage management and managers with this legitimating power is taken as a 'Good Thing' in transformation rhetoric. Yet here it is important to examine the structural limitations of empowerment and how these interact with the work that heritage is being asked to do in a mitigation context such as Metolong. Inasmuch as the goal of the training programme at Metolong was to create both technical and interpretative capacity, the nature of contract archaeology (particularly in internationally-funded development work) is that the agenda is necessarily set by a few senior investigators, officials, and developers (cf. Kankpeyeng and DeCorse 2004; Arazi 2009; MacEachern 2010). The terms of mitigation and salvage are therefore, and to varying degrees depending on the developer-archaeologist relationship, out of the hands of trainees and thus some sort of expert/trainee divide is unavoidable.

The legitimation conferred through capacity building programmes is therefore perhaps not undermined, but at least qualified: the authority for salvage, and for determining what is worth saving, rests with the professional archaeologists and developers who are amalgamated

under the general heading of white authority. Nowhere is this (literally) illustrated more clearly than by graffiti drawn in the scar left by the rock art removal component of the MCRM Project's mitigation programme. This involved Basotho as community liaisons and rock art specialists but was nevertheless closely associated with the '*makhooa ka Metolong*', or 'white people of Metolong' (Figure 8.2). Because MARA's academic research focus means that the programme is not tied to a developer agenda it has not experienced these divides as strongly. However, the short-term and somewhat sporadic nature of fieldwork discussed above illustrates the fragility of the authority conferred to trainees by MARA's (and, indeed, any) capacity building programme, where capacitated heritage managers are dependent upon interventions by Principal Investigators to make their expertise pay. We offer policy suggestions for remedying this situation in this chapter's conclusion.

<Insert Figure 8.2 near here>

For the present, it is important to note that these authoritative tensions are not wholly the result of flaws within the training programmes themselves: we have acknowledged our confusions and shortcomings elsewhere (King and Arthur 2014), but examining how these training programmes fit into the larger transformation and development landscape leads us to conclude that a major restriction on any particular capacity building endeavour related to heritage management is that it inevitably confronts a lack of parallel systemic and institutional change. This means that once heritage managers complete training programmes they find the path to educational and commercial opportunities blocked by a lack of measures for accrediting and assessing their skillset, and as a result they cannot make their capacity pay outside of the specific local contexts in which they were trained. Following Kathryn Lafrenz Samuels (2009:83), poverty and development failures become territorialised while authority and transformation rhetoric are the purview of cosmopolitan experts.

This is a situation that has repeated itself in participatory development projects worldwide (e.g. Hickey and Mohan 2004; cf. Moore 2001; Englund 2006:101-103), and so it is not surprising that the same dynamic appears in a heritage management context. It is, however, particularly pernicious in South Africa at the moment because of the overwhelming popular dissatisfaction with the inability of heritage to deliver on its 22-year-old promises of socio-economic redistribution, political unification, and cultural healing (Meskell 2011). That transformation in heritage management has had more rhetorical than tangible impact thus far not only increases the potential for this dissatisfaction and an accompanying dis-enchantment with heritage, but also emphasises the divide between heritage elites and those who remain

'un-transformed'. This schism is possibly even starker in Lesotho, where (with a handful of exceptions) archaeology and heritage management have been almost entirely tied to development and conducted by foreigners.

Heritage Works

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the strictures and structures of archaeological expertise and the development framework that it references have an unbreakable stranglehold on the authority of heritage managers. Recent literature (Coombe and Weiss 2015) on the globalisation of heritage and development has illustrated that heritage regimes are not hegemonic, top-down affairs in which value is instituted by a paramount authority. They are, rather, shifting networks of actors whose desires, agency, and authority operate on varying spatial scales. Despite the institutional frustrations that capacity building in both the MCRM Project and MARA Programme have experienced, where these training programmes have addressed themselves to trainees' involvement in alternative or vernacular interpretations of heritage we see potential for changing the terms under which culture and development are coupled, at least at ground level.

