


**Desktop Cultural Heritage Assessment:
Proposed Re-Modelling and Expansion of Ramosukula Secondary School on Portion 59
of the Farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ, Emfuleni Local Municipality, Sedibeng District
Municipality, Gauteng Province**

For

<p>Project Applicant Department of Infrastructure Development (GDID) Mr. Peter Wanjau 17 Keurboom Crescent Noordwyk Midrand Cellphone No: +27 74 965 9021 Email Address: peter@exilite-consulting.co.za</p>	<p>Environmental Consultant GKM CONSULTING PTY LTD Grace Magaya 74 Third Street Northmead Benoni, 1501 Cellphone No: 081 494 1611 Email: grace@gkmenvironmental.co.za</p>
--	--



By
Francois P Coetzee
Heritage Consultant
ASAPA Professional Member No: 028
99 Van Deventer Road, Pierre van Ryneveld,
Centurion, 0157
Tel: (012) 429 6297
Fax: (012) 429 6091
Cell: 0827077338
coetzfp@unisa.ac.za

Date:	June 2019
Version:	1 (Final Draft)

Executive Summary

This report contains a desktop heritage impact assessment investigation in accordance with the provisions of Sections 38(1) and 38(3) of the *National Heritage Resources Act* (Act No. 25 of 1999) (NHRA) and focuses predictive results as requested by GKM Consulting Pty (Ltd) for the proposed re-modelling and expansion of Ramosukula Secondary School on Portion 59 of the Farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ, Emfuleni Local Municipality, Sedibeng District Municipality, Gauteng Province.

The site of the Ramosukula Secondary School has already been extensively developed and consists of various buildings and associated infrastructure. The site is bordered by a dirt road and several agricultural fields. Although no known archaeological and historical sites were noted in the historical maps and literature there is still the possibility of graves, especially located in the southern portion of the development (overgrown with trees). However the 2004 Google Earth image clearly indicates that the whole southern section was cleared, making the probability of any heritage site extremely low.

It is therefore recommended that a heritage site survey will not be required and that the development be exempt from a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA).

However, please note:

Archaeological deposits usually occur below ground level. Should archaeological artefacts or skeletal material be revealed in the area during development activities, such activities should be halted, and a university or museum notified in order for an investigation and evaluation of the find(s) to take place (*cf.* NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 36 (6)).

Definitions and abbreviations

Midden:	Refuse that accumulates in a concentrated heap.
Stone Age:	An archaeological term used to define a period of stone tool use and manufacture
Iron Age:	An archaeological term used to define a period associated with domesticated livestock and grains, metal working and ceramic manufacture
LIA:	Late Iron Age sites are usually demarcated by stone-walled enclosures
NHRA:	National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999)
SAHRA:	South African Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRIS:	South African Heritage Resources Information System
PHRA-G:	Provincial Heritage Resources Authority - Gauteng
GDARD:	Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
HIA:	Heritage Impact Assessment
DMR:	Department of Mineral Resources
I&APs:	Interested and Affected Parties

I, Francois Coetzee, hereby confirm my independence as a cultural heritage specialist and declare that I do not have any interest, be it business, financial, personal or other, in any proposed activity, application or appeal in respect of the listed environmental processes, other than fair remuneration for work performed on this project.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'F. Coetzee', is written over a light green rectangular background.

Francois P Coetzee
Cultural Heritage Consultant
Accredited Archaeologist for the SADC Region
Professional Member of ASAPA (CRM Section) Reg no: 28

Contents

1. Introduction and Terms of Reference	6
2. Objectives.....	6
3. Description of Physical Environment of Study Area	6
4. Proposed Project Description.....	10
5. Legal Framework.....	11
6. Study Approach/Methodology.....	13
6.1 Review of existing information/data.....	13
7. Recommendations and Conclusions	16
8. References.....	17
Addendum 1: Archaeological and Historical Sequence	19
Addendum 2: Surveyor General Farm Diagram	27
Addendum 3: Relocation of Graves	29

Figures

Figure 1: Regional map of the survey area (situated west of Vanderbijlpark) (indicated by the red area).....	7
Figure 2: Regional context of the survey footprint located situated west of Vanderbijlpark (indicated by the red area).....	8
Figure 3: Local context of the survey footprint (1:250 000 Topographical Map 2626).....	8
Figure 4: The survey area as indicated on the 1:50 000 topographic map 2627DA (1995)	9
Figure 5: Survey area within general context (Google Earth Pro 2019).....	9
Figure 6: Survey area within local context (Google Earth Pro 2019).....	10
Figure 7: The location of Portion 59 of the Farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ	10
Figure 8: Proposed layout of the proposed re-modelling and expansion of the school.....	11
Figure 9: Northern march of General French of the British Forces (red dots on the left, river crossing at the red square) (after Breytenbach 1983).....	14
Figure 10: The survey area as indicated on the 1:50 000 topographic map 2627DA (1945)	15
Figure 11: The location of known sites in the region according to the SAHRIS system (2018)	15
Figure 12: Jeppe's Map dating to 1899 indicates the general location of the farm	16
Figure 13: War Office Map indicating the location of the survey area north of Pretoria in 1899.....	16
Figure 14: The location of the major spheres of influence of Mzilikazi from the early 1820s to late 1830s.....	26
Figure 15: Movement of Mzilikazi's warriors relative to the survey area north of Brits (after Bergh 1998)	26
Figure 16: Surveyor General's sketch of the farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ when it was surveyed in 1927	27
Figure 17: Surveyor General's sketch of the farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ which was first surveyed in 1894	28

