

be revised to accommodate the concerns of stakeholders, who include sponsors, government agencies and local communities. The involvement of multiple stakeholders often leads to the alteration of research designs, management strategies for sites and even access to these sites (Flood, 1989; Creamer, 1990; Pwiti, 1996; Berggren and Hodder, 2003; Chirikure and Pwiti, 2008). In an example given by Berggren and Hodder (2003), foreign archaeologists in the Andes are required to hold rituals to appease the spirits and ensure the success of the project, especially during the exhumation of human burial sites. In Australia, Creamer (1990) has shown how research designs and access to sites were altered after pressure from Aborigines, while Chirikure and Pwiti (2008) have illustrated how community involvement at Old Bulawayo in Zimbabwe had led to wrong site interpretation and presentation. In Botswana, the discovery of human skeletal remains during archaeological research at Bosutswe resulted in conflict between the research team and the local authorities of a neighbouring community (Denbow *et al.*, 2008). This paper however, argues that these challenges are not a sufficient deterrent to warrant lack of stakeholder (especially the community) involvement in archaeological conservation and management.

Integration of community values

Based on research carried out in Botswana, this paper argues that integration of community values into archaeological research is as important as in archaeological conservation and management. As communities consider archaeological and cultural resources to be part of the landscapes they interact with, this can be sustainably beneficial to safeguarding these resources for posterity. During ethnographic surveys undertaken as part of the research study, the communities surveyed clearly stated that they wanted to be consulted in the research and management of archaeological and cultural resources, as they are knowledgeable about these resources and they own them. Through cross-analysis of the responses given during the surveys, it became apparent that knowledge of resources was aligned to archaeological resources while ownership was related to historical resources. Contrary to the fear heritage professionals may have that local communities claim knowledge they do not possess, knowledge in this case included aspects such as, “We know where they are”; “We know how it used to be”; “We know how high this stone wall was and that it had decorations that collapsed”. Having responses such as these is testimony to the need for community engagement in archaeological conservation. Communities traverse landscapes replete with archaeological and cultural resources, and, as such, they can provide information on the location of sites, the processes that might have affected sites over time and on the potential threats to such sites.

Besides the knowledge and ownership of resources, the four communities outlined other cultural values and activities that take place across landscapes that harbour archaeological resources. They also insisted on the need for consultation regarding resources that sit on