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Social hierarchies comprise different levels of consciousness, each of which is mediated by the other. The social condition of low status, while ideologically “fixed,” exists only with reference to those above, so neither is independent from the other. Between ethnic groups, especially across the mode of production divide, such as hunters and herders, hunters are often on the periphery of herding society. If they accept the “coin” of pastoralism, i.e., become clients, not only do they serve important functions necessary for the success of pastoral life, but they ideologically accept their position as dependent. Taking examples from Africa and Arabia, this paper attempts to show the almost universal condition of the marginalization of non-stock holders on the periphery of herding society and suggests that the same conditions would have been manifest in the prehistoric period.

OF MASTER AND BONDSMAN

“The master is the consciousness . . . existing on its own account which is mediated with itself through an other consciousness” (Hegel 1807 in Baillie 1949: 234).

In his Phenomenology of Mind, Hegel stated the relationship that exists between Master and Bondsman, whereby each is chained to the other. “The essence of the Bondsman is to exist for another, not for self. But the master also lacks true independence, since his independent existence . . . is mediated by the Bondsman” (Collins 1986: 248). The bond in feudal terms can be inscribed in law by force, or it can be enforced by ideological persuasion. The ideological pressure can be religious, or it can be social, i.e., accepting dominance. As Baillie (1949: 227) puts it, “Servitude is not only a phase of human history, it is in principle a condition of the development and maintenance of the consciousness of self as a fact of experience.”

Hegel would even suggest that those with apparently the greatest choice, i.e., Masters, are encumbered by their position in having to deal with Bondsmen. Another way to look at this is to see the lower-status individual as necessary, not only for the Master’s status and his consciousness as Master, but as an integral part of a much larger social and economic whole. Without the low status individuals there is no hierarchy, therefore no one above is needed to mediate in power disputes. Power exists in the unequal relationship: power which manifests itself in control over minds and resources. Among hierarchically structured pastoral societies Bourgeot would see a spatial dimension to this when he suggests that appropriation of the resources within that space allows control over dependants. “Le mode d’utilisation de l’espace apparaıˆt comme la sphère où se réalise l’ordre social imposé par les groupes aristocratiques” (Bourgeot 1979: 150). (The way of using space would seem to be the domain in which social order imposed by aristocratic groups occurs.)
HUNTERS ON THE PERIPHERY

Woodburn (1991) classifies hunter-gatherers as either “immediate-return” (using resources on a daily basis) or “delayed-return” (having assets which are controlled and need maintenance). Immediate-return groups, he suggests, are subject to pressure from more dominant outside groups and, in consequence, are “encapsulated” by them. This encapsulation takes the form of coercion and places the hunters in a dependency situation. He discusses the possibility that “immediate-return systems and the forms of social organisation associated with them are to be treated, at least in part, as a product of pressure from outsiders” (Woodburn 1991).

There are numerous examples which have been recorded of hunting/foraging people living on the edge or within the interstices of pastoral societies in both Africa and the Near East (Fig. 1). In Arabia, the Solubba (Slejb) were to be found around Bedouin society; in the Sahara, Nemadi were on the edge of Maure society; in East Africa today Hadza, Dorobo, and Sandawe are on the margins of Maasai and Nandi society; in Namibia, Tjimba were on the edge of Himba society; while in the Cape, South Africa, Sonqua (Soqua) were described on the fringe of Khoikhoi society. It is even possible that this peripheral association between hunters and herders may well have been more common in the past, but the hunters have subsequently disappeared, either incorporated into more dominant groups or
(less likely until European colonialism) killed off.

What is most striking about all the associations recorded is that the hunters were and are both regarded as different and of low status, since status is usually defined in terms of livestock holdings. Access to stock on the part of the hunters was usually limited to nonbreeding animals, either for services rendered or perhaps for bridewealth payments, except when the animals could be stolen. The crucial point is that even when a breeding herd was taken it could seldom be nurtured, because of either the limited labor available among the hunting thieves or the inability to defend the herds against attack by the previous owners, so the animals were usually immediately killed and eaten or traded to other herding groups. Into the bargain, many of these peripheral hunting groups had skills that set them apart from the herders. In the case of the Solubba, they were smiths who worked metal for the Bedouin. Smithing is feared in many African societies. Among the Tuareg the low-status Inadan “have access to indirect power through . . . their allegedly relationship to the fire djinns” (Rasmussen 1992: 107) and they also “. . . practise curing in spirit-possession rituals” (Rasmussen 1992: 112). In East Africa a similar condition exists. The Maasai scorn blacksmiths (Saitoti and Beckwith 1991: 20), the ilkanono iron workers being a “depressed caste or underclass within pastoral society (Spear 1993: 7). Among the Rendille “. . . blacksmiths . . . have a power to bless and to curse especially in relation to dangerous iron objects, circumcision, razors, spears, etc. There is a general notion of pollution attached to blacksmiths: their food and hospitality is generally avoided, and the Rendille prefer not to intermarry with them” (Spencer 1973: 63). Thus the peripheral people can have an ambiguous relationship with the more dominant herders: on the one hand, they are considered unclean and placed in a position of low status; on the other hand, they are feared, but needed to perform their special skills.

