

Archaeology under Apartheid:
A Preliminary Investigation into the Potential Politicization of Science in South Africa

Honors Thesis

Presented to the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences,
Biology and Society Program, of Cornell University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Research Honors Program

By
Andrew Michael Zipkin
May 2009

Margaret Walsh Rossiter

© 2009 Andrew Michael Zipkin

This document may not be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or
research without the express written permission of the author.

Introduction

“In those countries where the archaeology of the colonized is mostly practiced by descendants of the colonizers, the study of the past must have a political dimension”

Martin Hall – The Burden of Tribalism: The Social Context of Southern African Iron Age Studies (1984)

Several related fields of inquiry, such as history, anthropology, and philosophy of science have in recent years attempted to understand how various disciplines function as specifically human endeavors, and as separate topics from their respective discoveries and advances. While much attention has been paid to fields that are supposed to yield objective reproducible truths, in the model of Western civilization’s scientific ideal, fields that straddle the humanities have been subjected to less intense inquiry. Perhaps this is because such fields are expected to be less objective and thus evidence of the human factor in the process of discovering and interpreting new knowledge is considered less surprising. Archaeology and Physical Anthropology have received some limited attention from a strictly historical perspective, especially emphasizing their roles in developing biological definitions of race and changing concepts of human identity and origins. However, I believe that understanding the dynamics of how humans study our own history is a subject worthy of investigation. In particular, I want to understand the degree to which archaeologists’ conclusions and the manner in which they present them are influenced by the social and political climate in which they work. The results of archaeological research are usually not reproducible because the very nature of excavation, the main process of investigation utilized by archaeologists, is to destroy the physical context of the material being excavated. All that remains once a site has been excavated to completion are recovered artifacts, bones, perhaps soil samples, and the archaeologist’s notes. This sort of methodology heightens the importance of the

researcher and their particular interpretation. For this project, Iron Age research conducted in the nation of South Africa was chosen as the topic through which to investigate the dynamics of archaeology, especially focusing on the potential politicization of research articles published under the apartheid era government.

This project was undertaken in two major components – first, a literature review of existing histories of South African archaeology and second, original research into Iron Age research articles from South Africa published during apartheid. Through these two broad methods, I sought to achieve three goals. The first of these was to develop a practical temporal framework under which to study South African archaeology. By this I mean the development of convenient system of dividing up the history of archaeology as a discipline in South Africa into periods that reflect who was conducting research and where their funding and support originated. This goal was achieved through the literature review aspect of the project from which I developed a four period system covering the mid-19th century through the end of apartheid in 1994.

The second and more overarching goal of this project was to investigate how viable it is to study the dynamics of archaeological research. In this sense, my project was a pilot study seeking to test which methods of inquiry are most effective and identify how more in depth future studies could proceed. Iron Age archaeology conducted during apartheid was chosen since it has previously been suggested by some authors that this area of research and time period has a high likelihood of exhibiting pronounced political and social influences. During the apartheid era from approximately 1948 - 1994 archaeology as a profession was closely connected to the minority rule government via funding and excavation approval measures. Additionally, Iron Age research in particular

produced discoveries with major political implications. Thus, this seemed the most promising area through which to attempt to understand how archaeologists work as part of wider society.

Finally, the third goal of this study was to test specific assertions about Iron Age archaeology in apartheid South Africa. Scholars Martin Hall and Nick Shepherd, two of the more prolific commentators on South African archaeology, have made strong, historically plausible, but otherwise unproven claims about the motivations of archaeologists during apartheid. The process of investigating these two authors' hypotheses served as a proving ground for the methodology of studying the field of archaeology, thus achieving the second and third goals of this project. The importance of the original research component of my study has more to do with the *ability* to prove or disprove claims about how archaeology works rather than whether the specific claims of Hall and Shepherd are correct. Overall, this project progressed from a literature review, which facilitated the development of a historical framework and identified existing claims about archaeology, into a pilot investigation of the viability of studying archaeology as a discipline by searching the literature for evidence to challenge the veracity of the hypotheses of Hall and Shepherd.

Before moving forward with the research portion of this work, it necessary to clarify just what the term Iron Age means. Iron Age, as used here, refers to a lifestyle rather than a specific time period. The people referred to as Iron Age Africans migrated into southern Africa from the north beginning around 1800 years ago, possessed an agricultural and metalworking culture, and are considered ancestral to most of the various tribes encountered in the region by Europeans during the colonial period. This definition

is derived specifically from those used by Hall (456, 1984) and Shepherd (828, 2003). It cannot be emphasized strongly enough that Iron Age peoples are generally viewed by archaeologists as being continuous with modern tribal/ethnic groups in South Africa. The archaeological record is not simply part of the landscape but is the primary means by which modern South African ethnic groups, all of which lacked written language before the colonial period, can learn about their history outside of oral traditions. In addition, if one accepts the concept of the continuity of indigenous peoples, the archaeological record can be used to build a legal argument in territorial disputes. For example, the presence of two thousand year old pottery shards possessing designs characteristic of a politically recognized extant tribe or ethnic group may be used to argue for exclusive rights for that tribe to the area of land surrounding the site in which the pottery was found. In fact, as will be discussed in detail in the literature review, for South Africa during the apartheid years such an argument unfolded regarding the entire country and to whom it belonged by historical precedent. In light of this particular fact, there should be little question as to why Iron Age archaeology is so explicitly political in South Africa and why such research seems more likely to reflect the personal views of the author than work undertaken in other more abstracted or distant contexts.

To return to the specific topic used to focus this study, I will begin by stating exactly which claims of Hall and Shepherd are being investigated. Hall posits that archaeological literature about the Iron Age of southern Africa published during the 1960s in South Africa will emphasize two major points – first, the ancientness and “Africaness” of the Iron Age, and second, the diversity of African Iron Age cultures (462, Hall 1984). Though Hall is not explicit about whose publications he is referring to, I

interpret it to be those of white, South African, professional archaeologists. This is suggested by his further assertion that

“...while many archaeologists are opposed to the use of history and prehistory for the justification of white nationalistic policies, most are probably also opposed to black nationalism, which threatens existing social and economic orders and therefore the institutions from which archaeological research is conducted” (462, Hall 1984).

Although there were a relatively large number of amateur or part time archaeologists working in South Africa during this time, they would not be concerned with government funding or approval since they typically received neither for their actions. And of the small group of professional archaeologists living and working in South Africa during this period, they were predominantly white, South African citizens (rather than foreign archaeologists working in South Africa), who published their work in English language media. This is confirmed by a simple bibliographic survey of the most frequent authors represented in regional scientific and archaeological journals.

To generalize, professional archaeologists were not linked to the Afrikaner nationalist movement, with exceptions of course, and did not benefit initially from its rise to political power and narrow, supremacist view of the past. Given this fact and the history of political and cultural antagonism between Afrikaners and other whites in South Africa, it is both plausible and probable that archaeology would remain anglophilic as a discipline, as it had since the first article on the subject appeared in the Cape Magazine Monthly in 1870 (4, Deacon and Deacon 1999). To recap, Hall claims that professional archaeologists in South Africa during the 1960s, who were almost exclusively white racially and anglophilic in their publishing habits, produced research reflecting their political views. As indicated by the quote from Hall’s 1984 paper, according to him the

researchers in question were opposed to the Afrikaner oriented National Party government's racial policies but not to the existence of a stable government willing to fund archaeological research. Under this assumption then, Iron Age research published in this period should emphasize diverse indigenous African achievements but not their broad similarities which could be exploited by the Black Nationalism movement for ideological purposes such as fostering Pan-Africanism and defeating minority rule. Tellingly, during the 1930s and 40s, the Afrikaner nationalism movement itself had utilized the claims of partisan academics for the clearly political motive of forging a strong sense of Afrikaner racial unity (227-230, Dubow 1992). Taking this longer view, the specter of abuse of scientific research for political purposes may have been evident to older academics that worked both before and during the apartheid era and influenced their writing style.

Regarding South African archaeology during its period of resurgence and new government patronage beginning in the later 1960s, Shepherd makes a more process oriented assertion than Hall. While Hall emphasizes the personal politics of professional archaeologists and how their leanings might be manifested in their work, Shepherd considers the adoption of the American originating Processualist school of thought and its possible role in overcoming political pressure on Iron Age researchers. Shepherd believes that at least some South African archaeologists rapidly adopted the techniques of Processualism and that school of thought's emphasis on narrow, testable conclusions and scientific methodology, contrasted to the broad cultural and historical claims that characterized archaeological research in preceding decades.

“In fact, the advent of the New Archaeology emerges as the key enabling development in the growth of archaeology under apartheid. It allowed local practitioners to emerge as beneficiaries of apartheid, without the squalid necessity of engaging with its policies. A discipline with a narrowed purview, wedded to a technical language, implacably opposed to the mixing of archaeology and politics...and given to the production of specialist pasts, posed little threat to apartheid. In return, archaeologists were given a relatively free hand” (838, Shepherd 2003).

Shepherd’s claim implies a tacit arrangement between archaeologists and government officials who oversaw public funding and excavation permits. Like Hall’s, this hypothesis about archaeology in the 1960s is quite plausible and is supported by the political context of South Africa during this time, but specific evidence is not referenced in the paper where the claim is made. While Hall’s and Shepherd’s claims were made independently, I consider them closely linked in that they both seek to explain how and why archaeology thrived under the apartheid regime during the 1960s and 1970s.

Methodology

The first goal of this project, building a temporal framework under which to consider the history of South African archaeology, was the simplest to achieve. The main obstacle to overcome was identifying which factors are most relevant when breaking the history of a discipline up into defined periods. As referenced in the introduction, I ultimately decided to divide South African archaeology into periods based upon what types of individuals were conducting research and from where they received their funding and support. By what type of individuals I particularly mean what their usual profession was because South African archaeology underwent a major transition from an amateur to a professional discipline during the approximately century and a half in question. Ultimately however, the sources of funding and support became the dominant feature in

defining my framework since this underlies the paradox of archaeologists being supported by a government whose propaganda contradicts their research. A secondary consideration was where archaeologists published their research. As will be discussed in the historical background, the forums in which South African archaeological research was published and discussed changed in concert with the political transitions of the South African nation from a series of independent Afrikaner territories, to a British colony, to an internationally oriented, minority rule union, and finally to a parochial minority rule apartheid state. Finally the ethnic identity of archaeologists also played a role, primarily regarding English and Afrikaner whites.

