


Exploring Differences and Finding Connections in Archaeology and History Practice and Teaching in the Livingstone Museum and the University of Zambia, 1973 to 2016

Francis B. Musonda
University of Zambia

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/zssj>

 Part of the [African History Commons](#), [African Studies Commons](#), and the [Archaeological Anthropology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Musonda, Francis B. (2014) "Exploring Differences and Finding Connections in Archaeology and History Practice and Teaching in the Livingstone Museum and the University of Zambia, 1973 to 2016," *Zambia Social Science Journal*: Vol. 5 : No. 2 , Article 6.
Available at: <https://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/zssj/vol5/iss2/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarship@Cornell Law: A Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Zambia Social Science Journal by an authorized editor of Scholarship@Cornell Law: A Digital Repository. For more information, please contact jmp8@cornell.edu.

Exploring differences and finding connections in Archaeology and History practice and teaching in the Livingstone Museum and the University of Zambia, 1973 to 2016

Francis B. Musonda

*Department of Historical and Archaeological Studies,
University of Zambia*

This article looks at the way archaeology and history have been practised and taught at the Livingstone Museum, Zambia and the University of Zambia in relation to each other as closely allied disciplines between 1973 and 2016. It identifies some of the areas in which they have either collaborated well, or need to do so, and those that set them apart in their common aim to study the past. The paper has identified a number of grey areas that have tended to be inimical to the advancement of the two institutions in their quest to advance the study of Zambia's historical and prehistoric past. The paper is presented in a narrative form in which issues central to the development of archaeology are discussed and challenges highlighted. The paper has established that despite the close relationship that exists between archaeology and history and their practice in the Livingstone Museum and the University of Zambia, little has been done to ensure that the two disciplines benefit from collaboration.

Key words: archaeology, history, collaboration, stakeholders, career transformation.

Introduction

The introduction of prehistoric studies in Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia) took place at the turn of the twentieth century as part of the colonization of the territory by the British colonial bureaucracy and settler community (Fielden, 1905; Macrae, 1925; Musonda, 2012). The European concept of time as was being studied in prehistory was introduced in Northern Rhodesia as an important fundamental idea in the study of the country's past. As prehistoric studies began to be undertaken in the Victoria Falls area (Clark, 1952, 1964, 1975) this marked a momentum to assert the understanding of the antiquity of humankind, thus bringing into context the importance of cultural heritage protection. Perhaps it was from this perspective that the colonial government saw the need to preserve the country's cultural and natural heritage and ensure its protection.

Legislation known as the Bushman Relics Proclamation of 1912, was enacted to enforce heritage protection in the country. This was followed by the establishment of the Rhodes-Livingstone Museum (now Livingstone Museum) in 1934 and the National Monuments Commission (now National Heritage Conservation Commission) in 1947 as part of the Museum (Mufuzi, 2010, 42). The two institutions were separated in 1948. These initiatives were followed by several positive steps taken by government to create awareness among the local communities of the importance of protecting archaeological resources. At that time, few indigenous peoples, if any, could contemplate instituting similar measures, other than what was allowed for under traditional conservation practices (Musonda, 1987a, 1994).

The establishment of the museum and the National Monuments Commission was in conformity with the broad colonial policy of protecting the country's heritage and providing a cultural avenue through which intellectual life and understanding of Zambia's past would begin and develop. It was through these initiatives that archaeology developed in Northern Rhodesia as a discipline that was solely concerned with the Stone Age period (Clark, 1950a, 1950b) until the late 1950s when the recent past began to receive some attention (Musonda, 2012). The study of the recent period was largely left to historians while the distant past remained the prime focus of archaeologists. However, excavations at Iron Age sites such as Isamu Pati (Fagan, 1967), and Ingombe Ilede (Fagan et al., 1969, 57-186) brought history closer to archaeology because of the nature of the material culture which suggested interaction between the prehistoric and historical past of the country (Fagan, 1968; Phillipson, 1975).

It was not until the early 1970s that indigenous Zambians began to participate actively in the study of their past. Like most Zambians at the time of independence, they entered their fields of study including those who ventured into the field of archaeology and museum career purely by accident. Some did so after turning down Zambian government secondary school teaching jobs in preference for museum jobs, while others started their careers in parastatal companies that were being set up by government. For this writer, it was on completion of a Bachelor of Science degree at the University of Zambia in February 1973 that the Livingstone Museum presented a career plan that was in line with the programme of study pursued at the University, which was to allow for specialization in geography within the museum context.

The hope of pursuing the museum career in geography was strengthened by the encouragement of the then Chairman of the National Museums Board, the late Mr. Edward Shamwana, and my former University of Zambia (UNZA) lecturer, Mr. John Giardino. As the museum worked on the logistics to establish

the proposed department, it became necessary to deploy me in a related museum department. It was agreed that I serve under the Department of Pre-History where Joseph Vogel was involved in excavations of Iron Age sites in the middle Zambezi valley. Two months later, an opportunity presented itself to participate in an archaeological excavation at Mumbwa Caves, where Karla Savage, a PhD student from the University of California, Berkeley, was conducting excavations. I worked at the site for three months from April 1973, before proceeding to the University of Ghana to study archaeology. It was while in Ghana that I became aware of connections between archaeology and geography, as well as mathematics. The use of statistics and cluster analysis in artifact analysis, and heavy reliance on concepts such as ecology, stratigraphy, environment and landscape in interpreting prehistoric societies made the study of archaeology more meaningful and acceptable.

A strong foundation in the natural sciences is advantageous to the study of archaeology in a broad range of areas in Stone Age and Iron Age studies. The Ghanaian training was interdisciplinary in character and allowed for acquisition of knowledge in such specialized areas as geology, biology, geography and paleontology. It was while in Ghana that it became clear that archaeology was essentially interdisciplinary, with a humanistic approach to the study of the past that is not dependent on mere fact finding. This is what distinguishes archaeology from other social sciences. The training mix of archaeology and museum work was complex. Museums are practical institutions undertaking activities that enhance research, exhibitions, collections, storage, conservation and much more, bringing together scholarly and professional domains (Alexander and Alexander, 2008).

My career move from Livingstone Museum to the University of Zambia was not unprecedented. Encouragement and direction came from the career paths of J. Desmond Clark, Brian M. Fagan, Joseph O. Vogel and Ray R. Inskeep who had successful careers at the Livingstone Museum and went on to have successful teaching and research careers in universities in the U.S.A. and South Africa. Similarly, there were others such as David W. Phillipson, Robin Derricourt and John Robertson who had equally successful research careers in the National Monuments Commission of Zambia and were later professionally contributing to knowledge dissemination in universities in the United Kingdom, North America and Australia.

