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This research focuses on decolonizing and transforming archaeological practices and pedagogies in Tanzania and Uganda. The number of African archaeologists is growing and national heritage institutions have gained ownership of the African heritage and past; however, there is very limited discussion on African communities’ experiences in archaeology and on the role of national heritage institutions, higher education, and African archaeologists in making archaeology more ethical, engaging, accessible, and directly applicable to African communities. I used historical and ethnographic inquiries to address these issues by exploring the institutionalization of archaeology in national heritage institutions; the developments of practicing and teaching archaeology within the Tanzanian and Ugandan higher education systems, particularly pedagogies and practices of field archaeology; and local communities’ perceptions, reactions, and expectations of archaeology and archaeologists.

This research shows archaeology was first institutionalized in museums and departments of antiquities during the colonial period. In the post-colonial period, these institutions became national heritage institutions and archaeology was introduced within
the first two public universities, the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania and Makerere University in Uganda. Due to differences in political stability, financial and personnel resources, and archaeologists’ commitments, archaeology in these universities developed unevenly. The former university developed both undergraduate and graduate archaeology programs whereas archaeology at Makerere University regressed.

Despite the uneven number of local archaeologists and the institutionalization of archaeology, both countries have more similarities than differences in the process of decolonizing and transforming archaeology. National heritage institutions focus mostly on providing research permits and conservation of archaeological heritage. Local communities are uninformed, marginalized, and at times exploited. Most archaeological research projects have no direct relevance to Tanzanian and Ugandan communities, especially in rural areas. The contributions of African scholars vary but predominantly their efforts have been directed to challenging colonial interpretations and developing archaeology teaching programs that train African students in traditional Western archaeological approaches. Pedagogies that incorporate African knowledge systems and communities’ voices and promote decolonial and transformative archaeology are yet to come. This research recommends the need to continuously problematize and localize archaeology, critique and transform national heritage institutions, and redesign archaeology curricula.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This research examines the practice and teaching of archaeology in East Africa, with a focus on the Tanzanian and Ugandan experiences. I focus on the institutionalization of archaeology in museums and departments of antiquities as well as the history, development, and current trends of practicing and teaching archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania and at Makerere University in Uganda. Particularly, I examine changes in the practices and pedagogies of field archaeology, contributions of African scholars within these praxes, and local communities’ perceptions, reactions and expectations of these praxes.

The most challenging aspect of practicing archaeology in postcolonial Africa, as in other parts of the world, is figuring out how to decolonize and transform a discipline that is colonial by nature in all settings—individual, local, national, regional, and global—or in other words, how to practice a non-oppressive, locally relevant and transformative archaeology (Andah 1995; Atalay 2006, 2012; Atalay et al. 2014; Liebmann and Rizvi 2008; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Schmidt 2009b). Opening doors to students who come from indigenous communities¹ has been a first step, among others, toward this goal. Although giving opportunities to indigenous scholars is an important step forward, the decolonizing process remains a challenging task. It is even more challenging and demanding for indigenous scholars as a result of the multicultural environment in which they are situated, and the colonial and neocolonial experiences they encounter both in the context of educational and non-educational institutions, as well as in the discipline of

¹ I use the concept of indigenous as “a relational term that emphasizes both cultural distinctiveness and relationship with colonial powers” (cf. Nicholas 2010:1).
archaeology itself. Archaeology in Africa is not an exception to such structural challenges.

In African countries, archaeology has been changing gradually in various contexts, including in theories, methods, diversity of practitioners, and institutions (e.g., Mitchell and Lane 2013; Schmidt 2009b; Stahl 2005; Robertshaw 1990c). Though these changes are partly a result of political independence of African countries and the increasing involvement and training of Africans in archaeology, I find very limited discussions on five themes: 1) the institutionalization of archaeology in non-academic settings (e.g., Abungu 1997; Karega-Munene 1996; Kusimba 1996a; Kusimba and Klehm 2013; Posnansky 1996); 2) practicing, teaching and learning archaeology in African universities (Posnansky 1996; Schmidt 2005; Segobye 2005); 3) the relationship between local communities and archaeologists (Denbow, Mosothwane, and Ndobochani 2009; Mapunda and Lane 2004; Pikirayi 2011; Schmidt 2014; Walz 2009); 4) the role of education as a decolonizing methodology (e.g., Atalay 2008; Schmidt 2005; Rizvi 2008a; Segobye 2005; Silliman 2008); and 5) the roles of national heritage institutions (e.g., Drewal 1996; Karega-Munene 2009; Posnansky 1996; Schmidt 2009a) and African scholars in decolonizing and transforming archaeology and its pedagogy (Chami 2009a; Holl 2009; Kusimba 2009; Ndlovu 2009; Segobye 2009).

One of the ways to address these themes is to document and observe changes and continuities in the practice and teaching of archaeology in African institutions contextually. This research, based on historical and ethnographic inquiries, brings these themes into consideration within the scholarship of postcolonial archaeologies by scrutinizing the institutionalization of archaeology in non-academic national institutions;
by analyzing the learning, teaching, and practice of archaeology in two public universities; and by examining local communities’ perceptions, demands, and reactions of archaeology.

**Personal Context**

What is so special that you people come to suffer here for? What did you really see? You are still young people and in the Maa tradition we have a saying that a child can foresee things before his father see them; so what did you foresee? (Baba Zawadi, Oldupai, Northern Tanzania, August 2011)

When my two colleagues, Naserian Ndangoya and Kokeli P. Ryano, and I reached Oldupai to conduct part of this research, Baba Zawadi² and other elders tried to understand the logic behind our decision to come to their area and to learn about their perceptions of archaeological practices. They asked several questions, ranging from what we foresaw and how and in what way they would benefit from this kind of research. Similar to the above questions Baba Zawadi raised, members of local communities in eastern and central Uganda as well as the Bagamoyo region of Tanzania, and students and scholars of archaeology in these countries also interviewed me about why I chose this kind of research. This experience clearly shows how ethnography can create opportunities for “informants” to reverse roles by interviewing ethnographers and archaeologists, useful to achieve what Jonathan Walz (2009:23) has argued: “comprehending Africans’ representation of archaeologists (an inversion of the typical hegemony of representation).” This is certainly different from other “ordinary” archaeological research where archaeologists have limited interactions with members of

² Pseudonym.
local communities, which in turn silence the perspectives of both students of archaeology and local communities. In this section I attempt to answer their questions.

My interest in this research emerged as a result of the long and dynamic relationship among my education, research, and cultural backgrounds as well as personal experiences. Before this project, my archaeological research experience was mostly in Eritrea, located in the Horn of Africa. In collaboration with Eritrean and foreign scholars, as a student at the then University of Asmara (UOA)\(^3\) and later as a member of the National Museum of Eritrea (NME) doing my required national service, I worked in the vicinity of Asmara, the capital city, to document and excavate archaeological sites. Asmara is populated mostly by two groups of Tigrinya speaking communities\(^4\): those who consider themselves as indigenous to the area, and those who migrated from other parts of Eritrea. I belong to the indigenous people who live within the vicinity of Greater Asmara, and my first archaeological research experience comes from this region.

The education system I experienced from elementary through high school had very little relevance to my daily life activities, not only in its content but also in the language\(^5\) used. Growing up in Asmara, the things I cherished most were my Tigrinya heritage, especially the landscapes and histories of the villages. As the education system from elementary to high school exposed me to a different means of learning, the Tigrinya communities around the Greater Asmara area were educating me, and still

---

\(^3\) The former University of Asmara is now dispersed into different colleges across the country.

\(^4\) The Tigrinya speaking communities are one of the ethnic groups from the highlands of Eritrea and northern Ethiopia, and represent fifty percent of the Eritrean population.

\(^5\) Before independence, Amharic, an Ethiopian language, was the mode of teaching in elementary school. So, my study was in Amharic rather than my mother language, Tigrinya. After independence, the Eritrean government adopted Tigrinya as a mode of communication for Tigrinya speakers in elementary level and English for junior and high school; so I did my studies at the junior and high school levels in English. I never had a chance to study in my native language.
continue to do so, about my history, identity, and heritage. For instance, I learned that they have different values for what were later introduced to me as archaeological sites. They associate some archaeological sites as places that had been dwelled in by ancestors, especially when sites are located nearby villages or belong to recent times. In addition, they regard other archaeological sites as mysterious places that belong to elves and may bring bad spirits, especially sites that are located in caves. My great grandmother, my grandmother, and my mother told me several stories of the elves and the areas associated with these stories, including one story explaining that if people go to these areas the elves will make them insane. As a child, I was terrified and equally astonished by these stories, and I repeatedly begged my cousins in the villages to take me to these places but they were too afraid. Later, I became familiar with a few of these mysterious places as “archaeological sites.”

As a college student and later working at the NME, I enjoyed every moment I had an opportunity to conduct archaeological surveys and excavations in the area. What was new to me was the process of archaeological inquiry itself, and the interaction with indigenous and local communities within an archaeological research context. Before I examine the interactions I had with the communities of the Greater Asmara area from September 1997 to May 2002, let me first share how I was introduced to and why I opted for archaeology. My story is almost the same as the East African archaeologists’ stories I present in Chapter 3. But because all of them shared their stories with me in depth, I believe, I must share my educational background and how I became a student of archaeology.
As a first-generation high school graduate, I was successful in my pre-college studies and passionate about my studies. In the first year of high school, all students sampled courses from four streams: arts, commerce, science, and technology. By the second year, we had to choose one, and I chose commerce. My dream after obtaining a high school diploma was to work in a bank or to have my own import-export company. However, by the time I finished my third year, I learned from my classmate of two things that diverted my dream. First, I learned that high school was not the highest educational achievement, and that I could go on to college if I passed the national examination. This new information increased my desire for learning and caused me to work harder to get to the highest educational achievement. Second, I also learned that right after finishing high school and taking the national examination, all high school graduates were required to go to national service, which included military training. Then after the first three months of military training if one passed the national examination, he or she was admitted into the then University of Asmara, the only university in the country. Otherwise, the graduates must join the indefinite national service program.

Fortunately, I passed the national examination, and I joined the University of Asmara in the 1996-1997 academic year. Unfortunately, I was not allowed to study any of my choices: economics, accounting or management. In my second year, I was assigned to the Department of History. At that time, I didn’t like history, and the day I found out that I was admitted to the Department of History, I was devastated. I decided to drop out of college, but my father, who values educational opportunities for his daughters more than anything else, insisted that I should not drop out; rather, I should continue to learn the history of my country and wait for new opportunities to emerge.
Indeed, my father was so right. I came across several opportunities that immersed me in the world of archaeology.

At the time the registrar’s office assigned me to the Department of History, the University of Asmara implemented its new curriculum for a Bachelor of Arts degree and a one-year certificate program in Archaeology. My encounter with archaeology is one of the opportunities my father advised me to wait for, and it happened within 24-hours. As an undergraduate student majoring in history, I had to choose a minor. Archaeology was one of the options that was offered to me. I asked the then Head of the Department of History, “What is archaeology?” He replied, “Archaeology is about going to the field to look for old things” and added, “You will like it.” I did like the fact that it involves going to the field and allows one to explore landscapes. So I chose archaeology. In my third year, I performed well in my archaeology courses. I strongly desired to be an archaeologist, and I was invited by one of the professors of archaeology, Prof. Peter Schmidt, to join the department. I changed my major to archaeology, and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in archaeology and a minor in history.

As first-generation undergraduate students of archaeology, we had the opportunity to take four practicum courses that allowed us to interact with both the indigenous and non-indigenous communities in the Greater Asmara area. The non-indigenous local people who resided in the city were intrigued by our activities. Every time I travelled from one side of the city to another wearing dirty field school clothes, either in a bus or walking, people asked me “What kind of job do you work?” I replied, “No, I don’t work; I study archaeology and I am just coming from my fieldwork training.” Most of them were shocked and said, “What kind of school is that?” Usually, I shared
with them the knowledge I had gained on what archaeology means and what we did in
the field and in the laboratory at the NME. A few of them admired it while most of them
were puzzled with the whole concept of archaeology. Others wondered why I studied
archaeology, and yet others were proud of me for taking up this profession and
couraged me to excel.

My sense of belonging to the indigenous people has taken different directions as
a result of my interaction with them at a lineage level, and later as a student of
archaeology. Some of the most delightful experiences I have had working in the region
are the communities’ hospitality, trustworthiness, and easiness towards
archaeologists. Indigenous people were very keen to know what was going on, not
collectively but individually; mostly men approached us, the students, and asked
questions — “What are you doing?” For example, the town of Sembel and its
surrounding land, where the Sembel site⁶ is found, belong to the people of Godiaf.
Though Godiaf is part of Asmara, inhabited by people from different parts of the country,
it has its own indigenous people⁷. I remember in 1998 when we were undertaking an
archaeological survey a couple of elderly men approached us, and asked what we were
doing. We, the students, informed them that we were trying to find old things in order to
write our history. At least at that time, as new students of archaeology and not knowing
the colonial legacies of the discipline, we thought were doing something that was
beneficial for our country or at least I thought so. One of the elders said in Tigrinya,

“Xebuk ezom dekey”, meaning “good my children.” Then he added, “We need our

⁶ Sembel site is located in southwest of Asmara, dates from 800BC to 400 BC (Schmidt, Curtis, and Teka
2008).

⁷ In the late 1990s the indigenous people of Godiaf were waiting for the government to distribute their
land, so they were very conscious of anything that had to do with their land.
history as long as your work does not interfere with our interests. It is good to write and document our history.”

We encountered a similar concern from the indigenous people of Tselot, Daro-Qawlos, Cushet, Tese da emab, and Tese da kristian. A common thread for me in these villages was that I have grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins in them. So, they said, “Asmeret, a daughter of so and so is here with her peers and instructors to look for old things.” They didn’t question what we were doing, believing that I am their daughter and I wouldn't do anything harmful or unbeneﬁcial to them. Clearly, they trusted me. They, however, perceived me and my work in different ways: first, as a daughter, they were confused by my gender role. Nonetheless, they were proud of me as a female “scientist” and hoped for prosperity. As a collaborator from within, they respected me, knowing that I was interested in our history and heritage. At the same time, I never thought that I was imposing Western world perspectives of history and heritage making onto them. Instead, I was very enthusiastic and delighted to ﬁnd archaeology as a way that could help us write our history and conserve our heritage.

I even went further by introducing archaeology to my family members. I explained my profession to my grandmother, my aunts and my mother. At ﬁrst, they were frightened, believing that some places are associated with bad spirits. In fact, they told me they would pray for me to be safe every time I would be in the ﬁeld for an archaeological survey or excavation. I hoped that through time they would understand that my profession is safe from bad spirits. They still pray for my safety, even while they highly value my Western educational background. As time passed, instead of

---

8 The expectation of prosperity might have been more linked to the identity of my instructors, who were White Americans.
convincing them not to worry about my safety, I learned to admire and accept their worldviews.

In the final year of my undergraduate studies, to fulfill the requirement for my Bachelor of Arts degree thesis, I conducted an archaeological survey in the southeast of Asmara, just a kilometer away from my parent’s home. My objective in this project was to document the archaeological sites. To do this, following the language of archaeologists, I had to survey a one square kilometer area. I was very much interested in regional archaeology, and it allowed me to explore the landscape with which I was already familiar. I had already learned from the archaeological field schools that archaeology requires teamwork. Thus, I had to establish my own survey team. I instructed my siblings—two sisters 18 and 10 years old and my brother 12 years old—to accompany me to the field. At a family level, they were my community to whom I introduced archaeology and archaeological survey. They assisted me in holding tapes and reading measurements. In the process through which we were conducting a pedestrian survey, they learned how to identify potsherds and stone tools. Since then, they always follow the Eritrean TV programs that cover archaeological sites.

Archaeological research and field schools carried out in the Greater Asmara area have produced significant findings that have appeared in several journals of archaeology and also have been published in a co-edited book, Ancient Archaeology of Eritrea (Schmidt, Curtis, and Teka 2008), awarded the best book of African archaeology in 2008 by the Society of Africanist Archaeologists. The development of archaeological pedagogy meant that about 100 Eritreans graduated with BA degrees in Archaeology as vibrant young scholars. I consider this an example of the beginning of community-based
archaeology in Eritrea because, as previously marginalized groups, we, Eritreans⁹ were given the opportunity to study archaeology and work on archaeological research projects.

My active involvement in archaeological research around Asmara equipped me to work as a co-instructor of field schools and laboratory courses and to supervise archaeological field research. I gained invaluable experience and an understanding of contested power relationships within the academic communities, governmental institutions, and affiliated individuals over control of the research process and management of the past.

Though as archaeologists and students of archaeology we were successful in documenting and interpreting archaeological findings of the area, at least to the extent of my knowledge, we did not however have formal interaction or maintain stable relationship with the local communities. With the exception of few students who did oral tradition research and ethnoarchaeological research¹⁰, most students did not document and represent the view of the past and the concept of heritage from the local communities’ perspectives. What we documented was what we thought was important from the perspective of the mainstream archaeological practices and based on the way we were trained. Most importantly, I learned that although I conducted archaeological work on the landscape on which I was raised and belonged, my work was neither connected with what my people taught me nor did it have direct relevance. I found myself excited for archaeology but challenged by its application; but as a student

⁹ Mostly students from the Tigrinya speaking communities

¹⁰ For example, I collected oral traditions from the nearby villages for my Bachelor of Arts senior research paper but the analysis and interpretation were heavily based on traditional archaeological methods (Mehari 2000).
however, I was still not ready to challenge the practice; rather, I was more eager to know more about archaeology.

In fall 2002, I enrolled in graduate school in Anthropology at the University of Florida as a recipient of a Pre-Doctoral Fellowship from the Wenner-Gren Foundation. Most courses enriched my knowledge of the historical and contemporary contribution of Western scholars to anthropological theories and methods as well as of more rarely mentioned southern scholars’ contributions that appeared as occasional case studies. My master’s research paper, “Ceramic analysis of the Sembel site,” was published in the *Archaeology of Ancient Eritrea* (Schmidt, Curtis, and Teka 2008), and used traditional archaeological analytical methods. This research experience, together with the courses I studied, cultivated my interest in the representation of worldviews in knowledge production. I became aware that my master’s research paper was based on Western forms of knowledge production. It also caused me to wonder about questions such as: how would the Tigrinya people—especially women who play key roles as producers and direct consumers of pottery technology—analyze and interpret the pottery remains collected from the Sembel site? My naïve imagination about the relevance of archaeology in my own landscape has since become a different reality in which I see its potentials and challenges. This pondering has led me to engage constantly in the decolonization of my thinking about the practice of archaeology.

These fieldwork experiences marked a transition in my career. I have gained the advantage of becoming part of Western praxis and have had the opportunity to know

11 Southern scholars refers to scholars who come from countries formerly called third world countries and now collectively identified as the Global South. In other words, scholars who come from societies outside the dominant European and North American metropole (Connell 2007).
archaeology and its potentials for my people. In retrospect, I feel uncomfortable for unknowingly perpetuating only Western perspectives in the first few years of my career in archaeology. But this experience and the interactions I had with my family and the communities of Greater Asmara also challenged me to rethink my role. As the eldest child among eleven siblings, as a member of these communities, and as one of the first-generation Eritrean students of archaeology, it caused me to question how I can practice an archaeology that is relevant and meaningful to the community.

By the year 2003, I decided not to carry out any archaeological survey or excavation until I was equipped with the means to conduct research that was meaningful and relevant to my community. This year marked the foundation of my interest in what is called within academic discourse generally as community archaeology (e.g., Atalay 2006, 2012; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Marshall 2002; McDavid 1997, 2002; Moser et al 2002; Nicholas 2001; Pikirayi 2007, 2011; Rizvi 2008a; Schmidt 2010, 2014). My interest in community-based archaeology emerged from the interactions I had with both indigenous and non-ingenuous communities of the Greater Asmara area in my own cultural landscape. I sometimes wonder if I would have cultivated this interest in a different landscape. Regardless, my interest in community archaeology became more solid through the back and forth reflexive exercises I had between graduate school and my vision of archaeological practice in Eritrea, particularly in the Greater Asmara area.

It was only once I began my PhD studies that I started to filter out how the Western perceptions and practices are related to my African-Eritrean-Tigrinya cultural backgrounds in particular and to other non-Western cultures in general. It also became
clear to me that most of the courses I took or assisted in teaching in undergraduate and graduate studies mostly reflected Western scholars’ work. The representation of scholars from non-Western cultures is mostly absent (e.g., Pagan and Ramos 2008; Schmidt and Patterson 1995). If it is assigned as a reading, mostly in courses that address African archaeology or anthropology, even then the publications by non-Western scholars are rarely assigned, and the more favor African publications that are assigned are often by Western Africanist scholars. This experience led me to question why the publications by non-Western scholars, particularly Africans, are silenced. Do they have contributions to archaeology and African communities? Do we even have a significant body of work by African archaeologists that can be represented or silenced? On a larger scale, if there are African archaeologists’ contributions that need to be represented, what is the consequence of this skewed representation of knowledge distribution to archaeological higher learning at the global level?

Despite these unequal representation of diverse scholars, through my undergraduate and graduate educational and research experiences, I was able to obtain leverage by becoming part of the western praxis and to engage in critical thinking of archaeology in relation to my own personal and cultural experiences. As a result, in 2006, I crafted my first dissertation research proposal (An Ethnoarchaeology of Indigenous Material Culture of Healing in the Central Highlands of Eritrea), which emerged out of self-critical reflection of my master’s degree. But, the inability to conduct
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12 In this dissertation I view an Africanist archaeologist as an archaeologist who socio-culturally belongs to groups outside of Africa and specializes in African archaeology. Most Africanist archaeologists come from Western Europe and North America. On the other hand, an African archaeologist is an archaeologist who originally belongs to African ethnic group(s) and specializes in African archaeology. Of course, these definitions may need to be more refined in some Africa countries, for example in South Africa, to capture modern composition of cultural diversities and national unity.
this research, due to the socio-political situation in my country, propelled me to shift my attention to the importance of education in African liberation and to broaden my goals in archaeology beyond the conventional parameters of being a native archaeologist.

After I passed my qualifying exam in mid-2006, it became clear to me that I was constantly engaged in the decolonization of my thinking about the pedagogies of archaeology in higher education. My experience in higher education (both in undergraduate and graduate studies) has continuously intensified my interest in the politics of archaeology and its pedagogy. As a result, I presented a paper in the Postcolonial African Archaeologies Symposium held at the University of Florida in 2007. In that paper, I questioned the quality and power dynamics of teaching, the relevance of archaeology to local communities, the role of the State, and the issue of representation (such as ethnicity and gender) in training Africans in archaeology based on the Eritrean experience (Mehari 2007). My participation in that symposium redirected my dissertation research interest toward postcolonial archaeology, with a special focus on learning, teaching, and the practice of archaeology.

I started this section using the words of Baba Zawadi, a resident of Oldupai, the location of the case study presented in Chapter 7. To answer his question about what I have foreseen and to answer the questions I received from other members of local communities, students, and archaeologists in East Africa on a larger scale, my personal, educational and research experiences allowed me to rethink deeply the role of archaeology for African people and students of archaeology. How do Africans practice and teach archaeology? Does archaeology have direct benefit to African communities? How do archaeologists interact with people who reside in an area of archaeological
interest? Has training Africans in archaeology changed the relationship between local communities and archaeologists? How do indigenous, descendant, and local communities perceive archaeological research practice? And what are their reactions and demands? It was with these questions in mind and embedded in the research questions described below that I embarked on an inquiry into the historiography and ethnography of the institutionalization, practice, and teaching of field archaeologies in Tanzania and Uganda. A suitable research area to carry out this dissertation research project would have been in the Horn of Africa, particularly in Eritrea and Ethiopia. But considering the political relationship between Eritrea and Ethiopia, I chose Tanzania and Uganda for the reasons I present below.

**Research Questions**

The main focus of this research was to examine the historical developments and current trends of practicing and teaching archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda. In the beginning of this research, I asked three questions:

1. What constitutes local archaeological research?
2. Is there a change in the practice and pedagogy of archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda?
3. What is the role of Ugandan and Tanzanian archaeologists in decolonizing and transforming archaeology and its pedagogy?

To answer these questions, I specifically address four issues:

- The institutionalization of archaeology in non-academic settings from 1920s to mid-1980s.
- The developments of archaeology at Makerere University (MAK) in Uganda and the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) in Tanzania in the last fifty years.
- Pedagogies and practices of field archaeology at UDSM.
- The role of African scholars\(^\text{13}\) in decolonizing and transforming field archaeology and its pedagogies, particularly in improving the relationships with local people who reside in areas of interest for archaeological research and field school projects.

**Research Area**

My plan was to conduct the research in three countries including Kenya; however, due to financial limitations, I carried out this study only in Tanzania and Uganda. I focused on these countries not only because of geographical proximity and my familiarity with the archaeology of the immediate region, the Horn of Africa, but also for three other important reasons. The richness of the cultural heritage of the region (from the beginning of human origins to the present) has been appealing to various international researchers, funding organizations and tourists. Moreover, formerly under British colonial governance, these countries have been left with similar colonial legacies that are manifested in their higher education systems and in the institutionalization of archaeology. However, each country also went through different cultural, economic, and socio-political changes that have significantly affected the institutionalization of archaeology within their higher education systems. These similarities and differences are not only intriguing but also suitable for postcolonial studies that engage in the decolonization and transformation of archaeology in African countries.

**Ethnographies of Archaeologies: Means of Interacting, Learning, and Transforming**

We [archaeologists] ourselves are under as close scrutiny as the sites and artifacts we describe. The impact [of archaeology and archaeologists] in time becomes cumulative. If we can step back and study ourselves as the pace of archaeological research accelerates then we will have a better

\(^{13}\) I particularly focus on the role of African scholars because African scholars are expected to be leaders of the profession in their own countries.
In 1990, Merrick Posnansky presented a paper on “the archaeologist and the African community” at the Society of Africanist Archaeologists held at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Florida. Acknowledging that “all archaeology is socially invasive” and archaeologists’ actions have an impact on local communities, Posnansky (1993:6) reminded archaeologists that their actions are under scrutiny and encouraged them to use self-assessment or have reflexivity. Without a doubt, African(ist) archaeologists have been reflexive to update and rework their discipline, but Posnansky was calling for a reflexivity of archaeology and archaeologists outside of the discipline, thereby meaning to conduct an ethnography of archaeological practices.

Posnansky did not explicitly use any of the terms that some scholars are now referring to as ethnographies of archaeological practice, ethnographic archaeology, archaeological ethnography or related terminologies (e.g., Castañeda 2008; Castañeda and Mathews 2008b; Edgeworth 2006b; Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009b; Hamilakis 2011; Hollowell and Mortensen 2009; Meskell 2005, 2007). However, what can be inferred from his writings, based on long-term research experiences in several African countries (particularly in Begho in Ghana, see Posnansky (2004)), is the call for an ethnography of archaeology different from, but complementary, to some of the traditional ethnoarchaeological research interests.

Many of us are now interested in ethnoarchaeology and we seek to understand the present in order to get insights into our understanding of the past but how often do we take time to step back to see what we are … doing to the communities we investigate? (Posnansky 1993:8).

For many years, within the context of ethnoarchaeology, ethnography has been supplementing interpretation toolkits in the archaeological studies of African pasts (e.g.,
MacEachern 1996). However, Posnansky’s call was different than what had been well-established ethnoarchaeological research. It belongs to the scholarship of ethnographies of archaeologies that emerged in the early 1990s, a scholarship that only later gained popularity, mostly outside of Africa (for review see e.g., Castañeda 2008; Edgeworth 2003, 2006a; Hamilakis 2011; Hollowell and Mortensen 2009; Hollowell and Nicholas 2008). Ethnographers of archaeology consider archaeological practices as objects of study. They also see ethnography as an instrumental methodology of reflexivity\(^\text{14}\) that, when applied to archaeology, assesses or examines the impacts of archaeological practices both within and outside of archaeological practices.

This research directly relates to the scholarship of ethnographies of archaeological practices and stakeholders. Interested in decolonizing and transforming archaeology and strengthening its relevance and usefulness in African countries (in this case in Tanzania and Uganda), I carried out this research and worked with colleagues with the belief that both archaeology and archaeological knowledge are socially constructed (cf. Castañeda and Mathews 2008b). Thus, if archaeological practices and pedagogies are to continue in African countries, they must be part of African ways of life and first serve African people. I use ethnography not only as a research methodology in qualitative inquiry but also as a reflexive and operational approach to decolonize and transform archaeology within African countries.

The argument that ethnographies of archaeologies are crucial to decolonize and transform archaeology into a vibrant and people-centered discipline is already in

\(\text{\hspace{1cm}}\)

\(^{14}\text{Reflexivity in archaeology (Hodder 2000, 2003; Berggren and Hodder 2003) “deals with a theoretical position that supposes that archaeological knowledge is determined by both the experience and the context of the investigator” (Londoño 2014: 6258). It also involves “recognition of positionality” that one’s position or standpoint affect one’s perspective thus recognizing multiple positions and multivocality as crucial (Hodder 2003:58).}\)
practice, but most recognized works come from outside of Africa (e.g., Castañeda and
Mathews 2008a; Hamilakis and Anagnostopoulos 2009a; Hamilakis 2011; Hollowell and
Nicholas 2008; Hodder 2000; Mortensen and Hollowell 2009). Despite the lack of
intellectual stimulation for what Posnansky (1993, 2004) encouraged 25 years ago,
some publications represent work based in African countries, which can be explicitly or
implicitly identified as ethnographies of archaeologies: for example, Denbow,
Mosothwane, and Ndobochani (2009); Fontein (2006); Meskell (2005, 2007); Mire
(2007, 2011), Ndoro (2001); Pikirayi (2011); and Walz (2009). Most of these
ethnographic research are done by archaeologists. As there are many faces of
ethnography within and outside of anthropology (e.g., Hollowell and Nicholas 2008;
Mortensen and Hollowell 2009; Wolcott 2008), there are also genres in the ethnography
of archaeology done by both archaeologists and non-archaeologists (for reviews see
Edgeworth 2003, 2006a, 2010; Castañeda 2008; Hamilakis 2011; Hollowell and
Nicholas 2008; Mortensen and Hollowell 2009).

Despite its variation, the scholarship of ethnographies of archaeologies
recognizes that there are multiple ways of knowing and knowledge production occurs in
gеopolitically and socio-economically situated contexts. This recognition requires
archaeologists to be reflexive and ethically responsible, and archaeology to be locally
relevant, useful, and transformative. Thus, ethnographies of archaeologies have
developed with an increasing concern for ethical practices and reflexivity approaches in
archaeology (Castañeda and Mathews 2008b: 3-7; Edgeworth 2010:53; Hodder 2000;
Meskell 2005, 2007). In light of these challenges, ethnographers of archaeologies
question accepted hegemonic notions of archaeological practice and related concepts
such as knowledge production, identity, place, time, past, and heritage. As a result, they strive for an integrative knowledge system; however, these hegemonic concepts must be first deconstructed and situated in their spatial, temporal, and social context.

In this context, ethnography is useful both within and outside of archaeology. Within the discipline, ethnography is important as a means of exposing power vested on archaeologists or heritage experts. It is also useful to provide critical examination of the archaeological process within the discipline as Edgeworth (2006a) noticed and also demonstrated in this research (Chapters 2-6). Outside of archaeology, it is important to gain insights into stake-holders’ perceptions and views. Ethnographies of stake-holders’ perceptions and views are crucial, especially local communities’ needs from archaeological practices and their perceptions, and views of archaeological practices. Some examples from African countries have shown how ethnography can serve to unveil meanings attached to local landscapes at a given time, especially when based on long-term ethnographic research (e.g., Denbow, Mosothwane, and Ndobochni 2009; Pikirayi 2011). By recognizing, respecting, and embracing multiple positions and multivocality, ethnographies of archaeologies also shed light on means of communicating and negotiating with different stakeholders in archaeology (e.g. Barut 2000; Denbow, Mosothwane, and Ndobochni 2009; Meskell 2005, 2007).

In this research, particularly in Chapter 7 and Appendix A, I elucidate how ethnography of archaeology can be used as an avenue for local communities to interview archaeologists and students of archaeology, to teach them about the communities’ worldviews and values, and to provide their perceptions of archaeologists and archaeological practices. Moreover, this study shows how ethnography allows
archaeologists to have opportunities to learn from local communities and employ reflexive approaches. It is particularly concomitant with the assertion that local people are not passive, and they have their own worldviews, systems of knowledge production and negotiations, and expectations of archaeological practices as well as their own stories to tell (e.g. Hodder 2000, Meskell 2005, Smith 1999; Walz 2009).

I chose to conduct ethnographies of archaeologies in African countries not because I consider myself as a renegade archaeologist (e.g., see Chami 2011). On the contrary, I am advocating for ethnographies of archaeologies in order to problematize archaeology in African countries; particularly to assess archaeologists’ attitudes and actions, to evaluate archaeology’s contribution to African developments and challenges, and to learn African communities’ conceptions of heritage and past as well as perspectives and expectations of archaeological practices. I want to examine the immediate relevance of archaeology not only among the few privileged Africans who have gained access to Western education, and particularly archaeological education, such as myself, but also to the general African public and to local communities who reside in areas of archaeological interest.

In a similar manner as aforementioned scholars, I employ ethnographies of archaeologies to transform archaeology to be “for, by and with” African peoples, a discipline that produces knowledge based on African knowledge systems, concepts, and realities. In other words, to have a transformative archaeology that is accessible, participatory, and directly relevant and useful. In a way, this research also represents the diversity of ethnographies of archaeologies not only because I carried out multi-sited ethnography but also because the research includes varieties of ethnography and
history of archaeology: ethnographies and histories of archaeological heritage institutions, archaeological practices, archaeological pedagogies, and community archaeology.

Ethnographies of archaeologies are crucial to what Schmidt (2009b:xii) envisioned as building “an archaeological culture of transparency”; to pinpoint colonial legacies, neo-colonial oppressive practices and other forms of unethical practices or to recognize transformative ethical practices. They provide archaeologists insights to reflect upon their practices and pedagogies and to promote various ways of deconstructing colonial practices, transforming archaeologies, and practicing transformative pedagogies and archaeologies that are sensitive to local contexts and needs. To achieve these insights, ethnographers of archaeology use several methods, including ethnographic and historical inquires.

**Notes on Methods: Ethnographic and Historical Inquires**

This research is based on ethnographic and historical inquiries that incorporate both anthropological and historical methods. I conducted fieldwork between 2010 and 2012. During July 2010, I started field research in Uganda, which ended by November 2010. From December 2010 to January 2011, I began fieldwork in Tanzania, but due to immigration requirements, I had to return to the United States of America. Then I resumed the research in Tanzania May of 2011 and finished in January of 2012. Because archaeological practices and pedagogies are more developed in Tanzania, which produced more Tanzanian archaeologists than Ugandans, I chose to spend 5 months in Uganda and 11 months in Tanzania. In order to collect pertinent information that addresses the research questions, aims and objectives within this timeframe, my ethnographic and historical inquires involved three methods: archival research, informal
and semi-structured interviews, and participant observation. Utilizing a variety of methods allowed me to generate rapport and strong connections with African scholars, students, local communities and other stakeholders such as museum staff and antiquities officers. All of them, in turn, provided me knowledge about the old and new ways of practicing and teaching archaeology.

**Fieldwork in the Archives**

Archival data is an indirect form of observation, and it is useful people cannot change their behavior after the fact (Bernard and Ryan 2010). It is also useful in studying “what would be too politically ‘hot’ to study another way” and in tracing cultural processes through time (Bernard 2006:448-449). In this research, I used archival data as a range of documentary sources to reveal the nature of colonial and decolonial archaeology. Archival data for this research comes from both published and unpublished sources, located in different places. I consulted secondary data from autobiographies and biographies of pioneer Africanist scholars, as well as articles published in national (Uganda Journal and Tanzania Notes and Records) and international journals with specific interest in the archaeology of Africa (e.g., Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa archaeology) or those with a general interest (e.g., Man and Nature). I also used articles and reports published in the Nyame Akuma newsletter of the Society of Africanist Archaeologists, as well as annual reports of the British Institute in Eastern Africa (BIEA) and the departments of antiquities of Tanzania and Uganda. Except the Department of Antiquities in Uganda, which published an annual report only for the year of 1969 (see Chapters 2 and 3), the rest have published

---

15 A term adapted from Brettell (1998).
reports for decades. I explored the Nyame Akuma newsletter from the time of its start in 1972 to present, the BIEA annual report from 1966 to present and the Department of Antiquities of Tanzania report from 1957 to 1977.

For unpublished documents, I mainly focused on national resources. I used the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) Archaeology Unit office and library, the UDSM main library, the African Archaeology Network library16, the Department of Antiquities’ archive, and the Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology research permit catalogue – all in Tanzania. In Uganda, I consulted the files of the History Department at Makerere University (MAK), the files of the Uganda Museum, and the Ugandan National Council for Science and Technology research permit catalogue.

I employed both published and unpublished archival data to elicit the history of archaeology’s institutionalization, the history and developments of archaeological practices and pedagogies of field archaeology. I used archival research of published documents to have a critical and contextual understanding of the history of the discipline and the involvement of Tanzanians and Ugandans in archaeological practices (Chapters 2–5). I surveyed articles on the archaeology of Tanzania and of Uganda published both during colonial and postcolonial times. To locate articles published during the colonial period, I consulted both national and regional journals. I also used the same journals to locate articles produced during the postcolonial period by Africanist, Tanzanian, and Ugandan archaeologists. Furthermore, I read publications

---

16 The African Archaeology Network is a pan-African effort interested in archaeological research and capacity building. It origin is traced to the late 1980s (Kilhberg 2007; Pwiti 2001), but its current focus started in 2004 (Kinahan and Kinahan 2006). African countries need to have membership so that their citizens who are interested in archaeology can benefit. The network has designated coordinators in all African countries with membership, and its headquarter is based at the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania as an independent organization, separate from the then Archaeology Unit, now the Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies.
authored by Ugandan and Tanzanian archaeologists regardless of where these journal articles, book chapters, and books have been published. I obtained lists of their publications through one or both of the following means: 1) I collected curriculum vitae of Tanzanian and Ugandan scholars who hold PhDs, and 2) to supplement any overlooked publications but most importantly to obtain publication information of those for whom I could not obtain their curriculum vitae, I searched the name of these scholars on Google Scholar’s search engine. I specifically focused on publications by African scholars in order to understand what constitute local practices and pedagogies and to identify the contributions of African scholars in these endeavors (Chapters 4–7).

Furthermore, I used archival data from unpublished departmental documents to address the history of archaeology within academic settings, specifically the University of Dar es Salaam and Makerere University (Chapters 4 and 5). The archival data collected from these universities’ libraries and departments of history and archaeology and heritage studies were instrumental to create a demography of Tanzanian and Ugandan archaeologists (Chapters 3 and 7); to answer when, why, and how archaeology was introduced to these universities; to explain how archaeology as a teaching and research program developed or did not develop in these universities; and to examine how the curricula was in the beginning and what changes and continuities occurred over time (Chapters 4–6). I used these archival data either as independent evidence or supplemented with interview and participant observation, depending on the exigencies.

**Interview**

The second method I used was interview. Ethnographic interviews (Agar 1996, Spradley 1979) are crucial for archaeologists to learn about themselves; local
communities’ feelings, thoughts, and intentions; historical events which influence those feelings, thoughts and intentions; and local people’s general thinking styles, frames of reference and their worldviews. I used ethnographic interviews of archaeologists, students, local communities, and antiquities and museum officials to document local archaeological practices and pedagogies (Chapters 3, 6, and 7). Using purposive or judgment sampling, I interviewed eight PhD, four MA and six BA degree holders in archaeology from Tanzania and five PhD holders in archaeology or related fields along with nine master’s degree holders from Uganda. I used informal oral interviews to understand what motivated African archaeologists to join the discipline (Chapter 3), to learn their contributions to archaeological practices and pedagogies, to explore their relationships with local communities, and to identify new or reworked approaches to established methods in field archaeology (Chapters 6 and 7).

Similarly, I interviewed archaeology students to understand their knowledge of archaeology before starting undergraduate studies, specific motivations that encouraged them to pursue archaeology, and their views on the teaching of archaeology. In addition, I collected students’ views of archaeological field schools based on journal writing. Two Ugandans, who informally participated in archaeological research, and nine Tanzanian undergraduate students voluntarily participated in anonymous field school journal writing. They handed their journals to me at the end of their field schools, and I converted these handwritten journals into a Microsoft word document. These were later transferred to MAXQDA software program, a professional software used for data analyses. The data from these journals were useful to assess
students’ learning outcomes and experience in field schools and to identify the relationship between students and local communities (Chapter 6).

The representation of archaeologists within the History Department at MAK has been absent, with the exception of one prominent Africanist archaeologist in the early 1960s and one Ugandan archaeologist in the early to mid-1970s (Chapters 3 and 4). Thus, I interviewed 8 historians\textsuperscript{17}, both emeriti professors and active faculty members either with doctoral degrees or master’s degrees in history or in development studies. The faculty members and emeriti professors were recruited during different times and belong to different generations, those who earned their first degrees in the early 1960s to those who graduated with their first degrees in the early 1990s. The interview was designed using semi-structured, open-ended questions. The questions I asked included: historians’ cultural and educational backgrounds, research interests, employment histories, understandings of archaeology and its usefulness in national and community development, and any memories they could recall about the attempts made to introduce archaeology within the History Department.

Outside of the academic settings, to document the relationships between archaeologists and local communities, I decided to conduct both informal and semi-structured interviews with local communities in areas where most of the archaeological research and field school projects take place. To interview members of local communities, I worked in collaboration with Tanzanian and Ugandan colleagues who are either members of the local communities or have cultural and linguistic affiliations to the local communities. Most of them have either BA or MA degrees in archaeology,

\textsuperscript{17} The number of historians interviewed was based on convenience; I interviewed those who were available at the time I conducted the research
except in eastern Uganda where I worked with Onyango Aloysius, then an undergraduate student in the History Department at Kyambogo University in Kampala. I worked with Aloysius because none of the Ugandan archaeologists belong to the Adhola people. I collaborated with Herman Muwonge in Masaka area, with Salum Muya and Jonathan Mwandambo in Bagamoyo and Kaole, and with Naserian Ndangoya and Kokeli P. Ryano in Oldupai. At the time we conducted the research, Herman Muwonge and Kokeli P. Ryano had already obtained master’s degrees in archaeology from UDSM. Naserian, Salum, and Jonathan were in their last year of the undergraduate archaeology and heritage program at UDSM.

My colleagues and I consulted local people who live near or in areas of archaeological interest in four places (two in Tanzania: Bagamoyo-Kaole areas in the coastal region and Oldupai in the northern part of Tanzania; and two areas in Uganda: around Masaka area in central and around Tororo area in eastern Uganda). Based on purposive sampling, members of local communities from these areas were interviewed individually to share their experiences, perspectives, and expectations of archaeological practices in their areas. Though, I did research in four areas through the assistance and collaboration I received from my colleagues, I analyzed and present in this dissertation only the findings from Oldupai for two reasons: 1) the findings from Oldupai include most of the themes that emerged in the other three case studies and 2) because of the longevity of archaeological research in Oldupai. The detailed methods of data collection and means of inviting Tanzanian colleagues to participate in the Oldupai research activity is discussed in Appendix A-2.
To give a general idea about how I conducted interviews with archaeologists, students of archaeology, and historians, I started every interview informally by introducing myself and the research. I shared information about where I come from followed by what brought me to their countries and the research’s objectives. In most cases, I was interviewed first before I was able to start any interview. Then, to conduct the interviews, I shared with the participants the informed consent approved by the University of Florida Institutional Review Board 2010-U-009818. I also distributed copies of the proposal to those who volunteered to participate, particularly archaeologists and students, but also some historians, before the beginning of the interviews. Some of them provided comments and some only read the proposal. Those who gave comments about the proposal either participated only in informal interviews or both in informal and formal interviews. Based on the choices of the informants, interviews were done in various settings: in their homes, personal offices, departmental offices, quiet pubs and restaurants or also during field schools. All consented interviews were recorded using an Olympus digital recorder. Later, I transcribed them into text using Microsoft word-processing program, and then copy and pasted the text to the MAXDA software program for further analysis.

**Participant Observation**

I used participant observation, as a third method, to document micro-level behaviors (DeWalt and DeWalt 2002; Fife 2005). I attended undergraduate lectures,
seminar sessions, and graduate seminars, but the most significant to this dissertation was my participation in undergraduate field schools programs (Chapters 6 and 7). I observed and participated in ongoing archaeological field-school research projects for seven weeks. This allowed me to understand the relationship between local communities and archaeologists and students of archaeology. In Tanzania, I participated in field schools that took place in northern Tanzania, including in Olduvai Gorge. In Uganda, I attended two field schools that took place in Masaka and Tororo areas.

Participant observation also played a great role in enabling me to investigate how local scholars are teaching archaeology, what skills are students gaining, and to trace changes and continuities in the practices and pedagogies of field archaeology (Chapter 6). Archival research in departmental, antiquities, and museum offices for several months, attending classroom-based lectures for more than two months as well as occasionally delivering lectures to undergraduate students, and living with local communities that reside around archaeological sites for six weeks also provided me insights into the day-to-day activities of the institutions, practitioners, students, and local communities at large.

**Sampling**

This study is mostly based on purposive or judgmental non-probabilistic sampling. This type of sampling is noted as a useful approach for identifying specific cultural phenomena or conducting critical studies (Bernard 2006:186-187). Participants and areas are selected based on purposive sampling. To critically study the process of decolonizing and transforming archaeology in each country, this research involved
institutions in different settings and people from different groups. From each country, a
national museum or a department of antiquities and one public university were selected.

In Uganda, I situated the study in the Department of Monuments and Museums,
within the Ministry of Tourism because it is the only institution currently responsible for
national archaeological activities and for forwarding archaeological research proposals
to the Uganda Council of Science and Technology—a national research clearance
institution. In Tanzania, there are two institutions responsible for national
archaeological activities: the Department of Antiquities and the National Museum of
Tanzania (NMT). The responsibility of the former includes managing immovable cultural
heritage and endorsing archaeological research proposals approved by the Tanzania
Commission for Science and Technology, and the NMT is responsible for acquisition
and management of movable cultural heritage. Though I included both institutions
during the archival research, most of the discussion comes from my experience with the
Department of Antiquities because the research’s focus was on archaeological field
research activities and archaeological sites, which are designated as immovable cultural
heritage and thus responsibility of the department rather than the NMT.

Within academic settings, I conducted research in two universities. The number
of universities and colleges in both countries has increased as result of the privatization
of higher education. This means a few universities, particularly in Tanzania, have
already started hiring archaeology graduates. However, because the University of Dar
es Salaam in Tanzania and Makerere University in Uganda are among the first three
public universities in the region where archaeology was first introduced, this research
had to take place in these two academic institutions.
A similar approach was used to select villages or areas that have attracted archaeological research projects. While the two locations in Tanzania—Bagamoyo-Kaole areas in the coastal region and Oldupai in northern Tanzania—were selected because they have been exposed to archaeological research activities, the two areas in Uganda—around Masaka area in central and around Tororo area in eastern Uganda—were not selected because of the longevity of archaeological research in their vicinities but rather because they were the only active archaeological research activities at the time this research was conducted. Generally, the Masaka area is archaeologically a well-researched area in comparison to other parts of Uganda, but the villages or areas we conducted research have encountered archaeological activities only for two or three seasons. My colleagues and I interviewed members of the local communities from these areas based on purposive sampling; for example, we chose informants based on those who worked in archaeological research projects and those who didn’t, proximity of the place where archaeological activities took place, or gender and age differences. At times, it was also based on convenience sampling, meaning interviewing those who were available. But most importantly, we let representative members of the local communities guide us on who and when to interview.

Archaeologists and students of archaeology were also selected based on purposive and convenience sampling approaches respectively. PhD holding archaeologists were included based on purposive sampling because of their educational achievements, institutional affiliations and responsibilities. Archaeologists with master’s and bachelors’ degrees were chosen based on convenience sampling for two reasons. One, archaeology graduates have relocated to different parts of the country depending
on the job opportunities they obtained. Two, undergraduate students who attended the 2010-2011 academic year field schools were assigned to different field stations. Thus, based on which field stations they were assigned to, I consulted students to participate in journal writing activity.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis requires strong organization and reduction skills (Bernard 2006; Creswell 2008). Most scholars believe that these skills are part of the process of data analysis. From the beginning, I organized data by type—archival, interviews, and observations. When it was not possible to enter these data type into a Microsoft word document, I kept notebooks for each data type. I later converted these notebooks into electronic documents. Similarly, I transcribed all the interviews I conducted first into a word document and later transferred to MAXQDA software. Interviews conducted by my colleagues in different languages (Luganda and Adhola in central and eastern Uganda respectively, Kiswahili in the coastal region and Maa in the northern region of Tanzania) were first translated into English either directly to a Microsoft word document or into a field notebook then transcribed into a Microsoft word document.

In such labor intensive research, it is also important to note that ethnographic and historical data are “an inductive, iterative, and eclectic processes that require re-reading, reanalyzing, and using more than a single approach” (Creswell 2008:244-245; LeCompte and Schensul 1999). Thus, analysis also involved my personal evaluations and brought my perspectives and experiences to the interpretations, as well as at times those of my colleagues. I started data analysis first by making a general exploration of the data set both during and after the fieldwork. At first, it was a daunting experience but
once I revisited the data set several times—while listening and transcribing interviews and reading texts both from interviews, participant observation field notes and notes from archival research—I started to feel as if I found the path to the next level of analysis; thus I felt a certain level of synchronization was achieved. Then I used both content and ground-theory analysis approaches, which are noted among the common traditions of text analysis (Bernard 2006). Both approaches involve data reduction by developing codes or themes useful to build descriptions. The coding, searching, and sorting process also articulates the process of analysis, which leads to comparison and building models or theories (Bernard 2006; Bernard and Ryan 2010; Creswell 2008). I followed all these steps during content and grounded-theory analyses to search for patterns of thoughts, behaviors, and experiences, and explain why these patterns are there (Bernard 2006; Fetterman 2010). Though both analytical approaches have similarities, they also have differences.

Content analysis is a set of methods for systematically coding and analyzing qualitative data, and it is used to explore explicit and overt meanings in text (Bernard and Ryan 2010:287). It has several steps: it includes formulating questions based on existing theory or prior research, selecting set of texts, creating codes or themes to apply systematically to the selected text, creating matrix for each case, and analyzing the matrix (Bernard 2006; Bernard and Ryan 2010:287). I created several themes to collect and analyze both published and unpublished archival data. These themes included: Africans in archaeology, institutionalization of archaeology, professionalism, 

19 In these analysis approaches, I used MAXQDA software to sort, organize, and compare created or identified themes. To achieve validity, I discussed the findings with my colleagues from these countries. I also discussed with my dissertation chair, Prof. Peter Schmidt, who has four decades of research experience in these two countries, particularly in Tanzania. As Africanist scholar working in the region, he also made an immense commitment to the establishment of archaeology teaching program at the UDSM.
African archaeologists, archaeology curriculum, field archaeology, and archaeological field schools.

I did content analyses of archaeological publications to understand the process of doing archaeology (Chapter 2, Figure 2-1), to uncover colonial and decolonial practices, and the institutionalization of archaeology in museums and departments of antiquities (Chapter 2). Content analyses of annual reports of the BIEA, and national institutions (museums, departments of antiquities), and publications by former directors of these museums and staff members were useful to study the establishment of these institutions, the institutionalization of archaeology in these institutions, and the involvement of Africans in archaeological exhibition and research activities by these institutions (Chapters 2, 3, and 7). I also performed content analysis of unpublished departmental documents to trace the development of archaeology curricula at UDSM and MAK. This approach was used to assess these curricula’s effectiveness in decolonizing and transforming archaeology into a transformative discipline by identifying the contribution of African scholars in the context of course syllabi, as well as evaluating the curriculum for integrating any African perspectives and its relevance to contemporary local communities’ needs.

While content analysis was used mostly to published and unpublished sources, I applied the grounded-theory approach to the interview and participant observation data. The grounded-theory approach developed by sociologists is widely used to analyze ethnographic interviews (Bernard and Ryan 2010). It involves three basic steps: 1) initial coding: reading a text to identify potential themes, 2) memoing or reflection of the result of the initial coding, and 3) integrating, refining, and writing up these results to build
theories or explanations grounded in texts (Bernard 2006; Bernard and Ryan 2010). In this approach, themes are not created but rather they emerge through immersion in the data by listening to interviews several times during transcription and rereading interview texts and observation notes. In the process, several themes emerged, including career choice in archaeology, involvement of Africans in archaeology, archaeology practical field training activities and outcomes, and local communities and archaeology. Result from this study was used to provide understandings and explanations of the involvement of Africans as archaeologists, students, and local communities as well as to deliver their views and perspectives in their own words (Chapters 3, 6, and 7). It is important to note that the methods of data collection and analysis that I used and my colleagues participated in, were guided by theory of decolonization and transformation in archaeology.

Theoretical Background and Significance

To understand the nature of learning, teaching, and practicing archaeology in African academic and non-academic institutions, I focus on theories of decolonization and transformation related to postcolonial archaeology and critical pedagogy. The scholarship on decolonization and transformation emanates from various field of studies, including African, feminist, subaltern, indigenous, and postcolonial studies in anthropology and other fields. It is a good example in social science for demonstrating how knowledge is constructed socially. Epistemologically guided by social constructionism20, this research is relevant to the scholarship of decolonization and

---

20 Constructionism is the view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context (Crotty 1998:42).
transformation in two ways: 1) its argument on the need to localize archaeological practices, including pedagogies, as a central means of decolonization and transformation, and (2) its commitment to explore the extent to which these localized practices and pedagogies occur in African universities and to provide concrete evidence on where and how they are or are not taking place.

In this context, the process of decolonization is understood as a non-colonial praxis that deconstructs, devolves, democratizes, and challenges systems of power and social inequalities (e.g., Harrison 2008, 2009, 2010; Andah 1995; Schmidt 1995a; Smith 1999; Rizvi 2008b) while focusing on localizing praxis (Smith 1999). On the other hand, transformation is viewed as dynamic disciplinary, institutional, societal, and individual adjustments that are achieved by involving, engaging, empowering, and addressing the needs of various stakeholders.

This research is related to critiques of archaeological practices and pedagogies in the post-colonial era (e.g., Andah 1995; Atalay 2006, 2012; Dowson 2004; Liebmann and Rizvi 2008; Schmidt 2005, 2009a; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Segobye 2005; Silliman 2008). Its main theoretical and methodological interest is to decolonize and transform archaeology and its pedagogies, and the emphasis is on the need to scrutinize archaeology in both academic and non-academic African institutions. To understand how archaeology within Tanzanian and Ugandan public institutions has decolonized, transformed or maintained colonial and neo-colonial legacies, I engage both archaeology and pedagogy by exploring the intersections among higher education institutions, departments within which archaeology is housed, curriculum, practitioners, students and local communities.
Decolonizing Archaeology

The decolonization of archaeology has been taking place through the influence of various methodologies (cf. Liebmann 2008; Nicholas and Hollowell 2007; Lane 2011; Schmidt and Karega-Munene 2010; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Schmidt 2009a). This research focuses on decolonizing and transforming archaeology in African countries, adopting the decolonization and transformation of archaeology as a “localized practice.” It entails a localized practice that eschews paradigms inherited from colonial practice, e.g., those attributing change and development to foreign influences and devaluing indigenous peoples’ knowledge, histories, and heritage (e.g., Chami 1994; Andah 1995; Mapunda 1995a; Ndoro 2001; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Smith 1999). It also develops new ways that bring marginalized voices into history making and heritage making and managing (e.g., Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Hodder 2003; Kent 1998; Pikirayi 2011; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Wylie 1997). Moreover, a localized practice respects, values, and embraces indigenous and local communities’ perspectives (e.g., Atalay 2006; Mapunda 1995a; Pikirayi 2011; Smith and Wobst 2005; Watkins 2000). It develops local ways of researching, teaching, and outreach (e.g., Atalay 2008; Million 2005; Silliman 2008) to address the well-being, needs, and agendas of those communities (Atalay et al 2014; Ferguson 2003; Marshall 2002; Pyburn 2003; Smith and Jackson 2006; Rizvi 2008a). Finally, it promotes social justice, equality, and diversities in all levels of archeological practices, including among its own students, scholars, and across disciplines (e.g., Chami 2009; Kusimba 2009; Pagán-Jiménez and Rodríguez Ramos 2008; Rizvi 2008b; Schmidt 2009b). Parallel to this theoretical framework, this research explains how these localized practices function in the realm of archaeological practices and pedagogies within Ugandan and Tanzanian institutions.
Archaeology and Education

The role of education in archaeology has been a growing interest (e.g., Bender and Smith 2000; Malone, Stone, and Baxter 2000; Rainbird and Hamilakis 2001; Stone and Mackenzie 1990; Stone and Molyneaux 1994). There is, however, very little discussion on the role of education as a decolonizing and transforming methodology. Recently, it has been getting attention in coined terms such as “engaged critical pedagogy” (Arnold 2005; Hamilakis 2004), “the politics of pedagogy” (Hamilakis 2004; Pyburn 2005; Clarke 2004), and, “interrogating and transforming pedagogies” (Fagan 2000; Rainbird and Hamilakis 2001; Smith and Bender 2000). Regardless of the less pronounced debates in archaeological pedagogy, archaeologists are aware of the political nature of the pedagogy of the discipline (Ucko 1990). Some archaeologists have peripherally discussed existing forms of domination and social inequalities within and outside of the pedagogy of archaeology (e.g., Colley 2000; Hamilakis 2000; Stone and Mackenzie 1990; Stone and Molyneaux 1994). Others are aware of the need to act on decolonizing and transforming archaeological pedagogies. Yet very few provide evidence of how they decolonize and transform archaeological pedagogies mainly within Western higher education settings (e.g., Atalay 2008; Colley 2000, 2004; Hutchings and La Salle 2014, Pyburn 2005; Schmidt 2005; Shay 2008; Silliman 2008; Walker and Saitta 2002; Wood 2002). This research emphasizes on the need to problematize archaeology in African institutions.

