

4-2-253-0003-20030401-ACC

9/2/253/3

REPORT ON A CULTURAL RESOURCES
SURVEY DONE ON PORTION 8 OF THE FARM KLIPRAND 76-JR,
LIMPOPO PROVINCE

For:
Dolf van der Walt & Associates
Town and Regional Planners
PO Box 4529
Pretoria
0001

Report by:
Anton C. van Vollenhoven BA, BA (Hons), DTO, NDM, MA (UP), MA (US), DPhil (UP)
J. André Strydom

Archaeus CC
PO Box 31064
Wonderboompoort
0033
Tel: (012) 335 2117
083 291 6104
Fax: (012) 320 2742
E-mail: AntonVV@TSHWANE.GOV.ZA

April 2003

REPORT NO.: AE300

SUMMARY

A survey was done in order to determine the presence, nature, extent and significance of cultural resources on portion 8 of the farm Kliiprand 76 JR, Limpopo Province. During the field survey a few objects and one site were identified.

Although the site will be impacted upon by the proposed development, it is not of major importance. It is also judged that the objects will not be impacted upon. The proposed development can therefore continue. Appropriate recommendations are put forward in this report.

Contents

	Page
1. Aims of the survey	4
2. Terms of reference	4
3. Conditions and assumptions	4
4. Legislative requirements	5
5. Methodology	5
6. Description of the area surveyed	6
7. Discussion	7
7.1 Stone Age	7
7.2 Iron Age	7
7.3 Historical Age	8
8. Individual description of identified sites	8
9. Conclusion and recommendations	9
10. Bibliography	9
Appendix A	11
Appendix B	12
Appendix C	13

1. Aims of the survey

Archaeos CC was requested by Dolf van der Walt & Associates on behalf of the owner of the property, to conduct a phase 1 survey of historical and archaeological (cultural) resources on portion 8 of the farm Kilprand 76 JR. The aim of the survey was to identify, locate, document and evaluate sites, objects, structures and features of cultural significance found on the farm.

The area that was surveyed is the southeastern part of the farm, an area of approximately 30ha. Currently the farm is a game farm, but it is proposed to develop a resort on the area that was investigated.

2. Terms of reference

The terms of reference for the study were to:

- 2.1 Identify all objects, sites, features and structures of an archaeological or historical nature (cultural resources) located in the area of the proposed development (see appendix B).
- 2.2 Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their historical, social, religious, aesthetic, scientific and tourism value.
- 2.3 Describe the possible impact of the proposed development on these cultural remains, according to a standard set of conventions.
- 2.4 Propose suitable mitigation measures to minimise possible negative impacts on the cultural resources.
- 2.5 Review applicable legislative requirements.

3. Conditions and assumptions

The following aspects have a direct bearing on the survey and the resulting report:

- Cultural resources are all non-physical and physical human-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences that are associated with human activity. These include all sites, structures and artifacts of importance, either individually or in a group, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development.
- The significance of the sites and artifacts are determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.
- Cultural significance is site-specific and relates to the content and context of the site. Sites regarded as having low cultural significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium cultural significance may or may not require mitigation depending on other factors such as the significance of impact on the site. Sites with a high cultural significance require further mitigation (see appendix A).
- The latitude and longitude of an archaeological site is to be treated as sensitive information by the developer, and should not be disclosed to members of the public.

- All recommendations are made with full cognisance of the relevant legislation, in this case the National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999) of South Africa.

- It has to be mentioned that it is almost impossible to locate all the cultural resources in a given area, as it will be very time consuming. Developers should however note that the report should make it clear how to handle any other finds that might occur during their activities. This basically means contacting an archaeologist to advise them on how such finds should be taken care of.

4. Legislative Requirements

Aspects concerning the conservation of cultural resources are dealt with mainly in two acts. These are the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

4.1 The National Heritage Resources Act

According to the above-mentioned law the following is protected as cultural heritage resources:

- a. Archaeological artifacts, structures and sites older than 100 years
- b. Ethnographic art objects (e.g. prehistoric rock art) and ethnography
- c. Objects of decorative and visual arts
- d. Military objects, structures and sites older than 75 years
- e. Historical objects, structures and sites older than 60 years
- f. Proclaimed heritage sites
- g. Grave yards and graves older than 60 years
- h. Meteorites and fossils
- i. Objects, structures and sites of scientific or technological value.

