



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **Troubled Waters : developing a new approach to maritime and underwater cultural heritage in sub-Saharan Africa**

Sharfman, J.

### **Citation**

Sharfman, J. (2017, December 19). *Troubled Waters : developing a new approach to maritime and underwater cultural heritage in sub-Saharan Africa*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/59501>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/59501>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The following handle holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation:

<http://hdl.handle.net/1887/59501>

**Author:** Sharfman, J.

**Title:** Troubled Waters : developing a new approach to maritime and underwater cultural heritage in sub-Saharan Africa

**Issue Date:** 2017-12-19

## **Appendix I    Review of Legislation**

### **REVIEW OF LEGAL OBLIGATIONS IN THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT, 25 OF 1999, RELATING TO COMMERCIAL EXPLOITATION OF HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS.**

In 2008, the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) received queries regarding its refusal to issue permits for the commercial salvage of historic shipwrecks. These queries prompted SAHRA to re-examine the criteria for adjudicating permit applications in order to adhere to various legislative directives governing permitting decisions and in order to ensure that it did not open itself to possible legal challenges resulting from misapplication of legislation. Specifically, SAHRA needed to adhere to the requirements of National Heritage Resources Act, 25 of 1999 (NHRA) and its associated Regulations (Regulation No 6820). Also of relevance in this regard was the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, 2000 (PAJA).

### **BACKGROUND**

On 25 January 2007, a meeting to discuss objections to SAHRA's Shipwreck Policy was held between The South African Heritage Resources Agency, the Department of Arts and Culture and interested public parties. The primary objection to the Policy was that it did not allow for the consideration of permit applications by the SAHRA Permit Committee if those applications proposed a commercial component to projects. Because the Policy could be legally interpreted to be in conflict with the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (NHRA), the SAHRA CEO agreed that, subject to Council approval, it would be repealed. The matter was subsequently discussed by SAHRA's Council and the Policy was repealed. The

result of this was that the shipwreck permitting system that had been in place since 1986 was re-opened and permit applications for commercial salvage of historic shipwrecks had to be considered. The decision also meant that guidelines and principles that were contained in the Shipwreck Policy were no longer applicable. This in turn meant that consideration of permit applications must be concluded in light of both existing and previous legislation.

At the same meeting, it was agreed that the Department of Arts and Culture and SAHRA would co-operate to develop a comprehensive policy on underwater cultural heritage management in general and historical shipwrecks in particular. It was agreed that this new policy would come into force in 2010 and would be advised by the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. Although South Africa has not ratified the UNESCO Convention, the Department of Arts and Culture has recommended ratification and implementation by South Africa. The recommendation has been submitted for the Parliamentary agenda. A draft Underwater Cultural Heritage Policy has also been completed. Both the Convention and the Policy work towards halting commercial exploitation of historic wrecks in South African waters. At the time of writing neither has been implemented.

### **LEGISLATIVE SHORTCOMINGS**

#### **1. Commercial Exploitation of Underwater Cultural Heritage**

Although it is recognised that archaeology and commercial exploitation of wrecks are fundamentally incompatible, the NHRA does not specifically ban commercial exploitation of the shipwreck resource

and, in some instances, implies that sale of maritime and underwater cultural heritage resources is condoned. Section 35 (4) states that:

(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority –

(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;

Section 32 of the NHRA states that:

(1) An object or collection of objects, or a type of object or list of object, whether specific or generic, that is part of the national estate and the export of which SAHRA deems it necessary to control may be declared a heritage object, including –

(a) objects recovered from the soil or waters of South Africa, including archaeological and palaeontological objects ...

It continues to describe actions that may be applied to such objects, including:

(12) The owner of a heritage object... must notify SAHRA of the name and address of the new owner when such an object is sold or otherwise alienated ...

Chapter VIII of the NHRA's Regulations applies to permit applications for shipwrecks. It contains the following stipulations:

25 (2) these regulations do not apply to any person applying for a permit to trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of wreck material or objects. Such applications must be made in terms of the regulations in Chapter VII. [Application for Permit to Export a Heritage Object (Section 32(21))]

30 (4) No object recovered from a wreck may

be disposed of except to the collaborating institution without the prior agreement of SAHRA.

30 (5) Objects recovered from wrecks older than 1850 or deemed to be significant by SAHRA will be regarded as a study collection and may not be dispersed, sold or otherwise disposed of without special permission of SAHRA.

30 (6) In the event that an agreement regarding the division of wreck material between the collaborating institution and the permit holder is approved by SAHRA ...

Chapter VII of the Regulations referred to above applies to applications to:

1 (c) trade in, sell for private gain or export from the Republic  
(i) any category of wreck material or object;

Although the Act does not deal specifically with the details of sale of wreck material or objects, the implication is that it is permissible under current legislation. For this reason, an application for a shipwreck permit cannot, at this time, be refused on the grounds that it is for a commercial project. Because new policy and the UNESCO Convention for the Protection of Underwater Heritage have not yet been accepted into South African legal framework, these cannot be used as reference tools for decision-making on permit applications.

## 2. Minimum Archaeological Qualifications

The South African Heritage Resources Agency may prescribe standards of practice and minimum qualifications for working on heritage resources. Section 25 of the Act stipulates that:

(2) A heritage resources authority may –

(h) subject to the provisions of section 59, make and from time to time amend regulations relating to any matter which the

heritage authority concerned considers to be necessary or expedient to prescribe to fulfil its functions and implement its powers and duties under this Act, including —

- (i) the standards of practice and qualifications required of individuals, institutions or other bodies for the performance of work on heritage resources protected in terms of, and in the various fields covered by, this Act;

Regulations, however, refer only vaguely to required qualifications in Chapter VIII (28):

(3) If a wreck is older than 1850 or deemed to be significant by SAHRA, a suitably qualified maritime archaeologist, approved by SAHRA and preferably employed at a recognised institution, must be included as a full member of the team: Provided that if a maritime archaeologist is not available, a suitably qualified approved archaeologist may be included in the team, on condition that he/she remain in regular contact with SAHRA during the work. If there is no archaeologist available at the collaborating institution, arrangements for the inclusion of a suitable archaeologist on the team must be made in consultation with SAHRA.

Section 29 of the Regulations adds that:

(5) The team archaeologist referred to in regulation 28 (3) is not obliged to dive with the team, but may do so at his/her discretion.

Although SAHRA may approve or disapprove of an archaeologist, the criteria by which qualifications can be judged, are lacking. Following the SAHRA Council's repeal of the Shipwreck Policy, SAHRA has no guidelines in place that would determine minimum qualifications, professional affiliations or experience of archaeologists working on a shipwreck site. Legal opinion has, therefore, deemed that any decision regarding qualifications cannot be unreasonably prejudicial to the applicant should an archaeologist be able "to demonstrate a knowledge and understanding

of, and commitment to, the use of underwater archaeological recording and excavation procedures and methods" as required by Chapter VIII 28(2) of the Regulations. The development of an excavation strategy may be the most suitable way for the archaeologist to demonstrate his/her competence and a suitable document on which the Permit Committee can adjudicate applications. The development of guidelines, standards and qualifications that can be included in the Regulations has been suspended until the Department of Arts and Culture gives a directive for maritime and underwater cultural heritage resources management through the implementation of its national Policy.

### 3. Minimum Standards and Suitability of Collaborating Institutions

Permit applications for activities aimed at underwater cultural heritage require that the applicant have a written agreement from a collaborating institution which "supervises and advises on the recovery of objects, accepts objects as part of its collection and undertakes their curation and conservation", and performs other agreed upon functions. Again, legislation does not elaborate on the standards. Chapter I of the Regulations defines a collaborating institute simply as:

"collaborating institution" means a museum or university or other institution approved by SAHRA, which has a written collections policy, a proven capacity to conserve and curate objects and the will to do so;

Further functions of the institution, or other parties to the application, may be further defined in a Heritage Agreement as elaborated in Section 30 of Chapter VIII of the regulations.

As was discussed above in reference to minimum qualifications of archaeologists, no guidelines for recognition of institutions exists at present. Again, the request for a detailed conservation plan may be the most suitable manner in which to judge the suitability of an institution. Conservation and curation require specific facilities and are perhaps more easily assessed prior to commencement of excavation or issuing of an excavation permit.

**CURRENT REGULATORY CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMITS TO EXCAVATE HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS**

Current criteria for the assessment of applications for excavation permits for shipwrecks are largely contained in the Regulations. In the absence of Guidelines, these criteria relate principally to administrative procedure and refer only to standards and qualifications as described above. There are, however, certain sections of the Regulations (with reference to sections of the NHRA) that allow SAHRA to establish conditions, standards and requirements of an excavation should a permit be issued. Chapter VIII allows SAHRA to assess whether or not requirements are being met on an annual basis through reports and, during excavation through monitoring and site visitation. Specifically:

32. (1) Every permit holder must, by 31 December of any given year, submit to SAHRA-

(a) an annual progress report, in accordance with Guidelines, which must include a description of the work done during the year, an accurate site plan with the positions of all objects excavated or collected clearly marked, and a list of all objects removed from the site and their current whereabouts;

(2) A final report, conforming to the standards set out in the Guidelines, must be submitted to SAHRA within six months of the date of expiry of the permit.

Should a permit be issued, the requirements can be determined by SAHRA in terms of Section 48 of the Act:

(2) On application by any person in the manner prescribed under subsection (1), a heritage resources authority may in its discretion issue to such person a permit to perform such actions at such time and subject to such terms, conditions and restrictions or

directions as may be specified in the permit, including a condition —

(a) that the applicant give security in such form and such amount determined by the heritage resources authority concerned, having regard to the nature and extent of the work referred to in the permit, to ensure the satisfactory completion of such work or the curation of objects and material recovered during the course of the work; or

(b) providing for the recycling or deposit in a materials bank of historical building materials; or

(c) stipulating that design proposals be revised; or

(d) regarding the qualifications and expertise required to perform the actions for which the permit is issued.

The authority of SAHRA to conduct on site monitoring is given in Chapter II of the Regulations:

6. A heritage inspector or other authorised representative of SAHRA may at any reasonable time inspect any site or object for which a permit has been issued or for which a permit is being applied.

Conditions for granting of a permit and requirements for that permit to remain valid can be detailed in a Heritage Agreement as set out by Section 42 of the Act. Non-adherence to conditions stipulated in such an agreement would allow SAHRA to cancel a permit.

## **Appendix II Element Decision Tables**

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	N	N	Y – treasure hunters and archaeologists attempted to manage sites	N	N	N
<b>Local</b>	P – Cmdr. Somasari Devendra initiated efforts to incorporate maritime archaeology and protection of shipwrecks into the Sri Lankan historical narrative	N	N	P – Treasure hunters and tour operations	N	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	N	N	N	P – some archaeological access	N – Although people accessed sites and looted artefacts, there was no developed narrative for MUCH	N
<b>National</b>	P – Sites discovered on the Great Basses Reef had become part of a national narrative, particularly through tourism	N	P – Cmdr. Somasari Devendra and maritime historians undertook some research	N	N	P – The Merchant Shipping Act of 1971 ensured that abandoned wrecks in Sri Lankan waters belonged to the state. There was, however, no regulation of MUCH resources
<b>Regional</b>	Y – Regional trade was recognised	Y – Regional trade was significant	N	P – Although a maritime museum did not exist, artefacts were accessible in museums and through private trade	N	N
<b>Global</b>	Y – Shipwrecks form part of the global narrative of expansion and colonisation	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	P – International experts implementing the project promoted the Rules of the 2001 Convention, although the convention was not ratified	P – Muckelroy and others published some work	Y – An increasingly vocal international community began to develop a narrative based on global shipping activities	N
	<b>16.65% - 83.3%</b>	<b>0% - 66.7%</b>	<b>33.3% - 33.3%</b>	<b>33.3% - 33.3%</b>	<b>0% - 33.3%</b>	<b>0% - 16.65%</b>

SRI LANKA – After *Avondster* Project (post-2004)

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	N	N	N	Y – Some private collections exist	N	N
<b>Local</b>	Y – The World Heritage Site and Museum narratives related to single communities	N – Shipbuilding and maritime development do not apply to specific communities	N	N	N	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	Y – The World Heritage Site, Museum and shipwreck narratives related to multiple communities	P – MUCH is significant to communities that participate in maritime activities and associate with maritime history	Y – MAU, Central Heritage Fund, Department of Archaeology share capacity	Y – Archaeological/practitioner access	Y – Archaeologists and historians have written the MUCH narrative	N
<b>National</b>	Y – The MUCH narrative includes multiple sites and is part of the national history	Y – Sri Lanka recognises the role of maritime culture in its evolution	Y – The MAU provides national capacity	N	Y – Through cultural institutions it has been possible for the public to contribute towards the accepted MUCH narrative	Y – National legislation has been promulgated
<b>Regional</b>	Y – Regional trade and maritime activities are recognised	Y – Regional trade and maritime links are significant	N	Y – The maritime museum at Gale is publicly accessible	N – Regional consultation has not yet been achieved	N
<b>Global</b>	Y – Shipwrecks form part of the global narrative of expansion and colonisation	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion. Universal significance values of the World Heritage Site	Y – UNESCO has arranged some international training and there are some international projects taking place, but capacity is temporary	Y – Extensive publication of Avondster and other MUCH research	Y – The international community has contributed to the MUCH narrative through the World Heritage Site and through projects	N
	<b>66.7% - 100%</b>	<b>16.67% - 100%</b>	<b>33.3% - 66.7%</b>	<b>66.7% - 66.7%</b>	<b>33.3% - 66.7</b>	<b>0% - 33.3%</b>

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	N	Unknown	N	N	N	N
<b>Local</b>	N	Unknown	N	N	N	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	P – Maritime culture is part of Swahili culture, but underwater cultural heritage is not recognised	Unknown	N	P – some archaeological access	N – The MUCH narrative is poorly defined. Archaeological interventions have been site specific	N
<b>National</b>	N	P – Swahili culture has a firm maritime component, but underwater cultural heritage is not included in the national significance values	N	N	Y – Zanzibar’s House of Wonders has some artefacts recovered from shipwreck sites which have determined an accepted narrative	N
<b>Regional</b>	Y – European, Arabian and regional trade. Swahili culture, although maritime narrative is not clearly defined	Y – Regional trade was significant	N	Y – Zanzibar’s House of Wonders has some artefacts recovered from shipwreck sites	N	N
<b>Global</b>	Y – the Zanzibar and Kilwa Kisiwani World Heritage Sites narrative on European and Arabian expansion	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	P – International experts implementing the project promoted the Rules of the 2001 Convention, although the convention was not ratified	Y – Some maritime archaeological research was carried out at Kilwa Kisiwani (Pollard 2008a; 2008b)	Y – An increasingly vocal international community began to develop a narrative based on global shipping activities. Includes UNESCO, international managers and archaeologists	N
	<b>16.67% - 66.7%</b>	<b>0% - 66.7%</b>	<b>0% - 16.67%</b>	<b>16.67% - 66.7%</b>	<b>0% - 66.7%</b>	<b>0% - 0%</b>

TANZANIA – After MUCH Programme

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	N	Unknown	N	N	N	N
<b>Local</b>	Y – Stone dhow and submerged walls were identified in the oral traditions. The origin of submerged walls is described differently within communities	Unknown	P - MUCH team members provide community management at their respective work places	Y – Oral traditions surrounding maritime heritage appear to exist	N	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	P – Local maritime histories were revealed – although limited – during oral history surveys	Y – Values ascribed to stone dhow are significant amongst several communities	P – It was envisaged that MUCH team members would be deployed across communities	P – Some archaeological access	N – The MUCH narrative is poorly defined. Archaeological interventions have been site specific	Y – MUCH team members have attempted to work with communities to manage underwater sites
<b>National</b>	N	Y – MUCH significance values e.g. at Kilwa Kisiwani and Zanzibar are nationally recognised	Y – A MUCH team was established	N	Y - Zanzibar’s House of Wonders has some artefacts recovered from shipwreck sites which have determined an accepted narrative	N
<b>Regional</b>	Y – European, Arabian and regional trade. Stone dhow mythology appears regionally. Swahili culture, although maritime narrative is not clearly defined	Y – Regional trade and development of Swahili culture	P – It was envisaged that capacity could be deployed to similar sites in the region (e.g. Kenya)	Y - Zanzibar’s House of Wonders has some artefacts recovered from shipwreck sites	N	N
<b>Global</b>	Y – the Zanzibar and Kilwa Kisiwani World Heritage Sites narrative on European and Arabian expansion	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	Y – International experts support national initiatives	Y – Some maritime archaeological research was carried out at Kilwa Kisiwani (Pollard 2008a; 2008b; 2011, Jeffery and Parthesius 2012)	Y – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a narrative based on global shipping activities.	Y – archaeologists and other practitioners have an agreed code of ethics and standards
	<b>50%- 66.7%</b>	<b>33.3% - 100%</b>	<b>33.3% - 83.4%</b>	<b>50% - 66.7%</b>	<b>0% - 66.7%</b>	<b>33.3% - 33.3%</b>

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	Unknown	Unknown	N	Y – Treasure hunters have personal collections	N	N
<b>Local</b>	Unknown	Y – White South Africans attach significance to shipwrecks	P – Diving community managed wreck sites to some extent	Unknown	Y – Treasure hunters have contributed towards their MUCH narrative	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	P – Local maritime histories were revealed through archaeological excavations and treasure hunting	N	N	Y – Treasure hunters restrict access to sites and collections	Y – Multi-disciplinary academic investigation of wreck sites	N
<b>National</b>	Y – The impact of colonialism is significant in South Africa's heritage agenda	P – The impact of colonialism is significant in South Africa's heritage agenda, however, shipwreck sites and other underwater cultural heritage are not key markers of the colonial past for most South Africans	Y – SAHRA is mandated to manage shipwrecks by the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)	Y – Shipwrecks are popular diving attractions	Y – There is an accepted national MUCH narrative (closely aligned with the European narrative)	Y – National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)
<b>Regional</b>	N	N	N	Y – Various maritime museums around South Africa have shipwreck displays	P – Although not regional, a shared European-South African narrative exists	P – An archaeological code of ethics is applied to shipwreck sites, but treasure hunters do not share this code of practice
<b>Global</b>	Y – South Africa's shipwrecks are relevant to a number of nations participating in European global expansion from the 14 <sup>th</sup> century	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	P – South Africa had not ratified the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage, but made efforts to apply its Annex as well as the 1996 ICOMOS Charter on the Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage	Y – Many popular, and some academic, works on shipwrecks are available	Y – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a narrative based on global shipping activities.	N
	<b>16.67% - 66.7%</b>	<b>33.3% - 50%</b>	<b>16.67% - 50%</b>	<b>66.7% - 100%</b>	<b>66.7% - 83.4%</b>	<b>0% - 50%</b>

SOUTH AFRICA – Ideal (using Legacy Sites)

