A history and critical analysis of Namibia's archaeologies

Goodman Gwasira

A dissertation submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of History, Faculty of Arts, University of the Western Cape

December 2020

Supervisor: Prof Ciraj Rassool

Declaration

I, Goodman Gwasira, declare that '**A history and critical analysis of Namibia's archaeologies'** is my own work, that it has not been submitted for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by complete references.

Goodman Gwasira
10 December 2020

Acknowledgements

To list all the people who afforded their time and resources to assist me to conduct this study is regrettably impossible. Without the contribution and encouragement of each and every one of them I would have found the cross too heavy to carry. Therefore, if I have omitted to mention anyone by name it is unintentional. I thank them all.

Firstly, I thankfully acknowledge the Carl Schlettwein Stiftung in Basel Switzerland for awarding me a scholarship for my studies. I thank particularly Mr Lucio Schlettwein for the generous scholarship that the Carl Schlettwein Stiftung afforded me. In addition to the scholarship to study at the University of the Western Cape I was awarded numerous short study visits to the Basler Africa Bibliographien during the course of my studies. I am very grateful for their support. I also thank the Remaking Societies, Remaking Persons Supranational Forum for supporting some of my research.

I am thankfully and greatly indebted to my mentor and supervisor Professor Ciraj Rassool for the endless insights and deep knowledge of the fields of archaeology and heritage that he shared with me. Prof Rassool availed himself during my field work in Germany. He also provided resources for me to travel to attend conferences and workshops around Africa and Europe, which, shaped my thoughts on decolonising archaeology and museums. I am thankful for the endless discussions that we had at conferences and workshops that shaped my study. His keenness to see me through this study, kindness and constructive criticism encouraged me in the most profound ways. A greater part of this study was conducted remotely by using various forms of communication, which included Zoom, Skype and

WhatsApp video meetings. This dissertation would have been a lonely journey and impossible without him availing his time generously. Thank you Prof.

I'd like to think members of the Department of History and the Centre for Humanities Research at University of the Western Cape, especially Prof Patricia Hayes, Prof Premesh Lalu, Prof Leslie Witz, Prof Nicky Rousseau and Dr Bianca van Laun. My fellow students, Sophie Schasiepen, Abiti Nelson, Sam Longford and Mary Mbewe were especially helpful in our discussions. Nothing would be possible without university administrators, and I benefited enormously from assistance from Villeen Beerwinkel, Jane Smidt and Janine Brandt.

I acknowledge and thank the Basler Afrika Bibliographien in Switzerland accommodating me in their studio during the many study visits that I made to Basel. I thank the staff of the Basler Afrika Bibilographien for their assistance with using the archives. I particularly thank Dr Dag Henrichsen for being always on the look-out for any archival material that may be relevant to my study and alerting me on its existence. I am grateful for the long discussions about my topic of research that Dr Henrichsen and I had. In short Dr Henrichsen inspired and encouraged me a lot. I am also very thankful to Lisa Roulet and Reto Ulrich for their assistance and support during my archival research.

My gratitude go to my friends and colleagues in Switzerland who shared my enthusiasm in the topic of decolonising academic and professional knowledges and ways of knowing. I thank Dr Giorgio Miescher, Dr Luregn Lenggenhager and PD Dr Lorena Rizzo for the interest they showed in my research and the insights that they shared.

I am thankful to the staff of the National Archives of Namibia for their kindness and for affording me special access even though the archives were officially closed due to renovations that were taking place. Thank you to the Head of the archives Betty Matongo, and archivists Albertina Ndapandula Nekongo and Charon Uanguta for their kind assistance. I also thank Dr Werner Hillebrecht for assisting me with locating material in the national archives. I am humbled that he continued to render assistance long after he retired from the archives.

Research for this study also took place in the collections of Iziko Museums of South Africa, held in the Social History collections department. I thank the colleagues, Dr Wendy Black, Wilhelmina Seccona, Leila Hisham and Dr Gerald Klinghardt for their support and excellent service. I also thank Dr Graham Avery and Dr Janette Deacon for sharing their experiences as archaeologists in South Africa.

I am very grateful to colleagues from the University of Cologne who assisted me in different ways during my field work in Germany. My gratitude goes to Dr Tilman Lenssen-Erz, Dr Götz Ossendorf, Dr Isabel Schmidt, Prof Dr Rudolph Kuper and Prof Dr Hans-Peter Wotzka for assisting me through the files at the Heinrich-Barth-Institute. I also thank Prof Dr Michael Bollig and Ulrike Wesch for the discussions we had about my research and for offering me work space in the Global South Studies Centre, where Dr Clemens Greiner was also helpful. I thank Dr Larissa Förster for her encouragement and support throughout the study period. To Marie-Theres Erz, thank you for providing a home for me in Cologne.

The staff at the Namibia Scientific Society offered me excellent support during my research and I wholeheartedly thank Gunter von Schumann, Isidor Kamati, Armin Jagdhuber and

Waltrut Frizsche for being always ready to guide me through the library and archives of the Namibia Scientific Society. In addition, I thank Gutner von Schumann for sharing his deep knowledge of the administration of heritage in Namibia.

I am profoundly grateful for the assistance that I received from my colleagues at the National Museum of Namibia. In particular, I thank Kaarina Efraim, Nzila Mubusisi and Emma Uiras for providing me with access to museum records and archives. Special thanks to the museum librarians Aune Iyambo and Zakazapi Hijangoro. I am deeply indebted The Director of National Cultural Programmes, Esther Moombolah-Goagoses and the Executive Director of the Ministry of Education Arts and Culture, Sanet Steenkamp, for granting me permission to conduct research in the National Museum of Namibia. I also thank my colleagues from the National Heritage Council Erica Ndalikokule, Agnes Shiningayamwe and Manfred Gaeb for being always ready to assist with information upon request.

I am fortunate to work with colleagues who were prepared to take up an extra load from my daily tasks so that I could focus on my studies. I thank the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Namibia Prof Kenneth Matengu for his support, and Dr Martha Akawa and Martha Mosha for teaching some of my courses. I also thank my colleagues Dr Bennett Kangumu and Prof Gilbert Likando for their support and encouragement. In addition to work colleagues, I thank Prof Dr Reinhart Kössler for teaching my course while I was in Cape Town for research, Dr Jeremy Silvester for being my sounding board whenever I had some new thoughts about my research, and Vera Freyer and Dr Beatrice Sandelowsky for sharing their experiences of practicing archaeology in Namibia.

I sincerely thank Dr John and Jill Kinhan for their inspiration. I started out my journey into archaeology as their private student. In the course of this study, I received tremendous support from both John and Jill for which I am most grateful. I thank them for sharing their experiences and for the long discussions about my dissertation in the car park at the University of Namibia. Many thanks also go to Dr Seke Katsamudanga from the Department of History, University of Zimbabwe, for sharing his vast knowledge of the histories of archaeology in Zimbabwe.

Finally, I am express my profound gratitude to my wife Sekai and daughters Anotida and Stephanie who stood by me throughout this study. I deprived them of attention at times. I thank them for their support and love. I am most grateful for the trust and confidence that my parents and parents-in-law had in me throughout this study. I thank them for the moral and spiritual support. I am grateful to my siblings for being there for me and encouraging me. To all the people mentioned here I am deeply grateful. I thank the Lord Almighty for giving me strength.

Abstract

This study critically examines the political, social and institutional settings in which archaeology was introduced in Namibia. I re-examine the idea of archaeology as a scientific and objective discipline that could be practiced without input from the knowledge systems of local communities. Archaeology developed alongside colonialism in Africa. Archaeology became an apparatus for knowing about the strategic resources that could be found in Namibia. Through the processes of recording sites and artefacts archaeology provided information that was useful to the colonial administration. In this dissertation I therefore argue that archaeological practice was a form of ordering and governing people in a settler colony.

Archaeology in Namibia was practiced mainly by amateurs both before and after independence. The amateurs maintained their dominance in archaeology through establishing elaborate networks with academic and heritage institutions in Germany and South Africa, which were the colonial metropoles of Namibia. Archaeology in Namibia was a preserve of the white male amateurs. Black people were excluded from practicing the discipline and were relegated to menial tasks of being guards and porters at archaeological sites. The declaration of archaeological sites as national monuments that were worthy of preservation had an effect of land dispossession from the black people. However the alienation of black people was not restricted to land dispossession, it also involved excluding their knowledge about archaeological sites.

There were no educational programme in universities in Namibia. The consequence of this was that archaeological artefacts were exported to universities outside Namibia for analysis

and interpretation. This had an effect that the narrative that was produced about Namibia did not include the perspectives of the local people. The metropoles of colonialism in Namibia continued to be the centres of knowledge production while Namibia remained a field site for the extraction of information. I therefore argue for a reframed archaeological practice that recognises the experience and knowledge of the local communities as a way of decolonising archaeology in Namibia.

Key Words

Namibia, heritage, knowledge production, amateur archaeology, professionalised archaeology, formalised archaeology, museum collections, archaeocentrism, coloniality

List of abbreviations

ACACIA	Arid Climate Adaptation and Cultural Innovation
ASAPA	Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
AWHF	African World Heritage Fund
BAB	Basler Afrika Bibliographien
CEA	Culture and Environment in Africa
CRM	Cultural Resources Management
DFG	Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft
DMGA	Daureb Mountain Guides Association
HBI	Heinrich-Barth-Institute
MAN	Museums Association of Namibia
Namdeb	Namibia Diamond Corporation
NHC	National Heritage Council
NMC	National Monuments Council
NMN	National Museum of Namibia
NMMZ	National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe
NQA	Namibia Qualifications Authority
NQF	Namibian Qualifications Frame work
NUF	Namibia Underwater Federation
QRS	Quaternary Research Services
SA3	Southern African Association of Archaeologists
SAfA	Society of Africanist Archaeologists
SAHRA	South African Heritage resources Agency
SASQUA	Southern African Society for Quaternary Research
SWA	South West Africa
TUCSIN	The University Centre for Studies in Namibia
UCT	University of Cape Town
UNAM	University of Namibia
WAHS`	Welwitschia Archaeological and Heritage Solutions

Table of Contents

Introduction

This is a study of the history of different manifestations of archaeology in Namibia, as practice, as discipline and as heritage. It is located in the history of collecting disciplines and institutions such as archives, botanical gardens and museums, and it also belongs to the study of heritage conservation. The dissertation investigates the history of archaeological practice in Namibia as a source of scientific information. It re-examines the idea of archaeology as a scientific and objective discipline that seeks its validation from material culture of the past and of local communities. Archaeology in Namibia developed in settings of deep and multiple colonialisms. Each colonial period in Namibia resulted in some particular archaeology being introduced and practiced. However, there were also some overlaps in the way archaeological research was mobilised, conducted and managed as part of colonialism as control and governance. Colonial archaeology involved knowledge practices of the land and of landscape, such as mapping, collecting animal and plant species as well as artefacts of nature and culture.

A common characteristic of archaeological practice that permeated through the colonial period and the first three decades of independence in Namibia was it had the consequence of alienating local communities, and thus acquired an association of dispossession. Archaeologists were interested in the sites and artefacts but not the knowledge systems of the indigenous communities that also interpreted the artefacts. The major consequence of colonial archaeology was that it produced a narrative of Namibia as a territory that was frozen in the Stone Age. Archaeological resources management on the other hand resulted in dispossession of land and cultural resources.

This dissertation is a contribution to the fields of disciplinary history or archaeology and heritage studies as knowledge fields in Namibia. It problematises the use of archaeology as a discipline of knowing about the land and economic resources as part of the extension of empire and governance over the people. The deep and multiple colonialisms that Namibia experienced had an effect that some archaeologies such as those practiced by indigenous communities were dismissed as unscientific. Such archaeologies were excluded from practice and overshadowed by professional and academic archaeologies. There is therefore a need for a new postcolonial archaeological approach that takes into account the communities and can be relevant to national development programmes.

In this dissertation, I interrogate the political, social and academic settings that resulted in the emergence of multiple archaeologies. It is important to analyse such settings when studying a history of a discipline because the entanglements of such settings shaped the practice of archaeology, and as Renfrew and Bahn aptly observed: 'every view of the past is a product of its own time.'[1] In the case of political setting I argue that the mapping of sites, documentation and collection of artefacts as a practice in knowledge production was significant as a form of accumulating information about the land and its resources. This made archaeology a convenient discipline of colonialism. It is not surprising that archaeology developed in close association with the political field and its supporters included politicians such as Jan Smuts the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa and the South West Africa Administration. The colonial settings in which archaeological practices developed in Namibia resulted in distinct archaeologies. The different archaeologies were influenced by the multiple metropoles that controlled research and

[1] C. Renfrew and P. Bahn, *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991), 17.

collection at the time the discipline was introduced. The creation of the independent Namibian state did not bring much change since different archaeologies continued to thrive and more metropoles entered the arena of archaeological research.

The development of archaeology in Namibia occurred as a result of networks between individuals and institutions and these connections determined the type of archaeological practice that was dominant during different colonial periods. German archaeology was closely associated with the University of Cologne and in this association, the discipline manifested itself as empirical. German archaeology presented itself as objective science that did not attempt to interpret the archaeological artefacts. Meticulous documentation of rock art and its contextual information has been the chief feature of German archaeology in Namibia. The consequence of this approach was the scientisation of archaeology and the professionalisation of amateur archaeologists such as Harald Pager.[2] This approach also resulted in the alienation of local communities which lived near rock art sites such as the Brandberg. Empirical archaeology did not attempt to understand how such communities perceived the imprints, marks and artefacts of sites, including rock art.

South African archaeology was introduced in Namibia as part of the process of the pacification of the territory as part of the South African empire. At its onset South African archaeology in Namibia was mainly associated with the work of the Archaeological Survey in Pretoria and later was closely connected to the University of the Witwatersrand through the Rock Art Research Institute. The impact of South African archaeology in Namibia was experienced mainly in the field of heritage resources management. During the South African administration, the National Monuments Council's location in

[2] T. Lenssen-Erz, *Tides of the Desert*, (Cologne: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 2002), 549-558.

Windhoek was a regional office of the South African National Monuments Council's Cape Town Branch. I examine the interconnection between the two offices and contend that they reproduced asymmetrical power relations between South Africa and Namibia that was appropriate to a colonial order. Relations between professional archaeologists and their black field assistants during research at sites in Namibia reflected the inequalities that characterised apartheid. The management of the archaeological sites during the South African period resulted in the dispossession of indigenous communities as sites were declared national monuments. German archaeology on the other hand continued to thrive during the South African colonial period partly due to the close links that were maintained between the two countries.[3] In addition to the close links, German archaeology did not engage in the politics of the South African occupation of Namibia. Germany practiced 'apolitical' archaeology and hence was not considered as a threat to South African colonialism.

In the historiography of archaeological practices in Namibia, Sandelowsky offered a basic history of archaeological practice in Namibia based on her autobiography.[4] Kinahan on the other hand presented a critique of German archaeology in Namibia.[5] However there is no thorough scholarly critique of the history of archaeologies in Namibia that interrogates the institutional and political settings in which archaeology emerged. Therefore, this study will concentrate on producing a critical analysis and history of archaeological practice in Namibia as an original contribution to the field of cultural history and heritage

[3] J. Kinahan, 'Traumland Südwest: Two Moments in the History of German Archaeological Inquiry in Namibia', in H. Härke (ed.) *Archaeology, Ideology and Society. The German Experience* (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main, 2002), 356-377.
[4] B. Sandelowsky, *Archaeologically yours: A personal journey into the prehistory of Southern Africa* (Windhoek: Namibia Scientific Society, 2004).
[5] J. Kinahan, 'Theory, Practice and Criticism in the History of Namibian Archaeology', in P. Ucko (ed), *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective* (London: Routledge, 1995), 77-95.

in Namibia. I examine the political and institutional structures that gave rise to the various archaeologies that were practiced in Namibia.

This dissertation is also located within the field of decolonising archaeological practice. Archaeology was partly responsible for developing some of the imbalances and exclusionary structures of colonialism. It continued to be practised in this way when Namibia became independent, through the same methodologies of recording and analysing artefacts being followed, without concerning itself with the daily struggles of the local communities. I want to argue that this was a form of coloniality. Thus a decolonised archaeological practice should focus on new inclusive methods of knowledge production so that the power imbalances are corrected.

As an independent African state, Namibia needs a transformed archaeology. Amateurs have continued to practice in Namibia archaeology while their counterparts in South Africa were compelled to stop due to strict legislation and the rigorous demands that came with the scientisation of the discipline. The transition of archaeology from a practice that was dominated by amateurs to one that was professionalised and academic did not take place in Namibia. Before independence in Namibia the amateur archaeologists preserved their domain of archaeological practice through occupying strategic positions in the then National Monuments Council. State institutions of heritage management promoted the continuation of amateur archaeology after the attainment of independence. The amateur archaeologists sustained their dominance in the practice of archaeology through transactions with the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council that included entering into memoranda of agreement. The consequence of the dominance of amateurs in Namibia has been the perpetuation of whiteness in

archaeology. Through the practice of recording the landscape and artefacts the amateurs maintained the structures of colonialism that excluded black people from practicing. Amateurs maintained connections with the metropoles of archaeology through submitting regular reports of their 'discoveries' to academic and heritage institutions in Germany and South Africa. In return metropolitan archaeologists required those amateurs to facilitate their entry and work in Namibia. The effect of these connections was that the character of archaeology in Namibian remained colonial, while giving an impression of neutrality.

A decolonised archaeology also widens the focus to include epochs of archaeology that were originally omitted in Namibia. In the case of Namibia, the decolonisation of archaeology would mean extending the practice to geographical locations such as the north and north eastern Namibia. A decolonised archaeology challenges what Mills described as 'traditions of disciplinary knowledge and practice'.[6] I argue in this dissertation that decolonising archaeology in Namibia entails making archaeological sites, artefacts and research results usable to the local communities. Decolonisation is a process of breaking down the structures of colonialism that promoted the exclusion of indigenous practices and knowledges from mainstream archaeology in Namibia.

This study made use of research materials from various archives in Africa and Europe. The main approach was to recognise that archives were themselves artefacts that were created in particular political and institutional settings. Six different archives that are located in Namibia, South Africa, Germany and Switzerland were consulted during the course of this study. The archives were from Iziko Museums in Cape Town, the South

[6] D. Mills, *Difficult Folk? A Political History of Social Anthropology* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010), 11.

African Heritage Resources Agency in Cape Town, the National Museum of Namibia, the National Archives of Namibia, the Namibia Scientific Society, the Basler Afrika Bibliographien and the Heinrich-Barth-Institute at the University of Cologne. Some of the materials in archival holdings such as those from the National Museum of Namibia and the Heinrich-Barth Institute were not yet catalogued. Thus, I had to develop my own system of citing them. Material from the archives that I consulted generally demonstrated that archaeology in Namibia emerged in circumstances that demanded negotiation of contested interests. I also conducted interviews with both academic, professional and amateur archaeologists in Germany and Namibia. In cases where I could not conduct interviews, I used the email to contact archaeologists who responded to my questions regarding their work as in Namibia.

Research for this dissertation developed from my experience in practising and teaching archaeology in Namibia. I worked as the curator of archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia and in the academic field, I have been teaching the archaeology modules in the History Section of the Department of Geography, History and Environmental Studies at the University of Namibia. I was involved in some of the archaeological projects and processes that are described in this dissertation. I have been interested in the history of archaeology as practised in different settings. I have a particular interest in circumstances that are marked by deep colonialism. Archaeology is a practice of the collection of artefacts, mapping the landscape, and researching its markings and traces, and is part of settlement and occupation of land. Therefore, I am interested in the history and practices of excavating and collecting artefacts and how such activities have been organised, institutionalised, professionalised and regulated. My academic interest is in understanding

the different ways in which narratives and arguments about societies and their material cultures were made based on archaeological research.

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter One examines the global origins of the archaeology in antiquarianism and the different approaches that have been used to make sense of mute artefacts and establish narratives of past human societies. I consider the shifts that have taken place in archaeological theory and explore the connection between such changes and the politics of archaeological knowledge production. In this chapter I also compare the development of the regional archaeologies of southern and western Africa and describe them in relation to the development of archaeologies in Namibia. I contextualise the origins of the discipline in the imperial and colonial processes of the late 19th and the 20th centuries and argue that the emergence of archaeology was directly connected to the formation of colonial political economies.

Chapter Two interrogates the history of archaeology in Namibia by contextualising the origins of the discipline in the practice of amateur archaeology. This chapter argues that archaeology was primarily built on the foundations of the work of supposed pioneers who had no formal training in the discipline. The 'pioneers' of archaeology in Namibia included colonial government officials, missionaries and individual enthusiasts such as farmers. In addition, institutions such as the Namibia Scientific Society were central in supporting and sustaining the practice of amateur archaeology. The chapter further argues that the introduction of archaeology in Namibia took a peculiar trajectory. While amateur archaeological practice was legally stopped in countries such as South Africa and Zimbabwe, in Namibia it continued to be the mainstay of discovery, documentation and preservation of archaeological sites and artefacts. Amateur archaeologists ensured that

they continued to practice despite the fact that the same regulations that were used to stop amateur practice in South African were applicable to Namibia. In this chapter I also examine the narrative of Namibian history that was developed through amateur archaeology. The chapter ends by presenting the argument that 'pioneer' archaeology in Namibia was legitimised, authorised and maintained through webs of networks of influential political figures, academic institutions and heritage management agencies.

Chapter Three uses moments in the history of archaeological research of the Brandberg Mountain to interrogate the construction and transmission of archaeological knowledge that was generated by professionalised archaeology, as well as the power that came with professional archaeological practice. It is concerned with the rise of professionalised archaeology in Namibia through the entanglements of German, French and South African metropoles. The chapter uses the Maack shelter of the Tsisab ravine also known as the "White lady" shelter to understand the institutional settings of archaeological projects and how such settings led to the emergence of a professionalised form of archaeology in Namibia. The chapter argues that professional archaeology manifested itself as a discipline of alienation of indigenous communities and professional protectionism. Namibia provided a field for extraction of archaeological resources, mainly by outside professionals and was not developed as site that was based on local expertise or local centres of theory development. The chapter further argues that the discovery of the White lady is central to the development of archaeology in Namibia.

In Chapter Four, I examine the practice of contract archaeology in Namibia as it emerged in response to shifts in the local and international legislation regarding environmental impact assessments. These laws, policies and regulations made it mandatory for

developers to conduct pre-development environmental impact assessments. I argue that the emergence and practice of contract archaeology in Namibia was symbiotically connected to the politics and economics of environmental impact assessment. Through the example of the Oranjemund Shipwreck excavations, I demonstrate that the practice of contract archaeology in Namibia alienated local expertise from participating in knowledge production. Contract archaeology emerged in circumstances that resulted in the protection of the practice by an elite of professionals. The consequence of these developments was the exploitation of Namibia as a centre of the commercialisation of archaeological practice and not a centre of knowledge production. I further argue in this chapter that the over-emphasis on contract archaeology as the mitigation of development by archaeology as a business had the consequence of undermining any possibility of scholarly archaeological education. The chapter further examines institutional structures including regulations that were used to control contract archaeology.

Chapter Five explores the historical roles and examines the entanglements of the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council with South African experts in controlling the practice of archaeology in independent Namibia. I use the case of the Dâureb Mountain Guides to examine these entanglements. I argue that bureaucratisation of the administration of archaeology has posed obstacles for any ideas of a democratised archaeological space in Namibia. The chapter also analyses the forms of archaeological governance in Namibia. It examines the nexus between state bureaucracy and community initiatives in the administration of archaeology. I contend that through collecting, interpreting and in managing archaeological heritage, the work of the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council had the effect of enlarging and supporting a knowledge order which has been referred to as the South African empire. The chapter

also examines how the practice of archaeology as cultural resources management perpetuated coloniality through land dispossession and dehistoricising indigenous communities that resided close to major archaeological sites.

I conclude the dissertation by proposing a postcolonial archaeological practice that I call postarchaeocentric. A postarchaeocentric archaeological approach raises critical questions about the socio-political and economic contexts in which artefacts were collected, analysed and disseminated as knowledge. It recognises that archaeology is inherently a social and political practice and hence cannot afford to avoid critical questions about the nexus between contemporary society and archaeological practice. New archaeologies are manifesting themselves in the form of the use of archives and collaborative projects with local communities. Such approaches question early interpretations and bring archaeology to the public domain. Alternative archaeologies have to be fostered if the discipline is to be relevant to the national development plans of Namibia. The postarchaeocentric approach questions the role of archaeology in a postcolonial society. It seeks to reimagine archaeology as a social project which places the knowledges and ways of knowing of indigenous people and local communities at the centre of archaeological practice.

Chapter One

Archaeologies, old and new

Introduction

This chapter outlines the history of archaeology in different parts of the world. It considers the origins of the discipline in antiquarianism and the different approaches that have been used to make sense of mute artefacts and established narratives of past human societies. Furthermore, it critically interrogates the place of archaeology in the knowledge production project in the contexts of colonialism in southern Africa in general and multiple colonialisms in the particular case of Namibia. I consider the shifts that have taken place in archaeological practice and explore the connection between such changes and the politics of archaeological knowledge production. In this chapter, I also consider the development of the regional archaeologies of southern and West Africa and describe them in relation to the development of archaeologies in Namibia, which I argue took place in similar circumstances of multiple colonialisms and multiple metropoles.

The history of archaeology in Namibia and southern Africa has been written from different perspectives. Most of it has focused on specific collections, or focused on a particular period, and even how names were assigned to different periods.[7] In the historiography of archaeological practices in Namibia, Beatrice Sandelowsky has offered a basic history of archaeological practice in Namibia based on her autobiography.[8] John Kinahan on the other

[7] P. Mitchell, 'The South African Stone Age in the Collections of the British Museum: Content, History and Significance', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 53, 167 (1998), 26-36, presents a history of the South African Stone Age collections of the British Museum. Such as study provided some information on the history of the development of archaeology in South Africa, mainly by focusing on the biographies of the early collectors.

[8] B. Sandelowsky, *Archaeologically yours: A Personal Journey into the Prehistory of Southern Africa* (Windhoek: Namibia Scientific Society, 2004).

hand has presented an overview of the different approaches of archaeological practice in Namibia.[9] Elsewhere, Kinahan offered a concise synthesis of archaeological research in Namibia up to independence in 1990.[10] More recently, Alma Nankela has provided a useful synopsis of archaeological research in the form of a history of scholarship on Namibian rock art over the past 50 years.[11]

This chapter departs from the common approach through a critical assessment of the institutional and governmental settings in which archaeology was established and developed in Namibia. In this evaluation, I argue that Namibian archaeological development was entangled with the history of expansionism and colonialism. Thus, archaeology was practiced and imposed in ways that alienated some constituencies and it was selective in what could be studied, by theme, period and geographical area. In this case, alienation was not only thematic. It was also geographic. Archaeology tended to be restricted to the region below the red line, and communities in areas to the north largely had no relationship with this discipline. And below the red line, in general, black communities were not involved in the archaeological activities that were the preserve of whites and foreigners.[12] Understanding these dynamics is important for any project that seeks to change and decolonise archaeological practice in Namibia. Just as the colonial economy was extractive, so was archaeological practice. Namibia developed as and remained a field for extracting material culture and did not develop as a centre for knowledge production.

[9] J. Kinahan, 'Theory, Practice and Criticism in the History of Namibian Archaeology', in Peter Ucko (ed), *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective* (London: Routledge, 1995), 77-95.
[10] J. Kinahan, 'From the Beginning: The Archaeological Evidence', in M. Wallace with J. Kinahan, *A History of Namibia: from the Beginning to 1990* (London: Hurst, 2011), 15-43.
[11] A. M. Nankela, 'Rock Art Research in Namibia: A Synopsis', *Africana Studia*, 24, 1 (2015), 35-55.
[12] The red line was veterinary cordon that was initially constructed to control the spread of Rinderpest in the colony. It however ended up being used to control the mobility of people; see G. Miescher, *Namibia's Red Line, the History of a Veterinary Settlement Border* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Archaeology was not developed as an institutionalised discipline in Namibia because the metropoles that were involved in archaeological research became and remained the centres of knowledge production in an asymmetrical knowledge relationship. Namibia remained constituted as the field and as the periphery of data extraction, in a relationship of underdevelopment. Where some semblance of institutionalisation took place, it was part of the apartheid colonial practice where the official heritage agencies in relation to which archaeology was practiced, such as the National Monuments Council and the Department of Education, were extensions of the South African state. The effect of this was that archaeological knowledge on the part of local communities was suppressed and viewed as unscientific.[13] Furthermore, over the long term, this resulted substantially in a marked shortage of black archaeologists and an absence of archaeology education programmes in Namibian universities after independence.

After independence, the coloniality of archaeological practice was maintained and reproduced in Namibia even in the establishment of national agencies such as the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council of Namibia. These national heritage institutions continued to rely on the colonial metropoles for expertise and legal frameworks required for archaeological practice. In this chapter, I give an overview of the emergence of archaeology from its antiquarian background in Mediaeval Europe to its export to African societies through imperial expansion and settler colonialism.

[13] In 1953, the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, Hendrik Verwoerd, presented his infamous vision of South African Bantu Education system in which he clearly spelled out the level to which the Africans could be educated under the apartheid regime saying: "I just want to remind the Honourable Members of Parliament that if the native in South Africa is being taught to expect that he will lead his adult life under the policy of equal rights, he is making a big mistake. The native must not be subject to a school system which draws him away from his own community, and misleads him by showing him the green pastures of European society in which he is not allowed to graze." 'Apartheid Education', available at http://newlearningonline.com/new-learning/chapter-5/apartheid-education, retrieved 19 May 2019.

Early signs of archaeology

Archaeology emerged as a subject of discovery and of ordering these discoveries through the classification of material culture. In a way, archaeology aimed at making sense of the human past, including economic, political, and social achievements. The origins of archaeology lie in the collections of curiosities by 'learned men' of the Middle Ages in Europe, and such collections were not limited to material culture only. At this time the collectors were enthusiasts, not specialists. Both cultural objects and natural specimens were collected and held in cabinets of curiosity. There was no clear disciplinary distinction. From the 19th century, natural scientists collected artefacts that became described as archaeological while cultural scholars collected natural specimens as well. Archaeology became a specific discipline through standardisation of methodology and through a process of scientisation that sought to place the scientist-archaeologist at the centre of collecting and research.

Colin Renfrew and Paul Bahn distinguished archaeology from earlier practices of discovery and collecting for rarity and curiosity. They argued that archaeology was distinct because it was methodological and it followed a scientific process that involved data collection and analysis.[14] The interpretation of archaeological data usually followed research questions and was based on some theoretical framework. Archaeology in this case can be viewed as research of past human societies, which is based on material culture left behind after the given societies disappeared. This perspective assumed that there were specific research questions with which the archaeologists approached their subject. Such an approach differed significantly from those of antiquarian collectors, whose primary goal was to collect unusual artefacts purely for purposes of fascination and presentation, while the prime 'scientific' aim

[14] C. Renfrew and P. Bahn, *Archaeology*: *Theories, Methods and Practice* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991).

of archaeology was to explain what a society was, how it had developed and how it could be distinguished as an identifiable culture.

Archaeology's prehistory lies in antiquarianism, and the long fascination that its practitioners had for societies and people that preceded them, which gave rise to practices of collecting, displaying, storing, and sometimes studying objects from the past, with the purpose of satisfying human curiosity and collecting and displaying rarity. Sometimes, this antiquarianism also involved rudimentary excavation, and some effort at making objects presentable, that might even be thought of as proto-restoration. During the 18th century, some of the first signs of archaeology occurred in the setting of exploration by Europeans, such as Giovanni Battista Belzoni, the Italian showman-turned-explorer and early hydraulics expert, who skilfully removed significant large Egyptian antiquities, and shipped them to England, where they entered the collection of the British Museum.[15]

During this period, the antiquarians practiced culture-historic archaeology, which stressed the classification of societies according to their material culture. When applied to southern Africa later, at the onset of colonialism, culture-historic archaeology functioned to locate communities by tribe and to place groups into prehistory. In some cases, it was used to define the antiquity of some communities such as the San and to classify them as primitive. The practice of culture-historic archaeology provided a justification for colonisation. This was the dominant archaeological theory until the introduction of the processual archaeological theory from the late 1950s.[16]

[15] https://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/collections/egypt/collectionhistory/Belzoni, retrieved 27 February 2020.
[16] B. Trigger, *A history of Archaeological Thought*, 2nd ed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).

From 1958 onwards, a new approach to archaeology called processual archaeology was developed, and this was likely the first time when archaeologists broke rank from antiquarians, and their collecting for curiosity purposes. A new idea that archaeology was a branch of anthropology was introduced and in this case archaeology became part of the study of people and their cultures. Archaeology departed from the practice of collecting interesting and beautiful artefacts. Some interpretations concerning cultures were developed. Processual archaeology dominated archaeological research as the theoretical framework with which archaeologists worked for almost twenty years from the 1960s. It was known as the new archaeology and it argued that archaeological knowledge was factual and that only statements that derived from observable units of analysis which were empirical could be perceived as meaningful. Processual archaeology was a philosophical ethos upon which scientific archaeology in Namibia was instituted. The application of processual archaeology in Namibia by the Forschungsstelle Afrika at the University of Cologne resulted in a distinct archaeological approach that David Lewis-Williams called the 'Cologne school'. [17] Lewis Williams had challenged the 'Cologne school' and argued that it was inadequate for the purposes of understanding material culture such as San rock art.

One site in Namibia where processual archaeology was intensively practised by the Forschungsstelle Afrika was the Brandberg Mountain, where the Cologne research project was located from 1963 until the post-independence period. The Cologne archaeology project in Namibia was to be defined by empirical documentation of rock art. The project started as the work of supporting of Ernst Rudolf Scherz who had documented rock art in Namibia as amateur archaeologist. Scherz had gone to the Forschungsstelle Afrika in 1962 to request for

[17] J. D. Lewis-Williams, 'Documentation, Analysis and Interpretation: Dilemmas in Rock Art Research: The Rock Paintings of the Upper Brandberg. Part I: Amis Gorge by H. Pager', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 45,152.

financial support to continue with his documentation of rock art in Namibia. In addition to seeking financial support, Scherz also requested support in publishing his tracings.[18] The work of documenting the rock art of the Brandberg was continued by Harald Pager from 1977 when Scherz retired from documenting the rock art.[19]

The empiricist approach was heavily criticised by Lewis-Williams who argued that it treated rock art as neutral data and perceived the process of recording and documentation as unaffected by the researcher.[20] I take this argument further and argue that the empirical resulted in an archaeological practice that perceive archaeology as a discipline of social history.

The empirical approach viewed archaeological artefacts such as rock art as purely scientific objects that were neutral and could not be used to produce interpretive models unless they were analysed through some computation. The empirical approach was viewed as useful for excluding bias and subjectivity in studying a cultural system that was viewed as having disappeared a long time ago.[21] The introduction of archaeology as a science in Namibia,

[18] G. Gwasira, Interview with R. Kuper, Cologne, 8 April, 2016.
[19] T. Lenssen-Erz, *Tides of the Desert* (Cologne: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 2001).
[20] J. D. Lewis-Williams, 'Documentation, Analysis and Interpretation: Dilemmas in Rock Art Research: The Rock Paintings of the Upper Brandberg. Part I: Amis Gorge by H. Pager', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 45,152 (1990), 126-136; Lenssen-Erz and Kuper defended their empirical approach as a scientific practice: T, Lenssen-Erz, 'Jumping about: springbok in the Brandberg rock paintings and in the Bleek and Lloyd collection. An attempt at a correlation', *Contested images: Diversity in southern African rock art research* (1994), 275-291; H. Pager, *The rock paintings of the upper Brandberg, part II: Hungarob Gorge. Vol. 4* (Cologne: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 1993). In a different conversation Lenssen-Erz provided a justification of the empirical approach by noting that 'The empirical approach values mainly the rock art itself: such an approach aims at defining criteria according to which every single element in the art is given an equal "chance" to provide input for analysis, or rather and in the first place, to be systematically and understandably listed and filed as part of ancient people's world views at all…we prioritise a certain trend of western science which in itself feeds back into the re-appropriation of rock art by local communities…everything is based on authoritative interpretations of statements that people made who have died long ago and were not interviewed as to whether these interpretations a right (sic).' Tilman Lenssen-Erz, email to Goodman Gwasira, June, 20, 2018.
[21] It is generally postulated that rock art execution in Namibia could have stopped about 1000 years ago, when pastoral communities appear in the archaeological record of Namibia. *World Heritage Committee inscribes two natural, one mixed, and four cultural sites onto UNESCO's World Heritage List* available at http://whc.unesco.org/en/news/359, retrieved 27 February 2019.

therefore took place in circumstance of exclusion. The knowledge of the local communities that lived near the sites over a long period of time was viewed as inadequate for the production of alternative models for interpretation. I argue therefore that the introduction of a scientised archaeological practice had an effect of alienating and disempowering local communities. Local communities were alienated from their cultural narratives and cultural resources.

We can argue that processual archaeology was introduced in Namibia as a colonial science According to Shepherd it was the nature of colonial sciences to produce narratives that were based on the rejection of the "notion that knowledge is constructed within cultural, political, and economic contexts."[22] The Cologne archaeological project produced inventories of archaeological sites from the Brandberg Mountain that did consider the existence of knowledge about archaeology amongst the local people who lived at the Brandberg or near the site. The archaeology that was practiced by the Forschungsstelle Afrika in Namibia was not socially or politically engaging. The effect that this kind of processual archaeology as was practiced by the Forschungsstelle Afrika had was that it dehistoricised local communities by detaching them from the points of reference of their pasts.

The debate regarding the methodology of studying rock art in Namibia further underscored the position of Namibia as a field site for the colonial metropoles. Both Germany and South Africa were colonial authorities in Namibia, before and after the First World War, respectively. Archaeologists from both countries were not able to view Namibia as potential centre of knowledge production. Namibia was a battle ground for the development of 'scientific' methods and interpretations that distinguished the two distinct schools of rock art

[22] N. Shepherd, 'The politics of archaeology in Africa', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 31 (2002), 190.

research that were respectively associated with the University of the Witwatersrand and the University of Cologne.[23] The Cologne school became synonymous with empirical documentation of rock art while the University of the Witwatersrand's approach to rock art research was defined by the application of ethnographic interpretations. Namibia, the settler colony, was a battlefield for ideology and methodology.

Processual archaeology scientised the practice of archaeology by bringing in tools and methodologies that were used in other scientific disciplines such as physics and chemistry. However, processual archaeology, focused mainly on human adaptation to environmental conditions, was perceived to be insufficient for explaining human cultural change. Therefore, in response to the understanding that processual archaeology was an inadequate approach, post-processual archaeology was developed as an alternative theoretical framework.[24]

From the 1980s onwards, the post-processual approach was developed and adopted in archaeological research. Post-processual archaeologists argued that the biases of the researcher had an influence on the conclusions that were reached. Researchers inadvertently imposed their biases on the interpretations and narratives that they developed. Post-processual archaeology took into account the fact that archaeology was inherently political and thus exclusion of social histories further oppressed ordinary people. Shepherd suggested that post-processual archaeology was not about presenting an alternative methodology to processual archaeology. Instead, there were multiple archaeologies that were marked by multiple methodologies.[25]

[23] J. D. Lewis-Williams, 'Documentation, Analysis and Interpretation: Dilemmas in Rock Art Research: The Rock Paintings of the Upper Brandberg. Part I: Amis Gorge by H. Pager', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 45, 152 (1990), 126-136.
[24] C. Renfrew and P. Bahn, *Archaeology*: *Theories, Methods and Practice* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991).
[25] N. Shepherd, 'Archaeology and Postcolonialism in South Africa: The Theory Practice and Politics of Archaeology after Apartheid' (PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, 1998); N. Shepherd, 'State of the

Despite the changes in archaeological theory the practice of archaeology in settler colonies such as Namibia largely remained colonial. Archaeology provided a way of strengthening colonial order by governing people. In Namibia, archaeology was a field of claiming the land through a notion of discovery, and through settlement and occupation of the land. Colonialism also involved knowledge practices of the land and of landscape, such as mapping, assembling animal and plant species as well as collecting artefacts of nature and culture. Archaeologists who practiced in Namibia continued to conduct their research without paying attention to the colonial history of the discipline.

John Kinahan, the former curator of archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia and a leading authority of the archaeology of Namibia, was an exception. Kinahan interrogated the development of colonial archaeology in Namibia and argued that there was ideological continuity in the practice of German archaeology in Namibia.[26] Kinahan challenged the perception that Africans could not change without external stimuli when he proposed that internal shifts in the hunter-gatherer economy resulted in the development of a hunter-herder economy in Namibia.[27] The history of archaeology in Namibia, which, had its origins in race sciences mirrored the emergence of the discipline in the rest of southern Africa.

The development of archaeology in Southern Africa

The history of archaeology in southern Africa has been presented as having started in 1857 when Thomas Holden Bowker encountered some stone artefacts in the Fish River valley in

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

[26] J. Kinahan, 'Theory, Practice and Criticism in the History of Namibian Archaeology', in P. Ucko (ed.), *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective*, (London: Routledge, 1995), 77-95.

[27] J. Kinahan, *Pastoral Nomads of the Central Namib Desert: The People History Forgot* (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 1991).

South Africa.[28] However I contend that, long before colonialism, recognition occurred of the importance of archaeological sites as sources of historical narratives occurred. African communities managed archaeological sites such as graves, shrines and even stone-walled sites of significance. Community archaeological practices in southern Africa did not necessarily involve interpretations that were based on excavations of sealed sites. African societies developed narratives that were connected to or influenced by archaeological sites and artefacts that were found on the land.

The practice of archaeology by local African communities was demonstrated in the work of the Museums Association of Namibia (MAN) between 2010 and 2015. MAN embarked on a project that sought to address the colonial imbalance in the distribution of heritage sites in Namibia. The project known as the 'Heritage Hunt' focused mainly on regions that were not represented on the national monuments list before Namibia attained independence in 1990. MAN worked with local communities in identifying what the communities regarded as important heritage sites. Archaeological sites and their associated narratives were part of the heritage that the local communities had identified as important. In the Zambezi Region the 'Heritage Hunt' identified many archaeological sites including some clay pits that provided "evidence of pre-colonial brick-making in this region and were used to build the Kalolo settlement following their invasion of the region."[29]The precolonial clay mines and other archaeological artefacts such as clay pots and graves form part of the narratives of precolonial land occupation in the Zambezi region.

The introduction of archaeology into Namibia

[28] D. Underhill, 'A History of Stone Age Archaeological Study in South Africa', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 66, 193 (2011), 3-14.
[29] I. Haikaere, B. Kangumu and J. Silvester, 'Heritage Hunt Report for Caprivi Region' (Unpublished report, Museums Association of Namibia, 2010).

Archaeology was introduced in Namibia through a web of professional and academic networks that had connections to the metropoles that colonised the territory. The metropoles regarded their colonies such as Namibia as field laboratories for developing social paradigms of racial superiority. Archaeology was complicit in race studies since it tended to support claims made that a lack of complexity among African communities could be observed in the archaeological record. Rock art that appeared sophisticated was attributed to external origins such as having been created by Phoenicians or Mediterranean seafarers in the case of the White Lady frieze in the Brandberg Mountain.[30] Indigenous artists were generally viewed as lacking sophistication. When Colonel Imke Hoogenhout, one of the Administrators of South West Africa during the South African colonial period, saw a copy of the White Lady painting of the Brandberg he declared that "this is no bushmen art: this is great art."[31] Africans and especially the 'Bushmen' were viewed as incapable of producing sophisticated material culture. Rassool argued that the 'Bushmen' were subjects of racial sciences in southern Africa.[32] Therefore the 'Bushmen' were viewed as objects that could be used for studies. If archaeology was to emerge as a discipline for decolonisation in the postcolonial era there would be a need for an examination of the relations between archaeology of the 'Bushmen', colonial disciplines and the colonial administration.[33] However archaeology itself needed to be decolonised first. Decolonising archaeology would involve confronting the perception that human remains were archaeological objects that could be studied in the same way as archaeological artefacts such as stone tools.

[30] Breuil, H. The *White Lady of the Brandberg* (London: The Trianon Press, 1955)
[31] P. Bahn, *The Cambridge illustrated history of prehistoric art*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 62.
[32] C. Rassool, 'Human remains and the disciplines of the dead, and the South African memorial complex', in D.R. Peterson, K. Gavua and C. Rassool (eds.), *The Politics of Heritage in Africa, Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 133-156.
[33] M. Posnansky, 'Archaeology comes of age', *World Archaeology*, 13, 3 (1982), 345-358. In this article Posnansky argued that "The survival of hunter-gatherer peoples like the Bushmen, Hadza and the Ituri forest pygmies gave Africa an air of a laboratory where, humanity, like big game, persisted in an unchanged fashion in a stagnating cultural scene."

In addition to human remains, archaeology paid attention to sites and artefacts that belonged to the Stone Age because this was a period that was considered to be distant enough to be studied without being entangled in a political genealogy of the creators of the artefacts. Iron Age sites had the potential of yielding information that could have demonstrated that precolonial societies were complex and sedentary societies. Some Iron Age communities still existed in Namibia but their archaeology was sparsely researched. According to Kinahan, archaeology in Namibia developed in a political setting that was aimed at sustaining the view of the primeval and arrested development of the culture of African indigenous people.[34] Studying the Iron Age would have defeated the aim of presenting African as primitive since the material from Iron Age sites would have demonstrated that African societies had complex social, political and economic structures.

The introduction of archaeology happened as part of imperialism, colonial conquest, settler colonialism and a European fascination with the exoticism of Africa. There was a desire to collect information about natural resources of new unexplored lands. Some photographs of early archaeologists in Namibia such as Scherz bear testimony to the fact they collected more than archaeological artefacts. Archaeologists also collected information about the land and the people. In some of the images, Scherz could be seen collecting minerals and making ethnographic sound recordings of the San people singing.[35] We can argue that archaeological sites ceased to be locations where artefacts and bio-facts were neutral objects that could be

[34] J. Kinahan, 'Traumland Südwest: Two Moments in the History of German Archaeological Inquiry in Namibia' in H. Härke (ed.) *Archaeology, Ideology and Society. The German experience*, (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main, 2002), 356-377.
[35] PA 4. S09_004, PA 4.S09_005, BAB, photographs of Scherz collecting minerals; PA 4.S17_0291, PA 4. S17_0274, BAB, Scherz conducting ethnographic recordings among a group of San people.

collected. Archaeological sites were transformed into locations for collecting information that was useful to the colonisers in the work of ordering and governing people.

Archaeology was practiced by colonial officials such as settler administrators, army personnel, missionaries, traders, and others who were associated with the colonial system. However, it remained the exclusive domain of European male practitioners. Therefore, the introduction of archaeology reinforced the paternalistic and patriarchal attitudes of colonialism that excluded women and the black people. From the onset, archaeology in Namibia was introduced in settings that were deeply marked by class, race and gender. Archaeology was introduced as a practice of managing the colony and therefore the discipline paid a lot of attention on documenting and recording the land of the territory and its resources.

The history of archaeology was a history of establishing chronology and classifying cultures mainly based on stone artefacts because they were inorganic and usually survived the longest in the archaeological record. Whereas in most newly independent African countries there was a shift in archaeological interest from Stone Age to other periods such as the Iron Age, in Namibia interest in the focus on the Stone Age continued while interest in the Iron Age became diminished.