The mentioned cultural resources may only be disturbed or moved by an archaeologist and only after a permit has been issued by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

4.2 The National Environmental Management Act

This act states that a survey and evaluation of cultural resources must be done in areas where development projects, that will change the face of the environment, will be undertaken. The impact of the development on these resources should be determined and proposals for the mitigation thereof should be made.

5. Methodology

5.1 Survey of literature

A survey of literature was done before the field survey. This gave an indication of previous research done in this area. Various sources were consulted in this regard (see bibliography).

5.2 Field survey

The survey was conducted according to generally accepted archaeological practices. It was concentrated on the area indicated for development. In this area all natural features such as outcrops, streambeds, erosion trenches and areas with unnatural looking vegetation (if applicable) were investigated.

The survey was done on foot to ensure that areas inaccessible to motor vehicles were also covered. As the bush area very dense in some areas, the visibility made it impossible to cover the total area. The report will however clearly state how to handle any unexpected cultural resources that might be found at a later stage.

5.3 Documentation

All sites, objects features and structures identified were documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Co-ordinates of individual localities were determined by means of the Global Positioning System (GPS). The information was added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

5.4 Presentation of the information

In discussing the results of the survey, a chronological rather than a geographical approach was followed in the presentation of an overview of human occupation and land use in the area. This helps the reader to better understand and facilitate the potential impact of the development. Information on the individual objects, sites, features and structures is presented under section 8 of this report.

6. Description of the area surveyed

The farm Kliprand 76 JR is situated to the west of the Rust de Winter dam and lies right next to the nature reserve surrounding the dam. This is approximately 65km north of Pretoria. The closest residential area is the town of Rust de Winter, which lies to the northeast thereof. It is located on map 2528AD, Hammanskraal, of the South African 1:50 000 topographic series.

No natural water resource was seen on the area that was surveyed, but as the Elands River feed the Rust de Winter dam (a human made dam), water is close by. The most important water sources are the Elands and Pienaars rivers that might have existed in prehistoric times. These rivers respectively drain the area to the east and west of the farm, but smaller streams also drain the area in all directions around it. It is therefore expected that the area would have provided good habitation for people. It therefore also would have provided grazing and hunting grounds and might have been used for this purpose.

As no natural shelter exists on the surveyed area, it seems unlikely that people would have stayed there for long periods of time. However such shelter might have been close by (within walking distance) therefore providing habitation. These people might have utilised the surveyed area.

It is clear that no part of the area was used for agricultural purposes. The owner of the farm also stated that it was only used for the grazing of cattle until a few years ago (Personal comment: H. Meyer). Therefore very little disturbance in recent times are found, meaning that archaeological sites and artifacts found, could be in context.

The Bushveld Complex underlies geologically speaking the farm. More particularly the underlying rock formation is Magaliesberg quartzite and diabase (Ward 1993: 11). The underlying geology provides suitable material for the making of stone tools, therefore providing Stone Age people with suitable living conditions.

The vegetation of the area forms part of Acocks's (1988) Sourish Mixed Bushveld. In more contemporary terms, it would be classified simply as Mixed Bushveld. This type of

environment probably does not differ much from that in Iron Age times and even during the Late Stone Age. It therefore would have provided suitable living conditions.

The fauna on the farm consist of various antelope species, as well as buffalo, giraffe and zebra. Of course some of these was brought in recently, therefore it cannot be considered to be exactly the same as in prehistoric times. It however is an indication of the suitability of various fauna species that might have provided food to early man. As hunting was an important aspect of prehistoric existence, the availability of animals would favour human occupation, especially during the Stone Age.

Therefore it seems that the area was very suitable for exploitation by humans, although it was probably not used for long-term occupation. During historical times white farmers occupied the area since 1841, resulting in the cultivation of crops and stock farming (Bergh 1999: 15).

7. Discussion

7.1 Stone Age

The Stone Age is the period in human history when lithic material was mainly used to produce tools (Coertze & Coertze 1996: 293). In South Africa the Stone Age can be divided in three periods. It is however important to note that dates are relative and only provide a broad framework for interpretation. The division for the Stone Age according to Korsman & Meyer (1999: 93-94) is as follows:

Early Stone Age (ESA) 2 million – 150 000 years ago

Middle Stone Age (MSA) 150 000 – 30 000 years ago

Late Stone Age (LSA) 40 000 years ago – 1850 - A.D.