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	Unknown	Unknown	N	N	N – “Experts” continue to drive narrative production	N
<b>Local</b>	Y – Non-shipwreck sites such as fish traps relate to single communities	Y - Single communities ascribe significance to Legacy Sites. For example, the ancestral heritage of Lake Fundudzi is uniquely associated with Vha Venda culture	P – Diving community managed wreck sites to some extent	Y – Rituals at Lake Fundudzi are limited to relevant communities	Y – Communities such as the community at Lake Fundudzi agree on public narrative	Y – The heritage of Fish traps and Lake Fundudzi comply with local community management processes
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	Y – Legacy Sites relate to multiple communities	Y – Multiple communities also ascribe significance to various Legacy Sites	Y – A coastal network of cooperating institutions was envisaged to assist with MUCH management	Y – Researchers have limited access to collections and sites	Y – Multi-disciplinary academic investigation of sites and resultant narratives	Y – Local management groups in coastal networks share responsibilities
<b>National</b>	Y - The impact of colonialism is significant in South Africa’s heritage agenda. The shipwreck narrative is no longer dominant	Y – By identifying Legacy Sites that have relevance to broader audiences, MUCH becomes nationally significant	Y – SAHRA is mandated to manage shipwrecks by the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)	Y – Legacy Sites are popular tourist attractions	Y – There is an accepted national MUCH narrative	Y – National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)
<b>Regional</b>	P – Legacy sites tie in with regional narratives	P – Legacy Sites link to regionally significant heritage narratives. For example, the Robben Island cultural landscape has important political links to the sub-Saharan region	Y – The MADP planned to create regional capacity	Y – Various maritime museums around South Africa have shipwreck displays	Y – Legacy Sites extended to regional stakeholders	P – An archaeological code of ethics is applied to shipwreck sites, but treasure hunters do not share this code of practice
<b>Global</b>	Y – South Africa’s shipwrecks are relevant to a number of nations participating in European global expansion from the 14 <sup>th</sup> century	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	Y – South Africa planned to ratify the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage and several experts would be coopted into the MADP	Y – Many popular, and some academic, works on shipwrecks are available	Y – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a narrative based on global shipping activities.	Y – South Africa would ratify the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage)
	<b>66.7%-83.4%</b>	<b>66.7%- 83.4%</b>	<b>50%- 100%</b>	<b>66.7%- 100%</b>	<b>66.7%- 100%</b>	<b>66.7%- 83.4%</b>

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	Unknown	Unknown	P – Individuals have taken a more active role in MUCH management having completed training	N	N – “Experts” continue to drive narrative production	P – Individuals have taken an ethical stance on how sites should be accessed, e.g. dive operators stop divers from taking objects off of sites
<b>Local</b>	P – Non-shipwreck sites such as fish traps relate to single communities, but awareness remains low	Y – Single communities associate their heritage with Legacy Sites. For example, the ancestral heritage of Lake Fundudzi is uniquely associated with VhaVenda culture	P – Some community management capacity has been created at individual sites such as fish traps (Still Bay)	Y – Rituals at Lake Fundudzi are limited to relevant communities	N – “Experts” continue to drive narrative production	P – local management groups have become involved in managing sites such as Fish Weirs
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	P – Legacy Sites provided opportunities for multiple interpretations of MUCH, but uptake remained low	P – Multiple communities could associate with various Legacy Sites, but there is a need for communities to be able to determine their own sites	Y – A coastal network has been established although it is unclear whether it will be sustainable	Y – Researchers have limited access to collections and sites	Y – Multi-disciplinary academic investigation of sites and resultant narratives	Y – Local management groups in coastal networks share some responsibilities
<b>National</b>	Y – The impact of colonialism is significant in South Africa’s heritage agenda. The shipwreck narrative remains dominant	Y – By identifying Legacy Sites that have relevance to broader audiences, MUCH becomes nationally significant. However, there has not been broad buy-in	Y – SAHRA is mandated to manage shipwrecks by the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)	Y – MUCH sites are popular tourist attractions	Y – There is an accepted national MUCH narrative	Y – National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)
<b>Regional</b>	P – Legacy sites tie in with regional narratives, but regional networks did not endure	P – Legacy Sites link to regionally significant heritage narratives. For example, the Robben Island cultural landscape has important political links to the sub-Saharan region	P – The MADP created regional capacity, but South Africa cannot sustain capacity outside of its borders	Y – Various maritime museums around South Africa have shipwreck displays	Y – Legacy Sites extended to regional stakeholders	P – An archaeological code of ethics is applied to shipwreck sites, but treasure hunters do not share this code of practice
<b>Global</b>	Y – South Africa’s shipwrecks are relevant to a number of nations participating in European global expansion from the 14 <sup>th</sup> century	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	Y – Several experts were coopted into the MADP	Y – Many popular, and some academic, works on shipwrecks are available	Y – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a narrative based on global shipping activities.	Y – South Africa will ratify the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage and has adopted the Annex
	<b>33.3% - 83.4%</b>	<b>50% - 83.4%</b>	<b>66.7% - 83.4%</b>	<b>66.7% - 100%</b>	<b>33.3% - 100%</b>	<b>66.7% - 83.4%</b>

ILHA DE MOZAMBIQUE – Status Q1to 2013

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	Unknown	Unknown	N	Unknown	Unknown	N
<b>Local</b>	P – Shipwrecks have, for various reasons described in the body of this dissertation, become part of the Ilha de Mozambique narrative	P – Communities ascribe significance to wreck sites, but degree of significance is unclear. The wrecks may be of economic interest	N – Although there are efforts to manage MUCH, there are no trained groups or individuals	Y – Arqueonautas controls site access	P – Treasure hunters partially control the narrative	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	Unknown	Unknown	N	N	P – Some academic work focused primarily on terrestrial infrastructure is available (see Duarte 2012)	N
<b>National</b>	Y – Maritime heritage is part of the national narrative	P – There is a recognition of the value of MUCH, but it is not entrenched in the national consciousness as evidenced by issuing permits to commercially exploit sites	P – There are no MUCH managers employed by the state and, while archaeologists exist, they are not provided with site access	N	N	P – Archaeological legislation may be applied to shipwreck sites, but is not
<b>Regional</b>	P – Coastal trade and the African slave trade are part of the regional narrative	Y – Shipping and maritime activities are significant in regional history and heritage	N	Y – A museum of recovered shipwreck finds exists on the island	N	N
<b>Global</b>	Y – The role of maritime trade is preserved in the Ilha de Mozambique World Heritage Sites values	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	N – Despite international interest in Ilha de Mozambique, heritage practitioners are not permitted to access shipwreck sites or contribute towards management decisions	P – General Portuguese historic narratives include reference to Ilha de Mozambique, but no island specific narrative has been made available. Arqueonautas has published reports on its activities, but these are not easily accessible	Y – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a narrative based on global shipping activities.	N
	<b>16.7% - 83.4%</b>	<b>16.7% - 83.4%</b>	<b>0% - 16.7%</b>	<b>33.3% - 50%</b>	<b>33.3% - 33.3%</b>	<b>0% - 16.7%</b>

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	Unknown	Unknown	Y – Members of the group that participated in training have taken up responsibility for management on an individual basis	Unknown	Unknown	N
<b>Local</b>	Y – Local MUCH related to terrestrial sites has become part of the Ilha de Mozambique narrative	Y – The Ilha de Mozambique community has identified sites with local significance values	P – Community members have been trained, but more training is necessary for the community to implement management strategies, especially related to shipwreck sites	Y – Religious and other local practices	Y – Small local networks are working on developing a narrative	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	Y – Narrative spans multiple communities at Ilha de Mozambique and elsewhere	N	P – Local community and academic community share expertise	P – Arqueonautas' collection of objects is accessible to curators and archaeologists. It is unknown if other private heritage collections exist	N – No new archaeological work was under way in 2015	N
<b>National</b>	Y – Maritime heritage is part of the national narrative and is becoming increasingly relevant	P – There is a recognition of the value of MUCH, but it is not entrenched in the national consciousness as evidenced by issuing permits to commercially exploit sites	P – Archaeologists are being trained to work on shipwreck sites, but there are no government managers	P – Not all sites are accessible yet	P – Community meetings (academic, government, local) are taking place. Following agreement, it is likely that new narratives will develop	Y – Archaeological legislation is now applied to shipwreck sites
<b>Regional</b>	Y – Coastal trade and the African slave trade are part of the regional narrative. Sites such as stone dhow occur in Tanzania and Kenya	Y – Shipping and maritime activities are significant in regional history and heritage	N	N – Arqueonautas' shipwreck museum is currently closed	Y – Expertise from South Africa, Europe and America is being coopted to assist on developing MUCH at Ilha de Mozambique	N
<b>Global</b>	Y – The role of maritime trade is preserved in the Ilha de Mozambique World Heritage Sites values	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	Y – Several international institutions are assisting with management, including training local divers	P – Portuguese historic narratives include reference to Ilha de Mozambique, but no island specific narrative is available. Arqueonautas' reports are not easily accessible	Y – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a narrative based on global shipping activities	P – The rules of the World Heritage Convention are being applied to terrestrial MUCH sites on the island
	<b>66.7% - 100%</b>	<b>33.3% - 83.4%</b>	<b>66.7% - 50%</b>	<b>50% - 33.3%</b>	<b>33.3% - 83.4%</b>	<b>0% - 50%</b>

EASTERN CAPE – Status Quo 2014

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	P – Descendants of shipwreck survivors have determined an individual narrative, but it is not dominant	Unknown – Descendants of shipwreck survivors don't appear to ascribe significance to shipwreck sites themselves	N	Unknown	P – Shipwreck survivor descendants participate in developing local narratives, but these are not well known	N
<b>Local</b>	Unknown	Y – White South Africans attach significance to shipwrecks.	N	Unknown	Unknown	N
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	Unknown	Unknown	N	N – In the past, salvage companies have had exclusive rights to wreck sites, but this is no longer the case	P – Treasure hunters and archaeologists have contributed to the local shipwreck narrative	N
<b>National</b>	Y – The impact of colonialism is significant in South Africa's heritage agenda	P – The impact of colonialism is significant in South Africa's heritage agenda, however, shipwreck sites and other underwater cultural heritage are not key markers of the colonial past for most South Africans	Y – SAHRA is mandated to manage shipwrecks by the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)	Y – Shipwrecks are popular diving attractions	Y – Museums and national managers have determined a general narrative for the shipwrecks of this area	Y – National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)
<b>Regional</b>	Y – The shipwreck history of the Eastern Cape includes Mozambique (shipwreck survivors trekked north to the Portuguese settlements)	N	N – not at this site	P – Museums in East London and Pietermaritzburg have displays from shipwrecks in this area. There are no local museums	N	P – An archaeological code of ethics is applied to shipwreck sites, environmental management contributes somewhat to site management
<b>Global</b>	Y – South Africa's shipwrecks are relevant to a number of nations participating in European global expansion from the 14 <sup>th</sup> century	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	N – Not at this site	Y – Many popular, and some academic, works on shipwrecks in the case study area are available	P – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a general narrative based on global shipping activities.	N
	<b>33.3%- 100%</b>	<b>33.3%- 50%</b>	<b>0%- 33.3%</b>	<b>0%- 83.4%</b>	<b>33.3%- 50%</b>	<b>0%- 50%</b>

	<b>Narrative</b>	<b>Significance Values</b>	<b>Management Capacity</b>	<b>Accessibility</b>	<b>Participation</b>	<b>Rules</b>
<b>Individual</b>	P – Descendants of shipwreck survivors have determined an individual narrative, but it is not dominant Y – New MUCH narratives are emerging from oral histories	Unknown – Descendants of shipwreck survivors don't appear to ascribe significance to shipwreck sites themselves Y – Values are relevant to local communities	Y – Individuals are curating oral histories P – communities hope to support management efforts	Unknown Y – Religious activities access MUCH. Tour guides are building MUCH into their offerings	P – Shipwreck survivor descendants participate in developing local narratives, but these are not well known P – Local narratives are being produced, but are not widely acknowledged or accessible	Unknown Unknown
<b>Local</b>						
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	P – Some aspects of cosmologies are seen in multiple communities in South Africa Y - The impact of colonialism is significant in South Africa's heritage agenda.	P – Some intangible heritage values are applicable across multiple communities Y – The MUCH of this area is of national significance. The significance of emerging narratives has not yet entered the national consciousness	N Y – SAHRA is mandated to manage shipwrecks by the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999)	N Y – Shipwrecks are popular diving attractions	P – Treasure hunters and archaeologists have contributed to the local shipwreck narrative Y – Museums and national managers have determined a general narrative for the shipwrecks of this area	Unknown P – National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) is applied to tangible heritage, but not intangible heritage
<b>National</b>						
<b>Regional</b>	Y – The shipwreck history of the Eastern Cape includes Mozambique (shipwreck survivors trekked north to the Portuguese settlements)	N	N – not at this site	P – Museums in East London and Pietermaritzburg have displays from shipwrecks in this area. There are no local museums	N	P – an archaeological code of ethics is applied to shipwreck sites, environmental management contributes somewhat to site management
<b>Global</b>	Y – South Africa's shipwrecks are relevant to a number of nations participating in European global expansion from the 14 <sup>th</sup> century	Y – Global maritime trade and expansion	N – not at this site	Y – Many popular, and some academic, works on shipwrecks in the case study area are available	P – International archaeological and heritage communities have developed a general narrative based on global shipping activities.	N
	<b>66.7% - 100%</b>	<b>50% - 66.7%</b>	<b>50% - 33.3%</b>	<b>33.3% - 83.4%</b>	<b>50% - 50%</b>	<b>0% - 33.3%</b>

LAKE FUNDUDZI – Status Quo 2015

	Narrative	Significance Values	Management Capacity	Accessibility	Participation	Rules
<b>Individual</b>	Unknown	Unknown	Y – Individuals are curating oral histories	Unknown	Y – Interviews with individuals showed that personal understandings of the site contributed towards its narrative	Unknown
<b>Local</b>	Y – What is known of the intangible heritage is part of the local narrative	Y – Values are relevant to local communities. Vhatavhatsindi, for example, perform rituals specific to their royal status. Other villages understand the heritage of Lake Fundudzi differently as evidenced in the submissions and objections to declaration	Y – Communities have curated the heritage of the Lake over several centuries through ritual and spiritual practices	Y – Burial and worship rituals of the Vhatavhatsindi royal family are performed at the Lake	Y – Consultations with stakeholders showed that the lake communities stubbornly fought any expert interpretation of the site. The narrative was determined by people of status and elders	Y – A code of ethics surrounding the approach and viewing of the lake has been determined by local communities
<b>Multiple Communities</b>	P – What is known of the intangible heritage is related to multiple communities around the lake	Y – Intangible heritage values are applicable across multiple communities	Y – Different stakeholders manage different aspects of the heritage. For example, elders curate oral histories, royal family curates burial rituals	Y – Only members of the Vhatavhatsindi tribe participate in burial rituals	Y – Only members of the Vhatavhatsindi Royal family can access burial rituals and determine narratives	Y – Different stakeholders in villages around the lake appear to be responsible heritage associated with their vicinity
<b>National</b>	Y – In initiating the site declaration process, SAHRA brought Lake Fundudzi into the national narrative	P – The significance values assigned to Lake Fundudzi during the declaration process are ill defined	P – SAHRA is mandated to manage a declared site in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999), but has failed to do so in this instance	P – Visitors may view the lake after performing certain rituals, but may not enter it or view rituals	Y – Museums and national managers have determined a general narrative for the shipwrecks of this area	Y – National Heritage Resources Act (25 of 1999) is applied to the National Heritage Site
<b>Regional</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N
<b>Global</b>	N	N	N	P – Some popular works on the mythology of South Africa mention the mythical creatures of Lake Fundudzi. Some academic research describes the sacred significance ascribed to the Lake	N	N
	<b>50% - 33.3%</b>	<b>66.7% - 16.7%</b>	<b>100% - 16.7%</b>	<b>66.7% - 33.3%</b>	<b>100% - 33.3%</b>	<b>66.7% - 33.3%</b>



## **Appendix III Lake Fundudzi Questionnaire**

TROUBLED WATERS

Hello, our names are Lusanda and Edward. We conduct interviews for the African Center for Heritage Activities, an independent research organisation. We carry out research on heritage places and activities across South Africa and are conducting a survey on the heritage in your area, including the economic effects of heritage activity. [*Define/explain heritage – to be added separately*]. We wonder if you would be so kind as to participate in our study. All the information that you give me will remain strictly confidential. You will not be asked to give your name, or any information that might be used to identify you. We will only be studying the responses of the community as a whole. The interview will take about 40 minutes. Are you willing to participate? If no or in doubt, close interview.

**SECTION A: DEMOGRAPHICS AND GENERAL ATTITUDES**

1	Gender	Male	Female			
2	Age in years	Specify either in years or in terms of event/chief at time:				
3	Place where born (village/town)	Specify place:				
4	How many people live permanently in this household? <i>Specify a number for each of the age categories given.</i>	Under 18 years	18-65 years	65 years and over		
5	Are you currently being paid a wage or salary to work on a regular basis, whether full time or part time? Regular means you would get this wage or salary in most months (more often than not)	Yes		No		
6	What kind of work do you usually do in this job? In other words, what is your occupation or job title?					
7	How much do you earn in an average month?	Less than R1000	R1000–R3000	R3000–R6000	R6000–R10000 More than R10000	
8	How many people in your household earn a regular income? Regular means a wage or salary you would get in most months (more often than not)	Specify number:				
9	Do you or anyone else in your household receive a government grant? Please remember that all your responses are confidential and will not be shared with anyone else.	Yes		No		
10	What type(s) of government grant do you or anyone else in your household receive? Again, please remember that all your responses are confidential and will not be shared with anyone else. <i>Tick as many as apply.</i>	State (South African Government) old age pension				
		Unemployment insurance (UIF)				
		Workmen's compensation				
		Disability grant				
		Child support grant				
		Foster care grant				
		Care dependency grant				
Other (specify)						
11	Have you ever earned money from work relating to your heritage? For example, showing people around your village, or selling traditional clothing or ornaments. If so, what work was it?	Ever earned	Yes		No	
		How	Selling art work/curios			
			Tour guiding ((having tourists or visitors pay you to show them around?))			
			Home stays (having tourists or visitors pay to stay in your home?)			
			Language courses (teaching people to speak your language?)			
			Living heritage performances (performing traditional music, dance or poetry?)			
			Cooking classes (teaching people to cook traditional food?)			

APPENDIX III LAKE FUNDUDZI QUESTIONNAIRE

			Other (specify)																									
12	What is the total monthly income in your household, from all sources (salaries, wages, grants)?	Less than R1000	R1000 – R3000	R3000 – R6000	R6000 – R10000	More than R10000																						
13	What cultural activities and beliefs are important for you? <i>Open-ended response.</i>																											
14	I'm now going to read out a list of nearby places. Please tell me which of these places in your area are important for your traditions and culture, including your religion? <i>Tick as many as apply.</i>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>Dzivha Fundudzi (Lake Fundudzi)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Bako la Raluvhimba</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Phiphidi waterfall system</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Mapangubwe</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Nevhotalu Forest</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Thathe Forest</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Vhutanda Forest</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Musanzhe Forest</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Dzata ruins</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Raluvhimba Cave</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Other (specify)</td><td></td></tr> </table>					Dzivha Fundudzi (Lake Fundudzi)		Bako la Raluvhimba		Phiphidi waterfall system		Mapangubwe		Nevhotalu Forest		Thathe Forest		Vhutanda Forest		Musanzhe Forest		Dzata ruins		Raluvhimba Cave		Other (specify)	
Dzivha Fundudzi (Lake Fundudzi)																												
Bako la Raluvhimba																												
Phiphidi waterfall system																												
Mapangubwe																												
Nevhotalu Forest																												
Thathe Forest																												
Vhutanda Forest																												
Musanzhe Forest																												
Dzata ruins																												
Raluvhimba Cave																												
Other (specify)																												
15	What would you consider as the one biggest problem of your area (village)? Specify just one problem.																											