Archaeological research in Namibia focused on the classification of Palaeolithic artefacts through the documentation work of the Cologne archaeological project in the Brandberg Mountain. The Cologne archaeological project in Namibia began after the Second World War and this period could be viewed as the beginning of professional archaeology in Namibia. Firstly, the University of Cologne contracted a rock art enthusiast who had been validated

and legitimised by working with Abbé Henri Breuil from 1947, soon after the Second World War.[36]

According to Kuper, the attitude of Germans after the Second World War was not to have a permanent presence in its former colonies. Germany had lost its territories, including Namibia, and hence had no direct control of activities that could be established in the country.[37] South African had colonised Namibia thereafter, under a mandate, and therefore institutions of heritage management were controlled by South Africa. The Cologne archaeological project did not develop out of an interest in cultural studies but rather out of a fascination that Gustav Schwantes who was a professor of prehistory at the University of Cologne had with succulent plants. Schwantes had been introduced to the prehistory of then South West Africa by local farmers when he visited Namibia in search of succulent plants. One of the local succulents is named after him: the *Pleiospilos Nelii Schwantes.*

Schwantes instructed his student Schwabedissen, who had studied in Hamburg before the Second World War, to study the prehistory of Namibia, but Schwabadissen was not interested. It is clear that from its onset, the prehistory of Namibia was not a priority for German archaeologists. However, when Scherz visited Germany in 1962 he approached his brother-in-law Gentz, who worked for the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungs Gemeinschaft, DFG), with a request for financial assistance for his rock art documentation project. Gentz then referred Scherz to Herman Shwabedissen, who was by then the professor of prehistoric archaeology at the University of Cologne. Schwabedissen

[36] The Abbé Henri Breuil was an influential figure in the history of archaeology in Namibia. He was a French Catholic Priest and a Professor of Ethnology. Abbé Breuil was also responsible for the misnomer of the major prehistoric rock art frieze in Namibia that he named the White Lady of the Brandberg. He made the archaeology of Namibia widely known through his publications such as H, Breuil, The *White Lady of the Brandberg*, (London: The Trianon Press, 1955).
[37] G. Gwasira, Interview with R. Kuper, Cologne, 8 April, 2016.

felt obliged to assist Scherz with the application for funding to the DGF because his mentor Schwantes had ordered him to study the prehistory of Namibia. However, the project was to become multidisciplinary right from its inception. Schwabedissen sought the participation of Oswin Köhler, a linguist and ethnologist who had worked as an ethnologist in the South African-administered Department of Native affairs in the then South West Africa from 1954 to 1955. When Köhler was invited to be part of the new Cologne archaeology project in Namibia, he was working as a professor and the Director of Institut für Afrikanistik at the University of Cologne.[38] In addition to Köhler, Schwabedissen invited Helmut Petri, who was an ethnologist, to participate. Petri was a professor and the Director of the Institut für Ethnologie at the University of Cologne.[39] With the financial assistance from the DFG, Scherz documented rock art in Namibia until he retired in 1977. From 1978 The Forschungstelle Afrika hired Harald Pager who was a graphic designer from Austria to continue with the work of documenting the rock art of the Brandberg Mountain.[40]

Schwabedissen, Köhler and Petri initiated a collaboration between archaeology, ethnology and linguistics that was to define the University of Cologne's research programme in Namibia. The Cologne archaeology project was to last until 2005 when a conference that concluded the project was held in Windhoek. The conference was entitled 'A home coming of rock art'. The original tracings that Harald Pager traced were returned to Namibia and were stored at the National Archives of Namibia.[41] The original tracings and rock art photographs that were made by Scherz remained at the Forschungsstelle Afrika at the

[38] Namibiana Buchangebot, 'Oswin Köhler' available at https://www.namibiana.de/namibia-information/who-is-who/autoren/infos-zur-person/oswin-koehler.html, accessed 9 December 2020.
[39] R, Vogelsang and B Eichhorn, *Under the Mopane Tree, Holocene Settlement in Northern Namibia*, (Cologne: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 2011).
[40] T. Lenssen-Erz, *Tides of the Desert* (Cologne: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 2001).
[41] P. Smith, 'Namibian Rock Art Comes home'. *The Namibian Newspaper*, 14 April 2005 available at https://www.namibian.com.na/print.php?id=9919&type=2, accessed 8 December 2020.

University of Cologne. The multidisciplinary collaboration that was initiated by Schwabadissen, Köhler and Petri was to be replicated in another long term research project of the University of Cologne in Namibia called Arid Climate Adaptation and Cultural Innovation (ACACIA). The research results of ACACIA were converted into a Master of Arts degree programme called Culture and Environment in Africa which commenced in 2009 in Cologne. The programme provided opportunities for postgraduate studies for African scholars through the Nordrhein-Westfalen scholarship scheme. I was one of the first students who graduated in the CEA programme.

Two important characteristics of the Cologne archaeological research project in Namibia are that it emerged as a multidisciplinary approach and was a project. Its nature as a project meant that it was a temporary intervention which viewed Namibia as a field of extraction and not a site of expertise that is worthy of long-term investment in physical infrastructure for the development of the discipline. It also meant that Namibia was not viewed as a centre of knowledge production where local human resources could be developed. Archaeological sites in Namibia were not perceived as centres of knowledge engagement. Therefore, other forms of knowing and knowledge production that were based in local communities were excluded.

The Cologne archaeology project was more interested in recording and dating the rock art rather than understanding the meaning of rock art. A professional archaeologist was embedded in the project with the express task of excavating sites where Scherz worked in order to determine the age and chronology of the art. Archaeology made its claim through providing scientific evidence of the antiquity of the rock art. The Cologne rock art project

aimed at scientising the discipline "through the belief that archaeology is objective science."[42]

There was a link between the colonial administration and the emergence of archaeology in Namibia. Some spectacular discoveries were made during the colonial surveying of the land. Reinhardt Maack 'discovering' the White Lady of the Brandberg in 1918 while he was on a topographical surveying expedition.[43] Some other rock art sites in the same area of the Brandberg were 'discovered' by colonial officials such as Lieutenant Jochmann of the German Schutztruppe in 1909 and subsequently named after him as the Jochmannwandt. Other practitioners that were professionally connected to the German colonial administration in Namibia included geologist Reuning, who performed the first recorded archaeological excavation at the Groβe Spitzkoppe archaeological site in 1917.[44] During the South African colonial period in Namibia, there was a link between the colonial administration and the foreign archaeologists that came to work in the country. In some cases, the connection was at the highest level and facilitated the work of foreign archaeologists such as Abbé Breuil, who had a direct connection to the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, Jan Smuts.[45] During the colonial period, the Cologne rock art documentation project was the flagship of German archaeological activity in Namibia. After Pager's death, Rudolph Kuper and Peter Breuining from the Forschungsstelle Afrika at the University of Cologne went to retrieve

[42] J. Kinahan, 'Traumland Südwest: 'Two Moments in the History of German Archaeological Inquiry in Namibia', in H. Härke (ed.), *Archaeology, Ideology and Society. The German experience*, (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main 2002), 356-377.
[43] H. Breuil. 'The White Lady of Brandberg, South-West Africa, Her Companions and Her Guards', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 3, 9 (1948), 2-11.
[44] A Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia* (Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan, 2006).
[45] J. van der Poel, *Selections from the Smuts Papers, Volume vii, August 1945- October1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 160. In 1947 Smuts and Breuil wrote letters to each other; for example, on 5 September 1947 Breuil's assistant Mary Boyle wrote to thank General Smuts for his patronage: "My dear General before we leave South West Africa tomorrow to return to Johannesburg, the Abbé [Breuil] and I would like to thank you for having made it possible for us to realise our dream to see and study Our Lady of the Brandberg."

Pager's copies of the Brandberg that had been taken to the University of Stellenbosch in South Africa. It is worth noting at this point that Pager had elected not to deposit the copies in Namibia rather to deposit them in South Africa. It is generally argued that Pager was mindful of the revolution that was taking place in Namibia and hence was afraid that the copies could be damaged in the war. [46] However, South Africa itself was not peaceful at the time. The decision to deposit the copies in South Africa could have been influenced by the general attitude of German archaeologists to local institutions such as the State Museum that were in Namibia. In a letter to Jalma Rudner dated 9 June 1982, German archaeologist Wolfgang Wendt pointed at the bleak state of the Sate Museum by referring to the fact that 3 published pots were never accessioned in the museum and were consequently lost: "This is a short hint with regard to the desolate situation at the State Museum and the archaeology department in particular."[47] This was a clear indication that right from the onset of the introduction of archaeology in Namibia, the territory was not considered as a site of expertise rather it was perceived as a field form where archaeological evidence could be extracted and exported. There was a perception that Namibia was at the periphery of the metropoles of knowledge production such as Germany and South Africa. Specimens were exported to the metropoles and processed before being returned to Namibia as scientific and 'factual' information that could then be consumed by foreign tourists. Even in the post-independence era, such scientific knowledge that came from the metropoles was seen as useful for local guides to recite at archaeological sites such as the Brandberg and Twyfelfontein World Heritage site.[48]

[46] G. Gwasira, Interview with R. Kuper, Cologne, 8 April, 2016.
[47] W. Wendt in a letter to Jalma Rudner, 9 June, 1982, Rudner Archival Documentation, Archaeology Unit, Social History Collections Department, Iziko Museums of South Africa.
[48] In a private email Tilman Lenssen-Erz pointed to the contribution of scientists to the information that is used by local tour guides at sites such as the Brandberg and Twyfelfontein; "We prioritise a certain trend of western science which in itself feeds back into the re-appropriation of rock art by local communities. More bluntly: local guides at rock art sites (e.g. Twyfelfontein or Brandberg/Daureb) reproduce narratives that were developed by western scientists who have the power to make such views an accepted discourse (which is certainly not wrong but never were any indigenous people been directly involved in these approaches; everything is based on authoritative interpretations of statements that people made who have died long ago and were not interviewed as

It remains unchallenged that the development of archaeology in Namibia was symbiotically connected to the Cologne archaeological project in Africa. The Cologne project was validated by international connections. International professional archaeologists, of late mainly Africans, have used material at the Forschungsstelle Afrika at the University of Cologne for their research. To highlight this validation, most of the visiting researchers sign the wall of fame that is in the kitchen of the Forschungsstelle Afrika. In doing so, the scholars endorse the institution's existence as a metropole of rock art studies not only in Namibia but across Africa. The posters of rock art from the different African countries authenticate the institute as an international leader in the documentation of rock art.

Archaeology was introduced in Namibia under circumstances of colonialism. It was professionalised soon after the First World War through webs of professional, academic, and political networks. Unlike in other southern African countries, where archaeology was institutionalised, in Namibia it was introduced as a research project that had a specific life span. The unique characteristic of Namibia as a site of multiple colonialisms and also as a country that was colonised by South Africa meant that the policy of racial segregation and discrimination was applicable to Namibia. Other foreign countries that wished to carry out archaeological studies in Namibia were required to adhere to the laws of South Africa. Their permits were evaluated and issued by the National Monuments Council in Cape Town, South Africa. The consequence of adhering to South African laws was that archaeologists from Europe accepted South Africa's colonisation Namibia.

to whether these interpretations a right.)" G. Gwasira, interview with T. Lenssen-Erz, 8 April, 2016; T Lenssen-Erz, email to G Gwasira, June, 20, 2018.

The origins of archaeology in Namibia were closely connected to the benefits of colonialism and apartheid. It was practiced by those who were privileged by the apartheid system while excluding the majority who were black people. In fact, even amateur archaeology continued to be practiced by those who were enabled by the apartheid system. Another unique feature of the development of archaeology in Namibia is that the rise of professional archaeology did not signify the decline of amateur archaeology as was witnessed elsewhere in southern Africa. Amateur archaeologists in Namibia managed the colony through 'science'. The whiteness of archaeology in Namibia persisted after independence and had an effect of failing to develop a distinctive Namibian archaeology that was inclusive of the black communities. Archaeological research continued to be extensively conducted in the areas south of the red line.

Archaeology in Zimbabwe

Archaeology in Zimbabwe was introduced by early administrators and missionaries such as the Reverend Theodore Bent, who invoked the illusion that Great Zimbabwe was the work of external and non-African builders that he claimed were Phoenicians. Also, in the Zimbabwean case archaeology was introduced as a tool for colonial conquest: a tool that could be used to justify conquest through the derogation of the indigenous aptitude and in some cases censure of narratives that could be construed as foregrounding indigenous civilisation.[49] This opened up the land for colonial settlement under the pretext that there were no local civilisations that were indicative of a complex society before colonialism. In this case, archaeology functioned as a direct and immediate activity involved in the colonisation and opening up of land and territory and making it governable, knowable, and

[49] S. Katsamundanga and M. Manyanga. 'Introduction: Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-independence era', in M. Manyanga and S. Katsamundanga (eds.), *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-Independence Era*. (Harare: SAPES Books, 2013), 1-16.

collectable. Early archaeology in Zimbabwe was based on descriptions and concerns of chronology, which were aimed at reconstructing "past societies and social conditions of the past."[50] In the process, archaeology emerged as a discipline that could scientifically demonstrate the lack of local aptitude and that the territory had suffered an arrested development. This would in turn justify the colonisation of the territory. According to Katsamundanga and Manyanga, the "early colonialists saw archaeology as a vehicle through which they would understand African societies in order to effectively govern them."[51]

In the post-independence era Zimbabwean archaeology took on new value. It was perceived as an alternative source of information that could be used to augment archival sources. In this case, archaeology was viewed as an auxiliary subject within the larger discipline of History. Thus, archaeology emerged as a unit in the Department of History at the University of Zimbabwe because archaeology was perceived as a subject that could decolonise Zimbabwean history and develop as a politically acceptable narrative of the new nation of Zimbabwe in 1980. It provided methodologies that could be used to challenge the historical narratives and archival sources, which were themselves products of colonialism. In this sense, archaeology was viewed as having the potential to provide what Walter Mignolo has described as "epistemic disobedience."[52] Post-independence archaeology in Zimbabwe had different questions than colonial archaeology. It became immersed in questions concerning sites of knowledge production as well as questions of who had that knowledge: was it the scientists (expert) or was the knowledge found in local or indigenous systems of knowing?

[50] I. Pikirayi, 'Research Trends in Historical Archaeology on the Zimbabwe Plateau and Adjacent Margins', in G Pwiti (ed.), *Caves, Monuments and Texts: Zimbabwean Archaeology Today*. Studies in African Archaeology 14, (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1997), 143-159.
[51] S. Katsamudanga and M. Manyanga, 'Introduction: Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-Independence Era', in M. Manyanga and S. Katsamudanga (eds.), *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-Independence Era. (*Harare: SAPES Books, 2013), 1.
[52] W. Mignolo, 'Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and De-Colonial Freedom', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26, 7-8 (2009), 1-23.

Archival sources were viewed as reflecting opinions and attitudes of the privileged elite, who were mainly male and European. Archival sources were not balanced and hence archaeology was used as a counter approach that aimed at rewriting the history of Zimbabwe from a politically acceptable perspective, albeit a nationalist one. It was useful for contesting the primacy and dominance of the written record.[53]

Another major development in the history of archaeology in Zimbabwe was the shift from using archaeology for the purposes of generating an alternative voice in the history of the country to using archaeology for cultural resource management. Two more universities that offered archaeology were established from the mid-1990s. The Great Zimbabwe University was established near the World Heritage Monument of Great Zimbabwe in 1995; it offers a programme in archaeology, museums, and heritage studies in the school of Arts, Culture and Heritage Studies. The third university that offers archaeology in Zimbabwe is the Midlands State University that was established in 2000. Its archaeology programme is hosted in the Department of Archaeology, Cultural Heritage and Museum Studies. This signified a realisation of archaeology as a discipline that should go beyond concerns with chronologies and description of artefacts. Archaeology was viewed as having a major role in heritage management, which in turn was a development discipline. Cultural heritage was deeply located within local communities and archaeology in this case was viewed as a discipline that could contribute to social history. Most of the training that takes place in archaeology in Zimbabwe is in cultural resource management. There was a realisation that even though

[53] I. Pikirayi, 'Research trends in historical archaeology on the Zimbabwe plateau and Adjacent Margins', in G. Pwiti (ed.), *Caves, Monuments ad Texts: Zimbabwean Archaeology Today* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1997). In this chapter Pikirayi aptly explained the use of archaeology in the postcolonial period in Zimbabwe when he noted that "In Zimbabwe the programme of historical archaeology is set by history and the historical vision of the past. Not only are the materially based studies of archaeology regularly subordinated to those of the literary record but the entire conceptual framework of questions and evidence is restricted by historical concerns. There is no doubt that history as an academic discipline has gained a stronghold at the University of Zimbabwe, the colleges and in high schools at the expense of archaeology which is only regarded as part of the former."

formal heritage management programmes were in existence from 1914 in Zimbabwe, most of the programmes were unscientific and unethical.[54] An accelerated training programme in the area of cultural resources management in Zimbabwean universities that was in line with the nationalist approach to archaeology was consciously desired.

A revisionist programme in archaeology challenged what was orthodox and emphasised the importance of including and learning from local communities, especially those associated with major sites of spirituality such as the Great Zimbabwe. According to Pwiti, the main question that framed the new archaeology programme in post-independence Zimbabwe and that led to the emphasis on cultural resource management was "preservation for whom?"[55] During the colonial era local communities were either ignored or alienated from their archaeological sites on the argument that sites such as the Great Zimbabwe were not constructed by Africans and thus local communities were not relevant to the conservation and preservation of the sites. Therefore, the process of decolonising archaeology in Zimbabwe included decolonising the university syllabus and its methodologies. This resulted in university archaeology programmes that focused on cultural resources management.[56]

Cultural resource management became a prominent feature of the archaeology syllabus in Zimbabwe because of the realisation of the importance of archaeological studies in the nation building project after the territory attained independence in 1980. Archaeology developed a new role of restoration and inspiration of national pride. This led to a new archaeological

[54] G. Pwiti, 'Taking African Cultural Heritage Management into the Twenty-First Century: Zimbabwe's Masterplan for Cultural Heritage Management', *African Archaeological Review*, 2, 81 -83.
[55] Pwiti ibid.
[56] G. Pwiti, (ibid, 81) argued aptly that conservation programmes at archaeological sites were 'undertaken in a colonial context in which local communities were not seen as relevant because this particular aspect of their heritage was seen as not belonging to them. This was the state of affairs not only in Zimbabwe, and not only with regard to cultural heritage but to archaeological research as a whole on the African continent."

consciousness that resulted in in the development of university programmes that were not only academic and scientific but that also prepared graduates to be professional heritage managers that consider local communities in their work.

Zimbabwe falls within the Anglophone region of archaeology and as such experienced some localisation and institutionalisation of archaeology after the Second World War. Archaeology was practiced in institutions such as museums, antiquities departments, and universities in the Anglophone Africa. Thus, Zimbabwe like other Anglophone countries has a long history of the establishment of institutionalised archaeology. Namibia in contrast suffered the German attitude of not wanting to create permanent institutions but rather continued to view Africa as a field for mining raw data that was to be analysed in the metropoles.

Archaeology developed out of interest in 'Early Man Studies', and in the Namibian case it continued to be the focus of early archaeological research at the expense of knowing about the history of local and recent indigenous communities. This resulted in a narrative about Namibia which gives an impression of arrested development. A focus on other communities instead of Stone Age archaeology could have revealed complex societies, such as the Iron Age farming communities, and would have challenged the hegemonic view of Namibia.

Archaeology in Ghana

The University of Ghana has the oldest Department of Archaeology in sub-Saharan Africa, established in 1951, six years before Ghana attained its independence in 1957. From its inception at the University of Ghana, archaeology was offered as short courses and was more of a research unit than a department of archaeology. From 1963 onwards it became a

Department of Archaeology. This is a reflection of archaeology having been introduced in Africa not as a discipline that was intended to be institutionalised. The introduction of archaeology in Ghana resonated with that of Namibia, where it was not meant to be a university subject at its inception. It was only after independence that archaeology became an academic subject within the university in both countries. The Department of Archaeology at the University of Ghana underwent a refocusing in 2008, when it was renamed Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies. Before this refocusing, the practice of archaeology in Ghana can best be described as "a dead science that only sought matters that were past gone."[57] Such an archaeological practice was not relevant to the local communities and rarely included the local communities in research, interpretation, and in the presentation of results.[58] This realisation led to a refocus of the department's research to include areas that make archaeology a service discipline by including heritage studies. Combining archaeology and museum studies made the discipline of archaeology more relevant to newly independent African states because they could define their own heritage instead of having the nations' heritage agenda defined by the metropoles of archaeological research elsewhere outside the African continent. It made archaeology an applied science that functioned for the society and for nation building.

Archaeology in Zambia

The history of the development of archaeology in Zambia is similar to that of other southern African countries. It started as an amateur practice that gradually developed into a scientific

[57] K. Gavua said this in his address entitled 'Archaeology is crucial to national development.' He was addressing the Legon Archaeology Students Association (LASA) Symposium in October 2005 accessible at https://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/Archaeology-is-crucial-to-national-development-Gavua-92862#, retrieved 17 April 2019.

[58] K. Gavua and K. Nutor, 'Bringing Archaeology to the People: Towards a viable public archaeology in Ghana', in J, Anquandah, B. Kankpeyeng and W. Apoh (eds.), *Current Issues in the Archaeology of Ghana* (Legon-Accra: University of Ghana, 2014), 264-276.

discipline during the colonial period and eventually transformed into a practice of cultural resource management and a source of an alternative nationalist historical narrative of the independent nation. According to Musonda, the development of archaeology in Zambia materialised through four historical phases: the amateur, professional, expatriate, and indigenous stages.[59] The amateur period was characterised by collection of artefacts and other objects (cultural and natural) of curiosity, which was done mainly by colonial administrators and explorers. Musonda observed that the Zambian trajectory differed from other southern African countries in that amateur archaeology developed out of the interest of officials of the British South Africa Company (BSAC), who were more interested in mineral wealth than conquering the territory for political purposes. Thus between 1890 and 1911 there was very little activity in the archaeology of Zambia, since colonisation was not the prime focus of the BSAC. However, amateur archaeology was quickly replaced by colonial archaeology when the two Protectorates of Barotseland, North-Western Rhodesia and North-Eastern Rhodesia, were amalgamated into the Protectorate of Northern Rhodesia. From then, and specifically from 1924 when it became a British Government administered protectorate, trained archaeologists were contracted to research the territory. Musonda argued that this witnessed the beginning of professional archaeology in Zambia.[60] Musonda's third phase of the development of archaeology in Zambia commenced after the country attained independence in 1964 and manifested itself as a period of practice by expatriates mainly from the metropoles of Zambian archaeology, Britain, and the United States of America. Britain was a major contributor of expatriate archaeologists in Zambia because the country was a British Protectorate, while the United States of America and specifically Berkeley, California, had an enormous influence on the archaeology of Zambia through Desmond Clark, whose

[59] F. B. Musonda, '100 Years of Archaeological Research in Zambia: Changing Historical Perspectives', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 67, 195 (2012), 88-100.
[60] Ibid.

students followed in his footsteps by working in Zambia after independence. However, archaeological practice during the expatriate phase in Zambia remained greatly influenced by the two metropoles in terms of its focus, methodology, and interpretation.

One of Musonda's arguments about the expatriate archaeology in Zambia is that it was characterised by focusing on the same period of history as that which the predecessors did. For example, attention was paid to the Stone Age (which was Clark's period of interest) at the expense of the Iron Age. Musonda argued that the Iron Age was avoided because it has the potential to upset the colonial narrative by bringing archaeology closer to society, and this would have led to intellectual emancipation.[61] It can be argued therefore that in the early years of Zambian independence one can observe some coloniality in the practice of archaeology. This is demonstrated by the continued reliance on British and American expatriates in addition to the sustained focus on the Stone Age at the expense of Iron Age archaeology. Archaeology was useful for authenticating the colonial narrative of Zambia as a territory that was largely empty at the time of colonisation except for the existence of nomadic Stone Age people who had no fixed territory and did not possess a complex society. The Iron Age in this sense would not produce physical evidence of such antiquity that it could contribute to the history of 'mankind'.[62] Focus on Stone Age archaeology perpetuated the view that Africa "remained a kind of cultural Museum in which archaic traditions continued without contributing to the main course of human progress."[63]

[61] F. B. Musonda, '100 Years of Archaeological Research in Zambia: Changing Historical Perspectives, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 67, 195, (2012), 94.
[62] Musonda argued that "The antiquity of local history was rejected because it was contrary to the European opinion of the time. Africa was the last place to provide evidence to refute the accepted unilineal model for the development of human societies." (Ibid, 92).
[63] J. D. Clark, 'Human Behavioural Difference in South Africa during the Later Pleistocene', *American Anthropologist*, 73 (1971), 1211-36.

The importance of archaeology in reconstructing a fuller history of African states rather than focusing mainly on the human beginnings in Africa began to be realised in the 1950's as evidenced by a paradigm shift in countries such as Ghana and Zambia. Nationalist movements, especially after the attainment of the Ghanaian independence in 1957, began to consider archaeology as an alternative source of history. Archaeology was then viewed by nationalist movements as "having the ability to contribute to national identity in an emerging nation."[64] It can be argued that this was precisely why colonial archaeology officially omitted Iron Age archaeology: because it was too recent and there were too many similarities with the practices of the current Bantu speakers, which had a danger of authenticating the antiquity of the present populations of Iron Age farmers in southern Africa. Nationalist movements on the other hand were spearheaded by the Bantu speakers and some focus on the Iron Age challenged the idea that Africa remained uncivilised and with less complex societies. Nationalist movements used archaeology and particularly Iron Age archaeology to restore African dignity. In Zimbabwe, the national narrative was constructed on the Iron Age site of Great Zimbabwe and its satellite sites around Southern Africa. In Zambia, the Iron Age site of Ingobe Ilede became the prime site for evidence of complex Iron Age farming communities that were involved in long distance international trade long before the arrival of the British South Africa Company.

Archaeology in Zambia was initiated by the state. One can realise the direct involvement of the state through the work of Sir Hubert Young, the Governor of then Northern Rhodesia. Even when a professional archaeologist, Desmond Clark, came to work in Zambia, he started to work on the material that was kept at the magistrate's court. This shows that state control

[64] F. B. Musonda, '100 Years of Archaeological Research in Zambia: Changing Historical Perspectives, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 67, 195, (2012), 93.

of archaeological research and practice was enforced in Zambia in colonial time. In the post-independence period, the new nation state also controlled archaeology for a nationalist agenda. The development of archaeology in Zambia was symbiotically connected to expatriate practitioners and institutionalisation in the Museum and the National Heritage Conservation Commission. Institutionalisation of archaeology in Zambia happened through the work of the Livingstone Museum and the Heritage commission, and this resulted in the training of indigenous archaeologists in the early 1980s.

There are some points of similarity between the development of archaeology in Zambia and in Namibia. The archaeology of Zambia was scientised by James Desmond Clark from 1938, when he applied scientific methods of gathering, interpreting, and disseminating archaeological data. It appears that understanding stratigraphic contexts of artefacts was synonymous with being scientific. In this regard, the scientisation of archaeology was based on methodology borrowed from geology. Dating archaeology was also a sign of it being considered science. In Namibia, Erich Wolfgang Wendt was seconded to the Cologne project to make archaeological research in Namibia scientific by dating archaeological deposits of sites where there was rock art, while Ernst Rudolph Scherz continued to record the rock art. Iron Age archaeology was neglected in Namibia while much research during the colonial period focused on the Stone Age. The official argument for this omission in Namibia was that the areas where the Bantu speakers settled were war zones. However, 30 years after independence, Iron Age archaeology in Namibia still needed to be established.

The major difference in Namibia is that amateur archaeology continued to be the mainstream archaeological practice even after independence. In some cases, it combined with other archaeologies such as professional, expatriate and academic. Indigenous archaeology in

Namibia is still in its infancy. It is not a well-defined archaeology and is somewhat determined by expatriates who realise the need to be relevant to the national needs of Namibia, most prominent of which is capacity building. Archaeology was not institutionalised in Namibia. Even though there was a department of Archaeology at the then State Museum Windhoek (and now the National Museum of Namibia), it did not train indigenous archaeologists. In addition, it was part of the South African Department of Education and was not independent of the aspirations of the South African colonial government in Namibia.

Discussion and conclusion

The main argument of this chapter is that although the introduction of archaeology in Africa has its roots in settler colonialism, the practice itself did not settle during the colonial period. Its introduction was meant to establish a conduit for research to the metropoles. Archaeology was part and parcel of other disciplines of collection such as ethnology, anthropology, entomology and even botany. These were disciplines of assembling knowledge about the colony, and archaeology functioned to validate the knowledge through providing artefactual evidence. It was part of the disciplines that provided an assembly line for colonial knowledge about Africa. The process of redefining the practice to include museum and heritage studies gave archaeology *domicilium*, relevance and acceptance in post-independence African states.

The emergence of archaeology happened in a context of exoticism, imperialism, colonial conquest, and the desire to collect information about natural resources of new unexplored lands. Imperial expansion was justified through the pretext of civilising new nations. The information that was generated through archaeology was used to support apartheid in Namibia and to create indigenous minorities.

Archaeology has been about hunter-gatherer studies despite that there were some efforts to focus on pastoral archaeology by researchers such as Kinahan and Jacobson. Pastoral archaeology, however, is also a comfortable topic to work on.[65] It does not have the same burden as Iron Age archaeology in Namibia, which presents some discomforts; firstly because it is not associated with mega monuments such as the Zimbabwe culture and it is very political in many regards. Iron Age Bantu speaking people were seen as having complex systems that would point to some civilisation of Africa and hence contradicted both the colonial and apartheid ideologies. An archaeology of Iron Age farmers could easily lead to the archaeology of resistance to colonialism and in the case of Namibia this would not evade studying topics such as the genocide that was committed against the OvaHerero and the Nama people.

In addition, the quality of information in archaeology is usually judged by how generalisable the results can be. In such cases the information should be drawn from large scale studies including regional projects. Namibian Archaeology grew out of disciplines of taxonomy and this was due to its symbiotic relation with natural science disciplines of discovery. Archaeological practice in Namibia and southern Africa has been culture-historic in practice. Posnansky has argued that this led to the failure to "influence archaeological theory significantly."[66] What Posnansky failed to appreciate is that the circumstances in which archaeology was introduced in southern Africa in particular did not aim at developing influential archaeological theory, rather it was introduced as part and parcel of the efforts to classify the African populations as part of the colonial process. The alienation of African

[65] John Kinahan's work on pastoral archaeology resulted in the publication of his seminal work *Pastoral Nomads of the Central Namib Desert: The People History Forgot*. (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 1991). On the other hand, Leon Jacobson published a lot of journal papers on pastoral archaeology in Namibia.
[66] M. Posnansky, 'Archaeology comes of age', *World Archaeology*, 13, 3 (1982), 354.

indigenous communities from their own heritage through the declaration of archaeological sites as national monuments did not allow for the cross fertilisation of information between archaeology and oral history. Africa was not a centre for the development of archaeological theory but rather a field of extraction of archaeological evidence. Such evidence, which was viewed to be contradicting the dominant political ideology of the time was either suppressed, destroyed, discarded or remained unpublished.[67] Archaeology was used for opening up the land and territories for colonisation. This was done through gathering physical evidence that pointed to a lesser civilisation and then used as a justification for colonialism. The taxonomic approach of archaeology during the culture-historic approach resulted in the classification of indigenous African communities and in some circumstances apportioning specific landscapes for them as a way of making the communities and territories governable. The exploitative nature of archaeology was acknowledged by Posnansky but only under the discussion of no-institutionalising nature of early archaeology. This exploitative characteristic was experienced in the removal of artefacts for the benefit of overseas university students and cultural institutions. African archaeologists had to be trained in overseas universities.[68]

Archaeology in southern Africa developed in a political setting that aimed at sustaining the view of lack of development of the culture of African indigenous people and lack of history thereof. There was a selective approach to themes and epochs that were researched when archaeology was introduced in southern Africa. It focused on the Stone Ages because researching the Iron Age would have revealed that the Bantu speaking people are not recent

[67] P. Shenjere-Nyabezi, G Pwiti and M. Manyanga, 'Making the most out of rubbish: trends in archaeological studies in post-independence Zimbabwe', in M. Manyanga and S. Katsamudanga (eds), *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-Independence Era*. (Harare: SAPES Books, 2013), 117-142.
[68] P. Hubbard, 'Review of *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-independence Era* by Munyaradzi Manyanga and Seke Katsamudanga', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 70, 201 (2015), 133-34.

arrivals in southern Africa. This would have upset the justification for colonialism. Therefore, archaeology started off as a discipline of systematic deracination of the indigenous people.

In as much as archaeology was used as a tool for collecting information that would be used to support colonialism, it also became a tool for collecting information for alternative histories that emancipated the people of southern Africa. This on its own is evidence that archaeology is a highly political discipline and cannot be treated as a scientific discipline which lays some claims to being objective. Archaeology cannot be practiced outside social and political settings. The rise of nationalism and the advent of independence in the late 1950s and 1960s led to an increasing recognition that archaeology could be used for reimagining African histories. Post-independence indigenous archaeologists have called for transformation in archaeology of southern Africa.[69] Thus archaeology continues to be perceived as powerful in the project of decolonising historical perspectives.

[69] N. Ndlovu, 'Transformation challenges in South African archaeology', *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64, 189 (2009), 91-93.

Chapter Two

‘Pioneer’ archaeology in Namibia

Introduction

This chapter argues that archaeology was primarily built on the foundation of the work of a layer of amateur archaeologists who had no formal training in the discipline, such as colonial government officials, missionaries, individual enthusiasts like farmers, and associations like the South West Africa Scientific Society. It further argues that the introduction of archaeology to Namibia took a peculiar trajectory because, while amateur archaeological practice was legally stopped in countries such as South African and Zimbabwe (where it was also foundational), it continued to be the mainstay of discovery, documentation, and reservation of archaeological sites and artefacts in Namibia, even though the same regulations that were used in South African were applicable to Namibia as well. The chapter ends by presenting the argument that ‘pioneer’ archaeology in Namibia was validated, authorised, and maintained through networks of influential political figures such as Jan Smuts, through academic institutions like the University of Cologne, and through heritage management institutions such as the National Monuments Council and the National Museum of Namibia.

This chapter examines how avocational archaeological practice in Namibia was developed and organised, and how it manifested itself and was regulated in Namibia. It presents an ethnography of archaeological collections that were assembled by avocational archaeologists and brief biographies of selected avocational archaeologists as a way of establishing the circumstances in which avocational archaeology developed as one of the prominent archaeologies of Namibia. These collections are found in museums, in private ownership, and in avocational associations or club houses. Furthermore, the chapter critiques the

methodologies that were used in collecting artefacts and examines the narrative of Namibian history that was created from the collections. These were based on avocational archaeology as a science of 'objective' knowledge production and a discipline that used material culture to produce histories that in most cases were devoid of indigenous human actors. I argue in this chapter that avocational archaeology in pre-independence Namibia was the foundation on which other archaeologies that were practised and continue to be practised were constructed.

Unlike in South Africa, the rise of professional archaeology in Namibia did not signify the decline of avocational archaeology. Instead, avocational archaeology was practised side by side with other archaeologies in a complementary manner. I further contend that avocational archaeology was validated and authorised by professional and academic archaeologists and state agencies that were responsible for archaeological curation in Namibia. This recognition and sanctioning of avocational archaeology in Namibia guaranteed its survival and growth as a form of archaeological practice of the same value as professionalised archaeology. Avocational archaeologists contributed immensely to the development of archaeological methods, to finding and documenting sites and ultimately producing a narrative that viewed Namibia's past as principally Palaeolithic. This chapter also investigates the role of political and social networks in the establishment or institutionalisation of avocational archaeology. I use examples of individual avocational archaeologists (such as Ernst Rudoplh Scherz, Jalmar Rudner) and a volunteer association (the Windhoek Diving club) to illustrate the arguments above.

I further argue in this chapter that archaeology is not only the professionalised scientific documentation and analysis of finds (from surface or sealed sites, and from sedimentation or stratigraphies). Instead, archaeologies are constituted out of relations between people,

institutions, and landscapes. Archaeologies are produced by what Witz and Rassool have termed “transactions of knowledges”, which is a process by which the production of knowledge is negotiated and contested amongst various disciplines and interested parties.[70] Thus, archaeologies are diverse. As this chapter demonstrates, there was no clean break between professional and avocational archaeology. Both archaeologies were entangled in practice, such that the distinction mainly served to express power to define what was accepted as ‘scientific’ while in reality the scientific was just an extension and perfection of avocational citizen knowledge.

Methodology

The information that is used in this chapter was collected through interviews with amateur archaeologists and from archives of local and international institutions. The approach of this study to archaeological research is to treat archives as artefacts, thereby looking at archival records as opposed to the archaeological record, which focused on artefacts from archaeological sites and objects outside their social contexts. In this case, the archive is the subject of the study through a critical biographical analysis of an archive. The archival record provides enormous opportunities for archaeologists to engage critically with the histories of the discipline and sites. This form of archival archaeology is different from historical archaeology because in archival archaeology the archive is the subject of analysis. The archive is viewed as an archaeological record, whereas in historical archaeology, the archive is treated as a source of information.

The archive is an artefact that was assembled in particular and entangled historical contexts. In this study, the archaeological archive is treated as a product of deep colonialisms that

[70] L. Witz and C. Rassool, ‘Making histories’, *Kronos*, 34, 1 (2008), 6-15.

affected Namibia. It is an artefact of both colonialism and coloniality that is viewed from a postcolonial perspective. I use three archives to illustrate that the development of archaeology in Namibia was a knowledge project that was inextricably connected to colonial processes and coloniality. I use the Scherz archive in the Basler Africa Bibliographien, the Scherz archives in the National Archives of Namibia, and the Rudner archives in the Iziko Museums Social History Collections Department. These archives were assembled in the course of the work of 'pioneer' archaeologists Ernst Rudoplh Scherz and Jalmar Rudner.

Terminology

Various terms have been used to refer to the practice of archaeology by volunteers and non-professionals who do not benefit financially from the practice. One of these terms is "avocational", which refers to a person who undertakes archaeological activities outside their main occupation. To such people, archaeology is a hobby and as such some researchers refer to them as hobbyist archaeologists.

Hart describes another term, "amateur", which essentially refers to an archaeologist who has "not received formal training in field work, laboratory analysis, methods, and theories that professionals obtain."[71] In addition, they practised archaeology outside their main occupations. This definition of the amateur is problematic because it creates an impression that the amateur is inept and therefore should not be allowed to practice unless under the supervision of the skilled professional. Such an understanding of the term amateur pits the professional in competition against the amateur. Conversely, as this chapter argues, the term amateur archaeologist should not be used as synonymous with incompetence. Amateur

[71] S. M. Hart, 'High Stakes: A Poly-communal Archaeology of the Pocumtuck Fort, Deerfield, Massachusetts' (PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts: Amherst, 2009).

archaeologists developed the field and laboratory methods that the professionals later went on to use. A good example that will be used in this chapter is that of Ernst Rudolph Scherz, who was a chemist by training but worked as a marketing official for karakul sheep in Namibia. His wife Annelise Scherz was also an amateur archaeologist, as well as being a professional photographer.

The term amateur archaeologist is problematic because it was mainly used by professional and academic archaeologists for the purposes of excluding other archaeologists that were viewed as unscientific. As this chapter will demonstrate, the practice of amateur archaeology was done in the absence of the institutionalisation and professionalisation of the discipline. Amateur archaeology preceded the dominant forms of archaeology and was considered an archaeological practice in in its own right. The distinction came later and became entrenched only after trained archaeologists started to practice in South Africa. Before then, archaeology was practiced by enthusiasts or amateurs. Afterwards, it became a profession where only those initiated through academic training were allowed to practice. Academically trained archaeologists then needed to protect their profession. This resulted in the alienation of the pioneers of archaeology in South Africa.[72] The alienation was extended to local communities, whose knowledge was appropriated or dismissed as unscientific.

Viewed from this perspective, the term amateur archaeology ceases to be a useful distinction of a disciplinary practice and instead has become a reflection of the attitudes of the trained archaeologists towards their 'untrained' counterparts. The latter's practice was perceived as harmful and destructive.[73] The term therefore reflects the struggles and politics of a

[72] N. Shepherd, 'Archaeology and Post colonialism in South Africa: The Theory Practice and Politics of Archaeology after Apartheid' (PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, 1998).
[73] J. Kelley, 'Thoughts on Amateur Archaeology', *American Antiquity*, 28 (1963), 394-396.

profession in which a select group claimed ownership of the practice. I argue here that contrary to such perceptions, archaeology in Namibia was developed on the strength of the work of enthusiasts who have also been seen as 'pioneers', a term that we need to use with care so as not to perpetuate a colonial frame. The term 'amateur' is preferred in this dissertation because from its Latin origins it does not have negative connotations. It refers to a lover of something. Therefore, the term amateur is used in this thesis to refer to a person who practices archaeology for the love of it without deriving financial benefits from it. It is used as an adjective that describes a person who is driven by passion to generate and share knowledge from archaeological exercises.

Other terms that have been debated by scholars such as Brian Taylor include dilettanti and dabbler, but these appear to refer dismissively to a person who is not interested in the informational value of archaeological sites and artefacts.[74] Delittanti and dabbler, in the sense that Brian Taylor defines these terms, are not applicable to the Namibian case because the pursuit for knowledge was the driving forces behind most amateur archaeologists. This is demonstrated in the meticulous recording and documentation of sites, features, and artefacts, which was followed by analysis and the publication of results. Sometimes, the amateur archaeologists in Namibia published in collaboration with academic archaeologists and in renowned journals such as the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*.

While the term 'pioneers' of archaeology is used interchangeably with amateur archaeologists in this dissertation, the term amateur archaeologists is used more prominently because its syntactic role as an adjective is to distinguish it firstly as a form of archaeology on its own

[74] B. Taylor, 'Amateurs, Professionals and the Knowledge of Archaeology', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 46 (1995), 499-508.

that can be contested against the professionalised form. Secondly, it illuminates the dialectics of power and to some extent resistance that have existed between practitioners of professional archaeology and those of amateur archaeology (the experts and non-experts). The amateur archaeologist is viewed as an outsider, layperson and non-specialist. In contrast, the designation of professional is associated with a job that requires formal training and skill. Professional archaeology requires a high level of education and specialisation. Specialisation creates a sense that knowledge is preserved for a privileged few, and this produces circumstances whereby archaeology, as Nick Shepherd has argued, is alienated from its social base and remains accessible to "a small elite defined through their relation to the academy or class position."[75]

Taylor argued that there is essentially no difference between amateur and professional archaeologies except to create a social class whereby one practice is viewed as being of lesser importance. He further argued that the distinction was necessitated by the need for protecting a source of income by the professional archaeologists.[76] With this argument, Taylor emphasised one of the characteristics of 'pioneer' archaeologists: they did not make a living out of archaeology. They were instead people who had other professions, like Scherz who was a chemist. However, 'pioneer' archaeologists even in Namibia were perceived as threats to the livelihood of professional archaeologists and were treated with suspicion. They were often viewed as treasure hunters and unprofessional figures whose activities could lead to the destruction of sites.[77]

[75] N. Shepherd, 'Archaeology and Post colonialism in South Africa: The Theory Practice and Politics of Archaeology after Apartheid' (PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, 1998), 314.
[76] B. Taylor, 'Amateurs, Professionals and the Knowledge of Archaeology', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 46 (1995), 499-508.
[77] G. von Schuuman, interview, 4 March 2016, Namibia Scientific Society. Gunther von Schuuman is a member of the Windhoek Diving Club and an active participant in the work of the clubs' underwater archaeology unit.

Nick Shepherd illustrated such power relations in southern African archaeology by referring to the debate in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* of 1973 between amateur archaeologists –represented by the likes of Jalmar and Ione Rudner in South Africa and Albert Viereck in Namibia (both contemporaries of Dr Ernst and Mrs Annalise Scherz) – and the new breed of professional archaeologists. In this debate, the amateur archaeologists expressed their fear of being pushed into extinction by the demands of 'scientising' the discipline. The *South African Archaeological Bulletin* in which the amateur archaeologists published their work started to demand strict rigour in the quality of papers to be submitted for publication which aimed at meeting the "scientific standards that were set overseas."[78]

In addition, the National Monuments (NMC) Act 28 of 1969 placed some stringent conditions on archaeological practice such that amateurs were no longer allowed to practice without the supervision of a professional archaeologist. The NMC Act 28 of 1969 prohibited the issuance of general permits for collection from surface sites. Archaeologists were only allowed to apply for separate permits for each site. In the same debate, T.M. Evers (representing professional archaeologists) appeared to argue for cooperation between amateurs and professionals, but he also emphasised that there should be restrictions on what amateurs were allowed to do. The "scientific' work, which is beyond producing site reports but includes scientific publication (that is, approximates the standard from European metropoles of archaeology), should be left to the professional archaeologist.[79] Archaeology was viewed as a scientific discipline and therefore amateurs were seen as not being capable of maintaining the "high standard of scientific archaeological research".[80]

[78] T. M. Evers, 'End of an Era? A Discussion', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28. 109/110, (1973), 16.
[79] Timothy Michael Evers was a professional archaeologist at the University of the Witwatersrand and appeared to be a very fierce defender of professional archaeologists against non-professional practitioners/members of the South African archaeological society. Despite acknowledging the importance of reports from amateurs he argued that not all were equipped with knowledge "for precise recording of material from archaeological sites".
[80] T. M. Evers, 'End of an Era? A Discussion', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, 109/110, (1973), 16.

The scientific methods that were emulated were from overseas and not developed locally. The metropoles where the professional archaeologists were trained influenced their approaches to archaeology, including their desire to maintain the scientific standards of the metropoles. Thus, the 'scientisation' of a discipline demanded that the research process in the periphery remained comparable to research centres of a similar nature from international contexts. A common feature of amateur archaeology, in contrast, was that it looked internally at local problems and attempted to solve them by developing methodologies that may be site specific in some regards. A good example is how Scherz developed a system for recording rock art sites. Scherz was responding to the particular difficulty of retracing archaeological sites, in this case being able to find the site of the White Lady of the Brandberg.[81]

Whereas the National Monuments Act 28 of 1969 was applicable to Namibia, it was not enforced with as much rigor as in South Africa. It can be argued that one of the reasons why amateur archaeology continued in Namibia was because the National Monuments Council (NMC) office in Windhoek was a sub-office of the NMC Cape Province. In addition, the Windhoek office was led by, technically speaking, amateurs such as E. R. Scherz.[82] There were no professional archaeologists at the NMC Windhoek office until the late 1980s, when one was employed. In fact, the NMC was composed mainly of members of the South West Africa Scientific Society, which was an amateur society itself. Therefore, being amateur archaeologists, they would not implement a law that discriminated against themselves. The same applied to the NMC Cape Province office, where Jalmar Rudner was the honorary archaeologist in the 1970s.

[81] PA. 4 II.1.4. 1, BAB, E. R Scherz, 'Report on a Trip to the Brandberg for the Purpose of Investigating the Rock Art that is Found There'.
[82] A. Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*, (Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan, 2004).

A further possible reason for the thriving of amateur archaeology in Namibia was that there were no archaeologists in the academy and in heritage management agencies in Namibia. Archaeology was only introduced as a unit in the history courses at the University of Namibia in 1994. However, there was an attempt at institutionalising archaeology at The University Centre for Studies in Namibia (TUCSIN) by Beatrice Sandelowsky soon after the death of Harald Pager. The idea was to use Pager's documentation of the Brandberg rock art as the launching pad for the process of institutionalisation. This idea would have resulted in the Harald Pager Archaeology Centre, but it did not receive favourable support from the University of Cologne and thus was not established. Professional archaeologists such as Erich Wendt were working on projects that were funded from overseas and did not view it as their role to enforce the heritage laws. Namibia thus presents a good opportunity for describing the characteristics of amateur archaeology mainly because of its long, unbroken history. Specific features that distinguish amateur archaeology from professional archaeology have evolved over time. Archives such as Basler Afrika Bibliographien, National Archives of Namibia, Henrich-Barth Institut at the University of Cologne and those from the Iziko Museums of South Africa are useful in reconstructing the features of amateur archaeology.