Decolonizing Education: Critical Pedagogy

The decolonization and democratization of education is rooted in the work of critical and progressive pedagogy, feminist as well as indigenous studies (e.g., Davies 2003; Freire 1985; hooks 1994, 2003; Ka’ia 2005; Mihesuah and Wilson 2004; Mosha
The critique of these scholars, and others, is directed to the well-founded structure of the academy and its social inequalities (along lines of race, gender, class, and ethnicity) and urges that academia be indigenized, decolonized, and democratized, making it relevant to the needs and interests of disadvantaged communities. For example, based on experiences from the USA, New Zealand, and Tanzania, Mihesuah and Wilson (2004), Ka’ia (2005) and Mosha (2000), advocate to legitimize underrepresented groups, including indigenous peoples and their knowledge, interests, and needs in the academy to make it “a more egalitarian space” that promotes social equality (Davies 2003: x). Critical and progressive pedagogy scholars, such as Freire (e.g., 1970, 1985) and hooks (1994, 2003), affirming the embedded relations of power and knowledge production and the political nature of education, call for the use of reflexivity in promoting a critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy is achieved by having sensitivity to a community’s histories and cultures through ensuring its members’ participation. Engaged critical pedagogy should also encourage students and teachers to critique dominant forms of knowledge and to examine their own experiences (hooks 1994; 2003). These debates on educational changes, as Ka’ia (2005) and hooks (2003) point out, partly depend on the role of scholars from underrepresented groups (indigenous or not) being responsible to and responsive to their communities’ needs. The inspiration behind such expectations is the perception of the role of education as “the practice of freedom” (Freire 1970:68; hooks 1994:12). Hence, education is considered as a way to liberate, a life-transforming experience both at individual as well as societal levels. In archaeology, one of the main routes by which decolonization occurs is that of promoting education and training for all, including underrepresented
groups. This research expands the discussion of education as a means of liberation and transformation but also as a means of oppression by examining the role of emerging African archaeologists in empowering themselves, in indigenizing, decolonizing, and democratizing or oppressing their work as well as the academic settings in which they study and/or work.

**Decolonizing and Transforming Archaeologies in Africa**

Discourse on decolonization of African archaeology is taking place through interrogating the colonial interpretations of the past and making alternative histories (e.g., Andah 1995; Kent 1998; Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Shepherd 2002), incorporating indigenous epistemologies (e.g., Andah 1995; Keitumetse 2005; Mire 2007, 2011), and, questioning the direct role of archaeology in solving Africa’s problems—social, economic, political, and environmental (e.g., Brandt and Mohamed 1996; Kent 1996; Schmidt 2009b; Schmidt and McIntosh 1996; Segobye 1996; Sowunmi 1998). Others also accentuate the existence of colonized spaces by addressing inequalities in epistemologies, in workplaces based on gender, race and class, and the silencing of local communities’ perspectives and views on archaeological practices (Andah 1995; Lane 2001, 2003; Meskell 2005; Ndlovu 2009; Schmidt 2009b; Shepherd 2003a, 2005; Ucko 1990; Wadley 1997; Weedman 2001; Lyons 2007). This transformation is mainly the result of efforts by both African and Africanist archaeologists. The work of these two emerging groups is an evident achievement that substantiates the perception of education as “the practice of freedom” (Freire 1970:68; hooks 1994:12).

Equally, training of indigenous African archaeologists has been recognized as crucial for the development of African archaeology since the introduction of archaeology
at Makerere University in Uganda in the early 1960s and the founding of departments in Ghana in 1951\textsuperscript{21} and Nigeria in the early 1970s (Chapters 3, 4 and 5; Nzewunwa 1990; Posnansky 1971; Wandibba 1990, 1994). Despite the various challenges of few training institutions, the lack of trained personnel, the lack of resources for sustaining research and maintaining African scholars, and a continued distance between archaeologists and their publics—communities and institutions (e.g., Kusimba 1996b; Mapunda and Lane 2004; Segobye 2005; 2009), institutions of higher education are becoming key players in training Africans to be custodians of their own heritages. Over the last two decades, especially with the development of archaeological training at institutions such as the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania in the 1980s, the University of Asmara in Eritrea and the University of Botswana in Botswana in the 1990s, a number of African archaeologists have emerged to take postcolonial archaeology in new directions (cf. Robertshaw 1990c; Schmidt 2009b). Although these new changes are partly a result of training African archaeologists, I find very limited discussions on how teaching and learning archaeology in African settings take place, the role of education as a decolonizing methodology (e.g., Atalay 2008; Schmidt 2005; Segobye 2005), and the role of African scholars and institutions in decolonizing and transforming archaeology and its pedagogy. One of the ways to explore these research themes is to examine changes and continuities in the pedagogy of archaeology and in archaeological practices in key teaching institutions. This research provides a historical foundation and an ethnographic analysis of existing archaeological practices by local African scholars.

\textsuperscript{21} Though archaeology founded in 1951, teaching started in 1968.
with a special focus on the institutionalization of archaeology and the teaching and practice of field archaeology in two public universities in Tanzania and Uganda.

**Significance**

This research supplements the scholarship of decolonization (e.g., Falola and Jennings 2002; Freire 1970; Harding 1998; Harrison 2008, 2010; hooks 1994; Smith 1999; Thomas 1994), and contributes directly to critiques of archaeological practices in the post-colonial era (e.g., Atalay et al. 2014; Lane 2011; Liebmann and Rizvi 2008; Schmidt 2009b). It is significant at several levels. At local, regional, and national levels, by unveiling the consequences of current practices and pedagogies, this research provides a foundation for the decolonization and transformation of archaeology in East African universities so that the field can better serve the needs of African communities, demonstrate a deeper appreciation for using African experience and intellectual contents in pedagogy, and effectively engage African students in the study of their past and heritage in a meaningful way.

By meeting such thresholds of significance, in a broader archaeological praxis, this research contributes to the newly flourishing theoretical discussion on “postcolonial archaeologies” (e.g., Liebmann and Rizvi 2008; Schmidt 2009b), “the politics of pedagogy,” “the scholarship of teaching and learning,” and decolonizing pedagogies in archaeology (Atalay 2008; Clarke 2004; Hamilakis 2004; Pyburn 2005; Segobye 2005; Schmidt 2005), “community archaeology” (e.g., Atalay 2012; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Pikirayi 2007, 2011; Schmidt 2010, 2014), and "ethnographies of archaeologies" (e.g., Castañeda and Matthews 2008a; Hamilakis 2011; Hodder 2000; Meskell 2005). Very few archaeologists engage in a systematic appraisal of teaching in their sub-discipline, even if, presumably, many conscientiously work to enhance and improve their teaching
(Clarke 2004: 282). It is with this awareness that I examine teaching and practicing archaeology in African settings and seek alternative models. Hence, the main contribution of this research is its attempt to integrate experience of African students of archaeology and African communities’ perspectives of archaeological practices in transforming mainstream archaeological practices, pedagogies, and archaeological institutions.

**Organization of the Study**

This dissertation is composed of eight chapters, including introductory and concluding chapters. Archaeology in Africa is a colonial legacy and each country has its own colonial and postcolonial experiences. Thus in Chapter 2, I analyze the institutionalization of archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda during the colonial period and up to the mid-1980s in the postcolonial period. I identify what was colonial and not colonial in the 20th century, and I further illustrate how the institutionalization of archaeology in these countries undertook different trajectories. In Chapter 3, I present the involvement of Africans in archaeology and the pathways Ugandans and Tanzanians used to access archaeological training in higher education before the establishment of archaeology in Ugandan and Tanzanian higher education settings.

Knowledge about the development and the placement of archaeology in African higher education is vital to examine whether archaeological practices and pedagogies in African universities are neo-colonized, decolonized, or otherwise transformed. Such understanding is also crucial to pinpoint the role of African institutions and scholars in the development and transformation of archaeology in their countries. Archaeology in Tanzanian and Ugandan higher education systems was introduced during the early 1960s in two universities: Dar es Salaam College in Tanzania, now University of Dar es
Salaam (UDSM), and Makerere College in Uganda, now Makerere University (MAK). It was more vibrant at Makerere College than Dar es Salaam. By the late-1960s, however, its visibility at MAK started to decline and eventually remained underdeveloped, continuing to appear only as a topic within history courses, whereas at UDSM it started to emerge as a full-fledged program in 1985. Today, UDSM has a refined program that offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees while MAK just opened an archaeology program in the 2013-2014 academic year to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Archaeology. In Chapters 4 and 5 I situate the placements and developments of archaeology within the Tanzanian and Ugandan higher education systems and provide the contemporary contexts. These chapters cover the conditions that made the establishments of archaeology possible in African universities and those that inhibited the developments. Particularly, Chapter 4 presents the emergence and subsequent stagnation of archaeology at MAK, and Chapter 5 is about the emergence and development of archaeology at the UDSM. I particularly address why archaeology developed into a full-fledged program at UDSM, but not at MAK. Political stabilities, socio-intellectual movements, individual commitments, and financial resources are discussed as major factors for the gradual emergence and development of archaeology at UDSM.

I conducted research in both universities; however, in Chapters 6 and 7, I draw heavily on the data collected from the UDSM for various reasons, including because archaeology at MAK remained undeveloped. In addition, archaeological field trainings based in Uganda are offered informally outside the university context, mostly by British Africanist scholars. On the other hand, Tanzanian scholars at the UDSM run their own
field schools. Though both countries have disparities, their field schools focus on training African students in traditional Western archaeological approaches. Furthermore, though the current status of archaeology in these universities is quite distinctive, both countries have more similarities than differences in teaching and practicing field archaeology. Since my focus is to pinpoint changes and continuities in practicing and teaching field archaeology within higher education, in these chapters, I emphasize the historical and contemporary structural foundation of archaeology in the country that has a well-developed program both for undergraduate and graduate studies. Chapter 6 covers current pedagogies of field archaeologies offered at the UDSM. In this chapter, I illustrate how the pedagogies of field archaeologies focus on training African students in the traditional Western archaeological approaches that isolate African communities in the process of history making and creating heritage. Within this context, pedagogies that promote accessible archaeology and relevance to the needs of local communities are yet to come.

In the colonial period, local communities were excluded from archaeological practices and if they were involved at all it was mostly when information or assistance was needed. Such colonial arrangements and legacies constantly dissociated local communities from uncovering, constructing and managing their heritages. In Chapter 7, I ask one question, have these colonial legacies of the relationship between archaeologists and local communities changed in the contemporary practices and pedagogies of field archaeologies as a result of having African archaeologists? Particularly, I examine local communities’ perceptions of and attitudes towards archaeology, archaeologists and students of archaeology. By so doing, I elucidate how
the ways archaeologists approach local communities have become a major hindrance to community development and to transforming archaeological practices and pedagogies.

In the conclusion chapter, I illustrate how political liberation brings but also fails to create professional liberation. Furthermore, I address how archaeology was localized in the colonial period and what characterizes current postcolonial field archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda. I also discuss where Ugandan and Tanzanian personnel localized archaeology in their countries and where additional efforts are needed. Finally, I conclude this research by providing recommendations for improving the archaeology programs at the UDSM and at MAK.
CHAPTER 2
COLONIAL FOUNDATION

In this chapter I examine the practice of archaeology in the colonial period and the institutionalization of archaeology up to the mid-1980s. In Tanzania, I examine the institutionalization of archaeology in the National Museum of Tanzania (NMT) and the Department of Antiquities. In Uganda, I discuss the institutionalization of archaeology at three locales: the Uganda National Museum (Uganda Museum), the Department of Antiquities, and the later amalgamated Department of Antiquities, Monuments, and Museums.

Most African countries’ governmental heritage institutions research and manage heritage under the auspices of inherited colonial institutions (Robertshaw 1990c). In East Africa, contemporary institutionalized forms of archaeology, museum, and heritage studies are also products of European colonization (Abungu 2006; Robertshaw 1990b; Posnansky 1996). As part of this structure, contemporary Tanzania’s quasi-governmental and governmental heritage institutions, known as the King George V Memorial Museum and the Department of Antiquities, respectively, in the colonial period, were embraced in the post-independence period to create, document, conserve, and manage what is regarded as heritage. Today, the same institutions continue to function under the guidance of Western perspectives. This arrangement equally applies to the respective institutions in Uganda. The development of museums in African countries and their roles was raised as early as the beginning of the 1960s both by museum professionals working on the continent and international organizations, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), e.g. through its journal *Museum*. The major challenge identified then was:
How museums in African countries were responding to the wider background differences they had with African societies – e.g., cultural, linguistics, and educational. On the other hand, the development of departments of antiquities and monuments and their roles in postcolonial Africa still remain uninvestigated. A fundamental question that needs to be addressed is how the newly emerged nations defined their own heritage, particularly in the way archaeology is practiced, when they decided to embrace museums and departments of antiquities.

Identifying how governmental heritage institutions and their personnel in Tanzania and Uganda were embraced and how they conceptualized heritage at the time they outlined the rationales for the establishment of archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam and Makerere University is essential. It is essential in order to assess whether decolonization and transformation of archaeology have taken place at a national level, especially within the higher education institutions since these institutions have the responsibility to produce independent and responsive professionals. In the 1960s, the interest of the newly emerged African nations in the pasts of the African peoples is undeniable (e.g., Karoma 1990; Robertshaw 1990a; Schmidt 1995a). However, what I seek to illustrate here is that the institutions in the postcolonial period that had major influences in the establishment of archaeology within the higher education system, mainly the National Museum of Tanzania and the Division of Antiquities, embraced archaeology without problematizing\(^1\) it; thus, continuing to

\(^1\) Problematisation is ‘demythicisation’ (Freire 1972:132) and involves “dialogical, problem-posing and conscientising” methodology that places the oppressed in a consciously critical confrontation with the problem (Freire 1976:157, quoted in Corty 1998:155-156). In this context, the problem is archaeology as a colonial legacy, how it should be institutionalized, practiced, and what relevance should it have in the postcolonial African nations. This problem solving approach requires the oppressed ones to raise above their situations and then critically reflect upon it.
conceptualize heritage and the past from colonial and contemporary Western perspectives. On the other hand, the experience of Uganda, particularly the introduction of archaeology at Makerere University, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, had a different start in the 1960s due to the way archaeology was perceived and practiced at the Uganda Museum both in the last decade of the colonial times and in the early 1960s. Uganda had a different start with a slightly problematized archaeology that was dedicated to reclaim African history and to engage Ugandans in the making of history. The problematization mainly focused at the level of data acquisition, interpretation, dissemination, ethics and pedagogies (see Figure 2-1). However, the development of archaeology’s institutionalization in its national heritage institutions from the 1970s onwards and the reintroduction of archaeology at Makerere University in the 2013-2014 academic year have followed a similar rationale as the Tanzanian institutions.

Tanzania

Tanzania’s Western-oriented institutionalized form of studying the past as well as defining and managing heritage was planted during the last century. By the end of the 19th century, modern-day Tanzania had two separate political entities, Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Starting from the mid-1880s to 1918, Tanganyika was a German colony, and until the early 1900s Zanzibar was governed by successive sultans (Kimambo and Temu 1969; Iliffe 1979). By 1922 both Tanganyika and Zanzibar were already part of the British government administration (Otiso 2013). Tanganyika was a colony until the time of independence on December 9, 1961 and Zanzibar was a British Protectorate until December 10, 1963. Both Tanganyika and Zanzibar formed modern-day Tanzania in 1964. In this dissertation, I focused on mainland Tanzania, formerly known as Tanganyika, because during the colonial period archaeological research was prevalent
on the mainland. In addition, postcolonial Zanzibar has its own Department of Archives, Monuments, and Antiquities, and thus requires a separate investigation.

**Archaeological Research**

In the colonial period, archaeological research in Tanganyika predates the establishment of archaeology-related institutions; particularly the mid-1920s and the 1930s represent the historical foundation for the contemporary archaeological research in the country (Chami 1994; Robertshaw 1990b; Masao 2005). The archaeology of these decades up to the late 1950s marks several events including the establishment of systematic archaeological research. The history of archaeology and its role in the reconstruction of the past and the roles of pioneer scholars are extensively covered elsewhere (e.g. Chami 1994; Mabulla 1996b; Mapunda 1995b; Masao 1979, 2005; Mturi 1998; Kessy 2005; LaViolette 2004; Robertshaw 1990b). However, I include in this section a brief history of how archaeological research was conducted in these formative periods in order to provide a longitudinal context of the current concept of heritage and the past, and to explore contemporary standards of archaeological practices and pedagogies at the University of Dar es Salaam.

In reviewing the historiography of archaeology in mainland Tanzania, Tanzanian archaeologists, Chami (1994), Mapunda (1995), Masao (2005), and Mturi (1998) have highlighted biases in archaeological practices in terms of location, time coverage, and research themes. Geographically, archaeological research in the colonial period was mostly carried out in the northern, central, and coastal regions. Thematically, archaeologists focused on human origins and Stone Age archaeology in the northern part, rock art studies in the central region, and the history of civilization in the coastal areas. Similarly, archaeology as a professional practice before the mid-1950s was
exercised by a few foreign scholars, namely Louis Leakey and Mary Leakey from Britain (though Louis Leakey identified himself as a White African [Leakey 1966]), and Margit Kohl-Larsen and Ludwig Kohl-Larsen from Germany. The Leakeys practiced archaeology for more than half a century in Tanzania and significantly influenced the structure of contemporary archaeological practices in the region, more so than the Kohl-Larsens.

What has not been critically examined within the historiography of archaeology in the region is the process of doing archaeology\(^2\) (see Figure 2-1) in the colonial period and its legacy in the postcolonial period. If all archaeologists in colonial East Africa were not colonialists, as Robertshaw (1990b) warned, then what exactly was colonial in the archaeological praxis of the colonial period, and who were the colonialists and non-colonialists? In this research on the decolonization and transformation of archaeology, I critically examined the archaeological literature produced both in the colonial and postcolonial periods. I undertook this endeavor from a different gaze, not from the standard literature review of archaeological research as has been the case in Uganda and Tanzania. Instead, through content analysis of the archaeological literature, I examined the process of doing archaeology (Figure 2-1) not to cover the changes and continuities in the mainstream archaeological theories, methods, and techniques, but to critically interrogate various components of archaeological praxis, including professionalization and institutionalization of archaeology. I do this by analyzing the work of noticeable archaeologists in the colonial period. For Tanzania, I focus on the work of the Leakeys.

\(^2\) What I mean here by the process of doing archaeology is the archaeological research design as outlined in Figure 2-1.
The Leakeys worked in different parts of Tanzania; however, most of their research was based in northern Tanzania, notably in Olduvai Gorge (Mturi 1998; Masao 2005). Within the Olduvai Gorge area, locally known as Oldupai in the Maasai language, systematic geological, paleontological and archaeological research started in 1931 when Louis Leakey along with his colleagues carried out the first expedition (Leakey 1966). The type of research Louis Leakey conducted in Olduvai from the beginning was multidisciplinary, mostly involving scholars from the aforementioned disciplines. In the first expedition, Leakey’s initiatives laid several foundations for later colonial legacies. First, because of his experience with the African landscape and the distribution of archaeological sites in Kenya, he challenged the former scientist, Hans Reck, who visited Olduvai in 1911, when it was known by the Germans as Oldoway. As he shared in his biography, Leakey argued for the evidence of an extended history of human origins in Olduvai Gorge by pointing out the existence of stone tools before he even reached there. In this context, he brought Olduvai Gorge into the spotlight of the Western research agendas and valorized the role of East Africa in understanding human origins and developments.

He [Professor Hans Reck] assured me that while he was at Oldoway he had searched diligently for Stone Age implements and although he was anxious to go with me to Oldoway he warned me that I had better give up the idea of going there altogether if I wanted to find prehistoric implements, as all we would find would be the bones of fossil animals (Leakey 1966:274).

Louis Leakey’s willingness and Hans Reck’s reluctance to recognize the importance of paleontological and archaeological evidence are examples of how European scholarship was influenced by the study of the African past(s) and how the practice of archaeology in Africa was built on European colonial ideological foundations.
Despite the agency of the African past(s) on influencing European scholarship and the role of archaeology in valorizing the perception of Africa as the cradle of humanity, for years Olduvai have become a fertile land where Western scholars, wealthy individuals, and institutions invested their energy, time, and money for the studies of human origins and developments in Africa from Western scientific worldviews. For example, Blumenschine, Masao, and Peters (2005) have extensively reviewed the achievements of these Western scientific research endeavors in Olduvai. These achievements transformed archaeological theories, methods, and techniques (e.g., Gowlett 1990; Robertshaw 1990b); however what needs to be highlighted in these achievements is the inherited colonial legacy—the legacy of dependency on designing and financing archaeological practices, valorizing Western philosophies and perspectives on the interpretation of African landscapes, and publishing produced archaeological and paleontological knowledge in Western European languages and disseminating the same knowledge mostly in European and American-based academic journals and publishing companies.

This legacy also encouraged the involvement of Western scholars, both men and women. For example, Leakey contributed to the representation of European women in

---

3 Research at Olduvai Gorge started through funding from European individuals, notably financial donations from Charles Boise and other grants especially from Wilkie Brothers Foundation and Wenner-Gren in the 1950s (Leakey 1966, 1984). In the 1960s additional major funding was provided by the National Geographic Society of the United States. Over the years, various interdisciplinary research projects has continued through the support of funding organizations from the developed countries and the collaborative effort of mostly citizens of the donor countries and about three to four Tanzanian scholars.

4 The Leakeys also published few articles in South African journals; however, their publication record on the local journal *Tanganyika Notes and Records* was very poor. *Tanganyika Notes and Records* issued its first volume in 1936. In the post-independence period, the journal was renamed *Tanzania Notes and Records*, and by 1985 the journal gradually failed. The journal existed throughout the Leakeys’ career time in Tanzania; however, unlike their contemporaries in Uganda, such as J. Wayland in the colonial era and Merrick Posnansky in the postcolonial era who preferred publishing locally, the Leakeys published only three articles in this journal.
East African archaeology starting in 1935 by involving Mary Nicole Douglas, later to be known as Mary Leakey (Leakey 1984). But the Leakeys did not encourage the involvement of Africans professionally and their interaction with the local people of the area, the Maasai people, was based on manipulation and alienation (see Chapter 3 and Chapter 7 respectively). Similarly, another colonial approach introduced by the Leakeys was the export of collected materials either to the neighboring colony (present-day Kenya) or to Western European museums and laboratories such as the British Museum. This approach not only led to the double colonization (both European and Kenyan) of the material culture collected from Tanzania but also negatively impacted both the institutionalization of archaeology at the King George V Memorial Museum and the involvement of indigenous Africans, now Tanzanians, in archaeology.

**Archaeology in Museum**

Archaeology in Tanzania was first institutionalized through the creation of a museum in 1940. So far the history of the origin of a museum in the country is synthesized at least from two points: the establishment of a museum and the assemblage of objects. On one hand, the first interest in establishing a museum in mainland Tanzania is traced back to the early 1900s during the German colonial period

---

5 The former Tanzanian directors of the National Museums of Tanzania (NMT) (Kayombo 2005, Msemwa 2005, and Masao 2010) have consulted R. Meyer-Heiselberg (1972) to write on the development of museums in the country. Meyer-Heiselberg was the curator of the King George V Memorial Museum (KGMM) from 1969 to 1972, and compiled available annual reports, reviews, and papers to reflect the thirty years (1936 to 1966) evolution of the museum from KGMM to the National Museum of Tanganyika and then to the National Museums of Tanzania. I found Meyer-Heiselberg’s compiled book, “National Museum of Tanzania reporting thirty years of work,” as the main accessible source to consult. Consequently, most of the information I used to discuss the origin of the National Museum and the institutionalization of archaeology within the museum settings comes from this document.

6 In Zanzibar, the British colonial government established the first museum, the Peace Memorial Museum in 1925 to commemorate those who had died in the First World War (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972). It also included an ethnographic exhibition, which presented the local people of the island in a static way (Sheriff, Voogt, and Luhila 2006:18-19). In this dissertation I focus only on mainland Tanzania.
(e.g., Masao 2010; Msemwa 2005). Both Masao (1975:103, 2010:42) and Msemwa (2005:2) acknowledge that the proposed museum was never established due to the outbreak of World War I. On the other hand, Kayombo (2005:7), the late director of NMT, has traced the history of collecting objects, specifically stone artifacts, around the same time. These stone artifacts, collected during railway construction, were stored in a house called “Kulturgebaude,” meaning a house of culture in the German language. If I take Kayombo’s statement as a reference point, then at this stage there was no institutionalization of archaeology and the collection was just accidental. This event, however, introduced the idea of a museum as a Western concept and institution, and more importantly the basis of Western ideologies, perspectives and concepts of history, culture and heritage. These ideologies and perspectives place greater emphasis on material objects than on focusing on local ontologies and epistemologies or, as Mire (2007, 2011) highlighted, on the knowledge that defines these objects and the landscape within which the objects are preserved. In other words, African people and their thoughts, ideologies, and world perspectives were suppressed as subjugated knowledges (Foucault 1980).

Prior to the coming of the Germans, care of the heritage of the different ethnic groups was vested in the hands of chiefs and clan heads (Msemwa 2005:2). In the process of documenting the transformation of the National Museum of Tanzania in the post-independence period, Msemwa (2005) distinguishes the Western concept of a museum from what he refers to as the African concept. The main difference between the two is the way objects are perceived and their purposes. In the traditional African settings, objects have a dynamic life-cycle and serve to engage the broader public. On
the contrary, in the traditional European concept of a museum, objects are viewed as static and directed to engage a few privileged groups. These traditional European concepts of a museum, objects, and forms of conservation and historical documentation seem to have infiltrated into African world perspectives as early as the establishment of the house of culture, *Kulturgebaeude*. Though the house of culture\(^7\) was destroyed during World War I, the idea of a museum and the focus on material objects as a static means of narrating stories, defining and conserving heritage continued during the British colonial period to serve a few privileged groups who had the ability to decipher Western worldviews and languages, including those who accepted the Western ways of reconstructing the past and defining heritage without problematization.

In Tanganyika (mainland Tanzania), the first museum, which gave rise to what is now Tanzania’s National Museum and House of culture, was built during 1938–1939 in memory of King George V of England who died in 1936 (Msemwa 2005:3). However, the idea of establishing a museum started in 1934 by the then Tanganyika’s governor, Sir Harold MacMichael (Gillman 1972). MacMichael encouraged interested persons to collect material culture. As a result, ethnographic and archaeological objects were collected from all over the territory and stored in an old Arabic building, the old Seyyid Barghash Building, in Dar es Salaam (Gillman 1972, Masao 2010). Gillman (1972:5) reported that these objects were “housed very unsatisfactorily” in a building “far too dark and dusty for the purpose.” But what is prominent is irrespective of the satisfactory or unsatisfactory conservation status of these objects: Sir Harold MacMichael’s interest in

\(^7\) In the post-independence period, the House of Culture concept is incorporated to transform the concept of a museum to include intangible and tangible heritage and to attract Tanzanians (see Msemwa 2005).
collecting objects was still from a Western perspective with no benefits returned to Africans.

The death of King George V instigated the collection of money to establish a suitable memorial for him. The funds were collected through donations from the public, and the first chairman of the museum’s Board of Trustees, Clement Gillman (1972:5), reported the contribution from Africans as “most gratifying.” Through contributions from the territory’s population and from the British colonial government’s matching public funds, an appointed committee decided to establish a museum in Dar es Salaam. Thus, the King George V Memorial Museum (KGMM) was opened in 1940 with the purpose of providing a “cross-section” of the Territory, including its geological, geographical, environmental characteristics as well as its people’s past and their present way of living, including public health and agriculture (Gillman 1972:6-7). To give past and present understanding of the territory, the previously collected ethnographic and archaeological objects, stored in the “far too dark and dusty” building, were moved to the KGMM. From a curatorial point, this shift marks the beginning of the institutionalization of archaeology in mainland Tanzania within a museum setting.

Three points can be discussed with regard to the establishment of the first public museum that focuses on the entire territory of Tanganyika. First, the people of Tanganyika (Mainland Tanzania) paid their tribute as “they were asked to” (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:12). Though Mntambo (1941) admired the KGMM as a public museum for the interest and benefits of the inhabitants of the territory, it is clear that the

---

8 One of the first African assistants recruited at the museum, Petro Ch. Mntambo (1941) mentioned that before the establishment of KGMM, there were several little provincial museums in Tanganyika that focused on specialized fields such as a medical museum in the medical laboratory in Dar es Salaam and a geological museum in the Lands and Mines Department in Dodoma.
emphasis was to honor the King. In turn, the established museum also served to expand knowledge about the colony by getting a “cross-section” of the entire territory through various field of studies including geology, geography, archaeology, history, and ethnography. As was stated in the Museum’s 1956/1957 annual report, the objective of the museum was to collect, preserve, and exhibit objects of prehistory, history, ethnology, and natural history of Tanganyika for the purposes of general information, education and research (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:118). This focus strictly indicates what Msemwa (2005) has argued: an emphasis on objects that benefits a few privileged locals and foreigners. In the late 1940s and 1950s, according to the annual reports of the museum, the museum faced several burglaries. Such burglaries can only happen when a museum curates a heritage that is externally created and defined by foreign citizens for their own benefits. Thus, the concept of museums emanating from Western practices has been beyond the domain of the majority of the African population and to some a museum continues to be viewed as “a place where ‘dead’ items are kept and preserved” (Abungu 1997:142).

The second point is the involvement of Africans in the day-to-day administrative activities of the museum, including managing archaeological collections, was very peripheral until a decade after the country’s independence. Africans were recruited in the museum as early as 1937. Athman Bin Ali was the first African hired as a museum attendant, and Athman A. E. Mohammed and Petro Ch. Mntambo joined as museum assistants in 1939 (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:223). In the next two decades, not more than five Africans were working in the same capacity. Positions such as curator, assistant curator, and secretary were the preserves of British nationals. African staff
rarely received training and, for the most part, according to the museum's annual report for 1954-1955, they “reached a good standard of training largely due to their own efforts” (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:106). The attitude that Africans were not suited for white-collar museum jobs gradually changed so that in 1965 the museum's board of trustees appointed the first Tanzanian national to a semi-senior post, that of assistant technician (Masao 1975:104). In the following year, an assistant curator/educational officer position was given to Fidelis Taliwawa Masao (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:225). Eventually, full “Tanzanisation” of the museum administration, and open training access to nationals became possible a decade after independence (Masao 1975:104).

The third point to address that is relevant to the institutionalization of archaeology within the museum is the museum’s archaeological collections, research activities, and archaeological personnel. In the 1940s, the museum had a very limited archaeological collection because most archaeological research findings uncovered by the Leakeys were taken away to Kenya. The museum’s archaeological research activities only started in the 1950s. For example, in 1950 Graham Hunter, the then Curator of the museum, excavated a cave in the Dodoma area and made several collections from the Central and Southern highlands of Tanzania. Recognizing its weakness in archaeological collections, the museum’s 1956-1957 annual report forecasted an intent to increase its archaeological collections with the establishment of the Department of Antiquities (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:123-124).

---

9 John Albert Rauf Wembah-Rashid was also another Tanzanian who was appointed as an ethnographer at the museum in the late 1960s, possibly after graduation with his first degree from the Dar es Salaam University College where he participated in archaeological research activities led by representatives of the University in 1967 (Sutton and Roberts 1968, Chapter 5). In the late 1970s he went to the U.S.A. for higher education (NMT 1981:3) and earned a PhD in Anthropology from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1983 (Wembah-Rashid 1983).
By the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s, the museum increased its collection through the acquisition of archaeological and paleontological findings from Olduvai Gorge, through efforts of the newly appointed curator\textsuperscript{10} of the museum and the director of the newly established Department of Antiquities\textsuperscript{11}. Prior to the end of the 1950s, archaeological and paleontological findings of Olduvai Gorge, mainly under the concession of the Leakeys and their Kenyan assistants (Mturi 1978c), were stored in the Coryndon Museum in Nairobi, Kenya (West 1963). Taking archaeological and paleontological findings from their original area is central to the legacy of colonial archaeological practices.

By the beginning of the 1960s, the NMT started to improve its archaeological collections and research activities through its own curator attending fieldwork mostly organized by the Department of Antiquities (Sassoon 1964), through demanding plaster casts from the Coryndon Museum, and negotiating with the same museum to return the Olduvai Gorge’s collections (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972). At the same time, the NMT also appointed an assistant archaeologist, Mrs. H.C. Lovell, “to devise a simple, practicable cataloging system for the entire archaeological collections” (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:188). At this stage the museum started to make progress in institutionalizing archaeology in its collection, management, research activities and personnel. Nevertheless, though three British archaeologists were working at the museum, the

\textsuperscript{10} Stanley E. West was the first archaeologist appointed as curator of the museum from October 1960 to September 1965 (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:165, 223). The previous curator (1956-1959), J. R. Harding, reported some Late Stone Age and Iron Age findings from the coast of Tanzania (Harding 1960, 1961, 1963); however, her education background is not clear (Weedman 2001:17-19), and in the Museum’s annual report Stanley E. West is acknowledged as the first archaeologist with an MA degree in archaeology.

\textsuperscript{11} Discussion on the origin of the Department of Antiquities follows below.
archaeological research component of the museum was in its infancy, and it was mostly done in collaboration with the Department of Antiquities. Furthermore, Tanzanians were still excluded from the few archaeological research activities conducted by the museum staff until the involvement of Fidelis T. Masao mostly from 1972\textsuperscript{12} onwards. Masao engaged in archaeological research activities both through his own individual archaeological research projects (Masao 1976a, 1976b) as well as in collaboration with the Department of Antiquities (Mturi 1976c, 1978a).

Though the museum’s archaeological research activities and the representation of Tanzanians remained at its lowest level, the effect of archaeological findings, on the contrary, particularly from Olduvai Gorge in the late 1950s and early 1960s, highly contributed to the making of the museum. These findings served in framing the museum’s concept of heritage, and in validating as well as accepting archaeology and related fields of studies as a means of uncovering the past, writing history, and promoting heritage making. This contribution is vividly depicted in the museum’s 1962-1963 annual reports:

Tanganyika occupies a unique position in the scientific work by virtue of all the important discoveries of fossil man in Olduvai Gorge. It is proper that the national museum should be developed to be a center for research and study concerning the past of man and his environment. The present development of the museum was begun with this very much in mind, that here we should have an institution which would attract the attention of the

\textsuperscript{12} Fidelis Masao was appointed in the museum in 1966. His publication about Kondoa rock art and Olduvai Gorge also appears as early as the late 1960s and early 1970s (Masao 1972, 1976a); however, as it appears in the Tanzania’s Department of Antiquities 1972-1973 Annual Report (Mturi 1978a), his full participation in archaeological fieldwork in Tanzania was mostly after he obtained his master’s degree in anthropology from the University of Colorado in the United States in 1972. J. A.R. Wembah-Rashid’s appointment in the museum in the late 1960s might also be considered an earlier involvement of Tanzanians in archaeological activities; however, Wembah-Rashid’s involvement in archaeology first started through John Sutton’s initiative at the University of Dar es Salaam (Sutton and Roberts 1968, Chapter 5) and later as an ethnographer at the museum he published his individual research relevant ethnoarchaeology of iron technology the Ufipa people in Southern Tanzania (e.g., Wembah-Rashid 1969).
world at large, not only on account of the material that it houses but also for an active policy of research (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:171).

The focus of the museum on human and environment in general may seem flawless; however, in retrospect it was clearly unable to problematize archaeology and other disciplines that produced these discoveries. It further failed to problematize intrinsic concepts of past, history and heritage from the native Tanzanian citizens’ perspectives, especially within the realm of archaeological territory. Instead, the museum was swayed by famous findings and embraced archaeology and related fields of study in its development mission based on findings that were vital to fulfill the Western countries’ scientific practices and intellectual wonders. Thus, the museum oriented its priorities more in service of the technologically and economically empowered Western countries instead of focusing on the local meanings of the past, heritage and its management.

This form of commitment is clearly attested in the same annual report of the museum:

> The discovery of Olduvai Gorge makes archaeology and the physical remains of man important, not only to Tanganyika but also to the understanding of the whole study of evolution of man and will receive special treatment… (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:172).

The special treatment was achieved by allocating a specific exhibition “the Hall of Man.” The Hall of Man was opened to the public on January 1965 (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:197) to display the geology, the evolution of the primates, fossil remains, and stone tools in Olduvai and other sites, as well as archaeological findings of different periods from different parts of the country. The Hall of Man display is still one of the permanent exhibitions of the National Museum. Another space allocated for archaeology was within the History Galley, and included collections from coastal archaeological and historical sites. Such special treatment outwardly elevated the national image for further exploitation and exploration, and honors Western Africanist
scholars’ endeavors through their cultural and scientific inquiries to investigate the natural and cultural landscape of the country at the expense of local perspectives, histories, and heritages.

The institutionalization of archaeology at the museum, particularly the special treatment of archaeological and paleontological findings that shed light on the understanding of human origins based on evolutionary concepts, received some resistance from concerned foreign citizens. For example, in the late 1950s some concerned people aired their objections to the representation of the outcomes of archaeology and related field of studies in the museum on local newsletters such as *Tanzanian Standard*.

Sir, referring to recent articles and letters regarding the King George Memorial Museum it seems appropriate to draw attention to the hideous hoarding that has been created inside, and wherein is being depicted the claim that Man originated from animals through evolution, I have yet to find an African who believes this. It would be an insult to suggest such a relationship. They believe in the Supreme Being Creator, who created man and all things living. Belief in Creation was woven into their folklore long before David Livingstone opened up the “Dark Continent”.

It is an excellent idea to appeal to business houses and individuals to make a gift of a show-case for the housing of exhibits depicting the 120 tribes of Tanganyika, but why make our Museum a platform for propagating a hypothetical intrusion of Western “Civilized” thought contrary to the faith of these people? Such a show-case may eventually exhibit models of a life-size ape and a life-size Tanganyikan; but the comparison, as the comments, will be odious to the ever-increasing number of Africans showing an interest in the Museum of their country and people. (Reprinted in Meyer-Heiselberg 1972: 207-208).

Though objections to evolutionary views at the museum remained unaddressed due to the aforementioned overwhelming discoveries, the idea of using the museum as a platform to exhibit the country’s ethnographic diversity became prevalent in the postcolonial period. In the beginning of the 1960s, according to the 1962 to 1963
museum’s annual report, the progress of the museum moved forward and the new government embraced it “as an active institution pursuing an important role in the cultural background of the Nation” where its high standard of maintenance was encouraged through “raising of the annual subvention in 1962-1963 from 3000 pounds to 20,000 pounds” (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972:171) and through changing the museum’s name. On June 1963 the museum’s name was changed from KGMM to the National Museum of Tanzania.

The nationalization of the museum was embraced within President Julius Nyerere’s ideology on culture as the soul of a nation. Thus, it was viewed as “a national culture, educational and scientific center where Tanzanians learn about their past for understanding the present and forming aspiration for the future” and to destroy the fallacy that Africa has no culture to be proud of through concerted scientific evidence (Wembah-Rashid 1974:5). Clearly, the newly postcolonial government embraced the museum to fulfill its nationalist and pan-African ideologies that reclaim African cultural values and histories. Archaeology within the museum, however, with the exception of the iron smelting demonstration at the Village Museum of Dar es Salaam (see Wembah-Rashid 1969, 1973; Nitro 1981), was adopted without problematizing its core principles; thus for the most part it continues to suppress local histories and heritages that could have significant contributions to national and community development.

**Department of Antiquities**

Two decades after the inception of the KGMM, another institutionalization of archaeology occurred under a separate government office, namely the Department of
Antiquities. This institution is one of the two colonial institutions\textsuperscript{13} of archaeology that emerged through the dedication of Rev. Gervase Mathew and Sir Mortimer Wheeler’s research interest. Mathew’s interest in the archaeology of East Africa started as early as the end of the 1940s (Mathew 1953)\textsuperscript{14}. In his seminal article published in *Antiquity*, Mathew (1953) reviewed the archaeology of East Africa, highlighted the importance of correlating archaeology and oral traditions, and cautioned the colonial government on the alarming rate of destruction of monuments and sites in the region. Then he suggested three measures. The two practical measures were the need to have a “Uniform Act”\textsuperscript{15} to safeguard sites and monuments in East Africa and the importance of carrying out archaeological expeditions. However, the main suggestion he made was the need to establish Departments of Antiquities in the region as an ultimate measure toward the development of archaeology.

Yet ultimately the development of East African archaeology and the survival of its ancient monuments and sites demand the creation of adequately staffed Departments of Antiquities in the areas concerned. Only this can ensure the continuity necessary for the adequate conservation of sites, for planned fieldwork and for the steady publication of its results (Mathew 1953: 218).

Wheeler’s interest in East Africa arose as a result of his research findings from the south Indian coast, and led to the idea of establishing a British Institute in the region (Kirwan 1976: vii). His interest in the precolonial history of East Africa coincided with the rising interest in reconstructing African history. Consequently, together with Rev.

\textsuperscript{13} The other institution that has a colonial foundation is the British Institute of History and Archaeology in East Africa, which is still determinant in the current status of practicing archaeology in East Africa.

\textsuperscript{14} He is “remembered as one of the founders of the British Institute in Eastern Africa, and one of the founder members of its Council” (Freeman-Grenville 1976: ix).

\textsuperscript{15} Mathew (1953) noted that each country had some form of Acts that could be used to enforce protection of monuments and sites.
Gervase Mathew, he was successful in convincing other scholars on the idea of establishing a British Institute particularly in 1953 at an international conference on African history held at the School of Oriental and African Studies\textsuperscript{16} in London, where this consensus was reached: to document and preserve East Africa’s archaeological sites and monuments, to investigate historic sites, and to train students. The idea of the need for a training school in East Africa similar to British Institutes and Schools in other parts of the world was also first brought up during this conference.

To fulfill his vision, Wheeler visited East Africa in 1955. Together with his colleagues, he formed the Tanganyika archaeological society to study ancient monuments and to raise funds for that purpose (Freeman-Grenville 1955:64). Then he led an expedition with Rev. Gervase Mathew and J. P. Moffett to Kilwa Kisiwani in the coastal region. He also made several contacts with government officials, for example with the then Governor of Tanganyika Sir Edward Twining (Kirwan 1976: viii). Soon after that, though the Tanganyika archaeological society quickly disintegrated, we see the opening of departments of antiquities in Uganda and mainland Tanzania.

In mainland Tanzania, the second stage of institutionalization of archaeology occurred in 1956 when the decision to establish a department of antiquities within the then Ministry of Social Services was made. The Department of Antiquities was established to oversee antiquities, protected monuments and reserved areas of Tanganyika (Chittick 1958). Thus on April 1957, it started operating by incorporating the

\textsuperscript{16} The School of Oriental and African Studies (often called by its acronym, SOAS) was established in 1917 to cater information of African languages, peoples including their regions and history (cf. King 2000). By 1948 when Roland Oliver was hired, the focus of the School shifted to training African civil servants and establishing African universities based on British educational system.
As its main guiding principle, and by taking management responsibilities and ownership title of areas that were previously protected under the Ordinance. Though Rev. Gervase Mathew highlighted the importance of African oral traditions and archaeology, this British-oriented form of institutionalization of archaeology was introduced to monopolize histories and heritages of the peoples of East Africa. In terms of research and conservation, the department could only function under the guidance of Western or Western-trained scholars. During this period, there were no indigenous Africans in Tanganyika or Protectorate Uganda trained to conduct archaeological research or run the department. Regardless, to maintain its agenda the logical step for the colonial government would be to appoint prominent expatriates who could relate to and run such foreign forms of institution. Accordingly, Hubert Neville Chittick was appointed as its first conservator, and became a member of the King George V Memorial Museum’s Board of Trustees (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972).

Along with the establishment of the Department of Antiquities and its connection with the museum, both Chittick (1958) and Kirwan (1976) also noted that bearing in mind the plan of establishing the East African School of Archaeology, the Antiquities’ office was based in Bagamoyo, in the coastal part of the country. The School of Archaeology was never materialized in the first year due to financial limitations, but according to the Antiquities annual report for the year of 1958, the idea persisted. And the colonial government included a total of €6,500 in the department’s budget for the

---

17 In 1937, the British colonial administration passed the Monuments Preservation Ordinance, which empowered the governor to declare and gazette structures of historic significance as monuments, and sites of archaeological, scientific, and historical significance as reserved areas (Karoma 1996:192; Mturi 1996:170). The Antiquities Act of Tanzania, enacted by the independent government in 1964 and amended in 1979 replaced the Monuments Preservation Ordinance promulgated, and now is the basic legislation for the protection and preservation of the country’s cultural heritage (Kamamba 2005:13).
year 1959 towards the cost of the proposed School of History and Archaeology in East Africa (Chittick 1959:1). At this point, it seems that the Department of Antiquities and the School of History and Archaeology were conceived to become one institution.

By 1959, however, these two interrelated ideas, financially planned as one institution, branched out into two different institutions: the British Institute of History and Archaeology in East Africa and the Department of Antiquities\textsuperscript{18}. The change was perhaps a carefully engineered arrangement by the colonial government to have its own Institute free from the soon-to-be independent government of Tanganyika, just a year after. This arrangement can be easily attested since during the following almost four decades the British Institute became “a palpable symbol of the contradiction between a disenfranchised African population not enabled to construct its own ancient history and a foreign institute on African soil that studies African history and continuously produces knowledge satisfying mostly the European academy” (Schmidt 1995b:129)\textsuperscript{19}.

The establishment of the Department of Antiquities in colonial Tanganyika crystalized the contemporary division of labor between its office and that of the National Museum in mainland Tanzania. Unlike the museum that focused (and still does) on the movable cultural objects to serve a few privileged nationals and foreign scholars and tourists, the Department of Antiquities has emphasized the authorization of

\textsuperscript{18} The idea of establishing a School of Archaeology and History never took off. Rather the British Institute of History and Archaeology in East Africa, which later became the British Institute in Eastern Africa (BIEA), was established in 1959 as a research institute (Kirwan 1976). Its archaeological research interests focused on Iron Age and changed the archaeological research themes of the region for the coming decades, different from the dominant research theme in Tanganyika at that time which was led mostly by the Leakeys from 1930s to 1950s.

\textsuperscript{19} Over the last few years the BIEA however seems to have adjusted its approaches to studying African history. It has somehow increased giving opportunities to Africans in editorial positions within its Azania journal, the number of publications by Africans has increased, and also a few of its members has carried out research that may possibly have direct relevance to Africans (e.g., see Davies 2012).
archaeological and ethnographic research permits\textsuperscript{20}, as well as conservation of immovable “heritage” which includes specific demarcated structures and landscapes as protected monuments and reserve areas. Thus, following the Monuments Preservation Ordinance, the Department of Antiquities continued to apply principles that dislocate or deny African communities full access to and engagement with their cultural landscapes. However, the same landscapes are preserved for Western-based archaeological scientific explorations that claim to focus on reconstructing African history\textsuperscript{21}. Consequently, such approaches are examples of structural foundations transferred, without problematization, as colonial legacies into the post-colonial period.

The two major structural foundations embedded within the Department of Antiquities are the activities of the department itself and the way Africans are involved in these activities (Chapter 3). In the late 1950s, the department’s activities started with legal provisions, the appointment of caretakers, repairs to standing ruins, and periodic visits of inspection\textsuperscript{22} of monuments (Chittick 1960:1). Then, it focused its activities on preservation and management of monuments and on conducting archaeological research (Chittick 1960:1). As I mentioned earlier, and Bwasiri (2011a, 2011b) and Kamamba (2005) argued, the legal provision followed a fortress approach that denies Africans access to their cultural landscapes and in the making of their histories, and ownership is vested under the central government. Furthermore, the 1964 Antiquities

\textsuperscript{20} For the Department of Antiquities to provide research permits or even to access proposals for a permit, proposals first must be approved by the Tanzania Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH).

\textsuperscript{21} The Antiquities Division still continues to focus on colonial approaches and legislative procedures (see Bwasiri 2009, 2011a and 2011b for discussion).

\textsuperscript{22} Most of the time inspection of monuments relied on Provincial Administrations (Chittick 1960:1).
Act amended in 1979 focuses on what is defined as relics, monuments, and protected objects. Preserving knowledge (Mire 2007) and living heritage (Bwasiri 2011a and 2011b), as acknowledged by Tanzanian scholars, has been marginalized in favor of the "tangible heritage" which is identified mostly based on Western standpoints.

In the postcolonial period starting in the 1960s, archaeological research activities in mainland Tanzania continued through three research outlets inherited from the colonial period: research conducted by foreign institutions and scholars, research carried out by the Department of Antiquities, and "collaborative research." The Department of Antiquities started surveying and excavating coastal sites (Chittick 1962, 1963, 1966) and Iron Age sites in Pare and Moshi Districts, and in other parts of the country, such as Arusha, Kondoa, Mubulu and Singida Districts, to document and examine rock paintings (Chittick 1959). In 1961, a year after the British Institute of History and Archaeology in East Africa was established in Dar es Salaam, Neville Chittick, the Conservator of Antiquities, was appointed as Director of the British Institute (Sutton 1984). This led to the beginning of a joint research project between the department and the British Institute financed by the latter (e.g., Chittick 1966). Despite the financial support, this project was most likely a matter of convenience than a collaborative research because both institutions were under the leadership of Neville Chittick. However, Chittick eventually left the Conservator position to become the Director of the Institute. This change left the department without a Conservator for the year of 1962 (Sasoon 1964).
From 1963-1968, Hamo Sassoon\(^{23}\) served as Conservator of the department (Posnansky 2005). Archaeological research of the department continued focusing on Iron Age sites in northern Tanzania and rock painting sites in central Tanzania (Sassoon 1964, 1966, 1967a, 1968a, 1968c). From 1969 onwards, the department came fully under the leadership of Tanzanians. For example, throughout the 1970s, under the direction of Amini A. Mturi, the department conducted archaeological excavations in northern Tanzania (Mturi 1976c, 1986), which contributed to human origins, Stone Age and Iron Age studies.

By 1969, the transition of leadership also automatically qualified the Department of Antiquities for what is known as “collaborative” research projects, mostly with Euro-American scholars based in the United States and sponsored by funding organizations also based in the United States. These activities focused on sites identified as Middle Stone Age, Late Stone Age, and Pastoral Neolithic sites (Bower and Chadderdon 1986; Chadderdon and Wynn 1981, Keller 1973; McBrearty, Waane, and Wynn 1982; Mturi 1976a, 1977, 1998; Wynn and Chadderdon 1982). These collaborative research activities strengthened the existing archaeological research themes and set the foundation for neocolonial legacies of archaeological praxis that put African institutions and African scholars, both those formally trained in archaeology and those without archaeological experiences, in a subordinate status (Chapter 3).

\(^{23}\) Hamo Sassoon was a British expatriate who worked as Deputy Director of Antiquities in Nigeria from 1957-62 before appointed as Conservator of Antiquities in Tanzania (Posnansky 2005:160)
The Department of Antiquities continues in a similar manner, except now Tanzanian archaeologists based at the University of Dar es Salaam\textsuperscript{24} are major leaders and more active in carrying out archaeological research than the Department of Antiquities, particularly starting in the late 1980s (Chapter 6). According to interviews I carried out with some of the Department of Antiquities staff members, archaeological research in the department was more active in the 1960s and 1970s than it is under its current form. Their perspective is clearly supported, especially when one glances at the department’s annual report from 1957 to 1977. “Now, we don’t even have these annual report publications. Mturi did a lot, but the leaders after him really killed archaeology in this department,” expresses one of the employees. Thus, the department is mostly involved in conservation, documentation, and research permit authorization. This change is attributed to at least two reasons: 1) the change of leadership starting in 1981, and 2) the lack of local funding resources. By the late 1970s and early 1980s, Tanzania underwent a serious economic crisis (Tripp 1997), and making it impossible to maintain the allocated budget for research and publication. This decline in the development of archaeological research in museums and Antiquities was common to most African countries (e.g., Musonda 2012; Shaw 1989) and continues to remain the same.

Uganda

The development of archaeology and its influence on the concept of the past and heritage in Uganda closely relates to the sociopolitical history and economic situation of the country. European contact in precolonial Uganda started in 1862 and the initial

\textsuperscript{24} The emergence of Tanzanian scholars and the development of archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam will be presented in Chapter 3 and Chapter 6 respectively.
declaration of Uganda as a British Protectorate took place in 1894 (Gukiina 1972). The relationship was formalized through the Uganda Agreement in 1900. The oligarchies of Uganda from different regions had various forms of contacts and agreements with the British. The oligarchies were representatives of the indigenous peoples who come from different ethnic groups with diverse socio-cultural, political, and economic values. Some ethnic groups had centralized kingdoms while others followed decentralized forms of political organizations.

This diversity was an asset to the British, who used the centralized kingdoms to strengthen their indirect rule in Uganda (Gukiina 1972; Mutibwa 1992), particularly the Buganda Kingdom, which was “the largest and mightiest African political system in East Africa” at the time (Gukiina 1972:43). The Buganda Kingdom also sought to strengthen its own interest in the region. Thus, the indigenous peoples, particularly non-Baganda and sometimes even the Baganda people, experienced multiple forms of colonialism – internally from the Kingdoms and externally from the British. This dual form of oppression intensified the regional tensions that existed in the precolonial era and created new forms of inequality. After remaining for more than six decades under British Protectorate, Uganda achieved its political independence in 1962. However, the layered forms of oppression and inequality Ugandans experienced continued to be a disadvantage in the postcolonial period, and led to a long civil war until the country started to gain its political stability in 1986.

The country took almost a century to emerge as a stable nation. Traditional political, economic, social, cultural and religious values undeniably changed both in the colonial and postcolonial times. In the colonial period, local administrations and
institutions valorized the local kingdoms in power which acted as agents of British imperialism. Regional valorization also continued in the postcolonial period. With the colonial historical backdrop, three main institutional venues emerged for archaeology; they were created through the establishment of a museum (Posnansky 1963), the conditions for the beginning of scientific archaeological research (O’Brien 1939), and the establishment of a department of antiquities. The idea of establishing a museum in Protectorate Uganda preceded the beginning of archaeological research and the establishment of Department of Antiquities. The Uganda Museum was opened in 1908 (Posnansky 1963). On the other hand, archaeological research interest started in 1919, and the Department of Antiquities was introduced in 1956. Since the genesis of an archaeological collection occurred outside of the museum, I will first discuss archaeological research and then proceed to illuminate how archaeology was institutionalized at the Uganda Museum from 1954 onwards, followed by the Department of Antiquities. Tracing the development of these institutions is fundamental to a critique of the state of archaeology in the country and is key for understanding how knowledge production, history writing, heritage construction, and heritage management take place in a country that experienced layers of colonialism and inequality.

Archaeological Research

Both pioneer and contemporary archaeologists have documented the history of archaeology in Uganda by focusing on various research themes. For example, the work of O’Brien (1939) and van Reit Lowe (1952) mostly addressed the history of archaeological research that focuses on Stone Age, and Posnansky (1967) reviewed Iron Age research. Some attempts to synthesize were also made in the 1960s; for example, as the Inspector of Antiquities, Sassoon (1970) provided the list of
archaeological research projects carried out in the country from the early 1920s until the late 1960s. Similarly, current published and unpublished scholarly work indicate that both foreign and Ugandan scholars have addressed the history of specific research themes and material remains – mostly lithic, ceramic, and iron – in their research background sections (e.g. Kiyaga-Mulindwa 2004; Muwonge 2009; Tibesasa 2008, 2010; Wamtu 2010). Despite these efforts, unlike the case of Tanzania (e.g., Mapunda and Msemwa 2005), the history of archaeological research in Uganda is fragmentary, and a comprehensive review is much needed.

Archaeology was introduced to Uganda informally through colonial government administrators and researchers. For example, Wayland (1934c) quoted reports published in the 1908 Uganda Official Gazette that indicate that the Assistant Commissioner of the Masaka District investigated the Cairns of Koki and excavated one of the mounds. However, the most prominent informal introduction of archaeology occurred as part of the colonial geological explorations. The year of 1919 marked the earliest prominent archaeological research interest in Protectorate Uganda with the arrival of E. J. Wayland to join the colonial government geological service. E. J. Wayland, a British geologist “by profession and an archaeologist by avocation” (Robertshaw 1990b:79), started systematic archaeological research in Uganda as part of his geological research (Wayland 1934a). E. J. Wayland’s work, particularly the pluvial hypothesis and ancient stone industries in Uganda (Wayland 1924, 1929, 1930, 1934a), also set archaeology, chronology, and geology in East Africa “on the course that was to follow for the next forty years or more” (Robertshaw 1990b:79; Cormack 1999:7).
The institutionalization of archaeology in Uganda was immensely influenced by both archaeologists and museum professionals, and had a different path than in Tanzania. Exploring the history of archaeology in Uganda by digging into the published research articles and notes in Western countries’ journals such as *Man, Nature*, and the national journal, *Uganda Journal*, I have learned about different forms of colonial archaeology and archaeological gazes taken by pioneer researchers in Uganda such as E. J. Wayland and those who followed after him. Based on the historical inquiries and critical analysis of the archaeological literature in the colonial period I conducted, I agree with Robertshaw’s (1990b:78) statement: “To dub these individuals [archaeologists working in East Africa in the colonial period] and their archaeology as ‘colonialist’ is to misrepresent their attitudes, archaeological training and goals.” E. J. Wayland was one of the pioneer scholars whose work cannot be categorized entirely within the colonialist framework.

Wayland was not formally trained in archaeology, but what makes him a colonialist is that he followed the 20th century standard Western25 archaeological praxis. Western colonial archaeological practices were funded by the colonial governments or by their affluent citizens and companies, used African laborers, and engaged scholars, institutions, and publics from the colonizers. Wayland fits into this praxis in various ways. His archaeological research, funded by the Percy Sladen trustees based in London, was directed to studying objects of the past using the culture historical approach – mainly focused on typology and stratigraphy. Wayland mentioned his interaction with Africans very little (e.g. Wayland 1934b); but it is easy to infer from the

25 Mostly based on British archaeological praxis.
few photographs published in journal articles (e.g., Wayland 1934a) that he involved Africans only as porters and laborers. Moreover, he was engaged in the profession of archaeology in collaboration with his European colleagues, either those based in Europe such as M. C. Burkitt and H. J. Braunholtz (e.g., Wayland and Burkitt 1932; Wayland, Burkitt and Braunholtz 1933) or those based in the colonies within Africa. Consequently, the connections he fostered with other Europeans also enabled him to send diagnostic archaeological collections to different archaeological institutions mostly based in Europe, mainly in Britain—the British Museum, the Pitt-Rivers Museum in Oxford, and the University Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology in Cambridge. All these Western scientific traditions he followed portray him as a proponent of colonial practices in uncovering the African pasts, writing histories, and constructing heritage.

One might argue that Wayland’s connections with mostly British-based institutions and scholars were part of the academic exercise of his time and represented professionalism. Indeed, they were. However, as will be discussed in Chapter 3, this form of colonial practice prevented the involvement of Africans formally in the archaeological enterprise for nearly four decades. It contributed to the creation of a culture of dependency for future Ugandan archaeologists in the postcolonial period, including in funding archaeological projects and in knowledge production and dissemination. This form of dependency valorizes both Western scholars’ work and Western archaeological institutions. In turn, the result is the intimate connection of Westerners with the African objects of the past and landscapes through Western systems of thought, languages, and values of heritage. This also means the devaluation of African heritage institutions which are mostly recognized for providing “research
authorizations” and harnessing African physical labor in ongoing archaeological research run mostly by Western scholars.

