



Archaeynos Culture & Cultural
Resource Consultants
BK 98 09854/23

**A REPORT ON A CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT AT THE
SITE FOR THE PROPOSED UPGRADING OF THE SKILPADHEK BORDER
POST, NORTHWEST PROVINCE**

For:

***K2M TECHNOLOGIES
POSTNET SUITE 167
PRIVATE BAG X 82329
SAFARITUINE
0300***

REPORT: **AE741**

by:

A.C. van Vollenhoven & A.J. Pelser

October 2007

Archaeynos
P.O.Box 31064
WONDERBOOMPOORT
0033
Tel: **083 291 6104**/083 459 3091/082 375 3321
Fax: 086 520 4173
Email: antonv@archaeynos.co.za

Members: AC van Vollenhoven BA, BA (Hons), DTO, NDM, MA (Archaeology) [UP], MA (Culture History) [US], DPhil (Archaeology) [UP]
AJ Pelser BA (UNISA), BA (Hons) (Archaeology), MA (Archaeology) [WITS]
FE Teichert BA, BA (Hons) (Archaeology) [UP]

SUMMARY

Archaeon cc was requested by K2M Technologies to conduct a cultural heritage impact assessment on the site for the proposed development of the Skilpadhek Border Post, Northwest Province. The area was surveyed on foot.

The fieldwork undertaken revealed eight (8) sites as well as other archaeological features of some cultural heritage significance on the property. Four of these will be directly impacted upon by the development, but there will be a definite secondary impact on all the others. Mitigation measures will therefore have to be implemented.

Two of the sites directly impacted upon are of high cultural significance. These should be excavated and mapped together with one of the other sites from the same period (Late Iron Age). The latter site should be preserved and protected, but it seems to fall just outside of the area of development. Therefore the other two could be protected or needs to be researched and documented after which it may be destroyed.

A management plan may be written for the preservation and protection of all sites not impacted upon directly and which are of high cultural significance. This should include the Late Iron Age site mentioned above, but since this site are outside of the area of development it may not be the developers responsibility.

Consideration should be given to incorporating the old structures at the old mine and army base into the newly planned development. It is especially the ammunition store that will become important in the future and therefore the protection thereof can be considered. Historical research on this site would be a solution in order to preserve the history of this site. This may also form part of the mentioned management plan.

CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	2
CONTENTS.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION	4
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	4
3. CONDITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	4
4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	5
5. METHODOLOGY	7
6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA.....	7
7. DISCUSSION.....	8
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
9. REFERENCES	16
APPENDIX A.....	18
APPENDIX B	19
APPENDIX C – LIST OF FIGURES	20

1. INTRODUCTION

ArchaeoNOS cc was requested by K2M Technologies to conduct a cultural heritage impact assessment on the site of the Skilpadhek Border Post between South Africa and Botswana. It is proposed that the border post be upgraded. The proposed upgrade includes an increase in the infrastructure in the area. The site is situated in the Northwest Province (Figure 1).

The client indicated the area where the proposed development is to take place, and the survey was confined to this area. The survey was done on foot in order to reach areas inaccessible by motorized vehicles.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Terms of Reference for the survey were to:

1. Identify all objects, sites, occurrences and structures of an archaeological or historical nature (cultural heritage sites) located on the property (see Appendix A).
2. Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their archaeological, historical, scientific, social, religious, aesthetic and tourism value (see Appendix B).
3. Describe the possible impact of the proposed development on these cultural remains, according to a standard set of conventions.
4. Propose suitable mitigation measures to minimize possible negative impacts on the cultural resources.
5. Recommend suitable mitigation measure should there be any sites of significance that might be impacted upon by the proposed development.
6. Review applicable legislative requirements.

3. CONDITIONS & ASSUMPTIONS

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

1. Cultural Resources are all non-physical and physical man-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences associated with human activity. These include all sites, structure and artifacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development. Graves and cemeteries are included in this.
2. The significance of the sites, structures and artifacts is determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. The various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these aspects.

3. 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 B).
4. The latitude and longitude of any archaeological or historical site or feature, is to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.
5. All recommendations are made with full cognizance of the relevant legislation.
6. 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.
7. The fenced of area where the current border post buildings are situated, was not surveyed as the area clearly was disturbed by human activities and the buildings are younger than 60 years.

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.

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 that assists in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.
- e. alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years as protected.