Amateur archaeology in Namibia was practised by individuals, clubs, associations and academic institutions. In some cases, amateur archaeology was practised, promoted, and regulated by state heritage agencies such as the State Museum, which was the South African name given to the old German-controlled Landesmuseum in Windhoek, later called the National Museum of Namibia after independence. During the 1960s, the State Museum's curator of archaeology, Rhona McCalman, developed an archaeological site record form that was distributed to farmers as well as general enthusiasts. This site record form was created in a simplified way so as to make it easier for the enthusiasts to record sites and artefacts that

they encountered in their day-to-day work. The form was meant to be sent to the archaeology laboratory at the State Museum, where archaeologists were meant to follow up by either excavating the sites together with the enthusiasts or by simply recording the sites and artefacts onto the national database of archaeological sites. In this way, the professional state archaeologist acted to authorise and validate the archaeological efforts of the amateur (in this case, the farmer). The fact that the state professional archaeologist was involved in sanctioning amateur archaeology can also be interpreted as some form of resistance to the colonial imposition of South African archaeological practices and legislation. During the South African colonial period, rules and regulations that aimed at controlling the practice of archaeology were passed in South Africa and also made applicable to South West Africa. This was illustrated in the 1973 debate that was spearheaded by Jalmar Rudner in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*.[83]

Characteristics of amateur archaeology in Namibia

Amateur archaeology had features that distinguished it from other archaeologies. These features were demonstrated in the way it was practised and organised, and thus we can identify and comprehend unique features that make amateur practice an archaeology in its own right. There are of course some aspects that were similar to those of professional archaeology, but there were some that were distinct features of amateur archaeology. The aims of amateur archaeology have usually been framed as discovery and documentation for preservation purposes, but more analytically, can also be understood as the amassing of knowledge of the land, as part of the possession of the land. I argue here as well that despite being viewed as unscientific, amateur archaeology provided the basis on which professional and academic archaeologies were developed. It was through the scientisation of methods and

[83] J. and I. Rudner, 'End of an Era', *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 28, 109/110 (1973), 13-26.

in some cases interpretations that were developed by enthusiasts and to some extent community archaeologists that the rise of archaeology as a scientific discipline occurred in Southern Africa. It was only after archaeology began to be taught at universities that it became scientific and that it began to alienate earlier forms of its practice. Nick Shepherd shows that in South Africa between the 1960s and 1970s, there was a transition from amateur to professional archaeology.[84]

I contend and demonstrate, in this section, using the example of the Windhoek Diving Club's Archaeology Unit that contrary to being just a pastime, amateur archaeology in Namibia demanded strict adherence to scientific field methods and was controlled by state agencies such as the National Museum of Namibia. In the absence of an academic institution that practiced archaeology in Namibia, amateur archaeologists relied on validation, legitimisation, and even authorisation by academic archaeologists from South Africa, Germany, the United States of America, and France.

One important characteristic that was common to all amateur archaeologists was that they were systematic in the documentation and storage of artefacts and archives. Amateur archaeologists such as Scherz and Rudner were very meticulous and methodological in recording archaeological specimens. Rudner, for example, used both the cardex system and maps to record information about the sites that he worked on.[85] The information he noted down included the sites where the artefacts were encountered. Rudner worked in a period when the Global Positioning System was not yet in use, hence he could not record the exact coordinates for his sites. Nevertheless, he was as precise as possible in his description of

[84]N. Shepherd, 'State of the Discipline: Science, Culture and Identity in South African Archaeology, 1870-2003', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29, 4 (2003), 835-836.
[85] J. Rudner. Archival Documentation. Archaeology Unit, Social History Collections Department. Iziko Museums of South Africa.

provenances by making reference to topographical features such as rivers, valleys and dunes. In some cases, he estimated the distances from prominent fixed physical features to the sites. However, he did not include the quantities of the artefacts and their physical condition, but rather noted the existence of artefacts or nonexistence of specific types of artefacts. In cases where some sites had been worked on by other researchers, Rudner noted what collections were made and who the researcher responsible for the collections was. However, the index cards that Rudner used for database of his sites did not reflect the date when the sites were encountered and also when the information was entered. This is a reflection of how the systems that are used in museums to record information about archaeological sites and artefacts have evolved over time.

Scherz was another example of an amateur archaeologist who developed a method of recording sites so that they could easily be re-visited and also would not be bypassed by other researchers. This was after he had spent much time trying to relocate the Maack Shelter in preparation for the first visit by the Abbé Breuil in 1947. Scherz had met Mrs Bowler-Kelley, an assistant to the Abbé Breuil, at a conference of the Scientific Society of the Union (of South Africa) that was held in Windhoek in 1937. She requested that he organise a trip to various rock paintings in then South West Africa. During the preparation trip, Scherz experienced the difficulty of trying to locate a known site like the Maack shelter (White Lady) in the Brandberg. He thus decided to "make a card system for all sites in South West Africa", which was "supposed to facilitate the investigation of the prehistoric art of South West Africa."[86] The ultimate result of Scherz's effort was the posthumus publication of his

[86] PA 4 II.1, BAB, 'Report on a trip to the Brandberg for the purpose of investigating the rock art found there'. In this report, Scherz described the card system that he saw as a means to facilitate the "investigation of the prehistoric art of South West Africa". He tested this card system during his expedition with the Abbé Breuil in 1947 and it proved to be useful since they could retrace some sites that were previously published by Dr N.S. Weyersberg of the Frobenius Institute without precise location data.

catalogue of rock art from the then South West Africa.[87]

Amateur archaeologists were responsible for developing field laboratory methods and collections management systems that are still in use in museums such as the National Museum of Namibia. Systematic documentation responded more to the needs of research than the desire to develop a theory. It was driven by the aspiration to discover and preserve. As Scherz reported: "On this trip I could see how inconvenient it is for a scientist to spend hours in search of already known sites with only limited time at his disposal. Hence the reason I decided to make a card system for all sites of South-West."[88] It is safe to argue that there was pressure on the amateur archaeologists to demonstrate that they were scientific, hence their detailed documentation, which included site maps. Archaeology is a field that has built its knowledge through the application of methods from various scientific disciplines. It was practised through a combination of disciplines that collected artefacts and biofacts, such as ethnology, entomology, and those which sought to control the land, such as civil engineering (in the case of Van Riet Lowe).

In some cases, the lines between the disciplines were blurred. Goodwin is a good example of a practitioner who collected objects of ethnography in addition to archaeology. On his visit to Odibo Mission station in northern Namibia, he collected dolls of veneration.[89] This reflects Goodwin's training in both ethnology and archaeology. He trained at Cambridge in archaeology under Miles Burkitt and in ethnology under A.C Haddon.[90] With physical

[87] R. E. Scherz, *Felsbilder in Südwest-Afrika: Teil I: Die Gravierung in Südwest-Afrika ohne den Nordwesten des Landes*, (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1970). (see also) E. R. Scherz, *Felsbilder in Südwest-Afrika: Teil II: Die Gravierung in Nordwesten Südwest-Afrikas* (Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 1975).
[88] PA 4 II.1.4.1, BAB, E. R. Scherz, Report on the trip to the Brandberg for the Purpose of Investigating the Rock Paintings Found There.
[89] Social History Collections Accession number 5825, Iziko Museums of South Africa.
[90] J. Deacon, 'Introduction to Goodwin's Legacy', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 6 (1989), 3-6.

evidence being at the core of archaeological interpretation, archaeologists thus have had to present precise data in a 'scientific' manner. Amateur archaeologists carried out large-scale surveys of specific regions and focused on specific material culture. However, the lines between the material culture collected have occasionally been blurred. In some cases, ethnographic, zoological, and botanical material that were not from archaeological contexts were also collected. Since amateur archaeology was an enterprise in gathering knowledge about the land, these practitioners often collected material that was of interest to other researchers, such as the stone artefacts collected by Scherz for Professor Van Riet Lowe.

I therefore argue that the desire of amateur archaeologists to produce information that could be viewed as scientific led them to develop field and laboratory methods that were later enhanced by academic and professional archaeologists. However, for these approaches and even results to be considered scientific, the amateur archaeologists enlisted the assistance of professional archaeologists. Working with professional archaeologists thereby functioned to validate the amateur archaeologist. The fact that amateur archaeologists sought validation for their work is seen in their constant reference to having worked on a particular project with specific professional archaeologists. This was not limited to Namibia or Southern Africa. The Society for American Amateur Archaeology also boasts of working under the direction of professional archaeologists as well. On the main page of its website, the society mentions that "Most publications stem from fieldwork carried out by Society Members under the direction of the Organizer."[91]

The need for approval, authentication and even permission to practice was a very prominent characteristic of amateur archaeology in Namibia. Collecting artefacts that were of interest to

[91] http://asaa-persimmonpress.com/, retrieved 26 September 2018.

professionals, who may themselves have had an engineering background, was a way of seeking legitimisation since it was "proof" that the amateur could recognise archaeological artefacts. The amateur needed the legitimising voice of the professional to approve of their archaeological knowledge. Validation and legitimisation also functioned through co-operation and co-publishing with professional archaeologists. The amateur archaeologist 'discovered' sites, documented them and produced reports that were sent to an academic institution such as the University of Cologne. Based on the report, the professional academic archaeologists would then have planned a professional field reconnaissance trip in which they would work with the amateur archaeologist. In more recent times of archaeological research in Namibia, one site that was assessed and seen to be of archaeological significance is the area of Twyfelfontein, a world heritage site, was discovered and reported by an amateur archaeologist. The site has now become a focal point of new research collaboration between the University of Cologne's African Archaeology Unit and the Archaeology Department of Goethe University Frankfurt. The interest of the two academic institutions was generated through a report produced by an amateur archaeologist.[92]

In addition to discovering sites and producing reports that would form the basis for professional archaeological research, another aspect of cooperation between the amateur and the professional was experienced in co-working at sites and co-publishing. Working with

[92] Joe Walter is a typical example of an avocational archaeologist who still practices in Namibia. He is a retired City of Windhoek Engineer who spends at least three months of each year on a self-sponsored expedition in the field looking for archaeological sites and meticulously recording them on 1: 50 000 topographical maps. He produces field reports which have site maps and even photographs of the artefacts and archaeological features. One of his reports "Mik Bergen Bericht", 13 November 2010, triggered a new research programme. Although when asked to describe himself he does not use the term amateur or archaeologist, preferring to refer to himself as an enthusiast. Joe Walter's report on the Mik Mountains rock engravings ignited the interest of the University of Cologne and the Frankfurt University. The professional and academic archaeologists from these two institutions work together with Joe Walter in the Mik Mountains on an extended archaeological programme. This has already resulted in a publication on the archaeology of the Mik Mountains, P. Breunig, J. Behringer, M. Fels, and J. Maidhof, 'West of the Best: Rock Art and Archaeological Discoveries in the Doro! Nawas Region of Northwest Namibia.', *Acta Archaeologica*, 89, 1, (2018), pp. 174-192.

professional archaeologists, specifically those from state agencies such as the then State Museum in Windhoek served to validate the amateur and to legitimise their operations. This could also account for why amateur archaeology thrived in Namibia while it either declined or was obliterated in other southern African countries. The state sanctioned the work of the amateur archaeologists through co-working at sites and co-publishing. This is exemplified by the work of Albert Viereck, one of the foremost amateur archaeologists in South West Africa in the 1960s. He collaborated with the curator of archaeology at the State museum in Windhoek, Rhona McCalmann in 1961 at a site known as the Peperkorrel near Windhoek. This culminated in a publication in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* in 1967 entitled 'Peperkorrel', a factory site of the Lupemban affinities from central South West Africa'.[93]

Amateur archaeologists occasionally sought the approval of professional archaeologists when preparing public presentations. A case in point was when Jalmar Rudner was preparing his presidential speech for the South African Archaeological Society and he requested comments from McCalmann. In her letter to Rudner dated 25 February 1975, McCalmann gave a stamp of approval to Rudner's archaeological expertise after recommending an extensive reordering of some of the sections of the speech to "make for a better development of the argument." McCallmann concluded the letter by endorsing Rudner's archaeological proficiency by saying, "The whole thing is first rate and all you say needs saying, besides you have the

[93] Albert Viereck was one of the foremost enthusiasts who researched and documented many archaeological sites in Namibia. He was a farmer at Farm Neuhof-Kowas which was near Windhoek. Viereck is reported to have documented more than 129 archaeological sites in his career as an amateur archaeologist which spanned more than 30 years (www.namibiana.de/namibia-information/who-is-who/autoren/infos-zur-person/albert-viereck.html, my translation; accessed 1 December 2020). He was an ardent publisher of the results of his efforts. The introduction to the paper he published together with Rhona McCalman the then state archaeologist emphasises the fact that he worked with a professional archaeologist both in the field and in writing and publishing. Viereck's collection of archaeological artefacts was donated to the South West Africa Scientific Society now known as the Namibia Scientific Society. In addition to the artefacts the Viereck collection includes an inventory of sites that he worked and correspondence regarding radio-carbon dating of his sites. The file also includes the permit for the transfer of his private collection of archaeological material to the South West Africa Scientific Society. A. Viereck, *Steinwerkzeug Sammlung: A. Viereck, Neuhof-Kowas,* Archival Documentation, Namibia Scientific Society.

experience and knowledge to say it."[94] Obtaining positive reviews from professional archaeologists such as A.J.H. Goodwin legitimised the work of amateurs. Goodwin concluded his review of Rudner's publication on the archaeology of the Brandberg Mountain in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* of 1957, commending Rudner's work: "this paper has a great value indeed, opening up new field for thought in a relatively little-known area."[95]

Amateurs ensured their acceptability as archaeologists through publication of their material in journals of scientific societies and even professional journals. These journals were peer-reviewed and therefore publishing in them demonstrated that the authors were *bona fide* archaeologists.[96] This was a way of self-validation which furthermore demonstrated that the distinction between professional and amateur archaeology was a socio-political construction rather than being based purely on scientific work. An amateur could search for sites, document artefacts and features, analyse artefacts, and present them in a scientific format in the same way as a professional. The distinction between the two was instead motivated by a desire to create elitism. This served to produce a state whereby the practice of archaeology was dominated and controlled by a class of trained and qualified practitioners to the exclusion of enthusiasts who worked mainly from experience.

[94] J. Rudner. Archival Documentation, Archaeology Unit, Social History Collections Department, Iziko Museums of South Africa.
[95] A. J. H. Goodwin, 'Review of The Brandberg and its archaeological remains by J Rudner', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 12, 48 (1957), 147.
[96] Practitioners such as Jalmar Rudner and Viereck published in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* and the *Journal for the South West Africa Scientific Society*. They also published in annual reports such as the Annals of the South African Museum and the South West Africa Annual. Locally in Namibia, practitioners such as Scherz, Sydow and Krynauw regularly published their material in the Journal for the South West Africa Scientific Society. In addition, they also published monographs for example Wolfgang Sydow's *The Pre-European Pottery of South West Africa* (Windhoek, State Museum, 1967). D.W. Krynauw who was an archivist at the South West Africa Scientific Society and a secretary of the National Monuments Commission wrote a monograph entitled *Twyfelfontein* in 1968.

Networks

The emergence of archaeology in Namibia can be described as having been the result of a web of connections between professional academic archaeologists and local amateur archaeologists. These relationships functioned to validate the amateur archaeologist and at the same time the working relationships enhanced the knowledge of the professionals. They relied on the vast knowledge about the land that the local amateur archaeologists could provide. As a point of departure for this section that assesses the networks that characterised amateur archaeology and by extension the ultimate identity of archaeology in Namibia, I turn to Aron Mazel's response to Garth Sampson's review of his paper on the history of the Late Stone Age of South Africa. Mazel pointed out that "No social research, nor any other research for that matter, is conducted in a social and political vacuum."[97] This aptly summarises the practice of archaeology in general. It thrived on networks that involved academic institutions, politicians, the wealthy in the society, and scientific societies. Such networks marked the birth of archaeology in Namibia. Amateur archaeology operated in the same manner as professional and academic archaeology in the sense that it thrived through political and social networks. Such networks validated the work of the amateur archaeologist.

Archaeology is a practice in gathering knowledge about the land. A case in point is what happened when Breuil wanted to work in Namibia and had to rely on Scherz's knowledge of the land, while Scherz in turn believed that working with the Abbé enhanced his knowledge of the discipline. Breuil's letter to Scherz on 18 September 1947 thanked him for the "well-informed and unselfish way you guided us during our trip and for the great photographic help you and Mme Scherz gave us." This is further supported by the desire of the Abbe Breuil to have Scherz and Martin on his second expedition. In his letter to Scherz before that trip, the

[97] A. Mazel, 'Letter to the Editor', *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*, XLIII, 148, (1988), 78.

Abbe made it clear that he needed their knowledge of the land, language, travelling and living conditions: “It is too early to plan an agenda, but I am counting on you and Dr Martin for that, since you know the country and travelling and living conditions, and also the language.”[98]

Scherz worked with the Abbé Breuil and received his approval when the Abbe handed Scherz his spear.[99] This act of handing down the spear can be interpreted as a type of ceremonial handover that recognised Scherz as someone who could take over responsibility from an expert, thereby legitimising the amateur. However, Scherz saw his validation as coming from his ties to the University of Cologne. He pointed out in a letter to Neville Chittick that he became a professional in 1963 when he was contracted to the University of Cologne. Scherz notes in the letter that he had been “working on South West African rock art for more than 35 years as a hobby and since two years as a full time job.” [100] It appears from this letter that the amateur became a professional by being affiliated with an academic department and by earning a salary for the work. Professionalisation in this case is different from scientisation, which came with some expectations of being formally trained within the disciplinary methodology. The ultimate validation of Scherz as an archaeologist was achieved posthumously through his network with the University of Cologne when Peter Breunig published Scherz’ work. Harald Pager was similarly validated by the University of Cologne through the posthumous publication by Tilman Lenssen-Erz of his tracings.

Networks between amateur archaeologists and academic institutions also manifested

[98] PA 4 II.1.4, BAB, Breuil’s letter to Scherz, 9 December 1947.
[99] Kinahan in his critique of the Cologne school of archaeology in Namibia refers to this event. J. Kinahan, ‘Theory, Practice and Criticism in the History of Namibian Archaeology’, in P. Ucko (ed.), *Theory in Archaeology: A World Perspective*, (London: Routledge, 1995), 77-95.
[100] PA 4 Z1 Correspondence, BAB, Scherz letter to Neville Chittick, 17 February 1965.

themselves in the practice of maritime archaeology by the Windhoek Diving Club. A small group from the Windhoek Diving Club founded the marine archaeology section in 1990. Due to the specialised nature of marine archaeology and the need for basic training, the club enlisted the help of a professor of marine archaeology from the University of South Carolina in the United States of America. Lynn Harris had been contracted by the South African National Monuments Council to develop a shipwreck research database and to offer public education courses in maritime archaeology to museum staff and divers in Port Elizabeth, Knysna, East London, Cape Town, and Durban between 1994 and 1995.[101] The Windhoek Diving Club developed an amateur archaeology unit that recorded shipwrecks and archaeology associated with waterbodies. They were, for example, responsible for the retrieval and conservation of World War I cannons from Lake Otjikoto near Tsumeb in northern Namibia. All members of this unit took archaeology modules at university, though not necessarily as part of a complete archaeology programme. Therefore, there was a need for them to obtain some basic training on taking measurements and recording data. They took the Nautical Archaeology Society certification programme that was being offered in South Africa by Lynn Harris.

To be a successful amateur archaeologist required one to have some basic training in Namibia, though this did not necessarily have to be formal academic training. Networks with academics ensured that the amateurs from the Windhoek Club Archaeology Unit could be authorised to practice by the National Museum of Namibia in the absence of trained marine archaeologists in the country. Such networks ensured that amateur archaeologists received informal basic training in field archaeology. Even Scherz referred to having learned much

[101] 'Resume, 2014: Lynn B. Harris', https://sahris.sahra.org.za/sites/default/files/commentattachments/Lynn%20Harris%20resume%202014.pdf, accessed 2 December 2020.

that was useful in his work on rock art through conversations with the Abbé Breuil during his 1947 expedition. Rudner was similarly trained by the first professor of archaeology in South Africa, A.J.H Goodwin.

Institutional networks included the University of the Witwatersrand's archaeological survey, through which the Abbé Breuil worked to obtain permits to work in Namibia. His main contact there was Van Riet Lowe, the engineer who was by then professionalised through an appointment to a non-teaching professorship in archaeology. Institutional networks provided resources and facilities for archaeologists. When the Abbé was in South Africa, he wrote to Scherz on a letterhead of the Union of South Africa's Department of the Interior, Bureau of Archaeology and the Archaeology Office of the Witwatersrand University. The use of the official state letterhead highlighted the Abbé Breuil's authority and his influential political network.

Archaeology in Namibia developed in political circumstances of restricted mobility. The movement of Scherz in Namibia for archaeological work was controlled by the state. He had to request permission to travel around the country even for his Karakul business. Even when he was granted the permission, it came with restrictions. For instance, he was not allowed to go to coastal regions because there was no karakul farming in such places. He had to renew his permits every three months. Whenever he had permission to go to an area for rock art documentation, he had to report to the commander of the local police station on arrival. Scherz was followed wherever he went because he was considered an "enemy alien", since he arrived from Germany in 1933. He was treated with suspicion by the South African Administration because he joined the National Volunteer Reserve in 1941. This was viewed as a way of trying to avoid obtaining permission to travel around the country. He was also

treated suspiciously because he was a German who had refused to fight against Germany but had opted to fight against Italy instead.[102] Thus with a formal request for him to organise trips for Breuil, which had been written on the letterhead of the Department of Interior, Scherz could navigate his way through the South West Africa Administration and obtain permission to travel to sites.[103] Extensive Political networks that were established by Breuil were later useful for Scherz in his work. When Scherz's sister-in-law experienced some difficulties in being granted permission to enter the territory by the South African Administration, Breuil and Van Riet Lowe came to their assistance and she was eventually allowed to enter the territory in 1949.[104]

Political and diplomatic office bearers such as the Consul for France in Cape Town, the Administrator of South West Africa, Petrus Imke Hoogenhout and even Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, Jan Smuts, facilitated research activities such as exportation of artefacts for study in France by the Abbé Breuil. Through institutional and political networks, the local amateur archaeologist was used as a conduit for researchers from outside Namibia. Political networks that included embassies facilitated the smooth exportation of artefacts such as stone tools and even the tracings of Breuil. Scherz was responsible for posting the material through embassies such as the French consulate in Cape Town.[105] They organised permits and

[102] SWA 2767, Letter from the Deputy Commissioner of the South African Police Service in South West Africa, 28 November 1947.
[103] SWAA 2767, Letter from the Office of the administrator, 4 February 1944.
[104] PA. 4II.1. 1.18, BAB. The Abbé Breuil in a letter to Scherz (23 December 1948) points out that he was willing to assist with facilitating a permit for Scherz's sister-in-law. In another letter dated 6 April 1949 the Abbé Breuil conformed having communicated this request through Van Riet Lowe, PA. 4 II, 1.1.18, BAB, Scherz confirmed the assistance of the Abbé Breuil in his letter where he wrote that "My wife is most grateful for the great trouble you took with regard to her sister, we do hope so eagerly that she will be here soon., Pa. 4 II.1.22.1, BAB, Scherz' sister-in-law confirmed having arrived in Namibia when she wrote a letter to Mary Boyle on 16 May 1950, PA. 4 II.1.38, BAB. It is also possible that this facilitation was done through General Jan Smuts. Although Breuil does not explicitly say so in this correspondence with Scherz mentions that he had met the Prime Minister Smuts and given Scherz's name as a contact person for a visit to the Brandberg.
[105] PA. 4II.1.25, BAB, The Consul at the French Consulate in Cape Town wrote a letter to Scherz in which he acknowledged receipt of a box of stone tools, "I have the pleasure of informing you that the case containing a collection of stones from South West Africa has been duly received at the consulate and shipped to France on board M/V "Beyla" on the 9th instant".

planned and led research visits as field guides on behalf of professional archaeologists. The amateur archaeologists amassed knowledge about the country through a network with farmers and channelled the knowledge to professional researchers, as was the case when Scherz gave intelligence about sites in southern Namibia. In a letter to Breuil dated 24 October 1947, Scherz directed Breuil to some rock paintings in the area.[106] The same letter revealed another network that was used by amateur archaeologists to gather information about the country. They established and maintained extensive networks with farmers.

In a letter to the Abbé Breuil in October 1947, Scherz revealed such networks with farmers when he wrote, "As far as I am informed by farmers in the neighbourhood the big elephant is painted in sulphur and his size about 4-5 feet."[107] Scherz became interested in rock art during his work as a marketing officer for the Karakul Producer's Association. His work involved visiting farms and that is where he encountered rock art. He developed a network with farmers and even worked with some of them. Farmers were influential in the development of archaeology in Namibia not only for the information that they could offer about archaeological sites on their properties but also because they could sponsor expeditions. An example of this was Mr Strey who was a farmer from the Erongo region. It was Strey who sponsored the transport for the Abbé Breuil's 1950 expedition.[108] Strey was part of Scherz's network of farmers. His sponsorship was in addition to the state funding that had been obtained through institutional and political networks in South Africa. These networks

[106] PA. 4II.2.4, BAB, Letter of Scherz to Breuil, 24 October 1947. In this letter Scherz gives some advice on how to reach some rock paintings: "Regarding the rock paintings in Warmfontein, Arouab: From Karasburg as from Keetmanshoop. The distance is the same, but I would advise to take the road from Keetmanshoop to Nurubis and Gaitsanas".
[107] PA. 4 II, 2.4, BAB, Letter of Scherz to Breuil, 24 October 1947.
[108] B. Dunn, 'Cultures of Copying. An Archival and Digital Re-examination of Rock Art Copies Made by the Abbé Breuil on His 1948 and 1950 Expeditions to Namibia's Erongo Mountains', (BA Hons thesis University of South Africa, 2017).

included missionaries, who would inform archaeologists of sites in the areas where they ministered and who were also helpful in collecting samples. Father Froehlich, for example, was at Andara Mission in the Kavango and Father Hartmann was an ardent collector of stone implements at Sambyu Mission in the Kavango as well. Other missionaries such as father Trueckenmueller of the Roman Catholic mission in the Orange Free State facilitated the smooth movement of artefacts.[109]

On another level networks were established with professional associations. This assisted the amateur archaeologist when it came to obtaining the relevant permits. In the case of Scherz, a recommendation letter from the honorary secretary of the South West Africa Scientific society assisted him in obtaining permission to travel round the country.[110] Amateur archaeologists were active members of societies like the South West Africa Scientific Society and heritage agencies like the National Monuments Commission. This gave the amateur archaeologist an upper hand when it came to practicing in South West Africa. It can be safely concluded that this was one of the reasons amateur archaeology held on to a prominent position in Namibia after its decline in South Africa.

The amateur archaeologists controlled the practice in the country. Membership to societies such as the South West Africa Scientific Society provided an opportunity for developing wide-ranging networks with members who could offer varied expertise from their personal professions. This feature was very helpful in the operations of the amateur archaeologists since they could easily obtain specialised support from colleagues, for example, geologists, botanists, ethnologists and even politicians. This worked to validate their work as scientific.

[109] PA, 4 II.1.1, BAB, Breuil in a letter to E Pfeifer (10 February 1949) refers to sending some colour plates through Father Trueckenmueller and even expecting the missionary to copy the plate for Scherz and for the Windhoek library.
[110] PA 4 II.1.15, BAB, Letter from E Pfeifer: honorary secretary of the SWA Scientific Society.

In South Africa, professional archaeologists used legal instruments like the National Monuments Act 28 of 1969 to protect their occupation by making it impossible for amateur archaeologist to practice without attaining a certain level of academic training. In then-South West Africa, the amateur archaeologists established themselves in the Scientific Society and the National Monuments Commission as a way of controlling the practice of archaeology.

Amateur archaeologists managed to use their networks to negotiate agreements in which they were officially recognised by the agencies that were responsible for heritage conservation and management in Namibia. This has been the case even after independence. An example of this is the Memorandum of Understanding between the National Museum of Namibia and the Windhoek Diving Club. This Memorandum of Understanding allowed for collaboration between the two institutions. The museum facilitated the required permits for the amateur archaeology unit to survey for maritime archaeology mainly along the coast of Namibia and other water bodies. In return, the Windhoek Diving Club archaeology unit submitted a report on each expedition to the museum and the National Heritage Council. Artefacts collected during the expedition were to be registered in the National Museum of Namibia archaeology laboratory first. After being accessioned, the artefacts could then be lent to the Windhoek Diving Club for analysis or display. The Windhoek Diving Club developed a maritime exhibition centre, which they call a museum, where they put artefacts on display. This demonstrates that amateur archaeology in Namibia has been well-structured and supported through intricate networks of professional associations, clubs, and even state agencies. As a result, this practice has continued to thrive alongside professional archaeology. It was in this complex network of relations and varying interests that archaeology emerged. Family connections and links with the wealthy were also part of the elaborate networks that gave rise to archaeology in Namibia.

Discussion and conclusion

The Scherz archives that are found in the Basler Afrika Bibliographien are composed of two distinct sets. One set consisting of three files is about communication between the Scherzes (Ernst and Annalise), Abbé Breuil, Ms Boyle (Breuil's assistant) and the publishing houses in France and the United Kingdom. These files have been curated and have had the intervention of collections management. The second set, which is not yet curated, consists of one file that Scherz had left in the custodianship of a Namibian archaeologist Beatrice Sandelowsky, who in turn deposited it at Basler Afrika Bibliographien.

The correspondence between the Scherzes and the Abbé Breuil are professional and are based on the three field expeditions that the Abbé Breuil undertook to Namibia for the purposes of recording and studying rock art between 1947 and 1950. This was triggered by the encounter with a frieze in the Tsisab Ravine of the Brandberg by Reinhart Maack in what went on to be called the Maack shelter. The White Lady of the Brandberg is located in the Maack Shelter. It is from those letters that we can reconstruct the political and academic setting in which archaeology emerged in Namibia. It is also important to note that archaeology appeared to have arisen as a practice in rock art studies and also from the need to interpret and 'possess' the landscape, as a form of bringing order and civilisation to the territory, and to find justification in imagined antecedents. In the minds of the colonisers, indigenous African populations were pri*mitive and incapable of producing civilised art. The example of the White Lady and the theories of its origins pointed to a narrative that was acceptable to the South African colonial administration. The consequence of this colonial act was the complete alienation of the indigenous people from the 'science' of rock art. The photographic archive of Scherz is silent about the names of the indigenous helpers despite their appearance in some

photographs.[111] Local communities and their knowledge were not considered in the study of rock art.

The archives demonstrate that the emergence, development, professionalisation and institutionalisation of archaeology in Namibia relied highly on networks that included South African politicians, officials of the South West African colonial administration and influential people in business like Ernest Oppenheimer, amateur archaeologists like Scherz, and professional archaeologists like Abbé Henri Breuil. This points to a discipline that developed in settings that required negotiation of contested interests where the creation and ownership of knowledge was contested between the professional archaeologists, amateurs, politicians and heritage administrators. Associations that controlled knowledge, but which presented themselves as academic, such as the South West Africa Scientific Society, were also important to the network. Even during South African occupation, the Scientific Society was substantially in the hands of German-speaking people.

Correspondence between Scherz and German engineer, Dr E. Denninger concerned collaborative research in Namibia on the determination of the age of rock painting. There were thorough discussions of the methods before Denninger finally came to Namibia. This was done through the South West Africa Scientific Society. They wrote a letter supporting the research and emphasising that "The research work of Dr Denninger as a specialist for particular research methods in connection with the determination of the age of the rock paintings is in the interest of both science and the country."[112] There was also the Cologne

[111] D. Henrichsen and S. Hubler, 'Intimacy, re-enactments and violence: Photographic practice, research archives and the Everyday in the Brandberg/Daureb 1930s-1950s', Workshop on *Rock art research in southern Africa, the everyday and the significance of photography: A workshop on colonial photographic research archives and contemporary scholarly practices*, Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 7 July 2016.
[112] PA. 4 Z I D, 'Correspondence C', BAB, Letter from the South West Africa Scientific Society supporting Dr Denninger's scientific visit, 28 May 1965.

network through Hermann Schwabedissen, who was the professor of archaeology at the University of Cologne. It was under Professor Schwabedissen that the Cologne archaeology project started in Namibia. This was driven through the agenda and approaches of the Institute für Ur und Fruhgeschichte der Universität zu Köln.

The South West Africa administration, Ministry of Education, and the South Africa colonial government were interested in the work of Scherz. Not only did they support it financially but the South West Africa administration also instructed Scherz to create a map of the sites and deposit it in the Windhoek museum. They wrote letters of instruction to people such as Van Riet Lowe and facilitated the passage of artefacts and research results.[113] Even embassies were involved in shaping archaeology in Namibia. The South African colonial administration was closely linked to the development of archaeology in Namibia because archaeology worked in the same way as anthropology; it was a useful tool for emphasising the differences between the settler-colonisers and the indigenous people, thereby justifying apartheid.

It is important to locate this support of the South West Africa administration within the particular historical period in which they assisted in the development of archaeology. It was a time when the apartheid state had taken over power in South Africa. The state attempted to manage and control research output in archaeology in South West Africa and Stone Age research was seen as apolitical. The theories of the Abbé Breuil that were based on the White Lady were naturally attractive to the apartheid state because they had “proof” that the white race was superior and could also point to the antiquity of the while people’s contact with Africa. Archaeology emerged in Namibia in a setting of rock art research and a racial order as they developed simultaneously. The White Lady provided tangible and material evidence of

[113] PA 4 II.1.75.1, BAB, Scherz’s letter to the Abbé Breuil, 29 June 1951.

white superiority and was testimony to white presence. Archaeology also arose as a discipline of claims about land. In the case of the White Lady, it was used as evidence that the colonisers had a legitimate claim on the territory, since their alleged ancestors had supposedly arrived in Southern Africa long before the Bantu speakers. The co-existence of the White Lady painting with other San art on the same boulder was proof of co-existence of the two cultural authors of the rock art. Rock art became a locus of territorial making and claiming European origins for the White Lady painting was an act of asserting some antiquity of contact, experience and relationship with the territory, while simultaneously placing San people in the Palaeolithic.

Another aspect of the networks that facilitated the emergence of archaeology is demonstrated by correspondence that showed how archaeologists relied on political officials when they experienced problems. Archaeology was inextricably immersed in political processes and political patronage. When problems arose with Van Riet Lowe's interest in the site, the Abbé wrote to request the intervention of the Administrator of the South West Africa, Colonel Hoogenhout. Breuil updated Scherz in his letter saying,

> I answer to your letter of the 29th of June asking me if I had received the original copies made by me of the White Lady etc 1947-48 and other paintings of the Tsisab Ravine, I am obliged to reply that Mr Van Riet-Lowe informed me about three months ago that they had left for South Africa House in London, their arrival is not yet announced…. I have written my difficulties to the administrator asking him for his help that the results of our three expeditions may not be lost.[114]

The files also contain references concerning the contested ownership of research results that included complaints and warnings or clarifications about copyright issues. The irony of this is that Breuil himself copied the work of the San in the Brandberg and even earned money from

[114] PA 4 II.1.76.1, BAB, Abbé Breuil's letter to Scherz.

it, first as a professional archaeologist and also through selling his reproductions and books. The theme of copyright is very prominent throughout the files, including up to the publication process of Breuil's books. These notes show how central copyright is in the correspondence, thereby giving the impression that when indigenous knowledge was transformed into scientific knowledge it attained a higher status worthy of protection through intellectual property rights laws. The scientisation of archaeology created stratification, in which the reproductions and reconfiguration of indigenous knowledge by 'scientific' researchers were considered more valuable and even scientifically more accurate and authoritative than the original San rock art, which they had copied from boulders.

Some of the letters tell a different story from the idea that the expeditions were made for scientific enquiry. It appears that there was also a commercial angle. Mary Boyle wrote a letter to Scherz complaining that the academics and other influential people in South Africa did not seem to realise the commercial value of the Abbé Breuil's art.

Another theme that arises from the archives is that archaeological research fed into the practices of conservation, the protection of sites, and cultural tourism. After the Abbé's three expeditions, rock art sites began to be proclaimed as (South African) national monuments. Some examples include Twyfelfontein (1950), Brandberg (1951), Paula's Cave (1951), Phillip's Cave (1951), and the Bushman Paradise (1954).[115] These sites were given prominence and better conservation attention than other sites because they had supposedly been investigated 'scientifically'.

The correspondence files reveal that, after its introduction by 'pioneers', archaeology in

[115] Andreas Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*, (Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan, 2004).

Namibia developed as a discipline of protectionism and empire-building. There are many examples where Breuil requested that Scherz report to the South West Africa administration so that certain people (usually viewed as rivals, including Van Riet Lowe) would be blocked from visiting the White Lady. In one letter, he advised against allowing two Frenchmen from the Musee de L' Homme to visit the Brandberg, writing:

> I will advise you that I heard that Mouduy/ Manduit, a very little and unintelligent low employee of the Musee de L' Homme - will with -I don't know what French expedition, not truly scientific one, wander into the Kalahari, visit Windhoek and also have intention of going to the Brandberg and some other sites where we worked. If so please obtain from the Governor to forbid them to go to this your country. They can wander in the Kalahari if they like.[116]

Protectionism was taken so seriously that Scherz heeded to Breuil's warning about the two Frenchmen. Scherz alerted the South West Africa administration on the perceived impending danger through a Mrs Loening and promised to keep watch. Archaeologists felt entitled to the sites they worked in. Abbé Breuil even expected that Van Riet Lowe would give him a report of his trip to the Brandberg:

> I heard that Van Riet Lowe was going to Windhoek and the Brandberg and perhaps elsewhere in South West Africa. He has not written to me of this tour, nor what he did there. Do you know anything about this, if so would you be kind enough to send me news? I do not trust him at all.[117]

There appeared to be some paranoia about other researchers visiting or re-visiting the sites that professional archaeologists worked on. The political network that aided the protection of a select league of archaeologists in the practice of archaeological knowledge production was thus an important element of gate-keeping.

The second set of material is found in the files that was given to Sandelowsky by Scherz.

[116] PA 4 II.1.72, BAB, Breuil's letter to Scherz, 20 April 1951.
[117] PA 4 II.1.77, BAB, Breuil's letter to Scherz.

This file consists of correspondence concerning administrative aspects of archaeological research, such as permission to access some sites. This correspondence was between Scherz and the various departments of the S.W.A. Administration, like Bantu Affairs and Afdeling Natuurbewaring en Toerisme. One other theme that we can reconstruct from the Sandelowsky file is that archaeology in Namibia developed in a setting whereby mobility was controlled by the state. Archaeological research was restricted by the laws that controlled mobility. Archaeologists had to apply for permission to go to areas that were beyond the red line. In some cases, they were denied permission. Scherz himself was denied permission to visit and document some rock art sites in Kaoko. Another letter that confirms control of mobility was the one in which Scherz responded to the request by the South African Archaeological Society to accompany them on a tour of Namibia. He advised that they could not camp at Fransfontein because this was merely a little reserve where camping was not allowed. Occasionally, the archaeologists could be used by the administration to accompany people to places in Namibia, probably due to their knowledge of the country. Archaeologists then had no choice but to service the state.

The idea of the 'discovery' of the White Lady is central to the development of archaeology in Namibia. It set in motion some interest in the ancient past of Namibia and led to the development of field-based methods of documentation that are still in use today. It also led to the development of theories about Africa and its supposed primitiveness. Methods of dating and protecting archaeological sites were adopted and developed from the study of the White Lady.

The development of archaeology in Namibia was symbiotically linked to the work of amateurs, who derived validation and legitimisation from professional archaeologists outside

the country. The process of the development of the discipline resulted in the alienation and disempowerment of local communities such that their own practices of archaeology, such as the care of sites and some collecting, were dismissed as being inferior. This resulted in some dislocation between the local communities and their archaeological heritage. There was a clear hierarchy of knowledge which prioritised the 'scientific' knowledge of professional and academic archaeologists, followed by that which was produced by the amateur archaeologists. Local knowledge was dismissed as non-existent. 'Pioneer' archaeology in Namibia as practiced by the amateur archaeologists was partly responsible for the lack of institutionalisation of the discipline in the country because of the entanglement of the practice with the political processes of colonialism and with international centres of knowledge production. This was a network of social and disciplinary control, in which amateur practice facilitated coloniality, while also in some ways side-stepped legal aspects of South African administration.

In this chapter, I have also argued that archaeology was a knowledge production enterprise. This enterprise manifested itself through the silencing of other participants, such as women and African assistants. One can imagine a pyramid-like hierarchy of knowledge which had at its apex the scientific knowledge produced by male professional archaeologists like Abbé Henri Breuil followed by the knowledge produced by white male amateur archaeologists. Anything produced by either women or African assistants did not count as knowledge. To illustrate this critically, I have examined the Scherz archives that are found in the Basler Afrika Bibliographien. My approach to the study of archaeological research practices treats archives as artefacts. It focuses on the archives themselves as opposed to the archaeological record, with the archive as the subject of analysis, rather than the source of information. In this archival archaeological approach that I propose here, the archive is viewed as an

archaeological record, indeed as an artefact.

The archive is an artefact that was assembled in a particular historical context. In the case of my study, the archaeological archive is treated as a product of deep colonialisms that affected Namibia. The archive reflects the relationships that existed in the period when it was constructed as an artefact. In this study, I have used three archives to illustrate that the development of archaeology in Namibia was a knowledge project linked to colonial metropoles through networks of the academy and the political sphere.

The Scherz archives at the Basler Afrika Bibliographien (BAB) consist of correspondence files and a photographic archive that were acquired from four various sources. The photographic archive, which mainly contains private images of the Scherz couple and their collaboration with other people in rock art documentation, has been labelled "the Everyday in African rock art research" and was donated to Basler Afrika Bibliographien by Mrs Annalise Scherz in the 1980s. These images document the private life of the Scherz couple. In addition to the photographic archive, there are three sets of correspondence files in the Basler Afrika Bibliographien. The first set consists of files that were rescued by Sigrid Schmidt from Dorothea Otto's house in Germany and later donated to the BAB. This set of correspondence was later curated by the head of archives at BAB. The second set of correspondence files was actively collected by the head of BAB archives by requesting material from people who interacted with the Scherz couple. The final set of correspondence was given by Anneleise Scherz to Beatrice Sandelowsky, one of the first professional archaeologist in Namibia, who later presented it to BAB. This file and other Scherz publications were given to Sandelowsky by Anneliese Scherz shortly after the death of Ernst-Rudolf Scherz.[118]

[118] Beatrice Sandelowsky, email to Goodman Gwasira, July, 25, 2016.

A critical analysis of the structure, contents and geographical distribution of the Scherz archives reveals the characteristics of archaeology in Namibia at the time of its commencement. It exposes archaeology as a knowledge production project that was characterised by alienation and exclusion and that thrived on networks between the archaeologists, business people, politicians, institutions, and individual professional or academic archaeologists.

There are some silences in the correspondences that lead to the conclusion that archaeology excluded other participants. The participation and contribution of women and black workers can be inferred in the letters and seen in the images but was not prominent in the actual presentation of scientific and authoritative knowledge. The silences about gender in archaeology are manifested not by the lack of mention of women in the correspondences but by the role that they are portrayed as playing. Reduced to assistants or what Shepherd called "wives of archaeologists", they were not recognised for the development of field techniques, such as rock art photography in the case of Anneliese Scherz. They were overshadowed by their male counterparts, which shows that archaeology developed as a patriarchal discipline, something undoubtedly experienced by Mary Boyle. We hear of Mr Strey in the Scherz archives but rarely of Mrs Strey until we encounter Mary Boyle's letter to the Scherzes of 22 September 1962 in which she notes: "I see Mrs Strey has written an article in Lantern, illustrated by her reproductions of the White Lady."[119] Earlier, there was a query from the Abbé about an American woman who had traced the White Lady, but Scherz responded that he only knew of Mrs Strey as having traced it. This is the little we hear about Mrs Strey in the history of rock art research in Namibia. The Scherz publications on Namibian rock paintings

[119] PA 4 II.3. 14, BAB, Ms Boyle's letter to the Scherz, September, 22, 1962.

and engravings were either all produced in Ernst Scherz's name or included the names of other male collaborators. Anneliese Scherz was not considered a co-author, despite the overwhelming evidence that she also contributed not only by photographing the rock art but through developing the photographs and by her field photography techniques. Anneliese Scherz was after all the professional photographer.

Archaeology was a discipline of exclusion, one that was deeply entrenched within race relations and apartheid ideology. One way in which this is expressed in the Scherz archival record is through the exclusion of black workers' thoughts about the landscape and archaeology in general. This silence does not mean that such stories did not exist or were not recorded. Although Scherz recorded them, he treated them as anecdotes that he retold on the numerous safaris that he led. Scherz noted that

> On many a cosy evening, on the porch, by the fireplace, by the campfire, I heard a wealth of stories and anecdotes. Some of it - however little actually - remained in my memory. I also often told them around the campfire on my many safaris". (My translation).[120]

The kind of questions and stories that Scherz probed from his black co-workers indicate that the knowledge of the co-workers was not considered scientific. To him, it was not worth taking into account how they perceived or even used rock art. The stories that Scherz told around a fire during his safaris give the impression that black workers were considered as nothing more than "*Küchenovambo*".[121] This relegation of African rock art knowledge to the

[120] "An manchem gemütlichen Abend, auf der Veranda, am Kamin, am Lagerfeuer, hörte ich eine Fülle von Geschichtern und Anekdoten. Manches davon- wie weniges eigentlich – blieb in meinem Gedächtnis haften. Ich erzählte sie oft vor allem auch am Lagerfeuer meiner vilen Safaris" E.R. Scherz, *Südwester Geschichten am Lagerfeuer erzählt von Ernst Rudolf Scherz*, (Basel, Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2005), 2.

[121] E. R. Scherz, *Sudwester am Lagerfuer erzahlt von Enrst Rudoplf Scherz*, (Basel, Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2005), p. 11. Scherz used the term *Küchenovambo* when referring to his black workers, which reveals how derogatively they were considered. Not all of them were Aawambo people but they were universally referred to as Kitchen Owambo by Scherz. Such a reference betrays the relationship between the "master" and worker as being one that was non-scientific. The black worker in this case was not perceived to be one that was capable of generating knowledge except working in the kitchen.

realm of the anecdotal was part of the site's appropriation through archaeology.

Amateur archaeology in Namibia was marked by the practice of enthusiasts. It was a practice that alienated and disempowered other sections of the society such as women and African assistants. This reproduced and mirrored the imperial and colonial settings in which archaeology was introduced in Namibia. The amateur archaeologist sought validation, legitimation and authorisation from the professional archaeologists. However, the practice of archaeology was professionalised for the purpose of safeguarding a source of income for an exclusive group of European men whose knowledge about archaeology, the landscape, and even preservation was privileged over other forms of knowing. This was despite the fact that professional and academic archaeologies were constructed on the foundation that was laid by amateur archaeology, and even by African assistants. The methods and techniques that were professionalised were developed by amateurs. The professionalisation of archaeology thereby created a stratified system in which some knowledge became accepted as scientific while other knowledges were disregarded as citizen science and anecdote.

Notwithstanding this, amateur archaeology in Namibia thrived because their practitioners developed and maintained extensive networks with politicians, wealthy families, European institutions and even national institutions, such as the State Museum. Furthermore, amateur archaeology was sustained by the fact that at the time, there were no professional or academic archaeologists practising in Namibia. The Historical Monuments Commission in South West Africa that was supposed to control archaeological research permits in Namibia itself had amateur archaeologists like Scherz as members of its staff. The origins of Namibian archaeology are thus marked by the persistence of an amateur practice by enthusiasts, co-existing with professionals in a divided, stratified knowledge order based on gatekeeping,

protectionism and appropriation.

Chapter Three

The rise of professional and academic archaeology in Namibia

Introduction

This chapter uses moments in the history of archaeological research of the Dâureb/Brandberg Mountain to interrogate the nature, politics and processes of professionalisation of archaeology in Namibia. It is concerned with the rise of professionalised archaeology in Namibia through the entanglements of German, French and South African metropoles. I use the Dâureb/ Brandberg Mountain to understand the institutional settings of the archaeological projects of the metropoles. I interrogate how such settings led to either the emergence or lack of a professionalised form of archaeology in Namibia.

The Dâureb, Namibia's highest mountain, was one of the most extensively documented rock art regions in the world. The Brandberg was the most comprehensively studied archaeological region in Namibia. Up to now, six volumes on the rock paintings of the upper Dâureb were published by the Heinrich-Barth-Institute at the University of Cologne. More than 900 sites comprising almost 50 000 individual images were recorded in the Dâureb.[122] In addition to the rock art research, the Stone Age culture of the Brandberg, which covers the last 500 years was studied in the research that emerged from the University of Frankfurt and the University of Cologne.[123] The Brandberg is an archaeological region that comprises different kinds of archaeological remains, such as settlements consisting of stone structures that formed the bases of huts.[124] In addition, some stone chambers or cairns and stone walls

[122] R. Kuper, 'Foreword', in H Pager (ed), *The Rock Paintings of the Upper Brandberg Part 1: Amis Gorge* (Köln: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 1989).
[123] P. Breunig,' Archaeological Research in the Upper Brandberg', *Nyame Akuma*, 27 (1986), 26-27.
[124] L Jacobson, 'Lost Valley of the Hungarob: A response to Kinahan', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 52 (1997), 73-75.

were reported to exist in the Brandberg.[125] It was a site of major research into pastoral archaeology that led to the formulation on Kinahan's theory of an internal development of nomadic pastoral economy as opposed to the introduction of pastoralism through migration and replacement.[126] The Brandberg was a site for the professionalisation of archaeologists who had an interest in Namibian studies and became the epicentre for professionalising archaeologists in Namibia. Several master's and doctoral degrees in archaeology were awarded for work carried out on this site. The candidates were made professional through academic qualifications. At the same time, the Brandberg also became a focal point for mobilising local community training in archaeological tourism.