In 2005, a job opportunity arose in the University of Zambia with an offer of a teaching position in the Department of History. This was an ill-equipped department for teaching archeology. Despite that, I took up the position knowing that doing so would open a window for Zambians to a broader understanding

of archaeology. My conviction was that archaeology is not only a discipline for museums and heritage institutions where material culture could be exclusively gathered, but also for universities. This marked a career transformation from museum work to university teaching and, more importantly, to scholarly interaction with the discipline of history.

This paper discusses perspectives in which archaeologists and historians look at each other through examination of a variety of contexts which are essential in the understanding of disciplines that study the past, and how their stakeholders are affected. Further, it examines my transition from museum work to a university environment and addresses issues that are common in museums and university departments that share research activities and the teaching of archaeology with history. These are disciplines that many universities in sub-Saharan Africa consider to be sister disciplines. The paper is written from a somewhat rare vantage point in the Department of History (now Department of Historical and Archaeological Studies) at the University of Zambia, where for the past eleven years I have been teaching and conducting research in archaeology, assisting with tutorials, and teaching history courses that have archaeology components in an effort to build a relationship and bridge the gap between the two disciplines.

Reflections on Archaeology and History in the Livingstone Museum

During the colonial period, the practice of archaeology in Zambia was largely an expatriate endeavour (Musonda, 2012). This was in line with what was happening elsewhere on the African continent (Robertshaw, 1990; Clark, 1986). The discovery of archaeological materials in the Victoria Falls region, and other parts of the country, during the early twentieth century (Fielden, 1905) marked the beginning of the reconstruction of the country's past and concern with questions of historical process. The Livingstone Museum housed large quantities of archaeological materials which were essential in fostering ethnic and national identity. Reconstructions of the past as displayed in the Archaeology Gallery were fundamentally narrative in character and dealt largely with stone tool assemblages that were described in great detail as a way of interpreting past cultures and events.

Early archaeological reports reveal that little was done to explain patterns or regularities in the past that would have been useful in the understanding of spatial distribution of assemblages (Clark, 1952, 1964, 1975). Evidence of human occupation was presented in the accepted manner of compiling culture histories, through reconstruction of ways of life of ancient peoples,

and description and analysis of cultural processes (Willey and Phillips, 1958; Binford, 1968a). However, in the ensuing years, the discipline grew through research and encountered diversification in areas of study that ranged from stone tool technology, Iron Age traditions, iron technology, copper technology, Bantu studies and origins of agriculture. Results of these archaeological studies reflect the colonial policy of not only ensuring cultural heritage protection, but creating public awareness about its importance. This approach to the study of the past ensured that by 1964 when Zambia became independent, many parts of the country had been explored and the history of the people fairly well reconstructed.

However, there was no appreciable attention paid to bridging the gap between historical and archaeological studies, although history was accorded a place in the Rhodes-Livingstone Museum in 1961, with the employment of Gervase C.R. Clay, the first historian at the Museum who served as Director at the same time (Mufuzi, 2010, 67). Earlier, at the Third Pan-African Congress on Prehistory held in Livingstone in 1955 (Clark (ed.), 1957), J. Desmond Clark, the then Director of the Museum had made a passionate plea to Congress participants to support his proposal to create a position for an Iron Age specialist to study Iron Age societies (Clark, 1990, 193; Musonda, 2012, 92) and Ray R. Inskeep became the first Iron Age specialist in the country in 1957. This trend of having both historian and archaeologist on the museum establishment continued after Independence. This was done to emphasize the importance of studying local history. Unfortunately, this move did little to bridge the gap between archaeology and history. The two disciplines continued to be independent entities. Archaeology continued to deal with issues of the ancient past, such as stone tool making, hunting and gathering activities, while history concentrated on traditional discourses such as colonial history and the struggle for political independence. There was no clear link created between the prehistoric and historical past. Focus in both disciplines was on the original goals which guided the inception of the Livingstone Museum as it increasingly became an important research centre. However, the post-independence period had its challenges when it came to the practice of history in the museum. The nationalist spirit at the time ensured that history endeavoured to improve the negative image of Zambian culture and its recent past that had been inculcated by the authorities in the colonial era. Thus, emphasis shifted to improving knowledge of indigenous people's culture which had been despised, .

The lack of a clear working link between archaeology and history continued unabated well into the twenty-first century. Even when indigenous Zambians became part of the cultural heritage establishment, there was no evidence to show that there were strong concerns to bridge the gap between historical and

archaeological studies; cross-fertilization of ideas was patchy. Museum displays under archaeology continued to be based on the traditional approach to the study of the past that largely describes what happened in prehistory, rather than explaining prehistory (Wenke, 1980, 5). However, following the employment of qualified people in archaeology, history and ethnography (Mufuzi, 2010), there was an increased establishment of a localized display base that began to expand on issues of the ancient and most recent past. This marked a paradigm shift from Eurocentric to Afrocentric museum displays.

Undoubtedly, archaeology and history shared a common purpose in studying the past (Dymond, 1974). Their differences in methodology and research techniques required the museum to develop innovative ways that would lead to equitable sharing of resources necessary to bridge the gap between them. It was essential that a sense of closeness and commonality be created in undertaking research and institutional direction that would heighten a sense of belonging together. Was it the case of management not being responsive to the similarities that existed between the two disciplines? Or was it simply a lack of understanding the differences between them that underlined the critical gap between history and archaeology in the Livingstone Museum and the lack of attempts to unify them?

Bridging the gap between history and archaeology in the museum practice could have easily found support from research conducted at archaeological sites such as Twickenham Road (now Chakeluka Iron Age site) (Phillipson, 1970; Musonda, 2013), Isamu Pati and Ingombe Ilede (Fagan et al., 1969) whose interpretations depended on aspects from both disciplines. These sites sought explanations that were essential in contextualising populations that were prehistoric and historical in their ethnic identities.

The failure to bridge the gap between the later prehistory and historical period of the Soli/Lenje ethnic group in the Lusaka area, as revealed by excavations at Chakeluka Iron Age site, led to contestation of archaeological interpretation of cultural materials from the site (Musonda, 2013). While archaeology attempted to articulate events of the last stages of the site occupation prior to the setting up of colonial structures (Derricourt, 1986, 60-70; Phillipson, 1970), historical studies were patchy and of little relevance to the solution of contentious issues generated by archaeological discoveries. The failure of historical studies (or is it historians?) to address and articulate concerns of local communities regarding accusations of archaeologists' tampering with ancient burial sites was a clear indication of the reality of a gap between archaeology and history.