The incorporation of living heritage assessments in mitigation programmes both at Metolong and elsewhere permits space for perspectives on heritage management and mitigation that are not necessarily based in the compensatory or loss-driven value of cultural assets (King and Nic Eoin 2014; Kleinitz and Merlo 2014). By 'living heritage', we mean intersections of practice, memory, and (crucially) material culture that express themselves in the quotidian present with reference to the past (Nic Eoin and King 2013; see also Harrison 2013:18, 204-205). Through these assessments Basotho and foreign heritage managers were able to draw out local preoccupations with, for instance, changes in plant resource procurement and use (including medicinal, ritual, and subsistence purposes), access to pasturage, and the symbiotic relationship between grazing and the maintenance of abandoned villages (Nic Eoin and King 2013; King and Arthur 2014:174-177; cf. Siteleki 2014). These associations demonstrate not only that heritage is linked to livelihoods in ways that development-led mitigation schemes often do not account for, but also impacted how communities perceive, value, and mitigate the significance of these linkages through particular and often unexpected strategies. For example, plant availability is negotiated through household or village herbaria, grazing patterns are reconfigured along with a total re-imagining of the Metolong landscape (including the re-location of several supernatural snakes that had hitherto dwelt in large pools in the river, Snow 2011), and the significance of abandoned villages inheres in their continued use for building materials and grazing area rather than their preservation (King et

al. 2014; King and Nic Eoin 2014; cf. Daly et al. 2016). As heritage is enacted and embodied in practice, it includes a range of economic, mnemonic, material, and obligatory relationships that do not fit neatly into development or market frameworks (King and Nic Eoin 2014; cf. Englund 2008). Capacitated heritage managers are crucial to identifying and contextualising these perspectives, as long as 'capacity' involves engaging with the conceptual apparatuses of heritage as much as if not more than training to preserve and salvage its material components.

In the case of the MARA Programme, given that this was the first systematic engagement with the archaeology of the Matatiele region, the training programme was seen as a way to begin this engagement as a dialogue between community members and academics. Consequently, MARA's participants (academics and trainees alike) were able to negotiate contradictions between various conceptions of heritage and how they should be experienced and managed. For instance, while MARA's primary focus is rock art survey (resonating with the national emphasis on rock art as marketable heritage, e.g. Duval and Smith 2013), the overwhelming sentiment in Matatiele itself is that the area's definitive heritage is represented by its pre-eminence as a hub for Nguni and Sotho initiation schools (Mokoena 2015; Zulu 2016). Referring to a heavily ritualised coming-of-age process, men's and women's initiation schools demand seclusion and often take place in painted rock shelters, where activities can damage rock paintings and archaeological deposits. This sort of conflict in heritage management is not new in southern Africa (e.g. Ndlovu 2011). The crucial point for MARA is that the training programme in combination with the focus on living heritage and ethnography created a space to debate these issues and acknowledge the legitimacy of trainees' authority. That said, recent ethnographic research (Mokoena 2015; Zulu 2016) directs attention to widespread sentiment that initiation schools are actually a locally-driven and regionally-specific form of marketable heritage, targeting a broad audience of Basotho and South African aspiring initiands wishing to avail themselves of expertise in Matatiele. This point and its potential comparison with more 'top-down' ideas of heritage tourism await further in-depth exploration.

These observations refer us back to Sarah Radcliffe's (2006:233) thesis above that in development contexts culture is invoked in various facilities (from marketable product to institution to creative entity), which in turn generate expectations, obligations, and relationships among actors. We are not suggesting that the expertise of individuals trained through capacity building programmes is necessarily founded upon their expertise in localised forms of living heritage. Rather, we draw attention to the examples just described in

order to hint at the potential for participants in capacity building programmes to change the terms, or at least the immediate context, of how heritage is conceived and constituted. Rock art can be changed from product to an aspect of cultural institutions such as initiation. Preservation can be redefined once associations between material culture, landscape, and livelihood are revised. These are possibilities that demand further exploration in future work but for the moment demonstrate the outcomes of capacity building that include explicit engagement with the values, forms, and force of heritage – that is, its politically and epistemically persuasive power (Lafrenz Samuels 2015). Engagements that, in other words, take seriously 'non-expert' agency in outlining a role for heritage in development.