Solubba/Bedouin Relationship

The Solubba were considered to be one of several pariah groups on the edge of Bedouin society (Fig. 1). As Dickson (1951: 515) describe them: “they are found all over the northern half of the Arabian Peninsula . . . In the south they are more despised and looked down on than in the north . . . Practically every (Bedouin) tribe within the area has a community of Solubba living with it, as they are found useful as menders of pots and pans, hunters and trackers.” However, the Solubba were also feared, as the women were accused of being able to cast the Evil Eye, since they were “versed in the devilish lore of witchcraft” (Dickson 1951: 515).

Both Dickson and Doughty (1888, reprint 1927) and Jabbur (1995) describe how the Solubba knew the secret water holes of the desert, so were able to melt into areas where the Bedouin were reluctant to go. The mystique of the Solubba has given them the reputation as the best hunters and guides, although Musil (1927: 247) found that there were places even the Solubba did not know. This mystique is added to the belief of contamination as ironworkers which set them apart from the Bedouin society. Chelhoud (1954: 58) compares this with many African smiths and says “son activite salutaire le rend indispensable. Mais parallelement a fonction, plutot en rapport avec elle, il exerce le plus souvent des activites qui le rendent interdit. Tout contact avec lui devient ainsi dangereux car il souille et contamine tout ce qu’il touche.” (His beneficial work makes him indispensable. However, along with his function, usually because of it, he is involved most often in activities which make him prohibited. All contact with him thus becomes dangerous because he soils and contaminates all that
he touches). The parallels between the social position of Solubba among the Bedouin and the Inadan among the Tuareg continue. Both Bedouin and Tuareg societies are three-tiered, with nobles at the top, vassals in the middle, and slaves at the bottom. The smiths are apart and no intermarriage is permitted.

The Solubba were not allowed access to the power structure of Bedouin society, since they were forbidden to marry Bedouin. Equally they did not get involved in the convoluted blood feuds and litigation of Bedouin society. As long as they stayed in and around the Bedouin camps they had to accede to Bedouin demands and were very subservient, but they apparently had the choice of leaving when they wanted, so maintained their independence away from Bedouin camps. Doughty (1927: I: 281) remarks: “No Beduwy . . . will rob a Solubby, although he met him alone in the depths of the wilderness . . . but the wayfaring Beduwy would be well content to espy . . . the booth of a Solubby, and hope to eat there of his hunter’s pot.” Possibly they were considered so unclean that they were ignored as inconsequential, except when their skills were demanded. Apart from their artisanry and hunting skills many were reputed to have been fine poets (Ingham 1986) and healers (Palgrave 1865). In fact the survival of wounded Bedouin after a fierce battle was all too often dependent on their healing skills.

Because of their bush skills they were highly prized as trackers and scouts, being sent out ahead of the herds to look for new pastures. They reputedly did not keep herds of their own except for specially bred donkeys which they crossed with wild asses (Guarmani 1938) to make them better adapted to extreme desert conditions. Because they kept no stock of their own Solubba families would tend to stay with Bedouin groups only until the milk supply ran out, then they would move on with their belongings to hunt game (Doughty 1927: I: 281).

Maure/Nemadi Relationship

In the Southwestern Sahara (Fig. 1) there existed until quite recently groups of hunters who interacted with pastoral Maures (Briggs 1960). Like the Solubba described above, the Nemadi are known from older sources, particularly French military officers. The latest personal description by Gabus (1952) was an attempt to describe people whose lifestyle was disappearing fast, mostly due to their livelihood as hunters being threatened by French colonial hunters decimating the herds of addax.