Professionalisation in general functioned to control a given practice through setting and regulating the standards of practice. Professionalisation was also an exercise in regulating who could practice archaeology. This was achieved through excluding those who did not fulfil the required academic requirements. This implied that a certain level of training needed to be achieved before one could be considered as a professional in the field. Professional councils or associations were established to oversee the practices through regulating competence. Scholars such as Taylor have argued that professionalisation was a way of distinguishing qualified practitioners from amateurs. However, such a distinction was part of "the professional's self-justification" which was achieved through the setting up of professional bodies that regulated the practice.[127] Professionalisation was a political project that aimed at accomplishing gatekeeping for the "initiated". It is, therefore, critical to question the locus of power to determine the standards of practice, especially, when analysing

[125] R. MacCalman, 'Grosse Dom Schlucht Brandberg: A New Discovery of Prehistoric Rock Art in South West Africa', *IPEK*, 21 (1964/65), 91-97.
[126] J. Kinahan, *Pastoral Nomads of the Central Namib Desert: A People History Forgot*, (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 2001).
[127] B Taylor, 'Amateurs, Professionals and the Knowledge of Archaeology', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 46 (1995), 504.

the history of archaeology in a country like Namibia which experienced multiple and deep colonialisms.

The professionalisation of archaeological practice functioned to support and perpetuate colonial processes especially during the apartheid period. During this period education was used as a tool for controlling the social and economic mobility of the indigenous Namibians. Setting academic requirements for professionalising the practice of archaeology worked to exclude the indigenous people from the discipline. This ensured archaeology remained the preserve of privileged, white, male practitioners. Anne Witz argues that professionalisation functioned to enforce an "occupational closure".[128] Professionalism made a clear distinction between the amateur and the authorised professional. This distinction on its own was a practice of exclusion and protecting a trade for the accredited few, with indigenous people largely excluded from the practice. In addition, amateurs who had been hitherto the mainstay of archaeological research were systematically disqualified through regulations such as the National Monuments Act 28 of 1969. This law ensured that there was a legal basis for this disqualification and exclusion of the indigenous people from practicing archaeology. Any other forms of archaeology that did not follow the mainstream methodologies which were taught in university programmes became unacceptable.

The professionalisation of archaeology in Namibia was accomplished through various processes. One of the ways was through the initiation of the local enthusiasts by academic archaeologists from European and South African universities. Such networks were useful for validating the work of amateurs. Another form of professionalisation was through obtaining

[128] A. Witz, 'Patriarchy and professions: The gendered politics of occupational closure', *Sociology*, 24, 4 (1990), 675-690.

formal academic qualifications. Thirdly legislation regulated and controlled archaeological practitioners in South Africa, and was also applicable to Namibia since the territory was still under South African rule. No specific heritage legislation was enacted for Namibia during the German period of Namibian colonialism (1884-1915). During that period, archaeological work in the territory was neither regulated nor practiced by professionals. Practitioners were mainly amateurs who had very strong links to the colonial administration, whether as military men, missionaries or other professionals that were curious and enthusiastic about the antiquity of Namibia.

Another avenue for being a professional archaeologist was through joining professional associations. Namibia did not have any professional association where archaeologists could register. Nevertheless, there was a sense of professionalisation that derived from being a member of the *Südwest Africa Wissenschaftsgesellschaft*. This institution was later known as the South West Africa Scientific Society, and after independence, changed its name to the Namibia Scientific Society. Since the territory was part of South Africa through colonisation, archaeologists who were residents in Namibia joined professional bodies based in South Africa such as the Southern African Association of Archaeologists. The main reason behind joining the South African-based association was that the archaeologists in Namibia needed to keep up to date with developments in theory and general practice of archaeology. This was a form of self-regulation that ensured archaeologists remained relevant. However, for much of the time of these different forms of archaeological practice in Namibia, the territory was made to remain at the frontier of South Africa. In addition, it was also at the periphery of archaeological work and thus practitioners worked in total isolation from the rest of the world. It was therefore tactical for archaeologists who practised in Namibia to exploit the

opportunities of networking with international researchers, as Sandelowsky noted.[129] International archaeologists who practiced in Namibia joined professional associations in South Africa too as a way of keeping up to date with developments in southern African archaeology.

In this chapter, I outline how each of the above processes functioned to professionalise archaeology in Namibia. I argue that these processes did not succeed in the replacement of amateur archaeology by professional archaeology. On the contrary, amateur archaeology continued alongside the professionalised form and in some cases, such as in maritime archaeology, the amateur form remained the only form of archaeological practice in Namibia. Such parallel and sometimes entangled archaeologies uniquely characterise archaeological practice in Namibia when compared to other countries such as Zimbabwe, South Africa, Botswana and Zambia. I argue further that one of the reasons for the lack of local professionalisation of archaeology was the influence of powerful institutions such as universities in Europe and South Africa. Finally, I contend that the professionalisation of archaeology in Namibia had inherent characteristics of exclusion and segregation based on race and gender.

This difference from Zambia, Botswana and especially Zimbabwe occurred because until 1990, Namibia was a settler colony or a territory with a local settler population. Archaeology developed mainly as a knowledge practice about the Palaeolithic, lost in an ancient time, and

[129] B. Sandelowsky and F.R Cagle, 'Archaeology and allied interdisciplinary research in South West Africa', *South African Archaeological, Bulletin*, 24 (1969), 197-19. "In places such as South West Africa the danger of becoming isolated and uninformed of current research in one's own and other fields is a very real one. In addition, lack of stimulation can very easily be experienced". Sandelowsky even went further to encourage that an archaeologist working in the then South West Africa needed to develop networks with researchers from other disciplines because it was easy to loose contact with developments in the scientific world.

deemed not to contribute to the national narrative of the struggle for an independent nation. Amateur archaeology provided the nexus or the medium for the maintenance of a professional archaeology based in Namibia's multiple metropoles, of Germany and South Africa. This symbiosis between professional and amateur archaeologies worked to place archaeological research in a relationship of underdevelopment and dependency, with an asymmetric professionalisation. This has limited professional Namibian archaeological capacity mainly to the fields of conservation and contract archaeology and has hampered any possibility for a postcolonial practice of archaeology.

Terminology

A survey of professionalism carried out by amateur archaeologists who were members of the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology defined professional archaeology as a practice by "skilled scientists who get paid for their work and who have access to fine support facilities, equipment and personnel to carry out their research."[130] A profession is usually understood as an occupational group which has achieved a position of control over the content and application of a body of expertise and skill.[131]

The term professionalisation is used in this thesis to refer to the processes by which the practice of archaeology was shaped into a professional occupation, as opposed to the voluntary, non-vocational practice of amateurs. As an occupation, it would be assumed that archaeology required extensive training and specialised knowledge, which then needed to be regulated. Professionalisation in general is achieved through the establishment of independent industry-specific bodies that regulate, maintain ethical standards, monitor quality

[130] W. A. Turnbaugh, C. L. Vandebroek and J. S. Jones, 'The Professionalism of Amateurs in Archaeology', *Archaeology*, 36, 6 (Nov/ Dec. 1983), 24-29.
[131] P. Healey, 'The Professionalisation of Planning in Britain: Its Form and Consequences', *The Town Planning Review*, 56, 4 (Oct. 1985), 492-50.

and facilitate continuous professional development among their members. Professional associations uphold an oversight on the knowledge, skills and professional conduct of practitioners and provide opportunities for networking and keeping each other in check. Professionalisation of archaeologists from this perspective was a process by which the practice of archaeology was regulated. It implied that a certain level of training had to be achieved for one to be registered.

In addition to the establishment of professional associations, archaeology was professionalised through enactment of legislation that paid attention to heritage management in general such as the National Monuments Act 27 of 1969 and later the National Heritage Act 24 of 2007. However, entanglements with what Haber has termed metropolitan academic institutions led to a form of asymmetric professionalisation that replicated colonial practices. Such practices included using the colonised countries as fields of professionalising and empowering students from the colonial powers.[132] In the case of colonial Namibia these entanglements were with institutions from Germany and South Africa. There was a gradual expansion of entanglement with foreign academic institutions that professionalised archaeologists in Namibia after independence to include others mainly from France, the United States of America and the United Kingdom. However, in this chapter I focus on professionalisation by German and South African institutions and argue, following Haber, that the disciplinary method of archaeology which was a standard of being a professional archaeologist functioned to perpetuate and reiterate coloniality.

[132] A.F Haber, 'Un-disciplining archaeology', *Archaeologies*, 8, 1 (2012), 55-66.

Professional Associations

Professionalisation was achieved through the means of setting up professional bodies or associations such as the Southern African Archaeological Society (SA3), which changed its name to the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists (ASAPA). Another example of a professional body to which one could be registered to be considered an archaeologist was the Pan-African Archaeological Society. Professional associations such as ASAPA regulated the practice of archaeology by setting minimum academic qualifications that were to be attained before one was accepted as a member. In addition to the minimum academic qualification, which was an honours degree in archaeology from a recognised tertiary institution, professional associations also set the standards of practice.[133] In the case of ASAPA for one to be accredited as a cultural resources management practitioner, the minimum qualification was a Masters' Degree in archaeology.

The Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists was formed in 2004 to replace the Southern African Association of Archaeologists (SA3), which itself was established in 1970.[134] According to the ASAPA website, SA3 decided to become a professional body in 2004 as a "response to the changing status of archaeology and the increasing professionalisation of its practitioners."[135]

However, it is also possible that the change to ASAPA was an act of responding to the political changes that were taking place in South Africa. The democratisation of the country

[133] Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists Constitution. Article 6, subsection 6.1.a Professional Membership. Available at https://asapa.co.za/asapas-constitution/, retrieved 17 September 2019. However a qualified archaeologist still had to work under the supervision of a person with at least a Masters' degree in archaeology.
[134] B. W. Smith, 'A Transformation Charter for South African Archaeology', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64, 189 (2000), 87-89.
[135] Available at http://asapa.co.za/, retrieved 30 June 2018.

exerted pressure on institutions to be representative and responsive to the new image of a rainbow nation. Institutions such as ASAPA felt the need to demonstrate that they were inclusive. However, there was a need to control the inclusion of previously excluded people. Controlling the inclusiveness of archaeology in South Africa was achieved through setting standards of practice and minimum qualifications of professionalisation. The standards effectively excluded the previously disadvantaged groups. This was evidenced by the frustrations that were expressed by some members from the previously disadvantaged communities regarding the composition and operations of ASAPA 20 years after its transformation, as articulated by Ndukuyakhe Ndlovu:

> I am of the strong opinion that little transformation has taken place within the discipline since the fall of the apartheid regime. Attempts to address the past should not rely only on the democratisation of the production of knowledge. They must also be reflected in the new professionals entering the discipline; our ranks should reflect the full demographic spectrum of our country.[136]

Like its predecessor, the ASAPA aimed at regulating the practice of archaeology by its members. A code of ethics for the profession was developed and some minimum standards and code of conduct were established and adopted at the ASAPA biennial general meeting of 2006. According to Smith, "The passing of these documents presented a commitment by ASAPA members to meet the highest means by which any member not living up to the standards could be called to account."[137]

The Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists regulated cultural resource management through a system of accreditation of professional practitioners. The making

[136] N. Ndlovu, 'Transformation Challenges in South African Archaeology', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64, 189 (2009), 91-93.
[137] B.W. Smith, 'A Transformation Charter for South African Archaeology', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64 ,189 (2009), 87.

ASAPA a body that controlled the practice of archaeology was benchmarked on international best practices. The Association aimed at ensuring "members act in accordance with the ASAPA Code of Ethics, Code of Conduct and Minimum Standards of Practice (Appendices A, B & C to this Constitution), that are on par with international archaeological best practice".[138] The Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists' system of accreditation was adopted for use in issuing excavation permits by the Amafa a Kwazulu Natali, which is the provincial heritage resources authority in KwaZulu-Natal. The South African Heritage Resources Agency, which is South Africa's national heritage resources authority, also uses the professional standards and guidelines for Cultural Resources Management of ASAPA to evaluate applications for excavations. The National Heritage Council of Namibia has also anchored its protocols regarding excavation on ASAPA's standards. The 2004 National Heritage Act in Namibia required that permit applicants indicate proof of professional qualifications or demonstrate that they will work under the supervision of a professional archaeologist.[139] The use of guidelines and regulations that were developed by a professional association to authorise practitioners distinguished the professional from the amateur. The professional association functioned to safeguard the profession for a few authorised practitioners while excluding other forms of knowledge production that were practiced by supposed unqualified or underqualified archaeologists. In the words of Haber, professional associations in this case "recapitulate Coloniality".[140]

[138] Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists Constitution. Available at https://asapa.co.za/asapas-constitution/, retrieved 17 September 2019.
[139] The National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) section 52, sub-section b states: "that the works or activities be carried out under the supervision of a person with appropriate professional qualifications or experience as specified in the permit, at the applicant's expense"; and sub-section c states: "in the case of a permit authorising excavation of a site, that Namibian citizens, as may be specified in the permit, be engaged in the activities for the purpose of receiving professional training."
[140] A. F. Haber, 'Un-disciplining Archaeology', *Archaeologies* 8, 1 (2012), 55.

ASAPA continued with a practice that was laid out by its predecessor, the South African Association of Archaeologists, which had developed guidelines through the work of Ray Inskeep that were used by the then National Monuments Council.[141] When Inskeep replaced Goodwin as the professor of archaeology at the University of Cape Town in 1960 he embarked on a process of professionalising the practice of archaeology.[142] This was done partly for the purpose of ensuring that his students would obtain employment after graduating. Inskeep was also against the practice of archaeology by people who did not possess proper training. This was in spite of the fact that his predecessor Goodwin encouraged non-professional practitioners such as the Rudners to collect artefacts, which later formed a significant part of the archaeological collection of the South African Museum. The Rudners epitomised the well-informed, pastime archaeologists who consulted and worked together with the academics in the practice of their hobby. While Goodwin recognised the potential of such activities in contributing significantly to the growth of archaeology, Inskeep on the other hand, wanted to keep such practitioners in check in order to ensure that his students obtained employment in archaeology after graduating.

Janette Deacon made the argument that Inskeep was instrumental in professionalising archaeology in Southern Africa through forming the South African Association of Archaeologists and the Southern African Society for Quaternary Research (SASQUA). These were institutions that controlled how the discipline was practiced and safeguarded legitimate entry into the profession.[143] The fact that there was an overt intention of securing and protecting employment for graduating students demonstrates that the professionalisation of

[141] J. Deacon, 'The Cinderella Metaphor: The maturing of Archaeology as a Profession in South Africa', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 48, 158, (1993), 77-81.
[142] J. Rudner and I. Rudner, 'End of an Era', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, 109/110 (1973), 13-14.
[143] J. Deacon, 'The Cinderella Metaphor: The Maturing of Archaeology as a Profession in South Africa', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 48, 158 (Dec. 1993), 77-81.

archaeology was part of a process of gate-keeping, as was observed in other disciplines that relied on professional bodies, such as sociology.[144] For Inskeep, there was a need for academic training for one to be recognised as a professional archaeologist. He had drawn up the regulations for obtaining excavation permits which were adopted by the National Monuments Council. These regulations created great discomfort among the hobby-archaeologists because they essentially banned the recording and collection of artefacts without a permit. For one to be granted a permit, one had to either be a professional archaeologist or work under the supervision of a professional archaeologist. The discomfort of the avocational archaeologists was represented in the strong debate about the ending of an era of amateur archaeology in South Africa. The debate was carried out in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* of 1973 and was led by Jalma and Ione Rudner. The main complaints of the amateur archaeologists in the debate were that the new National Monuments Act No. 28 of 1969 did not appreciate the contribution that amateur archaeologists had made to knowledge production and conservation.

Amateur archaeologists systematically recorded archaeological sites and collected surface artefacts but their main aim was to contribute to knowledge through 'extracting information' from artefacts and disseminating the information through the *Archaeological Bulletin*. This was no longer possible under the stringent rules and regulations imposed by the NMC (Act 28 of 1969). The Act prohibited all recording and collection of artefacts without a permit. According to Cooke, it appeared that the main contention was based on the NMC Act being 'over-rigidly' applied in South Africa.[145] Hence there was a call by the amateur archaeologists for the relaxation of the law to allow for collection of artefacts from surface

[144] Yogesh Ata provides a critical discussion of how sociology was professionalised through gate-keeping in 'Professionalisation of Sociologists', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 6, 6 (Feb. 6, 1971), 431-433.
[145] C. K. Cooke, 'End of an Era? - A Discussion', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, 109/110 (1973), 14.

scatters. In addition to that the amateur archaeologists advocated for the issuance of general permits to members of the Archaeological Society.

Inskeep's desire for a law that disqualified amateur archaeologists resulted in a process of professionalisation that was exclusionary. Professional archaeology in southern Africa emerged as an exclusive practice. Archaeological practice echoed the politics of job reservation under apartheid whereby some professions were reserved for the 'whites' only through legislation such as the Labour Relations Act of 1956. The fact that amateur archaeologists were of settler descent and were not allowed to continue practicing under the NMC Act (Act 27 of 1969) meant that the practice of archaeology by black people was not even fathomable. Black people were not considered for training as professional archaeologists. Instead they were used as cheap labour at archaeological digs. Archaeology was a practice whereby black people were considered good only enough to perform menial tasks, and, as Shepherd has argued, they were used as native labour.[146]

ASAPA also controlled the output of research and publication of professional archaeologists in Southern Africa. The association entered into an agreement with the South African Archaeological Society to take over the editorial functions of the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. The effects of such control by professional bodies were not as strong in Namibia as they were in South Africa. This was partly because Namibia continued to rely on the work of hobby-archaeologists due to lack of trained local archaeologists. Amateur archaeologists in Namibia circumvented the rigid professional requirements of publishing in

[146] N. Shepherd, '"When the Hand that Holds the Trowel is Black...": Disciplinary Practices of Self-Representation and the Issue of "Native" Labour in Archaeology', *Journal of Social Archaeology*, *3*, 3 (2003), 334-352. This issue is something taken up by Dag Henrichsen in his study of the rock art field work in Brandberg conducted by Ernest and Annelise Scherz. See L. Roulet and D. Henrichsen, 'Anneliese and Ernst Rudolf Scherz's 'Ethnographic Object Collection' from Namibia and Southern Africa', *BAB Working Paper*, 1 (2020), 1-43.

the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. They did this by co-publishing with academic archaeologists.

Namibia was generally at the margin of South African control so there was a possibility that the application of some regulations was not as rigid as in South Africa. However, the international researchers who formed the largest body of professional archaeologists in Namibia had to obtain their research permits from the National Monuments Council office in Windhoek, which was a branch of the NMC in Cape Town.[147] The permit applications were approved in Cape Town. The Windhoek office of the National Monuments Council processed the permit applications for the consideration of the NMC Council in Cape Town. This meant that the guidelines and standards for practice were regulated from South Africa, which, by extension, meant their applications were subjected to the same conditions as set out by SA3 or later ASAPA.

The State Museum Windhoek, which became the National Museum of Namibia after independence, was one of the first offices to have a post of professional archaeologist in Southern Africa.[148] However, the State Museum in Namibia was not responsible for controlling the professional practice of archaeology. The National Monuments Council office processed applications for excavation permits. However, the Windhoek office was managed by amateur archaeologists and hence they managed to carry on practising without the burden of the professional standards that were developed by professional associations. It can be

[147] This was the case until March 1990 when Namibia gained Independence. All NMC files that related to Namibia were repatriated in 1990. Only the files that related to Walvis Bay was never returned even after Walvis Bay was reintegrated into Namibia in 1994. The returned files are now housed in the National Archives of Namibia albeit being not curated up to now.

[148] A. Otto-Reiner, '*From Landesmuseum to National Museum of Namibia: 100 years (1907-2007) A chronology of an African Museum'*, (Windhoek: National Museum of Namibia, 2007).

argued, therefore, that what was transpired in Namibia was some kind of guerrilla archaeology by a local white elite in a settler colony.[149]

Another organisation that regulated its members' practice of archaeology in Africa was the Society of Africanist Archaeologists (SAfA). Membership to the society was available to people who were interested in archaeology and associated disciplines that focused on Africa. African members who resided on the continent had free membership including free access to selected journals such as *Nyame Akuma*. An additional advantage of membership to this society was that a member could subscribe to *The African Archaeological Review* and the *Journal of African Archaeology* at a discounted fee. SAfA included disciplines that were not necessarily archaeological as long as they were associated to archaeology. SAfA endorsed the practice of archaeology by qualified professionals. Regulation was accomplished through the SAfA Code of ethics. Two sections of this code of ethics clearly emphasised that archaeology should be practiced by properly trained personnel. Section 2 revealed that SAfA equated the practice of archaeology by qualified professionals to a guarantee of "responsible archaeological work".[150]

In addition to emphasising the need for archaeological work to be undertaken by qualified professionals, the code of ethics recognised the importance of consulting local people. However, this was not a recognition of the local people as producers of knowledge but rather as enablers of research. The role of local or indigenous people was to provide legitimacy to

[149] The term guerilla archaeology is used in this thesis to refer to an ad hoc underground and creative approach or practice that does not follow the set regulations. In such an approach rules and regulations are circumvented to allow the amateurs to continue practicing without the hindrance that was exerted by the new law. The term is not used in the same sense of a creative public engagement by archaeologists as in the case of Cardiff University Guerilla Archaeology.

[150] Society for Africanist Archaeologists, 'Statement of Professional Behaviour', available at https://safa.rice.edu/ retrieved 24 November 2019.

the research of the qualified professionals. Indigenous people granted researchers the necessary permission to visit sites and as sources of information about traditional beliefs that needed to be respected. This created hierarchies of knowledge whereby the specialist knowledge of the archaeologist was considered higher than that of the local community.

Section Three of the SAfA code of ethics addressed the professional standards that regulated its members when practicing archaeology. The importance of obtaining adequate training before one was licensed to practice archaeology was again stressed in that section. In addition, an archaeologist had to comply with legislation and research protocols. Legislation that protected and controlled archaeological research demanded that a certain minimum academic qualification was to be attained before one could practice. In some circumstances, as discussed above, professional archaeologists were legislated into existence while amateurs were legislated out of practice.

The promulgation of heritage legislation in South Africa resulted in the suppression of the amateur practice in that country. In Namibia, on the other hand, this was not the case. Amateur archaeology continued to be the mainstay of the practice. Even after independence, amateur archaeologists in the sub-discipline of maritime archaeology safeguarded their continued existence through academic networks and creative agreements. In 2001 the Namibia Underwater Federation (NUF) entered into an agreement on how to conduct coastal surveys with the National Museum of Namibia. The agreement covered areas such as the curation and storage of finds from the NUF expeditions. NUF was given the permission to curate the finds and store them at their museum. The artefacts were labelled and numbered consecutively with a prefix ‘MA’ which stood for marine archaeology. The NUF accession numbers were only cross-referenced with the National Museum accession numbers once the

artefacts were cleaned and restored. The NUF was allowed to borrow some artefacts on permanent loan basis for display at their museum. The staff from the archaeology department of the National museum had unlimited access to the finds for the purposes of inspection.[151] This allowed them to circumvent the legislation. Amateur archaeologists continued to practice under a special arrangement with the National Museum of Namibia.

Professionalisation through the academy

The central figure in professionalising archaeology through professional associations in South Africa and by extension in Namibia was Ray Inskeep. He was also prominent in professionalising the discipline through academia.[152] Inskeep insisted that positions in the field of archaeology at museums and the National Monuments Council in South Africa were to be reserved for university-trained archaeologists. Over the years Namibia employed a total of twelve archaeologists in professional capacities either at the National Museum of Namibia or at the National Heritage Council of Namibia to date.[153] Out of these archaeologists, 7 practiced as professional archaeologists in Namibia before independence in 1990 while 5 were employed after 1990. Among the pre-independence generation, three achieved their qualifications in South Africa, one in the United States of America, one in the United Kingdom, one in Germany, and one in Sweden. Demographic information of the pre-

[151] 'Minutes of the meeting held with representatives of the National Museum (NM) of Namibia and the Namibia Underwater Federation (NUF), held at 10:00am on Friday, 26 October 2001'.

[152] In the 1920's Namibia was taken over by South Africa on the basis of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations' covenant and as a Class C Mandate agreement by the League's Council. Under the National party rule in South Africa (1948-1997) Namibia was treated like a fifth province of South Africa and hence South African practices and even legislation that were applicable to Namibia. This happened in spite of the fact that the UN had rejected the calls by the then South African Prime Minister Jan Smuts to incorporate Namibia South Africa's fifth province.

[153] The National Museum of Namibia was known as the State Museum Windhoek while the National Heritage Council was called the National Monuments Council during the South African colonial period. A list of archaeologists that worked at the National Museum from 1907 to 2007 was published in A. Otto-Reiner, '*From Landesmuseum to National Museum of Namibia: 100 years (1907-2007) A chronology of an African Museum*', (Windhoek: National Museum of Namibia, 2007). In addition to Otto-Reiner's list I compiled an updated list for this study.

independence group indicates that four were South Africans while the other three were from Germany, the United Kingdom, and Namibia respectively.

This trend continued after independence in that Namibian archaeologists were trained overseas as well as in South Africa. This may point to the relations between South Africa and Namibia. Before independence South Africa administered Namibia as part of its territory and therefore the distinction between Namibian and South African archaeologists working in the then South West Africa was not emphasised. The archaeologists were employed as part of South African institutions (State Museum and National Monuments Council). However, this scenario points also to the fact that no institutions for training archaeologists in Namibia were developed during the South African colonial period.

All the archaeologists who were professionalised after independence in 1990 studied outside Namibia: in Germany, France, the United Kingdom, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. Thus, it can be argued safely that professionalisation of archaeologists in Namibia took place in the metropoles of colonialism. Other professional archaeologists who conducted research in Namibia were not employed by any institutions in Namibia. They were researchers who worked on long-term and short-term projects. They obtained qualifications from their home universities. In this case, Namibia was a site of professionalisation.

A post-colonial critique of archaeology requires that we question the mutual connection between the processes of professionalising archaeology and the colonial metropoles that performed this professionalisation. A critical reflection of such contexts reveals that archaeological sites were miniature representations of the power relations that manifested themselves in the body politic of the day. Namibia remained a satellite of South Africa: it

was a frontier of South Africa, and in many ways this continued after independence. In the case of archaeology, it was and has remained a site for extraction of archaeological knowledge and not a site of knowledge production. The practice was benchmarked on South Africa and other metropoles such as Cambridge and Cologne.[154] This resulted in the lack of a distinct Namibian archaeology.

The observation that archaeologists continued to be professionalised outside Namibia after independence indicates some form of coloniality in the field of archaeology. Universities from colonial metropoles such as the Germany, France and South Africa continued to be producers of qualified archaeologists for Namibia just as it was during its colonial period. On the other hand, the fact that professional archaeologists were gaining their qualifications outside Namibia before and after independence led to persistence of amateur archaeology in Namibia despite it being side-lined in other southern African countries. South Africa and Zimbabwe produced their own professional archaeologists. In both cases amateur archaeology was overtaken by professional archaeology.

While professionalisation took the form of university qualifications during the colonial period, efforts were intensified in the post-apartheid South Africa to include the marginalised communities who did not have the opportunity to acquire university education. The South African education system, which was applicable to Namibia, did not allow black people to study in fields such as archaeology. However, a new qualification framework was introduced in South Africa after the democratisation of the country in 1994. Under the Outcomes Based Education system people with little or no formal education could be accredited through on-

[154] Despite being a metropole of Namibia, South Africa itself was a periphery of Cambridge. As late as the end of the 1980s, almost all archaeologists at a leading South African university spoke with British voices, and had doctorates from the University of Cambridge.

the-job training. This democratised the archaeological space in South Africa. A survey of enrolment in archaeology programmes at South African universities that was carried out by Shepherd and published in 2005 revealed that there was "a clear indication of increasing numbers of black students."[155] Shepherd also noted that women student numbers increased to a point where they became the majority at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

Professionalisation through the academy in Namibia followed the same trend as in South Africa. Although Namibia did not include archaeology as a school subject when the education system changed, there were some efforts aimed at developing archaeology at the newly established University of Namibia (UNAM). The then Department of History recognised the potential that archaeology had in investigating the precolonial history of Namibia.[156] From the outset, archaeology at the University of Namibia was not a means of professionalising local archaeologists. Rather it was introduced as an auxiliary subject in history that was offered as a unit in precolonial history. Thus, from the beginning, archaeology at UNAM did not address the concerns of the new political establishment.

Unlike in Zimbabwe, archaeology was not a discipline that was developed and deployed for nation building. Instead the role of archaeology at UNAM was perceived as providing material evidence for precolonial historical events. Thus, archaeology was not relevant to the nation-building discourse that had developed. The way it was practiced entrenched the perception of Namibia as an entity that had experienced some form of arrested development. The focus on archaeological research was and continues to be on the Palaeolithic. This made

[155] N. Shepherd, 'Who is Doing Archaeology at South African Universities? And What are they Studying?', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 60, 182 (2005), 123-126.
[156] The Department of History was later amalgamated with the Geography Department to form a new Department of Geography, History and Environmental Studies. History became a Section of the Department and archaeology continued to be a unit in the History Section.

the discipline safe and apolitical because it did not confront the social and political issues of current communities. More often, the argument from archaeologists was that there was no connection between the material culture of past societies and the social concerns of living communities. On the contrary, the reality was that there was a lack of research that focused on the archaeological remains that were associated with living communities. Studies of Iron Age archaeology, for example, were almost non-existent in Namibia.[157]

The first course in archaeology at UNAM was offered in collaboration with the National Museum of Namibia in 1995. The course was taught by the then State Archaeologist John Kinahan. The University of Namibia had by then introduced archaeology as a subject in the final year-history curriculum. The students who opted to take this subject underwent an intensive archaeology course at the National Museum of Namibia.[158] The course involved theory, practical laboratory sessions, and field work. While the theoretical component, which covered basic principles of archaeology, and the laboratory practical, were taught by Kinahan, the field work was taught as part of two foreign field expeditions.

The first field work session was taught by archaeologists from the Heinrich-Barth-Institute at the University of Cologne and was led by Tilman Lenssen-Erz. The second field work session was taught by archaeologists from Southampton University who were led by Thomas Dowson, formerly of the University of the Witwatersrand. The University of Namibia and National Museum of Namibia course was "not designed to produce fully trained

[157] There were a few Iron Age studies that were conducted by Sandelowsky, Kinahan and Kose. However, these were very few and scattered compared to rock art, pastoral and stone age archaeologies. See B.H. Sandelowsky, 'Kapako and Vungu Vungu: Iron Age sites on the Kavango River', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, Goodwin Series, 3 (1979), 52-6; Kinahan and J.C. Vogel, Recent Copper working Sites in the Khuiseb Drainage, Namibia', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 37 (1982), 44-5; E. Kose. 'New light on the ironworking groups along the middle Kavango in northern Namibia', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64 (2010), 130-47.

[158] I was one of the first 8 students of the archaeology course that was taught by John Kinahan.

archaeologists in the shortest possible time but rather to create awareness and enthusiasm in the subject".[159] In other words, the course was an introduction to archaeology and students who wished to pursue archaeology as a career could enrol at another university in the southern African region or overseas. Once again this indicated that there were no real efforts or even an appetite to establish a training programme for archaeologists at the tertiary institutions in Namibia. Professionalisation did not take place locally soon after independence, and that still remained *status quo* in the early 2020s.

In 2003, there was a renewed attempt at including archaeology in history courses at UNAM, but students could still not specialise in archaeology. The aim was to use archaeology as an alternative source of historical information, and that is why the first units were taught in the third year of the history programme. Gradually the archaeology modules were expanded with the hope of developing a stand-alone training programme. There was still no institution that trained professional archaeologists in Namibia 30 years after independence. Heritage studies was introduced at UNAM but still archaeology was not. The argument from UNAM was that archaeology was not a financially viable course because it attracted few students. Archaeology was not taught in schools, and therefore it could not be taught to students of the Bachelor of Education at the University. The majority of the history students at UNAM were enrolled in the Bachelor of Education programme.

Black professional archaeologists continued to be trained in the metropoles of archaeological research in Germany, France, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and South Africa.[160] It can be argued, following, Rassool, that archaeology in Namibia "found it difficult to shake off the

[159] L. Fild, 'Digging Deeper: Discovering our Hidden History', *The Namibian Weekende*r, Friday 15 September 1995, 1.
[160] C. Rassool, 'Power, Knowledge and the Politics of Public Pasts', *African Studies*, 69, 1 (April 2010), 80.

ways it has been marked by South Africa's history of colonialism, apartheid, race and power."[161] The fact that Namibia failed to introduce archaeology as a university programme presented an opportunity for relocating "expertise outside the academy, and to question assumed knowledge hierarchies" as Rassool argued further.[162] The postarchaeocentric archaeology that is proposed in this thesis may be one way to challenge the paternalistic practice and colonial identity of archaeology in Namibia.

Maritime archaeologist, Bruno Werz identified the lack of suitable infrastructure and presence of few professional archaeologists as a major impediment to the establishment of an archaeological training programme in Namibia.[163] There were no laboratories for archaeological materials analysis in Namibia. There was a lack of funding for local scholarships. The Namibian archaeologists who became professional and qualified outside the country were able to do so with bursaries obtained from the specific countries where they studied. They studied within specific research projects and hence were limited in their choices of areas or epochs of specialisation. The Directorate of National Heritage and Cultural Programmes of the Namibian government established a scholarship for two archaeologists but this was never implemented.

No strategy for training archaeologists in Namibia was developed in both the colonial and postcolonial periods. Instead, due to state priorities, universities established strategies for developing capacity in the fields of Medicine, Agriculture and Engineering. There appeared to be some reluctance in developing archaeology as a full discipline at local institutions of

[161] C, Rassool, ibid
[162] C. Rassool, 'Power, Knowledge and the Politics of Public Pasts', *African Studies*, 69, 1 (April 2010), 96.
[163] B. Werz, 'A Suggested Blueprint for the Development of Maritime Archaeological Research in Namibia', *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, 2 (2007), 103-121. Although Werz's observation was made with regards to the particular case of Marine and Maritime Archaeology in Namibia. It is applicable to Namibia's archaeology in general.

higher learning because archaeology was not seen to address the developmental needs of the society such as health, food security and infrastructural development.

Werz suggested developing a research programme in marine archaeology as one way of addressing the lack of professional maritime archaeologists in Namibia.[164] The problem with Werz' suggestion is that research projects such as the one he proposed perpetuated circumstances in which external professionals produced knowledge that could be used by the few local professionals. Research programmes have had a troubled history of not taking into account the need for training in Namibia. Past research programmes did not provide an answer to the lack of infrastructure. Instead, they functioned to entrench coloniality that turned Namibia into a mine for archaeological data that was processed externally. The data from such projects was then re-circulated into Namibia as 'professional' knowledge. However, the knowledge from such projects was published in academic journals and in languages that were not easily accessible to the local people. Therefore, the knowledge that was produced was not useful for drawing the attention of local people to archaeology. These approaches did not create awareness of the uses of archaeology in writing the narrative of the nation. They had the effect of an "increased output of information" and not the development of local capacity. They did not have the potential to professionalise, and rather served to entrench the territorial nature of archaeology.

A critical analysis of the development of archaeology in Namibia requires that the processes of assembling and developing knowledges are questioned especially with regard to social and power relations. Archaeological projects sought to maintain the status quo whereby black

[164] B. Werz, 'A Suggested Blueprint for the Development of Maritime Archaeological Research in Namibia', *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, 2 (2007), 103-121.

Namibians would not achieve the status of a scientist. Namibia was not traditionally a site of professionalising the local people. The conclusion of this thesis addresses the issue of a training strategy for archaeology in Namibia which will be tactically anchored on rethinking the role of archaeology in developing the national narrative of Namibia.

Informal training at archaeological sites

The idea of democratising archaeological spaces in Namibia took the form of informal training of black Namibians. There are many examples of informal training programs that took place at major archaeological sites such as the Dâureb/Brandberg Mountain and Twyfelfontein. These courses were designed and conducted by individual archaeologists who worked at the sites. The professional archaeologists were concerned about the lack of local expertise. They also wanted to use their respective research results to conserve archaeological heritage. Therefore, they designed and offered training workshops that were aimed at capacitating the communities that lived near the archaeological sites. Some of the training workshops were commissioned by the state heritage agencies while others were implemented by individual archaeologists in collaboration with local institutions. I critically assess some of the projects that were conducted by the Heinrich-Barth-Institute of the University of Cologne in this chapter. However, by doing so I do not claim that it was only the University of Cologne that trained local community members. Rather the documentary sources of the Heinrich-Barth-Institute of the University of Cologne have been more accessible to me than those of other institutions and of other individuals.

One of the training workshops that was offered to the local communities targeted female members of the Dâureb Mountain Guides Association (DMGA). The training project was designed by Tilman Lenssen-Erz and Marie Theres-Erz of the Heinrich-Barth-Institute of the

University of Cologne and it aimed at empowering and capacitating woman guides at the Brandberg and Spitzkoppe Mountains. Training of the woman guides took place at the Brandberg Mountain.

There had been gender disparity in conducting tours to the upper Brandberg. The male guides had created an impression that it was too demanding for their female counterparts to scale the summit of the mountain. The DMGA were paid on a commission basis which was calculated according to the number of tours or days an individual guided per month. Tours to the upper Brandberg took up to a week while those to popular sites in the lower Brandberg could be completed in a matter of hours. The daily remuneration rate for the upper Brandberg sites was higher than that for sites in the lower Brandberg. Women guides were thus relegated to lower paying tours to the White Lady shelter and other sites in the lower Brandberg. The real motivation for male guides was that it generated higher income to guide tours to the upper mountain than to the White Lady shelter. To address this disparity Lenssen-Erz and Theres-Erz developed and implemented a workshop called "Empowerment and capacity building for female guides of the DMG".

The training workshop was funded by the University of Cologne-based Jutta Vogel Foundation in 2011. The training programme covered ten specific areas: communication skills, leadership skills, health, security, hygiene, ecology, learning the pathways and routes in the mountain, archaeology (rock art in particular), and nature studies.[165] The instructors of this training project included local guides who had vast experience of the mountain, such as

[165] T. Lenssen-Erz and Marie-Theres Erz. Qualifizierungweiblicher Füher am Brandberg. Bericht und Abrechnung. (Unpublished report, 2011).

Angula Shipahu and Efraim Mateus. These two elderly local guides were the people who had discovered most of the rock arts sites that were subsequently documented by Pager.

A journalist, Steve Felton, who accompanied the Heinrich-Barth-Institute team during the training project expressed how Shipahu's knowledge of the landscape and archaeology was sought after throughout the training programme. The journalist noted how on the second day of climbing the mountain the team could not reach their target camping site. Despite the fact that they could see the target camp site from a distance, Angula knew that they would not reach it before the sunset. According to Felton:

> The goal was the Wasserfall Cave, and we could see it in the distance, high up a hill on the other side of a steep gorge, but the sun was going down. Tilman wanted to press on – as team leader he never tired – but Angula knows what is possible and when to stop.[166]

Therefore, Angula instructed all to camp at a lower site. The knowledge that Shipahu had amassed over the 38 years of guiding in the mountain was decisive. At the end of the training the female guides were awarded certificates by the Heinrich-Barth-Institute which confirmed that they had climbed the mountain and "learned something about guiding and rock art,"[167] as Felton noted. Although this training programme did not professionalise members of the local community as archaeologists, it prepared them for engagement with archaeology. Similar short training programmes were offered at the behest of the National Heritage Council of Namibia by many other archaeologists, including John Kinahan and Siyakha Mguni from the Rock Art Research Institute at the University of the Witwatersrand.

[166] S. Felton, 'Conservancy ladies tackle the Brandberg' available at http://www.nacso.org.na/news/2011/06/conservancy-ladies-tackle-the-brandberg retrieved 11 September 2019.
[167] S. Felton, ibid.

Although the informal training increased the knowledge among local community participants, it was not accredited. The certificates of participation were not useful for promotion or for gaining formal employment. Job advertisements required university or accredited formal training. The qualifications that were required were a university degree in archaeology or anthropology. Some posts that were mainly for the management of the rock art sites required either a bachelor's degree or a postgraduate diploma in heritage management and conservation and at least one year of experience at managerial and supervisory level. In some cases, a 3-year diploma in history, anthropology, sociology, geography of conservation science coupled with 3 years of job-related experience were required.[168]

Through the short training workshops, local community members acquired an aptitude that could only earn them employment as tour guides at the archaeological sites that belonged to the National Heritage Council, and not as archaeologists. However, their wages remained lower than those of registered national guides.[169] Even though the local communities became knowledgeable and specialised in their archaeological sites they were still not legally regarded as qualified tour guides. They were not accredited by the Namibia Tourism Board as required by the law.[170] The regulations required that for one to be registered as a tour guide they had to be in possession of at least a high school qualification. Such a qualification was fixed at the Namibia Qualifications Framework level 3, which is an equivalent of Advanced Level at high school. The challenge on the ground is that most local community guides did not possess high school qualifications at matric level. The Heinrich-Barth-Institute's training

[168] Position advertisement: Site Manager Brandberg and Spitzkoppe National Heritage site, *The Namibian Newspaper*, 6 March 2019.
[169] The term national guide is used in Namibia to refer to guides that work for private tourism firms. These guides attain the National Guiding Certificate. This qualification is at Level 3 on the national qualification framework of the Namibia Qualifications Authority. Namibia Academy of Tourism and Hospitality, 'Qualification, Subject and Time tables', available at https://www.nathnamibia.org/subjects.html, retrieved 18 August 2020.
[170] Regulations relating to tour guides in Namibia: Namibia Tourism Board Act, 2000 (Act 21 of 2000).

programme for women guides at the Brandberg was aimed at capacitating local communities who could not be recognised as guides due to stringent legal requirements of the Namibia Tourism Board. The training was instead described as capacity building and not professionalisation. It was explicitly explained in the course structure that the training was to develop aptitude in the community regardless of whether or not this would be used after the training.[171]

Such training courses aimed at opening up the archaeology landscape in Namibia with a view to increasing participation. However, a critical evaluation of capacity building workshops reveals that they perpetuated the status quo. The local people did not get professionalised. In the case of training at archaeological sites in Namibia the local communities were neither professionalised as archaeologists nor as tour guides. They were prepared through the training to be security guards. The National Heritage Council of Namibia implemented a regulation that prohibited the visitation to rock art sites without a local guide. This might sound as if the guides were being recognised for their 'qualifications' but in reality this was done to ensure that no rock art was damaged by the visitors. Nationally recognised guides insisted on guiding their own visitors to the rock art sites. The local guides accompanied the national guides but could not take over the interpretations. However, the local guides could perform guiding tasks for the visitors who came on their own and not as part of tour operators' itineraries.

[171] T. Lenssen-Erz, 'Workshop: Empowerment and capacity building for female guides of the DMG', (unpublished course material, 2011) clearly stated that: "The training is a means of capacity building since whether they will later on offer guided tours or not, at any rate they will always be able to convincingly maintain on front of tourists or their colleagues that they have profound knowledge of what the upper mountain is about since they have seen it themselves in a particularly intense training (differently from their male colleagues who never had a particular training especially for the upper mountain (sic)."

Informal training in the form of capacity building workshops was not recognised for prior learning for purposes of entry into university degree programmes. It was also not recognised for registration as a professional guide under the Namibia Tourism Board Act 21 of 2000. At the end of the women's guide training at the Brandberg, the trainees were awarded certificates of successful participation. The certificate was neither accredited by the University of Cologne nor recognised by the Namibia Qualifications Authority. Programmes of such a nature have developed highly knowledgeable people who then have not been able to use the knowledge gainfully. Former participants of such capacity building training workshops at the Brandberg and Twyfelfontein revealed in interviews for this dissertation that they assumed that after the training their certificates would assist them to obtain a better pay grade. They also pointed out they had assumed they had acquired some qualification that would assist them in securing better employment grades in the National Heritage Council. The participants were however disappointed to realise that their certificates of attendance at training workshops were not accredited. According to scholars such as Lapeyre certificates of participation should allow participants a pathway into formal and accredited training.[172] The conclusion of this thesis revisits this idea of a pathway into certified and accredited programmes as a way of decolonising archaeological education in Namibia and breaking the barriers to higher and vocational education.

I argue here that such capacity building training workshops can be useful building blocks for pathways into formal professionalisation of archaeologists in Namibia. I further posit that the decolonisation of archaeology in Namibia can more likely be achieved through a postarchaeocentric turn.[173] For capacity building training courses to be relevant and useful,

[172] Lapeyre, 'Community-based Tourism as a Sustainable Solution to Maximise Impacts Locally? The Tsiseb Conservancy Case, Namibia', *Development Southern Africa*, 27, 5 (2010), 757-772.
[173] I explain this concept in the dissertation conclusion where I propose a new archaeology for the postcolonial Namibia which will be an addition to the archaeologies that are practiced in the country.

the development of training modules should be done in collaboration with local training or teaching institutions. This will ensure that local accreditation requirements and regulations are fulfilled. Articulation to a higher level of qualification can be guaranteed if the training programmes are recognised by local agencies. In the absence of a local professional association that can regulate the practice of archaeology, the training programme can be assessed by the Namibia Training Authority and registered on the National Qualification Framework (NQF). Once the programme has been registered on the NQF and accredited by the National Council of Higher Education, it can be proposed as a pathway to a degree qualification.

A good example of pathways to undergraduate studies is found at the Cardiff University in Wales.[174] A pathway to a particular degree programme such as archaeology is equivalent to 'A' level. A candidate who successfully completes a pathway can articulate to a degree study programme. For local community members who aspire to be archaeologists such a pathway in Namibia would have to recognise the prior learning or experience that they possess. On the other hand, an accredited capacity-building qualification can be useful for those who aspire to be registered as accredited guides. Such pathways also have to take into account that there are some other types of archaeologies that local communities have practiced. However, such archaeologies have not been recognised so far because they have not stemmed from formalised and recognised qualification-bearing programmes.

I argue here that archaeology does not only manifest itself through the professionalised documentation and analysis of finds, surfaces, sedimentation and stratigraphies by using

[174] Cardiff University. 'Part-time courses for adult: pathways to a degree' available at https://www.cardiff.ac.uk/part-time-courses-for-adults/pathways-to-a-degree, retrieved 11 September 2019.

scientific methods. Other archaeologies are practiced by local communities and do not depend on the analyses of professional archaeologists. The appropriation of the rock art of the Brandberg by the local Damara-speaking people and the infusion of their own traditions into their own interpretations of the rock art can be regarded as some form of archaeological practice. Such new interpretations can be equated to the development of the interpretive model of rock art that was based on the San ethnography in South Africa. An earlier interview that I had conducted with the traditional custodian of the Brandberg, the late Mr !Hannabeb pointed to some great similarities between the San trance dance and the traditional healing practices of the Damara speaking people.[175]In addition to the similarities the Damara-speaking people had appropriated the San rock art for their day to day navigation purposes in the landscape. Mr !Hannabeb gave an example of how they observed that giraffes painted in white colour were always located near semi-permanent sources of water while those in red were near permanent sources of water.[176] The Damara people of the Dâureb Mountain used these patterns to navigate the mountain when they were herding their sheep and goats.

Local and international archaeologists, particularly from South Africa, were contracted by the National Heritage Council to offer training to local guides at archaeological sites. This resulted in different training systems but with similar emphasis on the scientific information. This approach was required especially for the purposes of standardising the information that was disseminated to the visitors. However, this also created some form of hierarchy of knowledges whereby the knowledge of the local guides was either downgraded or disregarded completely. Such knowledge and ways of knowing did not find their ways into the official narrative at archaeological sites. The community participants were taught the

[175] Goodman Gwasira, Interview with Mr !Hannabeb on the Meaning and use of Daureb rock art to Damara people. Ugab River, May 28, 2000, National Museum of Namibia. The late Mr !Hannabeb was the traditional custodian of the Brandberg Mountain and lived at the Ugab River at the edge of the mountain.
[176] Goodman Gwasira, Interview with Mr !Hannabeb, May, 28, 2000, National Museum of Namibia.

theories of rock art interpretation and the science of rock art. Here I argue that new approaches that recognise the potential of local knowledge systems can be very helpful in understanding archaeology. Such approaches will help in countering the coloniality of archaeological practice and knowledge production.