Tables

Table 1: Physical Environment.....6
Table 2: Socio-economic environment..... 7
Table 3: Legal framework..... 11
Table 4: Activities that trigger Section 38 of the NHRA..... 12
Table 5: Field rating system to determine site significance 12

1. Introduction and Terms of Reference

GKM Consulting Pty (Ltd) an independent environmental consultant was appointed by Exlite Engineers on behalf of the Department of Infrastructure Development (GDID) undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) according to the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and 2014 EIA regulations (as amended) for the proposed re-modelling and expansion of Ramosukula Secondary School on Portion 59 of the Farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ, Emfuleni Local Municipality, Sedibeng District Municipality, Gauteng Province. A desktop Cultural Heritage Assessment was requested by GKM Consulting to predict the potential impact of the proposed development on cultural heritage remains.

2. Objectives

The general objective of a desktop cultural heritage survey is to predict the likelihood of cultural heritage remains consisting of both tangible and intangible archaeological and historical artefacts, structures (including graves), settlements and oral traditions of cultural significance, occurring in the area of the proposed development.

3. Description of Physical Environment of Study Area

The report focussed on an area situated west of Vanderbijlpark and just north of the Vaal River. The site is located next to a dirt road south of the Potchefstroom Road and consists of existing school buildings and associated infrastructure.

Farm Name(s) and Portions	Zeekoefontein 573 IQ • Portion 59
Size of Survey Area	2 ha
Magisterial District	Emfuleni Local Municipality Sedibeng District Municipality
1:50 000 Map Sheet	2627DA
1:250 000 Map Sheet	2626
Central Coordinates of the Development	26.728523°S 27.645514°E

Table 1: Physical Environment

The northern parts of the survey area falls within the Grassland Biome, particularly the Mesic Highveld Grassland Bioregion and more specifically the Soweto Highveld Grassland (Gm 8). This veld type extends to the Mpumalanga, Gauteng (and to a very small extent also in neighbouring Free State and North-West) Provinces. It occurs on a broad band roughly delimited by the N17 road between Ermelo and Johannesburg in the north, Perdekop in the southeast and the Vaal River (border with the Free State) in the south. It extends further westwards along the southern edge of the Johannesburg Dome (including part of Soweto) as far as the vicinity of Randfontein. In southern Gauteng it includes the surrounds of Vanderbijlpark and Vereeniging as well as Sasolburg in the northern Free State (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).

The survey footprint is characterised by extensive development in the region. As such the area is completely surrounded by various developments and infrastructure (fences, roads, power lines and agricultural lands).

Vanderbijlpark normally receives about 544 mm of rain per year, with most rainfall occurring during summer. The region receives the lowest rainfall (0 mm) in June and the highest (106 mm) in January. The monthly distribution of average daily maximum temperatures shows that the average midday temperatures for Vanderbijlpark range from 17°C in June to 27.8°C in January. The region is the coldest during July when the mercury drops to 0°C on average during the night (SAExplorer 2019).

Current Zoning	Residential (Agricultural Holding)
Economic activities	Farming (agricultural)
Soil and basic geology	Sedibeng contain areas with geological concerns, which are mainly dolomitic and are degraded. Sedibeng is widely affected by a range of geological conditions that have implications for development. These areas are around Vereeniging, Vanderbijlpark, Meyerton and surrounding areas to their west, east of Midvaal up to Heidelberg and areas to the east of Lesedi. These geological areas of concern include undermined areas and where there is a perched water table.
Prior activities	Agricultural (Farming)
Socio Economic Environment	According to Statistics South Africa (Census, 2001), the Sedibeng District Municipality has an overall population of 796 756 people. Of these people, the majority, 658 417, live in the Emfuleni Local Municipality, 64 640 reside in Midvaal while 73 689 live in Lesedi. The Sedibeng Integrated Development Plan (IDP), however, indicates that the population growth rate is 1.8% pa On a geographical basis Midvaal covers the largest area at 2312 km ² , while Emfuleni has an area of 1276 km ² and Lesedi an area of 1042 km ² (Sedibeng IDP, 2006-2007)
Evaluation of Impact	An evaluation of the impact of the development on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999, Section 38(3d)): Positive

