

**A SURVEY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES IN  
SEGORONG VILLAGE, PENGE AREA,  
SEKHUKHUNELAND, NORTHERN PROVINCE**

For:

**Naledi Development**  
P O Box 15283  
SINOVILLE  
0129

Survey conducted and report prepared by the:

**NATIONAL CULTURAL HISTORY MUSEUM**  
PO Box 28088  
SUNNYSIDE  
0132

Telephone - (012) 324 6082  
Telefax - (012) 328 5173

REPORT: 2001KH15

Date of survey: August 2001      Date of report: August 2001

## SUMMARY



### **A survey of cultural resources in Segorong village, Penge area, Sekhukhuneland, Northern Province**

The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of the area in which it is proposed to open up a new section of the existing Annesley mine.

Based on what was found and its evaluation, it is recommended that the proposed development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- Site 2430AC77 should ideally be documented in full, even if the mine is not going to operate in that particular area. Alternatively, that it should be fenced in before development takes place and should thereafter be avoided.
- Site 2430AC78 should be fenced in and avoided at all costs, unless the relevant members of the interested and affected parties give their consent for the mine to operate in the area. Then the site should be investigated archaeologically in full before development starts.
- It is recommended that at least some photographic record is made of the area before everything is destroyed. Concurrently, material such as the grinding stones can be collected and used in museums and schools as part of their educational programmes.

The developer should also be notified that archaeological sites might be exposed during the construction work. If anything is noticed, it should immediately be reported to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.



## CONTENTS

SUMMARY . . . . .	i
CONTENTS . . . . .	ii
1. AIMS OF THE SURVEY . . . . .	1
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE . . . . .	1
3. DEFINITIONS . . . . .	1
4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS . . . . .	2
5. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	3
6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA . . . . .	3
7. DISCUSSION . . . . .	4
8. RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	5
9. REFERENCES . . . . .	5
10. PROJECT TEAM . . . . .	6
APPENDIX 1 . . . . .	7
APPENDIX 2 . . . . .	8
APPENDIX 3 . . . . .	9
APPENDIX 4 . . . . .	10

**A SURVEY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES IN  
SEGORORONG VILLAGE, PENGE AREA,  
SEKHUKHUNELAND, NORTHERN PROVINCE**

## **1. AIMS OF THE SURVEY**

The National Cultural History Museum was requested by **Naledi Development** to survey an area in which it proposed to develop a new open cast mine. This area coincides largely with the village of Segorong, near Penge in the Sekhukhuneland district of Northern Province. The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of the areas that is to be impacted by the proposed development.

## **2. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The **Terms of Reference** for the study were to:

- 2.1 Identify all objects, sites, occurrences and structures of an archaeological or historical nature located in the area of the proposed development.
- 2.2 Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their historical, social, religious, aesthetic and scientific value.
- 2.3 Determine the possible impacts on the known and potential cultural resources in the area of interest.
- 2.4 Develop mitigation or control measures for impact minimization and cultural resources preservation.
- 2.5 Develop procedures to be implemented if previously unidentified cultural resources are uncovered during the construction.

## **3. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

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

- **Cultural resources** are all nonphysical 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 groups, 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.
- Sites regarded as having low significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium to high significance require further mitigation.
- The latitude and longitude of archaeological sites are to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.

#### 4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Aspects concerning the conservation of cultural resources are mainly dealt within two acts. These are the South Africa Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the Environmental Conservation Act (Act 73 of 1989).

##### 4.1 South African Heritage Resources Act

###### 4.1.1 Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

Section 35(4) of this act states that no person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority:

- (a) destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;
- (b) destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;
- (c) trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or
- (d) bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals

or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.

The above mentioned may only be disturbed or moved by an archaeologist, after receiving a permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency.

#### **4.2 Environmental Conservation Act**

This act states that a survey and an evaluation of cultural resources should be undertaken in areas where development, which will change the face of the environment, is to be made. The impact of the development on the cultural resources should also be determined and proposals to mitigate this impact is to be formulated.

### **5. METHODOLOGY**

#### **5.1 Preliminary investigation**

##### **5.1.1 Survey of the literature**

A survey of the relevant literature was conducted with the aim of reviewing the previous research done and determining the potential of the area. In this regard, various anthropological, archaeological and historical sources were consulted - see the list of references below.

##### **5.1.2 Data bases**

The **Archaeological Data Recording Centre (ADRC)**, housed at the National Cultural History Museum, Pretoria, and the **Environmental Potential Atlas** was consulted.