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

Human remains

In terms of Section 36(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act, no person may, without a permit issued by the relevant heritage resources authority:

- a. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position of otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
- b. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
- c. bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are subject to provisions of the Human Tissue Act (Act 65 of 1983) and to local regulations. Exhumation of graves must conform to the standards set out in the **Ordinance on Excavations (Ordinance no. 12 of 1980)** (replacing the old Transvaal Ordinance no. 7 of 1925).

Permission must also be gained from the descendants (where known), the National Department of Health, Provincial Department of Health, Premier of the Province and local police. Furthermore, permission must also be gained from the various landowners (i.e. where the graves are located and where they are to be relocated) before exhumation can take place.

Human remains can only be handled by a registered undertaker or an institution declared under the **Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983 as amended)**.

Unidentified/unknown graves are also handled as older than 60 until proven otherwise.

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 are made.

5. METHODOLOGY

5.1 Survey of literature

A survey of literature was done in order to obtain background information regarding the area. Sources consulted in this regard are indicated in the bibliography.

5.2 Field survey

The survey was conducted according to generally accepted HIA practices and was aimed at locating all possible objects, sites and features of cultural significance in the area of proposed development. If required, the location/position of any site was determined by means of a Global Positioning System (GPS), while photographs were also taken where needed.

The survey was undertaken on foot.

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.

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

The Skilpadhek Border Post is situated approximately 55 km northwest of the town of Zeerust in South Africa and 5 km east of Lobatse in Botswana. This is in the Northwest Province. The site to be developed (Figure 2), include the upgrading of the current facilities at the border, consisting of the border control offices and staff housing as well as the former Army base. The Army base is currently used for accommodation of members of the South African Police Services. It also contains remains of a former mine and other military buildings.

The above mentioned infrastructure is situated to the north of the N4 highway. To the south of this road a few buildings are situated. The larger part of the area to the south will be developed to meet the requirements of the planned upgraded border post.

As far as the area to the north of the N4 is concerned, the following is applicable. A mountain range to the north more or less forms the northern boundary of the proposed development. The area therefore slopes down to the south. The area to the south, west and southeast of the Army base is still in its natural state. It includes a river bed and marshland as well as indications of erosion running from uphill (northeast) down to the river. Foothills of the mountain also run parallel through this area, west of the base (Figure 3-4).

It is also clear that water runs down the different slopes in the area in times of good rainfall. The recent good rains clearly left such indications on the landscape. The identification of different cultural material such as Stone Age tools and Iron Age potshards which were clearly washed down from higher up the slopes is a clear indication of this.

The area where the old mine and buildings is situated shows clear indications of disturbance. The vegetation is less dense here and species such as sickle bush dominate the plant growth. A large amount of cultural material is found in abundance lying around in this area. These do not necessarily have any significance apart from indicating that humans utilized the area extensively. Such indications were also found in some of the natural areas both to the north and south of the N4.

To the south of the N4 more foothills are running parallel to those to the north. The slope here runs from south to north. Most of the area also is in a natural state. An aloe forest is found on the northern slope of one of the mountains. A large erosion donga is situated in the northeast of this area, right next to the N4 road.

Factors such as water, shelter, food and building material are therefore available in the area. These make the area suitable for human habitation.

It needs to be mentioned that signs of the area being used extensively during recent times is clear from the large quantities of refuse, mainly glass bottles found throughout the surveyed area.

7. DISCUSSION

The fieldwork undertaken revealed eight (8) sites and features of some significant cultural heritage importance on the property. Four of these will be impacted upon directly by the development. However the development will have a secondary impact on the others. Mitigation measures will have to be implemented.

Before discussing these sites in detail a background regarding the different phases of human history is needed. This will enable the reader to better understand the sites found during the survey.

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.

The mountain and foothills would certainly have provided ample shelter for Stone Age people. One might even find a rock shelter in the mountain which may contain rock art.

However, the main mountain was not included in the survey as it falls out of the area of the proposed development.

The stream running through the area would have provided sufficient water. The valley as well as the smaller strips between the foothills would have been an easy hunting ground for these people as migrating animals would easily have been trapped and killed here. One might expect to find more Stone Age tools in the valley, especially in the donga and perhaps even an area where stone tools were manufactured higher up the slopes of the mountain.

The only Stone Age site that has been documented in this area is one of a rock engraving, west of the town of Zeerust (Bergh 1999: 5). Stone Age material from all the phases of the Stone Age was found all over the surveyed area during the survey. It is clear that Stone Age people inhabited the area and used it extensively in prehistoric times.