Table 2: Socio-economic environment




Figure 1: Regional map of the survey area (situated west of Vanderbijlpark) (indicated by the red area)




Figure 2: Regional context of the survey footprint located situated west of Vanderbijlpark (indicated by the red area)




Figure 3: Local context of the survey footprint (1:250 000 Topographical Map 2626)



Figure 4: The survey area as indicated on the 1:50 000 topographic map 2627DA (1995)




Figure 5: Survey area within general context (Google Earth Pro 2019)



Figure 6: Survey area within local context (Google Earth Pro 2019)




Figure 7: The location of Portion 59 of the Farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ

4. Proposed Project Description

The Ramosukula Secondary School consists of various existing buildings and associated infrastructure. The proposed project entails the re-modelling and expansion of the school.




Figure 8: Proposed layout of the proposed re-modelling and expansion of the school

5. Legal Framework

APPLICABLE LEGISLATION AND GUIDELINES USED TO COMPILE THE REPORT	REFERENCE APPLIED
The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No. 108 of 1996)	
The National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998)	Section 24
The National Water Act (Act No. 36 of 1998)	
Air Quality Act (Act No. 39 of 2004)	-
National Forests Act, Act of 84 of 1998	-
The National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999)	Section 38, 34, 35, 36
Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act (Act No. 85 of 1983)	
Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (Act No. 28 of 2002)	
The National Water Act (Act No. 36 of 1998);	
Mine Health and Safety Act (Act No. 29 of 1996) (MHSA)	
Biodiversity Act (Act 10 of 2004)	
Sedibeng District Municipality (IDP) 2006 – 2007 & 2017 – 2021	Various sections

Table 3: Legal framework

In terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) according to the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and 2014 EIA regulations (as amended), the following apply:

Listing Notice	Activities
1	12
3	14
3	23

- Section 38 of the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) stipulates that the following activities trigger a heritage survey:

Development criteria in terms of Section 38(1a-e) of the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999)	Yes/No
Construction of road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other linear form of development or barrier exceeding 300m in length	Yes
Construction of bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length	No
Development exceeding 5000 m ² in extent	No
Development involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions	No
Development involving three or more erven or divisions that have been consolidated within past five years	No
Rezoning of site exceeding 10 000 m ²	No
Any other development category, public open space, squares, parks, recreation grounds	No

Table 4: Activities that trigger Section 38 of the NHRA

- Field rating system as recommended by SAHRA:

Field Rating	Grade	Significance	Recommended Mitigation
National Significance	Grade I	High significance	Conservation by SAHRA, national site nomination, mention any relevant international ranking. No alteration whatsoever without permit from SAHRA.
Provincial Significance	Grade II	High significance	Conservation by provincial heritage authority, provincial site nomination. No alteration whatsoever without permit from provincial heritage authority.
Local Significance	Grade III-A	High significance	Conservation by local authority, no alteration whatsoever without permit from provincial heritage authority. Mitigation as part of development not process advised.
Local Significance	Grade III-B	High significance	Conservation by local authority, no external alteration without permit from provincial heritage authority. Could be mitigated and (part) retained as heritage register site.
Generally Protected A	Grade IV-A	High/medium significance	Conservation by local authority. Site should be mitigated before destruction. Destruction permit required from provincial heritage authority.
Generally Protected B	Grade IV-B	Medium significance	Conservation by local authority. Site should be recorded before destruction. Destruction permit required from provincial heritage authority.
Generally Protected C	Grade IV-C	Low significance	Conservation by local authority. Site has been sufficiently recorded in the Phase 1 HIA. It requires no further recording before destruction. Destruction permit required from provincial heritage authority.

Table 5: Field rating system to determine site significance

- Heritage resources have lasting value in their own right and provide evidence of the origins of South African society and they are valuable, finite, non-renewable and irreplaceable.
- All archaeological remains, features, structures and artefacts older than 100 years and historic structures older than 60 years are protected by the relevant legislation, in this case the **National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (Act No. 25 of 1999, Section 34 & 35)**. The Act makes an archaeological impact assessment as part of an EIA and EMPR mandatory (see **Section 38**). No archaeological artefact, assemblage or settlement (site) may be moved or destroyed without the necessary approval from the **South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)**. Full cognisance is taken of this Act in making recommendations in this report.

