

Report on Archaeological Survey of portions 98, 99, 100 and 140 of the
farm Friedenheim 282 JT
compiled by

Kudzala Antiquity



May 25, 2005

Surveyor, Mr JP Celliers BA (Hons) Archaeology.

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Description of surveyed area
3. Aim and method of survey
4. History of the area
5. Findings and recommendations
6. Bibliography
7. Appendix A – Maps
8. Appendix B – List of site locations

1. Introduction

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act no. 25 of 1999) requires of individuals (engineers, farmers, mines and industry) to have impact assessment studies undertaken whenever any development activities are planned. This includes guidelines for impact assessment studies to be done whenever cultural resources may be destroyed by development activities.

Against this background a preliminary Archaeological or Cultural Resources Management (CRM) survey was carried out during 14 May 2005 on the farm Friedenheim 282 JT. Van Vollenhoven (1995:3) describes cultural resources as all unique and non-renewable physical phenomena (of natural occurrence or made by humans) that can be associated with human (cultural) activities. These would be any man-made structure, tool, object of art or waste that was left behind on or beneath the soil surface by historic or pre-historic communities. These remains, when studied in their original context by archaeologists, are interpreted in an attempt to understand, identify and reconstruct the activities and lifestyles of past communities. When these items are disturbed from their original context, any meaningful information they possessed is lost, therefore it is important to locate and identify such remains before construction or development activities commence.

A CRM survey consists of three phases; this document deals with the first phase. This (phase 1) investigation is aimed at getting an overview of cultural resources in a given area, thereby assessing the possible impact a proposed development may have on these resources. When the archaeologist encounters a situation where the planned project will lead to the destruction or alteration of an archaeological site, a second phase in the survey is normally recommended.

During a phase 2 investigation the impact assessment of development activities on identified cultural resources is intensified and a detailed investigation into the nature and origin of the cultural material is undertaken. Normally at this stage, archaeological excavation is carried out in order to document and preserve the cultural heritage. Phase three consists of the compiling of a management plan for the safeguarding, conservation, interpretation and utilization of cultural resources (Van Vollenhoven, 2002).

Continuous communication between the developer and surveyor after the initial report has been compiled may result in the modification of a planned route or development to incorporate or protect existing archaeological sites.

2. Description of surveyed area

The survey was carried out near Nelspruit, on portions 98, 99, 100 and 140 of the farm Friedenheim 282 JT. A number of buildings, mainly residential, are located on the surveyed land. The survey was conducted on foot in an effort to locate any cultural remains. The area to the south where indigenous vegetation still occurs was concentrated on more as this part showed less signs of agricultural use. The surveyed area clearly used to be cultivated lands where commercial produce like tobacco was cultivated.

3. Aim and method of survey

As stated earlier the aim of the survey is to establish the whereabouts and nature of cultural heritage sites should they occur in the area. This includes settlements, structures and artefacts which have value for an individual or group of people in terms of historical, archaeological, architectural and human (cultural) development. It is the aim of this study to locate and identify such objects or places in order to assess whether they are of significance and warrant further investigation and/ or protection.

The South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) formulated guidelines for the conservation of all cultural resources and therefore also divided such sites into three main categories. These categories might be seen as guidelines that suggest the extent of protection a given site might receive. They include sites or features of local (Grade 3) provincial (Grade 2) and national (Grade 1) significance. For practical purposes the surveyor uses his own classification for sites or features and divides them into three groups, those of low or no significance, those of medium significance, those of high significance.

Sites of low significance:

These are sites or features that indicate some form of human activity in the form of a structure, shelter, or material used by historic settlers but which is in such a weathered state that it will provide very little information that warrants further investigation. Features or structures that are not considered as national treasures also fall within this category.

Sites of Medium significance:

A good number of sites fall into this category. These include sites which are moderately to well-preserved and may be of such a nature that they may be utilized for future research. Sites of this nature also fall into an archaeologically well-known category which means that in most instances they will provide little new or significant information during further investigation.

Sites of High significance:

There exist archaeological sites that contain invaluable data which will significantly enhance the knowledge that archaeologists currently have about our cultural heritage. These sites are rare and normally of more ancient origin (Stone Age shelters and Early Iron Age settlements are among the more common ones). In most instances these sites should be preserved and not damaged during construction activities. When development activities do however jeopardize the future of such a site, a second and third phase in the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) process is normally advised.

Graves are considered very sensitive sites and should never under any circumstances be jeopardized by development activities. In all instances where graves are found by the surveyor, the recommendation would be to steer clear of these areas. If this cannot be done or if construction activities have for some reason damaged graves, specialized consultants are normally contacted after development activities have been brought to a halt.

This survey was carried out on foot in an effort to locate any cultural remains in the area where the proposed development will take place. No significant cultural remains could be located during the survey. It should be noted however that some cultural remain may not have been located during the survey purely because they were missed during the proceedings or camouflaged in patches of impenetrable vegetation.

