One World, Many Knowledges

Tar Halvorsen, Peter Vale

Published by African Books Collective

Halvorsen, Tar and Peter Vale.
One World, Many Knowledges: Regional experiences and cross-regional links in higher education.

African Books Collective, 2016.
Project MUSE.muse.jhu.edu/book/46096.

➡ For additional information about this book

https://muse.jhu.edu/book/46096

Tradition and modernity: the inclusion and exclusion of traditional voices and other local actors in archaeological heritage management in Mozambique and Zimbabwe

Albino Jopela, Ancila Nhamo and Seke Katsamudanga

The issue of community participation has taken centre stage in the management of cultural heritage since the early 2000s. All over the world, efforts are being made to involve local stakeholders in maintaining and conserving aspects of cultural heritage. Local stakeholders include traditional custodians, such as chiefs and spirit mediums, as well as other community members who may have a variety of interests in preserving an area's cultural heritage. Similarly, there have been calls to reintroduce traditional management systems, that is, methods of looking after heritage sites that were employed before the advent of colonialism (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Chirikure et al. 2010; Maradze 2003; Ndoro 2003; Pwiti 1996; Sullivan 2003). These methods were previously excluded in favour of what were seen as 'scientific' or formal methods of managing and conserving heritage. There is a growing awareness that these more modern methods have not led to the effective management of heritage sites, and that many communities maintain traditional custodianship systems which have worked effectively to ensure respect for and the survival of sites of cultural heritage (Joffroy 2005; Ndoro 2001b; Pwiti and Ndoro 1999).

In Africa, especially, traditional management systems have preserved sites of cultural significance since time immemorial. Cultural, religious and traditional belief systems (and traditional leaders) have ensured the survival of many archaeological sites (Mumma 2005; Ndoro 2006). Many of these sites, for example mountains, caves and crevices, are still used for rain-control ceremonies, or are spiritual areas where ancestors are buried. Taboos that

regulate and restrict access to such sites are strictly enforced by traditional, political and religious authorities. The active engagement of communities living with archaeological sites is evident in southern Africa at places such as Domboshava and Silozwane in Zimbabwe (Pwiti and Mvenge 1996), Tsodilo Hills in Botswana (Thebe 2006), Kondoa-Irangi in Tanzania (Bwasiri 2011; Kessey 1995), Chongoni in Malawi (Ndoro 2006) as well as Chinhamapere in Mozambique (Jopela 2006; Nhamo et al. 2007; Sætersdal 2004).

The formal management of heritage sites imbued with sacred significance has led to conflicts between local communities and heritage-management institutions across the region (Taruvinga and Ndoro 2003). The dilemmas associated with managing such sites have been discussed from different perspectives by a number of scholars since the mid-1990s (see Katsamudanga 2003; Maradze 2003; Ndoro 2001b, 2003; Pwiti and Mvenge 1996; Pwiti et al. 2007). Despite growing awareness of the important role of local communities in the active management and use of sites, formally trained heritage managers often criticise the traditional use of heritage resources as potentially having a negative impact on such sites. Several scholars have argued that this view stems mainly from the rigid heritage policies inherited from the colonial period, which did not allow for inclusion of people other than heritage professionals in the conservation of heritage sites (see Pwiti and Ndoro 1999; Ndoro and Pwiti 2005; Ndlovu 2009).

As a result, heritage professionals have faced incessant opposition from local communities who live with heritage sites. These professionals have been accused of:

- protecting only those aspects of heritage sites that heritage managers consider important and, in most cases, excluding the intangible aspects of heritage, that is, their spiritual or cultural significance;
- presenting heritage resources in a lingo that is familiar (and thus only accessible) to those within the profession;
- dwelling on issues that may not be of interest to the wider public;
- involving local communities in very limited ways if at all; and
- failing to address development issues that are, at times, more important and more relevant to the concerned communities.
- It has been acknowledged that, at times, the aspirations of heritage managers and archaeologists, as well as some of the research and management practices of the past, have been at variance with community interests (Chirikure et al. 2010; Marshall 2002; Smith 2004). On the other hand, the limited resources and capacities of formal heritage organisations, and the failure of their strategies to conserve cultural heritage, has led

scholars and heritage practitioners to recognise that state-based or formal heritage management systems are incapable of ensuring the effective and sustainable management of archaeological heritage on their own (Mumma 2003).