Although no sites are known in the immediate vicinity of Kliprand, Stone Age occurrences were found to the south and west thereof at Wonderboompoort, Akasia, Tswanaing and Phumula (Van Vollenhoven 2000: 150; Van Vollenhoven & Strydom 2002: 7). These date from the Early Stone Age right through to the Late Stone Age.

No Stone Age sites were found at Kliprand, but two stone tools were identified. Hammer stones that were seen in the area also might have been used during the Late Stone Age.

The first stone tool has the shape of an arrowhead, but as it did not break from the core as planned, it was used as a scraper. It resembles artifacts from the Middle Stone Age in size as well as the large prepared level where it has been struck to separate it from the core (Phillipson 1985: 58). It is made of a volcanic rock not found on the farm and was therefore brought from outside the area, probably because it was a good material to use for this purpose. The sharp scraping edge was retouched with great skill and can still be seen.

The second tool is a Late Stone Age scraper, made from a much softer material. Secondary marks on the tool clearly show that it has not been made from the best suitable material for this purpose and it was therefore probably not in use for a long time. It also seems to have been exposed to water after being discarded.

7.2 Iron Age

The Iron Age is the name given to the period of human history when metal was mainly used to produce artifacts (Coertze & Coertze 1996: 346). In South Africa it can be divided in two separate phases according to Van Der Ryst & Meyer (1999: 96-98), namely:

Early Iron Age (EIA) 200 – 1000 A.D.
Late Iron Age (LIA) 1000 – 1850 A.D.

No Iron Age sites are in the immediate vicinity of Kliprand, probably because of a lack of research. However, to the southwest of the farm, north of Pretoria, a large amount of Iron Age sites has been found, with the Late Iron Age site at Wallmannsthal as the best known. This site is associated with the Ndebele people.

Several sites where Moloko pottery was found, are also known in the area. The Moloko can be seen as an early manifestation (1100-1500A.D.) of the Tshwana people. These sites include Tswanaing and sites on the Magaliesberg. Other Late Iron Age sites in the area are found in Akasia and at Pyramid (Van Vollenhoven 2000: 152-153), while Bergh (1999: 7) makes mention of 125 sites in the area mentioned.

No Iron Age site was identified during the survey, but a number of broken hammer stones and upper grinding stones that were found throughout the area, probably dates back to this period of human history. It is significant that these tools are broken as this is typical of the Ndebele people, who broke such artefacts once they left a site. As this area is known to be linked to the Ndebele people; these artefacts were probably associated with them and date back to the Late Iron Age. It however is not possible to determine anything further in this regard.

7.3 Historical Age

The historical age started when the first people that was able to read and write moved into the area. The first permanent settlers were the Voortrekkers, who settled here since the middle of the 19th century (Van Vollenhoven 2000: 158-160).

The only site found during the survey dates from the Historical Age. It will be discussed below, but it should be mentioned that a variety of historical artifacts were found throughout the area, including a part of an old dropper, pieces of glass similar to that of the Late 19th – Early 20th century and pieces of porcelain. More recent pieces of porcelain and glass were also found.

The site is of no major importance. It may therefore be demolished without further consultation or mitigation.

8. Individual description of identified sites

8.1 Site number: 1

Description: A long stone wall of about 20cm high, with a square finishing touch. No binding material was used.

Locality: GPS: 25°14'13"S
28°28'44"E

Discussion: The squareness indicates that it has been build in historical times and probably was a wall of a cattle kraal, used by white farmers. This corroborates with the fact that the farm was once used for grazing cattle.

Cultural significance: Low, as this is a common occurrence and as it is not complete.

Significance of Impact: Medium, as it falls right inside the area of proposed development.

Certainty of prediction: Definite

Recommended management action: No mitigation is required. This documentation can be seen as enough and the site may be demolished, if necessary.

Legislative requirements: None

9. Conclusions and recommendations

9.1 The Stone and Iron Age are represented in the area of the proposed development, but it is not seen as very important. This report is seen as ample recording of these occurrences.