4. History of the area

Scientists are of the opinion that residents of the Nelspruit area roamed this part of the Lowveld much longer ago than mentioned above. A hominid of the Australopithecine species is believed to have been the first to stake a claim as first inhabitant. Succeeded by more modern physical types such as *Homo erectus*, evidence of both these pre-historic predecessors of modern man was discovered on the location at the Lowveld National Botanical Gardens in Nelspruit. This evidence is in the shape of formal stone tools belonging to the Early (Approx. 1,5 – 3 million AD) and Middle Stone Age (Approx. 200 000 – 30 000 AD) periods. (Milne in Bornman, 1979).

The first modern inhabitants of the eastern Lowveld were probably the San or Bushmen. They were a nomadic people who lived together in small family groups and relied on hunting and gathering of food for survival. Evidence of their existence is to be found in numerous rock shelters throughout the Lowveld where some of their rock paintings are still visible. A number of these shelters have been documented in the Nelspruit area (Bornman, 1995; Schoonraad in Barnard, 1975). It has been argued that the red ochre source for these paintings is to be found at Dumaneni, near Malelane (Bornman, 1995).

Some 1500 years ago the first Bantu-speaking tribes appeared in the Eastern Transvaal, leaving behind them a history of iron and copper production, farming with cattle and sheep and also planting crops. These tribes migrated from the north and brought with them unique skills such as the making of beautifully decorated pottery. According to Milne (Bornman 1979) at least three Early Iron Age pottery sites have been recorded in Nelspruit, there are also sites at Friedenheim, Plaston and Hazyview.

Other finds of Archaeological and cultural significance have also been documented in this area. These are rock-art sites or better known as Bushman paintings. A survey conducted about three years ago at the nearby Bongani Mountain Lodge and surrounding area, revealed some 100 sites of San Rock Art (Hampson et. al. 2002).

5. Findings and Recommendations

No archaeological or culturally significant remains were located during the survey of portions 98, 99, 100 and 140 of the farm Friedenheim 282 JT.

It is important to note though that the bulk of archaeological remains are normally located beneath the soil surface. It is therefore possible that some significant cultural material or remains were not located during this survey and will only be revealed when the soil is disturbed. Therefore it is recommended that the owner of the land or developers take this into consideration when such activities are planned and executed at this location.

Should excavation or large scale earth moving activities reveal any human skeletal remains, broken pieces of ceramic pottery, large quantities of sub-surface charcoal or any material that can be associated with previous occupation, a qualified archaeologist should be notified immediately. This will also temporarily halt such activities until an archaeologist have assessed the situation. It must also be noted that if such a situation occurs, it will probably have further financial implications for the developers.

6. Bibliography

1. Barnard, C. 1975. *Die Transvaalse Laeveld. Komee van 'n Kontrei.*
2. Bornman, H. 1979. *Nelspruit 75 in '80.* Published and distributed by the Town Council of Nelspruit.
3. Bornman, H. 1995. *Pioneers of the Lowveld.*
4. Breutz, P.L. 1985. *Pre-Colonial Africa: The South-Eastern Bantu Cultural Province.*
5. Hampson, J; Blundell, G; Challis, W. 2002. *The Rock Art of Bongani Mountain Lodge and its environs, Mpumalanga Province, South Africa: An Introduction to Problems of Southern African Rock-Art Regions.* South African Archaeological Bulletin 57 (175): 13-30.
6. Evers, T.M. 1977. *Plaston Early Iron Age Site, White River District, Eastern Transvaal, South Africa.* South African Archaeological Bulletin. 32: 170-178.
7. Pienaar, U. de V. 1990. *Neem uit die Verlede.* Pretoria: Nasionale Parkeraad.
8. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 2002. *Die Metodiek van Kultuurhulpbronbestuur (KHB).* S.A. Tydskrif vir Kultuurgeskiedenis 16(2).
9. Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 1995. *Die bydrae van Argeologie tot Kultuurhulpbronbestuur.* Referaat gelewer voor die Suid-Afrikaanse Vereniging vir Kultuurgeskiedenis, Transvaal Streektak, Sunnyside.

7. Appendix A



8. Appendix B

List of Site Locations

During the survey, the location of sites are normally plotted with the aid of a GPS (Global Positioning System). The site locations are then numbered in the following fashion:

The initials FN followed by a number marks the identity of the site. The “F” stands for Friedenheim and “N” for Nelspruit. In this instance a GPS coordinate was allocated for documentation purposes only.

1. Site name: FN 1 (Site 1)
Date of compilation: 14/05/2005
GPS reading: Longitude, 31° 00, 616' E
Latitude, 25° 26, 707' S
Altitude: 639 m
Photo: N/A