Since numerous communities throughout Africa still use traditional mechanisms to ensure that culturally significant places are respected (Jopela 2006; Ndoro 2003; Sheridan and Nyamweru 2008), the inclusion of traditional systems is increasingly considered a solution to many of the problems facing heritage managers across the continent, especially in relation to the prevention of vandalism and the resolution of conflicts with local communities (Macamo 1996; Maradze 2003; Ndoro and Pwiti 2001; Nhamo 2009). However, as in Chirikure and Pwiti's (2008) discussion of community archaeology, most advocates of this approach do not look critically at the problems such approaches might introduce into the management of cultural sites. Although we do not contest the potential for traditional approaches to function effectively as community-based management systems, we question whether traditional systems *alone* can effectively protect archaeological sites in Africa today. Using archaeological sites in western Mozambique and Zimbabwe, this chapter interrogates some examples of the inclusion of traditional management systems in managing archaeological sites

Traditional systems and heritage management in Mozambique and Zimbabwe

The emergence of colonialism in Africa brought with it new and foreign political, social and economic systems that led to the transformation of indigenous cultures (Mamdani 1996). In the political arena, the colonialists brought the concept of a nation, where all people within a defined geographical boundary identify themselves as part of a nation, regardless of their totems, clans, religions or traditional polities. In both western Mozambique and Zimbabwe, this was quite contrary to the traditional political systems, where different areas fell under different hierarchical leaders. Each area had its own paramount chief (*Mambo*), headmen (*Sadunhu*) and village headmen (*Sabhuku*). Initially, the colonial rulers had little use for these structures but invoked them when they became useful (in enforcing tax collection, for example). Most colonial systems involved well-structured central governments with ministers of local government, as well as provincial and district administrators, to oversee local political processes. Although the offices of the traditional leaders were maintained, the individual leaders had

to be endorsed by the colonial district, provincial and national administration, or they would not be recognised.

In Mozambique, the Portuguese, like other colonising powers, attempted to co-opt and employ the traditional authorities to administer on their behalf. The traditional authorities were framed as indigenous authorities (*autoridade gentílica*) and centred on *régulos* (chiefs or village headmen). To some extent, these chiefs functioned as auxiliaries to colonial rule and as intermediaries between the colonial government and rural communities (Kyed 2007; Lundin and Machava 1995). Traditional authorities thus effectively became integrated into colonial political systems as government employees with very limited powers of attorney – a situation that has remained largely unchanged ever since (Bourdillon 1991). Thus, while some traditional leaders were integrated into the colonial administrations, traditional systems of governance were not recognised or included as part of formal civil-management frameworks. However, in the case of heritage management, it should be noted that traditional systems were not always entirely suppressed either (Jopela 2011).

Colonial institutions and legislation

In relation to the protection and management of cultural heritage sites, new institutions – such as Zimbabwe's (then Rhodesia's) Monuments Commission of 1936 and Historical Monuments Commission of 1958 – were constituted and mandated to look after the country's cultural heritage and the Monuments and Relics Act of 1936 was used to govern various aspects of conservation. In Mozambique, the earliest attempt of the Portuguese colonial authority to protect cultural heritage was through the adoption of Legislative Diploma 825 of 1943, which established a legal framework for the establishment of the National Commission for Monuments and Historic Relics in 1947. The Commission centred its efforts on the conservation of immovable heritage, and in this case, mostly Portuguese colonial monuments, such as churches and fortresses (Macamo 2006).

Thus, formal institutions and legislation took over the work that had previously been performed by traditional leaders, such as chiefs and spirit mediums. The institutions defined standards of acceptable conduct at cultural heritage sites and colonial legislation was used to enforce these standards. The laws prohibited the performance of certain cultural activities at these places, especially those that were proclaimed national monuments (a designation that protects sites of particular importance to a nation). All these structures and laws still exist today, albeit under new names; the Monuments Commission

of Rhodesia was renamed National Museums and Monuments of Rhodesia under Chapter 313 of the National Museums and Monuments Act of 1972. When Zimbabwe achieved independence, this institution became the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe, a mere replacement of the name Rhodesia with Zimbabwe. The legislation followed a similar trend in name changing with the most recent adjustment being a change in 1998 of the coding of the legislation from Chapter 313 to Act 25/11. However, in terms of defining and regulating the management of cultural heritage, the content of the legislation has remained unchanged since 1972.

Obviously, heritage legislation was preceded and succeeded by other laws on land ownership that appropriated land and alienated local populations from their land, as well as from sites of cultural heritage to which where they were attached. In Zimbabwe, laws such as the Land Apportionment Act of 1930 and the Land Tenure Act of 1959 were responsible for alienating indigenous people from their lands of origin and moving them to more marginal areas with poorer soils and lower rainfall. As Pwiti and Ndoro (1999) have pointed out, land alienation created both physical and spiritual distance between the local people and their cultural sites. This led to a gradual loss of knowledge about traditional activities and rituals associated with the sites. For many years these legal instruments also effectively suppressed traditional management systems at most cultural heritage sites. Although at some places, traditional custodians managed to sneak in to perform ceremonies and rituals (Pwiti and Mvenge 1996; Sinamai 2006), traditional systems were severely weakened.