The Nemadi, while Moslem, are reputed to have paid only lip-service to Islamic traditions of daily prayer, or fasting during Ramadan. There is a strong tendency to describe them in Islamic terms as unclean, i.e., would eat meat improperly killed, and may even have eaten pork (warthog), although Brosset (1932: 340) claims that the latter was practiced only by a small group of people called Rouseset, a fraction of Mechdouf from the Hodh who were included under the name “Nemadi.” From this we can deduce that the Nemadi may have been specific groups of hunters, but the name would seem to have been used as a generic for any hunters, or for people of low status.

To the Maures, the Nemadi are outcasts: ignorant, nonreligious, and thieves (Gabus 1952: 61). Although there may have been some marriage between them, in general the Nemadi were endogamous (Briggs 1960), and among some Maure groups it would be shameful to marry a Nemadi (Gabus 1952: 62). There is also a belief that some of the Nemadi came from the Azaouad further east, and there they were vassal hunters to the Tuareg (Gabus 1952: 59). Although Marty (1930: 119) described them thus: “They live without any
contact with the neighbouring Maures, in an extreme minimum of social or political organisation or hierarchy, solitary, savages in the real sense of the word, only hunters, and feeding themselves almost exclusively from game run down or car\textemdash rion,” it is obvious from other writers that they could choose to be isolated, but nonetheless had relations with neighbouring groups. As Gabus (1952: 66) writes: “Each Nemadi has his personal patron which he calls “sahreb,” meaning “friend” or “protector.” The patron loans, for example, a camel for the great annual hunt: le gue\textemdash mer. In return, he receives the skins of antelopes or a chunk of meat\ldots During winter the patron offers the Nemadi a goat kid, a sheep or a goat, a goat-skin of millet.” Other groups had to pay tribute in the form of cloth.

Somali/sab Relationship

The sab are “bondsmen” bound in servitude to noble Somali families (Fig. 1). There are three groups of sab, all of whom are specialists in their own right and perform tasks considered beneath Somalis. The Midgaan are hunters, leather workers, and hairdressers and use magical songs in hunting; the Tumaal are blacksmiths; and the Yibir are soothsayers, magicians, and pedlars, who collect alms at weddings and childbirth through giving their blessing to the couple or child, and because they scrounge and are reputed to eat impure meat are called “corpse-eaters” (Lewis 1961). The origin myth is that all sab were once Somali who became degraded through eating meat that was not properly slaughtered in Muslim law (Goldsmith and Lewis 1958).

The sab are looked down upon by Somalis and, as such, are forbidden to marry them, but they do intermarry among each other. The noble families to whom the sab are attached are their protectors, and no relations can exist with other noble Somali except through their patrons. Equally the sab have no political rights in relations with Somalis, and act as subordinates in their presence. One form of protest, however, is to have secret codes among themselves that Somali cannot understand. “And in their distinctiveness and exclusion from full participation in Somali social relations the sab have many of the features of an endogamous caste” (Lewis 1961: 14).

The smallest and weakest of the three sab groups, and those who are on the furthest fringes of Somali society, the Yibir, are those most feared by the Somali as they are seen to have the greatest magical powers. “The Somali believe contact with them to be not merely degrading, but also actively defiling. With their small numbers it is often said that no one has seen a Yibir’s grave, and they are popularly thought to vanish in a wind when they die.” Their magical powers are reputed to come from the pre-Islamic period. Thus they are perceived (and feared) to have association with the Devil, who was vanquished by the advent of Islam (Lewis 1961: 264). This in itself would have sufficient ideological power to keep the sab in an “unclean,” and therefore distance/subordinate status. Each sab group, then, performs its own specialized tasks. While these may be scorned by the Somalis, the product of their labors is nonetheless crucial to Somali life. These groups are small in numbers, and there is never sufficient leverage for these lower classes to enter Somali political life. Today their escape is to the towns where they can set themselves up as independent entrepreneurs to sell their artisanry.

Maasai/Dorobo, Hadza, and Sandawe Relationships

In East Africa there are a number of hunting societies which live on the fringes of Maasai society. One of these, the Dorobo (Fig. 1), are not a unified ethnic
group but a catch-all category of low status hunters that occupy peripheral areas (often tsetse infested) from Uganda to Tanzania. Kenny (1981: 477) states that “...no Dorobo are isolated from neighbouring societies which are organised quite differently, being bound into social distinctions based on the control of cattle or agriculturally productive land. The Dorobo depend on these peoples for certain vital items, while they turn to the Dorobo for game and other wild products, for significant ritual services, for information concerning pasturages, and on occasion for assistance in time of famine or plague.” As Thomson (1885: 447) noted, “They are rarely found in numbers, and usually in very small villages, so that there is nothing like tribal life among them. They enjoy considerable immunity from attack by the Masai, as they are sources of wealth to the latter...” He goes on to say (Thomson 1885: 448) that “they build regular villages, and in general appearance they resemble the inferior class of Masai... they are on the whole looked upon as a species of serf, and treated accordingly.”