The archaeology of the Dâureb Mountain conducted during the colonial period missed an opportunity to benefit from cooperation with local communities in order to develop multi-layered and multi-vocal narratives of the precolonial history of Namibia. The *status quo* was maintained through the purely scientific training that took place after independence. The effect of this is exemplified in the choreographed, scientised presentation of the archaeological heritage of the Dâureb Mountain by local guides. The local guides can recite all the Latin names of the flora and fauna found in the Brandberg. In addition, they narrate the scientific interpretations of the rock art without including their own local narratives (in the official recitation) regarding the mountain and its cultural heritage. This creates the impression that they do not have any cultural attachment to the rock art whereas such attachment is actually actively supressed by dominant 'scientific' knowledge. Allowing the local guides to practice their own form of archaeology and infuse some of their traditional knowledge will re-empower and re-dignify them.

Andrea Nightingale argued that "The promotion of expert knowledge and professional practice is often used as a somewhat contradictory vehicle for educated elites to retain control over the ownership and knowledge about the sites".[177] There was some form of exploitation of the knowledge that was 'scientised'. This created a distinction between such knowledge

[177] A. J. Nightingale, '"The experts taught us all we know": Professionalisation and Knowledge in Nepalese Community Forestry', *Antipode*, 37, 3 (2005), 581-604.

and local knowledges. The 'scientised' knowledge was perceived as professional while local knowledges were completely and officially omitted because they could not be validated using scientific methods.

This served to entrench power relations in which the scientist claimed authority while the local people were receivers and users of that authoritative knowledge. This approach undermined the ability to democratise the archaeological space in Namibia. Instead, it further marginalised and alienated the local communities from archaeological knowledge of which their ancestors have been identified as some of the cultural authors. The local communities had a closer relationship to the sites and artefacts than the professional archaeologists and European scientists. It is often argued in the case of the Brandberg that a direct relationship between the Damara speakers, who are the majority of the local community near the Brandberg, and the rock art has not been established yet. However, over the many years that the local people interacted with the rock art, they developed new attitudes and even appropriated the art for their own utilitarian purposes. In addition, there have been postulations, which were based on depictions of archery in the rock art, that the Damara people could have created some of the art in the Brandberg.[178]

The knowledge that formed the syllabi that the guides were taught by the professional archaeologists was assembled in specific empirical and political contexts. Therefore, the impact of the knowledge that was offered during the training of local guides cannot be underestimated. Such knowledge must be interrogated in the context of a postcolonial critique of archaeology. Scientific studies in archaeology were carried out in a cocoon but not

[178] H-D. Noli, 'The Technical Investigation into the Material Evidence for Archery in the archaeological and Ethnographical Record of Southern Africa' (PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, 1993).

in a vacuum. Local communities were not considered to be able to contribute meaningfully to scientific studies. They were restricted to roles of porters and other menial tasks such as fetching water and cooking for scientists.[179]

Western science and western concepts of heritage were tools of alienation and control of local communities. The training workshops had the effect of reinforcing the power relations between the scientists and the local communities. The consequence of this was a continued suppression of the knowledges of the African communities and the perpetuation of a hierarchical order of knowledge. Training of local communities through capacity-building workshops resulted in further gate-keeping of the profession by archaeologists.

A postcolonial critique of archaeology requires that we pose questions about the symbiotic connection between the introduction of the discipline of archaeology in Africa (and attendant museum collecting) and its closeness to military conquest and colonisation.[180] A critical reflection of such contexts reveals that archaeological sites and practices were reflections of colonial control, of a racial state, and of a postcolonial state with persistent racial and colonial legacies, even of multiple colonial metropoles. Under these conditions, archaeological sites were made to be places of glorified discoveries. They had no chance of becoming sites of mutual knowledge production and sharing, even though local people possessed their own archaeological knowledge. These archaeological sites became sites of appropriation and dispossession. The knowledge that the local tour guides developed could not be used to improve their chances of obtaining better paying jobs elsewhere. The capacity-building

[179] N. Shepherd, '"When the Hand that Holds the Trowel is Black…": Disciplinary Practices of Self-Representation and the Issue of "Native" Labour in Archaeology', *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 3, 3 (2003), 334-352.
[180] D. Hicks, *The Brutish Museums: The Benin Bronzes, Colonial Violence and Cultural Restitution* (London: Pluto Books, 2020).

workshops functioned to maintain control and inequality. European graduates of archaeology who were professionalised through academic qualifications could then be employed in any archaeology-related job while the local communities who received capacity-building training remained porters for researchers.

Discussion and conclusion

The professionalisation of archaeology in Southern Africa functioned to control how the discipline was practiced and in the process was used as a method of excluding other actors and "other forms of knowledge associated with the archaeological past" as Shepherd argued.[181] It also led to specialisation according to areas of expertise. The effect of this was that it created hierarchies of knowledge. 'Scientised' knowledge became more dominant over other forms such as traditional knowledge. Professionalised archaeology assumed that local people were detached from the archaeological sites and artefacts. The main focus of archaeology in Namibia was on the Stone Ages and the antiquity of the development of humans. In such a case, contemporary communities were not viewed as the cultural authors of archaeology and therefore were excluded. The knowledge of contemporary communities which in most cases was accumulated over a long time of appropriation of the sites was either ignored or perceived not to exist. Contemporary communities were perceived and not having the capacity or the authority to speak about archaeology.[182]

Archaeology was 'scientised' in a way that systematically disqualified those perceived to be non-scientific actors who had established archaeology in southern Africa. Part of the 'scientisation' was achieved through the governance of the practice, which was done by

[181] N. Shepherd, 'Disciplining Archaeology; the Invention of South African Prehistory 1923-1953', *Kronos*, 28 (2002), 127-145.
[182] This was in spite of the local communities' close proximity to sites and apparent evidence that they appropriated archaeological resources for their own day to day uses.

setting regulations and standards that were discriminatory against the untrained archaeologist. ASAPA was the culmination of a long history of disciplinary-related societies that began with the founding of the Cape Archaeological Society in 1944 by A.J.H. Goodwin, and that was later transformed into the South African Archaeological Society in 1945.[183] Such popular societies sought to promote and organise the practice of amateur archaeology in Southern Africa. They were established to share results of hobby-archaeology. The Cape Archaeological Society was then transformed into the South African Archaeological Society so that it could cover the Union of South Africa and even neighbouring countries such as the then Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and South West Africa (now Namibia).

Professionalisation of archaeology in Southern Africa consolidated the position of experts over non-experts. It was a practice of giving agency to expert knowledge. In addition to professional associations and legislation, the discovery of radiometric dating techniques revolutionised and professionalised archaeology. This created of a category of expert archaeologists who were trained to collect samples in order to date and calibrate them and to interpret the radiometric dates. This created a select group of trained archaeologists whose knowledge was considered as superior to that of the amateurs.

In a discussion of professionalisation of planning in Britain, which underwent a similar process to how archaeology was professionalised in southern Africa, Healey noted that the linkage of expert knowledge to training requirements resulted in the occupational control which had the ultimate impact of monopoly and protectionism. In the case of archaeology in Southern Africa, professionalisation was configured around powerful academic personalities, such as Goodwin and Inskeep in South Africa. In Namibia, professionalisation was associated

[183] 'Editorial', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 161 (1995), 1-2.

with the University of Cologne archaeology, Rudolph Kuper. These powerful academic personalities could easily achieve their undertaking of professionalising archaeology in Southern Africa. They established a monopoly of the practice and ensured protectionism because they were linked to influential academic institutions, the Universities of Cape Town and Cologne respectively. They also had influence in institutions such as the National Monuments Council and the museums. The main difference between processes of professionalisation in South African and Namibia was that in South Africa it resulted in the localisation of archaeological practice, including developing nomenclature that was based on local South African conditions. Thus, the academics in South Africa "South Africanised" archaeology according to Shepherd.[184]

The German approach in Namibia did not localise the professionalisation. Instead, Namibia remained a centre for extractive archaeological practices that sought to 'mine data' which was then transformed into knowledge back in Germany. Namibia was a field for professionalising German archaeologists, as can be shown by the postgraduate throughput obtained after studying Namibian archaeology. The professionalisation of German students through research on Namibian archaeological sites did not result in academic institutionalisation of archaeology in Namibia. German archaeologists did not practice in Namibia after completing the process of professionalisation.[185]

[184] N. Shepherd, 'Disciplining Archaeology; the Invention of South African Prehistory 1923-1953', *Kronos*, 28, (2002), 127-145.

[185] This does not mean that no German-trained archaeologists worked professionally in Namibia. Erich Wolfgang Wendt worked in the Cologne project and was famous for discovering the oldest datable works of art at Apollo 11 in 1969. Gerhard Fock trained at the University of Tübingen in Germany and was the first professional archaeologist to work at the State Museum in Windhoek before moving to the Northern Cape in South Africa where he worked as an archaeologist at the McGregor Museum until his retirement. Fock like his counterparts, Scherz and Wendt also obtained DFG funding through the Cologne project.

Professionalisation in Namibia was partly enabled by denying opportunities for the development of institutions for the training of archaeologists in Namibia. There was an idea from Shirley Pager to establish a Harald Pager Study Centre in Windhoek, but this was rejected by authorities from the Forschungsstelle Afrika at the University of Cologne.[186] The reasons proffered for this denial were that there were no scientists who would use such a centre in Windhoek and such a move would make Pager a local hero and not the international scientist he was. This proposal was not viewed as an opportunity to localise the professionalisation of archaeology in Namibia and establish resources locally. The University of Cologne discouraged the idea of the study centre because that would have exposed Pager's work in a way that they would not have been able to control. That could have resulted in material being published by other people before the Forschungsstelle Afrika. Any proposal for the use of the Pager material for publications was denied. Dr Eva Crane from England suggested such a publication and it was turned down.[187] Kinahan also proposed a "*Festschrift*" in the honour of Harald Pager but this too was denied.[188] This can be interpreted as part of the characteristics of the Cologne archaeological project towards the professionalisation of archaeology in Namibia. It was influenced by the desire to achieve protectionism. The Namibian archaeology section of the *Forschungsstelle Afrika* was justified and authenticated by Pager's work and therefore allowing the Pager documentation to be domiciled in Namibia would have been self-defeating.[189] Developing a Pager Study

[186] According to a letter from Forschungsstelle Afrikas to Shirley-Ann Pager (Pager's wife) dated 18.07.86. Forschugsstelle Afrikas, Jennerstr. The files in the Forschungsstelle Afrika are not yet curated. There is, no standardised system in place for this rich archive of correspondence and other administrative information about the Cologne project in Namibia. In this thesis these correspondence will be identified by the dates when the letters were written which is followed by information of where the files were stored during the time of my field research in 2016.

[187] According to a letter from Eva Crane dated 14.08.1985, Forschugsstelle Afrikas, Jennerstr.

[188] Letter from Forschungsstelle Afrikas to Shirley-Ann Pager (Pager's wife) dated 18.07.86. Forschugsstelle Afrikas, Jennerstr.

[189] The Pager documentation was eventually returned to Namibia in 2005 which was a year that marked the official end of the Cologne rock art project in Namibia. The copies of the Pager rock art are at the National Archives of Namibia. The associated documentation such as photographs and notes, including Pager's diary are

Centre in Namibia would have meant that Namibia would potentially have become a centre for knowledge production and not just a field for 'data' extraction. Researchers would then have had to spend time in Namibia studying the Harald Pager documentation.

After Pager's death, two archaeologists went to Namibia to collect the rock art documentation that Pager had assembled under the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) funding. This material included slides, photographs, tracings and diaries of the upper Brandberg. It was made clear that there was an agreement between Pager and *Forschungsstelle Afrika* that the material would remain property of the Institut für Ur und Fruhgeschichte. Shirley-Anne Pager made sure that they separated material from the upper Brandberg from Pager's other work, which was not part of the contract.[190]

The Professionalisation of archaeology in Southern Africa had the effect of pushing amateur archaeologists out of practice. While this was the case mainly in South Africa, as it turned out, in Namibia, amateur archaeology was bolstered through some semi-formal professionalisation that happened in settings of international networks of individuals and institutions.

In discussing exclusion as an impact of that professionalisation of archaeology in Southern Africa, it is instructive to remember the comment by Jalmar and Ione Rudner (Rudners) that appeared in the 28th issue of the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*: "the role of the amateur archaeologists in South Africa is coming to an end and the professional archaeologist is taking over."[191] Jalmar Rudner had worked in South Africa as well as in Namibia. His

still in Cologne. This material forms the cornerstone of a new project known as the *'African* Archaeology *Archive Cologne'*.

[190] Letter from Shirley-Ann Pager dated 14 August 1985, Forschugsstelle Afrikas, Jennerstr.

[191] J. Rudner and I. Rudner, 'End of an Era', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, (1973), 13-26.

focus had been on shell middens and sites that were considered to have originated from the so-called strandloppers or the Khoi, but as with other amateur archaeologists he also collected and recorded any interesting archaeological artefacts outside his primary interest. He was an honorary curator of archaeology at the South African Museum long before the first professional archaeologist was employed there.

Amateur archaeologists felt threatened by professionalisation that happened through academic encirclement and by the promulgation of what they perceived as hostile heritage laws. The desire to create and protect positions for students who were graduating in archaeology and the changes in heritage laws such that a permit was required for collection of surface artefacts threatened the existence of amateur archaeological practice in Southern Africa. Until 1969, the practice of amateur archaeology was encouraged, and to some extent regulated by the South African Archaeological Society, which Goodwin had formed in 1945 to "help the amateur and cooperate with members and institutions in research and protection of archaeological material and records."[192]

Not only were posts filled by newly trained professional archaeologists but the rigorous demands of writing technical papers for publication in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* exerted pressure on the amateur archaeologists. As the Rudners noted, "there have been complaints that the bulletin has become too technical for the layman."[193] Thus the amateur archaeologists could not even continue to communicate their work with their audience and with each other. In addition to this they no longer had unrestricted access to

[192] J. Rudner and I. Rudner, 'End of an Era', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, (1973), 13.
[193] J. Rudner and I. Rudner, 'End of an Era', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, (1973), 13.

archaeological sites. The professional archaeologists had been gradually privileged to generate and circulate expert knowledge.

Having read this concern regarding the tightening of access to information dissemination that was raised by the Rudners. I set out to trace the development of such an exclusivist process of professionalisation. I searched through issues of the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* between 1945 to 1973. The Rudners made a claim that 1960 marked the beginning of a new era in South African archaeology. The era was characterised by the taking over of the practice by the trained professional archaeologists.

However, I extended the period of publication that I focussed on to include the year that their concern was published so as to see if there were some changes in the structure of the *Bulletin* and also to establish when the strict conditions were introduced. The first 8 years (1945-1952) of the *Bulletin* reveal that there was no standardisation of the format in which the articles contributed to the bulletin was expected. It was purely a popular publication for the enthusiast that included what could have passed as technical papers from a few individuals. The majority of the articles in this period were reports about encountering some artefacts and general information about archaeology in the world. Even in cases where articles were written and some references were included there was no prescribed style of referencing that was preferred for the *Bulletin*. It appears that it was left to individuals to decide how to compile a list of references. This is clearly illustrated in the 1947 *Bulletin* in which three different authors referred to the same journal in their list of references but used different ways of citing the journal. One cites the *South African Journal of Science* as: H.B.S. Cooke: *S. Afr. Jour. Sci.* xxxv, 1938 (204 -208). The other cites it as: S. C. van Riet Lowe 1938: Early man and past climates in South Africa. *S. Af. J. Sci.* vol XXXV (432). The third writes: Well, L.H:

Marine Animals in a Rock Painting near Fouriesburg, OFS. *S. Af. Jour. Sci.*Vl.1. XLll, 236 - 239, 1946.[194] Such inconsistences are common features in the first issues of the bulletin. It appears anyone could use any style of referencing as long as it looked scientific. The fact that the three authors were referring to the same journal title and publishing in the same issue of the *Bulletin* should have warranted some form of uniformity in the way in which they cited the journal in their lists of references.

From volume VII of 1953, the journal adopted a new structure. Research articles were given prominence as the first articles. These were placed immediately following the editorial. This seems to have been more of a structural change that was necessitated by the need to group articles and make the *Bulletin* easier to comprehend than a decision toward professionalisation. There was no mention of any intention to standardise the articles based on conventions of academic writing. Nevertheless, it can be argued that these were the first signs of treating contributions differently in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. The journal had started developing a 'scientific outlook'. Research articles often had a particular scientific structure that included some supporting evidence for the claims that they made in the form of statistical data, charts, tables, maps, radio-carbon dates and even a bibliography.

Dissatisfaction with the approach of the *Bulletin* as being too scientific for the layman were recorded in the editorial of volume IX no. 34 of 1954. Here there was a clear sign that there was some ranking of knowledge depending on who produced it and how it was produced. The *Bulletin* used terms such as 'non-sensational', 'accurate', 'informative' and 'non-informative' as a means of expressing a judgement based on criteria that relegated some forms of knowing as less important than others. In this example, the *South African*

[194] All these articles were published in the *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 11, 6 (1947).

Archaeological Bulletin can be said to have provided a platform for professionalising archaeology.

The annual report of the South African Archaeological Society in 1954 informed the members that in the process of morphing into a professional scientific bulletin the members of the editorial team were "keen on informative, accurate and non-sensational articles."[195] It also justified the strict conditions that were required to be met before an article could be considered for publication. This was part of the process of ensuring professionalisation. Articles for publication were benchmarked on international standards. Technical articles were viewed as constituting "professional and overseas appeal". Standardisation of articles had started with the publication of conventions of making line drawings of artefacts by Van Riet Lowe.[196] Uniformity and consistency in data presentation distinguished the professional from the amateur. This was again one way in which the amateur archaeologist was being systematically driven into oblivion.

Non-research articles were written without references, which distinguished them from scientific or technical articles. An analysis of the back issues of the *South African Archaeological Bulletin* indicated that from 1953 onwards, more articles by amateurs were relegated to the correspondence section, which was reserved for the back pages of the *Bulletin*. Due to the fact that there were still very few professional archaeologists, the bulletin carried technical articles from mostly the same individuals. However, some amateurs resorted to co-publishing with trained professional archaeologists.

[195] South African Archaeological Society Annual report, publications, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, IX, 33 (1954), 59.
[196] C. van Riet Lowe, 'Notes on drawing stone Implements', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, IX, 33 (1954), 30-31.

The development of the standards was done by the professionals, which gives an indication that they set the standards in the belief that a professional always conformed to standards. In 1956 the *Bulletin* published another set of standards for illustrating artefacts that directed how drawings were to be made and even stipulated the size of the photographs.[197] However, inasmuch as this seems intended to achieve scientific accuracy, it also has to be read in the context of technological requirements for printing. That was the required standard for letter press printing then. Preparing an article for publication was made even more difficult for the amateur archaeologist when new requirements were published in 1956. The new requirements stipulated the need for a literature review and bibliography of references. The main challenge was that archaeology for amateurs was a pastime while for professionals it was an occupation. Professionals were more likely to be rewarded for publishing professional and technical articles. On the other hand, the motivation for amateurs was to share exciting material, and hence, their output did not require the form of a scientific article.

Professionalisation of archaeology functioned to privilege expert knowledge against other forms of knowledge production and knowing. It was exclusive and created stratification, in which the professional archaeologists were perceived as the producer of scientific and objective knowledge. The amateur's knowledge was no longer made easily accessible through the *Bulletin*. The structure of the *Bulletin* changed further when Inskeep took over as editor after the death of Goodwin in 1959. Contributions by amateurs, some of whom had featured regularly in earlier issues of the *Bulletin,* were consigned to the correspondence section towards the end of the publication. The first issue of the *Bulletin* in 1945 reflected contents that were mixed, but as the discipline became more professionalised and more

[197] South African Archaeological Society, 'Illustrations for Reproduction', *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* XI, 42 (1956), 28.

trained archaeologists took positions in the heritage sector, the journal became more rigorous and in the process alienated its founding constituency, the amateur.

This chapter has examined the various forms in which professionalisation of archaeology in Namibia took place. I argued that the failure of professionalising local Namibian archaeologists in the country was a result of Namibia being perceived as a site for extracting archaeological evidence and not as a site for knowledge production. Namibia's history of deep and multiple colonialisms led to the paternalistic practice of archaeology by the metropoles of colonialism. Archaeological practice in Namibia was a miniature representation of the political order and the hierarchies of knowledge production that were dominant before independence. Professionalisation entrenched alienation and segregation by race and gender. That this state of affairs continued after independence reflected the legacies of Namibia's colonialisms and the coloniality of knowledge production.

The metropoles were involved in an intellectual project that saw the geographical location of archaeological archives and training in the institutions outside Namibia. Some archives ended up at the Basler Afrika Bibliographien (BAB), others at the Forschungsstelle Afrikas at the University of Cologne, some in France, and some at the University of the Witwatersrand's Rock Art Research Institute. Such a location of knowledge was accompanied by different uses of the archives. Other archives such as the BAB were active in the sense that they continuously developed projects that used the archives through exhibitions such as the 'White Lady Black Lady: photography in everyday life in African rock art research', and in publications and thematic discussions.[198] The correspondence archives at the University of

[198] The exhibition was co-curated by Dag Henrichsen and his colleagues from the Basler Afrika Bibliographien together with a student working group from the University of Basel. It was first installed in Switzerland at the Basler Afrika Biblographien in 2016 after which it was installed in Windhoek at the Franco Namibian Cultural Centre in 2017. In both cases a workshop was organised around issues of colonial photography. The first

Cologne remained un-curated and mainly unused. However, the correspondence of Harald Pager with the Institut für Ur und Fruhgeschichte was very important for understanding the development of formal archaeological projects and the professionalisation of archaeology in Namibia. Pager's documentation of the rock art of the Brandberg in the form of photographs, slides, tracings and parts of his diary were, however, organised and made accessible as part of the African Archaeology Archive, Cologne. The archives on Namibia's archaeology are also kept at the Southern African Rock Art Digital Archive at Witwatersrand University.

The metropoles contested each other at times. One such a contestation was demonstrated by the discussion that followed a public presentation by Lenssen-Erz on the new Cologne project "Tracking in the caves" at the Cologne workshop on "Photography and rock art research in Southern Africa' in 2016.[199] In the heated discussion, Lenssen-Erz was criticised for viewing the San people as objects of study and not as co-workers at archaeological sites as he claimed. This was a moment that demonstrated the ideological differences of metropoles as they challenge each other on ethical grounds. This exchange recreated Namibia as an object of study. Namibia continued to fascinate researchers from overseas metropoles as a site of academic contention where theories and approaches can be tested, including the need for new ethical methods. Namibia has been and continues to be a laboratory for archaeologists, historians and anthropologists to test their approaches.

workshop '*Workshop on Rock art research in southern Africa, the everyday and the significance of photography: A workshop on colonial photographic research archives and contemporary scholarly practices'*, was at the Basler Afrika Bibliographien on 7 July 2016.The workshop in Windhoek '*Workshop: Historical Rock Art& Archaeological Research in Namibia', was held as the Franco-Namibian Cultural Centre in on19 January 2017;* L. Roulet and D. Henrichsen, 'Anneliese and Ernst Rudolf Scherz's 'Ethnographic Object Collection' from Namibia and Southern Africa', *BAB Working Paper,* 1 (2020)1-43.

[199] T. Lenssen-Erz, Tracking in Caves –Sharing Knowledge: Making Indigenous Knowledge a Part of Archaeology', Workshop on *Rock art research in southern Africa, the everyday and the significance of photography: A workshop on colonial photographic research archives and contemporary scholarly practices,* Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 7 July 2016.

Finally, I also argued in this chapter that the failure to establish archaeology education programmes in Namibia after independence can be attributed to archaeology not being a state priority. Archaeology has failed to position itself as a discipline of the nation, in the way that it did in independent Zimbabwe. Namibia's national narrative has remained anchored on resistance to colonialism and the prosecution of the liberation struggle. Archaeological research has not made a case for addressing such issues and sites of battles and killings through the resources of historical archaeology. Failure to contribute to the national narrative resulted in archaeology being unable to position itself as a discipline of building a new society in Namibia. Such a reframed archaeology need not be located within the work of building the nation. What is needed rather is a socially engaged archaeological practice that challenges the authority of the professional.

Chapter Four

Contract Archaeology in Namibia

Introduction

Contract archaeology in Namibia emerged as a response to shifts in the local and international legislation regarding environmental impact management. These laws, policies, and regulations made it mandatory for developers to enable pre-development environmental impact assessments to be conducted. According to the Namibian environmental and heritage laws the developer was responsible for paying for the impact assessments. Environmental laws such as the Environmental Management Act (Act 7 of 2007) defined the human environment as "the human environment that is the landscape and natural, cultural, historical, aesthetic, economic and social heritage and values."[200] As such, archaeologists positioned themselves as the providers of specialist archaeological services since environmental impact assessments required specialist reports for cultural heritage as well.

In addition to the heritage and environmental legislation, the development of contract archaeology was promoted by the international funding institutions in the field of development aid that made predevelopment survey a prerequisite for funding major developmental projects in the country. The attainment of Namibian independence placed a huge responsibility on the new government to bring development to the country. especially to parts that were previously disadvantaged by the apartheid policy of Separate Development, which was adopted for Namibia as a result of the Odendaal Commission report of 1964. This policy resulted in gross inequalities related to the development of the Bantustans compared to

[200] Environmental Management Act (Act 7 of 2007). Contract archaeologists in Namibia used this definition on the environment to justify their practice since the National Heritage Act was not explicit about contract archaeology.

that of the police zone area.[201] The adoption of market capitalism by the post-independence government facilitated the growth of a small industry of archaeological service provisions. Private individuals could supply services in response to the demand that was initiated by the requirements of large scale development projects such as dam construction for power generation, where specialist reports were required as part of the environmental impact assessment.[202] I argue in this chapter that the emergence of contract archaeology in Namibia was symbiotically connected to the politics and economics of environmental impact assessment as part of the programme of economic development after independence.

Since the mid-1990s, contract archaeology was one of the most consistently practiced forms of archaeology in Namibia. For instance, more than 400 contracts were completed by one firm, Quaternary Research Services (QRS) to date. This firm has been led by John Kinahan, who is the most prominent professional and academic archaeologist in Namibia. Society does not create space for the valorisation of archaeology as a scholarly practice. The consequence of this is that scholars conduct research in service of commerce. Under these circumstances, the practice of archaeology is subordinated to a commercial interest whereby it prepares the ground for commercial development.[203]

Contract archaeology was extensively practiced in the mining sector such that it became a very prominent and distinct approach to gaining knowledge in archaeology. The high

[201] B. Frayne, 'Political Ideology, Social Change, and Planning Practice in Namibia', *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* 20, 1 (2000), 52-65.
[202] J. Kinahan, 'Heat and Dust: Some Reflections on Contract Archaeology in Southern Africa', *South African Archaeological Bulletin,* 68, 197 (2013), 1-2.
[203] J. Kinahan, 'The Presence of the Past: Archaeology, Environment and Land Rights on the Lower Cunene River', *Cimbebasia,* 17 (2001), 23-39. I cite this paper here not as an example of contract archaeology in Namibia. When the survey was conducted it was commissioned by the government and the archaeologist was the state archaeologist and he carried out the impact assessment in his capacity as a government employee and not a contract archaeologist. However, the paper provides the best example of how the demands of large-scale development required multidisciplinary teams to conduct environmental impact assessments.

prevalence of contract archaeology projects has generated a huge body of grey literature that might one day be useful for analysing and understanding the environmental and cultural past of Namibia. It has been comprehensively and consistently practiced to the extent that it can be regarded as the most conspicuous form of archaeological practice. Therefore, a critical evaluation of the history of contract archaeology in Namibia is justifiable.

Contract archaeology is also referred to as commercial archaeology in some literature. Contract archaeology is a Cultural Resources Management (CRM) practice that involves the conservation and preservation of archaeological evidence as part of the mitigation of the destructive processes of development. There were, however, some practitioners that did not agree that contract archaeology can be equated to CRM. In Namibia, it was practiced mainly as part of specialist reporting for archaeological impact assessments, especially in the mining sector. Contract archaeology was also practiced as part of archaeological surveys that were commissioned by developers or investors. This was influenced by the fact that section 54 (7) of the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) required a developer to engage "a person with appropriate professional qualifications or experience, with a view to determining" the heritage that may be threatened and assess the impact of the development.[204]

In this chapter, the term contract archaeology is used to refer mainly to an archaeological practice that was performed for economic gain in the commercial environment of development and one which contributed to providing specialist reports for environmental impact assessments, as required by both the environmental and heritage laws of Namibia. I critically examine how contract archaeology was organised, administered and practiced in Namibia.

[204]National Heritage Act, Act 27 of 2004, S. 54, ss. 7.

Contract archaeology provided professional services such as "carrying out surveys, excavations and analyses for development projects, usually as part of a larger-scale environmental impact assessment".[205] It has become an arena where private firms and individual consultants provided commercial archaeological services. According to Kinahan, contract archaeology was the area of archaeology in which more and more archaeologists were working. Archaeologists opted to practice contract archaeology because there were few posts for archaeologists in museums and heritage agencies. Few universities in southern African offered archaeology as a programme. Those universities that offered archaeology did not have posts for academic archaeologists. There was no academic programme in archaeology in Namibian universities, which made it impossible to employ trained archaeologists in institutions of higher learning. However, archaeology was only taught as a unit in the history courses as part of the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Education programmes at the University of Namibia.

I argue in this chapter that the lack of proper control and regulation of the practice of contract archaeology stemmed from the fact that the independent Namibia state did not prioritise archaeology as part of the national development agenda. This led to continued relegation, diminution and alienation of all forms of archaeology including those that emanate from communities and those which could contribute to community empowerment as part of heritage. Instead of being properly organised and governed by the state contract archaeology remained located entirely in the commercial sphere and was organised and practiced as a business as part of a capitalist enterprise.

[205] Kinahan, 'The Presence of the Past', 23-39.

One of the questions of this study addressed how contract archaeology made its argument for its authority. Any argument that contract archaeology made was subsumed within commercial agreements entered into at the instigation of developers to conduct surveys, rescue excavations and work in laboratories so that it was able to generate a narrative of self-circulating authority. The commercial nature of contract archaeology distanced the practice from being part of the nation-building project. It was self-regulating and operated on its own authority. This was a means of commercial enablement and compliance, with very limited possibilities for promoting archaeological value.

Terminology

There are various terms through which contract archaeology is known throughout the world. In the United Kingdom, it is mainly known as commercial archaeology. In the United States of America, it is called rescue or salvage archaeology. In southern Africa, the term contract archaeology is used more widely. In some cases, these terms were used interchangeably. However, such usage does not take into account the fundamental differences that can be observed in the practice of such archaeologies. While there were some similarities in the origins of these practices, there were also some critical differences. One key difference is that commercial archaeology is a business run on a profit basis while contract, rescue, or salvage archaeology does not necessarily have to result in financial gain on the part of the contracting archaeologist. The state cannot offer commercial services in archaeology since its role is that of a regulator. Contract, salvage or rescue archaeology can be practiced by the state without the need for the developer to pay more than what is required for the work to be done. In commercial archaeology, on the other hand, the contracting partner pays a market-related professional fee that is profitable on the part of the archaeologist or consulting firm. Fees for these professional archaeological services are then determined by market forces. Archaeology

in these circumstances is considered as heritage that can be commodified and is also perceived as subordinate within a commercial framework.

There is also a difference between contract archaeology and rescue or salvage archaeology. While contract archaeology has a provision for salvaging or rescuing material evidence, this is not its express aim. As it was practiced in Namibia, contract archaeology was a client-driven, legally binding agreement to carry out a survey, assess impacts, and to advise on mitigation as part of ensuring legal compliance. Rescuing or salvaging was only done where necessary. The term contract archaeology is used in this dissertation to refer to a practice of archaeology whereby there is an agreement between two or more parties to engage in a relationship that perceives archaeological heritage as the common factor that needs to be mitigated in response to commercial or capitalist dictates and environmental laws.

Archaeologists such as John Kinahan argued that there must be a distinction between contract archaeology and cultural resources management (CRM) because generally the contracts on which archaeologists are engaged rarely involve the management of cultural resources.[206] Kinahan's argument and observation was based on how contract archaeology evolved and how it was practiced in Namibia. It was predicated on the specialist archaeological reports for environmental impact assessments. Specialist archaeological reports were incorporated as components of the environmental impact assessments that did not require the production of management and conservation plans. According to ASAPA guidelines, specialist reports identify sites, assess significance, comment on the possible impact of the development, and make recommendations for mitigation or conservation.[207] They usually are not the major

[206] Kinahan, 'Heat and Dust', 1-2.
[207] ASAPA (Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists) Constitution and Appendices, available at http://archaeologicalethics.org/code-of-ethics/association-of-southern-african-professional-archaeologists-asapa-constitution-and-appendices, retrieved on 13 February 2020.

components of the environmental impact assessment plans, although they are important components. Contract archaeology in Namibia drew its authority from environmental impact assessments.

According to Ndlovu, there were some similarities among the various terms used to describe this developer funded archaeology. It was a practice in cultural resources management.[208] Contract archaeology makes its claim and justification from the point of view of heritage protection, in ways that are not subordinated to commercial frameworks. In Namibia it emerged as a distinct field of archaeological practice in response to heritage and environmental laws.

Contract archaeology in Southern Africa

The rise of contract archaeology worldwide was entangled with the emergence of environmental conservation laws, as a response to the general economic boom that followed the great depression and the Second World War. There was a concern that material culture needed to be recorded because of the potential destruction of material evidence as part of post-war development and the rebuilding of war-ravaged urban landscapes. In countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States of America, the decade of the 1960s was one of economic expansion that was manifested by the increase in development projects, in the construction sector. Large earth moving projects were taking place, which disturbed archaeological sites, both those that were buried and surface sites. There arose the need to record the sites before they were disturbed and destroyed. In response to this desire to record material evidence of human history, a new branch of archaeology emerged that did not

[208]N. Ndlovu, 'Contract Archaeology in South Africa: Some Ethical Concerns', *Azania Archaeological Research*, 49, 2 (2014), 203-17.

require the formulation of theories and research questions, as was practiced in academic processual archaeology. According to Faulkner, artefacts were viewed as facts which needed to be recorded in situ so as to preserve an 'accurate' record that could be studied by academic archaeologists in the future.[209]

Contract archaeology is perceived by scholars such as Faulkner as some form of official archaeology that was legitimised and authorised by the state.[210] It can be traced back to the time when the ideology of heritage protection was popularised. Faulkner argued that state bureaucracy and legislation were the enablers of contract archaeology. The effect of such state enforcement was that archaeological practice became politically undemocratic. It restricted the "access to archaeology to an elite of self-accredited practitioners".[211] As such, it suppressed other archaeologies such as those from communities. The fact that minimum professional standards had to be met for one to practice contract archaeology made it hierarchical. However, the knowledge that was assembled from contract archaeology was also viewed as of a lower standard than academic archaeology despite being viewed as scientific by both archaeologies.

The ideology of heritage protection is rooted in the concept of 'endangered heritage', which, according to Gnecco and Dias, is in itself a creation of capitalist expansion. The idea of an endangered past was incorporated into heritage management as a way of creating commercial opportunities for cultural resources management practitioners. Hence a demand was artificially created and a supply needed to be generated too. This would lead to a need to transform the archaeological curricula at universities so that it responded to the requirements

[209] N. Faulkner**,** 'Archaeology from Below', *Public Archaeology*, 1 (2000), 21-33.
[210] Ibid.
[211] Ibid, 21.

of contract archaeology. According to Gnecco, "Development creates an endangered past that can be profitably studied but that would not have to be studied had it not been endangered by development."[212]

The emergence of contract archaeology in South Africa and by extension in Southern Africa was symbiotically connected to shrinking university budgets. The first example of formalised contract archaeology was in the form of contracts offices with connections to departments of archaeology at the University of the Witwatersrand and the University of Cape Town (UCT). Both offices were established in anticipation of the promulgation of the Environmental Conservation Act (Act 73 of 1989) in South Africa, which required "impact statements, including those on cultural resources for development."[213] Contract archaeology in South Africa also developed under the circumstances of economic sanctions that were imposed on South Africa with the aim of ending the apartheid system. The sanctions were imposed by the United States of America, European Community nations, and Japan through the comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986.[214] The Commonwealth had also agreed to impose the sanctions on South Africa in August 1986.[215]

The knock-on effect of sanctions on the funding of public life in South Africa was that there was a substantial decrease in government funding for universities and agencies of heritage management, with money directed elsewhere. According to Hilary Deacon, institutions were forced to seek their own financial sources so that they could remain relevant and carry out

[212] C. Gnecco, and A. S. Dias, 'On Contract Archaeology', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 19, 4 (2015), 689.
[213] H. J. Deacon, 'What Future Has Archaeology in South Africa?', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 43, 147 (1988), 3-4.
[214] K. A. Rodman, 'Public and Private Sanctions Against South Africa', *Political Science Quarterly*, 109, 2 (1994), 313-34.
[215] The Commonwealth, 'From the Archive: Sanctions Agreed Against Apartheid-era South Africa'; available at https://thecommonwealth.org/media/news/archive-sanctions-agreed-against-apartheid-era-south-africa, retrieved 23 January 2020.

their mandate. In the field of archaeology, contract archaeology was projected as a viable option.[216]

Contract archaeology was formalised as a distinct field of archaeological practice in South Africa it was already being practiced in an ad hoc manner within universities and museums. It can be safely stated that formalised contract archaeology in South Africa was established from 1989.[217] Nick Shepherd presents a different history of contract archaeology to that of Hilary Deacon. For him, a contextual reading of the history of contract archaeology in South Africa reveals that it developed as a response to the political crisis in South Africa in the late 1980s.[218] South Africa was then experiencing the effects of economic failure, and this exerted pressure on universities. It forced universities to think creatively about how to sustain their disciplines. Archaeology departments had to experiment with contract archaeology. Coincidentally, the Environmental Conservation Act was also being drafted, and this gave an impetus to ideas of archaeological practice as mitigation and commerce that manifested themselves in the departments.

While university budgets were shrinking, positions in museums and universities were also saturated, and hence there was a need to open up new avenues of employment for university graduates. Contract archaeology created employment possibilities and expanded the labour market**.** Contract archaeology was constituted as the fundraising arm for university archaeology departments since government funding on research was reduced.[219] Furthermore, contract archaeology was meant to ensure new posts so that graduates being trained at South

[216] H. J. Deacon, 'What Future Has Archaeology in South Africa?', 3-4.
[217] N. Shepherd, 'Contract Archaeology in South Africa: Traveling Theory, Local Memory and Global Designs', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 19 (2015), 748 -63.
[218] Ibid, 750.
[219] Ndlovu, 'Contract Archaeology in South Africa', 203-17.

African universities would be employed.[220] It was seen as the hope for the broadening and continuation of archaeology. Thus, the formalisation of contract archaeology was encouraged by the passing of the legislation.

In addition to this, an active Cultural Resources Management programme was stimulated based on observations of how contract archaeology was practiced in the United States, where it had been employed since the 1960s. Shepherd accordingly argues that contract archaeology in South Africa was stimulated by ideas of how it was organised and practiced in the USA.[221] In general, European metropoles were largely responsible for the introduction of archaeology in Southern Africa through colonialism. Thus, the archaeologies that were practised in the different southern African countries mirrored those from the colonial metropoles. South Africa, Zimbabwe and Botswana were influenced by Britain (with Cambridge University itself as the metropole), while in Namibia, archaeology reflected the influence of Germany, specifically that of the University of Cologne.

The development of contract archaeology in Namibia followed the same trajectory as that of South Africa. There was a period when the State Museum of Namibia practiced rescue archaeology before it was turned into a field of commercial endeavour. The idea of formalised contract archaeology in Namibia as a commercial venture was adopted from developments in South Africa, which was then the colonial metropole for Namibia. This happened after South Africa passed the Environmental Management Act in 1989. However, the earliest form of contract archaeology in Namibia only manifested itself in the late 1990s.

[220] H.J. Deacon contended that: "It is clear that, with the cut-back in government spending, the creation of new posts will be curtailed. However, there is the prospect that with the introduction of legislation providing for the conservation of the natural environment, a new demand for archaeological services will be made" ('What Future Has Archaeology in South Africa?' 3).
[221] Shepherd, 'Contract Archaeology in South Africa', 748–63.

Contract archaeology emerged in Namibia as a response to the Environmental Assessment Policy, which was adopted in 1995. This kind of archaeology was mobilised around providing commercial services as a sub-practice of environmental impact assessments that contributed to specialist reports. Contract archaeology in this instance focused specifically on the cultural and historical components of the environmental impact assessment reports. The Environmental Assessment Policy enabled contract archaeology through its definition of the term environment, which was "broadly interpreted to include biophysical, social, economic, cultural, historical and political components."[222] This policy was later incorporated into the Environmental management Act (Act 7 of 2007). In addition to responding to the Environmental Assessment Policy, contract archaeology was stimulated by the strict demands of international development agencies. Funding institutions such as the Development Bank made environmental impact assessments a requirement for financing development projects.[223]

Namibia's independence from South Africa exerted pressure on the new democratic government to prioritise provision of essential services, especially in areas that had been systematically denied development under apartheid. Roads and railway networks were built and extended, and health facilities, schools and dams were constructed by the new government of Namibia. Power stations and power lines were also established. In addition to infrastructural development, the management of the post-independence economy opened up the space for large extractive and earth moving industries, mainly in the mining sector. These developments were part of a new dispensation that required the reversal of an inherited, skewed distribution of development. Increased economic activities created the need for

[222] 'Namibia's Environmental Assessment Policy for Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation 1995', available at https://www.met.gov.na/files/downloads/05c_Environmental%20Assesssment%20policy.pdf, retrieved 21 July 2020.
[223] These policies were known as the environmental and social safeguarding policies.

protecting and preserving the environment and its associated heritage resources and thereby stimulated the rise of contract archaeology in Namibia. The development discourse created a demand for archaeological services. The field of contract archaeology was called upon as part of such assessments because there were policies and legislation that supported and directed the practice. Three main areas that were contained in the Environmental Assessment Policy of 1995 in which contract archaeology was conducted were power generation, major dams, and mining.

Before the national policies and legislation were developed and enacted, contract archaeology emerged as a practice that followed the adoption of international best practice among large extractive uranium and diamond mining industries in Namibia.[224] Companies such as Namibia De Beers partnership (Namdeb), which mined diamonds, implemented predevelopment Environmental Impact Assessments that included archaeological surveys. This was in line with the company's environmental policy.[225] Namdeb's consultant archaeologist Dieter Noli was contracted to conduct the archaeological surveys in Oranjemund and Lüderitz. He then continued to provide archaeological consultancies for pre-mining surveys as an individual consultant.[226]

Large-scale projects such as the Kudu Gas Power Station required environmental impact assessments for their powerlines and therefore contract archaeology was called upon. For the Kudu Gas Power Station, Nampower, the parastatal responsible for electricity generation in

[224] In Kinahan, 'Heat and Dust', he pointed out that contract archaeology was 'driven by new global practices and guidelines. In Namibia, I was able to work as an independent contractor fully 10 years in advance of the present heritage legislation'.
[225] Namibia Diamond Corporation Environmental policy 2019 available at https://www.namdeb.com/environmental-policy-2019/, retrieved 4 February 2020.
[226] S. Chirikure and A. Sinamayi, 'World History from the Seabed: Rescuing a Portuguese Shipwreck off the Coast of Namibia', in S. Tripati (ed) *Shipwrecks Around the World: Revelations of the Past* (New Delhi: Delta Book World, 2015), 114-29.

the country, required an environmental impact assessment.[227] The fact that these companies implemented international best practices even in the absence of the law led to the conclusion that contract archaeology was "carried out primarily as the prerogative of the developer rather than at the behest of the authorities."[228] I argue, therefore, that contract archaeology in Namibia emerged as an uncontrolled practice. It remained uncontrolled because there were no policies or guidelines in place that were used to manage contract archaeology. It emerged as a self-regulating practice.[229]

Another element in Namibia that fostered the emergence of contract archaeology was that of heritage resources management. Namibian heritage was managed through the application of the South African National Monuments Act (Act 28 of 1969). This was repealed and replaced by the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) fourteen years after independence. Part VI of the new act outlined the special provisions for the protection and management of certain heritage resources. Section 54 of this act referred to environmental impact assessments that should be done as part of the demands of the Environmental Assessment Policy of 1995 and later the Environmental Management Act of 2007. According to the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004), heritage impact assessments were to be done as part of the environmental impact assessments. The heritage legislation did not explicitly refer to either archaeological impact assessment or to heritage impact assessments. Instead, it unequivocally mentioned environmental impact assessments.[230] The legal basis of contract archaeology in Namibia was

[227] Enviro Dynamics, 'Environmental Impact Assessment of the Power Lines from the Kudu Gas Power Station (Uubvlei Site) to Oranjemond and Obib Respectively. Final Route Evaluation and Environmental Impact Report', Volume 1 (2005), available at https://www.nampower.com.na/public/docs/kudu/eia/Kudu_EIA%20Tx%20Lines_Final%20RepApp%20Envirodynamics_June2005.pdf, retrieved 22 January 2020.
[228] John Kinahan, email to Goodman Gwasira, November 20, 2019.
[229] The National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) only provided a legal basis for contract archaeology at a later stage.
[230] National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004), S. 54 ss. 7.

a matter of reference to environmental legislation and policies as contained in the National Heritage Act.

It is noteworthy, however, that the section that referred to environmental impact assessment in the National Heritage Act was implemented in circumstances where there were no guidelines or policies that operationalised the legal instrument. There were no institutional procedures for the administration of contract archaeology in Namibia. In contrast, South Africa and Zimbabwe had specific regulations, guidelines and minimum standards that governed archaeological intervention in developmental projects. The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA), like its Zimbabwean counterpart the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe (NMMZ), adopted and domesticated the standards and guidelines of professional associations such as ASAPA. These were used to regulate the work of contract archaeologists, especially when they carried out archaeological impact assessment.

In the absence of legislation and guidelines that governed the practice of contract archaeology in Namibia archaeologists tended to be accountable to themselves. There was self-regulation of the practice, which resulted in non-standardisation and a lack of control of the practice by the government heritage agencies. In such circumstances, the mistakes or unethical practices by practitioners could "go unnoticed", as Chirikure pointed out.[231] Such circumstances resulted from situations whereby, despite some regional standards and guidelines being readily available, they were not enforced universally. In Namibia, the ASAPA code of ethics was not enforced by the National Heritage Council. The practice of contract archaeology relied on the self-discipline and good will of the practitioners and developers. According to

[231] S. Chirikure, 'Do as I Say and Not as I Do. On the Gap between Good Ethics and Reality in African Archaeology', in A. Haber and N. Shepherd (eds), *After Ethics* (New York, Springer, 2015), 27-37.

Chirikure, “There is no common set of ethics binding archaeologists working in Africa while international standards were rarely used to improve the local system.”[232] Therefore some institutions developed their own sets of standards for the practice of contract archaeology but such standards were not binding at national level.

Lack of control or administration of the guidelines regarding archaeological practice in general and contract archaeology in particular was not unique to Namibia. It was an issue that professional archaeologists were preoccupied with for decades. The Southern African Association of Archaeologists (SA3), for instance, developed a code of ethics in 1990.[233] However, the guidelines were not universally binding, and their effect was limited to members of the SA3. ASAPA, which was the successor of the SA3 further developed some guidelines. However, neither of the two contract archaeology companies, in Namibia, QRS and Welwitschia Archaeological and Heritage Solutions (WAHS) were on the list of registered CRM practitioners of ASAPA. Therefore, the companies were not accountable to ASAPA. This indicated that even though ASAPA had some minimum standards of CRM practice and their accreditation was valid throughout SADC, the standards were not applied in Namibia due to lack of acceptance and adoption of the ASAPA code of conduct by the National Heritage Council of Namibia. The effectiveness of the ASAPA guidelines was in any case contested and was challenged by scholars such as Ndlovu, who argued that ASAPA did not impose sanctions on archaeologists who did not comply with its code of ethics.[234]

The argument here is that regional and international standards and guidelines for the practice of archaeology were not effective because state heritage agencies in countries such as

[232] Ibid, 27.
[233] J. Deacon, ‘The Cinderella Metaphor: The Maturing of Archaeology as a Profession in South Africa’, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 48, 158 (1993), 77-81.
[234] Ndlovu, ‘Contract Archaeology in South Africa’, 203-17.