Transforming Topographies of Power

The foregoing has illustrated how interrogating the bundling of capacity, development, and socio-economic empowerment under the heading of transformation too often becomes dis-empowering. In seeking to address calls for transformation in heritage management, the MCRM Project and MARA Programme (representing CRM and academic projects, respectively) were confronted with the shallow or highly localised engagements of transformation as a development instrument. Despite aspirations of mobilising heritage for socio-economic empowerment (via skills transfer) and restitution (via a new multi-vocality), the absence of institutional means for acknowledging the authority thus created means that capacitated people (and their expertise) remains conditional and territorialised.

This leads us to the first of our policy recommendations: the need for a credentialing system that acknowledges the outcomes of capacity building programmes and the place of their alumni in professional heritage management structures (cf. Ndlovu 2014:205). This is a measure to be undertaken by the heritage management community which, in southern Africa, is represented by ASAPA and the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) as national regulatory body. As mentioned above, ASAPA's constitution contains a provision bringing 'field technicians' – implying those heritage managers with a field-based skillset – under their aegis. The clearest established course of action for this is for technicians to avail themselves of the 'archaeology management' qualifications framework, which consists of a nationally standardised course and examination administered by the South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA). ASAPA is currently pursuing recognition from SAQA, which would entail ASAPA and its affiliated institutions such as universities to coordinate, administer, and assess the qualifying frameworks course being examined (C. Namono, personal communication). This is a daunting path upon which to embark, both because of the bureaucracy involved and the resources (human and infrastructural) that it would necessitate.

Moreover, introducing new credentialing pathways for field-trained individuals would re-shape the landscape of professional heritage management in southern Africa, prompting re-consideration of what constitutes adequate and necessary qualifications and introducing competition into an already crowded industry – outcomes that may trouble some members of ASAPA's CRM wing. Whether or not SAHRA would take such qualifications seriously is a separate issue. At the moment, membership in a professional organisation is not compulsory to practice CRM in South Africa, or submit official reports in compliance with heritage legislation to SAHRA, and thus there is little incentive from the regulatory (and by extension, the commercial) sector for individuals to enrol in a SAQA-type course.

Ultimately, the issue of credentialing speaks to two overriding concerns about institutional recognition of field technicians: recognition within a community of heritage practitioners and colleagues, and the commitment of SAHRA to establishing and upholding standards for in heritage management in line with professional best-practices and qualifications. Adopting a standardised evaluation system like SAQA would be a significant step toward actualising the tenets of ASAPA's Transformation Charter, although it would not resolve all of the most pervasive concerns about capacity building outcomes and may create others. Of particular concern for us is where achieving SAQA certification at the level of Principal Investigator necessitates a post-graduate degree, which not only retains the glass ceiling that forecloses career mobility for field technicians but makes it explicit and codified. We therefore support instituting a credentialing scheme that will enable heritage managers trained in capacity building programmes to obtain recognition from their peers, apply for work and eventually contracts in heritage management, and – importantly – pursue educational opportunities rather than making educational shortcomings a barrier to career development.

To be clear, we are not suggesting this approach specifically as a means of recruiting diversity within the discipline of archaeology, but rather directly addressing the relevance of archaeology and heritage management in the contexts in which they operate. The training programmes described here are aimed at providing a skillset applicable across a range of fields, and in the credentialing schemes described here, trainees could seek recognition of their abilities for the purposes of finding related employment. Our aim here is not to lay out a pathway to transforming heritage management as a profession, but for practically and directly engaging with the expectations that capacity building produces.