**SECTION B: ATTITUDES TOWARDS LAKE FUNDUDZI**

16	Is Lake Fundudzi of cultural importance to you?	Yes	Not any more	No								
17	What kind of religion do you practice?											
18	What access does your community have to Lake Fundudzi?	Free access	Some access, but limited in some way (needs permission, payment, etc)	No access								
19	I'm now going to read out a list of activities. Please tell me which of these activities you or anyone else in your household do around Lake Fundudzi? <i>Tick as many as apply.</i>	<table border="1"> <tr><td>I don't do any activities around the lake</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Activities about my beliefs (e.g. religious or other)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Activities for my health and well-being (e.g. cleaning, cleansing, washing)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Activities for food or income (e.g. fishing, grazing livestock)</td><td></td></tr> </table>			I don't do any activities around the lake		Activities about my beliefs (e.g. religious or other)		Activities for my health and well-being (e.g. cleaning, cleansing, washing)		Activities for food or income (e.g. fishing, grazing livestock)	
I don't do any activities around the lake												
Activities about my beliefs (e.g. religious or other)												
Activities for my health and well-being (e.g. cleaning, cleansing, washing)												
Activities for food or income (e.g. fishing, grazing livestock)												

TROUBLED WATERS

		family sites, ancestry)	
		Tourism activities	
		Other (please specify)	
20	Do people agree what should be done with Lake Fundudzi?	Yes	Do not know No
21	What are the debates or tensions or issues around the future of the lake?	<i>Open-ended response.</i>	
22	What do you think are the reasons why some people are not happy for Lake Fundudzi to be declared a heritage site?	Disrespect of cultural practices that make the lake sacred	
		Commercialising the area through making it into a tourist site	
		Don't want outsiders interfering with the site	
		Loss of control of activities associated with the lake	
		Unwanted free access to outsiders	
		Other (specify)	
23	Do you think the lake and the valley need protection?	Yes	Do not know No
24	Do you think Lake Fundudzi should be declared a heritage site? <b>NOTE: If answered YES here, ask questions 25Y-32Y and end survey. If answered NO here, ask questions 33N-36N and end survey</b>	Yes	No

APPENDIX III LAKE FUNDUDZI QUESTIONNAIRE

For those answering YES to Q23, ask questions 25Y – 32Y and end survey

25Y	I'm now going to read out a list of possible consequences of building a heritage site at Lake Fundudzi. Please tell me which of these you think will happen if Lake Fundudzi is declared a heritage site? <i>Tick as many as apply.</i>	The area will be protected from industrial development	
		The environment will be protected from overfishing, mining, and cultivation of crops	
		The environment will be harmed because more people will come and have access	
		It will bring tourists to the area	
		It will take control away from traditional leaders	
		It will create jobs	
		It will bring infrastructure development to the area	
		It will anger the ancestors because of a lack of respect for the sacred status of the lake	
		It will not be managed properly (due to lack of skills of government officials, or corruption)	
		Other (specify)	

26Y	I'm now going to read out a list of groups involved in the area. Who do you think will <b>benefit the most</b> if Lake Fundudzi is declared a heritage site? If you think that only some people within a village will benefit (for example, if men and women would benefit differently), please give details. <i>Tick at most 3 responses.</i>	Everyone will benefit equally	
		People from the Vhatavhatsindi clan	
		People from Tshifume village	
		People from Tshiavaha village	
		People from Thononda village	
		People from Tshiheni village	
		People from Tshitangani village	
		People from Tsharotha village	
		People from Makuleni village	
		People from other villages (specify)	
		Fudzi Development Committee	
		Local interest groups (for example, Ndima community services, Vhuga ha Vhangana, LEDET)	
		Limpopo government	
		National government	
		SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency)	
		Outsiders (please specify)	
Other (please specify)			

TROUBLED WATERS

27Y	I'm now going to read out a list of groups involved in the area (this list is the same as the previous question). Who do you think will <b>benefit the least</b> if Lake Fundudzi is declared a heritage site? If you think that only some people within a village will benefit (for example, if men and women would benefit differently), please give details. <i>Tick at most 3 responses.</i>	Everyone will benefit equally		
		People from the Vhatavhatsindi clan		
		People from Tshifume village		
		People from Tshiavaha village		
		People from Thononda village		
		People from Tshiheni village		
		People from Tshitangani village		
		People from Tsharotha village		
		People from Makuleni village		
		People from other villages (specify)		
		Fudzi Development Committee		
		Local interest groups (for example, Ndima community services, Vhugaha Vhangana, LEDET)		
		Limpopo government		
		National government		
		SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency)		
		Outsiders (please specify)		
		Other (please specify)		
28Y	I'm now going to read out a list of groups involved in the area. Who of these should have access to the heritage site? By "access" we mean that people would be allowed to visit the area. If you think that only some people within a village should get access (for example, if men and women should be treated differently), please give details. <i>Tick as many as apply</i>	Everybody should be able to visit the site		
		People from the Vhatavhatsindi clan		
		People from Tshifume village		
		People from Tshiavaha village		
		People from Thononda village		
		People from Tshiheni village		
		People from Tshitangani village		
		People from Tsharotha village		
		People from Makuleni village		
		People from other villages (specify)		
		Outsiders		
		Others (please specify)		
29Y	I'm now going to read out a list of groups involved in the area. Who of these should have ownership of the activities at the heritage site? By "ownership" we mean playing a role in managing the site and making	People from the Vhatavhatsindi clan		
		People from Tshifume village		
		People from Tshiavaha village		

APPENDIX III LAKE FUNDUDZI QUESTIONNAIRE

	<p>decisions about how the site is run and how income generated by the site is spent. If you think that only some people within a village should have ownership (for example, if men and women should be treated differently), please give details. <i>Tick as many as apply</i></p>	<p>People from Thononda village</p> <p>People from Tshiheni village</p> <p>People from Tshitangani village</p> <p>People from Tsharotha village</p> <p>People from Makuleni village</p> <p>People from other villages (specify)</p> <p>Fudzi Development Committee</p> <p>Local interest groups (for example, Ndima community services, Vhugaha Vhangana, LEDET)</p> <p>Government</p> <p>SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency)</p> <p>Outsiders with experience of running a heritage site</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p>
		<p>Others (please specify)</p>	
<p>30Y</p>	<p>How would you like your community (that is, the people from your village) to be involved? <i>Open-ended response.</i></p>		
<p>31Y</p>	<p>I'm now going to read out a list of possible features that a heritage site might contain. Which of these features would you like to see at a Lake Fundudzi heritage site? Please also provide us with any other features you would like to be included.</p>	<p>A visitors center</p> <p>Signs, trails and exhibits explaining the history of the area</p> <p>Overnight accommodation</p> <p>Restaurant</p> <p>Parking for cars and buses</p> <p>Toilets and washrooms</p> <p>Education programs: materials and activities for telling people stories about the area</p> <p>Participation of schools and universities (visits from these groups to learn about the Lake)</p> <p>A museum</p> <p>Training of qualified professionals to manage the site</p> <p>Training of qualified tour guides</p> <p>Volunteer programs (for outsiders to come and work</p>	<p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p> <p></p>

TROUBLED WATERS

		at the site during certain times of the year)	
		Other (please specify):	
32Y	Should tourists be allowed to visit the heritage site? If you feel that some restrictions or conditions should apply (for example, if only some areas should be open, or if the site should only open for some times of the year), please give these.	Yes	No
		Restrictions/conditions: <i>Open-ended response.</i>	

For those answering NO to Q23, ask questions 33N – 36N and end survey

33N	I'm now going to read out a list of possible consequences of building a heritage site at Lake Fundudzi. Please tell me which of these you think will happen if Lake Fundudzi was declared a heritage site? <i>Tick as many as apply.</i>	The area would be protected from industrial development	
		The environment would be protected from overfishing, mining, and cultivation of crops	
		The environment would be harmed because more people will come and have access	
		It would bring tourists to the area	
		It would take control away from traditional leaders	
		It would create jobs	
		It would bring infrastructure development to the area	
		It would anger the ancestors because of a lack of respect for the sacred status of the lake	
		It would not be managed properly (due to lack of skills of government officials, or corruption)	
		Other (specify)	

34N	I'm now going to read out a list of groups involved in the area. Who do you think will <b>benefit the most</b> if Lake Fundudzi was declared a heritage site? If you think that only some people within a village will benefit (for example, if men and women would benefit differently), please give details. <i>Tick at most 3 responses.</i>	Everyone will benefit equally	
		People from the Vhatavhatsindi clan	
		People from Tshifume village	
		People from Tshivaha village	
		People from Thononda village	
		People from Tshiheni village	
		People from Tshitangani village	

APPENDIX III LAKE FUNDUDZI QUESTIONNAIRE

		People from Tsharotha village		
		People from Makuleni village		
		People from other villages (specify)		
		Fudzi Development Committee		
		Local interest groups (for example, Ndima community services, Vhuga ha Vhangana, LEDET)		
		Limpopo government		
		National government		
		SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency)		
		Outsiders (please specify)		
		Other (please specify)		
35N	I'm now going to read out a list of groups involved in the area (this list is the same as the previous question). Who do you think will <b>benefit the least</b> if Lake Fundudzi was declared a heritage site? If you think that only some people within a village will benefit (for example, if men and women would benefit differently), please give details. <i>Tick at most 3 responses.</i>	Everyone will benefit equally		
		People from the Vhatavhatsindi clan		
		People from Tshifume village		
		People from Tshiavaha village		
		People from Thononda village		
		People from Tshiheni village		
		People from Tshitangani village		
		People from Tsharotha village		
		People from Makuleni village		
		People from other villages (specify)		
		Fudzi Development Committee		
		Local interest groups (for example, Ndima community services, Vhuga ha Vhangana, LEDET)		
		Limpopo government		
		National government		
		SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency)		
		Outsiders (please specify)		
		Other (please specify)		

TROUBLED WATERS

36N	What do you think should be done to manage the heritage of Lake Fundudzi? <i>Open-ended response.</i>	
37N	Under what conditions would you support the declaration of Lake Fundudzi as a heritage site? In other words, what conditions would need to change for you to change your mind? <i>Open-ended response.</i>	

## Appendix IV MADP Assessment

### ANALYSIS OF COURSE ASSESSMENT RESPONSES

Questionnaires were circulated to 39 of the 133 participants, including tutors, institutional managers and trainees and one-on-one interviews were conducted, where possible. Responses were received from 32 individuals (24% of total participants) . Although programme evaluators recorded responders' names, they were withheld from the evaluation report in all but one instance. When asked for general comments about the appropriateness and effectiveness of the Programme, 96.9% of respondents agreed that it had been successful. Gribble and Jeffery state that "there were a number of comments to the effect that practical skill development conducted during the courses was good and the value of the [Maritime Archaeology Development Programme] to people had been revealed"<sup>42</sup>, and "all respondents considered that MUCH was an important heritage asset, requiring protection and management"<sup>43</sup>.

When pressed for more detail, however, they allowed for some perceived shortcomings and commented that:

*"... it made people aware and is a very good start."* (author's italics)

*"Training is relevant ... but it was difficult to judge if training is effective [without long term monitoring and assessment]."*<sup>44</sup>

42 Gribble, J. and Jeffery, W. (2012). *South African Maritime Archaeology Development Programme. 2010-2012. External Evaluation Report*. Unpublished Report. South African Heritage Resources Agency. p 12

43 *Ibid.* p 14

44 *Ibid.* p 11

Answers suggested that while participants identified value in the programme, both as a training venture and as an awareness raising initiative, and that it had shifted public perceptions of the field, it fell short of showcasing maritime and underwater cultural heritage as a generally relevant and mainstream sub-discipline within heritage. The Programme had gained success by moving the shipwreck-focused definition of underwater cultural heritage as specified by relevant legislative frameworks into an inclusive environment. By doing this it was possible to promote the importance of maritime and underwater cultural heritage in a more diverse manner and therefore garner acceptance of the field at public and political levels. The Programme also allowed heritage practitioners to draw local stakeholders into management roles. By showing that maritime and underwater cultural heritage provided a link between submerged and terrestrial sites, that both submerged and terrestrial sites formed part of the maritime cultural landscape, and that the events that played out at one site set the context for what happened at another site, heritage managers could show although sites may not be a directly recognisable part of an individual's history and heritage, their influence-consequence relationship with sites that were directly relevant made them worthy of protection. But these gains were generally limited for Programme participants and connections often felt forced. Neither experts nor trainers nor beneficiaries could, however, suggest a practical way forward for developing the field to achieve natural, widespread buy-in. Respondents to the questionnaire suggested the inclusion of non-traditional sites or moving training activities to better suit diverse narratives.

*“[Maritime and underwater cultural heritage should include] maritime history, including examples of non-colonial wrecks.”<sup>45</sup>*

*“Move [training] onto traditional, indigenous sites.”<sup>46</sup>*

The challenges that had existed during the development phases of the Programme proposal, including those related to an awareness of Governmental indifference towards underwater cultural heritage had continued into the implementation phases of the project. Although the South African Heritage Resources Agency’s Chief Executive Officer was a vocal proponent of the Programme, Executive and middle management offered little support and while the Department of Arts and Culture had invested extensively in the Youth Development Programme portion of the project in its launch year, they had adopted a “wait and see” position in the second year. At the time of compiling the programme evaluation report, the Department had not announced its intention to hold a second Youth Development event and none of the participating institutions would commit funding to either continuing the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme in its existing form or with an adapted and updated approach. As Gribble and Jeffery pointed out, 75% of respondents or interviewees indicated that while the social and political environment that existed at the time was “conducive to the implementation of an effective and sustainable Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage programme in South Africa”<sup>47</sup>, a lack of political awareness, an unwillingness for government to devote funds to maritime and underwater cultural heritage and a lack of political will hampered the implementation of an effective Programme and a viable management structure. Institutional inputs of this nature were key contributors if the Programme were to be sustainable. At the outset, maritime heritage practitioners had faced two primary obstacles as previously discussed. Firstly, there was negligible capacity in the field and secondly, there was relatively little public interest in underwater cultural heritage as a result of historical baggage related to treasure hunting and perception. These difficulties formed a negative feedback loop: public apathy meant that the field failed

to attract new practitioners, and the lack of expertise meant that nothing was being done to indicate that protection, archaeology and scientific endeavour were preferable alternatives to treasure hunting and would lead to lifting public indifference. To overcome these obstacles, it was necessary to grow capacity from a base level and create an environment for engagement across a wide socio-cultural cross-section. Any intervention of this nature would, therefore, need to be accessible and require no financial outlay from its potentially low-income target audience. The scale of the programme, together with its intent to provide capacity and skills across the board therefore relied heavily on institutional investment and political will, as described above. Despite the best efforts of the Programme designers and implementers and despite verbal support from Government, the early phases of the Programme continually failed to gain commitment in real terms. The frustration felt by those who sought to establish long-term sustainability stemmed from a perception that extended Government patronage would rely on making the maritime theme more accessible to a new public. How this could be done eluded the implementing team and advocates of the project. When asked how the Programme could be improved to be more inclusive, respondents to the course evaluation questionnaire continued to espouse similar sentiments for enhancing the Programme’s reach and applicability. The establishment of a management system in which maritime and underwater cultural heritage was shown to be universally relevant and a development programme that would benefit communities who engaged with heritage both socially and economically, was crucial.

*“In order to reach a broader audience, candidates from the different provinces could be trained up to a certain level so that they can ‘spread the word’ in their communities. It doesn’t have to be NAS training; it could be a variation that is relevant to the communities who live in a particular area – for example, Lake Fundudzi. Using relevant information and the local language, people will be empowered to protect sites that are important to them [author’s emphasis].”<sup>48</sup>*

45 *Ibid.* p 10  
46 *Ibid.* p 11  
47 *Ibid.* p 14

48 *Ibid.* p 13

The final phrase of this astute answer would unlock an evolution in approaching maritime and underwater cultural heritage and its management.

The response as a whole offers important insights into the degree of success achieved by the Programme. Specifically, it addresses core issues of relevance and the reach of awareness raising efforts. If underwater cultural heritage is to be brought into the mainstream, is specialised skills training aimed predominantly at shipwreck sites and shipping infrastructure the most effective approach to accomplishing this? While such skills undoubtedly benefit heritage managers and practitioners and even individuals or groups with a casual interest in conducting activities on submerged sites, the practical nature of these competences means that they do not capture the attention of stakeholders with an intellectual interest in the maritime past or those who do not identify a personal cultural link with submerged maritime historical sites. Again, designers of a relevant approach to maritime and underwater cultural heritage management needed to rethink methodologies that would connect a much larger population to their maritime past in developing new strategies and apply them to management models.

Management and development strategies needed to be practicably applicable. While the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme provided participants with a definite skill set, the challenge of applying skills acquired during the Programme within participants' day-to-day activities was a theme that ran throughout Gribble and Jeffery's evaluation report. Participants stated that while the acquired skills had value, they struggled to convert them into applicable strategies or practical actions that would assist with management of the sites that they interacted with<sup>49</sup>. The introduction of the Legacy Sites concept late in the Programme somewhat offset this obstacle, but was limited in scope. Sites that were included as Legacy Sites were still sites that heritage managers and archaeologists believed were important. They did not necessarily resonate across the spectrum of course participants. This did not wholly detract from their value. At the start of the Programme, the view that "underwater

cultural heritage = shipwrecks" was strong. This was evident in the examples used for training and the composition of the participant body. The majority of trainees were divers from institutions interested in expanding their recreational diving offerings, or individuals interested in gaining new qualifications or in developing skills to work more effectively on underwater sites. It was envisioned that these individuals could be recruited as volunteers to assist professional heritage practitioners in their management activities. In the closing phases of the Programme, and following the introduction of Legacy Sites to introduce a more diverse audience to the discipline, 58% of those who responded to Gribble and Jeffery's evaluation questionnaire felt that the Programme had improved understanding of maritime and underwater cultural heritage and the reasons for its management<sup>50</sup>. This meant that a larger group of managers would be able to apply course content to their own sites by extrapolating management principles applied to Legacy Sites to similar sites in their environment. This did not, of course, mean that managers felt connected to sites. Rather, they understood the need for protection more deeply.

The response provided the designers of management approaches further opportunities to reflect on potential strategies that could both fill capacity gaps and broaden the appeal of maritime and underwater cultural heritage. Although not implemented, it was thought that management planning and performance could be aided by the establishment of a network of capacitated agencies, professionals and volunteers established in the course of the Programme. Connected networks could share skills and expertise, easing the burden on individual agencies to employ many teams all capacitated with the same competencies. The teams did not need to have the expertise to engage with all site types, nor did they need to identify with all site types. Instead, individuals from other agencies and teams within the network could be called upon to advise on policy decisions and management approaches as required. It would even be possible to call on capacitated individuals from within the private sector who had been upskilled through the training programme. The

49 *Ibid.* p 13

50 *Ibid.* p 15

network proposed by the Maritime Archaeology Development programme was an advance on the Tanzanian management model in that managers could not only make inter-institutional cooperational agreements, but could also call on a pool of public to assist and advise at heritage sites. Basic capacity dilemmas that posed challenges to individuals working in heritage management or interested in protecting and promoting maritime and underwater cultural heritage sites could be significantly alleviated should the network be established.

Unfortunately, the Programme failed to achieve this goal. The Programme's short-term goals hindered the establishment of the coastal heritage management network. Because a decision had been reached that each field season would target different stakeholder groups, individuals who would ideally have been able to come together to discuss and develop management strategies, capacity needs and training requirements did not return to the field schools every year. Although a small number of people participated in the training programme for the full three years, many who could make up the potential network did not meet and could, therefore, not continue to develop a shared capacity network. In hindsight, the decision to train larger numbers of people instead of providing longer term engagement was poor. Those participants that took part throughout the programme formed a close professional group who continue to practise in the heritage field and continue to call on one another for advice and assistance. Individuals who participated in single field schools have not remained connected and, in the absence of support, many have drifted away from maritime and underwater cultural heritage and abandoned the skills acquired during the Programme.