On the other hand, Wayland was not solely a colonialist, because his attitude and approach to the African archaeological record were different. For example, the report he wrote for his 15-year interdisciplinary research experience in Uganda indicates that he was interested in documenting the ancient history across space and time (Wayland 1934a). Unlike his contemporaries, e.g., scholars such as Louis Leakey who correlated the African archaeological record with European paleolithic and paleoclimate terminologies before the advent of chronometric dating, Wayland approached the African archaeological record differently. He was persuaded by the specific charter of the cultural material in Africa; thus, he advocated for the use of African-based terminologies26. This divergence could be due to the fact that he was not formally trained in archaeology.

Consequently, Wayland deviated from the racist approach of imposing Eurocentric terminologies onto artifacts; instead, he engaged in a purely scientific endeavor dictated by the uniqueness of the African archaeological record as well as by its similarities to that of Europe. In particular, he was sensitive to the cultural and paleoclimate changes in Africa. By studying both the evolution of ancient stone industries and paleoclimate changes, Wayland valorized local and continental history of human origins and developments. Of course, there is no doubt that he followed the same archaeological research standards as his contemporaries. His analysis and

---

26 Posnansky (1982) and Robertshaw (1990c) highlighted the different attitudes and approaches of archaeological research in Africa before the 1950s.
interpretation of ancient stone industries celebrated Western knowledge of and perspectives on the African landscape, history, and heritage. But he stood firmly in defending the African context of the archaeological record, which also made an impact on his colleagues who later worked in Uganda (O’Brien 1935, 1939; van Riet Lowe 1952). For example, O’Brien, vividly envisioning African archaeology and its contribution to eliminating racial prejudice in the future, made a strong statement on the need to focus on the African context:

One important fact that emerged during the course of our work was that it is no longer possible or desirable for African archaeologists to turn their eyes northwards to Europe for guidance and enlightenment in their many problems. We can no longer regard Africa, at least the south of the Mediterranean area of colonization, as having been continuously influenced from the north and east, but must recognize that, apart from an occasional foreign impetus, African Stone Age Man achieved his own, essentially African culture, built out of African materials, in an African environment to which that culture was especially and purposely suited. In that realization lies, I believe, a promise of tremendous significance for the future of African archaeology and for the solution of racial and kindred anthropological problems in that continent (O’Brien 1939:295).

Wayland also paid attention to the archaeological record across different chronological segments – the Paleolithic, the Neolithic, and the Iron Age. When interpreting the archaeological record of the Iron Age, Wayland gave significant consideration to the technological, cultural, economic and political achievements of the ancestors of the people of Uganda. He quickly dissuaded himself from his previous speculation about an East African coast influence on Bigo Bya Mugenyi, which was associated with diffusionist and racist approaches (Wayland 1934c). Instead, he made

27 This is not to indicate that the Leakeys were disinterested in studying the Neolithic and the Iron Age; however most of their efforts in Tanzania were dedicated in Olduvai Gorge primarily with the focus on the Early Stone Age.

28 One of the late Iron Age sites in Western Uganda, which is also significant for the understanding of precolonial state formation in the region.
attempts to gather indigenous oral traditions and considered Bigo Bya Mugenyi as a local achievement by supporting the famous Gertrud Caton-Thompson interpretation of the Great Zimbabwe, which emphasized Iron Age cultural and technological developments in Africa as African achievements\textsuperscript{29}. Indeed, his attitudes and approaches were a better start for the development of archaeology in Uganda.

As will be discussed below, the Uganda Museum benefited from the archaeological collections, which were derived from the Geological Survey research, mostly under the leadership of Wayland, and deposited in the museum of the Geology Department in Entebbe. His attitude concerning a more localized research was beneficial to Uganda because by the 1950s Uganda already attracted scholars who engaged in researching the archaeology of Uganda mainly with a focus on Iron Age (Lanning 1953; Mathew 1953; Posnansky 1962, Shinnie 1959). The approaches of these scholars to the most recent history was not only because of Wayland’s influence but also due to their own attitudes on studying the African pasts and the nature of the archaeological record in Uganda. However, an important observation to make here is that attitudes and approaches of scholars do matter in the development of archaeology in African countries. It is because of these scholars’ attitudes and approaches that Uganda had a better start than Tanzania in the institutionalization of archaeology in the late 1950s and the 1960s.

\textsuperscript{29}Today, Gertrud Caton-Thompson’s interpretation of Great Zimbabwe is criticized not for considering Great Zimbabwe as an African achievement but for treating such achievement as infantile (e.g., Fontein 2006; Kuklick 1991).
Archaeology in the Uganda Museum

Archaeology in Uganda was institutionalized through the Geological Museum in Entebbe starting the early 1920s and through the Uganda Museum mostly in the 1950s. The Uganda Museum took over the responsibilities of the archaeological collections from the Entebbe Geological Museum in the end of the 1950s and eventually became the main national institution that houses archaeological collections. Thus, my main focus here is the institutionalization of archaeology within the Uganda Museum.

Tracing the history of the museum, Deming (1966) pointed out that the idea of establishing a museum in Protectorate Uganda was conceived separately by both the Buganda, one of the Ugandan Kingdoms, and the British Protectorate. Though Deming did not specify the reason for the establishment of a museum and left the negotiation between the Buganda Kingdom and the colonial government vague, she pointed out that both parties contributed financially to the establishment of the Uganda Museum. In 1908, the museum was established in Entebbe, Central Uganda, within the Botanical, Forestry and Scientific Department. In 1910, the museum was transferred to Fort Lugard in Kampala and then moved to the Makerere University College in 1942. During this time, the museum was run by British expatriates and had a single room that mostly housed ethnological and historical collections (Deming 1966; Posnansky 1960; Nyiracyiza 2009).

---

30 The history of the Uganda Museum has been discussed by former expatriate curators (Posnansky 1960, 1963; Bishop 1964), by other foreign scholars based in Western countries (e.g., Deming 1966, Plum 2002; Torne 1981), and by Ugandans who are employees of the museum (Kamuhangire 2005b; Nyiracyiza 2009). My discussion on the history of the museum and institutionalization of archaeology at the museum is mostly drawn from these publications.

31 Though for administration purpose the museum was situated within the colonial government, it ran through its own board of trustees, particularly from the end of 1930s to 1977.
For thirty years, since its inception, the museum moved from one department to another and suffered from lack of funding and lack of enthusiasm (Deming 1966:4-6). Though later the museum strove for public relevance, in these thirty years, despite its committee, which was formed in 1927, including representatives from the politically dominant group, the Buganda Kingdom, the museum was characterized by ethnological collections that were feared by the peoples of Uganda. According to Deming (1966) and the undated guidebook recently prepared by the Uganda Museum under the title *Preserving Heritage for Humanity*, the museum’s collection frightened many local people because it represented mainly fetishes, charms, and horns. Many Ugandans recognized the museum as ‘*Enyumba y’amayembe*’ (the house of Fetishes) and the Curator as ‘*Omukulu W’amayembe*’ (the Head of the fetishes). Some Ugandans even thought that these fetishes gave strengths to the colonial government (Deming 1966). Their fears were not far from the truth considering the impacts of the Western concept of a museum and of heritage in contemporary national heritage institutions.

Such forms of arrangement of material culture in a specific spatial setting and concept of heritage were unfamiliar to Africans. Thus, Africans (now Ugandans) were not sure how to interact with their own material culture that was conceptualized and displayed using Western systems of thought. They were also uncertain how to interact with their own people who were involved as museum attendants and handled fetishes in public space outside of their own cultural and linguistic settings.

Many people entered the Museum uncertain how to act in the presence of these fetishes. Visitors generally asked if it were permitted to greet the attendants, or to walk side by side in the Museum with persons of the opposite sex. The next stage was usually conversation about the fetishes. Glimpses of acute anxiety were not uncommon, and it seemed clearly urgent that the Museum should set up an exhibit showing the growth and
nature of religion, depicting the fetishes in their wider context (Deming 1966:2).

The museum was not only challenged for its lack of cultural relevance by the African visitors, but it was also challenged by the colonial government from an administrative point of view. The museum was urged to defend its own existence (Deming 1966:5-6). The Governor requested the museum to have both historical and educational purposes. In 1938, a new committee was appointed to assess the need for a museum in Uganda in all aspects – its administration, finances, and activities. A prime mover within the committee was Klaus Wachsmann, a German refugee who was interested in musical instruments and later served as the museum’s first professional curator from 1947 to 1957\(^\text{32}\). In the late 1930s, as a committee member, he advised the museum to have “an imaginative public relations program” (Deming 1966:6).

It was only in 1939, under the honorary curatorship of Mrs. K. M. Trowell, that the museum began to develop from a single room with ill-kept exhibits to a museum of recognized status (Posnansky 1960:253). Trowell envisioned the museum to function as a living organism. Though at first she suggested that the museum’s focus be on specific field of studies, she later recommended linkages between the museum and Makerere University College (Deming 1966:9). In 1942, the museum moved to Makerere and focused on the material culture of Uganda. There Margaret Trowell established a school of art that focused on the art of Uganda. The museum operated from Makerere University College until it was evicted from its location in 1952 (Deming 1966; Posnansky 1960). For two years, the museum remained closed without providing any

\(^{32}\) The year Wachsmann became the curator of the museum is not clear. Deming (1966) noted that Wachsmann became the curator of the museum in 1948 where as Posnansky states that the appointment took place in 1947. I follow Posnansky’s statement.
public services. Then in 1954, through the Protectorate Government financial support, it moved to its current location–Kitante Hill on Kira road in Kampala. However, due to construction problems of the building, the museum was only fully opened in 1959 (Posnansky 1963). Deming (1966:14-15) pointed out that the opening of the museum in its permanent location was possible because of the new Governor Andrew Cohen’s interest in community development and the museum having its Chairman of the Board of Trustees within the then Ministry of Finance.

During all these changes and adjustments, archaeological research was part of a different institutional setting–the Geological Survey Department (Posnansky 1960). But, a movement toward changing the lack of representation of archaeology in the Uganda Museum started in 1945 when Ailsa Nicol Smith, then acting curator of the museum, in her report pointed out the need for archaeological and anthropological research (Deming 1966). Similarly, Klaus Wachsmann, as the curator of the museum, made some attempts to increase the visibility of archaeology in the museum. For example, when he attended the first conference on African history at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in 1952, according to Deming (1966:13), Wachsmann searched funds for archaeological research to be deposited at the museum. On the contrary, perhaps influenced by the Rev. Gervase Mathew (1953) argument, the colonial government appointed an archaeologist, Kenneth Marshall, in the Geological Survey Department. Marshall served only for two years, and his departure left Uganda without an archaeologist for another two years until Peter Shinnie joined the Department of Antiquities. During this time, most of the museum’s archaeological collections came
from the work of the Rev. Gervase Mathew and the District commissioner of Masaka Eric Lanning (e.g., Lanning 1953; Mathew 1953; Posnansky 1960:256).

Material culture from archaeological research became major collections of the Uganda Museum when the Neolithic and Iron Age assemblages held by the Geological Museum in Entebbe were handed over to the museum in 1955 (Deming 1966:15; Posnansky 1960:256). The Uganda Museum then fully entered into the responsibility of conducting archaeological research in Uganda in 1958, and received a special financial support of only £170 from the colonial Government (Deming 1966:19; Posnansky 1960:256). Soon this small financial resource was strengthened through funds from UNESCO and the British Academy in 1959 (Deming 1966). The transition of archaeological research activities from the Geological Museum to the Uganda Museum happened for two reasons: 1) because of the abandonment of the archaeology position traditionally held in the Geological Survey Department, and 2) because of the freeze of the Department of Antiquities due to financial limitation.

During this transitional period, the Uganda Museum was honored with its first prominent archaeologist, Merrick Posnansky. Posnansky, trained in the University of Nottingham and Cambridge University in Britain, first came to Kenya in 1956 because of the job opportunities in archaeology (Posnansky 2009; Smith 2009:177; Walz 2010). In the following excerpt, he discusses the starting point of his career in Kenya and Uganda:

---

33 Posnansky (1960:256) reported the demise of the Protectorate Government Department of Antiquities in 1958. However, he continued the responsibility of the Department of Antiquities while he was curator of the museum (Personal communication November 2013).

34 Now Merrick Posnansky is Emeritus Professor of History and Anthropology at the University of California Los Angeles in the United States of America.
In the mid-1950s, there weren’t so many jobs in archaeology but there were still opportunities in what we still called the Colonies, and so there were opportunities in places in Kenya where I went.

...in 1956 I went out to Kenya to work for the Royal National Parks of Kenya as the Warden of Prehistoric sites and stayed in Kenya for nearly two years, and then went in 1958 to Uganda as the Curator of the Uganda Museum, where I also looked after antiquities... (Smith 2009:177).

As the Curator of the Uganda Museum from 1958 to 1962, Posnansky was “responsible for important developments in the archaeological research and in exhibits” (Deming 1966:19). His work surpassed the Iron Age research previously started by E. J. Wayland, E. Lanning, G. Mathew, and Peter Shinnie (e.g., Lanning 1953; Mathew 1953; Shinnie 1960; Wayland 1934c). His contribution to the Iron Age research and the development of archaeology in the region will be discussed briefly below and a detailed discussion will be presented in Chapter 3.

After Posnansky, the museum was run under the leadership of another British expatriate, Walter W, Bishop. Though a geologist by profession, the same as E. J. Wayland, Bishop contributed to the knowledge of prehistory, geology, and chronology in the region (Cormack 1999). According to Posnansky, Bishop was interested:

[I]n education [he] did many things with [the] University Extension program ... he was a very vigorous Museum Curator and revolutionized the study of Palaeontology and made it much more meaningful, rather than just the study of bones. He related the bones to environments and made these environments live and showed how people interacted with their environments. Rather than Palaeontology comprising collections of fossil fauna... he had a much stronger ecological approach (Smith 2009:177).

Under his leadership from 1962 to 1965, the museum mounted several temporary exhibitions and the permanent Independence Pavilion Science and Industry exhibition, which was “opened by the Prime Minister of Uganda on October 8 1962, the eve of Independence Day” (Bishop 1964:103). In 1963, particularly due to the permanent and
temporary exhibitions on science as well as temporary exhibitions on African Pottery and Child Development in East Africa, as Bishop (1964) and Deming (1966) presented, the number of visitors increased from 80,000 in 1962 to 175,000 in 1964. This increment indicates how interactive the Uganda Museum was from the end of 1950s to the mid-1960s.

In 1965 the museum came under the full leadership of Ugandans with the promotion of Charles Sekintu as the Curator of the museum. Sekintu previously played major roles in the museum’s activities, including designing and constructing exhibitions, maintaining inventory of the ethnographic and music collections, and coordinating the involvement of Africans (now Ugandans) in the museum (Plumb 2002). Thus, he not only became the first Ugandan Curator but also the first African Curator in Central, East, and South Africa. Unfortunately, this shift in leadership was limited, Ugandan staff members were unable to pursue the development of the museum further as a result of the political turmoil which started in 1966 during Milton Obote’s rule, expanded under the dictatorship of Idi Amin in 1972, and followed by the return of Milton Obote, which lasted until 1985.

Comparing the development of the Uganda Museum both during the colonial and postcolonial times, Kamuhangire (2005b:121) noted that “the fame of the museum collapsed and by 1977, the museum was in shambles”. Due to the political instability, the external funding that the museum enjoyed in previous decades was terminated and the museum staff had to leave35. By 1976, with the exception of two museum staff who formerly obtained training in cultural heritage through UNESCO’s program, the museum

35 The post-1986 development of the museum is discussed by (Plumb 2002), Kamuhangire (2005b), and Nyiracyiza (2009).
was run by new staff who had no previous museum experience (Torne 1981:2-3). Charles Sekintu was forced to leave the country and the museum was under the leadership of Acting Curators who were reporting to the Conservator of Antiquities (Plumb 2002; Torne 1981). Because by this time, the Uganda Government abolished the museum’s Board of Trustees, the museum lost its semi-autonomy and became completely a government institution as part of the Department of Antiquities and Museums within the Ministry of Culture and Community Development (Kamuhangire 2005b:121).

Clearly the late 1950s and the 1960s represent the heyday of the Uganda Museum, and most of the permanent exhibitions were established during this period. The curator of the museum in the mid-1960s attested to the achievement of the museum both as a cultural and tourist center.

The Uganda Museum from a new building on the outskirts of Kampala has become a lively and attractive center close to the heart of the people, where everyone from overseas visitors to the local schoolboy can appreciate something of the intricate pattern of history and landscape, music and wild-life, prehistory and industry, which is Uganda (Bishop 1964:105).

And as Kamuhangire (2005b:120-121) has argued, the positive image of the museum to be known as a world famous museum was undeniably due to the availability of funding and committed, well-trained museum staff members. But what I attempt to highlight and what I need to examine closely during this period of international recognition and local achievement are: 1) how Africans (now Ugandans) were involved in the museum both as audiences and as staff members of the museum, 2) how archaeology was operating

-----

36 Since 1934, the Uganda Museum functioned as a semi-autonomous body with a Board of Trustees. Thus it had its own bank account: It could solicit internal and external funding and the government granted a monthly subvention which catered for staff salaries and a few non-wage expenditures (Kamuhangire 2005b:120).
at the museum, and 3) how the new postcolonial Government of Uganda embraced the museum.

The involvement of Africans in the museum, both as audiences and as staff members, started as early as the 1940s due to the specialization and determination of the expatriate museum professionals. Like their contemporaries in other museums in the region, Margret Trowell and Klaus Wachsmann focused on objects, but they were engaging with living objects that had direct meaning to the local peoples’ intangible heritage. Margret Trowel was interested in objects of arts and crafts, and Klaus Wachsmann focused specifically on musical instruments (Trowell and Wachsmann 1953). Both of them envisioned the museum as a dynamic institution. For example, because of her interest in the material culture of Uganda, Trowell recruited Ugandans who were students at the Makerere University College or were working in the police department to identify and classify objects based on their local relevance as well as to catalogue them (Deming 1966:9).

Similarly, Wachsmann involved Africans in live music performance. As Posnansky (1960:256) noted, the museum attendants in the music exhibit were all trained musicians from different parts of Uganda and played a wide range of instruments. They explained their music to visitors in various vernacular languages. Ugandans with formal Western education were also employed at the museum as early as the end of the 1940s. Charles Sekintu then a graduate from the Makerere School of Art is one of them (Plumb 2002). Indeed, Trowell’s and Wachsmann’s research interests

---

37 The desire of training Africans [now Ugandans] to occupy senior posts in the museum was also expressed by the museum’s board of trustees in 1961 (Deming 1966:20). Similarly, the training of locally-recruited museum personnel was also encouraged through the foundation of the Museums Association of Middle Africa in 1959 at a regional conference of East African museums (Posnansky 1963:153).
and visions of the museum were not only instrumental in directing the museum in the late 1950s and 1960s as a dynamic institution that served more than cataloging ethnographic and archaeological objects, but were also influential in involving Africans in the museum before Uganda achieved its political independence. By 1964, the museum had a senior staff of six African officers and three Europeans, while the junior staff was wholly African (Bishop 1964:104)\textsuperscript{38}.

In addition to the efforts of these curators to recruit Africans in the museum and to portray the museum’s public relevance, the reaction of indigenous Africans as visitors of the museum was formally addressed in 1952 when the Department of Sociology at the Makerere University College sought the representative views of all the museum visitors—Africans, Asians, and Europeans. This survey was carried out in order to inform the museum how to improve its exhibitions in the new location that opened in 1954. Posnansky (1960) and Vowels (1963:153) highlighted that the highest number of visitors were Africans. African visitors identified the display of musical instruments as the most favored exhibit, because it allowed visitors to interact. Similarly, a popular comment they provided was that people need to have interest in the museum “because it showed the ways of the past” (Vowels 1963:153).

In the late 1950s, the museum was further challenged to consider the cultural, linguistic, and educational diversity of its visitors. As the then Curator of the museum wrote:

One problem in a multi-racial society, in which the educational standards of the visitors range from illiterate Bahima herdsmen dressed in brightly

\textsuperscript{38} African museum staff members, including Charles Sekintu, then assistant curator, were given opportunities for further oversea training in museum studies through the Uganda Government Scholarship and the Rockefeller Foundation from the United States (Bishop 1964).
 coloured blankets to the students from the nearby University College, is to arrange a programme of temporary exhibitions to suit all tastes (Posnansky 1960:258).

Similarly another expatriate museum staff member also highlighted the challenge of the museum in addition to creating connection with its visitors is to address issues of diversity and relevance.

...but in Uganda there are additional problems: a multiracial society with the attendant language difficulties, illiteracy, limited transport facilities, as well as the more intangible factors, such as a suspected lack of comprehension of two-dimensional representation and the possible lack of impact of ethnographic exhibitions on Africans, sophisticated and unsophisticated alike (Vowels 1963:153).

The museum continued its mission to fulfill the visitors’ expectations in the new building where the permanent exhibitions were installed. As a museum staff member wrote:

There was a music gallery where both African attendants and visitors played traditional music. Archaeological collections had been made in the intervening years and were used with the ethnographic specimens to present a consecutive story of man in Uganda. Display methods were simple and colourful and made as much use as possible of models and dioramas, pictures and photographs; short texts were given in English. Every effort had been made to make the public feel at home, in view of the fact that it was known that many potential African visitors dared not [to] come to the "house of charms", as the museum was called (Vowels 1963:153).

Thus “to suit all the tastes” of the museum visitors, the Museum staff in cooperation with the Department of Sociology at the Makerere University College undertook a second survey in 1959. This one-week survey aimed at “finding out as much as possible about the racial and tribal composition, educational attainments and interests of the museum publics” (Posnansky 1960:256). The result indicated that of the 460 museum visitors who participated in the one week survey, 87 percent were Africans, followed by Europeans, eight percent, and Asians, five percent. African visitors were both those with and without formal European education, and the survey revealed
that though the museum was located within the Buganda territory, the African visitors
came from different parts of Uganda, from the Kisumu area in Kenya, and from Rwanda
but they lived within the vicinity of Kampala (Vowels 1963:154). According to the
museum visitors’ tastes, the museum exhibitions were ranked as follows:

The most popular exhibit was a representation of a shrine, designed and
executed by the African artist on the museum staff (on occasion, offerings
have been left in front of this showcase). … A series of models showing
traditional and ceremonial buildings … was a close second, while the
dioramas and models in the archaeology room … and the practical
demonstrations of traditional music attracted a good deal of attention.
Most people liked to see things from their own tribe. The salient points to
emerge were the continued interest in the supernatural, the apparent
indifference to showcases in which photographs were used and the low
educational level of the average African visitor (Vowels 1963:154)

What is evident in this endeavor is that, as Posnansky (1963:150) indicated,
music helped “the museum to encourage the preservation of other items of Uganda’s
cultural heritage.” The museum took some measures to be sensitive and attentive to the
views of its heterogeneous publics and strove for an inclusive approach. Moreover, the
arrangement of the permanent exhibitions, which comprised “ethnology, African music,
arkeology and a little paleontology, history and numismatics [the study or act of
collecting of coins, paper money, and medal]” (Posnansky 1963:149), and their ranking
by the visitors are indicative of the placement of archaeology within the museum’s
exhibitions in a contextual way as one way of telling stories about the past.

Several other methods were used to involve the public in the museum’s activities
and research findings. As Posnansky (1963:151) indicated, among the influential means
the museum used to involve the public were its own educational activities and linkages
with other educational institutions. For example, most of the temporary exhibits that
dealt with local history were prepared by local artists and volunteer students from
Makerere University. Students from all educational levels were among the main museum visitors, and the museum staff made special trips to secondary schools to provide lectures as a means of preparation for museum visits or to popularize the museum’s work – such as archaeology – and to generate students’ interest in these topics (Posnansky 1959:32). In addition, to address adult education outside of the regular school system, the museum extended its outreach program through creating linkages with the Extra-Mural Department of the Makerere University College, a department then responsible for adult education at a national level. The adult education outreach program included courses that focused on the land and people of a particular area about which lectures were given, films shown, archaeological sites and game parks visited and exhibitions of traditional crafts arranged (Posnansky 1963:151).

Such adult education programs, as Posnansky (1963:151, 1959, 1960) argued, later stimulated participants to create folk museums in Mbarara in Western Uganda and the Soroti Museum in Eastern Uganda in 1959. These museums, supported by local government subventions, were created with the purpose of tackling the rapidly increasing influence of Westernization, preserving local cultures not for their primitiveness but for the purpose of retaining cultural identity for later appreciation, and of promoting local pride in a local culture through local arts and crafts (Posnansky 1959:29-31, 1960:259). Folk museums were conceptualized as centers for cultural heritage preservation, and archaeology was incorporated in these museums as a means of enriching local culture, heritage, and history.

These educational program developments and achievements at the museum might also have been realized because the museum had representation from the
Ministry of Education on its board of trustees. In 1962 the representation of the Government within the museum’s Board of Trustees shifted from the Ministry of Education to the Ministry of Information, Broadcasting and Tourism (Bishop 1964:105; Deming 1966:20). Interest in educational service at the museum started as early as the mid-1940s (Deming 1966); however, the museum was able to formally establish its educational outreach service only in 1963 through funds given by the Uganda Government (Bishop 1964:104). By this time, a third method to involve the public in the museums activities was implemented through cooperation with the then Ministry of Information, Broadcasting, and Tourism. This cooperation allowed the Uganda Museum to reach the public via newspapers and broadcasting services to disseminate new research findings (Posnansky 1963). In turn, the literate public remained well informed and contributed greatly by informing the museum about new heritage sites. In this way the museum was able “to establish a tradition as being a live museum rather than the house of charms” (Posnansky 1963:153). The involvement of the public through various ways became very instrumental even when Uganda faced political instabilities in the 1970s and 1980s because, as Kamuhangire (2005b:119) pointed out, “the Uganda Museum was never touched by looters in any way,” and if there were any thefts, “they were internally organized and they were not pronounced,” as it was the case in Tanzania and other African countries (e.g., Schmidt and McIntosh 1996).

To answer the second question, how archaeology was operating at the museum, what one needs to visualize is how and why archaeology was integrated into the museum. As already highlighted, archaeology was integrated into the museum upon the request of its professionals. When archaeological collections were transferred from the
Geological Museum and became major collections of the Uganda Museum at the end of the 1950s, the Uganda Museum was already challenged to have local relevance and, as illustrated above, sought viable and inclusive approaches. Archaeology was incorporated into the museum when the museum professionals were committed to achieve local relevance. Thus, it greatly benefited from the museum’s missions and visions.

By the late 1950s and early 1960s, the mission of archaeology in the museum was to write local histories. Museum professionals were committed to archaeological research, management of archaeological collections, and dissemination of archaeological knowledge to the public. Merrick Posnansky commenced the museum’s interest in archaeological research through his own interest in the recent past. The museum’s focus on the recent past was also influenced by the richness of the oral traditions of the people of Uganda, the existence of traditional kingdoms, and the lack of substantial paleontological evidence (Posnansky 1963). Moreover, the focus on the recent past meant the involvement of Africans in archaeological research activities beyond viewing them as a source for physical labor (Chapter 3). Thus, all the archaeological research projects initiated by the museum in the early 1960s were mostly carried out using both African and foreign student volunteers who worked in close harmony (Posnansky 1960) while still maintaining the colonial legacy of involving Africans as casual laborers.

The commencement of archaeological research by the museum also increased its archaeological collections up to three hundred and twenty-five objects, including paleontological collections. However, the most important accession among its collection
was the Early Iron Age pottery collection (Deming 1966). In addition to the archaeological objects obtained through its internal research projects, the museum also enhanced its Paleolithic collections by exchanging its collections with institutions within and outside of Africa (Posnansky 1960).

Enhancement of archaeological research and collection management also meant an increase in the interest of the museum in disseminating archaeological knowledge to the public. Throughout the colonial and postcolonial times, unlike in Tanzania, academic articles that highlighted archaeological research findings in Uganda were published both in international and local journals, but mostly the latter. Locally, since 1934, archaeology academic articles were published in *Uganda Journal*. Thus, archaeological research activities carried out under the museum’s sponsorship were also published either in *Uganda Journal* or by the museum itself as occasional papers. Interest in publishing journal articles locally persisted not only due to the availability of local opportunity but also due to the commitment of expatriate scholars. For example, Posnansky recently shared his view on the importance of publishing locally when Jonathan Walz interviewed him to determine why most of his publication were local.

This is something I got from my father, who was a tailor. He always used to say “You should spend your money where you earn your living.” I always felt I should publish accounts where I did my research. For instance, in Kenya I published three pieces in *Rock* which was a Christian newsletter and I published several items in a Police newsletter [called *Habari*] in Uganda where the police were everywhere. They [the police] were well thought of [before 1967] and could help protect sites. I was particularly proud of a piece I wrote on Kibuuka, the Baganda God of War. I wanted to show the importance of shrines and their contents. I also often did things in news magazines…. Many of these were ephemeral and non-reviewed, but there is significance in them. This is where I had a disagreement with Louis Leakey. He used to publish in the Illustrated London News or Nature, but rarely published in anything local (Walz 2010:185). :
In addition to publishing journal articles locally, the museum expanded its interest in disseminating archaeological knowledge through exhibitions. Archaeological exhibitions were part of the museums’ broader vision and aimed to achieve local relevance. As part of the permanent exhibition, archaeological exhibitions were designed to reach visitors including those “with a limited educational background or with little time to spare” (Posnansky 1963:149). Starting from the known history including the hereditary kingdoms’ history to the unfamiliar archaeologically produced history, both the Iron Age and Stone Age, exhibitions were delivered by installing “dioramas depicting the more important events in Uganda’s Iron Age” and by displaying actual objects such as pots, ritual objects, ironware, and stone tools (Posnansky 1963:149-150). Similarly, as presented above, because of its commitment to providing educational services to the public, the museum stretched its wings to offer archaeology as part of its school trip lectures and adult education program, as well as to involve selected college students in archaeological research projects and to disseminate archaeological knowledge in local newspapers. Though the museum did not entirely transform archaeology into a local context, all these efforts allowed local citizens to learn about their country’s history through archaeology. Furthermore, the museum made successful attempts to convince selected local people about the importance of archaeology in their own cultural setting, particularly the role of archaeology in folk museums, which were funded by the postcolonial Government of Uganda.

Beyond providing subventions for running three folk museums, understanding how the new government of Uganda under the leadership of Apolo Milton Obote embraced the Uganda Museum is a complex one. On the one side, the government
viewed the museum as a means of archiving national development and unity. An example of this can be attested by the donation made by the government to the museum to build a new wing that housed the permanent exhibition on science and industry\(^3\) in 1962, and the government’s financial commitment to establish and run the education department in 1963 (Bishop 1964). On the other side, as a means of achieving national unity, the Uganda government abolished all the traditional kingdoms of Uganda in 1967 (Kamuhangire 2005a, 2005b; Nyiracyiza 2009; Plumb 2002). Kingdoms were ordered to hand in all the royal regalia to the government, which then sent these rare items to the Uganda Museum (Kamuhangire 2005a). These decisions indicate how the museum was perceived by the political party in power as a repository for coercively alienated or confiscated cultural objects, a perception that shows how a museum can be used as a tool for both political and cultural repression. Furthermore, the abandonment of traditional kingdoms and the confiscation of royal regalia dissociated people from their cultural practices. It also contributed to the weakening of the indigenous cultural heritage management systems, including the neglect of traditional palaces and royal tombs (Kamuhangire 2005a:28), and led to the centralization of heritage management as administered by the two government institutions (Nyiracyiza 2009), the Uganda Museum and the Department of Antiquities.

**The Department of Antiquities**

In the mid-1950s another form of institutionalization of archaeology emerged in East Africa. The British colonial government introduced the departments of antiquities in the region. Due to the influences of Rev. Gervase Mathew and Sir Mortimer Wheeler, as

---

\(^3\) The Independence Pavilion of Science and Industry permanent exhibition had five sections: natural resources, industry and communication, disease, and the future of Uganda
highlighted in the emergence of the Department of Antiquities in Tanganyika, the colonial government established the Department of Antiquities in Protectorate Uganda within the Ministry of Education\textsuperscript{40} in 1956 (Shinnie 1990:277), and appointed a Director of Antiquities.

The Department of Antiquities started under the leadership of two pioneer Africanist archaeologists, Peter Shinnie and Merrick Posnansky. Unlike their contemporaries, these expatriates set exemplary practices in liberating African archaeology in East and West Africa (cf. Schmidt 2014). Peter Lewis Shinnie, who studied history and Egyptology at Oxford University, graduated in 1938, and obtained practical training from Mortimer Wheeler (David 2007a:96), was appointed as the first Director of Antiquities of Uganda\textsuperscript{41} in 1956. In an interview with Pamela Jane Smith in 2000 at the Society of Africanist Archaeology Conference, Shinnie briefly described how he came across the job opportunity to work as the Director of the Antiquities and his experience in Uganda.

So I went off to Uganda to be the first and last\textsuperscript{42}, I think, Director of Antiquities in Uganda, because I needed a job very badly. I had a wife and two small children. There didn’t seem to be anything going in strict academic Egyptology at that time. My training had been not only in Egyptology but now considerably in the field, because I had been doing

\textsuperscript{40}Since its inception the Department of Antiquities moved from different ministries. In the mid-1960s, according to the museum’s archives, the Department of Antiquities was placed within the Ministry of Information, Broadcasting, and Tourism. Later around 1968, the department moved to the Ministry of Culture and Community Development and remained in the same ministry until the end of 1980s. In 1990-1991, the ministry changed to Ministry of Youth, Culture and Sports. In 1992, the Department of Antiquities and Museums moved to the Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities. Then in 1999, the same ministry changed its title to Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry where now the Department of Museums and Monuments is situated in.

\textsuperscript{41}He went to Uganda in 1956 to work as Director of the Antiquities after he spent a year looking for a job in Britain. Before that he was the Commissioner for Archaeology in Sudan but he had to leave the position due to the process of Sudanisation (Smith 2009:191).

\textsuperscript{42}Indeed, he was the first but certainly not the last Director of Antiquities in Uganda.
my own excavations now for several years, excavating and publishing the results. So off I went to Uganda and I didn’t like it very much. The Antiquities were totally different, something I was not especially competent to deal with. I wasn’t used to being right into Africa. Now I think that Africa is great, but I didn’t feel strongly about it at that time and I wasn’t very happy; but I knew I did my best to set up an organisation to look after the antiquities of Uganda, such as there were. Subsequently later workers, of course, have found out much more and the archaeology of Uganda under the auspices of some rather distinguished later archaeologists have been found to be of very considerable interest (Smith 2009:191).

Though Shinnie, who attained the position through Wheeler, stayed in Uganda briefly, his contribution to the establishment of a governmental organization that looks after antiquities of Uganda is undeniable. Moreover, he contributed to the Iron Age research in Uganda through the investigation he carried out at Bigo in 1957 (Shinnie 1960) and laid a foundation for the legacy to come as followed by Merrick Posnansky. From 1958 to 1962, as provided in the previous section, the Department of Antiquities was informally combined with the Uganda Museum under the leadership of Merrick Posnansky. Thus the achievement of archaeological research and the involvement of Africans during this period was the same as what happened in the museum.

After Uganda attained its political independence in 1962, the postcolonial government resumed the Department of Antiquities in 1965\footnote{D. J. Clark (1974) noted that James Chaplin became the Director of Antiquities in 1962, however Sassoon (1970) noted that the Department of Antiquities resumed in 1965. Similarly, the archival research I conducted in 2010 at the Uganda National Museum also agrees with Sassoon’s date.} under the leadership of the late James Chaplin. James Chaplin was appointed as Inspector of Monuments after he attained a Diploma in Prehistoric Archaeology from the Institute of Archaeology in London (Clark 1974: vii). Before then, he had gained experience as an Inspector of Monuments and a researcher of Iron Age and rock art sites in Zambia. Under the supervision of Posnansky, Chaplin finished his master’s studies in archaeology from...
Makerere University. Consequently, he contributed to the existing Iron Age research theme in the region and revived rock art research interests both in Uganda (e.g., Lawrence 1953) and in Tanzania (cf. Masao 1979) by focusing on prehistoric rock art of the Lake Victoria Region (Chaplin 1974). The Ugandans who were recruited during this time, as will be discussed in Chapter 3, were mostly in training until the late 1960s and early 1970s.

At a national level, two major legislative changes occurred in the first five years of the independence period: the abolishing of traditional Kingdoms and the promulgation of the Historical Monuments Act. While the abolition of traditional Kingdoms, as discussed above, occurred outside of the Department of Antiquities, the Historical Monuments Act was entirely the effort of the department. Though Nyiracyiza (2009:4) argues that the changes enforced on the traditional kingdoms led to new legislation, the 1967 Historical Monuments Act, there was no causal relationship between the two. The Historical Monuments Act was envisioned before the traditional kingdoms were abolished.

According to Wayland (1934c:32), the first legislation that pertains to the protection of objects of archaeological and paleontological in Uganda was enacted in 1934 by the colonial government. However, I was not able to find a copy of this ordinance. The next discussion on the need to improve the legal framework and to introduce a more uniform act in the region was initiated by Mathew (1953). It was within this historical background that the Department of Antiquities not only was established but also its staff members started to draft new heritage legislation in the mid-1960s. The upshot was that the previous preservation act was repealed and the Historical Monuments Act was enforced in 1967. The main interest in this new act is “historical
monuments and objects of archaeological, palaeontological, ethnographical and traditional interest” and other related matters. The declaration in this act, which is still valid, was to retain the right, title or interest of the owners of objects and also to grant access of the objects to the public. However, it strictly put the legal responsibilities of heritage management and protection under the authority of the state, and officially validated the Uganda Museum and the Department of Antiquities as the responsible postcolonial heritage institutions. The latter was also designated to provide research permits for archaeological and related fields. Though the heritage legislation in Uganda does not focus on protected areas, it follows a fortress approach that emphasizes the protection of objects, restricts owners’ right to make alterations, and imposes restriction on subsistence practices that might interfere with the preservation of objects.

Even after securing the legal framework, in theory, the leadership of the department continued under both Ugandan and expatriate personnel. But in practice from 1969 to 1973 it was run by Hamo Sassoon. His responsibility mainly involved preservation and research authorization; however, he also conducted a few archaeological surveys and documented Iron Age sites (Sassoon 1972). After Sassoon left, the department was completely under the leadership of Ugandans. Archaeological research stopped due to the lack of trained personnel and the political instability in the country. Moreover, the department only focused on preservation and conservation activities. It existed in this context for another four years and then was amalgamated with the Uganda Museum.

44 Quote comes from the Historical Monument Act 1967 document archived at the Uganda Museum.
The Department of Antiquities and Museums

In 1977, the Department of Antiquities and the Uganda Museum were amalgamated into a single department, Department of Antiquities and Museums, within the Ministry of Culture and Community Development. According to Kamuhangire (2005b), the amalgamation was “well intended to save the museum service from complete collapse.” However, he contends that “it took time for the museum staff to adjust to the change” (Kamuhangire 2005b:121), and the museum lost its semiautonomous status and became a regular government institution solely funded through national revenues.

The head of the Antiquities Service became the head of the amalgamated department. The transition to the new administration was not smooth; both institutions had their own traditions and priorities as well as being run by leaders with different experiences. Kamuhangire (2005b) has briefly presented the relationship between these two institutions and identified two challenges: departmental adjustment and funding. The first challenge was that both parties had to share space and power to run the new department. The formerly Antiquities staff had to share offices with the Uganda Museum staff. The challenge arose because of personality clashes, as one of the then museum staff narrated:

When the Uganda Museums service was amalgamated with the Antiquities Service, the remaining museum staff were regularised into government service as civil servants with their salaries and positions as "person to holder"... While the amalgamation was well intended to save the museum service from complete collapse, it took time for the museum staff to adjust to the change. This was compounded by the fact that the Antiquities staff moved their offices to the Uganda Museum. Personality clashes ensued between the newcomers, who were regarded as intruders, and those who were there who thought that they had been stripped of their power and independence” (Kamuhangire 2005b:121).
In fact, the upshot was that the Chief curator of the museum, Charles Sekintu, had to take an early retirement.

Sekintu came back to his former position at the museum under the most difficult of circumstances and began to reassemble the collections, recruit personnel, and engage in endless disputes with the government administration. He spoke of feeling increasing pressure from the Ministry of Culture to resign or take an early retirement, and his position became politically tenuous. Then in his mid-sixties, Sekintu was feeling futility of the situation and decided somewhat bitterly to leave the museum that had been his life’s work (Plumb 2002:164).

Then, as successor of Charles Sekintu, Paul Wamala became the Chief Curator and Conservator of the Department of Antiquities and Museums from 1977 to 1995. The achievement of the department during this period was mainly administrative and focused on the preservation and conservation of historical and archaeological sites (see Chapters 3 and 4).

Colonial Legacies

Colonial archaeology in Africa is heterogeneous (Robertshaw 1990c, Schmidt 2009b, Schmidt and Karega-Munene 2010). In this chapter, I illustrated the uniqueness and commonalities of colonial archaeology that both Uganda and Tanzania experienced. The heterogeneities of colonial archaeology not only represent the multiplicity of European colonizers—British, Belgium, French, German, and Portuguese, as Schmidt and Karega-Munene suggested—but also the heterogeneous experience even within a single colonial power. For example, both Uganda and Tanzania were under the same British colonial power; however, the development of archaeology and its institutionalization during this period in these countries was significantly different. In Uganda, archaeologists in the museum and in the Department of Antiquities directed archaeological research towards the Iron Age. On the other hand, there was no
substantial archaeological research at the KGMM (later NMT), and the Department of Antiquities in Tanzania conducted its archaeological research randomly, ranging from Stone Age to Iron Age. Though Tanzania’s Department of Antiquities focused on Iron Age, the research approach neither consulted or involved local people nor used oral traditions in the interpretation of the past.

Both the Uganda Museum and the KGMM started by using ethnological objects outside of their local contexts and lacked local relevance. However, the way they transformed both in the colonial and early postcolonial period was significantly different. On the one hand, the Uganda Museum was criticized as early as the late 1930s and made significant adjustments because of the attitudes and approaches of its personnel. Early museum professionals not only advocated for dynamism in the museum but also supported the institutionalization of archaeology in the museum. On the other hand, the NMT maintained its status quo and continued without involving Africans and creating local relevance, particularly in archaeology, save for the creation of the Village Museum in 1966.

In the postcolonial period, despite their differences in political stability, the homogenous colonial legacies visible in these countries is the culture of dependency on the means of funding archaeological research, the perception of knowledge, and the involvement of Africans. In Chapter 3, I will examine the history of involving Africans in archaeology.
Research Design

1. Formulation
   a. Research interest: What is the goal of doing research?
   b. Who designs research?
   c. Research area: Where does research take place?

2. Implementation
   a. Research permit: Who approves research?
   b. Funding: Who provides funding?
   c. Research equipment and supplies
   d. Logistic (recruitment, transport, house, food)

3. Data acquisition
   a. Who communicates with local communities?
   b. How data are obtained?
   c. How sites are located, designated, and named?

4. Data processing
   a. Who is involved?
   b. How data are processed?

5. Data analysis
   a. What form of data is analyzed?
   b. How does analysis take place?
   c. Who does data analysis?
   d. What nomenclatures are used for objects?

6. Data interpretation
   a. Theoretical orientation

7. Publication and dissemination
   a. What is reported and how?
   b. Who writes and reports?
   c. Style and medium of reporting/writing – language and terminologies used?
   d. Avenues of publishing archaeological knowledge?
   e. Where and how is archaeological knowledge distributed?

8. Ethics: public and disciplinary

9. Teaching archaeological research design

---

Figure 2-1. The process of archaeological research design and practice\(^{45}\)

\(^{45}\) The stages of archaeological research design are partially adapted from Ashmore and Sharer (2003).
CHAPTER 3
WAYS TO PROFESSIONALISM: EAST AFRICANS IN ARCHAEOLOGY

What are the criteria for one to be considered an archaeologist? Should I consider myself an archaeologist? And would the rest of the world consider me an archaeologist? Ugandan, Conservator of Archaeology, September 2010

I am not sure if I am an archaeologist. Ugandan, MA in Archaeology, September 2010

There has to be a better way of earning a living. Tanzanian, PhD in Archaeology, August 2011

On my side, I didn’t even like it since a long time. It was accidental. It was bahati mbaya [bad luck]: I studied it without thinking twice: what is next after I graduate? Tanzanian, BA in Archaeology, April 2013

In Chapter 2, by describing at length two distinct processes of institutionalization of archaeology, one in Tanzania, the other in Uganda, I mapped the conditions that led to creating a culture of dependency for African archeologists in the postcolonial period. This form of historical dependency continues to impact the experience of African archeologists in the present. What is common in the above quotes is the issue of professionalism: career choice, (dis)satisfaction and doubts of belongingness. They also raise issues of career commitment and development in African archaeology.

During the first two months of my stay in Uganda in 2010, I attended two archaeological field research projects for four to ten days. One of the projects was directed collaboratively by Ugandan and foreign researchers, while the other one was run by Ugandans. As part of their objectives, both projects included training Ugandan and foreign undergraduate and graduate students. Based on my participation and observation of the nature of archaeological research in these two projects, on September 14, 2010, I organized a focus group discussion at the Uganda Museum to understand the state of archaeology and archaeologists in the country. There were nine
participants—all Ugandans—some with archaeology degrees and some with years of archaeological fieldwork experience but without formal accreditation. The first question presented for discussion was: “As a Ugandan archaeologist, do you practice an archaeology that is different or unique from the archaeology practiced elsewhere, especially in the Western World?” It was in this context that two Ugandans critiqued the question raised. The first, without formal archaeological training but with extensive practical experience, brought up the issue of belonging within international archaeological communities, while the second, with an MA degree in archaeology, still questioned whether s/he is an archaeologist.

Similarly in Tanzania, I interacted with students of archaeology and heritage management at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) on various occasions, including attending three of the eight 2010/2011 academic year field schools. In one of the field schools, I overheard a Tanzanian instructor with a PhD degree in archaeology wishing for “a better way of earning a living”. Later in the day a student told me: “You see, we are in a profession where even some of our professors still question themselves.” Then in the midst of planning to write this chapter, I also chatted via Facebook with a recent alumnus of the UDSM undergraduate archaeology program, who expressed his dissatisfaction about how he joined the program accidentally and why his decision was “bahati mbaya [bad luck]”.

These first-hand observations and experiences begged my attention as they fit with my desire to acquire contextual understandings for the emergence of internationally recognized African archaeologists. They also underscore the need to acutely examine the role of career choice in liberating and transforming archaeology in Africa. The
promising future of decolonized, transformed, and sociallyrelevant archaeologies in the continent is partially dependent on having deeper understandings of the motives and means by which Africans joined the profession and how these motives and means affect professionalism, particularly the way Africans practice archaeology. I have illustrated in Chapter 2 that the colonial institutions maintained archaeology as a profession to control the knowledge, culture, heritage and history of the region. As in most formerly colonized countries, archaeological research in East Africa precedes both the institutionalization of archaeology and the emergence of national professionals. Africa encountered contemporary archaeology because of European colonialism. Most postcolonial African governments inherited these colonial legacies in the form of museums and departments of antiquities. These inherited institutions, as demonstrated and argued in Chapter 2, have to be studied critically through historical and ethnographic inquires to assess and to improve their relevance in postcolonial East Africa.

Furthermore, I argue in this chapter that a more specific and pressing question that we scholars of archaeology in Africa need to ask is: how do Africans, especially those who gained access to Western education, embrace archaeology? Although insignificant in number, how did they come to know about archaeology? Why did they decide to study and become archaeologists? In other words, how did Tanzanians and Ugandans get involved in archaeology, and eventually become professional archaeologists? Close examination of these questions is crucial to better understand the foundation of the social-intellectual history of East African archaeologists and their contributions to transforming the discipline as well as implementing its benefits to the
East African public in general and to local communities who reside in areas of archaeological interest in particular.

In comparison to the population size of Tanzania (almost 45 million\(^1\)) and Uganda (almost 35 million\(^2\)), the number of internationally recognized Tanzanian and Ugandan archaeologists is miniscule. Both within academic and non-academic governmental institutions, such as museums and departments of antiquities, there are now three Ugandan and thirteen Tanzanian archaeologists with PhDs (Table 3-1 and 3-2). The development of locally relevant and responsive archaeology in these countries relies partly on the leadership and determination of these scholars. Thus, using archival and interview data, I discuss in this chapter how Tanzanians and Ugandans became professional archaeologists, especially the motivations and pathways they used to join archaeology from the 1960s up to 1984. I used the year 1984 as a marker because, for the first time, the UDSM started enrolling archaeology students in 1985 and similarly the political situation in Uganda started to become stable after the mid-1980s. This chapter has four sections organized around the following themes: the invisibility of African participants, how visibility does matter, (pseudo)institutional power, and professionally (un)recognized participants.

The invisible African participants section covers the involvement of East Africans as laborers without formal recognition of their contribution in the profession, hence the emergence of professionally unrecognized African archaeologists in the hierarchal status of archaeological community in East Africa. In the visibility does matter section I

---


highlight how Ugandans and Tanzanians gained access to archaeological training and were recognized formally as archaeologists; thus, the emergence of professionally recognized national archaeologists. The pseudo-institutional power highlights how a few Ugandans and Tanzanians seized deceptive power in archaeology within the departments of antiquities and museums. Deceptive because most of these powers are held by few nationals who are without proper archaeological training, and, as explained in Chapter 2, archaeology in these institutions has never been problematized in a way that allows it to suit the local contexts. The last section summarizes how the professionally recognized and unrecognized groups operate within the postcolonial archaeological division of labor. I have divided these four sections based on colonial and postcolonial periods, and in the postcolonial period they are arranged thematically. I now turn to address each section.

Invisible African Participants

The formative phase (Clark 1990) of archaeology in Africa from the 1920s to the end of the 1950s symbolizes the emergence of professional European-descendant and European archaeologists. Notable scholars of this era were Louis and Mary Leakey in Kenya and Tanzania and E. J. Wayland in Uganda (Robertshaw 1990b). This period also marks the beginning of involving indigenous Africans invisibly in archaeological praxis. Africans were involved, and labeled as, “labor gangs” or “workmen” (Leakey 1966:263, 289). Workmen served as porters, cooks, guides, informants, diggers, guards, and museum attendants. Publications that may be useful in inferring Wayland’s interaction with Africans are unavailable, though a few photos of Africans appear in one
of Wayland’s articles (1934a),\(^3\) and he mentioned that he had “porters” (Wayland 1934b). On the contrary, a number of autobiographies by and biographies about the Leakeys do mention Africans.

Starting during the 1930s and until the mid-1980s, mostly working in northern Tanzania, the Leakeys employed Kenyans (Leakey 1966, 1974, 1979, 1984). In the first expedition, Louis had eighteen African “workmen” from Kenya and most of them belonged to the Kikuyu ethnic group. They worked in various capacities as drivers, cooks, porters and as project leaders in surveys and excavations (Chapter 7). The Leakeys referred to the Africans from Kenya as our “Kikuyu workmen” (Leakey 1966:289), “our African excavation staff” or “our African diggers” (Leakey 1984: 71-74). Those identified by name include: “Our companion” Heslon Mukiri (Leakey 1984:96-97), “one of my workmen” Peter Nzube (Leakey 1984:151), “one of my African staff” Mwongela Mwoka (Leakey 1984:164), Kiteteu Itumanage, Kabebo Kimeu (Leakey 1984:168), and “one of the most experienced of my Kenyan staff” Ndibo Mbuika (Leakey 1984:176). The highest qualification given to some of them is “fossil hunters” (Abungu 2006) or token designations such as “one of the most experienced of my Kenyan Staff” (Leakey 1984:176). These token designations appear only in autobiographies, biographies, and rarely in the acknowledgment section of academic publications.

By the end of the formative phase, Merrick Posnansky in Uganda and Neville Chittick in Tanzania were among the two prominent expatriate scholars who joined the archaeological community in East Africa. Posnansky’s contribution to the involvement of

\(^3\) See Wayland (1934a: Plate XLVI: FIG 1, Plate XLVII FIG 2, and Plate XLVIII FIG 1)
East Africans in archaeology is partially addressed in Chapter 2 and also covered in the section below. In Tanzania, the form of involvement of Tanzanians in archaeology remained almost unchanged even with the appointment of Neville Chittick as the Director of the Department of Antiquities (Chapter 2). Like the Leakeys, Neville Chittick followed a similar approach that kept Tanzanians away from participating in field archaeology professionally. But unlike the Leakeys, who favored bringing Africans from Kenya, Chittick interacted with Tanzanians from the beginning. His work in the coastal parts of the country, starting in the late 1950s, was possible through the assistance of members of local communities who were employed as causal laborers, drivers, and guards (Chittick 1958, 1959, 1962).

The type of involvement of Africans in archaeology in the colonial period is yet to be studied critically. An excellent example of critical studies of archaeology in colonial Africa is the work of Nick Shepherd (2003b) in southern Africa. Shepherd (2003b:335), using archival images, vividly illustrates that it is the story of African men “(… almost always men) who dug, sieved, sorted, located sites and ‘finds’, fetched and carried, pitched camp, cooked and served food, negotiated with local chiefs and suppliers, and assisted in the interpretation of artifacts and events” that inform us about the experiences of Africans in archaeology. These archives remind contemporary scholars of archaeology in Africa and elsewhere that the agency of Africans in the development of Western-oriented archaeology in the colonial period is undeniable, even if it was unrecognized then and still remains what Shepherd (2003b) calls “secret history” that is uninvestigated. Clearly, their involvement did not lead to accredited professionalism.
Nevertheless, in the late 1940s some archaeologists working in Africa had already started advising on the need to train archaeologists. In 1947, John Goodwin specifically published an article on “Training of archaeologists” in *South African Archaeological Bulletin*. He wrote:

One such need is the training of archaeologists to fill the posts of Directors of Archaeology (or whatever they may be called) in colonial countries. Such posts already exist in some, and are likely to be created before long in others. We are thinking especially of the Sudan, Eritrea, Somaliland, Kenya and Nigeria (Goodwin 1947: 97).

Presenting on the lack of trained archaeologists to fill vacant posts, Goodwin suggested a solution: that training must be offered within a university setting. Then he emphasized who should be trained:

[O]ne might go even further back, emphasizing the fact that ‘new’ countries are only new to us Europeans; they have had their own history which can only be discovered and recreated by digging and other archaeological techniques, which we can and should teach them. ... Under proper direction, primitive peoples can do archaeological work. Not all will respond, of course, but some will, and they will become the nucleus for the training of others (Goodwin 1947: 97).

Two points arise here: 1) Goodwin acknowledged Africans having our own history, and 2) he insisted on the need for training, including Africans. His suggestion clearly shows that the history of Africans “can only be discovered and recreated” archaeologically. Of course contemporary archaeology is inherently European, thus Africans labeled as “primitive peoples” need “proper direction” from Europeans.

However, most of the journey to conduct archaeological research and the actual archaeological surveys and excavations were done with the help of Africans. Why, then,

---

4 John Goodwin was South African born, Cambridge-trained archaeologist. He was one of the first professional archaeologists to work in sub-Saharan Africa by taking a research assistant post at the University of Cape Town in 1923 (Shepherd 2003b:336)
would Africans need “proper direction”? The answer is simple: archaeology was viewed as a savior to Africans and their history, though in practice it has mostly served as a tool for imperialism than emancipation.

All these scholars, whether they encouraged or discouraged the genuine production of African history and archaeological training opportunities for Africans, echoed and performed within the racialized, totalitarian, and paternalistic socio-political environment of their era. This environment dehumanized indigenous Africans, appropriate[d] their “memory and history,” and “disenfranchise[d] Africans in the formation and production of their history” (Abungu 2006:144). How many Africans could have had the interest in studying archaeology and the ability to move to a higher status within archaeological community hierarchy from laborers to researchers? Could they have used archaeology to uncover their history and conserve their heritage? Such questions are a matter of conjecture. There could have been some who wished to be involved in archaeological projects. One rare example is the experience of Sanimu, a local Maasai man from Oldupai in northern Tanzania, who had a genuine interest in archaeology and paleoanthropology and insisted on becoming involved in the Kisese archaeological research expedition in central Tanzania directed by the Leakeys in the 1930s (Leakey 1984:63-67, Chapter 7).

Visibility Does Matter

The involvement of Africans professionally in archaeology started to become more visible in the late 1950s due to several changes: 1) interest in African history

---

5 Very few Africans apprenticed under expatriate archaeologists before the 1950s, for example the first Ghanaian indigenous archaeologist Richard Nunoo apprenticed under Thurstan Shaw in the 1940s (Kense 1990:145).
related to the rise of African nationalism that validated indigenous African pasts; 2) the shift in archaeological research themes from Stone Age to Iron Age; 3) the development of chronometric dating (Posnansky 1982; Robertshaw 1990a, 1990b; Schmidt 1978, 1990,1995) and, 4) the role of pioneer Africanist archaeologists\(^6\) who were (and still are) committed to liberating and transforming African history, African archaeology, and to involving Africans in the archaeological praxis. The recognition of African history as a discipline came along with the expansion of African universities. This intersection produced historians interested more in the recent history of Africa, the Iron Age, and interdisciplinary approaches (Posnansky 1971, 1982:349; Schmidt 1990; Chapters 4 and 5). The shift of research themes from Stone Age to Iron Age promoted historical archaeology as an approach that combines archaeology and oral traditions to construct African history, particularly as Merrick Posnansky’s work in Uganda exemplifies (Schmidt 1978, 1983, 1990, 2006).

As highlighted in Chapter 2, one of the developments that occurred in the mid-1950s was the emergence of a new form of institutionalizing archaeology in East Africa, i.e., the establishment of departments of antiquities. At that time, Uganda was still a British Protectorate, and the colonial government established the Department of Antiquities under the Ministry of Education (Shinnie 1990:228). This resulted in job opportunities for European expatriates. After Peter Shinnie left for Ghana, Merrick Posnansky was the next prominent expatriate archaeologist who came to Uganda in 1958 to become curator of the Uganda Museum and also to fill the available post for Director of Antiquities. In various interviews (e.g., Smith 2009; Walz 2010), he has

\(^6\) In the 1960s most of them were pioneer European Africanist archaeologists.
shared the starting point of his career in Kenya and Uganda, particularly his teaching career.

[I] am a teacher by interest so [I] began teaching archaeology for the extra-mural college, Makerere University College, based in Kampala, and began the first adult education courses in tropical Africa in archaeology in 1957 in Nairobi, which was quite exciting (Smith 2009:177).