- Cognisance will also be taken of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (Act No 28 of 2002) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 107 of 1998) when making any recommendations.
- Human remains older than 60 years are protected by the NHRA, with reference to Section 36. Human remains that are less than 60 years old are protected by the Regulations Relating to the Management of Human Remains (GNR 363 of 22 May 2013) made in terms of the National Health Act No. 61 of 2003 as well as local Ordinances and regulations.
- With reference to the evaluation of sites, the certainty of prediction is definite, unless stated otherwise.
- The guidelines as provided by the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) in Section 3, with special reference to subsection 3, and the Australian ICOMOS (International Council on Monuments and Sites) Charter (also known as the Burra Charter) are used when determining the cultural significance or other special value of archaeological or historical sites.
- A copy of this report will be submitted on SAHRIS as stipulated by the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 38 (especially subsection 4) and the relevant Provincial Heritage Resources Authority (PHRA).
- Note that the final decision for the approval of permits, or the removal or destruction of sites, structures and artefacts identified in this report, rests with the SAHRA (or relevant PHRA).

6. Study Approach/Methodology

Geographical information (KML and shapefiles) on the proposed prospecting activities was supplied by GKM Consulting. The most up-to-date Google Earth images and topographic maps were used to indicate the survey area. Topographic maps were sources from the Surveyor General. Please note that all maps are orientated with north facing upwards (unless stated otherwise).

6.1 Review of existing information/data

Additional information on the cultural heritage of the area was sourced from the following records:

- National Mapping Project by SAHRA (which lists heritage impact assessment reports submitted for South Africa);
- Environmental Potential Atlas (ENPAT);
- Online SAHRIS database;
- National Automated Archival Information retrieval System (NAAIRS);
- Maps and information documents supplied by the client; and
- Several heritage surveys have been conducted in the vicinity of the survey area (published and unpublished material) on the area (Coetzee 2008).

Although the general area near the Vaal River has been severely utilised over the millennia and more intensely during the last few centuries, the focus here is specifically on the

skirmishes and movement of soldiers during the South African War (Anglo-Boer War) (1899-1902).

An overall northern march of the British forces from the Free State to Pretoria started early May 1900. It seems that on 24 May 1900 Lord Roberts gave orders to Generals French and Hamilton to cross the Vaal River near Parys. The cavalry of General French crossed at Ou Viljoensdrif at the confluence of the Kromelmspruit and the Vaal River. His cavalry safely guarded the northern banks of the river which made it possible to bring over the rest of his column at Lindequesdrif. The strength of this position on the northern banks of the Vaal River enabled General French to provide cover for the crossing of General Hamilton at a drift on the farm Wonderwater (Breytenbach 1983:517-518).




Figure 9: Northern march of General French of the British Forces (red dots on the left, river crossing at the red square) (after Breytenbach 1983)




Figure 10: The survey area as indicated on the 1:50 000 topographic map 2627DA (1945)




Figure 11: The location of known sites in the region according to the SAHRIS system (2018)




Figure 12: Jeppe's Map dating to 1899 indicates the general location of the farm




Figure 13: War Office Map indicating the location of the survey area north of Pretoria in 1899

The Surveyor General's map of the farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ confirms that the farm was first surveyed in 1894 and the Deed of Transfer was in the name of J.J. du Plessis (934/1894) and was again surveyed in 1927 (also see Addendum 2).

7. Recommendations and Conclusions

The site of the Ramosukula Secondary School has already been extensively developed and consists of various buildings and associated infrastructure. The site is bordered by a dirt road and several agricultural fields. Although no known archaeological and historical sites were noted in the historical maps and literature there is still the possibility of graves, especially located in the southern portion of the development (overgrown with trees). However the 2004 Google Earth image clearly indicates that the whole southern section was cleared, making the probability of any heritage site extremely low.

It is therefore recommended that a heritage site survey will not be required and that the development be exempt from a Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA).

Also, please note:

Archaeological deposits usually occur below ground level. Should archaeological artefacts or skeletal material be revealed in the area during development activities, such activities should

be halted, and a university or museum notified in order for an investigation and evaluation of the find(s) to take place (*cf.* NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 36 (6)).

8. References

Breytenbach, J. H. 1983. Die Geskiedenis van die Tweede Vryheidsoorlog in Suid-Afrika, 1899-1902: Deel V: Die Britse Opmars tot in Pretoria. Pretoria: The Government Printer.

Coetzee, F.P. 2008. Cultural Heritage Survey of the Proposed Goosebay Eco Estate situated on Portions 1 and 3 and a Remainder of the Farm Woodlands 407RD, Free State Province. Unpublished report.

Huffman, T. N. 2007. *Handbook to the Iron Age: the Archaeology of Pre-Colonial Farming Societies in Southern Africa*. University of KZN Press: Pietermaritzburg.

Jeppe, F. 1899. Jeppe's Map of the Transvaal. London: Edward Stanford.

Lombard, M., Wadley, L., Deacon, J., Wurz, S., Parsons, I., Mohapi, M., Swart, J. & Mitchell, P. 2012. South African and Lesotho Stone Age Sequence Update (I). *The South African Archaeological Bulletin*. Vol 67 (195): 123-144.