Regarding the second and third goals of the project, with the separate claims of Hall and Shepherd about Iron Age archaeology in South Africa during apartheid made clear, the question now is does the literature support them? This question was deliberately chosen for my pilot study since it was based off of existing assertions and simply required someone to go and look for confirmation. In order to enhance the probability of locating information relevant to Hall's and Shepherd's claims, I have limited the project's scope to those areas where politicization seemed most likely to have occurred. The writings of professional South African archaeologists published in the *South African Journal of Science* and the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* are considered here. Specifically, this study searched for articles on the broad topic of the African Iron Age from the 1930s through the 1990s in these two journals. Since these are English or dual language, regional journals with a primarily South African audience, I believe they are more likely to contain politicized work in the vein of Hall's and

Shepherd's hypotheses than research targeted to a more international audience and published in major British and American journals like *Nature* and *Science*.

In particular, my hypothesis is that any evidence of Hall's and Shepherd's claims are most likely to appear as temporal trends in the publications considered coinciding with the changing political environment in South Africa. When comparing publications from the Government Unsupported Period of archaeology from 1948 through the mid 1960s to articles from the subsequent Apartheid-Professional Period, there should be a clear increase in conclusions claiming ancient and diverse Iron Age cultures, in accord with Hall's claim, and/or a distinct increase in the amount of technical language utilized, reflecting the hypothesis of Shepherd. The appearance of one or both of these trends would support respective the claims of Hall and/or Shepherd. In order to efficiently survey the existing literature, this study is deliberately qualitative in nature. While this may seem to detract from the strength of any conclusions drawn, the intent here is to investigate whether future quantitative research into this area is warranted. If evidence of Hall's and Shepherd's political-historical claims are supported, this study should provide a strong impetus for the conduction of more in depth research into the practice of archaeology under the apartheid regime.

The specific methods used to investigate Hall and Shepherd claims primarily relied upon Internet-based search engines. The Google Scholar feature of available at <http://www.google.com> was used as the first step of a search for the works of a particular author. Using Google Scholar I searched for any works by a given archaeologist who I had identified from the historical literature as an appropriate subject. Appropriate subjects included professional archaeologists who conducted at least some original Iron

Age archaeological research in South Africa between 1930 and 1994 while employed by a South African university, museum, or government organization. Researchers whose careers straddled the period of approximately 1940 – 1980 were especially desirable rather than archaeologists whose publications ceased before the late 1960s or began exclusively after that. It is notable that professional archaeologists historically formed a rather small community in South Africa, especially prior to 1970s when more support for training students and funding research increased participation in this field on a professional level. In addition, since this study exclusively utilizes English language publications, the sample of authors is inherently biased towards anglophile academics. However, I find the latter of these two points encouraging rather than discouraging since it is precisely among non-Afrikaner academics that political tension with the apartheid era government is most likely to be found.

For every researcher considered, the phrase “Iron Age” was searched for as title words and in the full text of documents using Google Scholar. In addition, for a given researcher archaeological sites that they were known from the historical literature to have worked on were also searched. For example, using the Google Scholar search engine, all articles by the author Revil Mason containing the phrase “Iron Age” in the title, or anywhere in the text, published between 1930 and 1994 in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* or the *South African Journal of Science* were searched. Also, the word “Broederstroom”, an archaeological site Mason was referenced as having worked on in the historical literature, was separately searched as a title word and full text word without the phrase Iron Age but with all other parameters the same. Google Scholar typically finds citations or references to articles but does not necessarily offer access to

them unless they are freely available online. As a result, articles from the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* were acquired using the JSTOR database available through Cornell University which has access to fully digitized editions of the bulletin from its first edition in 1945 through 2005. For articles found by Google Scholar in the *South African Journal of Science* a hard copy was located in the Cornell University Library collections since the only online version of the journal accessible through Cornell begins its coverage in 1995.

Only scientific articles describing original archaeological research into Iron Age sites in Africa were considered for this project. Some articles which were accepted did not include any archaeological research on specifically South African material but focused on Iron Age sites in nations bordering South Africa. These are considered relevant since Iron Age peoples and their migrations predated all modern political borders. Reviews, briefs, and letters to the editor about the Iron Age of Africa were notably excluded because they usually referenced original research already addressed in other full length articles and often lacked references. Also excluded were otherwise satisfactory articles that were published while the author was not employed by a South African institution. An America-based archaeologist writing about the South African Iron Age would not be under the same political pressures as a peer employed by the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg for example. This type of exclusion occurred in cases where an author was based in multiple countries including South Africa over the course of their career.

Using the search engine procedures outlined above, a collection of all appropriate works published by a given author for the time period 1930 – 1994 in the two journals

considered was accumulated. The actual analysis was undertaken by reviewing all the articles acquired for each author and comparing them chronologically for stylistic changes and looking for notable standalone articles. In particular, the abstracts and discussion sections were focused upon since this is where strong assertions that might prove politically relevant are most likely to appear. Methodology and data sections are by their nature concerned with process rather than conclusions. To continue with the previous example, a sequence of publications by Revil Mason was acquired, notes taken upon the topic, conclusions and style of each, the notes then reviewed, relevant articles identified, and finally quotes excerpted for use as evidence in the document sample included in this paper's research section.

Periods of South African Archaeology

Accomplishing the first goal of this project, I portioned the discipline of archaeology in South Africa into four distinct periods based upon the source of support for archaeological research and nature of the individuals undertaking it. From the 1850s through the early 1920s, archaeology in South Africa was undertaken exclusively by Europeans, many of whom were simply settlers and amateur collectors, some who were members of the colonial bureaucracy, and a few academics from unrelated fields. These individuals were entirely volunteers and largely self-funded any work they accomplished. This is identified as the Amateur-Settler Period. The next period occurred from the mid 1920s through the late 1940s when archaeology became increasingly practiced by career archaeologists and enjoyed significant government support, especially during the second half of this period. This is identified as the 1st Professionalization Period. From 1948 through the mid 1960s, archaeology lost most of its government support and

establishment as part of the civil service. Although achievements continued, training of professional archaeologists slowed and progress was mainly due to a few very active professionals and many amateur excavators. This is identified as the Government Unsupported Period. From the late 1960s through the end of apartheid in 1994 archaeology in South Africa was dominated by European descended professional archaeologists supported by universities and government funding; this is labeled the Apartheid-Professional Period. As of 2009 archaeology remains a professional discipline in South Africa and that is unlikely to change given increased legislation limiting amateur collection and excavation.

The Context of Southern African Archaeology as Illustrated by Great Zimbabwe

The origin and early practice of archaeology in southern Africa was, not surprisingly, executed by settlers and members of the colonial administration and interpreted in the light of their respective interests. Perhaps the most famous and controversial southern African (though not territorially *South African*) archaeological site is Great Zimbabwe. This Iron Age site located in the modern nation of Zimbabwe was the capital of a state of Shona-speaking agriculturalists from ~1290 – 1450 A.D. (164, Huffman 2007). The various analyses of this site are useful indicators of attitudes about southern African archaeology in general. First described in 1872 by German geologist Carl Mauch, Great Zimbabwe is composed of several stone ruins of impressive size and architectural complexity. Twenty years after Mauch's fervent suggestions of links to the mythical Queen of Sheba, antiquarian Theodore Bent conducted the first excavations at the site, sponsored in part by the British Association for the Advancement of Science (BAAS). In his 1892 publication on the subject, Bent proposed that construction began

with Arab gold miners and was followed by a period of Phoenician influence in the region (24-25, Hall 1996). Cecil Rhodes and his British South Africa Company, then occupiers of the region, granted exclusive excavation rights to the newly created Rhodesia Ancient Ruins Company. Incorporated in 1895, the Company was optimistic, incorrectly, about extracting gold artifacts from burials at the site (25, Hall 1996; 246, Gabel 1985).

By 1902, destruction of the site by the treasure hunting company reached such a degree that the Legislative Council of Southern Rhodesia passed a measure intended to prevent further exploitation. Immediately following this, local journalist and British South Africa Company publicist R.N. Hall used existing excavation records and materials to publish a volume on the site vastly elaborating Bent's earlier suggestions into a frankly invented four period scheme of foreign builders and colonizers (246, Gabel 1985; 457, Hall 1984). This repeated acceptance of an extra-African origin for Great Zimbabwe was a product of the times and served to legitimize the colonial practices of imperial Britain; the empire was simply continuing the civilizing work of previous great European societies (245, Gabel 1985; 65-66, Garlake 1973). In addition, the business interests of Dutch and British settlers throughout southern Africa, namely the need for readily available and cheap black labor, would not be served by an interpretation supporting a history of long established indigenous civilization and achievement. In particular, the Dutch (Afrikaner) settlers and their descendants in South Africa promoted as late as the 1980s a wholly unfounded version of history in which the modern black population of South Africa only migrated into the region during the 17th century. This view of history is known as the myth of the empty land (7, Marks 1980).

Although these earliest interpretations of Great Zimbabwe satisfied colonial policy-makers and settlers, their veracity was found wanting when presented to scientific bodies detached from local interests. The BAAS supported a second expedition to Great Zimbabwe, this time by David Randall-MacIver, a professional archaeologist with excavation experience in Egypt. Published in 1906, his work dismisses the Phoenician hypothesis and describes the ruins as clearly African in origin and of lower quality construction and less creative design than the foreign derived structures Hall believed he was studying (28-29, Hall 1996). A third excavation was supported by the British Association in the 1920s, conducted by Gertrude Caton-Thompson and published in 1929. Though her systematic analysis confirmed the indigenous nature of the site, and drew a predictably harsh response from the settler intelligentsia, Caton-Thompson's interpretation was still strongly colored by the Eurocentric attitude of 1920s archaeology. She described the mental abilities of the builders of Great Zimbabwe as "infantile" and "pre-logical" (29, Hall 1996; 195, Shepherd 2002). Her report asserts that the ancient Africans in question were hardly comparable to Europeans of the period; a symptom of the biological/philosophical concept of degeneration that framed archaeological and physical anthropological investigations of Africa at this time. The political implications of the 1920s Great Zimbabwe studies were also indicative of a future trend in archaeological research in South Africa – an ongoing conflict of interest for those researchers with vested local interests in the regions in which they worked.