In spite of these exchanges there is a great deal of ambivalence in the relationships as the Dorobo on the one hand are considered of lower status and sometimes not even fully human, but on the other are perceived as being mediators with the spirit world. Like several of the examples offered here, Dorobo society appears to outsiders as being relatively unstructured. What this usually means is that the Dorobo do not necessarily adhere to the niceties of social practice. For example rigorous exogamy is observed between age-sets of Maa speakers, while this is not the case among the Dorobo. Thus the Dorobo are perceived to be incestuous and marry their “sisters” (Thomson 1885: 480). In spite of this Dorobo women are taken as wives by Maasai, especially since lower bridewealth payments need to be paid. This, however, is hypergyny, since the Dorobo have no cattle with which to obtain Maasai brides, although daughters might be given to Dorobo in times of famine (Galaty 1986).

The Dorobo are reluctant to acquire cattle and probably only do so for “short-term advantage, since it would interfere with their way of life; such Dorobo, if they acquire stock, are believed to eat them at once, thus contributing to their reputation as gluttons” (Kenny 1981: 481). This does not mean that they cannot look after animals when they have them, or, under conditions when the animals have needed social value (such as for bridewealth payments) that they do acquire stock (Cronk 1989), but Ten Raa (1986) has described the difficulties which have to be overcome when this happens. Referring to another of the East African hunting groups, the Sandawe, he says (Ten Raa 1986: 372), “Their survival as a people has depended on avoidance and hiding rather than open battle, and on the unattractiveness of their country to cattlemen. As soon as they acquired even a few head of cattle they lost these advantages and they became vulnerable to raiders. In other words they acquired property which had to be defended, but they did not acquire the social organization to defend that property.”

Himba/Tjimba Relationship

There is some disagreement in the literature about who the Tjimba are. Some writers call these people who live in Kaokoland of Northwestern Namibia simply cattleless Himba (Fig. 1) (Van Warmelo 1951, Vedder 1928) who lost their stock during the Nama raids of the 19th century, but there are arguments to suggest that at least some of those called OvaTjimba were physically, culturally, and economically quite distinct (MacCalman and Grobbelaar 1965). According
to Vedder (1938: 135), the Tjimba got their name from their activities of getting food out of the earth, like the aardvark—so were poor people, unlike the Himba who were rich in cattle. It is probable that the name refers to any group without cattle in the area, and does not distinguish those who may never have owned cattle. The two groups described by MacCalman and Grobbelaar (1965) were stone tool using hunters who normally lived in the mountains away from herders, but who would attach themselves as clients when the situation warranted it, for example to obtain medical assistance or food. In return the hunters worked as goatherds for the Himba, a job which does not require great herding skills.

An additional difference between Himba and Tjimba way of life lies in the use of caves and rock shelters by Tjimba, and integration of large stones into the base of their huts (MacCalman and Grobbelaar 1965). This has subsequently been confirmed by Jacobsohn (1995: 147) among her informants. Since these stones are missing from Himba huts, it reduces the archaeological visibility of abandoned Himba settlements. Jacobsohn has also noted that the Tjimba women made smaller ostrich eggshell beads than their Himba counterparts. It is difficult to get people to admit that they are of Tjimba extraction today, and since most are fully integrated now into Himba society the distinctions are very subtle and almost unrecognizable except to the Himba themselves. This may have been partially due to the war in Southern Angola and to the serious drought of the 1980s which depleted most of the Himba herds, reducing everyone to similar poor status. It is of interest to find other groups of Kaokoland and Southern Angola who appear to have lived on the fringe of Himba herding society as specialists. These include Zemba and Hakoana religious specialists and Thwa ironsmiths. Like many other pastoral people in Africa, the Himba look down on manual labor; thus the Thwa are considered low status (Malan 1974).