This relates to our second policy suggestion, which is that where capacity building forms part of heritage management it includes a component that permits space for debating the value, aims, and context of the heritage in question. We have noted elsewhere that especially in

CRM contexts it is necessary to explore alternative (and perhaps more workable) conceptions of heritage in order to create methodologies that best address the socio-cultural and economic impacts of mitigation practices (King and Arthur 2014:176-177). Here, we direct attention to the observations made above that where training programmes include components in which trainees engage with underlying assumptions about what heritage is and does (especially its practical corollaries), this carries the potential for re-visiting and revising the terms under which culture is implicated in development projects. Living heritage, ethnographic, and oral historical enquiries are the most readily apparent avenues for such exploration. Excavation and survey programmes can also be designed to encourage a critical engagement with the definition of heritage (e.g. Gavua and Apoh 2010; Kleinitz and Merlo 2014).

Finally, and re-iterating points made elsewhere (Arthur et al. 2011:241; Arthur and Mitchell 2012:7; King and Arthur 2014:179), we recommend the abolition of unskilled labour on archaeological excavations in southern Africa. It has been argued convincingly that the distinction between technicians and archaeologists is more imagined than it is real (Berggren and Hodder 2003), and the failure to rectify the expert/technician divide that emerges through encouraging unskilled or un-credentialed labour has a tremendous bearing on livelihoods in southern Africa, as these schemes limit opportunities for education and secure employment.

At the outset of this chapter we described the networks of expertise, government, and civil society mobilised by the linked concepts of development, heritage, and capacity building; in closing we emphasise the structure of this arrangement, namely that it should be conceived as a network rather than a hierarchy of authority (cf. Ferguson 2006:91-93). Recent suggestions that archaeologists and heritage managers 'put their house in order' refer to the question of accountability when development agendas – which we take as including transformation – set the stakes for heritage (Chirikure 2014:218; cf. Ndlovu 2012, 2014). Where heritage professionals position themselves between developers and local stakeholders in a hierarchical structure, conflicts of interest emerge and result in socio-economic disenfranchisement. We argue that heritage managers (including trainees) should locate themselves and their expertise within a more horizontal topography of power (*pace* Ferguson 2006:93), considering where their authority impacts on other nodes in this network and where they can set (or change) the terms under which heritage and development are coupled.

Policy Suggestions

1. Establishing (either within ASAPA or another body) a vocational credentialing system for archaeological technicians whose skillset is the product of field-based capacity

building programmes as a pathway to employment and further education or credentialing within professional archaeology.

2. Where capacity building programmes are deployed as part of a heritage management or development programme, these should include avenues for participants to engage in the process of creating management strategies and communicating these to stakeholder publics.
3. The abolition of unskilled labour on archaeological excavations in southern Africa via measures adopted by ASAPA and other professional bodies.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the volume editors for the invitation to publish this paper. An earlier version of this chapter was presented at the conference 'African Heritage Challenges' at the University of Cambridge in May 2015; we thank the convenors and participants for their valuable comments. The projects described here were made possible through generous funding from the World Bank, the British Government, St Hugh's College (University of Oxford), and the South African National Research Foundation's African Origins Platform. We thank Mark McGranaghan, Peter Mitchell, and Luíseach Nic Eoin for their support and feedback on drafts of this paper. Finally, our greatest thanks go to those who participated in and led the MCRM Project and MARA Programme, especially Puseletso Lecheko, Tsepo Lesholu, Rethabile Mokhachane, Nthabiseng Mokoena, Alice Mullen, Hugo Pinto, James Pugin, Joseph Ralimpe, Mncedisi Siteleki, and John Zulu.

Notes

[1] The Rhodes Must Fall movement in South Africa is most accessible on social media platforms: through the hashtag #RhodesMustFall, on Facebook at www.facebook.com/RhodesMustFall and Twitter on the handle @RhodesMustFall.

[2] 'Homeland' or 'Bantustan' refers to a system of reserves for non-whites laid out by the Bantu Authorities Act in 1951 and in effect for most of the remaining tenure of the apartheid era. Primarily concerned with consolidating and controlling movement of non-white communities through carefully maintained and modified 'traditional' institutions, the multiple legacies of Bantustans can be mapped onto areas of rural poverty and

underdeveloped infrastructure in today's South Africa (see, e.g., Beinart 2001:162-3, 218-27).