There was no teaching of archaeology in East Africa until I began in 1957. I first began with Makerere University College in Kampala. They had a branch in Nairobi [Kenya], and I taught evening class in African prehistory. I should mention that the class was very much resented by Louis Leakey who said if you teach people about archaeology they will find out where the sites are, and if they find where the sites are, they will spoil the sites. I thought it was very important to teach people about archaeology. I also advertised for school teachers and students to help me when I worked in the place called Lanet. So Lanet was the first excavation completely conducted with [European] volunteers. These were volunteers from schools in Nairobi area. (Individual Interview April 15, 2010)

Posnansky has played a major role in training both non-Africans and Africans in archaeology in general and historical archaeology in particular. In addition to his background, inspired by the Kamba people of Kenya’s communal approach to past and future life, as Walz (2010:178) presented, Posnansky has applied a “holistic and inclusive” historical archaeology. In this approach, he “recognized, accepted as legitimate, and valued African oral traditions” (Walz 2010:178). He introduced archaeology at Makerere University, then called Makerere University College before it became a constituent college of the University of East Africa in 1963. Posnansky narrates that the training opportunities were given to both African men and women.

When I went to Uganda, one of the first thing [sic] I did was that on excavations we had University students, so that all our excavations were done with Makerere students, both men and women. So I think we were the first people who had African women participants on excavations in the late 1950s (Smith 2009:178).

In 1959 I ran a field school in a place called Bweyorere [in Western Uganda]. And there we had students from Kenya, Tanzania; then
Tanganyika, and Uganda participating in an excavation. That was the first time African students had been involved in an excavation. (Individual Interview, April 2010)

In Uganda, at the museum I made a special attempt to have women participate in archaeology. When I excavated at Bweyorere [in 1959], we had two Ugandan women out of a total of six students. They were studying history. At Bigo [in Uganda in 1960], I also had women student excavators (Walz 2010:187).

The students, both men and women, who are carefully selected from the numerous applications that are always sent in, receive only a subsistence allowance that covers wear and tear of their clothing and the occasional luxury. On the excavation they lead a fully communal life with the museum staff and training is given in the basic techniques, the evenings being utilized for informal archaeological discussions (Posnansky 1963: 152).

Their help [African students’ help] makes excavations more reliable and more friendly than the old-fashioned digs where the labour was all of the poorest class and the number of trained and intelligent workers was relatively small (Posnansky 1960: 275).

Unlike the Leakeys and Chittick who worked mostly on the Stone Age and Iron Age respectively and involved only men as laborers, Posnansky, focusing on Iron Age, initiated the involvement of both African men and women university students in archaeological practices. His dedication to an inclusive approach that considers gender equity is today clearly manifested in the archaeology of Uganda, where the small archaeological research projects run by local professionals are mostly done by Ugandan women (58 percent)\(^7\).

Thus as early as 1959, East Africans started to participate in Iron Age archaeological research projects as volunteer students. As Posnansky (1963:152) narrates, the students were invaluable interpreters and helped “to impress on the inhabitants of the area where the excavation is being conducted the value of

---

\(^7\) See Table 3-1 and 3-3 for the number of Ugandans who earned MA and PhD degrees in Archaeology. Of course, the involvement of Ugandan women could also be the result of the overall commitment of the Ugandan government to gender development.
archaeology.” Until then, no formal instruction was given in archaeology, so the Uganda Museum’s archaeological excavations provided the only possible introduction to archaeology for African students (Posnansky 1963:152). The Uganda Museum became the first institution in Eastern and Southern Africa to take African students on excavations as volunteers. As Posnansky puts it clearly, since State revenues were insufficient “to offer incentives for local people to take up archaeology as a vocation,” the aim of the museum then was “to make archaeology as attractive a vocation pursuit as possible so that years to come much of the archaeological research in East Africa can be undertaken by well-trained amateurs” (Posnansky 1963:152).

This vision marks the beginning of what scholars of postcolonial archaeology refer to in the contemporary literature as community archaeology (e.g., Atalay 2012; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Pikirayi 2007, 2011; Schmidt 2010, 2014) or also coined as “action archaeology” (e.g., Sabloff 2008) and “usable past” (Lane 2011; Stump 2013). It marks community archaeology because Africans were recognized, involved in the development of knowledge production, and encouraged to pursue higher education in archaeology. It also marks action archaeology because archaeology was used to solve the problem of misrepresentations of African history. Clearly, historical archaeology in East Africa has contributed enormously to writing histories of the region by pioneering “perspectives that are sensitive to history, symbolic systems, and the historical sensibilities of local peoples” (Schmidt 1983:75, also see1978, 1990, 1995, 2006). The advent of historical archaeology in the region has also engaged East Africans in the

---

8 In addition to Posnansky’s personal interest in teaching and inclusive approach, interest in African oral traditions and histories might have given the opportunity for Western language educated Africans to be involved in oral tradition research projects as language experts.
“African” historiography movements. The use of oral histories in historical archaeology equally altered the relationship between archaeologists and African communities. It created different avenues of engagement with African communities in the interpretations of their past (Schmidt 2014)\(^9\).

The 1960s mark a period of opportunity for Tanzania and Uganda both politically and archaeologically. The nature of archaeology changed for both non-Africans and Africans. For example, research that was predominately in the hands of a British agenda began to move in different direction with the engagement of citizens of different countries, mostly European and North American\(^10\) (Shaw 1976, 1989; Posnansky 1982). After their political liberation, African countries also embraced archaeology-related institutions with an implicit understanding of their role in generating historical interpretations that improve the image and history of Africans. This notion of archaeology in service of nationalism (Holl 1990; Trigger 1990) also opened access to Africans in the profession.

The trajectories for Tanzania and Uganda, however, were different. The 1960s mark not only the change to a political independence of Tanzania, but they also bring change in the practice of archaeology, both in research and teaching. Archaeological research in Tanzania was led mostly by three major research groups: the Leakeys, the British Institute, and the Department of Antiquities. Louis and Mary Leakey did not provide formal training to Africans. On the other hand, the Department of Antiquities and


\(^10\) Particularly the involvement of the United States of America starting after the Second World War, African archaeology benefited through major funding organizations such as the Wenner-Gren Foundation, the National Geographic Society (Shaw 1976:164), and later the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation.
the National Museum of Tanzania involved a few Africans through on-the-job informal training. Similarly, the British Institute\(^{11}\) might have made an attempt to introduce archaeology in the University of East Africa largely because it had a formal association with the University. However, this attempt was closely related to Merrick Posnansky’s archaeological research contribution in Uganda (see Chapters 4 and 5).

Within this historical backdrop, the initiation of indigenous East Africans into archaeology formally took place via three means: 1) working or volunteering in museums\(^{12}\), 2) studying History and related disciplines at the university level, and 3) working in departments of antiquities. Here, I discuss the involvement of East Africans via museums and universities, and the third means will be addressed in the following section.

The involvement of Ugandans in archaeology via museums started in the late 1950s. For example, the first Ugandan PhD holding archaeologist was initiated into archaeology as a result of working or volunteering in the Uganda Museum. Merrick Posnansky attests to this by sharing the experience of the late David Kiyaga-Mulindwa in a short obituary note.

\(^{11}\) The British Institute was never to assume a major training role since its funding was specifically to be directed toward research, and its staff were discouraged from undertaking teaching commitments (Robertshaw 1990b:91). Moreover, until the late 1980s, hiring Africanist archaeologists including British expatriates was not encouraged in Britain and the institutional development of African archaeology within British museums and universities lagged behind, which showed a “complete lack of appreciation of the importance of African’s past” (for review see Mitchell, Haour, and Hobart 2003:4). In the mid-1980s, the Institute started a graduate scholarship scheme to remedy the poor recruitment of research students in British Universities (BIEA 1986:3); however Ugandans and Tanzanians interested in archaeology benefited very little from this opportunity until much later in the 2000s. Even then their role is not to carry out their own research projects rather to work as field assistants of ongoing research projects of mostly British Scholars and graduate students of archaeology. The institute has just made some changes, including new research themes and providing funding for Africans.

\(^{12}\) A similar narrative has been presented in some African countries. For example, in Zambia the first-generation archaeologist who joined archaeology in the mid-1970s did so through accepting employment opportunity in a museum (Musonda 2012: 94-95).
David Kiyaga-Mulindwa first worked at the Uganda Museum when I was curator in the 1960’s, later took a degree at Makerere and a PhD from John Hopkins where he worked on earthwork sites in the forest of Ghana. I … was his local supervisor (David 2007b:1).

Kiyaga-Mulindwa’s colleague also narrates how it was possible for Kiyaga-Mulindwa to obtain a job at the museum before he earned his first degree at Makerere and later went for postgraduate studies in museology in the UK:

[D]uring vacation, he met someone, I think a cousin of his, and said, “It is a long vacation I am looking for a job”. So the cousin was working for the Uganda Museum, and he took him to the Curator, and said, “Mr. Curator, this is my cousin and he is looking for a job for his vacation.” That was before he went to Makerere to study history. So he got a job as one of the attendants in the museum. He continued to have that part-time job as a student at Makerere University and that’s how he became interested in archaeology. ... When he finished [college] he went back to the museum [to work as Curator of History and Archaeology in 1970]. (Interview with Kiyaga-Mulindwa’s Colleague July 19, 2010)

Similarly, the first Tanzanian PhD holder in archaeology, as he narrates, was initiated into the archaeological community because he worked in the Coryndon Museum in Kenya in the early 1960s:

When I was working at the Museum in Nairobi as the schools’ liaison officer … one afternoon, which I remember very vividly, Louis Leakey had a group of local students that had come to the museum and I think their teacher wanted or requested Louis Leaky to talk to the students. So Louis Leakey was standing at the main gate to the museum with a bunch of stone tools and one of them was a hand axe and he was trying to tell the kids this was a tool that was used by primitive people many hundreds or thousands [of] years ago. But despite the fact that Louis Leakey was born in Kenya, his Swahili was really bad but he knew that there was a Tanzanian around in the Museum so he called up on me and asked me whether I would be willing to help him with his translation. So he would say stuff in English about the tool he was holding and he would ask me to translate that into Swahili. I did it two or three times more or less. ... But towards the end of the school session and after the students had already left I went to his office … and he said “come in”, by then I had already met Barbra Isaac. … Barbra and I were sharing the same office or rather the same building … So I got to know Barbra and Glynn Isaac quite well. In any case, so I went to Leakey’s office in the basement and knocked on the door and, I didn’t put it like that, but I said I am hooked onto archaeology,
and I’d like to see where all these things you are talking about come from. He said, "Come in" and that weekend he had a trip to Olorgesailie [in Kenya].

That was actually my first archaeological site to visit. So Leakey invited me to go to Olorgesailie with them. When I got to Olorgesailie, Glynn Isaac was there. And since I had already established the connection with Glynn Isaac through Barbara, it was relatively easy for me to be invited to go back to Olorgesailie. I think I did go back probably once or twice. But my next trip was to Olduvai. Yes, I had already seen Olorgesailie but Olorgesailie is in Kenya and I think what made the Nairobi Museum famous is partly because of the collection that was coming from Olduvai. So I wanted to see what Olduvai was like and what material was lying at Olduvai. So again I was invited to Olduvai. I went to Olduvai and spent almost a week there. So that is how I was initiated into archaeology.

One, I was introduced into archaeology by a very famous man and I am sure that must have influenced later decision to go to do archaeology. Two, by the time I went to graduate work I had already secured employment at the museum. And archaeology is one of probably the largest departments in the museum and so I knew if I had to specialize in anything and be able to keep my museum position it would have to be archaeology. Well, I could easily have gone to history or ethnography but again because of the influence this big man had exerted on me I didn’t bother to look on other disciplines. So I thought just archaeology. (Individual Interview, January 15, 2011)

The second means by which Africans encountered archaeology was through studying history in college. Samwiri Lwanga-Lunyiigo, the first Ugandan archaeologist who earned a master’s degree in archaeology from the University of Ghana in Legon, Ghana, and was to be appointed in the History Department at Makerere University, also came across archaeology while he was a student of history at Makerere University.

Of course in Uganda no school was offering archaeology but when I went to [Makerere] University I did a first year course in early African history. … And at that time Prof. Posnansky, who was working at the Uganda Museum, taught that course. I found him a very inspiring and interesting teacher. Unfortunately, he left Uganda before I accomplished my degree in History. When I graduated … I was granted a Uganda fellowship … and there were no Ugandan archeologists at that time but the British Institute was very active … Then one of my history teachers, called Jim Allen, who had studied history at Oxford, suggested that since Prof. Posnansky taught at Makerere and since I had a Uganda fellowship that fellowship
was adequate to do postgraduate training at the University of Ghana. I had of course the option of going to Oxford to do a Diploma in Archaeology but then the money wouldn’t had been adequate. … Prof. Posnansky was contacted and he was keen to have me. So I went for a postgraduate program. (Individual interview, August 31, 2010)

In the same manner, Jonathan N. Karoma, the first Tanzanian archaeologist to be appointed in the History Department at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) in 1971, also expresses his encounter with archaeology as follows:

I had expressed an interest in pursuing archaeology following earlier exposure to archaeological; fossil and ethnographic materials in the national museum in town where I worked as a volunteer during vacations and also after participating in an excavation of a later Iron Age site at Ilula, in the Iringa Region of Southern Tanzania also as a student volunteer under Dr. Sutton (Karoma 1990:12).

Under John Sutton’s supervision, Karoma was the only student from the UDSM who opted to study archaeology from 1966 to 1985; he went to study archaeology at Berkeley in 1971. Similarly, Kiyaga-Mulindwa and Lwanga-Lunyiigo were the only Ugandans who opted for archaeology in their postgraduate studies. Having only one or two history students interested in studying archaeology seemed to characterize other universities in eastern Africa at this time, which attests to the esoteric nature of Western archaeological practices within African settings.

One of the noticeable characteristics among Africanist scholars and their commitment to East African archaeology is the significant variation towards the formal involvement of Africans in the discipline. Posnansky, for example, made a significant commitment to train Africans. On the other hand, Louis and Mary Leakey who by the 1960s had already worked in Olduvai Gorge for more than three decades employed

---

13 Until the mid-1970s, Simiyu Wandibba was also the only Kenyan history student from the University of Nairobi who pursued archaeology at the postgraduate level (Wandibba 1990:44-45).
only Kenyans and invited only one Tanzanian for a short visit, an invitation that came because the Tanzanian requested a visit. Similarly, Neville Chittick’s contribution in the formal training of Africans in archaeology was absent, except his participation in the projects run by Posnansky (Chapter 4) and perhaps informal training of Tanzanians in the Departments of Antiquities. Though efforts were made in 1960s by Posnansky to introduce archaeology to both East African men and women, joined later by John Sutton at the Dar es Salaam University College (Chapter 5), only a few East African men pursued postgraduate studies in archaeology.14

(Pseudo)Institutional Power

East Africans gained access in guarding the institutional power needed for archaeological field and laboratory research activities at a national level in the beginning of the 1960s. This became particularly possible with the establishment of museums and departments of antiquities, the process of Africanization, and the implementation of Antiquities laws. Departments of antiquities and museums contributed to the involvement of East Africans in archaeology. On the eve of independence, both Uganda and Tanzania embraced these institutions as part of their national agenda (Chapter 2). Thus, in the early 1960s as part of the Africanization process, Africans who had secondary school education or higher qualifications were able to obtain opportunities (mostly administrative positions) within the Department of Antiquities and Uganda Museum in Uganda, as well as the National Museum of Tanzania and the Department of Antiquities in Tanzania. These opportunities were the threshold for East Africans to

14 Tanzanian and Ugandan women only started earning MA and PhD degrees in Archaeology in the 2000s. Lucy N. Rutabazibwa, the first Tanzanian woman, earned Bachelor of Arts degree in archaeology in 1988 from the University of Dar es Salaam. But of course, this does not mean women did not participate in archaeological research before the 2000s
implement the colonial cultural heritage framework (Chapter 2) and to authorize archaeological research in their countries, as well as at the same time to be introduced to archaeological practices both formally and informally. Seizing the opportunity to authorize archaeological research without proper training of East Africans in archaeology and without problematizing archaeology in a national context represents what I view as pseudo-institutional power.

Uganda

In the case of the Uganda Museum, Ugandans started working at the museum in the late 1940s. For example, Charles Sekintu was already employed in 1949 (Plumb 2002). From the late 1950s until 1965 when he became the Curator of the museum, he worked with Merrick Posnansky and later with Walter Bishop. Through Posnansky’s assistance in the early 1960s he was able to attend postgraduate studies in museology in the Unites States. As already highlighted, during the time of Posnansky, Ugandans were also involved in archaeology on a voluntary basis as early as the late 1950s.

On the other hand, official recruitment of Ugandans within the Department of Antiquities began in 1966. After Merrick Posnansky’s service, James Chaplin was another expatriate appointed as Inspector of Monuments in 1965 together with a Uganda staff, James Nabuguzi, who was employed as Trainee Inspector of Monuments (Sassoon 1970:3). After the death of James Chaplin, Patrick Y. Bulenzi was recruited as Assistant Inspector of Monuments. Until 1970, James Nabuguzi and Patrick Y. Bulenzi were the first Ugandans to be employed in the Department of Antiquities and sent for

---

15 By the Department of Antiquities had already 71 Ugandans working in the capacity of guards and caretakers of archaeological and historical monuments in different parts of the country (Sassoon 1970:3-4).
training. Nabuguzi was a history graduate from Makerere University and went on to study MA in oral history until 1971. On the other hand, as an African, Bulenzi’s appointment in the department was unique. He joined the department after he worked in the Uganda Museum and had took extensive studies in geology, paleontology, and museum studies. His employment at the museum was made possible when Merrick Posnansky invited him to join the Uganda Museum in 1958. Between 1959 and 1965 he was sponsored by the Uganda Museum to study geology, museology, and paleontology in different European countries. While he was abroad, he was appointed honorary secretary of the Uganda Ancient and Historical Monuments commission. His appointment as honorary secretary is an example of the institutional power East Africans gained in the postcolonial period, just by virtue of being Tanzanian or Ugandan.

Bulenzi had several opportunities to participate in archaeological research projects before he joined the Department of Antiquities while he was working in the Uganda Museum. He particularly participated in excavations in Nsongezi and Bigo Bya Mugenyi archaeological sites and in Bukwa on Mt. Elgon and at Napak and Moroto paleontological sites in Karamoja. The first three he worked with Merrick Posnansky, and the latter with Walter W. Bishop. With his archaeological and educational background, it is no surprise to see that Bulenzi was appointed Assistant Inspector of Monuments in March of 1966 upon his return to Uganda from Europe. Two years after his appointment as Assistant Inspector, Bulenzi took short courses in Germany including archaeological research methods. After the death of Jim Chaplin and the departure of James Nabuguzi, Bulenzi’s duties in the Department of Antiquities partially included covering the responsibilities of the Inspector of Monuments, which was a
vacant position until Hamo Sassoon joined in 1969. Later, Hamo Sassoon offered Bulenzi an opportunity to study anthropology at the University of California Berkeley in the United States but he chose to join UNESCO in Paris in 1973, where he served for 25 years (Patrick Y. Bulenzi Personal Communication, November 2014).

This short history—which supports the argument that East Africans gained access to formal training in archaeology through volunteering in museums—indicates that, from the mid-1960s to early 1970s, Uganda’s Department of Antiquities was run by both Ugandan and foreign employees who were formally trained in archaeology and related areas. Moreover, expatriate archaeologists working in Uganda were committed to capacity building. Consequently, Ugandans both in the Department of Antiquities and the Uganda Museum had the opportunity to study archaeology and related areas. If Bulenzi had an interest in archaeology, and had he continued in the Department of Antiquities, he might have played a crucial role in the development of archaeology in Uganda. However, beyond Ugandans’ aptitude for archaeology, the political instability in the country until the late 1980s was overwhelming for its citizens. Thus, some Ugandans inevitably took up other opportunities than working in government institutions or studied archaeology abroad.

After Sassoon left for Nigeria in 1973 (Posnansky 2005), the department was fully under the leadership of Ugandans. Paul Musoke Wamala16 was the Head of the Antiquities from 1973 to 1977. Then, as successor of Charles Sekintu, he became the Head of the amalgamated Department of Antiquities and Museums from 1977 to 1995.

---

16 Paul Musoke Wamala earned an MA degree in anthropology from then the Soviet Union. Upon his return he was able to replace Patrick Bulenzi’s position.
Thereafter the department was run under the leadership of Ephraim Kamuhangire\textsuperscript{17} until 2007. Ugandans who worked within the department, especially in the archaeology section starting in the late 1960s, included the late James Sebaduka, A. Wanzama, K. R. Kateeba, Ephraim Kamuhangire, and the late Peter Sebina Bisaso\textsuperscript{18}. In the 1970s and mid-1980s their responsibilities included documentation, preservation and management of monuments, including historical and archaeological sites.

Confined to these administrative responsibilities and with a lack of archaeological training, Ugandan Conservators and Assistant Conservators struggled to keep the 1960s spirit of archaeological research alive. A letter sent by Paul Wamala in 1977 to the editor of \textit{Nyame Akuma} illustrates these challenges:

> The [d]epartment has suffered a lot as a result of lack of qualified personnel and this forced us into being a maintenance [d]epartment instead of embarking on archaeological surveys. No archaeological team has ever considered to visit Uganda though as you very well know Uganda is potentially a promising archaeological zone (Shinnie 1977:27).

Similarly at the end of the 1970s after he participated in a Japanese-led archaeological research project as a representative of the Department of Antiquities and Museums, K. R. Kateeba expressed concern over the apparent status of Ugandans as

\textsuperscript{17} Ephraim Kamuhangire started working at the Uganda Museum in 1975. He earned a PhD in History from Makerere University in 1993. His dissertation research included some archaeological research. During his appointment in the Department of Antiquities and Monuments, he worked as a major collaborator with foreign archaeologists.

\textsuperscript{18} The late James Sebaduka worked from 1969 to 2005. He had Certificate and Diploma in Conservation and Management of Museums from Italy through the UNESCO- ICCROM training program. A. Wanzama started first working with the Department of Antiquities in the early 1970s and served in the amalgamated department until the 1980s. He earned Bachelor of Arts degree in history and sociology from Makerere University. K. R. Kateeba might have joined the department in the end of 1970s and his training was in Geology. The late Peter Sebina Bisaso, who worked in the department from 1978 until 2007, had Bachelor of Arts degree in history and Education from Makerere University. Other than Kamuhangire, he had the longest practical experience in archaeology among the departments’ staff.
appendages in these projects and emphasized the need to train Ugandans in archaeology rather than relying heavily on foreign experts and their projects.

Uganda is still rich in antiquities and it is the duty of the [department, to unearth, preserve, study these antiquities and educate other Ugandans about them. Therefore the struggle to train the needed manpower should continue so that whenever we get such assistance as we got from Japan, it is only complementary (Department of Antiquities and Museums Archive, Folder Historical Site Northern region, pp. 9).

The basic issue, of course, was political instability under the Idi Amin regime, and subsequently, the return of Milton Obote which prevented basic human rights and national peace, let alone the training of Ugandans in archaeology. The country remained unattractive to Africanist archaeologists until the mid-1980s when the British Institute started working in areas liberated by the National Resistance Army, one of the opposition groups that later became the dominant political party.

When the British Institute resumed archaeological research in Uganda, Ugandan Conservators also returned to their earlier responsibilities, including authorizing archaeological research proposals and participating in or supervising these projects. A former commissioner of the department shared his involvement in these projects and described the challenges Ugandans experienced from such arrangements.

During Id Amin regime … I changed from the University [Makerere] to the Department of Antiquities. So I became a civil servant. … So when this late Iron Age project of the British Institute started, I was already senior government officer [in the Department of Antiquities] so I participated fully in that program. We would go for fieldwork, we would carry out excavations, and that’s why I learned a bit of the archaeology that is in me by participating in all those field trips and writing joint papers. So that is why I was telling you that if the British Institute managers had actually had the kind of, what can I call it, a policy like for example Paul Sinclair or Peter Schmidt had for the Antiquities of Tanzania then some of us would have actually picked up the field of archaeology. Because we were participating in these field activities but not benefiting from it in the form of advancement of our academic pursuits. I would have easily switched from history to archaeology because of my background … So of course it was
not me alone that participated in these projects which came to Uganda. There was a parallel research program by the French in the field of paleontology. … [That] research program has equally treated our Ugandan counterparts in the same way because we don’t have a [Ugandan] paleontologist … other than the French who come with them [the French project leaders] and then go back [to] join their university to further their academic interest. But again no Ugandan has benefited from that similar parallel program—which is not good. (Individual interview, August 2010)

According to the BIEA Annual Reports, and articles in Azania and Nyame Akuma, the BIEA research projects in Uganda were done in “collaboration” with Ugandans who worked at the Uganda Museum as conservators and assistant conservators. However, collaboration was not based on full participation of and mutual benefits for Ugandans; instead, it was based on lip service. Thus, throughout the 1990s to 2000s, students from Makerere University, and later from Kyambogo University, were attached to these projects through the Uganda Museum without gaining proper access to higher education in archaeology.

To some extent, the museum continued the legacy of introducing archaeology informally to Makerere University (and now Kyambogo University) undergraduate students and graduates through attachment with the BIEA. This legacy started in 1959 by Merrick Posnansky and stayed throughout the 1960s; however, the way it was reintroduced from the late 1980s until the early 2010s was different and led to illusory institutional power. In the 1960s, on the one hand, the involvement of Ugandans in archaeological research projects guaranteed higher education training opportunities for some of them. On the other hand, formal archaeological higher education training opportunities were unavailable for Ugandans in the late 1980s and the subsequent decades. Conservators, assistant conservators, and attached undergraduate students and graduate students had no archaeology background. In these foreign-led projects,
Ugandans continued to acquire only informal archaeological training, using their institutional connections but only being relegated to appendage status. James Sebaduka (1969-2005) and Peter Sebina Bisaso (1978-2007) perfectly fit this “appendage” status and illusory institutional power, where the institution seems to have power in making decision at a national level but its employees cannot exercise power due to lack of formal training opportunities. Though it is difficult to assess the degree of interest in formal archaeological education held by Ugandans who participated in these archaeological projects, it is clear that the role of the British Institute in training Ugandan archaeologists with international accreditation was very insignificant.

**Tanzania**

Tanzania’s trajectory towards formal training and archaeological engagement differed significantly from Uganda. In the early 1960s, both the NMT and the Department of Antiquities were already embraced by the postcolonial government to fulfill national agendas. The NMT was under the leadership of an expatriate archaeologist, Stanley West; however it had few archaeological research activities (Chapter 2). Regardless, Tanzanians remained uninvolved in the museum’s archaeological activities until the beginning of the 1970s. Their involvement in archaeological activities first occurred in the Department of Antiquities, both as part of the invisible form of involvement of Africans in the end of 1950s and then as part of Africanization in the early 1960s. The Department of Antiquities opened employment for some Tanzanians in the position of foremen, antiquity supervisor, driver, messenger, and Antiquities guards (Chittick 1963; Sassoon 1964, 1966, 1968a).

After Neville Chittick and Hamo Sassoon departed, the Conservator of Antiquities position remained vacant until 1970 (Mturi 1976b; Chapter 2). The department suffered
greatly from the loss of staff in the early post-colonial period (Sassoon 1964). The loss of staff included expatriates and even Africans who were hired as clerk, Antiquities supervisor, and Antiquities assistants. A Senior Antiquities Assistant (Emmanuel Isai), for example, worked with the department from 1962 to 1966, but left for another position in Community Development in the same ministry (Sassoon 1968b). This was a common occurrence in most newly independent African countries because with Africanization, job opportunities were wider, thus regular movements to better jobs took place.

Retention of permanent African employees in archaeology-related jobs was not easy (Posnansky 1996). Of the few Tanzanians who pursued archaeology and played a major role in the development of archaeology in the country was the late *mzee* Amini Aza Mturi.

A history graduate from Makerere College, Amini Mturi was recruited as Assistant Conservator in April 1966 (Sassoon 1968b). After five months he left for London to study archaeology and conservation at the Institute of Archaeology, University College of London. He returned in 1968 and continued serving in the same position until 1970, when he was promoted and became the first Tanzanian Conservator of Antiquities (Mturi 1976a, 1976b). He served in this capacity until 1981. It is unclear if he earned a degree from University College of London, as some believe that he was unable to finish his studies since he was very much needed in the Department of Antiquities. However, his contribution to the archaeology of Tanzania (e.g., Mturi 1998) and his efforts in maintaining the culture of the Department of Antiquities as he had inherited it from the expatriates is well presented in the department’s annual reports from the late 1960s to the late 1970s (e.g., Mturi 1976a, 1977, 1978a, and 1978b).
Among other Tanzanians recruited in the early 1970s specializing in archaeology and related disciplines were Simon Alcuin Cornelio Waane and A. T. Nkini (Mturi 1978a). Waane was recruited after he received his first degree with a triple major in history, political science, and sociology from the University of Dar es Salaam. The Department of Antiquities sent him for postgraduate studies in archaeology in 1974 and he earned both his master’s degree in 1976 (Mturi 1978b) and PhD in 1979 in Anthropology with the focus on ethnoarchaeology of pottery (Waane 1979) from the University of Illinois, U.S.A. He expresses his encounter with archaeology:

How I encountered archaeology? Well, I would say it was accidental. Because archaeology is not taught in Secondary Schools. And by the time I graduated it was not even taught at university level. … They advertised for a job in the Department of Antiquities. So I just applied for the job for the sake of looking for a job, but I wasn’t exposed to any serious archaeology prior to that. (Individual Interview December 29, 2011)

On the other hand A. T. Nkini had already earned a degree in archaeology from Leningrad University in USSR (Soviet Union) before he was recruited to the Department of Antiquities in 1972 (Mturi 1978a). Then the Department of Antiquities sent him to the Soviet Union to study paleontology at the University of Moscow (Mturi 1978a, 1978b). Other than two publications in the 1980s, I have not found any additional information about him, particularly how he was introduced to archaeology and obtained training in archaeology. Nevertheless, what is clear in the emergence of national institutional power in Tanzania is that it involved Tanzanians as decision makers and researchers in the Department of Antiquities. This development together with the national political stability also enabled nationals to secure postgraduate training for few Tanzanians.

Unlike in Uganda in the 1960s and 1970s, Tanzania’s Department of Antiquities carried out archaeological research projects—both independent and collaborative (e.g.
Chadderdon and Wynn 1981; Chittick 1959, 1962, 1963, 1966; Mturi 1976c, 1976b, 1977, 1979, 1986; McBrearty, Waane, and Wynn 1982; Sassoon 1967a, 1967b, 1968, 1968a; Wynn and Chadderdon 1982). However, independent local research in Tanzania by Tanzanians was very limited (e.g., Masao 1976a, 1979; Mturi 1976c, 1986; Waane 1976, 1979). Most activities in the Department of Antiquities focused on the documentation of archaeological sites, declaration, conservation, preservation and restoration of sites and monuments, and the authorization of ethnographic and archaeological research permits. Consequently, the staff members of the department were involved in the archaeological projects run by foreign scholars, but without proper training, except Waane and Mturi. This arrangement only elevated the dominance of archaeology by foreigners, mostly Western scholars.

By the 1970s, both Tanzanian and expatriate archaeologists were already challenging these inequalities of archaeological research and training (Mturi 1978c; Karoma 1977; Sutton 1973a, 1973b; see Chapter 5). As administrators and being able to draw on their institutional power at the Department of Antiquities, Tanzanian scholars were able to pinpoint the manpower needs (as they were then called in Tanzania) and push the idea of establishing a full-fledge archaeology program at the University of Dar es Salaam (Mturi 2005; Mabulla and Magori 2005; Mapunda 2005; more details on this will be provided in Chapter 5). Since 1985, the Department of Antiquities has sent its employees to study archaeology for BA degree at the University of Dar es Salaam, and by 1996 it started funding its employees for MA degree in archaeology at the University. It is safe to argue that the political stability of Tanzania, perhaps combined with the self-reliance ideology of Mwalimu Julius Nyerere and the strength of the Department of
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Antiquities, provided pioneer Tanzanians the opportunity to emerge as well-trained archaeologists and well-determined scholars. This is particularly the case with Amini Mturi, who was one of the major players in the establishment of archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam (see Chapter 5).

**Professionally (Un)Recognized**

In this chapter I presented the involvement of Tanzanians and Ugandans in archaeology, informally and formally, within the colonial and pre-1985 postcolonial archaeological practices in the region. Both countries maintain colonial professional structures that retain the involvement of Africans both those professionally recognized and unrecognized. Archaeology by profession has been hierarchal, thus its practitioners provide service in a hierarchal way. As will be discussed in Chapter 7, the contemporary hierarchy of the archaeological profession in Tanzania and Uganda appears in several categories: casual laborers (including kitchen crews, camp janitors, local guides, antiquity guards, and research assistants), antiquities/museum representatives, paid “volunteers”, university students, and principal researchers (including professors). The groups that are actually involved in archaeological field and laboratory work can further be classified as the *communicators* (guides and research assistants), the *legal observers* (these can be both formally archaeology trained and apprenticed government officials), and the *academic performers* (students and professors).

I presented that professionally trained and accredited African archaeologists studied archaeology in their postgraduate studies either in master’s or PhD programs. They were initiated into archaeology accidentally either while studying history in tertiary education or after working in the museums and antiquities departments. In the latter, they first acquired basic archaeological skills through participation in archaeological
research projects either as communicators or legal observers. The experiences of Tanzanian and Ugandan archaeologists is not unique. Similar narratives have been shared by a few indigenous African archaeologists about how they landed in the profession of archaeology accidentally (e.g., see Apaak 2010; Holl 2010; Kusimba 2010; Mehari 2007; Mafune 2010; Ndlovu 2009, 2010; Wandibba 1994; Usman 2010).

Though archaeology in the 1960s was more prominent at Makerere University than at the University of Dar es Salaam, by the 1970s both countries were moving relatively at the same pace in terms of producing formally trained archaeologists. Tanzania had already produced two scholars with PhDs, one with a master’s degree, one with a BA, and another with a post-graduate degree. Equally, Uganda had two archaeologists; one with a PhD and one with an MA degree. However, the political situations of Tanzania and Uganda were quite different, which had a significant impact both on the nature of research and the institutionalization of archaeology within and outside of the academic settings. Ugandan archaeologists were forced into exile. On the other hand, Tanzanian archaeologists, though challenged financially, were conducting research for the Department of Antiquities as well as envisioning to train Tanzanians in archaeology and related fields locally at the University of Dar es Salaam (Mturi 1978c; Karoma 1977).

Major differences occurred by the mid-1980s when the involvement of Ugandans in archaeological research resumed only within the hierarchy of communicators and legal observers and remained professionally unrecognized. Tanzanians gained the opportunity to include both academic institutional foundation and professional accreditation through the launching of an archaeology teaching program at the
University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) in 1985. In both countries the emergence of the first generation of formally recognized African archaeologists was made possible through commitments by both national and international institutions, including international funding organizations. Moreover, personal commitments of both pioneering Africanist and African archaeologists were very important (Chapters 4 and 5). When institutional and personal commitments are unsynchronized or absent, the results lead to what Uganda experienced from 1970s to the beginning of 2010s. Uganda only increased its own archaeologists in the 2000s. On the other hand, the experience of Tanzania and the UDSM illustrates the synchronization of local and international institutions and organizations as well as African and Africanist scholars’ commitments. In Chapters 4 and 5, I will focus on how the underdevelopment and development of archaeology took place in these universities.
Table 3-1. Ugandan archaeologists: PhDs and PhD Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decades</th>
<th>PhDs</th>
<th>PhD Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s-1980s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s-2000s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2. Tanzanian archaeologists: PhDs and PhD Candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decades</th>
<th>PhDs</th>
<th>PhD Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s-1980s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s-2000s</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-3. Ugandan archaeologists: master’s and doctoral degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>University Attended</th>
<th>Year Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>John Hopkins University</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University of the Witwatersrand</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University of Ghana</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University of Bergen</td>
<td>2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University of Bergen</td>
<td>2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>2010s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>2010s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>2010s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BA      | No BA holders |  |

19 Only three of them are currently working as archaeologists.
Table 3-4. Tanzanian archaeologists with MA degree in archaeology from 2002 to 2013 at the UDSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Tanzanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4
ARCHAEOLOGY AT MAKERERE UNIVERSITY

In this chapter I present the development of archaeology within the historical and contemporary context of the Ugandan higher education system. Archaeology within the Ugandan higher education system was introduced in 1962 at what was then Makerere University College. Makerere University College, now Makerere University (MAK), is the first university in the country established in 1922 as a technical school and became a university college in 1949 (Nwauwa 1996; cf. Musisi and Muwanga 2003). Consequently, most efforts to introduce archaeology within the Ugandan higher education system were devoted in this University. Taught within the History Department as part of history courses from 1962 to 1968 and within the Institute of African studies from 1964 to 1968 as subject for postgraduate students, archaeology was very vibrant. By the end of the 1960s, the visibility of archaeology at MAK decreased and eventually downgraded to a one-hour topic within history courses until the 2013-2014 academic year. Though from the end of the 1990s onwards the number of Ugandan higher education institutions has increased to more than ten universities and colleges (Musisi 2003) and in the 2000s that number has been doubled, archaeology was never introduced in these institutions and still remains unknown as a discipline or as a course, save for the reintroduction of archaeology at MAK in the 2013-2014 academic year and the recruitment of archaeology graduates at Kyambogo University in the late 2000s to teach history courses.

A comprehensive history of archaeology in Uganda is yet to come. Though Posnansky (1971) reported archaeology at MAK as the leading program in tropical Africa in the 1960s, discussion about the history of archaeology within the Ugandan
higher education system has thus been far absent. Moreover, the current status of archaeology within the country’s higher education system is yet to be documented. To trace changes and continuities of archaeological praxis in post-independence Uganda, baseline background research of the history of archaeology within the country’s higher education system is inevitable. Hence, in this chapter within the context of the country’s socio-political histories and the changes that took place in archaeology, I document the development of archaeology in the 1960s and examine why archaeology at MAK continued only as a topic within history courses for the following four decades. After political independence, Uganda went through a long civil war until the country achieved its political stability in the late 1980s (Mutibwa 1992). Within this national history, archaeological research in the country, as partly covered in Chapters 2 and 3, also influenced by external factors, had shifted through several forms, ranging from research themes to forming archaeologically relevant institutions and producing practitioners. In this chapter, I divide the development of archaeology at MAK into three timeframes: 1) The 1960s, 2) the 1970s to 1980s, and 3) 1990s to 2000s. These timeframes are based on the heyday of archaeology in the country during the 1960s and the political instability and stability in the subsequent decades.

1960s: The Opportunity

Most Ugandans with formal education, who were or have been involved in archaeology, reminisce about how archaeology was noticeable at MAK in the 1960s. For example, during an informal interview, I asked one of the former commissioners of the Department of Museums and Monuments, who was also a student in the History Department at MAK, to narrate the state of archaeology in the country, and the commissioner replied: “Archaeology was at its best in the 1960s”. Indeed, the 1960s is
the most cherished moment, when archaeology was represented both within the academic and non-academic institutions. This is demonstrated through the appearance of various publications in both local and international journals by a very few but quite distinguished scholars (e.g., Azania and Uganda Journal) and the efforts of these scholars invested at the Uganda Museum (Chapter 2). But, what structural foundations and socio-political contexts allowed for archaeology to be at its best at the University? And, what exactly does it mean that archaeology was at its best at MAK in the 1960s?

The beginning of the 1960s marks a period of opportunity for Uganda both politically and archaeologically. Uganda gained its political independence in 1962, with most of the foundation and efforts for this achievement having taking place in the 1940s and 1950s (Mutibwa 1992). The beginning of the 1960s is also an important time frame in the history of archaeology in Uganda; it marks new archaeological research directions (Chapters 2 and 3) and the introduction of archaeology at MAK. These changes were outcomes of the archaeological developments that transpired in the late 1950s with the institutionalization of archaeology at the Uganda Museum, the establishment of the Department of Antiquities, and the arrival of the British Institute of History and Archaeology in East Africa, aided by the political stability from 1962 to 1966.

Archaeological development in the late 1950s and its influence on the introduction of archaeology at MAK owe much to Merrick Posnansky through his appointment first to the Uganda Museum and later to the British Institute of History and Archaeology in East Africa (BIEA). As the Curator of the Uganda Museum from 1958–1962, Posnansky’s commitment to Iron Age research themes and to the formal
involvement of Africans in these research activities at the Uganda Museum and the then Department of Antiquities was significant (Chapters 2 and 3).

As presented in Chapter 3, archaeology was first introduced in 1957 at Makerere University College because of Posnansky’s interest in teaching archaeology for the extra-mural college while he was in Kenya. However, Posnansky’s major contribution to the establishment of archaeology at MAK strengthened in the beginning of the 1960s while he was Curator of the Uganda Museum and later Assistant Director of the BIEA. As the Curator of the Uganda Museum (1958-1962), according to the interview done by Walz (2010), Posnansky noted that the History Department at Makerere University College was remotely interested in archaeology. The attitude of most members of the department (especially the Chair of the Department) was that archaeology was important at the museum. Thus, Posnansky started to teach archaeology as part of the history syllabus at Makerere University College without being paid (Walz 2010:186).

A more influential factor that contributed to archaeology’s development in the 1960s and the introduction of archaeology formally at Makerere University College was the opening of the BIEA in 1959, but more specifically the recruitment of Merrick Posnansky as its Assistant Director in 1962. The BIEA’s research interests changed the archaeological research themes of the region, including Uganda, in the coming decades. The focus of the BIEA was the later history of Africa including the Iron Age. In Uganda, the BIEA research interest was possible through Posnansky, where he served as Assistant Director of the institute from 1962 to 1964.

Formal teaching of archaeology at MAK came at the initiative of Posnansky who taught introductory history courses that incorporated archaeological perspectives and
later introduced archaeology graduate courses. Within the BIEA, Posnansky was very successful on the education side (Walz 2010:185). In this position, he formally introduced archaeology at MAK as part of the undergraduate history syllabus. In 1962, as a guest lecturer from the BIEA, he taught the first class on prehistoric Africa for the History Honor's class to students like M.S.M. Kiwanuka and P.M. Mutibwa¹ (Bridges and Posnansky 2004:480). In the same year he also organized a two-week vacation course in archaeology. This was followed up by field schools in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda² (Bridges and Posnansky 2004:480-481, Walz 2010: 185-186).

In addition to these theoretical and practical introductory trainings, as part of the British Institute’s negotiation with the emerging University of East Africa³, Posnansky wrote a memo on “the Teaching of Archaeology at the University of East Africa” in 1963 (Bridges and Posnansky 2004:481). This memo was approved and led to the recruitment of archaeologists and to the introduction of archaeology by 1966 in all three East African Universities, including Nairobi and Dar es Salaam⁴. In an interview conducted in 2000 by Pamela Smith (2009) and similarly when I interviewed him in 2010, Posnansky shared when and how archaeology was first introduced into MAK formally and its influence in the region:

We started archaeology at Makerere from 1962. We then laid out a framework which led to creation of Departments of Archaeology or Archaeology in History Departments in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, and

¹ Now they are preeminent Ugandan Historians.
² The field school in Tanzania was carried out in collaboration with Neville Chittick, Director of the British Institute. John Sutton, then a Research Student of the Institute, was also another collaborator in Kenya.
³ The University of East Africa was made up of three colleges: Makerere, Dar es Salaam, and Nairobi university colleges, located in Uganda, Tanzania, and Kenya respectively.
⁴ Archaeology at the University Colleges of Nairobi and Dar es Salaam was introduced as part of history course in 1966 (Karoma 1990, Wandibba 1990:43).
eventually in Addis Ababa. We advanced the teaching of archaeology quite significantly for Africans (Smith 2009:179-180).

However, it seems the image of archaeology at MAK became more visible in 1964 when Posnansky transferred to Makerere University College, where he began teaching African history and archaeology and became Director of the Institute of African Studies (Bridges and Posnansky 2004:481; Smith 2009):

In 1964 I transferred to the University, Makerere University College, where I began the teaching African Archaeology at Makerere and designed a programme for the other colleges in East Africa to begin teaching archaeology. We also began a graduate programme (Smith 2009:177).

Thus, in the mid-1960, Posnansky setup archaeology graduate courses within the Institute of African Studies. This program attracted a number of foreign students including Peter Schmidt, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Florida. Offered over several terms, the seminar focused on the major archaeological findings in East Africa and also included field trips to sites in Kenya and Tanzania.

According to archival evidence at MAK in the History Department and discussions with Prof. Merrick Posnansky, archaeology was vibrant within the curriculum of the Institute of African Studies and the History Department. MAK, then Makerere University College, constituent of the University of East Africa, was celebrated as the first university within tropical Africa to offer an archaeology degree at the PhD level (Posnansky 1971). John Sutton was awarded PhD degree in 1965 for his research on the Sirikwa Holes of western Kenya—The Later Prehistory of the Western Highlands of Kenya. In 1966, the first MA degree in archaeology was awarded to the late James Chaplin for his research on the rock art of the Lake Victoria region (Chittick 1967).

Unfortunately, this success was short-lived because of the political instability in the country and the tensions that arose over the continuation of African Studies with
other academic units on campus—a contest over intellectual territories in a university where department identities were threatened by this interdisciplinary center. The upshot was that Posnansky found the atmosphere at Makerere not as receptive to the interdisciplinary research that he championed (Peter Schmidt, Personal communication 2013). Soon after this contest unfolded Posnansky left for Ghana in 1968 and the element of archaeology within the university vanished immediately. The Editor of Azania (Chittick 1968: viii-ix) stated:

In Uganda much historical work is being carried on, but archaeologically the situation is less happy. With the death of Jim Chaplin⁵, the first executive officer of the Monuments Commission, and the departure of Merrick Posnansky to Ghana, there is now no archaeologist in Uganda. It is ironic that Uganda was the first part of East Africa to receive archaeological attention, with the work of E. J. Wayland some forty years ago; let us hope that these studies will revive.

In the same journal, Posnansky (1968) shared:

With the death of T. P. O'Brien⁶ in London on July 25th, 1968, Uganda archaeology has lost a pioneer of achievement. His Prehistory of the Uganda Protectorate, published in 1939, for long remained an invaluable source book for the Stone Age of Uganda and many of his conclusions, which at the time were regarded as outlandish, have in the sixties been vindicated (Posnansky 1968: xi-xii).

In the late1960s, not only the importance given to archaeology started to vanish, but also the major scholars of the archaeology of Uganda were reduced either as a result of natural death or intellectual tensions. Among the Ugandan students who were introduced to archaeology, two undergraduate students, Lwanga-Lunyiigo and the late Prof. David Kiyaga-Mulindwa, decided to pursue archaeology for their postgraduate

⁵ James Harvey Chaplin was the first executive officer of the Monuments Commission and Inspector of Antiquities in Uganda from 1962 to 1967 (Chittick 1968: viii-ix; Clark 1974:vii; Chapters 2 and 3).

⁶ Terrence Patrick O’Brien was among the pioneer Africanist archaeologists in Uganda (Chapter 2).
studies. Lwanga-Lunyiigo was sent to study archaeology in Ghana, and Kiyaga-Mulindwa to study museum studies in the UK (Chapter 3). Hence, the late 1960s marked the departure of the expatriates and the beginning of Ugandans studying archaeology in postgraduate levels.

**1970s to 1980s: The Forgotten Business**

The history of archaeology at Makerere University in the 1970s and 1980s merges with the socio-political history of the country. The military regime of Idi Amin lasted from 1971 to 1979. During this regime, Ugandans experienced widespread terror and murder, the economic and political development dwindled, and Asians were deported (Mtubiwa 1992). The country slowly entered into postcolonial political instability and civil unrest, which further intensified with the return of Milton Obote’s regime from 1980 to 1985. The political crises of the 1970s and early 1980s impacted the country’s social, economic, and institutional foundations.

As part of this transition, noted in Chapter 2, the development of archaeology at the Uganda Museum and the Department of Antiquities waned. Similarly, due to the political situation and a policy change in financing higher education, MAK experienced several drawbacks, including a decline of financial resources and the loss of teaching staff as Musisi and Muwanga (2003) vividly narrated:

Makerere became a place of bare laboratories, empty library shelves, chronic shortages of scholastic materials and overcrowded halls of residence. ... The condition of the halls of residence perhaps best illustrates the extent of the financial crisis compounded by the increase in enrolment. Libraries and common rooms, toilets and washroom facilities were converted into additional student rooms, leaving students to make their own alternative toilet arrangements. ... The financial crisis had a major impact on teaching staff. Lecturers were demoralized by salaries that were not only meagre but often came late. Holidays passed without any university staff receiving their wages. Many lecturers took other jobs,
both within and outside Uganda. ... The lecturers who remained moonlighted as tutors, taxi drivers or went into business in order to survive, using university facilities as their operating bases. Although many gave the odd weekly lecture, they had little time for seminars, tutorials or one-to-one student contact, let alone research or intellectual debate (Musisi and Muwanga 2003:10-11).

The university only started to recover in 1992 after the country gained its political stability. The regression of archaeology at MAK in the 1970s and 1980s was part of the national tragedy. It can be identified through tracing the history of archaeological research in the country and the availability of personnel in the Uganda Museum, the Department of Antiquities, and in the History Department at MAK.

In the 1970s to mid-1980s, unlike the 1960s, archaeological research activities in Uganda was almost absent. Responsible local conservators of Antiquities and researchers were struggling to keep archaeological research alive (Chapter 3). For example, in 1977 Mr. Paul Wamala, then Conservator and Curator of the Department of Antiquities and Museums, sent a letter to the editor of *Nyame Akuma* and reads:

> New developments are taking place ... the Department of Antiquities is being amalgamated into the Uganda Museum and I am charged with the responsibility of seeing the two fully integrated. I hope this would remove the present duplication of services and manpower. I have just signed a contract with the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan as a co-researcher in the "Study for the Establishment and Development of Palaeolithic culture in East Africa". We should expect a team of archaeologists from Japan to arrive in Uganda in the second half of 1977.

> My problems at the moment are the agricultural encroachments and modern developments in the country; it is clear that archaeological sites are very much threatened and unless those of you who are concerned with African Archaeology take up helping us immediately, we are likely to lose this valuable information (Shinnie 1977:27).

Here the Ugandan Conservator, Paul Wamala, was highlighting the fluctuations of archaeological research in the 1970s and at the same time encouraging foreign scholars to renew their archaeological interests in Uganda. Though the tone of his letter
seemed promising at that time, Uganda remained unattractive to Africanist archaeologists until the arrival of Museveni to power in 1986. The lack of archaeological research endeavors in the country is quite visible in the national, regional and international means of disseminating archaeological knowledge. Archival research from the *Uganda Journal, Azania*, the annual reports of the *British Institute in East Africa*, and *Nyame Akuma* newsletter confirms the absence of systematic archaeological research inquiries during this time.

For example, the *Uganda Journal* between 1970 and 1976 published five volumes, Volume 34 to 38. These five volumes attest to the very few archaeological or related research activities that took place in the early 1970s. Among these few research activities are: the work by Larry Robbins from Michigan State University that documents Later Stone Age and Iron Age rock paintings (Robbins 1970), and the work by Wilson (1970, 1972) and Haden (1970), who both reported some archaeological findings in the northern Uganda. Between 1977 and 1980 the *Uganda Journal* was interrupted. Though the journal resumed its publication in 1980, articles about archaeological research started to appear only in 1995. These articles reported the research projects that started through the initiative of the BIEA and mostly British Africanist scholars in “collaboration” with the Ugandan staff members of the Department of Antiquities and Museums.

Similarly, reports of archaeological research activities in Uganda are absent in the annual reports of the BIEA from October 1970 to March 1985. In June 1985, the institute resumed its research activities in Uganda (Sutton 1985), and since then archaeological knowledge about Uganda continues to appear in its annual report (BIEA

---

7 The only exception is in the beginning of the 1970, the institute made a small financial contribution to Mr. S. Lwanga-Lunyiigo to work in Kooki (BIEA 1970:4).
1985 to 2011). Furthermore, articles by Lanning (1970), Nelson and Posnansky (1970), Soper (1971), and Chaplin (1974) published in the Azania journal between the 1970s and 1980s, with the exception of Robbins et al. (1977), are publications of archaeological research carried out in Uganda in the 1960s. In Nyame Akuma, after the letter sent by Paul Wamala in 1977, news about Uganda only appeared starting 1987 (Sutton 1987). Again, this report by Sutton was about the Iron Age research project undertaken by BIEA. The lack of archaeological research activities and publications in both national and regional journals clearly reflects the country’s socio-political instability and its isolation from the world of archaeology.

In the 1970s and until the mid-1980s, Africanist archaeologists who were major leaders in the teaching and practicing of archaeology in the 1960s were absent. With the exception of Hamo Sassoon in the Department of Antiquities in the early 1970s and the Japanese research that took place in the late 1970s (Chapter 3), archaeology was left in the hands of Ugandans who were working within two public institutions: the Ministry of Culture and Community Development as well as the History Department of Makerere University.

Within the Ministry of Culture and Community and Development, the Department of Antiquities under the administration of Hamo Sassoon in the early 1970s and later under Ugandans’ leadership, such as Paul Wamala, continued playing its role in activities relevant to archaeology. These activities were: documentation, as well as preservation and management of monuments, historical and archaeological sites. In the late 1970s, as Paul Wamala reported to the editor of Nyame Akuma (Shinnie 1977), the Department of Antiquities and Museums signed a collaborative research contract with
the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture of Japan to study the establishment and
development of Palaeolithic culture in East Africa. Though it was not possible to locate a
copy of the contract in the now Department of Museums and Monuments, a narrative
report of the collaborative research prepared for the department by one of its
conservators of antiquities (Mr. E. Kateeba) indicates that there was an awareness of
the need to have trained Ugandan personnel in archaeology (see Chapter 3).

At Makerere University, the 1970s marked the return of Prof. Lwanga-Lunyiigo, the first Ugandan archaeologist with an MA degree in archaeology from Ghana. According to Lwanga-Lunyiigo, as the first archaeologist, he did his best to restore the teaching of archaeology courses at Makerere University and carry out small, self-funded archaeological projects by taking students from the university to the field. Because of financial limitations and, most importantly, due to the political situation of the country, his effort to advance archaeology at the university and his desire for archaeology as a career ended by 1975.

In the early 1980s the political unrest was at its worst and forced most Ugandans, including educators and researchers, into exile or to their villages. This unrest also compelled the two pioneer Ugandan archaeologists, Kiyaga-Mulindwa and Lwanga-Lunyiigo, to leave their country and seek refuge in other African countries. Prof. Lwanga-Lunyiigo returned from Rwanda in 1986. He served as the Head of the History Department for two years and his effort to recover archaeology did not continue because his talents were needed in other government sectors. For example, a faculty member in the History Department, who was a graduate student in the late 1980s, has narrated the sporadic involvement of MAK history graduate students in the BIEA’s
archaeological research projects and considers these initiatives as an attempt to reintroduce archaeology at MAK:

I was actually one of the people who were supposed to be trained in archaeology. I participated in an excavation in Mubende … The fellow he worked [there] is now a Professor in the US… It must had been in 1987; we, two graduate students from the History Department, went [to Mubende]. The Head of the Department was then Prof. Lwanga-Lunyiigo. So the plan was to interest the two of us in archaeology. Unfortunately, we didn't continue. I think [because] it took a bit little time to organize the scholarship and by the time serious efforts were coming through then I was already in Canada. And I think the second reason was Prof. Lwanga-Lunyiigo soon left the department and the new head was not as keen in archaeology as Prof. Lwanga-Lunyiigo. (Individual Interview, October 7, 2010)

Similarly, during this decade, the contribution of the second Ugandan archaeologist, David Kiyaga-Mulindwa, to the development of archaeology in the country remained peripheral. After completing his doctoral studies in 1976 at John Hopkins University, Kiyaga-Mulindwa lived in Botswana and played a major role in the establishment of the archaeology program at the University of Botswana until his return to Uganda in the beginning of 1990s (Segadika 2007). In the absence of these two formally-trained Ugandan archaeologists, according to archival evidence, archaeology at MAK was a forgotten business and remained hidden within history courses as a topic.

By the end of 1980s, archaeological practice was taking place outside of MAK only by the BIEA. As noted above and in Chapter 3, the BIEA began its Late Iron Age Archaeology project in 1985. This project, planned for a 10-year period, brought archaeological research in the country back to life (for review see Kamuhangire 1995). Uganda was still recovering from the political instability and one of the Africanist archaeologists working at that time witnessed the situation in Uganda:

When I first worked with E. Kamuhangire, he never wore watch and that was because if you wore watch you were making yourself a target for the
soldiers’ roadblocks. They would kill you to take your watch. So you just never wore watch. It’s difficult for us to understand, and I even forgot what things were like in 1987. It is difficult even for me to understand what life was like before that [time]. (Interview August 2010)

The BIEA contributed to the informal training of Ugandans in archaeology and to the formal training and recognition of British Africanist scholars both in PhD and MA degrees. According to BIEA Annual Reports, Azania, and Nyame Akuma, the BIEA research projects in Uganda were done in collaboration with Ugandans who work at the Uganda museum as conservators and assistant conservators. These conservators and assistant conservators did not have an archaeology background, and their interaction and contribution to the archaeology of Uganda mainly remained as research collaborators and facilitators (Chapter 3). During this time, archaeology at Makerere continued only as a topic within history courses such as “Themes in African History before 1800” and “East African History Before 1800.” Though the image of archaeology within the university remained hidden, the BIEA continued involving Ugandans, mostly history graduates from MAK in its archaeological projects informally (Chapter 3).

1990s to 2012: Moving Away from Silence

In the beginning of the 1990s, Uganda gained its political stability but still with economic challenges (Musisi and Mwanga 2003). The British Institute in East Africa continued its project (Kamuhangire 1995) and David Kiyaga-Mulindwa returned from Botswana and became the only officially recognized, formally trained Ugandan archaeologist. According to the limited archival resources available in the History Department at MAK and interviews with current history faculty members of the department, since the mid-1990s the History Department had been working on and off to recover an archaeological component in the department by establishing the program
at an undergraduate level. Part of the reason for this interest were the constant requests from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts, and most likely these requests were initiated as the result of a push from governmental institutions such as the Ministry of Education. A brief interview with one of the former History Department chairs explains this by saying:

There was an attempt during the 1990s [to introduce archaeology]. It failed because we could not get staff. It was a serious attempt … and the university was willing to provide funding but we could not get staff. We had even hired somebody to draw the curriculum…. We recalled it as an important aspect of history. For example, that teaching history without archaeology was almost we were starting in the middle of the story. So then history without archaeology is not a complete program. That’s why we wanted to establish it. And also there was a need especially in our secondary schools. (Individual Interview, November 2010)

As correspondences between the History Department and Kiyaga-Mulindwa confirm, during this timeframe MAK consulted Kiyaga-Mulindwa to design an undergraduate archaeology program. In addition, the University had plans to hire Kiyaga-Mulindwa as a faculty member within the Department of History. However, this attempt failed for two reasons: first, in the mid-1990s due to lack of financial resources the university was unsuccessful in hiring Kiyaga-Mulindwa. The second incident was in the late 1990s; though the University managed to secure financial resources, Kiyaga-Mulindwa was unable to accept the offer due to his commitment to private archaeological projects carried out under World Bank development projects. In the beginning of the 2000s, Kiyaga-Mulindwa was recruited as a Professor of History at another Ugandan university, Kyambogo University. Until his death in 2007, he continued

---

A letter from Prof. and Head of History Department P.K. Tibenderana to the Dean, Faculty of Arts, Makerere University, March 29, 1996. A letter from Prof. Head Dept. Tibenderana to Dr. David Kiyaga-Mulindwa, RE: B.A. in Archaeology, Jan. 21, 1999.