Having taken the decision to make the Programme broadly inclusive and accessible and to make every effort to publicise maritime and underwater cultural heritage across a wide cross-section of industries and communities, the Programme attempted to attract individuals from the various identified stakeholder groups. The first year focused on individuals from the diving community and general public, year two on governmental organisations and year three on students from academic institutions. Only a handful

of individuals associated directly with the South African Heritage Resources Agency and identified as potential employees of the Agency were specifically invited to attend all three years. This did not exclude participation across the programme by others who wished to do so, but this was only by request. The result was that lasting networking opportunities did not present themselves to participants, and questionnaire respondents indicated that they were disappointed that they could not deem this Programme objective a success<sup>51</sup> as it would have assisted their own management objectives and mandates. In terms of developing an overall strategic management model applicable to sub-Saharan Africa where capacity and governmental funding are limited, the creation of a supportive network for heritage managers is crucial. Links between managers and experts will also play a critical role in decision-making processes and strategic planning and in lightening the load placed on practitioners who, in the absence of assistance, are often expected to be Jacks-of-all-trades.

Gribble and Jefferey agreed that the capacitated coastal network would greatly enhance management potential and capacity. In light of the expansion of the scope of maritime and underwater cultural heritage to include the Legacy Sites and other non-traditional aspects of the maritime past, they suggested that the coastal network would provide an opportunity to identify further unknown site types or provide further examples for comparison. By offering more specific training that centred on the competencies of members of the network, Gribble and Jeffery ventured that experts in a variety of capacities could be created. For example, instruction focused on heritage management, legislation and policy aimed at law enforcement agencies would give officials the armoury to apply their expertise in combatting illegal treasure hunting. By the same token, conservation training at museums would allow staff to better handle waterlogged archaeological finds. A separation of duties would empower individual specialists within their area of expertise and, when included into a coastal network, proffer a cost-effective means to better manage a more extensive set of endeavours required for administrating maritime and underwater cultural heritage. By creating a network of specialists,

---

51 *Ibid.* p 15

the management structures required for maritime and underwater cultural heritage would be more efficiently safeguarded. The *status quo* of maritime and underwater cultural heritage at the time of the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme exposed the challenges faced by heritage managers. It being unlikely that institutions would assign already stretched budgets to the creation of maritime and underwater cultural heritage management positions, let alone capacitated teams, this management model proposed that individuals already in positions that involved daily marine activity could use entry level skills to make basic assessments of sites and propose best-practice management strategies. Where further intervention was required, practitioners could call on practical assistance from the coastal network and expertise from professional archaeologists, conservators and policy makers. Because the coastal management network could not be effectively and sustainably established, limited capacity meant that there was a need for managers who were actively practising to carry a wide range of skills. In turn, this meant that the success of the management model relied on individuals rather than job positions within organisations. If any of the managers left, a significant amount of organisational memory was lost. With this in mind, the proposal to diffuse expertise amongst a network of individuals also offered a solution to critical capacity losses. It was clear that a network of expertise and support was an essential ingredient to the development of effective management systems in the developing world. Again, the contention was that it would be more effective to train a series of specialists at a variety of institutions than a generalist at a single institution.

An added advantage of this approach would be that it offered further opportunities to identify a variety of different, locally relevant maritime cultural sites, thus expanding the research potential of maritime and underwater cultural heritage and allow tailored training to suit these specific sites.

While the notion of specialisation networks appears to offer a silver bullet solution to maritime and underwater cultural heritage management in southern Africa, it exhibits some weaknesses as experienced in Tanzania. The dispersal of expertise

over a relatively large geographical area and over a variety of institutions limits the opportunities for the group to coordinate work. Without an ongoing, sustainable central management core with the ability to fund and commandeer experts when necessary, programmes become diluted by availability of individual members and bureaucratic processes.

Public participation in a coastal network proved more successful. The difficulties of assigning institutional funding to the maintenance of official coastal networks and the implementation of out-of-mandate management strategies is alleviated by encouraging the diving community and other interested stakeholders to establish small community projects. By assisting in the formation of amateur archaeological groups, heritage managers could promote sustainability through awareness. As vocational groups begin to implement projects, an awareness of their activities should grow amongst the diving community. As a direct result of the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme the University of Stellenbosch Underwater Club (MUC) and the Old Mutual Sub-Aqua Club (OMSAC) involved themselves in internally organised projects. OMSAC joined the Institute for Maritime Technology, a parastatal based at the Simons Town Naval Base in Cape Town in mapping the the *Clan Stuart*, wrecked in Simons Bay in 1914, while MUC was enthusiastic to assist the South African Heritage Resources Agency in mapping the *Brunswick*, an English East Indiaman wrecked in Simons Bay in 1805. The former is ongoing and is producing a variety of outcomes including geophysical surveys and historical research. Because the South African Heritage Resources Agency did not assign funding to its Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Unit, the latter partnership failed to materialise, although Harding (2013), supported by divers from the Unit produced detailed geophysical and analogue site maps as part of an archaeology Honours dissertation at the University of Cape Town.

In the absence of official coastal networks, the ability to establish enduring and effective management capacity dispersed over a wide geographic or institutional area could be stimulated by continued public interest in management or project outcomes,

such as those described above. Demands for good management practice at public level may stimulate network activities. Public attention, however, requires an awareness of both maritime and underwater cultural heritage or maritime archaeology as disciplines, and of their output. It was, therefore, to this sphere that the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme devoted significant attention. Public access to peer reviewed journals remains low. The joke amongst academics that published articles are read twice on average – once by the author and once by (one of) three referees – is, unfortunately, supported by a lack of knowledge surrounding maritime heritage practices and theory, at least in the public arena. An extensive public programme hosted by South Africa's Department of Arts and Culture and Robben island Museum was attached to the Programme. School children from coastal and interior provinces were invited to participate in a short maritime and underwater cultural heritage workshop. The Department hoped that by introducing school learners to the concepts of underwater heritage through Legacy Sites and maritime landscapes, they would be able to create enthusiasm for both the heritage and maritime archaeological and historical disciplines. Furthermore, by instilling the values, principles and ethics of heritage management (both submerged and terrestrial), the Department anticipated outcomes, on the micro-level, in which heritage began to become embedded in the thinking and therefore decision-making of young adults. As with the larger training programme, the Department invited different individuals each year, hampering the possibility of groups forming lasting relationships and communication systems. While the South African Heritage Resources Agency made efforts to establish social media platforms through which learners could communicate, lack of opportunities to either discuss heritage or practise learned skills led to an eventual decline in online activity. By the end of 2014, the *SAHRA Maritime Youth* Facebook page had been taken down. The failure of the youth programme to gain traction could also be attributed to a lack of institutional support. Individuals within the South African Heritage Resources Agency's Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Unit (formerly Maritime Archaeology Unit) were expected to bear the burden of public engagement

through social media but were unable to add this duty to their already heavy workloads. Assistance from the Department of Arts and Culture and the Public Relations division within the South African Heritage Resources Agency was not forthcoming.

Media surrounding the Maritime Archaeology Development programme and its associated activities was poor. Despite the presence of international expert trainers, students from around the world, an enthusiastic youth group and exciting research outputs, media were given little access to information about the project and publicity was kept to a minimum. An opportunity for promoting maritime and underwater cultural heritage was missed<sup>52</sup>. It seemed inevitable that in the face of meagre public engagement, the programme's sustainability was compromised. By the close of the Programme in 2012, assessors, participants and implementation personnel had begun to examine this shortcoming in an effort to understand how their approach to such projects and heritage management generally could be adjusted to coopt public support.

Respondents to the assessment of the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme questionnaire suggested that public awareness and interest could be better stimulated through an inclusive approach to the establishment of the coastal network envisaged by the Programme. Programme participants suggested conducting training initiatives more widely. Instead of focusing only on annual field schools at a central location like Robben Island, it was suggested that at least one activity be undertaken elsewhere on the South African coast. Gribble and Jeffery also recommended that the programme should diversify its offerings to include a wider range of sites and histories so as to include a more comprehensive range of stakeholders and publics<sup>53</sup>. Although specialised training remained an imperative, awareness raising initiatives and public engagement pitched at non-professionals could be attached to capacity building programmes to encourage broader appeal.

In this vein, a capacity building and training programme could be implemented at a variety of

52 *Ibid* p 26

53 *Ibid* p 22

sites and pitched at a variety of levels to showcase examples of the diversity of maritime and underwater cultural heritage. By strategically selecting sites for training purposes, the programme could bring together heritage professionals and other stakeholders from communities around heritage sites allowing discussion to facilitate the development of interactive management strategies in which stakeholders were equally involved. Gribble and Jefferey's recommendations for an inclusive approach had been tested in a confined environment during the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme. Under the supervision of Robert Parthesius, students from Leiden University in the Netherlands had joined the Programme to gain practical maritime archaeological experience and to conduct research aimed at Robben Island's maritime cultural landscape. In addition, the students were asked to contribute to a review of the Island's tourism offerings, make suggestions for new offerings and to establish pathways for growing the economy of the Robben Island Museum which has been experiencing a drop in visitor numbers over the past five years<sup>54</sup>. Indirectly, the implementation of a multi-vocal approach to site development and management was tested during the Programme. The outcomes of the students' efforts highlighted some of the necessities for further adaptation of the approach to heritage management that the Programme aspired to implement. Although they consulted widely amongst the Robben Island communities, including residents, employees and visitors, sites that were identified for being potentially included in a historical route tended to be those that were tangible and well known. They included military installations, pre-prison infrastructure, and archaeological remains related to the history of the Island. Intangible aspects of the Island's past and the interpretation of the experience of individuals and groups that were part of the Island's history were largely absent (with the exception of the experience of the political prisoners of the apartheid era). It is possible that this data was missing because the students had been set a specific task – identifying sites and proposing strategies for incorporating them into the tourism options offered

<sup>54</sup> Visitor numbers have been affected by a variety of elements including employee strike action, unreliable ferry services, etc. Whether this is compounded by an increase in apathy towards the political history of the Robben Island on which the tourism offering is based and a desire for variety amongst tourists is unclear.

by the Robben Island Museum. As observers and data collectors whose task it was to assemble data offered by the target communities, students would, for the most part, not attempt to solicit information that was not freely offered. Conversely, interviewees may have felt that the expectation was to provide examples of tangible, visible and objective aspects of the Islands' past that could be shown to tourists rather than personal interpretations of it. The project designers felt that while this places new historical layers into the consciousness of tour guides and heritage managers as both sources for tourism diversification and deeper research, a missing component of the Island's heritage, the personal interpretation of the past, needed to be included if people were to fully connect to the maritime cultural landscape in which they lived, worked and visited and, therefore, lobby for better management and protection, in which they played a role. To ensure that this would happen, it would be necessary to establish and validate the empathetic heritage experience and to look more deeply at the layers that defined why people wanted to visit the sites or share them with visitors. In other words, it was necessary to authorise individuals' *perceptions* of the heritage of the island, not just its history. How this could be done was explored and tested at Ilha de Mozambique and refined during Programmes in south Africa's Eastern Cape and at lake Fundudzi, as will be described below.

Programme designers had recognised the shortcomings contained in the outcomes of the student data – namely that interviewees only identified "classic" historical sites they believed would be of interest to tourists and researchers. Personal or community associations with a maritime past or the maritime cultural landscape, it seemed, were either not recognised as being relevant to the research or were not seen as having heritage value. It appeared that interview respondents were telling researchers what they believed the researchers wanted to know. Because the students were completely neutral in their interview approach, respondents were not prompted to expose potentially personal narratives related to water. This again pointed explicitly to the need to re-evaluate the Programme approach. Researchers and project personnel knew that there were deep heritage connections to the maritime landscape.

Individual conversations had, for example, revealed a belief system in which ancestors lived in the sea. But these traditional heritages remained hidden. While it is possible that local maritime perspectives were withheld from researchers because the Island communities did not want this heritage known it seems more likely that the residents, staff and visitors to Robben Island were simply unaware that these histories formed part of the greater maritime cultural landscape. The Maritime Archaeology Development Programme had failed at its core audience level in its efforts to raise awareness of the scope of the discipline. Because interviewees continued to associate maritime and underwater cultural heritage with the colonial assemblages and infrastructure that was visible on the Island, they did not consider personal engagements and associations with the maritime landscape as being relevant important.

The heritage trails that were created were not, therefore, vastly different from what was already known. Although the identified sites were of some interest to tourists, their narrative was skewed towards South Africa's "historical" period. The sites and histories were not unique and did not reflect the full antiquity of the landscape. In order to ensure long-term, sustainable protection and management of maritime and underwater cultural heritage in the developing world context, it is critical, as will be presented below, that local perspectives are recognised and incorporated.

In spite of the identified need for an evolution in approach, Robben Island Museum managers expressed their satisfaction with the outcomes of the Programme. They felt that the project had successfully raised the profile of maritime and underwater cultural heritage, that it had enhanced understanding of the differences between cultural and natural heritage management and that the heritage trails would contribute towards expanding the tourism offering of the Island<sup>55</sup>.

A total of 77% of stakeholder reported that they considered the Maritime Archaeology Development programme to be a sustainable platform for managing and developing maritime and underwater cultural

heritage in South Africa<sup>56</sup>, an apparently encouraging endorsement of the approach taken by the programme designers. Respondents' enthusiasm and positivity for the Programme aside, there was a continual underlying sense that the programme lacked some component. This became clear in the wide array of answers that were provided when asked how the programme could be improved and what could be added. Unfortunately, since programme participants' goals were focused on skills development, they did not identify flaws in the design elements of the approach to maritime and underwater cultural heritage. It appeared that as individuals grappled to put their fingers on what was missing from the course, they tended towards adding further practical training features to the course curriculum.

Questionnaire respondents identified the following practical components for inclusion in an expanded programme, as reported by Gribble and Jeffery<sup>57</sup>:

1. Detailed analysis of the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Heritage and other pertinent legislation and policy.
  - Participants felt that a deeper knowledge of the Convention and the mechanisms for international cooperation contained therein would provide managers with a basic set of policy tools to initiate, establish and sustain collaboration at national, regional and international level.
  - Participants believed that a better understanding of the laws, policy and legislative best practice would contribute towards assisting in policing of activities on submerged heritage sites.
  - Respondents from the Robben Island Museum indicated that their obligations and management plans were at times contradictory in that they needed to fulfil the directives of both national legislation and the instructions of the various World Heritage committees and

55 *Ibid.* p 13

56 *Ibid.* p 16  
57 *Ibid* pp 15 -16

- assessors. It was deemed valuable to be provided with support and guidance in navigating the requirements of various policies and legislation and harmonising management documentation and strategy. Maritime and underwater cultural heritage management would be slotted into cohesive policies and would inform, and be informed by, the legislative obligations of the museum.
2. Remote sensing technology and practical use.
    - Still focused on shipwrecks, many participants determined that locating and identifying sites would be of value to improving management. Because so few sites are known to heritage managers, it is difficult to develop policy, focus protection and conservation efforts and strategically apply significance criteria to sites. This is, perhaps, an unrealistic training goal. Equipment is expensive and highly specialised. Should heritage management agencies have access to these tools, as the South African Heritage Resources Agency does, specialised, focused, individual training is warranted to ensure that operational capacity exists. However, broad training in this field is unnecessarily expensive and, without access to equipment, will not benefit the vast majority of trainees.
  3. *In situ* conservation
    - Non-professional heritage managers indicated that they did not have the requisite skill sets to deal with submerged sites, should these be identified. Should sites be located within their management environments, they did not have the support capacity to work on sites and, therefore, preferred to be able to manage sites without disturbance.
  4. Site recording, mapping and assessment
    - Managers believed they could make better management decisions if they possessed basic maritime archaeological mapping and assessment skills. These could be used to monitor changes at sites, especially in areas where diving was prevalent.
  5. Site management – practical implementation including management plans
    - Participants deemed this a vital management skill. Individuals working in areas such as environmental conservation, recreational diving and law enforcement thought that they would be better prepared to convince their own managers to supply capacity and funding to site protection if they could develop strong management plans based on accepted site management policy and practice.
  6. Artefact conservation
    - Individuals from institutions such as parks, conservation areas and museums indicated that they were often approached by members of the public who had recovered objects from shipwrecks, and sometimes other cultural sites. In most instances objects were donated to the institutions. Managers felt that they were not adequately equipped to deal with archaeological artefacts and, as a result, did nothing with them. By providing training and establishing protocols for receiving and stabilising objects, it would be possible to better protect and manage such items.

It was thought that refresher training every two years, for example, would be a valuable addition.

Questionnaire respondents were not convinced, however, that practical training was the only pathway for developing an appropriate and implementable management structure. But, as described above, they struggled to identify a potential approach to the maritime and underwater cultural heritage disciplines as a whole, that would fit with the constraints and context of the developing world. It was clear to them though, that the current models were not effective and respondents deemed this to be largely because of the exclusionary nature of a discipline focused on

colonial shipwrecks in a predominantly inaccessible environment. Suggestions for developing an approach and training structure that would be locally relevant clustered around the need to broaden the scope of the field. Propositions for doing this indicated an inclusive approach<sup>58</sup>, including:

1. More public programmes and general awareness raising of the scope of and value of maritime and underwater cultural heritage.
2. Involvement of “other”<sup>59</sup> groups.
3. A broadening of the participant base (continuing to recruit new, entry level trainees while developing higher level skills).
4. More community participation.
5. Train the trainer programmes that provided course participants with a set of skills to train downstream communities without having to rely exclusively on course experts. These trainers would be able to introduce maritime and underwater cultural heritage to their communities following the course.
6. Opportunities for academic qualifications at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. Respondents indicated that future versions of the Maritime and Archaeology Development Programme could be used to provide foundation training that prepared individuals for further tertiary level studies. This included suggestions to develop multi-level programmes that could up-skill target audiences appropriately.
7. Awareness raising at a political level followed by training for specific bureaucratic skill sets such as policy making, assessment of impact reporting and legislation.
8. A collaborative management approach at institutional level. Trainees from institutions including various parks,

museums, law enforcement agencies and management authorities recommended the development of memoranda of understanding between government institutions. These would, in effect, formalise a management network at the official level. It was envisaged that through this network, institutions could call on a wide variety of expertise without having to employ their own heritage management teams.

9. Positioning maritime and underwater cultural heritage within a broader context including global heritage perspectives and general historical development. The process of contextualising the discipline could also highlight connections between environmental and cultural legacies in terms of management, scientific endeavour and socio-anthropological influences.
10. The development of a training structure aimed at community groups instead of individuals, including developing a set of processes that could be used by communities to develop management plans.

The insights contained in points 8 to 10 above were of particular significance in drafting of the new heritage development and management approaches.

Respondents unanimously agreed that the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme’s approach of improving management through institutional and individual capacity development faced serious sustainability challenges<sup>60</sup>. Because expertise was being created on an individual basis within institutions and because this meant that it was necessary for individuals to be available for one another across and between these institutions, the viability of the approach relied almost exclusively on a strong professional and institutional network. For the approach to succeed, institutions needed to form coherent and committed groupings and make provision for their employees to be seconded to others if necessary.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid* pp 15-16

<sup>59</sup> It was unclear from the response whether “other” groups referred to different communities, institutions or racial groups (in light of maritime archaeology and underwater cultural heritage being predominantly white disciplines)

<sup>60</sup> Gribble and Jeffery (2012, 16)

Programme designers had not thought deeply about the structure of the required institutional relationship. They had, however, recognised the need for a coastal network and had included it in the Programme's implementation documentation. The absence of an actual framework for establishing a network in the pre-activity planning phases resulted from two root unknowns. Firstly, because the goals of the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme included the development of improved management infrastructure, it could not predict in advance what that infrastructure would look like in reality. It was only possible to begin conceptualising the network once stakeholders had been identified and consulted. Secondly, the network needed buy-in at institutional management level and the programme designers could not be sure that decision makers could be convinced of the value of the approach. Should the Programme fail to bring institutions together in the network, it would be necessary to re-evaluate potential network structures.