The post-colonial period: revised legislation and a reversion to traditional practices

Most African countries inherited the hegemonic colonial systems of heritage management after the attainment of independence and these are still very much in control today (see Ndoro et al. 2008). Many of the restrictions that were put in place by colonial governments were adopted by the new nations. Mozambique did try to break with the colonial legal framework, however. In 1988, the Law for the Protection of the Cultural Heritage (10/88 of 1988) was adopted, and in 1994 the Bill on the Rules for the Protection of Archaeological Heritage (Decree 27/94) set out the principles and norms for carrying out archaeological work and for the conservation of archaeological objects, sites and monuments on national territory (Macamo and Sætersdal 2004). Unfortunately, this Bill largely overlooked issues concerning traditional or community-based management of cultural sites and did not go

far enough in integrating these into the post-colonial heritage framework in Mozambique (Jopela 2011).

However, it is important to acknowledge that although community participation has not yet been legislated, actual heritage-management practices have changed in many African countries. For example, since the later 1970s, heritage-management strategy in Mozambique has been broadened to include raising public awareness via community participation in the conservation of certain archaeological sites (Macamo 2003). For instance, by 1978, some four hundred people from local communities had participated in archaeological research and heritage-management projects at the Great Zimbabwe-type site of Manyikeni in south-central Mozambique. The following year a museum was opened at the site in an effort to make the archaeological remains more accessible to these communities, (Ndoro 2001a; Sinclair 2004).

Heritage management since the 1990s

In more recent years, both Mozambican and Zimbabwean governments have tried to restore the powers of the traditional authorities. Mozambique's first multiparty elections in 1994 symbolised the introduction of a new political order purporting to promote the decentralisation of power to the local level (Abrahamsson and Nilsson 1995; Lundin and Machava 1995). A broad study of decentralisation and traditional authority resulted in Mozambique's Decree 15/2000 of 2000 officially recognising traditional authorities – or as they have since been designated, community authorities (*autoridades comunitárias*) – as legitimate representatives of the rural communities. These community authorities can be traditional chiefs, religious leaders, civil-society leaders, village/ward secretaries (*bairro*), or other leaders recognised by the local community according to local traditions (Buur and Kyed 2006). The Decree provides for the extension of state apparatuses to these authorities by delegating to them state functions such as taxation, census/registration duties, law enforcement and policing, land allocation, road maintenance, health, education, as well as the implementation of local development plans including those related to environmental sustainability, employment and food security. The Decree and associated *regulamento* also obligate community authorities to uphold local customs and cultural values, and to participate in investigating and reviving forms of local traditional culture such as dances, cuisine, songs, music and ritual ceremonies (Buur and Kyed 2005).

Similarly, in Zimbabwe the government returned some powers to local chiefs and other traditional leaders with the enactment of the Traditional

Leaders Act 29/17 of 1998 and via amendments made to the Act in 1999, 2001 and 2003. The Act governs the conduct and duties of traditional leaders mandated with the task of reviving traditional value systems. The reinstatement of traditional systems in the management of cultural heritage coincided with the land redistribution programme in the late 1990s and early 2000s whereby the government promised to redress the distortions created by colonialism and to return ancestral lands to their traditional owners. This ushered in a new era in which local communities invaded commercial farms and other areas previously owned by white people in order to reclaim their ancestral lands. This was accompanied by a major drive to revive traditional ceremonies such as rainmaking rituals and rites to appease the ancestors. Some of these ceremonies were even funded by the government (Nhamo 2009).

However, this all took place after almost a hundred years of these traditions being subject to repression and suffocation through the alienation of land rights, the imposition of Western-style education and Christianity, and more recently the impact of urbanisation, globalisation and new technologies (Katsamudanga 2003). Looking critically at the upsurge of tradition, one has to pose a number of questions. For example, what is tradition? Who and what is really traditional? Can tradition transcend modern needs? These questions all have a bearing on how the management and use of cultural heritage should proceed in the new 'traditional' age, and the answers to these questions will help us to evaluate the appropriateness of calls for traditional management systems at cultural heritage sites.

Chinhamapere Hill in Mozambique

One example of the inclusion of communities in the management of a cultural heritage site in Mozambique comes from Chinhamapere Hill, a very prominent hill in the foothills of the Vumba Mountains, in the province of Manica on the border between Mozambique and Zimbabwe. The main site at Chinhamapere Hill relevant to this chapter is Chinhamapere I: a large rock-art panel situated just below the top of the hill (Nhamo et al. 2007; Sætersdal 2004). Surrounding all the archaeological sites on Chinhamapere Hill is a fairly dense savannah woodland that the local community see as an integral part of the sacred landscape, and value as a scarce resource for traditional ceremonies (Jopela 2006). As demonstrated elsewhere (Jopela 2010), the cosmology of the Shona-speaking communities in Manica is very supportive of environmental ethics. In other words, humans are seen as part of an interacting set of living elements in the landscape, and cultural values

(such as respect for humans, nature, and above all, for the ancestral spirits) enhance and promote the conservation of cultural and natural resources (see also Berkes et al. 2000; Nyathi and Ndiwini 2005).