Letter from Dr. Kiyaga-Mulindwa to the Council Secretary – Makerere University, June 25, 1996. History Department.
to recruit Ugandans interested in archaeology either in his archaeological projects or projects run by the BIEA. He, too, followed the legacy of Merrick Posnansky by involving college graduates in archaeological research and securing graduate training opportunities for some Ugandans, particularly through the African Archaeology Network in Tanzania at the University of Dar es Salaam.

Again, in the 1990s archaeological research was mainly undertaken by the BIEA along with other externally funded and directed projects. These initiatives continued to involve employees of the Department of Museums and Antiquities, and students of Makerere University and later Kyambogo University in the 2000s. This period replays and amplifies the role Ugandans have been playing in archaeological research projects administrated by Africanist archaeologists—serving ancillary, supportive positions in which Ugandans did not figure significantly in planning or decision-making (Chapter 3). Although such projects have created avenues for raising the awareness of Ugandans in archaeology, they have not integrated the contributions of Ugandans into project conceptualization or management, with the exception of one or two staff members at the museum (e.g., Kamuhangire 1995). Recently, Ephraim Kamuhangire (2011) published an article in the Ugandan newspaper New Vision in which he has reviewed the recent history and the state of archaeology in the country, summarizing the experience of Ugandans in archaeological and paleontological research projects carried out over the last 25 years. He observed that:

Another archaeological project also dating 25 years exists between the British Institute in Eastern Africa based in Nairobi and the Department of Museums and Monuments of Uganda. Therefore a lot of palaeontological and archaeological research has been conducted throughout Uganda for this long time. Books and papers in the two fields have been written and published. But
the publications are by the French, British and American directors of the research projects and their students. It is amazing that the staff and students from the Department of Museums and Monuments, [Makerere University] and Kyambogo University have participated in these research undertakings for all that time and yet none of them has been sponsored for a master’s or PhD degree out of them.

No clause was included in all the Memorandum of Understanding [sic] (MOUs) which were signed with the directors of the projects specifically aiming at training the Ugandan participants for academic qualifications. If the Ugandans had benefited from the MUOs between the French, Americans and British researchers, in the last 25 years, we would be having many Doctors of Palaeontology and Archaeology who would be Directors or Co-Directors of such research projects.

When I was a member of staff and later the Commissioner for Museums and Monuments, I pointed out this type of exploitation with the respective directors of the projects but my concern was overlooked. It seems that this oversight is still deliberate and it should be corrected forthwith.

Among many other points, the above testimony illustrates that the development of archaeology in Uganda will not be tangible and feasible until Ugandans are officially recognized and given the opportunity of formal archaeological education. It also highlights what role Africanist archaeologists and paleontologists need to play.

Currently, Uganda has three PhD holders (one of them is based in South Africa), and 9 MA holders (Table 3-1 and Table 3-3). None of them studied archaeology during their undergraduate studies. Because there has never been an archaeology program in the country, and most Ugandans joined archaeological projects after they earned their first degree in other disciplines—mainly from the Social Sciences and Arts. It is inevitable for such disparities to occur if a country does not have an institutional structure to produce its own national professionals. Then how did Uganda get its formally-trained and licensed archaeologists without having an archaeology program?

As discussed in Chapter 3, until the 2013–2014 academic year, Ugandans were familiarized with archaeology either informally or formally as a result of being employed in the museum or working in archaeological projects directed mostly by the BIEA. In the
late 1990s and up to mid-2000s, David Kiyaga-Mulindwa was also conducting cultural resources management projects while he was working on developing an archaeology program at Kyambogo University. His efforts ignited the fire to encourage a few Ugandans to earn their degrees in archaeology (Table 3-3). He also negotiated with Africanist archaeologists conducting research in the country to provide Ugandans opportunities for official training in archaeology. Because of his mentorship, the second generation of Ugandan archaeologists is determined to fulfill what he himself strove to achieve.

Most African archaeologists have obtained their MA and PhD degrees from universities in the developed countries: UK, USA, Canada, Sweden and Norway. But a more secured development of archaeology in some African countries has also led a few African universities to be major players in training Africans in archaeology both in undergraduate and graduate studies. The University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM) in Tanzania is a good example of such opportunities. UDSM has been the major archaeology training center for Ugandans and other neighboring countries since 2006 through funding obtained from the Swedish International Development Aid and Swedish Agency for Research and Economic Cooperation (SIDA-SAREC), operating through the African Archaeology Network Program based in Tanzania. Such opportunities have benefited Ugandans from a distance, but it also has brought major change to the development of archaeology at Makerere University—a change that recognizes the visibility of Ugandans’ contributions and also provides them official accreditation for their experience and educational achievements. This change of personnel capacity, in turn,
provided Makerere University the opportunity to establish its own archaeology program in the 2013-2014 academic year.

Indeed, the role of both Africanist and African archaeologists was central to the reintroduction of archaeology at MAK in the 2013-2014 academic year. This movement became visible in 2006 when Prof. Merrick Posnansky visited MAK as a short-term Fulbright scholar. Posnansky’s visit included the following tasks: 1) to help the department to design an archaeology syllabus, 2) to provide advice on how to re-start the programme, and 3) to work closely with some history staff members, thus impart basic skills for future running of the program (capacity building). According to interviews I conducted with historians in the History Department, two staff members from the department, who at that time had master’s degrees in History but no archaeological training backgrounds, were nominated as local representatives of archaeology in order to facilitate the process of reintroducing archaeology at MAK.

Posnansky was responsible for the initial stage of designing an archaeology curriculum. In the process of designing, he strongly recommended that any reintroduction of archaeology at MAK to “be incremental with growth being organic and based on local realities rather than imposing any outside master plan that might prove expensive or in appropriate” (Posnansky 2006:4). Though the meaning of “organic growth” is vague, Posnansky’s recommendation addresses two points: the importance of local relevance of archaeology and its sustainability at MAK. He advised MAK to offer an archaeology program both for students planning to attend “graduate training in archaeology and for those who wish to integrate archaeology within a training for

---

10 A Letter from the Department of History Makerere University to the Cultural Affairs Specialist, U.S Embassy Kampala, Feb. 16, 2007. History Department, Makerere University.
teaching at all levels; tourist promotion; media production; historical site and Park management; urban planning [and etc.];” (Posnansky 2006:4). For students interested in archaeology, the option was to finish a three-year degree or Honours in Archaeology within the History Department. The three-year training program was intended to offer 16 courses from archaeology, geology, geography, history, and other biological sciences (Table 4-1). The Honours program was designed for students to take at least 6 lecture courses (Table 4-2).

Unfortunately, Posnansky’s proposal was not implemented in the following four years, partly due to a lack of a qualified archaeologist in the History Department. This is not unique to MAK; for example, in the 1970s, archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam was undeveloped until Jonathan Karoma, a Tanzanian archaeologist, took the initiative to be an agent of archaeology in the History Department (Chapter 5). In the late 2000s, as a few Ugandans earned master’s degrees in archaeology from UDSM, the History Department was honored to hire Ugandan archaeologist as a full-time faculty member of the department. This resulted in the introduction of a new archaeology curriculum proposal in 2010 (Table 4-3). Prepared mostly by Ugandan archaeologists who graduated from the UDSM, this curriculum was revised in 2011 (Table 4-4).

Analysis of this curriculum will be provided in future publications. But, to point out briefly, a close examination of the proposed archaeology curriculum at MAK shows a strong affinity with the UDSM’s archaeology curriculum. Similarly, another Ugandan university, Kyambogo University, also proposed an archaeology curriculum by adopting UDSM’s curriculum. Adopting a curriculum from a neighboring country that has three
decades experience is a better start than borrowing from outside of the continent, mostly from Western countries’ universities. However, the proposed curricula at MAK and Kyambogo University not only replicate the UDSM’s curriculum but they also duplicate the problems that come with it. The UDSM archaeology curriculum itself needs close security to remove weeds that have grown over the years. Thus weeds include: not keeping the reading materials up to date, not incorporating and representing both African and Africanist archaeologists’ work beyond national level, not having a gender sensitive curriculum, and not designing more interactive course syllabi that incorporate and prioritize African perspectives, experiences, and challenges.

Summary
In this chapter, I have addressed the development of archaeology in Uganda and particularly at Makerere University. As the archival and interview data indicate, archaeology at Makerere University was more visible in the 1960s, not only at the national level but also at a continental level. This achievement was possible due to various reasons: the emergence of interest in African history; the well-developed History Department at MAK (Sicherman 2003), the recruitment of major pioneer Africanist archaeologists, especially Merrick Posnansky; the political independence of Uganda; and the establishment of the British Institute in Eastern Africa.

In the 1970s and 1980, the visibility of archaeology at Makerere University completely vanished as a result of political instability, which contributed to the lack of attention form an international archaeology community, including Africanist archaeologists, and the lack of local personnel in the country. As the political situation started to improve in the mid-1980s, archaeological research in the country reappeared under the leadership of Africanist archaeologists whose connection to MAK was very
peripheral. This disconnection coupled with the appendage status of Ugandans in these externally dominated research projects led Uganda without a well-established institutional structure and well-trained personnel, which both are vital to decolonizing and transforming archaeology.

Though the History Department at Makerere University made constant attempts to reintroduce an archaeology program, either due to financial limitation or lack of personnel, its attempts remained unsuccessful until the 2013-2014 academic year. Eventually, the successful establishment of an undergraduate archaeology program at Makerere University was possible as a result of training Ugandans at master’s and doctoral levels at the UDSM. Their training in archaeology occurred because of the commitment of Ugandan scholars, mainly Kiyaga-Mulindwa, to develop archaeology in the country by creating transnational training opportunities for Ugandans, particularly at the UDSM. The connection of MAK and Kyambogo University with the UDSM is vital for the development of a localized archaeology in the region; however, Ugandan universities, such as MAK and Kyambogo University, and Ugandan archaeologists need to invest extra effort to (re)design archaeology curricula relevant to the Ugandan settings and experiences, and not to replicate the problems occurring at the UDSM.
Table 4-1. B.A. Degree courses proposed by Posnansky in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>First Semester Courses</th>
<th>Second Semester Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>Introduction to World Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French Elementary</td>
<td>Electives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology Laboratory</td>
<td>Field training in archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>The environment, hominid development and the growth of agricultural systems</td>
<td>Survey of African Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate French</td>
<td>Electives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer for archaeologists</td>
<td>Field training in archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Uganda Archaeology</td>
<td>Public Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced French</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2. Honor courses proposed by Posnansky in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to World Archaeology*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>The Environment, hominid development and the growth of agricultural Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey of African Archaeology*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>Uganda Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Courses</td>
<td>Ethno-archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical and Diasporan Archaeology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-3. Distribution of archaeology and heritage courses proposed in 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Core Courses</th>
<th>Elective Courses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology and Heritage Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Anthropology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code [2010]</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>AHS [100] 1100</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [101] 1101</td>
<td>Old World Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [102] 1202</td>
<td>Principles and practices in Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [103] 1203</td>
<td>New World Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [110] 1310</td>
<td>Field Training in Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>AHS [200] 2100</td>
<td>Archaeological Theory and Methods up to 1950s</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [201] 2101</td>
<td>Anthropological Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [202] 2102</td>
<td>African Civilizations</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [203] 2103</td>
<td>Lithic Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [204] 2104</td>
<td>Ceramic Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [205] 2105</td>
<td>Primatology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [206] 2206</td>
<td>Human Evolution</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AHS [207] 2207</td>
<td>Advanced Theories and Approaches in Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code [2010] 2011</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [220] 2220</td>
<td>Field Attachment</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [208] 2208</td>
<td>Metal Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [209] 2209</td>
<td>Human Adaptations, Variations and Growth</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [210] 2210</td>
<td>Fauna Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV 2213</td>
<td>Principles of Geographical Information System (GIS)</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [300] 3100</td>
<td>Heritage and Cultural Resource Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [301] 3101</td>
<td>Research Methods in Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [302] 3102</td>
<td>Human Osteology and Osteometry</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 3101</td>
<td>The History of Uganda</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [303]3103</td>
<td>Architectural Studies in Archaeology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [304] 3104</td>
<td>People and Cultures of Africa</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [305] 3205</td>
<td>Archaeological Methodology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [306] 3206</td>
<td>Heritage Conservation and museum Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [307] 3207</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage and Development</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [308] 3208</td>
<td>Basics in Archaeology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRM 3206</td>
<td>Stratigraphy</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHS [320] 3220</td>
<td>Independent Project in Archaeology</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
ARCHAEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF DAR ES SALAAM

In this chapter I explore the historical and contemporary context of the institutionalization of archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM). I focus on how archaeology developed into a full-fledged program at the UDSM, how this program became the backbone of archaeology related departments in other Tanzanian universities, and how the UDSM became among the top African universities that offer training in archaeology. LaViolette (2002, 2005), Mabulla and Magori (2005), Mapunda (2005), Mturi (2005), and Schmidt (1995b, 2005) have specifically shared the history of the archaeology program at the UDSM up to the early 2000s. Based on their long-term personal experiences as instructors, and/or former students, they have pointed out the placement and development of archaeology within the History Department. These studies have set the initial background of the development of archaeology at the UDSM. In this chapter, I incorporate these previous studies into an account based on new findings from unpublished documents, interviews, and my observations to address what changes have occurred in the institutionalization of archaeology at the UDSM over the last fifty years and how it was possible.

At the time I started this study, the archaeology program at the UDSM had already achieved a shared departmental status with history, as the Department of History and Archaeology, and as of November 2013 archaeology has been subsumed

---

1 The UDSM, located in Dar es Salaam city within the Dar es Salaam region, is the first university established in the country in 1961 as the University College of Tanganyika. In 1963, the University College of Tanganyika became the Dar es Salaam University College as a constituent part of the University of East Africa. In 1970, the Dar es Salaam University College became an independent national university, forming the UDSM (Mkude, Cooksey, and Levey 2003).

2 I came to Dar es Salaam on December 1, 2010; but due to a delay of finalizing the research permit process, I did not start the actual research until January 2011.
within the Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies. This achievement was a long process because within the Tanzanian higher education system, archaeology was first introduced in the 1960s at the Dar es Salam University College, now the UDSM. The UDSM is the oldest and biggest university in Tanzania. Consequently, most efforts to develop well-established archaeological research and teaching programs within the Tanzanian higher education system continue to take place at this University.

At the UDSM, archaeology became visible in the mid-1980s as a unit within the History Department, offering a Bachelor of Arts degree in archaeology. By the mid-1990s, still operating as a unit, the archaeology program started offering postgraduate studies at the MA level. By the 2000s, a PhD in archaeology and a BA in cultural heritage studies were also introduced. Over the years, the UDSM archaeology program’s progress is evident; for example, some of its own BA, MA, and PhD graduates have started practicing archaeology or teaching some archaeology and related courses in other Tanzanian universities as well as in neighboring countries such as Uganda. What is clear from this synopsis of the program’s progress is that the UDSM remains the main university at a national level that has a rationalized and fully developed archaeology program, and at a continental level, it is one of the top universities offering training in archaeology.

The stability of archaeology at the UDSM is an exemplary experience from which other African countries such as Uganda can learn the challenges and possibilities of developing an archaeology teaching program in an African university. For example, a number of archaeologists have argued for the need to establish well-founded archaeology programs in African universities and shared the steps and commitments
needed as well as challenges faced to institutionalize archaeology (e.g., Karoma 1977; Mapunda 2005; Schmidt 1995b, 2005; Wandibba 1990, 1994). However, a more crucial endeavor is to have an academic discourse on teaching and practicing archaeology in African universities. The Scholarship on teaching and practicing archaeology is needed to explore the decolonization and transformation of archaeology as a localized practice (Chapter 1), including the commitment of the discipline and its practitioners to national and community development. The commitment of archaeology and its practitioners to national and community development can benefit African people and encourage African universities to produce independent, collaborative and responsive scholars. In turn, this form of practice, based on the grassroots level, can increase the visibility of archaeology in the eyes of African publics and also enrich its methodological and theoretical foundations based on local, national, regional, continental and global relevancies.

African universities set their missions and visions with the intention to address national, regional, continental and global priorities. For example, the UDSM was established as a public university at the time Tanzania was a socialist country under the leadership of President Mwalimu Julius Nyerere. Nyerere recognized the importance of higher education to prepare civic-minded intellectuals who would acquire the ability to reflect critically and to act upon daily-life conditions in society, and who would develop the attitude to serve and not only to rule that society (Nkulu 2005:81). As a Chancellor of the University, he emphasized intellectual independence and linking learning with living, meaning to have relevance to the development of the society as well as to the rest of the world (Nyerere 1973). The University continues its vision and mission along these lines.
According to its website\(^3\), the vision of UDSM is “to become a reputable world-class university that is responsive to national, regional and global development needs through engagement in dynamic knowledge creation and application.” This vision is carried out through its mission, which encompasses “the unrelenting pursuit of scholarly and strategic research, education, training and public service directed at [the] attainment of equitable and sustainable socio-economic development of Tanzania and the rest of Africa.” Archaeology, as a discipline instrumental to studying African pasts, has operated at the UDSM for almost three decades. Clearly, archaeology has gained its institutional status within the University. Based on the University’s vision and mission, however, there is a need to ask some important questions. For example, is there a change in the teaching and the practice of archaeology at the UDSM? And what is the role of scholars of archaeology in decolonizing and transforming the discipline, particularly its pedagogy and its relationship with and contribution to the people of Tanzania? These questions, which seek to explore the commitment of archaeology and its practitioners to the national and community development, require an extensive inquiry into the historiography and ethnography of archaeology both at the national level and at the university level.

The embryo of archaeology at UDSM is just one form of the institutionalization of the discipline in the postcolonial period. This more recent phase partly owes its foundation to the institutionalization of archaeology in non-academic settings. As discussed in Chapter 2, in non-academic settings, archaeology-related institutions, the

---

\(^3\) [https://udsm.ac.tz/mission-vision-and-values](https://udsm.ac.tz/mission-vision-and-values), accessed on January 10, 2011.
King George V Memorial Museum and the Department of Antiquities, were created during the colonial period. In the postcolonial period, these institutions serve as major national entities that oversee the cultural heritage of the country. The same institutions also, in one form or another, guided the establishment of archaeology at the UDSM. In this chapter, I examine the development of archaeology at the UDSM in five sections that address the following themes: introducing the seed, struggle for a local foundation, local foundation granted, organic growth, and liberation path. I use these five sections in order to reveal the different forms of struggle practitioners of archaeology faced in these periods, to examine the different strategies and rationales used to introduce and expand the archaeology program, and to highlight the achievements.

Introducing the Seed (Raison d’être)

To discuss the introduction and institutionalization of archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam, it is crucial first to provide a brief history of the University itself. The first higher education institution was established as a college of the University of London in 1961, known as the University College of Tanganyika. Two years later, it became the Dar es Salaam University College as a constitute college of the University of East Africa (Mkude, Cooksey, and Levey 2003). At that time, based on the limited archival resources, as Mturi (2005) has pointed out, the earliest relationship between the University College and government heritage institutions was possible through creating an association with the National Museum of Tanzania. Though Mturi (2005: 5-6) is uncertain about the nature of the linkage between these institutions and the role of

---

4 In the independence period, the King George V Memorial Museum was renamed the National Museum of Tanzania.

5 The University College of Tanganyika first started with the Faculty of Law (Mkude, Cooksey, and Levey 2003)
the Curator as a member of the Academic staff of the University, he suggested that probably the Curator was “occasionally requested to give lectures in the History Department” (Mturi 2005:6). Then he attested to this type of linkage as a legacy of European colonization; thus, it was common at that time for African universities to have a curator as a member of an academic staff.

Indeed, this type of linkage was common to African universities, but contrary to Mturi’s suggestion, the purpose of the linkage or the role of the Curator was not associated with the History Department. The History Department was opened two years after the linkage was formed. Moreover, according to the National Museum’s annual report for the year of 1962/1963, it was proposed that the Museum be closely associated with the College but not actually as a department of it (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972: 176). This specific proposal was made, during the meeting of the museum’s Board of Trustees on the 19th of February 1962, based on the museum’s needs to improve its functions of collection, preservation and study of material and the dissemination of knowledge to the public (Meyer-Heiselberg 1972). The Council of the University College agreed with the proposal. In this agreement it was decided to include representatives of the University College from the Office of the Principal of the College, from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and African Studies, and from the College’s Library. Furthermore, the Curator of the Museum became a member of the academic staff of the College and the Museum’s library was integrated into the College’s library. It seems, however, though the Curator of the Museum, Stanley E.

---

6 Mturi (2005:5) documented the linkage between the two institutions established in 1961; however according to the National Museum’s annual report, it did not take place until 1962. The History Department was opened in 1964.
West, was an archaeologist, this linkage aimed at the need to improve the museum
than to introduce archaeology as a research or a teaching program at the University.

The history of the idea of establishing archaeology at the UDSM has been written
from two sides. Based on a letter written to the Ministry of Manpower by the Ministry of
National Culture and Youth (MNCY) in 1978, Mapunda (2005:10) briefly situated the
genesis of the idea of establishing an archaeology teaching program at the UDSM
within the then MNCY, then the parent ministry for the Department of Antiquities.
Similarly, Mabulla and Magori (2005:26) adopted Mapunda's narrative. However, as
Mturi (2005:5) pointed out, the idea of establishing an archaeology teaching program at
the UDSM is a rather complex issue. It cannot be considered as the effort of only the
MNCY nor can it be comprehended by focusing on the effort of that institution as Mturi
(2005) did. It requires a multifaceted narrative that encompasses all the people and the
institutions involved.

On the contrary, the initiative to introduce archaeology courses started within the
UDSM in 1966, not within the MNCY in 1978. At the then University College of Dar es
Salaam, archaeology was first introduced within the History Department (Karoma 1977,
1990). Like most African countries that gained their independence in the 1960s,
Tanzania was interested in writing its own history. The History Department was
established in 1964 (Kimambo 1993) to serve both the expectation of the newly
established government and its academic responsibilities (Karoma 1990:8). To fulfill the
national human resource needs in immediately desired fields of study such as
education, the History Department was given the task of training students to become
teachers of history in precollege educational settings. Academically, the department
focused on reconstructing Africa’s past, and, therefore, fulfilling the interests of the newly independent country, which includes – as Karoma (1990:8) stated – focusing on writing and teaching pre-colonial history and tracing roots that foster authentic national consciousness and the recovery of the African initiative during the pre-colonial and the colonial periods (Karoma 1990:8, Schmidt 1995b, 1991). Archaeology was included to serve these purposes (Karoma 1977), particularly to produce counter colonial historiography knowledge that meets the need of the new nation (Kimambo 1993).

The first representation of archaeology at the Dar es Salaam University College started in 1966. In addition to the national interest in African history and the History Department’s research orientation, the introduction of archaeology at the University was linked to the connection between the University of East Africa and the BIEA and Merrick Posnansky’s determination (Chapter 4). According to Bridges and Posnansky (2004:481) and Smith (2009:179-80), the development of archaeology at the Makerere University College also led to lectures in “African Prehistory” in East African universities, including at the Dar es Salaam University College. This account is evident particularly in relation to the recruitment of the first archaeologist at the University in 1966.

The Dar es Salaam University College recruited its first archaeologist, John Sutton, who earned his PhD from Makerere, to the History Department “to teach courses on early Tanzanian history and to propagate the importance of the country’s antiquities among prospective history teachers” (quoted in Karoma 1990:8). This was in line with fulfilling the country’s needs of producing human resources in the fields of education, health and administration. During his seven years of employment in the History Department, according to Karoma (1990), Sutton put some efforts into
introducing archaeology as a course. He prepared an optional archaeology course\textsuperscript{7} and taught it for a year or two to some students in the department. But this course failed to sustain its existence and attracted only one student\textsuperscript{8}, Jonathan Karoma who was appointed as a tutorial assistant in March 1971\textsuperscript{9}. Karoma (1990) has suggested that the failure could be due to a philosophical shift in the department as a result of the political orientation of the country given its socialist orientation. So historians shifted their focus from nationalist to what variously referred to as “Marxist,” “Socialist,” “Materialist” and “Progressive” ways of interpreting history (Karoma 1990:10; Schmidt 1991, 1995b). Karoma (1990) pointed out that this ideological shift reoriented the focus of the History Department at the University from reconstructing pre-colonial history to writing modern-period African history. It also weakened and marginalized the earlier interest in archaeology, oral traditions, and linguistics as methods of writing history. Such a shift was evidently exercised by excising the optional archaeology course from the University’s prospectus from 1976 to 1985\textsuperscript{10}.

\textsuperscript{7} The evidence of the course Sutton introduced appeared in the University’s academic prospectus under the History Department’s curriculum until the mid-1970s though Sutton left in 1973. For example, the UDSM prospects for 1970-1971-1972 listed an archaeology course (course Code H.7 for archaeology and oral tradition) under the first year history syllabus; the objective of this optional course was to offer the basic methodological knowledge required in using both archaeology and oral traditions for the reconstruction of African history (UDSM 1970-1972:95). Similarly, the UDSM prospectus for the Academic Year 1975-1976 listed an optional archaeology course under the code HI 300 (UDSM 1975-1976).

\textsuperscript{8} Though failure of the discipline could be related to ideological shift, a more feasible reason for the lack of students opting for archaeology was related to the mysterious nature of the discipline. The low number of students in archaeology has been a regional problem than a national one (Chapter 3).

\textsuperscript{9} In the same year, Karoma went to study postgraduate studies in archaeology at Berkeley in the United States of America.

\textsuperscript{10} In 1985 with the establishment of the Archaeology Unit, new archaeology courses were listed in the University’s Prospectus for the 1985-1986 academic year (UDSM 1985-1986).
In addition to Sutton’s initiative, a more organized effort on the need to improve archaeological research program in the country occurred in 1969 when a working party was formed between the University College, the National Museum, and the Antiquities Department (Mturi 2005:6). During this time, the working party advised the responsible institution to establish an Institute of Archaeology and Paleontology. The then responsible institution, the Ministry of Education, rejected the idea of establishing an institute that was planned to connect these three institutions on the grounds that the Dar es Salaam University College was not a national institution.

On July 1, 1970 the Dar es Salaam University College became an independent national university to represent what is now the UDSM (Mkude, Cooksey, and Levey 2003). After nationalization of the University, in the early 1970s, according to Karoma (1977:2), there were two avenues that opened up discussion on the state of archaeology in the country. The first occurred in 1972 when Sutton presented a paper in the History Department at the UDSM. Looking at the nature of research, availability of resources, and facilities, Sutton (1972) identified the “lack of a coordinated and clear-sighted archaeological policy” as the main reason for the underdevelopment of archaeology in the country (Karoma 1977:2). Consequently, he suggested improvement on the existing policy and the need of staff training in archaeology. Three agendas emerged during this period, the need to govern archaeology and its activity at a national level, the need to improve archaeological research, and the need to train Tanzanians in archaeology.
The second avenue was the meeting that was held at the National Museum of Tanzania in January 1973\textsuperscript{11}. The purpose of this meeting was also “to review the state of archaeology in the country and to recommend guidelines for its improvement and development” (Karoma 1977:3; Mturi 1978c, 2005). Representatives from the Department of Antiquities, the National Museum, the History Department of the UDSM, the Historical Association of Tanzania, and other disciplines such as Zoology and Geography attended, and discussed three themes: research, facilities, and archaeology and the public. In this meeting, as Karoma (1977) narrates, at least two voices were presented: one was Sutton’s position perhaps as a representative from the History Department and the second was views from the representatives of the Antiquities Department and the National Museum.

Sutton presented two papers, the previous year seminar paper and also a four page blurb that focused on the state of archaeology at the UDSM (Sutton 1973a, 1973b, cited in Karoma 1977:2). Sutton (1973a) first identified the limited involvement of Antiquities staff and participants from the UDSM in foreign-led archaeological research projects, and then suggested potential training opportunities for local scholars through participation in these projects.

A rather frequent pattern is for expeditions and individual researchers, sometimes based in Nairobi but often from universities in America, Japan, Germany, or some other land, to enter Tanzania for some specified archaeological survey or excavation. They normally spend a short time in Dar es Salaam assembling equipment and getting their papers in order, and then set off to the relevant site or district up-country. They may be visited briefly in the field by the Antiquities staff or even by a small group from the University, thus providing some limited opportunity for

\textsuperscript{11} According to Karoma (1977:2), this meeting was basically Sutton’s brainchild.
enlightenment and views.... The real opportunities for local experience and expansion are wasted\(^{12}\) (Sutton 1973a, quoted in Karoma 1977:6).

Consequently, instead of brief attendances of Antiquities staff or volunteer participants from the University, he suggested a full participation approach that could allow archaeology to grow locally.

It should be clear from the above that the way to rectify this situation is not to restrict such foreign archaeologists. More important – and essential if we want the seed to germinate locally – is to encourage dialogue and insist on fuller participation (Sutton 1973a, quoted in Karoma 1977:6).

To put Sutton’s statement in context, during this time the government of Tanzania was strict on providing research permits to foreign scholars (Peter Schmidt, Personal Communication, 2013). Thus, it seems Sutton’s suggestion was also directed to address that restriction. Furthermore, Sutton argued that the idea of having a full-fledged archaeology department with laboratory facilities, office facilities, and technical staff was not a strong option. His reason for his argument was: the National Museum and the Antiquities Department could provide necessary research facilities, and if training in archaeology at undergraduate and graduate levels was needed, then Sutton suggested it had to be taken in other countries\(^{13}\).

\(^{12}\) This arrangement is still the same with the exception of a few collaborative projects that incorporate Tanzanian archaeologists.

\(^{13}\) Sutton’s (1972, 1973a) arguments, as Karoma (1977) and Schmidt (1995:131) pointed out, might seem to further support the subordinate status of archaeology at the University. However, this needs to be put into context. In the mid to the late 1960s, the number of Africanist archeologists that could have been hired was not large. Moreover, Sutton perhaps did not see the need to open a full-fledged department, having had first-hand experience in the History Department. Furthermore, Sutton had already first-hand experience at Makerere where archaeology was not situated in its own full-fledged department; thus to see archaeology as part of history was the norm for the time, except in few countries, for example, in Ethiopia and Nigeria). In addition, in the 1960s the Antiquities Department was a more active research institution compared to the late 1970s and afterwards when Karoma and Schmidt criticized Sutton’s arguments (for a different view see Schmidt 1995b:131).
The second paper, Sutton’s (1973b), reported on the meeting of archaeologists, including suggestions and recommendations on archaeological research, publication, research facilities, license and research clearance, staff and staff training, teaching and general dissemination of archaeological information (Karoma 1977:12). It was suggested on expanding existing research themes (Stone Age and Iron Age) based on interdisciplinary collaborative research, and institutional interaction of the three institutions (the Antiquities Department, the National Museum, and the UDSM). In terms of research facilities, it was suggested that investment be made in the two existing institutions, the Antiquities Department and the National Museum, rather than starting at the university. Instead, the University was expected to assist in strengthening these two institutions. This meeting also strongly emphasized the need for archaeology professionals with university degrees to work in these institutions as well as to hold positions in the projected regional and zonal museums. On the other hand, both the Antiquities Department and the National Museum advised the university to have enough archaeologists equipped to teach courses.

After the 1973 workshop, according to Mturi (2005:7), the Antiquities Division took the responsibility to push the University to establish archaeological teaching and research programs. Amini A. Mturi, then serving as Conservator of the Antiquities Division, made a couple of follow ups on the proposal to establish archaeology at the UDSM. For example, according to a letter he sent to the then Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences on April 2, 1978\textsuperscript{14} titled “the teaching of archaeology,” he

\textsuperscript{14} Letter from the Ministry of National Culture and Youth, Antiquities Division to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the University of Dar es Salaam, April 21, 1978. A copy of the letter was also sent to the Chief Academic Officer, the Head of History Department, and Principal Secretary of Ministry of Education.
mentioned that he previously sent two letters to the Faculty on 31st May 1972 and 13th October 1976. However, there was no reply from the University or the History Department until the Chief Academic Officer replied on October 29th, 1977\(^{15}\). This reply was written after Jonathan Karoma presented a paper on August 1977. Two questions can be raised about this narrative. The first is: if the Antiquities Division genuinely took up the responsibility to emphasize the need to establish an archaeology program at the UDSM, as Mturi highlighted, or if its parent Ministry were responsible for the genesis of the idea of establishing archaeology at the UDSM, as Mapunda (2005) claimed, why did the Antiquities Division write only two follow up letters in three years? The second question is why the University took five years to send a reply to the two letters from the Division between 1972 and 1976?

As demonstrated above, the idea of establishing archaeology at UDSM started within UDSM mostly through the influence of the development of archaeology in Uganda (Chapter 4). However, the answer to why the Antiquities Division did not make frequent follow ups seems to be related to the number of archaeologists available locally. The only person who was responsible within the MNCY was Amini A. Mturi. Thus, one archaeologist could only do so much alone with all the research and administrative responsibilities he had at a national level without any support from the Africanist archaeologists who were working in Tanzania. Similarly, the University delayed its response because there was no archaeologist who was actively appointed at the UDSM; John Sutton left in 1973 and Jonathan Karoma was on leave in the United States for his postgraduate studies.

\(^{15}\) I couldn’t find this letter in the archive.
This period shows the reasons for introducing archaeology as a course within the History Department, the people and institutions that participated in the process, and the failure to archaeology as a discipline. Karoma (1990) and Schmidt (1995b) provided structural reasons for the underdevelopment of archaeology at the UDSM, and in the country, between the mid-1960s and early 1970s. Karoma (1990) contends that archaeology was undeveloped because the History Department shifted its research interest from focusing on precolonial history to modern history — a shift related to change in national ideologies. Schmidt also provided three structural reasons: the dominance of the Leakeys, Sutton’s ambivalence and diffusionist perspectives, and “the nationalist assumption that archaeology was a handmaiden to African history” (Schmidt 1995b:131-132).

While these explanations have relevance to the underdevelopment of archaeology at the UDSM and in the country at large, there were also other reasons — including the lack of collaboration from the relevant national institutions and difference in archaeologists’ commitment and status. The Ministry of Education rejected the idea of establishing an archaeology program in 1969 not on the view that archaeology as a handmaiden to African history but rather because the Dar es Salaam University was not a national institution. Similarly, as Schmidt (1995b) noted, the lack of commitment from the Leakeys immensely contributed to the underdevelopment of archaeology in the country. However, Sutton made attempts for seven years to develop archaeology at the UDSM.

The main reason for the underdevelopment of archaeology at the UDSM in the early 1970s was lack of a well-established archaeologist who could represent
archaeology in the History Department. For that reason, the Department of Antiquities took the responsibilities in the early 1970s to promote archaeology at the UDSM. The return of Karoma to the History Department in the mid and late 1970s, as will be discussed below, did not result in immediate achievement. This was mainly related to Karoma’s status as a PhD student. In the academics politics where status is influential, a PhD student could neither survive the opposition from the historians nor could acquire resources needed to establish a department of archaeology. This needed a well-established archaeologist with a professional recognition and connections. Consequently, the development of archaeology at the UDSM or in the country required commitment from both national institutions and well-established archaeologists with visionary leadership.

The Struggle for a Local Foundation

In the late 1970s, as Mturi (2005) identified, the University of Dar es Salaam and the Department of Antiquities within the then Ministry of National Culture and Youth, were among the major players in the institutionalization of archaeology within the University. Though the roles of these and other institutions are undeniable, the interest of these two institutions in archaeology had much to do with the untiring commitments of the two pioneer Tanzanian archaeologists, Amini A. Mturi and N. J. Karoma, who devoted their time and energy to the development of an archaeology teaching program at the University. Starting in the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s, Karoma was the only archaeologist at the University (Karoma 1977, 1990; Schmidt 1995b). By the time he returned from the United States perhaps in 1975 to conduct research for his postgraduate studies, archaeology was viewed in the History Department at the UDSM,
to use Karoma’s words, as “irrelevant and anachronistic.” He expressed what he encountered as follows:

I joined the staff of the History Department in March 1971 and then went to study archaeology at Berkeley under Prof. J.D. Clark and the late Glynn Isaac in September that year. I had been recruited into the department at the time when the philosophical shift [from nationalist to socialist, Marxist – left wing interpretation of history] ... was beginning to take effect. When I returned to the department almost 3 and a half years later the left flank had taken over the leadership of the department and within the new intellectual milieu the pursuit of archaeology was being viewed both as irrelevant and anachronistic. The departmental head, who was also dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences took me aside and tried to persuade me to abandon archaeology and change to another specialization which would fit into what he called “progressive history” which was then being pursued in the department. I refused to change my specialization but at a price. The department and faculty would not support my requests for funds and facilities to conduct fieldwork for my doctoral dissertation. It was not until after the purge of the leftist flank in the University (during which my dean and head lost his job) later in the 1970s that I revived the discussion of the training of archaeologists in a seminar paper which I presented for discussion in the Department of History (Karoma 1990:12).

Situated within such disciplinary priorities and departmental politics that subjugated archaeology as a handmaiden to history and discouraged its practitioners from practicing archaeology, Karoma had to wait for a favorable time to deliver his views on the establishment of archaeology at the University and the need for training Tanzanians in archaeology. Though the MNCY through its department of antiquities made several appeals to the University, as highlighted earlier, according to the letter Mturi wrote on April 21st, 1978, there was no reply either from the University or the History Department. The next discussion on the question of reintroducing archaeology at the University occurred in August 1977 when J. N. Karoma presented a seminar

---

16 In addition, Karoma had to wait for six years probably because he had to gain in-depth archaeological training and knowledge before he could take such leadership commitment.
paper, “Towards an organic growth of archaeology in Tanzania,” in the History Department (Karoma 1977, 1979:8). The purpose of this paper was to comment on Sutton’s (1972, 1973a, and 1973b) argument on the cause for the underdevelopment of archaeological research and teaching in the country, to provide alternative solutions, and to inquire into the reaction of the History Department and the University’s authorities regarding the 1973 meeting.

Believing that part of the History Department’s hesitation towards archaeology emanated from Sutton’s position, Karoma (1977) critiqued Sutton’s (1972, 1973a and 1973b) position by asking: can Sutton’s suggestions lead to an organic growth of archaeology in the country? Confronting Sutton’s suggestion of “fuller participation” as a way to organic development, Karoma (1977:6-7) argued the interaction between foreign and local scholars did not lead to organic growth, rather it encouraged forever dependency and led to further stagnation of the discipline in the country. He provided a number of reasons to support his argument: foreign researchers’ work schedule was inconsistent and their allocated timeframe did not match with the UDSM’s academic calendar. In addition, foreign scholars had limited finances to retain university students and museum staff, and they usually preferred affordable local labor or permanent assistants as well as took their equipment with them.

For Karoma, such an arrangement could not have led to an organic development. Because for archaeology to grow organically, students had to be exposed to a broader aspect of archaeology as a discipline not as a set of historical techniques that had deprived them from acquiring theoretical and methodological knowledge to challenge and criticize archaeological knowledge meaningfully. In addition, Karoma
refuted the suggestion of sending students to foreign universities by arguing that foreign-trained students would be unable to practice their profession properly without local facilities. The pooling of resources from existing national institutions and neighboring countries was viewed as an unpractical suggestion because the National Museum and the Antiquities Department had insufficient collections and facilities. Thus, Karoma argued for strengthening national institutions as a more practical move than relying on a neighboring country, Kenya.

Identifying the archaeological resources and problems in the country, Karoma (1977) mainly argued that Tanzania is endowed with archaeological remains of the remote and recent past and archaeology has a role to reconstruct the remote history of modern Tanzania. Then he highlighted how the country suffered from not having well-coordinated and systematic archaeological research due to the lack of professionals, research facilities, and policies. As a result, Karoma (1977:5) argued that archaeology in Tanzania “failed to grow organically, i.e. to establish a local base from which it can be pursued as an academic discipline which addresses itself to problems of human concern.” Though Karoma was vague about what specifically he meant by problems of human concern, his argument was for archaeology to grow organically, Tanzania had to have its own archaeological research and teaching facilities, and the UDSM should have a crucial role in the organic development of archaeology instead of the National Museum or the Department of Antiquities (Karoma 1977: 7-8). Of course, as demonstrated in this research the commitments of all institutions are central; however, he reasoned that the latter two institutions could not be identified as research or teaching institutions though previously they conducted research and gave lectures. The
role of the National Museum is material collection and exhibition. The Antiquities Department is concerned with issuing research permits and with the preservation of sites and monuments. Consequently, for these reasons and due to the multidisciplinary nature of archaeology, the University was viewed as a more appropriate and an ideal institution to have archaeology as an academic discipline. Karoma viewed the lack of commitment to teaching archaeology at the University as a result of the placement of the discipline as a subsidiary to history. This form of representation of archaeology at the university also contributed to the lack of well-developed archaeological research facilities in the country, including staff.

In addition to the multidisciplinary nature of archaeology and the capability of the University as a research and teaching institution, Karoma (1977:15-17) listed the rationale for embracing archaeology at a national level. The main arguments of the rationale are: archaeology, as a scientific discipline, provides an understanding of human origins; it can reconstruct 99.9% of human history in the country; and it supplements information to other disciplines. Moreover, archaeological sites can be used as sources of tourist attraction. But, a more pressing argument Karoma presented was that specialists of archaeology related fields were highly needed. Then he stressed all these needs were impossible to be met by one archaeologist – thus, the need for an Institute of Archaeology. We can see here that somehow he reinforced the idea that was recommended by the working party in 1969. Of course, he did not anticipate a quick development of an institute; instead, he suggested starting a modest research and training facility that eventually could be expanded into a department.
Karoma’s proposal, however, had to face the two dominant ideologies within the History Department that placed archaeology on the periphery. Karoma (1990) and Schmidt (1991 and 1995b) identified these ideologies as the nationalist and the radical school of historians. Situated within these disciplinary ideologies, Karoma (1990) narrated how his proposal was vehemently opposed in the History Department:

One speaker said what I was about [to] produce was not “revolutionary history.” He then walked out of the meeting in apparent disgust. Another speaker opined that the requirement for equipment would ensconce the University into imperialism. A few days after the meeting the new head of the history department produced a toned down version of the position of the department. Rejecting my proposals, he argued that the history department was established to meet the country’s manpower requirements for teachers of history and was not in a position to train professionals other than history teachers (Karoma 1990:15).

According to Schmidt (1995b:132), Karoma was further challenged by a Marxist historian who demanded: “Will archaeology feed the people?” Schmidt (1991) argued that these interrogations were based on the view that archaeology requires a lot of resources, and the perception of archaeology by historians who view archaeology as “a collection of fact” without relevance to build a socialist history (Schmidt 1995b:132). The historians might had a different perception of archaeology and they might not have had an answer if an archaeologist asked them a question “Will history feed the people?” as Schmidt (1995b) pointed out. But an important note to make here is that the question raised by the historian whether archaeology would feed the people of Tanzania or not was a valid question. The views of historians about archaeology as “irrelevant and anachronistic,” not “progressive history,” and not “revolutionary history” are also equally acceptable. In fact, these questions, comments and critiques of the institutionalization of archaeology at the UDSM raised by historians should have been raised by archaeologists themselves. Had archaeologists considered the historians’ reactions and
views in the debate over institutionalizing archaeology, archaeology might have been challenged for its local relevance. The points raised by historians were more powerful to facilitate the problematization of archaeology at both national and local levels than the rationales used by Karoma (1977) and the appropriate Ministry to push the agenda of introducing archaeology at the UDSM (e.g., see Karoma 1979; Mturi 1978c).

The second major government institution that contributed to the institutionalization of archaeology at the University was the then Ministry of National Culture and Youth. In April 1978, on behalf of the Principal Secretary of the Ministry, the directorate of Antiquities under the leadership of Amini A. Mturi revived the discussion about the teaching of archaeology and the communication between the directorate and the UDSM (Karoma 1979:3). Aware of the History Department’s position, and based on his previous experiences, on April 21st 1978 Mturi wrote a follow-up letter to the letters he sent in the early and mid-1970s and to the proposals delivered by Karoma (1977). This four-page letter was addressed to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and copies were sent to the Chief Academic Officer, the Head of the History Department, and the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of Education. Mturi made a deliberate decision; instead of arguing about “the pro[s] and cons of the necessity of teaching archaeology” at the University or “the need to establish a course on Prehistory,” he emphasized the national needs of teaching archaeology at the UDSM. The same as Karoma (1977), Mturi highlighted that archaeology had to be considered seriously in order to understand human origins and history, which he identified as a crucial knowledge in the emergence of present-day heritage in Tanzania. Then he pointed out that since Tanzania has played a significant role in the theme of human
origins, cultural and scientific developments, it must prepare its citizens in “the advancement of this discipline.” The argument was not how archaeology could be useful and relevant for Tanzanians and Tanzania, rather what Tanzania had to contribute for the advancement of archaeology. Clearly this argument was heavily influenced by the archaeological and paleontological findings in the country, particularly from Olduvai Gorge. Unlike the historians at the UDSM, these major findings also pressed Tanzanian archaeologists to be concerned more with institutionalizing archaeology and exerting greater degree of control over the archaeological research projects carried out in the country than critiquing the discipline itself and its relevance in national and local developments.

Based on the national "manpower needs" argument, on behalf of the Ministry of National Culture and Youth, Mturi recommended that the UDSM take an initiative to provide an optional course in archaeology and a course in prehistory. The optional course was suggested to be taken by undergraduates who would be teachers and those who would eventually work in archaeology-related careers. The same course was expected to produce “undergraduates with a broad understanding of archaeology as a discipline and its practical implications” but not necessarily become “full-fledged experts.” Since the Ministry of National Culture and Youth was in need of at least 40 undergraduates to hold positions in the department’s headquarters, zonal offices, and national and regional museums, these undergraduate students were expected to be employed by the ministry in the Antiquities Department and in the planned museums.

---

17 Letter from the Ministry of National Culture and Youth, Antiquities Division to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, the University of Dar es Salaam, April 21, 1978. A copy of the letter was also sent to the Chief Academic Officer, the Head of History Department, and Principal Secretary of Ministry of Education.
Thus, the purpose of their training was first to acquire a general background of the discipline and then to be employed in the ministry where they could further gain training by getting involved in “the department’s research projects or by being attached to research teams working in the country.” The teachers were needed because of the two problems identified by the Antiquities Department.

There are no people at district and regional level who can assist in the identification of archaeological objects when discovered by various people in the field such as farmers, contractors etc. Such discoveries are either unreported or they have to wait for people from the headquarters and in the process many sites are destroyed. The second aspect is the undertaking of simple survey to identify sites and the undertaking of minor rescue excavations. Secondary school teachers who take an option in Archaeology can go a long way to assist in the resolution of such problems under the guidance of specialist staff in the headquarters and zonal offices (Letter from the Ministry, April 21, 1978).

In addition, the teachers were needed because the Ministry of National Education changed the syllabus for the secondary schools by including topics that deal with ancient history. Changes of the history syllabus, Mturi asserted in the same letter, were only “meant to accommodate the discoveries made in Tanzania relating to prehistory.”

After few months while still awaiting a response from the University (Karoma 1990), in August 1978, the Department of Antiquities under the leadership of Mturi made a major review of archaeological research in the country, and this review was presented in a paper that focused on a zonal approach, research inputs, conservation and development (Mturi 1978c, 2005:7). G. Tibakweitira, the Ministry’s Principal Secretary, also sent a summary of this review to the then Ministry of Manpower Development. Mturi reviewed the state of archaeological research in the country and

---

18 Letter from G. Tibakweitira, the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of National Culture and Youth, to the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of Manpower and Development. Title: “Training of Research and Conservation Personnel”. Sent on August 24th, 1978. Copies were sent to the Chief Academic Officer of
raised three points: the uneven archaeological research locations and themes, the
domination of archaeological research by foreign scholars and institutions, and the lack
of substantial contributions from the three local institutions – the Department of
Antiquities, the National Museum and the UDSM.

Similarly, in addition to the points Mturi raised, Tibakweitira highlighted the challenges that the national heritage institutions had to resolve, including the lack of qualified personnel, the incapability of the national institutions to follow up or expand the archaeological research projects that were run by Western scholars on a seasonal basis, the lack of access to the publications produced by Western scholars, and the need to train experts in archaeology and related fields. All these challenges were already raised in the early 1970s (Sutton 1972, 1973, cf. Karoma 1977); however, this time, the Ministry strongly focused on these challenges.

Mturi (1978c) further criticized the impact of archaeological research at a national level. He particularly argued that the role of archaeological knowledge in the national education system was very limited.

The dissemination of research results has little impact on our educational system since most publications are either in specialized journals or monographs published abroad and are not easily available in the country. Another reason for limited impact is the participation of Tanzanian experts in these research efforts and the absence of a strong archaeological research and teaching input at the University of Dar es Salaam (Mturi 1978c).

Thus, the proposed zonal approach entailed “the need to develop a more integrated and coordinated archaeological research programme in the country” (Mturi 1978c). The first step suggested to achieve archaeological research directed by a
collaborative and multidisciplinary approach was to have local contributions, including funding and personnel. However, the Department of Antiquities and its parent Ministry proposed that in order to attain collaborative and multidisciplinary archaeological research outcomes at a national level, Tanzania had to have clearly defined archaeological research zones. Archaeologically, this means the country needed to be divided into seven zones – the northern, the lake, the northeastern, the coastal, the southern highlands, the southern and the western zones (Mturi 1978c).

The zonal approach was suggested so as to establish a comprehensive national inventory of archaeological resources, to establish cultural and chronological parameters of a given period and designated zone, as well as to study settlement patterns, resource use, and human interaction with and adaptation to different environments. It was also envisioned that under this approach Tanzania would have zonal centers capable of undertaking and coordinating research activities and with qualified personnel, equipment, research collections and funding resources. Zonal centers were also envisioned to preserve sites and monuments within their proximity and to have educational service programs that contribute to public education both within formal and informal settings.

In this zonal approach, what was archaeologically known in each zone was presented. Heritage was understood and defined through the lenses of Western archaeological praxis and its achievements, mostly the discovered hominids, Stone Age and Iron Age implements. Again, here we see an example of how Tanzanian institutions and professions were overshadowed by archaeological discoveries and forced to welcome archaeology without problematizing it and critiquing its colonial legacy entirely.
Tanzanian archaeologists based at the University, the Department of Antiquities, and the National Museum accepted the foundation of Western archaeological practices with few criticisms.

The acceptance of archaeology with minor reflections and criticisms of its relevance in African settings does not apply only to Tanzanians, as I shared in my first experience in archaeology (Chapter 1). It seems to be a logical step to take especially when the discipline of archaeology is presented to young Africans only for its strengths. Even then, it was not completely unchallenged. The few criticisms raised by Tanzanians were still instrumental and focused on the involvement of Tanzanian citizens and institutions and the relevance of archaeological research to the national education development. Though Tanzanians aired their needs from archaeological institutions that are inherently colonial, they had reasonable concerns. Their concerns mainly included more on how to nationalize and develop archaeology than how to problematize archaeology. The nationalization and development of archaeology was envisioned to be accomplished by producing well-trained archaeologists and by having archaeologically informed teachers and communities.

The zonal approach might create an impression that the Ministry intended to decentralize the institutionalization of archaeology by dispersing archaeological research and educational centers in each zone, instead of having central institutions such as the Department of Antiquities and the National museums. However, the zonal approach was more oriented toward governing and centralizing archaeological practices at a national level. In fact, this approach indicates the acceptance of Western archaeological praxis without problematizing it and the view of archaeological sites as
resources that need to be used for national benefits. Thus, the zonal approach was in a way a postcolonial response to the colonial archaeology that had continued to dominate in the postcolonial period. The instant critique of colonially inherited institutions and the discipline of archaeology by Tanzanians was to accept and embrace the archaeological practices and their outcomes—archaeological resources—and to fight for their share. The underlining tone of the zonal approach was that Tanzania is well endowed with archaeological resources; however, these resources are fully monopolized by foreigners, meaning by Africanist archaeologists then based in Western institutions. Thus, Tanzanians must be share in these activities and must put effort to identify more of these resources. In that sense, the ministry was instrumental in raising issues of involvement in archaeological knowledge production and access to the produced knowledge.

The Ministry of National Culture and Youth was were informed about the lack of involvement of Tanzanians in archaeological research projects, the lack of a well-established local archaeology institution, and the lack of archaeological research relevant to national education development. Thus it proposed an action plan to the Ministry of Manpower Development. This plan highlighted the need to increase national capabilities, to expand protection, conservation, and presentation by opening up sites and monuments, to establish regional and district museums of ethnohistory, and to have qualified personnel. To achieve this ten-year plan, the Ministry suggested that the short-term measure was to send Tanzanians for undergraduate studies in British and American Universities. And to remove the bottleneck, the long-term measure was to establish a multidisciplinary Institute of Archaeology and Palaeontology that could serve
both as a teaching and research institute. The Institute of Archaeology and Palaeontology was expected to train experts in archaeology, palaeontology, palaeoecology, conservation, and museology.

According to Karoma (1979:7), the Ministry of Manpower Development supported the proposal submitted by the Ministry of National Culture and Youth but rejected the idea of establishing an independent Institute of Archaeology and Palaeontology due to financial reasons. Instead, the Ministry suggested that the UDSM was an ideal institution to offer the needed training for both financial and personnel reasons. The History Department at UDSM responded to this suggestion positively and provided strategies on how to offer archaeology to second and third year students within its own department so as to solve the problem of lack of trained personnel. Similarly, Karoma (1979) also expressed his position independent of the History Department and criticized the ten-year plan proposed by the Ministry of National Culture and Youth. Though he contended that to establish an Institute was a more needed action, he instead supported the Ministry of Manpower Development’s position on the basis that the UDSM already had well-established disciplines that could be instrumental to augment the multidisciplinary training needed in archaeology.

However, based on the archaeology curriculum he envisioned (see Appendix B, Table B-1; Karoma 1979:18), Karoma refuted the proposal offered by the History Department arguing that the department was not equipped to teach all the projected courses. Instead, he suggested placing the teaching program in archaeology and related fields either to be offered within the proposed Institute of Archaeology and Palaeontology or within the Faculties of Sciences and Medicine rather than the Faculty
of Arts and Social Sciences. Of course, for the aforementioned reasons, placing archaeology within the university setting was more likely to happen than establishing an institute. Consequently, Karoma equally raised the inescapable challenge that would be encountered if the multidisciplinary training in archaeology and related fields was to be offered at the University. Due to the rigidity of the University's curriculum, Karoma argued that training would only be offered within just one faculty, e.g., Faculty of Sciences or Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, and crossing between faculties was beyond the UDSM's academic culture.

Accordingly, such curricula restriction was an impediment to the multidisciplinary features of archaeology. Karoma was pessimistic about these curricula taboos being banned and suggested that the ultimate position was to place archaeology in the Geology Department within the Faculty of Sciences. However, he also commented that if crossing boundaries between faculties were possible then such flexibility was not only beneficial for archaeology but also for the UDSM’s academic culture. In response to the debate on the establishment of an institute and on the placement of archaeology, according to a letter written by the acting Head of the History Department Bonaventure Swai\textsuperscript{19}, the History Department consented to the idea of establishing an institute but considered it as an overly ambitious proposal\textsuperscript{20}; instead, establishing a teaching unit was viewed a more appropriate approach. However, the department also declined the suggestion of situating archaeology in the Geology Department and considered such a

\textsuperscript{19} A letter titled, “the establishment of a unit for teaching archaeology in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences,” sent from the History Department by Swai Bonaventure, acting Head, to G. Mmari, Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. June 24, 1979.

\textsuperscript{20} In the same letter, the acting Head of the department also indicated that the idea of establishing an institute was not a new one and attested that the hope that aired in the early 1970s to establish the Institute of African cultures at the UDSM had an intention to incorporated archaeology and prehistory.
proposal as “a narrow and fragile mooring”. Instead, the request was for an archaeology teaching unit within the History Department but with its own freedom to develop relations with other departments and faculties. The follow-up reaction from the Ministry of National Culture and Youth reiterated its ten-year plan and the zonal approach, and also emphasized the need to offer an interdisciplinary research and training unit in archaeology and related studies under the auspices of the department of botany, geography, geology, history, human anatomy, sociology, and zoology.

Local Foundation Granted Under History

The Ministry of National Culture and Youth’s repeated appeal to establish an archaeology program and Jonathan Karoma’s struggle at the UDSM finally came to a fruitful outcome in 1979. According to Schmidt (1991), an interdisciplinary committee from the departments of sociology, geography, history and zoology at the UDSM considered the Ministry’s proposal. The committee suggested three options for establishing an archaeology program at the University: to place archaeology within the Faculty of Science, within the History Department in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, or to establish a separate institute. The final recommendation was to create a separate Archaeology Unit within the History Department.

Once archaeology was granted a home within the History Department, the concern shifted to how to start the archaeology program in the History Department and how to secure financial resources for the Archaeology Unit. However, archaeology’s

---

21 RE: Studies in Archaeology, letter sent from the Ministry of National Culture and Youth, Antiquities Division by Amini Mturi to Prof. G. R. Mmari Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of University of Dar es Salaam, October 16, 1979. With a short paper on the “Establishment of an interdisciplinary research and Training Unit in Archaeological and related Studies at the University of Dar es Salaam”. Copies were sent to the Chief Academic Officer, the Dean of Faculty of Sciences, and the Head of the History Department.
revitalization, survival, and acceptance within the department were still unstable due to
the ways historians perceived archaeology. Some historians viewed archaeology as a
handmaiden of history. Others considered archaeology as an empirical field of study
based on false objectivity, unconcerned with the production of social knowledge, and
contradictory to critical theory (Karoma 1990; Schmidt 1991, 1995b). Archaeologists
had to navigate through the attitudes of some historians to establish the Archaeology
Unit in the department. For example, Schmidt (1991) narrated his experience related to
how he was treated by some faculty members of the History Department when he
presented a paper in the department in 1980. His paper addressed on the role of
archaeology and oral traditions in constructing a new history of technology in Africa, a
history that valorizes indigenous innovations. Though his lecture was sponsored by the
department, Schmidt (1991) noted that some of the historians were disengaged,
including the chair of the department who “read a book throughout the lecture.”