But it is also important to note that during the colonial and postcolonial periods up to the 1980s, issues pertaining to concerns of local communities

in matters of archaeological investigations and interpretations were marginal to the interests of most scholars. Archaeologists of that period were overly concerned with the study of archaeological materials and were able to lay the foundation for rigorous scholarship in such historical studies as metallurgy, Bantu migrations and pottery manufacture. Though these studies played an important role in bringing prehistory to history, little was done to address local histories. The claim by the Soli/Lenje communities that the human skeletal materials found at Chakeluka in 1968 during excavations of the site was evidence of their ancestral burial ground may be a case in point. It was not made manifest to European scholars until much later when indigenous scholars began to seek local explanations to aspects of the history of the area.

Career Transformation

In the mid-1970s, at the peak of the Zambianisation programme in the cultural sector, Robin Derricourt of the National Monuments Commission of Zambia, proposed to the University of Zambia that it include archaeology in its teaching programmes. He argued that the Department of History, established in 1966 (Phiri, 2016), would benefit from the country's archaeological discoveries in the reconstruction of Zambia's past. He considered collaborative research between the university and the country's cultural institutions (museums and National Monuments Commission) as being of great benefit to students and the country as a whole (personal comm.) Building human capacity was considered essential in a society emerging from more than ninety years of colonization. He argued that it was only through such programmes that young people would be able to make innovative responses necessary in meeting the needs of their communities. Any such collaborative efforts would subsequently become an integral part of a broader understanding and appreciation of the country's heritage. The university accepted the proposal, in principle, but could not implement it due to logistical problems.

However, in 2005, as stated above, the University of Zambia created a two year contract for me to teach archaeology within the Department of History. This followed an earlier offer made in 1988 which was not taken up, due to problems of accommodation in Lusaka, and strong pleas from the National Museums Board for me to continue being part of its developmental agenda. When retirement came in April 2005, time was now ripe to teach archaeology in a department with a distinctive character and an important role to play in the process of developing secondary school history teaching in postcolonial Zambia. At the time the Department of History was established, the country

lacked appropriately-trained people to teach history in schools. The inclusion of archaeology in the programme, though thirty-nine years later, was a fulfillment of the institution's mandate to adequately train teachers and establish networks with schools throughout the country.

The shift from museum work after thirty-two years of museum service, which largely involved research in archaeology, mounting archaeological displays, conservation of museum objects and museum administration, to teaching and research in archaeology, was indeed a challenge to career progression. Museum work entailed not only undertaking archaeological excavations of Stone Age sites but also the preservation of the country's cultural heritage and bringing this heritage to the attention of the local and international audience through publications and museum displays. As a museum worker, it was always exciting to participate in the design of displays and reconstruction of the country's cultural and historical past, and to add value to the people's cultural diversity and identities that together make up Zambia. This had to be demonstrated by presenting a broad picture of the development of cultures of different ethnic groups. Through working in collaboration with institutions such as the International Council of Museums, museum collections and activities were preserved and developed (Musonda, 2012).

As public institutions, museums enjoyed a lot of support from government, including financing of programmes and formulation of public policies that enhanced their management. Developing and executing public policies relating to training, financing, museum sustainability, seeking museum partnerships with stakeholders such as foreign embassies, schools, universities and local communities was an important component of museum development, accessibility to the public and promotion of museum self-financing. This was enhanced by the use of the media to communicate museum activities and programmes with their audiences, and in some cases use of traditional dimensions of temporary exhibitions and educational activities. These created an appreciable impact on public information dissemination.

In 1991 there was transfer of political power from the United National Independence Party (UNIP) to the Movement for Multiparty Democracy (MMD). This had major repercussions on museum research activities, resulting from their subordination to the political domain because of the newly embraced democratic liberalisation. Their total dependence on state funding, as non-profit-making institutions, entailed subservience to political authorities. It was a situation that translated into unclear departmental budgets for support of research and continuity of other museum programmes.

Departmental Traditions

As a new member of staff in the University of Zambia's Department of History, the first thing that became evident was the social cohesion that existed among individual members. They shared the characteristic of having intense interest in the study of the historical past.

It is quite obvious and expected that a departmental tradition that emerged at the inception of the University of Zambia in the mid-1960s would change over time as successful professionals took on new perceptions. One such important tradition was the holding of departmental seminars. Paper presentations on emerging new knowledge were a great source of inspiration and hard work. However, there was always something frustrating about some paper presentations that reflected the culture-historical approach, as their reconstructions of the past were fundamentally narrative in character. While most traditional historians may have no problems with such an approach to historical reconstructions, archaeologists are quite reluctant to accept the proposition that historical reconstructions of the past should be narrative because of the nature of their data and their approach to gathering such data. History should not only be narrative, but interpretative and analytical, especially if historical sources are rigorously interrogated. But the source of the problem may be to do with the historians' orientation, when they were trained and whether such training stressed good historical writing practices.

Another tradition that was as old as the department itself was the practice of moderating examination papers. Swapping exam papers and being able to agree on appropriate grades was indeed strength in the teaching of history, as it worked to uphold high academic standards and ensured fairness in the manner examinations were conducted and grades awarded.

As stated earlier, the Department of History (now Department of Historical and Archaeological Studies) remained one of the oldest departments in the University of Zambia, having been established in 1966 within the School of Education (Phiri, 2016). However, in 1989 there was a university policy shift to move the department from the School of Education to the School of Humanities and Social Sciences. Twenty-seven years later, one clearly got the impression that apart from teaching history to students, mostly from the School of Education, the policy shift had not achieved its intended purpose. Though history teaching remained an important component of academic work, it appeared this went only as far as preparing students for teaching in schools. Over eighty per cent of those in the department were from the School of Education; students from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, apart from those wishing to enter the School of Law, did not appear to be favorably inclined to history.

To ensure that all students had access to their course lectures, the department continued to conduct 'tutorials' in all history and archaeology courses. This was a clearly outlined method of teaching history which was mandatory and considered to be an important component of the history curriculum. Tutorial sessions were conducted at least once a week with numbers not exceeding fifteen students per session. The benefits were immeasurable.