Namibia did not adopt the standards and guidelines to them enforceable through local guidelines. Localisation of laws and standards meant adopting and converting them for local usage in a way that took into account the idiosyncrasies of given local conditions. What compromised the governance of contract archaeology was the lack of the capacity to implement the international guidelines and the non-existence of national guidelines. In Namibia, there was no local, professional association that regulated the practice of contract archaeology. As Chirikure significantly observed, "Professional associations play a strong role in the regulation of the conduct of their members."[235] The absence of a local professional association had the consequence of the adoption of ASAPA standards on an ad hoc basis. This was experienced in the case of the Oranjemund shipwreck excavations where the international contract archaeologists were expected to follow the ASAPA minimum standards of practice.

The National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 204) made reference to developer-funded environmental impact assessment and caused heritage resources to be included in such assessments at the expense of the developer.[236] However, there were still no guidelines and policies of the National Heritage Council that regulated how archaeological impact assessments were conducted. Since the main area in which contract archaeology was practiced in Namibia was in heritage impact assessment, contract archaeology was considered to be a strong component of cultural resources management. However, contract archaeology was commercialised by the demand that a developer paid for the impact assessments. Therefore, there was a need for guidelines for the practice and evaluation of archaeological specialist reports so that the reports were standardised.

[235] Chirikure, 'Do as I Say', 27-37.
[236] National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004), S. 54, ss. 7.

Developer-funded archaeological assessments stimulated the rise of private consultants offering archaeological services mainly because it would be unethical for government archaeologists to offer consulting services. Archaeologists who were employed at the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council were responsible for evaluating the specialist reports However, there were no official and published policies, guidelines and local minimum standards for archaeological impact assessments that guided the evaluation process. This prompted conscientious institutions such as the Chamber of Mines to contract archaeologists to develop guidelines and make them public in the hope that other archaeological consultants would uphold good ethics and standards without being controlled or monitored by the National Heritage Council.[237]

The lack of a policy in Namibia that guided the practice of contract archaeology in particular and archaeological impact assessments in general could have led to a conflict of interest. This was observed in countries such as Zimbabwe, where "museum professionals conduct impact assessments" as well as evaluate the reports after the work.[238] Archaeologists who worked in the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council of Namibia were responsible for evaluating the specialist reports. Therefore, the provision of private consultancy services by archaeologists from these institutions constituted a conflict of interest.

[237] J. Kinahan, 'Archaeological Guidelines for Exploration & Mining in the Namib Desert', The Namibia Archaeological Trust (2012), available at http://the-eis.com/elibrary/sites/default/files/downloads/literature/Archaeological%20guidelines%20for%20exploration%20and%20mining%20in%20the%20Namib%20Desert.pdf, retrieved on 13 February 2020.
[238] S. Chirikure, 'Do as I Say', 27-37.

In some cases archaeologists who were employed by the National Heritage Council registered consultancy firms that carried our archaeological impact assessments "only during weekends and on holidays basis (sic)."[239] It may be argued that given the limited number of professional archaeologists that practice in Namibia there was a need for regulating contract archaeology. The case of the Oranjemund shipwreck that is discussed below demonstrated that there was a need for such regulation. Given the limited number of local professional archaeologists, some contracts were awarded to foreign contractors, as happened with the shipwreck.

Chirikure cautioned that there was generally weak heritage legislation in Africa and in some cases there was a complete absence of policies to guide the practice.[240] The consequence of such circumstances was that foreign contractors might take advantage of the situation and abandon a professional code of ethics that applied in their countries of origin. The problems related to the lack of institutionalisation, the shortage of local archaeologists, and the lack of guidelines and policies that controlled contract archaeology in Namibia were demonstrated in the case of the rescue of the Oranjemund shipwreck.

The Oranjemund shipwreck

As I have pointed out, there was a general lack of institutionalisation of archaeology in Namibia, which resulted in a shortage of black professional archaeologists. The same problem applied to contract archaeology as there were only a few professional archaeologists who practiced in Namibia. There was also a lack of institutional structures, as well as policies and guidelines that could serve to administer and regulate contract archaeology in Namibia.

[239] Welwitschia Archaeological and Heritage Solutions available at https://sites.google.com/view/wahsnamibia/home, retrieved 3 December 2020.
[240] Chirikure, Ibid.

Given such a state of affairs, institutions in Namibia periodically relied on foreign consultants.

The absence of CRM training in Namibia led to specialised contractors being imported from countries such as Kenya, Zimbabwe and South Africa. In certain situations, such as the rescue excavation of the Oranjemund shipwreck, experts were contracted from countries such as Portugal and the United States of America. Contract archaeology is by nature time-based, especially where archaeological evidence has to be rescued. It has to be done very quickly so that there is still enough time left for the development project to be completed timeously.

In the case of the Oranjemund shipwreck the contract archaeologists had to work against the forces of nature since a wall of sand was built to allow for the retrieval of the remains of the ship and its contents. The wall prevented the site from being inundated by seawater. This meant that the wall had to be maintained 24 hours a day. Thus, the rescue operation was the most expensive archaeological excavation ever carried out in Namibia. The case of the Oranjemund shipwreck demonstrates the challenges and complications caused by the non-institutionalisation of contract archaeology. It also illustrates one of the main characteristics of contract archaeology, as a practice of archaeology that alienated local knowledgeable people on the basis that they did not possess professional knowledge as archaeologists. The underwater archaeology section of the Namibia Windhoek Diving Club consisted of members who ordinarily conducted maritime archaeological surveys on the behalf of the state. The Windhoek Diving Club hosted a high concentration of knowledge, skill and experience in salvaging maritime sites and in the conservation of marine archaeological artefacts. The club had the only underwater archaeology museum in Namibia where they preserved and

displayed the maritime archaeological history of the country. They were not invited to be part of the rescue team.

In the late 2010s, there was only one qualified maritime archaeologist in Namibia who by the time of the 'discovery' of the shipwreck had not yet trained as an archaeologist. In fact, his qualification was a direct spin-off of participating in the first rescue excavations as a student at the University of Namibia. It is important to note at this point that I was the first archaeologist to be engaged by the Namibian government as an honorary curator to work at the Oranjemund shipwreck site and made recommendations on the further procedures that were then implemented by the state.

The 'discovery' of the shipwreck on the Namibian coast was reported in the Namibian and world media, both in print and electronically on 1 May 2008. The media reports generated a great amount of international interest in the new find, and the discovery was considered to be of enormous national and global importance. This prompted the National Heritage Council of Namibia and the National Museum of Namibia to request that I, in my role as archaeologist from the University of Namibia, perform an audit of the objects that had been rescued from the shipwreck and develop the initial inventory. In addition, I had to prepare and present a report with recommendations on the way forward to the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council of Namibia.[241] I performed this task not as a contract archaeologist but as part of my exercise of community archaeological engagement. One of the recommendations I made was that the Namibian government should classify the shipwreck as a national heritage site and suspend all the initial rescue work that was taking

[241] G. Gwasira and F. Kambombo, *Audit of the Excavated Collections at Oranjemund* (unpublished Report, National Museum of Namibia, 2008).

place. It was recommended that the Namibian government take full responsibility for the coordination of the rescue work on the shipwreck.

The shipwreck in question was encountered in Mining Area 1 at U60 in the restricted coastal diamond area. The precise position was recorded by the Namibian independent consultant archaeologist, Dieter Noli, who had been contracted by Namdeb, without any authority, to rescue the shipwreck. Contrary to information in the media that the shipwreck had been found by geologists on 1 April 2008, our interviews revealed that a group of women miners at U60 had encountered the first evidence on 31 March 2008. It was they who had recovered some elephant tusks which they duly reported to their foreman. These tusks were believed to be part of the ship's cargo. On 1 April 2008, after the women had made their report, the bulldozer operator, Kaapandu Shatika, also encountered the shipwreck and immediately stopped working and informed his foreman, Leonard Auala, who then informed the Mine Engineer, Gully Muteka. The Namdeb geologist was also informed and he confirmed that it was a unique find and also recommended that the site be cordoned off.

This thread of information brings in a new dimension to the history of the 'discovery' of the shipwreck. African archaeology in general was notorious for acknowledging European professionals as the discoverers of important sites and artefacts, even though in some cases they only confirmed the prior knowledge of their African co-workers. Other such examples from Namibia include the 'discovery' of rock art in the upper Brandberg Mountain, which was attributed to Harald Pager with no recognition of the African co-workers, Angula Shipahu, Efraim Mateus, and Johannes Toivo. They had had spent many years surveying the mountain and informing Pager of the existence of more rock art sites, while Pager merely recorded and documented the art, with some systematisation.

It was therefore remarkable to note that after my report was presented to the government almost all scientific publications that followed named the discoverer of the shipwreck as Kaapandu Shatika. An exhibition and a documentary on the shipwreck even perpetuated this inaccuracy, and commenced by showing Shatika speaking about how he had discovered the shipwreck.[242] Initial observations of the 'discovery' indicated that it was of immense national and international importance because it had the potential of increasing our understanding of, among others areas of interest, early international trade networks, ancient navigation history, early coastal history of Namibia, and potentially of enslavement and the slave trade.

Three of the recommendations contained in the report had an influence on contract archaeology and the shipwreck. Firstly, it was recommended that the state appoint a project manager who was experienced in archaeological heritage management. The project manager was to ensure that whatever work was done at the site and on the artefacts was in line with national laws, international conventions, and best practices. The main task of the project manager was to coordinate all activities regarding the rescue and conservation of the shipwreck. The project manager was also to ensure that the interests of the Namibian state were safeguarded and accordingly credited. The second recommendation that had a direct bearing on contract archaeology was that the state was asked to appoint a team of qualified underwater archaeologists and other specialists to study the shipwreck. The UNESCO National Commission for Namibia had already contacted the UNESCO Paris office to assist in identifying suitable marine archaeologists through the network of the UNESCO 2001 convention (Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage). Thirdly, it was

[242] As part of the visibility plan for the shipwreck project the Ministry of Youth, National Service, Sports and Culture produced a documentary titled 'Oranjemund Shipwreck, Africa's Oldest Shipwreck'. This documentary starts with Kaapandu Shatika describing how he encountered the shipwreck during a routine mining process.

recommended that a qualified conservator of marine archaeological artefacts be appointed to urgently treat and stabilise the material that was rescued. The material had developed a state of equilibrium in its underwater context and exposure to dry air posed the danger of rapid deterioration. Considering that Namibia experienced an acute shortage of archaeologists and an absolute lack of conservators, there was a sound argument for engaging non-Namibian contractors.

As a result of the recommendations, Francisco Alves of the University of Lisbon and Filipe Castro of Texas A&M University in the USA, were appointed to conduct the underwater rescue work. They conducted their work in a way that failed to connect with any local structures. The effect of these appointments was to cause black Namibians to be alienated from the project on the basis of not being professional marine archaeologists, archaeological project managers or professional conservators. The practice of contract archaeology at the Oranjemund shipwreck was exclusionary right from its outset. It presented underwater archaeology as the preserve of foreign archaeologists. The priorities and agenda of the rescue excavation were structured overseas, including in the metropoles of Namibia's archaeology such as South Africa. Namibia became a field site for data collection and the knowledge about the shipwreck and its relevance to the history of Namibia were produced in institutions such as the University of Lisbon, Texas A&M and, as we shall see, the University of Cape Town. Institutions such as the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) oversaw the process of the shipwreck excavation through project management. Under the AWHF, the work was conducted by Webber Ndoro (AWHF), Shadreck Chirikure (UCT) and Ashton Sinamai, who had transferred from Midlands University in Zimbabwe to the National Museum of Namibia as curator. Indeed, we can argue that UNESCO and the AWHF inadvertently oversaw the

international operations of a discipline still marked by colonial relations of knowledge and exclusion.

It was considered to be in the long-term interest of the Namibian state to ensure that any institute or individual consultant contracted to work at the shipwreck were required to have a capacity building plan for Namibian students. This was done to make sure that the material evidence of the shipwreck would be cared for professionally long after the rescue. Professional development of Namibians in the field of archaeology was a requirement of the general excavation permit according to the National Heritage Act.[243] However, I argue that since the archaeological permit system in Namibia did not distinguish between contract and academic archaeological projects, contract archaeologists were also expected to train Namibians. Section 52 (2c) of the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) states: "in the case of a permit authorising excavation of a site, that Namibian citizens, as may be specified in the permit, be engaged in the activities for the purpose of receiving professional training."[244] The main challenge of this section of the national heritage law is that there have not been policies for implementing it. There was no strategy from the state which quantified the expected output of the requirement for training. Additionally, the use of the term 'capacity building' did not necessarily refer to professionalisation. Instead some Namibian worked at the shipwreck and were considered to be 'capacitated'. Long after the excavations were completed, Namibia continued to rely on foreign expertise to conserve the retrieved material culture because not enough Namibians were professionalised due to gate keeping by foreign professional archaeologists.

[243] National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004), S, 52, ss. 2 (c); and S. 55, ss. 9 (c).
[244] Ibid. S. 52 (c).

An examination of the implementation of the recommendations of my report on the Oranjemund shipwreck sadly demonstrated that all the expertise was drawn from outside Namibia. This did not mean that there was no local capacity to assist. The archaeology unit of the Windhoek Diving Club had the requisite knowledge and experience to document maritime archaeology on the behalf of the National Museum of Namibia. However, the heritage law required that the provider of specialist archaeological services be a professional archaeologist. This led to the exclusion of the members of the Diving Club's archaeology unit from the rescue of the Oranjemund shipwreck.

The practice of contract archaeology in relation to the Oranjemund shipwreck functioned in the same way as other archaeologies. Contract archaeology did not establish structures for the development of local capacity in archaeology in Namibia. The consequence of contracting foreign archaeologists alienated local expertise from participating in knowledge production. Local amateur and professional archaeologists were perceived to lack any specialisation in marine archaeology. However, the project also did not accommodate any Namibians in any capacity building.

I examined the composition of the shipwreck rescue and conservation team, their terms of reference and the outcomes of the project. I argue here that there was a recapitulation of colonial practices that resulted in lack of infrastructure for the development of archaeology in Namibia. Even though there were many instances of rhetorical reference to the need for training of Namibians, as revealed in tasks given to the contract archaeologists and in remarks by government officials at ceremonies such as at the commencement of the project, in actual fact the shipwreck rescue project resulted in the professionalisation of only two Namibians. One of them was trained as a maritime archaeologist at Bristol University in the

UK while the other pursued studies in archaeology and heritage studies at Great Zimbabwe University.

The University of Namibia's archaeology unit provided students to work at the site as part of their field work requirements. However, there was no archaeology module that was developed that made use of the shipwreck's material culture. No course in maritime archaeology was realised as a result of this rescue excavation. There were no physical structures such as laboratories for training archaeologists locally that were attained from the rescue project.

There was no collaboration between the project managers and the University of Namibia's archaeology unit that would have resulted in resourcing the university to train archaeologists and conservators locally. In this instance, contract archaeological practice in Namibia followed the same approaches of professional and academic archaeology, which did not establish structures for developing the practice and professionalising Namibians. Contract archaeology appeared to be a discipline that guarded its territory, where professional archaeologists safeguarded their profession. At the same time, it mimicked the colonial processes whereby professionalisation and value addition took place in the colonial metropoles. Professional training took place in the United Kingdom, and Zimbabwe. Zimbabwe emerged not only as an exporter of contract archaeologists but as another society for professionalisation of archaeologists for Namibia, made possible only because of the unusual ways archaeological education and research remained a site of academic strength in that country. Namibia remained a site for fieldwork and not for knowledge production and the making of professional archaeologists.

In addition to formal professionalization, there were efforts at short-term training in conservation and on the job training. Two trainees were sent to the South African Institute for Object Conservation as part of capacity building within the rescue operation. However, they did not receive professional qualifications in conservation. Instead they received a certificate of attendance. Technically this means they could claim to be professional conservators. The trainees were supposed to work under the supervision of a professional conservator. Given the fact that there were no qualified conservators in Namibia, archaeologists and conservators from outside the country were again contracted to work on the shipwreck objects.

The Oranjemund shipwreck rescue operation provided good evidence for the argument that contract archaeology did not develop structures for professionalising archaeologists. The geopolitics of archaeology in southern Africa and the structure of knowledge production had not changed since the introduction of the discipline through colonialism. Archaeology still mirrored the hierarchical power relations, which, as Ndlovu-Gatsheni contended, "hampers the formulation of possibilities for decolonised, democratic and inclusive development in Africa."[245] A decolonised archaeology in Namibia required the resourcing of local institutions to enable them to produce archaeologists for the society. It demanded a paradigm shift from focusing on the archaeological artefact to an archaeology that interrogated the nexus between societal development and the discipline.

Contract archaeology as practiced by university-based companies, such as the UCT-based Archaeology Contracts Office (later, ACO Associates cc) provided an opportunity for field experience for students. In this case, contract archaeology was part of the development of

[245] S. J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 'Coloniality of Power in Development Studies and the Impact of Global Imperial Designs on Africa', *Australasian Review of African Studies*, 33, 2 (2012), 48.

careers for archaeologists. Private consultants usually do not train archaeologists. They do not see it as their responsibility to include local communities in knowledge production. According to Kinahan, "Contractors are not activists; they simply do the work as independent specialists."[246] Contract archaeology by its nature of being a short-term project did not establish structures for training or skills transfer. Nonetheless, as Kinahan has aptly argued, involving contract archaeologists as research fellows in university departments could result in professional training of graduates.[247] In the case of the Oranjemund shipwreck a close collaboration between the university and the contractors would have resulted in some professional training of Namibian archaeologists.

Zimbabwe in contrast had a strategy for training archaeologists that was anchored on the heritagisation of the Great Zimbabwe monument and in the incorporation of that site into the national narrative. The development of archaeology in Zimbabwe was a state-driven project. This resulted in Zimbabwe exporting archaeologists to the southern African region and beyond. An example of this was the shipwreck rescue operation that saw five archaeologists and one anthropologist from Zimbabwe being contracted to work in Namibia.

Experts who were invited to work on the shipwreck rescue project were drawn from Zimbabwe, Kenya, South Africa and Europe. The team consisted of project managers (from Zimbabwe and South Africa), archaeologists (from Namibia, Zimbabwe, Portugal, Spain, and Netherlands), documentarists, and conservators (from Zimbabwe and Kenya). Namibia was represented by one private archaeologist who was already the Namdeb consultant. South Africa was represented by a private heritage company, Khensani Heritage Consulting firm,

[246] John Kinahan, email to Goodman Gwasira, February 14, 2020.
[247] Kinahan, 'Heat and Dust', 1-2.

which also furnished project management services. This international and multidisciplinary team was assisted by Namibians, some of whom were to receive on the job training. Capacity building as a task in the project was reserved for implementation in the post-excavation programme. However, the state records that are accessible so far do not outline any strategy for capacity building.[248]

The education of one maritime archaeologist and one heritage specialist were the two formal qualifications that resulted from the capacity building component of the shipwreck rescue project. However, two other people were capacitated informally through short courses: one through the South African Institute of Object Conservation, and the other through short-term training in the conservation of maritime archaeological artefacts in the Czech Republic. Emphasis on professional training and on the job training for Namibians resounded in official documents and speeches. Nevertheless, in practical terms there was a need for institutionalising the training by ensuring that proper structures and resources were established in Namibia. Institutional residency of a training programme and structures would have ensured the sustainability of the professionalisation efforts through the shipwreck rescue operation. Generally, there has been a lack of strategy for developing professional archaeologists in Namibia.

The case of the Oranjemund shipwreck and its concomitant contract archaeology demonstrated that the lack of strategy for capacity building continued after independence. Even though there was a realisation of the need for training Namibians as archaeologists as reflected in the contracts, this need was not reflected in the expected outcomes that were

[248] The Oranjemund shipwreck file was at the National Museum of Namibia. It contained correspondences regarding the project, contracts and financial issues. There was no document that outlined the capacity building strategy for the shipwreck project.

outlined in the same contracts. Therefore, it was impossible to evaluate the success or failure of the capacity-building element of the rescue operation. It would have been easier to evaluate the capacity building objective if there had been an expected outcome that outlined the targeted areas and levels of competency and possibly the number of Namibians who were to be professionalised.

Administration of contract archaeology in Namibia

Whether or not the practice of contract archaeology in Namibia should be administered, regulated and controlled by heritage authorities is a matter of debate. Contract archaeologists such as John Kinahan argued that the primary and sole role of the heritage authorities was to regulate the practice. Kinahan pointed out that there was no "need for any further role to be played by the NHC' beyond being a "regulatory body that represents the interests of the state."[249] The responsibility of the National Heritage Council was to enforce compliance with the heritage law. It issued permits and determined the appropriateness of and sufficiency of the measures that were proposed by contractors employed by developers. Contract archaeology was practiced as an agreement between developers and professional archaeologists in compliance with the National Heritage Act. Developers were required to apply for an environmental clearance certificates from the Environmental Commissioner. It was the prerogative of the Environmental Commissioner to refer the heritage component to the National Heritage Council for determination of sufficiency of mitigation measures.

Technically this meant that there was a possibility of the archaeology and heritage component being ignored since this did not constitute the main focus of the environmental impact assessment. Contract archaeology that was based on archaeological impact assessments thus

[249] John Kinahan, email to Goodman Gwasira, February 14, 2020.

followed the guidelines and procedures of environmental assessment. The implementation of the mitigation measures depended on the goodwill of the developer and the Environmental Commissioner. The lack of guidelines and procedures for heritage or archaeological impact assessments in the National Heritage Council compounded the challenge of regulating the practice of contract archaeology. The archaeology component of the environmental impact assessment was evaluated by the scientific committee of the National Heritage Council the majority of whom did not have experience or qualifications in archaeology. There were no guidelines that were developed for the evaluations committee to follow. Therefore, one major argument that this chapter makes is that the lack of national guidelines and procedures regarding the practice of heritage impact assessment or archaeological impact assessments in Namibia resulted in the lack of standardisation and inadequate administration of the practice of contract archaeology.

In South Africa some guidelines that defined the minimum standards for the archaeological and palaeontological components of impact assessment reports were developed and published by SAHRA. The guidelines standardised the work and procedures that were to be followed by contract archaeologists. The guidelines prescribed how archaeological impact assessment reports were to be written. There was some definition of particularly the kinds and levels of information that should be contained in the reports. Such a standardised approach allowed the heritage authorities to make informed decisions when evaluating the reports and deciding on mitigation.

Namibia did not have the guidelines and minimum standards that stipulated the levels at which different types of permits should be obtained. The SAHRA guidelines were unambiguous in their distinction between test pit permits, mitigation permits, destruction

permits or permissions, and interpretation permits.[250] These types of permits were clearly stipulated, and the stage at which each one of them should be applied for was specified. Such clear guidelines were useful in managing the process of conducting archaeological impact assessment in South Africa. The lack of such clear guidelines in Namibia inhibited the proper management of contract archaeology. Developers did not have any guidelines and procedures against which they could make informed decisions about archaeological heritage. However, such guidelines for environmental impact assessments exist in Namibia.[251]

The lack of guidelines in some instances resulted in permit applicants being unable to apply for the relevant permits. One such case ended up involving legal practitioners, who had to interpret the National Heritage Act for both the National Heritage Council and the applicant. A uranium Mining company had applied for exemption from obtaining a permit under section 47 of the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) to conduct predevelopment archaeological surveys. The National Heritage Council declined the application on the grounds that the company had not applied for the correct permit. According to the NHC, the company was supposed to apply for a normal research permit under Section 52 of the National Heritage Act.[252] The mining company sought legal opinion and their legal advisor contested the decision of the NHC. The legal advisor argued that the company could apply for consent in term of section 55(8) to carry out an archaeological survey without a permit. This resulted in the NHC seeking their own legal advice in which they were informed that the legal opinion of the mining company's lawyers was correct. The NHC was advised to issue the consent as prescribed in Section 55 (9) since the mining company had demonstrated that they had

[250] *SAHRA APM Guidelines: Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports* available at http://asapa.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ASG2-2_SAHRA_APIAs_MIN_STDS_Ph1-2_16May07.pdf, retrieved on 13 February 2020.
[251] Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations: Environmental Management Act (Act 7 of 2007).
[252] Letter from the Director of the National Heritage Council, November 15, 2011.

engaged “a person with appropriate professional qualifications or experience”, as required by that specific section of the law.

This case demonstrated the need for guidelines. The mining company had applied for an exemption from a permit instead of a research permit. Upon realising that they could not obtain an exemption, the mining company opted to change and apply for a consent. Guidelines for archaeological impact assessments would have been useful in directing the mining company to apply for the correct permit. Guidelines for archaeological impact assessments would have contained the types of permits that could be applied for and the stages of work at which such permits should be applied for. The NHC contested the selection of the consultant archaeologist preferred by the mining company. They insisted that the NHC should provide the professional archaeologist.[253] However, the legal advisor of the NHC pointed out that the National Heritage Act required that “the activity authorised by the consent be supervised by a person with appropriate professional qualifications or experience as specified in the consent.”[254] This did not restrict the selection of the professional archaeologist to the National Heritage Council. The lack of guidelines for contract archaeology led to this situation where the appointment of a consultant archaeologist was contested. In this case, a clear law, as well as policy and guidelines would have provided explicit and clear instructions for the type of permit the mine required. The existence of such guidelines would have led to an avoidance of seeking legal opinion.

[253] Letter from the Director of the National Heritage Council, November 15, 2011.
[254] Namibia, National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004), S. 59 ss. 9 (a).

Discussion and conclusion

Contract archaeology in Namibia developed as a response to the introduction of environmental and heritage laws and policies that made environmental impact assessments compulsory in Namibia. Examples of such policies, regulations and laws were Namibia's Environmental Assessment Policy (1995), Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2012, Environmental Management Act (Act 7 of 2007), and the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004). While environmental laws were elaborate and operationalised by means of policies and regulations, the heritage law in Namibia was not operationalised. Thus, contract archaeology made its claim and authorisation through an interpretation of the definition of environment that was provided in the Environmental Management Act. Contract archaeologists justified the practice by making reference to the fact that the "Environmental Management Act covers environmental impact assessment in Namibia and includes protection of the anthropogenic environment so strict compliance with the provisions of the Act would extend to archaeological assessment."[255]

I argue, therefore, that contract archaeology in Namibia was stimulated mainly by the legal requirements for environmental impact assessments. The promulgation of the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) and the Environmental Management Act (Act 7 of 2007) exerted pressure on developers to comply with legal requirements. In the case of the National Heritage Act, it was clearly stated that a suitably qualified person was to be engaged to carry out the impact assessments. This influenced the rise of contract archaeology as it appeared to be a better source of income than to be employed in the government as a state archaeologist.

[255] John Kinahan, email to Goodman Gwasira, February 14, 2020.

The fact that there were no archaeology programmes in the university where one could be employed as an academic archaeologist also influenced the rise of contract archaeology. The only other options for gainful employment were limited to the National Museum of Namibia or in the National Heritage Council. The laws broadened the practice of archaeology in Namibia by enabling the development of a distinct archaeological practice. It is therefore safe to think of archaeologies and not archaeology since these practices in Namibia have distinct origins despite the possibility that they might be entangled.

Contract archaeology also emerged as a practice that focussed on large scale archaeological surveys that were commissioned by multinational mining companies. The uranium rush of the 1990s increased the demand for contract archaeology as a sub-practice in environmental management. The mining companies operated in other countries where heritage impact assessment laws were elaborately and strictly enforced. They adopted these practices and developed their own regulations that were implemented in Namibia. In this case, archaeological service providers were required to follow international best practice. I therefore contend that contract archaeology in Namibia also emerged as a response to external stimuli. Adherence to international practices and the need to maintain consistency in mining operations were catalysts for the evolution and growth of contract archaeology.

I argue that the practice of contract archaeology in Namibia was shaped by the history of its evolution. It emerged as a practice that alienated local practitioners and knowledge. This was done on the basis of the legal requirement for qualified professionals to practice archaeology. Contract archaeology developed in circumstances that mirrored the colonial introduction of archaeology in general. Expertise was imported but that did not result in the professional

development of adequate numbers of local archaeologists. Instead, Namibia was exploited as a centre of commercialisation of archaeological practice.

On the other hand, archaeology was not a priority of the state and therefore contract archaeology remained unregulated and thrived on the good will of the developer and the consultant archaeologist. The consultant archaeologist determined what was of archaeological significance. Where the developer commissioned an archaeological survey, the developer decided whether or not to implement the recommendations of the reports. The reports were the property of developers who were the contracting agencies.[256] The professional archaeologist was accountable to the contracting agency and not the National Heritage Council since the permits were in the name of the contracting agency.

In Namibia, a few scholar-archaeologists, like John Kinahan, have been able to practice as contract archaeologists and also to conduct scholarship on the basis of this research. While it is possible for contract archaeology to involve research and scholarship, it has mainly developed as a domain of mitigation and rescue that occurs in a commercialised environment of development. In the absence of lecturing posts in archaeology at Namibian universities, contract archaeology has emerged as an alternative form of employment for archaeologists. In addition to being a form of employment, contract archaeology has provided some financial resources required for the analysis of artefacts and the production of academic publications. But with a lack of direct regulation and governance, other than through environmental laws and policies, contract archaeology has not emerged as a strategic field for professional development and heritage awareness. This would require the resourcing of archaeology more broadly as a field of education and scholarship in Namibian universities and the

[256] Kinahan, 'Heat and Dust', 1-2.

encouragement of community-based forms of practice not dominated by commercial interests.

Chapter Five

The Administration of Archaeology in Namibia

Introduction

Archaeology existed in the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council, both of which are state apparatuses. These institutions practice administrative archaeology. Archaeology was a practice of collections management in the National Museum of Namibia because the museum cared for all the archaeological artefacts that were deposited by bona fide researchers and enthusiasts. The bona fide researchers conducted their research under a permit that was issued by the National Heritage Council. One of the conditions of the research permit was that their artefacts, field notes and subsequent publications were to be deposited in the National Museum.[257] In cases where the archaeological site was located in a nature conservation area, the research permit application needed to be supported by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, the Ministry of Mines and Energy, or by the mining companies such as Namdeb.

This chapter examines the work of the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council of Namibia as sites involved in the care and management of archaeological artefacts and practices in Namibia. Here I show that in collecting and interpreting and in managing archaeological heritage, the work of these institutions had the effect of expanding and reinforcing a knowledge order which has been referred to as the South African empire. I

[257] This condition also applied to the artifacts that were borrowed by researchers. Condition number 6 on the loan agreement form stated that "The researcher should provide the Curator of Archaeology with two copies and one digital copy of the resulting research, published or unpublished upon completion (sic)". National Museum of Namibia research application form, 2016; A condition in the approved permit for E. W. Wendt unambiguously stated that all material from his research were to be deposited at the State Museum. This is stated in a letter from the Director of the State Museum to the Secretary of the NMC Regional Office, National Archives of Namibia R.N.G. 18/1 Permitte Algemeen, 24 September 1971.

argue that archaeological practice in both these institutions had the effect of alienating indigenous people and their ways of knowing landscapes. Acts of identification and declaration in the name of archaeological preservation and national heritage have had the effect on local interpretations of stripping away their authority. By placing all interpretive authority in the hands of a professionalised archaeology, indigenous people were de-historicised through a careful exclusion of their recent histories from what was considered to be of archaeological value.[258]

This process of establishing heritage value through professionalised archaeology is one that can be called archaeocentrism. In this case, the emphasis was placed on the archaeological sites and artefacts as the only sources of information. The knowledges of the indigenous communities who lived near sites and had over a long period of time appropriated the sites were not considered scientific enough to be recorded. Rather, boundaries and buffer zones that were created around the sites in the name of preservation resulted in the dispossession of indigenous people from their traditional land use. The picture of Namibia that was presented through archaeological collections and archaeological preservation was of a society that was frozen in prehistory.

Between the 1940s and the 1980s, the control over archaeological practice by South African institutions such as the Archaeological Survey and the National Monuments Council created the colonial order of South African power and control over Namibia in the field of heritage resources management. The South African empire extended beyond the Southern African region to include the colonial metropolitan centre of archaeology, namely Cambridge

[258] S. Chirikure and G. Pwiti, 'Community Involvement in Archaeology and Heritage Management: An Assessment of Case Studies in Southern Africa and Elsewhere', *Current Anthropology*, 49, 3 (2008), 467-485.

University. In addition to interrogating institutional entanglements, I also examine the nexus between state bureaucracy and community initiatives in the administration of archaeology in Namibia. In my evaluation of these entanglements among the state apparatuses and their failure to engage local communities, I argue that the administration of archaeology was a tool for state governmentality.

Development of the museum in Namibia

The rise of the museum in Namibia, like in other parts of Africa, was intricately connected to the colonisation of the country. Mackenzie noted that imperial power was symbiotically connected to research in the natural and cultural sciences. Museums were part of the global exchange networks in the imperial territories and hence were part and parcel of the imperial efforts of collection, research, preservation, and knowledge production about the empire.[259] An examination of the connection between the development of museums in Namibia and imperialism reveals some interdependencies among disciplines of collection and conservation such as archaeology, mammalogy and ethnography.

Like museums in other colonies, the National Museum of Namibia developed out of complex relationships between the imperial or colonial metropoles and their frontiers. Rassool argues for an interpretation of the empire as more than a geographical entity. Rather, the concept of an empire should be understood in the framework of a theory of knowledge production. Rassool argues that such an analysis of the empire exposes the asymmetric and exploitative power relations in the relationship between the colony and its coloniser. In the practice of archaeology, the "extractive, hierarchical and stratified relations of knowledge" were

[259] J. M. MacKenzie, 'Introduction', in J. M. MacKenzie (ed), *Imperialism and the Natural World* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), 1-14.

experienced in the work of the National Museum of Namibia.[260] Luregn Lenggenhager demonstrated that the unequal relationships were also typical of the connections between the colonial officials and nature conservation in north-eastern Namibia.[261]

At the onset of German colonialism in Namibia, natural and cultural objects were of scientific interest to Germany. German Museums requested specific specimens from the territory for display and studies.[262] However, the first efforts at establishing a museum in Namibia can be traced back to the arrival of the German Governor Bruno von Schuckmann in 1907. It could be argued that he is the father of the idea for the State Museum in Namibia. According to Otto-Reiner, Von Schuckmann was credited with initiating the development of the first local museum.[263] The first collections of the museum were sought from all district officers from 1908 onwards, and in 1909 the first exhibitions in then German South West Africa were installed and opened to the public.[264]

The museum was introduced into the colony as part of the colonial venture that provided a system of imagining and constructing the empire. It served as a reservoir of physical evidence for the justification of colonialism and of conquest. What is intriguing in the Namibian case is that the idea of a museum was introduced towards the end of a genocide, hence the museum can be understood as an institution of colonial violence despite that fact that there were not human remains from the genocide that were reportedly collected and stored or displayed in

[260] C. Rassool, 'Restoring the Skeletons of Empire: Return, Reburial and Rehumanisation in Southern Africa', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 41, 30 (2015), 653-70.
[261] L. Lenggenhager, *Ruling Nature, Controlling People: Nature Conservation, Development and War in North-Eastern Namibia since the 1920s* (Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2018).
[262] National Archives of Namibia ZBU1005, Kaiserliches Gouvernement für Deutsch-Südwestafrika, Landesmuseum in Windhuk Specialia, 6 June 1902.
[263] A. Otto-Reiner, *From Landesmuseum to National Museum of Namibia: 100 years (1907-2007) A chronology of an African Museum* (Windhoek: National Museum of Namibia, 2007).
[264] Ibid.

this museum. However, the active participation of the state administrators in either the establishment or collection and provision of artefacts is indicative of the state control of the museum narrative.

The museum was known as the 'Landesmuseum', which translates to State Museum. This in itself points to the role of the museum as an institution of the empire project of knowledge accumulation. Governor Von Schuckmann placed an advertisement in the local newspaper the *Deutsch-Südwestafrikannische Zeitung* on 28 September 1907 in which he invited residents of the territory to a meeting regarding the establishment of a natural science collection. This advertisement, when translated into English, reveals more about the purposes for establishing the collection which would launch the museum. Firstly, the museum was to serve as a source of information regarding natural objects of strategic economic importance:

> Fuer die Vorlaefige Aufstellung einer Sammlung die zunaescht unter Beruecksichtgung der pflanzenWissenschaftlichwichtigen Natur geenstaende (Futter, Gift und Naturpflanzen, tierische shaedlinge, wichtige mineralien pp). (For the provisional establishment of a collection which is to be prepared taking into account the plants, scientifically important nature (fodder, poison and natural plants, animal pests, important minerals, etc.).[265]

This was stated in Von Schuckmann's invitation to the first meeting concerning the formation of the State Museum. Secondly, the museum was to be an exclusive place for European residents and visitors.

The museum was not set up as an institution that the indigenes of the territory could use. Instead, the museum was used to showcase the ethnographies of the indigenous people. The

[265] 'Aus dem Schutzgebiet Anruf: Begründung einer Naturwissenschaftlichen Sammlung für das Schutzgebiet', *Deutsch-Südwestafrikannische Zeitung*, 28 September 1907. My Translation.

museum was aimed at displaying their peculiarities as the Governor's advertisement explicitly stated that there was a need to create a scientific collection in Windhoek:

> Es ist schon lange Zeit als ein dringendes Bedürfnis empfunden worden, in Windhuk eine natur-wissenschaftliche Sammlung zu begründen, in welcher sich jeder neu ins Land kommende Farmer, Kaufmann, Angehöriger der Schutztruppe und Beamter über die in Schutzgebiet verkommenden Tiere, Pflanzen, Mineralien und Ethnographischen Besonderheiten orientieren. (It has been felt for a long time that there is a need to establish a collection in Windhoek, in which every new farmer, merchant, member of the Schutztruppe and official can find out about the animals, plants, minerals and ethnographic peculiarities degenerating in the protected area).[266]

The museum was established as a public institution where the general populace were allowed to view the objects that were on display. However, this general populace did not include the local indigenous people. Hence, we can safely conclude that the museum in Namibia was established as an exclusive space where the indigenous people and their cultures were objectified. The indigenous people and strategic resources such as "fodder, poison, useful plants, animal pests and important minerals" were the subject of the museum. The scientific collection for the museum was assembled to preserve the 'ethnographic peculiarities' that were 'degenerating' in the territory. Indigenous people were the subjects and not the audience of the museum. It was an institution that gave orientation to the settlers and other Europeans regarding the strategic economic opportunities that the territory could provide.

The Landesmuseum was established out of a 'natural sciences' collection, which demonstrates that cultural heritage preservation was not yet the mission of the museum. Cultural heritage became the focus of conservation when European heritage was prominent in

[266] *Deutsch-Südwestafrikannische Zeitung*, Ibid. My translation.

Namibia.[267] The indigenous people whose ethnographies were gathered for the scientific collection were considered as natural specimens. When cultural objects were collected, they were regarded as ethnographic. Cultural objects were collected to showcase *Besonderheiten* (peculiarities). When analysed in the context of the economic mission of the Landesmuseum, the ethnographic peculiarities could be taken to mean the distinctive ethnic features that could be useful in the colonial economy. Ethnography became a euphemism for collecting information about the people and classifying them for suppression. This was reflected in the configuration of cultural history displays and ethnographic displays which were in separate locations in Windhoek.[268]

The fact that the Landesmuseum was established in 1907 was significant and placed the museum in the environment of colonial conflict. The years 1904 to 1908 were marked by a brutal war of resistance to colonialism.[269] The war, which was variably referred to as the Herero rebellion or Herero uprising, resulted in the first genocide of the twentieth Century in which almost two-thirds of the Herero community and a third of the Nama community were exterminated.[270] In the postcolonial era, the war was reframed as a war of national resistance.[271] The national museum was therefore developed under conditions of colonial violence and conflict. Nevertheless, the Landesmuseum lacked scientific expertise and hence

[267] A. Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia* (Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan, 2004).
[268] E. Schildkrout, 'Museums and Nationalism in Namibia', *Museum Anthropology*, 19, 2 (1995), 65-77. See also A. Wessler, 'Von Lebendabgüssen, Heimatmuseen und Cultural Villages. Museale Repräsentation des Selbst und des Anderen im (De-) Kolonisierungsprozess Namibias', (PhD Thesis, Universität zu Köln, 2007).
[269] P.H. Katjavivi, *A History of Resistance in Namibia* (Paris: James Currey, 1988).
[270] K. Poewe, *The Namibian Herero: A history of their Psychosocial Disintegration and Survival (*New York: Edwin Mellen, 1985*)*; C.W. Erichsen, 'The angel of death has descended violently among them': A study of Namibia's concentration camps and prisoners-of-war 1904 -1908' (Master's Thesis, University of Namibia, 2004); J. Zimmerer and J. Zeller, *Genocide in German South-West Africa, the colonial war of 1904 -1908 and its aftermath* (Wales: Merlin Press, 2008); D. Olusoga and C.W. Erichsen, *The Kaiser's Holocaust., Germany's Forgotten Genocide* (London: Faber and Faber, 2010).
[271] T. Emmet, 'Popular Resistance in Namibia, 1920-5', in B Wood (ed.), *Namibia 1884-1984. Readings on Namibia's History and Society* (London: Namibia Support Committee and United Nations Institute of Namibia, 1988), 224-58.

artefacts and even human remains that were used for racial scientific studies were shipped to various German institutions.

During the German colonial period the museum received many natural and ethnographic objects. The earliest entry for the collection of an archaeological artefact was 1914, according to the archaeology accession book. It is recorded as a grinding stone from Farm Goreis in the Outjo District.[272] The fact that the earliest recorded collection of an archaeological artefact was rock art is significant. It is noteworthy that archaeology in Namibia was mainly about rock art studies. The discipline essentially developed out of 'Bushmen studies' and specifically out of their rock art.[273] Archaeology was consolidated through the work of amateur archaeologists such as Scherz and ultimately through prolonged formal academic studies such as the Cologne research project. However, rock art appeared to be considered as a sub-discipline of archaeology at the University of Cologne.

Rock art archaeology at the University of Cologne was located in the Heinrich-Barth-Institute, which linked to the University through the Forschungsstelle Afrika (Africa Research Centre). The University of Cologne made a clear distinction between archaeology and rock art studies. The location of rock art studies outside the Institut für Ur und Frühgeschichte (Institute of Pre- and Proto-History) raises questions regarding whether or not rock art was considered scientific enough to be archaeology. The only research projects with a focus on Namibia that are listed on the department's website are 'Tracking in Caves' and the 'Interdisciplinary investigations of the cultural, chronological and environmental sequence of Pockenbank, Namibia: At the margins of Late Pleistocene subcontinental

[272] National Museum of Namibia, archaeology department, Accession Number B 0122.
[273] J. Kinahan, 'Traumland Südwest: Two Moments in the History of German Archaeological Inquiry in Namibia', in H. Härke (ed.), *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: The German Experience* (Frankurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000), 355-74.

networks.'[274] It would appear that rock art, which was the most prominent archaeology in Namibia, was considered an adjunct theme in archaeology at the University of Cologne.

This perception that rock art studies were not considered as scientific archaeology was further stressed by the fact that the University of Cologne employed archaeologist Erich Wolfgang Wendt to perform the scientific work related to dating rock art in Namibia.[275] Wendt arrived in Namibia in 1968 with an express assignment to excavate rock shelters where rock art was found. Wendt's task was to 'scientise' rock art by documenting and thus justifying rock art studies as archaeology. In 1969 Wendt encountered what were to be regarded as the oldest datable works of art in the Huns Mountains of southern Namibia. He excavated the Apollo 11 Cave and encountered some portable painted and engraved slabs. The stratigraphic layer in which these slabs were found was dated using radio carbon dating and produced an age of at least 25000 years before the present.[276] The Apollo 11 site was later re-dated by Voglesang and produced an even older date of about 30000 years BP.[277]

A project that was aimed at 'scientising' the Dâureb/Brandberg Mountain rock art research was introduced through the excavations of Peter Breunig. His excavation resulted in the recovery of some exfoliated pieces of rock art, one of which fitted on a frieze to complete a human figure. The painted, exfoliated piece of rock art was dated to a minimum of 3000

[274] Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Department of Prehistoric Archaeology, 'Forschungsprojekte' available at https://ufg.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/en/forschung/forschungsprojekte, retrieved, 10 October 2020.
[275] HBI, Brandberg File, Kuper's application.for funding to the German Research Foundation (DFG) states the title of Wendt's part of the project is 'Archäologische Ausgrabungen und Untersuschungen mit dem Ziel der Einfüngung der Felsbilder in the Kuturablauf und der Datierung' (Archaeological excavations and investigations with the aim of placing the rock art in the sequence of the culture and the dating) 23 March 1979.
[276] W. E. Wendt, 'Preliminary Report on an Archaeological Research Programme in South West Africa', *Cimbebasia*, B, 2 (1972), 1-6.
[277] R. Vogelsang, J. Richter, Z. Jacobs, B. Eichhorn, V. Linseele, and R. G. Roberts, 'New Excavations of Middle Stone Age deposits at Apollo 11 rock shelter, Namibia: Stratigraphy, Archaeology, Chronology and Past Environments', *Journal of African Archaeology*, 8, 2 (2010), 185-218.

years BP.[278] It is safe to conclude therefore that the emergence of an archaeological collection at the National Museum of Namibia was associated with a lesser scientific form of archaeology which needed to be scientised through excavations.

The second connection between the earliest recorded archaeological artefact at the National Museum of Namibia and the management of archaeology at the National Heritage Council in the post-independence period was about managing and promoting rock art sites. The earliest rock engraving recorded in the accession book came from Twyfelfontein, which later became the first World Heritage Site in Namibia. During the Colonial period, archaeological and general heritage management at the National Monuments Council focused primarily on the Brandberg and Twyfelfontein rock art sites. There were 112 gazetted list heritage properties on the National Monuments Council's list of monuments by 1990.[279] Of all the public monuments only the Brandberg and Twyfelfontein were given attention by the National Monuments Council (NMC). All archaeological sites that were on the NMC list were rock art sites: Brandberg, Twyfelfontein, Piet Alberts Kopje, and Apollo 11. This status quo continued for the first 14 years after independence until new sites that were associated with the liberation struggle were declared national monuments. Even after independence, there were no other types of archaeological sites that were declared as national heritage sites except rock art sites from the Erongo Farm in the Erongo Mountains.[280]

Archaeological resource management and administration continued to portray archaeology in Namibia as essentially rock art studies even after independence. This portrayal was realized through promoting rock art studies among upcoming indigenous archaeologists. It can be

[278] P. Breunig, *Archäologischer Reiseführer Namibia* (Frankfurt am Main: Africa Magna Verlag, 2014).
[279] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*.
[280] The six new rock art sites from the Erongo Farm were declared as national heritage sites in 2019.

argued that the emphasis on rock art archaeology was influenced by the fact that the National Heritage Council earned most of its income from two sites: the Brandberg and Twyfelfontein. Rock art tourism was the main form of cultural tourism in Namibia.

Legal Status of the National Museum of Namibia

The National Museum of Namibia was not established by an Act of Parliament. It was instead governed as part of the Department of National Education during the South African colonial period. For the largest part of its existence the museum operated without a policy. From 1989 it was managed under the State Museum Policy of 1989. This policy continued to be used 30 years after independence. From 2004, the museum drew its mandate from a provision in the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004). The National Museum of Namibia was designated as the repository for movable heritage that was legally managed by the National Heritage Council. According to the Act, the council shall "entrust any heritage object so acquired to the custody of the National Museum".[281] During the South African colonial period the museum, the art gallery, the archives, and the monuments council were counterpart institutions. The other three were legally constituted as institutions with legal status through acts of parliament after independence, but the museum continued to justify its existence through provisions in the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004). The museum therefore continued to operate without its own legal status.

[281] National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004), S. 5 (a). While the National Museum was designated as a repository for archaeological artefacts that were collected under a permit from the National Heritage Council, the National Heritage Act does not preclude other museums and heritage institutions such as the National Archives and National Art Gallery from being also designated as repositories of archaeological artefacts and other heritage objects.

The archaeology collection at the National Museum of Namibia

Before the establishment of a museum collection in the then German South West Africa artefacts were exported to Germany, where they were incorporated into collections of German museums. Artefacts and natural specimens were sent to institutions such as the Botanisches Museum in Berlin.[282] From 1902, efforts to establish a museum in the territory were made specifically by the Governor Leutwein. However, such efforts did not materialise due to the outbreak of the 1904-1908 war. Watermeyer, who was tasked with establishing the museum, died during the war at Waterberg.[283] The outbreak of the First World War in 1914 led to the plundering of the collection that had been assembled for the museum in the territory from 1907.[284]

The initial efforts towards preserving Namibia's heritage were made during the German colonial period, but these efforts did not materialise due to the two wars. Nevertheless, the German colonial period was characterised by the exportation of artefacts and natural specimens. Some of these objects have become subjects of the provenance research projects that are taking place as collaborative projects between Namibia and Germany.

