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INTRODUCTION

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, the recognition of local indigenous communities and the use of traditional conservation practices to manage world heritage cultural landscapes have increasingly gained enhanced support from many archaeologists and cultural heritage managers. Even though this is the case, the concept of indigenous people, as I will demonstrate in this chapter, has been debated within academic circles, and there is no agreement on the meaning of the term or even the process by which its meaning might be established. The absence of a precise definition for the term presents challenges to scholarly analysis, especially in its use in archaeological studies, and to the conservation and management of world heritage cultural landscapes.

In this chapter, I will attempt to briefly trace an element of the history of the concept of indigenous communities. I then examine a number of the definitions while also attempting to explain how this term has been used to describe indigenous people in Africa and especially in southern Africa where this study is situated. The increasing recognition of the concept by international organisations has led to a situation where it has become inevitable that the concept be applied to the study of archaeology and the protection and management of world heritage cultural landscapes.

BRIEF HISTORY AND EXPLANATION OF INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

Considering the multiplicity and nature of people that can be considered as indigenous in the world, there is no single definition of the term indigenous communities that can be universally agreed upon (Kiene 2011; Sawyer and Gomez 2012). Such a definition is difficult to derive, in part, as a result of the increasing association of the term over recent decades with new indigenous rights, benefits and demands, and people who may be claiming indigenous status (Niezen 2003). The definition of the term appears, therefore, to change from time to time to reflect on the shifting perceptions of people and organisations that are concerned with indigenous people and their issues (Ndahinda 2011). Consequently, there are several approaches for understanding the term indigenous communities, and each approach has its own origins and implications. In the following paragraphs, I explore several definitions and perceptions about indigenous people.

The term indigenous communities appears to have emerged from the colonial practices that were experienced by the “first” or “original” inhabitants of America, Australia, and Asia during their different colonial periods (Smith 1999). A number of well known examples of indigenous people in these regions of the world are the Pueblos and the Amerindians of North and South America, the Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders of Australia, and the Māori of New Zealand (Lane 2014). These and many other indigenous communities have retained distinct characteristics which are clearly different from those of other segments of their national populations. During the colonial period,
these communities were overpowered and began to be marginalised by their colonial masters, many of whom subsequently became dominant over the indigenous people (Anaya 1996).

The status of the indigenous communities in the conquered relationship was characterised, in most instances, by marginalisation, isolation, and non-participation, especially when compared with the mainstream and influential groups within the country. Their ability to influence and participate in the external policies that exercised jurisdiction over their traditional lands and conservation practices was very frequently limited. The suppression of the original inhabitants of America, Australia, New Zealand, and other countries in the Pacific region resulted in the formation of several movements for indigenous communities, especially during the 1960s and the 1970s (cf. Saugestad 2004; Blaser, Feit and McRae 2004; Sawyer and Gomez 2012). During these periods, the development of these movements was extensively impelled by the decolonisation of formerly colonised countries and by the recognition of the rights of indigenous communities by international bodies such as the United Nations (UN) and certain non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The issues that stimulated the formation of the movements were broken land treaties (many of which were dubious) that had resulted in the loss of traditional lands as well as conflict and gross violations of the rights of indigenous people including, in some cases, massacres (see United Nations 2009). These movements were primarily established to demand the return of pilfered lands and property as well as compensation for centuries of cultural heritage destruction and marginalisation from the former colonial powers (Night 2003).

It is against this colonial background that, from the dawn of colonial rule until decolonisation, the concept of indigenous communities was born and associated with all of the “original” or “first” people living on territories that were conquered by colonial countries (see Anaya 1996; Ndahinda 2011). Thus, according to Anaya (1996, 3), the term indigenous broadly refers to living descendants of pre-invasion inhabitants of lands that are now dominated by others. As further explained by Anaya, these communities are considered indigenous in the sense that their ancestral roots are embedded in the lands in which they live and that they are distinct communities with a continuity of existence and identity that connects them with the people, ethnic groups, or nations of their ancestral pasts. Eldredge (2002) views the term indigenous communities as generally being understood to refer to tribes, nations, or ethnic groups that have historically inhabited lands prior to the advent of colonialism. However, Eldredge further elaborated that indigenous communities are usually minorities within larger societies which are discriminated against in socioeconomic life, disadvantaged in terms of power and opportunity in their respective states, and are also linguistically or culturally distinct from the mainstream population (Eldredge 2002, 436).