The 1960s saw the emergence and recognition of the importance of African History. In 1960 the *Journal of African History* was launched. This was followed in 1966 by the *Cambridge History of Africa* volumes, coinciding with the opening of the University of Zambia. This led to an unprecedented increase in historical knowledge (McCracken, 1993, 243). During this period there was an expansion of pioneering work by newly appointed expatriate lecturers who previously had little or no experience of Africa. The acceptance of oral traditions in addition to written sources as a basis for studying African history was a huge bonus to history teaching in a new university (Musambachime pers. com.). The presence of expatriate history lecturers such as Professor Omer-Cooper ensured rapid development of the department and its rise to eminence (Phiri, pers.com).

The introduction of Bantu studies in the late 1960s (Summers, 1967, 1970) created an opportunity for historians and archaeologists to engage in debates on the origins and spread of Bantu-speaking peoples, though this was with varying degrees of success in the face of changes that were taking place in pottery typologies and linguistic classification (see for example Phillipson 1976, 1977). Scholars with interest in the study of preliterate societies used pottery assemblages, linguistics and oral traditions to explain these phenomena (Phillipson, 1976; Ehret and Posnansky (eds.), 1982; Oliver, 1966; Guthrie, 1962). Many of the reconstructions of Bantu expansion often relied on similarities of pottery assemblages and pottery sequence to trace movements of people who were identified linguistically and chronologically (Eggert, 2005, 301-326; Phillipson, 1976, 65-82). As archaeologists worked out sequence of pottery types evolving in some direction to explain the origins and expansion of Bantu-speakers, historians were introduced to all the details of pottery style, technology, decorative motifs and other attributes (Oliver, 1966, 361-376). Despite the conflicting theories of origin and migration there was growing understanding regarding the aims of history and archaeology. Archaeological discoveries and historical reconstructions of Bantu expansion have indeed been able to support each other. However, archaeologists and historians worked together only in as far as reconstructing movements of the Bantu-speakers was concerned.

From the early 1990s, the study of African history began to slow down, due to budget cuts and freezing of departmental staff establishments. The resource crisis affected attainment of potential strength in scholarship and was a grave problem to self-advancement. Networking with colleagues from western countries was adversely affected, brilliant colleagues with ambition to move on relocated to other universities, while others were forced into early retirement. Despite these challenges, teaching of history continued to maintain a significant presence in the University of Zambia, attracting large numbers of undergraduate students mainly from the School of Education and developing a strong research-oriented postgraduate programme.

Following his exposure to an American university educational system, B. J. Phiri presented a proposal to include public history in the history programme. Despite the acknowledgement that public history was a respectable and useful addition with academic value to the departmental syllabus, the proposal never reached the School Curriculum Committee. It appeared that colleagues in the department were content with the traditional subject matter that was being taught. Teaching and research interests continued to revolve around the political and social history of Zambia and neighboring countries, and contemporary issues, a situation that tended to denigrate the long precolonial history of the region. The department could have done well to revisit and focus its research on some of the old historical debates, such as the origins and dispersal of the Bantu-speaking peoples, origins of metallurgy and food production.

However, the introduction of archaeology in the history programme in 2005 added a new dimension to the interpretive context and organization of course outlines of some of the courses in history, such as "History of Zambia", that rely on archaeology for explanatory paradigms and professional socialization. The "History of Zambia" course has many archaeological components in it that make it ideal for exploring connections between the two disciplines. The incorporation of archaeology enabled the department to reposition itself in response to expanded responsibilities and diversity of societal needs. There was greater need to look beyond the perception of history as simply a teaching subject in schools and begin to incorporate more issues in the discipline that would make it more relevant to the needs of the modern world.

Perhaps, it is less speculative to argue that participation in the teaching of "Introduction to the study of History" and the "History of Zambia" courses enhanced my understanding of historical concepts, theories and differing agendas in research and interpretation of data under the postcolonial system. The stabilisation of academic debates in history, surrounding the nature of colonial agendas of colonial and nationalist historians of Africa, may partly be credited

to the work of archaeologists (Volume 1 UNESCO). This has largely been in the context of agendas of colonial and postcolonial articulation and interpretations of historical events, ethnic contestations, knowledge construction and consensus-building. The use of archaeology in the interpretation of historical events has been a huge success especially on the basis of its defiance of the Eurocentric myth of an unchanging continent, without a history, which has been, and perhaps continues to be, the basis of teaching much of African history. These were the sentiments expressed in a series of lectures by Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper in the early 1960s (Trevor-Roper, 1963, 871). It was through such an approach to knowledge-building that archaeology had its strongest contacts with history.

Bridging the gap between history and archaeology

It may not be quite so clear to all students of history that there are benefits to be derived from a close interplay with archaeology, because of its theoretical approaches, methodology, techniques of data recovery, nature and body of archaeological data and archaeological points of view. Insistence on a scientific approach to the study of the past, and employment of scientific concepts in the investigation of the past (Binford, 1968b, 1972a, 78, 1972b; Hodder, 1982, 1992) could make historians weary and scared. The theoretical debates of the 1960s - 90s which introduced processual and post-processual approaches to archaeology contributed substantially to the internal development of archaeology in Zambia. Archaeological approaches to investigations of sites in the Middle Zambezi Valley by Joseph Vogel (Vogel, 1987, 159-170), Kalambo Falls by J. D. Clark (1974, 2001), Iron Age and Later Stone Age sites by David W. Phillipson (2005) and others (Musonda, 1987b) blended the old and new methods in the study of the past, a sign that archaeology in Zambia had come of age.

For archaeologists, use of theory helps to simplify the understanding of archaeological data and enriches archaeological development and subsequently reveals how archaeological investigation and interpretation could add a new dimension to the world understanding itself (Ucko, 1995, 24). In archaeological research, the use of hypothesis testing, generalization and inference has been a phenomenon that is shared by all sciences, in the same way archaeology shares concepts with other disciplines including history in the social and cultural sphere.

What may not be very clear to archaeologists is whether historians consider the aspect of evolution of culture from Early Iron Age to Later Iron Age as representing technological improvement among Bantu speakers in the same way archaeologists explain it, as part of a sequence of pottery types achieving some functional efficiency in pottery making. Archaeologists associate Later Iron Age

pottery as representing gradual improvement from Early Iron Age pottery. This is largely reflected in refinement of rims, decorative motifs, and body structure. If there would be any difference in the interpretation of evolution of pottery assemblages between historians and archaeologists, this is a possible area where the two disciplines would need to collaborate.