Amateur-Settler Period Archaeology

The first known collection of archaeological artifacts occurred in 1858 near the Great Fish River of Eastern Cape by British settler T.H. Bowker and was donated to the

Royal Artillery Museum of London where it remained for around a century (23, Hall 1996). This early example is telling of how archaeology was practiced during the Amateur-Settler Period with settlers, predominantly British, acting as an extension of their mother country. Some amateur archaeologists attempted to catalog their finds using the newly defined stone tool industries for the European Paleo- and Neolithic (40-42, Deacon 1990), while others simply acted as antiquarians, collecting and describing such items as novelties. One of those who acted in the prior manner was the French entomologist Louis Peringuey who was exposed to stone artifacts while working in the wine lands of Stellenbosch around 1900 (4-5, Deacon and Deacon 1999). He published a comparison of the Stellenbosch tools to the Paleolithic of Europe in *Nature* and presented his work to the South African Philosophical Society in 1900.

It is notable for this period that nearly all the references to archaeology come from individuals living under the auspices of the internationally politically oriented British colonial state on the coast rather than the Afrikaner dominated interior. This British-international orientation of science is further evidenced by the 1905 co-meeting of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science and its British counterpart in Cape Town and Johannesburg (19, Bonner 2007). In his 2006 book on South African scientific history, Saul Dubow (174) makes note of South African scientists' rather obvious position of subordination to the British delegates at meetings during the conference. The British Association holding its meeting abroad in a colony also illustrates the broad imperial mission of British science at this time. The dynamic between Britain and her colonies might best be imagined as a two-way street of British outreach spreading the scientific method and of colonial scientists orientation and

deference back towards the mother country's scholars as an audience and source of approval.

Unlike the aforementioned controversy over Iron Age African civilization at ruins like Great Zimbabwe, early archaeology in South Africa proper was mostly focused on small stone tools and artifacts, assumed to have been the product of the so-called indigenous Bushmen people and their direct ancestors. In addition, the few academic analyses of archaeological material written during this period almost exclusively utilized surface collections and were primarily concerned with tool typology and relative chronologies (245, 251, Gabel 1985). Interestingly, even as this approach to African prehistory progressed, there was little suggestion of controversy over the implications for ancient African habitation of the region. Perhaps this was due to the absence of claims of civilization, such as were made for Great Zimbabwe, or because a strong sense of settler unity and nationalism independent of a mother country were absent. Additionally, archaeology itself was a relatively young field, having only emerged as a proper academic discipline in Europe within the previous half century. The earliest mention of archaeology in a South African publication was in 1870 in the Cape Magazine Monthly, a major vehicle for the development of a regional anglophone intellectual community. The Secretary of Education for the British colonial government, Langham Dale, wrote general interest articles on the practice of archaeology and on recent discoveries (4, Deacon and Deacon 1999). Early South African archaeology chugged along in its merry, amateur, and antiquarian manner largely untroubled.

1st Professionalization Period Archaeology

Research into the prehistory of South Africa was accelerating during the first two decades of the 20th century. In 1913, the discovery of the so-called “Boskop Man” skull near Potchefstroom spurred on theories of highly advanced ancestral populations in the region that had since degenerated into the present day natives (4-5, 12-13, Bonner 2007). This discovery and subsequent fossil finds provided the basis for paleoanthropology to emerge as a combination of archaeology and anatomy and focus upon humanity’s evolutionary past in particular. During this time of diversification in prehistoric research, the second phase of South African archaeology was clearly initiated with the appointment in 1923 of A.J.H. Goodwin, a Cambridge University trained South African archaeologist, to a research and lecturing position at the University of Cape Town (4, 26, Hall 1996). Although his original research was expected to be ethnographic in nature, Goodwin turned his attention to the vast stone tool collections amateur archaeologists had been accumulating and donating to the South African Museum. His task then was to define typological categories for the diverse artifacts at his disposal and, if possible, to begin assigning chronological priority (830, Shepherd 2003).

Simultaneous to Goodwin’s early work was anatomist Raymond Dart’s discovery of the “Taung Child” fossil, assigned to the new species *Australopithecus africanus* in 1925 and announced, notably, in the British journal *Nature* (829, Shepherd 2003). While this ground-breaking discovery would not receive international acceptance until the 1940s when it was confirmed by similar fossil finds in the area, it transformed Dart into a regional celebrity and catalyzed paleoanthropology and prehistoric research in general in South Africa. In particular, the fossil seized the attention of influential politician Jan Christiaan Smuts who threw his weight behind the discovery and proclaimed it

emblematic of South Africa's central importance as a "cradle of mankind" (14, Bonner 2007). Smuts would soon become the patron of Goodwin and his colleagues and of South African archaeology in general.

On Goodwin's part, work on establishing a system of tool cultures was progressing, especially with the assistance of Clarence van Riet Lowe, a civil engineer with archaeological interests that he had met at the 1926 meeting of the South African Association for the Advancement of Science (11, Mason 1989). Van Riet Lowe visited and discovered, though never formally excavated to completion, many artifact bearing sites during the 1920s and 30s including the Cave of Hearths in 1937 (19, Mason 1989). In addition, van Riet Lowe was an encourager and correspondent of amateur collectors; he himself of course not being a trained archaeologist as well. His observations provided Goodwin the contextual information he was desperately lacking in the museum collections. Goodwin and van Riet Lowe helped develop a new distinctly African classificatory system during the late 1920s, elaborated from the European tool industry classifications Goodwin had learned at Cambridge (44-45 Deacon 1990). In particular, the two researchers introduced the Middle Stone Age to the already existing Early and Later Stone Ages for the region, a scheme which remains in use today throughout sub-Saharan Africa.

While the new system was deliberately independent from the European classifications, Goodwin, van Riet Lowe, and most other Africanist archaeologists still considered southern Africa a cultural black hole of sorts, lacking innovation and simply absorbing radiations of new technologies from without. This interpretation was connected to the biological notion of early humans having evolved in Africa, followed by

the migration outward of some groups who continued to evolve into the dominant peoples of the contemporary world while those who remained sunk into cultural and biological degeneracy. This was a common view among archaeologists and other researchers of human evolution at the time and did not detract from the reception of Goodwin and van Riet Lowe's work.

During the late 1920s news of Goodwin and van Riet Lowe's work was spreading among the South African intelligentsia and Jan Smuts, the on-again-off-again Prime Minister of South Africa and a leading intellectual and cultural figure, became close friends with van Riet Lowe. In 1929 Smuts was not in political power in South Africa but, still an internationally known figure, was the president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science (22-23, Mason 1989). As Prime Minister in 1935, Smuts established the Archaeological Survey with van Riet Lowe as Director, also combining it with the National Monuments Council (45-46, Deacon 1990; 73, Mason 1989). In addition, van Riet Lowe received the first university appointment in southern Africa explicitly for archaeology at the University of the Witwatersrand (253, Gabel 1985). Archaeology in South Africa had taken a major step toward becoming a professional discipline rather than a primarily amateur endeavor.

These advances in archaeology occurred in the context of emerging tensions within the growing South African scientific establishment as a whole. At the 1929 joint meeting of the British and South African Associations, Afrikaner resentment of British dominance in the academic arena made its first notable appearance. Although a minority relative to anglophilic scientists, Afrikaner researchers in various fields expressed their vexation "at the way in which scientific universalism was equated with membership in

the Commonwealth” (21, Bonner 2007). This political intrusion foreshadowed the future use of science by Afrikaner academics as a political tool during the construction of the theoretical framework for apartheid, especially in the defining of Afrikaners as a new and superior race derived from the “hybridization” of different European races (227-228, Dubow 1992).

During the interwar years it is also notable which periods of time were popular subjects for archaeologists working in Africa. While sustained Stone Age archaeology was being done in the region, additionally in South Africa and Rhodesia major Iron Age research was also undertaken during the 1920s and 1930s, unlike the rest of the continent. In addition to the ongoing excavations at Great Zimbabwe, in South Africa gold artifacts had been discovered at Mapungubwe in 1933 by a prospector. Excavations went on at the site from 1934 until 1940 with the contributions of various scholars including van Riet Lowe. The most noteworthy discoveries included pottery that showed affinities to wares found at Great Zimbabwe and pieces of celadon that originated in China and provided an approximate date of 1200 A.D. for one component of the site (254, Gabel 1985). The conclusions drawn from Mapungubwe, namely that an Iron Age African population had established itself in northern South Africa 700 years earlier and continued to spread its culture southward, were invigorating to archaeology at the time. Proposed dates like this also provided the first empirical challenge to the myth of the empty land.

To return to the Archaeological Survey, its founding in 1935 can be considered a watershed in the history the discipline in South Africa. Goodwin had earlier anticipated and lobbied for a more academically grounded archaeological institution and under Smuts patronage archaeology became part of the civil service. Writing about this event

in 1989, archaeologist Revil Mason suggests that the combination of the National Monuments Council into the Survey hamstrung it from the start with too much bureaucracy and too little money to go around (73-74). Despite this, it is undeniable that the Survey was a major step toward professionalization. The first decade of the bureau's work coincided with an increased nationalization of the audience. In addition to the traditionally dominant forums of British archaeological and anthropological societies, local archaeologists, both professional and amateur were beginning to organize (831-832, Shepherd 2003). Although this movement resulted in the 1945 founding of the South African Archaeological Society and its journal the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, the preceding decade had not been one of exponential growth for South African archaeology.

The general economic depression of the 1930s and the outbreak of World War II meant that the teaching of archaeology suffered, even as some major excavations such as Mapungubwe continued. During the war years, it worth noting that although few South Africans were being prepared for research, there were several Europeans working in the country including Abbe Henri Breuil who had fled occupied France (127-129, Mason 1989). In addition, the financial situation led Goodwin to strongly promote amateur archaeologists to continue their work, contribute to the bulletin of the new society, and of course pay their membership dues (48-50 Deacon 1990). This encouragement of weekend excavators would have a significant impact when the discipline began to fully professionalize during the late 1960s. Despite the economic situation and paucity of career archaeologists, pre-apartheid South African archaeology reached an apex with the first Pan-African Congress on Prehistory in 1947, held in Nairobi, Kenya. Fully one-

third of the delegates were South African, flown in by military plane at the order of Prime Minister Smuts. The delegates delivered an invitation from Smuts to hold the next Congress in Johannesburg, which was eagerly accepted. The 1952 Congress however, would have to be relocated to Algiers at the last minute (48-49).

The Government Unsupported Period

Jan Smuts, South African archaeology's political patron, lost the 1948 election for Prime Minister. The Afrikaners, descendants of the early predominantly Dutch colonizers of southern Africa, had been a persistent force in the region since their arrival during the 17th century. Indeed, Britain had fought two brutal wars against them in order to subdue South Africa as a dominion of the British Empire. Smuts' relatively moderate and anglophilic United Party had dominated the government for fourteen years but in 1948 the National Party was swept to power by Afrikaner voters favoring apartheid legislation. The politics and goals of the former Union Party government were international in nature, seeking a place in the British Empire and supporting the United Kingdom during World War II. The latter policy was especially unpopular with Afrikaners who had not yet forgiven the British for their invention of concentration camps during the Second Boer War. Smuts and his political peers had been largely unconcerned with the ideological implications of archaeology for either native anti-colonialist sentiment or the burgeoning Afrikaner nationalist movement (832-835, Shepherd 2003).