An archaeology collection is an archive. It comprises material culture from archaeological contexts that were assembled in specific settings of time, politics and praxis. In addition to the artefacts, an archaeological collection consists of documentary sources, such as correspondences and field notes or field journals. We can interpret these archives to reconstruct a history of collection and management of a country's archaeologies.

[282] National Archives of Namibia, ZBU1005, Kaiserliches Gouvernement für Deutsch-Südwestafrika, Landesmuseum in Windhuk, Specialia, 6 June 1902.
[283] A. Otto, 'The State Museum -Windhoek: History and Development' (unpublished paper, Namibia Scientific Society, n.d.).
[284] Ibid.

The archaeology laboratory of the National Museum of Namibia became the official national repository for all archaeological finds in the country. Archaeology was one of the first collections that the museum acquired when it was formed. It grew from a few stone implements to a collection of more than 400 000 artefacts. The archaeology department managed records of more than 3500 archaeological sites.[285] The collection represented a complete sequence of archaeology in Namibia. It comprised material from the three Stone Ages, the Iron Age, pastoral archaeology, rock art, maritime archaeology, and historical archaeology. The archaeology collection also included human remains that were collected from research based archaeological excavations while some were deposited by the police after they had been found to be of no forensic value. No human remains collected from unethical contexts were observed in the archaeology accession book. Furthermore, faunal, botanical, and soil samples from archaeological excavations were stored in the archaeology department.

The archaeology collection at the National Museum of Namibia included artefacts from ethno-archaeology. Beatrice Sandelowsky's research in the Kavango resulted in some clay pots collected from the local communities. In 1968 Sandelowsky acquired some clay pots that were made by women in the Kavango with an aim of comparing them to the potsherds that she encountered at Iron Age sites at Kapako, Vungu Vungu and Andara in the Kavango. The pots formed part of the archaeology collection at the National Museum of Namibia.[286]

[285] 'National Museum of Namibia archaeology department' (Brochure, 2005).
[286] National Museum of Namibia, archaeology department, Accession Numbers B1579 - B1588.

The collection also consisted of artefacts from outside Namibia. Material was also acquired from other countries, such as from Likoma Island in Malawi. [287] The first female professional archaeologist to work at the National Museum, Rhona McCalman, embarked on a process of exchanging artefacts with institutions from other countries. The archaeology accession book recorded exchanges with Cambridge, Tripolitania (which is now part of Libya), France, and the United States of America. The reasons for the exchanges were recorded for comparative purposes. Other artefacts that were from outside Namibia include stone implements from South Africa.[288]

The archaeological collection at the National Museum of Namibia was acquired through various ways. The earliest collections were donated by individuals, mainly farmers and other enthusiasts. Mostly the donations were in the form of stone implements. They were brought into the museum without supporting information except the name of the place where they were found, which was usually a farm name. The name of the donor was recorded. Generally, the artefacts were lone finds. Due to lack of precise location information, such artefacts were not used for scientific studies. Some of the earliest artefacts in the collection were donated by the Namibia Scientific Society. This happened when the administration of the museum was returned to the government in 1957 after a thirty-year period of being managed by the Namibia Scientific Society.[289]

The second most prominent method of acquisition was through scientific expeditions. Museums and scientific associations from outside Namibia made expeditions for collecting ethnographic artefacts. Expeditions appeared to be the earliest alternative to donations by

[287] B. H. Sandelowsky, 'Kapako and Vungu Vungu: Iron Age sites on the Kavango River', *South African Archaeological Bulletin, Goodwin Series,* 3 (1979), 52-61.
[288] National Museum of Namibia, archaeology department, Accession Number B0187.
[289] Otto-Reiner, *From Landesmuseum to National Museum of Namibia*.

enthusiast and amateur archaeologists from 1960 onwards.[290] The expeditions represented a more planned and focused method of collecting archaeological material. They covered specific geographical areas at a time. The various curators of archaeology at the State Museum Windhoek conducted their own expeditions. The respective curators who undertook the expeditions were recorded in the accession book by their initials.

In addition to state archaeologists who contributed to the assemblage of the collection, other state officials such as magistrates were involved in gathering archaeological artefacts in their areas of jurisdiction and sending them to the museum. Farmers and other enthusiasts contributed significantly to the collection. In some cases, the farmers were acknowledged for the 'discoveries' that they made in isolated areas despite the fact that shepherds in their employ would have reported having encountered some archaeological artefacts while looking after livestock. The shepherds were not acknowledged for their finds.[291]

Some expeditions were carried out by individual archaeologists or amateur archaeologists from outside Namibia. An example is one conducted by Ione and Jalma Rudner in Angola and South West Africa between June and August 1970. They collected flakes and cores from the surface at sites in the Hardap in Namibia. Their collections were deposited in the then State Museum Windhoek. Some of the artefacts were deposited in the South African Museum and have become part of the Iziko Museums Social History collection.[292] The South African

[290] An examination of the Accession Book in the archaeology department revealed a pattern that collections that were acquired before 1960 mainly came from amateurs and enthusiasts. Such collections were mainly stone implements. From 1961 the State Museum embarked on expeditions that included various museum departments. This coincided with the arrival of Rhona MacCalman as a professional archaeologist at the museum. As early as 1962. MacCalman conducted an expedition to the Brandberg. This particular expedition added potsherds and stone implements to the archaeology collection at the museum, accessioned under B1198. The rock art that was documented during this particular expedition was published in H. R, MacCalman, 'Grosse Dom Schlucht Brandberg: A new discovery of prehistoric rock art in South West Africa', *IPEK*, 21, (1964), 91-97.
[291] L. Jacobson, 'The Importance of the Farmer for Rescue Archaeology', *Staatsmuseum*, 5, 1 (976), 4-15.
[292] Iziko Museums, Social History Collection, Accession number 8475.

Museum conducted an expedition in 1963 which resulted in some artefacts being deposited in the State Museum while others were exported to South Africa. Dolls of veneration were collected by A. J. H. Goodwin at Odibo Mission in northern Namibia during this expedition.

Some of the expeditions did not result in archaeological objects being deposited in the State Museum. One case that was recorded in the archives of the Historical Monuments Commission concerns a complaint that was raised by the curator of archaeology at the State Museum. The curator of archaeology, Rhona MacCalman, reported that Jalma Rudner collected some artefacts that were deposited in the South African Museum. MacCalman learned that Rudner had completed an expedition to then South West Africa in 1960. Rudner was scheduled to present the results of his expedition at a public lecture in Cape Town. MacCalman observed that some artefacts were not deposited in the State Museum.[293] The South West Africa Scientific Society and the Historical Monuments Commission stipulated in 1950 that prospective expeditions for the purposes of collecting "specimens of scientific or historical value (natural history, archaeology, ethnography etc.)" were required to apply for a permit.[294] The permit was issued on the condition that a sample of each specimen was submitted to the South West Africa Museum.[295] If only one specimen was collected during an expedition, it was to be submitted to the South West Africa Museum. Thus MacCalman pointed out to the Historical Monuments Commission that the stipulation was not followed in the 1960 Rudner expedition.

From the 1980s there was a shift towards acquiring archaeological artefacts through large scale regional surveys and scientific excavations. Kinahan embarked on a project that aimed

[293] National Archives of Namibia RNG/ 18/1, South West Africa Regional Committee.
[294] National Archives of Namibia RGN 18/1/, Letter of the Secretary of the SWA Scientific Society, Dr E. Pfeifer, 3 April 1950.
[295] National Archives of Namibia RNG 18/1, South West Africa Regional Committee, 3 April 1950.

at providing "systematic information on the distribution and characteristics of the archaeological record in Namibia."[296] From the time Kinahan started working at the National Museum of Namibia in 1979 he initiated a series of regional archaeological surveys which were useful for assessing archaeological resources in Namibia. The artefacts from surveys were incorporated into the national collection. Examples of regional surveys that Kinahan carried out were the Bushmanland survey in 1983, the Sandwich Harbour survey in 1984, and the Uniab Delta Survey in 1984.[297] In addition to these surveys, Kinahan conducted the most extensive survey in the Brandberg Mountain, which resulted in his PhD thesis.[298]

Kinahan's survey approach represented a major shift in the practice of archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia. He placed a strong emphasis on systematic research in addition to managing the national collection. Kinahan's approach expanded the scope of archaeology from the narrow understanding of archaeological artefacts as objects of curiosity that required to be stored for posterity. He revolutionised the perception and practice of archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia. Systematic documentation, interpretation and scientific publication were the hallmarks of Kinahan's period as the curator of archaeology. Although artefacts continued to be received from farmers and other enthusiasts, surveys became the most prominent method of acquiring material for the archaeology department.

The archaeology collection at the National Museum of Namibia was possibly also established through purchases and donations of artefacts. Archival records in Namibia are not very clear

[296] J. Kinahan, 'Project report: Archaeological Survey of Namibia' (unpublished report, 17 July 1989).
[297] These surveys and references to their corresponding reports were recorded in the accession book under numbers B2717, B2733 and B2742 respectively.
[298] This was completed in 1989 and published as John Kinahan *Pastoral nomads of the Namib Desert: the people history forgot* (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 2001).

regarding the purchases that resulted in the archaeological collection at the museum. There is a reference to the possibility that the stone artefact collection of Father Hartmann was bought by the Historical Monuments Commission. Father Hartmann was one of the Fathers of the Oblates of Mary the Immaculate who were stationed at Roman Catholic Missions in the Kavango. He worked at the Sambyu Mission station. Father Hartmann collected stone artefacts from the Kavango and even from southern Angola.

Father Hartmann's collection of stone artefacts was viewed as representative of the whole Stone Age sequence and was at the time a unique assemblage. The Historical Monuments Commission sought to buy the collection so that it could be divided between institutions in the territory, such as the South West Africa Scientific Society and the South West Africa Museum.[299] The task of dividing the collection was given to geologist Henno Martin, amateur archaeologist Wolfgang Sydow, and the Director of the S.W.A Museum Albert Meiring, who was a professional archaeologist.[300] Father Hartmann's collection of 4592 stone artefacts was accessioned in the archaeology collection in 1957.[301]

Other missionaries who collected archaeological and ethnographic objects were more explicit than Father Hartmann regarding their intention to sell their objects to the museums. Father Frölich of Andara Mission in the Kavango was one such ardent collector of archaeological

[299] The suggestion that Hartmann collection was bought by the Historical Monuments Commission is contained in a Memo to members of the Commission that was written by the secretary to the commission, JH Esterhuyse. He mentioned in the memo that "It is impossible to attempt an estimate of the money value of the collection, but it is certain that overseas museums could be found who would be prepared to pay several hundred pounds for one half of this collection". National Archives of Namibia, HMK 17/1/2, Inboorlingshandwerk Pre-historiese, Klipwerk van Hartmann.
[300] National Archives of Namibia, HMK 17/1/2, Inboorlingshandwerk Pre-historiese, Klipwerk van Hartmann, Letter of the Commission's Secretary to Dr A Webber.
[301] National Museum of Namibia, archaeology department, Accession Number B0971. This material was originally accessioned as number 54 in the old accession book of the S.W.A. Scientific Society.

and ethnographic objects, which he sold to the South African Museum.[302] In May 1936 he sent a letter to the ethnographer at the South African Museum in which he proposed to sell his collection from the Hambukushu of the Kavango. The curator, Margaret Shaw, offered to buy Father Frölich's collection in a letter that she wrote to him in February 1936.[303]

There archaeology collection of the National Museum of Namibia reflected the successive colonial periods that Namibia experienced. Archaeological artefacts that were collected after independence tended to result from field research expeditions by the colonial powers that had colonised Namibia, primarily Germany and South Africa. Some of the collections resulted from large-scale contact archaeological work that became the characteristic archaeological practice after independence. Amateur archaeologists continued to contribute significantly to the archaeology collection after independence. However, their contribution became almost exclusively limited to marine archaeology. In addition to purchases, the collection grew out of material that was deposited after research mainly by postgraduate students from Europe and South Africa who treated Namibia as a research site and not a centre for knowledge production.

An examination of the demographic composition of the archaeologists who contributed to the production of the archaeology collection revealed that the white male archaeologists and enthusiasts contributed considerable amounts of artefacts. The collection comprised mainly of artefacts that could be used as evidence of the antiquity of humankind. The National Museum archaeology collection thus presented a narrative of Namibia as a territory that was

[302] Iziko Museums of South Africa, Archaeology Unit, Social History Collections Department, Father Flörich, letter to Margaret Shaw, 23 may 1936. In this letter, Father Flörich quoted an amount of £16.14 for the collection, including packaging and transportation.
[303] Iziko Museums of South Africa, Archaeology Unit, Social History Collections Department. Margaret Shaw, letter to Father Flörich, 21 February 1936.

frozen in the Stone Age and that possessed very little evidence of having moved to the Iron Age. The artefacts almost exclusively represented the prehistoric period of Namibia and the period of contact with European seafarers along the Namibian coast. There was no archaeology of the more recent historical communities that one still finds in Namibia except for the relatively small collection of the Iron Age studies of Sandelowsky.

The collection also demonstrated gaps in the geographical coverage of archaeology in Namibia. Northern regions were not researched. The reason for such gaps could have been that such northern regions were the war zone of Namibia. Travelling to the regions and other former Bantu Homelands was controlled by the colonial regime. White people required a permit from the respective Bantu Commissioners to travel to such places.[304] Upon arriving in the northern regions or Bantu Homelands, they had to report themselves to the nearest police post and their movements were monitored for the duration of their stay. Therefore, politics determined the nature of archaeology that was practiced in Namibia. Neutral themes such as regional surveys were safer archaeological activities to carry out since they did not require interpretations that could be perceived as contradicting the colonial policies.

Archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia was practiced as a form of preserving cultures that were either perceived to have disappeared or were seen to be disappearing. There were no artefacts that reflected the history of resistance to colonialism and the liberation struggle. Instead, the collection and its documentation illustrated practices of archaeology by the museum that were not confrontational to the state. Rather, archaeological practice conformed to the ideals of the colonial state.

[304] Permit applicants who wished to visit sites that were in Bantu Homelands were referred to the respective Bantu Commissioners or the Chief Bantu Commissioner.

Archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia developed out of networks of professional, academic and amateur archaeologists. These networks included formal institutions such as museums and scientific associations, for example, the South West Africa Scientific Society. Political patronage also contributed to the growth of the archaeology collection at the National Museum of Namibia. The archaeology collection that was brought to the museum before 1958 reflected networks of amateur archaeologists and enthusiasts**.** Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa Jan Smuts emerged as a major patron of archaeology in Namibia through his support of the work of the Abbé Breuil. The networks connected archaeologists at the National Museum to those from the colonial metropoles such as Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town, Paris and Cologne. The consequence of the networks was the reinforcement of the colonial metropoles as centres of knowledge production while Namibia remained a field research site.

In general, the practice of archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia can be characterised as cultural resources management. The archaeology department of the National Museum of Namibia was an extension of the National Heritage Council (NHC). The archaeology department managed the movable artefacts on the behalf of the NHC. The curators were primarily responsible for collections management. Without the collection of artefacts that belonged to the National Heritage Council, there would not be an archaeology department at the museum. In addition, the curators were expected to undertake research and develop and implement educational programmes.

A study of the accessions records and other archival documents in the archaeology department showed that the task that was implemented more prominently than the others

depended on the curator who was in charge of the collection. Amateur curators from the inception of the collection to the 1960s managed the collection and produced very little literature about archaeology in Namibia. From the 1960s to the late 1970s there were initial attempts at adding contextual information to the archaeological collection. This was archived mainly through systematic documentation of sites such as in the Brandberg Mountain by MacCalman and Jacobson. The period between 1979 and 1997 has already been described above as a period of large-scale regional survey. It was also a period when the archaeology department provided specialist reports for environmental impacts assessment. The museum archaeologists also served the National Monuments Council from 1992, when the archaeologist who was by then the Acting Director of the National Monuments Council in Namibia resigned.

The first black archaeologist was employed at the National Museum of Namibia in 1998. His contract was specifically connected to the Cologne archaeological project in Namibia. Initially, the archaeologist was contracted to co-design, with the University of Cologne, and install a permanent exhibition on the rock art of Namibia. This culminated in a permanent rock art exhibition at the National Museum of Namibia.[305] The exhibition showcased the University of Cologne's rock art documentation project from the Brandberg Mountain. This period was marked by a substantial focus on public engagement. The focus of the archaeology department shifted to conceptualising public presentations that were aimed at popularising archaeology. Collaboration shifted from mining information to sharing information and returning it to the communities.

[305] G. Gwasira, 'Rock Art in Namibia: Its Past Present and Future', *Pictogram*, 10, 1 (1998), 54-56.

In addition to collection management, the archaeology department developed some programmes that were aimed at introducing the idea of archaeology mainly to the previously excluded communities. One such activity was a presentation of the rock art of the Brandberg at a community hall in the village of Uis. The assistants of Harald Pager lived in this village and were present at the hall. Pager documented most of the rock art of the Brandberg. The results of his documentation were published by the Heinrich-Barth-Institute of the University of Cologne. The idea of the presentation was to popularise archaeology and to create awareness about rock art. In addition to the presentation at the community hall, a proposal for an interpretive centre in the village of Uis was developed in 2001.[306] The plan was a result of a three-month scientific exchange and study visit to the Heinrich-Barth-Institute. The interpretive centre was to serve as a satellite display centre for the National Museum of Namibia.

A second public engagement programme was conceptualised during the same scientific visit to Cologne. The programme aimed at "making archaeological research more accessible and relevant to many Namibians".[307] The public archaeology programme included developing public displays in parks such as the Zoo Park in the centre of Windhoek. Many people from various walks of life spent time relaxing in this park, but most were not aware of its importance as an archaeological site. Remains of an elephant and some associated stone implements were excavated by the State Museum in 1961 and were dated to 5200 BP.[308] The remains were to be displayed in the park, telling the history of their excavations as a way of encouraging young patrons of the park to think of a career in archaeology.

[306] G. Gwasira, 'Report on the scientific exchange and study visit to the Heinrich-Barth-Institute of the University of Cologne, Germany: 17 January-10 March 2000' (unpublished report, National Museum of Namibia, Archaeology Department).
[307] Ibid, 5.
[308] H. R. MacCalman. 'The Zoo Park Elephant Site, Windhoek', *Palaeoecology of Africa and of the Surrounding Islands & Antarctica*, 1 (1967), 102-03.

Another way of engaging communities was through the development of CD-ROMs and posters about archaeology that were distributed in schools.[309] Efforts were also made to document oral histories regarding rock art sites such as the Brandberg. Some of the programmes of public archaeology, such as engaging schools, had already been established by the former curators of archaeology. However, there was a deliberate shift towards targeting former black schools, specifically those that were located near archaeological sites such as Jacob Basson School in the village of Bergsig near Twyfelfontein. This was aimed at exposing pupils to archaeology as a potential career. Archaeological research during this period focused on how to involve communities in the management of archaeological resources.[310]

The period between 1998 and 2003 was also marked by an engagement with individual researchers who held archaeological artefacts privately. One such engagement concerned initial negotiations with Wendt to deposit the archaeological artefacts and field records from his extensive research in the 1960s. This resulted in some of the Wendt collection from his excavations at Twyfelfontein being deposited in the museum.[311] In addition, an agreement was reached with Wendt for him to curate the Apollo 11 material, and the museum provided him with boxes. The curator resigned from the museum before the Apollo 11 collection was deposited by Wendt. The rest of the Apollo 11 material was later deposited under a different

[309] The CD-ROMs and posters were produced with the financial support of the American Ambassador's Fund for Cultural Development.
[310] G. Gwasira, 'Community Involvement in Rock Art Site Management in Namibia', *Australian Rock Art Research*, 20, 1 (2003), 34-36; G. Gwasira, 'Rock Art Site Management in Namibia with Particular Focus on Twyfelfontein', *Pictogram*, 12, 1 (2000), 16- 23.
[311] National Museum of Namibia, archaeology department, Accession Numbers B4267 and B4268 Zwei Schneider, B4269- B4272 Hassenbild, B4273 Ururu Shelter near Twyfelfontein, B4275 Affenfelsen.

project, but the negotiations and agreement to cede curation authority to Wendt paved the way for the later project.

The period between 1998 and 2003 represented a resurgence of Cologne as a prominent force in the archaeology of Namibia. Namibia once again reverted to being a field site while Cologne reclaimed its position as the centre for knowledge production. The consequence of this was that the archaeology department at the National Museum of Namibia lost its autonomy. The archaeology department became a conduit for what Rob Gordon referred to as the 'Colognisation of Namibian anthropology'.[312] The research and professional priorities of the archaeology department at the National Museum of Namibia were inadvertently structured by the nature of collaboration with the Heinrich-Barth-Institute.

The museum's archaeology department was without a curator from 2003 to 2008. In this period, the archaeology technical assistant managed the collection. The period was marked by processing of loans, facilitating research, and the technical assistant's participation in expeditions by researchers from outside Namibia. The first black female Namibian curator of archaeology was employed at the museum in 2009. A discernible trait of her period was the strong emphasis on developing internal policies for the management of archaeological collections. New loan forms were designed and used to keep track of the different types of loans. Old loans that had not been returned were followed up intensely. This resulted in the return of archaeological artefacts from the University of Cologne, some of which had been exported as far back as 1996. An inventory of the material that was returned included information about the provenance and a description of the contents of each box.[313] The use of

[312] R. Gordon, 'The Stat(us) of Namibian Anthropology', *Cimbebasia*, 16 (2000), 13.
[313] National Museum of Namibia archaeology department, Returned loans file, 'Nämlichkeitsnachweis über die Rückführung archäologischer Funde an das National Museum Namibia in Windhoek', 5 February 2018.

the archaeology collection by foreign researchers was also prominent in this period. Most of the research was conducted for postgraduate studies. Once again the museum was left with no archaeologist for a period of 3 years after she resigned in 2017. A collections manager was eventually appointed in 2020.

The examination of the various practices of archaeology at the National Museum presented above indicated that even though the tasks of a museum archaeologist were clearly defined in their contracts, each archaeologist selected a specific area of concentration in their work. The main tasks that curators were contracted to performed were collection management, education and research. From the examples given above each curator had a different major focus area. However, archaeological practices at the museum remained entangled. While one practice was amplified, for example, research in the case of Kinahan, the curator performed other tasks such as teaching and collections management.

The practice of archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia was sustained by the connections with metropoles of archaeological research, such as the University of the Witwatersrand, the University of Cologne, and the Musée de l'Homme in France. Knowledge production happened in these centres while the museum provided a conduit for foreign archaeologists to be professionalised in their home countries. The result of this reliance on foreign institutions was that the museum remained a site for field research for external researchers and did not develop into a centre for knowledge production. It was rather a resource from which raw data and artefactual evidence were 'mined' and processed outside Namibia. An exception was the period between 1979 and 1997 when knowledge production was at the centre of the museum archaeology. Academic papers of archaeology were published in the museum's peer reviewed journal, *Cimbebasia*. Local theories such as

Kinahan's model regarding the rise of nomadic pastoralism were developed at the museum.[314] Books on prehistoric archaeology and the archaeology of contact between Europe and Africa were published by both John and Jill Kinahan.[315]

Generally, the organisational structure of the National Museum before independence reflected the society in which the museum was established. There was a clear distinction between the work that black staff members did and that of white staff members. Professional posts such as curators were occupied by white staff only while Africans did menial jobs such as cleaning and acting as messengers. Some black staff members manged to be employed as technical assistants. However, they were not treated as equal to their white colleagues. An example of how the museum reflected the segregation that was characteristic of the apartheid period was seen when an indigenous staff member was allocated to assist the curator of the Kaffrarian museum in fieldwork, Captain Shortridge. The then State Museum sought "a third class railway warrant for native Johannes from Windhoek to Outjo" for the trip.[316]

Furthermore, there was no programme for formal training for the technical assistants so that they could advance to curatorial positions. The effect of this was felt at independence, when most white staff resigned from the museum. Collections management became a challenge. There were no professional indigenous curators who could replace them. The museum had to start identifying and sending black Namibians for training in archaeology. The consequence of this situation was that there were long phases when the museum and the National Heritage Council had no single archaeologist on their establishments. The lack of diversity among the

[314] J. Kinahan, *Pastoral Nomads of the Central Namib Desert: The People History Forgot* (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 1991).
[315] J. Kinahan, *By Command of their Lordships: The Exploration of the Namibian Coast by the Royal Navy, 1795-1895* (Windhoek*:* Namibia Archaeological Trust, 1992); J. Kinahan, *Cattle for beads: The archaeology of historical contact and trade on the Namib coast* (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 2000).
[316] National Archives of Namibia, A198/6/2.

professional archaeologists at the museum was problematic because it translated into an exclusion of the world view of indigenous African people in the archaeology of Namibia. This was mirrored by the omission of some aspects of African histories, such as the archaeology of farming communities or archaeology of conflict. Iron Age farmers developed complex societies, however, their material culture was not represented in the archaeological collection except for some clay pots and potsherds.

Nineteenth and twentieth century Namibian history was conspicuously characterised by wars of resistance and liberation. For example, there was a genocide and some forced removals during the colonial period. However, archaeology at the National Museum of Namibia was silent on these aspects of the Namibian past. The composition of the archaeological heritage in the museum collection was to a greater extent influenced by the interests of the curator, who was in charge of the collection at any given time in the history of the museum. William White and Catherine Draycott aptly observed that "Who archaeologists are – our backgrounds, experiences, and mental models – can shape which questions we ask and how we interpret archaeological evidence."[317]

The archaeology collection at the National Museum represented a prehistoric view of Namibia. It offered a narrative of a country that missed the agricultural phase that is attributed to the Bantu-speakers. The collection itself gave clues of the attitudes of curators during the colonial era. The collection demonstrated that the archaeologists avoided confrontation with themes that would challenge the dominant political ideology. Archaeological material was not interpreted to support possible future land claims in sites

[317] W. White and C. Draycott, 'Why the Whiteness of Archaeology Is a Problem', *Sapiens*, available at https://www.sapiens.org/archaeology/archaeology-diversity/, retrieved 19 July 2020.

such as the Old Location of Windhoek from which people were forcibly removed.[318] Archaeology was presented as an objective science of the antiquity of human anatomical and behavioural evolution. Yet archaeology is inherently political.

Local perspectives on historical or archaeological sites and objects were missing in the museum records. For a long time, interpretations of professional archaeologists were deemed more important or accurate than those of communities who lived near archaeological sites. In Namibia this did not relate to black communities only. White farming communities, mainly of German and Afrikaner background, possessed equally useful oral traditions. Some of the oral traditions have been recorded, for example, Fritz Metzger's 'Naro and his clan'.[319] Some white farming families have a long and rich history of successive generations living in Namibia. They have amassed much knowledge about the traditions of the people they lived and worked with or who worked for them.

Farmers were seen as useful sources of information about archaeological sites and artefacts for the museum, but their perspectives were not considered as scientific enough and were therefore not recorded in the museum archives. The site documentation form was designed in a way that made it easy for farmers to record basic information about any possible archaeological site or artefacts on their land. The museum archaeologist would in turn visit the site to evaluate the information. Thus, unlike the black people of Namibia, white farmers ended up being officially acknowledged in the accession book as sources of information regarding the location of archaeological sites. However, the farmers' interpretations of the

[318] The Windhoek Old Location was located in the present day Hochland Park suburb of Windhoek. The non-white residents of the location were forcibly removed to a new racially and ethnically segregated location called Katutura on the outskirts of Windhoek. The residence resisted the removals and on 10 December 1959 thirteen residents were shot and killed while resisting to be moved to Katutura. This incident is known in Namibian history as the Old Location massacre. No archaeological investigation was conducted in the area up to date.
[319] F. Metzger, *Naro and his Clan* (Windhoek: John Meinert & S.W.A. Scientific Society, 1950).

archaeological material were not sought and neither were they recorded or considered. Professional archaeologists were responsible for verifying and analysing the sites and material. The farmers could only report the existence of what they suspected to be of archaeological value on their farms.

John Kinahan began preparing Namibia for addressing the lack of indigenous archaeologists. He developed and taught an archaeology module at the University of Namibia in 1995. A cohort of archaeologically aware black Namibians was produced through this course. However, there was still no national strategy for training indigenous archaeologists and thus efforts of the curator of archaeology did not result in a permanent teaching programme. Later the National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004) made a provision for training Namibians as a condition for permit applications. An excavation permit was granted on the condition that "Namibian citizens, as may be specified in the permit, be engaged in the activities for the purpose of receiving professional training".[320] Namibia continued to experience a challenge with the training of archaeologists because the state did not value archaeology as it valued science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Archaeology was a social science in the museum and at the university.

Archaeology at the National Heritage Council of Namibia

The National Heritage Council of Namibia is the legal body that oversees the practice of archaeology and general heritage management in Namibia. It has a history that is deeply entangled with South African settler colonialism in Namibia. The history of formally managing archaeological resources and the practice of the discipline in Namibia was connected to the desire to preserve historical buildings, specifically those of European

[320] National Heritage Act (Act 27 of 2004), S. 52, ss. 2 (c).

heritage and places of natural beauty in the Union of South Africa.[321] There was formal legislation that protected archaeological heritage before the promulgation of the Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act of 1934. According to Vogt, the laws prior to the 1934 Act were not applicable to Namibia.[322]

Archaeological management was from the start a practice in the alienation and prohibition of certain people and types of archaeological heritage instead of an inclusive exercise that acknowledged local knowledges. Women practitioners and African co-workers were silenced by the prominence that was afforded to white male practitioners. This exclusion of women and African co-workers was experienced in cases of both trained and amateur archaeologists. I therefore contend in this section that the management of archaeological resources was a system for controlling who practiced archaeology and for protecting the profession for a few selected "suitable persons" who were "qualified by training and experience", as Harding noted.[323]

Archaeology was introduced in Namibia by enthusiasts during the German Period. They were mainly collectors of artefacts that were perceived to be peculiar and that demonstrated the antiquity of the evolution of humans. The enthusiasts included colonial military men such as Jochmann, who became infamous for the engraving his name and date of visit at an archaeological site in the Brandberg. Jochmann was a member of the German protection army. He was involved in the survey of the Brandberg in 1909 and engraved his name at a

[321] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*.
[322] Ibid.
[323] J. R. Harding, 'History of the South African Commission for the Preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques in the Union of South Africa', *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 63, 3/4 (1954), 231.

site that was eventually known as the Jochmann Wall. He was also the first to publish a popular article about the rock art in the Brandberg.[324]

Other German enthusiasts included professionals in other disciplines, such as Reuning the geologist who conducted some of the first systematic excavation in Namibia in 1910 at the 'Bushman's Paradise' site in the Spitzkoppe.[325] The most prominent enthusiast to practice during the German period was Reinhardt Maack. He was a teacher of art at the German *Realschule* in Windhoek.[326] Maack was famed for the 'discovery' of the White Lady of the Brandberg in 1917[327] and the 'discovery' of Twyfelfontein rock engraving site in 1921.[328]

There was no official body that managed and controlled the practice of archaeology. Heritage management was not institutionalised and formalised. However, there were some local and indigenous ways of managing and interpreting heritage. In addition to the indigenous ways of caring for heritage and archaeology the earliest recorded effort at retrieving archaeological artefacts for the purpose of preservation was conducted by a guano trader in 1853. He retrieved the fragments of the Dias Cross and sent them to the South African Museum. The Dias Cross was erected near Lüderitz in 1488 by Bartholomew Dias.[329] Another Portuguese cross, the Cape Cross, was removed ostensibly for safekeeping to Germany in 1893.[330] It has

[324] H. Jochmann, 'Die Buschmannzeichnungen in Deutsch-Südwestafrika', *Die Woche*, 12, 3 (1910), 113-16.
[325] I. Schmidt, 'A Middle Stone Age Assemblage with Discoid Lithic Technology from Etemba 14, Erongo Mountains, Northern Namibia', *Journal of African Archaeology*, 9, 1 (2011), 85-100.
[326] A *Realschule* was the type of school that provided education to intermediary students. The German education system differentiated the levels of education that were provided. At the bottom was the *Hauptschule* which provided education opportunities for the less academic pupils. This was followed by the *Realschule.* At the top of the German school system was the Gymnasium which catered for academically gifted students. There was a category that combined all types of education which was called the *Gesamtschule*. Ironically some of Maack's original reproductions of the White Lady of the Brandberg are stored at the old *Realschule* in Windhoek where he taught when he first encountered the painted site in the Brandberg. The National Museum of Namibia is currently housed in the old German *Realschule* building.
[327] J. D. Lewis-Williams, 'Image and Counter-Image: The Work of the Rock Art Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand', *African Arts*, 29, 4 (1996), 34-93.
[328] A. M. Nankela, 'Rock Art Research in Namibia: A Synopsis', *Africana Studia*, 24, 201 (2020), 35-55.
[329] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*.
[330] Ibid.

been argued elsewhere that the cross was "presented to Kaiser Wilhelm II, who used it to serve his propaganda purposes regarding the empire's naval superiority".[331] In 2019 the Cape Cross was at the centre of debates regarding returning cultural objects to Namibia. The Deutsches Historisches Museum decided to return the cross to Namibia.[332] As part of the process of returning it, some events were organised, including a symposium under the theme 'The Stone Cross from Cape Cross – Colonial Objects and Historical Justice'.

The intention to return the Cape Cross raised many issues regarding the process of restituting cultural objects and even human remains to Namibia. There were no guidelines for demanding objects and for handling the objects once they arrived in Namibia. There was no policy regarding the final destination of the objects in Namibia. Thus, the government of Namibia requested a delay in the return of the cross while it developed some guidelines. Namibia had experienced challenges concerning what to do with human remains and other cultural objects that were returned from Germany. The human remains that were returned had created debate about whether they should either be restituted to the communities that claimed them as ancestors or be treated as national assets. There were competing views even among the communities that claimed the human remains as ancestors. Some wanted them to be buried while others demanded that a museum of genocide be constructed for the display of the human remains. The human remains could be used as tangible evidence in pursuit of restorative justice.[333] However, the Cape Cross was eventually returned without the ceremony and prestige that had been initially planned. It was repatriated and stored in a

[331] 'Germany returning Stone Cross artifact to Namibia' available at https://www.dw.com/en/germany-returning-stone-cross-artifact-to-namibia/a-48768706, retrieved 3 October 2020.
[332] Ibid.
[333] L. Förster, 'These skulls are not enough' – The Repatriation of Namibian Human Remains from Berlin to Windhoek in 2011', available at http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2013/11/18/these-skulls-are-not-enough-the-repatriation-of-namibian-human-remains-from-berlin-to-windhoek-in-2011/, retrieved 2 October 2020.

container at the harbour town of Walvis Bay while the Namibian government was to decide what to do with it.

Heritage conservation and management in Namibia was from its onset associated with protecting colonial heritage. It was also symbiotically associated with colonial violence that translocated heritage objects and alienated the indigenous communities from their heritage and history. The first signs of formal and locally based heritage management were realised in South Africa through the formation of the Historical Monuments Commission In 1923.[334] This commission had oversight in Namibia and was the predecessor of the National Monuments Council. A locally based Historical Monuments Commission was subsequently established in Namibia in 1949.[335]

Correspondences and other heritage administrative records that are in the national archives of Namibia reveal that the Historical Monuments Commission was assisted by the South West Africa Scientific Society in its work of compiling a register of archaeological sites and preparing sites for proclamation as national monuments. After the establishment of the Historical Monuments Commission, both institutions received and processed applications for permits to conduct archaeological research. The South West Africa Administration retained the power to issue the permits after consulting the commission and the scientific society. The state controlled archaeological research. Before the local commission was instituted, permits

[334] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*.
[335] National Archives of Namibia, A.427/41, Letter from I. J. Keun to J. H. Stodel, 10 October 1949. In this letter, Keun informed Stodel that the Historical Monuments Commission was established in the then South West Africa. All matters regarding heritage preservation were referred to the commission.

had to be obtained from the South African administration and sometimes under the patronage of Jan Smuts, the Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa.[336]

The Historical Monuments Commission was responsible for preserving natural and historical monuments, relics and antiques, as was clearly stated in the full name of the law that established it: the 'Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiquities Act of 1934'. The Historical Monuments Commission worked together with the museum, which by then was still administered by the South West Africa Scientific Society, in collecting art works.[337] The commission had the power to proclaim, preserve and protect heritage sites. In the particular case of Namibia, the commission did not have professional archaeologists working for it. The only professional archaeologist to have worked in Namibia during the period of the Historical Monuments Commission was Gerhard Fock. He was the first trained archaeologist employed by the State Museum from 1955. [338] He resigned to join the McGregor Museum in South Africa in 1958.

Fock was not employed by the Historical Monuments Commission but was rather employed by the State Museum. Therefore, amateur archaeology continued to thrive in Namibia because the body that regulated the practice of archaeology was composed of amateur archaeologists and enthusiasts. Although they were only formal members of the commission from 1949 to 1972, they had already contributed significantly to the practice of archaeology and the management of archaeological heritage prior to the institutionalisation of the

[336] In a letter seeking permission to visit South West Africa, Mary Boyle described the Abbé Breuil and herself as "European prehistorians, known personally to Field –Marshal Smuts and his wife", National Archives of Namibia A/427/41.
[337] National Archives of Namibia, HMK 4.1.1, Letter of Cecil Lemmer, the Chairperson of Historical Monuments Commission, to the Administrator of South West Africa, 21 December 1949. The letter expressed the desires of the Historical Monuments Commission to purchase the art collection of Mr Bowker, who was relocating from Windhoek to Swakopmund.
[338] Otto-Reiner, *From Landesmuseum to National Museum of Namibia*.

commission. Members of the first Historical Monuments Commission in Namibia included some of the most ardent collectors of the earliest archaeological artefacts that were recorded in the National Museum of Namibia's acquisition book. These were Cecil Lemmer, Fritz Gaerdes and Ernst Scherz.[339] The Administration of South West Africa relied on amateur archaeologists to provide professional advice on heritage matters and guide international academic researchers such as the Abbé Breuil to archaeological sites.[340] Thus, amateur archaeologists wielded some power, which they used to continue practicing despite the fact that from 1934 the applicable heritage laws required professionally trained individuals to practice archaeology. Amateur archaeologists were responsible for deciding and recommending the issuance of archaeological permits by the Historical Monuments Commission.

An analysis of the lists published by Vogt of the members of the three commissions that managed heritage in Namibia from 1949 to 1995 revealed that archaeology was represented by amateur archaeologists in both the HMC and the NMC Regional Committee for South West Africa.[341] From 1957 to 1970 the secretary of the HCM was a prominent amateur archaeologist, D. W. Krynauw.[342] There were periods when archaeology was not represented on the commissions. During such periods the museum archaeologist served both the museum and the NMC. However, museum archaeologists did not process archaeological permit applications. They instead provided their expertise in researching and preserving

[339] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*, xiii.
[340] The Secretary of the Historical Monuments Commission, Keun, revealed in a letter to J.H. Stodel that amateur archaeologists were considered to be experts. Keun wrote "on receipt of your letter of the 25th of July 1949, His Honour the Administrator of South West Africa consulted this body who, in turn, detailed its expert Dr Scherz, to investigate the matter". National Archives of Namibia, A.427/41, Letter from I. J. Keun to J. H. Stodel, 10 October 1949.
[341] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*, xiii.
[342] Ibid., xvii.

archaeological sites. Museum archaeologists required permits to conduct their duties at archaeological sites.

The promulgation of the National Monuments Act (Act 27 of 1969) in South Africa heralded a change in heritage management in then South West Africa. The new law replaced the 1934 law and provided for the formation of an NMC regional committee for SWA. The Regional Committee, which was essentially the NMC secretariat in Namibia, was a sub-office of the National Monuments Council, which had its headquarters in Cape Town. The regional committee continued to accommodate amateur archaeologists as its members until 1972. For the next 20 years there was no archaeologist who served on the regional committee.

At independence in 1990, the National Monuments Council was constituted as a national body that was responsible for heritage management in Namibia. It ceased to be a regional committee of the NMC of South Africa. Vera Freyer worked as the archaeologist for the NMC and was formally employed as its Acting Director from May to October 1992 when she resigned from the National Monuments Council. The duties of the archaeologist were mainly administrative, such as preparing submissions for the proclamation of monuments, issuing archaeological permits, and restoring of monuments. There was a permit committee that decided and issued archaeological permits to researchers. According to Freyer, there was a close working relationship between the NMC and the museum archaeologists. However, there was a clear distinction of duties as the NMC archaeologist's duties were more managerial than scientific. Although they worked together on projects such as the rehabilitation of rock art sites, the NMC archaeologist was not involved in the research

projects of the museum archaeologists.[343] Emphasis of archaeological heritage management at the NMC was on rock art heritage.[344]

An examination of the list of monuments that were proclaimed in Namibia before independence speaks of a tradition of using heritage as a state apparatus for the pacification and alienation of the communities that were viewed as hostile towards the efforts of colonisation. Archaeological sites that were proclaimed as monuments belonged to what was viewed as 'bushman relics'. These archaeological sites and relics, which according to Vogt represented "factual historical and documentary evidence of the past" portrayed a picture of an arrested cultural development,[345] included the remains of a prehistoric elephant kill from the Zoo Park in the centre of Windhoek, sites of veneration, rock art sites, and a musical stone.

The preoccupation with preserving the relics of the 'Bushmen' that was shown in the list of proclaimed archaeological heritage was synchronous with the myth of a vanishing race. The San became the subject of racial science during the colonial period because they were believed to be a race that faced extinction. The NMC was in the service of the colonial administration and it assisted the museum by proclaiming and ensuring that the sites and artefacts of the subjects of anthropometric studies, the San, were preserved. It can be argued that while the museum occupied itself with preserving what Rassool has called "living

[343] V. Freyer, email to G. Gwasira, 19 November 2018. In the email Freyer described the aspects of NMC archaeology in response to questions that I sent to her. It was not possible to meet her for an interview and after many attempts to meet we agreed to consult via email.
[344] The testimonial for Freyer that was written by Dr J. J. Bruwer, the then Acting Director of the National Monuments Council when she resigned from the NMC, revealed that the main focus of heritage management was on archaeological sites The testimonial was dated 30 October 1992.
[345] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*, x.

fossils", the NMC complemented the efforts by preserving the correspondent fossils that were considered to be 'inanimate'.[346]

The practice of archaeology at the National Heritage Council throughout its history privileged the knowledge and ways of knowing that were Eurocentric. What constituted archaeology and was deemed worthy of proclamation was determined firstly by South African standards. The HMC, the regional committee of the NMC, and eventually the NHC of Namibia all followed what the empire authorised as archaeological heritage. According to Vogt, the heritages of other indigenous communities of Namibia were omitted because they were considered to be non-existent as these communities practiced 'nomadic pastoralism'.[347] Vogt's argument does not account for the lacuna in the archaeologies of sedentary societies of north and north-eastern Namibia. He contended that there was no research on the possible sites in northern Namibia, hence the skewed spatial distribution of monuments on the list before independence.[348]

In contrast, I argue that firstly it was the definition of what constituted archaeology that excluded the archaeology of the northern bantu-speaking communities. Archaeology was synonymous with 'Bushmen' relics, as borrowed from the first heritage law in South Africa, the Boesman Overblyfselen Beschermings Proklamatie of 1921 (Bushmen remains protection proclamation).[349] Secondly, northern Namibia did not have settler colonial heritage compared to regions that were south of the red line. There were mission stations but these were not considered for proclamation until 1992, when the Nakambale mission house was proclaimed a national monument.

[346] Rassool, 'Restoring the Skeletons of Empire', 659.
[347] Vogt, *National Monuments in Namibia*, xx.
[348] Ibid.
[349] Ibid.

From 2004 the National Monuments Council was replaced by the National Heritage Council of Namibia. There were no archaeologists employed by the National Heritage Council until 2009 when a rock art specialist was employed as the first black archaeologist for the council. Museum archaeologists had continued to provide services to the NMC between 1992 and 2003. Archaeological permits were processed by the Scientific Committee of the NMC in which an archaeologist, Beatrice Sandelowsky, served from 2000 to 2003. The archaeological permit application procedure remained the same during the pre-independence and post-independence periods. It involved obtaining the consent of the head of the National Museum of Namibia in cases where the artefacts to be studied were in the museum collection. The head of the institution to which the artefacts were to be exported was required to make a declaration that they would ensure that the artefacts were returned after the studies.

Major archaeological sites such as the Brandberg and Twyfelfontein were managed on a daily basis by the local communities. In the case of the Brandberg, the community youths formed the Dâureb Mountain guides who provided guiding services. However, from 2004 onwards the Dâureb Mountain Guides Association was not permitted to continue offering their services. Eventually the association disbanded and some of the guides were absorbed as staff of the National Heritage Council. No community guides were allowed to provide services if they were not employed by the National Heritage Council.

The Dâureb Mountain Guides Association had sought to address the skewed interpretation and presentation of archaeology of the Brandberg, which had hitherto been based on the 'scientific' knowledge of the archaeologists. The Association initiated the 'Daure Daman Oral History' in 2004 which aimed at documenting stories regarding how their elders

perceived the rock art of the Brandberg. These stories were to be incorporated into the presentation of the site by the Dâureb Mountain Guides.

In 2005 the DMG presented their preliminary results at a rock art conference in Windhoek. According to Eric Xaweb, who was one of the members who presented at the conference, having realised that there was a huge amount of documentation regarding the Brandberg the Dâureb Mountain Guides "decided to gather stories from the elders to give a true reflection about the people living around the Brandberg".[350] This was in response to the realisation that the perspectives and knowledges of the Damara-speaking people had not found their way into the official archaeology of the Brandberg. The oral history project demonstrated that contrary to the view that the Damara-speaking people had nothing to do with the rock art of the Brandberg there had been some uninterrupted association with the rock art for at least one hundred years. The project could not be completed because the Dâureb Mountain Guides Association was disbanded when the National Heritage Council moved to reclaim the mountain as their preserve.

The project nonetheless illustrated the need for community archaeology. The management of archaeology at the NHC was bureaucratic. It was marked by the exclusion of indigenous voices in both the proclamation and the presentation of the archaeological heritage. Knowledge about the archaeology of the Brandberg had hitherto been developed in the metropolitan centres of archaeology of Namibia such as Germany and South Africa. The community guides sought to transform the Brandberg and the Uis settlement radically from

[350] Transcription of Eric Xaweb's recorded presentation at 'A Homecoming of Rock Art Conference, Windhoek', by E. Fäder, 11-13 April 2005, received from T. Lenssen-Erz, email to G. Gwasira, 29 December 2019.

archaeological ‘mines’ to centres of knowledge production. The ‘Daure Daman Oral History’ project had the potential of raising epistemological questions regarding archaeology as a practice of knowledge production that perceives artefacts and sites as objective testaments to the past. Archaeologists who worked in the Brandberg did not regard the Damara-speaking people as having knowledge about the site and the rock art. The preliminary results of the project challenge the professional archaeologists’ claim to knowledge about the Brandberg. This kind of knowledge production was not encouraged by the NHC. Instead communities were alienated and isolated from the archaeological sites. The two, archaeology and society, were treated as disconnected entities. When the site was proclaimed as a monument in 1951 people could only enter it with a permit. When the NHC re-asserted its control of the site local community guides were disengaged from the site, yet there was a potential for co-production of knowledge at the site.

Conclusion

Following Rassool’s argument that the museum is an apparatus of empire, it is safe to reason that archaeological practice in Namibia’s State Museum and the National Monuments Council reflected how the South African empire functioned structurally through “extractive, hierarchical and stratified relations” to govern the colony.[351] The Museum and the Monuments Council in Namibia were sites of reproduction and entrenchment of the South African empire. Archaeological management was formalised through the South African laws that governed people’s relationships to and with heritage sites and objects. The management of archaeological practice in Namibia was thus a bastion of South African control of the indigenous inhabitants and their ways of knowing. Even though there was no law that controlled the practice of archaeology during the German colonial period in Namibia, both

[351] Rassool, ‘Restoring the Skeletons of Empire’, 653.

the South African and German periods were marked by an unambiguous exclusion and alienation of local communities from the production of knowledge.