This difference in the interpretation of pottery is likely to arise because field investigations do not always support the concept that there is always some form of relationship between evolving pottery and stratigraphic succession. An archaeological site, such as Chakeluka, with a complex stratigraphy is unlikely to show any relationship between the two. Excavations at Chakeluka site (Musonda, 2013, 52-62) revealed lack of support for interpretations that tend to suggest that typological sequence always represents an improvement in cultural tradition and perhaps advancement of a community. The presence of rubbish pits, collapsed huts, and hut floors having been dug through earlier occupation levels, hearths and other features that were possibly as a result of intermittent clearing and cleaning during occupation could be a departure from the norm. The opposite may have been quite true that there was degeneration of the pottery tradition an aspect that may defy common sense in historical reconstruction.

In archaeology, it is common to present an undisturbed sequence of horizontal strata with the lowest layer representing the oldest and the topmost one as being the youngest (Fagan, 1983). A more desirable explanation in understanding the rules of stratigraphy was therefore needed at Chakeluka site. The provision of practical training to students was an essential aspect in understanding how stratigraphy in an archaeological trench is established and the order of layers determined prior to historical reconstruction.

When the archaeology programme began in 2005, the aim was to balance the need for diversity of subject matter with limits on available staff and resources, how to be able to interest students in the study of archaeology without compromising the policy of history teaching in the department and practices in the University, and how best to deliver to the expectations of the student while forging new partnerships with the wider community. We worked to find commonalities among the subject matter in history and archaeology that could improve the study and understanding of the past and how the concerns of these professions would best be dealt with in a spirit of learning from each other. This approach to course design benefitted largely from training received from the University of California (Berkeley) which emphasised the thematic issues that blend with historical studies. From the outset, this proved worthwhile for teaching archaeology in the Department of History.

Archaeology in the USA during the 1970s and 1980s, when I was a student there, was taught as part of Anthropology, a discipline that spans virtually all the fields of knowledge in the Social Sciences, Humanities, Natural Sciences and Biological Sciences. The exposure to disciplines that embrace knowledge of all aspects of human behaviour enhanced understanding of essential aspects of scientific methods necessary in interpreting prehistoric peoples' way of life. Pursuing some of these aspects of study under the umbrella of anthropology created no discernible boundaries between certain topics, but instead allowed the study of the past to range freely over other areas of knowledge.

In the teaching of history, there is unjustifiable emphasis on written sources, particularly archival sources, something of a cliché that history deals only with interpretations of historical facts, whereas other sources, such as archaeology, deal with the facts themselves. This tends to underplay the contributions that sources such as interviews (oral history), oral traditions, linguistics and anthropology make towards historical reconstructions. How then can a discipline be wholly dependent on written records characterized by biases but still provide us with a correct reality of past events? However, the trend is shifting toward using other sources of data such as environmental, archaeological and anthropological to elucidate historical phenomena.

How then, can we mitigate against this misrepresentation of what history is? This can be done by highlighting its sources of data, their strengths and weaknesses (Musonda, 1986, 391-412) and covering all branches of history in research and teaching. The problem that has arisen in recent years is that some aspects of history such as social, political and colonial history have come to attract more researchers at the expense of others. Most researchers in the department made social, colonial, and political history their stomping ground, whereas environmental history continued to be neglected. We were yet to see history produce highly creative and insightful studies that would have any real impact on historical archaeology and the way historians viewed pre-colonial and the colonial past. This blending of the study of the historical past and archaeology would have ensured all histories of the precolonial past were not marginalised and weakened in the country's historical writing (Connah, 2004, 2007; Langworthy, 1972). In the process, some form of appreciation would have been created among students studying archaeology and history that the two disciplines indeed complement each other, and that both offer valuable data to the understanding of the past. It was here that the sense of preference for a historical discipline, with a better data system that tended to pervade both archaeology and history, was watered down and allowed to overlap with only the timescale to divide them.

It would be naïve for anyone to harbour any sense of superiority of one discipline over the other on the basis of some of the differences that exist between them. Although this may not be entirely unexpected, colleagues in the Department of Anthropology at Berkley in the late 1970s and early 1980s often denounced history as having little relevance to the study of Africa's distant past. There may have been some validity in this criticism considering that the major area of study in archaeology was the origins of humankind several millions of years ago. But to view historians as purveyors of highly subjective data was perhaps misconceived. There is even no truth in the assertion that most historians are theoretically less informed, something that finds support in their preference for conceptual framework, while their archaeology colleagues struggle with problems of theoretical framework.

To narrow the gap of suspicion between archaeologists and historians, there is need for collaborative research that would contribute to obtaining appropriate historical and archaeological interpretation for a comprehensive and stimulating past. Such an undertaking would not only contribute to improved academic standards, but would ensure improved communication and writing skills among students. In order to broaden and seek career insights and direction, the archaeology programme was set out to establish networking activities with cultural institutions that would benefit students. Each academic calendar included visits to museums, and field trips to archaeological sites, that provide data necessary to bridge the gap between history and archaeology. The Mumbwa Caves, Ingombe Ilede, Kalambo Falls, and Nachikufu Caves are such sites that have helped popularize the study of history.

Outings to archaeological sites always provoked intense excitement among students and offered unparalleled challenges and opportunities as much as they provided them with extraordinary learning experiences. Most importantly, they often revealed the essential value of field trips in supplementing classroom work. The inclusion of history students on these field trips revealed important connections between archaeology and history and enhanced the sharing of knowledge between the two disciplines. Cross-fertilization of knowledge was essential to fulfilling the diverse needs of students from different academic backgrounds. Undoubtedly, this provided them with academic direction in the study of the past.

The Ingombe Ilede site was particularly outstanding in sensitizing students to the interpretive interdependence of archaeology and history. The site has yielded spectacular Iron Age artifacts including gold beads, iron ornaments, and an assortment of foreign objects that provide evidence of external trade in Zambia prior to the coming of colonialism. The quality and quantity of

archaeological research that has continued at the site since it was first excavated in the late 1950s is very impressive.

An interesting aspect that emerged from linkages created between archaeology and history in the department was the increasing awareness of issues that are of great significance to the study of the past, particularly the recent past. History students learnt to become responsive to such themes and concepts as radiocarbon dating, cultural diffusion, origins of humans, hunter-gatherer behaviour, origins of food production, metallurgy, Bantu origins, typology, taphonomy, stratigraphy, artifact classification, and stone toolmaking. Some of these themes and concepts were not only less well understood in history, but often presented learning challenges to students.