The blossoming of Afrikaner nationalism and the sharp switch in 1948 to the parochialism of the new government created an instant impediment to the further growth

of professional archaeology. Since at least the time of Goodwin's and Dart's research in the 1920s, South African archaeology had been building a body of work suggesting a local evolutionary origin for humankind, personified by the Taung Child. In addition, and more problematically, archaeologists conducting Iron Age research in South Africa at this time were finding increasingly strong and confirmatory evidence of a significant indigenous population prior to colonization, though its absolute antiquity could only be guessed at in most cases. This version of history sharply contrasted with the ideology preached by the Afrikaner nationalists. Elaborate theological arguments from the Dutch Reform Church were used to support a uniquely Afrikaner creationist ideology which emphasized God as the “Great Divider” and the pluriformity of races (218, Dubow 1992). In addition, the new government promoted a propagandist version of regional history that featured a recent migration into South Africa across the Limpopo River of black Bantu-speaking agriculturalists, a period of devastating instability and conflict among those tribes largely depopulating the region (*mfecane*), and a glorification of the early Boer settlers who civilized a wild, nearly empty land (141-143, Bonner 2007; 48 Deacon 1990; 7-8, Marks 1980). Van Riet Lowe was informed almost at the last moment by the National Party government that the planned Congress would be “inconvenient” to hold in Johannesburg. As noted by Shepherd (2003) “...1951-1952 was to be remarkable not for the holding of the second Pan-Africa Congress in Prehistory, but for the tercentenary of Jan and Maria van Riebeeck, and the staged re-enactment of the arrival of colonialism at these shores”.

The later 1950s and especially the beginning of the 1960s were a period of stagnation in funding and public support for archaeological and scientific research in

general for South Africa. Despite having been a founding member in 1946, under the new government, South Africa pulled out of the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) a decade later because of their stance on the invalidity of the biological race concept among other perceived offenses (xi-xii, Tobias 2007). While this was a tragedy for all of science in South Africa, archaeology in addition suffered through the deaths of both Goodwin and van Riet Lowe during the 1950s. They left behind an impressive legacy of research and young institutions, but few trained researchers to carry on what they began and little government support for such endeavors. The decreased funding and government support that immediately followed the rise of the National Party can be viewed as a severe downturn in the broader progression towards professionalization which continued overall from the previous period.

One of those few professional researchers was J. Desmond Clark who conducted extensive fieldwork in Rhodesia and in 1959 wrote the first major synthesis of southern African archaeological knowledge since that Goodwin and van Riet Lowe's 1929 publication (49 Deacon 1990; 262, Gabel 1985). Goodwin's former position at the University of Cape Town was taken up in 1961 by another Cambridge archaeologist, Ray Inskeep, who would train many of South Africa's future Stone and Iron Age archaeologists during that decade (227, Mason 1989). Another of those younger researchers conducting excavations in the 1950s was Revil Mason, originally an accounting student, who had met van Riet Lowe in 1948 and changed plans soon after. During the 1950s, Mason began to develop his so-called "Origin of Black People" program of research and education; a personal endeavor to promote non-ideological

teachings of human history (177, Mason 1989). Additionally, Mason published the “Prehistory of the Transvaal” in 1962, further uniting archaeological knowledge for the region. These were among the only full time, professional archaeologists in southern Africa. Inskeep lobbied the government for support on the basis of archaeology as a national “symbol of modernity and development” and was roundly denied (834, Shepherd 2003). The low point was yet to come however, the Archaeological Survey, founded by van Riet Lowe and Smuts, was transferred to the University of the Witwatersrand, separating it from the civil service and weakening its public funding (191, Mason 1989). B.D. Malan, a former student of Goodwin’s and one of the few South Africans with proper fieldwork experience, was placed in charge of the Historical Monuments Commission, the meager government successor to the now university based Archaeological Survey. The Commission was largely incapable of recovery operations due to lack of funding and staff. Government support for excavation, preservation, and research was simply not forthcoming (50, Deacon 1990).

One major advance in the field that did occur during the 1950s was the radiocarbon revolution. The use of Carbon-14 dating made it possible to determine the absolute, rather than relative, date of archaeological artifacts and human remains. Although the use of C-14 dating had led to the a paradigm shift regarding climatic sequences in the region, its use did not gain widespread prevalence quickly; in 1959 there remained under 50 C-14 dates for sub-Saharan Africa (260, Gabel 1985). Radiocarbon is particularly relevant to Iron Age studies in South Africa since the antiquity of most Stone Age sites is now known to range into the hundreds of thousands and millions of years, while radiocarbon loses its efficacy after about 50,000 years before present. While

previous dates for Iron Age sites had been highly speculative, with rare exceptions like the dated Chinese celadon from Mapungubwe, suddenly the potential existed for putting a calendar date on indigenous African habitation of the region. While the late 1940s through the early 1960s was a period characterized by the lack of government support for archaeology, the achievements of a few dedicated professionals and the adoption of modern chronometric dating technologies requiring the use of university laboratories continued the overall trend of professionalization that began during the 1920s.

Apartheid-Professional Archaeology

The renaissance for archaeology in South Africa began in the late 1960s, spurred by economic development and an increasingly culture and education conscious government. Throughout this decade the economy grew at an incredible pace, the GDP increased at a real rate of 6% per year and foreign investment poured in (Byrnes 1996). Coupled with this rapid growth was the strengthening of the apartheid regime; the internal security forces expanded in size and jurisdiction and opposition movements were swiftly crushed without judicial proceedings (835, Shepherd 2003). During this period archaeology in South Africa would begin to modernize and acquire a formal architecture of state support. These processes occurred in concert with the increasing legislative elaboration of the apartheid system by the National Party government. Seeking all the trappings of a modern state, the government spent huge sums of boom time money on cultural and scientific institutions including archaeological endeavors, just as Ray Inskeep had urged a few years earlier (834). In 1960 there were only two professionally trained archaeologists employed by South African museums, one by a university, and three by National Monuments Council/Archaeological Survey. Within a decade this had

expanded to ten museums posts, six university positions, and one job in the ineffectual National Monuments Council. Notably, none of these positions were held by amateurs or scientists moonlighting from other disciplines, only professional archaeologists were supported by the state (51, Deacon 1990). Despite the sudden flood of public support, there were hints of an underlying contradiction. Revil Mason's 1965 and 1967 presidential statements to the South African Association for the Advancement of Science contained assertions that South African education was racially biased and that South African society was becoming unstable due to mounting social pressures. Both statements were utterly "ignored by historians, educationalists and archaeologists" (241-242, Mason 1989).

Paradox, Processualism, and Professionalization

The great paradox of the florescence of South African archaeology has already been alluded to; the pouring of funds by the apartheid government into archaeology was expanding an institution which generated data diametrically opposed to Afrikaner ideology. How was it possible for this to occur? Did the benefits of a modern cultural apparatus to the National Party government outweigh the danger of revealing a past that did not fit with Afrikaner nationalism? Indeed, it would seem this was the case. But more curiously, how did archaeologists respond to such patronage? Some researchers may have handled this situation by shifting their focus to slightly less controversial fields such as Stone Age archaeology which also greatly expanded at the time. Alternatively, those concerned about the political implications of their work may have retreated into "highly technical analysis which excluded all but the acolytes of the profession" (63, Hall 1990), a point on which Hall and Shepherd seem to agree.

According to Shepherd (2003), one of the proposed contributing factors to the overcoming of the government support paradox was the rapid adoption of Processualism by South African researchers. After years of looking to Britain and France for guidance in archaeological theory and methodology, younger South African researchers began to reorient their gaze to North America where a new focus on rigorous theory and hypothesis driven archaeology was gaining momentum. The work of American Lewis Binford had come to the forefront of the archaeological world during the 1960s and his scientific method driven Processualism was beginning to replace the cultural-historical archaeology traditionally practiced in America and elsewhere (203-210, Binford 1965; 835-836, Shepherd 2003). Furthermore, Binford's brand of archaeology did not generate broad histories that could contradict governmental dogma (838, Shepherd 2003).

As previously discussed, South African archaeology was in its origins a primarily amateur endeavor and was sustained by amateurs during the lean years of the 1950s and early 60s. Prior to 1960 the content of the bulletin of the South African Archaeological Society was approximately half articles written by amateur researchers. By 1970, this had been reduced to around 10% (51, Deacon 1990). This was quite intentional as professional archaeologists lobbied for legislation restricting the right to collect artifacts and worked to isolate non-professional competitors for resources. Two more subtle factors - the increasingly technical nature of investigations, heavily reliant upon technologies like radiocarbon dating, and a settling upon scientific papers as *the* format of presentation, excluded the weekend excavator that for decades had been at the heart of South African archaeology (836-837, Shepherd 1990).

Along with the decidedly intentional demise of amateur archaeology, the professionalizing and technicalization of archaeology had another, perhaps intentional, effect. In 1969, organized opposition to the apartheid government was gaining strength around the Black Consciousness movement; as colonial rule collapsed in surrounding nations, the movement in South Africa reached a head with the 1976 Soweto uprising. In the seven intervening years Black Consciousness, as its name suggests, built popular support by fostering the development of a coherent Black self-identity (73, Hall 1990). Iron Age research had progressed to the point that there was incontrovertible evidence for overturning the Afrikaner promoted myth of the empty land. The work of Revil Mason (1981) at Broederstroom confirmed the presence of copper and iron producing African pastoralists as early as 350 AD, while other archaeologists filled in the subsequent record of Iron Age civilization.

Unfortunately for indigenous Africans awakening to their identity, a large portion of this original research was unavailable due to limited opportunities for advanced education and when accessible, was largely unintelligible in its technical presentation. There is also the possibility suggested by Hall that Iron Age research was deliberately written with avoidance of political exploitation in mind. In addition, the Black African aversion to institutions and information associated with the minority government may have caused active rejection of what research was available (72-74, Hall 1990). Alternatively, the leaders of the Black Consciousness movement promoted their own abstraction, of a utopian, egalitarian, pre-colonial society. This is best illustrated by Mufaka's "Dzimbabwe: Life and Politics in the Golden Age 1150-1500 AD" (1984). "Indeed, it is amazing how the Zimbabweans, with very little material resources, were

capable of infinite happiness...This is a heritage which should be the envy of the human race" (24, Mufaka 1983, quoted in Shepherd 2002). The expansion of archaeology under the patronage of the apartheid government had generated volumes of new research indicating the fallacy on the National Party government's stance on South African history. However, most such conclusions were incomprehensible to both Afrikaner policy makers and Black Nationalist activists due to highly technical methodology and presentation or deliberate stylistic choices on the part of the researchers, if the claims of Hall and Shepherd are correct.