While historians viewed archaeology either as a subsidiary or as an empirical
field based on false objectivity, as Schmidt (1991, 1995b) argued, the Principal
Secretary of the then Ministry of National Culture and Youth (MNYC) and the Director
General of the then Tanzanian National Scientific Research Council (TNSRC), now the
Tanzanian Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH), welcomed
archaeology and worked together with both Tanzanian and Africanist archaeologists to
establish the Archaeology Unit with its own sufficient resources.

[Both leaders from MNYC and TNSRC]…took note that archaeological
research met an important goal: to write history from archaeological
sources that deconstruct historiographic myths and reconsidered
dominant interpretive paradigms without being dependent upon the
colonial documents that underlie such positions in the first instance.
Seeing the value of such an archaeology, knowing the history of Mturi's
failed contacts with the UDSM, and seeking ways to overcome the economic argument against archaeology, both of these influential leaders began to work toward the establishment of archaeology at the UDSM. Seeing that the University was resistant and, furthermore, was partially masking that resistance behind the excuse of insufficient financial resources, both leaders formed an alliance with a group of local and outside researchers that coopted the agenda and pushed the development of archaeology ahead (Schmidt 1991).

Without the support of these two institutions, the development of archaeology at the UDSM would not have occurred.

The debate on the need to have sufficient financial resources was bridged by establishing a non-profit foundation, the Foundation for African Prehistory and Archaeology (FAPA). FAPA was established through a collaborative effort of concerned Africanist and Tanzanian archaeologists, with the goal to focus on the development of archaeological training, research, and cultural resource management in Tanzania. Founders of the organization made formal agreements with the MNYC and the TNSRC in 1981. Though in the beginning the University was indecisive, later it agreed to accept the support from FAPA and Brown University22. Thus, FAPA applied to the Ford Foundation for funding to establish an archaeology teaching program at the UDSM. The proposal consisted of

...an ideological justification that stressed the importance of the exclusive accessibility of most of African history through archaeology and the power of archaeology to deconstruct colonial constructs. It also set out a program for the systematic development of a comprehensive curriculum, a library, computer facilities, transport, equipment, and a research/training program. One component focused on the immediate post-graduate training of a cadre of five to six Tanzanians to form the instructional base for the enterprise after an interim period of six years with partial expatriate assistance (Schmidt 1991).

22 The linkage with Brown University was established because of Peter Schmidt’s affiliation with the institution at the time.
An important point to note here is that the ideological justification presented to the Ford Foundation had a different rationale compared to the one prepared by Mturi in the late 1970s on behalf of the MNCY (e.g., Mturi 1978c) and later reiterated by Mabulla and Magori (2005). Though the Department of Antiquities acknowledged the importance of archaeology in national education development, the argument on the role of archaeology in deconstructing colonial constructs was entirely related to the Africanist collaborator’s (Peter Schmidt) research interest that focused on deconstructing the colonial interpretative paradigm of ancient iron technology in East Africa (Schmidt 1975; 1978, 1983, 1995b, 1997; Schmidt and Avery 1978). Thus, archaeology that focused on recent history was suddenly seen as an important part of the national education plan within the MNCY and the TNSRC because of the ethnoarchaeological and archaeological research findings about ancient African iron technology from northwestern Tanzania and the exposure of leaders of these institutions to the importance of archaeology in nation building (Schmidt 1995b, 2005:49).

The implementation of the experiment of sending Tanzanians overseas for higher education and establishing the Archaeology Unit in the History Department was also possible through the support received from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at the University (Schmidt 1991). The Dean of the Faculty was particularly instrumental in two ways: through supporting the reciprocal tuition waiver arrangement between the UDSM and Brown University and through securing space for the Archaeology Unit (Schmidt 1991). Thus the UDSM was able to send two Tanzanians23 to undertake postgraduate studies at Brown University through the funding received from the Ford

---

23 One graduate student was recruited from the Ministry of National Culture and Youth, and another from the National Museum (Schmidt 1991)
Foundation and through the tuition waiver agreement established between the two universities. Once funding to run the Archaeology Unit was secured from FAPA through the Ford Foundation and Caltex Petroleum Corporation (Chapter 6), the Dean also assisted in obtaining a library, a laboratory and an office space for the Unit at the University. The Archaeology Unit was then placed in Sisal House, another building across from the Arts Quadrangle building that houses the History Department.

The Archaeology Unit was established as a semi-autonomous unit within the History Department and run by a Coordinator\textsuperscript{24}. The Unit had the liberty to establish its own research agenda and training priorities, but administratively it was under the History Department. Schmidt (1991) highlighted that this arrangement was detrimental in terms of deciding staff hiring, size, and subsidiary staffing such as secretary, driver, and messenger. Though no financial problems were encountered in the beginning (see Chapter 6), as Schmidt (1991) projected, the Unit had a problematic future in terms of representing its needs and voice beyond the departmental meetings because a unit is considered as “the lowest rank in the University administrative structure” (Mapunda 2005:11). Thus, the Archaeology Unit’s voice was muted until 2003 when its Coordinator was invited to attend the Faculty Board meetings (Mapunda 2005). This experience was not unique to archaeology, because all the units at the University operated under the guidance of their parental departments. However, it impacted archaeology heavily, including in staff development and funding field schools (Mapunda 2005; Schmidt 1991; Chapter 6).

\textsuperscript{24} Robertshaw (1990b) noted that the archaeology program at the UDSM as an integral part of history; however, as Karoma (1991) extensively criticized this assertion and misrepresentation, the archaeology program at the UDSM was different from the archaeology program at the University of Nairobi in Kenya. Institutionally, it was established as a unit not as an integral part of the History Department.
Despite such administrative oppressions, the Archaeology Unit had an opportunity to design its own curriculum. After the optional archaeology course was discontinued in the early 1970s, archaeology was taught only as a topic in History courses such as “Themes in African History” (Karoma 1990; Mabulla and Magori 2005). The actual effort to develop a full-fledged archaeology curriculum started in 1979 when Karoma presented a tentative list of 14 courses (Karoma 1979:18; see Appendix B, Table B-1). The rationale for designing the curriculum was “to train people for positions as archaeologists and curators in local and national museums, antiquities and district cultural offices” (Mabulla and Magori 2005:27), the same as the rationale for establishing the archaeology program at the University.

The plan to design an archaeology curriculum continued. In 1980, the first version of the curriculum was approved by both the History Department and the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences25 (see Appendix B, Table B-2). The following year, the University Senate approved this curriculum. From the beginning, the proposed curriculum outline was multidisciplinary, which included anthropology, archaeology, geology, geography, history, sociology, statistics and zoology courses. The same curriculum was revised in 1986 (see Appendix B, Table B-3). The revised curriculum still had multidisciplinary courses; however, some courses, for example from zoology, were excised while other courses, for example from geography, were added as core courses. According to the original document, the revision was needed to improve course content and comprehensiveness so that the University could produce high quality archaeology graduates.

25 This information is obtained from the 1986 document that shows revision of the 1980 archaeology syllabus. University of Dar es Salaam. History Department. Source, Peter Schmidt’s personal archive.
The 1986 curriculum, with additional minor changes, first appeared in the 1987/88 academic year University's prospectus (UDSM prospects 1987; see Appendix B, Table B-4). There are a few disparities in the curriculum as it appeared in the 1987/88 and the 1991/1993 prospectuses (UDSM prospects 1987, 1991, 1992). Similarly, Mabulla and Magori (2005:27-28) have presented a slightly different version of the curriculum from the 1986 revised curriculum as well as from what appeared in the prospectuses (see Appendix B, Table B-5). For example, the main difference between the 1986 revised curriculum and the one presented by Mabulla and Magori (2005) is that one of the third-year archaeology courses (HI 333 Techniques in Archaeology II) and a few other geology and zoology courses were removed from the curriculum. But most of the archaeology courses appear in all sources. Despite having different versions of the early curriculum, which could be just be seen as a form of adjustment, the key point observed is that the curriculum was multidisciplinary and designed to overcome the typical rigid curricular approach based on the traditional British curriculum development system at the time, which still characterizes the curricula at the UDSM (Schmidt 2005:49). As Karoma (1979) predicted, according to Schmidt (1991), the new archaeology curriculum not only offered diverse courses but also crossed over the disciplinary boundary between the faculty of arts and the faculty of science, which was not the norm at the University.

Contrary to what Robertshaw (1990b) presented, the UDSM archaeology curriculum was offered to students over three academic years, rather than just in the last year of their undergraduate studies. The curriculum was diverse and included courses from the aforementioned disciplines; however, the number of geology courses
offered were higher than other courses. The focus on geology courses might have been related to one of the changes that took place in archaeology at the time, importing geological applications into archaeology, and the availability of expertise in the Geology Department at the UDSM. But after a few years, due to the students' educational background, geology courses were assigned as elective courses, and eventually in the 2000s earth science courses were completely removed from the curriculum. As one of the first-three students enrolled in 1985 shared:

We said there is no need for people to do history if they didn't study history at A-level\(^26\) like we did. So we told them they have to make [the curriculum] flexible. If one did arts in A level then [he or she] can do archaeology and history and those who did science can also able to do that [meaning choose science courses]. (1985 student, Interview September 2011)

In the 1980s, the archaeology curriculum suited its own market and government policies and continued in the same way until the next curriculum adjustment started in the late 1990s.

The curriculum designers and the instructors were well determined on the potential of archaeology. As one of them wrote:

We pondered how best to engage our students in the active construction of new histories in Africa, with the goal to build a confident cadre of professional archaeologists well-grounded in local historical perspectives as well as in scientific procedures appropriate for dealing with local historical sensibilities. These perspectives guided our development of archaeology in Tanzania (Schmidt 2005:50).

Schmidt (1995b:137) has argued that the guiding principles for the establishment of archaeology at the UDSM and its curriculum were to revalue African scientific experiences by accessing failures and successes of the past and archaeology’s use in

---

\(^26\) Secondary school advanced level.
the present, as well as producing African scholars who produce and practice an archaeology appropriate for Africa. However, with the exception of what will be presented in Chapter 6, it is very disappointing to see that a separate historical archaeology course that addresses oral traditions and archaeology was not and still is not offered to archaeology students, save Sutton’s attempt in the late 1960s and early 1970s and the optional history course (HI 386 Oral Histories in Tanzania) that has been included in the archaeology curriculum for years. The guiding principles of the archaeology program were to practice an archaeology appropriate for Africa and, as Schmidt (2005) highlighted, the curriculum was intended to be free from the colonial library. Though, instructors used some archaeological pedagogical methods in practical courses and trained Tanzanians to be independent scholars (Chapter 6), the courses offered were not entirely free from the colonial library and in the long-term equally contributed to colonizing elite Africans as inheritors of Western archaeological praxis (Chapter 6 and Chapter 7).

Either way to implement the curriculum, the founders of the Archaeology Unit recruited both faculty members and students strategically. Mapunda (2005:16 -17) has already delivered the context of the recruitment of the faculty members of the Archaeology Unit. In 1985, the Archaeology teaching program was launched by hiring both Tanzanian and Africanist scholars. The recruited nationals were mostly employees of government institutions, mainly the Antiquities Department and the National Museums who served as experts of archaeology, physical anthropology and cultural anthropology within these institutions and worked as part-time instructors at the University. The Tanzanian archaeologists hired at that time besides Jonathan Karoma
were Amini Mturi and Fidelis Masao. Physical anthropologist Cassian Magori and cultural anthropologist Rashid-Wembah were also hired to provide the anthropological component of the study. The Africanist faculty were employed as full-time but on a contract basis; they included Peter Schmidt, Adria LaViolette and William Fawcett from the United States; Paul Lane, Tim Reynolds and Andrew Reid from the United Kingdom and Else Klepp from Norway. As Mapunda (2005) noted, the recruitment of Africanist faculty on a contract basis was a temporary measure until Tanzanians finished their postgraduate studies. From 1985 to the mid-1990s, the Archaeology Unit’s faculty had both Tanzanian and Africanist scholars, mostly male archaeologists. The two female Africanist archaeologists recruited were: Andria LaViolette served from 1987 to 1989 and Else Klepp from 1989 to 1990.

Similarly, considering the mystified public image of archaeology, qualified students were in short supply; thus, two strategies were used to overcome the challenge. The first strategy was the recruitment of a sociology graduate as a tutorial assistant. The tutorial assistant was immediately sent to Brown University based on the aforementioned established linkage program. The second strategy was the recruitment of undergraduate students. The first cohort had one female and two male students who were recruited from the Department of Antiquities. Thus, before joining the UDSM, they worked in the Department of Antiquities within the then MNCY. By the time they were enrolled into the archaeology program, they already had some basic knowledge of archaeology or experience either through participating in archaeological laboratory or fieldwork. This background pertains only to the first cohort. In the following years, Jonathan Karoma and Peter Schmidt followed the UDSM undergraduate student
recruitment strategy, but they still had to spend extra effort to recruit students into the archaeology program due to the lack of public awareness of archaeology including both in primary and secondary education systems. It is for these reasons that most of the students who were recruited into the archaeology program or who were first employed in the Department of Antiquities shared with me that their encounter with archaeology was accidental.

For me, I came to archaeology accidentally. I would say accidentally because my first degree was Sociology. When I earned my degree, Prof. Peter Schmidt was in Tanzania trying to enter into contracts with the Government and the University to use the money which was available at that particular time to develop archaeology in Tanzania, to establish a unit or a department of teaching archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam. He was there looking for young people he could train as archaeologists and some could be employed at the University of Dar es Salaam to become members of staff. Then they discovered that since there was not any student who graduated from archaeology; he couldn’t get a young person … graduating in archaeology. So he was advised either he goes to [the] History Department or to other disciplines which are very close to archaeology. And I think he was advised to come to [the] Sociology [Department], the department I was in. And I had already requested to remain at the University as a member of staff in Sociology but there was no chance; there was no space, actually. So then he asked to recruit me and go to the university administration to go ask for permission to recruit me as a staff member of archaeology in the History Department … He had established what is called Archeology Unit, and this was in History Department. … So he was advised to recruit me after consulting the administration, I think. He came to my dormitory where I was staying, was guided to find my room, and he told me that I had been selected to be recruited as a staff member of archaeology in History Department. And of course at that time I didn’t know what archaeology was because I hadn’t done anything on archaeology. So the hard work was that of convincing. He had to convince me that I could do it because I didn’t believe I could do it. Not knowing what is archaeology, it was very difficult. And he had to convince me that since I had done sociology and some element of anthropology, and archaeology in America was regarded as anthropology then he told me that I could do archaeology. I could manage, and it was easy for me to learn and understand it. So I agreed. There is where the accident came. It is that accident that brought me into archaeology. And he had to take me to field school. There was fieldwork which he was organizing under some Canadian scholars, and he took me
to participate so that I would be given the basics of archaeology, the ABC of archaeology. And it was in that field work we decided also that I go to America … to register as a master student. (Individual Interview, 26 December 2011)

By the early 1990s, despite these challenges, the Archaeology Unit managed to graduate 22 students with BA degree in archaeology (Mapunda 2005:19, Table 5-1). Four graduates, recruited as tutorial assistants at the UDSM, were immediately sent for postgraduate studies to different universities based in the United States and the United Kingdom. Over the years, the number of graduates in the Archaeology Unit, now Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies, has increased significantly from 3 graduates in 1988 to 90 in 2010 and even more in the following years (Table 5-1, reasons for these increases will be covered in Chapter 6).

Though the archaeology unit was established as a teaching program, archaeological research activities at the UDSM were also accomplished through the full-time and part-time faculty members’ research interests, graduate students’ research projects, and undergraduate practical courses. Before 1985, archaeological research at the UDSM was carried out by John Sutton and Jonathan Karoma. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Sutton’s work, either in collaboration with the BIEA or with colleagues and students from the History Department at the UDSM, focused on documenting archaeological evidence, establishing the Iron Age sequence, and understanding ancient agricultural systems, which also contributed to the Bantu migration studies (e.g. Sutton 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1973a, 1973b, 1978; Sutton and Roberts 1968). After Sutton’s departure, from the mid-1970s to mid-1980s archaeological research at the UDSM was represented through Jonathan Karoma’s graduate studies research, which was intended to examine the transition from Late Stone Age to Early Iron Age. Within
this research objective, Karoma conducted research on the rock art of the Usandawe area and excavated rock shelters (Mturi 1979:72).

When the archaeology unit was launched in 1985, Karoma shifted his research focus from the transitional period between the Late Stone Age and Early Iron Age to the Middle Stone Age on the coast near Kilwa. Similarly, the newly recruited faculty either brought their own research interests into the university or started new research projects. For example, Peter Schmidt incorporated approaches from his own research interest that focused on Iron Age sites in the western Lake Victoria region. His research among the Haya people, by investing trust in local collaborators (cf. Schmidt 2014, 1985), linked oral traditions and archaeological evidence, using natural and cultural landscapes as mnemonic devices, and employed experimental archaeology to construct local histories of the region, including evidence of highly advance iron technology (Schmidt 1975, 1978; Schmidt and Avery 1978; Chapter 6). The type of research that invested trust in local collaborators has left a long-term positive impact in terms of capacity building both among the community members and at the UDSM in the Archaeology Unit, as Schmidt (2005, 2014) has shared.

One might also argue that the research projects that were carried out independently or collaboratively by the UDSM part-time faculty members of the archaeology unit could be seen as integral part of the UDSM archaeological research achievements. Among the part-time faculty members, Fidelis Masao and Amini Mturi were major contributors to the UDSM archaeological research themes. Fidelis Masao contributed to various research topics: Late Stone Age and Rock Art sites in central Tanzania (Masao 1976a, 1976b, 1979, 1982), museum studies (Masao 1975, 1989,
and collaborative paleoanthropological research in northern Tanzania (Johanson et al. 1987). However, his main input to the UDSM archaeological research themes was through the individual projects he had carried out in the 1970s, which focused on descriptive and regional comparative analysis of Late Stone Age assemblages and rock paintings from central Tanzania (Masao 1976a, 1976b, 1979). The collaborative paleoanthropological research carried out in northern Tanzania in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Blumenschine and Masao 1991; Blumenschine, Masao, and Peters 2005; Johanson et al. 1987) also informally represented the university’s research interest on Stone Age and human origins. Similarly, as the former Director of the Department of Antiquities, Mturi’s research interest was temporally, spatially, and thematically widespread. He contributed to Iron Age, Stone Age and human origins studies, as well as introduced new research interest on conservation and management of archaeological and historical sites (e.g., Mturi 1976c, 1982, 1985, 1986, 1987).

Though the archaeological research interests introduced into the UDSM archaeology program were diverse, archaeological practical field trainings offered as part of the undergraduate studies program were organized mainly by the fulltime faculty members and predominantly focused on Iron Age studies with emphasis on relationships between the coastal and hinterland communities (Fawcett and LaViolette 1990, Schmidt et al. 1992, Chapter 6). Contrary to Robertshaw’s (1990a) claim, the archaeological research interests pursued by the graduate students who were hired as tutorial assistants represented the broad range research interests of the faculty members of the archaeology unit and focused on not only Iron Age but also Stone Age studies (e.g., Chami 1994; Kessy 1992; Mabulla 1996b; Mapunda 1995b). For example,
Felix Chami (1988a, 1988b, 1992) secured the research interest that started as part of the archaeological practical field trainings by examining the cultural sequences of the Limbo site in Kisarawe District in southeastern Tanzania and its affiliation with both coastal and hinterland sites. In turn, his research challenged colonial historiography and contributed to the reinterpretation and rewriting of the history of East African coastal settlement patterns, cultural developments, technological achievements, regional and international cultural contacts (e.g., Chami 1994). Similarly, Bertram Mapunda focused on establishing cultural history of the Later Iron Age period and understanding indigenous iron technologies and social-economic adaptations in Nkansi District, Rukwa region, southwestern Tanzania (Mapunda and Burg 1991; Mapunda 1995a, 1995b). As well, the first graduates of the UDSM undergraduate program pursued their graduate studies on Stone Age and human origins (Mabulla 1990, 1996b; Saanane 1991, cited in Karoma 1991). For example, Mabulla’s research examined the Middle Stone Age and Late Stone Age foragers’ land-use and adaptations strategies in Lake Eyasi Basin in northern Tanzania.

What is important to note in these research endeavors by Tanzanian archaeologists is that each of them brought new specializations and approaches into the scholarship of the archaeology of what is now known as Tanzania in particular and of East Africa in general. Chami specialized in pottery technology and used both local and foreign historical documents to interpret archaeological evidence documented in central coast of Tanzania (e.g., Chami 1994). Mapunda specialized in iron technology.

---

27 His dissertation research was funded by SIDA/SAREC, and the role of Paul Sinclair was instrumental both in training Africans and in the development of archaeology in eastern and southern Africa (e.g., Pwiti 2001).
and, in addition to the traditional archaeological methods, employed both ethnographic and archaeometallurgical approaches (e.g., Mapunda 1995b). His ethnographic approach not only used local information to locate archaeological sites but also to include local perspectives on the history of iron technology and the interpretation of archaeological evidence in the Nkansi District, as well as to share archaeological knowledge with local people. Similarly, by specializing in lithic technology and using ecological and ethnographic approaches, Mabulla (1996b, 2003) examined the Hadzabe land-use and resources extractions and the influences of landscape ecology on individual and group behaviors. In turn these research findings were used to create models for a better understanding of Middle Stone Age and Late Stone Age foraging adaptive strategies (Mabulla 1996b). The ethnographic studies about the Hadzabe people also contributed to cultural heritage studies by highlighting how cultural rights and way of life of the Hadzabe people have been threatened by non-foragers new comers and national and international policies. The link between archaeology and heritage studies pioneered by Amini Mturi (e.g., Mturi 1975, 1982, 1985, 1985) also became part of their research agendas, particularly through the work of Mabulla (1996a, 2003) and Mapunda (1991).

Despite these research and teaching achievements, during this period archaeology at the UDSM still continued as a unit under history. However, the commitments of the archaeologists to navigate through the attitude of historians, to develop both local and international collaborations, to secure financial resources are exemplary achievements of the archaeology unit’s success in securing its existence and to surpass its assigned minor status within the university’s administrative ranking.
system. The archaeology unit’s achievements are remarkable and sustainable, especially when it achievements from the mid-1980s to mid-1990s are evaluated based on the introduced curriculum, the persistence of student enrollments and post-graduation recruitments and research achievements (e.g., Mapunda 2005). On the other hand, analysis of objects of the past (e.g., lithic and ceramics) are strictly based on Western archaeological practices. Some of them have also focused on using both Western and local knowledge to analyze and interpret objects of the past, particularly those who focused on studying the history and development of iron technology.


The organic growth envisioned by John Sutton and Jonathan N. Karoma started to take place in the mid-1990s. Archaeology was finally institutionalized locally at the UDSM with its basic facilities, completely run by Tanzanian faculty, yet still had to struggle to secure local financial support (Chapter 6). The number of students enrolled was relatively the same (Table 5-1). The undergraduate curriculum introduced in the 1980s was offered without change because of the university’s rigidity and conservative curricula structure (Mabulla and Magori 2005:29; Mapunda 2005:17).

Despite these challenges, a major achievement during this period was the establishment of graduate studies in archaeology at the master’s level both by thesis and by coursework (Mabulla and Magori 2005; Mapunda 2005). These two plans were achieved at different times. The UDSM archaeology MA program by thesis started in 1995. As Mapunda (2005:17) argued, though the enrolled number of students (3 students) might seem small, its impact was magnificent because it encouraged undergraduate students to pursue graduate studies locally at a cheaper price. The MA
program by coursework was initiated as a result of the demand from local (graduates) and foreign students\textsuperscript{28}. Accordingly, the Archaeology Unit proposed:

In the last two years [1996, 1997], for example, the Unit received eight letters (including E-mails) of inquiry from foreign students, five from western Europe and three from the USA. In addition to these, we received eight inquiry visitation by Tanzanian candidates interested in postgraduate program, the majority of them being our alumni.

At the time, the curriculum for master’s degree by coursework was proposed by Tanzanian scholars, the Archaeology Unit was already offering the MA program by thesis. However, as stated in the proposal, most foreign students preferred MA by coursework because, according to the proposal, they are “interested in both theoretical and practical aspect of African Archaeology” and as Mapunda (2005:18) noted because they prefer to take courses in African archaeology “taught by Africans in Africa”.

Whether African archaeology taught in Africa by Africans made a difference or not in Africanizing archaeology at the master’s level still deserves its own inquiry. The MA program by coursework was proposed based on three rationales. First, students preferred the MA by coursework, especially foreigners. Second, the Archaeology Unit’s faculty members already gained varied areas of specialization, ranging from Early Stone Age and human origin to Iron Age. Thus, they could offer courses relevant to their specialties. Third, the unit has a rich and up-to-date library and a good assortment of field equipment.

It should be noted that Tanzania has a wide range of heritage resources that can be used to produce varied cadre of archaeological and paleontological professionals. Ironically these resources have, up to now,
been used mainly by foreign institutions to train their archaeologists and anthropologists.\textsuperscript{29}

In this quote the idea is that Western professionals are training their own cadre thus Tanzanians also had to train their own. But the question that should be asked is why were Tanzanian professionals needed? What was the purpose, to repeat what Western professionals were doing or to problematize archaeology in Tanzania? The emphasis was to produce Tanzanian professionals so that they replace the positions held by Africanist archaeologists.

Another mechanism introduced in the late 1990s as a means of sustaining the archaeology program, as Mapunda (2005:22) noted, is the introduction of inter-university collaboration. This inter-university linkage program started in the 1998/1999 academic year, and still continues, was arranged between the University of Dar es Salaam and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) from the United States. Though the plan was to have two options, either to run a collaborative or an independent field school, today the program runs mainly through an independent field school. The main task of the Archaeology unit has been to “coordinate the program” (Mapunda 2005: 22). Recently, according to my own observation, this coordination comes at the expense of the quality of the teaching of archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam, particularly the undergraduate program (Chapter 6). Mapunda (2005:22) has mentioned that the Archaeology Unit would gain “free access to equipment bought through such projects as well as offering scholarships to Tanzanian students for MA in Archaeology.” As he reported by 2000, it benefited two students. However, the idea of access to equipment withered over time.

\textsuperscript{29} Department of History, Archaeology Unit, M.A. Proposal in early 2000s.
The organic growth of archaeology, meaning the development of a local institution of academic archaeology, contributed to the liberation path to the study of the past in Tanzania archaeologically. Africans became teachers of the past in university settings and curators in museums. Africans also became leaders of and collaborators in archaeological research endeavors. The focus on objects to study the past still continues as the essence of archaeology; but now, different from the 1960s, with the development of archaeology at the University, interpretation of the past also considers African agencies in the development of ancient civilizations and makes attempts to incorporate African experiences. Similarly, Africans based at the National Museum became major custodians of the archaeological collections, and the National Museum of Tanzania, as the national home to archaeologically selected objects of the past, plays a great role in curating objects of the past.

**Liberation Path (2000 to present)**

In the beginning of the 2000s, change in the Archaeology Unit was inevitable both as a result of internal and external factors; the curriculum changed (Table 5-3), the number of faculty members and students increased (Chapter 6), and the departmental structure was also adjusted. Deterioriation in the unit’s facilities also became prevalent during this period (Chapter 6). The emergence of collaborative research and locally based publications, e.g. the *African Studies Past*, also became evident during this period (for the first volume see Chami, Pwiti, and Radimilahy (2001). In this section I focus only on the curricular reforms that occurred from 2000 to 2010.

Following the University curriculum review, restructuring and semesterization, the archaeology unit reviewed and improved the archaeology teaching program in 2001/2002 (Mabulla and Magori 2005:30). By 2001/2002, the 1980s undergraduate
curriculum was modified (Appendix B, Table B-6). All the geology courses were designated as optional courses and several new courses—courses on social sciences, specialized archaeology laboratory courses, a course on cultural heritage management, and a course on museum studies—were introduced. These courses were introduced to satisfy the need to train students in museum studies and heritage management (Mabulla and Magori 2005) and introduce the faculty specialization through laboratory courses. The archaeology undergraduate curriculum went through minor reform in 2006 (Appendix B, Table B-7). During this time the geology and other courses adopted from the faculty of sciences were dropped and the archaeology program only continues to offer courses within the College of Arts and Social Sciences, where students take courses either from the Department of History or Geography. Furthermore, all the archaeology courses denoted as HI, represented as history courses in the university’s curriculum, now appear as AY to indicate archaeology courses.

During this curriculum reform, a new program, the Culture and Heritage Program, emerged because of the challenge of site destructions, employment issues, and the demands of tourism. According to the University prospectus (2001/2002), the undergraduate students in this program take three minor courses, one from History or Archaeology and two minors from two of the following disciplines: Fine and Performing Arts, Cultural Anthropology, Literature or Language (English or Kiswahili).

Another curriculum development was the approval of the proposed MA archaeology program by course work in 2003. The MA archaeology curriculum (Appendix B, Table B-11; Mabulla and Magori 2005:32-33) was fully designed by Tanzanian archaeologists who were trained in Canada, Sweden, the United Kingdom,
and the United States for their master’s and doctoral studies. It has seven compulsory archaeology courses, including one course for writing the MA thesis. All the six optional courses are also offered within archaeology. The MA courses are designed to incorporate only archaeology courses and their content is slightly different from the undergraduate curriculum. From 2002 to 2013, the archaeology unit managed to graduate fifty students from the master’s program (Table 5-4). In 2005, the archaeology program introduced the PhD program in archaeology by thesis, and by 2010 the status of the Archaeology Unit changed to the Department of History and Archaeology and this new department had five students in the PhD program and conferred its first PhD degree in archaeology to Amandus Kewkason. The archaeology PhD program is still research-based although since 2011 there has been an ongoing effort to provide PhD in archaeology by coursework.

In 2005, the History Department started offering non-degree Certificate and Diploma programs on Heritage Management (Appendix B, Tables B-8 and B-9). Thus, it managed to provide the programs that were requested by the Ministry of National Youth and Culture in the late 1970s. This training operated under “Promoting Tanzania’s Cultural Heritage Resources: Training for Professional Academic Tour Guidance,” sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. This program was introduced as a means of serving the public to fulfill the University’s mission. It was also further emphasized that this program can serve as a means of improving connections with social sectors and promoting professionalism:

The aim here is to contribute to the production of vital human resources in the area of heritage management, an area for which no formal training opportunities exist in the country so far. Through this programme the University would further improve its linkage with key services areas in the
society while at the same time playing its role of serving as a model in promoting professionalism (Department of History and Archaeology archive, accessed in 2011).

In one of the pamphlets published later the department advertises the diploma program as evening classes – and provides the background:

Tanzania is endowed with abundant cultural heritage resources, including paleontological, archaeological, historical and ethnographic. Apparently, these resources have not been exploited fully mainly due to lack of public awareness and dearth of professional, especially in the management and marketing of such resources. In view of that, the University of Dar es Salaam, through the Project on Promoting Cultural Heritage in Tanzania, funded largely by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, established training courses in Heritage Management and Tour guidance. The objectives are: To improve public awareness in cultural heritage resources. To increase the number of trained heritage managers and tour guides. To improve gender balance among professionals in the heritage sector.

In the 2009, the department proposed to offer a Bachelor of Arts in Heritage Management Program (Appendix B, Table B-10) that was approved. This program developed from the non-degree certificate and diploma of the same program that started in 2005. According to the proposal, the B.A. Heritage Management Program was developed based on the demand from stakeholders and the experience of offering history, archaeology, and culture and heritage programs. The proposed program’s focus is oriented to train students on the management of heritage resources, knowledge and skills as well as the curation, conservation, and preservation of sites and objects.\(^{30}\) It was also intended to increase the participation and status of females in the profession by lowering the entry requirement for female students and providing scholarships to best female graduates from the certificate-diploma program. By 2011, the department

was working on introducing a new curriculum on heritage management at the MA level, which was approved in 2013.

Overall in the Department of History and Archaeology – with special focus on the archaeology curriculum -- since its development, the archaeology curriculum has gone through changes. The changes have been the result of adding courses, new programs such as the Certificate, Diploma and degree of heritage studies as well as MA and PhD programs in archaeology. The archaeology program, especially the BA and MA archaeology program, has courses that are very traditional archaeology. And, it exhibits a repetition of courses. For example, there are about six laboratory courses that focus on the analysis of ceramics, metal, lithic and bones. The most updated is the curriculum for the heritage program. There are several courses on archaeology that overlap in their contents, and they use the same textbooks. There is a strong emphasis on students knowing the traditional Western archaeological practices.

A major move to liberate archeology from the History Department started in 2006 when the archaeology faculty applied directly to the World Bank for financial assistance to build a University Museum at the UDSM to house the archaeology program. In 2008, the archaeology program was granted 1.2 Million USD for the building and 300,000 USD for the heritage program. By the 2013/2014 academic year, archaeology finally declared its independence from history, by becoming the Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies and soon its department will move to the new University Museum building.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I traced the development of archaeology at UDSM from the mid-1960s to the present time, and compared it with that of MAK. The transformation of the
placement of archaeology at UDSM from merely a historical technique into a viable department was possible through the collaborative efforts of both local and foreign institutions and personnel. Over the last four decades, several developments were introduced at the UDSM: changes in faculty composition and size, research interests, curriculum developments, student enrollment, degree offerings, and departmental status. More Africans being employed at the level of staff members indicates that the archaeology program is Africanized. It is not dominated by Westerners in terms of human resources and the students are mostly Africans. The curriculum has general courses, but specific courses also indicate that there has been an African component, for example, by introducing specific courses such as the Development of Archaeology in Tanzania. But still what makes the archaeology program unique is the way the field schools were designed and carried out. Chapter 7 will address archaeological field trainings at the UDSM, but first below I provide a synthesis of the institutionalization of archaeology in Ugandan and Tanzanian higher education systems.

**Uganda and Tanzania**

Chapters 4 and 5 show that Uganda and Tanzania have a reverse experience in the institutionalization of archaeology in their higher education systems. In Uganda, Merrick Posnansky was able to successfully introduce archaeology to MAK because of his commitment to research into precolonial history and the Iron Age as well as his interest in teaching archaeology to Africans. In his position as Director of the Institute of African Studies, he was able to leverage support from some historians to teach archaeology within the Department of History and within the institute. The relatively early establishment of MAK in 1922 compared to the UDSM in 1961 meant that most of
the academic programs were first established at MAK, including its Department of History. Clearly, historians welcomed archaeology as a way to enrich African history.

On the other hand, UDSM imported archaeology for the same reason in the late 1960s. Though John Sutton stayed for seven years at the UDSM, where his role differed from Posnansky’s at MAK. Sutton served primarily as an instructor within a History Department where historians were more interested in using archaeology as means of preparing prospective secondary school history teachers to teach precolonial history of Africa. When research interests of the historians shifted from precolonial history to modern colonial and postcolonial history, archaeology lost support from historians, even failing to maintain its former acceptance. The reintroduction of archaeology to USDM in the end of the 1980s was linked to the Tanzanian political stability that encouraged a focus on developing personnel in heritage studies and archaeology. Despite the lack of training opportunities that Tanzanians encountered in the 1960s, during the 1970s they came to recognize that their low representation in these related fields was due to the dominance of foreign researchers and lack of Tanzanian professionals. By the beginning of the 1970s, personnel from both the Department of Antiquities and the NMT began to argue for a locally based teaching and research archaeology program, the lack of qualified personnel at UDSM meant that archaeology would remain a forgotten business until the end of 1970s.

It was only through the intercession and commitment of Jonathan Karoma that the request made by the Department of Antiquities in the 1970s obtained a response from the University. Karoma’s commitment to archaeology’s development was assisted by the support of Amini Mturi, the Director of the Department of Antiquities. Other key
actors at this time were the Principal Secretary of the Ministry of Culture and Information and a committed Africanist scholar, Peter Schmidt. Schmidt worked through the university community particularly the Dean and Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and some historians from the History Department to advocate the development of an archaeology program. Schmidt’s research on Iron technology had attracted the interest of policy makers in several ministries, leading them to conclude that archaeology was an important investment in Tanzania. This interest encouraged Schmidt to mobilize local and international support for the establishment of archaeology in the History Department. Together with Jonathan Karoma, Schmidt was instrumental in formulating the curriculum as well as securing funding from the Ford Foundation and Caltex in Dar es Salaam to start the archaeology teaching program, launch a research program, and to provide funding for postgraduate studies. Tanzanians who had obtained training in the 1970s and early 1980s, based either at the NMT or the Department of Antiquities, joined together with expatriate archaeologists (e.g., Schmidt, LaViolette, Lane, Reid) to make the new Archaeology Unit teaching and research efforts succeed until local scholars fully took full responsibility for the program in the mid-1990s. Thus, local and international collaboration created an archaeology program with a strong foundation that provided the means for its later flourishing as a full-fledged Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies. It was a collective effort toward decolonizing and transforming archaeology that was not possible in Uganda, where very different political conditions prevailed during the 1970s and 1980s.

After decades of political instability and the return of peace of civil society, historians at MAK during the mid-1990s have developed an interest to revitalize the
teaching of archaeology within the Department of History, but archaeology still remains underdeveloped. The once favorable environment and momentum established by Posnansky in the 1950s and 1960s--expanding archaeology to include indigenous knowledge and developing a museum program that privileged public participation--was sadly lost during the years of political chaos. There are recent hopeful signs: In the last two years MAK introduced several archaeology courses, a delay tied to a lack of financial resources and a lack of archaeologists within the History Department, possibly a lack of committed archaeologists in the Department of Monuments and Museums, and also among Africanist archaeologists. The experience of MAK in the nearly three decades since the restoration of political stability illustrates that it is only when collaborative efforts are put forward that archaeology can set down roots in an African university. Truly successful efforts, such as the UDSM, had required collaboration among both African and Africanist scholars and local and foreign institutions. As a result, UDSM has well-developed undergraduate and graduate programs, and students have the opportunity to attend practical field trainings every year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled/Graduated Year</th>
<th>Degree in</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985/1988</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986/1989</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/1991*</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Graduation was delayed for a year because the university was closed in 1990.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/1992</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/1993</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/1994</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992/1995</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993/1996</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994/1997</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995/1998</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996/1999</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997/2000</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998/2001</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>*one female student enrolled in 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one female student enrolled in 1997*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolled/Graduated Year</th>
<th>Degree in</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Sub-Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999/2002</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/2003</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2004</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/2005</td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History and Archaeology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2006</td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled/Graduated Year</td>
<td>Degree in</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2007</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>*One female student enrolled in the 2003/2004 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2008</td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>*One female student enrolled in 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>*One female student enrolled in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2009</td>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>*One female student enrolled in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled/Graduated Year</td>
<td>Degree in</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2010</td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>*One female student enrolled in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*One female student enrolled in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Additional three students did not graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2011</td>
<td>Archaeology &amp; Geography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Additional one student did not graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Additional seven students did not graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled/Graduated Year</td>
<td>Degree in</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2012</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>One male and one female student enrolled in 2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Four female students enrolled in 2007 and three female students enrolled in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Management</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>One male student enrolled in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled/Graduated Year</td>
<td>Degree in</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011/expected Graduation November 2013</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Management</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012/expected Graduation November 2014</td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Management</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5-3. Stages of curricula reform in the Archaeology Unit at the UDSM 1985 to 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985/86</td>
<td>Introduced Annual Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Introduced MA in Archaeology by thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Introduced ACM Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/2002</td>
<td>Campus-wide course Semesterization in effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Started MA in Archaeology coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Started Certificate and Diploma Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Revision of archaeology courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Started BA Heritage Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Started MA Heritage Management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-4. MA graduates in archaeology from 2002 to 2013 at the UDSM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Tanzanian</th>
<th>Non-Tanzanian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6
OPPRESSIVE OR TRANSFORMATIVE FIELD SCHOOLS

The main emphasis of this chapter is drawn from the experience of the University of Dar es Salaam (UDSM). At UDSM though few students attended archaeological research in the late 1960s, formal archaeological field schools started with the opening of the undergraduate archaeology teaching program in the 1985-1986 academic year. The first official field school was carried out in the summer of 1986 in a place called Lushoto in the northern part of Tanzania. There were three first-year archaeology students; one of them was female. The field school was led by both Tanzanian and American instructors. The inception of an internally led field school brought a new change in the nature of archaeological practices in the country. One element of this new change was that both the Western-trained Tanzanian scholars and the first-generation Tanzanian students, who joined the archaeology program, gained the opportunity to be part of the archaeological practices, including field schools. Another aspect of this change was that some Western scholars gained the opportunity to teach archaeology in an African university and to continue to fulfill their professional goals by assisting in the process of establishing local field schools.

This first field school was a learning experiment for the succeeding field school seasons. It was characterized by its own resources, research agendas, participants and experience. The role of Western-trained Tanzanian and Western scholars was not only to train students in archaeological fieldwork but also to learn and find an applicable model of teaching archaeological fieldwork to African students—Tanzanian students.

1 Most of this chapter is already published as a co-authored journal article in Azania: Archaeological Research in Africa 49 (2)184-202 under the title “Knowledge about archaeological field schools in Africa: the Tanzanian experience” (Mehari, Schmidt, and Mapunda 2014). I have already obtained permission to use the article as a chapter in this dissertation and some sections in Chapter 8.
Similarly, this experimental field school was based on the then contemporary mainstream archaeological fieldwork teaching methods and the expected learning outcomes. Considering the educational background of the field school directors and co-directors, the first field school was, if not completely, mostly modeled on the American archaeological field school culture and traditions, but with its own unique principles. The aim was to produce independent and responsive African archaeologists, trained in Western methods yet also trained to think freely on how to address historical problems. It encouraged students’ initiatives in planning an archaeological research project. It was also aimed at producing Tanzanian archaeologists who fit into and respond well to the needs of their country\(^2\). The installation of field school’s culture and traditions from Western countries led to the formation of imaginary views and expectations of archaeology in the minds of the university community and the future archaeology students. It also led to the emergence of new forms of field school culture and traditions based on the realistic African experience—the Tanzanian experience. Changes and continuities in certain aspects of the first field school are found in the main characteristics of the current archaeological field schools. To address some of the changes and continuities, I further present the historical and current trends of the objectives, the resources, the administrative and logistic aspects, and the learning experience and outcomes of the field schools carried out from UDSM.

\(^2\) As will be discussed, after almost two decades, the student-centered approach changed due to a major shift in financing higher education and also higher number of students’ enrollment.
Objectives, Expectations, and Evaluations

Tanzania does not have nationally recognized professional archaeological organizations that guide or define what transformational experience and knowledge students need to join into its archaeological community. Much of what needs to be formally taught is guided by UDSM syllabi, influenced to some degree by the employment needs of the Department of Antiquities and the National Museum, the two leading stakeholders of the heritage sector in the country.

The two compulsory courses (AY120 and AY220) take place within the University's objectives to offer practical trainings to its undergraduate students. The University of Dar es Salaam Prospectus (1985-1986:33) listed the objectives as follows:

- To enable students to apply or learn the practical application of the theory they have learned at the University in solving real-life problems.
- To minimize an over-emphasis on theory and thus give equal weight to practical work experience.
- To give students ample chance to acquire work befitting their academic training so that they will be able to serve their communities well after graduation.
- To establish and maintain close contacts between employers and the Faculty and between the Faculty and the Ministry of Manpower Development.

The expectation of UDSM is that the practical training will:

---

3 The Department of Antiquities, situated within the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, deals with archaeological research authorization. Field school projects are expected to conform to the national laws, policies, and guidelines that regulate permissions pertinent to conducting archaeological research.

4 The objectives of practical trainings within the College of Arts and Social Sciences have been the same (for example see UDSM undergraduate prospects 2007).

5 Until 2010, the college was known as the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences.
• Be related to the students' University studies, enabling him or her to see the relationship between the theory of his or her studies and the practice of work for national development.

• Be related to the students' future careers, enabling him or her to gain on-the job experience (UDSM Prospectus 1985-1986:33).

Within the former History Department, now the Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies, the practical training syllabi of the mid-1980s to 2000/2001 as well as 2001/2002 to the present indicate that the objectives of the practical field courses in the archaeology program are to introduce students to two basic archaeological methods. The first of these is survey (HI 135, now AY 120), viz:

[A] six-week [currently funded for eight-weeks] course that covers the fundamentals of archaeological survey and site testing. Basic skills will be taught in survey, mapping, site recording and assessment, cataloging, artifact processing, site layout, testing strategies, sample excavations and the recording of archaeological data (UDSM Prospectus 1992:46).

This course transitioned to:
[F]undamental skills of archaeological survey and site testing with foci on survey strategies, site layout, testing strategies, mapping, photographing, site recording and assessment as well as artifact processing, including cleaning, cataloguing and provenience management (Archaeology Unit 2006:28).

The second basic methodology to learn concerns excavation skills (HI 235, now AY 220), viz:

An advanced practical training course in … site assessment, remote sensing techniques, supervision of site layout and excavation, control and recording of data, and organization of a field laboratory and expedition logistics (UDSM Prospectus 1992:47-48),

Which transitioned to:
[A]rchaeological excavations and site testing with foci on site mapping, photographing, site recording and assessment as well as artifact processing, including cleaning, cataloguing and provenience management (Archaeology Unit 2006:56).
These descriptions show that for over 25 years the objectives of the practical training remain unchanged, basically offering students fundamental skills of traditional archaeology, mostly survey, excavation, and other means of data recording. What did change was training in certain skills. For instance, remote sensing was removed from the syllabi since the 2001/2002 academic year while lessons on photography were included, though in practice these lessons have not been taught in most recent field schools. Hence, practical training may not cover everything mentioned in the syllabus because of the interests and skills of the field directors and instructors as well as the availability of resources.

The expected timeframe to deliver these practical courses is eight weeks for each course during both the first and second year of the program. Field schools may run from four weeks (at Olduvai, for example) to seven weeks depending on the exigencies of the field setting. Students are graded on their ability to comprehend different skills and apply them while in the field (35%), interest in and commitment to archaeology as demonstrated through endurance, perseverance, attendance and punctuality, as well as ability to manage a camp and skills in handling and tolerating social differences (30%), and ability to keep and organize field notes (35%) (Archaeology Unit 2006: 28 and 56).

Within such primary objectives, the UDSM archaeology field schools have been used as the foremost means of conducting research for most of the archaeological research done by Tanzanian archaeologists, individually or collaboratively. In some

---

6 A minor exception is the introduction of a separate practical training course for second year Heritage Management students in the late 2000s, where students are assigned to appropriate ministries instead of taking the AY 220.
cases, Tanzanian and foreign scholars have collaborated in research in these training settings.

**Source of Funding**

The history of financing archaeological field schools at the UDSM is complex but important to understand because it directly influenced the philosophical foundations and content of the training exercise. In summary, it is linked to three factors: 1) the history of funding higher education in Tanzania; 2) financial sources within the Archaeology Unit; 3) the location of field school projects and the principal directors’ status and academic networks. Until the late 1980s, the Tanzanian government paid for all higher education expenses (Ishengoma 2004; Nyahende 2013). The Archaeology Unit operated within this system in terms of tuition fees and stipends for students. Most of its field training expenses were paid by international donors. Particularly important donors for the first decades until 1995 were Caltex Petroleum Corporation and the Ford Foundation via the Foundation for African Prehistory and Archaeology (FAPA), and later the Norwegian Development Agency (NORAD); funding from the Ford Foundation was then renewed for 1997-2000, including support for field schools. This external funding was critical for launching the teaching and research programs as well as the funding of master’s and doctoral degrees for several Tanzanian archaeologists at universities in the United States (Brown University, University of Florida, and Rutgers University) (Chapter 5). It also allowed instructors to avoid the annual scramble for personal research funding that was to characterize the mid-1990s to present; during which the financing of archaeology at UDSM became entirely part of the Tanzanian higher education system, with the exception of the Ford Foundation support, marking a major transition from dependency on external sources.
In the late 1980s and early 1990s, due to an economic crisis and structural adjustment requirements, the Tanzanian government changed its ways of financing higher education by introducing the cost-sharing approach (Galabawa 1991; Ishengoma 2004) by which government and students share the cost of learning according to the capacity of the students' families to meet some or all costs. Cost-sharing in higher education “became necessary in order to maintain quality of the academic programs, to encourage needy students and improve access to higher education, while at the same time containing government fiscal expenditures in higher education” (URT 1998:76, cited in Ishengoma 2004:18). This change was implemented in three phases during the 1992/1993, 1993/1994, and 2004/2005 academic years. In the first and second phases, the government covered some expenses including practical training. Archaeological field schools benefited from this arrangement up to the third phase. However, the third phase in 2004/2005 affected the financing of field schools in the UDSM archaeology program. Beginning with this phase, the government introduced the higher education Students’ Loan Board (HESLB) and required parents and students to pay the special faculty requirement\textsuperscript{7} and field practical training and research fees\textsuperscript{8}, among others additional costs, by taking government loans (URT 2005, cited in Nyahende 2013). Loans for higher education are need-based. Not all students qualify for a 100% loan and when they must make up the difference in costs, they pay to attend the required archaeology field schools. This is done mostly with financial support from parents, relatives or guardians and only rarely from private donors. Payment of these loans has

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
    \item Special faculty requirements for archaeology students cover field gears – raincoat, and boots.
    \item Field practical training and research covers field allowance for transportation, food and accommodation, plus thesis research costs.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
been uneven, requiring the HESLB to seek more effective collection policies (Nyahende 2013).

Implementation of the third phase meant changes in funding for a variety of field expenses, leading to some fundamental shifts in the pedagogical underpinnings of the training program. Previously, the University bursary covered instructors’ field allowances and basic field costs⁹. The Faculty ceased its support before the 2004/2005 academic year, possibly because most of the research projects including field school training at that time were collaborative research projects and/or supported by external funds (letter written on 27 May 2003 from the Archaeology Unit to the Faculty of Social Sciences and Arts). Since 2004/2005, the university pays only instructors’ field allowance. This adjustment created a shortage of field equipment and facilities in the then Department of History and Archaeology, with such challenges differing by the location of field school projects and the principal directors’ status and academic network. Because some principal field directors launch field schools in areas such as Olduvai Gorge where there is collaborative research with scholars from Western universities, this approach has gained in popularity since the financial pinch began in 2004/2005. The presence of established research laboratories, equipment, and other facilities in such cases have been crucial for sustaining field training. Some field schools have also benefited from research projects led by Tanzanian archaeologists funded by the African Archaeology Network through the Swedish Agency for Research Co-operation with Developing Countries (SAREC). Moreover, other field schools are carried out as part of doctoral candidates’ research projects. In these combined research/training approaches, funding

---

⁹ Field costs refer mostly to maintaining vehicles and supplying fuel, and a few basic field supplies such as aluminum foil and plastic bags.
is derived from various sources, sometimes a combination of funding from UDSM and Western Universities. Such differing circumstances have affected the financing of archaeological field schools and simultaneously created disparities in the quality of archaeological field training, changing how students learn and internalize the research mission of archaeology.

The third phase of financing higher education coincided with an increase in enrollments in the archaeology program at UDSM (Figure 6-1, 6-2 and Table 6-1). In the early 2000s, the number of applications and admissions shot up from a single digit in the 1980s and 1990s to over 50 from the mid-2000s. The increase from the 2002/2003 academic year to 2004/2005, had much to do with the move of the Department of Antiquities and the National Museum from the then Ministry of Education and Culture to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism in 2002, a shift that opened up employment opportunities in the two institutions that absorbed most alumni of the Archaeology Unit, producing a scramble amongst students for training in archaeology to obtain such work. In the 2005/2006 academic year, the number of students within the archaeology program increased by 75 percent over the previous year and in the 2010/2011 academic year the department enrolled a total of 160 students (Table 6-1 and 6-2). This increase—which was attributed to a number of reasons—triggered a host of coping mechanisms, including introduction of multiple field schools with multiple supervisors. It also legitimized the practice of junior staff members recruiting students for field training in their dissertation research.

10 Including financial adjustment and introduction of new curriculum such as heritage management program.

11 However, the number of instructors has increased at a lower rate than the number of students.
Locations and Research Themes

The locations of UDSM’s archaeological field schools have become increasingly contingent upon the principal field directors’ research interests that are dependent on external funding and collaborative opportunities. This trend towards individual projects has moved field school training away from the initial emphasis on issues and problems defined by students. The older model of student-centric research/training, funded by UDSM and international donors, is remembered, with some nostalgia, as an effective idea that can no longer be practiced because of financial exigencies and the expansion of student intake arising over the last decade.

In 1986 the first field school, attended by three students, took place in the Usambara Mountains, Tanga region, near Lushoto town. In the following year, it was moved to the south of Dar es Salaam in the immediate hinterland behind the coast. Its mission was still within an Iron Age research theme (Fawcett and LaViolette 1990, Schmidt et al. 1992), but specifically looking for and examining hinterland communities linked to the coastal. From 1987/1988 to the 1991/1992 academic years, field schools were mostly placed north of Dar es Salaam within the coastal region, but also partially in the interior part of the country, again with the intention to expand knowledge about the linkages between the hinterland and coast (Chami 1994; Fawcett 1992; LaViolette et al. 1989; Mapunda et al. 2004; Mapunda and Chami 1999). By the 1992/1993 academic year, the Archaeology Unit was offering field schools every year in different parts of the country (e.g., Chami and Kessy 1995; Mabulla and Bower 2000; Mapunda et al. 2004; Mapunda and Chami 1999). This rotational approach became prevalent:

…because of three reasons. First the field work is entrusted to one member of staff who determines his area of interest for that year. The intention is to give equal opportunity of every member of staff to pursue
his specific archaeological problems while training students. Second, this provides opportunity for our future graduates to be conversant with different type of archaeologies and different areas of the country so that they are not narrowly graduating as Olduvai (stone age) or coastal (iron and historical) or so archaeologists. Third, the Archaeology unit in this country is probably the only institution pursuing archaeological research in its professional sense. Due to this, it would be better to explore archaeological potentials of the different parts of the country for national inventory (email from the Archaeology Unit Coordinator to an American counterpart, 23 February 1999; Archaeology Unit Field School Folder 1999–2004).

As is clear from this programmatic description, as well as from interviews with other members of the Faculty, the thrust of field school training fourteen years after the founding of the archaeology unit came to rest squarely on individual faculty initiatives and priorities rather than student initiatives and participation in planning—the key pedagogical traits that mark the earlier years. The number of instructors has increased at a lower rate than the number of students, an increase that caused the Archaeology Unit to expand its training locales to multiple field stations to serve on average 16 to 44 students. According to archival documents in the Archaeology Unit and interviews with instructors and former students, most of the field schools within the last eight years took place in the following 14 regions: Arusha, Pwani (Coastal), Dodoma, Iringa, Kigoma, Manyara, Mbeya, Morogoro, Mtwara, Njombe, Rukwa, Ruvuma, Tanga and Zanzibar. The highest frequency of students were assigned to Arusha, Coastal, Manyara, Dodoma, and Rukwa regions. A few field schools also took place in other East African countries, including Uganda and the Comoros. With such diversity and increased participation have come ancillary advantages—diverse choice of research locale—and disadvantages—impacts on the quality of learning due to the high number of students. Multiple locales replaced the earlier annual rotational approach. Instructors had the opportunity to conduct their field research within training projects every year. This
significantly enhanced research productivity for instructors and it naturally led to an increased focus on instructors’ priorities with expected variations in the application of training protocols, viz:

The staff members now, we are fully Tanzanian and the number is bigger. But what is more striking about the change in number is also we had to change the teaching methodology in a way, and this especially affected field school. Initially, when the number of students was low we used to take all students to one place – first and second year [students]. So when we had two instructors there, it would have maybe less than ten students for both first and second year in the field. So things would be easy to handle. Now in the 2000s the number increased and one station or one site would not be enough. So students had to be split into different places. In the beginning, we tried to organize a little bit in favor of students that we would…say those who went to up country sites in the following year, [then] they should go maybe to a coastal site. Or those who were working in the late part of archaeology, like Iron Age, next time they move to an early part of archaeology, the Stone Age, etc. So we were trying to organize that way. But then later on that was no longer possible because the number was too huge to control, and we had to engage almost all members of staff who were capable of going to the field. And staff who had their own research and some of them doing PhDs and some of them doing their own projects, so they take students to go to the field and students are somewhat forced to get into the system of the research that is already in place. If this now is at the level of excavation they could not learn how to do survey because already they were in the excavation level; so all that is part of the variations that are there.” (Interview with anonymous Professor of Archaeology, July 7, 2011)

**Transportation, Accommodations and Food**

Traditionally, Western scholars conducted archaeological research projects in remote parts of Tanzania. They travelled (and still travel) using four-wheel vehicles, and predominately stay(ed) away from the local communities’ residential areas in tents. The experiences of UDSM archaeological field schools participants have been different from that of Western scholars’ and students’ experiences.

In the mid-1980s, the Archaeology Unit obtained two vehicles through FAPA funding and the UDSM provided drivers. These vehicles were mostly used during field
school seasons to transport students and instructors to research areas, and to move around within research areas. This privilege, however, gradually eroded as these and other additional vehicles started to deteriorate. By the 2004/2005 academic year, the University had ceased to cover transportation expenses such as fuel and repair expenses, and drivers' salaries. Changes in financing higher education and the concomitant increase in the number of archaeology students had profound impacts on field schools. UDSM began to cover the instructors’ direct transportation expenses and to provide students with transportation allowances as part of their student loans. This meant no drivers, no fuel, and no maintenance for vehicles, requiring the UDSM archaeology field schools to use new forms of transportation that depart considerably from the colonial and later models of vehicle-centric research and training endeavors.

Today both students and instructors commute to research areas using the public bus transportation system or in some cases an instructor might use a personal vehicle and personal funds to run it during field school. During field schools transportation is mainly on foot and students walk long distances. Some students are not accustomed to such long-distance walking. Changes in the means of transportation have brought challenges to both students and instructors in terms of reliable scheduling and safety issues. Some travel for half an hour one way from their camps to the research areas while others may walk for almost two hours. Yet these changes may also come to have positive implications on the local communities' perceptions of archaeologists, who are seen as sharing the locals' life ways rather than using privileged four-wheel vehicles that have heretofore been trademarks of field archaeology. These changes demonstrate that economically-challenged African scholars and students of archaeology can actually
practice archaeology without four-wheel vehicles, tents and other features of Western-born field archaeologies. Though this funding shortfall now seems a challenge, in the long term such an experience may lead to the emergence of better archaeological practices based on realistic and appropriate responses to African economic and cultural conditions.