There were more challenging connections that introduced students to case studies as part of assignments, instead of limiting them to the traditional approach of essay writing with its attendant problems of copy and paste and plagiarism. The 'garbage project' in archaeology started in Tucson, Arizona, USA, by Rathje (Rathje, 1984; Rathje and Murphy, 1992) was one of the greatest challenges to the teaching of archaeology. Students were guided to undertake the study of garbage heaps around the university campus and surrounding areas as part of taphonomic studies initiated by Rathje. Students with a major in history found the study very stimulating. Its implications on how archaeologists interpret their material culture, what material traces survive after disposal, and how archaeological sites are created were far reaching in the study of the past.

Undoubtedly, the exposure of history students to new approaches to the study of the past enabled them to begin making new advances in the interpretation of historical material. They were able to visualise the past and began to deal with many complex issues in understanding societies of the recent past. As is well known to archaeologists, the recent past embraces the ethnographic present and this aspect of archaeology is of great interest to historians. The archaeology of Chakeluka Iron Age site discussed above, embraces the ethnographic present and provides an excellent example of a heritage site that could be managed sustainably. Through an innovative programme mooted by the National Heritage Conservation Commission in the early 1990s which aimed to promote sustainable heritage development, the country's cultural and historical heritage was now better known and understood by students through site visits. The creation of *in situ* conservation and protection practices were some of the measures undertaken to help bridge the gap between university and cultural institutions in their endeavour to train students about their past.

Visits to heritage sites were particularly significant in providing students with an opportunity to learn the importance of establishing good working

relations with living communities that could have a stake and historical connection to the past. Such approaches to the study of the past would help avoid future confrontations with stakeholders as was the case at Chakeluka Iron Age Site (Musonda, 2013, 57-58).

Challenges

As noted above, Dymond (1974) emphasised that one of the major differences between archaeology and history lies in the methodology and techniques by which the past is studied. In 2009, the Department of History introduced its archaeology students to how archaeological data is gathered in a practical way. At the core of the difference is the nature of evidence archaeology deals with, the physical remains of the past that are recovered by means of systematic archaeological excavations (Renfrew and Bahn, 2012, 49). It was the re-excavation of Chakeluka Iron Age Site (Musonda, 2013) that exposed both archaeology and history students to techniques and methods of excavation, archaeological finds, stratigraphy, site occupation, chronology, interpretation of material culture and historical reconstruction of the past. In a discreet way, students were introduced to archaeological methodologies that are used in solving some of the problems in prehistory and the order in which historical events took place. Appreciation of the relevance of archaeology to historical reconstruction was achieved when it became clear that this archaeological site was ideal for cross-checking colonial documents relating to the establishment of the town of Lusaka, because of its unique position between prehistoric and historical periods (Williams, 1986).

Between 2008 and 2012 the University of Zambia perceived its mission in new ways through the development of a strategic plan. Research, teaching, public service and knowledge dissemination to its stakeholders began to undergo experimentation with new approaches and methodologies that correspond to the modern view of the world. The Department of History was part of this organizational change in which interests of stakeholders and students in disciplines of archaeology and history were carefully evaluated. This resulted in new courses being designed as instruments of capacity building and transforming attitudes towards a better appreciation of the programmes. One of the changes introduced was student online registration. This technological transformation had disastrous consequences on the numbers of students studying history and archaeology during the first year of its implementation. There was a sharp drop in student numbers in history and archaeology courses. This was especially so in elective courses where numbers dropped in favor of courses and programmes deemed more attractive to students in the School of Education.

The new student registration system failed to provide sufficient information on courses, course combinations and course prerequisites for academic programmes. It did not even encourage consultations between students and lecturers so as to minimize over-registration in preferred courses and under-registration in others. Student scepticism about the relevance of history and archaeology to their academic interests exacerbated the problem. Student numbers in the “Introduction to Archaeology Course” dropped from slightly over 80 to below 25. Such a situation could not allow development of an archaeology programme as rapidly as envisaged in the strategic plan. Four courses that were offered at undergraduate level, together with the two offered at postgraduate level, could not attract more than 50 students, a situation that was inimical to the programme development.

Despite the online registration challenges, archaeology and history continued to appeal to students dedicated to the study of the past. It became clear that there was greater need than ever before to transform student perception of how the past should be studied. Changing the name of the department to deal with historical and archaeological studies was considered a better option as it would respond creatively to the growth and change in market needs as demands on knowledge continued to shift. Name change was expected to create good prospects for a scholarly convergence of history and archaeology and a real possibility for a bridge between them. Those who specialise in digging for their data in the ground could now be united with those who dig for their records in the archives and both began to see the value of each other’s work.

Diversification of courses in both archaeology and history was not only encouraged but became a pertinent trend and a positive response to changes taking place in universities globally. Efforts were also made during the same period to explore linkages with cultural institutions that would benefit from the teaching of Cultural Resource Management as part of archaeology. Although this could not be implemented immediately, the move was considered a positive way to create a university curriculum that would address different educational, ethnic and economic backgrounds of students entering the department. Undoubtedly, such an approach to university learning would respond effectively to societal needs and enhance the study of the past, and subsequently contribute to increasing student enrolment in the department.

An unlikely interconnecting phenomenon between history and archaeology came in the location of books in archaeology and history in the main library. The library holds a large number of books in many specialised disciplines, works of literature and government documents. Despite the late introduction of archaeology in the university’s programmes, there was a small collection of

archaeology books, most of which were published before the 1980s. They were strategically located next to the history books. The collection, though valuable to general archaeological knowledge, proved to be of little relevance to the archaeology courses designed in 2005. As teaching of archaeology progressed, it was discovered that there was great need to provide more relevant reading materials to students. As a way of militating against the serious shortfall and heightening student interest in the subject, attempts were made to ensure that they had access to relevant and up-to-date reading materials in sufficient quantities. As a temporary solution, several personal materials were placed in the 'Short Loan Section' of the library which allows for two-hour and overnight borrowing.

As expected, the placement of relevant reading materials at the student disposal provided access and helped stimulate interest in archaeology. Unfortunately, the enthusiasm created was to the detriment of the books which suffered mutilation and other forms of damage. A few of them were torn, while others had passages underlined in red ink. This was a blatant disregard for the conditions given for the release of the reading materials. As a result of this destruction and disregard for a private collection, they were withdrawn from the library, an action that was not well received by most students.

However, on the basis of positive student reaction to the introduction of archaeology teaching, there was a corresponding positive response to seek alternative sources of reading materials. The students, who mostly come from the School of Education, showed greater appreciation for the incorporation of archaeology in history teaching as the move facilitated production of local human resource in the education sector that would be more knowledgeable and responsive to modern demands.