The definition of indigenous people has also been a subject of intense discussion in various UN specialised agencies such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the World Bank, and the Food and Agriculture Organisation. Nevertheless, since its establishment in 1945, the UN has addressed several situations which affect indigenous people as part of its overall human rights work. The concerns of indigenous people began to be recognised in a number of instruments and studies prepared over the years and in the activities of human rights organisations dealing with, for example, minorities, slavery, servitude, and forced labour. However, although there is no general agreement within the UN on what are and what are not indigenous people, there are several definitions that have been developed and have gained broad recognition as guiding principles for the description and identification of indigenous communities. In this study, I focus only on the UN ILO Convention No. 107 of 1957 and 169 of 1989 as well as José R. Martínez Cobo’s Study on the Problem of Discrimination against Indigenous Populations which, in my opinion, are the primary guiding standards and statements of coverage on indigenous people and, therefore, pertinent to this research.

The ILO was the first UN agency to address indigenous issues by establishing the Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention No. 107 in 1957. In
this Convention, a distinction was made between tribal and semi-tribal populations, on one hand, and indigenous tribal populations on the other. The former were then described as members of tribal or semi-tribal populations in independent countries whose social and economic conditions are at a less advanced stage than the stage achieved by the other sections of the national community and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations. The latter, however, were defined as members of tribal or semi-tribal populations in independent countries which are regarded as indigenous because of their descent from the populations which inhabited the country or a geographical region to which the country belongs at the time of conquest or colonisation and which, irrespective of their legal status, live more in conformity with the social, economic, and cultural institutions of that time than with the institutions of the nation to which they belong (see ILO 1957, Article 1).

This definition of indigenous people was later criticised by several scholars who argued that the definition denoted a condescending attitude towards indigenous and tribal people as they were perceived as “backward” and “temporary” societies. The belief at the time the definition was coined was that, for them to survive, indigenous communities had to be brought into the mainstream populations which should be achieved through integration and assimilation (see, for example, United Nations 2009). However, in the years following its adoption, the limitations of this Convention became evident, and demands were made to re-examine it. This was largely due to an increasing consciousness and increasing numbers of indigenous people participating in the international fora such as the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations. This prompted the ILO to begin revising the Convention so that it became more relevant to indigenous communities. After its revision, the Convention was renamed Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention No. 169 and was adopted by member states in 1989 (see ILO 2003).

With Convention 107 revised, Convention 169 marked a change in the initial ILO’s approach to the definition of indigenous people. Based on Cobo’s definition of indigenous people, which I explain below, the new Convention now defines indigenous people as people in independent countries who, on account of their descent from populations which inhabited the country or a geographical region to which the country belongs at the time of conquest or colonisation or the establishment of present states boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural, and political institutions. During the review of Convention 107, however, protection was, and still is, the primary objective and must be based on respect for indigenous and tribal people’s cultures, their distinct ways of life, and their traditions and customs. It is also based on the belief that indigenous and tribal people have the right to continue to exist with their own identities and the right to determine their own way and pace of development (ILO 2003). However, prior to the adoption of ILO Convention No. 169, there were also extensive debates within the UN Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities regarding indigenous people. As a result of this debate, a decision was made in 1970 by the Sub-Commission which recommended that a comprehensive study be conducted on the issue of discrimination against indigenous populations. In the following year of 1971, José R. Martínez Cobo from Ecuador was appointed as a Special Rapporteur for the study which was to suggest national and international measures for eliminating such discrimination (see Cobo 1986). The range of issues covered in Cobo’s study included a definition of the term indigenous people, the role of inter-governmental and NGOs, the elimination of discrimination, and basic human rights principles as well as special areas of action in fields such as language, culture, social and legal institutions, land, political rights, religious rights and practices, and equality in the administration of justice. His conclusions, proposals, and recommendations became a significant landmark in the UNs’ definition and considerations on human rights and problems that are currently faced by indigenous communities. After an extensive discussion of the issues involved, Cobo offered a working, but long, definition of indigenous communities, people, and nations whereby he articulated a number of basic ideas which included the rights of indigenous communities
to define themselves. Cobo’s working definition of indigenous communities reads as follows: Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal system. This historical continuity may consist of the continuation, for an extended period reaching into the present of one or more of the following factors:

a) Occupation of ancestral lands, or at least part of them;

b) Common ancestry with the original occupants of these lands;

c) Culture in general, or in specific manifestations (such as religion, living under a tribal system, membership of an indigenous community, dress, means of livelihood, lifestyle, etc.);

d) Language (whether used as the only language, as mother-tongue, as the habitual means of communication at home or in the family, or as the main, preferred, habitual, general or normal language);