Accommodation and food management are part of the learning objectives of UDSM’s archaeological field schools. Before departure, accommodation arrangements are made with the help of instructors. In the first field school, students and instructors stayed in a nearby and conveniently located guest house, but since the second field school the organization of accommodation and food management changed significantly. Depending on the location of field schools, students stay in available rooms in schools and local homes, and mostly within the local communities’ residential areas. This leads to a greater degree of integration between the university participants and community members, with the ancillary benefits of better communication and understanding of archaeology at the local level to the extent of interacting in sports and other social-cultural activities with the local communities. In some cases, students stay in available archaeological research centers, e.g. Olduvai, and use tents. This is rare, although former students who had such an experience view it as an adventurous and memorable part of their training. Regardless of the nature of accommodations, all UDSM field schools demonstrate the rich and warm culture of the Tanzanian people—a culture of sharing. Male and female students are delighted to share rooms (or tents) with their peers, using gendered divisions. In some field schools, it is common to observe 10 to 15 female or male students sharing a single room. Or two male or female students sharing
a tent normally designed for one person. While the increase in the number of students has its own challenges, there are also potent lessons to draw from the UDSM experience, which illustrates the contribution of a culture of sharing to the continuity and endurance of field schools\textsuperscript{12}.

Camp leadership, financial\textsuperscript{13} and food management are entirely the responsibilities of students. For every field station, students elect one leader for camp management and two leaders for financial and food management. There are variations in the way food management takes place from one field school locale to another. Some instructors require students to take full or partial responsibilities in food preparation and cleaning utensils as part of their training. Other instructors leave students to make decisions concerning the responsibilities or hiring members of local communities\textsuperscript{14} to do the work. Still, what is common in all the field schools is that students themselves decide what and how much to budget, what to eat\textsuperscript{15}, what should be sufficient, and who cleans what and when. This self-help approach satisfies growing concerns about the sustainability of

\textsuperscript{12} Some students don’t receive their loans on time and others are not provided with 100\% loans. Through a culture of sharing, those who receive 100\% loans on time help to address any financial challenges collectively.

\textsuperscript{13} In some field schools, the budget is managed by instructors, especially if a field school takes place under mixed projects, such as projects involving foreign scholars or the projects of UDSM instructors pursuing their PhD research.

\textsuperscript{14} Exceptions apply to a few field stations, such as Olduvai, as most cooks and assistant cooks come from urban areas like Dar es Salaam and Arusha.

\textsuperscript{15} Food variations depend on the location of field schools and their proximity to a city, the availability of local produce and the number of students that attend each field school. The number of students may impact food availability: the more students, the more substantial financial contribution and food availability. Regardless of these and other factors, the common national Tanzanian cuisines [such as, \textit{chai} (tea), \textit{Chapatti} (flatbread), \textit{Wali} (rice), \textit{Ugali} (porridge), \textit{Maharage} (beans) and \textit{mboga} (green vegetables) are the signature of every UDSM archaeology field schools. Chicken, \textit{daga} (small fish), \textit{nyama} (meat) are provided occasionally depending on the budget and resources available.
field schools and archaeological research and training around the globe, which well equips students to manage their field research project during their postgraduate studies.

**Introduced Ethics: Teaching and Learning Approaches**

The idea of training African students in archaeology as it developed at the University of Dar es Salaam is meant to lessen the power and domination of those long involved in the process of rewriting and conserving the African past(s). The UDSM pedagogical philosophy, as originally cast, meant opening gates for Africans to have rights to their past(s) and heritage by involving students intimately in all phases of history making. Highlighting the nature of archaeology in Africa, Schmidt (2005: 48) raised questions on what approaches to teaching archaeology are pertinent and appropriate to meet African needs, including immediate needs such as food, clean water, basic healthcare, sanitation, and the conventional human rights related to the civil and political realm. Such real-life challenges that African students face cannot be solved solely by protocols prescribed by Western produced textbooks, or, for that matter, any textbooks. Thus, it was and continues to be essential to implement a more integrative and experimental approach. Initially this approach was effected by encouraging students to take charge, starting from the design phase of research and involving them as “student researchers” (Schmidt 2005:50 -52) in all stages of archaeological research, including publication.

The UDSM archaeological field schools of the 1980s were carried out based on such an important philosophical principle at work: students helping to design and execute field school research programs. Schmidt et al. (1992) (as directors of the first and second field schools, along with their first year students) shared a brief description
of the reasons, expectations, and visions of the then UDSM archaeology practical field training courses showing such principles at work.

This field school incorporated both training and research goals, working with the philosophy that research-driven instruction best instills principles of archaeological inquiry and exposes students to the full spectrum of research – from conception of the idea to the excavation in the field (Schmidt et al. 1992:1).

This principle was played out—with a gap in practice in the late 1980s and early 1990s—during the next fifteen years with brain-storming sessions about field research that would meet national, historical, and substantive archaeological needs. Students then presented their ideas at a seminar, and after long discussions the most viable proposal was selected (Peter Schmidt, Personal communication 2014), engendering a sense of ownership in the research that was to be the medium for their training. It also ensured deep involvement of students in technical details such as where they would work and what survey methods would be employed and where and why test units might be excavated. As a series of meetings mapped out various strategies and tactics, with instructors’ advice and guidance, students gained a sense of management and a depth of understanding that rarely comes with Western operated field training, which predominantly a top-down exercise run by professionals.

In addition, there was a vision of training students further in archaeological writing, both technical and academic. Students were trained in technical report writings through the preparation of field school reports for HI 135 and HI 235 by taking archaeological laboratory courses¹⁶ (in the second year HI 233 and in the third year HI

---

¹⁶ The two compulsory archaeological laboratory courses were: in the second year - HI 233 “Techniques in Archaeology I” and the third year - HI 333 “Techniques in Archaeology II”. As of 2001, all laboratory courses are optional —in response to a shift from term-system to semester-system (for discussion on curriculum change see (Kessy and Mabulla 2009; Mabulla and Magori 2005)). This means students might
and an independent course (HI 331). The archaeological laboratory courses allowed students to acquire basic practical laboratory knowledge and to analyze their first-year field school findings. HI 331 “Independent Project,” a compulsory course, also provided them an opportunity to analyze archaeological materials excavated during HI 235 and to write a final report.

Another ambitious approach used to train students in professional writing was through the development of a publication series that guaranteed students becoming co-authors of archaeological publications. This was done by publishing the results of the UDSM field schools in the “form of occasional papers appearing as monographs entitled: Archaeological Contributions of the University of Dar es Salaam” (Schmidt et al. 1992: vii). It was envisaged that:

Besides giving the new Unit some local and international visibility this practice would preclude the possibility of a scramble over Field School data by individual members of staff. In that way the field school would remain first and foremost a pedagogical exercise in which the training needs of students would come before the research and publishing needs of their teachers. As the first number in this series comes out it is our hope that this tradition aimed at both training and research will, in future, be upheld and maintained (Schmidt et al. 1992: vii).

This ethical program aimed at engaging students to significantly contribute to substantive decision-making about research goals, potential areas of research, research strategies, data interpretation, and publications was the hallmark of the early UDSM program. It set itself significantly apart from what it was modeled on after the Western field school culture and traditions. It may also be argued that despite changes that diffused teaching approaches, it contributed to an enduring foundation of not take all the recommended courses thus graduate possibly without acquiring the skills provided in these courses.

As of 2001, the independent course is open through invitation to students with a GPA > 3.5.
democratic decision-making that continues to inform field training at the logistic and management levels.

**Continuities, Changes, and Unfolded Issues**

While the syllabi for practical courses stipulated the expected learning activities, it is the degree of student engagement and participation in learning activities and their learning outcomes that go beyond what is projected. Learning activities and outcomes depend on the research questions of the field project, the natural environment of the research area, rural versus urban settings, the historical and cultural landscape of the area, and the availability and nature of archaeological sites. Other equally important considerations are the training backgrounds of the instructors (both official and supplemental instructors\(^\text{18}\)), the availability of financial resources and equipment, and the receptivity and number of students and other participants. This is to say, learning activities and outcomes have multidimensional influences. They are a result of a combination of experiences, including informal and formal forms of teaching and learning.

In the early years of external funding and low student enrollment, the Archaeology Unit at UDSM had adequate facilities (including vehicles), abundant basic equipment (compasses, trowels, Munsell Soil Charts, etc.) and sufficient personnel to carry out field schools. Less than ten students in a year ensured a high quality of

\(^{18}\) Today professors, graduate students, recent B.A graduates, non-degree holders, and laboratory and field technicians with years of experience are teaching field schools. The first two are the only field instructors employed by UDSM. The rest are recruited by professors informally either to teach field schools or as part of collaborative research and in the process they help to teach field schools particularly specific skills such as mapping and photography.
teaching. The ratio of teacher to students was on average 1:4. Such short-lived abundance remains a strong memory of these former students and now professors at UDSM. Over the years much of the success of the 1980s ethics of engaging students was dropped from this high level of success due to several factors including changes in departmental faculty, financial sources, significantly larger numbers of students, and the curriculum. By the time that Tanzanians made up all the Archaeology unit’s faculty, external sources of funding were depleted. This change paralleled the national higher education reforms relevant to financing higher education, creating the circumstances under which current UDSM archaeological field schools operate.

Mapunda (2006) has argued that “having passed through 116 days of full field training during the three years of their training, our BA (Archaeology) students graduate as highly skilled field archaeologist[s] capable of tackling most challenges commonly encountered in the field …” But major changes started with the increase in the number of students in the 2000s, especially from the 2005/2006 academic year (Figure 6-1). The teacher to student ratio now ranges from 1:16 to 1:60. Some field schools barely have sufficient equipment; for example one GPS or one Compass, four trowels for 40 to 60 students. It is common now to find students graduating without adequate technical skills such as compass reading, basic skills with tape measures, and map making and so on. Lack of close supervision is among the main challenges students pinpoint. In the 1980s, instructors had full resources including time to provide intensive supervision. Now, most instructors are engaged in multiple responsibilities—administrative, academic, collaborative research and other personal obligations (see LaViolette 2002, 2005 for a contextual discussion). This limits their participation during the duration of
field schools. The absence of some field directors/instructors affects the quality of learning to the extent that some second year students were compelled to teach temporarily both themselves and first year students (Field notes from the 2010-2011 academic year field-schools).

The vision to train students in archaeological writing changed significantly along with curriculum change and imposed financial limitations in the 2000s. In the early 2000s, the Archaeology Unit changed the two compulsory laboratory courses\textsuperscript{19} and an independent course\textsuperscript{20} introduced in the 1980s (Kessy and Mabulla 2009; Mabulla and Magori 2005). This curriculum adjustment—linked in part to much larger enrollments—interrupted the chain of professional experience students used to acquire by analyzing and writing reports about the data they collected from their field school projects. Today students who opt for laboratory courses analyze archaeological materials (lithic, ceramic, fauna or metal) without knowledge of the research projects that produced these collections, a delinking of field research from analysis. On the positive side this expands their range of knowledge about material culture and provides a more diverse understanding of the archeology of Tanzania, but it less clearly connects research to analysis.

The Archaeological Contributions of the University of Dar es Salaam Monograph Series, established to create opportunities for students as co-authors, did not proceed as planned due to financial limitations. Publication of the second monograph (Mapunda

\textsuperscript{19} The two compulsory laboratory courses were changed to four elective courses [AY 204 “Lithic Analysis in Archaeology”, AY 205 “Fauna Analysis in Archaeology”, AY 206 “Metal Analysis in Archaeology”, and AY 207 “Ceramic Analysis in Archaeology” (Archaeology Unit 2006)]

\textsuperscript{20} The Independent course (HI 331) was changed to Independent project in Archaeology (AY 339), as noted earlier, upon invitation the department allows only students with a GPA $>$3.5 to take the independent course.
et al. 2004) was not feasible until the Ford Foundation provided financial support. Despite these changes and adjustments, UDSM field schools provided information for publishing reports, research articles and book chapters. Such publications have appeared in different journals, including in the *Studies in the African Past, Nyame Akuma*, and *Azania*. In these report articles, some scholars have acknowledged the role of students in discovering and documenting archaeological sites (e.g. Chami 2001, 2009b; Chami and Kessy 1995; Chami and Mapunda 1998), but students no longer play central roles in these academic representations21.

Clearly, financial and curriculum changes reshaped field training, shifting focus to multiple locales with more emphasis on instructor-driven research. This was a sea change from the student-focused initiative of the first decade and took UDSM field training in a direction that encourages an instructor-centric approach that has unquestionably led to very positive implications for staff productivity. Student participation at an intellectual level has been abbreviated, an inevitable consequence of changes within Tanzanian higher education. What is remarkable if not extraordinary is that the UDSM adapted to these changes and continued to make field training a centerpiece of its archaeology program.

In the midst of these changes and challenges, UDSM’s archaeological field schools continue to deliver a number of successes as noted above. The foremost achievement is the retention of field school training, despite government financing strategies that have imposed hardships while simultaneously creating opportunities for student participations through loans. Both students and instructors have learned how to

---

21 One exception is the involvement of some graduate students in research and publication. This is particularly the case for graduate students who worked with Felix Chami (e.g., Chami 2009b).
cope with these challenges and to nurture a culture of sharing among students, as well as collaborative research among Tanzanian and foreign scholars. Students continue to gain transferable skills—note taking, report writing, teamwork and leadership skills along with camp, food, and financial management, basic Western concepts of archaeology, and exposure to the African archaeological record. Moreover, field schools continue to contribute to the national inventory of cultural heritage as conceived through Western perspectives. Mapunda (2006) has noted that for more than two decades, they uncovered over 1000 km2 of previously archeological terra incognita and documented over 500 sites ranging from the Early Stone Age to the Iron Age, a significant achievement in light of the exigencies under which field schools have operated.

The success of past and current field schools is not without limitations. The ways archaeologists and students of archaeology interact with local communities who surround or live in nearby areas of archaeological research and field schools projects present a mixed record insofar as the transformation of archaeological practices and pedagogies are concerned. Though the UDSM prospectus clearly highlights the objectives and expected outcomes of practical field courses to provide students skills “to solve real-life problems,” and “to serve their communities well after graduation,” the syllabi of its archaeological field schools do not presently include, at a formal level, community and collaborative approaches in their teaching and learning strategies. A focus on training students in traditional field methods such as excavation, survey and laboratory analysis has been mitigated partly through informal interaction where some exchange of information occurs. The idea of a participatory community archaeology
(see for example Chirikure and Piwiti 2008; Atalay 2012; Pikirayi 2011; Schmidt 2014; Silliman 2008) has yet to be taken up as part of the field school pedagogy.

In most UDSM field schools, interaction between field instructors, students and local communities occurs in informal settings. If a field school project requires an ethnographic inquiry, then students and members of a local community interact during data collection (Mapunda 2007; Mapunda and Kessy 2001). Members of the community may also visit a site/camp to understand the research being undertaken. Students and instructors may interact with members of a local community as new village or city residents, for example, by attending a church or a market place and by playing sports and games. Archaeology students may provide service to the community by tutoring high school students (this happened at a field station in the 2010/2011 academic year). Another approach is public archaeology day, an outreach activity that encourages public engagement and usually takes place at the end of the field school, primarily with the intention of informing local people about archaeology.

Community members are not yet incorporated into strategic decision making during field schools, but there are some experimental and proposed models for how community members may contribute to archaeological research projects (Mapunda and Lane 2004; Mabulla 2005, Schmidt 2010, 2014). Most knowledge production remains in the hands of instructors, yet with the right incentives and research programs instructors may pull community members into the learning and knowledge production process. Engagement with African communities in archaeological research projects has a deep history in Africa (e.g., Kusimba 2009; Mapunda 1995b; Posnansky 2004, 2010; Schmidt 1997, 2010, 2014; Shaw 1977; Walz 2009) and it is compelling to have this option for
future field schools, especially in light of the much greater diversity of field schools. In postcolonial archaeological practices and pedagogies, relationships and attitudes that embrace, engage, and give voice to community knowledge and perspectives is strongly expected—a pedagogy that awaits formal integration into the curriculum.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I have illuminated the changes and continuities in the pedagogy of field archaeology at UDSM. The objectives of the practical course syllabi have not changed for more than 25 years, the instructors are now all Tanzanians, and the Archaeology Unit went through financial hardship especially in the mid-1990s. Despite the financial hardship, archaeological field schools are now funded by the Government of Tanzania. Though the Archaeology Unit, now the Department of Archaeology and Heritage Studies, still suffers from lack of adequate field equipment and facilities, it has managed to retain the field practical courses for years through its own effort and through national and foreign financial support. Location of field schools has changed over the years; however, unlike the beginning of the program that had uniform training, field schools now have disparities in quality due to the difference in access to resources and instructors. Accommodation and mode of transportation used by UDSM archaeological field schools are different from the colonial and contemporary field schools and research projects run by Western scholars in the country, because they have adopted to the local conditions. Common to most UDSM field schools is that students gain transferable skills in leadership through camp, food, and financial management as well as report writing skills. On the other hand, I have also highlighted that UDSM’s archaeological field schools are yet to incorporate community approaches in their syllabi and learning activities. In Chapter 7, I present local communities’
perspectives, reactions, and demands on archaeological practices, including field schools.

Figure 6-1. Number of students graduated between 1988 and 2012
Table 6-1. Number of students graduated between 2005 and 2012 by Area of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AY</th>
<th>AY &amp; Geo</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>HI &amp; AY</th>
<th>HM</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002/2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/2007</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/2008</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2009</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/2010</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/2012</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AY= Archaeology, AY % Geo = Archaeology and Geography, CH = Culture and Heritage, HI & AY = History and Archaeology, HM = Heritage Management

Figure 6-2. Percentage of students graduated between 2005 and 2012 by Area of Study
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year Enrolled</th>
<th>Degree in</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011 (expected Graduation November 2013)</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage Management</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/2012 (expected Graduation November 2014)</td>
<td>Culture &amp; Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage &amp; Management</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2. Number of students enrolled in the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 academic years
CHAPTER 7
LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND FIELD ARCHAEOLOGY

In this chapter I examine local communities’ perceptions of and attitudes towards archaeology, archaeologists and students of archaeology. I focus on one of the sites where archaeological field schools take place, Oldupai (Olduvai Gorge) in northern Tanzania where the Maasai community\(^1\) resides. Particularly, I look at the historical and current forms of relationships that archaeologists had and still have with the Maasai community. I examine the history of archaeological practice in the area and the community’s perceptions of and attitudes towards archaeology and archaeologists. By so doing, I elucidate how the ways archaeologists have approached local communities have become a hindrance to community development and to transforming archaeological practices. In other words, my concern is with explaining the hindrance or the foundation to what is now emerging in the recent discussion of archaeological practices in Africa as community-based archaeology (Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Chirikure et al. 2010; Pikirayi 2007; 2011, Schmidt 2010, 2014).

**Then and Now: Context of Oldupai (Olduvai Gorge)**

Oldupai is one of the paleoanthropological and archaeological localities situated within a nationally and internationally renowned area—the Ngorongoro Conservation Area (NCA). Located in northern Tanzania within the Serengeti Plains, the NCA is home to around 70,000 Maasai people (Melita and Mendlinger 2013), the largest pastoralist group in Tanzania (Århem 1986). The idea of a protected area in the Serengeti Plains

---

\(^1\) I identify the Maasai community based on how they identify themselves, though some of them move to nearby places still within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area during dry season in search of better resources, they consider Oldupai as their home place. I am still however in the process of having a better understanding of how the Maasai communities of Ngorongoro related to each other and with other Maasai communities outside of the conservation area.
and its surroundings started around the late 1920s. However, violations of the human rights of local people in the area became noticeable in the 1950s when the indigenous peoples\(^2\), including the Maasai, were forced to leave part of the Serengeti Plains that was designated as the Serengeti National Park (SNP) in 1940 (for a detailed history see Århem 1985, 1986; Homewood and Rodgers 1991; Shivji and Kapinga 1998).

The reaction of the indigenous people to the creation of the SNP led to the formation of the Ngorongoro Conservation Ordinance of 1959. Using this ordinance, the colonial government designated the southeastern side of the SNP as the NCA. The NCA was created as a multiple land-use area that encouraged tourism, conservation of natural resources, archaeological research, and the interest of the Maasai people (Århem 1986). The Maasai were persuaded to move out of their fertile land\(^3\), and the ordinance guaranteed them the right to sustain their customary land rights in the NCA and to acquire new water supplies. But over the years, the 1959 Ordinance has not been honored\(^4\). In fact, in the 1960s and 1970s, several grazing areas were inaccessible to the Maasai people, including Oldupai and Laetoli—the two famous paleoanthropological localities in north-central Tanzania.

Internationally, the NCA is a renowned World Heritage Site (WHS). In 1979, UNESCO inscribed NCA as a natural WHS for various reasons: for its scenic natural landscape, for its ecosystem that houses endangered species, and for its geological

\(^2\) In this context I am using the concept indigenous to identify the people who occupied the area and its vicinity before the coming of Europeans in the 19th century. These indigenous peoples include the Datoga, the Hadzabe, the Iraqwi, and the Maasai (Ndagala 1991, Homewook and Rodger 1991).

\(^3\) Some literature indicates that the Maasai were forced to get out of the Serengeti by the barrel of the gun (Olenasha 1999, cf. Olenasha, Ole Seki, and Kaisoe 2001:161).

\(^4\) In the postcolonial period, the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA) - a parastatal organization- was created in 1975 to look after the interest of the NCA.
formation, which includes Oldupai and Laetoli. In 2010, UNESCO inscribed NCA as a cultural WHS for yielding evidence of human origins and developments that ranges from at least three million years to the modern period. Both Oldupai and Laetoli represent this category for their paleoanthropological significances. As a globally-recognized area for its natural and cultural values, the NCA is also part of the northern Tanzania’s tourism circuit that extends from Mount Kilimanjaro on the east and the Serengeti to the west, generating more than half of Tanzania's foreign earnings from tourism and making it “one of the most valuable strips of tourism real estate in Africa” (cf. Nelson 2012: 2-3, Mitchell, Jodie, and Jenny 2009). Oldupai is situated within this circuit and has caught tourists’ interest as early as the 1960s because of its archaeological and paleoanthropological bounties.

The relationship between local people and researchers in Oldupai goes back almost a century. Within the Oldupai area, systematic geological, paleoanthropological and archaeological research started in 1931 when Louis Leakey and his colleagues carried out the first expedition (Leakey 1966). Before then, in 1913, Hans Reck collected fossils from the gorge. Though the exact time the Maasai people started working in paleoanthropological and archaeological research is not clear, Leakey (1966:288) mentioned that Hans Reck had had about a hundred native porters. Regardless of whether the native porters were Maasai or not, this indicates that Africans had started working in Oldupai research activities as “laborers” as early as 1913. In their autobiographies Louis Leakey (1966) and Mary Leakey (1984) also mention that Africans have been involved as laborers since the first expedition in 1931. In this

5 It is not clear whether the native porters were local Maasai or other groups.
expedition, Louis had eighteen African workmen from Kenya. Two of them were lorry drivers\textsuperscript{6}, and the rest worked in various capacities as cooks, porters, and as project leaders in surveys and excavations.

Oldupai continued as the paleoanthropological and archaeological concession granted to the Leakeys until the early 1980s. The Leakeys and their colleagues had various forms of interactions with the Maasai people of Oldupai and its surrounding areas. Yet much of what transpired between researchers and the Maasai community remains what Shepherd (2003b) calls, “secret history.” The few shared histories come from the Leakeys’ autobiographies, biographies, and in the acknowledgment sections of their academic publications. Based on the autobiographies, the interaction between the Leakeys and the Maasai community took various forms of exchange: Goods and services, friendship, and knowledge. For example, Leakey (1974) shared that he had contact with the Maasai since his first expedition by providing a small medical clinic. In the next expedition, the Maasai asked him to continue the clinic and the Leakeys made a counter-request for the Maasai to bring fresh milk to the camp:

They [Maasai elders] were mostly men whom I had known in 1931. ... They brought us gourds of curdled milk and a fat-tailed ram as presents. I, on my part, had brought a quantity of dry tobacco leaf, and this I now gave the elders in return. ... After greetings had been exchanged and all the proper courtesies observed, the elders inquired whether I would, as before, conduct a daily medical clinic for their sick. I had, of course, come prepared to do so. We made a counter request that they supply us daily with fresh milk ...” (Leakey 1974:45).

In addition to the exchange of goods and services, some members of the Maasai community interacted with the Leakeys based on their interest in the archaeological and

\textsuperscript{6} Leakey (1966:280) mentioned that he had a Maasai driver so one of the drivers might have been Maasai, but not from Ngorongoro, most likely from Kenya.
paleoanthropological research activities. For example, both Louis and Mary Leakey provided a story about a Maasai man named Sanimu and his interest in their activities.

He stayed around for several days and joined us regularly when we went fossil hunting, showing great interest in everything we were doing. … He asked whether I would like to know about another site where he had seen similar fossils, not far from where he was living. Naturally, my reply was yes … Sanimu, for that was his name, suggested that he go home on foot and return in about ten days’ time bringing with him samples of the fossils, after which he would pilot our vehicles to Laetolil [Laetoli]. True to his word, when he returned he brought with him in a little bag some pig and antelope teeth, all of them heavily fossilized and some embedded in a hard rock matrix (Leakey 1974: 50).

Mary Leakey (1984) has also shared her first-time experience in Olduvai Gorge in 1935 and added Sanimu’s story as follows:

Some came out of sheer curiosity... [one African] whose arrival led to my first visit to [Laetolil] … that was to be immensely important to me in later years … The casual visitor in question was an African, Sanimu … viewed our finds with great interest and told Louis of [Laetolil]…, where there were more ‘bones like stone’, to which he would take us if we wished. He even went on foot to fetch us some samples, and when we saw that they included genuine fossil bones and teeth we agreed to go… (Leakey 1984:57).

In fact, Sanimu’s interest was not limited to Oldupai and Laetoli. According to what Leakey (1974:63-67) narrated, he insisted on joining the Kisese expedition, a rock painting site in central Tanzania. Because he knew most of the local Maasai people in Kisese, he assisted the Leakeys as an interpreter. These narrations clearly illustrate that some Maasai might have had interest in archaeological and paleoanthropological research activities as early as the 1930s.

The contributions of African staff also briefly appear in the acknowledgement sections. For example, Leakey (1971:xx) acknowledges as follows:

The African staff, under the supervision of Mr. Heslon Mukiri (who has now completed forty years of fieldwork), deserve our sincere thanks for their consistently high standard of work. A number have shown
outstanding ability, not only in excavation but also in recognizing fragmentary hominid material and in developing delicate fossils.

Prior to the 1960s the African staff were mostly Kikuyu, since the 1960s Mary Leakey employed new African staff who belong to the Kamba people, also from Kenya.

What emerges from these sketchy histories is that other than Sanimu, the Maasai people was neither involved in the process of scientific investigations and heritage making nor did they merit any mention in the histories that have been passed on in written form. The Oldupai operation was the exclusive preserve of white scientists and either Kikuyu or Kamba laborers, some of which were eventually trained to perform survey and excavations tasks. Surrounding communities evidently did not figure into the research scheme nor in the daily rhythm of life, save for milk deliveries and for clinic access. This colonial structural foundation set the scene for what was considered the legitimate practice of archaeology and paleoanthropology—keeping interactions with local people to a minimum and depending on foreign African labor to perform survey and excavation tasks. When we consider that the Leakeys dominated archaeology and paleoanthropology in Tanzania for fifty years, it is easy to understand why their camps and their daily routines set the scene for years to come.

As the worldviews, contributions, and voices of the local Maasai people and to some extent the African “workmen” from Kenya continued as secret histories within the periphery of the research area, the Leakeys and their colleagues superimposed new names on the cultural landscape of Oldupai by identifying places as sites and naming them, using their names or to honor their families and friends. The fame of the Leakeys and the colonially constructed Olduvai Gorge continued to rise internationally, especially after the discovery of Australopithecus boisei, commonly known as Zinjanthropus boisei
in 1959 at the site named FLK, which stands for Frida Leakey Korongo (gully), named after Louis Leakey’s first wife. The discovery of *Zinjanthropus* brought the attention of international funding organizations and, as Mary Leakey (1984:122) correctly puts it, “captured the public imagination” and continued to attract plenty of tourists to the site.

By the 1960s, as the result of the discovery of *Zinjanthropus*, two other important interrelated developments occurred – an increase in tourists and the establishment of a site museum. These developments influenced the Maasai people’s experiences, perceptions, and expectations of archaeological and paleoanthropological activities in the gorge. Once *Zinjanthropus* was publicized to the rest of the world by *National Geographic Society* magazine and the Ngorongoro Conservation Area’s pamphlets (Leakey 1984), Olduvai Gorge caught the attention of tourists and the number of tourists increased from 600 in 1963, to 3,335 in 1965, and to 5,499 in 1966 (Sassoon 1968b). Another reason the number of tourists increased was the redirection of the Ngorongoro Road that leads to the Serengeti National Park, with the roadway closer to the gorge (Sassoon 1968a). As a result of the tourist flow, Mary Leakey decided to have a small museum, and this eventually led to the establishment of the current Oldupai Museum in 1970 (Leakey 1979). The history of Oldupai Museum is scant, but based on what Mary Leakey briefly included in her autobiography, a reader can understand how the idea of the museum emerged:

In 1968 … I was delighted that there should be tourists because they contributed to our research fund, and in due course I did my best to see that they should have literature and postcards available, good guides to show them in the Zinj site and the open-air museums we had made, a small museum explaining the geology of the Gorge with casts of the main hominid fossils and a selection of stones, and an open fronted grass-roofed banda with a magnificent view over the Gorge, where they could eat their picnic lunches (Leakey 1984:149).
Clearly, Mary Leakey’s testimony along with the antiquities annual reports indicate that, though the Department of Antiquities had already declared Olduvai Gorge as a monument in 1966 (Sassoon 1968a), the management of the conservation of the gorge and the entrance and guide fees remained under the care of the NCA and Mary Leakey until 1971 (Mturi 1976b:2). Visitors’ fees were used for the research fund (Leakey 1979). Furthermore, the Antiquities Guards employed at the museum were among the Kenyan staff hired by the Leakeys (Mturi 1976b; Sassoon 1968b). This employment arrangement not only marginalized Tanzanians but also took jobs from Maasai residents and silenced their worldviews. During this time, if Tanzanians had been involved in the activities of the gorge, their involvement was mainly to authorize research permits and to inspect ongoing research by sending the Director of Antiquities or other representatives. For example, Mary Leakey (1984:159) mentioned that Amini Mturi, then Director of the Antiquities, visited in the early 1970s to “pay one of his regular visits to see how we were getting on,” meaning to check if researchers were doing what they proposed to do. Otherwise, most of the archaeological and paleoanthropological research activities, including the museum, remained in the hands of foreigners.

The involvement of Tanzanians only started in the early 1970s. In 1971, the Department of Antiquities took over the administration and conservation responsibilities from Mary Leakey and the NCA Unit (Mturi 1976b:3). Consequently, to replace the Kenyan staff members, the Department hired three Tanzanians for the position of Antiquities Guard and trained them to work as Olduvai Guides. Moreover, a clerical officer, to collect Olduvai entrance fees, and excavation assistants, to work at the gorge,
were appointed in 1972 (Mturi 1978a:1). Though the Department of Antiquities does not specify the regional or ethnic affiliation of its employees, according to an interview with a current Antiquities official, the recruitment of Maasai people in the museum started in the early 1970s. From the 1970s to the early 1990s, two local Maasai men, Mr. Ole Paayo (1971–1977) and Mr. Peter Lauwa (1978–1992), were employed as assistant conservators. After these two local employees, these positions were mainly filled by Tanzanians who came from the larger Arusha Region\(^7\). Currently only two local Maasai men are employed as casual laborers in the position of night guards.

Although the Maasai people were kept marginalized from research activities, most daily camp tasks, and the museum prior to 1970s, they did attract the attention of the Leakeys over affecting the paleoanthropological remains with their cattle herds. Mary Leakey (1979:26) states: “As far as we are concerned the most serious problems presented by the Masai [Maasai] who live near the gorge is the damage that their herds of cattle do by trampling over fossils.” In 1965 this issue of destruction of fossil evidence was tackled through negotiation at a meeting attended by various stakeholders including the Antiquities, the NCA, the Leakeys, and the Maasai (Leakey 1979:26; Sassoon 1968a:7). An agreement was reached whereby the Maasai would keep their cattle away from the demarcated areas and in return Louis Leakey would construct a number of small dams within the gorge.

Through funding from the NCA, the National Geographic Society and other sources, the Leakeys constructed two dams and promised two more (Sassoon 1968a:7). In spite of genuine cooperation from the Maasai elders, according to the

\(^7\) The NCA is also part of the Arusha Region within the Ngorongoro District, but most of the Tanzanians recruited at the museum come from other districts particularly Karatu and Arusha.
Antiquities Annual Report, “some Maasai youths broke into the site museum at DK1\(^8\), which contains the ring of stones … [and] moved stones to make a hearth, lit a fire and held a meat-feast in the site museum, thus damaging the oldest known human structure in the world” (Sassoon 1968b:8). The Antiquities Department saw this action as vandalism and the youth were imprisoned for their act. Mary Leakey (1979:27) also mentioned that though the Maasai elders were cooperative in keeping cattle out of fenced areas, “the herd boys do not always obey their instructions and cattle still do considerable damage.”

This damage seemed to be done after the two dams were silted up. While the Leakeys may have represented their occasional contact with Maasai elders as congenial, clearly the archaeological and paleoanthropological relations with the community were not good—leading to successive problems with enclosed sites and what were seen as transgressions into protected areas of the gorge. The Leakeys and other stakeholders had breached the agreement. The dams they built were dysfunctional. One can only imagine how the condition of the dams was mirrored in the relationship between the Leakeys and the broader Maasai community as well as the standards created for the next research groups. For example, Jacob, who is in his fifties and a member of the Maasai community expressed the relationship between the Leakeys and the community with mixed feelings. He also compared it to what is happening nowadays, where current research groups do not provide medical service or water in the area\(^9\).

---

\(^8\) Douglas Korongo, one of the on-spot museums.

\(^9\) For exception, see below in the testimonies provided by some members of the community.
The Leakeys were more respectful to the local community. They were bringing water to the local people but maybe this was a technique to prepare the local community into colonization. ... Sometimes they took local people to the shifting sands\textsuperscript{10} and observed rituals done by the local people there. So they like the community very much and the community likes them. They made water reservoirs for the local people. So they are different from modern day researchers (Individual Interview August 2011).

After the two dams were silted up in the beginning of the 1970s, the problem of cattle trampling over fossils resurfaced when the Maasai resumed using the stream as a water source for their cattle as well as a grazing area (Mturi 1978a). Additional negotiation was needed\textsuperscript{11}, and according to Leakey (1979:27), sometime in the late 1970s the NCA Authority installed a pipeline to bring water down from Olmoti Mountain to drinking troughs in the Olbalbal Depression. Then the Maasai moved their homes away from the gorge to the new water source. What is important to notice in this event is that this area is several kilometers away from their original homesteads, and whether the Maasai moved willingly or forcefully to the new place is not clear; this requires more historical research.

This history causes me to wonder whether the “vandalism” (i.e., the removal of corrugated iron sheets and door that took place at DK site in 1989 [Karoma 1996]) might have been a political statement in relation to these long term negotiations that led to the repeated failed promises linked to poor policy decisions (Mabulla 1996a). Under the Ngorongoro Ordinance (1959), the Maasai are allowed to graze their cattle in the gorge and use the water sources at the bottom of the gorge, yet under the Antiquities

\textsuperscript{10} Shifting sand is a sacred place. But nowadays, some Maasai believe that the NCAA limits their activity especially when tourists are around.

\textsuperscript{11} The plan to construct a borehole was unfeasible and underground storage of rain water was recommended (Mturi 1978a:11). As a temporary solution, six water tanks were constructed to retain rain water.
Act, the gorge is protected as a monument. This ambiguity creates permanent tension between the Maasai and the Antiquities as well as the archaeological and paleoanthropological research communities. What emerges from this history is a clear picture of foreign scientists and the national heritage institutions too busy to pay significant attention to local needs, and inattentive to the breakdown of contractual obligations, leading to a breach of trust. It is little wonder that the Maasai community became alienated from research at Oldupai. Not only were they marginalized, they were ignored and, as Jacob expressed, they felt manipulated for colonization and still continue to be treated inhumanely.

Related legal issues continue today since the Antiquities Act overlooks local communities and their rights. Mary Leakey had left by the mid-1980s, and Oldupai was transferred to a different research group that incorporated non-Maasai Tanzanians as research members (Johanson and Shreeve 1990). The nature of local communities also changed. The current setting of local communities in Oldupai started to emerge in the 1970s when Tanzanian Antiquities officials permanently settled in the gorge. These officials eventually became part of the larger community that has a stake in heritage through their government duties, the souvenir shop they own at the museum, and the water and transportation facilities they have in their camps (Mehari, Ndangoya, and Rayno 2013). In terms of the archaeological and paleoanthropological research communities nowadays, there are a number of research groups that have separate camps and come at least once a year.

12 The 2008 cultural policy states community involvement (MNRT 2008) but in practice in the Maasai community of Oldupai is still alienated.
These projects have both Tanzanian and Western scholars as principal investigators. The way the research groups interact with and involve the Maasai community is different from Leakeys' time. They have started involving Maasai people as casual laborers. One of the research groups, known by the community as *Risiet*, upon the request of the Maasai community,\(^\text{13}\) has involved a number of Maasai in their research as early as 1994. Since the late 2000s, the number of Maasai people working with Risiet has increased, and as of 2010 even a few Maasai women have started working with Risiet to assist in kitchen work and sieving during excavation. On the other hand, another research group that started in the late 2000s, known by the community as *John’s people*, involves only three Maasai men in their archaeological and paleoanthropological activities. What is clear now is that the Maasai community evaluates their relationship with these research groups contextually, in relation to how they were treated by the Leakeys, and how they are treated now by different stakeholders, including the Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority (NCAA), the Antiquities Division, and the research groups themselves, especially the Tanzanian scholars who are co-principal investigators in these research groups.

Common to all research groups is that they continue the legacy of bringing in research assistants and cooks from outside of the area. But unlike the Leakeys time, now the research assistants and cooks are Tanzanians, who, mostly come from Arusha region but outside of the Ngorongoro District. The Maasai community of Oldupai view them as non-Maasai Tanzanians, thus outsiders. They highlight that both local researchers and antiquities officials hire museum assistants, research assistants, and

\(^{13}\) A few members of the community individually requested for employment opportunities.
laborers based on their ethnic affiliations, sidelines the Maasai residents. Furthermore, the division of insiders and outsiders is seen in terms of access to resources. During the dry season in Oldupai water is very scarce. Drinking water has always been a problem, although researchers and the Antiquities officials have their own water tanks in their camps. Most of these water tanks, according to the Antiquities Annual Report (Mturi 1978a), were built in the 1970s as temporary measures to respond to the shortage of water in the area. After the late 1970s, the issue of water access for the Maasai continues to be ignored by both the Antiquities Division and the researchers, and today we see the Maasai people of Oldupai remain marginalized from using this infrastructure, left to the mercy of researchers and antiquities officials. They have no medical facilities and other social services such as schools. Moreover, their rights to natural resources, land use, and customary practices are heavily infringed by the NCAA. A member of the community shared his feelings toward the archaeological and paleoanthropological research projects and the conservation activities in the area. His statement summarizes the experiences of the community:

I see that they are digging up bones and some of them are stored in the museum. ... I think I could be very good in those activities. ...These activities were supposed to be under our community, even the museum. Money from tourists was supposed to benefit our community. Sometimes when we visit the museum, we [the Maasai] are scared as they [the Antiquities] think we are a disturbance to tourists. But we don’t bother tourists because we don’t know their language ... we are not bandits and we don’t have a history for this, so I don’t get the logic [of the Antiquities] for scaring the local [Maasai] people who get around the visitors [tourists]. We don’t even poach the wildlife; we live with them and cause no harm to them. ... I have a lot of visions, [it is] only that I lack education. I think this land would have been very beneficial to its people but we lacked education and people from other places already took the lead (Individual Interview, September 2011).
Community Perceptions of Archaeological and Paleoanthropological Activities

The image of archaeology and paleoanthropology in the eyes of local communities depends on the longevity of a research project in a given area. These disciplines have been practiced in Oldupai for nearly a century. Based on conversations with members of the Maasai community, through the assistance of Naserian Ndangoya and Kokeli Ryano, I learned that the community is aware of the research projects that take place in the area as well as the different research groups that have been involved in the gorge over the years. When we asked some members of the community, both men and women, most of them replied yes to the question: “Have you ever seen people who work in the gorge?”

We further inquired what they call these activities or if the community has any local name to refer to such activities. Though some informed us there is no local nomenclatures used for these activities, others said they are called *ilaturu* (diggers), *ilo oturu soitok or loik* (those who dig up stones and bones), and *ilang’enik* (those who are learning about earth). But the most important observation is the way the community identifies the researchers as a group, not their activities. Though most of the interviewed members of the community are aware of the diversity of research groups that lead activities in the gorge, they are also equally cognizant of the dominant research groups (e.g., *Risiet* and *John’s people*). *Risiet* is a Maasai pronunciation used for the English word for research, and John’s people is used after the name of a Tanzanian principal investigator of that group. Though the community occasionally uses names of the principal investigators of the *Risiet* group, most of the time they use the collective name, *Risiet.*
Something Precious, Take Far Away and Sell It

We asked members of the community a follow up question: What they thought about these activities? A majority of them are aware that researchers dig for stones and bones. But their answers also indicate that most of them are not sure why researchers are interested in digging and collecting stones and bones. The common answer is: “We don’t know, but it is not for nothing.” So the understanding is that researchers can’t dig for nothing so it has to be for something. That “something” is understood differently, taking at least two forms. A very few of them thought researchers are engaged in these activities for the purpose of “discoveries” and “research to improve the coming generation,” “to trace past humanities,” “to get the rest of the things that Mary and Louis Leakey did not notice,” and “to make a museum”.

The majority, however, thought that researchers become involved in such activities “for wealth.” For the Maasai people, archaeological and paleoanthropological activities carried out in the area benefit the researchers: “They [research findings] must be of benefit to these people [researchers]; they are not doing it for nothing. It is for wealth.” As a man in his sixties replied, “They [researchers] remove the bones and stones of the past to go and eat them in their land.” Similarity, one female informant responded: “They go sell them and get wealthy and do not share with us,” while another one replied, “They are eating soils of our land.”

The idea that wealth is the ultimate goal of the researchers at Oldupai, of course, has a degree of accuracy if one considers that after publishing their findings, researchers obtain degrees, tenure and successive promotions, all of which mean

---

14 Some of them have primary or secondary educational backgrounds.
greater wealth by some measure. In fact, archaeological and paleoanthropological findings have become not only, as some writers have expressed (e.g., Morell 1995), the “ancestral passions” of researchers but also ancestral trust funds where researchers use them as a means of accumulating wealth. Yet, more troubling is that after fifty years of Tanzania’s independence, Maasai residents believe that they have the most skeletal knowledge of the actual research activities that take place at Oldupai. This is part of the colonial legacy that may be traced back to the beginnings of research there and subsequent postcolonial failures to engage the community in research even as employees for the excuse that the local people are ignorant and “incapable” of being trained.

The main understanding of the community seems to be that the researchers are doing their research because it is beneficial to them. Researchers obtain something precious and wealthy, take it to their country far away, and sell it. Among those with whom we have conducted in-depth interviews, one has expressed his thoughts in the following terms:

When these people collect them [stones and bones], they take them. ... Some of the small stones are not left in the [Oldupai] museum. When they get a white stone ... they also take it but we don’t know what they do with the stones and bones they take. We believe the people working in the gorge benefit but not the local community. It benefits researchers and that is why they untiringly continue working in the gorge. The tourists pay money when they visit but we don’t get that money.

We tried to ask ourselves why these researchers use stones to skin a cow and we thought they are trying to study ancient history. We see what researchers are doing but we are not sure what it is, we only have some impression that it may be the study of ancient history.... So we believe that the researchers are not here without a purpose, they must be doing something but we are not certain what it is for. ... [It] has benefit to them because compared to the Leakeys’ time, today there are a lot of Wazungu [white people] coming. It is after Risiet that we see a good number of
tourists\textsuperscript{15} coming to Oldupai. …. We feel that this river has potential and that is why different research groups are competing with and hostile to each other… We think they are clever people who are enjoying the fruits we cannot access because if we had education, we would all benefit. (Male, Individual Interview September 2011)

This testimony shows that the Maasai community is actively engaged in the critique of archaeological and paleoanthropological practices, the troubled relationships that exist among different research groups, and the Oldupai Museum. It further illustrates that local people are not passive. They have their own worldviews, systems of knowledge production and negotiations, expectations of research practices, and their own stories to tell (e.g. Hodder 2000; Meskell 2005; Schmidt 2014; Smith 1999; Walz 2009).

**Local Critiques of Research Activities**

Members of the Maasai community evaluate the effectiveness of archaeological and paleoanthropological research activities in the gorge from various perspectives; for example, how researchers relate with local community, how these activities affect their landscape, who benefits from these activities, and who the publics are. Their critiques are highly vibrant and comprehensive, which are parallel with, and even go beyond what has been addressed in the contemporary academic dialogue on community-based participatory archaeological research approaches (cf. Atalay 2012; Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Chirikure et al. 2010; Pikirayi 2011). In the very first place, Maasai people recognize and treat researchers as neighbors and they expect their neighbors to adhere to the Maasai community’s values as much as they adhere to the researchers’ values: mutual respect, cooperation, and representation. They evaluate the adherence of these

\textsuperscript{15} The number of tourists reaches up to 73000 (96%, foreigners) (Mehari, Ndangoya, and Ryano 2013).
and other values based on how the research groups, especially the Tanzanian principal investigators, interact with the community. Their evaluations amplify what some archaeologists who work in collaborative settings have argued that local communities evaluate “social persons” and see research as “social relations” that depends on respect and rapport (Heckenberger 2009:25; Pikirayi 2011). These critiques also underscore the different approaches in use—Maasai people relate with researchers as people, whereas researchers related first with objects of the past without recognizing the local people.

My colleagues and I have come across how such social relations are evaluated; for example, by comparing Risiet and John’s people, members of the Maasai community have shared with us several stories in this way:

They [the Maasai] are not complaining about Risiet but they are complaining about John’s people. The local people argue that John’s people never assisted the community. For example, when someone from the local community is sick and they request a car from John’s people they don’t get assistance. No opportunities for the local people except watching [one member working as a night guard], and [John] does not even assist the needy (Male, Individual Interview, September 2011).

What this story unveils is the intricacy of social relations in the gorge, and as neighbors researchers are expected to provide assistance to the Maasai community and also to give employment opportunities when the community requests them. In this context, the Risiet research group has addressed both requests, and some men and recently women have worked in projects run by Risiet. In addition, the community says that Risiet contributed money for the nursery school and bought a water tank for the school. A Maasai man in his mid-twenties says:

[As to Risiet], that Mzungu [white person] ...brought an aid for education purposes like for the nursery school, to have water tanks. ... Recently, another researcher contributed two million TZS and suggested that the
building should be reconstructed using hard material … [that thatched roof]. The researchers believe that we are protecting their wealth in the gorge while we are looking after our cattle. We are protecting wealth for people from outside and the learned community. The government knows that and says we should be together. ... Every year [during the Zinjanthropus day] the researchers celebrate by slaughtering cows and goats, preparing local brew and bringing beer. They invite the Maasai people, young men and women (irmurrani ndoiye) and then they pay them to dance during that event. ... These are some of the positive outcomes from the research activities in this area.

The Maasai people who work with Risiet get some money. ... They eat [at the camp] but they don’t stay there at night, they go home after work, around 6 PM. It is risky for them [because of wild animals]. ... There is some sort of bias against the local people. ... The local people work with Risiet go early in the morning and come back to their homes in the evening, no transport for them. They get a different treatment. But it is our problem because we don’t mobilize each other, those who are working don’t have their peer leader (Male, Individual interview, September 2011).

Another Maasai man in his fifties adds:

The aid for a nursery school was good for our community plus some other financial assistance for members of the local community with problems... Yes it is important but its importance is dependent on the opportunities that are offered to the local community. The local community should be given opportunities to work. If researchers incorporate the local community, we would realize the importance of these research activities ... Had we had our children been educated like you [Kokeli and Naserian] it would probably help us to fight for our rights here. Now we only have a few benefits at the mercy of researchers (Male, Individual interview, September 2011).

Though some elders felt it is not good to back bite their neighbors (the researchers) because the researchers have been helpful in putting up a nursery school, during focus group discussions others accentuated their rights in the process of knowledge production:

We have seen that Risiet has done something positive in this land ... [that] gives people opportunities. But one thing I think they are not very supportive is about the issue of education ... so I believe that the little benefits we get from them is only blinding techniques so that they use us to work for them because had they wanted us to move forward they would have supported us in terms of education. They know that our community is
not educated so they may think that we are easily manipulated (Focus group discussion, September 2011).

Consequently, though the Maasai community is fully aware of the deprivation of their rights in the process of knowledge production and heritage making, a majority of them believe these research activities are good. They should continue because they are beneficial to their country, the researchers, and tourists. Maasai people express their support by saying: “It is good because it impacts knowledge to those who know and it will teach the coming generation;” “We get a little training because I now know how to differentiate the bones of people from animal bones;” and “They teach people excavation through employment.” To the Maasai community, these activities have direct educational value for both the Maasai people who are working in these projects and for the University of Dar es Salaam archaeology students, the research groups who come every year, and tourists.

Moreover, the Maasai community acknowledges that these activities are good because they serve them as a means of generating income and getting help from the researchers. Some members of the community have been able to generate some income in two ways. One way they are earning income is by participating in the archaeological and paleoanthropological research activities as “casual workers.” The perspectives the community shared with us are that these projects are good because “They [Risiet] employ us, both men and women, young and old;” “They pay us. We are able to feed our children. We can buy whatever we want;” “We can buy a goat that will multiply. We say it is good because we will have money and will also take our children to school;” and “Something is better than nothing.” The community views employment
opportunities provided by Risiet as good in comparison with other employment opportunities offered by the museum and the other research groups.

The second means of earning small income is through selling beadwork. When possible, Maasai women sell bead handicrafts to researchers. This applies to all research groups, but more opportunity is available at the John’s people camp. This sounds contrary to the earlier testimony, but the John’s people camp is away from the antiquities camps where the Risiet group and the antiquities officials reside. The antiquities officials own the souvenir shop at the Oldupai Museum; thus, opportunities for Maasai women to sell handicrafts is not encouraged. Moreover, unlike the antiquities camp where the Risiet group resides, the John’s people camp guard is a Maasai who allows women to come freely into the camp and sell their beadwork. If women come to the antiquities camp where the Risiet group resides, they say they are “chased and beaten like dogs.” This experience, which women face on daily basis at the antiquities camp and the museum, reveals how archaeological and paleoanthropological research and the production of heritage engage in violations of basic human rights.

Another means of evaluating research via the lens of social relations is when members of the community speak of the good side of that archaeological and paleoanthropological research, saying: “They [researchers] love us. They don’t chase us and they don’t hate us;” “They don’t yell at us;” “They stay in peace;” and “They backfill the places so don’t hurt our livestock.” The backfilling statement is a comparison to activities that occurred in the past. The other evaluative statements—that express hate, love, and peace—need in-depth discussion in terms of comparison among different research groups. They, however, collectively refer to the intricacies of the
social relations that exist presently among the other communities of the gorge – the antiquities community and the NCAA community (Mehari, Ndangoya, and Ryano 2013). For example, only two Maasai men are working at the museum as night guards, and Maasai women are forbidden to sell their beadwork to tourists around the museum—this is a source of tension (Mehari, Ndangoya, and Ryano 2013.). Furthermore, according to the Maasai people, social relations among the Maasai and the archaeological and paleoanthropological research groups, especially involving Maasai people in research projects, were harmed by researchers’ attitudes that changed only after a long struggle.

They [researchers] used to have attitude that the Maasai can’t do heavy work that they are not strong and this delayed so much our involvement. And it was Wazungu [white people] who finally decided to involve us to observe our performance (Female, Individual Interview September 2011).

**Neighborhood Reciprocities: A Blessing to Communities**

The Maasai people direct their requests to various communities—at a local level to the communities of Oldupai—the Maasai community itself, the researchers, the Antiquities officials, and the NCA Authority – and at national and international levels to various communities such as international research communities and organizations, academic institutions, funding organizations, and government institutions. As the host community, the Maasai people strongly request that they must have equal opportunities in the research activities. They desire full participation in the process of knowledge production and heritage construction through equal employment opportunities and fair treatment. They also want their rights to scientific knowledge to be respected, and scientific research practices to have contributions to community development. These and other requests are emphasized during both individual and focus group interviews, viz:
By all standards we can do the digging; so why wouldn’t John involve us in his research and unnecessarily take people from outside? Why wouldn’t he give us orientation if he thinks we are ignorant of knowing? This is our land. And why would he pay 5,000 [TZS] for [Maasai] watchmen who are told that if they are not ready for the 5,000 each per day they can quit. Other assistants get from 13,000 [TZS] per day to almost 30,000 [TZS] per day. It is only Maa people who are paid 5,000 each and they are only two working in the John’s people. And the Maa people working there are the ones in danger because they don’t sleep at night and this is maltreatment, hatred (Male, Individual Interview, September 2011).

During the project days the Maasai people working with Risiet do not stay at night in the camps and this risks their lives. … But our people working there don’t pay attention much about this; … they get some money to cater for some of their problems and thus save selling of livestock. Our people think what they get is something big, so they wake up very early for the job. They [researchers] say wages increase with experience, how long someone worked in the project. … There is no remarkable contribution from the researchers. … The payment (5,000 per day or 10,000) is not comparable to the hard work we are doing. … [It] involves entire day, digging and nowhere to sleep at the camp. You work like a prisoner. They [Tanzanian principal investigators] are administrators; they are the people to give opportunities. They are managers of those research groups. It is hard to go along with a black man because he can’t give you the opportunity to see the Mzungu as we would like to confirm about the payment we get because there is a feeling that the black researchers take some money that was supposed to go to the Maasai assistants. Things are difficult (Male, Individual Interview September 2011).

These testimonies provide a glimpse into employment discrimination and ill-treatment as well as the inequalities the community faces and possibly mismanagement of archaeological and paleoanthropological research funds. But the community’s major intention is not “to back bite the neighbors,” rather they are asking for mutual respect, cooperation, equal representation, and a peaceful blessed neighborhood as well as working environment. They call for people-centered research approaches and practices that treat all the local communities (Maasai, research groups, and antiquities) of the gorge equally:

Researchers should know that their coming should be a blessing [to the communities] not the other way round. … They should also incorporate
local people’s opinions and views. Research should also impact positively the community. ... For example, we don’t have a school here, no medical facility, no water; researchers should take these into consideration. They should also put some sort of arrangement for Maa women to sell their bead products. They should have their own separate camps away from Antiquities officials, for example, what John’s people has done by building a separate camp is good. ... I am not saying there shouldn’t be security but the guards should treat local people with respect. But even people serving at these camps should not necessarily come from outside. For example, at the John’s people camp even someone to sweep is a Mbulu as if Maa women don’t know how to sweep. They should incorporate the Maasai people (Male, Individual Interview September 2011).

During Mary Leakey’s time, we had some water reservoir (elwenata) in the river. ... We would like the research groups to repair them. ... So far the research groups have not shown tangible benefits to the community; they should address water shortage; and the other important thing they should assist is school (Male, Individual Interview September 2011).

In their concept of a neighborhood reciprocity approach (Mehari, Ndangoya, and Ryano 2013), the Maasai community is strongly requesting both research groups and the Antiquities Division to incorporate their voices and views and to accommodate their needs. They are also looking for archaeological and paleoanthropological research practices that promote genuine collaboration and community-based participatory research:

We would like to see people from our own community gaining the upper hand in the administration of the research groups. For example ... the Tanzanian principal investigator of Risiet is leading some of the groups but he doesn’t make us aware of what is going on. ... Now we can only enjoy something little as we beg them to give some opportunities. Sometimes we even ask them what is going on and they briefly answer that they are accompanying visitors. And when we ask them further what would be their benefit, they tell us that it is beyond our bounds.

One of the challenges that readers (or any interest groups) of your report should consider is how to improve the living of this community especially by handling the critical problem of water shortage ... we are in misery because of water shortage, we are not settled. Research groups should not only concentrate on the research component but community component as how to improve our livelihoods. ... Most important are the
two things (water and schools); another is, as I said, that the local community should be involved in the process of research. ... Researchers should not bring all assistants they need from outside the community because some of the work we can do. I am not suggesting that researchers should not bring assistants from outside the community but that we also should be considered. ... We want to be incorporated in the assistantships until we gain knowledge. If our students like you [Kokeli and Naserian] eventually take the lead, it will be better for us and we will all [benefit] (Male, Individual Interview September 2011).

We have been trying to get assistance with the problem of mosquitos (malaria) because it has been disturbing us a lot, we would request our neighborhood to bring medicine for us because we are neighbors. ... We told the researchers and even the leaders about this but because we are not having education we are not receiving attention (Focus group discussion September 2011).

Clearly the Maasai community of Oldupai, like other communities, recognizes the importance of long-term sustainable practices (e.g., Atalay 2012; Pikirayi 2011). In addition to collaborative approaches they value access to formal means of acquiring archaeological and paleoanthropological knowledge at higher education level. Some members of the community have requested that researchers include youths in these research activities but the response by a Tanzanian principal investigator of Risiet is: “What archaeologists are doing is a professional job.” Consequently, the Maasai community says: “The door should be open for our young men and women who are just coming from schools even if it has to be by volunteering. This would encourage our children to follow these professions." They also acknowledge that the community is indirectly aware of the activities that take place in the gorge through recent outreach programs carried out by the Risiet group, which brought secondary school students and teachers from several schools in Arusha and Endulen as well as people from South Africa who gave a presentation about evolution. They believe, however, that “There should be a community education for all people” that "gives orientation about
archaeology and its activities.” Though the Zinjanthropus Anniversary Day provides a window for learning, it is not enough, as one of the women we interviewed pointed out:

Zinj day alone is not enough. We should be shown the bones and the geology of the gorge, just like the museum displays. And we should be told the potential of these discoveries and how the community should handle them. But this orientation should not be limited to the Maasai alone but even national leaders, they may not know anything about archaeology too. Archaeology is on its own department and it runs itself [it has its own culture] so other people are just as unaware about it as the [Maasai] community. When the public is completely aware the friction and conflict in the research would diminish because even local people wouldn’t mind other people coming to work there as long as they are involved. It will diminish politics in archaeology (Female, Individual Interview September 2011).

Without a doubt, the Maasai people are claiming their rights as immediate owners and custodians. They also claim the rights of the entire Tanzanian public to have access to scientific knowledge derived from multidisciplinary research projects which can be accessible through archaeological and paleoanthropological outreach programs. For the Maasai people, their concept of a neighborhood reciprocity approach includes education that goes both ways: They also want researchers and antiquities officials to be educated about and respect the Maasai people values, norms, and views:

Researchers don’t have respect, but it is not that they don’t respect us but they don’t even respect themselves. They are like equals to their daughters and sons. Some of the things are not fair to the [Maasai] tradition. For example, sometimes they bring young ladies from Karatu for sexual pleasures and this is disrespect [to] themselves. Sometimes we don’t get the logic of their education. Their traditions are different from ours and we are not used to their traditions. But it may influence our tradition and corrupt our children (Male, Individual Interview September 2011).