Investigating Trends in Archaeological Publications

Preliminary Considerations and Non-Stylistic Trends

In the following sections of the paper, I utilize examples of archaeological research publications from the 1950s through the 1980s in the *South African Journal of Science (SAJS)* and the *South African Archaeological Bulletin (SAAB)* to illustrate changing trends in publishing style and emphasis in conclusions. All searches for suitable articles were carried in accordance with the methodology previously described. However, as the search proceeded it became clear that the scope of the material ultimately used would reflect some particular characteristics. First, the earliest articles included are from the 1950s although the search range extended back to the 1930s. This is because prior to the 1950s articles on the Iron Age describing original research conducted by South African employed professional archaeologists in the *SAJS* and the *SAAB* are basically nonexistent. Even a general search via Google Scholar for Iron Age articles published between 1930 and 1950 with no author specified turned up

unacceptable results consisting of articles written by academics from related but not specifically archaeological fields or by authors who were employed at Rhodesian institutions, thus ruling them out from the political dynamics specific to South Africa. The trend of Rhodesian researchers publishing heavily within South African journals can be considered a significant result in its own right, possibly worth investigating in subsequent studies. This trend may in part reflect the historical emphasis of Rhodesian researchers focusing on the Iron Age because of the ongoing fascination with Great Zimbabwe.

Another notable trend is that the overwhelming majority of articles included here and found overall through my searches derive from the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. While the predominance of articles from the *SAAB* as compared to the *SAJS* is to be expected to some degree because of the prior journal's specifically archaeological focus, the degree to which this disparity exists was surprising. As this trend became apparent during the research process I conducted additional broad searches of the terms Iron Age and Stone Age for each journal through Google Scholar to provide some idea of how many articles existed overall involving these fields. The results are summarized in Figure 1 below. Most importantly, for the *SAJS*, there are only 30 articles that include the phrase Iron Age *anywhere* in their text and only 21 for Stone Age published between 1930 and 1994. Compared to the hundreds of articles represented in the *SAAB* this explains the disparity in origin for the articles included this study's sample. Although no Stone Age articles were considered in this study the term was also searched to provide a comparison to the occurrence of Iron Age articles. As a result of this, in retrospect, this study could easily have focused exclusively upon the *South African Archaeological*

Bulletin or conversely could be expanded to include a much larger range of South African academic journals. My concept of the *SAJS* being a premier forum for showcasing archaeological research was disproven to a large degree by the numerical results of my research.

	<i>South African Journal of Science</i>		<i>South African Archaeological Bulletin</i>	
	Article Title Search	Anywhere in Article Search	Article Title Search	Anywhere in Article Search
Iron Age	13	30	74	556
Stone Age	1	21	111	951

Figure 1: Google Scholar search results for the phrases Iron Age and Stone Age in the *South African Journal of Science* versus the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. Additional search parameters included articles published between 1930 and 1994 for each journal but no author or other terms were specified.

Finally, the sample of articles included in the following analysis is neither a complete nor unbiased selection of each author's publications for the two journals considered and represents what I consider to be the most promising examples for demonstrating a qualitative comparative methodology. It is important to bear in mind while considering the following examples that the goal of this exercise is to test the viability of proving or disproving Hall's and Shepherd's claims, not necessarily to accomplish either conclusively. The excerpts are arranged by author in chronological order, based upon that author's earliest published article in either the *South African Journal of Science* or *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. Thus, the selection of excerpts written by Revil Mason which span the 1950s through the 1980s will precede the selection of excerpts by Ray Inskeep whose first included work appears in the 1960s.

Revil Mason

The Excavation of Four Caves near Johannesburg by R.J. Mason. Published in 1951 in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. It is noted that the excavations discussed were undertaken by members of the Witwatersrand branch of the South African Archaeological Society, of which the author was a part, from 1949-1950.

This article briefly describes in mostly qualitative terms the pottery and faunal remains discovered at four caves outside of Johannesburg, South Africa. Black and white hand drawn illustrations of some pottery are provided along with simple charts breaking down pottery sherds by dimensions and visible characteristics. The portions of the paper that might be considered politically sensitive occur in the discussion section. Some excerpts include the following:

“The caves illustrate occupation during the Later Stone Age and immediately afterwards by an iron using people: Bush and Bantu respectively on cultural grounds alone.” (78)

“It seems possible that some ancient Sotho group may have occupied the Transvaal caves described here, since the Bapedi history constantly refers to the use of caves by the Transvaal Pedi, a Sotho tribe (Hunt,16).” (78)

“Regarding the chronology of these wares and the tribal affiliation of the associated stone-wall builders some controversy exists. Most writers agree, however, that this ancient southern Transvaal pottery should belong to the pre-Msilikatse era; thus giving a possible age of one and a half centuries to sherds removed from the caves.” (79)

Mason’s analysis reflects several obvious emphases; first, distinguishing the Stone Age from the Iron Age cultural layers and associating these classifications with ethnic identities, as indicated by the first quote above. In the second quote, Mason cites ethnographic data generated by another researcher which identifies a possible specific tribe that may have utilized the sites being discussed. Finally, Mason proposes a potential age for the pottery sherds found – about 150 years old. This is well within the range of time during which there should be Iron Age Africans living in South Africa according to the myth of the empty land, thus this data does not pose a threat to that point

of view. Published in the years immediately following the rise of the National Party government, this article is useful in showcasing the emphasis of the author on linking archaeological discoveries to modern peoples and does not display any evidence of politicization or major political relevance aside from supporting the presence of a specific tribe of Africans at these sites.

**South African Iron Age Pottery from the Southern Transvaal by Revil Mason.
Published in 1952 in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*.**

In this article Revil Mason introduces the term Iron Age as a deliberate alternative to the apparently misleading linguistic term Bantu to describe the metal-working agricultural peoples who migrated into South Africa from the north. The new phrase is utilized in the discussion of pottery collected from the surface of a hillside site called Tafelkop. This paper is much like the previous example of Mason's work in that it describes the pottery in terms of its physical characteristics, though this time with greater emphasis on the manufacture of the artifacts. Where it differs markedly is that in no place is an association made between the artifacts and a modern population. The only comparisons or connections made are to other known Iron Age sites with the intent of supporting the Tafelkop material's designation as Iron Age in origin.

"Deductions concerning the relationship of the Southern Transvaal Iron Age with other expressions of the development must be speculative and unsound until several sealed Iron Age deposits have been excavated in the adjacent area. Even at this stage, however, the ceramics I have described, and the known material from the southern Transvaal, show certain resemblances to wares recovered both at the Limpopo sites and from the earliest Rhodesian Iron Age." (75)

Compared to his 1951 paper, this work is significantly more cautious and narrow in the conclusions that are drawn by Mason. One notable feature of this work is the acknowledgment section which references the involvement of van Riet Lowe and Malan

in the criticism and editing process and Goodwin for “piloting” Mason’s article through the press (75, Mason 1952). The earlier article of Mason’s makes no such acknowledgments regarding the editing or publishing process and thus this article’s differences probably reflect the influence of these additional researchers’ advice. Given the separation of this article from his last by only a single year and yet the sharp difference in emphasis, especially the lack of references to modern ethnic groups, this could be a politically sterilized work. The total absence of calendar dates or even guesses at such in its published form mean that this work is ultimately in no way politically relevant. Unfortunately, based upon the article alone, what motives went into the editing process can only be speculated.

Radiocarbon Dating of Iron Age Sites in the Southern Transvaal; Melville Koppies and Uitkomst Cave by R.J. Mason and N.J. van der Merwe. Published in the *South African Journal of Science* in 1964. Note that van der Merwe was employed by Yale University in the USA and had access to a radiocarbon laboratory unavailable in South Africa. Mason was in the employ of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

This brief article provides two radiocarbon dates for the Iron Age of South Africa; in particular the sites tested were the southernmost dated examples of the Iron Age anywhere in Africa at the time of publication (142, Mason and van der Merwe 1964). The artifacts and other archaeological details of both sites are largely not addressed in this paper, though a greater description of the Melville Koppies site exists in a guidebook to the area by Mason and published in 1963. According to the article, at the request of the Johannesburg Council for Natural History, the Archaeological Research Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand surveyed the area including Melville Koppies and excavated that site in 1963. Using a sample of charcoal recovered from a metal smelting furnace in the Iron Age layers of the site, the Yale Radiocarbon Laboratory established a

date of 890 ± 50 years Before Present for that part of the site. Mason and van der Merwe assert that a “...stone-walled settlement, metal and food producing economy indicated by the material remains given the archaeological label ‘Uitkomst Culture’...” (142) was present in the southern Transvaal region of South Africa around 900 years ago. The second radiocarbon date comes from the Uitkomst Cave site 25 miles north-west of Melville Koppies and for which the previously mentioned archaeological culture is named. A sharpened wood stick found on the surface of a stratigraphic bed also containing a complete smelting furnace was the source of a date of 300 ± 80 years Before Present (142). It is also noted that Uitkomst Cave was originally excavated by Mason during the 1950s with funding from the National Council for Social Research.

The most notable aspect of this paper is the straightforward manner in which radiocarbon data is presented dating the Iron Age of the southern Transvaal to hundreds of years before the arrival of European settlers. If there is any paper that refutes the politicization via incomprehensible presentation hypothesis of Shepherd, this is the prime example. A leading archaeologist employed by a South African university and receiving public funding for his work published a paper that in no uncertain or abstract terms states the ancientness of Black African presence in South Africa. While no connections are drawn to specific modern ethnic groups, this is still a politically relevant paper published in a journal where many members of the academic community outside of archaeology are likely to encounter it. If there was any attempt to suppress controversial conclusions by Mason in his 1952 article, he clearly abandoned that effort in the following decade during which time he had also become a well established scientist.

Early Iron Age Settlement at Broederstroom 24/73, Transvaal, South Africa by R.J. Mason. Published in the *South African Journal of Science* in 1981. The author was employed by the Archaeological Research Unit of the University of the Witwatersrand at the time of publication.