The National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council were institutions that assisted colonial administrations to classify and govern the indigenous people of Namibia. Long after Namibia attained independence, the two institutions continued to practice archaeology following the same methodology that viewed artefacts and sites as neutral facts that were apolitical. This was indicative of the coloniality of archaeological practice in Namibia. Writing about rethinking the empire in Southern African, Henrichsen and his colleagues contended that "empire is, above all, a way of knowing and an enduring system of knowledge that persists long after the demise of colonialism."[352] I borrow this argument and extend it to conclude that coloniality was the major repercussion of the history of heritage management as practiced at the National Museum of Namibia and the National Heritage Council of Namibia. The colonial metropoles of archaeological research, specifically South Africa and Germany, continued to thrive as centres for knowledge production. At the same time, Namibia sustained this asymmetrical relationship by remaining a site for fieldwork.

[352] D. Henrichsen, G. Miescher, C. Rassool and L. Rizzo, 'Rethinking Empire in Southern Africa', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 41, 3 (2015), 431-35.

Conclusion

Reframing archaeology in Namibia- Postarchaeocentric turn

Archaeology in Namibia developed as a colonial project of amassing knowledge about the land. Such knowledge was accumulated through processes of dehistoricising the indigenous people, land dispossession and depoliticisation. I argue that archaeology in Namibia manifested itself through different practices that were to a large extent influenced by the political climate in the country. The consequence of the archaeologies that were practiced during the colonial period and after independence was that they promoted colonialism and coloniality. Some areas of archaeology were omitted geographically and thematically. A democratised and decolonised archaeological space can be achieved through a new practice that I call a postarchaeocentric direction. I further argue that archaeology as a discipline of nation-building has been a failed project in Namibia.

Archaeology was practiced as a science that reinforced the outlooks of the colonial powers. Therefore, archaeological sites and artefacts became expressions of power over local communities. This was achieved through the naming of sites, the construction of 'protective' structures around the sites in the name of conservation, the anonymisation of African co-workers and appropriation of sites.[353] Archaeological research at the Maack Shelter or White Lady Shelter in the Brandberg Mountain demonstrated these connections between the discipline and colonialism. Appropriation of the 'white lady' site began referring to the painting as 'Our lady' by the Abbé Breuil long before he even encountered it physically. When the Abbé Breuil finally visited the site for the first time he requested a mattress and

[353] Archival documents and photographs are mostly silent about black assistants or co-workers in the archaeology of Namibia. However, in some cases the co-workers appeared in photographs but without being identified or acknowledged by name. Such archives that excluded the black co-worker raise interesting future research questions about the politics of race in colonial archaeological knowledge production and the effect of such exclusions on the narratives generated through archaeological research in Namibia.

slept below it. The naming of the site and sleeping below the painting was an act of claiming and asserting authority over it.

This was the beginning of a long history of a relationship of imbalance between the researcher the subject of his research. The painting was attributed to non-indigenous cultural authors possibly Phoenicians.[354] Right from the onset of archaeological research in the Brandberg Mountain, Breuil created a disconnect between archaeological resources and their originators. He imposed a new frame of reference that favoured non-African origins. This was a practice in racial science. Local politicians such as the Administrator of South West Africa Colonel Imke Hoogenhout commented that the white lady painting was 'not primitive art' because it was 'good art'. It can therefore be argued that academic archaeology was introduced in the framework of race studies which viewed Africans and their culture as inferior and uncivilised.

Academic and professional archaeologists had the power to name the sites, interpret material culture and produce 'scientific evidence' that would be used by colonial officials as part of the process of the dispossession of the indigenous people of their land. The Abbé Breuil recommended that the 'white lady' site be sealed off by constructing a cage around it to protect it.[355] The Brandberg Mountain was declared a (South African) national monument in 1951 effectively making it a protected area where people could not visit without a permit. Local people were dispossessed of their land and alienated from resources such as pasture for their livestock. Archaeology was a discipline of claiming land through a deep interest in fossils and not the people. It was a practice that focused mainly on the sites and artefacts as

[354] H. Breuil, 'The White Lady of the Brandberg, her companions and her guards', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 3 (1948), 2-11.
[355] Letter of Keun to the Administrator of South West Africa, 10 March, 1948, A427/41, National Archives of Namibia.

though the cultural authors did not have any connection with their artefacts. The archaeologist was the ‘expert’ who took on the authority of reconstructing and authoring the history of the land. The consequence of such archaeological research was that it reflected and supported the colonial philosophy of governing people by dispossessing them of their land and cultural agency. Politicians were prominent in sustaining archaeology as a discipline of race and governmentality.

The practice of archaeology in this sense was concerned with establishing typologies and cultural sequences. The earliest excavations were done for the purposes of extracting dateable material to determine the antiquity of rock art. Thus archaeology was depoliticised. It focused on the artefacts and sites and not on the people who created and left the material culture. Even in cases where the originators of the material culture or their direct descendants were no longer present, the new local communities appropriated the sites into their own maps of meaning. However, the local communities were not considered in archaeological studies. Material culture was perceived as objective scientific samples that could be interpreted solely by archaeologists to produce histories that were not biased. The result of this approach to archaeology was a narrative of a territory of people without politics and of artefacts without markers. Archaeology created ‘a people without politics’. And yet, archaeology is inherently political due to its nature of mapping the cultural and economic resources that resulted in alienating local communities from their land and cultural practices. Contrary to the narrative of a people without politics that archaeology produced, the local people who associated themselves with sites such as the Brandberg Mountain used archaeology to assert their connectedness to the sites and to claim their rights to benefit economically from the archaeology of the Brandberg Mountain.

The practice of archaeology in Namibia was built on the ideas of the past that were espoused by amateur archaeologists. The discipline developed out of Bushmen Studies and was associated with race sciences. Archaeological research was mobilised around the study of Bushmen who were seen as the closest link to creation. They were perceived as the direct fossil ancestors of modern humans. The Bushmen were seen as 'living fossils' as Rassool has indicated. [356] As such the Bushmen relics including skeletal remains were the focus of apolitical research.[357] The lack of focus on the archaeology of groups other than the San was part of the dispossession of the people from the land and its markings. Historical archaeology, instead, focused on the contact between Europe and Africa specifically along the coast. Historical archaeology in Namibia followed the classical definition of James Deetz which emphasised the spread and impact of European material culture.[358] Historical archaeology in Namibia was practiced only in circumstances where some written records existed. African communities whose history continued to be orally transmitted were thus alienated.

Archaeology in Namibia focused mainly on the Stone Ages and establishing chronologies. This was seen as a way of avoiding being political. As a result, archaeology in Namibia missed an opportunity of engaging with socio-political issues concerning nation-building, restitution and land distribution and yet it could have contributed to those key subjects. Archaeology continues to have the potential for working in the service of the society. In cases where some communities were demanding their land that was expropriated during the colonial era to establish game parks, archaeology could have provided evidence for the

[356] C. Rassool, 'Restoring the skeletons of empire: Return, reburial and rehumanisation in Southern Africa', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 41, 30 (2015), 653-670.
[357] Detailed studies on the practice of archaeology in Namibia were published by Robert Gordon. See for example, R. Gordon, '(Sm)othering Others? Post-millennial anthropology in Namibia,' *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 18(2015), 135-151. See also J.B, Gewald, 'A Teutonic ethnologist in the Windhoek district: rethinking the anthropology of Guenther Wagner', in D. LeBeau and R.J. Gordon (eds*), Challenges for anthropology in the 'African Renaissance: a Southern African contribution*, (Windhoek: University of Namibia Press), 19-30.
[358] J. Deetz, *In Small Things Forgotten. The Archaeology of Early American Life* (New York: Anchor Books, 1977).

existence of such communities before the declaration of the parks. The on-going land claims court case of the Hai//om could have been supported by the archaeological evidence of precolonial windbreaks and hunting blinds as well as other cultural markers in the Etosha National Park. According to Hitchcock archaeological evidence suggested that the San were the first people to live in the Etosha National Park.[359] Such contributions of archaeology make it potentially relevant to the communities. Historical archaeology can also be useful for studying the history of the liberation struggle upon which the narrative of the new nation of Namibia is anchored. Archaeology needs to overhaul its methods and focus to realign itself to the challenges that the local communities face every day.

The sparse research on Iron Age archaeology focused mainly on ceramics as a typology for classifying indigenous communities. There were Iron Age and pastoral societies that archaeology forgot in Namibia and as a result they were 'erased' from the archaeological narrative. In cases where Iron Age archaeology was attempted, the emphasis was on the precolonial aspects of it. Paying attention only to the precolonial period meant that archaeology did not address the pasts of communities that were directly affected by colonialism. Prehistory was a safe period to focus on. Zimbabwean archaeology on the other hand concentrated on the pasts of Iron Age farmers whose direct descendants were colonised. Such pasts became the uniting point for anti-colonial resistance and the liberation struggle. Post-independence Zimbabwean archaeology consciously addressed issues of land dispossession and access to spiritually significant archaeological sites.[360] Thus Zimbabwean archaeology positioned itself as useful to the communities and relevant to the state.

[359] S. Koot and R.K. Hitchcock, 'In the way: perpetuating land dispossession of the indigenous Hai//om and the collective action lawsuit for Etosha National Park and Mangetti West, Namibia, *Nomadic Peoples*, 23 (2019), 55-77.
[360] M, Manyanga and S. Katsamudanga, 'Prodding the ancestors in post-independence Zimbabwe: conclusions and future prospects' in M. Manyanga and S. Katsamudanga, *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-independence era* (Harare: Sapes Books, 2013), 247-254.

Along with Iron Age studies the archaeology of conflict in Namibia would amplify the histories of anticolonial resistance and the liberation struggle. The archaeology of conflict has not been practiced in Namibia despite the existence of archaeological evidence such as firearms that were encountered at construction sites in Windhoek, battle fields and sites of concentration camps around the country. The firearms were presumed to have been associated with the Herero-Nama genocide.[361] Some archaeological studies of known battle sites could prove to be relevant to the development of the national narrative regarding resistance to colonialism. In reframing the archaeology of Namibia, I argue for a postarchaeocentric turn which is a politically engaged and community-based form of archaeological practice.

The Postarchaeocentric turn

The post archaeocentric turn recognises archaeology as a social justice project and not only a 'scientised' academic and professionalised field of study.[362] Postarchaeocentric archaeology strives to redress the injustices of colonialism and colonial archaeology. It addresses issues of access to land and economic opportunities that archaeological heritage present. The postarchaeocentric turn perceives archaeology as a form of knowledge production by communities. Archaeological sites in this case cease to be 'mines' and become centres for local knowledge production where local communities actively participate in archaeological programmes and activities. It is different from public archaeology because the postarchaeocentric turn starts with recognising and acknowledging that communities have

[361] A. Shigwedha, 'Century-old weapons unearthed', *The Namibian Newspaper*, 26 January 2005, available at https://www.namibian.com.na/12972/archive-read/Century-old-weapons-unearthed, retrieved 30 October 2020.
[362] See also Y. Hamilakis, 'Decolonial Archaeology as Social Justice' A*ntiquity*, 92, 362 (2018), 518-520.

always practiced archaeology by curating and interpreting sites. They developed knowledge based on how they experienced the sites. Such community archaeology was not acknowledged by 'scientised' academic and professionalised archaeologies. The practice of archaeology in the postarchaeocentric turn does not concern itself with the artefacts in stratified contexts or open surfaces. It is about using archaeology to confront the daily struggles of communities. Archaeology should be about making the past 'usable' as Pikirayi noted.[363] It should address issues of social justice and cultural restitution.

I use the term archaeocentric in this thesis to mean the practice of archaeology in which the artefacts and sites become the central and only focus of the discipline while the people who made and used the artefacts are considered to be either non-existent or unimportant. Archaeocentric archaeology is a practice whereby material culture from archaeological sites inclusive of its contextual data are the prime focus of the archaeologist. A postarchaeocentric archaeology raises critical questions about the sociopolitical and economic contexts in which the data was collected, analysed and disseminated as knowledge. It recognises that archaeology is inherently political and hence cannot afford not to ask critical questions about the nexus between contemporary society and the history of archaeology.

The archaeocentric archaeologists were more concerned about keeping up with method and theory in international scholarship than they were about relaying the results of their work to the descendants of the people whose archaeological remains they were studying. They did not consider the ideas and interpretations of the local communities as scientific. Indigenous people could only serve the archaeologists as cheap labour and hence were not co-workers.

[363] I. Pikirayi, 'What can archaeology do for society in Southern Africa?' *Historical Archaeology*, 43, 4 (2009), 125-27.

Archaeology, therefore, needs to be transformed so that it does not focus as much on the artefacts and sites. It should not only rely on the service of colonial metropoles and international institutions. Manyanga and Katsamudanga cautioned against relying on external institutions to develop and practice archaeology because 'socio-economic and political changes' can negatively impact the continuity of research programmes.[364]

The postarchaeocentric turn advocates for a reconfiguration of archaeology so that it addresses socio-political issues. It is perceived as a disciplinary practice that is informed by the participation of the people who were alienated from their knowledge and forms of knowing. It re-centres local communities in archaeological knowledge production and transforms them from being mere informers and local guides to co-producers of knowledge. It is a form of community-based archaeology. It is essential that the new generation of archaeologists in countries such as Namibia that emerged from a long history if deep and multiple colonialisms reflect on the histories of archaeologies and transform the practice.

In as much as advocating for a transformed discipline may not necessarily be something new in southern Africa there is still scope for interrogating the narratives that archaeology constructed in colonial settings. Zimbabwean archaeologists managed to question narratives regarding the Great Zimbabwe and developed new accounts of the site. This was largely made possible with the help of the state since Zimbabwean archaeology after independence was mobilised around questions of 'Zimbabweanness'. Archaeology was relevant and useful for nation-building. However Zimbabwean archaeology was used by the state for the purposes of governmentality, and even imposing itself on the people. The archaeology of the Zimbabwe culture (dry stone walls) became the boulevard for defining national identity,

[364] M. Manyanga and S. Katsamudanga, ibid, 247.

pride and for deconstructing colonial narratives. In the case of Zimbabwe archaeological transformation and the development of the required skills was dictated by the state. The state supported the development of a form of Zimbabwean archaeology through enacting laws and developing policies that complemented archaeological development. Such laws included, among others, the Traditional Leaders Act (Act 25 of 1998) which, according to Manyanga and Katsamudanga, assigned power over cultural sites to traditional leaders.[365] This could address issues of alienation of indigenous communities from their archaeological heritage. However, a major critique of transformation of archaeology in Zimbabwe can be that what was transformed were mainly the interpretations of monumental sites of dry stone walls. There was some form of coloniality in the emphasis on an archaeology of monumentalism which was the prime focus of colonial archaeology, and which was reproduced in nationalist archaeological narratives. Other archaeologies such as rock art studies continued to use the field methods and interpretive models that were designed by the colonial metropoles of archaeology.

Transformation of archaeology has been a major point of debate in southern Africa in general. South African archaeology itself has not yet been fully transformed. Instead it has continued to influence and dominate archaeologies of the southern African region. South Africa remained as the major centre for training of archaeologists in the region. At the same time South Africa continued in its role as a centre for knowledge production while the other southern African countries were research fields. This was despite the fact that South Africa itself was a periphery to Cambridge which was its colonial metropole. In terms of transformation, South African archaeology has transformed some of its structures albeit at a painfully slow rate. While some black South Africans have entered into archaeology as

[365] M. Manyanga and S. Katsamudanga, ibid.

heritage managers, academic archaeology has largely remained a preserve of mainly white archaeologists, but now joined by expert, Zimbabwean émigré archaeologists. Knowledge production has remained the domain of a particular scientific tradition that was established in South Africa as a result of the country being a research field site of Europe. The demands of transformation have seemingly not been as urgent, with émigré Zimbabwean archaeologists taking up posts, giving an impression of change. What transformation brought for South Africa was an opening up of archaeology, in ways limited to cultural resources and heritage management, for the education of a layer of managers of archaeological heritage.

South African archaeologists have called for transformation in archaeology of southern Africa. Nevertheless the call so far has mainly been about transforming institutions such as the ASAPA.[366] The transformation debate in South Africa has been more about overhauling institutions in which archaeology was practiced, such as museums, heritage agencies and universities.[367] In Namibia, the debate is not about transforming institutions because the demographic imbalances that existed in the National Museum of Namibia and the then National Monuments Council at the onset of independence did not last long. The challenges for Namibia are unique in the sense that there are few archaeologists in state services. The University does not have a Department of Archaeology. However, archaeology and heritage studies were deliberately located in the history programme as alternative methods of reclaiming Namibian history and undoing the empire, albeit in a dependent position. Archaeology assists in the project of decolonising historical perspectives but it cannot successful do this if it remains a colonial science.

[366] N. Ndlovu, 'Transformation challenges in South African archaeology', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64, 189 (2009), 91-93.
[367] N. Ndlovu and B Smith, 'The past is a divided country: Transforming archaeology in South Africa', *African Archaeological Review* , 36 (2019), 175-192.

The main challenge for transforming archaeology in Namibia is in remaking Namibia as a centre of knowledge production. While I argue for a transformed archaeology for Namibia through the introduction of a postarchaeocentric turn I do not advocate for the annihilation of other forms of archaeology that were practiced. Namibia does not need to transform structures because they do not exist. This is advantageous because Namibia needs to overhaul approaches to archaeological research and include knowledges that were dismissed as 'native science'. There is an opportunity for developing a Namibian archaeology which has hitherto not existed. Such an archaeology is practised by the local communities. This is not a call for a token involvement of local communities in public archaeology projects. A postarchaeocentric archaeology recognises the local communities as co-workers and co-producers of knowledge and hence they should be co-authors of the results of archaeological research and co-managers of archaeological heritage.

Postarchaeocentric archaeology reshapes archaeological sites as locations of community advocacy and atonement. To achieve this, I propose the establishment of a Programme on Community Archaeology in Namibia. The institute will address issues of access to education and training in archaeology in an effort to redress the racial imbalances that resulted from the alienation of indigenous communities from acquiring qualifications in archaeology during the colonial period. This will be a community-driven archaeological institution that acknowledges the forms of archaeologies that were practiced and the knowledges that were produced by indigenous communities. The Programme of Community Archaeology will provide pathways for recognition of community practices as equivalent to 'scientised' archaeology, without falling into the traps of a new governmentality. The vast knowledge and experience of local communities can be utilised to develop an accredited qualification in

archaeology. Archaeology was complicit in creating asymmetrical structures of power and hence the Programme of Community Archaeology will be an embodiment of decolonising archaeology in Namibia.

Bibliography

Manuscript Sources: Archival and Museum Collections

A: Archival Collections

(i) Basler Afrika Bilbiographien

Ernst Rudolf and Annaliese Scherz Correspondence:
PA. 4. II.1
PA.4 II.2

Ernst Rudolf and Annaliese Scherz Photograph Collection:
PA 4. S

Boyle Trianon Abbé II:
PA.4 Z

(ii) National Archives of Namibia

A198/6/2, Request for a third class railway warrant for native Johannes from Windhoek to Outjo.

HMK (National Monuments Commission)
HMK 4/1/1
HMK 17/1/2

Raad vir Nasionale Gedenkwaardighede (Windhoek office of National Monuments Council, South Africa)
RNG/ 18/1

South West Africa Administration
SWAA 2767

Kaiserliches Gouvernement für Deutsch-Südwestafrika
ZBU1005

(iii) Heinrich-Barth-Institute archives, University of Cologne

Correspondence Files

Administrative records.

B. Museum archives

(i) Iziko Museums of South Africa, Social History Collections Department, Archaeology Unit

Correspondence, 1936; 1982

Accessions Book, Rudner Collection (8475)
.

(ii) National Museum of Namibia, Department of Archaeology

Archaeology Accessions Books
B 0122, B0187, B0971, B1198, B1579, B1588, B2717, B2733, B2742, B4267, B4268, B4269 B4272 B4273, B4275

Administrative Records, 2005; 2016

Correspondence, 2018

C. National Heritage Council

Correspondence, 2011

Interviews

Interviews conducted by the author

G. Gwasira interview with Günter von Schumann, Namibia Scientific, 4 March 2016, Society.

G. Gwasira Interview with Mr !Hannabeb, Ugab River, Brandberg, May, 28, 2000

G. Gwasira, Interview with R. Kuper, Cologne, 8 April, 2016.

G. Gwasira, interview with T. Lenssen-Erz, 8 April, 2016.

Author's Correspondence

Beatrice Sandelowsky, email to Goodman Gwasira, July, 25, 2016.

V. Freyer, email to G. Gwasira, 19 November 2018

John Kinahan, email to Goodman Gwasira, November 20, 2019.

John Kinahan, email to Goodman Gwasira, February 14, 2020.

T Lenssen-Erz, email to G Gwasira, June, 20, 2018

T. Lenssen-Erz, email to G. Gwasira, 29 December 2019.

Legislation, Policies and guidelines

Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2012

Environmental Management Act (Act 7 of 2007).

Labour Relations Act (Act 28 of 1956)

Namibia Diamond Corporation Environmental policy 2019

Namibia's Environmental Assessment Policy (1995)

Namibia Tourism Board Act (Act 21 of 2000

National Heritage Act, (Act 27 of 2004)

National Monuments Act (Act 28 of 1969

Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act of 1934

SAHRA APM Guidelines: Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports

State Museum Policy of 1989

Online Sources

ASAPA (Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists) Constitution and Appendices, available at http://archaeologicalethics.org/code-of-ethics/association-of-southern-african-professional-archaeologists-asapa-constitution-and-appendices retrieved on 13 February 2020.

The Commonwealth, 'From the Archive: Sanctions Agreed Against Apartheid-era South Africa'; available at https://thecommonwealth.org/media/news/archive-sanctions-agreed-against-apartheid-era-south-africa, retrieved 23 January 2020.

Namibia Diamond Corporation Environmental policy 2019 available at https://www.namdeb.com/environmental-policy-2019/ retrieved 4 February 2020.

Enviro Dynamics, 'Environmental Impact Assessment of the Power Lines from the Kudu Gas Power Station (Uubvlei Site) to Oranjemond and Obib Respectively. Final Route Evaluation and Environmental Impact Report', Volume 1 (2005), available at https://www.nampower.com.na/public/docs/kudu/eia/Kudu_EIA%20Tx%20Lines_Final%20RepApp%20Envirodynamics_June2005.pdf retrieved 22 January 2020.

Namibia's Environmental Assessment Policy for Sustainable Development and Environmental Conservation 1995', available at https://www.met.gov.na/files/downloads/05c_Environmental%20Assesssment%20policy.pdf retrieved 21 July 2020.

Gavua, K, 'Archaeology is crucial to national development.' Address to Legon Archaeology Students Association (LASA) Symposium in October 2005 accessible at https://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/Archaeology-is-crucial-to-national-development-Gavua-92862#, retrieved 17 April, 2019.

Kinahan, J, 'Archaeological Guidelines for Exploration & Mining in the Namib Desert', The Namibia Archaeological Trust (2012), available at http://the-eis.com/elibrary/sites/default/files/downloads/literature/Archaeological%20guidelines%20for%20exploration%20and%20mining%20in%20the%20Namib%20Desert.pdf retrieved on 13 February 2020.

Welwitschia Archaeological and Heritage Solutions available at https://sites.google.com/view/wahsnamibia/home retrieved 3 December 2020.

SAHRA APM Guidelines: Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports available at http://asapa.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ASG2-2_SAHRA_APIAs_MIN_STDS_Ph1-2_16May07.pdf retrieved on 13 February 2020.

Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Department of Prehistoric Archaeology, 'Forschungsprojekte' available at https://ufg.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/en/forschung/forschungsprojekte, retrieved, 10 October 2020.

Germany returning Stone Cross artifact to Namibia' available at https://www.dw.com/en/germany-returning-stone-cross-artifact-to-namibia/a-48768706, retrieved 3 October 2020.

Namibiana Buchangebot, 'Albert Viereck' available at https://translate.google.com/translate?hl=en&sl=de&u=https://www.namibiana.de/namibia-information/who-is-who/autoren/infos-zur-person/albert-viereck.html&prev=search retrieved1 10 October 2020.

Lynn B. Harris, 'Resume, 2014' available at https://sahris.sahra.org.za/sites/default/files/commentattachments/Lynn%20Harris%20resume%202014.pdf, accessed 2 December 2020.

Namibiana Buchangebot, 'Oswin Köhler' available at https://www.namibiana.de/namibia-information/who-is-who/autoren/infos-zur-person/oswin-koehler.html accessed 9 December 2020.

Articles in Journals

Atal, Y, 'Professionalisation of Sociologists', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 6, 6 (Feb. 6, 1971), 431-433.

Breuil, H, 'The White Lady of Brandberg, South-West Africa, Her Companions and Her Guards', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 3, 9 (1948), 2-11.

Breunig P, 'Archaeological Research in the Upper Brandberg', *Nyame Akuma*, 27 (1986), 26-27.

Breunig, P, Behringer, J, Fels, M, and Maidhof, J, 'West of the Best: Rock Art and Archaeological Discoveries in the Doro! Nawas Region of Northwest Namibia.', *Acta Archaeologica*, 89, 1, (2018), 174-192.

Chirikure, S. and Pwiti, G, 'Community Involvement in Archaeology and Heritage Management: An Assessment of Case Studies in Southern Africa and Elsewhere', *Current Anthropology*, 49, 3 (2008), 467-485.

Clark. J. D, 'Changing Trends and Developing Values in African Prehistory', *African Affairs*, 64 (1965). 76-98.

Clark, J. D, 'Human Behavioural Difference in South Africa during the Later Pleistocene', *American Anthropologist*, 73 (1971), 1211-36.

Cooke, C. K, 'End of an Era? A Discussion', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, 109/110 (1973), 14.

Deacon, H. J, 'What Future Has Archaeology in South Africa?', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 43, 147 (1988), 3-4.

Deacon, J, 'Introduction to Goodwin's Legacy', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 6 (1989), 3-6.

Deacon, J. 'The Cinderella Metaphor: The maturing of Archaeology as a Profession in South Africa', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 48, 158 (1993), 77-81.

Editor, 'Editorial', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 161 (1995), 1-2.

Editor, 'Editorial', *South African* Archaeological *Bulletin*, 52 (1997), 73-75

Evers, T. M, 'End of an Era? A Discussion', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28. 109/110 (1973), 16.

Faulkner**,** N, 'Archaeology From Below', *Public Archaeology*, 1 (2000), 21-33.

Förster, L. 'These skulls are not enough' – The Repatriation of Namibian Human Remains from Berlin to Windhoek in 2011', *Darkmatter*, 11, 2013, available at http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2013/11/18/these-skulls-are-not-enough-the-repatriation-of-namibian-human-remains-from-berlin-to-windhoek-in-2011/, retrieved 2 October 2020.

Frayne, B, 'Political Ideology, Social Change, and Planning Practice in Namibia', *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 20, 1 (2000), 52-65.

Gnecco, C, and Dias, A. S, 'On Contract Archaeology', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 19, 4 (2015), 68-698.

Goodwin, A. J. H, 'Review of The Brandberg and its archaeological remains by J Rudner', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 12, 48 (1957), 147.

Gordon, R, 'The Stat(us) of Namibian Anthropology', *Cimbebasia*, 16 (2000), 1-23.

Gordon, R, '(Sm)othering Others? Post-millennial anthropology in Namibia,' *Journal of Namibian Studies*, 18(2015), 135-151.

Gwasira, G, 'Rock Art in Namibia: Its Past Present and Future', *Pictogram*, 10, 1 (1998), 54-56.

Gwasira, G, 'Community Involvement in Rock Art Site Management in Namibia', *Australian Rock Art Research*, 20, 1 (2003), 34-36; G. Gwasira, 'Rock Art Site Management in Namibia with Particular Focus on Twyfelfontein', *Pictogram*, 12, 1 (2000), 16- 23.

Haber, A. F, 'Un-disciplining Archaeology', *Archaeologies* 8, 1 (2012), 55.

Hamilakis, Y, 'Decolonial Archaeology as Social Justice' A*ntiquity*, 92, 362 (2018), 518-520.

Harding, J. R. 'History of the South African Commission for the Preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques in the Union of South Africa', *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 63, 3/4 (1954), 228-233.

Healey, P, 'The Professionalisation of Planning in Britain: Its Form and Consequences', *The Town Planning Review*, 56, 4 (Oct. 1985), 492-50.

Henrichsen, D, Miescher, G, Rassool. C and Rizzo, L. 'Rethinking Empire in Southern Africa', *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 41, 3 (2015), 431-35.

Hubbard, P, 'Review of *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-Independence Era* by Manyanga, M and Katsamudanga, S', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 70, 201 (2015), 133-34.

Jacobson, L, 'Lost Valley of the Hungarob: A response to Kinahan', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 52, 165 (1997), 73-75.

Jacobson, L, 'The Importance of the Farmer for Rescue Archaeology', *Staatsmuseum*, 5, 1 (1976), 4-15.

Kelley, J, 'Thoughts on Amateur Archaeology', *American Antiquity*, 28 (1963), 394-396.

Kinahan J, and Vogel, J. C, Recent Copper working Sites in the Khuiseb Drainage, Namibia', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 37 (1982), 44-5.

Kinahan, J, 'The Presence of the Past: Archaeology, Environment and Land Rights on the Lower Cunene River', *Cimbebasia*, 17 (2001), 23-39

Kinahan, J, 'Heat and Dust: Some Reflections on Contract Archaeology in Southern Africa', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 68, 197 (2013), 1-2.

Koot, S, and Hitchcock, R, K, 'In the Way: Perpetuating Land Dispossession of the Indigenous Hai//om and the Collective Action Lawsuit for Etosha National Park and Mangetti West, Namibia, *Nomadic Peoples*, 23, (2019), 55–77.

Kose, E, 'New light on the Ironworking Groups along the Middle Kavango in Northern Namibia', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64 (2010), 130-47.

Lapeyre, R, 'Community-based Tourism as a Sustainable Solution to Maximise Impacts Locally? The Tsiseb Conservancy Case, Namibia', *Development Southern Africa*, 27, 5 (2010), 757-772.

Lee, R. and Guenther, M, 'Problems in Kalahari Historical Ethnography and the Tolerance of Error.' *History in Africa*, 20 (1993), 185-235.

Lewis-Williams, J. D, 'Documentation, Analysis and Interpretation: Dilemmas in Rock Art Research: The Rock Paintings of the Upper Brandberg. Part I: Amis Gorge by H. Pager', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 45,152 (1990), 126-136.

Lewis-Williams, J. D, 'Image and Counter-Image: The Work of the Rock Art Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand', *African Arts*, 29, 4 (1996), 34-93.

MacCalman, H, R, 'Grosse Dom Schlucht Brandberg: A new discovery of prehistoric rock art in South West Africa', *IPEK*, 21, (1964), 91-97.

MacCalman. H, R. 'The Zoo Park Elephant Site, Windhoek', *Palaeoecology of Africa and of the Surrounding Islands & Antarctica*, 1 (1967), 102-03.

Mazel, A, 'Letter to the Editor', *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*, XLIII, 148, (1988), 78.

Mignolo, W, 'Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and De-Colonial Freedom', Theory, Culture & Society, 26, 7-8 (2009), 1-23.

Mitchell, P, 'The South African Stone Age in the Collections of the British Museum: Content, History and Significance', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 53, 167 (1998), 26-36.

Musonda, F. B, '100 Years of Archaeological Research in Zambia: Changing Historical Perspectives', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 67, 195 (2012), 88-100.

Nankela, A. M. ‘Rock Art Research in Namibia: A Synopsis’, *Africana Studia*, 24, 201 (2020), 35-55.

Ndlovu, N, ‘Contract Archaeology in South Africa: Some Ethical Concerns’, *Azania Archaeological Research*, 49, 2 (2014), 203-17.

Ndlovu, N, ‘Transformation Challenges in South African Archaeology’, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 64, 189 (2009), 91–93.

Ndlovu, N, and Smith, B, ‘The Past is a Divided Country: Transforming Archaeology in South Africa’, *African Archaeological Review* , 36 (2019), 175-192.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni S. J, ‘Coloniality of Power in Development Studies and the Impact of Global Imperial Designs on Africa’, *Australasian Review of African Studies*, 33, 2 (2012), 48-73.

Nightingale, A. J, ‘The experts taught us all we know”: Professionalisation and Knowledge in Nepalese Community Forestry’, *Antipode*, 37, 3 (2005), 581-604.

Pikirayi, I, ‘What Can Archaeology Do for Society in Southern Africa?’ *Historical Archaeology*, 43, 4 (2009), 125-27

Posnansky, M, ‘Archaeology comes of age’, *World Archaeology*, 13, 3 (1982), 354.

Pwiti, G, ‘Taking African Cultural Heritage Management into the Twenty-First Century: Zimbabwe's Masterplan for Cultural Heritage Management’, *African Archaeological Review*, 2 (1997) 81 -83.

Rassool, C, ‘Human remains and the disciplines of the dead, and the South African memorial complex’, in D.R. Peterson, K. Gavua and C. Rassool (eds.), *The Politics of Heritage in Africa, Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 133-156.

Rassool, C, ‘Power, Knowledge and the Politics of Public Pasts’, *African Studies’*, 69, 1 (April 2010), 70-101.

Rassool, C, ‘Restoring the Skeletons of Empire: Return, Reburial and Rehumanisation in Southern Africa’, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 41, 30 (2015), 653-70.

Rodman, K. A. ‘Public and Private Sanctions against South Africa’, *Political Science Quarterly*, 109, 2 (1994), 313-34.

Rudner, J. and Rudner I, ‘End of an Era’, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 28, 109/110 (1973), 13-14.

Sandelowsky, B, H, ‘Kapako and Vungu Vungu: Iron Age sites on the Kavango River’, *South African Archaeological Bulletin, Goodwin Series*, 3 (1979), 52-61.

Sandelowsky, B. H and Cagle, F. R. ‘Archaeology and allied interdisciplinary research in South West Africa’, *South African Archaeological, Bulletin*, 24 (1969), 197-19.

Schildkrout, E, 'Museums and Nationalism in Namibia', *Museum Anthropology*, 19, 2 (1995), 65-77.

Schmidt, I, 'A Middle Stone Age Assemblage with Discoid Lithic Technology from Etemba 14, Erongo Mountains, Northern Namibia', *Journal of African Archaeology*, 9, 1 (2011), 85-100.

Shepherd, N, 'Contract Archaeology in South Africa: Traveling Theory, Local Memory and Global Designs', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 19 (2015), 748 -63

Shepherd, N, 'Who is Doing Archaeology at South African Universities? And What are they Studying?', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 60, 182 (2005), 123-126.

Shepherd, N, 'State of the Discipline: Science, Culture and Identity in South African Archaeology, 1870-2003', in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 29, 4 (2003), 835-836.

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

Shepherd, N, 'Disciplining Archaeology; the Invention of South African Prehistory 1923-1953', *Kronos*, 28, (2002), 127-145.

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

South African Archaeological Society, 'Illustrations for Reproduction', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, XI, 42 (1956), 28.

South African Archaeological Society Annual report, publications, *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, IX, 33 (1954), 59.

Taylor, B, 'Amateurs, Professionals and the Knowledge of Archaeology', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 46 (1995), 499-508.

Turnbaugh, W. A, Vandebroek. C. L. and Jones, J. S. 'The Professionalism of Amateurs in Archaeology', *Archaeology*, 36, 6 (Nov/ Dec. 1983), 24-29.

Underhill, D, 'A History of Stone Age Archaeological Study in South Africa', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 66, 193 (2011), 3-14.

Van Riet Lowe, C, 'Notes on drawing stone Implements', *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, IX, 33 (1954), 30-31.

Vogelsang, R, Richter J, Jacobs, Z, Eichhorn B, Linseele V, and Roberts, R, G, 'New Excavations of Middle Stone Age Deposits at Apollo 11 Rock Shelter, Namibia: Stratigraphy, Archaeology, Chronology and Past Environments', *Journal of African Archaeology*, 8, 2 (2010), 185-218.

Wendt, W. E, 'Preliminary Report on an Archaeological Research Programme in South West Africa', *Cimbebasia*, B, 2 (1972), 1-6.

Werz, B, 'A Suggested Blueprint for the Development of Maritime Archaeological Research in Namibia', *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, 2 (2007), 103-121.

White, W and Draycott, C, 'Why the Whiteness of Archaeology Is a Problem', *Sapiens*, 7 July 2020, available at https://www.sapiens.org/archaeology/archaeology-diversity/ retrieved 19 July 2020.

Witz, A, 'Patriarchy and Professions: The Gendered Politics of Occupational Closure', *Sociology*, 24, 4 (1990), 675-690.

Witz, L, and Rassool C, 'Making Histories', *Kronos*, 34, 1 (2008), 6-15.

Books, Working papers and articles in edited collection

Bahn, P. *The Cambridge illustrated history of prehistoric art*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Bertman, S, *Handbook to Life in Ancient Mesopotamia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

Breuil, H, *The White Lady of the Brandberg* (London: The Trianon Press, 1955).

Breunig, P, *Der Brandberg* (Köln: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 2003).

Breunig, P, *Archäologischer Reiseführer Namibia* (Frankfurt am Main: Africa Magna Verlag, 2014).

Chirikure, S, 'Do as I Say and Not as I Do. On the Gap between Good Ethics and Reality in African Archaeology', in A. Haber and N. Shepherd (eds.), *After Ethics* (New York: Springer, 2015), 27-37.

Chirikure, S, and Sinamayi, A, 'World History from the Seabed: Rescuing a Portuguese Shipwreck off the Coast of Namibia', in S. Tripati (ed.) *Shipwrecks around the World: Revelations of the Past* (New Delhi: Delta Book World, 2015), 114-29.

Deetz, J, *In Small Things Forgotten. The Archaeology of Early American Life* (New York: Anchor Books, 1977).

Emmet, T, 'Popular Resistance in Namibia, 1902-5', in B Wood (ed.), *Namibia 1884-1984. Readings on Namibia's History and Society* (London: Namibia Support Committee and United Nations Institute of Namibia, 1988), 224-58.

Gavua, K, and Nutor, K. 'Bringing Archaeology to the People: Towards a viable public archaeology in Ghana', in J, Anquandah, B. Kankpeyeng and W. Apoh (eds.), *Current Issues in the Archaeology of Ghana,(* Legon-Accra: University of Ghana, 2014), 264-276.

Gewald, J. B, 'A Teutonic ethnologist in the Windhoek district: rethinking the anthropology of Guenther Wagner', in LeBeau D and Gordon R.J. (eds*), Challenges for anthropology in the 'African Renaissance: A Southern African contribution*, (Windhoek: University of Namibia Press), 19-30.

Hicks, D, *The Brutish Museums: The Benin Bronzes, Colonial Violence and Cultural Restitution* (London: Pluto Books, 2020).

Katjavivi, P. H, *A History of Resistance in Namibia* (Paris: James Currey, 1988).

Katsamudanga, S, and Manyanga, M, 'Introduction: Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-independence era', in M. Manyanga and S. Katsamudanga (eds.), *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-Independence Era* (Harare: SAPES Books, 2013), 1-16.

Kinahan, J, *By command of their Lordships: The Exploration of the Namibian Coast by the Royal Navy, 1795-1895'* (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 1992).

Kinahan, J, 'Theory, Practice and Criticism in the History of Namibian Archaeology', in P Ucko (ed.), *Theory in Archaeology: a World Perspective* (London: Routledge, 1995).

Kinahan, J, *Cattle for beads: The archaeology of historical contact and trade on the Namib coast* (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 2000).

Kinahan, J, *Pastoral Nomads of the Central Namib Desert: A people History Forgot,* (Windhoek: Namibia Archaeological Trust, 2001).

Kinahan, J, 'Traumland Südwest: 'Two Moments in the History of German Archaeological Inquiry in Namibia', in H. Härke (ed.) *Archaeology, Ideology and Society. The German experience*, (Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main 2002), 356-377.

Kinahan, J, 'From the Beginning: The Archaeological Evidence', in M. Wallace with J. Kinahan, *A History of Namibia: from the Beginning to 1990* (London: Hurst, 2011), 15-43.

Kuper, R, 'Foreword', in H Pager (ed.), *The Rock Paintings of the Upper Brandberg Part 1: Amis Gorge* (Köln: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 1989).

Lenggenhager, L, *Ruling Nature, Controlling People: Nature Conservation, Development and War in North-Eastern Namibia since the 1920s* (Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2018).

Lenssen-Erz, T, 'Jumping about: springbok in the Brandberg rock paintings and in the Bleek and Lloyd collection. An attempt at a correlation', *Contested images: Diversity in southern African rock art research* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press., 1994), 275-291.

Lenssen-Erz, T, 'Art for art's sake in rock art research – On the ethics of archaeological documentation', *Tides of the Desert*, (Cologne: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 2002), 549 –558.

MacKenzie, J. M, 'Introduction', in J. M. MacKenzie (ed.), *Imperialism and the Natural World* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), 1-14.

Manyanga M, and Katsamudanga, S, 'Prodding the Ancestors in Post-independence Zimbabwe: Conclusions and Future Prospects,' in M. Manyanga and Katsamudanga, S. (eds), *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the Post-independence era* (Harare, SAPES Books, 2013), 247-254.

Metzger, F, *Naro and his Clan* (Windhoek: John Meinert & S.W.A. Scientific Society, 1950**).**

Miescher, G, *Namibia's Red Line, the History of a Veterinary Settlement Boarder* (New York, NY: Pelgrave Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Mills, D, *Difficult Folk? A Political History of Social Anthropology* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010).

Olusoga D, and Erichsen, C.W, *The Kaiser's Holocaust, Germany's Forgotten Genocide* (London: Faber and Faber, 2010).

Otto-Reiner, A, *From Landesmuseum to National Museum of Namibia: 100 years (1907-2007) A chronology of an African Museum*, (Windhoek: National Museum of Namibia, 2007).

Pager, H, *The rock paintings of the upper Brandberg, part II: Hungorob Gorge. Vol. 4* (Cologne: Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 1993).

Pikirayi, I, 'Research Trends in Historical Archaeology on the Zimbabwe Plateau and Adjacent Margins', in G Pwiti (ed.), *Caves, Monuments and Texts: Zimbabwean Archaeology Today*. Studies in African Archaeology 14, (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1997), 143-159.

Poewe, K, *The Namibian Herero. A history of their Psychosocial Disintegration and Survival (*New York: Edwin Mellen, 1985).

Rassool, C, 'Human remains and the disciplines of the dead, and the South African memorial complex', in D, R, Peterson, Gavua, K and Rassool, C (eds.), *The Politics of Heritage in Africa, Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*, (New York: Cambridge University Press), 133-156.

Renfrew, C, and Bahn P, *Archaeology*: *Theories, Methods and Practice* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1991).

Roulet L, and Henrichsen, D, 'Anneliese and Ernst Rudolf Scherz's 'Ethnographic Object Collection' from Namibia and Southern Africa', *BAB Working Paper*, 1 (2020), 1-43 available at https://baslerafrika.ch/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/2020_1_HenrichsenRoulet.pdf retrieved 3 December 2020.

Sandelowsky, B, *Archaeologically yours: a Personal Journey into the Prehistory of Southern Africa* (Windhoek: Namibia Scientific Society, 2004).

Shenjere-Nyabezi, P, Pwiti, G, and Manyanga, M, 'Making the most out of rubbish: trends in archaeological studies in post-independence Zimbabwe', in Manyanga, M, and Katsamudanga, S, (eds.), *Zimbabwean Archaeology in the post-independence era*. (Harare: SAPES Books, 2013), 117-142.

Scherz, E. R, 'Felsbilder in Südwest-Afrika: Teil I: Die *Gravierung in Südwest-Afrika ohne den Nordwesten des Landes', (*Böhlau Verlag: Köln, 1970).

Scherz, E. R, '*Felsbilder in Südwest- Afrika: Teil II: Die Gravierung in Nordwesten Südwest-Afrikas'*, (Böhlau Verlag: Köln, 1975).

Scherz, E. R. *Südwester Geschichten am Lagerfeuer erzählt von Ernst Rudolf Scherz*, (Basel, Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 2005)

Sydow, W, *The Pre-European Pottery of South West Africa* (Windhoek: State Museum, 1967)

Van der Poel, J, *Selections from the Smuts Papers, Volume vii, August 1945-October1950*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

Vogt, A, *National Monuments in Namibia*, (Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan, 2004).

Wallace, M, with Kinahan, J. *A History of Namibia: from the Beginning to 1990* (London: Hurst, 2011).

Wilmsen, E. N, *Land filled with flies: A Political Economy of the Kalahari* (London: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

Dissertations and Theses

Dunn, B, 'Cultures of Copying. An Archival and Digital Re-examination of Rock Art Copies Made by the Abbé Breuil on His 1948 and 1950 Expeditions to Namibia's Erongo Mountains', (BA Hons thesis, University of South Africa, 2017).

Erichsen, C. W, 'The angel of death has descended violently among them': A study of Namibia's concentration camps and prisoners-of-war 1904 -1908 (Master's Thesis, University of Namibia, 2004).

Hart, S. M, 'High Stakes: A Poly-communal Archaeology of the Pocumtuck Fort, Deerfield, Massachusetts' (PhD thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 2009).

Noli, H-D, 'The Technical Investigation into the Material Evidence for Archery in the Archaeological and Ethnographical Record of Southern Africa' (PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, 1993).

Shepherd, N, 'Archaeology and Postcolonialism in South Africa: The Theory Practice and Politics of Archaeology after Apartheid' (PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, 1998).

Vogelsang, R, and Eichhorn B, *Under the Mopane Tree, Holocene Settlement in Northern Namibia*, (Cologne: Heinrich-Bath-Institut, 2011).

Wessler, A, 'Von Lebendabgüssen, Heimatmuseen und Cultural Villages. Museale Repräsentation des Selbst und des Anderen im (De-) Kolonisierungsprozess Namibias', (PhD Thesis, Universität zu Köln, 2007).

Newspapers and periodicals

Felton S, 'Conservancy ladies tackle the Brandberg' available at http://www.nacso.org.na/news/2011/06/conservancy-ladies-tackle-the-brandberg retrieved 11 September 2019

Fild, L, 'Digging Deeper: Discovering our Hidden History', *The Namibian Weekende*r, Friday 15 September 1995, 1.

Jochmann, H, 'Die Buschmannzeichnungen in Deutsch-Südwestafrika', *Die Woche*, 12, 3 (1910), 113-16.

A. Shigwedha, 'Century-old weapons unearthed', *The Namibian*, 26 January 2005, available at https://www.namibian.com.na/12972/archive-read/Century-old-weapons-unearthed, retrieved 30 October 2020.

P. Smith, 'Namibian Rock Art Comes Home'. *The Namibian*, 14 April 2005 available at https://www.namibian.com.na/print.php?id=9919&type=2 accessed 8 December 2020.

Conference and workshop papers, unpublished articles and manuscripts

Gwasira G, and Kambombo, F, 'Audit of the Excavated Collections at Oranjemund' (unpublished Report, National Museum of Namibia, 2008).

Gwasira, G, 'Report on the scientific exchange and study visit to the Heinrich-Barth-Institute of the University of Cologne, Germany: 17 January-10 March 2000' (unpublished report, National Museum of Namibia, archaeology department).

Otto, A, 'The State Museum -Windhoek: History and Development' (unpublished paper, Namibia Scientific Society, n.d.).

Lenssen-Erz, T, and Erz, M-T, Qualifizierungweiblicher Füher am Brandberg. Bericht und Abrechnung. (Unpublished report, Heinrich-Barth-Institut, 2011).

Lenssen-Erz, T, 'Workshop: Empowerment and capacity building for female guides of the DMG.' (Unpublished course material, 2011).

Kinahan, J, Archaeological Mitigation Report on the Husab Uranium Mine Project, (unpublished report, NHC, 2011).

Kinahan, J, 'Project report: Archaeological Survey of Namibia' (unpublished report, National Museum of Namibia 17 July 1989).

'Minutes of the meeting held with representatives of the National Museum (NM) of Namibia and the Namibia Underwater Federation (NUF), held at 10:00am on Friday, 26 October 2001' (Unpublished meeting report, National Museum of Namibia).

D. Henrichsen and S. Hubler, 'Intimacy, re-enactments and violence: Photographic practice, research archives and the Everyday in the Brandberg/Daureb 1930s-1950s' Rock art research in southern Africa, the everyday and the significance of photography: A workshop on colonial photographic research archives and contemporary scholarly practices, Basler Afrika Bibliographien, 7 July 2016.

Haikaere, I, Kangumu B, and Silvester, J, 'Heritage Hunt Report for Caprivi Region', (Unpublished report, Museums Association of Namibia, 2010).