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

Mucina, L. & Rutherford, M.C. 2010. The Vegetation of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. *Strelitzia* 19. Pretoria: South African National Biodiversity Institute.

National Heritage Resources Act. Act No. 25 of 1999. Government Printer: Pretoria.

Ordnance Survey Office (Intelligence Division). 1899. Transvaal and Orange Free State: Vereeniging. War Office No. 1367. Southampton: War Office.

Office of the President. 27 November 1998. National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998). Government Gazette Vol 401 (19519). Pretoria: Government Printer.

Rasmussen, R.K. 1977. The Migrant Kingdom: Mzilikazi's Ndebele in South Africa. London: Rex Collins.

SAHRA, 2005. Minimum Standards for the Archaeological and the Palaeontological Components of Impact Assessment Reports, Draft version 1.4.

South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). Report Mapping Project. Version 1.0, 2009.

Tyson, P.D. 1992. The climate of the last 2000 years in Southern Africa. *The Holocene*. Vol. 2.

Other Sources

Google Earth Pro 2019 (Images: 2019)

<http://samilitaryhistory.org/vol041dp.html> (Accessed: June 2019)

National Archives (NAAIRS) (Accessed: June 2019)

SAHRIS Database. <http://www.sahra.org.za/sahris> (Accessed June 2019)

The Heritage Portal (www.heritageportal.co.za) (Accessed June 2019)

www.saexplorer.co.za (Accessed June 2019)

<https://www.cwgc.org> [Commonwealth War Grace Commission] (Accessed June 2019)

Addendum 1: Archaeological and Historical Sequence

The table provides a general overview of the chronological sequence of the archaeological periods in South Africa.

PERIOD	APPROXIMATE DATES
Earlier Stone Age	more than 2 million years ago to >200 000 years ago
Middle Stone Age	<300 000 years ago to >20 000 years ago
Later Stone Age (Includes hunter-gatherer rock art)	<40 000 years ago up to historical times in certain areas
Early Iron Age	c. AD 200 - c. AD 900
Middle Iron Age	c. AD 900 – c. AD 1300
Late Iron Age (Stonewalled sites)	c. AD 1300 - c. AD 1840 (c. AD 1640 - c. AD 1840)

< = less than; > = greater than

Archaeological Context

Stone Age Sequence

Concentrations of Early Stone Age (ESA) sites are usually present on the flood-plains of perennial rivers and may date to over 2 million years ago. These ESA open sites may contain scatters of stone tools and manufacturing debris and secondly, large concentrated deposits ranging from pebble tool choppers to core tools such as handaxes and cleavers. The earliest hominins who made these stone tools, probably not always actively hunted, instead relying on the opportunistic scavenging of meat from carnivore kill sites.

Middle Stone Age (MSA) sites also occur on flood plains, but are also associated with caves and rock shelters (overhangs). Sites usually consist of large concentrations of knapped stone flakes such as scrapers, points and blades and associated manufacturing debris. Tools may have been hafted but organic materials, such as those used in hafting, seldom preserve. Limited drive-hunting activities are also associated with this period.

Sites dating to the Later Stone Age (LSA) are better preserved in rock shelters, although open sites with scatters of mainly stone tools can occur. Well-protected deposits in shelters allow for stable conditions that result in the preservation of organic materials such as wood, bone, hearths, ostrich eggshell beads and even bedding material. By using San (Bushman) ethnographic data a better understanding of this period is possible. South African rock art is also associated with the LSA.

The following chronological sequence was recently established by prominent Stone Age archaeologists (Lombard et al 2012):

Later Stone Age

- Age Range: recent to 20-40 thousand years ago

- General characteristics: expect variability between assemblages, a wide range of formal tools, particularly scrapers (microlithic and macrolithic), backed artefacts, evidence of hafted stone and bone tools, borers, bored stones, upper and lower grindstones, grooved stones, ostrich eggshell (OES) beads and other ornaments, undecorated/decorated OES fragments, flasks/flask fragments, bone tools (sometimes with decoration), fishing equipment, rock art, and ceramics in the final phase.
 - **Ceramic or Final Later Stone Age**
 - Generally < 2 thousand years ago
 - MIS 1
 - Contemporaneous with, and broadly similar to, final Later Stone Age, but includes ceramics
 - Economy may be associated with hunter-gatherers or herders

Technological characteristics

- Stone tool assemblages are often microlithic
- In some areas they are dominated by long end scrapers and few backed microliths; in others formal tools are absent or rare
- Grindstones are common, ground stone artefacts, stone bowls and boat-shaped grinding grooves may occur
- Includes grit- or grass-tempered pottery
- Ceramics can be coarse, or well-fired and thin-walled; some times with lugs, spouts and conical bases; sometimes with decoration; sometimes shaped as bowls
- Ochre is common
- Ostrich eggshell (OES) is common
- Metal objects, glass beads and glass artefacts also occur
- **Final Later Stone Age**
 - 100 – 4000 years ago
 - MIS 1
 - Hunter-gatherer economy