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.

Previous research indicates that Iron Age sites have been identified in the area to the south of Skilpadhek. In a band stretching roughly from Brits in the east to Zeerust in the west many Iron Age sites have been discovered previously (Bergh 1999: 7). These all belong to the Later Iron Age and include the important site of Kaditshwene. In the Dwarsberg Mountain, to the northeast of Skilpadhek, sites where Iron Age people smelted iron and copper are known (Bergh 1999: 8-9). It was therefore no surprise that such sites were identified during the survey.

During prehistoric times the area was inhabited by a Tshwana group, the Kgatla. In the 19th century another Tshwana group, the Hurutshe, inhabited the area (Bergh 1999: 9-10). During the Difaquane these people moved further to the west into what is today known as Botswana. They returned later on (Bergh 1999: 11).

Iron Age material, including potshards, grinding stones, hammer stones and rubbing stones have been identified in various spots in the surveyed area. Some of these are associated with other features, thus indicating sites, but others seem to be isolated. Isolated potshards was probably washed down from higher up the slopes of the mountain.

Three sites dating to the Iron Age were found in the surveyed area (see later). The vegetation of the area is suitable for the farming communities of the Iron Age, as these people herded livestock and planted different crops. The topography is also suitable for Iron Age settlement.

7.3 Historical Age

The historical age started when the first people that were able to read and write moved into the area. Early travelers have moved through Northwest and Botswana. The Zeerust area was

visited by Dr Andrew Cowan and Lieutenant Donovan as early as 1808 during an expedition on which they also traveled through Lobatse (Bergh 1999: 12, 117). Coenraad de Buys moved through the area in 1821 and 1825 (Bergh 1999: 12).

In 1825 the trader David Hume traveled through this area. The politician Centlivres Chase and his neighbor James Collins also moved through this area in 1825 on a trade mission. The well known Andrew Geddes Bain and John Biddulph moved through this area in 1826 (Bergh 1999: 12, 119).

The missionary John Campbell visited Kaditshwene in 1820 (Bergh 1999: 118). This was followed by the travelers Robert Scoon and William McLuckie in 1827 and 1829. After being invited by Mzilikazi, Dr Robert Moffat and James Archbell came to the area in 1829 (Bergh 1999: 12, 119).

After this the area was visited by a group of hunters lead by Piet Meyer and Hans Dons de Lange in 1830 (Bergh 1999: 13, 119). In 1830, 1832 and 1833 Hume again visited the area (Bergh 1999: 13, 121). This was followed by Captain William Cornwallis Harris in 1836. Between 1841 and 1847 Dr David Livingstone moved through the area just west of Skilpadhek (Bergh 1999: 13, 122-123).

The Voortrekkers moved into this area in the 1830's (Bergh 1999: 14). On 17 January 1837 the Battle of Mosega between the Voortrekkers and Mzilikazi occurred, just south of Zeerust (Bergh 1999: 14, 126). The country around Zeerust was inhabited by white farmers between 1841 and 1850 (Bergh 1999: 15).

Four sites found during the survey date from the Historical Age. Recent artifacts such as pieces of metal drums etc. were seen throughout the surveyed area. This clearly indicates that the area was occupied during the historical period.

7.4 Discussion of sites identified during the survey

Site 1

This site is that of the former Army base, including several buildings and other features. It also includes buildings and structures associated with mining activities on the site.

No GPS measurement was taken as the area is well defined on the map given. The buildings are not older than 60 years and are therefore not protected by the National Heritage Resources Act. The following features were identified:

- Houses to the northeast of the surveyed area. These are still in use and are of no heritage value.
- An administrative building with a small monument in front. The building is of no heritage value, but the monument has value. Unfortunately the commemorative plaque has been removed (Figure 5).
- Five similar buildings used to house the garrison (Figure 6). These are not old enough to be protected by the indicated legislation.
- Various other military buildings to the northwest of the above mentioned ones. These are not old enough to be protected by the indicated legislation.

- A parade ground and another large building on the extreme western side of the military area (Figure 7-8). These are not old enough to be protected by the indicated legislation.
- A storage facility for weapons, between the parade ground and the administrative buildings (Figure 9-10). Although this building probably is not older than 60 years it is a very unique structure and therefore consideration should be given to preserving it.
- A sports field to the west of the houses indicated. This is not old enough to be protected by the indicated legislation.
- Mine buildings, consisting of offices, houses etc to the northwest of the sports field. Some of these were built from asbestos and the later ones from bricks. The older buildings have colored cement floors and the younger ones novillon tiles. These are not old enough to be protected by the indicated legislation.
- A Late Iron Age upper grinder was found next to one of the barracks, but this is completely out of context and was probably carried there by someone.