The local traditional authority controls and effectively manages Chinhamapere and related places of cultural significance for the community. The political-traditional structures – led by a *Mambo* who is assisted by other leaders such as *Sabhuku* and *Svikiro* (a spirit medium) – are responsible for monitoring activities and behaviour at sacred sites and for making sure that local residents abide by the rules. For example, Mbuya Gondo, the spirit medium and traditional healer (*currandeira*) is responsible for conducting traditional ceremonies around Chinhamapere Hill. All visitors to Chinhamapere are directed to her and she performs rituals to obtain permission from the ancestral spirits for the visitors to enter the site. Furthermore, individuals and groups are not allowed to visit Chinhamapere or its environs without an official custodian or her appointee. Thus, when the octogenarian Gondo is unavailable to guide visitors herself, she empowers another member from the community to do so. This ensures strict adherence to the local cultural norms. The spirit medium has also contributed to the maintenance of the sacred forest by sensitising the community to the deforestation of the hill. This set-up testifies, to a certain extent, that traditional custodianship systems can be used effectively for ensuring the survival of cultural heritage (Jopela 2010).

Nharira Hills: a case from Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe the trek towards the incorporation of local stakeholders began in the 1980s when community traditions were integrated into interpretations of archaeological sites such as Domboshava and Great Zimbabwe. By the end of the last millennium, local communities were allowed to sell souvenirs and conduct other businesses at most archaeological sites that are open to the public in order to benefit economically from these resources. By 2010, community participation was considered part of good archaeological management, and some sites, such as Nharira Hills (a landscape sacred to the Nyamweda people) and Gomba valley (the headquarters of Charwe, the spirit medium of Nehanda), were left largely to the traditional authorities to manage (Chakanyuka 2007; Mataga 2003). These two sites have since been proclaimed national monuments on the basis of their intangible heritage. They are both under the strict control of spiritual leaders who strictly regulate access even for employees of the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe (Mataga 2003).

Concerns about community involvement in heritage management

Most people agree that traditional authorities and their management systems are important in the effective management of archaeological sites such as Chinhamapere. However, it is also true that such systems can lose their effectiveness in modern contexts. For instance, while Shona cosmology generally stresses the need to respect sacred sites and their surrounding areas, this belief system did not prevent the partial deforestation of the area around the Hill in the 1990s (DNPC 2003). In fact, in the immediate post-war period, the pressures on natural resources increased in many parts of Manica Province in Mozambique. Although local chiefs argued that damage to sacred forests would anger the spirits, bringing suffering to the culprits or to the entire community, this threat was not enough to deter desperate and destitute individuals who cut down trees to make charcoal and for other domestic uses, and whether the culprits and/or the community have really suffered as a result of tempering with sacred places has not been clearly proven. Thus, in scenarios of rapid demographic and economic change, traditional institutions may not necessarily be powerful enough to enforce traditional systems of conservation (Jopela 2011).

As already shown, it is undeniable that traditional management systems in many parts of Africa were suffocated by: the disruption caused by colonialism; the hegemony of rigid post-independence, state-based heritage polices and management systems; changes in the wider economic, social and cultural circumstances; and specific historical developments, such as land-reform measures, migrations, tourism, and globalisation (Cunningham 2001; Katsamudanga 2003; Milton 1996; Mumma 2003; Ndoro and Pwiti 2001). Although most people converted to Christianity, they also held on to some traditional beliefs, and traditional ways of life did not disappear entirely (Sheridan 2008). However, the contents of the traditions and the identities of traditional leaders are often contested. Even some of the chiefs and traditional leaders have only a vague idea of traditional systems. For example, during the reconstruction of Old Bulawayo (the first capital of King Lobengula) in Zimbabwe, traditional leaders argued that it would have been taboo to locate the entrances to traditional huts on the side alluded to by the archaeological evidence but they had to repudiate this later when it was discovered that the archaeological evidence was correct (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008).

Another example is Sekuru Mushore, a spirit medium who claims that his ancestors made the rock paintings found in the Nharira Hills. In academic circles, the paintings are generally regarded as products of the hunter-gatherer societies that populated the whole of the southern African sub-region from

the Zambezi River to the coastal areas of South Africa (Garlake 1987), that is, before the area was occupied by the Bantu ancestors of the Shona population to which Mushore belongs. The truth of Mushore's claims is thus open to debate. However, he also claimed spiritual knowledge of the painting technique and threatened to redo the fading paintings. Indeed, the works have since been repainted using very distinct oil paint,[1] probably by him but nobody knows for sure. This repainting is certainly contrary to the modern ethos of art conservation, and whether it could be considered traditional is also open to question. Thus, it is important to critically define the role of traditional spiritual leaders if we are to return the management and use of cultural heritage sites to them.