**Tswana/Basarwa Relationships**

In the modern state of Botswana the ruling classes are the Tswana, whose rural assets are large herds of cattle and tracts of land with boreholes to support their herds (Fig. 1). There are large numbers of stockless people, most of whom have been hunter/foragers within living memory (Hitchcock 1978) and whose land has slowly been eaten away as new boreholes were drilled. In the Western Sandveld these stockless people are Bushmen (called Basarwa in Setswana) who speak several distinct languages (Barnard 1992). The relationship between the herd-owning Tswana and stockless Basarwa is one of patrons giving work and partial sustenance to clients, since the Basarwa will work for Tswana in what is known as the *mafisa* system. *Mafisa* allows the herdsman (Basarwa) to use the product of the herd (milk) in return for labor. In addition, a further incentive is that the herdsman may be offered part of the reproduction of the herd, such as several calves as payment for services rendered. Basarwa will willingly take on the role of herdsmen with the hope that they can eventually build up their own herds.

In many of the remote areas of Western Botswana lions are a problem, and vigilance is needed on the part of the herdsman to protect the herd. Unfortunately this is difficult, and a certain number of animals, especially calves, are eaten by lions each year. If the herd owner can assume a 20% increase in his herd of 100 animals, at the beginning of the year he can offer his herder perhaps five of the calves that will be born that year. If lions take 10 animals, then the herd owner can say to the herdsman, you owe me five animals, but you can pay me back next
year’s crop. The herdsman thus get trapped into a long bonded relationship which mostly benefits the herd owner.

In the polygynous Tswana society a man might take a Basarwa wife, since the brideprice would be lower than for a Tswana wife. By contrast, Tswana women rarely marry Basarwa men, partially because of the difficulty of a Basarwa finding the bridewealth payments, but also because a woman would be seen to be “marrying down.” There is thus hypergyny which results in one-way gene flow (Morris 1992: 153) from Basarwa to Tswana. Those Basarwa who accrue stock or have lived in Tswana villages for many generations speak Setswana and think of themselves as Tswana. They try to rid themselves of the “taint” of Basarwaness, and will deny that they are Basarwa, but are still labeled as such by the Tswana majority (Motzafi-Haller 1994) and are placed in a lower status category.

Khoikhoi/Soqua Relationships

In the Western Cape Province of South Africa contact with aboriginal groups by Europeans began in the 15th century. The first depictions of Khoikhoi herders (Fig. 1) appeared in 1508, and it was from the Khoi that the early travelers obtained domestic animals in exchange for small pieces of iron. However, it was apparent that not all the people had stock to exchange. This was first seen in the people met by Vasco da Gama at St. Helena Bay in 1497. That these were different from the stock-keeping Khoi was not fully recognized until about 150 years later when the Dutch colony was set up at Table Bay. Initially the name given to the people living off marine resources at Table Bay was the “Fishermen,” but on January 9th, 1653 we first encounter the name given to them by the Khoi: Soqua or Sonqua (Thom 1952: 127). Although there is some argument on who exactly the Soqua were (see Elphick 1985), it is clear that the name was one given by the Khoi to those they considered “other”: sa, person who gets his food from the bush; qua, people in Nama language, was used pejoratively to refer to stock thieves or people in servile position (Elphick 1985: xxii).

The relationship between the stock-keepers (Khoikhoi) and stockless people (Soqua) varied between enmity, where, when caught, captives were killed without mercy (Thom 1952: 127), to clientship or attachment to a particular group from whom food could be obtained in return for service. As described in the journal of Van der Stel’s journey to Namaqualand, “. . . we find that these Sonquas are just the same as the poor in Europe, each tribe of Hottentots having some of them and employing them to bring news of the approach of a strange tribe” (Waterhouse 1932: 122), and by Kolb (1731: I: 76); “Sonquas are mercenaries to other Hottentot nations, serving for food.”

There is the question of how independent they were of the Khoikhoi. The hunters of the Cape may have been forced to modify their lifestyle after the introduction of domestic animals into Southern Africa ca. 2000 years ago, although archaeological research has indicated that two quite distinct economic entities operated in the Western Cape up to the colonial period (Smith et al. 1991) (see below). Analysis of the ostrich eggshell bead sizes from several sites suggest that there was some transfer across the economic divide in the later period (Yates in prep.). On the basis of archaeological observations of increased use of plant foods, Parkington (1984: 172) has argued that “. . . the Soqua pattern of greater emphasis on gathering than hunting arose at least in part as a response to the appearance of pastoralism in the landscape.” Since many of the sites from this period are small rock shelters in the mountains, we can infer that some of the hunter–gatherers were
pushed onto the periphery of pastoral land use, perhaps even into using the mountains as refuges instead of the more productive (at least in an animal biomass sense) coastal foreland where the Khoikhoi were to be found.