The cultural significance of the site as a whole is **medium**. Although the site is not older than 60 years, it forms part of the history of the area and it would be unfortunate if something from this era could not be salvaged. The development will have a direct impact on this site.

The best solution would be to not to demolish everything but to incorporate it into the proposed development if this is practical. This could be done by reusing and renovating certain buildings. The ammunition storage building can for instance be preserved, but may be renovated (without changing the structure) to suit another function. However as these buildings are younger than 60 years it is not protected by law and may be demolished.

Doing historical research to determine the history of the site and using it as a small display somewhere at the border post will be an appropriate way of preserving the history of this site. This should include something about the mining activities as well as that of the military presence.

Site 2

This is a Stone Age site identified right outside of the eastern boundary of the surveyed area, north of the N4.

GPS: 25°16'53"S
25°43'37"E

The site is on both sides of a dirt road through the area.

The site mainly consists of Middle Stone Age tools, but Late Stone Age material was also identified (Figure 11). It seems to be an industrial site where stone tools were manufactured. The possibility of some tools being washed down from higher ground should also be considered. It means that a large Stone Age site might be situated against the higher slopes of the mountain.

The cultural significance of the site is **high**. Therefore it may not be demolished.

The development will not have a direct impact on the site, but a secondary impact will always be apparent. The developer should therefore ensure that this impact is minimized by keeping people from entering the area. The easiest way to do this will be to place a fence around the site. Excavations in order to study the find may be considered, but is not a necessity. The advantage of such research would be that the site will be documented in full meaning that it will probably not hamper future developments in the area. However, since the site is outside of the area planned for development, the developer should just ensure that the integrity of the site is not compromised.

Site 3

This site was found in the west of the surveyed area, between one of the ridges running through the area and the Botswana border. It might even be possible that it is extended to the Botswana side of the border, but nothing could be identified from a distance.

As the site is reasonably large, two GPS measurement were taken.

GPS: 25°16'22"S
25°43'06"E – this is at a rectangular structure which seems to be the highest one against the slope of the ridge.

25°16'15"S
25°43'04"E – this is to the southwest of the site, almost against the Botswana border.

The site clearly is a historical site as some of the features on the site are rectangular and some included cement, asbestos and bricks (Figure 12-14). Historical artifacts, such as porcelain, glass, metal tins and other metal artifacts such as part of a bicycle were found. At least two refuse middens were also found in association with this site.

The site includes circular structures as well as rectangular ones (Figure 15). In most cases it only seems to be the outlines of former structures. This gives the impression that prefabricated buildings were probably placed here. Some of the outlines are made of stones, but other are made of bricks. The foundations of at least one proper brick structure were identified.

Interesting artifacts identified included an Early Stone Age hand axe (Figure 16), probably used as one of the stones in one of the structures, a large clay pot still in situ (Figure 17) outside of one of the structures, grinding stones, metal slag and pottery. The overall impression one gets is that although the site was occupied during historical times, the people who stayed there still lived a traditional lifestyle. It is suggested that the site probably pre-dates the time of the Bophuthatswana Government and that the people was removed in order to establish the original border post and army base.

The cultural significance of the site is **medium**, but if it is indeed linked to issues of forced removals it might be **high**. Without further research it is impossible to determine the age of the site. It may be anything between 20 and 80 years. It is therefore not possible to determine whether the National Heritage Resources Act is applicable. The best solution therefore is to handle it as if the act is applicable.

Although no development is planned in this area, it will definitely have a secondary impact on the site. The site should therefore not be disturbed and should be preserved. Again this should be included in a management plan for the sites of cultural significance in the area. Such a plan will determine the exact rules for the possible future preservation and documentation of this site.

As the site will not be directly impacted on the site can just be left as it is. The developer should however see to it that building activities do not impact thereon.

Site 4

This site is situated north of the fence of the enclosed border post buildings.

GPS: 25°16'26"S
25°42'58"E

The site consists of seven holes that were dug probably to obtain slate for using as building material (Figure 18). Similar holes were also found in other parts of the surveyed area, but these might have something to do with earlier mining activities in the area.

The cultural significance of the site is **low**. It probably is younger than 60 years.