Cobo’s definition gained wide recognition, however, it was criticised by several researchers as applying primarily only to the “conquered” lands of the American continent and some parts of the Oceania and cannot be practically applied in other parts of the globe such as Asia and Africa (see Kiene 2011; McNeish and Eversole 2005). According to McNeish and Eversole (2005), Cobo’s definition was designed to encompass the experiences of the Americas, Australia, and New Zealand with their comparatively recent overseas colonisation and then adapted to other parts of the world that also have culturally distinct and marginalised ethnic groups. As further noted by McNeish and Eversole, the second problem with this definition is that it implies a minority population living within a numerically and politically dominant “mainstream” culture. Yet, according to these researchers, in countries such as Bolivia, indigenous communities may be the majority but can still be marginalised. Additionally, a majority ethnic group may define itself as indigenous and exploit this position to deny rights to smaller groups as is sometimes the case in South-East Asia (see McCaskill and Rutherford 2005). The other difficulty with Cobo’s definition is that, in countries that have not experienced overseas colonisation such as Japan, Thailand, and Nepal or that were never effectively colonised such as Liberia and Ethiopia in Africa, definitions of indigenous communities are less unambiguous given that the historical continuity
of pre-invasion or pre-colonial communities is more difficult to trace or demonstrate. The term indigenous communities itself and its assumptions cannot, therefore, adequately address the circumstances of some ethnic groups in the world and those that live near to or in world heritage cultural landscapes.

However, whilst this is the case, the idea of indigenous communities can also be understood in many ways that are quite contrary to the definitions and ideas explained previously but which are a justifiable meaning of the word itself. In Africa, the expanded definitions were to account for the experiences of communities who lived in places where descent could not clearly confer indigenous status (Igoe 2006). For instance, the expanded versions could be co-opted politically by the descendants of colonial settlers who may lay claim to an indigenous identity through their occupation and settlement of land over several generations or simply by being born in that territory (Smith 1999). Also, as argued by Anaya (1996, 5), the dominant settler populations that were born in colonial patterns have created communities that could possibly now be described as indigenous to the place of settlement. The difficult position of these perspectives is that this indigeneity would have been founded on a colonial history (see also Fisher 2010, 126), and this can be considered as not truly indigenous. However, although the meaning of indigenous communities can be understood in this context, there is always a distinction between an indigenous person and an outsider as it is considerably difficult for the foreigner to understand or practise certain nuances of a culture or a people.

THE CONCEPT OF INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES IN AFRICA

Indigenous movements in Africa and Asia are a recent phenomenon that were introduced in the continents roughly in the early 1980s and gained international acknowledgment in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Niezen 2003; Pelican and Maruyana 2015). From the 1990s onwards, the concept of indigenous people in Africa began to have a wider recognition. During the early 1990s in east Africa for instance, a broader network of culturally based NGOs, which made up the Tanzanian indigenous peoples’ movement, was established. This movement included NGOs representing the Barabaig, Maasai and the Hadzabe hunter-gatherer communities. These organisations worked together through a forum called Pastoralist and Indigenous NGOs (PINGOs) that was established in 1994 (Igoe 2003). In southern Africa, the San people in Botswana were involved in the indigenous rights movement from the late 1980s while in west Africa, the Mbororo of Cameroon, a pastoralist group gained international recognition as an indigenous people in 2005. An association for the promotion of ethnic interests called Mbororo Social and Cultural Development Association of Cameroon (MBOSCUDA) was founded by the Mbororo people in 1992 (see Pelican 2008; Mouiche 2011).