##### **5.1.3 Other sources**

The topocadastral and other maps were also studied - see the list of references below.

#### **5.2 Field survey**

The field survey was done according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible sites, objects and structures. As the area that had to be investigated is rather large, it was divided up into different blocks using natural and man-made features. Each of these blocks were then surveyed by walking across it in transects. Special attention was given to unnatural topographical occurrences such as trenches and holes and stream beds and clusters of trees were investigated.

As no information regarding access roads, borrow pits or other potential infra-structural

development was supplied, these aspects should be addressed as soon as possible.

### 5.3 Documentation

All sites, objects and structures identified were documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Coordinates of individual localities were determined by means of the **Global Positioning System** (GPS)<sup>1</sup> and confirmed by plotting on a map. This information was added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality (Appendix 2).

## 6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

The area that was investigated is located on the farms Streatham 100KT, Annesley 109KT and Holfontein 126KT, in the Sekhukhuneland district of Northern Province (1:50 000 map 2430AC & 2430AD) (see Fig. 1).

The lithology of the area can be described as parallel hills and lowlands, largely made up of shale, norite and andesite. The original vegetation is classified as Mixed Bushveld, but due to overgrazing and harvesting for fire wood, it has largely turned into scrub land.

## 7. DISCUSSION

Little is known about the archaeology of the larger geographical area. Stone tools dating to the Early and Middle Stone Age, are known to occur in a number of places, eg. on the farms Onverwacht and Godwinton. Some Iron Age sites are known to exist upstream as well as down stream of the Olifants River (eg. Van Schalkwyk 1998). Historical sites and battle fields are known to exist more to the west.

Some stone tools dating to the Early and Middle Stone Age were found within the boundaries of Segorong village (see Fig. 4 & 5). These artifacts were not numerous and also occur as surface material, implying that they are not in a primary context any more. As such they are judged to have little significance and were left in place.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the manufacturer a certain deviation may be expected for each reading. Care was, however, taken to obtain as accurate a reading as possible, and then correlate it with reference to the physical environment before plotting it on the map.



No archaeological site dating to the Iron Age was identified in the area of proposed development.

A number of sites containing graves were identified in or near the area of proposed development - see separate report No. 2001KH14 (Van Schalkwyk 2001).

Settlement of the area only started with the opening up of the different mines - Penge was started in 1910 (SESA 1973). According to local oral tradition, intensive settlement only started to take place by the early 1920s, although a number of people are said to have been living here before that. The low density of habitation is clear from sources such as Van Warmelo (1935) (see Fig. 3). Taking into consideration the “organic” nature of such settlements, little, if anything older than 60 years could be found.

Exceptions do occur. Two sites dating from historical times are of special interest. The first (2430AC77 - see Appendix 2) apparently dates to the early 1920s. As such, it is older than 60 years. It also exhibits interesting cultural features and is definitely worthy of documentation/ conservation. The second site (2430AC78 - see Appendix 2) does not exhibit many features, but have high emotional significance as it is said that a former chief used to live here and that he is also buried here.

A large number of abandoned structures occur. Most of these structures, according to local informants, were abandoned within the last 15 years. As local jobs became scares, people moved closer to Burgersfort and other areas, in the hope of finding jobs. In most cases, family, friends and neighbours can still identify who the inhabitants were and when and where they moved to from Segorong.

The result of this social mobility is that there is a lot of potential “archaeology” to be found. Upper and lower grinding stones are found all over (Fig. 6), structures and stone walls occur in abundance (Fig. 7 & 8). However, one should not be misled by this, as most of it is of quite recent origin.

Although some interesting structures and features occur, it can be stated with a good degree of certainty that whatever structures, features, practices, etc. are identified in the Segorong area, one has just as good a chance of finding it outside the area. However, one should keep in mind that if these are destroyed because of mining activities, it will be gone for ever.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of the area in which it is

proposed to open up a new section of the existing Annesley mine.

Based on what was found and its evaluation, it is recommended that the proposed development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- Site 2430AC77 should ideally be documented in full, even if the mine is not going to operate in that particular area. Alternatively, that it should be fenced in before development takes place and should thereafter be avoided.
- Site 2430AC78 should be fenced in and avoided at all costs, unless the relevant members of the interested and affected parties give their consent for the mine to operate in the area. Then the site should be investigated archaeologically in full before development starts.
- It is recommended that at least some photographic record is made of the area before everything is destroyed. Concurrently, material such as the grinding stones can be collected and used in museums and schools as part of their educational programmes.

The developer should also be notified that archaeological sites might be exposed during the construction work. If anything is noticed, it should immediately be reported to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.