[3] Details available at marasurvey.wix.com.

Reference List

Arazi, N. 2009. 'Cultural Resource Management in Africa: Challenges, Dangers, and Opportunities', *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa,* 44(1): 95-106.

Arthur, C. and Mitchell P. 2010. 'The Archaeology of the Metolong Dam, Lesotho: A Preliminary Assessment', *Antiquity* Project Gallery 84.

Arthur, C. and Mitchell, P. 2012. 'The Metolong Dam: A Lasting Legacy?', *The Digging Stick,* 29: 4-8.

Arthur, C., Mitchell, P., and Mohapi, M. 2011. 'Archaeology and Dam Projects in Lesotho', *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites,* 13: 231-252.

Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA) 2008. *The Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists' Transformation Charter for Archaeology in South Africa*. Available at: http://www.asapa.org.za/uploads/files/ASAPA%20Transformation%20Charter.pdf

Beinart, W. 2001. *Twentieth-Century South Africa*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berggren, Å. and Hodder, I. 2003. 'Social Practice, Method, and Some Problems of Field Archaeology', *American Antiquity,* 68(3): 421-434.

Chirikure, S. 2014 '"Where Angels Fear to Tread": Ethics, Commercial Archaeology, and Extractive Industries in Southern Africa', *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa,* 49(2): 218-231.

Chirikure, S., Manyanga, M., Ndoro, W., and Pwiti, G. 2010. 'Unfulfilled Promises? Heritage Management and Community Participation at Some of Africa's Cultural Heritage Sites', *International Journal of Heritage Studies,* 16(1-2): 30-44.

Chirikure, S. and Pwiti, G. 2008. 'Community Involvement in Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Management', *Current Anthropology,* 49(3): 467-485.

Cooke, B. and Kothari, U. (eds.) 2001. *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed Books.

Coombe, R.J. 2009. 'The Expanding Purview of Cultural Properties and Their Politics', *Annual Review of Law and Social Science,* 5: 393-412.

Coombe, R.J. and Weiss, L. 2015. 'Neoliberalism, Heritage Regimes, and Cultural Rights', in L. Meskell (ed.) *Global Heritage: A Reader*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell. 43-69.

Daly, L., French, K., Miller, T.L., and Nic Eoin, L. 2016. 'Integrating Ontology into Ethnobotanical Research', *Journal of Ethnobiology,* 36(1): 1-9.

Dawdy, S. 2009. 'Millennial Archaeology. Locating the Discipline in the Age of Insecurity', *Archaeological Dialogues,* 16(2): 131-142.

Davies, M.I.J. 2012. 'Some Thoughts on a "Usable" African Archaeology: Settlement, Population, and Intensive Farming among the Pokot of Northwest Kenya', *African Archaeological Review,* 29: 319-353.

Duval, M. and Smith, B.W. 2013. 'Rock Art Tourism in the uKhahlamba/Drakensberg World Heritage Site: Obstacles to the Development of Sustainable Tourism', *Journal of Sustainable Tourism,* 21(1): 134-153.

Englund, H. 2006. *Prisoners of Freedom: Human Rights and the African Poor*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Englund, H. 2008. 'Extreme Poverty and Existential Obligations: Beyond Morality in the Anthropology of Africa?', *Social Analysis,* 52(3): 33-50.

Esterhuysen, A. 2000. 'The Birth of Educational Archaeology in South Africa', *Antiquity,* 74(283): 159-165.

Esterhuysen, A. 2012. 'The Cinderella Metaphor: South African Archaeology (Still) in the Making', *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa,* 47(1): 5-13.

Ferguson, J. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development', Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, J. 1999. *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ferguson, J. 2006. *Global Shadows: Africa in the Neoliberal World Order*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Gavua, K. and Apoh, W. 2010. 'Encounters with Development and Power: Salvage Archaeology at the Bui Hydroelectric Dam Project Site in Ghana', unpublished paper presented at the 13th congress of the Pan African Archaeological Society for Prehistory and Related Studies and the 20th meeting of the Society of Africanist Archaeologists, Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Dakar, Senegal.