A genuine neighborhood reciprocity approach entails several commitments. These commitments include transparency, equity, unity, cooperation, engagement, empowerment, mutual respect, and benefits:
This river/gorge is the example ... [where] all the Wazungu come from far and other people also come. It is Mamisa [Mary Leakey] who pioneered and she still being paid for the gorge although she died long ago and the husband died too but payment goes to their children. If they want to be paid what about us who have been here before Mamisa came? So even yourself if you come later for the same activities, please don’t try to be selfish (Focus group discussion September 2011).

These local testimonies and critiques powerfully unveil the colonial and postcolonial structures of research approaches and practices in Oldupai and their impacts on the Maasai people. They convey lessons to different stakeholders willing to learn from and have dialogue with local people and each other in order to make a difference.

**Learned Lessons: Colonial and Postcolonial Legacies**

In East Africa, a number of scholars have suggested different forms of community participation in various contexts; for example, in the context of perceptions of heritage (Msemwa 2005), heritage conservation and management (Kigongo and Reid 2007; Mapunda and Msemwa 2005; Masele 2012; Mturi 1996), archaeological field research (Mabulla 2005; Mapunda 2001; Mapunda and Lane 2004; Stanish and Kusimba 1996), cultural tourism and heritage development (Abungu 2012, 2013; Mabulla 1996a, 2000; Musiba 2014; Musiba and Mabulla 2003; Schmidt 2010, 2014), and heritage legislation (Bwasiri 2011; Kamamba 2005; Kamuhangire 2005a). Similarly, national cultural heritage institutions are in the process of adjusting their heritage legislation and polices. For instance, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania in its 2008 cultural heritage policy resolved to take a sustainable conservation approach through “controlled utilization, development and protection of cultural heritage

---

16 According to Musiba (2014), as of July 2013 the administration of Oldupai is transferred from the Antiquities Division to the NCCA. This shift involves a grand development plan that intends to involve local communities in heritage management and empower them economically.
resources for long-term benefits of the present and future generations… [which] involves active engagement of the communities as the best custodians living around cultural heritage resources” (MNRT: 2008: vii).

Consequently, in the postcolonial era, one may expect the experience of local communities and their perceptions towards field archaeology to improve and their voices to be heard. However, as the Maasai community’s critiques vividly illustrate, archaeological and paleoanthropological practices and national heritage institutions continue to disenfranchise local communities and disregard their voices, rights, and needs. Knowledge production, heritage construction, conservation and management still continue under the concessions held by scholars and government officials. The colonial legacies of bringing research and camp assistants from other areas remain unchanged, with only minor efforts to include local communities sometimes using oppressive approaches. Such stagnation, colonial legacies, and emerging postcolonial marginalization, denies African communities engagement, equal employment opportunities, economic and educational empowerment, cultural respect, and basic community development.

This stagnation is not unique to Oldupai, where the research focus is on the distant past—human origins. It also applies to archeological research that focuses on the last 3,000 years ago. Recent research focusing on local communities’ perceptions, reactions and demands on heritage management in Kinondoni district in Tanzania (Masele 2012) and preliminary research I conducted on local communities perceptions on archaeological practices among agriculturalist communities in Tororo and Masaka districts in Uganda and in Bagamoyo district in the Coastal region of Tanzania present
similar concerns. As a mother in Kaole said, “Yes, you [archaeologists] eat someone’s food without he or she invites you. And you come here in that order,” (Field note December 2011) or, as a seven-year-old Ugandan girl shouted when she saw archaeologists wandering in her family’s backyard, “Mom, the invaders are here!: (Field note July 2010).

Transforming archaeology and community development may be achieved if stakeholders such as governmental institutions, funding organizations, and scholars integrate African communities’ views, needs, experiences, and rights into archaeological practices. The Oldupai and other examples teach interested stakeholders that archaeology as an enterprise that uses oppressive approaches has a significant impact on daily lives, especially in well-researched areas. Local communities have desires to learn and practice archaeology. In spite of their disenfranchisement, they continue to be loyal to researchers, heritage managers, and heritage institutions. They are still welcoming and willing to work together as long as the dominant stakeholders recognize their views, needs and rights based on a neighborhood reciprocity approach.

Today we would not be worrying about the destruction of the cultural and natural resources if the NCAA had consulted us. The NCAA thinks we are children; they have thought for us for a long time. It’s time they listen and understand that we deserve respect, and consult us when decisions affecting our lives are made. Wisdom is Wisdom even if [it is] by a woman (Olenasha, Ole Seki, and Kaisoe 2001:154).
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION

The theoretical focus of this dissertation is decolonizing and transforming archaeological practices and pedagogies in African countries. Demonstrating dearth of a coherent literature that evaluates the role of African communities and archaeologists in the process of decolonizing and transforming of archaeological practices and pedagogies in African institutions, I argued that critical ethnographic and historical inquires can be crucial methodologies of decolonizing and transforming contemporary archaeological practices and pedagogies in African institutions. Using these approaches, I examined archaeological practices and pedagogies in Tanzania and Uganda.

To answer the questions and issues I raised in Chapter 1, I first historicized the institutionalization of archaeology in these countries’ museums and departments of antiquities from 1920s to mid-1980s (Chapter 2); discussed the involvement of Tanzanian and Ugandans in archaeology (Chapters 3 and 7); examined the relationships among national heritage institutions, archaeologists, and local communities (Chapter 7); and analyzed the placement, practice and teaching of archaeology in two universities: the UDSM in Tanzania and MAK in Uganda (Chapters 4, 5, and 6). In this chapter, I provide a synthesis of six chapters (Chapters 2–7) to reexamine the three central questions of this dissertation: what constitute local archaeological practices? Is there a change in the practice and pedagogy of archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda? And what is the role of Ugandan and Tanzanian archaeologists in decolonizing and transforming archaeology and its pedagogy?
Localizing Archaeology

To trace what constitute local archaeological practices, I first examined the culture of archaeological practices and pedagogies both in the colonial and postcolonial periods. I used the concept of localizing archaeology in two contexts: 1) to refer to archaeological practices that took place locally in Tanzania and Uganda by scholars who were or are staff members of national museums, departments of antiquities, and universities, and 2) localizing archaeology as a decolonial and transformative practice.

Localizing archaeology in Tanzania and in Uganda started with the institutionalization of archaeology, which took place in two settings— in non-academic setting in the colonial period and academic setting in the postcolonial period (Chapters 2, 4, and 5). This research shows that institutionalizing archaeology locally does have the possibility of bringing a decolonial and transformative archaeology in the long-term. However, importing Western scientific archaeology without problematizing colonial archaeology also led to the formation of institutions and legislations that are insensitive to local and national contexts.

Institutionalization of archaeology in non-academic settings was materialized through the creation of museums, the proclamation of ordinances pertinent to archaeology, and the establishment of departments of antiquities (Chapter 2). In Uganda, influenced by both archaeologists and non-archaeologists museum professionals, archaeology was localized in three settings: in the early 1920s within the Geological Museum, in 1955 within the Uganda Museum, and in 1956 within the Department of Antiquities. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, both the Uganda Museum and the Department of Antiquities launched archaeological research that focused in the precolonial history, which extends throughout the so called Iron Age. These incidents
were the result of several factors: the movement of political decolonization of African countries, interest in African history, and the attitudes and approaches of Africanist archaeologists.

In mainland Tanzania, institutionalization of archaeology also happened in two stages: in 1940 within the King George Memorial Museum and in 1957 within the Department of Antiquities. Archaeological research at the NMT only became visible in the early 1970s and archaeological exhibitions, starting in the early 1960s, mostly focused on the distant past – human origins. The Department of Antiquities also started archaeological activities in 1957 that focused in the Iron Age. However, despite the movement of political decolonization and interest in African history, due to the archaeologists’ attitudes and approaches, archaeology in the NMT and the Department of Antiquities continued in a colonial approach.

What could be considered colonial or decolonial and transformative in the institutionalization of archaeology within non-academic settings? To accept archaeological practices as decolonial and transformative, there must be first an identified colonial archaeology. The process of identifying archaeological practices as colonial or de-colonial maybe different from one research to another. Because every researcher brings different personal and academic experiences into the critical historical and ethnographic assessment of archaeological practices. But using the archaeological research design as a reflexive tool, it might be possible to identify colonial and neocolonial archaeological practices.

During the British colonization, the localization of archaeological practices in Tanzania and Uganda were based on colonial knowledge systems and methodologies.
that mostly favored androcentric, Eurocentric, and ethnocentric approaches and subjugated indigenous African peoples’ ways of conceptualizing history and heritage. With the exception of involving Africans in exploitative ways at the stage of data acquisition (Chapters 2, 3 and 7), the rest of the archaeological research design stages were performed strictly from European world perspectives. British Africanist decided which past to study and what heritage to preserve. They formulated and implemented research questions to study East African cultures and pasts, and then analyzed, interpreted, managed and disseminated findings from their own socio-cultural, political, and economic viewpoints and experiences.

British colonial archaeological practices in Tanzania and Uganda, which still have relevance, were characterized by dependency in designing and funding archaeological projects, by object-centred practices that privilege Africanist archaeologists, and valorized Western philosophies and perspectives. They marginalized African systems of knowledge, experiences and worldviews. Moreover, they cultivated a cultural dependency of producing, publishing, and disseminating archaeological knowledge using Western European languages and publishing companies. Consequently, colonial archaeological practices either isolated Tanzanians and Ugandans in the process of doing archaeology and from the right to “scientific knowledge” or involved them only at the lower level hierarchy of the archaeological division of labor —mainly to contribute the menial tasks necessary in the process of Western knowledge production but not the actual knowledge production that appreciates African systems of thoughts, languages, values, and experiences.
It is advisable however to point out that colonial archaeologies as manifested in East African countries during the European colonization were also heterogonous, depending on the multiplicity of European colonizers in the region (Robertshaw 1990c, Schmidt 2009, Schmidt and Karega-Munene 2010). Furthermore, as demonstrated the practice and institutionalization of archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda, archaeological practices were heterogeneous even under a given colonial rule because of the nature of archaeological resources and the attitudes and approaches of archaeologists.

In the colonial period, the significant variation of localizing archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda was particularly visible in curation of archaeological collections and dissemination of archaeological knowledge. E. J. Wayland, the major archaeologist, working in Protectorate Uganda, prioritized towards a more locally oriented curation of archaeological collections and publications. Thus, archaeological findings were kept within Protectorate Uganda by establishing an archaeology section in the Geological Entebbe Museum, and reports of these findings were published in a local journal— the *Uganda Journal*. Whereas the Leakeys exported archaeological findings from Tanganyika to the neighboring colony, Kenya, and published in academic journals mostly based in Britain and the USA. This is not to indicate that the institutionalization of archaeology in Uganda was free of colonial legacies; however, the steps Wayland followed were essential in the institutionalization of archaeology at the Uganda Museum on the eve of independence and the following few years (Chapter 2).

The attitudes and approaches of Africanist scholars also matter either in the development of a decolonial and transformative archaeology or in retaining a colonial archaeology. It is because of the scholars’ attitudes and approaches that Uganda had a
brief experience of moving toward a decolonial archaeology in the late 1950s and the 1960s. Toward a decolonial because, though archaeology retained most of its colonial form, it was institutionalized locally in a museum that was determined to have imaginative public relations, East Africans were involved in archaeology formally, and African knowledge systems were valorized partially by incorporating oral traditions at the interpretation stage of the archaeological research design. On the other hand, the attitudes and approaches of Africanist scholars in Tanzania led to the transfer of archaeological material culture from Tanzania to Kenya and Western European countries, which delayed the institutionalization of archaeology in the NMT. Moreover, Tanzanians were excluded from archaeological activities conducted by the museum staff members until the early 1970s when the museum started its archaeological research activities in collaboration with the Department of Antiquities. Formal participation of Tanzanians in archaeological practices were only possible because of political independence and the institutionalization of archaeology within academic institutions (Chapter 3).

On the eve of political independence, archaeology continued in museums, departments of antiquities, and universities. Both Tanzania and Uganda—as emergent East African countries—embraced museums and departments of antiquities, legal frameworks, and archaeological practices with the anticipation that these institutions would contribute to national visions (Chapter 2). Another local characteristic of archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda during this period was the involvement of Africans in institutions of archaeology, such as departments of antiquities and museums (Chapters 2 and 3). Again, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, this development was
more prominent in Uganda than in Tanzania. But as Uganda’s political instability became quite rooted starting in the late 1960s, its archaeology was localized only through maintaining and guarding archaeological sites and monuments. The active participation of Ugandans in archaeology in the 1950s and early 1960s (Chapter 2) eventually dwindled. However, the few Ugandans who were involved in archaeological administration were also insisting for active and meaningful participation of Western-educated Ugandans in archaeology.

In a different vein, though Tanzanians also continued similar preservation and conservation responsibilities as Ugandans in the 1960s and 1970s, Tanzania had a different experiences in localizing of archaeology. Tanzanians were formally hired first in the Department of Antiquities in the late 1950s, then at the NMT in the mid-1960s, and in the History Department at the UDSM in 1970s. In the late 1960s and 1970s, as administrators in the Department of Antiquities with basic or without archaeological knowledge, Tanzanians were challenged to set priorities of national archaeological policies. Together with John Sutton, an Africanist archaeologist, they insisted on the involvement of Western-educated Tanzanians in archaeological practices so that the seed of archaeology “to germinate locally” (Sutton 1973, cited in Karoma 1977)—thus, to have a local based institution. Though intended to improve the involvement of educated Tanzanians in archaeological projects and to improve the relationship between archaeology and the public, the explicit agenda of local foundation of archaeology became to achieve national custody of archaeological practices. Consequently, by the beginning of the 1970s, educated Tanzanians became central players in making archaeological policies by occupying positions in both academic and
non-academic institutions. Hence, at least one Tanzanian archaeologist was recruited in each institution: the Department of Antiquities, the NMT, and the History Department at the UDSM.

Both countries had different experience in localizing archaeology and involving Africans in archaeology in the early and mid-1960s due to disparities in resources: availability of universities, departments of history, and recruitment of Africanist scholars. Uganda had better resources to localize archaeology. MAK, as the first university in the region, has the first history department and the appointments of leading historians. The Uganda Museum also benefited by the commitment of a preeminent Africanist archaeologist, Merrick Posnansky. Because his determination to encourage an African archaeology led to public archaeology outreach programs in the museum, to earlier application of oral traditions in archaeology in the making of alternative histories of precolonial Uganda, and to the involvement of African university students in archaeology. All these developments occurred before achieving national independence, continued in the 1960s, and eventually led to the introduction of archaeology at the UDSM in 1966.

On the other hand, the relationship between the NMT and UDSM was influenced by the late establishment of the UDSM, the introduction of archaeology at the university, and the role of museum staff. The attempt to introduced archaeology within the Tanzanian higher education system started five years after the independence period, partly because the Dar es Salaam University College itself and the History Department were opened after the independence period. Similarly, though the UDSM and the NMT established a relationship in the early 1960s, there was no collaboration between the
two to develop archaeology in the country. Because the institutionalization of archaeology in the museum was not strong, and the museum staff members lack visionary leadership and commitment to encourage an African archaeology.

In this context, archaeology continued its existence in East African museums as a means of decolonizing and transforming African History and the image of East Africans as the case in Uganda. Or it continued to transform the image of Africa as the cradle of humankind as illustrated in Tanzania. However, despite such well-intentioned agendas, the conception of heritage and the past, the process of doing archaeology, and the cultural heritage legal frameworks were strictly colonial. They were not problematized. Archaeology within the museums and departments of antiquities was adopted without problematizing its core principles; thus for the most part, it continues to suppress local histories and heritages that could have significant contribution to national and community development.

Even in the postcolonial period when Tanzanian and Ugandan personnel —either properly trained or not —are responsible for national institutions (Department of Antiquities in Tanzania and the Department of Monuments and Museums in Uganda), the archaeology they inherited—lacking problematization—is coupled with lack of national archaeological research priorities and funding opportunities. These circumstances have led national institutions to limit their archaeological responsibilities only to authorizing research permits and to protecting archaeological monuments, thus both maintaining the colonial legacy and at times disrupting the positive colonial and early postcolonial legacies; this is particularly true with the Uganda Museum
Archaeology in East African Universities

Archaeology gained currency as a decolonizing strategy for African history and was introduced to East African universities as means of “making alternative histories” (Schmidt and Patterson 1995; Chapters 4 and 5). This was possible due to the socio-intellectual movement of decolonizing African history, which raised an interest in localizing archaeology as a historical technique to verify oral traditions. However, with regards to the institutionalization of archaeology in higher education systems, Uganda and Tanzania have a reverse experience.

Archaeology at MAK was more visible in the 1960s and thereafter appeared only as a topic in history courses until the 2013–2014 academic year. On the other hand, archaeology at the UDSM was only a topic in history during the 1960s and 1970s, becoming visible from the late 1980s onwards. Why such disparities and what made archaeology more visible at MAK in the early 1960s and at the UDSM in the late 1980s onwards? The lessons learned from examining the experiences of these two countries are that archaeology flourished in these Universities through scholars’ commitments, support from historians and other university personnel, support from non-academic government institutions, and availabilities of financial resources from both national and international institutions (Chapters 4 and 5).

Archaeology at MAK remained undeveloped. On the contrary, at the UDSM, it developed into several programs. In the last thirty years, Tanzanian archaeologists at the UDSM have invested most of their efforts in research and teaching. Historical analysis of the field school research projects shows that Tanzanian archaeologists’ research interests are heavily influenced by their training background, particularly their dissertation research projects and the availability of funding. Practices of field
archaeology mostly include archaeological methods — survey and excavations. Research objectives are directed to document archaeological sites and to interrogate colonial constructs of the African past. Their research themes differ. Some have focused strictly on interrogating colonial historical constructions using strictly Western scientific approaches. Others also have incorporated what Schmidt (2014) called an African legacy, e.g., oral traditions. However, very few students experience the later approach (Chapter 7). It is also important to acknowledge that all Tanzanian archaeologists aim at producing local history, either remote or recent history. In the process of doing archaeological research, their efforts to decolonize and transform archaeology vary and each individual contributes uniquely by focusing on interpretation. However, it requires further research to provide an individual context.

But a major point to highlight is that once archaeology is institutionalized, it faces all the challenges of African universities encounter. African higher education institutions are challenged by colonial legacies and the struggle to achieve local relevance (Nkulu 2005:61). They face various layers of “colonized spaces” (Davis 2003) because of their colonial legacies in structure, curriculum, statues, and personnel and resources (Ajayi et al. 1996). Thus they mostly have failed to engage fully with the African systems of knowledge, languages, heritages, values and daily life problems. As a result, Africans still continue to face difficulties in seeking a negotiation between African and Western ways of knowledge production and their applications. But these challenges – alien, colonial, and multicultural – settings have also served as potential sites of struggle, and places of achieving “liberation” and “life transforming experiences” (Freire 1970; hooks 1994) for indigenous scholars who have critically reflected to divert these colonial
settings and have struggled to remain “being responsible and responsive to their communities’ needs” (Ka’ia 2005). Archaeology at the UDSM and MAK also operates in this context as a colonial, neocolonial or decolonial discipline.

For example, due to curriculum reform restrictions that apply throughout the university, inherited from the British colonial higher education system, the curriculum of the Archeology at the UDSM was revised only twice. During these revisions, former archaeology courses introduced in the mid-1980s remained unchanged and only new courses were added such as courses on heritage studies and museum studies. As exemplified by the practical field training course syllabi in Chapter 7, most of the archaeology courses remain unchanged. Instructors have been teaching both former, unchanged courses and the new courses introduced in the post 2000s. The major success of the local scholars teaching in the program is graduating large number of students, increasing the faculty size, and eventually achieving departmental status that incorporates heritage studies. Unavoidable questions that emerge for this thirty year history are: how diverse is the department’s faculty in terms of gender equity? And what is the role of the department to community development, particularly to those who live in places where archeological field schools take place?

The experiences of MAK and the UDSM illustrate that giving opportunity to Africans to pursue archaeology and establishing archaeology programs in African universities are crucial steps to the process of decolonization and transformation of archaeology in African settings. However, a full-fledged department and a large number of African archaeologists in African universities by themselves are not enough to effect this transformation. Archaeology needs to be challenged for its well-established and
conventional research themes such as Stone Age, Iron Age and Rock Art. It needs to be challenged for not meeting the needs of local peoples. Both African institutions and scholars need to problematize why archaeology should be practiced in African universities, why African students should study archaeology, and how might the discipline be relevant to African people.

Previously, a significant argument has been that archaeology is useful for rewriting African history. Moreover, its practice has been justified on the grounds that African countries have rich archaeological heritages – thus, they need archaeology. Yet these arguments are not enough to maintain archaeology's legitimacy in Tanzanian and Ugandan universities in the 21st century. Future legitimacy is threatened by the identification and recognition of heritage sites through the use of strictly Western principles and perspectives. Most of the current archaeological research projects continue to perpetuate research themes inherited from the colonial and early postcolonial periods dominated by Africanist scholars. Thus, efforts by African scholars to write local histories and teach field archaeology have been mostly oriented to privilege traditional Western archaeological methods and theories, as demonstrated in Chapter 6.

The success of current and prospective African students of archaeology in becoming future professional archaeologists will be shaped by the theoretical and practical training that is provided for them. A primary purpose of archaeological field schools is to welcome aspiring African students into the professional archaeological community. With the requisite technical skills, they must then be able to provide an ethical education for Africans to become independent thinkers and responsive scholars.
scholars who fit into and respond well to the needs of their countries and societies as well as maintaining a global relevance. But without the hybridity of local knowledge coming into play and without a familiarity with global archaeology, future African scholars cannot be responsive to their societal needs nor can they be independent scholars in the image of world archaeology.

Such hybridity requires adequate financial and other facilities in order to thrive, yet its most important need is committed scholars subscribing to an ethic of transforming archaeology through participatory approaches that incorporate contributions from students and communities. The UDSM archaeological field schools demonstrate the maintenance of research agendas that promulgate mainstream Western traditional archaeological methods and theories. UDSM archaeological field schools are government funded, so instructors should have the commitment to design and carry out new research projects that have direct impact on solving day to day real-life challenges that impact local people. Instead of instructors dedicating limited government resources only to research projects that serve to revise the interpretation of history, they need to fully engage in liberating the process of how they conduct archaeological research.

If the ethics of training field archaeologists in Africa would focus more on providing strong mentorship and supervision of African students, engaging them as partners in the study of their past, then the decolonization and transformation process as well as the future success of more African perspectives will naturally develop. Privileging a focus on quality education that accounts for both historical and contemporary contexts of local knowledge, along with Western and contemporary global
archaeologies, will ensure a generation of African archaeologists attuned to historical sensibilities and social needs that are both local and global. This will mean continuing to revisit curriculum innovations that ensure creative ownership of research agendas, ideas and skills as well as nurturing the relationships among professional archaeologists, students of archaeology, and local communities. It will also mean a critical revisiting of pedagogies to change the mind-sets of instructors as well as current and future students of archaeology to avoid a colonial and authoritarian archaeology and to seek learning pathways that expand knowledge beyond traditional textbooks and field school orthodoxies.

The continued distance between archaeologists and their publics --both communities and institutions--have been decried for some time (e.g., Andah 1995; Kusimba 1996b; Mapunda and Lane 2004; Segobye 1996, 2005, 2009; Sowunmi 1998). Now a number of African and Africanist archaeologists are starting to address directly the relationship between local communities and archaeology (e.g. Chirikure and Pwiti 2008; Pikirayi 2007; 2011; Schmidt 2010, 2014). Despite these welcome developments, research that recognizes local communities' perceptions, reactions, and demands on archaeology, particularly in the context of field archaeology from Sub-Saharan African countries, are few (cf. Pikirayi 2011 for the exception). These important issues remain mostly absent in both historical and contemporary discussions of archaeological practices, including at the UDSM, where archaeological research and teaching have been taking place for thirty years.

One prominent example of how archaeology reclaimed its colonial nature is the case study presented in Chapter 7 where local people isolated from archaeological
research projects and gaining only lip service benefits. Both in Tanzania and Uganda, with the exception of research projects that seek information from local communities and that have a "public archaeology day" where some archaeologists share their research findings, the relationship between local communities and archaeologists still follows a very colonial approach. In the postcolonial period, one may expect Tanzanian and Ugandan archaeologists to launch research projects that encourage a community approach. However, most local scholars are working with research paradigms performed under the umbrella of Western scientific perspectives and languages. There are various reasons for this rigidity, including the geo-politics of archaeology, the academic institutions they work in, the over-loaded administrative responsibilities they have, the academic demands they encounter to maintain their careers, and perhaps their own lack of initiatives toward more pragmatic approaches.

Similarly, transforming archaeology in African countries is an undeniable and critical task that both African and Africanist scholars strive for intentionally and unintentionally (Lane 2011; Mire 2007; Pikirayi 2011; Schmidt 2009b, 2010). These endeavors to transform archaeology in research, outreach, and teaching occur within different contexts including, but not limited to, national laws and policies, archaeological ethics, funding and government institutions, trainer/practitioners’ ways and means of practice, and the capacity of trainees and practitioners to examine their cultural backgrounds as well as their flexibility to adjust to new perspectives. Transforming archaeology is obviously needed not only for the advancement of the discipline at a global level, but more importantly it is needed for the betterment of African people, writ large. This transformational trajectory has been a primary part of a number of African
and Africanist archaeologists’ goals that include a number of interrelated objectives (e.g., Andah 1995; Mapunda and Lane 2004; Schmidt 2009b; Schmidt and McIntosh 1996; Segobye 2005, 2009) by linking our profession to the daily lives of the people who matter the most, specifically descendant and non-descendant local communities who reside in nearby archaeological research areas. It is these approaches that MAK and UDSM need to incorporate into their archaeology curricula.

Furthermore, at a national level there needs to be development of archaeological associations. With the exception of the emergence of social groups that are identified as “Ugandan archaeologists” or “Tanzanian archaeologists” in social media websites such as Facebook within the last four years, neither Tanzania nor Uganda at the moment have nationally recognized professional archaeological associations that could direct the process of the development and transformation of archaeology in these countries, help develop codes of ethics, and establish local sources of funding archaeological research. To transform archaeology, such organizations are necessary to work independently yet to advise the Department of Antiquities in Tanzania and the Department of Monuments and Museums in Uganda. It is only through these established organizations that each country can prioritize the need to decolonize and transform archaeological research as well as to raise ethical awareness. While these voluntary organizations and the governmental entities that they advise work together, empowerment and transformation can only be gained once Tanzanian and Ugandan scholars interrogate the process of doing archaeological research through critical historical and ethnographic studies of archaeology in their countries.
This research has illustrated that, since the early 1960s, colonization or decolonization and transformation of archaeology in Tanzania and Uganda have been a collaborative effort among African communities (including national institutions, archaeologists, students, and local communities), Africanist archaeologists, and mostly Euro-American institutions. However, though these collaborative efforts are crucial in the decolonization and transformation process, I focused on the African communities since they have both national and community expectations to be responsible institutions and citizens. Thus, to achieve a genuine outcome, the process of decolonization and transformation of archaeology requires genuine local commitments from Tanzanian and Ugandan governments, institutions, archaeologists, students of archaeology, and local communities. As George Abungu, a Kenya archaeologist, has argued, there is a need to move toward an archaeology that challenges existing orthodoxies and develops its own dynamic and working praxes:

In Kenya and Tanzania [or in East Africa], home to world renowned archaeological and paleontological sites, there were no indigenous Africans holding PhDs until the end of the 1970s … It is therefore obvious that this denial would translate into a particular way of looking at archaeology, once the local professionals become empowered; it would be the archaeology of protest, one of wanting to be heard and to ‘own’ the instrument of the production and interpretation of ‘local’ knowledge (Abungu 2006:152).

As an African, I have encountered several critical questions while undertaking this research. These questions include: why decolonization and transformation of archaeological practices and pedagogies are needed in African countries? Who should undertake these theoretical and practical commitments? How and when they can be achieved? And, what would decolonial and transformative archaeologies look like? These questions should be openly discussed at the UDSM and MAK. African students
need to be trained to problematize concepts such as archaeology, past, and heritage. They need to engage in critical pedagogy of archaeology (its definition and goals) and the process of doing archaeology (research design). This is important to generate locally and globally relevant and applicable research agendas, as well as to valorize local senses, thoughts, knowledge, and experiences. Such critical pedagogies are also useful to improve local participation, to engage archaeological principles in solving local problems, and to encourage establishment of local organizations that provide funding for transformative archaeological practices and pedagogies.

Thus pedagogies of field archaeology need to be flexible and experiential, and not characterized by rigidity. Students need to be trained to think freely not only how they address historical problems but also contemporary problems. They need to be trained to think freely and critically how they can apply archaeological principles to solve contemporary problems, including socio-political, economic, environmental, and health problems. It is then as promoters of African archaeology we can possibly witness the emergence of a transformed and transformative archaeology. When this change takes in effect, it will fulfill or directly address the objectives of practical training at the UDSM for the College of Arts and Social Sciences, which seeks to achieve national and community development, and the employability of its graduates.

At a continental level, a more crucial endeavor is to have an academic discourse on the practice and teaching of archaeology in African institutions: national museums, departments of antiquities, and universities. This scholarship is needed to critically examine the process of colonization, decolonization, and transformation of African archaeology: thus, African past and heritage. It is also necessary to critically assess the
commitment of the discipline and its practitioners to national and community development. In turn, these forms of practice based on grassroots level can increase the visibility of archaeology in the eyes of African publics and enrich its methodological and theoretical foundations based on local, regional, continental and global relevancies.
I chose Oldupai (Chapter 7) as one of the case studies\(^1\) based on an advice I received from a senior Tanzanian archaeologist. The Tanzanian archaeologist advised me that to achieve one of objectives (the relationship between archaeologists and local communities) of this dissertation research, it was more appropriate to choose the most researched and the most visited archaeological site. Oldupai fulfills both criteria.

Before I started research in Oldupai, I had only basic knowledge of the Maasai people living in the area, and of Louis and Mary Leakey who had made major discoveries contributing to the understanding of human origins. Like any novice ethnographer, I was haunted by a number of questions on how to carry out ethnographic research in Oldupai. These questions included how to get to the area, where to stay, how to find colleagues who have an archaeology background and know the local language, Maa. Though I knew the Tanzanian archaeologist who gave me advice would be helpful, such questions were persistent. Luckily in July 2010, another opportunity was unveiled when I participated in a collaborative archaeological research project run by Ugandan and Tanzanian archaeologists. Dr. Kokeli Ryano, then finishing his MA degree in archaeology at the University of Dar es Salaam, was one of the research participants from Tanzania. Kokeli is a Maasai from Morogoro region, and during his undergraduate studies he went to Oldupai in 2007 to fulfill the archaeology

---

\(^1\) The other case studies were in two in Uganda, in central Uganda around Masaka area and in eastern Uganda around Tororo. The fourth case study was in Bagamoyo and Kaole in the Coastal Region of Tanzania. However, in this dissertation I present only the Oldupai findings because it includes most of the features found in other three case studies and because of the longevity of archaeological research in the area.
field school requirement, and again in 2008 as a research assistant. When I shared my research goals for Oldupai, Kokeli agreed to participate.

I also met Naserian Ndangoya, another colleague who participated in this project, at the University of Dar es Salaam in January 2011. At that time Naserian Ndangoya was an undergraduate student in the then Department of History and Archaeology. I attended undergraduate archaeology classes as part of this dissertation research (Chapter 1), and Naserian was enrolled in these classes. I used this opportunity to invite Naserian to participate in the research because she is Maasai, a cultural heritage student with archaeology background, and comes from Arusha region where Oldupai is located.² I preferred to recruit both male and female local colleagues for two reasons: 1) to encourage gender equity in current and future collaborative research and 2) to ensure that any unforeseen gender roles and relations within the Maasai cultural beliefs and practices were properly adhered.

Meeting the Maasai community³ of Oldupai happened through various means. First, through the permission of one of the Tanzanian archaeologists working in Oldupai, I was able to attend an archaeological field school in August of 2011 for two weeks. During this time, I stayed at one of the Antiquities Division camps, and met Antiquities officials and a few members of the Maasai community. Some members of the community came to the camp either because they are regularly involved in

² Later we found out some of the Maasai elders happen to know Naserian’s father very well, which was a bonus for our research.

³ We identify the Maasai community based on how they identify themselves, though some of them move to nearby places still within the Ngorongoro Conservation Area during dry season in search of better resources, they consider Oldupai as their home place. We still however need to have a better understanding how the Maasai communities of Ngorongoro related to each other and with other Maasai communities outside of the conservation area.
archaeological projects or in the maintenance of the camp. In addition, some youth came to the area to interact with the archaeology students who came for field school. In some occasions, I was also able to meet some members of the community in the gorge while participating in an archaeological survey.

The 2011 field school allowed me to get acquainted with some members of the local communities (both the Maasai and Antiquities officials), the archaeology of the area, and research assistants who came from other parts of Tanzania as well as the gorge in general. In these encounters I used the opportunity to inform some male members of the Maasai community about my plan to come back to conduct an additional research that focuses on the local community’s perceptions of archaeological research. They questioned me, using Swahili as mode of communication, why such research was needed. With intermediate level of Swahili, I explained that the main purpose was to learn from the community about archaeological practices and what needs to be improved. After a brief communication, I was encouraged and given full support to come back to purse the research.

Considering the remoteness of the area in terms of facilities, there were two options as to where we (Naserian, Kokeli, and I) could have stayed – with the Antiquities officials or with the Maasai community. I made the decision. A number of reasons directed my decision particularly access to resources and previous contact with the Antiquities officials. But, perhaps the most realistic reason was guided by the experience of my first visit. At the end of my first visit, I requested for lodging assistance at the Antiquities camp. The Antiquities officials approved the request and guaranteed me to stay in the camp free of charge.
I accepted the offer to stay in the Antiquities camp upon my return with my colleagues (Naserian and Kokeli) because of the comfort that the camp can offer in terms of access to water, lodging, and solar power to charge our electronic devices. Furthermore, since we did not have a vehicle we had to walk on foot every day, and for the first time until we had to get used to the area and we introduce ourselves to the Maasai community properly, I thought the suitable option for us was to stay with the Antiquities officials. Staying in the Antiquities Camp was also viewed as a means of interacting with members of the Maasai community and locating informants.

The next month three of us came to Oldupai. Once settled, we started interacting with the community members who came to the camp. This time the camp needed fencing; consequently, a large number of Maasai men and women were given temporary jobs by the Antiquities Division and a Tanzanian principal investigator of one of the archaeological and paleoanthropological research projects in the area. In addition to meeting with these diverse members of the community, I was able to acquaint with those I met during my first visit. Kokeli was also able to reconnect with some of the Maasai people he met in 2007 and 2008. Other two venues that made possible to interact with the community members was the second Antiquities camp and the Oldupai Museum. We observed that some of the Maasai women were coming to the museum to find opportunity to sell their beadwork and to buy food and cleaning supplies from the shop next to the museum thus Naserian focused on interaction with them in order to make the community aware of our presence and to obtain preliminary information. This opportunity allowed us to get access into the community, to meet diverse members –

---

4 At the end of the interviews, some members of the Maasai community informed us it would have been better if we had stayed in one of their homes.
elders and youth, both men and women, to be welcomed, and to receive advice on how to proceed to the next step.

In all interviews, Naserian and Kokeli interacted with informants using the local language, Maa, to make communication easier to the local people and to obtain information within the local context. We conducted individual in-depth interviews and focus group discussions in a way that engages both parties – our group and the informants – in the process. Because of their background, Naserian and Kokeli quickly picked up the local tradition of sharing information that the Maasai people use on a daily, at least twice a day, in the morning and evening to inform each other or update on what is happening to the person or family for that matter. Thus they used this local mode of conversation in all interactions we had. This kind of conversation gives one of the participants a chance to speak and another to listen, normally by giving some sounds or sometimes by nodding to indicate that a listener is following a conversation but he or she also has the chance to interfere for purposes of clarification.

Our approach was generally first to introduce the local people who we are and what brought us to their area. If a person/group agreed to participate, arrangements were made as to when the conversation would take place depending on the convenience of the participants. They were also asked whether they could allow us to audio-record the interviews using digital voice recorder; luckily all participants, individually or in groups, consented which gave Naserian and Kokeli the opportunity to transcribe the information at a later time.

In the process of initial individual interview interactions, members of the community interviewed us by asking “What are you here for?” We informed them that
our presence was “to learn from the community about their perspectives of activities that take place in the gorge”. We conducted several initial individual interviews with a number of men and women. Kokeli/Naserian asked questions and translate relevant information from Maasai to English in order to include me in the conversation. Once we started the individual interviews, the informants switched the role and decided to interview us by asking some critical questions. They inquired how the information they provide us influence and impact our group, their community as well as the informants themselves. In this situation we revisited the informed consent and explained the whole research permit process and why we were conducting the research. We informed them that the research was part of an academic exercise that will allow me to obtain my PhD degree, and in turn this academic exercise through publication is hoped to create awareness among the research communities working in the area.

If they agreed to participate, we informed them that we would learn about their background, their interaction with archaeologists, and their views of archaeological practices. We guaranteed them that we would report the information anonymously and interview records and transcriptions would be kept only with three of us (the researchers), and if they wished not to participate they could withdraw at any time. We highlighted there was no benefit from participating in the research at individual level; however the indirect benefit was through publication the research would seek to understand the community’s perspectives, identify ways to incorporate their views and concerns into the archaeological practices, and how local communities and
archaeologists effectively communicate. We also promised to present the research outcome in conferences.

After this we were advised to consult the elders. We met with some of the elders, and the next day the elders requested us to give them a list of questions. We submitted a few questions written in Kiswahili, which were intended to guide the group discussion. The elders responded back with short written answers for all questions. We immediately informed the elders that the information they provided was a good start but it would be nice if the community could provide us an opportunity to have a group discussion. The elders agreed and arranged the group discussion to take place after three days.

The group discussion was held in the evening in one of the elders’ home. We stayed for the night there and as a way of paying respect we took a goat, few kilos of sugar, tea, and soft drinks. A goat was slaughtered in the evening and chai (tea and milk) was prepared for all participants. The elders organized the meeting with mostly men. Thus there were six elder men and one woman. The elder woman was going back and forth to the women who were preparing the chai and attending their domestic responsibilities. Thus the dominance of male informants in the conversation was notable. In this focus-group discussion, elders would give each other a chance to respond on a question or give additional information as to what the other has just said. Others would cross-examine themselves by asking other participants to confirm whether his memory of the event or issue discussed was correct. In this case, others would affirm or correct the given information if necessary. Despite the male domination, the elder woman was later invited to contribute her view. One of the elders also reminded

---

5 At the end of the project, we took to the informants’ homes a small present – a kilo of sugar and a box of tea or soap bars – as a way of expressing our appreciation.
Kokeli and Naserian that it was necessary to translate the information into English so that I could understand the discussion. Thus throughout the discussion, Kokeli asked questions, Naserian translated the conversation into a notebook, and I read Naserian’s notebook.

All in-depth individual interviews began by greetings and informally sharing current information about the well-being of each other. After that we proceed with interview. Then we would pose a question to the informant to begin the ethnographic conversation and, depending on each question, he/she would give short or long answers. Long-answers gave a community member an opportunity to situate the background of the case under discussion or the initial answer. Both our group and the informants also had a chance to ask any questions we/they had, as is done in the local mode of exchanging conversation. Due to the nature of the conversation, slow and that demands patience and attention to details, interviews with informants would take some hours of a day and would proceed in the next couple of days when they are available to continue where we left the conversation. In order to include me into the process of exchanging information, when it was important either to update or brief me on what has been said and to allow her ask additional questions on pertinent issues, Kokeli and Naserian translated some conversations into English at the time of interview.

Later, Naserian and I returned back to the community in January 2012. This time, instead of with the Antiquities officials, we stayed with the Maasai community. Naserian⁶ and two high school students⁷ from the community were able to conduct 59

---

⁶ Having Naserian in our group was inspiring to the local Maasai women, who were very happy to see a woman from their group involved in archaeological research projects.
individual open-ended structured interviews in the form of orally administrated questionnaires to supplement and verify the information collected through participant observation, in-depth individual and focus group interviews. During both visits, among the leading questions we asked were: Have you seen people who look for stones and bones\(^8\) in the gorge? Does the community have local names for these activities (archaeological and paleoanthropological research)? And could you share with us what the community thinks of these activities?

All the information collected through interviews, focus-group or questionnaire format was transcribed from Maa into English by Naserian/Kokeli. Despite the fact that Kokeli and Naserian spoke Maa fluently, they thought it would have taken a long time to transcribe this information into its original language because their knowledge of a written Maa grammar is limited. English transcription would also facilitate for me to easily access and understand the information. Transcription took a bit longer just to make sure that the information on the audio-records is correctly transcribed, not just contextually but also to obtain its appropriate local meaning.

---

\(^7\) The two high school students wanted to participate in the project. I left their names anonymous for any unforeseen negative consequences.

\(^8\) We learned from those we have interviewed in the very beginning that they call archaeologists those who look for bones and stones
Table B-1. Karoma’s envisioned archaeology curriculum\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology I: Scope, Concepts and Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology II: Field Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology III: Laboratory Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>East African Prehistory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>African Prehistory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>World Archaeology and/or European, Near Eastern, Far Eastern, America or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eurasian Prehistory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The History of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Elementary Fieldwork (5 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Advanced Fieldwork (10 weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Individual Reconnaissance Survey Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Science in Archaeology (geology, ecology, statistics, physics etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Current trends in Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Social Sciences in Archaeology (Anthropology, Ethnography, History, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^9\) Extracted from (Karoma 1979:18).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>HI 130</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 131</td>
<td>Old World Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 132</td>
<td>Primatology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Geology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 102</td>
<td>External Processes</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 105</td>
<td>Intro to Geology (Practical)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 115</td>
<td>Mapping and Instruments (Practical)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 125</td>
<td>Photogeology (Practical)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 100</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 100</td>
<td>Themes in African History</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 101</td>
<td>Methods of Social Science Research</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100</td>
<td>Elementary Statistics</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>HI 230</td>
<td>Methodology and Field Techniques I</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 231</td>
<td>African Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 232</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania I</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 208</td>
<td>Principles of Stratigraphy</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 229</td>
<td>Quaternary Geology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZL 210</td>
<td>Man and his Environment</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 200</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 200</td>
<td>History of East Africa</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

10 This information is obtained from the 1986 document that shows revision of the 1980 archaeology syllabus. University of Dar es Salaam. History Department. Source, Peter Schmidt’s personal archive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>SO 270</td>
<td>Social Structure of Tanzania Societies</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 280</td>
<td>African Civilizations and Cultures</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 200</td>
<td>Physical Resources</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>HI 330</td>
<td>Methodology and Field Techniques II</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 331</td>
<td>Independent Projects</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 332</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania II</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 332</td>
<td>Quaternary Palaeoecology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 394</td>
<td>The Sociology of Culture and Knowledge</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 333</td>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MT 208</td>
<td>Computing I</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BT 300</td>
<td>Soil Science</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 130</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 131</td>
<td>Old World Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 132</td>
<td>Principle of Physical Anthropology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 135</td>
<td>Practical Field Training in Archaeology: Survey and Testing</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Geology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 102</td>
<td>External Processes</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 103</td>
<td>Internal Processes</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 105</td>
<td>Introduction to Geology (Practical)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 115</td>
<td>Mapping and Instruments (Practical)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 125</td>
<td>Photogeology (Practical)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 100</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 100</td>
<td>Themes in African History</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 101</td>
<td>Methods of Social Science Research</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100</td>
<td>Elementary Statistics</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 102</td>
<td>Cartographic and Quantitative Method I</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 This information is obtained from the 1986 document that shows revision of the 1980 archaeology syllabus. University of Dar es Salaam. History Department. Source, Peter Schmidt’s personal archive. The University of Dar es Salaam (1991/1992) Prospectus shows some changes to this curriculum outline. From the first year (GY 101 Internal Processes Geology course and GE 102 Cartographic and Quantitative Method) and from the second year (GY 229 Quaternary Geology, ZL 210 Man and His Environment, GE 200 Physical Resources and GE 102 Remote sensing and Quantitative Methods in Geography were dropped). In the second year, ZL 302 Evolution and GY 214 Structural Geology I were added as optional courses to replace the two geography optional courses. Furthermore, the previously listed as optional course HI 334 Special Themes in Archaeology changed to core course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>HI 230</td>
<td>Archaeological Methodology and Theory I</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 231</td>
<td>African Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 232</td>
<td>Introduction to Principles of culture</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 233</td>
<td>Techniques in Archaeology I (Practical/Lab)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 235</td>
<td>Practical Field Training in Archaeology: Excavation</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 208</td>
<td>Principles of Stratigraphy</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 229</td>
<td>Quaternary Geology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZL 210</td>
<td>Man and his Environment</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 200</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 202</td>
<td>History of East Africa</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 270</td>
<td>Social Structure of Tanzania Societies</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 280</td>
<td>African Civilizations and Cultures</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 200</td>
<td>Physical Resources</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 102</td>
<td>Remote Sensing and Quantitative Methods in Geography</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>HI 330</td>
<td>Archaeological Methodology and Theory II</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 331</td>
<td>Independent Projects</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 332</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 333</td>
<td>Techniques in Archaeology II (Practical/Lab)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>HI 220</td>
<td>Philosophies and Methodologies of History</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 334</td>
<td>Special Themes in Archaeology</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 394</td>
<td>The Sociology of Culture and Knowledge</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table B-3. Continued |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>HI 130</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 131</td>
<td>Old World Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 132</td>
<td>Principle of Physical Anthropology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 135</td>
<td>Practical Field Training in Archaeology: Survey and Testing</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Geology</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 102</td>
<td>External Processes</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 103</td>
<td>Internal Processes</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 125</td>
<td>Photogeology (Practical)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 100</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 100</td>
<td>Themes in African History</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 115</td>
<td>Mapping and Instruments (Practical)</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 101</td>
<td>Methods of Social Science Research</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100</td>
<td>Elementary Statistics</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-4. 1980s archaeology curriculum from UDSM’s prospectus\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{12} UDSM prospectus (1987:49-52).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>HI 230</td>
<td>Archaeological Methodology and Theory I</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 231</td>
<td>African Prehistory</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 232</td>
<td>Introduction to Principles of culture</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 233</td>
<td>Techniques in Archaeology I (Practical/Lab)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 235</td>
<td>Practical Field Training in Archaeology: Excavation</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 208</td>
<td>Principles of Stratigraphy</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 200</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 202</td>
<td>History of East Africa</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 270</td>
<td>Social Structure of Tanzania Societies</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 280</td>
<td>African Civilizations and Cultures</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 200</td>
<td>Physical Resources</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 102</td>
<td>Remote Sensing and Quantitative Methods in Geography</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZL 302</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 214</td>
<td>Structural Geology</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>HI 330</td>
<td>Archaeological Methodology and Theory II</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 331</td>
<td>Independent Projects</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 332</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 333</td>
<td>Techniques in Archaeology II (Practical/Lab)</td>
<td>Core</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>HI 220</td>
<td>Philosophies and Methodologies of History</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 334</td>
<td>Special Themes in Archaeology</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 394</td>
<td>The Sociology of Culture and Knowledge</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 218</td>
<td>Sedimentology</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Study</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Course Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>HI 130</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 131</td>
<td>World Prehistory</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 132</td>
<td>Principles of Physical Anthropology</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 135</td>
<td>Practical Field Training in Archaeology (Survey)</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 100</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 100</td>
<td>Themes in African History</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 101</td>
<td>Introduction to Geology</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 102</td>
<td>External Processes</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 105</td>
<td>Introduction to Geological Mapping</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 125</td>
<td>Photogeology (Practical)</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 135</td>
<td>Ten Field Excursions</td>
<td>COD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 101</td>
<td>Methods of Social Science Research</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 100</td>
<td>Elementary Statistics</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 100</td>
<td>Background to Physical resources</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>HI 230</td>
<td>Archaeological Method and Theory I</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 231</td>
<td>African Prehistory</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 232</td>
<td>Introduction to the Principles of Culture</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 233</td>
<td>Techniques in Archaeology I</td>
<td>CAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>HI 235</td>
<td>Practical Field Training in Archaeology (Excavation)</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 200</td>
<td>Development Studies</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 207</td>
<td>Vertebrate Palaeontology</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 208</td>
<td>Principles of Stratigraphy</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 202</td>
<td>History of East Africa</td>
<td>COD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 270</td>
<td>Social Structure of Tanzania Societies</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 280</td>
<td>African Civilizations and Culture</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZL 302</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>HI 330</td>
<td>Archaeological Methods and Theory II</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 331</td>
<td>Independent Projects</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 332</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 200</td>
<td>Philosophies and Methodologies of History</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAY = Compulsory Archaeology Course, COD = Compulsory Course from other Discipline, OC = Optional Course
Table B-6. The archaeology program’s curriculum from 2001/2002 Academic Year \(^\text{14}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of study</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>HI 140</td>
<td>Introduction to archaeology</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 141</td>
<td>Principles of archaeology</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 142</td>
<td>Introduction to anthropology</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 143</td>
<td>Old world prehistory</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 146</td>
<td>Field training in archaeology (survey)</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 102</td>
<td>Introduction to social science research methods</td>
<td>FCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 103</td>
<td>Social science research methods</td>
<td>FCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL 111</td>
<td>Introduction to critical thinking and argumentation</td>
<td>FCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL 106</td>
<td>Communication skills for arts and social sciences</td>
<td>FCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 101</td>
<td>Development perspectives I</td>
<td>FCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 102</td>
<td>Development perspectives II</td>
<td>FCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST 117</td>
<td>Introduction to computers</td>
<td>FCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 101</td>
<td>Basic concepts and perspectives in historical scholarship</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 104</td>
<td>Themes in African history</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 144</td>
<td>New world prehistory</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 145</td>
<td>Introduction to primatology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 120a</td>
<td>Introduction to geology, geomorphology and soils</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{14}\) From Mabulla and Magori (2005:27-28) with minor adjustment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>GY 100</td>
<td>Introduction to geology and geological processes</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>HI 240</td>
<td>Background to archaeological methods and theory</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 242</td>
<td>Human evolution</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 243</td>
<td>African Civilizations</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 248</td>
<td>Research methods in archaeology</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 250</td>
<td>Field training in archaeology (excavation)</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 214</td>
<td>Human adaptations, Variations and growth</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 244</td>
<td>Lithic analysis in archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 245</td>
<td>Fauna analysis in archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 246</td>
<td>Metal analysis in archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 247</td>
<td>Ceramic analysis in archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 249</td>
<td>Archaeological methodology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 2008</td>
<td>Principles of Stratigraphy</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 257</td>
<td>Palaeontology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 258</td>
<td>Remote sensing and GIS I</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>HI 314</td>
<td>Cultural heritage management</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 342</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 344</td>
<td>Independent project in archaeology</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 345</td>
<td>Advanced archaeological theory</td>
<td>CAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 343</td>
<td>Introduction to museum studies</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 345</td>
<td>Recent research approaches in archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of study</td>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Course Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>HI 346</td>
<td>Peoples and cultures of Africa</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GY 368</td>
<td>Remote sensing and GIS II</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZL 302</td>
<td>Evolution</td>
<td>OC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAY = Compulsory Archaeology Course, FCC = Faculty-wide Compulsory Course, OC = Optional Course
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>AY 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 101</td>
<td>Principles of Archaeology</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 102*</td>
<td>Introduction to Anthropology</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 103</td>
<td>Old World Prehistory</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 120</td>
<td>Field Training in Archaeology (Survey)</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 104</td>
<td>New World Prehistory</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 105</td>
<td>Introduction to Primatology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>AY 200</td>
<td>Background to Archaeological Theory and Methods</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 202*</td>
<td>Human Evolution</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 203</td>
<td>African Civilization</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 208</td>
<td>Research Method in Archaeology</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 220</td>
<td>Field Training in Archaeology</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 201</td>
<td>Human Adaptations, Variations, and Growth</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 204</td>
<td>Lithic Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 205</td>
<td>Fauna Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 206</td>
<td>Metal Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from (Archaeology Unit 2006:6-7). Each course weighs 3 units. In the list below courses marked * are only for archaeology major students whereas * means an optional course for archaeology minor students. Unmarked courses apply for both archaeology major and minor students. A course marked − is not for archaeology major or minor students rather for students who major in education. Other compulsory courses are taken from other disciplines that include computer, communication, development studies, history and philosophy (Kessy and Mabulla 2009)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>AY 207</td>
<td>Ceramic Analysis in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 209</td>
<td>Archaeological Methodology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 268</td>
<td>History of East Africa</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>AY 300*</td>
<td>Advanced Archaeological Theory</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 301</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Management</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 302</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 303*</td>
<td>Introduction to Museum Studies</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 300+</td>
<td>Advanced Archaeological Theory</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 304-</td>
<td>Basics in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 305</td>
<td>Human Osteology and Osteometry</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 306</td>
<td>People and Cultures in Africa</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 307</td>
<td>Recent Research Approaches in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 399</td>
<td>Independent Project in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 368</td>
<td>Oral Histories in Tanzania</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC = Compulsory course, OC = Optional course
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Core course code and title</th>
<th>Elective course code and title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HI 010  History of Tanzania</td>
<td>HI 013  Heritage Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HI 011  Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
<td>HI 015  Exposure to Culture Heritage Institutions in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HI 012  Heritage Laws and By-laws</td>
<td>HI 016  Heritage Conservation Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HI 014  Introduction to Museum</td>
<td>HI 017  Rescue Operation Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HI 018  Cultural Tour Guiding</td>
<td>HI 019  Entrepreneurship in the Heritage Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HI 049  Practical Training</td>
<td>HI 020  Care of Collections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adopted from the University of Dar es Salaam Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Department of History (Incorporating Archaeology Unit). Heritage Management and Tour Guidance Certificate Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HI 051</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HI 052</td>
<td>Heritage Laws and By-Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HI 054</td>
<td>Museum Management and Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HI 055</td>
<td>Principles of Cultural Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HI 056</td>
<td>Conservation of Heritage Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HI 057</td>
<td>Rescue Operations for Heritage Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HI 058</td>
<td>Cultural Tour Guiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HI 059</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship in Heritage Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HI 060</td>
<td>English for Tour Guides I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HI 061</td>
<td>History of Tourism in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HI 063</td>
<td>English for Tour Guides II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HI 99</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-10. Heritage Management\textsuperscript{18}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Course Code\textsuperscript{19}</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>HI 101</td>
<td>Basic Concepts and Perspectives in Historical Scholarship</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Archaeology</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 102</td>
<td>Introduction to Social Science Research Methods</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 101</td>
<td>Development Perspectives I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CL 106</td>
<td>Communication Skills for Arts and Social Sciences</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 106</td>
<td>Basic French I</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FP 100</td>
<td>Art and Society</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 152*</td>
<td>Introduction to Archival Studies and Heritage Documentation</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 103</td>
<td>Social Science Research Methods</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS 102</td>
<td>Development Perspectives II</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL 111</td>
<td>Introduction to Critical Thinking and Argumentation</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL 161</td>
<td>Basic French II</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 115</td>
<td>Introduction to Culture and Society</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 120</td>
<td>Field Training in Archaeology (Survey)</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{18} Archival source from the Archaeology Unit. A document titled “the curriculum for the proposed B.A. Heritage Management and Cultural Tourism, document updated on February 9, 2009”.

\textsuperscript{19} All courses are 3 units. Courses marked * are new courses. CC= Core Courses and OC= Optional course,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Course Code&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Year</td>
<td>AY 203</td>
<td>African Civilizations</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 261</td>
<td>History of Tanzania</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GE 251</td>
<td>Tourism and Leisure</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS 217</td>
<td>Introduction to Computers</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 221*</td>
<td>Conservation and Curation of Fauna Materials</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 222*</td>
<td>Conservation and Curation of Metal Materials</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 215*</td>
<td>Principles of Cultural Tourism</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 262</td>
<td>History of East Africa</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 225*</td>
<td>Tourism in African History</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 226*</td>
<td>History of Heritage Conservation in Africa</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 223*</td>
<td>Conservation and Curation of Lithic Materials</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 224*</td>
<td>Conservation and Curation of Ceramic Materials</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 264</td>
<td>African and World Religions: Islam and Christianity</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 230*</td>
<td>Practical Training in Heritage management</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>HI 368</td>
<td>Oral Histories in Tanzania</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 301</td>
<td>Culture Heritage Management</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>20</sup> All courses are 3 units. Courses marked * are new courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Course Code&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Year</td>
<td>AY 322*</td>
<td>Ethics in Cultural Tourism</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 303</td>
<td>Introduction to Museum Studies</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 380*</td>
<td>Evolution of Ethnic Identities in Tanzania</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 306</td>
<td>Peoples and Cultures in Africa</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 324*</td>
<td>Introduction to Architecture in Archaeology</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 302</td>
<td>Archaeology of Tanzania</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 321*</td>
<td>International Heritage Laws</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 323*</td>
<td>Intangible Heritage Resources in Tanzania</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI 379</td>
<td>Oral Histories in Tanzania: Practical</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SO 393</td>
<td>Society, Culture and Health</td>
<td>OC</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CC= Compulsory course, OC= Optional course

---

<sup>21</sup> All courses are 3 units. Courses marked * are new courses.
Table B-11. MA archaeology Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Core Courses</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Optional Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AY 600</td>
<td>Archaeological Approaches</td>
<td>AY 606</td>
<td>Lithic Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AY 601</td>
<td>Archaeological Methodology</td>
<td>AY 607</td>
<td>Ceramic Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AY 602</td>
<td>Development of Archaeological Theory</td>
<td>AY 608</td>
<td>Metal Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AY 603</td>
<td>African and the Emergence of Humankind</td>
<td>AY 609</td>
<td>Architectural Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AY 604</td>
<td>Cultural Heritage Management</td>
<td>AY 610</td>
<td>Technologies of the Organic Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AY 605</td>
<td>The Emergence of Africa's Complex Socio-cultures</td>
<td>AY 611</td>
<td>Development of Archaeology in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>AY 699</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>HI 605</td>
<td>Theory of History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI 606</td>
<td>Historiography of Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HI 612</td>
<td>Topics in Tanzania Environmental History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MA by coursework program is designed for 18 months. The program consists of two semesters of class instructions. In the two semesters of study, students take 20 units, 12 of which are cores courses and a few optional courses to add the remaining 8 units. The dissertation course weighs 12 units (Archaeology Unit 2006:82-83).
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