One common feature about the establishment and development of the indigenous rights movement in Africa is that, they all drew motivation from the definition of “indigenous peoples” adopted by the UN as a legal category, and have connected with the global indigenous rights movements, several of which are NGOs. Nonetheless, unlike in the Americas and the Pacific, the indigenous movements in Africa did not develop as a critique of European colonialism and imperialism; they were instead established as a way of responding to the policies adopted by their post-colonial African states which made their traditional ways of living untenable (Pelican and Maruyana 2015). In east Africa for example, movements that were formed by the Masai, Hadzabe and the Barabaig were aimed at resisting dislodgement from their traditional grazing areas that had been turned into national parks and large scale commercial farms when the government of Tanzania liberalised its economy during the 1990s (Igoe 2003). In Botswana, the First People of the Kalahari, representing the Basarwa (San) communities was formed in 1991 as a way of opposing their eviction from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve to pave way for the mining of kimberlite in the cultural landscape (Marobela 2010). What is clear with these cases is that that the discrimination and marginalisation experienced by the indigenous people throughout the world matches the experiences of the indigenous people in Africa under the administration of their post-colonial independent governments.
Under the administration of their African governments, the formation of African indigenous rights movements are aimed at reviving their cultural practices, claiming their traditional lands, improving their socio-economic practices and promoting their education. These movements are also aimed at seeking political representation in government. A number of the programmes outlined above however, began to be supported by the local indigenous communities, national and international NGOs. This has led many anthropologists to conclude that claims of authochtony and indigeneity in Africa have not been completely and genuinely aimed at returning to the traditional practices that have to be safeguarded, but at gaining access to resources that come along with the national and international support of the movements (see Igere 2003; Pelican 2008). The problem of supporting indigenous rights movements in Africa has been that, it categorise Africans into two camps; those that are considered indigenous and those that are considered not. Meskell (2010) correctly observed that, as a result of interventions by outside agencies, such approaches have created landscapes of exclusion, rather than inclusion among the indigenous communities in the continent.

Given the above background, it can be argued that the establishment of indigenous rights groups in Africa, many of which were influenced by foreign indigenous rights movements and by the internal policies of their governments [most of which remained unchanged at independence], has fashioned new ways of explaining indigeneity in Africa. Following the establishment of indigenous rights movements in Africa, there are now several communities that can be described as indigenous people such as the San of southern Africa, the Pygmies of the Great Lakes Region, the Hadzabe and Ogiek of Tanzania, and the Sengwer and Yakuu of Kenya in east Africa. Although these people were traditionally hunter-gatherers, many of their descendants have now modernised their lives as a result of African government-mandated modernisation programmes and, in many cases, they no longer inhabit their ancestral or original lands as will be described in chapter 4. However, apart from these communities, the pastoralists and farming communities such as the Pokot in Kenya and Uganda, the Barabaig in Tanzania, the Maasai in Kenya and Tanzania, the Samburu, Turkana, Rendille, Endorois and Borana in Kenya, the Karamojong of Uganda, the Himba in Namibia and the Tuareg, Fulani and Toubou in Mali, Burkina Faso and Niger can also be considered as some of the indigenous people of the continent (Lee and Hitchcock 2001; ACHPR 2006). As indigenous people, they have different cultures and social institutions and also practise different religious systems (ACHPR 2006).

The major problem with regarding the above Africans as the only indigenous people in Africa is that, other African people are technically denied the same status, even though they are known to have originated from the same continent. If the definition of indigenous people is based on the idea of “original” or “first” people, then it cannot be applied in Africa as all Africans are considered to have originated from the same continent (see Sylvain 2002; Saugestad 2004; Kiene 2011).

However, definitions of indigenous people in Africa began to worry many African governments that the restricted application of the term indigenous to certain sections of their people is likely to cause tension and conflict among various ethnic groups surviving in their territories. The African governments began to also argue that the absence of defined parameters of the groups to whom the concept “indigenous” applies is likely to cause juridical problems of implementation, especially when the view that all Africans are indigenous to the continent is considered. The rights and demands of the indigenous people in Africa however, began to be viewed as retrogressive and an impediment to the development of their national governments (Laher 2014).

The above arguments by the African governments appears to have been founded on the observations that indigenous people were now seeking a separate and distinct identity from that of the state (ACHPR 2007). These concerns by the African governments were however, dismissed as the struggle by the indigenous peoples for recognition was considered as not constituting a demand for special treatment or separate legal regime but was considered as a way of guaranteeing the equal rights and freedoms
of groups that have been historically marginalised (Wachira 2012). For African States, a definition for indigenous people was considered to be not essential or useful as there is no universally agreed definition of the term and no single definition can capture the characteristics of indigenous populations (ACHPR 2007).