## 9. REFERENCES

### 9.1 Unpublished sources

#### 9.1.1 Data base

Archaeological Data Recording Centre, National Cultural History Museum, Pretoria.

Environmental Potential Atlas, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

### 9.2 Published sources

#### 9.2.1 Books and journals

Holm, S.E. 1966. *Bibliography of South African Pre- and Protohistoric archaeology*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.

Mason, R.J. 1962. *Prehistory of the Transvaal*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Standard Encyclopaedia of South Africa, 1973. Vol. 8. Cape Town: Nasou Ltd.

Van Riet Lowe, C. n.d. *The distribution of Prehistoric rock engravings and paintings in South Africa*. Archaeological Survey, Archaeological Series No. 7.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 1998. *A survey of cultural resources in the proposed Rooipoort dam, Olifants River, Northern Province*. Unpublished report 98KH22. Pretoria: National Cultural History Museum.

Van Schalkwyk, J.A. 2001. *Identifying and listing of graves in Segorong village, Penge area, Selhukhuneland district, Northern Province*. Unpublished report 2001KH14. Pretoria: National Cultural History Museum.

Van Warmelo, N.J. 1935. *A Preliminary survey of the Bantu Tribes of South Africa*. Ethnological Publications No. 5. Pretoria: Government Printer.

Van Warmelo, N.J. 1977. *Anthropology of Southern Africa in Periodicals to 1950*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

#### 9.2.2 Maps

1: 50 000 Topocadastral maps - 2430AC, 2430AD

## 10. PROJECT TEAM

J van Schalkwyk

## **APPENDIX 1: STANDARDIZED SET OF CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES**

### **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
- 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: More than 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring
- Possible: Only more than 40% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of an impact occurring
- Unsure: Less than 40% sure of a particular fact, or the likelihood of an impact occurring

### **Recommended management action:**

For each impact, the recommended practically attainable mitigation actions which would result in a measurable reduction of the impact, must be identified. This is expressed according to the following:

- 1 = no further investigation/action necessary
- 2 = controlled sampling and/or mapping of the site necessary
- 3 = preserve site if possible, otherwise extensive salvage excavation and/or mapping necessary
- 4 = preserve site at all costs

### **Legal requirements:**

Identify and list the specific legislation and permit requirements which potentially could be infringed upon by the proposed project, if mitigation is necessary.

**APPENDIX 2: SURVEY RESULTS<sup>2</sup>**

[Previous site numbers relate to other known sites on a particular ¼ degree sheet already documented in the ADRC, and does not necessarily refer to sites occurring on or close to the specific area of development.]

1. Site number: 2430AC77

Location: Annesley 109KT: S 24°23'07.8"; E 30°14'10.7"

Description: Extensive stone walled site, indicating multiple use.

Discussion: This site seems to hold promise for documenting early historical settlement patterns.

Significance of impact: High

Certainty of prediction: Definite

Recommended management action: 3 = preserve site if possible, otherwise extensive salvage excavation and/or mapping necessary

Legal requirements: SAHRA permit

2. Site number: 2430AC78

Location: Annesley 109KT: S 24°22'41.5"; E 30°14'09.4"

Description: Area where *Kgoši* Magomane Matlakala are supposed to have stayed at some time in the past. It is said that he ruled in different places as chief from the early 1880s.

Discussion: Apart from the grave of *Kgoši* Matlakala, there are also some other graves, belonging to immediate family, in the area.

Significance of impact: High

Certainty of prediction: Definite

Recommended management action: 4 = preserve site at all costs

Legal requirements: None

---

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix 1 for an explanation of the conventions used in assessing the cultural remains.

### APPENDIX 3: GLOSSARY AND ABBREVIATIONS

This section is included to give the reader some necessary background. It must be kept in mind, however, that these dates are all relative and serve only to give a very broad framework for interpretation.

#### STONE AGE

Early Stone Age (ESA)	2 000 000 - 150 000 Before Present
Middle Stone Age (MSA)	150 000 - 30 000 BP
Late Stone Age (LSA)	30 000 - until c. AD 200

#### IRON AGE

Early Iron Age (EIA)	AD 200 - AD 1000
Late Iron Age (LIA)	AD 1000 - AD 1830

#### HISTORICAL PERIOD

Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1840 in this part of the country

ADRC - Archaeological Data Recording Centre

core - a piece of stone from which flakes were removed to be used or made into tools

SAHRA - South African Heritage Resources Agency

**APPENDIX 4: ILLUSTRATIONS**