Several propositions for actions that would assist in establishing and sustaining a coastal network were offered. Most ideas included regular central workshops and training. For example, annual or bi-annual field schools could be rotated amongst sites under the management of the network institutions. Submerged sites that lay within the environments managed by an institution such as South African National Parks and that faced specific management challenges could be used as field sites. This would not only support the institution itself, but also provide a platform for continuing skills development related to current management issues.

After setting up a South African coastal network, the evolution of a regional network seemed natural to field school participants. Regional stakeholders faced many of the same management problems, including the threat of treasure hunting, lack of capacity, lack of infrastructure and finance and low levels of government support. Many of the challenges for research activities aimed at maritime and underwater cultural heritage were also universal. Logistical difficulties related to accessing sites in remote and difficult environments could be alleviated through sharing resources and capacity (South Africa, for

example, has a team of well trained, experienced diving archaeologists who could support field activities throughout the region).

Regional stakeholders believed that a regional network could help fill knowledge gaps that hampered management decision-making processes, with 69% agreement that the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme had been a significant kick-start to designing and establishing a maritime and underwater cultural heritage collaboration network at a national and regional level<sup>61</sup>. All but one of the respondents indicated their belief that a regional network would enhance abilities to manage maritime and underwater cultural heritage at regional, national and local levels<sup>62</sup>. Sub-Saharan Africa has enjoyed little underwater archaeological attention. Although some shipwreck sites have been located, identified and assessed, few have been excavated or scientifically examined. Nowhere have other submerged site types been investigated archaeologically. This has resulted in an assumption that every site that is discovered is the only example of its kind in the region and, therefore, significant, prompting management decisions that stipulate that all sites must be the subject of physical management intervention including active *in situ* conservation and continual monitoring. While there are undoubtedly arguments for attempting to conserve everything as well as debate about who determines significance, and how, the realities of the developing world context mean that, currently, best management practices would necessitate choosing to direct funding and capacity at sites deemed most appropriate. These might include sites of archaeological, scientific or heritage significance, or sites that are under direct threat. By sharing knowledge and expertise amongst heritage managers at a regional level, such decisions would be more informed and more appropriate.

As described above, the goal of establishing a coastal management network could not be achieved. Although the South African Heritage Resources Agency was a natural choice for acting as lead institution, and middle management from all potential partner organisations were enthusiastic to

61 *Ibid.* p 16

62 *Ibid.* p 16

establish an official institutional relationship, upper management at the South African Heritage Resources Agency failed to provide bureaucratic support in the form of upper lever approaches to counterparts in other agencies. The result was that individual participants in the field schools could agree to keep in contact and provide advice, but could not commit their institutions to any official collaboration.

Respondents felt that institutions may be hesitant to commit to a network of professionals due to the potential funding burden that might be incurred. While many looked to the South African Heritage Resources Agency and, by extension, South Africa as the regional leader in maritime and underwater cultural heritage, there was little indication of how this leadership role could be realised. It became clear that a concerted effort should be made to design a network structure that accounted for the restrictions faced by regional and national stakeholders. Funding and infrastructure constraints could be listed as primary challenges, but administrative and operational difficulties also needed to be examined. The individuals in the developing network were already fulfilling operational needs within their organisations. Would it be reasonable and possible to ask them to place additional items related to underwater cultural heritage management onto their workload? If the network required assistance, would institutions have the capacity to meet their own milestones and goals if individuals were seconded elsewhere? It seemed unlikely. Participants and stakeholders consistently indicated that momentum was key to collaboration and retaining capacity. There were several suggestions as to how momentum could be maintained. Communication was a core element in this. Participants thought that the development of a platform through which stakeholders and practitioners could exchange information on projects, developments, challenges, potential solutions and progress reports would intensify interactions between countries and would benefit regional capacity growth. The platform could be further developed as a tool through which resources and expertise could be requested and shared<sup>63</sup>. As mentioned, lack of resources and infrastructure, including financing, equipment and people has been a leading concern in the region. *Ad hoc* capacity building programmes

have limited impact if basic support structures are not in place. These limitations had already been illustrated in the development of the Tanzanian maritime and underwater cultural heritage team. While expertise was established on multiple levels within institutions and government departments, they were not supported through funding that was a necessary requirement to deploy the team from their various locations and equipment was not readily available or accessible. The equipment that had been provided to the team was held in a central repository in Dar es Salaam, which meant that individuals at other centres could not easily use it in their daily operations. Because the managers of the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme had not been able to implement the proposed network of expertise and capacity even at a national level through a coastal network, the practicalities of overcoming these constraints were not adequately addressed. Possible resolutions were informally discussed and will be explored below, but none were formalised, costed or scrutinised.

Participants and stakeholders in the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme suggested that by structuring interactions through the formation of committees and task teams at national, regional and international levels, a network may be “forced” to cooperate<sup>64</sup>. By placing expectations and deadlines on individuals and activities, peer pressure may encourage ongoing dialogue and interaction. Again, this system relied on the establishment of a platform through which members could communicate and seek advice. Once more, this relied on securing funding to maintain the network and the enthusiasm of participants to involve themselves in a structure that increased workload. As an interim measure, it was suggested that contact be maintained through meetings and workshops perhaps biannually where experiences and challenges could be exchanged and policies and solutions to problems could be developed. These meetings would be attended by individuals at the practitioner level. It was recommended that regular regional conferences be organised where high ranking government officials could be informed of developing projects and lobbied for support<sup>65</sup>.

63 *Ibid.* p 16

64 *Ibid.* p 16

65 *Ibid.* p 16

## ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Gribble and Jeffery's appraisal of the final outcomes of the three-year Maritime Archaeology Development Programme was, on the whole, positive. They concluded that the development of a well considered "Draft National Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Strategy" together with a supporting "Vision and Mission Statement for the National Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Strategy" that provided the rationale for the Programme's implementation approach contributed towards the evolution of a "clear direction [and framework] for a sustainable, future [Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage] programme"<sup>66</sup>.

Despite the lack of widespread publicity and the failures to garner media support, the positive feedback received from the participants of the Youth Programme as well as the individuals involved in the capacity building and training portions of the programme appeared to indicate that the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme had achieved public and community support<sup>67</sup>. This was a critical outcome for the project designers, for the South African Heritage Resources Agency and the Department of Arts and Culture. It showed that the approach to developing the field had advanced in the right direction. The introduction of Legacy Sites had captured new, previously marginalised maritime heritage audiences and had involved them in strategic thinking about management of maritime sites. This was an important step in reintroducing maritime heritage into the heritage management mainstream. As Gribble and Jeffery (2012, 25) pointed out, "[a]lmost from the outset, and through [its lifespan], the programme has shifted elements of its focus to broaden perspectives of what Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage is, to engage with how Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage sites and histories are viewed and valued by South Africans, and to make the programme as relevant as possible to as wide an audience as possible." Although an approach that evolved as the programme progressed brought with it some challenges surrounding convincing divers and heritage managers to alter

their perspectives of what constituted the heritage resource and how it should be interpreted, it was generally agreed that the new approach enhanced, rather than detracted from the programme and its outputs<sup>68</sup>. In its current format, the approach of the programme could serve as a foundation model to regional partners involved in the development of their own national programmes<sup>69</sup>. Unfortunately, the programme is heavily funding dependent. Although costs are relatively low when compared with field schools offered internationally, the model may still be out of financial reach in countries in which maritime heritage is a relatively low priority area, often perceived to be in juxtaposition or conflict with official heritage narratives. This poses a significant hurdle in implementing the approach more broadly. In the South African example, the programme benefited from discussions surrounding the scope of the field and eventual production of strategic documents that informed the programme approach. Since these included the identification of Legacy Sites that helped make maritime archaeology and maritime underwater cultural heritage more accessible, it was possible to immediately form connections with communities who felt little connection to shipwrecks. It is questionable, however, whether this is enough. In the three years following the conclusion of the Maritime Archaeology development programme, continued participation in maritime and underwater cultural heritage management and research has been low. While it is true that at an institutional level jobs have been created, these jobs have focused almost exclusively on the management of shipwreck sites. Robben Island Museum has also remained committed to the field both in terms of developing their tourism offering to include a broader interpretation of the heritage landscape and in terms of continuing to develop capacity within the institution for the management of the submerged cultural resources that surround the Island itself. Awareness in the public domain has also increased, but this has been largely limited to individuals in the diving community who now take a more conservation minded approach to diving on shipwreck sites, as evidenced in an increase in reporting of inappropriate behavior to heritage management authorities. Awareness

66 *Ibid.* p 25

67 *Ibid.* p 25

68 *Ibid.* p 26

69 *Ibid.* p 26

raising efforts for maritime heritage at Government Ministerial level have also found traction. While action has been slow, MUCH has remained on the Government agenda in the form of policy development and project implementation. Maritime and underwater Cultural Heritage was identified as a key area for development, a large-scale “underwater museum” was proposed and South Africa ratified the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage.

Despite gains, there has been little opportunity for continued engagement and participation. Archaeological projects and field schools do not cater for public involvement or contribution and there have been few avenues for Government to develop their strategies and planning based on ongoing activities. Political and bureaucratic support that had been developed was neither consolidated, nor pursued<sup>70</sup>.

Perhaps the greatest failing of the Programme was its inability to sustainably engage with black South Africans in the communities in which it had operated. Having generated enthusiasm amongst school learners and created a national network of interested individuals, the South African Heritage Resources Agency neglected to establish a forum through which students could communicate, remain informed and participate in heritage. No strategy for management of the *SAHRA Maritime Youth* Facebook page was put into place resulting in its stagnating and eventually becoming defunct. As with other aspects of the Programme, communication and maintenance of the network was reliant on the personal commitment of individuals who were unsupported by their institutional structures. Despite the investment of personnel and resources of institutions such as the South African Heritage Resources Agency, there seemed to be both unwillingness and lack of interest in maintaining the advances made during implementation. At the time of writing, there is no portal through which civilians can connect with government institutions.

This shortcoming of the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme was already becoming

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.* p 27

evident as the project drew to a conclusion in 2012. An examination of the sustainability and future of the Programme led Gribble and Jeffery (2012) to conclude that future iterations needed to continue to innovate and expand on identifying new approaches to management and research that would make maritime and underwater cultural heritage more relevant and accessible to a broader public<sup>71</sup>. It was suggested that this could be achieved through the creation of more bespoke training and engagement offerings. Future iterations of the Programme should:

- *“Consider carefully the targeting of participants in the programme and/or how the training is packaged and delivered for different audiences.*
- *Consider packaging the Programme to suit specific contexts and stakeholders<sup>72</sup>. [For example, non-diving individuals should be given appropriate terrestrial site assessment skills, while divers would require other proficiencies.]*
- *Explore, develop and grow options for cooperative management of [maritime and underwater cultural heritage] between ... agencies.”<sup>73</sup>*

Gribble and Jeffery had suggested that inter-agency cooperation be done at government level between, for example, the South African Heritage Resources Agency and Marine Parks. However, as will be shown below, this concept needed to be expanded more fully to include stakeholders outside of traditional, legislative management agency. To reiterate Gribble and Jeffery’s point<sup>74</sup>, the Programme approach needed to be more inventive and locally relevant in its approach. Training, if it was to be the focus of future programmes, needed to be reimagined to incorporate needs beyond site identification and mapping.

While “innovation” was a key word that recurred frequently in the Programme assessment report it

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.* p 26

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.* p 29

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.* p 31

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.* p 27

was unclear what this meant in reality. Gribble and Jeffery provided general direction for areas where heritage practitioners might find better community acceptance in the execution of their work, but were limited in their vision to activities aimed at already identified Legacy Sites. Prudently, they suggested that management and research projects “address the wide scope of South Africa’s tangible and intangible maritime and underwater cultural heritage<sup>75</sup>” but still such projects were devised by practitioners, academics and managers. No space was offered for an approach in which stakeholders who were the focus of studies and the intellectual custodians of the heritage in question to provide their own direction or perspective. Instead, projects would highlight the need for heritage management and site protection, offer awareness raising surrounding sites identified by “specialists”, and engage stakeholders on a level that satisfied management requirements. Projects would allow experts to produce data that they felt was relevant and measurable and disseminate it publicly<sup>76</sup>. In effect, maritime and underwater cultural heritage research would be carried out in a manner which satisfied funders and taxpayers but which had little local meaning beyond potential income from tourism. A sanitised version of the past that was relevant because managers believed it to be so would be presented through awareness raising initiatives and engagement. While an approach that highlighted managers’ perceptions of heritage values and the resultant need for management might achieve some measure of protection for sites, management would unlikely be sustainable. Awareness raising may generate initial excitement for heritage resources, but the implementation of proscribed management activities would diminish as initial interest wore off. Again, the endurance of the Programme goals over the three years since its completion illustrates the failure of a top down approach and the need for an inclusive perspective of the past.

As the Programme reached its conclusion, a general perception that engagement and participation would shrink in the absence of continued funding permeated the group. The realities of what was possible in the future in light of the expense of continuing to offer

the activities established during the project life cycle, especially field schools, had a negative impact on the participants. Despite the efforts of Programme leaders to elicit support from government, it became clear that a different approach would be necessary if the management and protection of maritime and underwater cultural heritage was to be brought into prominence.

In spite of shortfalls, the Maritime Archaeology Development programme was not without merit. Its capacity building aspirations resulted in an extensive pool of potential supporters and practitioners. Indeed, Gribble and Jeffery suggested that the basic Programme components could be used as a template for the development of maritime and underwater cultural heritage at a regional level. Sub-Saharan states facing similar challenges could model their own programmes on the South African example<sup>77</sup>. In addition, the use of a general regional template for developing capacity in the field could stimulate regional cooperation and collaboration<sup>78</sup>.

Gribble and Jeffery recognised the challenges they faced in proposing a new direction and approach for maritime and underwater cultural heritage. Within the terms of reference for their assessment of the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme, they could not deeply explore detailed, specific solutions for the inherent shortcomings of the Programme. Instead, they could highlight concepts for building a new approach and advocate for regular (three-yearly) approach reviews of the aims, policies and strategies of such a programme in order to “tune the programme [activities] to changing circumstances and issues to ensure that it remains forward looking and relevant”<sup>79</sup>.

This was true for all involved in the Programme. Broad conceptualisations for improvements did not automatically translate into actions. For example, to further ensure that the field, and training in the field specifically, became relevant to South Africans and to allow course participants to identify with the concepts and theory presented in the NAS training, it was widely agreed that the NAS framework required

75 *Ibid.* p 31  
76 *Ibid.* p 31

77 *Ibid.* p 26  
78 *Ibid.* p 31  
79 *Ibid.* p 32

a degree of development and ‘Africanisation’ to ensure that it became understandable to those working in the South Africa context. The Programme opened discussions on ways to make the improvements and changes practical, but did not go further than including local sites as examples for case studies and changing some of the presentation illustrations to local pictures. Even in these instances, case studies and photographs were focused solely on shipwrecks. Despite the introduction of the Legacy Sites in defining the field, training only made cursory reference to them. Why this occurred, and why trainers and managers found it difficult to implement wholesale changes is easily explained in the context in which the Programme was introduced. Firstly, prior to 2009 and the realisation of the first field school, maritime archaeological research had not ventured beyond shipwreck sites with the exception of a post-graduate dissertation on maritime graffiti at prison sites in the Castle of Good Hope and Simon’s Town, Cape Town (Horwitz 1999) and Deacon’s short article on fish traps. Other archaeological, historical and anthropological research that had been conducted on societies that used the sea had not been undertaken from a maritime perspective. Heritage managers had not, therefore, thought deeply enough about examples of human relationships with the sea. This meant that the use of examples such as stone age exploitation of marine foods, maritime oral histories or maritime influences on terrestrial sites were not considered. Secondly, most recognised maritime archaeological projects had been conducted in association with treasure hunters. It must be pointed out, these were legal, sanctioned and in line with South Africa’s existing shipwreck management principles and policies. But by 2009, when heritage managers were making efforts to discourage commercial exploitation of shipwreck sites, examples of archaeologists collaborating on treasure hunting projects were deemed undesirable for use as case studies. This severely hampered training efforts where local examples of sites and interpretations of sites would have been useful illustrative tools for presentation during courses.

A further contribution towards the programme’s limited success was its inability to achieve all of its goals. Specifically, because the Programme

failed to complete the production of a “Manual” for maritime and underwater cultural heritage in South Africa (and in the region); the development of a framework for academia and research in the field, and; the implementation of new management strategies, policy and legislative initiatives, there were no documents or structures that outlined how stakeholders could become involved, how students could continue research or how managers could implement better management models.

As described above, poor media coverage may have contributed to the lack of widespread, sustained interest in the Programme following its completion in 2012. Perhaps more relevant, however, was the deficiency of accessible projects and publications. Although the Programme had envisaged the production of a *Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Manual* that would outline the enlarged scope of the field, provide information about current research trends and projects and offer a new vision for management, research and engagement, a detailed document was never generated. Instead, a booklet entitled *Towards Best Practice in Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage in South Africa* (SAHRA 2011) was drafted for internal use at the South African Heritage Resources Agency and limited circulation. Its main function was as a template from which a Manual could be developed. The booklet was further utilised as a “vision document” and was intended to guide heritage practitioners at statutory level in their approach to dealing with maritime and underwater cultural heritage. It again made use of the Legacy Sites concept as a foundation from which to engage stakeholders, and sketched a future approach to maritime and underwater cultural heritage in which multiple voices could contribute towards redefining the field and identifying South Africa’s maritime links. This approach would have formed the backbone of the more detailed Manual.

As an internal document, the booklet enjoyed little circulation and while the South African Department of Arts and Culture briefly distributed it via their website, it is likely that neither participants in the Maritime Archaeology Development Programme nor members of the general public paid it much attention. It was, however, a valuable document for

the development of the next iteration of the approach to drafting a maritime and underwater cultural heritage management model, as described below.

The successes of producing a new group of capacitated individuals whose expertise could be employed in monitoring, assessment and management of submerged and terrestrial maritime sites was tempered by a lack of academic infrastructure. Programme participants were trained in the basic skills needed to assist archaeologists and heritage professionals in their management efforts, but the Programme did not establish the framework for more advanced research and study and could not, therefore, create avenues for professional progression. This limited opportunity for creating high level expertise and for expanding necessary heritage thinking in maritime and underwater cultural heritage. Without a tertiary level programme being put into place, the field continues to fall behind its terrestrial counterparts on a theoretical level.



## Appendix V Assessment of Salvage Activities (Arqueonautas)

Between 21 July and 1 August 2015, a team was assembled to examine facilities, conservation standards, archaeological excavation strategies, site management strategies, museum displays, academic contributions and social investment contributions made by Arqueonautas. The team brought together experts from the academe (George Washington University, Eduardo Mondlane University), museums (Smithsonian Institute, Iziko Museums of South Africa, Naval History and Heritage Command) and NGOs (African Centre for Heritage Activities and Centre for International Heritage Activities).

The assessment of Arqueonautas's work resulted in the government finally cancelling their permits and halting commercial salvage operations in Mozambique. While this is a key development and the significance of the assessment cannot be overstated, only the role of the Ilha de Mozambique community in heritage management activities will be discussed here. For detailed discussion of the assessment outcomes and the activities of Arqueonautas and for a history of long-term lobbying efforts see Duarte (2010, 2012).

Based on the role that the community had played in training, capacity building and awareness raising, together with the positive outcomes of the Underwater Cultural Heritage – Mozambique programme, they were asked to assist with this assessment. A team made up of community leaders and those responsible for the implementation of the 2014 training programme was asked to focus on three key areas, namely:

- Community attitudes to Arqueonautas
- Arqueonautas's compliance with the Rules of the 2001 UNESCO Convention

- Archaeological project planning standards as relating to community benefits and development.