If the previous paper discussed is evidence against the theory of archaeologists hiding the political significance of their work then this 1981 paper represents an additional confirmation that at the very least one prominent researcher had no qualms about making the conclusions of his work obvious. The abstract, present in both English and Afrikaans, is quite direct about the evidence for ancient Black African habitation.

“These occupants were iron and copper producing Negroid pastoralists who apparently at times shared the site with Late Stone Age individuals. Radiocarbon dates for the site range from c. A.D. 350 to 600...Industrial activity produced iron smelting debris and heaps of iron ore...The prospect of a relationship between the occupants of Broederstroom 24/73 and modern Sotho people is considered.” (401)

This paper is exactly the opposite of what one would expect from a researcher concerned about possible reprisals for controversial conclusions. A dozen radiocarbon dates are provided for various objects from the site; eleven of these date to the early Iron Age between 350 A.D. and 600 A.D. as noted in the abstract and one dates to the late Iron Age at 1620 ± 50 A.D. (407). While the dates are provided in a table identified by site location codes and radiocarbon laboratory sample codes, they are also labeled with material (charcoal or bone) and by subject (hut floor, mound, burial, etc.) so there is no ambiguity as to their significance.

Finally, following a detailed description of the pottery artifacts recovered and the specific styles associated with them, Mason proceeds to make the following assertion.

“It is possible to carry the evolutionary link further and see the most complex types of vessel decoration at Broederstroom...as distant ancestors of that used on the pottery made by the Pedi of the eastern Transvaal, by the Lobedu of the

northern Transvaal and the Tswana of the western Transvaal at Dinokana today.”
(412)

Through the above statement and the associated argument which included radiocarbon dates, Mason conclusively refuted the myth of the empty land in a format readily accessible to any individual who came across this article and could read English or Afrikaans.

The argument might be made that by this point in the early 1980s the myth of the empty land was losing its significance as a believable version of history since two decades of archaeological work, especially that of the vocal Revil Mason, had been gradually disproving it. However, to illustrate just how sensitive a topic the propaganda of the minority government remained, around the same time as Mason’s paper was published, a prominent white historian named Floors van Jaarsveld dared to question in a public lecture how Afrikaners could claim that God intervened in the fate of the Boers at the Battle of Blood River against the Zulus when only days before the whites had been slaughtered. For the offense of a questioning the so-called “Day of the Covenant” a far right Afrikaner militant named Eugene Terre’Blanche and his followers tarred and feathered van Jaarsveld on the spot (McGreal 2001). Admittedly, this is an example of an extreme figure that was ultimately an embarrassment to the National Party government. Nevertheless, the ranks of Terre’Blache’s organization the Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging swelled following the attack on van Jaarsveld. Until the first free elections in 1994, the Afrikaner nationalism movement lived and died by its myths.

Ray Inskeep

Some Iron Age Sites in Northern Rhodesia by R.R. Inskeep. Published in 1962 in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. The author was employed by the University of Cape Town at the time this article was published.

In this lengthy article, Ray Inskeep addressed several new Iron Age sites in Northern Rhodesia, the present day Zambia, and their relationship to other sites in the two Rhodesias. The three main sites discussed in the article are Kalomo, Kalundu Mound, and Kabanga Mission. Pottery from these three sites was recognized as similar to each other and unique relative to known pottery cultures from other Iron Age sites in the region. Ultimately based upon the material from a total of 16 sites, Inskeep developed the concept of a new Iron Age culture which he termed the Kalomo Culture after the type site. Using a comparative analysis of pottery motifs from the sites in question relative to museum collections of pottery from extant tribes, Inskeep concluded that the Kalomo Culture is not ancestral to the culture of any modern tribal group but part of an older array of early Iron Age cultures.

“We may conclude this discussion of the Kalomo culture by saying that, in its earliest stages, it appears to be one of a number of early Iron Age variants distributed north and south of the Zambezi which show some signs of having a common ancestry.” (174)

“We may conclude by observing that from the rather piecemeal evidence that has come to light in the past few years, it is now possible to identify, with some confidence, two prehistoric Iron Age cultures in the southern parts of Northern Rhodesia. The earlier of these may well be the products of the first farmers and metalworkers to reach the region. The later shows every sign of being ancestral to the present-day Tonga peoples.” (175)

Based upon these two concluding statements, it would not be improper to say that this paper demonstrates some features consistent with Martin Hall’s hypothesis.

Seemingly contrary to Hall’s expectation that archaeologists would not emphasize unity in Iron Age cultures in their publications, in the first excerpt Inskeep notes that the Kalomo Culture is part of an array of commonly descended pottery traditions. However, Inskeep’s analysis is primarily based upon distinguishing the differences in pottery motif

that identify various archaeological cultures found in Northern Rhodesia – an approach that emphasizes Iron Age diversity. Earlier in the paper, via a process of extrapolating radiocarbon dates from other archaeological sites with similar pottery to the Kaloma type site, Inskeep claims an approximate date of 750 A.D. for the first appearance of the Kalomo Culture (173). In the second excerpt provided above, Inskeep identifies his older Kalomo Culture as being associated with strictly Iron Age peoples in the region while the culture of the modern Tonga people is descended from a different, younger tradition. So while the archaeological culture the paper focused upon is identified as both very ancient and part of a family of related Iron Age traditions, it is divorced from the culture of the modern Black African inhabitants of the region, thus negating much potential utility to the Black Nationalism or Pan-Africanism movements.

This article provides a particularly interesting example because despite being written by a South African archaeologist and published in the SAAB, the material discussed is from Northern Rhodesia. In addition, this article was published during the Government Unsupported Period of South African archaeology which complicates an interpretation suggesting political motivations in the writing style since government funding was largely absent regardless of the implications of one's research. As a result, if I can conclude anything about this paper, it is that any similarities to Hall's hypothesis probably have more to do with Inskeep's personal politics at the time of this publication than with concern over arousing the ire of government or funding bodies.

T.C. Partridge

Ficus Cave: An Iron Age Living Site in the Central Transvaal by T.C. Partridge.
Published in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* in 1966. The author was employed by the University of the Witwatersrand at the time of publication.

This 1966 article by Partridge describes discoveries from a rich Iron Age cave site in the Makapansgat Valley. Outside of the cave there is evidence of habitation including middens and the remains of low stone walling (125). The surface of the deposits inside the cave displayed artifacts suggesting relatively recent inhabitation by Iron Age people. These artifacts include pottery sherds, pieces of human modified bone, grindstones, and the remains of gourds (126). A 5 foot x 5 foot square was excavated in spits to a depth of 54 inches. Artifacts and bones were distributed throughout the deposits indicating that the cave was continuously utilized during the time frame covered by the excavation (125-126).

Analysis of the more than 1400 pottery sherds recovered indicated a generally homogenous assemblage, further supporting the claim of continuous habitation of the cave (126). A single example of channeled wear pottery from the deeper deposits excavated was notable because this style had not previously been found so far to the south. Partridge uses this to suggest an early Iron Age relative date for the beginning of habitation at Ficus Cave, due to the channeled wear's resemblance to pottery from the Rhodesian Iron Age (127). Aside from that single example, Partridge states that "all of these smaller finds would be expected in most modern Bantu villages" (131). Furthermore, "The pottery may be tentatively linked with present-day Sotho wares, although insufficient re-search has been carried out in the Transvaal to permit definite correlation" (131). So while the connections to modern tribes made by the author are not strong or specific, they are present.

Far more interesting are the claims made about when and why habitation of Ficus Cave ceased. The only human remains found during this excavation were a single rib

fragment with cut marks on it, recovered from one of the upper spits (131). This is particularly relevant when one considers the tragedy that occurred at the nearby so-called Historic Cave where a Boer militia besieged and ultimately slaughtered hundreds of Northern Sotho people in retribution for an attack on a trading party in 1854 (131). Partridge describes how recent excavations at that site uncovered irrefutable evidence of cannibalism by the desperate people trapped within the cave during the siege. Partridge ultimately proposes that multiple caves in the Makapansgat Valley were used for refuge during the Boer occupation of the area in 1854 and in particular the long term habitation of Ficus Cave was brought to an end by that conflict. Despite the fact that no absolute dates are provided and the connections to tribal groups are generalized, this paper is potentially explosive from a political perspective. Partridge describes the “...extermination of the clan of chief Makapan (Umgobana) by a large Boer commando...” and makes reference to the remains of “roasted human limbs” (131). While these statements are both historically and archaeologically accurate, if Partridge was intent on not agitating Black Nationalists or anti-minority rule activists, as Martin Hall suggests should be the case, this was certainly not the way to go about stating his conclusions.

Tim Maggs

Pastoral Settlements on the Riet River by T.M. O’C Maggs. Published in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* in 1971. The author was employed by the University of Cape Town at that time of publication and the research was supported by a grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research.

In this 1971 paper, Maggs surveys a number of Iron Age archaeological sites in the Orange Free State of South Africa. The paper is noted as being the product of a wide ranging and ongoing investigation in the Iron Age throughout that territory, supervised by

Professors Inskeep and Wilson of the University of Cape Town. For the most part, Maggs's paper is concerned with describing in detail the nature and context of a large number of artifacts found from surface collection and limited excavations. The conclusions drawn include:

"Pottery from Iron Age sites in the northern and eastern Orange Free State is quite distinct from that of the Riet. The main differences are in decoration, use of ochre, use of broken-up potsherds as temper and in some cases vessel forms. Similarly, ethnological collections from the Southern Sotho and Tswana, the nearest Bantu-speaking peoples, show pottery that has no apparent connection with the OFD 1 material. We must conclude that no similar pottery assemblage has yet been described." (53)

"Ribs from the two burials excavated at OFD 1 were submitted to Dr. J. C. Vogel of the National Physical Research Laboratory, Pretoria, for radiocarbon dating. The results were: Burial 1 Pta-247 bone collagen 110 ± 50 B.P. (A.D. 1840) Burial 2 Pta-248 bone collagen 380 ± 50 B.P. (A.D. 1570). Dr. Vogel comments that: 'From the C-14 calibration curve the most probable historic dates derived from these measurements are: Burial 1 either A.D. 1845 or A.D. 1690, Burial 2 either A.D. 1590 or A.D. 1475.'" (56)

In short, Maggs claims that at one particular site, OFD 1, Later Stone Age people were present around the time of the radiocarbon dates listed and based upon the artifacts associated with their burials they are distinct culturally from extant tribal groups in the region. In addition, Maggs also notes the presence of copper bands used for personal adornment which he suggests were obtained by the inhabitants of the site from trading with Iron Age Sotho-Tswana peoples to the north (58-59). Ultimately, Maggs identifies the probable inhabitants of OFD 1 as Bushmen pastoralists who traded with nearby Iron Age groups for a period from as early as the 15th century A.D. through as late as the 19th century. While this is a fairly dense article to work through due to its length at 26 pages and high detail, the conclusions drawn are clearly stated and modern tribal groups are identified. Although Iron Age Africans were not present at this site, indigenous groups

who traded with such peoples were present making this paper relevant to understanding the locations and dates of migrations of Iron Age, Bantu speaking tribes from the north.