Tradition and modernity

Many traditional leaders today are influenced by modern ideals and aspirations. In Zimbabwe for example, Chakanyuka (2007) noted that, once traditional custodians take control of cultural heritage sites, they do not abide by traditional ways of life. At Domboshava, for example, the chief of the area permitted the destruction of the Rambakurimwa sacred forest, to pave the way for the building of a gazebo (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008). His argument had a very modern tone; he wanted to create jobs for his people. This was probably a noble thing to do but its implications for the call to return to traditional systems of managing cultural heritage must be considered.

Power dynamics

Traditional systems of governance operate within a socio-political hierarchy. However, factors such as the separation of powers and duties between the political and religious institutions; the ambition of traditional leaders to enhance their authority through controlling people and resources; and the monetary compensation derived from tasks ascribed to traditional structures, have given rise to political tensions between traditional authorities in Mozambique's Manica Province (Serra 2001). This tension, which may threaten the continuity of the traditional custodianship system responsible for the daily protection of the site, is best illustrated by the relationship between *Mambo* Chirara and *Swikiro* (spirit medium) Mbuya Gondo (the site custodian) over the control of Chinhamapere. Like other contested heritage sites, this example illustrates that the management of heritage is often inseparable from issues of power and ultimately from local and national politics. Places of cultural significance can function as manifestations of power, and all who need power, either to control a small community (or village) or a whole chieftaincy (or district),

turn to these places for legitimacy (Jopela 2011; Sinamai 2003). The power dynamics associated with the control over heritage resources are clearly part of local politics and are shaped by power relations amongst members of the community. Disputes between traditional authorities with regard to control of these places exposes the impact of the socio-economic and political factors on these institutions (that is, the increased integration of rural areas into the cash-based economy, the formal state recognition of traditional institutions and the various development pressures). Such changing environments have led some to suggest that traditional leaders are more concerned with re-acquiring powers and economic benefits, rather than with controlling access to and use of natural and cultural resources in ways that ensure their survival into the future (Jopela 2011).

A mixed blessing

Although there are problems with traditional systems, their inclusion in the management of heritage sites remains crucial. Formal management systems cannot effectively protect many aspects of heritage sites, and especially those that are of cultural significance to the communities living around them. In addition, most African countries cannot afford to formally manage all their heritage sites and thus continue to rely on traditional management systems. Even though, in the colonial and postcolonial periods, formal heritage management systems were often imposed on local communities in both Zimbabwe and Mozambique, traditional custodianship systems neither disappeared completely nor remained static. In many cases they shifted so as to remain relevant alongside new models of governance (Jopela 2011). Similarly, traditional custodianship systems exist in many parts of the continent, and local people use these to manage places that are culturally significant to them (Ndoro et al. 2008).

Indeed, traditional authorities, in their various different forms, have demonstrated remarkable levels of resilience. Although their influence varies from place to place, they are critical in areas where they are widely recognised, such as in many districts of Manica Province in Mozambique (Artur 1999; Tornimbeni 2005). Although socio-political factors, including the civil war and consequent population movements negatively affected the integrity of Chinhamapere to a certain extent, it is also true to say that traditional institutions ensured the survival of the Hill's sacred forest, and current practices testify to the survival of other valued aspects of the landscape (Jopela 2011). In fact, Macamo and Sætersdal (2004) point out that, with few exceptions, the absence of deliberate human impact (such as graffiti) on the

rock art site and its environs is a testament to community reverence for the archaeological remains.

Thus, although traditional systems and all that they encompass have many weaknesses and imperfections, they also seem to embody constructive strengths and still enjoy legitimacy in many communities (Logan 2008). Therefore any attempt to develop an improved management framework for archaeological sites must include a role for traditional leadership and institutions as part of, or alongside, formal methods, not because these authorities are inherently good, but because, where they exist and have legitimacy, they clearly and effectively enforce 'public authority' on the ground (Kyed 2007). Traditional systems will continue to undergo dynamic and evolutionary changes as factors such as migrations, civil war, and globalisation constantly incorporate new values into people's understanding of their spiritual, social and physical environment (Katsamudanga 2003). Ideally, therefore, there should always be mechanisms to ensure that these changes enhance the management and protection of heritage sites that fall under traditional custodianship.