An analysis of community interviews and workshops, wreck site inspections and assessment of documentation reveals several relevant factors that support the MUCH approach applied during the Underwater Cultural Heritage – Mozambique programme. It should be noted that these are not final findings and are by no means a comprehensive analysis or list of findings of the assessment. Work continues at Ilha de Mozambique under the supervision of Ricardo Duarte and a team made up of community stakeholders and Eduardo Mondlane University students.

1. It was interesting to note that while the Ilha de Mozambique community was, as expected, strongly opposed to Arqueonautas's activities, these objections are rooted partly in the fact that local heritage was deemed unimportant while Portuguese heritage was highlighted. In addition, the community had no access to recovered objects and little has remained on the Island. Community anger and resentment, in this regard, would have been equally strong had excavation been done to high academic standards and objects removed to museums elsewhere in Mozambique or the world. There was little differentiation between objects removed and sold and objects removed and stored off site. While no one had objections to academic research (it was, in fact, welcomed), it was widely felt that research outcomes should benefit local museums and local opportunities for

economic development through tourism. From a community perspective, the primary failure of the salvage company was to ignore community needs and to exclude community in decision-making processes. This seems to indicate that opposition to salvage is rooted in perceptions of exclusion and marginalisation. It also implies that expropriation of heritage objects by any means would have brought Ilha de Mozambique stakeholders to the same point of frustration as experienced at the start of the Underwater Cultural Heritage – Mozambique programme.

2. By excluding community groups and by withholding information from residents, the salvage company invited speculation and rumour. It would appear from the initial examination of documents and sites undertaken during then assessment that excavation activities were focused on those wrecks that might result in higher commercial yield. This may indicate that a good proportion of less commercially valuable sites have been left relatively undisturbed. Because of the abundance of wrecks coupled with the expense of excavation, sites of little commercial value were disturbed only as far as necessary for identification, if possible, or to conclude an assessment of the accessibility and value of cargo. This reality appears to be in stark juxtaposition to the expectations of Ilha de Mozambique residents who fear that all the wreck sites around the Island have been plundered. While this is a preliminary observation and further analysis is required, it may indicate that there is still substantial potential for academic research. This may also mean that opportunities for local participation, tourism development, heritage narrative development and heritage presentation associated with shipwrecks still exist.

These attitudes towards the activities of the salvage company suggested a deep community connection with maritime heritage and a strong desire for a community driven approach to identifying, recording and promoting the heritage of the Island. The desire to retain the objects recovered from submerged

sites at Ilha de Mozambique as well as the need for the inclusion of the local perspective on maritime and underwater cultural heritage was made clear to facilitators and assessors. The Island inhabitants understand the complexity of multiple heritage layers and multiple historical narratives and have a strong grasp of the value of heritage for tourism and community identity. There is a robust aspiration amongst groups and individuals to tell the story of Ilha de Mozambique from a local perspective. The trained MUCH team have continued to explore the maritime cultural landscape and have begun to identify research questions that might be taken up by academics. These include questions surrounding the contribution of local knowledge to maritime activities. This may be as diverse as contributions to shipbuilding, local navigation knowledge or the intangible rituals and practices associated with maritime life. Questions surrounding the evolution of the distinctive stone town and village sectors of the island or the local architectural features of maritime structures may also be constructed. Finally, the investigation of the role of the Island in Indian Ocean trade, including European-Eastern trade, African or Arabian coastal trade or the slave trade, as well as the impact of trade on the Island and the African mainland, will contribute significantly to academic and community goals. It is encouraging that research agendas are, in part, being set based on local needs and interests rather than by the interests of outside researchers. Again, while research is encouraged, it is important that it is locally relevant and contributes to the Island.

It was reassuring to note that that there was tremendous support at Ilha de Mozambique for the training and engagement approach described above. Facilitators were warmly welcomed back to the Island and specifically requested to continue with the programme initiated by the original capacity building and training project.

## Appendix VI Much Capacity in Sub-Saharan Africa

### CAPACITY AND PRACTICE: WHO IS LOOKING AFTER UNDERWATER CULTURAL HERITAGE?

Seen as a leader in the field of underwater cultural heritage and maritime archaeology, South Africa has set the standard for maritime heritage practice throughout the southern Africa. Since 1990, six individuals in South Africa have received formal maritime archaeological training at post-graduate level. Of these, just two remain in the field. Of the two who have specialist maritime archaeological training, one has a DLit from Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, the other a Masters Degree from the University of Cape Town, the latter supervised in his thesis by the former). Both have established non-governmental organisations and are self-employed. Maritime archaeology is no longer offered as a specialisation and no maritime archaeological programmes exist at any of the South African universities. A further three individuals have completed post-graduate studies focused on maritime archaeological themes, but outside of formal maritime archaeological programmes. The qualifications and university offerings suggest a European bias both in subject matter and in theoretical and methodological approach.

In 1988 Bruno Werz, the first specialised maritime archaeologist in South Africa, was coopted on a contract to assess and develop the field. Werz's interest lay in VOC shipwrecks and his early work emphasised this aspect. Between 1990 and 1999 he supervised five post-graduate students at the University of Cape Town, all of whom produced work related to shipwreck sites. It was not until 1994, when Werz recovered an acheulean hand-axe from amongst the artefact assemblage of artefacts uncovered on a shipwreck site, that the presence of other site types occurring in the underwater environment was considered in South

Africa. Despite this discovery, archaeologists remained on the back foot. Legislation remained favourable to treasure hunters and, because shipwrecks were the singular target for salvage, management remained pursuant therewith.

Five individuals trained in terrestrial archaeology or history are currently active in maritime heritage practice in South Africa. Three have full time employment at governmental institutions, one is on a short-term contact at a governmental institution and one is self-employed.

Elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa others are slowly developing underwater cultural heritage and maritime archaeological capability, but this process is slow. Little maritime archaeological research has been carried out. Kenya is growing its maritime archaeological capacity through collaborations with UNESCO and the Chinese government. Currently, one maritime archaeologist practises at the National Museum of Kenya and is based at Fort Jesus World Heritage Site in Mombasa. Namibia has employed one recent Masters graduate at the *Bom Jesus* conservation facility in Swakopmund. He achieved his degree at the University of Bournemouth in 2011. Portuguese educated Ricardo Duarte practises maritime archaeology in Mozambique and teaches an introductory course at the Eduardo Mondlane University in Maputo. Several of Duarte's graduate students have recently received diving training and are entering the maritime archaeological field. Six post-graduate archaeology students in Senegal received introductory training in underwater survey and mapping in May 2016.

UNESCO has convened three capacity building programmes for potential underwater cultural heritage managers from Africa at Selcuk University in Turkey and in Mombasa, Kenya.



## Bibliography

### REPORTS, BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- Aas, C., Ladkin, A. and Fletcher, J., 2005. Stakeholder Collaboration and Heritage Management. *Annals of Tourism Research* 32(1),28-48.
- Abungu, G. 2016. Walking the Long Path to Partnership: Archaeology and Communities in Eastern Africa – Relevance, Access, and Ownership, in Schmidt, P.R. and Pikirayi, I. (eds), *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. Kindle Edition: Routledge, Chapter 3.
- ACHA – African Centre for Heritage Activities, 2013a. *Interim Report: Maritime and underwater cultural heritage capacity building and awareness raising programme – Ilha de Mozambique*. Report African Centre for Heritage Activities, Cape Town.
- ACHA – African Centre for Heritage Activities, 2013b. *Funding proposal for the Prince Clause Fund for Cultural Emergency Relief*. Proposal African Centre for Heritage Activities, Cape Town.
- ACHA – African Centre for Heritage Activities, 2013c. *Underwater Heritage Impact Assessment for the Development of the Breakwater at Salamander Bay*. Report African Centre for Heritage Activities, Cape Town.
- ACHA – African Centre for Heritage Activities, 2014a. *Final Report: Maritime and underwater cultural heritage capacity building and awareness raising programme – Ilha de Mozambique*. Report African Centre for Heritage Activities, Cape Town.
- ACHA – African Centre for Heritage Activities, 2014b. *Final Project Report: SAHRA EC Maritime Oral History Project*. Report African Centre for Heritage Activities, Cape Town.
- ACHA – African Centre for Heritage Activities, 2014c. *Final Project Report: Lake Fundudzi Management Project – Phase I*. Report African Centre for Heritage Activities, Cape Town.
- Adams, J. L., 2010. *New Directions in International Heritage Management Research*. Minnesota (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Minnesota).
- African Economic Outlook 2014. *Global Value Chains and Africa's Industrialisation*. Report OECD Publishing.
- Albino J. and Per Ditlef, F., 2015. Public archaeology, knowledge meetings and heritage ethics in southern Africa: an approach from Mozambique. *World Archaeology* 47(2), 261-284.
- Allen, J.d.V., 1993. *Swahili Origins: Swahili culture and the Shungwaya phenomenon*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Anderson, R., Green, J. and Souter, C., 2007. *Galle Harbour Maritime Archaeological Impact Assessment: Report for Sri Lankan Department of Archaeology*, Report Western Australian Museum, Welshpool.
- Apoh, W., and Gavua, K., 2016. “We Will Not Relocate Until our Ancestors and Shrines Come with us”: Heritage and conflict management in the Bui Dam Project area, Ghana. Schmidt, P.R., and Pikirayi, I. (eds), *Community Archaeology*

- and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. Kindle Edition: Routledge, Chapter 10.
- Avery G., 1975. Discussion on the age and use of tidal fish-traps. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 30, 105-113.
- Aznar-Gómez M. J., 2010. Treasure Hunters, Sunken State Vessels and the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. *International Journal of Marine and Coastal Law* 25, 209–236.
- Babits, L. E. and Van Tilburg, H. (eds), 1998. *Maritime Archaeology: A reader of Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*. New York: Springer.
- Bannerman, N. and Jones, C., 1999. Fish Trap Types: a component of the maritime cultural landscape. *International Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 28(1), 70-84.
- Bass, G. F., 1966. *Archaeology Under Water*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Bass, G. F., 1968. *Archaeology Under Water*, New York: Frederick A. Praeger.
- Baucaire, R., 1998. The Fos Underwater Excavations, in Babits, L. E. and Van Tilburg, H. (eds), *Maritime Archaeology: A reader of Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*. New York: Springer, 9-15.
- Bhaskar, R., 1975. *A realist theory of science*. London: Verso.
- Bhaskar, R., 1986. *Scientific realism and human emancipation*. London: Routledge.
- Bhaskar, R., 2008. *A Realist Theory of Science*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Bhaskar, R., 2011. *Reclaiming Reality: A Critical Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Bennie, J., 2006. *Provincial Maritime Museum Collections*. Presentation Underwater Cultural Heritage Workshop. Cape Town: Department of Arts and Culture.
- Benton, T. and Craib, I., 2001. *Philosophy of social science*. London: Palgrave.
- Blumberg R.C., 2001. *Statement by Robert C. Blumberg, US Observer Delegate to the 31st UNESCO General conference, to commission IV of the general conference, regarding the US views on the 2001 UNESCO convention on the protection of underwater cultural heritage, 29 Oct 2001*, Paris: UNESCO.
- Boshoff, J., 1998. NAS Courses in South Africa. *Bulletin for the Australian Institute of Maritime Archaeology* 22, 133-136.
- Boshoff, J., 1999. *Culling the white elephants: the development of Maritime Archaeology at the SA Cultural History Museum*. Paper 4th World Archaeology Conference, Cape Town.
- Bouman, D. and Roling, M., 2006 *1693: De ongelukkige standring van het VOC-schip De Gouden Buys*. Research Report, Amsterdam.
- Bowens, A. (ed), 2009. *Underwater Archaeology: The NAS Guide to Principles and Practice*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bowitz, E. and Ibenholt, K., 2009. Economic Impacts of Cultural Heritage – Research and Perspectives. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 10(1), 1-8.
- Brandt, P. 2006. “Ideals” vs “Reality”: *Maritime Archaeology in South Africa*. Presentation Underwater Cultural Heritage Workshop, Cape Town: Department of Arts and Culture.
- Breen, C. and Lane, P., 2003. Archaeological Approaches to East Africa’s Changing Seascapes. *World Archaeology* 35(3), 469-489.
- Breen, C., 2007. Advocacy, international development and World Heritage Sites in sub-Saharan Africa, *World Archaeology* 39(3), 355-370.

- Brice, G., 1996 Salvage and the Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Marine Policy* 20(4), 337-342.
- Brown, A.G.K., 1987. Maritime Archaeology in South Africa, dead on arrival? *Bulletin of the Australian Institute for Maritime Archaeology* 11(1), 1.
- Carchedi, G., 1983. *Problems in class analysis*. London: Routledge.
- CIE – Centre for International Heritage Activities, 2010a. *Annual Report*. Internal Report, Leiden.
- CIE – Centre for International Heritage Activities, 2010b. *Report on activities at Kilwa Kisiwani 14-27 November 2010*. Internal Report, Leiden.
- CIE – Centre for International Heritage Activities, 2011. *Ilha de Moazambique World Heritage Site. Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage: Report on Sensibilization seminar 24-28 January 2011*. Internal Report, Leiden.
- Chiliza, S. and Hingston, E.D.C. 2014. A Kinematic Analysis of an Ancient Rockslide at Lake Fundudzi, South Africa, in Lollino, G., Giordan, D., Crosta, G., Corominas, J., Azzam, R., Wasowski, J. and Sciarra, N. (eds), *Engineering Geology for Society and Territory* 2. 783-786.
- Chirikuru, S., Manyanga, M., Ndoro, W., and Pwiti, G., (2010). Unfulfilled promises? Heritage Management and community participation at some of Africa's cultural heritage sites. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 16, 30-42.
- Chirikure, S. and Pwiti, G., 2008. Community involvement in archaeology and cultural heritage management: An assessment from case studies in southern Africa and Elsewhere. *Current Anthropology* 49, 467-485.
- Chirikure, S., and Sinamai, A., 2015. World History from the Seabed: Rescuing a Portuguese shipwreck off the coast of Namibia in Tripathi, S. (ed), *Shipwrecks Around the World: Revelations of the Past*. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 114-130.
- Claus, P. and Marriott, J., 2012. *History: An introduction to theory, method and practice*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Cockrell, W. A., 1998. Why Dr. Bass Couldn't Convince Mr. Grumbel, in Babits, L. E. and Van Tilburg, H. (eds), *Maritime Archaeology: A Reader of Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*. New York: Springer, 9 – 15.
- Comer, D.C., and Willems, W.J.H., 2011. Tourism and Archaeological Heritage: Driver to Development or Destruction? *Proceedings of the 17<sup>th</sup> ICOMOS General Assembly Symposium, 27 November to 2 December 2011*. UNESCO House: Paris, 499-511.
- Davidson, S., Hoewards, T., Dellino-Musgrave, V., Oxley, I. and Dunkley, M., 2014. *The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001: An impact review for the United Kingdom*. Report English Heritage, London.
- Deacon, H.J., 1988. Practice and Policy in Maritime Archaeology. *The South African Archaeological Bulletin* 43(148), 123 – 125.
- Deacon, H. *The Island: A history of Robben Island 1488 – 1990*. Cape Town: David Phillip.
- Deacon, J. 1993. Protection of historical shipwrecks through the National Monuments Act. *Proceedings of the Third National Maritime Conference, Durban 1992*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.
- Department of Transport, 1983. *Report on the Inter-Departmental Committee of Inquiry re Shipwrecks*. Report, Department of Transport, Pretoria.
- Department of Environment, 2010. *Water, Heritage and the Arts. Environment Heritage and the Arts: 2010-11 Budget Measures*. Report Department of Environment, Canberra.
- Devendra, S. and Muthucumarana, R., 2013. *Maritime Archaeology and Sri Lanka: Globalization, Immigration and Transformation in the*

- Underwater Archaeological Record. *Historical Archaeology: Globalization, Immigration and Transformation* 47(1), 50-65.
- Devendra, S. and Muthucumarana, R., 2015. Maritime Archaeology in Sri Lanka: Twenty five years old and a new beginning. In Tripathi, S. (ed), *Shipwrecks Around the World: Revelations of the Past*. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 381-424.
- Dromgoole, S., 2013a. Reflections on the position of the major maritime powers with respect to the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001. *Marine Policy* 38, 116-123.
- Dromgoole, S., 2013b. *Underwater Cultural Heritage and International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dromgoole, S. and Gaskell, N., 1993. Who has the Right to Historic Wrecks and Wreckage? *International Journal of Cultural Property* 2(2), 217-274.
- Duarte, R.T., 2010. *Arqueonautas intervention in Mozambique Island*. Report International Committee on Underwater Cultural Heritage, Paris.
- Duarte, R.T., 2012. Maritime History in Mozambique and East Africa: The Urgent Need for the Proper Study and Preservation of Endangered Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 7(1), 63-86.
- Duarte, R.T., 2015. *Assessment of the activities of Arqueonautas at Ilha de Mozambique*. Report Eduardo Mondlane University, Maputo.
- Duncan, B., 2011 "What Do You Want to catch?": Exploring the Maritime Cultural Landscapes of the Queenscliff Fishing Community, in Ford, Ben (ed), *The Archaeology of Maritime Landscapes*. New York: Springer, 217-232.
- Ebot, T. F., 2008. *The History of History in South Africa Secondary Schools, 1994-2006*. Cape Town (unpublished Masters Thesis, University of the Western Cape).
- Engelbrecht, A., 2006. Textbooks in South Africa from apartheid to post-apartheid: ideological change revealed by racial stereotyping, in Roberts-Schweitzer, E., (in consultation with) Greaney, V. and Duer, K (eds), *Promoting Social Cohesion through Education: Case Studies and Tools for using Textbooks and Curricula*. Washington D. C.: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/World Bank.
- Evans, A. M., Russell, M. A. and Leshikar-Denton, M. E., 2010. Local Resources, Global Heritage: An Introduction to the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 5, 79-83.
- Fabian, S., 2013. Rethinking History: East Africa's Gorée: Slave trade and slave tourism in Bagamoyo, Tanzania. *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 47(1), 95 – 114.
- Fanon, F., 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Ferber, M., 2006. Critical Realism and Religion: Objectivity and the Insider/Outsider Problem. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96(1), 176-181.
- Firth A. 2011. Underwater Cultural Heritage off England: character and significance, in Yorke R. (ed), *Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage in International Waters Adjacent to the UK: Proceedings of the JNAPC 21st anniversary seminar*. Portsmouth: Nautical Archaeological Society.
- Flatman, J., 2011. Places of special meaning: Westerdhal's comet "Agency" and the concept of the "Maritime Cultural Landscape", in Ford, B (ed), *The Archaeology of Maritime Landscapes*. New York: Springer, 217-232.
- Fleisher, J., Lane, P., LaViolette, A., Horton, M., Pollard, E., Morales, E.Q., Vernet, T., Christie, A. and Wynne-Jones, S., 2015. When did the Swahili Become Maritime? *American Anthropologist* 117(1), 100-115.