The development does have a direct impact on this site. It may be destroyed during construction activities. This report is seen as ample documentation thereof.

Site 5

This site is located between the two ridges running parallel through the western side of the surveyed area, north of the N4. Since it is a large site four GPS measurements were taken. However this does not necessarily give the extent of the site or include the whole site.

GPS: 25°16'09"S
25°43'20"E – This was measured at a circular feature which might be younger than the rest of the site. A lower grinder and a ploughshare were found next to this feature (Figure 19).

25°16'08"S
25°43'20"E – This is at an area with metal slag, a lower grinder and pottery.

25°16'09"S
25°43'21"E – This was taken at a large heap of metal slag.

25°16'13"S
25°43'26"E – This was where two clay furnaces was identified.

No stone walling could be found. This might indicate that the site belongs to the earlier part of the Late Iron Age. However such stone walls might be found higher on the ridge. Small stone circles found might have been platforms for grain bins (Figure 20-22). Many typical

Iron Age artifacts were identified, including lower and upper grinders, hammer stones, rubbing stones, anvils, slag (Figure 23) and bone.

Pottery found included parts of blow pipes (called tuyéres) and potshard. Some of the potshards had decorations and others were very thick indicating that it was once storage pots for things like grain or beer. The decorated pottery found here (Figure 24) could be linked to the so-called Buispoort or Madikwe ceramic facies, dating the site to between AD 1500 – AD1850. Buispoort is located northwest of Zeerust.

The most important features identified were a number of large heaps consisting of metal slag and at least two clay furnaces used for the smelting of metal (Figure 25). Without excavating the site it is not possible to determine the exact function of these furnaces within the process of metal working.

The cultural significance of the site is **high**. Sites with indications of metal working are reasonably scarce and none have been found in this area previously. The closest such sites in the vicinity is that at Kaditshwene, more than 50 km to the south and those at Madikwe, more than 50 km to the north. Therefore the site should not be demolished.

The development will not have a direct impact on this site, and it seems as if it is outside of the area of development. However, its close proximity thereto means that there will definitely be a secondary impact. Mitigation is therefore required. The developer should ensure that the integrity of the site is not compromised.

Site 6

This site was located to the south of the houses that are still in use in the old army base. No GPS measurement was taken as the site is indicated on the maps supplied.

The site consists of historical structures, including a midden, cement platforms and remains of a pump as well as dams. Many fairly recent glass bottles are also found in the area.

The cultural significance of the site is **low**. It is not older than 60 years. It does form part of the history of the area before the establishment of the park, but is of no particular significance. Therefore it may be demolished.

As there is no direct impact on this site, it may be left as it is. However, the site will need to be cleaned up as it really is a mess.

Site 7

This site is situated to the south of the N4, against the northern slope of the ridge. This is in the same area as the aloe forest. It is not certain that this indeed is a site, but the large amount of potshards found here as well as some other Iron Age artifacts (upper grinders, hammer stones and whetstones), indicate that it is not mere isolated material.

GPS: 25°16'46"S
25°43'03"E

Due to the possibility of this feature being associated with site no 8, the cultural significance of the site is **high**. The development will have a direct impact on this site. Mitigation is therefore required, but this should be included with that of site no 8.

Site 8

This site is located on the eastern top of the ridge on the southern side of the N4.

GPS: 25°16'53"S
25°43'02"E

It is not a large site, but includes a number of stone walls (Figure 26-27). At least one of these is a large circular enclosure. Grinding stones, slag heaps, a whetstone and potshards were identified. The site dates to the Late Iron Age. The slag heaps indicates that metal was smelted here.

The cultural significance of the site is **high**. Apart from having indications of metal working, it also may be associated with site no 5. Since the site is not very large it may be demolished, but only after mitigatory measures have been implemented.

The development will have a direct impact on this site. The site should be excavated and documented along with site no 5 before any of the planned developments may proceed.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is concluded that the survey resulted in the identification of eight sites as well as other cultural material lying around in the area. The area of proposed development was utilized by humans as long ago as the Early Stone Age and has been inhabited and utilized ever since.

The following is recommended:

- Site no 4 and 6 is of minor cultural significance. Both may be destructed without requiring a destruction permit from SAHRA.
- Site no 1 may not be old enough to be protected by law, but due to it being part of the history of the area, it should be preserved as far as possible. Although the site is not older than 60 years, it would be unfortunate if something from this era could not be salvaged.
- The best solution would be to not to demolish everything but to incorporate it into the proposed development. This could be done by reusing and renovating certain buildings. The ammunition storage building should be preserved, but may be renovated (without changing the structure) to suit another function.
- It is proposed that historical research should be conducted in order to determine the history of the site. This can be used in a small display somewhere at the border post. This is deemed an appropriate way of preserving the history of this site. This should include something about the mining activities as well as that of the military presence.