Conclusions

In this chapter we aim to highlight the advantages and disadvantages of including various players in cultural heritage management in two different socio-political contexts. From the discussion, it is apparent that there is no easy way of ensuring the survival of heritage sites, especially those associated with sacred value systems. Although traditional mechanisms were deployed in the management of these sites before the advent of colonialism, the changes that have taken place since then may militate against their reconstitution at some sites. The loss of knowledge about these systems due to colonial upheavals, and the transformations in social, political and economic dimensions that the modern society has since undergone, need to be seriously considered. Rather than basing our assumptions on an idealised past, we need to consider how this loss of knowledge impacts on the management of heritage sites. We have to acknowledge the modern nature and the modern needs of traditional authorities.

In our view, the most promising way forward would be to incorporate both 'traditional' and 'modern' aspects of heritage management, choosing whichever works best in a particular context – a hybrid approach for our hybrid societies. This does not involve relinquishing all decision-making responsibility to local communities, but rather establishing participatory management systems. Such systems are defined as situations 'in which two or more social actors concerned

about a heritage site negotiate, define and guarantee among themselves a fair sharing of its management functions, entitlements and responsibilities' (Taruvinga 2007: 41). This approach recognises the different values, interests and concerns of all stakeholders, thereby allowing the whole community to assume important roles and responsibilities in heritage management. Where traditional systems of management work, as in the example of Chinhamapere rock art site, they should be complemented by modern laws which cater for errant modern members of society who do not respect such systems.

There is also a need to balance reality with people's aspirations. Communities in developing countries are often mainly interested in bread-and-butter issues; they need to ensure that they survive another day if they are to enjoy the benefits of the past. Clearly, archaeological heritage management needs to be beneficial in terms of communities' modern needs, and not only in terms of their traditional heritage. However, this should not be achieved at the expense of cultural heritage sites. The reality is that, in the modern globalised world, most of these sites now have value beyond the immediate community in which they are located. Modern structures should then monitor and intervene where traditional management systems may be detrimental to the wider preservation of cultural heritage. The case of Domboshava is a good example in that the destruction of the sacred Rambakurimwa forest affects a broad spectrum of people, both present and future.

The inclusion of stakeholders other than traditional chiefs and spiritual leaders is essential. For example, urban authorities and schools are crucial stakeholders as they have the potential to give modern urban dwellers, and young people, who may no longer be in contact with traditional authorities, a stake in archaeological heritage management. In Zimbabwe, an archaeological component has been incorporated into junior secondary and more advanced school syllabi. More needs to be done to equip teachers and provide relevant textbooks to ensure that schools effectively teach archaeology material. Other organisations, such as churches and urban cultural groupings, need to be included since they interact with the cultural heritage too.

Note
1   Observed by Ancila Nhamo, 31 July 2009.

References

Abrahamsson H and Nilsson A (1995) *Mozambique: The Troubled Transition from Socialist Construction to Free-Market Capitalism*. London: Zed Books.

Artur DR (1999) 'Estudo de Caso: Província de Manica', in: DR Artur, JC Cafuquiza and A Caso (eds) *Tradição e Modernidad: Que lugar para a Trdição Africana na Governação Descentralizada?* Maputo: PDD/MAE/DAL/GTZ/CIMISAU.

Berkes F, J Colding and C Folke (2000) 'Rediscovery of traditional ecological knowledge as adaptive management', *Ecological Applications* 10 (5): 1251–1262.

Bourdillon M (1991) *The Shona Peoples: An Ethnography of the Contemporary Shona, with Special Reference to their Religion* (third edition). Gweru: Mambo Press.

Buur L and HM Kyed (2005) *State Recognition of Traditional Authority in Mozambique. The Nexus of Community Representation and State Assistance*, Discussion Paper 28, Nordic Africa Institute, Uppsala, Sweden.

Buur, L and HM Kyed (2006) 'Contested sources of authority: Re-claiming state sovereignty and formalizing traditional authority in post-conflict Mozambique', *Development and Change* 37 (4): 847–869.

Bwasiri E (2011) 'The implications of the management of indigenous living heritage: The case study of the Mongomi wa Kolo Rock Paintings World Heritage Site, central Tanzania', *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 66 (193): 60–66.

Chakanyuka C (2007) Implications of 'Fast Track' Land Resettlement Programmes on Cultural Heritage in Zimbabwe. Master's dissertation, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.

Chirikure C and G Pwiti (2008) 'Community involvement in archaeology and cultural heritage management: An assessment from case studies in southern Africa and elsewhere', *Current Anthropology* 49 (3): 1–13.

Chirikure S, M Manyanga, W Ndoro and G Pwiti (2010) 'Unfulfilled promises? Heritage management and community participation at some of Africa's cultural heritage sites', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16 (1–2): 30–44.

Cunningham AB (2001) *Applied Ethnobotany: People, Wild Plant Uses and Conservation*. London: Earthscan.