Conclusion

Despite the large number of archaeological sites investigated and the contributions made by archaeologists working in Zambia to the study of the country's prehistoric past since the turn of the twentieth century, the bulk of what we know today has been narrated by historians. Even though Livingstone Museum has built a strong tradition of archaeological work in the country, it is historical narratives that provide us with the bulk of our knowledge of the past. But even though archaeology and history have been operating in our museums since the colonial period, they have done so as separate entities. It was not until 2005 when archaeology was introduced in the University of Zambia's Department of History that it was acknowledged that there was indeed need to have the two

disciplines integrated. The transition from museological practice to university teaching had the good fortune to create the necessary exposure to archaeological field work, archaeological and historical materials as well as training students in both archaeology and history at all levels. Designing archaeology storylines for museum displays, and the interpretive side of history, tended to dominate museum work and was but a weak link to the study of history. Museum exhibits were characterised by a narrative approach which created an interdisciplinary bridge between archaeology and history. These linkages emphasized the importance of interaction between historians and archaeologists in meaningful and creative ways. Both needed to create data that would in turn be of greater use to the other.

However, despite the country's good fortune of enacting a Heritage Act at the turn of the twentieth century, to enhance heritage protection, public awareness was not fully realised. Few people acknowledged the importance of this effort. The devastation caused to archaeological and historical sites and few premiums placed on dissemination of public knowledge of the rich cultural heritage, is a case in point. Equally frustrating to the purveyors of cultural knowledge was lack of concerted effort by successive governments to promote the teaching of archaeology in schools as a premium to raise public awareness and create linkages with history.

There are numerous advantages if archaeology is embraced by historians. Archaeology has continued to provide a broad background to related disciplines such as history, which draw significantly on archaeological data. Archaeological materials need history to provide chronological order and historical context, especially for recent archaeological material. Similarly, history would also rely on archaeology to enhance the sense of the physical world of antiquity, expand the corpus of material and through the use of written components deepen our understanding of the past (Dyson, 2009, 59).

Undoubtedly, the teaching of archaeology, side by side with history and its attendant field trips to archaeological sites like Ingombe Ilede, Mumbwa Caves, Nachikufu Caves, and Kalambo Falls facilitated the production of local human resource in the education sector that is both knowledgeable and responsive to societal needs. Since its introduction in the university programme, more than 500 Zambian graduates have undergone professional training in archaeology and the majority of these are prospective teachers in secondary schools.

The process of teaching archaeology to history teachers has been necessary because a significant portion of Grade 8 and Grade 9 Social Studies syllabus in Zambian schools consists of archaeology, which continues to be part of national and pan-African histories in the upper grades. Since archaeological discoveries were made in Eastern and South Africa by Louis and Mary Leakey (Leakey,

1965) Raymond Dart (Dart, 1925) and others, historical reconstructions in sub-Saharan Africa have largely benefited from archaeology as a source of data particularly for the early period. Recent prehistoric periods have continued to depend on written records, linguistic evidence and oral traditions for historical reconstruction.

This paper has highlighted numerous advantages that accrue to practitioners of history and archaeology when the two disciplines embrace each other. The differences, though real, can be overcome once archaeologists and historians work together and find connections in their study of the past that can be enhanced and welcomed in their ranks. Both disciplines have flaws in their methods of study which can quickly be rectified and minimised to lessen the divide between them. As argued here, the archaeology curriculum initiated in the University of Zambia in 2005 was founded on strong connections with history. Presently, it stands at a crossroads where it is capable of expanding, if the environment continues to be favorable, and also to shrink if efforts are not taken to train more archaeologists to continue with its teaching and research.

References

- Alexander, E.P. and M. Alexander. 2008. *Museums in Motion. An Introduction to the History and Function of Museums*. Second Edition New York: Altamira Press.
- Binford, L.R. 1968a. "Archaeological Perspectives." In S.R. Binford, and L.R. Binford, *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, (ed.) Chicago: Aldine. 5-32.
- Binford, L.R. 1968b. "Archaeological Theory and Method." In S.R. Binford and L.R. Binford. *New Perspectives in Archaeology*, (ed.) Chicago: Aldine. 1-3.
- Binford, L.R. 1972a. *An Archaeological Perspective*. New York: Seminar Press.
- Binford, L.R. 1972b. "Contemporary Model building: Paradigms and the current state of Paleolithic research." In D.L. Clarke. *Models in Archaeology*, (ed.) London: Methuen. 19-166.
- Clark, J.D. 1950. *The Stone Age Cultures of Northern Rhodesia*. Cape Town: South African Archaeological Society.
- Clark, J.D. 1952. "Prehistoric Man at the Falls." In J.D. Clark (ed.) *The Victoria Falls Illustrated*. Commission for the Preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments and Relics: Northern Rhodesia.
- Clark, J.D. (ed.) 1957. *Third Pan-African Congress on Pre-History. Livingstone 1955*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Clark, J.D. 1964. "Stone Age Man at the Falls". In B.M. Fagan (ed.) *A Handbook to the Victoria Falls, The Batoka Gorge and Part of the Upper Zambezi River* (second edition), 55-64.

- Clark, J.D. 1974. *The Kalambo Falls Prehistoric Site, Vol. II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, J.D. 2001. *The Kalambo Falls Prehistoric Site, Vol. III*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, J.D. 1975. "Stone Age Man at the Victoria Falls." In D.W. Phillipson (ed) *Mosi-oo-Tunya: A handbook to the Victoria Falls Region*. London: Longman Group Ltd, 28-47.
- Clark, J.D. 1986. "Archaeological retrospect". *Antiquity* 60, 179 – 188.
- Clark, J.D. 1990. "A Personal Memoir." In P. Robertshaw (ed.) *A History of African Archaeology*. Oxford: James Currey, 189-204.
- Connah, G. 2004. *Forgotten Africa. An Introduction to its Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Connah, G. 2007. "Historical Archaeology in Africa: An Appropriate Concept?" *African Archaeological Review* 24, 35-40.
- Dart, R.A. 1925. "Australopithecus Africanus: The man-ape of South Africa." *Nature* 115, 195-100.
- Derricourt, R.M. 1986. "Prehistoric Settlement in the Lusaka Region". In G.J. Williams (ed.) *Lusaka and its Environs*. Lusaka: Zambia Geographical Association. 60-70.
- Dymond, D.P. 1974. *Archaeology and History: A Plea for Reconciliation*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Dyson, S.L. 2009. "Archaeology and Ancient History". In A. Erskine (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient History*. Malden, M.A: Blackwell Publishing, 59-66.
- Eggert, M. 2005. "The Bantu problem in African Archaeology". In A. Stahl (ed.) *African Archaeology*. Malden, M.A.: Blackwell Publishing, 301-326.
- Ehret, C. and M. Posnansky (eds.) 1982. *The Archaeological and Linguistic Reconstruction of African History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fagan, B.M. 1967. *Iron Age Cultures in Zambia (Kalomo and Kangila) Vol.1*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Fagan, B.M. 1968. *A Short History of Zambia*, Second edition. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Fagan, B.M. 1983. "Introduction: Archaeology Interprets Prehistory". In B.M. Fagan (ed.) *Prehistoric Times. Scientific American*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Fagan, B.M., D.W. Phillipson and S.G.H. Daniels. 1969. *Iron Age Cultures in Zambia (Dambwa, Ingombe Ilede and the Tonga). Vol . II* London: Chatto and Windus, 57-186.
- Fielden, H. W. 1905. "The Stone Age of the Zambezi Valley and its relation in time". *Nature*, 73 -77.
- Guthrie, M. 1962. "Some developments in the Prehistory of the Bantu languages". *Journal of African History* 3, 273 – 282.