Technological characteristics

- Much variability can be expected
- Variants include macrolithic (similar to Smithfield [Sampson 1974]) and/or microlithic (similar to Wilton) assemblages
- Assemblages are mostly informal (Smithfield)
- Often characterised by large untrimmed flakes (Smithfield)
- Sometimes microlithic with scrapers, blades and bladelets, backed tools and adzes (Wilton-like)
- Worked bone is common
- OES is common
- Ochre is common
- Iron objects are rare
- Ceramics are absent
- **Wilton**
 - 4000 – 8000 years ago
 - MIS 1

- At some sites continues into the final Later Stone Age as regional variants (e.g. Wilton Large Rock Shelter and Cave James)

Technological characteristics

- Fully developed microlithic tradition with numerous formal tools
 - Highly standardised backed microliths and small convex scrapers (for definition of standardisation see Eerkens & Bettinger 2001)
 - OES is common
 - Ochre is common
 - Bone, shell and wooden artefacts occur
- **Oakhurst**
 - 7000 – 12 000 years ago
 - MIS 1
 - Includes Albany, Lockshoek and Kuruman as regional variants

Technological characteristics

- Flake based industry
 - Characterised by round, end, and D-shaped scrapers and adzes
 - Wide range of polished bone tools
 - Few or no microliths
- **Robberg**
 - 12 000 to 18 000 years ago
 - MIS 2

Technological characteristics

- Characterised by systematic bladelet (<26mm) production and the occurrence of outils ecailles or scaled pieces
 - Significant numbers of unretouched bladelets and bladelet cores
 - Few formal tools
 - Some sites have significant macrolithic elements
- **Early Late Stone Age**
 - 18 000 – 40 000 years ago
 - MIS 2-3
 - Informal designation
 - Also known as transitional MSA-LSA
 - Overlapping in time with final Middle Stone Age

Technological Characteristics

- Characterised by unstandardised, often microlithic, pieces and includes the bipolar technique
- Described at some sites, but not always clear whether assemblages represent a real archaeological phase or a mixture of LSA/MSA artefacts

Middle Stone Age

- Age Range: 20 000 – 30 000 years ago

- General characteristics: Levallois or prepared core techniques (for definitions see Van Peer 1992; Boeda 1995; Pleurdeau 2005) occur in which triangular flakes with convergent dorsal scars, often with faceted striking platforms, are produced. Discoidal systems (for definition see Inizan et al. 1999) and intentional blade production from volumetric cores (for definition see Pleurdeau 2005) also occur; formal tools may include unifacially and bifacially retouched points, backed artefacts, scrapers, and denticulates (for definition see Bisson 2000); evidence of hafted tools; occasionally includes marine shell beads, bone points, engraved ochre nodules, engraved OES fragments, engraved bone fragments, and grindstones.
- In the sequence below we highlight differences or characteristics that may be used to refine interpretations depending on context.
- **Final Middle Stone Age**
 - 20 000 – 40 000 years ago
 - MIS 3
 - Informal designation partly based on the Sibudu sequence

Technological characteristics

- Characterised by high regional variability that may include, e.g. bifacial tools, bifacially retouched points, hollow-based points
- Triangular flake and blade industries (similar to Strathalan and Melikane)
- Small bifacial and unifacial points (similar to Sibudu and Rose Cottage Cave)
- Sibudu point characteristics: short, stout, lighter in mass compared to points from the Sibudu technocomplex, but heavier than those from the Still Bay
- Can be microlithic
- Can include bipolar technology
- Could include backed geometric shapes such as segments, as well as side scrapers

Sibudu

- 45 000 – 58 000 years ago
- MIS 3
- Previously published as informal late Middle Stone Age and post-Howieson's Poort at Sibudu
- Formerly known post-Howieson's Poort, MSA 3 generally, and MSA III at Klasies River

Technological characteristics

- Most points are produced using Levallois technique
- Most formal retouch aimed at producing unifacial points
- Sibudu unifacial point (type fossil) characteristics: faceted platform; shape is somewhat elongated with a mean length of 43.9 mm), a mean breadth of 26.8 mm and mean thickness of 8.8 mm (L/B ratio 1.7); their mean mass is 11.8 g (Mohapi, 2012)
- Some plain butts
- Rare bifacially retouched points
- Some side scrapers are present
- Backed pieces are rare
- **Howieson's Poort**
 - 58 000 – 66 000 years ago
 - MIS 3-4

Technological characteristics

- Characterised by blade technology
- Includes small (<4 cm) backed tools, e.g. segments, scrapers, trapezes and backed blades
- Some denticulate blades
- Pointed forms are rare or absent
- **Still Bay**
 - 70 000 – 77 000 years ago
 - MIS 4-5a