González-Ruibal, A. 2009. 'Vernacular Cosmopolitanism: An Archaeological Critique of Universalistic Reason', in L. Meskell (ed.) *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, Durham: Duke University Press. 113-139.

Hall, M. 1984. 'The Burden of Tribalism: The Social Context of Southern African Iron Age Studies', *American Antiquity,* 49(3): 455-467.

Hall, M. 1995. 'The Legend of the Lost City: Or, the Man with Golden Balls', *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 21(2): 179-199.

Hall, M. 2005. 'Situational Ethics and Engaged Practice: The Case of Archaeology in Africa', in L. Meskell and P. Pels (eds.) *Embedding Ethics*, New York: Berg. 169-194.

Harrison, R. 2013. *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Henry, L. 2004. 'Morality, Citizenship, and Participatory Development in an Indigenous Development Association: The Case of GPSDO and the Sebat Bet Gurage of Ethiopia', in S. Hickey and G. Mohan (eds.) *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?*, London: Zed Books. 140-156.

Hickey, S. and Mohan, G. (eds.) (2004) *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?*. London: Zed Books.

Hitchcock, R.K. 2015. 'The Lesotho Highlands Water Project: Dams, Development and the World Bank', *Sociology and Anthropology,* 3(10): 526-538.

Holtorf, C. 2009. 'Archaeology. From Usefulness to Value', *Archaeological Dialogues,* 16(2): 182-186.

Jopela, A.P. de J. 2011. 'Traditional Custodianship: A Useful Framework for Heritage Management in Southern Africa?', *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites,* 13(2-3): 103-122.

Kankpeyeng, B. and DeCorse, C. 2004. 'Ghana's Vanishing Past: Development, Antiquities, and the Destruction of the Archaeological Record', *African Archaeological Review,* 21(2): 89-128.

King, R. 2012. 'Teaching Archaeological Pasts in South Africa: Historical and Contemporary Considerations of Archaeological Education', *Archaeologies,* 8(2): 85-115.

King, R. and Arthur, C. 2014. 'Development-Led Archaeology and Ethics in Lesotho', *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa,* 49(2): 166-183.

King, R., Arthur, C., and Mitchell, P. 2014. 'Ha Makoanyane: The Archaeology and History of Colonial Transitions in Lesotho', *Southern African Humanities,* 26: 57-81.

King, R. and Nic Eoin, L. 2014. 'Before the Flood: Loss of Place, Mnemonics, and "Resources" Ahead of the Metolong Dam, Lesotho', *Journal of Social Anthropology,* 14: 196-223.

Kleinitz, C. and Merlo, S. 2014. 'Towards a Collaborative Exploration of Community Heritage in Archaeological Salvage Contexts: Participatory Mapping on Mograt Island, Sudan', *Aus der Archäologie,* 25: 161-175.

Lafrenz Samuels, K. 2009. 'Trajectories of Development: International Heritage Management of Archaeology in the Middle East and North Africa', *Archaeologies,* 5(1): 68-91.

Lafrenz Samuels, K. 2015. 'Introduction: Heritage as Persuasion', in K. Lafrenz Samuels and T. Rico (eds.), *Heritage Keywords: Rhetoric and Redescription in Cultural Heritage*, Boulder: University of Colorado Press. 3-28.

Lane, P.J. 2011. 'Possibilities for a Post-Colonial Archaeology in Sub-Saharan Africa: Indigenous and Usable Pasts', *World Archaeology,* 43(1): 7-25.

Lane, P.J. 2015. 'Archaeology in the Age of the Anthropocene: A Critical Assessment of Its Scope and Societal Contributions', *Journal of Field Archaeology,* 40(5): 485-498.

Lewis-Williams, J.D. and Thorp, C.A. 1989. *Archaeology: Lesotho Highlands Water Project Environmental Study*. E.R. Ltd., Lesotho Highlands Development Authority.