- The large historical site next to the border fence (no 3), pose an interesting question. Although the site is only of medium cultural significance, it might be more important. However this can only be determined if historical research is conducted. Such research will also assist in determining the age of the site. This will undoubtedly influence the outcome in determining the significance of the site. In the meantime the site should be handled as if older than 60 years.
- The site should however be preserved no matter what the outcome of such research. The site should also be included in a management plan for the sites of cultural significance in the area. Such a plan will determine the exact rules for the possible future preservation and documentation of this site.
- Site no 2 (the Stone Age Site) may not be demolished. Although there will only be a secondary impact on the site, the developer should ensure that this impact is minimized by keeping people from entering the area. The easiest way to do this will be to place a fence around the site. Excavations in order to study the find may be considered, but is not a necessity. The advantage of such research would be that the site will be documented in full, meaning that it will probably not hamper future developments in the area. However it is rather proposed that the site be included in a management plan for sites of high cultural significance in the area.
- Sites no 5, 7 and 8 should be handled in a similar fashion. The cultural significance of all of these are high and they may be directly linked to each other. Since sites with indications of metal working is reasonably rare and none have been found in this area previously mitigation is necessary.
- Site no 5 has the most research potential of the three sites and should be excavated. It may not be demolished. After excavation and mapping of the site it should also be included in a management plan for the sites of cultural significance in the area.
- The other two may be demolished, but only after suitable mitigation measures have been implemented.
- The mitigation measures recommended is excavation of sites 7 and 8 as well as their mapping and drawing in order to obtain basic information to supplement that of site no 5.

9. REFERENCES

- 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.
- Huffman, T.N. 2002. **Regionality in the Iron Age: the case of the Sotho-Tswana.** In: Southern African Humanities, Vol.14 pp. 1-22, December 2002. Pietermaritzburg.
- 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.
- Maps and photographs supplied by the client.
- Republic of South Africa. 1999. **National Heritage Resources Act** (No 25 of 1999). Pretoria: the Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1998. **National Environmental Management Act** (no 107 of 1998). Pretoria: The Government Printer.
- Suid-Afrikaanse Argeologie: Enigste Studiegids vir SAR100-J. 1989. Universiteit van Suid-Afrika: Pretoria.
- 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.

Appendix A

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 B

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 categorized as of a high importance. Also any important object found within a specific context.

Appendix C

List of Figures:

- 1. Map of the area surrounding Skilpadhek, indicating the proposed site for development.**
- 2. Aerial photograph showing the surveyed area.**
- 3. General view of the area where the army base was situated.**
- 4. General view of the surveyed area north of the N4.**
- 5. The administrative army building with a small monument in front. The bronze plaque has been removed.**
- 6. One of the large buildings used as sleeping quarters for the soldiers.**
- 7. The podium at the parade ground.**
- 8. On the front of the podium is a coat of arms with the picture of an eagle. This probably was the regimental insignia.**
- 9. Inside of the weapons store.**
- 10. Outside of the weapons store indicating a circular wall around it.**
- 11. Middle and Late Stone Age tools from site no 2.**
- 12. Remains of a rectangular brick structure at site no 3.**
- 13. Remains of a rectangular stone structure at site no 3.**
- 14. Well defined stone structure at site no 3.**
- 15. Remains of a circular stone structure at site no 3.**
- 16. Early Stone Age hands axe from site no 3.**
- 17. Remains of a large clay pot in situ at site no 3.**
- 18. View of the excavations where shale was removed.**
- 19. A lower grinder found at site no 5.**
- 20. Circular structure made of stone at site no 5. This may have been a platform for a grain bin.**
- 21. Another circular structure at site no 5 which also might have been a platform for a grain bin.**
- 22. A third circular stone structure at site no 5 which might have been a platform for a grain bin.**
- 23. One of the large slag heaps, remains of metal smelting, at site no 5.**
- 24. Potshards from site no 5. The decoration is of the Buispoort or Madikwe ceramic facies.**
- 25. Oval shaped furnace made of clay.**
- 26. Low stone wall at site no 8.**
- 27. Large stone wall at site no 7.**