Unique Art Objects in the Iron Age of the Transvaal, South Africa by R.R. Inskeep and T.M. O'C Maggs. Published in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* in 1975. Inskeep is identified as being associated with the Pitt Rivers Museum at the University of Oxford in England and formerly of the University of Cape Town. Maggs was employed by the Natal Museum, Pietermaritzburg, South Africa at the time of publication.

This 1975 paper by Inskeep and Maggs describes a series of remarkable examples of Iron Age art found at a site called Lyndenburg in the eastern Transvaal of South Africa. Among the numerous artifacts recovered were seven pottery pieces shaped like human heads and possibly intended to be worn as masks or ceremonial helmets. The heads display a cross hatching pattern that may represent ritual scarification practiced by their makers and known from ethnographic evidence for a wide range of traditional African cultures. In addition, animal figurines, bone lozenges, and iron and copper beads were also discovered. While specific radiocarbon dates are not provided for these artifacts or materials associated with them, the authors make comparisons to similar sites that have been dated.

“More recently several sites in the Transvaal have been dated to the fifth century or earlier, establishing that the Early Iron Age had arrived south of the Limpopo by the early centuries of the Christian era.” (135)

Following this particular quote the paper goes on to list a variety of well-dated Iron Age sites in the Transvaal leaving no ambiguity about the antiquity of the Iron Age in that region. However, after making strong claims for the ancientness of the finds, the authors then defer from making any argument about a tribal identity of the makers.

“In fact, important and exciting as the heads are as examples of African Early Iron Age art, they remain disappointingly silent as ethnographic documents. Time

lapse increases the difficulty of looking for contemporary examples that might aid in their interpretation, and perhaps the farthest we can go at present is to suggest that the heads as a group represent part of the paraphernalia relevant to some ritual or ceremonial context.” (136)

Interestingly, this paper may be interpreted as conforming to some expectations related to Hall’s hypothesis. In this case, the authors do not hide their conclusions in technical jargon or Processualist language; they just limit themselves to relatively narrow claims. The assessment of the age of the art objects is based upon a wide variety of other sites of known age. This well supported and clearly stated assertion of an ancient Iron Age presence in South Africa follows the claim of Hall that archaeologists sought to disprove the myth of the empty land propaganda of the National Party government; a trend also supported by the previously discussed work of Revil Mason. In addition, the minimal ethnographic significance of the heads suggested by Inskeep and Maggs also conforms to the expectations of Hall. In discussing the heads, Inskeep and Maggs reference minor similarities to a wide range of Iron Age and extant African cultures, seemingly emphasizing those cultures’ diversity while downplaying the larger significance of the Lyndenburg heads, ultimately labeling them a probable experiment unlikely to be found elsewhere. This paper provides the first case of a single paper supporting both of aspects of Hall’s hypothesis - that archaeologists would emphasize the ancientness of an Iron Age presence in South Africa while minimizing the relevance of specific finds to Black Nationalism.

T.M. Evers

Iron Age Trade in the Eastern Transvaal, South Africa by T.M. Evers. Published in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* in 1974. At the time of publication the author was a graduate student in the Department of Archaeology, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa.

This paper by Evers is a synthesis of everything known about trade among Iron Age populations in the Eastern Transvaal as of 1974, drawing heavily upon original research undertaken by the author for his master's thesis. While most of the paper details how different items and materials such gold, beads, copper, or salt were traded, the summary at the beginning of the article and the conclusion section at the end include some strong, general statements about the identity and antiquity of the Iron Age people in the region.

"The Highveld and escarpment were dominated during the second millennium A.D. by an essentially Pedi culture...A settlement at Badfontein was excavated in 1971 and iron artefacts, glass beads, pottery and animal-bone food waste were recovered. Pottery is indistinguishable from modern Pedi ware and the lay-out both of homesteads and settlements is equally Pedi in design. A radiocarbon date of A.D. 1680 \pm 90 (RL/205) has been obtained." (33)

Evers is very straightforward in indentifying the modern tribal association of the Iron Age people whose artifacts have been recovered from a particular site in the Highveld region of the Transvaal and providing a radiocarbon date for their habitation. In addition, he pushes back the date of Iron Age mining in the province to the 8th century A.D. based upon evidence from several additional sites.

"There are two major copper-mining areas in the Transvaal, at Messina (northern Transvaal) and round Phalaborwa, Gravelotte and Tzaneen in the north-eastern Lowveld...Mining was carried out from as early as A.D. 700 until the nineteenth century." (33)

Regarding this paper, there is not much need for detailed analysis as the author seems utterly unconcerned with any political ramifications of his publication. An ancient Black African presence within South African territory is readily identified with dates from multiple sites to support it and a modern tribe is named as being continuous with the Iron Age inhabitants of a large swath of the Transvaal. As a graduate student during the

Apartheid-Professional Period whose research was funded by the Human Sciences Research Council (36), South Africa's statutory social science research agency, Evers would seem a likely candidate for exhibiting some form of politicization in his work and yet no evidence of Shepherd's predicted trend is present. Regarding the expectations set forth by Hall, this paper roundly contradicts Afrikaner propaganda and is also directly relevant to Black Nationalism, thus managing to be politically significant to both sides.

A series of additional papers by T.M. Evers were also analyzed in the same manner as above but with no difference in conclusion. Similar papers from 1975 and 1980 and a 1987 paper co-authored with N.J. van der Merwe stated with the same directness the ancientness and tribal associations of Iron Age South Africans. The 1987 paper in particular elaborated a detailed cultural sequence for ceramic traditions in the Transvaal which linked a particular style originating between 1300 and 1500 A.D. to modern groups including the Venda, Ndebele and Koni peoples (105, Evers and van der Merwe 1987). There is also no evidence of a Processualist influence in any of these four papers. None of them are framed by hypotheses or narrow questions or delve into any analysis more technical than a detailed consideration of pottery style and adornment.

Assessment of Goals, Limitations, and Suggestions for Future Research

The first goal of this project, to generate a practical framework under which the history of South African archaeology can be divided, proved accomplishable over the course of my investigation. The literature review that comprised the research for the Periods of South African Archaeology section of this project is really where the possibility of investigating political trends in archaeological publications first became

apparent. Much of the literature review was actually undertaken as part of a paper on the general history of South African archaeology that preceded the initiation of this thesis project (Zipkin 2007). Starting with a general history of the discipline in that country, it was then possible to break this down into specific time periods with associated expectations for trends in archaeological publications. For example, journals from the Apartheid-Professional Period should be characterized by the scientific article as the dominant type of publication, an increasing number of studies based upon excavations rather than surface collections reflecting increased funding, and an increasing emphasis on radiocarbon dating as access to that technology expanded. These expectations were born out during the original research portion of my project in which articles from across three different periods of South African archaeology were searched.

Regarding the limitations of my approach to dividing up the history of South African archaeology, my main concern is that my criteria are perhaps too specific to my thesis to be transferable to another researcher investigating the discipline. By dividing up archaeology based upon the source of funding and support for research, and the professional and ethnic identities of archaeologists, my four period system is appropriate for researching political intrusion into science due to antagonism between Afrikaner nationalism and Iron Age archaeological discoveries. For example, my framework ignores the gender of who was conducting archaeological research. A study of the dynamics of archaeology from a feminist perspective would probably need to divide up the history of the discipline using different characteristics. In addition, the years since the end of apartheid have seen an increased emphasis on involving native Africans in archaeology and anthropology. In any subsequent studies that address archaeology since

the end of apartheid, it may be necessary to define another historical period to reflect the potentially changing ethnic/racial composition of the archaeological community in South Africa.

The second goal of this project was to test the viability of studying trends within the discipline of archaeology through a pilot study. After having identified existing claims of political influence in archaeological publications during my literature review, I set about testing a methodology for investigating the veracity of these claims. The set of criteria I utilized to narrow my scope to an approachable selection of material was admittedly rather elaborate. Only scientific articles published in the *SAAB* or the *SAJS* between 1930 and 1994, on the subject of Iron Age archaeology in South Africa or a nation bordering it, and written by an author employed by a South African institution were considered. Of these, only a selection are actually presented and analyzed within this paper due to redundancy of including many articles from which the same conclusions were drawn, as well as the time limitations of this project. The result is that a small sample comprising work from only five archaeologists was actually included. While at least twice that number of professional archaeologists was identified as frequent contributors to the literature on the African Iron Age during the 1930s -1990s , many published outside the scope of this study in non-article formats like letters to the editor lacking references or were employed by Rhodesian institutions.

Ultimately, I believe that the qualitative methodology I employed was reasonably successful for such a pilot study and more importantly suggested a number of directions in which future research could proceed. Using historical resources about South African archaeology as a source for potential authors to investigate, as well as broad Google

Scholar searches for any Iron Age publications, yielded a large number of possible articles. However, searching through each one in order to determine if it conformed to the requirements of this study was not particularly efficient. In addition, as referenced earlier, I determined partway through my research that relatively few scientific articles on the Iron Age occur in the *SAJS* and that many authors publish in occasional journals such as museum annals or guide books and unexpected locations like industrial mining journals (for an example of the latter, see Mason 1982). This discovery, combined with the fact that historically South African archaeology has been dominated by relatively few professionals, suggests that future studies should adopt a different methodology. One suggestion for how future research should proceed for this or a similar topic is through a more biographical focus. For example, one could research the entire academic and employment history of a particular South African archaeologist, identify which periods of his or her life are most likely to contain political influences on their work, and then survey all the relevant articles by that individual regardless of where published. This approach would be appropriate for studying a hypothesis such as Martin Hall's which I have come to believe concerns an archaeologist's personal politics more than political pressure from an external source.