(Direcção Nacional do Património Cultural) (2003). Rock Art Site Management Plan for Chinhamapere Cultural Heritage Site, Manica Province, Mozambique. Maputo.

Garlake P (1987) *The Painted Caves: An Introduction to the Prehistoric Rock Art of Zimbabwe*. Harare: Modus.

Joffroy T (ed.) (2005) *Traditional Conservation Practices in Africa.* Rome: ICCROM.

Jopela A (2006) Custódia Tradicional do Património Arqueológico na Província de Manica: Experiência e práticas sobre as pinturas rupestres no Distrito de Manica, 1943–2005. Bachelor of Arts dissertation, Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, Maputo.

Jopela A (2010) 'Traditional custodianship of rock art sites in central Mozambique: A case study from Manica District', *Studies in African Past* 8: 161–177.

Jopela A (2011) 'Traditional custodianship: A useful framework for heritage management in southern Africa?' *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 13 (2–3): 103–122.

Katsamudanga S (2003) 'The dilemma of preserving intangible heritage in Zimbabwe', paper presented to the Fourteenth General Assembly and Scientific Symposium of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), Victoria Falls, October 2003. Available online.

Kessey J (1995) 'Indigenous control of rock imagery in Tanzania', in G Ward and L Ward (eds) *Management of Rock Art Imagery,* Occasional Publication 9, Australian Rock Art Research Association, Melbourne.

Kyed MH (2007) State Recognition of Traditional Authority: Authority, Citizenship and State Formation in Rural Post-War Mozambique. PhD thesis, Roskilde University, Denmark.

Logan C (2008) *Traditional leaders in modern Africa: Can democracy and the chief co-exist?* Working Paper 93, Afrobarometer. Available online.

Lundin IB and J Machava (1995) 'Quadro de conclusões gerais sobre o debate das autoridades tradicionais', in IB Lundin and J Machava (eds) *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional*. Maputo: MAE.

Macamo S (1996) 'The problems of conservation on archaeological sites in Mozambique', in G Pwiti and R Soper (eds) *Aspects of African Archaeology: Papers from The Tenth Congress of the Pan African Association for Prehistory and Related Studies.* Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.

Macamo S (2003) 'Projectos SAREC e a participação das comunidades locais na pesquisa arqueológica: O caso do Distrito de Vilankulo, província de Inhambane, Moçambique', *Comunicação apresentada na Primeira Conferencia Nacional da OSSREA*. Maputo.

Macamo S (2006) Privileged places in south central Mozambique: The archaeology of Manyikene, Niamara Songo and Degue-Mufa, Studies in Global Archaeology 4, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Uppsala, Sweden and Universidade Eduardo Mondlane, Maputo.

Macamo S and T Sætersdal (2004) 'Archaeology and cultural heritage management in Mozambique: Some experiences and some future challenges', in T Oestigaard, N Anfinset and T Sætersdal (eds) *Combining the Past and the Present: Archaeological Perspectives on Society*. BAR International Series No. 1210 Oxford: Archaeopress.

Mamdani M (1996) *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Kampala: Fountain.

Maradze J (2003) 'Back to the Old School? Revival of traditional management systems in Zimbabwe', paper presented to the Fourteenth General Assembly and Scientific Symposium of the International Council on Monuments and Sites, Victoria Falls, October 2003.

Marshall Y (2002) 'What is community archaeology?' *World Archaeology* 34: 211–219.

Mataga J (2003) Managing the Intangible Heritage of Monuments and Sites in Zimbabwe: A case study of the National Museums and Monuments of Zimbabwe (NMMZ). Master's dissertation, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.

Milton K (1996) *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory. Exploring the Role of Anthropology in Environmental Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.

Mumma A (2003) 'Community-Based Legal Systems and the Management of World Heritage Sites', *World Heritage Papers* 13: 43–44.

Mumma A (2005) 'The link between traditional and formal legal systems', in W Ndoro and G Pwiti (eds) *Legal frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage in Africa*: 22–24. Rome: ICCROM.

Ndlovu N (2009) 'Access to rock art sites: A right or qualification?' *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 64 (189): 61–68.

Ndoro W (2001a) 'Heritage management in Africa', *The Getty Conservation Newsletter* 16 (3): 20–23.

Ndoro W (2001b) *Your Monument our Shrine: The preservation of Great Zimbabwe*. Studies in African Archaeology No. 19, Uppsala University, Sweden.

Ndoro W (2003) 'Traditional and customary heritage systems: Nostalgia or reality? The implication of managing heritage sites in Africa', *World Heritage Papers* 13: 81–84.

Ndoro W (2006) 'Building the capacity to protect rock art heritage in rural communities', in N Agnew and J Bridgland (eds) *Of the Past, for the Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Ndoro W and G Pwiti (2001) 'Heritage management in southern Africa: Local, national and international discourse', *Public Archaeology* 2 (1): 21–34.