The Sonqua had a number of services that they could offer the Khoi. Some have already been mentioned, such as being watchdogs, to prevent surprise attack by stock thieves, or armed warriors. Other services included providing meat from wild animals or honey. It is probable that they might also act as herdsmen, taking care of the stock of their patrons. This would have meant protecting them against predators and making sure that they were adequately watered. In return they would have been given milk and possibly the odd slaughter animal (male sheep, or female beyond breeding age). What would have been denied them was breeding stock, especially cows in milk, as this potentially could have put them in competition with the Khoi for resources. It is also possible that they worked as rain makers or healers as they are reported to have done among the black farmers in the eastern part of South Africa.

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF CULTURAL DIFFERENTIATION

The ethnographic examples presented above offer us clues to hierarchical social separation and boundaries between groups. How might this manifest itself in material culture terms that can be recognized archaeologically?

Work on the Vredenburg Peninsula north of Cape Town (Fig. 1) has yielded information on prehistoric hunters and herdsmen who may well have been the direct ancestors of the Khoikhoi and Soqua described above. Two quite different types of sites have been excavated: (1) Kasteelberg, a large open site dated between 1800 and 800 B.P., of greater than 1500 m² and 1.7 m in depth; (2) Witklip, a small rock shelter dated between 3000 and 300 B.P., with an area of 17 × 3 m and depth of 1 m.

Kasteelberg is basically a shell midden (located 4 km from the coast) with large quantity of sheep bones, although these were not the dominant animals, as seal bones were even greater in number. Other terrestrial mammals were hunted, such as small and medium large antelopes. At this site over 700 pot shards were found per cubic meter, flake stone was common, but formally retouched pieces constituted only 0.2% of the total stone. Many ostrich eggshell beads were found in various stages of manufacture. These ranged in size from 5 to 11 mm in diameter. Portable grooved stones, similar to ones found in the bedrock around the site had ochre staining and dated mostly during the period 1000–800 B.P. Other items of material culture included bone tools (points, in all stages of manufacture, as well as awls, pendants and ivory bracelets) (Smith 1992b).

By way of contrast, Witklip, although also a shell midden (located 9 km from the sea), had few sheep bones and almost no seal bones. The fauna was dominated by small antelopes and tortoises. There were only 10 pot shards per cubic meter, but formally retouched stone tools constituted 4% of the total. Ostrich eggshell bead sizes were less than 5 mm (some as small as 2.5 mm). Various other cultural items included bone tools (points and tubes), shell pendants, the ground mouth of an ostrich eggshell water container, and an ochre-stained upper grinder (Smith et al. 1991). Of note is the fact that formally retouched tools existed before and after the introduction of pottery and sheep bones at Witklip, and there is almost no overlap in the sizes of ostrich eggshell beads from the lower levels of Witklip with those from Kasteelberg (Fig. 2).

These two quite distinct archaeological signatures are related to herdsmen with
large numbers of sheep and who were expending considerable energy capturing seals and hunters of small antelope. Missing from either of the collections are large numbers of cattle bones. This is surprising considering that the main reason that Europeans initially colonized the Cape was to provision the ships en route to the Dutch East Indies with meat from the large herds of cattle owned by the Khoikhoi in the 17th century.

The top levels at Witklip, dated between 500 and 300 B.P., show a greater overlap in the size of ostrich eggshell beads of Kasteelberg that occurred lower down in the sequence. This is supported by measurements of the beads from another small rock shelter, Die Krans, located roughly half way between Kasteelberg and Witklip, where the same pattern manifests itself. Is it possible that this is an archaeological indication of greater social connections between herders and hunters, with the hunters more and more aspiring to the material culture of the herders? It could also be a more formal structuring of the hierarchy, with the labor from hunters being needed by the herders as cattle herds grew in size and/or greater marginalization of the hunters with a widening of the wealth differentials inherent in cattle ownership.