Although African States argue that the definition of indigenous people is not necessary in Africa, there is a general view among archaeologists in southern Africa that the Late Stone Age or the Later Stone Age hunter-gatherer communities were the first or original communities to inhabit the region prior to the arrival of the Bantu people (see, for example, Klein 1983, 1984; Huffman 2005; Segobye 2006; Pikirayi 2011, Lane 2014). These communities were the San people whose current descendants are mostly found in the distant parts of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe (Hall 1993; Sadr 2005; Denbow 2009). Evidence of their genesis from the region has been confirmed by the remains of the Late Stone Age archaeological material and rock art, which has been discovered in many cultural landscapes in the region. For approximately the past two millennia, these hunter-gatherer communities were in contact with herders and farmers and, more recently, with people of European descent (Hausman 1984; Klein, 1983, 1984; Mitchell 2002; Sadr 2005). Some researchers have argued that these hunter-gatherer communities were displaced or assimilated into the expanding and dominant Bantu communities and, during the process, were forced to abandon some of their cultural traditions such as painting on rocks (see, for example, Klein 1983, 1984; Brooks, Gelburd and Yellen 1984). However, the impact of the contact, especially with the pastoralist and farming communities, has been a subject of intense research and debate. This is because, as argued by Lee and Hitchcock (2001), there has been minimal archaeological evidence that points to the nature of the contact. Thus, according to Mitchell (2002), it has not been certain if the arrival of the Bantu people in southern Africa inevitably led to the subordination of the hunter-gatherer communities. Hausman (1984) had, in fact, speculated that the existence of distinct populations of the descendants of hunter-gatherer communities in southern Africa today indicates that there may not have been a complete assimilation of these communities by the Bantu communities. Archaeological research in the Kalahari desert by Karim Sadr, however, now indicates that assimilation of hunter-gatherer communities indeed took place but this happened at different times and under varying circumstances as they turned to herding, farming and trading following their contact with farmers and herders (Sadr 2005). Archaeological research in the Kalahari desert further suggests that while some hunter-gatherer communities were assimilated, others may have continued to maintain their traditional lifeways in the face of change while at the same time slowly adapting to herders and farmers as well as to traders (Denbow 2009).

Given the extensive and complicated history of human migration and settlement in many parts of Africa including southern Africa, being the “first peoples in the land”, therefore, has been disregarded as being a necessary precondition for describing indigenous communities on the continent (see ACHPR 2006, 2007; Gilbert and Couillard 2011). The dismissal of this opinion was based on the argument that domination and displacement was not exclusively practised by European settlers and colonialists in many parts of Africa and Asia, but dominant groups have also suppressed marginalised groups well before the arrival of European settlers in the continent as in the case of the San people that were dominated by the farming communities in southern Africa. To address this issue, it was suggested that the most constructive approach is that indigenous identity should relate more to a set of characteristics and practices than the priority of arrival or of domination (see Saugestad 2004; ACHPR 2006, 2007). This is because, while formal definitions are problematic, the term indigenous communities recognises clear commonalities of experience amongst diverse people and the characteristics that they share (McNeish and Eversole 2005; Smith 1999). In general, indigenous people should identify the characteristics that demonstrate that their cultures could be under threat, to the point of extinction in some cases, and that the survival of their particular way of life depends on access and rights to their traditional lands and the natural resources that are found on those lands. As indigenous communities,
they are discriminated against and regarded as less developed and less advanced than other more dominant sectors of society. They often live in geographical areas that are isolated and experience various forms of marginalisation, both politically and socially. They are also subjected to domination and exploitation within national political and economic structures that are commonly designed to reflect the interests and activities of the national majority. This discrimination, domination, and marginalisation violates their rights as indigenous communities; threatens the continuation of their cultures and ways of life; and prevents them from being able to fully participate in decisions about their own future and development. These attributes are important for the indigenous communities to identify themselves, and self identification has, in fact, become a key criterion for describing and identifying indigenous people (see ILO 2003; ACHPR 2006, 10, 2007). This identification can be made or acknowledged by the other surrounding indigenous communities and nation-states, although there are some instances where the identity claim can be a subject of some dispute, especially with regard to recognising assertions made over traditional land rights and claims.