- Fokwang, J., 2003. *Chiefs and Democratic Transition in Africa: An Ethnographic Study of the Chiefdoms of Tshivhase and Bali*. Pretoria (unpublished Masters Thesis University of Pretoria).
- Ford, B (ed.), 2011. *The Archaeology of Maritime Landscapes*. New York: Springer.
- Forrest, C.S.J. and Gribble, J., 2002, The illicit movement of underwater cultural heritage: The case of the Dodington coins. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 2(2), 267-293.
- Forrest, C.S.J. and Gribble, J., 2006, Perspectives from the Southern Hemisphere: Australia and South Africa, *The UNESCO Convention for the Protection of the Underwater Heritage: Proceedings of the Burlington House Seminar*, October 2005, JNAPC / NAS.
- Freire, J.V., 2014. Maritime Cultural Landscape: A New Approach to the Cascais Coastline. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 9, 143-157.
- Gao, Q., 2016. Challenges in Archaeological Tourism in China. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology*, 20(2), 422-436.
- Gawronski, J. and Kist, B., 2002. Witte Leeuw, Shipwreck, in Orser, C. E. (Ed), *Encyclopedia of Historical Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Geertz, C., 1993. *The Interpretation of Cultures*, London: Fontana Press.
- Gould, R.A., 2000. *Archaeology and the Social History of Ships*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, B., Ashworth, G.J. and Turnbridge, J.E., 2000. *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. London: Arnold.
- Graham, B.J. and Howard, P., 2008. *Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Green, J., Devendra, S., and Parthesius, R. (eds), 1998. Report for the Sri Lanka Department of Archaeology: Galle Harbour Project 1996 – 97. *Special Publication No. 4 of the Australian National Centre of Excellence for Maritime Archaeology*, Fremantle.
- Gribble, J., 2001. *Salvage and the Stats*. Presentation South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.
- Gribble, J., 2002. Past, Present and Future of Maritime Archaeology in South Africa, 2002, in Ruppe, C.V. and Barstad, J.F. (eds), 2013. *International Handbook of Underwater Archaeology*. London and New York: Kluwer.
- Gribble, J., 2005. The Ocean Baskets: Pre-Colonial Fish Traps on the Cape South Coast. *The Digging Stick* 22(1), 1-4.
- Gribble, J. and Jeffery, B., 2012. *South African Maritime Archaeology Development Programme 2010 – 2012: External Evaluation Report*. Internal Report South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.
- Gribble, J. and Sharfman, J., 2013. Maritime Legal Management in South Africa, in, Smith, C. (ed), *Online Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*.
- Guba, E. G., and Lincoln, Y. S., 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research, in Denzin, N.K. and Y. S. Lincoln, Y.S. (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Guerin, U. and Egger, B., 2010. Guaranteeing the Protection of Submerged Archaeological Sites Regardless of their Location: The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001). *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 5, 97-103.
- Hall, J.L., 2007. The Fig and the Spade: Countering the deceptions of treasure hunters. *Archaeology Institute of America Archaeology Watch*. August 2007, 1-10.

- Harding, J., 2013. *The Brunswick: An archaeological assessment of the wreck and its surrounding context*. Cape Town (unpublished Honours thesis University of Cape Town).
- Harris, L. (ed), 2016. *Sea Ports and Sea Power: African Maritime Cultural Landscapes*. Cham: Springer.
- Harris, L., Jones, J. and Schnitzer, K., 2012. Monuments in the Desert: A Maritime Landscape in Namibia. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 7, 111-140.
- Hatch, H. E. 2011. Material Culture and Maritime Identity: Identifying Maritime Subcultures Through Artifacts, in Ford, B (ed), 2011. *The Archaeology of Maritime Landscapes*. New York: Springer, 217-232.
- Haug, J., 2013. Odyssey's Treasure Ship: Salvor, Owner, or Sovereign Immunity', *Ocean Development and International Law*, 44(2), 170-184.
- Hegemon, M., 2003. Setting theoretical egos aside: issues and theory in North American archaeology. *American Antiquity* 68(2), 213-43.
- Hine, P.J., 2008. *Stone-walled tidal fish traps: an archaeological and archival investigation*. Cape Town (unpublished Masters Thesis University of Cape Town).
- Hine, P., Sealy, J., Halkett, D. and Hart, T., 201). Antiquity of Stone-Walled Tidal Fish Traps on the Cape Coast of South Africa. *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 65(191), 35-44.
- Holy, L. and Stuchlik, M., 1983. *Actions, norms and representations: foundations of anthropological inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horwitz, D.M., 1997. *Disreputable Fellows: Prisoners and graffiti from the cast, Cape Town*. Cape Town (unpublished Honours Thesis University of Cape Town).
- Howard, P. and Graham, B.J., 2008. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Heritage and Identity*. Burlington: Routledge.
- Ichumbaki, E.B., 2015. Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage of the United Republic of Tanzania: History, Opportunities and Future Directions, in Tripathi, S. (ed), *Shipwrecks Around the World: Revelations of the Past*. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 526-536.
- Iwowo, V., 2014. Postcolonial theory, in Coghlan, D. and Brydon-Miller, M. (ed), *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research* 16, 634-637.
- Jamieson W., 2006. Managing urban heritage resources within a cultural tourism context, in Jamieson W (ed), *Community destination management in developing economies*. Binghamton: Howard Hospitality Press, 153–187.
- Jeffery, B., 2011. *Ilha de Mozambique world heritage site maritime and underwater cultural heritage site report on sensibilization seminar 24 – 28 January*. Report Centre for International Heritage Activities, Leiden.
- Jeffery, B. and Parthesius, R., 2013, Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Initiatives in Tanzania and Mozambique. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 8,153–78.
- Jobling, J.1982. *The Arniston – 1815*. Report South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.
- Johnston, P.F., 1993. Treasure salvage, archaeological ethics and maritime museums. *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology*. 22(1), 53-60.
- Johnson, M., 2010. *Archaeology Theory: An Introduction*. (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kane, R. E., Kammerling, R. C., Moldes, R., Koivula, J. I., McClure, S. F. and Smith, C. P., 1989. Emerald and Gold Treasures of the Spanish Galleon Nuestra Senora de Atocha, *Gems and Gemology*, 25(4), 196-206.

- Kerr, P., 2016. *The Other Side of Silence*, London: Quercus.
- Khakzad, S., 2009, An Interdisciplinary Approach Towards Underwater Cultural Heritage Conservation and Management: Paper delivered at 1<sup>st</sup> WTA-International PhD Symposium on 'Building Materials and Building Technology to Preserve the Built Heritage 1, 43-61.
- Khakzad, S., 2014. The Necessity of a Common Language for Coastal and Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Anthropology and Archaeology* 2(1), 17-31.
- Khorommbi, K., 2001. *The Role of Venda Culture in Nature Conservation: A case study of the inhabitants of the Tshivhase area*. Port Elizabeth (unpublished Masters Thesis Port Elizabeth Technicon).
- Kinder, G., 1998. *Ship of Gold in the Deep Blue Sea*. New York: Grove Press.
- Kohn, M. and McBride, K.D., 2011. *Political theories of decolonization postcolonialism and the problem of foundations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lane, P.J., 2007. New International Frameworks for the protection of underwater cultural heritage in the Western Indian Ocean. *Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa* 42(1), 115-135.
- Lane, P.J., 2012. Maritime and Shipwreck Archaeology in the Western Indian Ocean and Southern Red Sea: An Overview of Past and Current Research. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 7(1), 9-42.
- Leake, E., 2014. Postmodernism, in Coghlan, D. and Brydon-Miller, M. (eds), *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research*, 16, 632-634.
- L'Hour, M., 2015. *Report and Evaluation: 16-24 June 2015 Mission of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body to Madagascar*, Paris: UNESCO. [available at [http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Rapport\\_Madagascar\\_EN\\_public.pdf](http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/pdf/Rapport_Madagascar_EN_public.pdf)].
- Loubser, J., 1989. Archaeology and Early Venda History. *Goodwin Series*, 6, 54-61.
- Lowenthal, D., 1998. *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maarleveld, T.J., Guerin U. and Egger B., 2013. *Manual for Activities directed at Underwater Cultural Heritage*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Maggs, T., 1984. The Great Galleon Sao Joao: remains from a 16<sup>th</sup> century wreck on the Natal South Coast. *Annals of the Natal Museum* 26(1), 173-186.
- Maitland, V. and Winton, S. (eds), 2010. *NAS II Robben Island Report*. Report Nautical Archaeology Society, Cape Town: South African Heritage Resources Agency.
- Mathewson, R. D., 1986. *Treasure of the Atocha*, New York: Pisces Books.
- Magill, K., 1994. Against Critical Realism. *Capital and Class* 18(3), 113-136.
- McGrail, S., 1989. Maritime Archaeology in Britain. *The Antiquities Journal*, 69, 10-22.
- Mediation and Transformation Practice. 2010. *National and Regional Strategic Workshop Report*. Report South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.
- Mehari, A.G., Ryano, K.P., 2016. Maasai People and Oldupai (Olduvai) Gorge: Looking for sustainable people-centered approaches and practices, in Schmidt, P.R., and Pikirayi, I. (eds), *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. Kindle Edition: Routledge, Chapter 2.
- Memmi, A., 2003. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. London: Earthscan.

- Milani, C.R.S., 2011. International organisations, social science research and national policy-making in Brazil: is it only evidence that matter?, in Papanagnou, G. (ed) *Social Science and Policy Challenges: Democracy, values and capacities*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Mills, G., 2010. *Why Africa is Poor: And what Africans can do about it*. Johannesburg: Penguin.
- Muckelroy, K., 1978. *Maritime Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muckelroy, K., 1998. Introducing Archaeology, in Babits, L. E. and Van Tilburg, H. (eds), *Maritime Archaeology: A reader of Substantive and Theoretical Contributions*. New York, Springer, 23-37.
- Ndlovu, N., 2016. Old Archaeology Camouflaged as New and Inclusive?, in Schmidt, P.R., and Pikirayi, I. (eds), *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. Kindle Edition: Routledge, Chapter 7.
- O'Keefe, P.J., 1996a. Protection of the underwater cultural heritage: developments at UNESCO, *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology*, 25(3-4),169-176.
- O'Keefe, P.J., 1996b, Protecting the Underwater Cultural Heritage: The International Law Association draft convention, *Marine Policy* 20(4), 297-307.
- O'Keefe, P.J., 2002. *Shipwrecked Heritage: A commentary on the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage*. Leicester, Institute of Art and Law.
- Pagel, M., 2012. *Wired for Culture: The natural history of human cooperation*. London, Penguin.
- Parker, A.J., 2001. Maritime landscapes. *Landscapes* 2(1), 22-41.
- Parthesius, R. (ed), 2007. *Excavation Report of the VOC Ship Avondster*. Report Centre for International Heritage Activities, Leiden.
- Parthesius, R. and Jeffery, B., 2013. Building Country Relevant Programmes in the Context of the Implementation of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage, in Van der Linde, S.J., Van den Dries, M.H., Schalnger, N. and Slappend, C.G. (eds), *European Archaeology Abroad: Global Setting, Comparative Perspectives*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.
- Parthesius, R., Millar, K., Devendra, S. and Green, J. (eds), 2003. *Sri Lanka Maritime Archaeological Unit Report on the Avondster Project 2001–2002*. Amsterdam: Amsterdams Historisch Museum.
- Parthesius, R., Millar, K. and Jeffery, B., 2005. Preliminary Report on the Excavation of the 17th-Century Anglo-Dutch East-Indiaman *Avondster* in Bay of Galle, Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 34, 216–237.
- Pikirayi, I., 2016. Archaeology, Local Knowledge, and Tradition: The quest for relevant approaches to the study and use of the past in Southern Africa, in Schmidt, P.R., and Pikirayi, I. (eds), *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. Kindle Edition: Routledge, Chapter 6.
- Pikirayi, I. and Schmidt, P.R., 2016. Introduction: Community Archeology and Heritage in Africa: decolonizing practice, in Schmidt, P.R., and Pikirayi, I. (eds), *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. Kindle Edition: Routledge, Chapter 1.
- Pollard, E., 2008a. *The Archaeology of the Tanzanian Coastal Landscapes in the 6th to 15th Centuries AD*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Pollard, E., 2008b. Inter-tidal causeways and platforms of the thirteenth- to sixteenth-century

- city-state of Kilwa Kisiwani, Tanzania *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 37, 98–114.
- Pollard, E., 2011. Safeguarding Swahili Trade in the 14th and 15th Centuries: A Unique Navigational Complex in South-East Tanzania. *World Archaeology* 43, 458–77.
- Pollard, E., Bates, R. Ichumbaki, E.B. and Bitu, C., 2016. Shipwreck Evidence from Kilwa, Tanzania. *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 45(2), 352-369.
- Prentice, A., 1993. *Tourism and Heritage Attractions*. London: Routledge.
- Renfrew, C. and Bahn, P., 1991. *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice*. Thames and Hudson: London.
- Robben Island Museum, 2013. *Integrated Conservation Management Plan 2013 – 2018*. Robben Island: Robben Island Museum.
- Robben Island Museum, 2015a. *Tour Guiding Manual*. Robben Island: Robben Island Museum.
- Robben Island Museum, 2015b. *Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) for Robben island Museum: Report on Workshop 10<sup>th</sup> – 11<sup>th</sup> March 2015, Robben Island, Cape Town, South Africa*. Robben Island: Robben Island Museum.
- Roberts, J.M., 2014. Critical Realism, Dialectics and Qualitative Research Methods. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 44(1), 1-23.
- Rudner, J., 1986. *The Science Committee*. Internal Memorandum National Monuments Council, Cape Town.
- SAHRA, 2009 - 2015. *Annual Report*. Cape Town, South African Heritage Resources Agency accessible at <http://www.sahra.org.za/annual-reports/>.
- SAHRA, 2011. *Towards Best Practices in Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage* Cape Town: South African Heritage Resources Agency.
- SAHRA, 2012. *Maritime Archaeology Development Programme. Report: 1 October 1999 to 31 March 2012*. Cape Town: South African Heritage Resources Agency.
- SAHRA, 2016. *Results of the 2016 Staff Satisfaction Survey*. Cape Town: South African Heritage Resources Agency.
- Saleh, N., 2011. *How Much Do Postcolonial Studies and a Critical Realist Political Economy Have in Common?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association Annual Conference “Global Governance: Political Authority in Transition”, Le Centre Sheraton Montreal Hotel, MONTREAL, QUEBEC, CANADA, 2011-03-16.
- Sayer, A., 2000. *Realism and social science*. London: Sage.
- Scarre, G. and Coningham, R. (eds), 2013. *Appropriating the Past: Philosophical perspectives on the practice of archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, P.R., and Pikirayi, I. (eds) 2016. *Community Archaeology and Heritage in Africa: Decolonizing Practice*. Kindle Edition: Routledge.
- Sharfman, J., 2001. *Report on archaeological activities at the wreck of the Grosvenor (1782)*. Report South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.
- Sharfman, J., 2011. *Report on Regional Meeting 2001 Convention. Dar-es-Salaam 28 – 29 April 2011*. Report South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.
- Sharfman, J., Boshoff, J. and Parthesius, R., 2012. *Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage in South Africa: The Development of Relevant*

- Management Strategies in the Historical Maritime Context of the Southern Tip of Africa, *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 7(1), 87-109.
- Sharfman, J., Maitland, V., Winton, S. and Parthesius, R., 2014. The State of Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage Research, Legislation and Technology in South Africa, in Funke, N., Claasen, M., Meissner, R., and Nortje, K. (eds), *Reflections of the State of Research and Technology in South Africa's Marine and Maritime Sectors*. Pretoria, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, 218-242.
- Smith, A.B., 1988. When is Marine Salvage 'Archaeology'? *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 43(148), 122-123.
- Smith, H. D. and Couper, A. D., 2003. The Management of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 4, 25-33.
- Smith, L., 2004. *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, L., 2006. *Uses of Heritage*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, R., 2009. Diamond Shipwreck: Shipwreck in the Forbidden Zone, *National Geographic* 216(4). <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2009/10/shipwreck/smith-text/2>, accessed 11 May 2017.
- South African Heritage Resources Agency, 2006. *Shipwreck Database*. Unpublished database, South African Heritage Resources Agency, Cape Town.
- Steinmetz, G., 1998. Critical Realism and Historical Sociology: A Review Article. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40(1), 170-186.
- Swart, J., 2017. *Maritime Rock Art*. In Press. Durban: Transnet.
- Throckmorton, P., 1964. The Great Basses Wreck. *Expedition* Spring, 21-30.
- Throckmorton, P., 1971. *Shipwrecks and Archaeology: The Unharvested Sea*. Boston: Atlantic - Little, Brown.
- Throckmorton, P. (ed), 1987. *The Sea Remembers: Shipwrecks and Archaeology*. London: Chancellor.
- Togo, M., 2009. *A Systems Approach to Mainstreaming Environment and Sustainability in Universities: The case of Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa*. Grahamstown (unpublished PhD Thesis Rhodes University).
- Turner, M., 1988. *Shipwrecks and Salvage in South Africa – 1505 to the Present*. Cape Town: Struik.
- UNESCO (n.d.) *The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage*. Information Kit on the 2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO, 2004. World Heritage Committee Decisions 28 COM 15C.1.
- UNESCO, 2008. World Heritage Committee Decisions 32 COM 7A.14.
- UNESCO, 1999. World Heritage Committee Decisions CONF 209 VII.C.1.
- UNESCO, 2014. World Heritage Committee Decisions 38 COM 8C.3.
- UNESCO, 2015. Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.
- UNESCO Global Education Digest, 2008. Comparing Education Statistics Across the Globe. UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Montreal.
- UNESCO Bangkok, 2012. *Training Manual for the UNESCO Foundation Course on the Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage in Asia and the Pacific*. Bangkok: UNESCO.