The differences in the two archaeological assemblages is both in the types of artifacts and frequency in which they occur. The stone tools used are certainly not the same, in either form or raw material. The Kasteelberg herders were most probably the pottery makers. An indication of the use of the pots by these people has come from gas chromatographic analysis of residues adhering to the inside of the shards. The fatty acids indicate that marine mammal fat was being rendered...
(Patrick et al. 1985). This would conform to the large numbers of seal bones excavated. What the fat was used for may be indicated by the historical record which says the Khoikhoi of the 17th century mixed fat with ochre, and smeared their bodies with the mixture. Support for this idea comes from the many granite bed-rock grinding grooves found around Kasteelberg, as well as several broken portable ones excavated from the sequence. The latter were found along with faceted upper grinders, and both had ochre staining on them. The depth and number of grinding hollows shows that a great deal of energy was being expended in this activity, and there are indications that it increased during the period 1000 – 900 B.P. We might use this as an indication of selective social activity, perhaps even of a ceremonial nature.

Ostrich eggshell beads were found in all stages of manufacture, suggesting that Kasteelberg was also a place for making these ornamental items. The fact that the size differs so markedly from those at Witklip and Die Krans may indicate a strong adherence to a cultural style. From the historic record we know that the Khoikhoi not only wore the beads as necklaces, but they also sewed them onto leather aprons and other items of clothing (see illustrations in Raper and Boucher (1988). The Witklip assemblage, with the fauna dominated by small antelope, and the high numbers of microlithic stone tools, contrast markedly with the Kasteelberg herder material. Low percentages of sheep bones (between 7.3 and 8.5% NISP) were recorded at Witklip, which would underline the close proximity of herders in the area. These are animals which could have been obtained through payment of services rendered, or by theft, but were apparently not a major focus of the economy. None of the low numbers of pot shards from Witklip could be refitted, and none of the rim shards matched or came from the same vessel. It is possible that the shards were not seen as utilitarian vessels, but imported to the site for other less obvious reasons.

**IDEOLOGY AND CONSCIOUSNESS**

Just as Hegel saw the master/bondsman relationship as mediated by the consciousness of each other, Galaty (1986) analyzes the relations between hunters and herders of East Africa as an awareness by each group of the “other” created “through understanding themselves in the negative terms of the other.” They have developed their own “anthropology” of the other to accommodate the different roles that need to be played by the groups which make up the “whole” of the ethnic mix. This, he says, allows the groups to “practice distinct modes of subsistence and interact with each other through limited and in only tentative accommodation” (Galaty 1986: 114). The relationship between the dominant herding society and its social satellites varies in detail, but a common thread can be identified: the need for the herders to maintain their power at the top of the hierarchy. In most cases the lower strata are not directly incorporated into the hierarchy except through economic relationships, e.g., they are not permitted to marry up. In fact the herders, if they do not almost ignore them, totally downgrade the position of the low status people, or do not even consciously see them. This, of course, may have the effect of keeping people firmly at the bottom of the hierarchy, and prevents any conscious attempts to “fight” the system.

Here we enter the realm of “ideology” and “consciousness.” The dominant group is perhaps very aware of its position, as it not only can use low-status groups as a foil, but there is also intragroup rivalry and jockeying for power. Unless the individual is part of the dominant group there is little chance of rising in status, except, perhaps, by sheer force of arms. Although
this is not unheard of, it is unlikely, given the potentially greater organization and manpower that can be released by the dominant group and a significant psychological factor discussed by Edgerton (1971: 280), that under stress pastoralists will tend to be socially cohesive. An ideology, or belief system legitimizing political and economic interests, need not necessarily be subscribed to by other groups in the vicinity, or even the low status groups within a society (Abercrombie et al. 1980). This would be true of people more or less divorced from the concerns of the dominant group. In fact one might even say that it would be particularly true of groups practising different modes of production. The issues which confront the two economies will be quite different. These range from ownership of property through how property and product may be transferred or distributed. Thus each mode of production may have its own ideological structure that is separate and independent at one level, but each may modify the other when they come into contact or conflict. “Family and personal ideology occupies a strategic place in the dominant ideologies of very different societies. It obviously relates to the transmission and accumulation of private productive property and will be functionally important to the extent that an economy operates by means of private ownership of productive resources (Abercrombie et al. 1980: 176).