Lucas, G. 2001. *Critical Approaches to Fieldwork: Contemporary and Historical Archaeological Practice*. London: Routledge.

MacEachern, S. 2010. ‘Seeing like an Oil Company’s CHM Programme: Exxon and Archaeology on the Chad Export Project’, *Journal of Social Archaeology,* 10(3): 347-366.

Maggs, T.M.O’C. 1998. ‘Archaeology at South African Universities: The Future?’, *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 53: 55-56.

Mazel, A.D. and Stewart, P.M. 1987. ‘Meddling with the Mind: The Treatment of San Hunter-Gatherers and the Origins of South Africa’s Black Population in Recent South African School History Textbooks’, *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 42(146): 166-170.

Meskell, L. 2009. ‘The Nature of Culture in Kruger National Park’, in L. Meskell (ed.) *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies*, Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 89-112.

Meskell, L. 2011. *The Nature of Heritage: The New South Africa*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Mitchell, P. 1992. ‘Archaeological Research in Lesotho: A Review of 120 Years’, *African Archaeological Review,* 10: 3-34.

Mitchell, P. 2005. ‘Managing on Scarce Resources: The Past Record, Present Situation, and Future Prospects of Archaeological Resource Management in Lesotho’, in N. Finneran (ed.) *Safeguarding Africa’s Past: Selected Papers from a Workshop Held at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 2001*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports. 37-46.

Mitchell, P. and Arthur, C. 2010. ‘Archaeological Fieldwork in the Metolong Dam Catchment, Lesotho, 2008-2010’, *Nyame Akuma,* 74: 51-62.

Mitchell, P. and Parkington, J. 1990. *The Archaeology of the Hololo Crossing Rockshelter*. Cape Town: Archaeology Contracts Office.

Mitchell, P., Parkington, J., and Yates, R. 1994. ‘Recent Holocene Archaeology in Western and Southern Lesotho’, *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 49(159): 33-52.

Mokoena, N. 2015. ‘Community-Involved Heritage Management: The Case of Matatiele’, unpublished master’s thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Moore, S.F. 2001. ‘The International Production of Authoritative Knowledge’, *Ethnography,* 2(2): 161-189.

MoLAS (Museum of London Archaeological Service) 1994. *The MoLAS Archaeological Site Manual*. London: Museum of London Archaeological Service.

Mwangi, O. 2007. 'Hydropolitics, Ecocide, and Human Security in Lesotho: A Case Study of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project', *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 33(2-3): 253-280.

Ndlovu, N. 2009. 'Transformation Challenges in South African Archaeology', *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 64(189): 91-93.

Ndlovu, N. 2011. 'Management Versus Preservation: Archaeological Heritage Management in a Transforming South Africa', *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites,* 13(2-3): 123-133.

Ndlovu, N. 2012. 'Archaeology and Development at Loggerheads: But Should They Be?', *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 67(196): 262-264.

Ndlovu, N. 2014. 'Contract Archaeology in South Africa: Some Ethical Concerns', *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa,* 49(2): 203-217.

Nic Eoin, L. and King, R. 2013. 'How to Develop Intangible Heritage: The Case of Metolong Dam, Lesotho', *World Archaeology,* 45: 453-669.

Parkington, J. 1999. 'Clanwilliam Living Landscape Project', *Nordisk Museologi* 1: 147-154.

Parkington, J., Poggenpoel, C.A., and Yates, R. 1987. *Lesotho Rescue Archaeology 1982/83*. Cape Town: Department of Archaeology.

Pikirayi, I. 2015. 'The Future of Archaeology in Africa', *Antiquity,* 89(345): 531-541.

Pogge, T.W. 2002. 'Can the Capability Approach Be Justified?', *Philosophical Topics,* 30(2): 167-228.

Radcliffe, S.A. 2006. 'Conclusions: The Future of Culture and Development', in S.A. Radcliffe (ed.) *Culture and Development in a Globalizing World: Geographies, Actors, and Paradigms*, London: Routledge. 228-237.