Additionally, a radically different methodology might be employed to study in depth Nick Shepherd's hypothesis. Shepherd proposed that South African archaeologists rapidly adopted technical jargon and Processualist methodology with its emphasis on narrow conclusions and scientific independence of political context in order to actively hide the implications of their work from government oversight bodies or any non-archaeologists at all. In order to properly conduct a study of how rapidly, if at all,

Processualism or technical language was adopted, a researcher could utilize automatic coding software to scan scientific articles for specific words or combinations thereof that are deemed relevant. Even with such techniques, the reasons *why* the technicalization of research publications or adoption of Processualism occurred would remain unclear. Adopting a more scientifically rigorous theoretical perspective could certainly have been relevant to receiving government funds without having to invoke roles for external political pressure or a researcher's personal views on apartheid. Only if combined with additional historical background research into where and when South African archaeologists were exposed to Processualism could this lead to a robust methodology for studying trends in archaeological literature.

Finally, to address the third goal of this project, regarding the claim of Nick Shepherd that South African archaeologists buried the sensitive conclusions of their work in style inaccessible to a layperson, I have found no supporting evidence. Clearly archaeology became more technical over the scope of time considered in this project, mostly as a function of the increasing professionalization of the discipline as well as the growing utilization of radiocarbon dating. However, in none of the articles sampled in this paper nor any considered for this project overall did I find any indication of a marked increase in technical jargon or narrow, specialist interpretations of the past. The selection of Revil Mason's papers, especially the latter two examples, demonstrates his blatant intention to loudly disprove the myth of the empty land. If this might be considered an exceptional case due to Mason's history of antagonizing the apartheid era government over its policies in public addresses (241-242, Mason 1989), do not overlook the work of Maggs or Evers included here. All of their papers discussed here, spanning 25 years of

work, demonstrate a straightforward assertion of an ancient, objectively dated, Iron Age African presence in South African territory. Ultimately however, any attempt to conclusively understand the role of Processualism in South African archaeological history will have to be far more efficient and comprehensive in its sources than this pilot study. This strongly encourages the adoption of the software based methodology discussed previously for a future investigation building on the Processualism aspect of the current project.

Concerning Martin Hall's hypothesis that some South African archaeologists manifested in their work an antagonism towards the Afrikaner Nationalist government and their propaganda version of history, as well as an unwillingness to provide fire to Black Nationalism movement, I believe that this project provides split support. By this I mean that the majority of papers considered in this study clearly and actively support an ancient Iron Age African presence well before the arrival of Europeans. However, there is at best speculative support for Hall's claims that archaeologists emphasized the diversity of Iron Age cultures to minimize their work's relevance to Pan-Africanism and Black Nationalism movements. In addition, I personally expected that if the archaeologists were opposed to Black Nationalism and the overthrow of minority rule, their work would also downplay the connections of Iron Age cultures to modern tribes since that could provide a history to bolster nationalistic sentiments. Ray Inskeep's 1962 paper displays some qualities matching Hall's hypothesis, specifically the downplaying of the connection between the archaeological material he is discussing and modern tribes in the area. Unfortunately, without being an expert in the styles of pottery discussed,

there is no way to verify whether this is actually correct or represents a deliberate stylistic choice on the author's part.

The 1975 paper by Inskeep and Maggs is the best evidence of a willful decision to not emphasize the relation of certain artifacts to contemporary groups. Without much elaboration, the discussion of the remarkable Lyndenburg pottery heads is concluded by stating the unlikelihood of finding modern analogous items through which to understand their original purpose. This paper and the preceding example are the only evidence, and vague evidence at that, that I found in any of the articles considered in this project which supports the second aspect of Hall's hypothesis. Furthermore, Partridge almost seems to go out of his way in his 1966 paper to state conclusions about the slaughter of Iron Age Africans in inflammatory and graphic language. Although his connections to modern tribes are not especially specific, by invoking the Boer slaughter of Northern Sotho tribesmen in 1854 and claiming that it was more widespread than already believed, Partridge's paper would certainly fan the flames of anyone harboring Black Nationalist views who came across it. This suggests an additional direction for future research; investigating the degree to which journals like the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* were read by members of the public who were not professionals in the field.

To conclude, this study provides a rather good reason to conduct further research into the trends of South African archaeology. Based upon the articles sampled in this pilot study, two claims about the politics of the discipline seem incorrect. This project does not provide the grounds on which to claim them *proven* incorrect since Shepherd's hypothesis warrants much more detailed historical treatment as well as a new investigative methodology, and Hall's could probably be better studied as two separate

hypotheses rather than two aspects of the same. The original conclusions that can be drawn from this project are necessarily narrow and preliminary, since the sample of articles used derives exclusively from a small group of professional archaeologists who published in the English language and are not Afrikaners ethnically. That being stated, this study suggests that the ethnic tensions between Afrikaners and English descended/anglophile South Africans which characterized 150 years of South African history manifested themselves in archaeological research. As beneficiaries of the National Party government from the 1960s onwards, anglophile archaeologists could easily have oriented their work to not contradict so blatantly the propaganda of the government. Obviously, this was not the case as multiple papers tore down the myth that Afrikaners had precedence over Africans in their own land.

Works Cited

- Binford, L.R. 1965. Archaeological Systematics and the Study of Culture Process. *American Antiquity* 31(2): 203-210.
- Bonner, P. 2007. Africa is seldom what it seems. In “A Search for Origins: Science, History, and South Africa’s ‘Cradle of Humankind’” ed. P. Bonner, A. Esterhuysen and T. Jenkins. Wits University Press, Johannesburg.
- Bonner, P. 2007. The myth of the vacant land. In “A Search for Origins: Science, History, and South Africa’s ‘Cradle of Humankind’” ed. P. Bonner, A. Esterhuysen and T. Jenkins. Wits University Press, Johannesburg.
- Bonner, P. 2007. The racial paradox: Sterkfontein, Smuts and Segregation. In “A Search for Origins: Science, History, and South Africa’s ‘Cradle of Humankind’” ed. P. Bonner, A. Esterhuysen and T. Jenkins. Wits University Press, Johannesburg.
- Bonner, P. 2007. The Legacy of Gold. In “A Search for Origins: Science, History, and South Africa’s ‘Cradle of Humankind’” ed. P. Bonner, A. Esterhuysen and T. Jenkins. Wits University Press, Johannesburg.
- Byrnes, R. South Africa: A Country Study. 1996. 28 March 2009.
<http://countrystudies.us/south-africa/62.htm>
- Clark, J.D. 1994. Digging On: A Personal Record and Appraisal of Archaeological Research in Africa and Elsewhere. *Annual Reviews of Anthropology* 24:1-23.
- Deacon, J. 1990. Weaving the fabric of Stone Age research in Southern Africa. In “A History of African Archaeology” ed. P. Robertshaw. Heinemann, Portsmouth.

Deacon, H. J. and Deacon, J. 1999. Human Beginnings in South Africa: Uncovering the Secrets of the Stone Age. Altamira Press, Walnut Creek, CA.

Dubow, S. 1992. Afrikaner Nationalism, Apartheid, and the Conceptualization of ‘Race’. *The Journal of African History* (33)2: 209-237.

Dubow, S. 2006. A Commonwealth of Knowledge: Science, Sensibility and White South Africa 1820-2000. Oxford University Press.

Evers, T.M. 1974. Iron Age Trade in the Eastern Transvaal, South Africa. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 29(113/114): 33-37.

Evers, T.M. 1975. Recent Iron Age Research in the Eastern Transvaal, South Africa. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 30(119/120): 71-83

Evers, T.M. 1980. Klingbeil Early Iron Age Sites, Lyndenburg, Eastern Transvaal, South Africa. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 35(141): 46-57.

Evers, T.M. and N.J. van der Merwe. 1987. Iron Age Ceramics from Phalaborwa North Eastern Transvaal Lowveld, South Africa. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 42(146): 87-106.

Gabel, C. 1985. Archaeology in sub-Saharan Africa 1800-1960. *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 18(2): 241-264.

Garlake, P.S. 1973. Great Zimbabwe. Thames and Hudson, London.

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

Hall, M. 1990. Hidden history: Iron Age archaeology in Southern Africa. In “A History of African Archaeology” ed. P. Robertshaw. Heinemann, Portsmouth.

Hall, M. 1996. Archaeology Africa. David Phillip Publishers Ltd, Cape Town.

Huffman, T. 2007. The early Iron Age at Broederstroom and around the ‘Cradle of Humankind’. In “A Search for Origins: Science, History, and South Africa’s ‘Cradle of Humankind’” ed. P. Bonner, A. Esterhuysen and T. Jenkins. Wits University Press, Johannesburg.

Inskeep, R.R. 1962. Some Iron Age Sites in Northern Rhodesia. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* **17**(67): 136-180.

Inskeep, R.R. and T.M. O’C. Maggs. 1975. Unique Art Objects in the Iron Age of the Transvaal, South Africa. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* **30**(119/120): 114-138.

Maggs, T.M. O’C. 1971. Pastoral Settlements on the Riet River. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* **26**(101/102): 37-63.

Marks, S. 1980. South Africa: ‘The myth of the empty land’. *History Today* 30(1):7-12.

Mason, R. 1951. The Excavation of Four Caves near Johannesburg. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* **6**(23): 71-79.

Mason, R. 1952. South African Iron Age Pottery from the Southern Transvaal. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* **7**(26): 70-79.

Mason, R. 1962. Prehistory of the Transvaal: a record of human activity. Witwatersrand University Press, Johannesburg.

Mason, R. 1964. Radiocarbon Dating of Iron Age Sites in the Southern Transvaal; Melville Koppies and Uitkomst Cave. *South African Journal of Science* **60**(5): 142.

Mason, R. 1981. Early Iron Age Settlement at Broederstroom 24/73, Transvaal, South Africa. *South African Journal of Science* **77**(9): 401-416.

Mason, R. 1982. Prehistoric mining in South Africa, and Iron Age copper mines in the Dwarsberg, Transvaal. *Journal of the South African Institute of Mining and Metallurgy* **May 1982**: 134-142.

Mason, R. 1989. South African Archaeology 1922 – 1988. The Archaeological Research Unit University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

McGreal, Chris. Stuck in the past. 2001. 2 Feb 2009.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2001/mar/16/schools.news/print>

Mufaka, K. 1983. Dzimbahwe: Life and Politics in the Golden Age 1100-1500. Harare Publishing, Harare, Zimbabwe.

Partridge, T.C. 1966. Ficus Cave: An Iron Age Living Site in the Central Transvaal. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* **21**(83):125-132.

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

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

Tobias, P. 2007. Foreword. In “A Search for Origins: Science, History, and South Africa’s ‘Cradle of Humankind’” ed. P. Bonner, A. Esterhuysen and T. Jenkins. Wits University Press, Johannesburg.

Zipkin, A. 2007. From Antiquities to Apartheid: A Review of South African Archaeology in the Period 1860-1994. Unpublished Literature Review.