- Hodder, I. 1982. "The Present Past." *An Introduction to Anthropology for Archaeologists*. Yorkshire: Pen and Sword Books Ltd.
- Hodder, I. 1992. *Theory and Practice in Archaeology*. London: Routledge.
- Hodder, I. (ed.) 2001. *Archaeological Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Langworthy, H.W. 1972. *Zambia Before 1980. Aspects of Pre-Colonial History*. Longman Group Ltd: London.
- Leakey, L.S.B. 1965. *Olduvai Gorge 1951 – 1961 Vol. 1 A Preliminary Report on the Geology and Fauna*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macrae, F.B. 1926. "The Stone Age in Northern Rhodesia". *Native Affairs Department Annual Report*, 4, 67 – 68.
- McCracken, J 1993. "African history in British Universities: Past, Present and Future". *African Affairs*, 92, 239 – 253.
- Mufuzi, F. 2010. "The Livingstone Museum and its contribution to Zambian History, 1934 – 2006." Unpublished PhD Thesis, Lusaka: University of Zambia (UNZA).
- Mufuzi, F. 2011. "Establishment of the Livingstone Museum and its role in colonial Zambia". *Historia*: 26-41.
- Mufuzi, F. 2012. "The Livingstone Museum and its role in postcolonial Zambia, 1964-2006". *Historial*, 57, 127-140.
- Musonda, F.B. 1986. "Use of Oral traditions in African Archaeology: its usefulness and limitations". In *Oral Traditions in Southern Africa – Vol. III*. edited by S.P.C. Moyo et al. Lusaka: Institute for African Studies, UNZA (University of Zambia), 391 – 412.
- Musonda, F.B. 1987a. "Traditional Wildlife and Soil Conservation practices in Zambia and their role in development". *Black Lechwe* 9, 13 – 20.
- Musonda, F.B. 1987b. "The significance of pottery in Zambian Later Stone Age contexts". *African Archaeological Review* 5, 147-158.
- Musonda, F.B. 1994. "Learning from History". In *The state of the environment in Southern Africa*. Research and Documentation Centre (SPCD), Harare, 21 – 38.
- Musonda, F.B. 2011. "In pursuit of the past: A consideration of Emergent Issues in African Archaeology in the last fifty years". In *Casting the Net Wide. Papers in Honour of Glynn Isaac and his Approach to Human Origins Research*, edited by J. Sept and D. Pilbeam. Oxford: Oxford Books.
- Musonda, F.B. 2012. "100 years of Archaeological Research in Zambia: Changing Historical Perspectives". *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 67 (195), 88 – 100.
- Musonda, F.B. 2013. "Ethnicity and ethical issues in Archaeological Interpretation: The case of Chakeluka Iron Age Site, Lusaka, Zambia". *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 68 (197), 52-62.
- Oliver, R. 1966. "The problem of the Bantu expansion". *African History*, 7, 361-76.

- Phillipson, D.W. 1970. "Excavations at Twickenham Road, Lusaka". *Azania* 5, 77-118.
- Phillipson, D.W. 1975. "The Iron Age in Zambia". *The Historical Association of Zambia* 5, Neczam: Lusaka.
- Phillipson, D.W. 1976. "Archaeology and Bantu Linguistics". *World Archaeology*, Vol. 8. No.1: 65 – 82.
- Phillipson, D.W. 1977. "The Spread of Bantu Languages". *Scientific American* 236, 106 – 114.
- Phillipson, D.W. 2005. *African Archaeology*. Third Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Phiri, B.J. 2016. *The History of the University of Zambia, 1966 – 2016*. Lusaka: University of Zambia (UNZA).
- Rathje, W.L. 1984. "The Garbage decade". *American Behavioral Scientist* 28 (4): 9 - 29.
- Rathje, W.L. 2001. "Integrated Archaeology: A Garbage Paradigm". In Buchli, V. and G. Lucas (eds.) *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. London: Routledge.
- Rathje, W.L. and C. Murphy. 1992. *Rubbish! The Archaeology of Garbage*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Renfrew, C. and P. Bahn. 2012. *Archaeology. Theories, Methods and Practice*. 6th Edition. New York: Thames & Hudson.
- Robertshaw, P. 1990. *A History of African Archaeology*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Summers, R. 1967. "Iron Age Industries of Southern Africa, with notes on their chronology, terminology and economic status". In W.W. Bishop and J.D. Clark (eds.) *Background to evolution in Africa*. Chicago, 687-700.
- Summers, R. 1970. "Forty years progress in Iron Age studies in Rhodesia". *South African Archaeological Bulletin* 25, 95 - 103.
- Trevor-Roper, H. 1963. "The Rise of Christian Europe". *The Listener*, November 28.
- Ucko, P.J. 1995. "Introduction: Archaeological interpretation in a World Context". In Ucko, P.J. (ed.) *Theory in Archaeology. A World Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Vogel, J.O. 1987. "Iron Age Farmers in Southwest Zambia: Some Aspects of Spatial Organization". *The African Archaeological Review* 5, 159-170.
- Wenke, R.J. 1980. *Patterns in Prehistory. Mankind's First Three Million Years*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiley, G.R. and P. Phillips 1958. *Method and Theory in American Archaeology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Williams, G.J.W. 1986. "The early years of the township." In: Williams, G.J.W. (ed.) *Lusaka and its Environs. A Geographical Study of a Planned Capital City in Tropical Africa*. Lusaka: Zambia Geographical Association.