If hunting and herding are two quite distinct modes of production (Smith 1990), then the issues which confront the two economies will be quite marked. The differences between hunting and herding societies, even among the so-called egalitarian herders of East Africa, is that domestic animals are “owned” by individuals or families. Their selection, breeding, maintenance, protection, and distribution are all controlled by the owners. Abercrombie et al. (1980: 176) go on to pose three questions: “What is the significance of private property in particular modes of production? What is the role of the family in relation to property? What is the role of these elements of the dominant ideology stressing family and property in relation to private property and its transmission?” Some might argue that since the stock of traditional herders is not commoditized this argument of private property is not applicable. I argue that it is the difference of approach to product between hunter and pastoralist societies which is significant, not so much the mechanism of economic control. At the individual level, Said (1983: 15) puts a succinct case for awareness of social position: “On the one hand, the individual mind registers and is very much aware of the collective whole, context or situation in which it finds itself. On the other hand, precisely because of this awareness—a wordly, self-situating, a sensitive response to the dominant culture—that the individual consciousness is not naturally and easily a mere child of the culture, but a historical and social actor in it.”

The difference between consciousness and ideology is in bringing a belief system to a critical level where the individual can act on it to affect some course of action. Having said this I am very aware that in modern Western European academic circles argument should be based on a recognition of different sides in any debate, and at the beginning of the 21st century individual freedoms are being pushed (as opposed to collective needs) in democracies and/or free-market economic systems. This does not mean that we can easily identify the social forces acting upon us. Critical awareness may be achieved by politicization if the individual has the freedom to exercise choice in a significant way. Most people have choice over the small, immediate concerns of life, but the long-term choices which are to be seen in the archaeological record are beyond most people, and this is certainly the case in preliterate societies, where the position of low status is not easily chal-
lenged. Consciousness does not equal power, it only identifies a condition. However, forcible domination by one group over another may completely restrict choice, particularly if the ideology of the mode of production means that it is antithetical to accepting a different one. The pressures to share among Kalahari hunter/gatherers today mean that the !Kung San have great difficulty becoming herders in their own right, since the demands of people coming for their share requires any animal to be immediately slaughtered and divided (see Smith (1990, 1992a) for arguments). Wilsen (1989), however, has argued that this was a function of colonial pressures, since the San have been in contact with herders for almost 2000 years. I respond that it is a more deeply entrenched phenomenon, tied into the ideology of the hunting mode of production.

In the master/bondsman tie one "reflects" the other, and low status people become all that we are not: the "other." In the case of the Dorobo, they become mythical figures, invented as a foil against which to gauge the actions of those assigning status. The Dorobo are seen as amoral and have an enviable freedom from restriction: "... they are always there, just out of the light of the cooking fire, or out of sight, but not out of mind, on the wrong side of the tracks" (Kenny 1981: 490–491).

CONCLUSION

It should be obvious from what has been discussed here that the degree of integration of peripheral groups into pastoral societies varies considerably, but almost without exception there is a tendency on the part of the pastoralists to keep them at arms length. Even those who are seen to be part of the pastoralist society, such as the Rendille ironworkers, who are dispersed among the clans to produce needed iron and officiate at rituals, are still people to avoid. In fact neighboring Samburu blacksmiths are expected to live in a separate encampment, and avoidance is quite extreme (Spencer 1973). The special skills of peripheral groups mean that there is an ambiguous relationship with herders that exists at several levels. At the economic level, the herder will use lower class groups as herdsman, but deny them access to breeding stock. At the ritual and purity level, the lower class groups might officiate, but be considered polluting. Galaty (1986) is quite clear that Maasai and Dorobo are aware of the "other," but in other cases, such as Bedouin and Solubba, the underclass is almost an unseen backdrop, needed, but not considered human enough to be given much thought. The image of the "other" is a very strong one which makes any possibility of crossing over difficult. Even to contemplate it would require a major ideological adjustment. Spencer (1973) notes that it might take several generations for a Rendille family which has deliberately ceased to be ironworkers to be "marriageable" within the rest of the society and even then only among certain phratries. The difficulties are not only ones of ritual pollution, as in the above example, but also between different modes of production. It would take a major reorganization of the relations of production to allow hunters, even those capable of herding stock, to build the animals into the symbolic and ritual realm that is characteristic of pastoralists.

The overlap in the archaeological assemblages between the Kasteelberg and Witklip sites implies that there was communication between different groups, but mostly of an economic nature. We must ask ourselves why, if there was social contact between these groups over the period 1800–900 B.P. from the archaeological observations, and up to 300 years ago from the historic record (see Parkington 1984), there was no greater merging of the two. The answer probably lies, as discussed here, in the continued marginalization of the hunters on the edge of the more dominant herder society and
restricted access by the hunter to the means of pastoral production: breeding stock.
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