9.2 The developer should be on the look out for similar signs of Stone and Iron Age occupation. If something more substantial, such as circular stone walling or furnaces, is found an archaeologist should again be contacted to investigate the find. It however seems very unlikely that such a development will occur.

9.3 Although no graves were found, it should be mentioned that graves should always be handled with extreme caution. Therefore, should any such sites be found during the development an archaeologist should immediately be consulted, as there are various legislative and ethical issues to be resolved. Graves should be left alone, until the relevant authorities to exhumate and relocate them have granted permission.

9.4 The cultural significance of graves is therefore always seen as high. If mitigation is required, it will always be in accordance with legislative requirements. Graves classified as archaeological, as it is older than 60 years, will be handled by the stipulations of the National Heritage Act (25 of 1999). Graves younger than 60 years should be handled as stipulated by the Consultation Ordinance no. 7 of 1925. The exhumation and reburial of the individuals are a time consuming and expensive exercise consisting of the following:

- Identification
- Research
- Social consultation (this is seen as the most important aspect as the success of the whole project is influenced by the success of the social consultation)
- Authorisation
- Exhumation
- Analysis
- Reburial
- Reporting

9.5 The historical site that was found has no great cultural significance as it not unique. It can therefore be demolished, should the need therefore arise.

10. Bibliography

- Bergh, J.S. (red.). 1999. **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies**. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Coertze, P.J. & Coertze, R.D. 1996. **Verklarende vakwoordeboek vir Antropologie en Argeologie**. Pretoria: R.D. Coertze.
- Knudson, S.J. 1978. **Culture in retrospect**. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Korsman, S.A. & Meyer, A. 1999. **Die Steentydperk en rotskuns**. Bergh, J.S. (red.). **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies**. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Map supplied by Dolf van der Walt & Associates.

Personal comment, dr. H. Meyer, owner of portion 8 of the farm Kliprand 76-JR, 2003.04.02.

Phillipson, D.W. 1985. **African Archaeology**. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

- Republic of South Africa. 1998. **National Environmental Management Act** (no 107 of 1998). Pretoria: The Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1999. **National Heritage Resources Act** (No 25 of 1999). Pretoria: The Government Printer.
- Van der Ryst, M.M. & Meyer, A. 1999. **Die Ystertydperk**. Bergh, J.S. (red.). **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies**. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Van Vollenhoven, A.C. 2000. 'n Voorgestelde paradigma vir navorsing op histories-argologiese erfenishulpbrongerrene in Suid-Afrika aan die hand van **gevallestudies in noordelike Gauteng**. (Unpublished D. Phil. Dissertation, University of Pretoria).
- Van Vollenhoven A.C. & Strydom, J.A. 2002. **Report on a cultural resources survey at Phumula, Limpopo Province**. (Unpublished report, Archaeos CC, Wonderboompoort).
- Ward, I. 1993. A geological brief. Krige, F. & Van der Waal, G.-M. (reds.). **Pretoria Kultuurhulpbronne. Die omgewing van Pretoria**. Pretoria: Stadsraad van Pretoria.

Appendix A

Significance of impact:

- Low where the impact will not have an influence on or require to be significantly accommodated in the project design
- Medium where the impact could have an influence, which will require modification of the project design or alternative mitigation or where there will be an impact, but the site is not important
- High where it would have a “no-go” implication on the project regardless of any mitigation

Certainty of prediction:

- Definite: More than 90% sure of a particular fact. Substantial supportive data to verify assessment.
- Probable: Over 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring.
- Possible: Only over 40% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of an impact occurring.
- Uncertain: Less than 40% sure of a particular fact, or the likelihood of and impact occurring.

Appendix B

Definition of terms:

Site: A large place with extensive structures and related cultural objects. It can also be a large assemblage of cultural artifacts, found on a single location.

Structure: A permanent building found in isolation or which forms a site in conjunction with other structures.

Feature: A coincidental find of movable cultural objects.

Object: Artifact (cultural object).

(Also see Knudson 1978: 20).

Appendix C

Cultural significance:

- Low A cultural object being found out of context, not being part of a site or without any related feature/structure in its surroundings.
- Medium Any site, structure or feature being regarded less important due to a number of factors, such as date and frequency. Also any important object found out of context.
- High Any site, structure or feature regarded as important because of its age or uniqueness. Graves are always categorised as of a high importance. Also any important object found within a specific context.