Technological characteristics

- Characterised by thin (<10 mm), bifacially worked foliate or lanceolate points
- Semi-circular or wide-angled pointed butts
- Could include blades and finely serrated points (Lombard et al. 2010)
- **Pre-Still Bay**
 - 72 000 – 96 000 years ago
 - MIS 4-5

Technological characteristics

- Characteristics currently being determined / studied
- **Mossel Bay**
 - 77 000 to —105 000 years ago
 - MIS 5a-4
 - Also known as MSA II at Klasies River or MSA 2b generally

Technological characteristics

- Characterised by recurrent unipolar Levallois point and blade reduction
- Products have straight profiles; percussion bulbs are prominent and often splintered or ring-cracked
- Formal retouch is infrequent and restricted to sharpening the tip or shaping the butt
- **Klasies River**
 - 105 000 to —130 000 years ago
 - MIS 5d-5e
 - Also referred to as MSA I at Klasies River or MSA 2a generally

Technological characteristics

- Recurrent blade and convergent flake production
- End products are elongated and relatively thin, often with curved profiles
- Platforms are often small with diffused bulbs
- Low frequencies of retouch
- Denticulate pieces
- **Early Middle Stone Age**
 - Suggested age MIS 6 to MIS 8 (130 000 to —300 000 years ago)
 - Informal designation

Technological characteristics

- This phase needs future clarification regarding the designation of cultural material and sequencing
- Includes discoidal and Levallois flake technologies, blades from volumetric cores and a generalised toolkit
- **Earlier Stone Age**
 - Age range: >200 000 to 2 000 000 years ago
 - General characteristics: early stages include simple flakes struck from cobbles, core and pebble tools; later stages include intentionally shaped handaxes, cleavers and picks; final or transitional stages have tools that are smaller than the preceding stages and include large blades.
 - In the sequence below we highlight differences or characteristics that may be used to refine interpretations depending on context.
- **ESA-MSA transition**
- 200 to —600 thousand years ago
- MIS 7-15

Technological characteristics

- Described at some sites as Fauresmith or Sangoan
- Relationships, descriptions, issues of mixing and ages yet to be clarified
- Fauresmith assemblages have large blades, points, Levallois technology, and the remaining ESA components have small bifaces
- The Sangoan contains small bifaces (<100 mm), picks, heavy and light-duty denticulated and notched scrapers
- The Sangoan is less well described than the Fauresmith
- **Acheulean**
 - 300 thousand to —1.5 million years ago
 - MIS 8-50

Technological characteristics

- Bifacially worked handaxes and cleavers, large flakes > 10 cm
- Some flakes with deliberate retouch, sometimes classified as scrapers
- Gives impression of being deliberately shaped, but could indicate result of knapping strategy
- Sometimes shows core preparation
- Generally found in disturbed open-air locations
- **Oldowan**
 - 1.5 to >2 million years ago
 - MIS 50-75

Technological characteristics

- Cobble, core or flake tools with little retouch and no flaking to predetermined patterns
- Hammerstones, manuports, cores
- Polished bone fragments/tools

Iron Age Sequence

In the northern regions of South Africa at least three settlement phases have been distinguished for early prehistoric agropastoralist settlements during the **Early Iron Age** (EIA). Diagnostic pottery assemblages can be used to infer group identities and to trace movements across the landscape. The first phase of the Early Iron Age, known as **Happy Rest** (named after the site where the ceramics were first identified), is representative of the Western Stream of migrations, and dates to AD 400 - AD 600. The second phase of **Diamant** is dated to AD 600 - AD 900 and was first recognized at the eponymous site of Diamant in the western Waterberg. The third phase, characterised by herringbone-decorated pottery of the **Eiland** tradition, is regarded as the final expression of the Early Iron Age (EIA) and occurs over large parts of the North West Province, Northern Province, Gauteng and Mpumalanga. This phase has been dated to about AD 900 - AD 1200. These sites are usually located on low-lying spurs close to water.

The Late Iron Age (LIA) settlements are characterised by stone-walled enclosures situated on defensive hilltops c. AD 1640 - AD 1830). This occupation phase has been linked to the arrival of ancestral Northern Sotho, Tswana and Ndebele (Nguni-speakers) in the northern regions of South Africa with associated sites dating between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries AD. The terminal LIA is represented by late 18th/early 19th century settlements with multichrome Moloko pottery commonly attributed to the Sotho-Tswana. These settlements can in many instances be correlated with oral traditions on population movements during which African farming communities sought refuge in mountainous regions during the processes of disruption in the northern interior of South Africa, resulting from the so-called difaqane (or mfecane).