- UK UNESCO 2001 Convention Review Group, 2014. *The UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage 2001: An Impact Review for the United Kingdom*, Report UNESCO, Paris.
- UNESCO Global Education Digest, 2008: Comparing Education Statistics Across the Globe. UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Montreal.
- Van der Waal, B.C.W., 1997. Fundudzi, a Unique, Sacred and Unknown South African Lake. *Southern African Journal of Aquatic Sciences* 23(1), 42-55.
- Van Meurs, L.H. 1980. *National Legislation on Marine Archaeology*. Legal Opinion National Monuments Council, Cape Town.
- Van Vuuren, L., Nel, M., van Damme, S. and Braune, E., 2007. *Our Water Our Culture: A glimpse Into the Water History of the South African People*. South Africa: Water Research Commission.
- Varmer, O., Gray, J., and Alberg, D., 2010. United States: Response to the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology* 5, 129-141.
- Vernon, G., 2013. *Even the Cows Were Amazed: Shipwreck survivors in South-East Africa 1552 – 1782*. Auckland Park: Jacana.
- Walker, C. and Carr, N., (eds) 2013. *Archaeology and Tourism: Sustainable meeting grounds*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Walley, C.J., 2004. *Rough Water: Nature and development in an East African Marine Park*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Wanner R., 2001, *Statement by Ray Wanner, US Observer Delegate to the 31st UNESCO general conference before the general conference plenary regarding the US views on the 2001 UNESCO convention on the protection of underwater cultural heritage, 2 Nov 2001, Paris, France*.
- Ward, C., 2003. Integrating Maritime Archaeology. *American Journal of Archaeology*, 107(4), 655-658.
- Wares, H. L., 2013. *Maritime Archaeology and its Publics in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town (unpublished Master Thesis University of the Western Cape).
- Wares, H.L., 2014. Lake Fundudzi Historical Overview, in ACHA, *Final Project Report: Lake Fundudzi Management Project – Phase I*. Report National Heritage Council. Pretoria.
- Werz, B. E. J. S., 2010. Sub-Saharan Africa's oldest shipwreck: historical-archaeological research of an early modern-era Portuguese merchantman on the Namibian coast, *The Mariners Mirror* 96(4), 430-442.
- Werz, B. E. J. S., 2015. Southern African Maritime Archaeological Research and the Development of the African Institute for Marine and Underwater Research, Exploration and Education, in Funke, N., Claasen, M., Meissner, R., and Nortje, K. (eds), *Reflections of the State of Research and Technology in South Africa's Marine and Maritime Sectors*. Pretoria: Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, 243-260.
- Westerdahl, C., 1992. The Maritime Cultural Landscape. *The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology* 21(1), 5-14.
- Westerdahl, C., 2008. Fish and ships. Towards a theory of maritime culture. *Deutsches Schifffahrtsarchiv Wissenschaftliches Jahrbuch des Deutschen Schifffahrtsmuseums* 30, 191–236.
- Young, R. J. C., 2003. *Postcolonialism: A very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## ONLINE RESOURCES

- CIA World Factbook. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/sf.html>, accessed 16 October 2016.
- Crossman Cheng, A., (n.d.) *All in the same boat? Indigenous property rights in underwater cultural heritage. The Free Library.* (2014). <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/All+in+the+same+boat%3f+Indigenous+property+rights+in+underwater...-a023891175,2> accessed 16 October 2016.
- Fox, E., 2016, 'Extreme Drought Persists Across South Africa', <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/01/south-africa-drought-160117111204356.html>, accessed 4 February 2016.
- Fulcher, M., 2010, "Spending review: English Heritage budget cut by 30 per cent" in *The Architects Journal*, 21 October 2010. <http://www.architectsjournal.co.uk/news/daily-news/spending-review-english-heritage-budget-cut-by-30-per-cent/8607289.article>, accessed 16 October 2016.
- Godjej, D., 2014. NGO's – Do they help? *New Internationalist Magazine*. <https://newint.org/features/2014/12/01/ngos-keynote/>, accessed 16 October 2016.
- Holodny, E., 2015. The 13 fastest growing economies in the World. *Business insider*. <http://www.businessinsider.com/world-bank-fast-growing-global-economies-2015-6>, accessed 4 February 2016.
- Martin, C.E., 2016. Western do-gooders need to resist the allure of 'exotic problems'. *The Guardian Global Development Professionals Network*. <http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2016/apr/23/western-do-gooders-need-to-resist-the-allure-of-exotic-problems>, accessed 10 October 2016.
- Muthucumarana, R. academia.edu page. <https://flinders.academia.edu/RasikaMuthucumarana>, accessed 31 October 2016.
- Noakes, G., 2010. English Heritage and Heritage Lottery Fund May Merge. *Museums Journal* [http://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/25082010-english-heritage-and-hlf-may-merge\\_](http://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/25082010-english-heritage-and-hlf-may-merge_) accessed 31 October 2016.
- New York Times 2007. Cultural Heritage: Whose Deep Sea Treasure is it Really? [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/04/opinion/04iht-edtreasure.1.7376670.html?\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/04/opinion/04iht-edtreasure.1.7376670.html?_r=0), accessed 31 October 2016.
- Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. [http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory\\_body\\_evaluation/599.pdf](http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/599.pdf), accessed 1 March 2016.
- PADI Project Aware – Coral Reef Conservation Course. [https://www.padi.com/padi-courses/project-aware-coral-reef-conservation-course\\_](https://www.padi.com/padi-courses/project-aware-coral-reef-conservation-course_) accessed 16 October 2016.
- Phillip, A., 2015. Inside the turbulent world of Barry Clifford, a pirate-ship hunter under attack, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2015/07/16/unesco-buried-explorer-barry-cliffords-captain-kidd-discovery-and-he-is-freaking-out/> accessed 16 October 2016.
- Rijksdienst voor het Cultureel Erfgoed website: <http://www.culturalheritageagency.nl/en>, accessed 28 May 2014.
- Staniforth, M. 2004. Maritime Archaeology Field School in *FUMAN: Flinders University Maritime Archaeology Newsletter*. [http://www.flinders.edu.au/ehl/fms/archaeology\\_files/dig\\_library/fuman/FUMAN2004.pdf](http://www.flinders.edu.au/ehl/fms/archaeology_files/dig_library/fuman/FUMAN2004.pdf), accessed 16 October 2016.
- UNESCO 1991: Advisory Body Evaluation. file:///Users/jonathan/Downloads/599-ICOMOS-709-en.pdf accessed 16 October 2016.

UNESCO, 2013, *Frist Africa Regional Meeting on Underwater Cultural Heritage held in Nigeria*, [http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/dynamic-content-single-view/news/first\\_africa\\_regional\\_meeting\\_on\\_underwater\\_cultural\\_heritage\\_held\\_in\\_nigeria/#.WAMvepN95TY](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/dynamic-content-single-view/news/first_africa_regional_meeting_on_underwater_cultural_heritage_held_in_nigeria/#.WAMvepN95TY), accessed 16 October 2016.

Vecchiatto, P. (2013) Government spending to rise to R1.15-trillion, Gordhan says. Business Day Live 27 February 2013. <http://www.bdlive.co.za/economy/2013/02/27/government-spending-to-rise-to-r1.15-trillion-gordhan-says>, accessed 25 July 2013.

Westerdahl, C. 1998. *The Maritime Cultural Landscape On the concept of the traditional zones of transport geography*. <http://www.abc.se/~pa/publ/cult-land.htm>, accessed 16 October 2016.

Williams MV (2006) UNESCO Convention on the protection of underwater cultural heritage: an analysis of the United Kingdom's Standpoint. In the UNESCO convention for the protection of the underwater cultural heritage proceedings of the burlington house seminar, Oct 2005, pp. 2–10. <http://www.jnapc.org.uk/Burlington%20House%20Proceedings%20final%20text.pdf>, accessed 16 October 2016.

World Bank: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD/countries/EU-PL?display=default>, accessed 4 September 2014.

## LEGISLATION AND POLICY

### *Australia*

Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976.

### *Mozambique*

Law no. 10/88 of 22 December.

### *South Africa*

Maritime Zones Act No. 15 of 1994.

National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25 of 1999.

National Monuments Act, No. 28 of 1969.

National Monuments Amendment Act, No. 22 of 1970.

National Monuments Amendment Act, No. 30 of 1971.

National Monuments Amendment Act, No. 35 of 1979.

National Monuments Amendment Act, No. 13 of 1981.

National Monuments Amendment Act, No. 25 of 1991.

Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, No.3 of 2000.

Public Finance Management Act (Act 1 of 1999)

As amended by Public Finance Amendment Act (Act 29 of 1999)

As amended by Public Audit Act (Act 25 of 2004)

As amended by Public Service Amendment Act (Act 30 of 2007).

Treasury Regulations for departments, constitutional institutions, public entities, Parliament and provincial legislatures Issued in terms of the Public Finance Management Act.

World Heritage Convention Act, No. 49 of 1999.

### *South African Heritage Resources Agency*

Shipwreck Policy, 2006 – Repealed 2006.

### *Sri Lanka*.

Antiquities Ordinance (no. 9 of 1940).

Antiquities (Amendment) Act (Act 24 of 1998).

Merchant Shipping Act (Act 52 of 1971).

National Aquatic Resources Research and Development Agency Act (Act 17 of 1981).

*UNESCO*

1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

2015 Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

United Nations 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea.

1996 ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of Underwater Cultural Heritage.

2001 Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage.

*United Kingdom*

Ancient Monuments Protection Act of 1882.

Protection of Wrecks Act 1973.

*United Republic of Tanzania*

Antiquities Act of 1964 No. 10 of 1964 (or Cap 333 Ref. 2002).

Antiquities (Amendment) Act of 1979 No. 22 of 1979.

*United States of America*

Antiquities Act of 1906.

**CASE FILES, NOTICES, MINUTES AND ARCHIVES**

Department of Arts and Culture 2006a. Meeting Minutes of discussion with Jonathan Sharfman on 1 February 2006.

Department of Arts and Culture 2006b. Meeting Minutes of Underwater Cultural Heritage Workshop. Cape Town 5 – 6 October 2006.

Department of Arts and Culture 2007a. Meeting Minutes of SAHRA and Salvors Permit Meeting. Cape Town 25 January 2007.

Department of Arts and Culture 2007b. Meeting Minutes of Underwater Cultural Heritage/Maritime Archaeology Policy Worksession Montana Park 19 – 20 March 2007.

Department of Arts and Culture 2008a. Meeting Minutes of SAHRA DAC Underwater Cultural Heritage Meeting. Cape Town 12 March 2008.

Department of Arts and Culture 2008b. Meeting Minutes of Underwater Cultural Heritage Meeting. Cape Town 13 March 2008.

National Gazettes No. 37287 of 14 February 2014. Notice No. 76.

SAHRA Case File 9/2/079/0009.

SAHRA Case File 9/2/269/0023.

SAHRA Permit Files PER/8/ – Shipwreck series.

SAHRA Case Files 14/K/ - Shipwreck series.

SAHRA General File 9/2/700 – General shipwreck file.

SAHRA Case Files 9/2/701/ – Shipwreck series.

SAHRA Minutes of Council Meetings.

**INTERVIEWS AND FIELD NOTES**

DES 2011. Regional workshop on underwater cultural heritage and the UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage held in Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania 28 – 29 April 2011.

ECOHP 2014a. Interviews with stakeholders living in the Port St Johns and Ingquza Hill Local Municipalities, Eastern Cape, South Africa. 23 February – 8 March 2014.

ECOHP 2014b. Interviews with stakeholders living in the Port St Johns and Ingquza Hill Local Municipalities, Eastern Cape, South Africa 19 March to 2 April 2014.

ECOHP 2014c. Training for stakeholders living in the Port St Johns and Ingquza Hill Local Municipalities, Eastern Cape, South Africa 26 – 30 May 2014.

IDM 2013a. Stakeholder meeting at *Fundacao Ilha de Mozambique* offices, Ilha de Mozambique, 22 October 2013.

IDM 2013b. Stakeholder meeting at Escondidinho Hotel, Ilha de Mozambique, 25 October 2013.

IDM 2013c. Museum visit, Ilha de Mozambique, 24 October 2013.

IDM 2013d. Informal interviews held at Ilha de Mozambique 21 – 26 October 2013.

IDM 2014a. MUCH training programme held at Ilda de Mozambique 2 – 14 February 2014.

IDM 2014b. Informal interviews at Ilha de Mozambique 21 – 26 July 2014.

IDM 2016. Informal interviews at Ilha de Mozambique 25 July – 14 August 2016.

LF 2014a. Interviews with communities living at Lake Fundudzi. 27 July – 17 August 2014.

LF 2014b. *Shooting at the Moon. Shaping the Heritage Agenda: Sustainable Heritage Resource Management in South Africa*. Workshop held in Cape Town 31 October 2014.

TZ 2010. Field notes Kilwa Kisiwani, Tanzania 12 – 20 November 2010.

## IMAGES

All photographs courtesy of CIE – Centre for International Heritage Activities and ACHA – African Centre for Heritage Activities.

## MAPS

### EASTERN CAPE

d-maps.com:<http://d-maps.com/m/africa/southafrica/afrdusud/afrdusud52.gif>, accessed 11 May 2017.

The Local Government Handbook: <https://www.localgovernment.co.za/districts/view/6/OR-Tambo-District-Municipality>, accessed 11 May 2017.

### LAKE FUNDUDZI

d-maps.com: <http://d-maps.com/m/africa/southafrica/afrdusud/afrdusud52.gif>, accessed 11 May 2017.

Google Earth: <https://www.google.com/earth/>, accessed 11 May 2017.

### MOZAMBIQUE

Nouah's Ark:

[http://www.nouahsark.com/en/infocenter/worldwide/africa/mozambique/mozambique\\_location.php](http://www.nouahsark.com/en/infocenter/worldwide/africa/mozambique/mozambique_location.php), accessed 11 May 2017.

The Delagoa World: <https://delagoabayworld.wordpress.com/2012/05/28/mapa-da-ilha-de-mocambique-seculo-xix/>, accessed 11 May 2017.

Wikimedia Commons: [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Mozambique\\_-\\_Nampula.svg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Mozambique_-_Nampula.svg), accessed 11 May 2017.

### SOUTH AFRICA

Nouah's Ark:

[http://www.nouahsark.com/data/images/infocenter/worldwide/africa/location/south\\_africa.png](http://www.nouahsark.com/data/images/infocenter/worldwide/africa/location/south_africa.png), accessed 11 May 2017.

## Abbreviations

ACHA	<i>African Centre for Heritage Activities</i>
CIE	<i>Centre for International Heritage Activities</i>
ICMP	<i>Integrated Conservation Management Plan</i>
ICOMOS	<i>International Council on Monuments and Sites</i>
ICUCH	<i>International Committee on Underwater Cultural Heritage</i>
MADP	<i>Maritime Archaeology Development Programme</i>
MUCH	<i>Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage</i>
NARA	<i>National Aquatic Resources Agency</i>
NAS	<i>Nautical Archaeology Society</i>
SAHRA	<i>South African Heritage Resources Agency</i>
STAB	<i>Scientific and Technical Advisory Body</i>
UCH-M	<i>Underwater Cultural Heritage – Mozambique</i>
UNCLOS	<i>United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea</i>
UNESCO	<i>United Nations Scientific, Educational and Cultural Organisation</i>

## List of Figures and Tables

<b>Figure 1</b>	Critical Realist Theoretical Framework for Maritime Archaeology Management and Practice	21
<b>Figure 2</b>	Spectrum of MUCH management elements	29
<b>Figure 3</b>	Conventional vs Alternative heritage values	34
<b>Figure 4</b>	Legacy Sites (clockwise from top left: Lake Fundudzi, Robben Island, Barrel Wreck, Fish Traps)	81
<b>Figure 5</b>	The impact of the Avondster Project on the management and promotion of underwater cultural heritage in Sri Lanka	91
<b>Figure 6</b>	The impact of the MUCH Programme on the management and promotion of underwater cultural heritage in Tanzania: 2008 - 2012	92
<b>Figure 7</b>	The impact of an ideal outcome for the MADP, South Africa	93
<b>Figure 8</b>	Locating South Africa (source: Nouah's Ark)	95
<b>Figure 9</b>	South African MUCH Status Quo 2011	95
<b>Figure 10</b>	Locating Ilha de Mozambique in Nampula Province (sources: Nouah's Ark, Wikimedia Commons)	97
<b>Figure 11</b>	19th Century Ilha de Mozambique (source: The Delagoa Bay World)	98
<b>Figure 12</b>	MUCH status quo at Ilha de Mozambique 2013	102
<b>Figure 13</b>	Locating Wild Coast study site (sources: d-maps.com and The Local Government Handbook)	103
<b>Figure 14</b>	Eastern Cape MUCH status quo 2014	105
<b>Figure 15</b>	Locating Lake Fundudzi in the Limpopo Province (sources: d-maps.com and Google Earth)	106
<b>Figure 16</b>	Lake Fundudzi MUCH status quo 2013	109
<b>Figure 17</b>	South Africa MUCH status quo post-MADP 2015	120
<b>Figure 18</b>	Diving and youth activities during the MADP	127
<b>Figure 19</b>	Reclaiming the Sea at Ilha de Mozambique	132
<b>Figure 20</b>	Entrance to the Capitania	135
<b>Figure 21</b>	Ilha de Mozambique MUCH status quo 2016	137
<b>Figure 22</b>	Whispers of the Sea Exhibition. Castle of Good Hope, Cape Town	139
<b>Figure 23</b>	Collecting hidden narratives in the Eastern Cape	141
<b>Figure 24</b>	Eastern Cape MUCH status quo 2015	142
<b>Table 1</b>	Matrix of characteristics applied to positioning heritage management in the spectrum of elements.	31
<b>Table 2</b>	Defining characteristics of the indicator matrix	32

## Summary

Maritime archaeologists, historians and heritage managers have struggled to position maritime and underwater cultural heritage (MUCH) in the sub-Saharan African heritage context. Management of MUCH resources, based on Western values and legislation, has focused almost exclusively on shipwreck sites. Management strategies have been implemented either to stop treasure hunting or to limit the damage caused by salvage activities. The application of internationally accepted MUCH management practices has, however, failed to engage the public of many African nations. This, exacerbated by an absence of the capacity and infrastructure frameworks enjoyed by the global north, has meant that the application of regulatory strategies has been a challenging task which has ultimately failed to successfully manage MUCH resources or engage sub-Saharan communities in maritime history and resource preservation.

This research proposes, applies and assesses alternative management and engagement models applicable to case study sites at Robben Island, Lake Fundudzi and the Wild Coast in South Africa and at Ilha da Mozambique in Mozambique, and contributes towards establishing a new approach to MUCH.

The approach examines the context in which the heritage resource exists, including the socio-political and economic environments, as well as the available mechanisms in place, and available, for research and management. It considers the scope of MUCH in a regional context and seeks to establish some preliminary guidelines for management strategies that are built on local relevance and local buy-in.

## Nederlandse Samenvatting

Maritieme archeologen, historici en erfgoedmanagers worstelen de laatste jaren met het beheer van het maritiem en onderwater cultureel erfgoed (MUCH) in sub-Sahara-Afrika. Het beheer van MUCH, gebaseerd op westerse culturele waarden en wetgeving, heeft bijna uitsluitend betrekking op scheepswrakken. Hierop zijn protocollen ontwikkeld die dit erfgoed tegen “treasure hunting” en commerciële berging moeten beschermen. De toepassing van dit internationaal geaccepteerde, Eurocentrisch MUCH-management heeft echter geen aansluiting gevonden bij de Afrikaanse context. Het heeft gefaald “communities” en het algemene publiek bij dit erfgoedbeheer te betrekken.

In deze studie worden alternatieve modellen van “management & community engagement” onderzocht voor zuidelijk Afrika. Aan de hand van verschillende casestudies op Robbeneiland, Lake Fundudzi en de Wild Coast in Zuid-Afrika en op Ilha da Moçambique in Mozambique, is een meer specifieke methode ontwikkeld die mogelijk ook voor de bredere regio toepasbaar kan zijn.

Deze methode bouwt op de lokaal aanwezige kennis en capaciteit en houdt rekening met de beperkte infrastructurele en materiële middelen om de Westerse protocollen te volgen. Uitgangspunt zijn de sociaal-politieke en economische omstandigheden van de gemeenschappen die nauw bij het beheer van het maritiem erfgoed moeten worden betrokken.

## Curriculum Vitae

*Date of Birth:* 28 February 1971

*Place of Birth:* Cape Town, South Africa

Jonathan Sharfman was born in Cape Town, South Africa. After completing his schooling, he embarked on an undergraduate degree majoring in Archaeology and Ancient History. In 1999, he completed an MA specializing in Maritime Archaeology. He has been a PhD Candidate from 2012 to 2017. Jonathan is a qualified skipper and commercial diver.

In 2003, Jonathan joined the South African Heritage Resources Agency, the organization that manages heritage in South Africa, as was promoted to manager of the Maritime and Underwater Cultural Heritage division in 2005. In 2013 he founded the African Centre for Heritage Activities, an NGO working in heritage throughout Africa. In his role as director, he has worked extensively with CIE-Centre for International Heritage Activities on projects in Mozambique, South Africa and Tanzania. Since 2013, Jonathan has been working with Iziko Museums of South Africa, the George Washington University, the Smithsonian Museum of African American History and Culture and the National Parks Service on the Slave Wrecks Project, a multinational project researching the trans-Atlantic Slave Trade. This work has taken him to the United States, Mozambique, and Senegal.

Jonathan has worked on several maritime archaeological projects to date. His shipwreck projects include the wrecks of the *Oosterland* (1695) and *Waddingxveen* (1695) in Table Bay, Cape Town as assistant archaeologist, and the *Grosvenor* (1782), on the Eastern Cape coast, South Africa as chief archaeologist. Most recently he has been assisting the Slave Wrecks Project to excavate the wreck of the *Sao Jose*, a Portuguese slave ship wrecked off of Cape Town in 1794.

Jonathan is currently working as a Post-Doctoral Associate at New York University Abu Dhabi and is Council member of the South African Heritage Resources Agency.