INDIGENOUS ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE COMPLICITY OF INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

As has been demonstrated in chapter 1, the involvement of local indigenous communities in the management of world heritage cultural landscapes is a persistent concern in cultural heritage management, which is one of the sub-disciplines of archaeology. This has, to some extent, influenced the development of a type of archaeology which is now known as indigenous archaeology where indigenous people are involved in the excavation, analysis, interpretation, and management of the cultural remains of their ancestors (Moser et al. 2002; Watkins 2000; Nicholas 2008). Indigenous archaeology was, therefore, primarily developed as a sub-discipline of archaeology in the late 20th century in order to rectify some of the historical discrepancies that had resulted from the “traditional” academic practice of the discipline. Non-indigenous archaeologists had been responsible for the excavation and management of archaeological remains during which time they frequently ignored the desires and sensibilities of the indigenous descendants (see McNiven and Russel 2005; Nicholas 2008; McGhee 2008). The indigenous rights movement previously discussed, and the rise of cultural heritage management have been, according to Allen and Phillips (2010), two major factors which led to the development of indigenous archaeology. Thus, the growing consciousness of archaeologists regarding indigenous issues and the complicity of indigenous people in research, interpretation, and management of cultural heritage landscapes and sites have been perceived as a process of decolonising the subject of archaeology (see Atalay 2006a, 2006b; McNiven and Russel 2005). This reflected broader anti-colonial changes in the attitudes of indigenous communities about who has a right to control their lives and manage their cultural heritage sites.

In the present day, it has become vital to integrate aboriginal rights considerations at the early stages of World Heritage identification and nomination. The human rights issues when managing World Heritage Sites, now requires that the indigenous communities participate in decision making, contribute to management through their traditional knowledge of conservation and also benefit from the management of the sites. In addition, as part of human rights in World Heritage Sites, the indigenous people should be allowed access to resources and to their sacred sites. Furthermore, modern World Heritage management now requires that there should be no oppressive enforcement of conservation measures and that indigenous communities should be informed before any decisions are taken when managing the sites. Logan (2014), views the endorsing of the rights of local and indigenous communities in World Heritage Sites as an effort by UNESCO to restore the credibility of the WHL, which as has been discussed in the previous chapter, as heavily biased towards the western world.

Based on the above arguments, the involvement of indigenous communities in the management of world heritage cultural landscapes is increasingly becoming considered as a democratic right and is
now being supported by archaeologists, as seen in the previous chapter, and is also now imbedded in UN documents, as we have seen in this chapter. McGhee (2008) asserted that these adjustments were not initiated by archaeologists, however, they were developed by several archaeologists who were reacting to demands of the socially and economically marginalised indigenous communities to afford those communities greater control of their cultural heritage remains (see, for example, Meskell 2010). Given this development, there is now a general agreement among many archaeologists that indigenous peoples must be involved in the research, interpretation, and management of their cultural heritage sites (see, for example, Moser et al. 2002; Colwell-Chanthaphonh et al. 2010; Pikirayi 2011) although, according to Lane (2014), the idea of “indigenous archaeology” still has a more restricted narrower range in Africa. Not only does the involvement of indigenous people in research provide specific information about the traditional management of these cultural landscapes, it also provides access to different perspectives and interpretations (George and Hollowell 2007). The involvement of indigenous communities in the management of these cultural landscapes provides them with an opportunity to create a counter-discourse that challenges the power relations that are involved in existing approaches of managing the past (Moser et al. 2002). It also has the potential to recast the roles and responsibilities of archaeologists and researchers from other disciplines to the communities in and with which they work (Pikirayi 2011).

**NATURE OF INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES IN WORLD HERITAGE CULTURAL LANDSCAPES**

Applying the concept of indigenous communities in the management of world heritage cultural landscapes is exceptionally cumbersome. This is because, according to Marshall (2002, 215) “communities are aggregations of people that are seldom, if ever, monocultural and are never of one mind”. In areas near or in world heritage cultural landscapes, as has been previously discussed, the term indigenous communities can refer to a diverse range of ethnic people who have different traditions, religions, cultures, and beliefs. In general, the relations and connections of the communities do not stop at designated boundaries but typically transcend the administrative boundaries of world heritage cultural landscapes and even of nation states, and it is often difficult to establish where each community begins or ends. Consequently, communities and cultures constitute a much wider and more common phenomenon close to or in world heritage cultural landscapes than is usually believed. Considering this situation, it is often difficult to identify those communities that have the greatest stake in any given management issue in a world heritage cultural landscape. At this juncture, I explore the types of communities that may or may not be indigenous to world heritage cultural landscapes.