Sites that were identified during the survey are archaeological sites dated to the later (stone walled) phase of the Late Iron Age (c. AD 1640 - AD 1830s) also known as the Late Moloko. These sites all conform to a general settlement layout that forms part of a certain worldview. As such, the livestock enclosures are situated in the central area of a settlement. The court (kgotla) is also located in this central area and is associated with men (men are usually also buried here). The surrounding scalloped walling is where the houses are situated and is associated with women. This type of settlement layout is generally known as the Central Cattle Pattern (CCP).

Ethno-historical Context

Difaqane (mfecane)

The period of upheaval known as the Difaqane (Mfecane) had widespread implications for the northern interior of South Africa. Mzilikazi, one of the generals of King Shaka of the Zulu kingdom left KwaZulu-Natal in 1820 and took his Khumalo clan north-westward on a journey which changed the face of the South African interior. He first reached to Pedi people north of the Olifants and Steelpoort Rivers and took over their land. A year later and after a lengthy sojourn the group arrived at the slopes of the Magaliesberg Mountains in the Pretoria area in about 1827. Mzilikazi established two military kraal or capitals. The one was situated on the Apies River called enDinaneni which was situated north-west of Pretoria on the road to Hartebeespoort Dam and enKungweni which was built along the Daspoort range of hills.

His main residence was on the south side of Meintjieskop, but he later moved to the north of the Magaliesberg Mountains, to a place named emHlahlandlela. This aggressive occupation of the land forced the local Ndebele (Ndzundza) groups to scatter and hide in mountainous

areas. Later during the 1830s Mzilikazi moved further west to establish a capital at Gabeni, north of Zeerust where he subjugated various Sotho Tswana groups in the area. His power was only challenged in 1837 by a combined Boer, Tswana and Griqua force. Mzilikazi later migrated into Zimbabwe and established his next capital, Bulawayo (Rasmussen 1977).




Figure 14: The location of the major spheres of influence of Mzilikazi from the early 1820s to late 1830s




Figure 15: Movement of Mzilikazi's warriors relative to the survey area north of Brits (after Bergh 1998)

Addendum 2: Surveyor General Farm Diagram




Figure 16: Surveyor General's sketch of the farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ when it was surveyed in 1927




Figure 17: Surveyor General's sketch of the farm Zeekoefontein 573 IQ which was first surveyed in 1894

Addendum 3: Relocation of Graves

Marked graves younger than 60 years do not fall under the protection of the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) with the result that exhumation, relocation and reburial can be conducted by an undertaker. This will include logistical aspects such as social consultation, purchasing of plots in cemeteries, procurement of coffins, etc. Other legislative measures which may be pertinent include the Removal of Graves and Dead Bodies Ordinance (Ordinance No. 7 of 1925), Regulations Relating to the Management of Human Remains (GNR 363 of 22 May 2013) made in terms of the National Health Act No. 61 of 2003, Ordinance on Exhumations (Ordinance No. 12 of 1980) as well as any local and regional provisions, laws and by-laws that may be in place.

Marked graves older than 60 years are protected by the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999) and as a result an archaeologist must be in attendance to assist with the exhumation and documentation of the graves. Note that unmarked graves are by default regarded as older than 60 years and therefore also falls under the NHRA (Act No. 25 of 1999, Section 36).

The relocation of graves entails the following procedure:

- Notices of intent to relocate the graves must be put up at the burial site for a period of 60 days. This should contain contact information where communities and family members can register as interested and affected parties. All information pertaining to the identification of the graves must be documented for the application of a SAHRA permit. All notices must be in at least 3 languages, of which English is one. This is a requirement by law.
- These notices of intention must also be placed in at least two local newspapers and have the same information as above.
- Local radio stations can also be used to try contact family members. This is not required by law, but can be helpful.
- During this time (60 days) a suitable cemetery must be identified near to the development or otherwise one specified by the family of the deceased.
- An open day for family members should be arranged after the period of 60 days so that they can gather to discuss the way forward, and to sort out any problems. The developer needs to take the families requirements into account.
- Once the 60 days have passed and all the information from the family members have been received, a permit can be requested from SAHRA. This is a requirement by law.
- Once the permit has been issued, the graves may be exhumed and relocated.
- All headstones must be relocated with the graves as well as any remains and any additional objects found in the grave.

Information needed for the SAHRA permit application

- The permit application must be done by an archaeologist.
- A map of the area where the graves have been located.
- A survey report of the area prepared by an archaeologist.
- All the information on the families that have identified graves.
- A letter of permission from the landowner granting permission to the developer to exhume and relocate the graves.
- A letter (or proof of purchase of the plots) from the new cemetery confirming that the graves will be reburied there.

- Details of the farm name and number, magisterial district and GPS coordinates of the gravesite.

Graves are generally be classified into four categories. These are:

- Graves younger than 60 years;
- Graves older than 60 years, but younger than 100 years;
- Graves older than 100 years; and
- Graves of victims of conflict or of individuals of royal descent.