Ndoro W and G Pwiti (eds) (2005) *Legal frameworks for the Protection of Immovable Cultural Heritage in Africa*. Rome: ICCROM.

Ndoro W, A Mumma and G Abungu (eds) (2008) *Cultural Heritage and the Law: Protecting Immovable Heritage in English Speaking Countries of Southern Africa*. ICCROM Conservation Studies No. 8. Rome: ICCROM.

Nhamo A, T Sætersdal and E Walderhaug (2007) 'Ancestral landscapes: Reporting on rock art in the border regions of Zimbabwe and Mozambique', *Zimbabwea* 9: 43–62.

Nhamo A (2009) 'From tradition to modernity and back: The use and abuse of cultural heritage in Zimbabwe's post-independence era', paper presented at the Second SANORD Conference on Inclusion and Exclusion in Higher Education, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa, 7–9 December.

Nyathi P and B Ndiwini (2005) 'A living religious shrine under siege: The Njelelle Shrine/King Mzilikazi's grave and conflicting demands on the Matopo Hills Area of Zimbabwe', in H Stovel, N Stanley-Price and R Killick (eds) *Conservation of Living Heritage*. ICCROM Conservation Studies Series, No. 3. Rome: ICCROM.

Pwiti G (1996) *Continuity and Change: An Archaeological Study of Farming Communities in Northern Zimbabwe AD 500–1700*. Studies in African Archaeology No. 13. Department of Archaeology, Uppsala University, Sweden.

Pwiti G and G Mvenge (1996) 'Archaeologists, tourists and rainmakers: Problems in the management in rock art sites in Zimbabwe. A case study of Domboshava national monument', in G Pwiti and R Soper (eds) *Aspects of African Archaeology*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.

Pwiti G and W Ndoro (1999) 'The legacy of colonialism: Perceptions of cultural heritage in southern Africa with specific reference to Zimbabwe', *African Archaeological Review* 16 (3): 143–153.

Pwiti G, A Nhamo, S Katsamudanga and A Segobye (2007) 'Makasva: Archaeological heritage, rainmaking and healing in southern Africa with special reference to eastern Zimbabwe', *Zimbabwea* 9: 103–111.

Sætersdal T (2004) Places, People and Ancestors: Archaeology and Society in Manica, Mozambique. PhD Thesis, University of Bergen.

Serra A (2001) *The legitimacy of local institutions for natural resource management: The case of Pindanganga, Mozambique*. Working paper 2, Marena Research Project, School of African and Asian Studies, University of Sussex and Centro de Experimentacao Florestal, Sussundenga, Mozambique.

Sheridan MJ (2008) 'The dynamics of African sacred groves: Ecological, social and symbolic processes', in M Sheridan and C Nyamweru (eds) *African Sacred Groves: Ecological Dynamics and Social Change*: Oxford, Athens, Pretoria: James Currey, Ohio University Press, UNISA Press.

Sheridan M and C Nyamweru (eds) (2008) *African Sacred Groves: Ecological Dynamics and Social Change*. Oxford, Athens, Pretoria: James Currey, Ohio University Press, UNISA Press.

Sinamai A (2003) 'Cultural shifting-sands: Changing meanings of Zimbabwe sites in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Botswana', paper presented at the Fourteenth General Assembly and Scientific Symposium of International Council on Monuments and Sites, Victoria Falls, October. Available online.

Sinamai A (2006) 'Nations and their past: Changing meanings of Zimbabwe sites in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Botswana', *Zimbabwea* 8: 31–41.

Sinclair PJ (2004) 'Archaeology and identity: Some examples from Southern Africa', in T Oestigaard, N Anfinset and T Sætersdal (eds) *Combining the Past and the Present: Archaeological Perspectives on Society*. BAR International Series No. 1210 Oxford: Archaeopress.

Smith L (2004) *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.

Sullivan S (2003) 'Local involvement and traditional practices in the World Heritage systems', *World Heritage Papers* 13: 49–55.

Taruvinga P and W Ndoro (2003) 'The vandalism of the Domboshava rock painting site, Zimbabwe: Some reflections on approaches to heritage management' *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites* 6 (1): 3–10.

Taruvinga P (2007) 'Community participation and rock art management in Zimbabwe', in J Deacon J (ed.) *African Rock Art: The Future of Africa's Past.* Nairobi: Trust for African Rock Art.

Thebe P (2006) 'Intangible heritage management: Does World Heritage listing help?' in N Agnew and J Bridgland (eds) *Of the Past, for the Future: Integrating Archaeology and Conservation*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute.

Tornimbeni C (2005) The state, labour migration and the transnational discourse: A historical perspective from Mozambique', *Vienna Journal of African Studies* 8: 1–17.