Four broad but overlapping types of communities can be determined in areas bordering or in world heritage cultural landscapes. These are local descent communities, non-local descent communities, non-descent local communities, and the “stakeholder” communities (Singleton and Orser 2003; Marshall 2002, 2009; Pikirayi 2011). According to Singleton and Orser (2003) and to Pikirayi (2011), descent communities are those communities that are local and ancestrally attached to a particular archaeological site or a specific cultural landscape. In this study, I consider descent communities as local indigenous communities as they live near or in the world heritage cultural landscapes that they are ancestrally attached to. These communities include those that were evicted during the colonial period and resettled in adjacent territories to facilitate the establishment of national parks and conservation areas in Africa, some of which have now acquired world heritage or transfrontier conservation area status as discussed in chapter 1. In my opinion, it is the local descent communities that are believed to possess the traditional conservation practices or knowledge that must be recognised and considered when managing world heritage cultural landscapes. However, other than descent communities, there are also other communities that may claim indigenous status to an archaeological site or cultural heritage landscape but may no longer necessarily be living in or near the cultural landscape. Singleton and Orser (2003) regard these communities as non-local
descent communities who are ancestrally linked to a specific archaeological site or a cultural landscape but are now living in a different geographical location, potentially hundreds or even thousands of kilometres away. It has already been indicated in the preceding chapter that a number of these communities are those that were resettled in distant areas when some of the cultural landscapes were proclaimed as national parks or conservation areas. However, even though they may be physically separated from their original cultural landscapes, many of the non-local descent communities may still be spiritually attached to them. Given that these communities are no longer physically attached to their original lands, they cannot be expected to have traditional conservation practices of managing the cultural landscapes that they had previously populated. The third category is that of non-descent local communities which are communities that either live close to or in cultural landscapes but are not culturally or ancestrally connected to such places (Marshall 2002). In southern Africa, as observed by Pikirayi (2011), non-local descent communities are perhaps in the majority given the complicated histories of the pre-European migrations and later of European land possessions which led to the removal of local descent communities from their ancestral lands. Although these communities may be indigenous in the sense that the majority may have been born and bred in and around the cultural landscape, their knowledge of the management of world heritage cultural landscapes using traditional conservation practices can be very much limited or even nonexistent. The last category is that of “stakeholder” communities who may not be local in terms of residence or even descent, however, these communities have vested interests in the management of world heritage cultural landscapes (Pikirayi 2011). This category includes tour operators, hoteliers, local administrative organisations, mining companies, church organisations, and many others (Makuvaza and Makuvaza 2012). This class of communities is not, therefore, indigenous to world heritage cultural landscapes and cannot be expected to possess knowledge of traditional conservation practices of such cultural landscapes.

**SUMMARY**

It has been demonstrated in this chapter that the term indigenous communities can signify different things to different people, organisations, and even to national governments. Considering this fact, there cannot be an agreement on the accurate meaning of the term. However, what appears to be generally agreed is that, within a particular geographical location, there are some groups that can be identified as indigenous communities while others may not. The decisive factors used for these considerations, however, are also usually ambiguous and often very controversial. In this study, I regard local indigenous communities as those people who lived in the Matobo Hills prior to the arrival of the Europeans or other non-African ethnicities, and before the process of colonisation had begun.

While it is clear that there can be a multiplicity of indigenous communities subsisting close to or in world heritage cultural landscapes, it must also be stated that these communities and the existing traditional conservation practices are susceptible to various transformations. Both indigenous communities and their traditional conservation practices are also dynamic, and they adapt to external as well as internal and local experiences and pressures, many of which may not be directly related to the management of world heritage cultural landscapes. Present-day indigenous communities are experiencing a dramatic change and remain threatened in many parts of the world. The transformation of many indigenous communities includes the permanent loss of native language, loss of traditional lands, and disruption of traditional ways of life. As is discussed in chapter 7, existing traditional conservation practices in world heritage cultural landscapes also survive under the threat of environmental, urbanisation, social, developmental, educational, political, demographic, and external management policies that are often different from those of the past. These factors usually result in the demise or cause major changes to traditional conservation practices as they are engulfed by the general progression of modernism (Taylor 2007). As the local indigenous communities transform, their traditional conservation practices and management
approaches will change as well. In view of that, the values that local indigenous communities attach to world heritage cultural landscapes also frequently changes. This means that the extent to which local indigenous communities’ issues and traditional conservation practices can be recognised and implemented in world heritage cultural landscapes, can be a mammoth task depending on the objectives that have to be achieved.