Reddy, T. 2008. 'Transformation', in N. Shepherd and S. Robins (eds.) *New South African Keywords*, Johannesburg: Jacana. 209-222.

Scudder, T. 2005. *The Future of Large Dams*. London: Earthscan.

Schmidt, P.R. 1995. 'Using Archaeology to Remake History in Africa', in P.R.

Schmidt and T.C. Patterson (eds.), *Making Alternative Histories: The Practice of Archaeology and History in Non-Western Settings*, Santa Fe: School of American Research. 119-147.

Schmidt, P.R. 2005. 'Teaching Revolutionary Archaeology: African Experiments in History Making and Heritage Management', *Archaeologies* 1(2): 46-59.

Schmidt, P.R. 2011. 'Social Memory and Trauma in Northwestern Tanzania: Organic, Spontaneous Community Collaboration', *Journal of Social Archaeology,* 10(2): 255-279.

Shepherd, N. 2002a. 'Heading South, Looking North: Why We Need a Post-Colonial Archaeology', *Archaeological Dialogues,* 9(2): 74-82.

Shepherd, N. 2002b. 'The Politics of Archaeology in Africa', *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 31: 189-209.

Shepherd, N. 2003a. 'State of the Discipline: Science, Culture, and Identity in South African Archaeology, 1870-2003', *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 29(4): 823-844.

Shepherd, N. 2003b. '"When the Hand That Holds the Trowel Is Black …": Disciplinary Practices of Self-Representation and the Issue of "Native" Labour in Archaeology', *Journal of Social Archaeology,* 3(3): 334-352.

Siteleki, J.M. 2014. 'Plant Power and Land Use in the Maloti-Drakensberg: A Case Study in GIS and IKS in Matatiele, Eastern Cape, South Africa', unpublished honours thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Smith, A.B. 1983. 'The Hotnot Syndrome: Myth-Making in South African School Textbooks', *Social Dynamics,* 9(2): 37-49.

Smith, B.W. 2009. 'A Transformation Charter for South African Archaeology', *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 64(189): 87-89.

Smith, L. 2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*, London: Routledge.

Snow, L. 2011. '*Noha Ea Metsi*: Water Serpents of the Basotho and Their Connections with Snakes in San Rock Art', unpublished honours thesis, University of Oxford.

Stahl, A.B. 2001. *Making History in Banda: Anthropological Visions of Africa's Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stump, D. 2010. '"Ancient and Backward or Long-Lived and Sustainable?" The Role of the Past in Debates Concerning Rural Livelihoods and Resource Conservation in Eastern Africa', *World Development,* 38(9): 1251-1262.

Stump, D. 2013. 'On Applied Archaeology, Indigenous Knowledge, and the Usable Past', *Current Anthropology,* 54(3): 268-298.

Thabane, M. 2000. 'Shifts from Old to New Social and Ecological Environments in the Lesotho Highlands Water Scheme; Relocating Residents of the Mohale Dam Area', *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 26(4): 633-654.

Weiss, L. 2014a 'The Historical Narration of Rights in South Africa: Past, Present, and Future Tense', *Heritage and Society,* 7(2): 121-138.

Weiss, L. 2014b. 'Informal Settlements and Urban Heritage Landscapes in South Africa', *Journal of Social Archaeology,* 14(1): 3-25.

Žižek, S. 2004. *Organs without Bodies: Deleuze and Consequences*, New York: Routledge.

Zulu, J. 2016. 'The Material Culture of Hlubi Male Initiation: A Case Study from Matatiele, Eastern Cape, South Africa', unpublished master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Figure 8.1: Map showing the locations of the MCRM Project and the MARA Programme. Figure created using ArcGIS® software by Esri. ArcGIS® and ArcMap™ are the intellectual property of Esri and are used herein under license. (Copyright © Esri. All rights reserved)

Figure 8.2**:** Photograph of graffiti at the ARAL 254 rock art site (Image credit and courtesy Luíseach Nic Eoin)